
Al-Sindi b. Abbān surnamed Abū Naṣr was a ghulām, slave, of Khalaf b. Hishām (d. 227), a scholar of Baghdaḍ. He had some interest in Hadith and was a pupil of Yahyā b. ‘Abbās al-Hāmīd al-Himmānī (d. 228), a Traditionist of al-Kūf. ‘Abbās al-Ṣamad b. ‘Alī al-Ṭashﬁ received Ḥadīth from him. He died in the month of Dhū ‘l-Ḥijja, 281/894.1

17. Abū ’l-Fawāris Abū Ḥamād b. Muḥammad b. Ḥasan b. al-Sindi (244-349 A.H.).

Abū Ḥamād, as the patronymic al-Sindi suggests, was a great grandson of a certain Indian slave. He was born in Egypt in 244 A.H. and was probably connected with a soap manufacturing business which gave him the nisba al-Ṣābi. Abū Ḥamād enjoyed a long life of one hundred and five years and died in Shawwāl, 349 A.H.2 Aḥmad transmitted Ḥadīth on the authority of al-Muzani (d. 264)3 and Yūnūs b. ‘Abbās al-ʿAla (d. 264), both Traditionists of Egypt, and Muḥammad b. Hammad al-Ṭibrānī (d. 271).4 Although al-Suyūṭī in his Ḥusn al-Muḥādhirā speaks very highly of him as a respectable authority of Apostolic Traditions in Egypt,5 in the opinion of more critical scholars of Asmāʾ al-Riḍāʾ, like al-Dhahabi and Ibn Ḥajar, Aḥmad was hardly trustworthy. For, firstly he was responsible for giving circulation to a baseless (bāṭil) Ḥadīth from his shaykh, Muḥammad al-Ṭibrānī and, secondly, he was found to have narrated in the Gharāʾib of Mālik a Ḥadīth6 with isnād consisting of

---

1. Ibid., Vol. IX, p. 234.
3. He was a famous disciple of Šāhānshāh al-Ṣābi (d. 294) (Shāhānshāh, Vol. II, p. 148).
5. al-ʿAbbās b. al-Faḍl b. ‘Awn al-Ṭanūṣī and Sawāda b. Ibrāhīm al-Anṣārī of whom the first was a liar and the other, a weak authority (ṣiḥḥī). To add to the above, in the opinion of Ibn al-Mundhir, Aḥmad was a liar (kābūb).

Aḥmad, surnamed Abū Bakr al-Ḥaddād (the blacksmith) settled at Ḫaṭṭīya bani Jīdār, a quarter in Baghdaḍ.6 His teachers in Ḥadīth were Muṣa b. Ḥārūn, the Ḥafiz (d. 294), Muḥammad b. ‘Abbās al-Muaddib (7) and al-Ḥasan b. ‘Aḥwāy yā al-Qāṭṭān (7). He was a reliable (thīqa) transmitter of Ḥadīth. Ḫāraqānī (d. 385) admitted him as such. Among his students, the famous was Abū Nuʿaym al-Ḥisfānī. A saintly personage, Aḥmad was reckoned as one whose prayers were granted (ṣajab al-dawāʿī). He died in 359/969.6 The nisba al-Sindi refers to his Indian origin.6


Naṣru-ʾl-ḥāk, who was the grandson of a Sindi slave purchased in Khusrāsān, became famous as Ibn al-Sindi. He narrated Ḥadīth on the authority of Abū ’l-ʿQāsim b. Ṣāḥib (7). Ibn al-Sindi had the privilege of being a shaykh of al-Khaṭṭīb al-Baghdaḍī (d. 463) who copied Aḥmadīth from him and regarded him ṣadūq (truthful). He died in Dhū ’l-Ḥaḍaʾ, 433 A.H.7

---

4. Anṣāb, fol. 24a, 31b. The name of the quarter is misprinted in Khaṭṭīb (Vol. IV, p. 187), as Naṣru ʾl-Ḥāṣib ʿal-Ḥaddād.

Abū Muḥammad al-Hindi was a freedman of Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Samʿānī, (466-510), the father of 'Abd al-Karīm al-Samʿānī (506-66), the author of the Kitāb al-Anṣāb. His nisba al-Hindi refers to his origin from India.

Abū Muḥammad studied Hadith under his master Abū Bakr who took him with him for further education in the subject to al-Ṭrāq, al-Ḥijāz and al-Shām. Thus in Baghdād he acquired Hadith from Jaʿfar b. Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sarrāj, Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Saʿūd al-Anṣāri and others; at Hamadān, from 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ḥamd b. al-Ḥasan al-Duwini; at Isfahān, from Muḥammad b. al-Haddād. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Samʿānī heard from him a few Traditions. He died at Marw in Ṣafar, 541/1149.¹


A contemporary and probably a brother of Abū Muḥammad al-Hindi just noticed, Abū ʾl-Ḥasan was a Traditionist and an Ascetic (Ṣafī). He was a freedman of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Yaʿqūbī, a Qāḍī of Bushanāt,² and became famous as a teacher of 'Abd al-Karīm al-Samʿānī. Like Abū Muḥammad al-Hindi, Abū ʾl-Ḥasan travelled with his master in Muslim lands hearing Hadith from noted Traditionists, viz., al-Sharīf Abū Naṣr Muḥammad, Abū ʾl-Fawāris Muḥammad b. 'Alī and Rizqū ʾllah b. Abī al-Wahhāb al-Tamīmī of Baghdād; ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib b. Abī Ṣittā, ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAlī (b. Khalaf b. Shuʿba), the Ḥaḍīṣ and Abīmad b. Muḥammad al-ʿAbdī of al-Baṣra. Besides, a number of contemporary Traditionists of ʿIṣbahān, al-Jabāl and Khuzistān were also included among his teachers. Abū Samʿānī states that he received Hadith from him at Qawshān and Herāt. He died in 543 or 542/1151.³

1. Ansāb, fol. 593 b.; Maʿārif, loc. cit.
2. Le Strange, p. 431.
CHAPTER II
AL-ŠAGHĀNĪ AND HIS WORKS

As al-Šaghānī, by his unique contribution to Ḥadīth literature, forms a class by himself, we have thought it proper to devote one whole and independent chapter to him.

Section I
HIS SHORT BIOGRAPHY.

Al-Hasan al-Šaghānī al-Lahārī (577-650/1181-1252)

Radī al-Dīn al-Hasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Hasan b. Haydar al-Quṣayrī al-‘Umārī al-Ḥanafī, popularly called al-Šaghānī, was born at Lahore on Thursday, Saffar 10, 577/July 1181. He was first educated under his father Muḥammad, a scholar of distinction. It is said that during his early years al-Šaghānī earned a reward of 1,000 dinārs by committing to memory the Gharaʾib of Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim b. al-Sallām (d.240)—a fact which speaks a volume about the extraordinary memory he possessed. While scarcely twenty-five, al-Šaghānī acquired a great proficiency in Ḥanafī Fiqh. Sultan Qutb al-Dīn Aybak (602-7/1205-10) then offered him the Qādīship of Lahore which he, however, refused to accept, and left for Ghaznī in pursuit of higher studies. He subsequently travelled widely in al-‘Īrāq and al-Ḥijāz devoting himself assiduously to the acquirement of the sciences of Tradition and philology under distinguished professors. The exact duration of his wanderjah in al-‘Īrāq where, in Baghdād, he read with al-Naṣṣar al-Mardhānī and Saʿīd b. al-Razzāz (d. 616), cannot be ascertained. By 610/1213 from which dates the beginning of his career as a Ḥadīth scholar; al-Šaghānī became popular in the learned circles. For, in that year as he entered al-Yamān, he was received very warmly. Here at Aden he studied until he reached Makka in 613/1216 where he met the famous Yaqūt al-Hamawī (d. 626) for the last time. Of his shaykhī in Makka, the name of Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥusayn (d. 618) has been preserved for us. On finishing his studies al-Šaghānī arrived in Safār, 615/April, 1218 in Baghdād where a rousing reception was accorded him. Caliph al-Nāṣir (577-623/1181-1226) himself invested him with a robe of honour. Al-Šaghānī finally settled down in Baghdād and enjoyed patronage from the ‘Abbāsid Caliphs. In 617/1220 Caliph al-Nāṣir appointed him ambassador for the court of Delhi under Ḥasan al-Mustanṣir (607-33/1210-36) an office which al-Šaghānī held for twenty long years. He hastened back to Baghdād in 624/1227 presumably on the death of al-Nāṣir and was again appointed to the same post by Caliph al-Mustanṣir (624-45/1227-47) in Shaʿbān of that very year. The fact that the historian Minhāj al-Ṣiraḥ records in his Taḥāqīf-i-Nāṣirī the arrival of the ‘Abbāsid ambassador in India in 625/1228, seems to further

2. Yaqūt, Muṣjam al-Udabāʾ, ed. Dr. Ahmad Farīd Rifaʿi (Cairo, 1930), Vol. IX. pp. 189-191. This shows that al-Šaghānī was quite familiar with Yaqūt al-Hamawī (d. 626).
5. Al-Quṣayrī, loc. cit.
corroborate the above appointment. Al-Ṣaghānī finally returned to Baghdad in 637/1239. It may be that the chaotic and complicated situation arising at the Court out of the murder of Sulṭāna Radyya (634-37/1235-40) compelled the ambassador to leave Delhi.

The remaining years of his life al-Ṣaghānī devoted exclusively to compilation and teaching Hadith and philology. He always had a crowd of pupils to surround him. The Traditionist Sharaf al-Dīn al-Dimyāṭī (d. 705), the shaykh of our al-Dhahābī (d. 735), was one of the pupils of al-Ṣaghānī. He died at his residence at Harīm al-Zāhirī in Baghdad in Sha‘bān, 650/October, 1252. His body was removed to Makka according to a testament of his and was interred therein. As a tribute to his memory al-Dimyāṭī says, "A devout professor seldom given to idle talks, al-Ṣaghānī was a great authority of Tradition, Philology and Jurisprudence." No greater testimony to his wide survey in Hadith literature could have been adduced than what he himself maintained in his al-‘Abāb, "I have heard in Makka, India, al-Yaman and Baghdad musalsal traditions close upon four hundred which is a record number."

Al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Ṣaghānī was a recognized authority on Hadith and Philology. He has left for us thirty-two works, of which as many as nine have been noticed by Brockelmann. Although the bulk of these works is on Philology, those dealing with Hadith literature are of special significance, purporting, as they do, to popularize the genuine Aḥādīth of the Prophet, which since the beginning of the fifth century had been gradually falling into disuse and disrepute among the Muslims particularly in the eastern provinces of the Caliphate. To understand the state of al-Ṣaghānī’s contemporary Hadith literature, a preamble seems to be called for.

Section II

Hadith Literature before al-Ṣaghānī

The fourth century of the Hijra witnessed the culmination of the great epoch for the growth and development of Hadith. Then as a result of researches on the part of the Taḥīr ‘Ilm the Science of Hadith literature—Ilm al-Ḥadīth—was evolved; while, in the course of the third century, Ijtihād, par excellence, of the Muslim divines and doctors, was responsible for the evolution out of the Qur'an and the Sunna of the Islamic Shari’a into four juridical systems, viz., the Ḥanafīs, the Mālikites, the Shāfīites and the Hanbalites, of which the first three also recognize the

1. Taḥāṣṣī-i-Nāṣiri, p. 174; Ulughkẖānī op. cit., Vol. II, p. 699. It is seen that there is something wrong either with the date 634 A.H. as given by al-Ṣaghānī, or with 626 A.H. as given by Mīrābī, for all-Ṣaghānī could not possibly have taken more than a month to reach India from Baghdad overland (Ulughkẖānī, loc. cit.)
4. Al-Qurashi, loc. cit.
locus standi of the Ijma (Consensus of the Community) and the Qiyas (Legal Analogy).

The four schools (Madhhab) were not evenly distributed in the Sunni World. In the fourth century the distribution was as follows: The Malikites were found in al-Maghrib, the Hanbalites or Ashab al-Hadith, in Syria and Baghdaad; the Hanafites, in the eastern provinces of the Caliphate with the exception of Nishapur and parts of the Transoxania which were Shafiite. Besides, the Shafiites had their hold also over Egypt.

Every Madhhab was a unit by itself, as it were. For guidance of its followers as also for preservation of its individuality, the study of Fiqh became essential. Thus, a group of scholars known as Fuqaha (sing. Faqih, Jurist) grew up from every Madhhab and devoted themselves to imparting lessons and writing books on Fiqh. In the course of time these Fuqaha, became responsible officials of their respective governments as heads of the department of Law and Ecclesiastics. Thus the Shafiite School of Law was adopted by the Ghazawids and the Ayubids, the Hanafite, by the Turks, and the Malikite by the Spanish Amlrate. This served as a great momentum for the study and culture of Fiqh. It was, now, not merely an academic pursuit but a passport for government service. Fiqh, therefore, opened up a new avenue for ambitious young men. How the study of Fiqh was rapidly gaining in popularity would be evident from the fact that in the third century the phraseology "tafaqqaha 'ala" was scarcely noticed; in the fourth it was seen side by side with that of "haddatha'an" and by the fifth century the latter, namely, "haddatha'an" was practically overshadowed by the former, namely, "tafaqqaha 'ala." That nationwide zeal and enthusiasm for Hadith learning, Ri'ha fi Ta'lab al-'Ilm, began to decrease and instead the craze for higher knowledge in Fiqh and all that it stood for increased. As a result, centres for the learning of Fiqh, jurisprudence, sprang up all over the Muslim World. Later, a Chair for the Shafiite Fiqh was instituted in the famous Nizamiyya College of Baghdaad, while al-Mustansiriyah provided for the instructions in all the four schools. Egypt, too, did not lag behind in this direction in so far as it had to her credit al-Madrasat al-Suyufiyah, al-Shafiyyah, al-Nasiriyah, and al-Salafiyyah for the study and cultivation of Fiqh. As a matter of fact, the Muslims, in masse, rose equal to the occasion so far as the culture of the Science of Fiqh was concerned. Even the Hanbalites themselves started writing down brochures on Fiqh, of course, based on the Qur'an and the Sunna. Interest for Hadith, therefore, lessened or was restricted to such Ahdith as were suited for the requirements of a particular Madhhab. But in their attempt to utilize Ahdith to subserve their respective Madhhab, the Fuqaha did more harm than good. For, the criteria to scrutinize the soundness of a Hadith could not have always been maintained with the result that almost every Hadith, sound or otherwise, that went to support the view-point of a particular Imam, was accepted and that justification was sought to be given even for weak

3. Ibid., pp. 30, 124.
4. Ibid., p. 37.
5. Ibid., pp. 180, 202.
6. For details see al-Khudri, pp. 246-74, 370-77.

5. Al-Khudri, p. 274.
ones. Thus, many a weak Ḥadith naturally crept into Fiqh literature. No wonder, then, that such a masterpiece of the Ḥanafī jurisprudence like al-Hidâyā should contain Traditions of indifferent authorities or which were spurious. But the greatest disservice done to Apostolic Traditions by the Fuqahā’ was that they encouraged inter-Madhhab rivalry particularly between the Ḥanafīs and the Shāfī’is. Towards the 5th century A.H. theological debate, munāẓara, between the Fuqahā’ of the two rival schools, usually presided over by a high government official, was very common. To establish the superiority of one school over that of the other, both the parties put forward their arguments, but rules of decency and decorum could not always be maintained. As a matter of fact, it was more often than not that a debate degenerated into brawls and mutual recriminations. During this time traditions were coined right and left. That the so-called traditions, e.g., Abū Ḥanīfa is the light of the nation, Ummā, and ‘a Qurashite savant, meaning al-Shāfī’, will flood the surface of the earth with knowledge’, are cases in point. Thus, most of the Fuqahā’ remained so pre-occupied with the formulation of their own madhāhib that they not only neglected the priceless Ḥadīth compilations such as the Sahihān or the Sunan works but also aided and abetted the circulation of weak or forged traditions, if they answered their purpose. Accordingly, in those days forces were let loose to give circulation of forged traditions or coin equally had ones in the persons of the so-called Mu’tammarin, e.g., Nastūr al-Rūmī, Abā ’l-Dunyā al-Asbajj and Ratan al-Hindi,4 or the Qaramatans who legalized fabrication

if it would tend to improve the morale of the people. This was not all. To capture the imagination of the audience the gaṣṣās, or the story-teller, interwove false Ḥadīth in the course of their story-telling. Likewise the Khānqāhs or the hospices of the ascetics became veritable hot-beds of fabrication inasmuch as every moralizing saying that would encourage the inmates to lead contemplative lives, passed for Ḥadīth. The commentators also passed off in their Tafsīrs many ill-founded sayings as Traditions with special reference to the extraordinary merits attached to the different Suras of the Qur’ān. Thus, like a mushroom, fabricated Ḥadīth grew and multiplied. To counteract this evil tendency the Traditionists like Ibn al-Jawzi (d.597), al-Ṣaghāni and others took up the cudgels. Ibn al-Jawzi’s al-Mawdū‘āt al-Kubrā, a comprehensive collection of manufactured Ḥadīth, will always remain a classic in this branch of the Science of Tradition. But he is accused as a rigorist (mutashāhid) inasmuch as his al-Mawdū‘āt is said to have included into it some Ḥasan and Saḥīḥ Ḥadīth. In the face of the ever-increasing influx of the fabricated traditions of the day, if Ibn al-Jawzi, out of his exuberance of the process of purging, has included some genuine Traditions he cannot be much blamed. Withal things did not much improve. For al-Ṣaghāni, writing within fifty years after Ibn al-Jawzi on the attitude of the intellectu- gentsia vis-a-vis Ḥadīth, states, ‘There have multiplied in our days Aḥadīth Mawdū‘a (fabricated traditions) which are being narrated by the gaṣṣās in the assem- blies as well as on the pulpits and by fuqahā’ (jurists) and fuqarā’ (saints) in the Madrasas and the Khānqāhs,

1. Al-Saghāni and his Works. 225
2. Al-Saghāni and his Works. 225
3. Ibid., pp. 8 seq.
4. Ibid., pp. 3-4. 5. Ibid., pp. 8 seq.
respectively. Thus they (Mawdū‘at) are being handed down to the posterity. Nothing but the sheer ignorance of the knowledge of the Sunna can be accounted for this state of things. As a matter of fact, Traditionists are nowhere to be met with save and except in the barren tract of Arabia. Forged traditions and so-called sayings of the Prophet are being freely circulated in books without paying any heed to their objectivity. Because of the reputation of the authors, these books are well received by the posterity with the result that the religion itself is now in jeopardy. No picture could have been more vivid and realistic than the one just portrayed by al-Šagḥānī speaking as he does from his personal experience and authority.

Section III.

His role as a Traditionist.

Next to Ibn al-Jawi, al-Šagḥānī2 applied himself heart and soul to weed out Ḥadāth Mawdū‘a. He was more systematic and his grasp of the problem more thorough than his compere Ibn al-Jawzi. His treatises3 on al-Mawdū‘at recount the topics in which fabrication was usually taken recourse to. They are as follows:

(i) Traditions relating to christening a person after the name of Muḥammad and Ahmad; (ii) Traditions relating to rice, melon, garlic, egg-plant and onion, etc., (iii) Traditions relating to Naksh, metamorphosis of as many as sixteen animals, viz., the tortoise, the bear, the hyena, the lizard, etc., as stated in some Tafsirs; (iv) Traditions relating to the merit of the months, days and nights as mentioned in the Yawqiṭ wa l-Mawdūq; (v) Traditions relating to the merit of the month of Rajab and (vi) Traditions relating to the merit of the lamps, candle-sticks and mats used in mosques.

Al-Šagḥānī is perhaps the first critic who has particularly emphasized on the nature of the wording and the meaning of a Hadith to be attributed to the Prophet apart from the usual conditions stipulated for a genuine Tradition.4 He has, therefore, held that the phrase qala al-Rasūl should in no circumstances be associated with a report other than a true Hadith.5 He has also drawn up a list of the master-fabricators, namely, Abū ‘l-Dunyā al-Asāhij, al-Kharrāsh, Ja‘far b. Naṣṭūr al-Rumī, Bishr, Yaghnam, Yakhshaf on the authority of Anas, Ratan al-Hindi and others.6 His books may, therefore, be regarded as an earliest attempt to enunciate the principles of Mawdū‘at.

Al-Šagḥānī also makes a fair collection of false traditions.7 The later researches have revealed that, like the rigorist Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Šagḥānī has taken a number of Ḥadāth to be mawdūq which are not actually so.8 The reason seems to be this that as the atmosphere was surcharged with fabrications, he was only too cautious.

Al-Šagḥānī was not rest satisfied merely with the act of purging the Apostolic traditions of fabrications. He did more. His greatest service for the cause of the Science, however, lay in his endeavour to popularize Ḥadāth Ṣahīḥa among the Muslims. As he felt that if, at the outset, he would present before the public the

3. MSS copies of the treatises are noticed in Lakhnawi’s library at Firangi Mahal (cf. Fawr al-Bahīyya, p. 30) and one in the library of Nadwa, Lucknow.
6. Risāla fi l-Mawdū‘at, pp. 3-4, also p. 12.
7. Ibid., pp. 4, 12.
Saḥīḥān or any other collection of authentic traditions, they were not likely to be well received because of their bulk, he prepared two of his earliest compendia on the subject, namely, al-Miṣḥāb al-Duʿā’i min Ṣaḥīḥ al-Ḥadith al-Māṭhūra and al-Shams al-Munirā min Ṣaḥīḥ al-Maṭhūra, which evoked a wide-spread interest among his co-religionists. Thus encouraged, he compiled his epitome of the Saḥīḥān which became famous under the name of the Maskarīq al-Anwar.1

His Maskarīq al-Anwar

The Maskarīq al-Anwar embodies into it 2,253 select Aḥādīth from the Saḥīḥs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim, of which 327 belong to the former and 875 to the latter, while the rest 1,051 are common to both. He has selected only the Aḥādīth Qawliyya in preference to those of Fīliyya and Taqriyya and also those called Mutabaṭat, Shawāhid and Riwāyat bi l-Ma’na, as they (Aḥādīth Qawliyya) play a more vital part in the formulation of the principles of the Shari’a. The selection of Aḥādīth, therefore, has not been arbitrary. As for the isnād, only the name of the Saḥābi is mentioned. The Traditions of al-Bukhārī are represented by ۶, those of Muslim by ṭ and those that are common to them both, by ḫ.

The book is divided into twelve bāb, chapters, which again are subdivided into one or more fasāls, sections. Each bāb has a group of Aḥādīth opening either with: (i) grammatical regents (مَرَاسَلَة), such as

2. According to the commentator al-Kazrūnī (d. 750), the total number of Aḥādīth contained in the Maskarīq is 2,240 (Unaṭ Khalifa, Vol. V, p. 547) as against 2,253, in the recently published edition of the work under the auspices of Dār al-Funūn at Qunīya (vide Maktabat Maḥmūdiya, edition Cairo, 1329 A.H.).
rolled on, the Mashārīq al-Anwār grew more and more popular so that by the 8th century journeys were undertaken and classes were held for its study. The part it played towards the propagation of Ḥadīth literature in Northern India during the pre-Renaissance period, we have already noticed. Suffice it to say here that it was the Mashārīq al-Anwār which kept aloft the banner of the Sunna in the Fiqh-ridden countries of India and Central Asia of the day.

Al-Ṣaghānī’s other works on Ḥadīth:

(i) Kashf al-Ḥijāb ‘an Aḥādīth al-Shihāb. Al-Ṣaghānī edited al-Quḍār’s (d. 454) Kitāb al-Shihāb with the symbols of Ṣaḥīḥ, da‘if and mawdū’ against each and arranged it on the lines of the Mashārīq al-Anwār.

(ii) Sharḥ al-Bukhārī, a short commentary of the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.


(iv) Mukhtāṣar al-Wafayāt, a general biographical treatise.

(v) Kitāb al-Du‘āfā‘ wa l-Matrūkh, a book dealing with weak, rejected Transmitters of Ḥadīth.

Al-Ṣaghānī as an editor of the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.

Al-Ṣaghānī’s name shall always remain immortalized as an editor of the text of al-Bukhārī’s Ṣaḥīḥ. As a matter of fact, the edition of the Ṣaḥīḥ current all over Arabia, India, Persia and al-Īrāq we owe to his master-mind and to nobody else’s.

1. A. Mingana, perhaps the first Orientalist to write on the history of the transmission of the text of the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, observes: Before the 4th century, the text of al-Bukhārī’s Ṣaḥīḥ was “in a fluid state and not definitively fixed in the form in which we have it in our day”. In the opinion of Mingana, there was little likelihood of the whole text of the Ṣaḥīḥ being extant in a systematically written form at the time. Thanks to the efforts of the Traditions like al-Aṣbī (d. 392), al-Qāhī (d. 405), Abū Dharr (d. 434) and Abū Nu‘aym (d. 460), in the course of the 4th and the 5th centuries the text was well-established. The process of systematicatization thus began continued until it was finally completed towards the early part of the 6th century by Abū ʾl-Waqt (d. 663) who might be called the last true editor-transmitter of the text of the Ṣaḥīḥ. But the Traditions, namely, al-Saḍāqī (d. 562), Ibn ʿAbdīr (d. 657), al-Saghānī (d. 680) and Sharaf al-Dīn al-Yūnī (d. 701) also contributed materially in this direction in so far as they co-ordinated the early variants of the text and handed them down in the form in which we see them in numerous MSS. of the Ṣaḥīḥ. The manuscripts of these editors, however, fell on the shoulders of al-Saghānī and al-Yūnī who gave the finishing touch to the text exactly as we have it in respect of its form, order and phraseology. The edition of the Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī current in Arabia, India, Persia and al-Īrāq are generally based on the text edited by al-Saghānī, while al-Yūnī’s edition is popular in Morocco, Algeria, Egypt and Syria. Vida A. Mingana: An Important Manuscript of the Traditions of Bukhārī (Oxford, 1930), pp. 1-2, 14, 16, 20, 25, 27, 29.