



ISSN: 2959-2224 (Online) and 2959-2216 (Print)

Open Access: <https://journals.iub.edu.pk/index.php/uas/index>

Publisher by: Department of Hadith, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan.

## Ibn Ḥajr's Chronological Critique of Ḥadīth Narrations in al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr: A Historical-Critical Study

**Marwan Mas'ud, S.Ag.\***

Bachelor, Hadith Science Study Program, Imam Al-Shafi'i College of Islamic Studies, Indonesia, E-mail: [masudmarwan14@gmail.com](mailto:masudmarwan14@gmail.com)

**Dr. Emha Hasan Ayatullah**

Lecturer, Hadith Science Study Program, Imam Al-Shafi'i College of Islamic Studies, Indonesia, E-mail: [ayatullohemha@gmail.com](mailto:ayatullohemha@gmail.com)

**Dr. Muhid Muhid**

Lecturer, Faculty of Ushuluddin and Philosophy, Sunan Ampel State Islamic University, Indonesia, E-mail: [muhid@unisda.ac.id](mailto:muhid@unisda.ac.id)

### Abstract

This study aims to examine the methodology of historical criticism employed by Ibn Ḥajr in his work *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. It highlights the contribution of isnād and matn criticism in correcting historical inaccuracies. The data used in this research consist of both primary and secondary sources, analyzed descriptively. The theoretical framework adopted is the theory of historical criticism, with conclusions drawn through a deductive approach. The findings clearly show that the scholars of ḥadīth paid great attention to the authenticity of transmissions, both in terms of their chains of narrators (*isnād*) and textual content (*matn*). Ibn Ḥajr, Ibn al-Turkumānī, and other scholars demonstrated a critical stance in examining narrations that contained irregularities (*idṭirāb*), additional wordings, or weaknesses in narrators. On the other hand, numerous narrations were transmitted through multiple transmission routes, thereby strengthening their authority, although scholarly disagreements in evaluation persisted. The historical-critical approach reveals that the authenticity of a ḥadīth cannot be determined solely by the continuity of its isnād, but must also consider the conformity of its matn with historical facts, chronology, and socio-cultural context. Thus, ḥadīth research emphasizes the importance of being cautious, objective, and comparative in assessing narrations to preserve the core message of the Prophet's traditions from distortion and misunderstanding.

**Keywords:** Ibn Ḥajr, al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr, Historical-Critical Study

### Introduction

The study of the Prophet's ḥadīth is one of the Islamic scholarly disciplines that places great emphasis on the authenticity of its sources. Since

\* Email of corresponding author: [masudmarwan14@gmail.com](mailto:masudmarwan14@gmail.com)

**Ibn Ḥajr's Chronological Critique of Ḥadīth Narrations  
in *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*: A Historical-Critical Study**

---

the earliest generations, Muslim scholars have developed meticulous methodologies to scrutinize narrations, both through the analysis of the *isnād* (chain of transmission) and the *matn* (text).<sup>1</sup> One of the most significant contributions to the field of ḥadīth criticism is the work of Ibn Ḥajr al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852 H), *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr fī Takhrīj Aḥādīth al-Rāfiʿī al-Kabīr*, which provides *takhrīj* (source verification) and critical assessment of the ḥadīths found in *al-Sharḥ al-Kabīr* by al-Rāfiʿī.

In this work, Ibn Ḥajr not only engages in *takhrīj* of narrations but also offers in-depth criticism that is chronologically oriented. He frequently discusses the variations in transmission routes, identifies earlier narrations, and compares textual variants based on the chronological order of narrators and their historical contexts. This method demonstrates that Ibn Ḥajr was not merely reiterating the authority of earlier scholars but asserting his independence as a ḥadīth critic with a historical-critical approach. Examining the chronological dimension of Ibn Ḥajr's criticism is crucial because it reveals how ninth-century (*Hijrī*) scholars constructed the authenticity of ḥadīths through an analysis of their historical development. By investigating *isnād* variations, chronological differences among narrators, and textual consistency, this study illuminates the dynamics of classical ḥadīth criticism while showing its relevance to modern theories of historical criticism.

A related previous study, *منهج الحافظ ابن حجر في شرح الغريب من خلال كتابه التلخيص* (*The Method of al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr in Explaining Rare Expressions through His Work al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*) by Saʿīd Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm.<sup>2</sup> examined Ibn Ḥajr's method in explaining rare expressions (*gharīb al-ḥadīth*) in *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. The study showed that Ibn Ḥajr employed multiple methods, such as direct interpretation, quoting jurists and linguists, choosing the strongest meaning (*rājih*), mentioning etymology and morphology, and discussing textual variants and their contexts. The method used was inductive-analytical (*istiqrāʾī-analītīq*), involving the identification of rare terms, presentation of the relevant ḥadīth, explanation of its legal implications, discussion of any underlying ʿillah, and evaluation of narrators. This highlights Ibn Ḥajr's systematic engagement not only with textual collection but also with linguistic analysis.

A third study, *الحديث المنكر في كتاب ابن حجر العسقلاني التلخيص الحبير دراسة نقدية* (*The Munkar Ḥadīths in Ibn Ḥajr al-ʿAsqalānī's al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr: A Critical Applied Study*) by Muḥammad Ṣubḥī Ṭahā Yāsīn and Muṣṭafā Ismāʿīl Muṣṭafā al-ʿUbaydī, investigated *munkar* (rejected) ḥadīths in *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*.<sup>3</sup> focused on Ibn Ḥajr's corrective remarks (*taʿaqubāt*) against al-Nawawī in the same work. The study began with a conceptual explanation of *taʿaqub* and an overview of Ibn Ḥajr's method, followed by a discussion of the various forms of *taʿaqub* employed by him. The author sought to identify the most accurate opinion (*al-rājih*) in each narration based on Ibn Ḥajr's critiques, summarizing the findings with concise and evidence-based arguments.

A third study, *الحديث المنكر في كتاب ابن حجر العسقلاني التلخيص الحبير دراسة نقدية*, نموذجية تطبيقية (*"The Munkar Ḥadīths in Ibn Ḥajr al-ʿAsqalānī's al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr: A Critical Applied Study"*) by Muḥammad Ṣubḥī Ṭahā Yāsīn and Muṣṭafā Ismāʿīl Muṣṭafā al-ʿUbaydī,<sup>4</sup> investigated *munkar* (rejected) ḥadīths in *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. The study discussed definitions, scholarly disagreements, and classifications of *munkar* ḥadīths. It highlighted differences between the comprehensive methods of the early scholars (*mutaqaddimūn*) and the more restrictive approaches of the later scholars (*muta'akhhirūn*). The researchers identified 118 *munkar* ḥadīths—68 of which were analyzed in detail—and categorized them based on the status of their narrators, such as contradicting accepted narrations (*maqḅūl*), being solitary reports (*tafarrud*), weak (*da'if*), unknown (*majhūl*), or abandoned (*matrūk*).

These three prior studies share a common object—*al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*—but differ in focus. Saʿīd Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm examined its linguistic dimension (*gharīb al-ḥadīth*), Aḥmad ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṭālibānī explored Ibn Ḥajr's ta'aqubāt on al-Nawawī, and Muḥammad Ṣubḥī Ṭahā Yāsīn and Muṣṭafā al-ʿUbaydī analyzed *munkar* ḥadīths. By contrast, the present study—*Chronological Criticism of Ḥadīth Narrations by Ibn Ḥajr in al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr: A Historical-Critical Study*—differs by emphasizing a historical-critical analysis of narrations based on the chronology of transmission. Hence, while sharing the same object, it introduces a novel analytical perspective and methodological focus.

This study adopts a historical-critical framework to examine Ibn Ḥajr's approach in *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*, focusing on how he relates the chronological order of transmission to his evaluation of ḥadīth authenticity. The novelty of this research lies in exploring how Ibn Ḥajr utilizes the historical sequence of *isnād* transmission and the development of narrations as a basis for criticism. Thus, the study not only observes his takhrīj methodology or authenticity assessments but also connects the historical dimension with the quality of transmission.

From an academic standpoint, this research offers two main contributions: (1) it clarifies Ibn Ḥajr's manhaj in ḥadīth criticism through a chronological perspective; and (2) it builds a methodological bridge between classical ḥadīth criticism and modern historical-critical theory. The novelty of this study, therefore, lies in its integration of classical and contemporary approaches—a dimension not yet addressed in prior studies of *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*.

### Method

This study employs a qualitative approach, which focuses on understanding and explaining social phenomena from the perspectives of individuals or groups. The library research method serves as the primary technique for data collection in this study.<sup>5</sup> Library research is characterized by four distinctive features: it requires direct engagement with texts, utilizes

ready-to-use data, is not constrained by spatial or temporal limitations, and relies on secondary sources.<sup>6</sup>

This research employs both primary and secondary data. Primary data is data obtained directly from the research subject using direct data collection instruments on the subject as the source of the required information.<sup>7</sup> The primary data are obtained directly from the main object of study—*al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr* by Ibn Ḥajr—while the secondary data are drawn from related scholarly sources, including contemporary journals, classical works such as ḥadīth and takhrīj compilations, and relevant analytical studies.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, secondary data is data obtained from second-hand or third-hand sources.<sup>9</sup> The secondary data used in this research consists of journals, contemporary studies, and classical works such as Hadith books, *takhrīj* books, and others.

This research employs the theory of historical criticism, which is an approach in the study of ancient or sacred texts that focuses on the text's origins, temporal setting, socio-cultural and historical context, authorship or transmission, how the text evolved both in terms of its chain of transmission (*isnad*) and its content (*matn*), within the context of Hadith), and how the text was received by its contemporary audience.<sup>10</sup> The analytical technique used in this research is descriptive analysis, which is a data analysis method aimed at describing the conditions or characteristics of the sample data.<sup>11</sup> Subsequently, the data will be concluded using a deductive approach, which involves analyzing the obtained data from a general perspective and then drawing specific conclusions.<sup>12</sup>

## **Discussion**

### **An Overview of Ibn Ḥajar and His Work *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr***

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (773–852 H) was a distinguished scholar of the Shāfiʿī school, honored with the title *Shaykh al-Islām* and recognized as one of the greatest *ḥuffāz* of his era. He memorized the Qurʾān at the age of nine and mastered various branches of knowledge such as jurisprudence (*fiqh*), legal theory (*uṣūl*), linguistics, history, and literature, while also excelling in poetry. At the age of nineteen, he began to distinguish himself in scholarship and then devoted himself intensively to ḥadīth studies from the year 796 H under the guidance of Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī for ten years.<sup>13</sup> From his teacher, he obtained authorization (*ijāzah*) to teach ḥadīth and went on to produce monumental works such as *Fath al-Bārī*, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, *al-Iṣābah*, *al-Durar al-Kāminah*, and *Nukhbat al-Fikar*.

His scholarly reputation was widely acknowledged by his teachers, students, and later scholars such as al-Sakhāwī, al-Suyūṭī, and al-Biqāʿī, who referred to him as *ḥāfiẓ al-ʿaṣr* and even *ḥāfiẓ al-ʿālam*. Al-Sakhāwī stated: “The praises of the imams for him are countless, and they are in consensus (*ijmāʿ*) regarding his excellence.” Al-ʿIrāqī described him as: “A learned and noble shaykh; a ḥadīth scholar of immense benefit, brilliance, precision, trustworthiness, and integrity; Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad Abū al-Faḍl, son of the

eminent scholar Nūr al-Dīn—unparalleled in his time.”<sup>14</sup> In addition to his vast knowledge, Ibn Ḥajar was also renowned for his noble character.

One of his major works, *al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr fī Takhrīj Ahādīth al-Wajīz al-Kabīr*, was originally titled *al-Tamyīz*. The book is arranged according to fiqh chapters in the same order as *al-Syarḥ al-Kabīr* by Ibn al-Rafī'. In this work, Ibn Ḥajar cites ḥadīths, performs takhrīj, and identifies weaknesses in both the chains (*isnād*) and the texts (*matn*), while mentioning *mutāba'āt*, *shawāhid*, and assessing the degree of authenticity. He also compares the evidences used by differing juristic opinions to determine the stronger view.<sup>15</sup> This work has had a profound influence, serving as a reference for both jurists (*fuqahā'*) and ḥadīth scholars (*muḥaddithūn*), including al-Shawkānī, and was later published in four volumes as a *ḥāshiyah* to *al-Majmū'* by al-Nawawī.

### Ibn Ḥajar's Chronological Criticism of Ḥadīth Narrations

Based on research conducted using al-Maktabah al-Shāmilah with the keyword “غلط” (error), three narrations were found in which Ibn Ḥajar applied historical criticism. This finding highlights his depth and interdisciplinary expertise across ḥadīth, jurisprudence, and history. The following is one example:

#### 1. Historical Criticism of the Narration of Umm Hāni' Regarding the Make-Up Fast (Qadā' Ṣawm)

١١٦٤ - [٣١٢٧] - حديث أم هانئ: دخل علي النبي ﷺ - وأنا صائمة، فناولني فضل شرابه فقلت: يا رسول الله إني كنت صائمة، وإن كرهت أن أرد سؤرك، فقال: «إن كان من قضاء رمضان فصومي يوما مكانه، وإذا كان تطوعا فإن شئت فاقضيه، وإن شئت فلا تقضيه.»  
النسائي من حديث حماد بن سلمة، عن سماك عن هارون بن أم هانئ، عن أم هانئ بهذا. ورواه من طرق أخرى، وليس فيها قوله: «فإن شئت فاقضيه.»  
ورواه أحمد وأبو داود والترمذي والدارقطني والطبراني والبيهقي من طرق عن سماك، واختلف فيه على سماك، وقال النسائي: سماك ليس يعتمد عليه إذا تفرد. وقال البيهقي: في إسناده مقال. وقال ابن القطان: هارون لا يعرف.

تنبيه

اللفظ الذي ذكره الرافعي أورده قاسم بن أصبغ في «جامعه» ومما يدل على غلط سماك فيه، أنه قال في بعض الروايات عنه: إن ذلك كان يوم الفتح، وهي عند النسائي والطبراني، ويوم الفتح كان في رمضان، فكيف يتصور قضاء رمضان في رمضان<sup>16</sup>.

1164 – [3127] – Ḥadīth of Umm Hāni': “The Prophet ﷺ entered upon me while I was fasting, and he offered me some of his leftover drink. I said: ‘O Messenger of Allah, I am fasting, but I dislike to refuse your leftover drink.’ He replied: ‘If it is a make-up fast for Ramaḍān, then fast one day in its place. If it is a voluntary fast, then if you wish, make it up, and if you wish, do not.’”

Al-Nasā'ī<sup>17</sup> narrated it from Ḥammād ibn Salamah, from Simāk, from Hārūn ibn Umm Hāni', from Umm Hāni' with this wording. It was also narrated through other chains, though without the phrase, “if you wish, make it up.”

Aḥmad,<sup>18</sup> Abū Dāwūd,<sup>19</sup> al-Tirmidī,<sup>20</sup> al-Dāraquṭnī,<sup>21</sup> al-Ṭabrānī,<sup>22</sup> dan al-Bayhaqī<sup>23</sup> also transmitted it through the route of Simāk. However, there

were discrepancies in his narrations. Al-Nasā'ī said, "Simāk cannot be relied upon when he narrates alone." Al-Bayhaqī remarked, "There is weakness in its chain." Ibn al-Qaṭṭān stated, "Hārūn is unknown."

Ibn Ḥajar then added that the wording cited by al-Rāfi'ī was also reported by Qāsim ibn Aṣḡagh in his *Jāmi*<sup>24</sup>. One of the indicators of Simāk's error is that in some of his versions, he claimed the event occurred on *Yawm al-Fath* (the Day of the Conquest of Makkah). This version is found in al-Nasā'ī and al-Ṭabarānī. However, the Conquest took place during Ramaḍān—so how could a make-up fast for Ramaḍān occur within Ramaḍān it self?<sup>25</sup>

This narration was also recorded by Ibn Abī 'Āṣim in *al-Ahad wa al-Matsani*,<sup>26</sup> al-Thahawi in *Syarḥ Ma'ani al-Atsar*,<sup>27</sup> al-Baghawi in *Syarḥ al-Sunnah*,<sup>28</sup> al-Darimi,<sup>29</sup> Ibn 'Abd al-Barr in *al-Istidzkar*,<sup>30</sup> dan Abu Dawud al-Thayalisi. The chain was deemed weak by Ibn al-Turkumānī,<sup>31</sup> al-Dhiya' in *Al-Jami' al-Kamil*<sup>32</sup> and al-Arna'ūt (and others) in their verification of Musnad Aḥmad due to inconsistencies (*iḍṭirāb*) in both the chain and the text.

Ibn al-Turkumānī concurred with this assessment in al-Jawhar al-Naqī, stating: "This ḥadīth suffers from inconsistency (*iḍṭirāb*) in both the text and the chain. The textual inconsistency is evident, as the narration claims the event occurred on the Day of the Conquest, while Umm Hāni' embraced Islam during that very conquest, which took place in Ramaḍān—so how could she be making up a Ramaḍān fast during Ramaḍān? As for the chain, discrepancies appear in Simāk's transmission: sometimes from Abū Ṣāliḥ, sometimes from Ja'dah, and sometimes from Hārūn." ...until the end of his statement, it should therefore be critically reviewed."<sup>33</sup> Ibn al-Turkumānī considered this hadith problematic because it suffers from *iḍṭirāb* in both its *matn* and *sanad*, thus its authenticity requires critical re-examination.

The hadith concerning Umm Hāni', as narrated in this report, presents a fascinating yet problematic narrative when analyzed through a historical-critical approach. The report depicts the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ entering upon Umm Hāni' while she was fasting and then offering her his leftover drink. Umm Hāni' refused, stating that she was fasting, although she actually had no desire to refuse the Prophet's leftover drink. The Prophet then provided an explanation: if her fast was for making up a missed Ramadan day (*qaḍā'*), then she was obliged to make up for it on another day; however, if it was a voluntary fast (*ṣawm al-tatawwu'*), she was given a choice to either make it up or not.

This report is documented by a number of prominent Hadith scholars, such as al-Nasā'ī, Aḥmad, Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī, al-Dāraquṭnī, al-Ṭabarānī, and al-Bayhaqī. However, the majority of the transmission chains ultimately trace back to Simāk, from Hārūn bin Umm Hāni', from Umm Hāni'. This is the critical point. Al-Nasā'ī judged that Simāk could not be relied upon when he reported a hadith singularly. Al-Bayhaqī asserted that its chain of transmission (*isnād*) is problematic, while Ibn al-Qaṭṭān confirmed that Hārūn bin Umm Hāni' is unknown (*majhūl*) in the biographical literature (*'ilm al-rijāl*). Consequently, from the perspective of its *isnād*, this hadith is already weak, as it relies on a problematic and obscure transmitter.

From the perspective of the text (*matn*), there are discrepancies in the wording. Some narratives include an additional phrase: "If it is a voluntary fast, then if you wish, make it up, and if you do not wish, do not make it up." However, this additional wording does not appear in other versions. Such variations raise the suspicion of interpolation or an addition by a specific transmitter. The core text regarding making up for Ramadan remains acceptable as it aligns with jurisprudential principles, but the addition concerning the option for voluntary fasts appears weaker.

Furthermore, there is a highly significant historical inconsistency. In one transmission chain, Simāk mentioned that this event occurred on the day of the Conquest of Mecca (*yawm al-fath*). However, the Conquest of Mecca took place in the month of Ramadan. If the event indeed occurred during Ramadan, how could the Prophet have commanded her to make up a Ramadan fast within the same month? Historically, this is difficult to accept and indicates a probable error in the chronological placement by the transmitter.

From a historical-critical perspective, the weakness of the *isnād*, the variant wordings, and the chronological inconsistency collectively indicate that this hadith lacks a solid historical foundation. It is possible that an error occurred in conflating two separate events, or that explanatory additions from a transmitter were later incorporated and considered part of the Prophet's statement. Therefore, although this hadith appears in several major compilations, it cannot be used as a legal proof (*hujjah*) in the absence of a stronger, independent transmission chain.

Thus, the Umm Hāni' report is more accurately classified as a weak (*da'if*) hadith. Its historical value is doubtful, and its content cannot serve as a definitive legal basis. Nevertheless, this hadith provides valuable insight into the dynamics of transmission, illustrating how a text can be altered through transmitters and how historical context serves as a crucial instrument for testing a hadith's authenticity.

## 2. Historical Criticism of the Ḥadīth of Mu'āwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam Concerning His Return from Ḥabashah

٥٢٧- [١٥٠٨]- حديث معاوية بن الحكم السلمي قال: لما رجعت من الحبشة صليت مع رسول الله ﷺ فغطس بعض القوم، فقلت: يرحمك الله، فحدقني القوم بأبصارهم، فقلت: ما شأنكم تنظرون إلي؟ فضربوا بأيديهم على أفخاذهم وهم يسكتونني فسكت، فلما فرغ رسول الله ﷺ قال: «يا معاوية، إن صلاتنا هذه لا يصلح فيها شيء من كلام الناس، إنما هي التسبيح والتكبير وقراءة القرآن.»

مسلم وأبو داود والنسائي وابن حبان والبيهقي. وليس عند واحد منهم: لما رجعت من الحبشة، بل أول الحديث عندهم: بينا أنا أصلي. وقوله: لما رجعت من الحبشة غلط محض لا وجه له، ولم يذكر أحد معاوية بن الحكم في مهاجرة الحبشة، لا من الثقات ولا من «الضعفاء» وكأنه انتقال ذهني من حديث ابن مسعود الذي تقدم، فإن فيه (لما رجعت من الحبشة)<sup>34</sup>.

527 – [1508] The ḥadīth of Mu'āwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam al-Sulamī states: “When I returned from Ḥabashah, I prayed with the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. One of the people sneezed, and I said, *yarḥamuka Allāh* (may Allah have mercy upon you). Then the people stared at me, and I said, ‘What is the matter with you that

you are looking at me?’ They began striking their thighs, signaling for me to be quiet, so I fell silent. When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ finished the prayer, he said: ‘O Mu‘āwiyah! This prayer of ours is not suitable for the speech of human beings; it is only for *tasbīḥ*, *takbīr*, and the recitation of the Qur’ān.’”

This ḥadīth was narrated by Muslim,<sup>35</sup> Abū Dāwūd,<sup>36</sup> al-Nasā’ī,<sup>37</sup> Ibn Ḥibbān,<sup>38</sup> dan al-Bayhaqī.<sup>39</sup> None of them recorded the wording “When I returned from Ḥabashah”; rather, their versions begin with “While I was praying.” Ibn Ḥajar stated that the phrase “When I returned from Ḥabashah” is a pure mistake with no basis. No reliable or even weak transmitter ever mentioned that Mu‘āwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam was among those who migrated to Ḥabashah. This appears to be a case of *intiqāl dhihnī* (mental transference) from the ḥadīth of Ibn Mas‘ūd mentioned earlier, in which the wording “When I returned from Ḥabashah” does appear.<sup>40</sup>

In addition to the narrations cited by Ibn Ḥajar, this ḥadīth was also transmitted by Ibn Abī Shaybah,<sup>41</sup> Ahmad,<sup>42</sup> Ibn Abī ‘Ashim in *al-Aḥad wa al-Matsani*,<sup>43</sup> Ibn al-Jarud,<sup>44</sup> Abu ‘Awanah,<sup>45</sup> al-Baghawī,<sup>46</sup> al-Thayalisi,<sup>47</sup> and was authenticated by al-Albānī,<sup>48</sup> al-Dhiya’,<sup>49</sup> al-Shathrī in his *Tahqīq Mushannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, and by al-Arna’ūt and others in their *Tahqīq Musnad Ahmad*. The multiplicity of transmission routes and corroborations by numerous scholars reinforce the ḥadīth’s authenticity.

The narration of Mu‘āwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam al-Sulamī regarding the Prophet’s rebuke against speaking during prayer offers an instructive case for historical-critical analysis. At first glance, the ḥadīth appears strong, as it is found in the major canonical sources. However, within its transmission layers lies a chronological error that warrants investigation and clarification.

From a *matn* perspective, the narrative’s core meaning is coherent: while Mu‘āwiyah was praying, a worshiper sneezed, and he responded with *yarḥamuka Allāh*. The congregation gestured for him to be silent, and afterward, the Prophet ﷺ clarified that prayer is not a time for ordinary speech, but for *tasbīḥ*, *takbīr*, and the recitation of the Qur’ān—a message consistent with the principle of humility (*khushū‘*) in worship. This central meaning aligns with the ethical and juristic foundations of prayer, giving the report considerable doctrinal reliability.

However, from the perspective of *isnād* and chronology, a textual irregularity arises: some versions introduce the phrase *lammā raja‘tu min al-Ḥabashah* (“When I returned from Ḥabashah”). As Ibn Ḥajar and other critics note, this opening does not appear in any reliable transmissions, all of which instead begin with *bayna anā uṣallī* (“While I was praying”). The reference to Ḥabashah is historically problematic because no records—whether from trustworthy or weak transmitters—mention Mu‘āwiyah’s participation in the migration to Ḥabashah.

From a historical-critical standpoint, such inconsistencies suggest possible causes: (1) *intiqāl dhihnī*—mental confusion between two similar reports, (2) textual interpolation by a copyist who inadvertently merged openings from different ḥadīths, or (3) oral transmission errors that became

fixed in writing. The critical-historical method therefore requires cross-verification between internal evidence (textual coherence and semantic consistency) and external evidence (chronology, transmission independence, and historical plausibility).

In this case, the internal evidence supports the authenticity of the ethical-ritual message—namely, the prohibition of talking during prayer—since this message harmonizes with many other Prophetic traditions. The external evidence, however, necessitates purging the anomalous clause concerning Ḥabashah. The most historically defensible reading, therefore, is the one beginning with “While I was praying,” without the Ḥabashah reference. In other words, the substantive message of the ḥadīth remains valid, but its chronological addition must be rejected as a redactional error.

Methodologically, this implies that when jurists or scholars cite this ḥadīth as evidence, they should rely on versions transmitted through independent, reliable routes (such as those of Muslim and al-Nasā’ī), rather than on manuscripts containing anomalous openings. The clause about Ḥabashah represents textual contamination—it does not undermine the moral-ritual truth of the ḥadīth but weakens any temporal or historical claim associated with it.

For further research, one might systematically catalog all *isnād* and textual variants from early manuscripts, study the biographies of key transmitters associated with the problematic wording, and compare them with parallel reports (such as that of Ibn Mas‘ūd) to reconstruct how the confusion emerged. Ultimately, historical-critical analysis confirms that the redactional error is real and explainable through the mechanics of textual transmission, while the core teaching about proper conduct during prayer remains sound and traceable to authentic sources.

### 3. Historical Criticism of the ‘Umrah of the Prophet ﷺ from al-Ji‘rānah

١٢٢٦ - قوله: نقلوا أنه صلى الله عليه وسلم اعتمر من الجعرانة مرتين؛ مرة في عمرة القضاء، ومرة في عمرة هوازن. كذا وقع فيه، وهو غلط واضح، فإنه ﷺ لم يعتمر في عمرة القضاء من الجعرانة. وكيف يتصور أن يتوجه ﷺ من المدينة إلى جهة الطائف، حتى يحرم من الجعرانة، ويتجاوز ميقات المدينة، وكيف يلتئم هذا مع قوله: قيل إنه ﷺ لم يحرم إلا من الميقات، بل في «الصحيحين» من:

[٣٢٧٧]- حديث أنس: أنه ﷺ اعتمر أربع عمر كلهن في ذي القعدة، إلا التي مع حجته؛ عمرة من الحديبية، أو زمن الحديبية في ذي القعدة، وعمرة من العام المقبل في ذي القعدة، وعمرة من الجعرانة، حيث قسم غنائم حنين في ذي القعدة، وعمرة مع حجته.

[٣٢٧٨]- ولأبي داود والترمذي وابن ماجه وابن حبان والحاكم من حديث ابن عباس قال: اعتمر رسول الله

ﷺ أربع عمر؛ عمرة الحديبية، والثانية حين تواطئوا على عمرة من قابل .... الحديث.

وذكر الواقدي: أن إجماعه من الجعرانة كان ليلة الأربعاء لاثنتي عشرة ليلة بقيت من ذي القعدة<sup>50</sup>.

1226 – The statement: “They transmitted that the Prophet ﷺ performed ‘umrah from al-Ji‘rānah twice—once during the ‘umrah of al-qaḍā’ and once during the ‘umrah of Hawāzin.” This statement is manifestly erroneous. The Prophet ﷺ did not perform *ihrām* for the ‘umrah of al-qaḍā’ from al-Ji‘rānah. It is inconceivable that he would depart from Madīnah toward Tā’if, passing beyond the miqāt of Madīnah, merely to assume *ihrām* from al-Ji‘rānah. This

also contradicts the report stating that “he ﷺ never entered into *iḥrām* except from the designated *miqāt*.”

In both *al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*<sup>51</sup> the ḥadīth of Anas [no. 3277] states that the Prophet ﷺ performed four ‘umrahs, all in the month of Dhū al-Qa‘dah, except the one combined with his ḥajj: the ‘umrah of al-Ḥudaybiyyah (or during its year), the ‘umrah of the following year, the ‘umrah from al-Ji‘rānah (when he distributed the spoils of Ḥunayn), and the ‘umrah performed with his ḥajj.

[3278] – Likewise Abū Dāwud,<sup>52</sup> al-Tirmidī,<sup>53</sup> Ibn Mājah,<sup>54</sup> Ibn Hibbān,<sup>55</sup> dan al-Ḥākim<sup>56</sup> transmit from Ibn ‘Abbās that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ performed four ‘umrahs: the ‘umrah of al-Ḥudaybiyyah, the subsequent one the following year, and so forth. Al-Wāqidī records that the Prophet ﷺ entered *iḥrām* from al-Ji‘rānah on a Wednesday night, twelve days remaining in Dhū al-Qa‘dah.<sup>57</sup>

The hadith from Anas is not only recorded in *al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* (al-Bukhari and Muslim) but is also transmitted by Aḥmad,<sup>58</sup> al-Darimi,<sup>59</sup> Abu Dawud,<sup>60</sup> al-Tirmidī,<sup>61</sup> al-Thahawi,<sup>62</sup> Ibn Hibban,<sup>63</sup> al-Bayhaqī,<sup>64</sup> al-Baghawi.<sup>65</sup> As for the hadith from Ibn ‘Abbās, in addition to the chains of transmission mentioned by Ibn Ḥajar, it is also narrated by Aḥmad,<sup>66</sup> Ibn Sa‘ad,<sup>67</sup> al-Darimi,<sup>68</sup> al-Thahawi,<sup>69</sup> al-Thabrani,<sup>70</sup> al-Bayhaqī,<sup>71</sup> Furthermore, its authenticity has been verified (*ṣaḥīḥ*) by al-Hakim, al-Dzahabi, al-Albani,<sup>72</sup> al-Dhiya,<sup>73</sup> al-Arna‘ūt, and others in their critical editions (*taḥqīq*) of *Musnad Aḥmad*, *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, and *Sunan Ibn Mājah*.

Ibn Hajar's commentary contains a claim that appears trivial on the surface—that the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ assumed the state of *iḥrām* from al-Ji‘rānah twice—but when analyzed through the lens of historical criticism, it reveals multiple layers of interpretation, factual inaccuracies, and transmission mechanisms that explain why this claim emerged and why it is historically untenable. Using a historical-critical approach, this issue will be narratively unpacked, combining textual, chronological, and geographical evidence to demonstrate the most plausible historical reading.

First, it is essential to recall the context: the primary, reliable reports (including the narrations from Anas and the statements of Ibn ‘Abbās found in *al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* and several *Sunan* works) consistently state that the Prophet ﷺ performed four major ‘umrahs: namely, the ‘*Umrat al-Ḥudaybiyyah*, the ‘umrah the following year (‘*Umrat al-Qaḍā*’), the ‘umrah from al-Ji‘rānah (related to the distribution of the spoils of Hunayn), and the ‘umrah performed in conjunction with his Farewell Pilgrimage (*Hajjat al-Wadā*). In this sequence, al-Ji‘rānah appears once as the point of *iḥrām* specifically linked to the events after Hunayn, and not as the *mīqāt* for ‘*Umrat al-Qaḍā*. This assertion is widespread across many primary sources, forming a stable documentary pattern: one instance of assuming *iḥrām* from al-Ji‘rānah at a specific time and context.

From the perspective of chronological and geographical criticism, the claim that the Prophet ﷺ assumed *iḥrām* from al-Ji‘rānah twice—once for ‘*Umrat al-Qaḍā*’ and once for the ‘umrah following Hunayn—contains a

clear error. Geographically, al-Ji'rānah is located on the route towards Ṭā'if, whereas 'Umrat al-Qaḍā' (which occurred after the Treaty of al-Ḥudaybiyyah) involved travel from Medina to Mecca, and it is conventionally understood that his *iḥrām* was assumed from the *mīqāt* for Medina (Dhū al-Ḥulayfah) or the applicable *mīqāt* for people coming from that direction. It is historically difficult to imagine the Prophet ﷺ deliberately traveling far towards Ṭā'if solely to assume *iḥrām* from al-Ji'rānah, bypassing the *mīqāt* that was designated for his caravan from Medina. Furthermore, there are transmission reports stating that the Prophet never assumed *iḥrām* except from a *mīqāt*—this assertion adds weight to the argument that the clause "he assumed *iḥrām* from al-Ji'rānah for 'Umrat al-Qaḍā'" contradicts the pattern recorded in the earliest sources.

Methodologically, historical criticism demands two types of evidence: internal evidence (textual coherence and consistency) and external evidence (chronology, geography, and the independence of transmission chains). The internal evidence here shows a strong consistency in the wording supporting the "four 'umrahs" scenario with al-Ji'rānah mentioned once. The external evidence—particularly considerations of *mīqāt* locations and the dates provided by historians like al-Wāqidī (who specifies the night of assuming *iḥrām* from al-Ji'rānah as a particular Wednesday, with twelve nights remaining in Dhū al-Qa'dah)—strengthens the interpretation that al-Ji'rānah was involved on a single, specific occasion (post-Hunayn). The incompatibility of the "twice at al-Ji'rānah" claim with this evidence renders it anomalous.

Why, then, did this erroneous claim emerge and spread? Historical criticism pays attention to the mechanisms of oral and written transmission: conflation (the merging) of similar or temporally close events by transmitters or copyists easily occurs; misreading or scribal errors could transfer location details from one event to another; and the collective memory of a community or historians might attach a familiar geographical point (like al-Ji'rānah) to more than one episode. Additionally, some chronicles or local records (e.g., certain works by al-Wāqidī or regional chronologies) sometimes provide differing date specifics, which later readers or copyists might have mistakenly attempted to synchronize. In textual criticism terminology, this is a case of "narrative attribute transfer" due to overlapping memory of reports.

From an *isnād* perspective, the contradictory claim is generally not supported by strong, independent chains that affirm two instances of assuming *iḥrām* from al-Ji'rānah. Conversely, the most coherent and widely supported variant is the one that places al-Ji'rānah as the point of *iḥrām* only once. The historical-critical principle prioritizes variants that are earliest, most internally consistent, and have the most transmission chains—this again indicates that the most reasonable historical reconstruction is a single instance of assuming *iḥrām* from al-Ji'rānah.

The implications of this analysis are twofold. Historically, this correction is important for reconstructing the chronology of the Prophet's ﷺ journeys and for understanding the practice of *mīqāt* in early Islam. Methodologically, this case serves as a concrete example of why Hadith

researchers must balance the authority of traditional reports with chronological-geographical verification and the examination of independent chains; seemingly minor errors in place or time can signal broader transmission interference. Nonetheless, this correction does not overhaul the core legal or ritual principles related to *‘umrah*—the fact that the Prophet performed several *‘umrahs* within a specific period remains intact—rather, it clarifies the precise locations where each *‘umrah* was initiated.

Thus, a historical-critical reading of this text affirms that the claim of "assuming *iḥrām* from al-Ji’rānah twice" is a historical error arising from the conflation of reports and transmissional inconsistencies. The most historically accountable reconstruction is that the Prophet ﷺ assumed *iḥrām* from al-Ji’rānah only once (related to the events after Hunayn), while *‘Umrat al-Qaḍā’* and his other *‘umrahs* had different points of *iḥrām* and chronological contexts, as indicated by the sound narrations and early chronicles. For further verification, subsequent studies are recommended, involving the mapping of *isnād* and textual variants in early manuscripts and the examination of historical sources that confirm the dates of these events.

### **Conclusion**

From the preceding discussion, it is evident that Hadīth scholars place significant emphasis on the authenticity of narrations, scrutinizing both their chains of transmission (*sanad*) and their textual content (*matn*). Scholars such as Ibn Ḥajar, Ibn al-Turkumānī, and others demonstrated a critical stance in sifting out narrations afflicted by *idṭirāb* (inconsistency), textual additions, or weak transmitters. On the other hand, many narrations are disseminated through multiple transmission channels, thereby strengthening their authority, although differences in assessment among scholars persist. The historical-critical approach reveals that the authenticity of a hadīth is not measured solely by an unbroken *sanad*, but also by the conformity of its *matn* with historical facts, chronology, and social context. Thus, Hadīth research underscores the necessity of a cautious, objective, and comparative approach in evaluating narrations, ensuring that the core message of the Hadīth is preserved from distortion and misinterpretation.



All Rights Reserved © 2025 This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

## References &amp; Notes:

- <sup>1</sup> Luthfi Maulana, "Periodesasi Perkembangan Studi Hadits (Dari Tradisi Lisan/Tulisan Hingga Berbasis Digital)," *ESENSIA: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Ushuluddin* 17, no. 1 (2016): 111–23, <https://doi.org/10.14421/esensia.v17i1.1282>.
- <sup>2</sup> Sa'īd Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥalīm, "*Manhaj al-Hāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar fī Sharḥ al-Gharīb min Ḳhilāl Kitābihi al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*," Majallat 'Ulūm al-Lughā wa al-Adab, ahead of print, April 1, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.21608/mala.2023.213450.1180>.
- <sup>3</sup> Sa'īd Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥalīm, "*Ta'qibāt al-Hāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī fī Kitābihi al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr 'alā Ibn al-Mulqan fīmā Qāla fīhi 'Gharīb, lā Yaḥḍurnī min Kharrajah' Amthila Tatbīqiyya*," Majallat 'Ulūm al-Lughā wa al-Adab 13, no. 13 (2025): 72–93, <https://doi.org/10.21608/mala.2023.213447.1179>.
- <sup>4</sup> Muḥammad, Ṣubḥī Tāhā Yāsīn and al-'Ubaydī, Muṣṭafā Ismā'īl Muṣṭafā, *al-Ḥadīth al-Munkar fī Kitāb Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī (al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr) – Dirāsa Naqdiyya Namūdhajīyya Tatbīqiyya* (al-Jāmi'a al-Islāmiyya, Baghdād, 2009), 1–328, <https://search.mandumah.com/Record/553349>.
- <sup>5</sup> Loraine Busetto et al., "How to Use and Assess Qualitative Research Methods," *Neurological Research and Practice* 2, no. 1 (2020): 14, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42466-020-00059-z>.
- <sup>6</sup> Michelle M Kelly et al., "Secondary Data Analysis: Using Existing Data to Answer New Questions," *J. Pediatr. Health Care* 38, no. 4 (2024): 615–18, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedhc.2024.03.005>.
- <sup>7</sup> I. Gusti Bagus Rai Utama et al., *Metodologi Penelitian Bidang Manajemen Dan Pariwisata (Dilengkapi Studi Kasus Penelitian dan Pembahasannya)* (Deepublish, 2023), 128.
- <sup>8</sup> Aḥmad ibn 'Alī Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Al-Tamyīz Fī Talkhīṣ Takhrij Aḥādīth Sharḥ al-Wajīz al-Mashhūr Bi-al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*, 1st ed., ed. Muḥammad al-Thānī ibn 'Umar ibn Mūsā (Dār Aḍwā' al-Salaf, 2007).
- <sup>9</sup> Dr Ahmad Tohardi, *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian Sosial + Plus* (Tanjungpura University Press, 2019), 702.
- <sup>10</sup> I Howard Marshall, "Historical Criticism," *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, Paternoster Exeter, 1977, 126–38.
- <sup>11</sup> Hossein Nassaji, "Qualitative and Descriptive Research: Data Type versus Data Analysis," *Language Teaching Research* 19, no. 2 (2015): 129–32, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815572747>.
- <sup>12</sup> Theophilus Azungah, "Qualitative Research: Deductive and Inductive Approaches to Data Analysis," *Qualitative Research Journal* 18, no. 4 (2018): 383–400, <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRJ-D-18-00035>.
- <sup>13</sup> Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr Fī Takhrij Aḥādīth al-Rāfi'ī al-Kabīr*, 1st ed. (Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1989). Vol. 1, p. 26.
- <sup>14</sup> Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī, *Al-Jawāhir Wa-al-Durar Fī Tarjamat Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Ḥajar*, 1st ed., ed. Ibrāhīm Bājīs 'Abd al-Majīd (Dār Ibn Ḥazm li-al-Ṭibā'ah wa-al-Nashr wa-al-Tawzī', 1999). Vol. 1, p. 264. Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Al-Gharā'ib al-Multaqaṭah Min Musnad al-Firdaws al-Musammā: Zahru al-Firdaws*, 1st ed., ed. al-'Arabī al-Dā'iz al-Firyāṭi et al. (Jam'iyyat Dār al-Birr, 2018). Vol. 1, p. 83.
- <sup>15</sup> Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Al-Gharā'ib al-Multaqaṭah Min Musnad al-Firdaws al-Musammā: Zahru al-Firdaws*. Vol. 1, p. 6.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Al-Tamyīz Fī Talkhīṣ Takhrij Aḥādīth Sharḥ al-Wajīz al-Mashhūr Bi-al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. Vol. 3, p. 1468.
- <sup>17</sup> Aḥmad ibn Shu'ayb Al-Nasā'ī, *Sunan Al-Nasā'ī (Maṭbū' Ma'a Sharḥ al-Suyūṭī Wa Ḥāshiyat al-Sindī)*, 1st ed., ed. reviewed by Shaykh Ḥasan Muḥammad al-Mas'ūdī Group of scholars (Al-Maktabah al-Tijārīyah al-Kubrā, 1930). No. 3291, vol. 3, p. 366.
- <sup>18</sup> Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad Al-Imām Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal*, 1st ed., ed. Shu'ayb al-Arna'ūt et al. (Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2001). No. 26897, vol. 44, p. 467.

**Ibn Ḥajr's Chronological Critique of Ḥadīth Narrations  
in al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr: A Historical-Critical Study**

---

- <sup>19</sup> Sulaymān ibn al-Ash'ath Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, 1st ed., ed. Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūt and Muḥammad Kāmil Qarah Balālī, Sunan (Dār al-Risālah al-'Ālamiyyah, 1430). No. 2456, vol. 4, p. 115.
- <sup>20</sup> Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā al-Tirmidhī, *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*, 2nd ed., ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (vol. 1–2) et al., al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaḥīḥ (Sharikat Maktabah wa-Maṭba'ah Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1395). No. 731, vol. 3, p. 100.
- <sup>21</sup> 'Alī ibn 'Umar al-Dāraquṭnī, *Sunan Al-Dāraquṭnī*, 1st ed., ed. Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūt et al. (Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2004). No. 2227, vol. 3, p. 133.
- <sup>22</sup> Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad Al-Tabarānī, *Al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, 2nd ed., ed. Ḥamdī ibn 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī (Maktabat Ibn Taymīyah, n.d.). vol. 24, p. 106.
- <sup>23</sup> Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, 3rd ed., ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aṭā (Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2003). No. 8348, vol. 4, p. 458.
- <sup>24</sup> 'Abd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad al-Rāfi'ī, *Al-'Azīz Syarḥ al-Wajīz, Known as al-Sharḥ al-Kabīr*, 1st ed., ed. 'Alī Muḥammad 'Awaḍ and 'Ādil Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawjūd (Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1997). vol. 3, p. 244.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Al-Tamyīz Fī Talkhīṣ Takhrij Aḥādīth Sharḥ al-Wajīz al-Mashhūr Bi-al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. Vol. 3, p. 1468.
- <sup>26</sup> Aḥmad ibn 'Amr Ibn Abī 'Āsim, *Al-Āḥād Wa al-Mathānī*, 1st ed., ed. Bāsim Faysal Aḥmad al-Jawābirah (Dār al-Rāyah, 1991). No. 3153, vol. 1, p. 460.
- <sup>27</sup> Ahmad ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭahāwī, *Syarḥ Ma'ānī al-Ātsār*, 1st ed., ed. Muḥammad Zuhri al-Najjār and Muḥammad Sayyid Jād al-Ḥaqq ('Ālam al-Kutub, 1994). No. 3476, vol. 2, p. 107.
- <sup>28</sup> al-Ḥusayn ibn Mas'ūd al-Baghawī, *Syarḥ al-Sunnah*, 2nd ed., ed. Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūt and Muḥammad Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh (al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1983). vol. 6, p. 371.
- <sup>29</sup> 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī, *Musnad Al-Dārimī*, 1st ed., ed. Marzūq ibn Hiyās Āl Marzūq al-Zahrānī (Printed at the expense of Shaykh Jam'ān ibn Ḥasan al-Zahrānī, 2015). No. 1759, vol. 1, p. 564.
- <sup>30</sup> Yūsuf ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Al-Istidhkār*, 1st ed., ed. Sālim Muḥammad 'Aṭā and Muḥammad 'Alī Mu'waḍ (Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2000). Vol. 3, p. 356.
- <sup>31</sup> 'Alī ibn 'Uthmān Ibn al-Turkumānī, *Al-Jawhar al-Naqī 'alā Sunan al-Bayhaqī* (Dār al-Fikr, n.d.). vol. 4, p. 278.
- <sup>32</sup> Muhammad 'Abdullah al-Dhiya', *Al-Jami' al-Kamil Fi al-Hadits al-Shahih al-Kamil*, I (Dar al-Salam, 2016). vol. 4, p. 675.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibn al-Turkumānī, *Al-Jawhar al-Naqī 'alā Sunan al-Bayhaqī*. vol. 4, p. 278.
- <sup>34</sup> Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Al-Tamyīz Fī Talkhīṣ Takhrij Aḥādīth Sharḥ al-Wajīz al-Mashhūr Bi-al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. Vol. 2, p. 810.
- <sup>35</sup> Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Corrected edition compared to several manuscripts and reliable copies, ed. Aḥmad ibn Rif'at ibn 'Uthmān Ḥilmī al-Qarah Ḥiṣārī et al., Within the Takhrij Service (Dār al-Ṭibā'ah al-'Āmirah, 1334). No. 537, vol. 2, p. 70.
- <sup>36</sup> Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. No. 930, vol. 2, p. 191.
- <sup>37</sup> Al-Nasā'ī, *Sunan Al-Nasā'ī (Maṭbū' Ma'a Sharḥ al-Suyūfī Wa Ḥāshiyat al-Sindī)*. No. 1218, vol. 3, p. 14. Aḥmad ibn Shu'ayb al-Nasā'ī, *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, 1st ed., ed. Ḥasan 'Abd al-Mun'im Shalabī (Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2001). No. 561, vol. 1, p. 297.
- <sup>38</sup> Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān ibn Aḥmad al-Tamīmī al-Bustī Ibn Ḥibbān, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān: Al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ 'alā al-Taqaṣīm Wa-al-Anwā' Min Ghayr Wujūd Qaṭ' Fī Sanadīhā Wa-Lā Thubūt Jarḥ Fī Nāqilīhā*, 1st ed., ed. Muḥammad 'Alī Sönmez and Khāliṣ Āy Demir (Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2012). No. 2755, vol. 3, p. 463.
- <sup>39</sup> al-Bayhaqī, *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*. No. 3918, vol. 2, p. 507. Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, *Al-Asmā' Wa-al-Ṣifāt*, 1st ed., ed. 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥashidī (Maktabat al-Sawwādī, 1993). No. 590, vol. 2, p. 325.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Al-Tamyīz Fī Talkhīṣ Takhrij Aḥādīth Sharḥ al-Wajīz al-Mashhūr Bi-al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. Vol. 2, p. 810.
- <sup>41</sup> 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad Ibn Abī Shaybah, *Al-Muṣannaḥ*, 1st ed., ed. Sa'd ibn Nāṣir ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz Abū Ḥabīb al-syathrī, vol. 25 (Dār Kunūz Ishbīliyā lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzī', 2015). No. 8235, vol. 5, p. 235.

- <sup>42</sup> Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*, 1st ed., ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā‘ūṭ et al. (Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 2001). No. 23766, vol. 39, p. 181.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibn Abī ‘Āsim, *Al-Āḥād Wa al-Mathānī*. No. 1398, vol. 3, p. 82.
- <sup>44</sup> ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Jārūd, *Al-Muntaqā Min al-Sunan al-Musnadah ‘an Rasūl Allāh*, 1st ed., ed. Abū Ishāq al-Ḥuwaynī (Dār al-Taqwā, 2007), 87.
- <sup>45</sup> Ya‘qūb ibn Ishāq Abū ‘Awānah al-Isfarā‘īnī, *Al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Mukhrij ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 1st ed., ed. Graduate theses and al-Jāmi‘ah al-Islāmiyyah academic research at the Faculty of Ḥadīth (al-Jāmi‘ah al-Islāmiyyah, 2014). vol. 17, p. 529.
- <sup>46</sup> al-Baghawī, *Syarḥ al-Sunnah*. Vol. 3, p. 238.
- <sup>47</sup> Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī, *Musnad Abī Dāwūd Al-Ṭayālīsī*. No. 1201, vol. 2, p. 427.
- <sup>48</sup> Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn ibn al-Ḥājj Nūḥ al-Albānī, *Silsilat Al-Aḥādīth al-Ṣaḥīḥah Wa-Shay’ Min Fiqhihā Wa-Fawā’idihā*, 1st ed. (Maktabat al-Ma‘ārif lil-Nashr wa-al-Tawzī‘, 1995). Vol. 5, p. 494. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn ibn al-Ḥājj Nūḥ al-Albānī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaḥīr Wa-Ziyādātih* (al-Maktab al-Islāmī, n.d.). Vol. 1, p. 450. Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Irwā’ al-Ghalīl fī Takhrij Aḥādīth Manār al-Sabīl*, al-Ṭab‘ah al-Thāniyah (al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1405). Vol. 2, p. 112.
- <sup>49</sup> al-Dhiya’, *Al-Jami‘ al-Kamil Fi al-Ḥadīth al-Shaḥīḥ al-Kamil*, I. Vol. 1, p. 450. .
- <sup>50</sup> Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Al-Tamyīz Fī Talkhīṣ Takhrij Aḥādīth Sharḥ al-Wajīz al-Mashhūr Bi-al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. Vol. 3, p. 1534.
- <sup>51</sup> Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Sulṭāniyyah, ed. Jamā‘a min al-‘Ulamā’ (al-Maṭba‘a al-Kubrā al-Amīriyya (original) / Dār Ṭawq al-Najāh (reprint), 1893). No. 1780, vol. 3, p.3. ; Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. No. 1253, vol. 4, p. 60.
- <sup>52</sup> Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. No. 1993, vol. 3, p. 349.
- <sup>53</sup> al-Tirmidhī, *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*. No. 816, vol. 3, p. 171.
- <sup>54</sup> Muḥammad ibn Yazīd ibn Mājah, *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, 1st ed., ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā‘ūṭ et al. (Dār al-Risāla al-‘Ālamiyya, 2009). No. 3003, vol. 4, p. 210.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibn Ḥibbān, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān: Al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ ‘alā al-Taqāṣīm Wa-al-Anwā‘ Min Ghayr Wujūd Qaṭ‘ Fī Sanadīhā Wa-Lā Thubūt Jarḥ Fī Nāqilīhā*. No. 3003, vol. 4, p. 210.
- <sup>56</sup> Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Ḥākīm, ed., *Al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, al-Ṭab‘ah al-‘Ulā, vol. 4 (Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1990). No. 4372, vol. 3, p. 52.
- <sup>57</sup> Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Al-Tamyīz Fī Talkhīṣ Takhrij Aḥādīth Sharḥ al-Wajīz al-Mashhūr Bi-al-Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr*. Vol. 3, p. 1534.
- <sup>58</sup> Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*. No. 11732, vol. 19, p. 368.
- <sup>59</sup> al-Dārimī, *Musnad Al-Dārimī*. No. 1811, vol. 1, p. 581.
- <sup>60</sup> Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. No. 1994, vol. 3, p. 350.
- <sup>61</sup> al-Tirmidhī, *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*. No. 816, vol. 3, p. 171.
- <sup>62</sup> al-Ṭaḥāwī, *Syarḥ Ma‘ānī al-Ātsār*. No. 3719, vol. 2, p. 153.
- <sup>63</sup> Ibn Ḥibbān, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān: Al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ ‘alā al-Taqāṣīm Wa-al-Anwā‘ Min Ghayr Wujūd Qaṭ‘ Fī Sanadīhā Wa-Lā Thubūt Jarḥ Fī Nāqilīhā*. No. 5480, vol. 6, p. 395.
- <sup>64</sup> al-Bayhaqī, *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*. No. 8792, vol. 4, p. 581.
- <sup>65</sup> al-Baghawī, *Syarḥ al-Sunnah*. No. 1846, vol. 7, p. 11.
- <sup>66</sup> Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*. No. 2211, vol. 4, p. 87.
- <sup>67</sup> Muḥammad ibn Sa‘d ibn Sa‘d, *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr*, 1st ed., ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad ‘Umar (Maktabat al-Khānījī, 2001). Vol. 2, p. 155.
- <sup>68</sup> al-Dārimī, *Musnad Al-Dārimī*. No. 1881, vol. 1, p. 605.
- <sup>69</sup> al-Ṭaḥāwī, *Syarḥ Ma‘ānī al-Ātsār*. No. 3701, vol. 2, p. 149.
- <sup>70</sup> Al-Tabarānī, *Al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*. No. 11629, vol. 11, p. 246.
- <sup>71</sup> al-Bayhaqī, *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*. No. 8842, vol. 5, p. 18.
- <sup>72</sup> al-Albānī, *Irwā’ al-Ghalīl fī Takhrij Aḥādīth Manār al-Sabīl*. Vol. 4, p. 292.
- <sup>73</sup> al-Dhiya’, *Al-Jami‘ al-Kamil Fi al-Ḥadīth al-Shaḥīḥ al-Kamil*, I. Vol. 5, p. 399.