

## A Brief Biography of Imām al-Tirmidhī rahimahullah (d.279 AH)

His name was Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā ibn Sawrah ibn Mūsā ibn al-Ḍahḥāk al-Sulamī al-Tirmidhī, some have recorded his name as Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā ibn Yazīd ibn Sawrah ibn al-Sakan. He was born in 210 AH in Tirmidh, which is in southern Uzbekistan. Near the end of his life, he became blind. Some have stated that this occurred near the start of his life, however, this seems inaccurate. Al-Dhahabī writes in Siyar, 13:270:

اِخْتَلَفَ فِيهِ فِقْهٌ وَوُلِدَ أَعْمَى وَالصَّحِيحُ أَنَّهُ أَصْرَ فِي كِبَرِهِ بَعْدَ رَحْلَتِهِ وَكَتَابَتِهِ الْعِلْمَ

“There is a difference of opinion; it has been said that he was born blind, and the correct view is that he became blind later in his old age after travelling and writing aḥādīth”

He was known for his prolific memory Al-Tirmidhī said as recorded by Al-Dhahabī, 13:273:

كنت في طريق مكة فكتبت جزأين من حديث شيخ فوجدته فسألته وأنا أظن أن الجزأين معي فسألته فأجابني فإذا معي جزآن بياض فبقيا يقرأ علي من لفظه فنظر فرأى في يدي ورقا بياضا فقال أما تستحي مني؟ فأعلمته بأمرى وقلت أحفظه كله قال اقرأ فقرأته عليه فلم يصدقني وقال استظهرت قبل أن تجيء؟ فقلت حدثني بغيره قال فحدثني بأربعين حديثا ثم قال هات فأعدتها عليه ما أخطأت في حرف

“I was on a journey to Makah, and so I wrote two volumes of the aḥādīth of a certain shaykh. Thus, I found him thinking that the two volumes are with me, so I asked him [to read the aḥādīth to him] and he agreed, suddenly I saw that the two volumes are empty white paper (Al-Tirmidhī had mistakenly brought the wrong two volumes). Thus, the shaykh continued to read to me verbatim when suddenly he looked at my hand and saw white paper. ‘Do you not have any shame from me?’ asked the shaykh, so I informed him of what had occurred and I told him ‘I have memorised all that you have read,’ so he said, ‘Read it,’ I read all of it and he did not believe me and said, ‘It is possible you learnt them (the aḥādīth) before you came?’ So, I told him, ‘Then narrate something else to me,’ he narrated 40 aḥādīth to me and then said, ‘Repeat them,’ I repeated all of them without making a mistake in a single letter”

Ibn al-Athīr writes in Jāmi‘ al-Uṣūl, 1:193:

وَلَهُ فِي الْفِقْهِ يَدٌ صَالِحَةٌ

“And he has in fiqh a capable hand”

He passed away in 270 AH in a place called Būgh which is close to Tirmidh as preferred by Sh. Aḥmad Shākir, 1:91. Some have stated that he passed away in Tirmidh. Hence, Sh. Aḥmad Ma‘bad states in his footnotes upon Al-Nafḥ al-Shadhī, 1:168 that it is possible he passed away in Tirmidh and was buried in Būgh.

### Prominent Teachers

His most common teachers in the Jāmi‘ include (note: the numbering is colour coded; red is Ṭāhir al-Azharī, green is Dār al-Ta‘ṣīl and gold is Sh. Shu‘ayb):

- 1) Qutaybah ibn Sa‘īd (d.240 AH); from whom he narrates 601/605/600 aḥādīth
- 2) Muḥammad ibn Bashār Bundār (252 AH); from whom he narrates 442/467/465 aḥādīth
- 3) Maḥmūd ibn Ghaylān al-‘Adawī (d.249 AH); from whom he narrates 292/303/300 aḥādīth
- 4) Hannād ibn al-Sariy (d.243 AH); from whom he narrates 280/288/289 aḥādīth
- 5) Aḥmad ibn Manī‘ (d.244 AH), the author of a Musnad; from whom he narrates 249/258/255 aḥādīth
- 6) Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn Abī ‘Umar al-‘Adanī (d.243 AH), the author of a Musnad, from whom he narrates 187/183 aḥādīth
- 7) Muḥammad ibn al-‘Alā‘ Abū Kurab al-Hamdānī (d.248 AH); from whom he narrates 179/178 aḥādīth
- 8) ‘Alī ibn Ḥujr ibn Iyās (d.244 AH); from whom he narrates 174/172 aḥādīth
- 9) ‘Abd ibn Ḥumayd (d.249 AH), the author of a Musnad; from whom he narrates 167/160 aḥādīth
- 10) Iṣḥāq ibn Mūsā ibn ‘Abdillah Abū Mūsā al-Anṣārī (); from whom he narrates 99 aḥādīth

Two of Al-Tirmidhī’s most prominent teachers were Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim. In fact, he writes in his Al-‘Ilal, pg.33:

وما كان فيه من ذكر العلل في الأحاديث والرجال والتاريخ فهو ما استخرجته من كتاب "التاريخ" وأكثر ذلك ما ناظرت به محمد بن إسماعيل ومنه ما ناظرت به عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن وأبا زرعة وأكثر ذلك عن محمد وأقل شيء فيه عن عبد الله وأبي زرعة ولم أر أحدا بالعراق ولا بخراسان في معنى العلل والتاريخ ومعرفة الأسانيد كثير أحد أعلم من محمد بن إسماعيل

“And whatever is mentioned within it from hidden defects in aḥādīth, narrators and historical events, then it is that which I have extracted from the book ‘Al-Tārikh’ [of Imām al-Bukhārī] and most of it is that which I have discussed with Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl, and from it is that which I have discussed with ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and Abū Zur‘ah. Most of it is from

Muḥammad and a small portion of it is from ‘Abdullah and Abū Zur‘ah. And I have not seen anyone in ‘Irāq nor in Khurāsān in knowing the hidden defects, historical details and knowledge of chains of narration more knowledgeable than Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl”

‘Umar ibn ‘Alak said as quoted by Al-Dhahabī in *Tadhkirah al-Huffāz*, 2:634:

مَاتَ الْبُخَارِيُّ فَلَمْ يَخْلُفْ بَخْرَسَانَ مِثْلَ أَبِي عَيْسَى فِي الْعِلْمِ وَالْحِفْظِ وَالْوَرَعِ وَالزُّهْدِ بَكَى حَتَّى عَمِيَ وَبَقِيَ ضَرْبًا سِنِينَ

“Al-Bukhārī passed away and he did not leave behind in Khurāsān the likes of Abū ‘Īsā in terms of knowledge, memory, piety and asceticism, he cried until he became blind and remained disabled [through blindness] for a number of years”

Al-Tirmidhī himself states as recorded by Ibn Ḥajar in *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, 3:669:

قَالَ لِي مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ إِسْمَاعِيلَ "مَا انْتَفَعْتُ بِكَ أَكْثَرَ مِمَّا انْتَفَعْتَ بِي"

“Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl [al-Bukhārī] said to me, ‘That which I have benefitted from you is more than that which you have benefitted from me”

In fact, he had reached such a stage that Imām al-Bukhārī also acquired aḥādīth from Al-Tirmidhī. Al-Tirmidhī clearly mentions that Al-Bukhārī acquired ḥadīth number 3727 and 3303 found in the Jāmi‘ from Al-Tirmidhī. He has benefitted from Al-Bukhārī’s insights in 114 places in the Jāmi‘. Sh. ‘Abdullah al-Sa’d mentions in Al-Madkhal, pg.53 that a unique feature of Al-Tirmidhī’s quotations from Al-Bukhārī is that we find Al-Bukhārī’s comments, at times, to contradict one another, hence Al-Tirmidhī’s quotation is considered Al-Bukhārī’s final view. In fact, he states, pg.56:

وَيُعْتَبَرُ كِتَابًا "الْجَامِعُ" وَ "الْعِلَلُ" لِلتِّرْمِذِيِّ الْمُسْتَدْرُ الثَّانِي لِأَقْوَالِ الْبُخَارِيِّ بَعْدَ كُتُبِهِ فَهُوَ مَنْ نَشَرَ عِلْمَهُ وَبُعْتَبَرُ مِنْ أَجْلِ تَلَامِيذِهِ

“And the two books Al-Jāmi‘ and Al-‘Ilal of Al-Tirmidhī are considered the second source for the statements of Al-Bukhārī after his books, thus he (Al-Tirmidhī) is the one who spread his knowledge and is considered from amongst his greatest students”

However, this does not mean that Al-Tirmidhī agrees with all the conclusions of his teacher. Rather, at times, he disagrees with his ruling upon a ḥadīth or narrator.

### The Travels of Al-Tirmidhī

There is some debate over when Imām al-Tirmidhī began his journey in search of knowledge. Ḥāfiẓ al-Mizzī writes that he only began searching for knowledge after 240 AH. He writes in *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, 1:401:

فَإِنَّ رِحْلَتَهُ كَانَتْ بَعْدَ الْأَرْبَعِينَ

“Indeed, his travels in the search of knowledge was after 240 AH”

While Sh. ‘Abdullah al-Sa’d is inclined towards this position, he himself admits that Al-Tirmidhī has narrated from the likes of Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh who passed away before 240 AH. Ibn Ḥajar has also refuted Al-Mizzī in his *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, 1:45 in the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Mūsā who passed away in 238 AH yet is considered a teacher of Al-Tirmidhī. Sh. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Itr gives preference that Al-Tirmidhī began travelling in 235 AH whereas Sh. ‘Addāb is inclined that his travels began after 230 AH. However, it is important to note that this does not mean that Al-Tirmidhī began acquiring knowledge at such an age, rather, the discussion here is on when he began to *travel* in search of knowledge.

Al-Dhahabī mentions that Al-Tirmidhī did not travel to Egypt and the Levant.

Sh. Aḥmad Shākir writes in his *Muqaddimah to Jāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī*, pg.:

وقد طاف أبو عيسى البلاد وسمع خلقا من الخراسانيين والعراقيين والحجازيين كما في التهذيب ولكني لا أظنه دخل بغداد إذ لو دخلها لسمع من سيّد المحدثين وزعيمهم الإمام أحمد بن محمد بن حنبل ولترجم له الحافظ أبو بكر الخطيب في تاريخ بغداد

“And indeed Al-Tirmidhī travelled to [various] cities and heard from a number of people from Khurāsān and ‘Irāq and Hijāz as is mentioned in Al-Tahdhīb, however, I do not think he entered Baghdād because had he entered it, he would have heard from the leader of the muḥaddithūn and their confidante, Imām Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥanbal, and indeed Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb would have made an entry for him in Tārīkh Baghdād”

Both Sh. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Itr and Sh. Ḥabībullah Mukhtār have followed Sh. Aḥmad Shākir in this assertion. However, Sh. Akram Diyā al-‘Umarī responds in *Turāth al-Tirmidhī*, pg.13:

ومن تحليل قائمة الشيوخ هذه تظهر نتائج واضحة تثبت عكس ما ذهب إليه الشيخ أحمد محمد شاكر... فإن الترمذي روى عن ٣٨ شيخا من بغداد وأقدمهم وفاة أربعة توفوا ٢٤٣ هـ... وهذا يدل على أن الترمذي دخل بغداد بعد وفاة الإمام أحمد وفي سنة ٢٤٣ هـ أو قبلها... وأما عدم وجود ترجمة للترمذي في تاريخ بغداد للخطيب فالإحتمال الأقوى أنه ترجم له وسقطت ترجمته من الطبعة الحالية كما سقطت تراجم كثيرة أخرى وأيضاً قد استدرك على الخطيب عدد كبير من التراجم ممن هم على شرطه فلا يصلح خلو "تاريخ بغداد" من ترجمة الترمذي دليلاً على عدم دخول الترمذي بغداد ويدعم ذلك التأمل العقلي إذ لا يعقل أن يقترب الترمذي إلى الكوفة وواسط وبيدع بغداد على شهرتها وتألقها في الحديث في

القرن الثالث الهجري

## The Books of Al-Tirmidhī

Other than the Jāmi', Imām al-Tirmidhī has written several other books including:

- 1) *Al-'Ilal al-Ṣaghīr* (العلل الصغير); this book is found at the end of Al-Jāmi'

Ibn al-Athīr writes in Jāmi' al-Uṣūl, 1:193:

وَفِي آخِرِهِ كِتَابٌ "الْعَلَل" قَدْ جَمَعَ فِيهِ فَوَائِدَ حَسَنَةً لَا يَخْفَى قَدْرُهَا عَلَى مَنْ وَقَفَ عَلَيْهَا

“And at the end of it is the book Al-'Ilal, indeed he has gathered in it beneficial points, its value is not hidden upon he who comes upon them”

- 2) *Al-'Ilal al-Kabīr* (العلل الكبير); whilst this book has not been found, Abū Ṭālib al-Qāḍī (d.585 AH) ordered the book according to the chapters of Fiqh. This has been published.

Sh. Ḥātim writes in Muqarrar al-Takhrīj, pg.90:

وهو كتاب جليل حفظ لنا قدرا كبيرا من كلام الإمام البخاري فعامته عنه وقليل منه عن الإمام الدارمي – عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن والإمام أبي زرعة الرازي

“It is a magnificent book, it has preserved for us a large portion of the statements of Imām al-Bukhārī for the majority of it is from him and a small portion of it is from Imām al-Dārimī - ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and Imām Abū Zur‘ah”

- 3) *Al-Shamā'il al-Nabawīyyah* (الشمائل النبوية); this book has been printed

The following are books of Al-Tirmidhī that have not yet been found:

- 4) *Kitāb al-Zuhd* (كتاب الزهد)

- 5) *Al-Tārīkh* (التاريخ)

- 6) *Al-Asmā' wa'l-Kunā* (الأسماء والكنى)

- 7) *Kitāb al-Tafsīr* (كتاب التفسير)

- 8) *Al-Rubā'īyyāt fi'l Ḥadīth* (الرباعيات في الحديث); Al-'Umarī explains in Turāth al-Tirmidhī, pg.15 that this book was not written by Al-Tirmidhī, but rather by Ḥāfiẓ Yūsuf ibn Shāhīn who compiled it from the Jāmi'

- 9) *Kitāb fi'l Jarḥ wa'l-Ta'dīl* (كتاب في الجرح والتعديل); Al-'Umarī explains in Turāth al-Tirmidhī, pg.14 that this is not a book and, rather, Al-Khalīlī simply states that Al-Tirmidhī has spoken on the field of Al-Jarḥ wa'l-Ta'dīl. Later scholars misunderstood this to mean that he has written a book on the topic.

- 10) *Kitāb fi'l Āthār al-Mawqūfah* (كتاب في الآثار الموقوفة)

## Imām al-Tirmidhī's Madhhab

Sh. Nūr al-Dīn 'Itr states that Al-Tirmidhī regularly refers to a group of scholars as 'our fellows' (أصحابنا). He states that upon closer inspection we realise that Al-Tirmidhī follows the opinions of the Mujtahid Fuqahā from the scholars of ḥadīth, such as Imām Mālik, Imām al-Shāfi'ī, Imām Aḥmad and Imām Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh. He writes in Muwāzanah, pg.389:

وَهَذَا صَرِيحٌ بِأَنَّهُ يُرِيدُهُمْ بِهَذِهِ الْكَلِمَةِ أَعْنَى فُقَهَاءِ الْمُحَدِّثِينَ وَلَيْسَ خُصُوصُ الْمَذْكُورِينَ يَدُلُّ لِذَلِكَ الْمِثَالِ السَّابِقِ وَالتَّالِي وَكَذَلِكَ جَاءَتْ مِثْلُ هَذِهِ الْعِبَارَةِ "أَصْحَابُنَا الشَّافِعِيُّ وَأَحْمَدُ وَإِسْحَاقُ" فِي "بَابِ الَّذِي يُصَلِّي الْفَرِيضَةَ ثُمَّ يُؤْمُ النَّاسَ"

“And this is explicit in that he intends with this statement (i.e. aṣḥābunā) the fuqahā from the muḥaddithūn, and it is not specified to those mentioned, the above and coming examples indicate towards this, and similarly a statement like this has also come 'Our companions Al-Shāfi'ī and Aḥmad and Ishāq' in the chapter of the one who reads a farḍ ṣalāh and then leads the people”

A clear indication that Al-Tirmidhī did not always follow Imām al-Shāfi'ī is the following section of the Jāmi':

١٥٧- حَدَّثَنَا قُتَيْبَةُ، قَالَ: حَدَّثَنَا اللَّيْثُ، عَنْ ابْنِ شِهَابٍ، عَنْ سَعِيدِ ابْنِ الْمُسَيَّبِ وَأَبِي سَلْمَةَ، عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ، قَالَ: قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ: «إِذَا اشْتَدَّ الْحَرُّ فَأَبْرِدُوا عَنِ الصَّلَاةِ فَإِنَّ شِدَّةَ الْحَرِّ مِنْ قَبْحِ جَهَنَّمَ»<sup>(١)</sup>.

وفي الباب عن أبي سعيد، وأبي ذرٍّ، وابن عمرَ، والمغيرة،  
والقاسم بن صفوانَ عن أبيه، وأبي موسى، وابن عباس، وأنس.  
وزوي عن عمرَ عن النبي ﷺ في هذا، ولا يصح.  
حديثُ أبي هريرةَ حديثٌ حسنٌ صحيح.  
وقد اختار قومٌ من أهل العلم تأخيرَ صلاةِ الظهرِ في شدةِ الحرِّ.  
وهو قولُ ابنِ المباركِ، وأحمدَ، وإسحاقَ.

وأما ما ذهب إليه الشافعيُّ أنَّ الرخصةَ لِمَنْ يَتَأْتَبُ مِنَ الْبُئْدِ  
وَالْمَسَقَّةِ عَلَى النَّاسِ، فَإِنَّ فِي حَدِيثِ أَبِي ذَرٍّ مَا يَدُلُّ عَلَى عِلَاقِ مَا قَالَ  
الشافعيُّ؛ قَالَ أَبُو ذَرٍّ: كُنَّا مَعَ النَّبِيِّ ﷺ فِي سَفَرٍ فَأَذَّنَ بِأَلَّا بِصَلَاةِ الظُّهْرِ،  
فَقَالَ النَّبِيُّ ﷺ: «يَا بِلَالُ ابْرُدْ ثُمَّ ابْرُدْ».   
فلو كان الأمرُ على ما ذهب إليه الشافعيُّ: لم يكن للإبرادِ في ذلك  
الوقتِ مَعْنَى، لاجتماعهم في السفر، وكانوا لا يحتاجونَ أَنْ يَتَأْتَبُوا مِنْ  
الْبُئْدِ.

وقال الشافعيُّ: إِنَّمَا الْإِبْرَادُ بِصَلَاةِ الظُّهْرِ إِذَا كَانَ مَسْجِدًا يَتَأْتَبُ  
أَهْلُهُ مِنَ الْبُئْدِ، فَأَمَّا الْمَصْلِيُّ وَحْدَهُ وَالَّذِي يَصَلِّي فِي مَسْجِدِ قَوْمِهِ: فَالَّذِي  
أَحْبَبُ لَهُ أَنْ لَا يُؤَخَّرَ الصَّلَاةَ فِي شِدَّةِ الْحَرِّ.  
وَمَعْنَى مَنْ ذَهَبَ إِلَى تَأْخِيرِ الظُّهْرِ فِي شِدَّةِ الْحَرِّ هُوَ أَوْلَى وَأَشْبَهُ  
بِالْأَتْبَاعِ.

Sh. Yūṣuf Bannūrī agrees as he writes, pg.323:

اختلفت الآراء في أبي عيسى الترمذي والذي ذكره الشاه ولي الله الدهلوي في "الإنصاف" ما نصه "وأما أبو داود والترمذي فهما مجتهدان منتسبان إلى أحمد وإسحاق وكذلك ابن ماجه والدارمي فيما نرى الخ وأنا أوافق في الأولين ومما يؤيد هذا أنه لم يذكر بالإنزام صراحة إلا مذهبهما ولم أصادف في جامع الترمذي له ردا لكلامهما في حين تجد ردا لكلام الشافعي وغيره في كتابه ولذا لم يذكره التاج السبكي في طبقاته مع ولوعه باستيفاء كل من قيل فيه أنه شافعي أو أمكن إدخاله في عداد الشافعية حتى جعل البخاري شافعيًا بدليل أنه تفقه على الحميدي والحميدي تفقه على الشافعي وما أهون هذا الإستدلال

”“

This is also the opinion preferred by Sh. Shu'ayb al-Arnaout, 1:58.

Did Ibn Ḥazm label Al-Tirmidhī as unknown?

Hāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar writes in Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb, 3:669:

وأما أبو محمد بن حزم فإنه نادى على نفسه بعدم الإطلاع فقال في كتاب الفرائض من "الإيصال" محمد بن عيسى بن سورة مجهول ولا يقولون قائل لعله ما عرف الترمذي ولا اطلع على حفظه ولا على تصانيفه فإن هذا الرجل قد أطلق هذه العبارة في خلق من المشهورين من الثقات الحفاظ كأبي القاسم البغوي وإسماعيل بن محمد الصفار وأبي العباس الأصبم وغيرهم والعجب أن الحافظ ابن الفرضي ذكره في كتابه "المؤتلف والمختلف" ونبه على قدره فكيف فات ابن حزم الوقوف عليه فيه؟

“As for Abū Muḥammad Ibn Ḥazm, then indeed he has proclaimed upon himself a lack of awareness, thus he states in chapter of inheritance from Al-Īṣāl: Muḥammad ibn Īsā ibn Sawrah is unknown, and a speaker should definitely not say, ‘Perhaps he did not’

Ibn Ḥajar is referring to Al-Dhahabī who said regarding Ibn Ḥazm in *Siyar*, 18:202:

ما ذكر "سنن" ابن ماجه ولا "جامع" أبي عيسى فإنه ما رآهما ولا أدخلهما إلى الأندلس إلا بعد موته

“He did not mention ‘Sunan Ibn Mājah’ nor the ‘Jāmi’ of Abū Īsā, for indeed he did not see them, and they did not enter Al-Andalūs except after his demise”

It seems that the first scholar to critique Ibn Ḥazm on this issue was Ibn al-Qatṭān in *Bayān al-Wahm wa'l-Īhām*, 5:637:

جهله بعض من لم يبحث عنه وهو أبو محمد بن حزم فقال في كتاب الفرائض من الإيصال إثر حديث أورده إنه مجهول

“Some who did not research about him labelled him as unknown and that was Abū Muḥammad Ibn Ḥazm, who said in the chapter of Farā'id from Al-Īṣāl after presenting a ḥadīth, ‘Indeed, he (Al-Tirmidhī) is unknown’”

However, Sh. Akram Ḍiyā al-'Umarī seems inclined towards the position of Al-Dhahabī as he writes in *Turāth al-Tirmidhī*, pg.27:

ويلاحظ أن ابن حزم روى حديثنا عن الترمذي في الخلى بإسناد وصفه بأنه مظلم – يعني ما بينه وبين الترمذي – ولم يتعرض للترمذي بتجهيل ولا غيره فلو كان سنن الترمذي عند ابن حزم من الطرق المعروفة المشهورة لما اضطر لإخراجه من هذا السند المظلم

“It should be noted that Ibn Ḥazm has narrated a ḥadīth from Al-Tirmidhī in his Al-Muḥallā through a chain of narration that he describes as oppressive – i.e. the section between him and Al-Tirmidhī [is oppressive] – and he did not engage in labelling Al-Tirmidhī as unknown or anything else, hence, if Sunan al-Tirmidhī was available to Ibn Ḥazm through known and famous narrations, he would not have been forced to narrate it (the ḥadīth) through this ‘oppressive’ chain of narration”

Sh. Al-'Umarī then states that considering that Ibn 'Abd al-Barr had access to Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī and considering that Ibn 'Abd al-Barr was a contemporary of Ibn Ḥazm and someone from whom it is said that Ibn Ḥazm learnt the field of ḥadīth, it would make sense to say that Ibn 'Abd al-Barr must have only had access to the book later in his life. Sh. Al-'Umarī goes on to state that it should be no surprise that Ibn Ḥazm did not have access to Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī considering that his contemporary Al-Bayhaqī also did not have access to the Jāmi'. However, we have explained in our biography of Al-Bayhaqī did have access to Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī, except that he did not have a *narration* of Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī.

However, it seems that Ibn Ḥazm may have come across Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī near the end of his life as he states in his book *Al-Risālah al-Bāhirah*, pg.50:

وهذه صفة حفاظ الحديث كالبخاري ومسلم والترمذي...

“And this is the quality of the ḥuffāz of ḥadīth such as Al-Bukhārī, Muslim and Al-Tirmidhī...”

Whilst the researcher of this book writes in the footnotes that he fears one of the scribes has made a mistake in accidentally adding the name of Al-Tirmidhī, the researchers of the Dār al-Ta'ṣīl print feel it is possible he came across the book later in his life.

#### Was Al-Tirmidhī lenient in his assessment of ḥadīth?

One of the most prominent claims against Imām al-Tirmidhī was that he was lenient in his assessment of ḥadīth. Scholars who made this claim include:

1) Al-Dhahabī writes in *Siyar*, 13:274:

في "الجامع" علم نافع وفوائد غزيرة ورؤوس المسائل وهو أحد أصول الإسلام لولا ما كدّره بأحاديث واهية بعضها موضوع وكثير منها في الفضائل

“In the Jāmi' there is beneficial knowledge, deeply beneficial points and the essence of masā'il, and it is one of the pillars of Islām, if it were not for that which he has tainted with weak aḥādīth, some of which are fabricated and many of them are related to acts of virtue”

He also writes in *Siyar*, 13:276:

"جامعه" قاض له بإمامته وحفظه وفقهه ولكن يترخّص في قبول الأحاديث ولا يشدّد ونفسه في التضعيف رخوا

“His Jāmi' proves his scholarship, memory and Fiqh, however, he is lenient in accepting aḥādīth and is not strict, and his approach in labelling a ḥadīth as weak is soft”

He writes in *Mīzān*, 3:407 in the biography of Kathīr ibn 'Abdillāh ibn 'Amr:

لا يعتمد العلماء على تصحيح الترمذي

“The scholars do not rely upon the authentication of Al-Tirmidhī”

However, Sh. 'Awwāmah responds in *Al-Kāshif*, pg. that Al-Tirmidhī is following Al-Bukhārī in this ruling. This is also the response given by Sh. Khālid, 2:1102. Similarly, Sh. Aḥmad Shākir responds to this by stating, 2:362:

وهو غلوّ منه فإن تصحيح الترمذي معتمد عند العلماء

””

He writes in *Siyar*, 7:72:

قد يترخّص الترمذي ويصحّح لإبن أرطاة وليس يجيد

“At times, Al-Tirmidhī labels a ḥadīth of Ibn Arṭāt as Ṣaḥīḥ and that is not good”

He writes in *Mīzān*, 4:416:

حسنه الترمذي مع ضعف ثلاثة فلا يُعتر بتحسن الترمذي فعند الحاققة غالبها ضعاف

“Al-Tirmidhī has labelled him as ḥasan despite three [individuals] weakening him, thus one should not be deceived with the label of ḥasan by Al-Tirmidhī, thus upon researching, the majority of it is weak”

2) Ibn Diḥyah () states as quoted by Al-Zaylā'ī () in *Naṣb al-Rāyah*, 2:217:

وكم حسن الترمذي في كتابه من أحاديث موضوعة وأسانيده واهية

“And how many aḥādīth has Al-Tirmidhī labelled in his book as Ḥasan that are fabricated and have very weak chains of narration”

However, Ḥāfiẓ al-'Alā'ī responds in his treatise *Tawfiyah al-Kayl li Man Ḥarrama Luḥūm al-Khayl*, 4:162:

وأما ما ذكره عن ابن دحية فليس بشيء أصلا لأن ابن دحين هذا متكلم فيه مشهور بالجازفة ولا يعتمد على قوله

“As for that which Ibn Diḥyah has mentioned then in reality it is nothing, because this Ibn Diḥyah is himself critiqued, [he is] famous for his extravagance and then is no reliance upon his statement”

3) Sh. Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī writes in *Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan al-Tirmidhī*, 1:9:

لولا تساهله عنده في التصحيح عُرف به عند النقاد من علماء الحديث

“If it were not for his leniency in authenticating with which he has been recognised by the scholars of ḥadīth”

Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Irāqī writes in his commentary upon *Jāmi’ al-Tirmidhī* as quoted by Sh. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Itr, pg.268:

وما نقله عن العلماء من أنهم لا يعتمدون على تصحيح الترمذي ليس بجيد وما زال الناس يعتمدون تصحيحه

“And that which he (Al-Dhahabī) has recorded that they do not rely upon the authentication of Al-Tirmidhī is not good, and the people have continued to rely upon his authentication”

Sh. Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī writes in *Fayḍ al-Bārī* as quoted by Sh. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ in the footnotes of *Thalāth Rasā’il*, pg.95:

ولم يحسن الحفاظ في عدم قبول تحسين الترمذي فإن مبناه على القواعد لا غير وحكم الترمذي مبني على الذوق والوجدان الصحيح وإن هذا هو العلم وإنما الضوابط عصا الأعمى

“And Ḥāfiẓ [Ibn Ḥajar] did not do well in not accepting the ruling of Ḥasan of Al-Tirmidhī, for indeed his basis was rules and nothing else, whereas Al-Tirmidhī’s rulings are based upon intuition and correct perception, and indeed this is the knowledge and indeed rules are the stick of the blind man”

Sh. Durays concludes, 2:1542:

والذي يترجح لدي أن الإمام الترمذي لديه تساهل في تصحيح بعض الأحاديث كما ظهر لنا فيما سلف من أمثلة ولا أرى أنه كان متساهلا بنفس القدر فيما حسنه لأنه أبان عن شرطه في الحسن أنه يشمل حديث الراوي الذي لا يحتج بما ينفرد به إذا سلم من الشذوذ وكانت له شواهد... ثم ينبغي أن يُعلم أن وصف الترمذي بالتساهل في بعض ما يصححه أو

يحسّنه لا يعني هدر أحكامه كلها بزعم أنه متساهل على الدوام

”

Sh. Sa’d al-Ḥumayyid’s conclusion also seems to agree with this in his *Fatāwā Ḥadīthiyyah*, pg.109.

Sh. Ḥātim explains that Al-Tirmidhī’s leniency was only in relation to the scholars of his time. He writes in *Muqarrar al-Takhrīj*, pg.

أما اتهامه بالتساهل فلا يعني إهدار أحكامه ولكنه يعني أنه أكثر خطأ في التصحيح والتحسين بالنسبة لأقرانه من كبار النقاد فهو تساهل نسبي وليس مطلقا ولا منهجيا ولا يفقده استحقاق الإعتماد عند عدم وجود دليل يخالفه

“As for the accusation that he is lenient, then this does not mean that his rulings should be abandoned, rather it means that he has made more mistakes in labelling a ḥadīth as Ṣaḥīḥ and Ḥasan in comparison to his contemporaries”

A clear indication of how Al-Tirmidhī’s rulings are taken into consideration is how Al-Mizzī quotes the ruling of Al-Tirmidhī for each ḥadīth in *Tuḥfah al-Ashrāf* as does Ibn al-Mulaqqin in *Al-Badr al-Munīr*.

### **A Brief Introduction to the *Jāmi’ of Al-Tirmidhī***

There is much debate over the name of the book, the differences may be summarised as follows:

Name	Preferred by
<i>Al-Jāmi’</i> (الجامع)	Al-Idrīsī (), Ghunḡar al-Bukhārī () [Al-Taḡyīd, pg.97], Abū Ṭālib al-Qāḡī (), Al-Sam’ānī () [Al-Ansāb, 3:42], Ibn Mākūlā (), Qāḡī ‘Ayāḡ () , Ibn Jamā’ah (), Al-Mizzī (), Al-Dhahabī () [Siyar, 13:274], Ibn Kathīr () [Al-Bidāyah wa’l-Nihāyah, ], Ibn Ḥajar (), Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān (), Al-Kattānī (), Ḥājī Khalīfah ()
<i>Al-Jāmi’ al-Kabīr</i> (الجامع الكبير)	This is the name found on the manuscript found in Paris with the handwriting of Al-Karūkhī. It is also the name found on the manuscript in the library of Lā lah lī with the handwriting of Ibn al-Jawzī. It is also the name found on the manuscript found in the library of Chester Beatty with the handwriting of Muṣṭafā ibn Ḥājī Qūṭalmas.  It is also the name given to it by Al-Maḡbūbī based upon the narration of Ibn al-Athīr in <i>Jāmi’ al-Uṣūl</i> who narrates the book from his teacher Al-Karūkhī to Al-Maḡbūbī [1:202]. This is also the name preferred by Dār al-Ta’ṣīl [1:42].
<i>Al-Jāmi’ al-Ṣaḡīḥ</i> (الجامع الصحيح)	Al-Ḥākīm (), Al-Khaṭīb (), Ibn al-Athīr [ <i>Jāmi’ al-Uṣūl</i> , 1:193], Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān (), Ḥājī Khalīfah (), Aḡmad Shākīr ()
<i>Al-Sunan</i> (السنن)	Abū Ya’lā al-Khalīlī ()

<p><i>Al-Jāmi' al-Mukhtaṣar min al-Sunan 'an Rasūlillah Ṣallallāhu 'Alayhi Wasallam wa Ma'rifaḥ al-Ṣaḥīḥ wa'l-Ma'lūl wa ma 'Alayh al-'Amal</i></p> <p>(الجامع المختصر من السنن عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومعرفة الصحيح والمعلول وما عليه العمل)</p>	<p>Ibn Khayr al-Ishbīlī () [Al-Fihrist, pg.152]</p> <p>Sh. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ also prefers this in his treatise on the topic stating that this is the name found on the manuscript found in the library of Fayḍullah Effendī. Many later scholars agreed with the conclusion of Sh. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ including Sh. 'Abdullah al-Sa'd, Sh. Sa'd al-Ḥumayyid [Manāḥij, pg.87] and Sh. Ḥātim al-'Awnī [Al-'Unwān al-Ṣaḥīḥ, pg.54].</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

As for when he completed the book, Ibn Ḥajar records in his Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb, 3:669 that he presented the completed book to various scholars in 270 AH, 9 years before his passing. Sh. 'Awwāmah understands from this that he completed the book in this year. Al-Is'ardī also quotes in his Faḍā'il al-Jāmi', pg.32 that Al-Tirmidhī completed the book on Eid ul-Aḍḥā in 270 AH.

Sh. Sa'd al-Ḥumayyid also states the same and considers this to be a unique feature of Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī, he writes in Manāḥij al-Muḥaddithīn, pg.85:

وهذا يعطي الكتاب قيمة فإن كون الإمام يؤلف كتابا في آخر حياته هذا يدل على أنه ألف الكتاب في حال نضجه العلمي وبعد أن رسخت قدمه في العلم

“And this gives the book value, for indeed the Imām having wrote the book near the end of his life indicates that he wrote the book at a time when his knowledge had matured and after his feet had become composed in knowledge”

However, Sh. Shu'ayb al-Arnaout writes in his introduction, 1:70:

لكن يحدش هذا أن أبا العباس المحبوبي قال إنه قد سمع من الإمام الترمذي كتاب الجامع سنة خمس وستين ومئتين وكان عمره إذ ذاك ست عشرة سنة

“However, what spoils this is that Abu'l 'Abbās al-Maḥbūbī states that indeed he heard the book Al-Jāmi' in the year 265 AH and his age at the time was 16 years”

### Content of the Book

Sh. Zāhid al-Kawtharī writes in the footnotes of Thalāth Rasā'il, pg.170:

وملمح الترمذي الجمع بين الطريقتين فكأنه استحسّن طريقة الشيخين حيث بيّننا وما أجمعا وطريقة أبي داود حيث جمع كل ما ذهب إليه ذاهب فجمع كلنا الطريقتين وزاد عليهما بيان مذاهب الصحابة والتابعين وفقهاء الأمصار واختصر طرق الحديث فذكر واحدا وأوأمأ إلى ما عداه وبين أمر كل حديث من أنه صحيح أو حسن أو منكر وبين وجه الضعف أو أنه مستفيض أو غريب

“The feature of Al-Tirmidhī is the combination of these two paths (the paths of Al-Bukhāri and Muslim and the path of Abū Dāwūd), thus it is as though he liked the approach of both Imāms and that”

Shāh Waliullah has stated similar in Ḥujjatullah al-Bāligah as quoted by Mī Abu'l Ḥasan 'Alī al-Nadwī in Nazarāt, pg.161.

Ṭāhir al-Azhar writes in Al-Madkhal, pg.44:

"الجامع" كتاب رواية وفقه ونقد وتعليل للحديث

“Al-Jāmi' is book of narration, Fiqh, critiquing and picking up hidden defects in ḥadīth”

Sh. Sa'd al-Ḥumayyid writes in Manāḥij, pg.94:

جمع بين "الصناعة الحديثية" وبين "الناحية الفقهية"

“He combined between the art of ḥadīth and the art of fiqh”

The book contains approximately 3,956 aḥādīth.

Sh. Yūsuf Bannūrī outlines 10 unique features of the Jāmi', pg.314:

- 1) He covers 8 essential fields of the Sunnah; 1. Beliefs 2. Aḥkām 3. Tafsīr 4. Etiquettes 5. Sīrah 6. Virtues of the companions 7. Al-Targhīb wa'l-Tarhīb 8. Signs of the Day of Judgement

Sh. Bannūrī writes:

كتاب الزهد في هذا الجامع ليس له عندي نظير في هذه الكتب الستة

“Kitāb al-Zuhd in this Al-Jāmi', for me, it has no parallel in any of these six books”

- 2) He provides rulings upon aḥādīth, Sh. Bannūrī writes:

هب أنه تساهل في الحكم غير أنه رأي إمام حافظ ثقة متفق على جلالته وإمامته على أن تصحيحه فوق تصحيح الحاكم أبي عبد الله في المستدرک كما حقق بعض المحدثين  
“Let us accept that he is lenient in his ruling, still it is the opinion of a reliable ḥāfiẓ Imām, ”

- 3) He mentions the opinions of the Fuqahā and scholars of the past to such an extent that it almost suffices us from some of the books written on comparative Fiqh such as the book of Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (), Abū Ja'far al-Ṭahḥāwī (),

Muḥammad ibn al-Mundhir () and others. Similarly, it sheds light upon the positions of certain schools of thought that have become extinct such as the school of Al-Awzā'ī () and Sufyān al-Thawrī ()

- 4) He usually makes two chapters for each topic; in each chapter he presents the evidence of two opposing schools. Sh. Kashmīrī mentions that the first chapter is usually for the scholars of Ḥijāz and the second chapter is usually for the scholars of 'Irāq. Of course, this is not a hard and fast rule, and, at times, the first chapter is for the evidence of all four schools of thought.
- 5) Al-Tirmidhī at times mentions the actual names of those who are only found with their agnomens in the chain of narration. This helps in identifying narrators of ḥādīth.
- 6) He has paid particular attention to discussing the authenticity of the aḥādīth that he presents with particular focus on Al-Jarḥ wa'l-Ta'dīl, he discusses these aspects after presenting the ḥādīth. Sh. Bannūrī writes:  
والإمام الترمذي لما لم يلتزم شرطا خاصا في كتابه في إخراج الأحاديث مثل ما التزمه الشيخان البخاري ومسلم ثم النسائي وأبو داود بل توسع ما لم يتوسع البقية كافأ ذلك ببيان درجة الحديث من الصحة والضعف ثم بالكلام من جهة صنعة المحدثين في الرجال
- 7) He discusses unique aspects and beneficial points about a ḥādīth after presenting the ḥādīth, discussing whether the chain of narration is connected or broken or whether the narrator from the Prophet ṣallallāhu 'alayhi wasallam is a ṣaḥābī or not
- 8) He usually only presents one ḥādīth in each chapter with one chain of narration, however, he indicates to other narrations narrated by other ṣaḥābah on that particular topic using wording such as وفي الباب. Many scholars wrote books in which they attempted to source these narrations, including Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar. Before him, Ibn Sayyid al-Nās in his commentary upon the Jāmi' and Al-'Irāqī in his commentary upon the Al-Jāmi' paid special attention to sourcing these narrations. Sh. Bannūrī states that he too had started writing a book in sourcing these narrations, this book was later worked upon by his son-in-law Maulānā Ḥabībullah Mukhtār, whose work was printed with the name *Kashf al-Niqāb 'Ammā Yaqūluhū al-Tirmidhī wa fi'l-Bāb*.
- 9) He provides explanations behind certain ambiguous aḥādīth, such as the ḥādīth that Allah the Almighty accepts ṣadaqah with His Right Hand.
- 10) He usually presents a version of the ḥādīth that has some singularity so that he can discuss the singularity, he then indicates to the authentic versions through his statement وفي الباب

Sh. Aḥmad Shākir mentions 3 unique features of the Jāmi', 1:66:

- 1) After narrating a ḥādīth of a chapter, he presents the names of the ṣaḥābah who have narrated a ḥādīth that fit under that chapter
- 2) In most chapters he presents the various views of the fuqahā on that topic
- 3) He pays special attention to mention the hidden defects of the aḥādīth that he presents

### Praise of the Book

Al-Tirmidhī himself states as recorded in Siyar, 13:274:

صنفت هذا الكتاب وعرضته على علماء الحجاز والعراق وخراسان فرضوا به ومن كان هذا الكتاب - يعني "الجامع" في بيته فكأنما في بيته نبي يتكلم

"I wrote this book and I presented it to the scholars of Ḥijāz, 'Irāq and Khurāsān, thus they were happy with it, and he who has this book - i.e. Al-Jāmi' - in his home, then it is as though there is in his house a talking prophet"

Abū Ismā'īl al-Harawī states as recorded in Siyar, 13:277:

"جامع" الترمذي أنفع من كتاب البخاري ومسلم لأنهما لا يقف على الفائدة منهما إلا المتبحر العالم و"الجامع" يصل إلى فائدته كل أحد

"The 'Jāmi' of Al-Tirmidhī is more beneficial than the book of Al-Bukhārī and Muslim, for indeed none can realise the benefits within them except a vastly knowledgeable scholar, [whereas] the benefits of Al-Jāmi' are reachable to everyone"

Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī writes in the introduction to 'Āriḍah al-Aḥwadhī, 1:5:

وليس فيهم مثل كتاب أبي عيسى حلاوة مقطع ونفاضة منزع وعدوية مشرع

"And there is not in them (the other five famous books) the likes of the book of Al-Tirmidhī"

Ibn al-Athīr writes in Jāmi' al-Uṣūl, 1:193:

وهذا كتابه "الصحيح" أحسن الكتب وأكثرها فائدة وأحسنها ترتيبا وأقلها تكرارا وفيه ما ليس في غيره من ذكر المذاهب ووجوه الإستدلال وتبيين أنواع الحديث من الصحيح والحسن والغريب وفيه جرح وتعديل

“And this book of his Al-Ṣaḥīḥ is the best of books and the most beneficial and the best in terms of order and the least in terms of repetition, and in it is that which is not in other than it from the mentioning of the opinions of scholars and the methods of using evidence and elaboration of the types of ḥadīth such as Ṣaḥīḥ, Ḥasan and Gharīb, and it is [the field of] Al-Jarḥ Wa'l-Ta'dīl”

The author of Nuzḥah al-Khawāṭir explains that Shaykh Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī would begin by teaching Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī before any other book, he would discuss all detailed issues related to the ḥadīth whilst commenting upon this book. Whilst covering the other books, he would simply refer to the discussion from the Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī lesson. The author of Nuzḥah al-Khawāṭir writes as quoted by MI Abu'l Ḥasan in Naẓarāt, pg.167:

وكان يقرأ جامع الترمذي أولا ويبدل جهده فيه في تحقيق المتن والإسناد ودفع التعارض وترجيح أحد الجانبين وتشبيد المذهب الحنفي ثم يقرأ الكتاب الأخرى "سنن أبي داود  
فصحيح البخاري ومسلم فالنسائي فابن ماجه سردا مع بحث قليل يتعلق بالكتاب  
”

A uniquely beneficial aspect of the book is how it assists in identifying a narrator as a reliable narrator through an implicit manner. For example, if there is a narrator in the chain of narration that we do not have a ruling for and he is alone in narrating a narration, then Al-Tirmidhī's labelling of the ḥadīth as حسن صحيح would tell us that the narrator is a reliable narrator though not explicitly. This type of implicit authentication of a narrator (labelled Al-Tawthīq al-Ḍimnī) was often used by the likes of Ibn Daqīq al-'Id and Ḥāfiẓ Mughlaṭāy.

### Methodology of the Book

In terms of how he refers to chapters in his book, he does not use the work 'Kitāb', rather, he uses terms such as 'Abwāb al-Ṭahārah 'An Rasūlillah Ṣallallāhu 'Alayhi Wasallam'. He usually presents one or two aḥādīth under each chapter which he labels 'Bāb'. A unique feature of the Jāmi' in comparison to the other five famous books is that Al-Tirmidhī pays special attention to mentioning the various opinions of the early Mujtahid scholars on the issue at hand. MI Abu'l Ḥasan 'Alī al-Nadwī writes in Naẓarāt, that Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī may well be the first book ever written on comparative fiqh.

In fact, his entire book is based upon those aḥādīth that are practised by the jurists. His opening lines in his Al-'Ilal, pg. are:

جميع ما في هذا الكتاب من الحديث معمول به وقد أخذ به بعض أهل العلم ما خلا حديثين

“Everything that is in this book from aḥādīth have been acted upon and indeed some scholars have adopted it, except two aḥādīth...”

One of the unique aspects of Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī is that in most chapters he presents the version of a narration that has some defect, either in its chain of narration or text, he does this to elaborate upon the defect found within the narration. After this he usually presents the correct version of the narration. Hence, Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī writes in Sharḥ 'Ilal, 1:411:

وقد اعترض على الترمذي رحمه الله بأنه في غالب الأبواب يبدأ بالأحاديث الغريبة الإسناد غالبا وليس ذلك بعيب فإنه رحمه الله بيّن ما فيها من العلل ثم بيّن الصحيح في الإسناد  
وكان قصده رحمه الله ذكر العلل ولهذا تجد النسائي إذا استوعب طرق الحديث بدأ بما هو غلط ثم يذكر بعد ذلك الصواب المخالف

“And indeed, an accusation has been made against Al-Tirmidhī that in most chapters, he usually begins with a narration that has some singularity in its chain of narration, and that is not a defect, for indeed, he – may Allah have mercy upon him – explains that which is within it from the hidden defects and then explains the authentic chain of narration. And his intention – may Allah have mercy upon him – was to mention hidden defects, and for this reason you will find that when Al-Nasā'ī has gathered all the chains of narration, he will begin with that which is a mistake, after that he will mention the correct [version] that contradicts it”

We have already discussed the conditions of Al-Tirmidhī in our discussion on Sunan Abī Dāwūd. However, Ibn Rajab adds in Sharḥ 'Ilal, 1:395:

واعلم أن الترمذي رحمه الله خرّج في كتابه الحديث الصحيح والحديث الحسن – وهو ما نزل عن درجة الصحيح وكان فيه بعض ضعف – والحديث الغريب كما سيأتي والغرائب التي  
خرّجها فيها بعض المناكير – ولا سيما في كتاب الفضائل – ولكنه بيّن ذلك غالبا ولا يسكت عنه ولا أعلمه خرّج عن متهم بالكذب متفق على اتّهامه حديثا بإسناد منفرد إلا أنه قد  
يخرّج حديثا مرويا من طرق أو مختلفا في إسناده وفي بعض طرقه متهم وعلى هذا الوجه خرّج حديث محمد بن سعيد المصلوب ومحمد بن السائب الكلبي نعم قد يخرّج عن سيء الحفظ  
وعمن غلب على حديثه الوهم وبيّن ذلك غالبا ولا يسكت عنه... والترمذي رحمه الله يخرّج حديث الثقة الضابط ومن يهم قليلا ومن يهم كثيرا ومن يغلب عليه الوهم يخرّج حديثه  
نادرا وبيّن ذلك ولا يسكت عنه... وأبو داود قريب من الترمذي في هذا بل هو أشد انتقادا للرجال منه  
”

### The Position of the Book in Comparison to the Remaining Five Famous Books

Sh. Nūr al-Dīn 'Itr feels that the position of the Jāmi' is immediately after Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim. He states in Al-Muwāzanah, pg.61 onwards that Al-Tirmidhī narrates from the same narrators as Abū Dāwūd except that Al-Tirmidhī clarifies when a narrator is weak. However, Al-Dhahabī writes in Tārīkh al-Islām, 3:963:

انحطت رتبة "جامع" الترمذي عن "سنن" أبي داود والنسائي لإخراجه حديث المصلوب والكلبي وأمثالهما

“The level of Al-Tirmidhī dropped from Sunan Abī Dāwūd and Al-Nasā’ī due to him narrating the ḥadīth of Al-Maṣlūb and Al-Kalbī and others like them”

Sh. ‘Awwāmah responds to this in his footnotes upon Tadrīb al-Rāwī, 3:52 that Al-Tirmidhī has not narrated from Al-Maṣlūb except that he has clearly mentioned after it that the chain of narration is not authentic and that he has only narrated it to show the problem within the ḥadīth. The same also applied for Al-Kalbī. Hence, he concludes:

فظهر بهذا أن الترمذي ما روى لهذين الرجلين احتجاجا واستدلالا ولا متابعة ولا استشهادا إنما روى لهما ليبين خطأهما فيما رواه فقط  
”“

### Al-Tirmidhī’s Usage of the Term حسن

Al-Tirmidhī writes in his Al-‘Ilal, pg.75:

وما ذكرنا في هذا الكتاب "حديث حسن" وإنما أردنا به حسن إسناده عندنا كل حديث يروى لا يكون في إسناده من يتهم بالكذب ولا يكون الحديث شاذاً ويروى من غير وجه نحو ذلك فهو عندنا حديث حسن

“And whatever we label in this book as Ḥadīth Ḥasan, then indeed we intend that it’s chain of narration is Ḥasan according to us. Every ḥadīth that is narrated that in its chain of narration there is not a person accused of lying, and the ḥadīth is not Shādh, and it has been narrated in another manner similar to, then it is according to us Ḥasan”

We learn from this statement that Al-Tirmidhī’s definition for Ḥasan is only for his own usage and not the usage of the muḥaddithūn in general as stated by Sh. Khālid, 3:1047. Hence, for a ḥadīth to be labelled as Ḥasan according to Al-Tirmidhī, it must fulfil three conditions:

- 1) There must not be a narrator in the chain of narration who has been accused of lying

While this condition is true, it seems that Al-Tirmidhī does not limit himself to this. Rather, even if a narrator has not been accused of lying, but he has been abandoned by most of the scholars of ḥadīth, then too he will not label his ḥadīth as Ḥasan. Sh. Khālid writes, 2:1094:

وبهذا يتضح أن الترمذي لا يحسن لكل محدث ضعيف مهما بلغ ضعفه إذا لم يكن متهما بالكذب كما فهم الحافظ ابن رجب وكذلك لا يتمتع من تحسین بعض مرويات الضعفاء الموصوفين بكثرة الخطأ كمحمد بن عبد الرحمن بن أبي ليلى ومجالد بن سعيد وعبد الله بن هبيرة كما فهم ابن الصلاح وبعض المعاصرين فليس كل كثرة للخطأ مانعة من التحسين عنده وليس كل ضعف دون الإتهام بالكذب قابل للتحسين عنده أيضا والذي يظهر لي مما تقدم أن من كان كثير الخطأ لدرجة أن أكثر النقاد يصفونه بالترك أو بعدم كتابة حديثه وأما من كان كثير الخطأ والنقاد مختلفون في الرواية عنه أي لم يتفق أكثرهم على تركه وإنما هو اختيار بعضهم فهو عند الترمذي مقبول من حيث تحسین حديثه إذا استكمل الشروط المتبقية  
”“

Along with this Sh. Khālid confirms that Al-Tirmidhī has not labelled any ḥadīth as Ḥasan that has a narrator accused of lying, except two narrators: Al-Ḥārith al-A‘war and Kathīr ibn ‘Abdillāh al-Muzanī. However, it seems that Al-Tirmidhī did not consider these to be accused of lying in his opinion. In fact, Ibn Rajab in Sharḥ ‘Ilal, 1:397 defends Kathīr ibn ‘Abdillāh by stating how a group of scholars have strengthened him as a narrator.

Accordingly, it seems that Al-Tirmidhī has maintained this condition completely in his usage of Ḥasan.

- 2) The narration must not be Shādh

The discussion on Shādh can be found near the end of this book. However, it suffices to say that Al-Tirmidhī has chosen the interpretation of Shādh that means that the narration does not contradict stronger narrations, either in text or chain of narration. The reason why this interpretation of contradiction is better than interpreting Shādh as singularity is because if it were to be the latter, the third condition would become obsolete. Another reason why this interpretation is better is because Al-Tirmidhī refers to singularity with the term *Gharīb*.

However, it is important to understand that the existence of a contradiction can be subjective. Hence, there are instances when other muḥaddithūn would label a ḥadīth as Shādh as they consider it to be contradicting authentic narrations, whereas Al-Tirmidhī manages to reconcile between them and therefore labels the ḥadīth as Ḥasan. An example is found in that he narrates the ḥadīth:

حجاج بن أرطاة عن عطية بن سعيد العوفي عن ابن عمر قال "صليت مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الظهر في السفر ركعتين وبعدها ركعتين"  
”“

Al-Tirmidhī then comments:

هذا حديث حسن وقد رواه ابن أبي ليلى عن عطية ونافع عن ابن عمر... صلّيت مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في الحضر والسفر فصليت معه في الحضر الظهر أربعاً وبعدها ركعتين وصليت معه في السفر الظهر ركعتين وبعدها ركعتين والعصر ركعتين ولم يصل بعدها شيئاً والمغرب في الحضر والسفر سواء ثلاث ركعات لا تنقص في الحضر ولا في السفر وهي وتر النهار وبعدها ركعتين

""

This narration seems to contradict that which the reliable narrators have narrated from 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar raḍiyAllāhu 'anhu that he said:

صحبْتُ النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فلم أراه يسبح في السفر

""

Hence, many muḥaddithūn have labelled the first ḥadīth as Shādh as it contradicts this authentic ḥadīth, whereas Al-Tirmidhī felt that the second ḥadīth is interpreted that the Prophet ṣallāllāhu 'alayhi wasallam acted upon a concession of not to perform the Sunnah ṣalāh, whilst in the first ḥadīth Ibn 'Umar decided to practice upon that which is better. Sh. Khālid writes, 2:1129:

فقد وقفت على عدة نصوص يظهر منها أن الترمذي يميل للجمع بين المتن التي يظهر منها التعارض ولو اختلفت في قوتها...أخرج عن العلاء بن عبد الرحمن عن أبيه عن أبي هريرة مرفوعاً "إذا بقي نصف من شعبان فلا تصوموا" وقال بعده "حديث أبي هريرة حديث حسن صحيح لا تعرفه إلا من هذا الوجه على هذا اللفظ ومعنى هذا الحديث عند بعض أهل العلم أن يكون الرجل مفطراً فإذا بقي من شعبان شيء أخذ في الصوم لخال شهر رمضان وقد روي عن أبي هريرة عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ما يشبه قولهم حيث قال صلى الله عليه وسلم "لا تقدّموا شهر رمضان بصيام إلا أن يوافق ذلك صوماً كان يصومه أحدكم" وقد دل في هذا الحديث إنما الكراهية على من يتعمد الصيام لخال رمضان...وبما تقدّم من نصوص يظهر لنا بجلاء أن المخالفة عند الترمذي لا تضر بالحديث ولو كان الحديث المخالف أقوى إسناد ما دام الجمع ممكناً وبهذا يتضح لنا أن الترمذي لم يحسن حديثنا هو في نظره من قبيل الشاذ والأحاديث التي ذكرناها آنفاً ليست شاذة في نظر الترمذي وإن كانت عند غيره شاذة

""

### 3) The narration must have corroboration through a supporting narration or something similar

The first point that is important to understand is that the supporting narration does not need to have the same wording as the present ḥadīth. Rather, if it is similar in meaning, then it will be considered a supporting narration, enough to avoid labelling the current ḥadīth as Gharīb. Ibn Rajab writes, 1:384:

يعني أن يروى معنى ذلك الحديث من وجوه أخر عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بغير ذلك الإسناد...المعتبر أن يروى معناه من غير وجه لا نفس لفظه...وهذا كما في حديث الأعمال بالنيات فإن شواهد كثيرة جداً في السنة مما يدل على أن المقاصد والنيات هي المؤثرة في الأعمال وأن الجزاء يقع على العمل بحسب ما نوى به وإن لم يكن لفظ حديث عمر مروياً من غير حديثه من وجه يصح

""

It is also important that not all the aḥādīth presented under the الباب are worthy of being labelled as supporting narrations, even if that may be simply in meaning. Sh. Khālid writes, 2:1137:

لا يلزم أن تكون الأحاديث المذكورة في الباب متقاربة في المعنى

"It is not necessary that the aḥādīth mentioned under 'wa fi'l-bāb' are close in meaning"

Another point that is important to understand is that multiple supporting narrations are not needed. Rather, one supporting narration will be sufficient. The supporting narration may simply be another chain of narration for the ḥadīth with the exact same wording.

However, what is key about this condition is that it does not seem to be a condition that is required all the time. Rather, it is found most of the time. Sh. Khālid writes, 2:1147:

شرط "أن يروى من غير وجه" هو أغلبي لا كلي والدليل عليه أنني وجدت الترمذي حسن عدة أحاديث مع تصريحه بأنه لا يعرف الحديث إلا من ذلك الوجه

""

As for why he labels the ḥadīth as Ḥasan despite it not having a supporting narration as required in his definition, then Sh. Khālid is inclined towards the opinion that Al-Tirmidhī feels that the chain of narration and the text of the narration is able to withstand the singularity and the flaws in the chain of narration and text of the narration are not that serious. He writes, 2:1156:

وهذا الشرط الأخير لم يلتزم به الترمذي التزاماً كاملاً وكأنه يرى أن الحديث إذا لم يكن في سنده متهم بالكذب ولا توجد له مخالفة في السند أو المتن ويكون الحديث سندا وممتناً يحتتمل لذلك الضعيف فلا مانع من تحسينه وهذا ظاهر في أغلب النصوص التي ذكرناها آنفاً فليست تتضمن أحكاماً شرعية تدل على الوجوب أو الحرمة وإنما هي في الفضائل

""

A few questions then remain:

- 1) Does Al-Tirmidhī only label a narration as Ḥasan if it fulfils the conditions he has mentioned or is he more expansive in his usage?

It seems that Al-Tirmidhī is mor expansive in his usage of the term Ḥasan. Hence, he also seems to label a ḥadīth as Ḥasan if:

- There is some form of breakage in the chain of narration, even if all the narrators are reliable

Sh. Khālid writes, 2:1159:

لاحظتُ أنه حسنٌ عدة أحاديث مع أن رجال السند كلهم ثقات ليس فيهم من ضعف كما يفهم من شرطه الأول أنه يطلق الحسن على حديث من لا يتهم بالكذب والثقة لا يوصف بعدم الإتمام بالكذب كما رجحنا فيما مضى وسبب عدم تصحيح الترمذي واكتفائه بالتحسين فقط هو وجود انقطاع في ذلك السند

“I noticed that he labelled a number of aḥādīth as Ḥasan despite its narrators all being reliable, not a single one has been weakened as understood [to be a requirement] from his first condition that he will apply [the ruling of] Ḥasan upon the narration of the one who has not been accused of lying, and a reliable narrator is not described as being unaccused of lying as we have given preference in that which has passed. The reason as to why Al-Tirmidhī does not label the ḥadīth as Ṣaḥīḥ and suffices with Ḥasan only is the existence of a breakage in the chain of narration”

- That in which some of the reliable narrators have narrated to the Prophet ṣallallāhu ‘alayhi wasallam whilst other reliable narrators have only attributed to the ṣaḥābah

Sh. Khālid writes, 2:1161:

ومما يدخل في مفهوم الحسن – كما ظهر لنا من تحسينات الترمذي التطبيقية – الحديث المختلف فيه الذي يروى مرة مرفوعا ومرة موقوفا أو يروى مرة متصلا مسندا ومرة منقطعا

”

- That in which Al-Tirmidhī has some doubt over its authenticity despite all the narrators being reliable

Sh. Khālid writes, 2:1164:

ومما يؤكد سعة مفهوم الحسن عند الترمذي غير ما تقدم في الحالتين السابقتين ما يشك في تدليسه ويتردد في ثبوته من ذلك حديث يرويه الأعمش مرة بالنعنة ومرة يقول فيه "حدثتُ عن أبي صالح عن أبي هريرة مرفوعا" من سلك طريقا يطلب فيه علما... فقال "حسن" وإنما لم نقل لهذا الحديث صحيح لأنه يقال إن الأعمش دلّس فيه فرواه بعضهم عنه قال: حدثتُ عن أبي صالح

”

- 2) Does Al-Tirmidhī’s definition and usage of Ḥasan correlate with what the later scholars termed as Ḥasan li Ghayrihī?

It is famously understood according to the later scholars that Al-Tirmidhī’s definition of Ḥasan is what the later scholars refer to as Ḥasan li Ghayrihī. Hence, Ibn Ḥajar writes:

الترمذي عَرَفَ الحسن لغيره

Thus, we must briefly discuss whether this is accurate. To understand this further, it is important to understand that a ḥadīth should only be labelled as Ḥasan li Ghayrihī if we have two weak narrations that collectively support one another to become Ḥasan. Hence, Ḥasan li Ghayrihī is a ruling upon the text of the ḥadīth. This is whilst Al-Tirmidhī’s definition of Ḥasan applies to the chain of narration, this means that, at times, he may label a ḥadīth as Ḥasan due to its chain of narration even though the text of the ḥadīth according to him is Ṣaḥīḥ. After presenting several examples, Sh. Khālid writes, 2:1178:

وهذه الأمثلة الستة السابقة تدل دلالة صريحة وواضحة لا لبس فيها أن الترمذي يحسن أحاديث مع صحة متونها عنده وتأكدت هذه الحقيقة لدي عند دراسة الأحاديث

التي قال فيها إنما حسنة فقد وجدت ٢٩٢ حديثا أي ثلاثة أرباع (¾) ما حسنه أو يقارب ٧٥٪. إما صحيحة أو حسنة لذاتها أو لها شواهد صحيحة أو حسنة لذاتها

فهذه الأحاديث أعلى منزلة من حديث ضعيف تقوى بضعيف آخر وقد ذكرت أحاديث هذا الصنف في المنزلة الأولى في قائمة الأحاديث التي قال فيها "حسن"

”

### حسن صحيح Al-Tirmidhī’s Usage of the Term

One of the hugely debated issues in *Jāmi’ al-Tirmidhī* is the issue of Al-Tirmidhī labelling a ḥadīth as حسن صحيح. Considering that a حسن ḥadīth is of a lower level than a صحيح ḥadīth, one wonders how both terms could be applied to a single ḥadīth. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ posits the concern in his Muqaddimah, pg.44:

في قول الترمذي وغيره هذا حديث حسن صحيح اشكال لأن الحسن قاصر عن الصحيح كما سبق ايضاحه ففي الجمع بينهما في حديث واحد جمع بين نفي ذلك القصور وإثباته  
 “In the statement of Al-Tirmidhī and others, ‘This ḥadīth is Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ’ lies a problem. This is because Ḥasan is deficient than Ṣaḥīḥ as the explanation of which has passed, thus combining the two for one ḥadīth involves combining between a negation of the deficiency and the establishing of it”

The scholars have attempted to give various responses to this conundrum:

- 1) Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ states that the ḥadīth has two chains of narration; one is Ṣaḥīḥ and the other is Ḥasan. Hence, his intention is *حسن وصحيح*. He writes, pg.44:

وجوابه أن ذلك راجع إلى الإسناد فإذا روي الحديث الواحد بإسنادين أحدهما اسناد حسن والآخر اسناد صحيح استقام أن يقال فيه أنه حديث حسن صحيح أي إنه حسن بالنسبة إلى اسناد صحيح بالنسبة إلى اسناد آخر  
 ”

However, Ibn Daqīq al-‘Īd responds to this by stating that there are many occasions when Al-Tirmidhī states *حسن صحيح* and then states that it is not known except through this chain of narration.

- 2) Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ gives another reponse that Ḥasan here is in a linguistic sense, i.e. the ḥadīth has a good meaning, he writes, pg.44:

بعض من قال ذلك أراد بالحسن معناه اللغوي وهو ما تميل إليه النفس ولا يأباه القلب دون المعنى الإصطلاحي الذي نحن بصدده

“Some of those who said that intended with Ḥasan its linguistic meaning, and that is whatever the innate disposition is inclined towards, and heart does not reject it, not the terminological meaning that we are in the midst of [discussing]”

However, Ibn Daqīq al-‘Īd responds in *Al-Iqtirāḥ*, pg.240 that this would mean that a ḥadīth could be labelled as Ḥasan despite being fabricated simply because its meaning is good.

- 3) Ibn Daqīq al-‘Īd himself then provides a response that Ḥasan should only be viewed lower than Ṣaḥīḥ when it is presented alone. As for when Ḥasan is presented with Ṣaḥīḥ, then it is not considered lower than Ṣaḥīḥ. Accordingly, *حسن صحيح* simply means Ṣaḥīḥ. Hence, he writes in *Al-Iqtirāḥ*, pg.241:

والذي أقول في جواب هذا السؤال إنه لا يشترط في الحسن قيد القصور عن الصحيح وإنما يجيئه القصور ويفهم ذلك فيه إذا اقتصر على قوله "حسن"... فيصح أن يقال في هذا إنه حسن باعتبار وجود الصفة الدنيا وهي الصدق مثلا صحيح باعتبار الصفة العليا وهي الحفظ والإتقان  
 “That which I say in response to this question is that it is not stipulated in Ḥasan the condition of being deficient from Ṣaḥīḥ”

Ibn Ḥajar considers this to be one of the strongest answers as he writes in *Al-Nukat*, pg.283:

وفي الجملة أقوى الأجوبة ما أجاب به ابن دقيق العيد

“In summary, the strongest answer is that with which Ibn Daqīq al-‘Īd has responded”

- 4) Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr states that *حسن صحيح* is applied by Al-Tirmidhī when the ḥadīth is somewhere between Ḥasan and Ṣaḥīḥ. Accordingly, *حسن صحيح* is stronger than Ḥasan but lower than *صحيح*. He writes, pg.140:

والذي يظهر لي أنه يشترط بالحكم بالصحة على الحكم بالحسن كما يشترط بالحسن بالصحة فعلى هذا يكون ما يقول فيه "حسن صحيح" أعلى رتبة عنده من الحسن ودون الصحيح ويكون حكمه على الحديث بالصحة المحضة أقوى من حكمه عليه بالصحة مع الحسن  
 ”

However, Ibn Ḥajar responds in *Al-Nukat*, pg.281 that this would mean that there are three types of rulings upon a ḥadīth; Ṣaḥīḥ, Ḥasan and somewhere in between, whereas no scholar says this. Another problem with this position that Ibn Ḥajar has stated is that this would mean that there are very few authentic aḥādīth in Jāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī as most of the time Al-Tirmidhī uses the term *حسن صحيح* and rarely uses the term Ṣaḥīḥ.

- 5) Al-Zarakshī posits the idea that Al-Tirmidhī labels a ḥadīth as *حسن صحيح* due to the difference of the muḥaddithūn, with some labelling it as Ṣaḥīḥ and others labelling it as Ḥasan, hence his intention is *حسن أو صحيح*. He writes as quoted by Al-Suyūṭī in *Al-Baḥr al-Ladhī Zakhar*, pg.1231:

ويتمثل أن يكون الترمذي أدى اجتهاده إلى حسنه وأدى اجتهاد غيره إلى صحته أو بالعكس

“It is possible that Al-Tirmidhī’s deduction led to it (the ḥadīth) being labelled as Ḥasan and the deduction of others led to it being labelled as Ṣaḥīḥ or vice versa”

Ibn Hajar states in Al-Nukat, pg. that this response is a good response, unless a ḥadīth is found which is agreed upon as Ṣaḥīḥ according to all scholars and despite that Al-Tirmidhī labels it as حسن صحيح. He also states that another problem with this answer is that the apparent is that Al-Tirmidhī's rulings upon a ḥadīth are based on his own deductions, not other scholars of ḥadīth.

Nonetheless, Ibn Hajar would go on to adapt Al-Zarkashī's answer into his own answer in Nuzhah.

- 6) Ibn Hajar combines between the response of Al-Zarakashī and the response of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and states that if the ḥadīth has only one chain of narration, then it is a reference to the difference of opinion amongst the muḥaddithūn. In this scenario, حسن صحيح is not as strong as صحيح.

But if the ḥadīth has more than one chain of narration, then it is a reference to some of the chains of narration being Ḥasan and others being Ṣaḥīḥ. In this scenario, حسن صحيح is stronger than صحيح. He writes in Nuzhah al-Nazar, pg.61:

ومحصل الجواب أنّ تردد أئمة الحديث في حال ناقله اقتضى للمجتهد أن لا يصفه بأحد الوصفين فيقال فيه حسن باعتبار وصف عند قوم صحيح باعتبار وصفه عند قوم وغاية ما فيه أنه حذف منه حرف التردد لأنّ حقه أن يقول "حسن أو صحيح" وهذا كما فيه حرف العطف من الذي بعده وعلى هذا فما قيل فيه "حسن صحيح" دون ما قيل فيه "صحيح" لأنّ الجزم أقوى من التردد وهذا حيث التفرد وإلا لم يحصل التفرد فإطلاق الوصفين معا على الحديث يكون باعتبار إسنادين أحدهما صحيح والآخر حسن وعلى هذا فما قيل فيه "حسن صحيح" فوق ما قيل فيه "صحيح" فقط إذا كان فردا لأن كثرة الطرق تقوّي

”

While some later scholars preferred this response, including Sh. ‘Abdullah ibn Sālim al-Baṣrī, many contemporary scholars have refuted this response. Sh. Ḥātim writes in Sharḥ al-Mūqīzah, pg.47:

ثم إنّ هذا الجواب يرده إذا قال الترمذي عن حديث متفق على صحته "حسن صحيح غريب لا نعرفه إلا من هذا الوجه" إذ كيف نقول بتردد الترمذي فيه مع الاتفاق على صحته؟! ومما يردّ جواب الحفاظ ابن حجر أيضا أنه لا يمكن أن يتصور أن لفظا واحدا يستخدمه العالم ثم يكون له معنيان مختلفان على هذا الوجه من التغيرات الدقيقة الغريب ثم يكون فيه (أيضا) من الغموض ما يصل به إلى هذا الحد إذ إنّ هذا عيب كبير في التصنيف والتأليف ولو وقع من الترمذي لبينه كما فعل في الحسن

”

Similarly, Sh. Ibrāhīm al-Lāḥim writes in Sharḥ al-Nuzhah, pg. :

وفي نظري أنه أضعف الأجوبة وأبعدها من مقصود الترمذي

“In my opinion, it is the weakest response and the furthest away from the intention of Al-Tirmidhī”

- 7) Al-Suyūṭī provides a response that Al-Tirmidhī is attempting to state that the ḥadīth is Ḥasan li Dhāṭihī, but due to corroborating narrations it has become Ṣaḥīḥ li Ghayrihī. He writes in Al-Baḥr al-Ladhī Zakhār, pg.1241:

المراد حسن لذاته صحيح لغيره

“The intention is that it is Ḥasan li Dhāṭihī [but] Ṣaḥīḥ li Ghayrihī”

As we shall later see, the research of the students of Deoband incorporates this answer.

- 8) Al-Suyūṭī responds with another possibility
- 9) The view preferred by most contemporary scholars including Sh. Khālid al-Durays is that there is no difference between حسن صحيح and Ṣaḥīḥ according to Al-Tirmidhī. Sh. al-Durays adds that the addition of غريب has no impact on the authenticity of the ḥadīth, rather, it is just Al-Tirmidhī attempting to show that there is some form of singularity in the ḥadīth. Accordingly, there is no difference between حسن صحيح, حسن صحيح and حسن صحيح غريب in terms of authenticity. He writes, 2:1612:

وما تقدم ذكره في الوجهين السابقين يترجح لي أن لا فرق بين "حسن صحيح" وما يقول فيه الترمذي "صحيح" أو "صحيح غريب" من حيث المنزلة أو من حيث تعدد الطرق وعلى هذا فلا يصح أن يقال "صحيح" أصح من "حسن صحيح" أو العكس لعدم وجود أدلة تدل على أن الترمذي قصد التفريق بينهما حقيقة

”

He then states that the strongest answer seems to be that of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and Ibn Daḥiq al-‘Īd, though he prefers the answer of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ as it takes into consideration the idea of corroborating narrations; a key concept of Ḥasan according to Al-Tirmidhī. As for the response of Ibn Daḥiq al-‘Īd that Al-Tirmidhī at times labels a ḥadīth as حسن صحيح and then states that it is not known except through this chain of narration, then the answer to this is that Al-Tirmidhī intends by this that the ḥadīth is not known with this exact wording except through this chain of narration. He then proves this through several examples as Al-Tirmidhī narrates:

زهير بن محمد عن عبد الله بن محمد بن عقيل عن جابر بن عبد الله عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال "أبما عبد تزوج بغير إذن سيده فهو عاهر"

Al-Tirmidhī labels this ḥadīth as حسن perhaps because Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdillāh is weak. He then narrates:

ابن جرير عن عبد الله بن محمد بن عقيل عن جابر بن عبد الله عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم " قال "أما عبد تزوج بغير إذن سيده فهو عاهر"

Al-Tirmidhī labels this ḥadīth as حسن صحيح. Thus, it seems that Al-Tirmidhī called it حسن صحيح because it is حسن in consideration of one chain of narration and صحيح in consideration of the other chain of narration just as Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ has said.

Sh. Durays’ conclusion is also what the students of Darul ‘Ulūm Deoband concluded in their research on this issue. Hence, they have written, 1:18:

كل ما وصفه الإمام الترمذي بـ"حسن صحيح" ينقسم إلى قسمين رئيسين (أ) ما هو صحيح بالذات بأنواعه المختلفة (ب) ما هو صحيح بالغير بأقسامه المتنوعة وهو الأغلب

لا شك في أنّ ما يصفه بـ"حسن صحيح" يكون دائما أقوى وأعلى مما يصفه بـ"حسن" أو "حسن غريب" وأما قوله "صحيح" فقط فلا يكاد يوجد في الجامع وإن وجد شيء من ذلك فلم يلاحظ فيه الترمذي شيئا يميّزه من "الحسن الصحيح" فلا يجزم فيه بقاعد مطردة من أنه أقوى من "الحسن الصحيح" أو دونه

“Everything that Al-Tirmidhī describes as Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ divides into two main types: (a) that which is Ṣaḥīḥ li Dhātihī with its varying types (b) that which is Ṣaḥīḥ li Ghayrihī with its varying types, this is the most common usage.

”

It is also the view preferred by Sh. Ḥātim though his reasoning is slightly different as he claims that Al-Tirmidhī is simply following the muḥaddithūn before him in his usage of this term. He writes in Sharḥ al-Mūqīzah, pg.49:

والذي أختاره في الجواب عن ذلك أنّ مصطلح "حسن صحيح" موجود قبل الترمذي عند البخاري فيما نقله عنه الترمذي ي "العلل الكبير" وعند غيره إذن فهذا الإستخدام موجود قبل أن يكون للحسن معنى اصطلاحى لأن الترمذي هو أوّل من استخدم الحسن بالمعنى الإصطلاحى وعليه فعندما جمع العلماء قبل الترمذي بين الحسن والصحة لم يجمعوا بينهما والحسن عندهم مرتبة دون مرتبة الصحيح بل استخدموا الحسن بالمعنى اللغوي والذي يدل في هذا السياق على مطلق القبول. وعليه فـ"حسن صحيح" قبل الترمذي تعني "صحيح" ولا إشكال فيها. ثم جاء الترمذي واستخدم هذا المصطلح "حسن صحيح" كما كان يستخدمه شيخه البخاري وغيره فاستخدمه بمعنى "صحيح" دون أن ينفذ في ذهنه أنه سيُتعمَلُ معه على أنه جمع بين مصطلحين متباينين لأنه كان اصطلاحا مستقرا قبل الترمذي واستخدمه الترمذي على ما كان عليه. وبهذا التوجيه يكون الجمع بين وصف الحسن والصحة مساويا لوصف الصحة فقط وإنما هو تنوع في العبارة ونحن بهذا التوجيه نتفق مع توجيه ابن دقيق العيد والذهبي في مساواة هذا المصطلح لوصف الصحة وتختلف في تقرير هذا التوجيه

”

#### حديث غريب Usage of the Term

Most contemporary scholars have agreed that when Al-Tirmidhī labels a ḥadīth as only حديث غريب, then it is almost always a weak narration. Sh. Khālīd al-Durays writes, 2:1085:

فَقَلَّمَا يَحْكُمُ عَلَى حَدِيثٍ بِالْغَرَابَةِ بِدُونِ إِضَافَةِ حَسَنٍ أَوْ صَحِيحٍ إِلَّا وَيَكُونُ ذَلِكَ الْحَدِيثُ ضَعِيفًا

“Very rarely does he give the ruling of Gharīb upon a ḥadīth without adding Ḥasan or Ṣaḥīḥ except that the ḥadīth is weak”

Sh. Ḥātim al-Awnī writes in Sharḥ al-Mūqīzah, pg.102:

فَإِنَّ التِّرْمِذِيَّ فِي كِتَابِهِ "الجامع" إِذَا وَصَفَ حَدِيثًا بِأَنَّهُ "غَرِيبٌ" دُونَ أَنْ يُضَيَّفَ إِلَيْهِ الْوَصْفَ بِالْحَسَنِ أَوْ بِالصَّحَةِ فَإِنَّهُ يَقْصِدُ بِذَلِكَ غَالِبًا تَضْعِيفَ الْحَدِيثِ وَوَصْفَهُ بِالتَّفَرُّدِ أَيْضًا

“For indeed, Al-Tirmidhī in his book Al-Jāmi’ when he describes a ḥadīth that it is Gharīb without adding to it the quality of Ḥasan or Ṣaḥīḥ, then he usually intends by this weakening of the ḥadīth along with describing it as containing a singularity”

Sh. Ḥātim then mentions that scholars who have mentioned this include Mughlaṭāy in his commentary upon Sunan Ibn Mājah.

Sh. Sa’d al-Ḥumayyid writes in Fatāwā Ḥadīthiyyah, pg.116:

فإنه يقصد بهذه الكلمة هذا حديث غريب أي هذا حديث ضعيف عرف هذا بالإستقراء في كتابه

“For indeed, he – may Allah have mercy upon him – intends with this statement ‘This is a Gharīb Ḥadīth’ i.e. ‘This is a weak ḥadīth’ this has been understood through complete research of his book”

#### Does Al-Tirmidhī use حسن غريب as a Reference to What the Later Scholars Labelled as Ḥasan li Dhātihī?

Some contemporary scholars have held the opinion that considering that Al-Tirmidhī uses Ḥasan as a reference to Ḥasan li Ghayrihī due to the narration having multiple chains of narration, his usage of Ḥasan Gharīb is a reference to the ḥadīth being Ḥasan li Dhātihī:

1) Sh. Nūr al-Dīn 'Itr writes, pg.171:

فإنه غالبا ما يميّز الحسن لذاته بقوله "حسن غريب"

"For indeed, he usually distinguishes Ḥasan li Dhātihī with his statement 'Ḥasan Gharīb'"

2) Sh. Shu'ayb al-Arnaout writes, 1:87:

وهذا النوع من الحديث الحسن - وهو الحسن لذاته - موجود في "الجامع" لكنه رحمه الله يميّزه بقوله "حسن غريب"

"And this type of ḥadīth Al-Ḥasan – and that is Ḥasan li Dhātihī – is found in Al-Jāmi', however he, may Allah have mercy upon, distinguishes it with his statement 'Ḥasan Gharīb'"

3) Sh. 'Awwāmah writes in Tadrīb al-Rāwī, 3:18:

أما إذا قال حسن غريب فإنه يريد الحسن لذاته لأن الغرابة تتنافى مع تعدد الطرق

"As for when he says, 'Ḥasan Gharīb' for indeed he intends Ḥasan li Dhātihī, for indeed the ruling of Gharīb negates the existence of multiple chains"

4) Sh. Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī writes, :

However, Sh. Khālid shows how only 21% of aḥādīth that Al-Tirmidhī labels with this ruling could be ruled as Ḥasan li Dhātihī. He concludes that in terms of authenticity, there is no difference between Al-Tirmidhī labelling a ḥadīth as Ḥasan and labelling a ḥadīth as Ḥasan Gharīb. Thus, the addition of the word Gharīb is just to show that there is some form of singularity in the narration. He writes, 2:1426:

والذي أرجحه أن ما يقول فيه الترمذي "حسن غريب" ليس أقوى مما يقول فيه "حسن" بل في بعض ما يقول فيه "حسن" ما هو أقوى من كثير مما يقول فيه "حسن غريب" كما أن في بعض ذلك ما هو أقوى من بعض ما يقول فيه "حسن" ومن غير شك يوجد في كلا الحكمين: الصحيح والحسن لذاته والضعيف المنجبر

""

#### What is the Shortest Chain of Narration in the Jāmi'?

Ibn Sayyid al-Nās writes in Al-Nafḥ al-Shadhī, 1: :

أما الثلاثي فلا نعلم له في جامعه منه إلا حديثا واحدا

""

#### Does Al-Tirmidhī have Partisanship against Abū Ḥanīfah?

Since he is the student of Imām al-Bukhārī, he of course had some level of partisanship against Abū Ḥanīfah. However, this was an academic disagreement and not of a personal nature. The evidence behind this is that he quotes from Abū Ḥanīfah in his Al-'Ilal, pg. :

حدّثنا محمود بن غيلان حدثنا أبو يحيى الحماني قال سمعت أبا حنيفة يقول "ما رأيت أحدا أكذب من جابر الجعفي ولا أفضل من عطاء بن أبي رباح"

As for why he does not quote Abū Ḥanīfah explicitly except in a few rare instances, then Sh. Bannūrī quotes Sh. Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī, pg.320:

لم يصل إليه مذهب أبي حنيفة خاصة بالإسناد الموثوق كما وصل إليه مذهب الشافعي القديم من رواية أبي الحسن الزعفراني

"The madhhab of Abū Ḥanīfah specifically did not reach him through a reliable chain of narration like how the old madhhab of Al-Shāfi'ī had reached him through the narration of Abu'l Ḥasan al-Za'farānī"

Sh. Bannūrī states, pg.320 that it is possible that he was influenced by his teacher Al-Bukhārī, who was influenced by his teacher Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh, who was influenced in his partisanship against by Abū Ḥanīfah by his teacher 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mehdī who had developed partisanship against Abū Ḥanīfah due to his teacher Sufyān al-Thawrī having an academic rivalry with Abū Ḥanīfah.

#### The Manuscript of Al-Karūkhī

One of the key issues with Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī is that a lot of discrepancies are found within the manuscripts when it comes to the rulings of Al-Tirmidhī. Whilst some manuscripts have حديث حسن for a ḥadīth, other manuscripts have حديث صحيح for the same ḥadīth. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ writes in Muqaddimah, pg.38:

وَتَحْتَلِفُ النُّسَخُ مِنْ كِتَابِ التِّرْمِذِيِّ فِي قَوْلِهِ هَذَا حَدِيثٌ حَسَنٌ أَوْ هَذَا حَدِيثٌ حَسَنٌ صَحِيحٌ وَهَذَا ذَلِكَ فَيَنْبَغِي أَنْ تُصَحَّحَ أَصْلُكَ بِهِ بِجَمَاعَةِ أَصُولٍ وَتَعْتَمِدَ عَلَى مَا اتَّفَقَتْ عَلَيْهِ

The manuscripts of the book of Al-Tirmidhī differ in his statement 'this ḥadīth is Ḥasan' or 'this ḥadīth is Ṣaḥīḥ' and similar to this, thus it is appropriate that you correct your copy by [comparing it with] a collection of manuscripts and then rely upon that which they all agree upon""

Therefore Sh. 'Awwāmah writes in the footnotes of Tadrīb al-Rāwī, 3:41:

وبناء على هذا أقول إن الدراسات المعاصرة التي تتصل بكتاب "السنن" عامة أو بحكم من أحكامه لدراسته مثل حسن أو حسن غريب أو حسن صحيح حسن صحيح غريب وهكذا إن هذه الدراسات لا تصل – فيما أرى – إلى نتائج حاسمة صحيحة لأنها تقوم على اعتماد طبعات "السنن" وليس فيها ما يعتمد على أحكام الإمام الترمذي لأنها غير معتمدة على أصول خطية موثوقة مقروءة على أئمة معتمدين فلهاذا كانت دراسات على أرض غير صلبة ولا يزال هذا الكتاب الرفيع القدر العمدة الحجة بحاجة إلى خدمة لائقة بمقامه العلمي الرفيع يعتمد فيه القراء على أحكام مؤلفه الإمام لا على أحكامنا

“Based upon this, I say, indeed any contemporary research connected to the book Al-Sunan in general, or regarding a ruling from amongst its rulings such as Ḥasan or Ḥasan Gharīb or Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ [or] Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ Gharīb, etc. do not reach – in my opinion – reliable definitive results because they rely upon the prints of ‘Al-Sunan’, and there is not any from them (the prints of Al-Sunan) that can be relied upon for the rulings of Imām al-Tirmidhī because they (the prints) have not relied upon authentic handwritten manuscripts that have been recited to reliable scholars. Therefore, the research is not well-grounded. Thus this venerable, reliable and authoritative book remains in need of work that honours its high academic status in which readers [are allowed to] rely upon the ruling of its author, the Imām, not upon our rulings”

Sh. ‘Awwāmah then praises the book of Sh. Khalid al-Durays ‘*Al-Ḥadīth al-Ḥasan li Dhātihī wa li Ghayrihī*’ since he has relied upon the most reliable manuscript of Jāmi’ al-Tirmidhī. Sh. al-Durays explains in his book that he phoned his teacher Sh. Muṣṭafā al-A’ẓamī regarding the most authentic copy of Jāmi’ al-Tirmidhī, he states that Sh. Muṣṭafā al-A’ẓamī replied, 2:1015:

أَفْضَلُ نُسْخِ جَامِعِ التِّرْمِذِيِّ فِيمَا أُعْرِفُ هِيَ نُسْخَةُ بَارِسَ النَّيِّ قُرِئَتْ عَلَى الْكُرُوخِيِّ وَعَلَيْهَا تَوْقِيعُهُ بِخَطِّهِ وَهِيَ أَفْضَلُ مِنَ النُّسْخَةِ الْمَقْرُوءَةِ عَلَى الْمُنْدَرِيِّ وَالِدِمْبَاطِيِّ لِأَنَّهَا مِنْ تَلَامِيذِ تَلَامِيذِ الْكُرُوخِيِّ فَنُسْخَةُ الْكُرُوخِيِّ الْمَوْجُودَةُ فِي بَارِسَ أَقْدَمُ وَهِيَ الْأَصْلُ وَالنُّسْخَةُ الْأُخْرَى فَرَعٌ عَنْهَا

“The best manuscript of Jāmi’ al-Tirmidhī in my knowledge is the manuscript of Paris that was read upon Al-Karūkhī, and upon it is his signature with his handwriting. It is better than the manuscript that was read to Al-Mundhirī and Al-Dimyāṭī for indeed they are from the students of Al-Karūkhī. Thus, the manuscript of Al-Karūkhī present in Paris is older and it is the original and the other manuscripts are derivations of it”

Al-Karūkhī’s name was Abu’l Faṭḥ ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Abī’l Qāsim ‘Abdillah ibn Abī Sahl ibn Abī’l Qāsim al-Karūkhī al-Bazzār. He passed away in 548 AH. He narrates the book from four students of Al-Jarāḥī (), the student of Muḥammad al-Maḥbūbī (d.346 AH). Furthermore, not only would he narrate the Jāmi’ from his four teachers, he would also write out the Jāmi’ at a cost for those who wanted a copy. Hence, this copy in Paris is written with the handwriting of Al-Karūkhī. The notable scholars who acquired the Jāmi’ from Al-Karūkhī include Ibn ‘Asākir (d.571 AH), Al-Sam’ānī () and Ibn al-Jawzī (d.597 AH).

#### Famous Narrators of the Book

The famous narrators of the book are:

- 1) Abu’l ‘Abbās Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Marwazī al-Maḥbūbī (d.346 AH)

This is the most famous narration of the book. Al-Is‘ardī writes in Faḍā’il al-Jāmi’, pg.42:

ومن روايته اشتهر

- Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Jabbār ibn Muḥammad al-Jarrāḥī al-Marwazī (d.412 AH)
  - ❖ Abū ‘Āmir Maḥmūd ibn al-Qāsim al-Azdī (d.487 AH)
  - ❖ Abū Naṣr ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Muḥammad al-Tiryāqī (d.483 AH)
  - ❖ Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Ghūrajī (d.481 AH)
  - ❖ ‘Abdullah ibn ‘Alī ibn Yāsīn al-Dahhān (d.412 AH)

- 2) Abū Sa’īd Al-Haytham ibn Kulayb al-Shāshī (d.335 AH)

He is the sole narrator of Al-Shamā’il al-Muḥammadiyyah.

- 3) Abū Ḥāmid Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdillah al-Tājir al-Marwazī

- 4) Abū Dhar Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Tirmidhī

- Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad al-‘Attār (d.388 AH)

- 5) Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qattān (d.343 AH)

- 6) Abū ‘Alī Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Harawī (d.324 AH)

- 7) Abu’l Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Taḳī al-Samarqandī

#### Famous Commentaries upon the Book

The famous commentaries of the book include:

- 1) ‘*Arīḍah al-Aḥwadhī* (عارضه الأحوذى) by Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī (d.543 AH)

- 2) *Al-Nafh al-Shadhī* (النفح الشذوي) by Ibn Sayyid al-Nās al-Ya'murī (d.734 AH); however, he did not manage to complete this book
- 3) *Takmilah al-'Irāqī li Sharh Ibn Sayyid al-Nās* by Ḥāfiẓ Zayn al-Dīn al-'Irāqī (d.806 AH), in this book Al-'Irāqī completed the commentary of Ibn Sayyid al-Nās. Al-Shawkānī benefitted a lot from this commentary in his *Nayl al-Awtār*. In fact, Al-Shawkānī writes describing the commentary of Ibn Sayyid al-Nās in *Al-Badr al-Ṭālī*, 2:250:

هو ممتع في جميع ما تكلم عليه من فن الحديث وغيره مع التزامه لإخراج الحديث التي يشير إليها الترمذي بقوله وفي الباب عن فلان وفلان إلخ...ولما وقفت على الجزء الذي يلي هذا الجزء للزين العراقي بهرني ذلك ورأيتنه فوق ما شرحه صاحب الترجمة (يعني ابن سيد الناس) بدرجات

”“

However, Al-'Irāqī did not manage to complete the book though he covered a significant amount. Accordingly, his son tried to complete the book as did Ḥāfiẓ al-Sakhāwī, though these two books have not been found.

As for Al-'Irāqī's commentary, it has been worked on and should be printed soon.

- 4) *Sharh Ibn Rajab* by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī (d.792 AH)

This book was lost during the various invasions of the Tatars, except for his commentary upon Al-'Ilal al-Ṣaghīr of Al-Tirmidhī. Sh. Shu'ayb writes, 1:102:

ولو سلم شرح ابن رجب هذا من الضياع لكان فيه غناء أي غناء عن الشروح التي انتهت إلينا

“And if this commentary of Ibn Rajab had been protected from destruction, it would have provided an independence, and what an independence! From all the commentaries that have reached us”

- 5) *Qūt al-Mughthadhī* (قوت المغتذي) by Imām al-Suyūṭī (d.911 AH)

This is a very brief commentary in which he has relied primarily upon Ibn Sayyid al-Nās and Al-'Irāqī.

- 6) *Tuḥfah al-Aḥwadhī* (تحفة الأحوذوي) by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mubārakpūrī (d.1355 AH)

This is one of the largest later commentaries upon the *Jāmi'*. He has placed a detailed introduction to the commentary at the start in which the first part is 336 pages and covers a description of various books of ḥadīth in a manner much like the book *Al-Risālah al-Mustaṭrafah*. The second part is approximately 150 pages and covers an introduction to *Jāmi'* al-Tirmidhī.

- 7) *Al-Kawkab al-Durrī* (الكوكب الدرّي) by Sh. Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī (d.1323 AH)

- 8) *Al-'Arf al-Shadhī* (العرف الشذوي) by Sh. Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī (d.1353 AH), compiled by his student Ml. Chirāgh

- 9) *Ma'ārif al-Sunan* (معارف السنن) by Sh. Yūsuf Bannūrī

This book was incomplete as he reached until the end of the chapters of Ḥajj. A significant portion of it is taken from the lessons of Sh. Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī. He wrote the book as a correction of some of the points found in Ml Chirāgh's compilation of *Al-'Arf al-Shadhī*. The author pays special attention to refuting certain claims made by Sh. Mubārakpūrī. Sh. Shu'ayb writes, 1:105:

ولو كُمل هذا الشرح لكان فردا في بابه وأساسا ومرجعا للعلماء والمحدثين فإنه رحمه الله أتى فيه بنفائس ولباب أقوال فحول العلماء وأغنى عن مطالعة الأسفار

“And if this commentary were complete, it would be unique in its field and a principle and a source for the scholars and muḥaddithūn, for indeed, he may Allah have mercy upon him has brought some beneficial points and the summary of the prestigious scholars and he has made us independent of researching the large tomes”

#### Famous Prints of the Book

- 1) Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī print
- 2) Mu'assasah al-Risālah print

The principal manuscript that Sh. Shu'ayb relied upon is the manuscript of Al-Karūkhī. He also used five other manuscripts including one written by Ibn al-Jawzī and another found in Maktabah Sulaymāniyyah in Istanbul that was read to Al-Mundhirī. However, not all of these manuscripts are complete. Along with this, Sh. Shu'ayb states that he benefitted from *Tuḥfah al-Ashraf* in establishing certain text. In the footnotes, Sh. Shu'ayb provides rulings upon the aḥādīth and, at times, explains the difficult words in the ḥadīth.

- 3) Dār al-Ta'sīl print

They have relied upon 12 manuscripts and taken support from 8 other manuscripts with their primary manuscript being the manuscript of Al-Karūkhī. From amongst their manuscripts was the manuscript of Maktabah Sulaymāniyyah in

Istanbul, written by one of the teachers of Al-Mizzī, this manuscript was compared with the manuscript of Ḥāfiẓ al-Mundhirī, Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqīnī and others. However, not all these manuscripts are complete.

Along with this, they too have benefitted and compared with Tuḥfah al-Ashrāf along with many other commentaries of the Jāmi' and books written on the narrators of ḥadīth.

They have a beneficial contents page at the end of the book of special beneficial points found throughout the book.

[Al-Arnaout, 'Muqaddimah Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī', (Beirut: Mu'assasah al-Risālah), ][Ma'rūf, 'Muqaddimah al-Jāmi' al-Kabīr', (: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, ), ][Al-'Umarī, 'Turāth al-Tirmidhī al-'Ilmī', ()][Aḥmad Ma'bad, 'Muqaddimah al-Nafḥ al-Shadhī', ()]['Itr, 'Al-Imām al-Tirmidhī wa'l-Muwāzanah Bayn Jāmi'ihī wa Bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn', ()][Al-Durays, 'Al-Ḥadīth al-Ḥasan li Dhātihī wa li Ghayrihī', ()][Ṭāhir al-Azhar, 'Al-Madkhal Ilā Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī', ()]['Abdullah al-Sa'd, 'Al-Madkhal Ilā Jāmi' al-Tirmidhī', ()][Faḍl al-Raḥmān, 'Hadiyyah al-Aḥwadhī', (), ][Iyād al-Ṭabbā', 'Al-Imām al-Tirmidhī', ()]

MUADH CHATI