

Fa Noon, W.
Ahmed
Ibn
Kantab
and
the Mikm

IS

Ne

401



Nr 401 13986/1971

AHMED IBN HANBAL

AND

THE MIHNA.

A CONTRIBUTION TO A BIOGRAPHY OF THE
IMÂM AND TO THE HISTORY OF THE
MOHAMMEDÂN INQUISITION CALLED THE MIHNA,
218—234 A. H.

INAUGURAL DISSERTATION

TO OBTAIN

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR

IN THE

PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY

OF THE

RUPRECHT-KARLS-UNIVERSITÄT OF HEIDELBERG,

PRESENTED BY

WALTER M. PATTON, B. D.



LIBRAIRIE ET IMPRIMERIE

E. J. BRILL

LEIDE — 1897.





AḤMED IBN ḤANBAL
AND
THE MIḤNA.

Ve



13986/1921
V2401

AHMED IBN HANBAL
AND
THE MIHNA.

A CONTRIBUTION TO A BIOGRAPHY OF THE
IMÂM AND TO THE HISTORY OF THE
MOHAMMEDAN INQUISITION CALLED THE MIHNA,
218—234 A. H.

INAUGURAL DISSERTATION
TO OBTAIN
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR
IN THE
PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY
OF THE
RUPRECHT-KARLS-UNIVERSITÄT OF HEIDELBERG,
PRESENTED BY
WALTER M. PATTON, B. D.

LIBRAIRIE ET IMPRIMERIE
CI-DEVANT
E. J. BRILL
LEIDE — 1897.

By permission of the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Heidelberg the following pages are offered as a dissertation to obtain the Doctor's degree. They constitute the Introduction and Part I of a work entitled "Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal and the Miḥna, a Biography of the Imâm Aḥmed including an Account of the Moḥammedan Inquisition called the Miḥna, 218—234 A. H."

The whole work will be published in the course of the present summer by the publishing house ci-devant E. J. Brill, Leiden.

PRINTED BY E. J. BRILL, AT LEYDEN.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

The following pages contain the record of the Imâm Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal and of a struggle ¹⁾ with which he stood connected, whose issues were so great as to warrant a close study of all that is involved in the movement. The history of Dogma in Islâm as written by Western writers has given us an idea of the questions which were being disputed at this time, and the outward history of events has recorded in very meagre outline the most important public occurrences of our narrative; but there has been, so far, no use made of the rich opportunity presented in the biography of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal to see the theological controversies of Islâm in their connection with the outward history of the State. This kind of historical study is the more interesting, because from it we are enabled to understand the relation of the State to religion at that time, and the place occupied by religion and its teachers in the State.

1) The Miḥna. This term, meaning in general usage a 'testing' or 'trial', whether by the accidents of fortune or the actions of men, is often used, (together with the VIII Form of the verb سَأَلَ) with reference to a religious test with a view to obtaining assent to some particular belief or system of beliefs. We find this special usage largely illustrated in the records of the Mu'tazilite inquisition, the account of which is to appear in the sequel. It is also found in the accounts of the Orthodox inquisition under the Khalif Kâhir 200 years later. Most commonly, the whole persecution extending from the year 218 A. H. to 234 A. H. is called the Miḥna.

We have referred above to the issues of the Miḥna, as the persecution inaugurated by al-Ma'mūn is called. The importance of them lies in the fact that they settled the orthodox character of Islām for all following ages; and in the preservation of orthodoxy lies the preservation of Islām itself, in our judgment. Had Rationalism succeeded in bringing about by persecution a general abandonment of orthodoxy, it is probable that the principle of free thought, without recognition of authority, would have had a disintegrating effect within Islām itself, and would have made it much more susceptible to modifying and reforming influences from without; so that, in time, we should have seen standards of faith and life, which contravene our reason as the Korān and Tradition do, given up for something more satisfying to reason and moral judgment. We need not enter into the question whether any good came from the preservation of orthodoxy, further than to say that if Islām was to continue to be Islām, to preserve orthodoxy was the best way to accomplish such a result.

We ought to give Rationalism credit for having asserted the principle, un-Islāmic though it be, that thought must be free in the search for truth. The abuse of free-thinking, however, in a love of speculation for speculation's sake, and in an inordinate desire of controversial victory is, in the history of this period, abundantly exemplified.

Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal during his whole career subsequent to the death of the Imām al-Shāfi'ī (204 A. H.) was the most remarkable figure in the camp of Mohammedan orthodoxy, and during the course of the Miḥna did more than any other individual to strengthen the resistance of his party to the repressive efforts of the Khalifs and their officers. He stood for the standing or falling of orthodoxy in its time of trial; and there is little exaggeration in the statement, made more than once concerning him, that 'all men were looking to him for an example, that as he decided on the test as to the Korān being applied to him, so they might follow'.

We have some interesting circumstantial evidence of

Aḥmed's position and influence among the people from the way in which he was treated by the Khalifs. Al-Ma'mûn had made up his mind to cite him to appear with the first seven men to whom he put the test, but even the violent bigot Aḥmed ibn Abû Dowâd the Chief-Kâdî advised his master not to summon him, doubtless recognizing that success with the seven men would be much more difficult should Aḥmed be with them, and feeling that the result of their trial would better determine whether or not it would be wise to attack one greater than they. Al-Ma'mûn's letter to his governor in Baghdâd after the latter had examined the doctors treats with gentleness Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, when one reads what he had to say about most of the other doctors there alluded to. In the case of al-Mu'taṣim, we must bear in mind that he did not scourge Aḥmed until he had exhausted every means to save him, by threats, arguments and entreaties. He declared that had al-Ma'mûn not ordered him to deal with him and such as he, he would have had nothing to do with the infliction of the punishment. Furthermore, the scourging took place in the court-yard of the palace unknown to the mass of the people, who stood outside waiting for the announcement as to how the trial had ended. As soon as they suspected that their Imâm was being tortured, there was a tremendous excitement; and it seemed as if the Khalif's palace would become an object of assault, when al-Mu'taṣim had Aḥmed's uncle 'Ishâk brought out, and had this man falsely intimate to them that he had not harmed his nephew in the least. To make himself still more secure against the danger of a popular uprising, al-Mu'taṣim kept Aḥmed within the precincts of the palace until the evening, and then dressed him up in gala costume and sent him under cover of dusk to his dwelling. We may consider it as significant of Aḥmed's standing among the people that there were no further attempts to coerce him during the remaining fifteen years of the Miḥna, though we are assured that he was active in teaching and as popular as he ever had been, or even more



so. Al-Wâthiq's treatment furnishes some evidence to shew how he regarded Aḥmed's influence. We are told that, despite the urging of Ibn Abû Dowâd, he would not cite Aḥmed for examination before him, but sent word to the Imâm to remove from his country; a good proof that Aḥmed had great power with the people. The biographer adds that he does not know whether the Khalif refrained from dealing with Aḥmed because of admiration for his steadfastness, or because of fear that evil consequences might come upon him should he lay violent hands upon so holy a man. For al-Mutawakkil we need say little here. His attention to Aḥmed and the messages which he sent him point clearly to his popularity and influence.

The religious sentiment in the Muslim populace had not much sympathy with the loose views and free living of the liberal teachers. Hence it was that they idolized as they did a man like Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal. His intense devotion to the things most venerated and cherished by the people: God, the Prophet, the Korân, the Tradition, the Sunna of the Prophet, and the Communion of the Faithful, endeared him to the mass of the common folk. He was, also, a remarkable example of an effort which always excited reverence in the breast of the Muslim, namely, the effort 'to bring himself near to God and thus secure a good reward from him'. Those who are familiar with the stock expressions of Mohammedan piety will understand what this means in the case of a sincere and earnest religionist. Judging by the record of a host of extravagant visions of blessedness in Paradise which men had of the Imâm Aḥmed after his departure from the world, one cannot doubt that all good Muslims believed him to have obtained even more than the good reward for which he had hoped.

That Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal has come to be regarded as the founder of the Ḥanbalite Madhhab, or School, is not to be wondered at, though it is not because of any intention on his part, as far as I can see. He was a great saint and defender of orthodoxy, and it is due to this fact that his pupils and

admirers, after his death, sought to give form to their master's teachings and compacted themselves into a sect or school of theology. I do not believe that Aḥmed himself had the idea that such would occur. That a school was formed spontaneously is a testimony to the powerful impression of the man's personality upon his own age and that following. The things which the Muslims reckon to Aḥmed's praise are his personal life, his intensely orthodox teaching, and his maintenance of his teaching in the face of persecution. He was learned in only one direction, that is, in the *Ḳorân*, Tradition, the Consensus of usage and opinion among the Faithful. These things he knew thoroughly; of worldly learning he does not appear to have had any great store. The kind of knowledge he had, supplementing great courage and firmness and much natural shrewdness, was his effective weapon in the controversial warfare which he had to wage. Aḥmed's great book the *Musnad* is the best monument to that knowledge in which he especially excelled. It exercised such an influence, in itself and in the works derived from it, for the maintenance of Tradition in its worthy place as a basis of theology, that its author's career ought to be known. We will then see the real life which was so steady in its effect upon Mohammedan religious thought, and which was but followed up in its effect by the book which it produced.

Some native biographers and historians have noticed the man and the persecution in which he suffered for his faith with too flattering recognition of Aḥmed's worth and services. Others whose interest is more secular and who record, for the most part, only the outward events of civil history have often passed over the religious movement of Aḥmed's time with little or no notice. But there is a significance about the man and the movement which the greatest of the chroniclers, such as Ṭabarî, have not been slow to recognize. Abu'l-Maḥâsin, who professes to be writing the annals of Egypt, but whose interest in religious persons and events is evident on almost every page of his work, has done full



justice to the general course of events in connection with the Mihna and to the public career of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal.

In the narrative which follows, I have sought to give the connected story of my subject's life from its beginning to its close. The account expands, however, at that point where his life becomes a factor in the public history of the time, in order that we may have a fair impression of the whole course of religious events then transpiring, and may, also, see more clearly Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal in the arena where he, more than elsewhere, won for himself that great fame which has placed him among the chief heroes and saints of his faith.

It should be remarked that European writers have too often written their accounts in a spirit of antipathy toward the orthodox theology of Mohammedanism, and have given more than a due share of commendation to the Mu'tazilites (Rationalists). They were, it is true, advocates of the freedom of thought, but were, none the less, in many cases, too self-indulgent and pleasure-loving to be credited with the highest moral aims or earnestness. It is doubtful whether, in most instances, their championship of free thinking was from any lofty conception of what constitutes true freedom. It would appear to be rather the motive of convenience that moved them to take the course they took. They preached the gospel of Freedom because they felt the Law and the Commandment to impose an inconvenience upon them, so that they could not do as they wished. All praise is due to the sincere men who loved freedom and sought it as the right of every man, but the sequel will shew not many of such men in that field of history which it covers.

The characters of the four Khalifs al-Ma'mûn, al-Mu'taṣim, al-Wâthik and al-Mutawakkil will receive some additional light from the narrative which follows; as a result, probably that of the first and last named will receive a different judgment from that which has been passed hitherto. Al-Ma'mûn, the scholar and patron of scholars, the first free-thinking Khalif who took a real interest in religion, will be more fully discovered as a man intolerant toward those who

differed from him, even to the degree of becoming an intense persecutor. As to his liberal tendencies, it is not likely we shall find any reason to change our judgment. He had a quick and very capable mind, and hated to be fettered. He believed he had the right to think to the full extent of his opportunity, and to make opportunity for mental ranging where he had none. Had he stopped at this point, he would have presented to us a record of great service to his fellow-men accomplished by moral means; but when he rejected what he deemed a spiritual tyranny, only to turn spiritual and physical tyrant himself, the pure quality of his early aspirations is for us sadly spoiled.

Al-Mutawakkil is a Khalif whose character cannot possibly be what European historians have made it out to be — darker than the plague of darkness itself. He was orthodox, but his treatment of liberals will easily bear comparison with his predecessors' treatment of the orthodox theologians; while the attitude he assumed toward Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal does not present to us a man without redeeming qualities. It is not to be understood that we condone his terrible treatment of individuals, and the gloating satisfaction with which he sometimes related his own barbarities. Nor would we soften terms over his treatment of Jews and Christians. But the man was a fanatical religionist, and many of his deeds must be viewed from the religious standpoint to a greater extent than they have been heretofore.

It will be seen that, in regard to some other points, I have indicated in a footnote here and there a difference of opinion from some of the modern authorities whose works have been consulted. But, none the less, I avail myself of the present opportunity to say that the books of scholars like Steiner, von Kremer, Houtsma and Goldziher have been of great service to me, and that I am fully appreciative of the service their contributions have rendered to our knowledge of that period of Mohammedan history with which my sketch professes also to deal.

In my work I have derived most of the material used

from three manuscripts in the Library of the University of Leiden; 1) Cod. 311*a*, which, with its companion Cod. 311*b*, represents the 5th and 4th vols, respectively, of a five volume Ms. of the *حليمة الاولياء* or *حليمة الابيار* of Abû Nu'aim Aḥmed ibn Abdallah al-'Ispahânî (d. 450). 2) Cod. 73*a*, which was not in the University collection of Mss. at the time that Dozy prepared his Catalogue, and is, therefore, not described. Its companion volume, Cod. 73*b* Gol., is however described. The two volumes form together one transcript of the work of Tâju'd-Dîn Abdu'l-Wahhâb ibnu'l-Subkî (d. 771), entitled *طبقات الشافعية*: 3) Cod. 1917, which is likewise not described in the University Catalogue, but will be found in the Catalogue of Landberg, "Catalogue de Manuscrits arabes provenant d'une Bibliothèque privée à el-Medîna et appartenant à la Maison E. J. Brill, Leide", p. 53, Cod. 188, Aḥmed el-Maqrîzî († 845) *مناقب أحمد بن حنبل* *Autographe de l'auteur*.

The biography of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal in Abû Nu'aim is found pp. 138—161 and in al-Subkî pp. 132—143. I have made most extensive use of the former of these two, as being the most detailed and circumstantial account of my subject's life. It is the oldest account of the three, and shews that fact in the amount of gossip and personal detail which it records, and which the later accounts have omitted. The narrative in al-Subkî affords a great deal of matter touching Aḥmed's part in the Miḥna, but not so much for the biography before and after that time. Al-Maqrîzî's contribution is almost sure to be a portion of his Mokaffa, and is a good piece of biographical writing, well-arranged, concise in expression, and covering fully the life and relations of Aḥmed. Considered as a literary production, it is a better account than that of Abû Nu'aim, because of its compactness and system; but, for one who is gathering materials to compose a sketch having itself a similar purpose to Maqrîzî's, as might be expected, the more diffuse narrative of Abû Nu'aim, with its accumulation of traditional accounts bearing on many minor points in Aḥmed's career, has much more to offer.

As is pointed out in a footnote Ṭabarī's Annales have been followed for the letters of the Khalif al-Ma'mûn. The same source, also, has afforded some useful information touching matters of more public interest during the progress of the Miḥna.

My endeavor has been to use the materials gathered from these and other sources in such a way as to make many witnesses contribute each something complementary to the testimony of his fellows, and yet have the whole convey the impression of a continuous narration.

To my greatly esteemed Professor, Doctor M. J. De Goeje, Professor of Arabic in the University of Leiden, I am indebted for direction, advice, and encouragement without which it would have been impossible to have accomplished the result that is here presented. I am very thankful to him for this, as also for his great courtesy as Interpres Legati Warneriani in placing at my disposal the three manuscripts which have been used in the preparation of the work.

Leiden, Feby 4th, 1897.

WALTER M. PATTON.

AḤMED IBN ḤANBAL AND THE MIḤNA.

I.

Aḥmed's Birth and Family Connections. Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal was born in the month of Rabi' the first, 164 A. H. ¹⁾. The home of his parents was in Khorasân ²⁾. His father Moḥammed ibn Ḥanbal was one of the descendants of a captain in the Abbaside army in Khorasân which fought to overthrow the Omayyads ³⁾. The family left Khorasân to take up residence in Baghdâd, however, and Aḥmed was born a few days or months after their arrival in the latter city ⁴⁾. We are not informed what family his parents had beside himself, and in none of the sources of information to which I have had access is there, excepting of a brother of his father's, ⁵⁾ Ishâk ibn Ḥanbal ⁵⁾ and a son of this man, Ḥanbal ibn ⁶⁾ Ishâk ibn Ḥanbal ⁶⁾, any mention of a relative of his father's or his own generation. His lineage was of pure Arabic stock ⁷⁾ from the family of Shaibân of the great tribe of Bekr ibn Wâ'il. Aḥmed is rarely called 'ibn Moḥammed', the name

1) Ibn Chall. N°. 19, Dhahabî, Liber Class. 8, N°. 18, Abu'l-Maḥâsin I, 735 ff.

2) Jâcût II, 777.

3) Abû Nu'aim, Leiden Ms. 311a, 150b, وكان أبوه من ابنسآ قواد خراسان

4) Ibn Chall. N°. 19, Dhahabî, Liber Class. 8, N°. 18, Al-Nawawî, Biog. Dicty. p. 139.

5) Abu'l-Maḥ. I, 771.

6) Abu'l-Maḥ. II, 76; cf. p. 26, l. 5 infra.

7) Al-Maḥrîzî, Leiden Ms, 1917, p. 1, وأصله من العرب قال يبحيى بن

معين ما رأيت خيراً من أحمد ما افتخر علينا قط بالعربية ولا ذكرها

of his paternal grandfather taking the place of that of his father, probably from the fact that the latter died at thirty years of age while his son was still in infancy. On the death of the father, the responsibility for Aḥmed's care and training devolved upon his mother, whose name and history we do not know ¹⁾).

Years of Study and Teachers. We are without any details of his early years and know merely that he continued to reside in Baghdâd until the year 179 A. H. In this year, when fifteen years of age, he began the study of the Tradition ²⁾. He first went to the lecture-room of Abdallah ibn al-Mubâarak, who came to Baghdâd for the last time in 179 A. H. He was too late in going, however, as Ibn al-Mubâarak had left the city to take part in an expedition to Tarsus ³⁾. Mâlik ibn ³Anas, too, died in the very year in which Aḥmed began to study; and the latter used to say that he had been deprived of Mâlik ibn ³Anas and Hammâd ibn Zaid, but that God had given him in their place Sofyân ibn ⁶Uyaina and ³Ismâ'il ibn ⁶Ulayya ⁴⁾. His first teacher was Hushaim ibn Bashîr al-

1) That Aḥmed's father did not die before his boy was born will appear from the following: Abû Nu'aim, p. 138 *b*, *وَتُوفِيَ أَبُوهُ مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ حَنْبَلٍ*,

وَلَهُ ثَلَاثُونَ سَنَةً فَوَلِيَّتُهُ أُمُّهُ قَالَ أَبِي كَانَ قَدْ ثَقِبَ أُذُنِي الْخ

2) Dhahabî, Lib. Class. 8, N°. 18.

3) Abû Nu'aim, 138 *a*, *وَكَانَ ابْنُ الْمُبَارَكِ قَدِمَ فِي هَذِهِ السَّنَةِ وَهِيَ*
آخِرُ قَدَمَةِ قَدَمَيْهَا وَذَهَبَتْ إِلَى مَجْلِسِهِ فَقَالُوا خَرَجَ إِلَى طَرَسُوسَ فَنُتِوِّى
سَنَةً أَحَدَى وَثَمَانِينَ

Abdallah ibn al-Mubâarak d. 181 A. H., al-Nawawî Biog. Dicty ٣٧٥.

4) Al-Makrîzî, p. 2, *وَكَانَ رَضَى يَتَنَاسَفُ عَلَى عَدَمِ اجْتِمَاعِهِ بِالْأَمَامِ*,
وَكَانَ لَانَ مَالِكٍ رَضَى تَوَفَى السَّنَةُ الَّتِي طَلَبَ الْأَمَامُ أَحْمَدَ فِيهَا لِلدِّيْتِ
وَهِيَ سَنَةُ تِسْعٍ وَسَبْعِينَ وَمِائَةً فَكَانَ يَقُولُ فَاتَنَى مَالِكٌ فَأَخْلَفَ اللَّهُ

Sulamî, to whom he went in the year 179. With Hushaim he studied in this year and, then, to receive more particular instructions in difficult traditions, he continued to study with him three years longer and part of a fourth year up to the time of Hushaim's death, which occurred in the year 183 A. H. From Hushaim's dictation he wrote the كتاب الحج, containing about 1000 traditions, a part of the تفسير, the

قصص and some minor writings. He is said to have learned from this teacher in all more than three thousand traditions ¹⁾. For the study of tradition he visited Kûfa and Baṣra, Mecca, Medîna, Yemen, Syria and Mesopotamia ²⁾ and among the other teachers under whom he studied were Sofyân ibn ʿUyaina († 198), ʾIbrâhîm ibn Saʿd († 183), Yaḥya ibn Saʿîd al-Kaṭṭân († 198), Wakīʿ († 196), Ibn ʿUlayya († 193), Ibn Mahdî († 198), Abd al-Razzâḳ († 211), Jarîr ibn Abd al-Ḥamîd († 188), al-Walîd ibn Muslim († 194), ʿAlî ibn Hishâm ibn al-Barîd, Muʿtamar ibn Suleimân († 187), Ghundar († 193), Bishr ibn al-Mufaḍḍal († 186), Ziyâd al-Bakâʾî, Yaḥya ibn Abû Zâʾida († 182), Abû Yûsuf the Kâḍî († 182), Ibn Numair († 234), Yazîd ibn Hârûn († 206), al-Ḥasan ibn Mûsâ al-ʿAshyab († 209), ʾIshâḳ ibn Râhawaih († 238), ʿAlî ibn al-Madînî († 234), and Yaḥya ibn Maʿîn († 233) ³⁾.

عليّ سفيان بن عيينة وفاتني حماد بن زيد فأخلف الله عليّ
اسماعيل بن عليّة

[قال أبو الفضل صالح] قال أبي وكتبت عن 1) Abû Nuʿaim, 139 a, عن

هشيم سنة تسع وسبعين إلا أني لم أعتقد بعض سماعي ولمنناه
سنة ثمانين واحدى وثنتين وثلاثه ومات في سنة ثلاثة وثمانين
كتبنا عنه كتاب الحج نأخوا من ألف حديث وبعض التفسير والقصص
وكتبنا صغارا قال قلت تكون ثلاثة آلاف حديث قال أكثر

2) On the subject of travelling about to acquire a knowledge of traditions cf. Goldziher, Moh. Studien II, p. 176.

3) Cf. al-Nawawî Biog. Dict. 14 f.; al-Subkî, p. 133; Dhahabî, Lib. Class. 8, N°. 18. Dhahabî adds Bahr ibn ʿAsad. Abu'l-Mah. I, 638, makes Ḳubaisa

He studied with al-Shâfi'î the Fikh and the 'Usûl al-Fikh ¹⁾. We do not know much of the history of Aḥmed until the year 218 A. H. is reached. In that year the Miḥna was begun by the Khalif al-Ma'mûn and Aḥmed comes at once into prominence. He must have been studying with Abû Yûsuf the Kâdî before 182 A. H. when Abû Yûsuf died. His personal intercourse with al-Shâfi'î began in 195 A. H., when the latter came to Baghdâd, and lasted till 197 A. H., when al-Shâfi'î went to Mecca. After a break it was renewed in Mecca, and after that, probably, for a brief space of time in Baghdâd, when al-Shâfi'î returned there for a month in 198 A. H. before finally taking his departure from 'Irâq ²⁾. We know that Aḥmed was in Baghdâd in this year. Wakî' ibn al-Jarrâh he knew very intimately before his death in 197 A. H. Aḥmed had such familiarity with this man's traditions that he gave his son liberty to take any of Wakî's books that he pleased, and told him that, if he would give him any tradition whatever from it, he would give him the 'Isnâd for it, or, if he would give him the 'Isnâd, he would give him the tradition. Wakî' had his tradition from Sofyân from Salama, but Aḥmed seems to have been able to add to his own teacher's knowledge in respect to the traditions of Salama ³⁾. With Sofyân ibn 'Uyaina he studied in Mecca

ibn 'Oḳba one of Aḥmed's teachers; I, 681, Khalaf ibn Hishâm al-Bazzâr; I, 715, 'Ismâ'îl ibn 'Ibrâhîm ibn Bistam; I. 734, Kûtaiba ibn Sa'îd ibn Jamîl. By Shahrastânî Wakî' and Yazîd ibn Hârûn are classed as Shyites, Haarbr. Trans. I. 218.

1) al-Maḥrîzî, p. 2, واجتمع بالامام الشافعى رحمه واخذ عنه الفقه واصوله

2) De Goeje, Z. D. M. G. XLVII, p. 115; Ibn Chall. N°. 569.

3) al-Subkî, p. 132, وقال قتيبة بن سعيد كان وكيع اذا كانت العتمة ينصرف معه احمد بن حنبل فيقف على الباب فيذكره فاخذ ليلة بعضادق الباب ثم قال يا ابي عبد الله [احمد] اريد ان اتقى عليك حديث سفيان قال هات قال تحفظ عن سفيان عن سلمة بن كهيل

before 198 A. H., in which year Sofyân died. We have no means of fixing the exact date when he studied with Sofyân. It was, no doubt, on the occasion of a pilgrimage, for Aḥmed performed the Hajj five times in all ¹⁾. It was also during the residence of al-Shâfi'î in Mecca, in all likelihood, for we have it recorded that 'Ishâk ibn Râhawaih on two occasions disputed there with al-Shâfi'î during Aḥmed's residence there, and it would seem also in his presence ²⁾.

The following incident is characteristic of the man. While in Mecca, Aḥmed's clothes and effects were stolen during his absence from his lodgings in the hours when he was engaged in study with his teacher (Sofyân). On his return, the woman of the house told him of the theft, but his only enquiry was as to whether the writing-tablets had been preserved. On learning that they had, he asked for nothing more. Still, owing to the torn state of his clothes, he was forced

كذا قال نعم تنّا يحيى فيقول سلمة كذا وكذا فيقول تنّا عبد الرحمن
فيقول وعن سلمة كذا وكذا فيقول انت حدثنا حتى تفرغ من سلمة
ثم يقول احمد فتكفط [عن] سلمة كذا وكذا فيقول وكيع لا فيأخذ
في حديث شيخ شيخ قال فلم يزل قائماً حتى جاءت الجارية فقالت
قد طلع اللوكب او قالت الزهرة وقال عبد الله قال لي ابي خذ اى
كتاب شئت من كتب وكيع فان شئت ان تسألني عن شيء
(الكلام marg.) حتى اخبرك بالاسناد وان شئت بالاسناد حتى اخبرك
عن الكلام

1) al-Nawawî Biog. Dict., p. ١٤٤, 1. 16.

2) al-Subkî, pp. ١57, ١58, مناظرة بين الشافعى واسحاق رضيهما روى
عن اسحاق بن راهويه قال كنا بمكة والشافعى بها واحمد بن حنبل
ايضا بها الخ
مناظرة اخرى بينهما فسكت الشافعى فلما سمع ذلك
احمد بن حنبل الخ

to remain away for several days from the lecture-room, until the anxiety of his fellow-students led them to seek him out and put him in the way of earning a little money to procure a change of garments. Their proffered gifts or loans he would not on any account accept¹).

Abd al-Razzâk Aḥmed first met in Mecca. On one of his

[قال أبو نعيم] حدثني أبي ثنا أحمد قال 1) Abû Nu'aim, 143 a, أملى عليّ عبد الله بن أحمد [بن حنبل] من حفظه قال نزلنا بمكة دارا وكان فيها شيخ يكنى بأبي بكر بن سماعة وكان من أهل مكة قال نزل علينا أبو عبد الله في هذه الدار وأنا غلام قال فقالت أمي الزم هذا الرجل فاخدمه فإنه رجل صالح فكنت أخدمه وكان يخرج يطلب الحديث فسرق متاعه وقماشه فجاء فقالت له أمي دخل عليك السرّاق فسرقوا قماشك فقال ما فعلت اللواح قالت له أمي في الطاق قال وما سألت عن شيء غيرها (142 a) حدثنا سليمان بن أحمد ثنا عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل ثنا علي بن الجهم بن بدر قال كان لنا جزار فاخرج اليهما كتابا فقال اتعرفون هذا الخط قلنا نعم هذا خط أحمد بن حنبل فقلنا له كيف كتب ذلك قال كنا بمكة مقيمين عند سفيان بن عيينة ففقدنا أحمد بن حنبل أياما ثم فرجنا إليه نسأل عنه فقال لنا أهل الدار التي هو فيها هو في ذلك البيت فجئنا إليه والباب مرسود عليه وإذا عليه خلعان فقلنا يا أبا عبد الله ما خبرك ثم نرك منذ أيام قال سرقت ثيابي فقلت له معي دنائير فإن شئت خذ فرضا وإن شئت صلة فإني أن يفعل فقلت تكتب لي باجرة قال نعم فاخرجت دينارا وإني أن يأخذه وقال اشتري لي ثوبا واقطعه نصفين فأومأ أنه يأنسز بنصف ويرتدي بالنصف الآخر وقال جئني ببقيته ففعلت فجئت بورق فكنت لي فهذا خطه

pilgrimages Yaḥya ibn Maʿīn accompanied Aḥmed ¹⁾, and they made up their minds that, after the completion of the pilgrimage, they would go to Sanʿā in Yemen and study Tradition with Abd al-Razzāk. On arriving at Mecca they met with the teacher, who had, like themselves, come to perform the Hajj. Yaḥya ibn Maʿīn introduced Aḥmed to him, and, after making known their wish to study with him, an appointment was made by Ibn Maʿīn in accordance with which they should receive his instructions in Mecca instead of going to Sanʿā. Ibn Maʿīn told Aḥmed of this and the latter asked him why he had made such an arrangement. His reply was that it would save a month's journey each way and all the expenses of the trip. Aḥmed, however, declared that he could not allow such considerations to overcome his pious resolutions, and, in the end, they did go to Sanʿā and received there the traditions. He suffered great hardships on the way thither, for, though offered money sufficient to enable him to travel in comparative comfort, he refused to take it and hired himself to one of the camel drivers of a caravan going to the place. At Sanʿā, likewise, he lived in penury and suffering, though help was tendered him such as would have secured him against anything of the kind. Abd al-Razzāk himself said that Aḥmed remained with him almost two years, and that when he came he offered him money, saying that the country was one where trading was difficult and to gain his livelihood would be impossible. Aḥmed was inflexible, however, saying that he had a sufficiency for his needs. The traditions which he had from this teacher were those of al-Zuhrī from Sālim ibn Abdallah from his father and the traditions of al-Zuhrī from Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyib from Abū Huraira. Aḥmed was fortunate in having studied with Abd al-Razzāk before the year 200 A. H., for his reputation as a sound traditionist was impaired after that date. It is in keeping with Aḥmed's character that he should, as we are informed, have put into practice every tradition which he

1) Abu'l-Feda, Annales, Reiske ed, II. 186.

learned from Abd al-Razzâk, even to one in which the Prophet is represented as giving to Abû Taiba, a surgeon, a dinâr for cupping him. Following this example Aḥmed, too, asked to be cupped and gave the surgeon a dinâr ¹).

حجّ أحمد حجاتٍ رافق في بعضها يحيى بن 7, p. al-Maḥrizī, 1)
معين واتفقا على أنهما بعد انقضاء الحج يصبیان الى صنعاء اليمن
ياخذان الحديث عن عبد الرزاق فوجداه في الطواف فلما فرغ
اجتمعا عليه وكان أحمد لا يعرف شخصه وإنما يعرفه باسمه فقال له
يحيى بن معين هذا أخوك أحمد بن حنبل فقال حيّا الله انه
ليبلغني عنه كل ما أسر به ثبتته الله تعالى على ذلك ثم واعد يحيى
الشيخ على قراءة فلما انصرفا عنه قال أحمد لابن معين لسم اخذت
على الشيخ الموعد فقال له يحيى قد اراحك الله مسيرة شهر ورجوع
شهر والنفقة فقال الامام أحمد ما كان الله ليبراني وقد نويت نية أفسدها
بما تقول ثم سافرا الى صنعاء اليمن واخذ عنه بها وصدق عن الامام
أحمد انه قال ما كتبت حديثا الا وقد عملت به حتى مرّ بي أن
رسول الله صلعم احتاجم واعطى ابا طيبة الحاجب دينارا فاحتاجمت
لما خرج أحمد بن حنبل, Abû Nu'aim, 141 b. واعطيت الحاجب دينارا
الى عبد الرزاق انقطعت به النفقة فاكرى نفسه من بعض الجمالين
الى ان وافى صنعاء وقد كان احكامه عرضوا عليه المواساة فلم يقبل من
احد شيئا.... يقول (عبد بن حميد) سمعت عبد الرزاق يقول
قدم علينا أحمد بن حنبل هاهنا فاقم سنتين الا شيئا فقلت له يا
عبد الله خذ هذا لشيء دفعه اليه فانتفع به فان ارضا ليست
بارض متاجر ولا مكسب وانا عبد الرزاق كفه مدها فيها دفانير فقال
لما قدم أحمد, Abû Nu'aim, 144 a. أحمد انا بخير ولم يقبل مني
ابن حنبل مكة من عند عبد الرزاق رأيت به شكوبا وقد تبين

With Ishâk ibn Râhawaih, who is called in the Kitâb al-Fihrist (I. 230) a leading Ḥanbalite, he corresponded for a length of time, until Ishâk took a letter of recommendation which Yaḥya ibn Yaḥya had written for him to Abdallah ibn Ṭâhir, and received from the latter because of it both money and high position¹⁾.

Aḥmed's When still a youth Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal was held
Period of in reverence as an authority on the Tradition,
Teaching. and in the assemblies of the sheikhs was looked up to with great respect²⁾. We do not know when his most

عليه اثر النصب والتعب فقلت [أى أحمد بن إبراهيم الدورقي] يابا
عبد الله لقد شققت على نفسك في خروجك الى عبد الرزاق فقال ما
اهون الشقة فيما استفدنا من عبد الرزاق كتبنا عنه حديث الزهري
عن سالم بن عبد الله عن أبيه وحديث الزهري عن سعيد بن
المسيب عن أبي هريرة رضى عنه قال أبى [أى أبو عبد الله] ما كتبنا
عن عبد الرزاق من حفظه شيئا الا مجلس الاول وذلك انا دخلنا
بالليل فوجدناه فى موضع جائسا فاملى علينا سبعين حديثا ثم التفت
الى القوم فقال لولا هذا ما حدثتكم يعنى أبى [أى أبو عبد الله] قال
أبى [أبو عبد الله] وجالس عبد الرزاق معمرا [مات سنة ١٥٣] تسع سنين
فكان يكتب عنه كل شيء يقول قال عبد الله وكل من سمع من عبد
الرزاق بعد المائتين فسماعه ضعيف وسمع منه أبى قديما

فدخل الحاجب ١٤٤٢ f. cf. al-Subkî, p. ١٥٦,
[الى ابن طاهر] فقال له رجل بالباب زعم أن معه رقعة ياكبى بن
ياكبى الى الامير فقال ياكبى بن ياكبى قال نعم قال ادخله فدخل
اسحق وناولته الرقعة فاخذها عبد الله وقبلها واقعد اسحق بجنبه
وقضى دينه ثلاثين الف درهم وصبره من ندمائه

قال أبو نصر سمعت عبد بن حميد يقول ١٤٤٦,
كان فى مسجد اظنه ببغداد واصحاب الحديث يتذاكرون واحدا
يومئذ شاب الا انه المنظور اليه من بينهم الخ

active period of teaching and literary work occurred, but he was established as the greatest traditionist of his time when al-Ma'mûn introduced the Mihna, and continued to teach until shortly after al-Wâthik came to the Khalifate when he was forced to give up teaching. He may have resumed teaching for a year or so after al-Mutawakkil came to power, but in 237 A. H. when he went to the camp he took an oath never to tell a tradition in its integrity as long as he lived, a vow which he appears to have kept¹⁾.

His Works. In regard to his books we know on the whole very little. He left at his death twelve loads and a half of books all of which he had memorized²⁾. The names which have come down to us are the following: كتاب - كتاب العلل - كتاب الرد - كتاب الناسخ والمنسوخ - كتاب التفسير - الفرائض - كتاب الفضائل - كتاب المسائل - كتاب الاشرية - كتاب الايمان³⁾. كتاب المناسك - كتاب الرد على الجهمية - كتاب طاعة الرسول - كتاب المسند.

The Musnad. Of one book, his great work, the Musnad, we have more definite particulars. It comprised the testimonies of more than 700 Companions of the Prophet, and was selected and compiled from 700,000 traditions (or according to another account from 750,000) and contained 30,000 (in some accounts 40,000) traditions. Ahmed boasted that whatever was in it was a reliable basis for argument, and that what was not contained in it was not to be regarded as a sound basis. He looked upon this book as an imâm which was to settle all differences of opinion about any Sunna of the Prophet⁴⁾. It has always had the greatest reputation in Mo-

1) Cf. Chapter II near the end; Chapter III near the beginning.

2) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. ١٤٣.

3) Kitâb al-Fihrist I, ٣٢٦.

4) al-Subkî, p. 133, l. 20, والى مسنده وهو اصل من اصول هذه الامة.

قال لنا [الامام] ان هذا الكتاب قد جمعته وانتقيته من اكثر من 27. 1. سبعمائة وخمسين الفا فيما اختلف فيه المسلمون من حديث رسول

hammedan theological circles, and has been used as a basis of many smaller works and as a source of information by many authors. Its immense size and the very inconvenient method of its arrangement have, however, done a great deal to prevent its becoming much more used than it actually has been. In fact, it has been rarely mastered by any one individual, and perhaps as rarely transcribed by one person. Hence it is that, whereas there are a number of partial copies of the work, only one complete manuscript is known to-day ¹⁾).

The Musnad as compiled by Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal is no longer extant ²⁾, nor does it seem to have survived his own age; for Abū Abd al-Raḥmān Abdallah Aḥmed's son, who edited, with some additions of his own, the work of his

الله صلعم فارجعوا اليه فان كان فيه والا ليس بحاجة فقال عملت
هذا الكتاب املًا اذا اختلف الناس في سنة عن رسول الله صلعم رجع
اليه وقال ايضا خرّج ابي المسند من سبعمائة الف حديث قال ابو موسى
المديني ولم يخرج الا عمن ثبت عنده صدقه وديانته دون من طعن
[?طعن] في امانته ثم ذكر باسناده الى عبد
الله ابن الامام احمد رحمة الله عليهما قال سألت ابي عن عبد العزيز
ابن ايان فقال لم اخرج عنه في المسند شيئًا لما حدث بحديث
المواقيت تركته قال ابو موسى فلما عدد احاديث المسند فلم ازل
اسمع من افواه الناس انها اربعون الفا الى ان قرأت على ابي منصور بن
زريق ببغداد قال آنا ابو بكر الخطيب قال قال ابن المنادي لم يكن في
الدنيا ارقى عن ابيه منه يعني عبد الله ابن الامام احمد لانه سمع
المسند وهو ثلاثون الفا والتفسير وهو مائة الف وعشرون الفا الحج

The sum 40000 for the traditions is that given in the Kitāb al-Fihrist I, ۲۲۹, 1. 22.

1) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 466 f.

2) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 473.

father after his death ¹⁾, speaks of what he heard from his father, what he read to his father from his own copy of the original page, and what he had gathered from books and papers belonging to his father, as being embodied in the edition which he had made ²⁾. In some cases he says that he 'thinks' he had a tradition from his father in such and such a form, in such and such a manner of communication, or under such and such a heading. These evidences seem to point to the absence of any book which could have been used to verify what he had in mind. The Musnad as now preserved to us is in the revised form given it by the editorial labours of Abdallah ibn Aḥmed. It is mentioned, further, that an edition of the Musnad with certain supplementary traditions by the editor was made by Abū 'Omar Moḥammed ibn Abd al-Wahîd († 345). A commentary in eighty sections making together ten volumes was prepared by Abu 'l-Ḥasan ibn Abd al-Hādî al-Sindî († 1139); an epitome called al-Durr al-Muntacad min Musnad Aḥmed was compiled by Zain ad-Dîn 'Omar ibn Aḥmed al-Shammâ al-Ḥalabî ³⁾ and, finally, an edition of the Musnad ordered alphabetically according to the names of the Companions of the Prophet from whom the traditions take their origin was made by the Jerusalem scholar Abū Bekr Moḥammed ibn Abdallah al-Maḳdisî: ترتيب مسند أحمد بن حنبل على حروف (المعجم ⁴⁾). A printed edition of the work, based chiefly on a manuscript in the Library of the Sâdat Wafâ'iya at Cairo was issued in 1896 ⁵⁾.

The great work according to the boast of Aḥmed himself was intended to be encyclopaedic in its aim, as far as traditions related to the Sunna of the Prophet were concerned. It apparently attempts to comprehend everything which in

1) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 472, 504.

2) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 497.

3) Haj. Hal. V, 534 f.

4) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 470.

5) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 468.



the author's judgment could possibly contribute to a complete notion of what the Sunna was. All the reliable materials coming down from the Companions were meant to be included within the book. Hence, only the very broadest tests were applied to the traditions which were accepted by the author. The main criterion was that the Isnâd must be sound; that is, no man whose reputation for truthfulness or religious character was deemed unsatisfactory could be allowed to validate a tradition¹⁾. The test of conflict with clear teaching of the Prophet elsewhere found was also applied, but not with the most thorough consistency²⁾; and, finally, the duplicate traditions were excluded, though here, also, Aḥmed's practice was not uniform³⁾. In a work of such an aim we expect to find and in this work do find all kinds of traditions: those relating to ritual, legal precedents, moral maxims, fables, legends, historical incidents and biographical anecdotes⁴⁾. Furthermore, we cannot find the same order which is observed in the great collections of al-Bokhârî and Muslim. Their material was much less in quantity than Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal's and much narrower in its scope. They had a purpose much more special in view, which permitted of a real system being observed. But Aḥmed's aim was simply to store up genuine traditions and nothing more⁵⁾.

In such a collection, too, as that found in the Musnad any one acquainted with the genesis of Mohammedan tradition can understand that there would appear all sorts of inconsistencies and contradictions. Such, in fact, are found in the book. Sayings are attributed to the Prophet which never could have been uttered by him. He is represented as having prescience of events occurring long after his time, and as lending his countenance to views whose later origin

1) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 478 & note 1); v. note 4, p. 19.

2) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 480; v. note 4, p. 19.

3) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 481.

4) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 474.

5) v. note 4, p. 19.

is clearly known; opposite opinions and parties alike find their support in distinct traditions of the Musnad ¹⁾. It might seem that there was room to question the honesty of the author who would thus leave all kinds of discrepancies in his work; but reflection will shew that a dishonest man would hardly admit or allow to remain in his compilation such things, and that the aim of Aḥmed, comprehensive and unscientific as it was, sufficiently accounts for whatever of miscellaneous or contradictory character there appears. It is quite likely, too, that the Musnad was a collection brought together during many years, and one to which labor was not continuously devoted by the compiler. In the use of the work, also, after its completion there probably was no continuity observed. He would read a portion now and a portion again, a portion to this one and a portion to that one (only three persons are said to have heard it complete from Aḥmed himself). These facts would make it difficult for him to have in mind and eye the whole work at one time, so as to perceive the mutual harmony or discrepancy of the parts of which it was composed. He, thus, might easily admit and with difficulty correct such inconsistencies as those of which we have spoken. With his aim, as we conceive it, however, inconsistencies made very little difference. He was but collecting sound traditions, and not supporting particular opinions or movements. It was not his idea to constitute himself a harmonist. Dishonesty in connection with any of the contents of the Musnad lies properly with other and earlier authorities than Aḥmed. We have no record of his having been charged with fabricating traditions during his lifetime ²⁾. His great fault was the uncritical aim and method. Even in the Isnāds, where he was supposed to be an excellent critic,

1) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L., 478, 489 f.

2) During the trial before al-Mu'taṣim it was not objected that any of his traditional arguments were unsound. When he was charged with plagiarizing a tradition (which he had not there cited), he was angry and took pains to put his adversaries to confusion. Cf. a passage in the long Arabic note in Chapter II.

he appears to have been rather liberal. There are found lists of authorities with anonymous individuals even as the first sources of the traditions cited; a few names are given credit, also, who do not stand as reputable authorities in the opinion of many theologians. In the cases of most of the latter Aḥmed, however, makes a special note to the effect that he sees no reason to refuse the traditions furnished by them. And, lastly, he favours at times the Kuṣṣāṣ, who, while not altogether discountenanced as authorities, were not held in great repute ¹⁾).

Abdallah, Aḥmed's son, did his part as editor with great conscientiousness, noting carefully his own additions to the materials gathered by his father, and inserting corrections and glosses with explicit statement of his own authorship of them. The traditions which he added to the Musnad appear to have been afterwards brought together by him in a separate book which bore the title *زوائد مسند الامام احمد بن حنبل لولده عبد الله الزاهد*. In some cases where Abdallah had heard a tradition found in the Musnad from another teacher as well as his father, he wrote a note to that effect when putting in the tradition concerned ²⁾).

During his lifetime Aḥmed read the Musnad to his sons Ṣāliḥ and Abdallah and to his uncle Ishāḳ ibn Ḥanbal, and they alone formed the favoured circle who heard the complete work from the lips of its author ³⁾).

As may be inferred from what has been already said,

1) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 471 f, 478 f; Cf. De Goeje, Gloss. Belādhorī and Gloss. Fragm. Hist. Ar. *قص*. The Kuṣṣāṣ having as storytellers no very serious aim were naturally enough in discredit with serious traditionists, but it may well have been that such men actually furnished some sound traditions. According to the critical method then in vogue, the soundness of such traditions would depend upon their contents to some extent, but more upon the Isnāds.

2) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 501 ff. Abdallah is said to have made additions, likewise, to his father's *كتاب الزهد*.

3) v. note 4, p. 19.

the great work of Aḥmed is not arranged with any reference whatever to the subjects of the traditions it includes. Such an arrangement is found rather in that kind of tradition-collections called Musannafs, a class of works which properly belongs to a later development of Arabic literature than these Musnads. The latter class, of which Aḥmed's book is representative, is ordered according to the earliest authorities or first sources of the traditions cited, and according to the localities where the author obtained his materials. In such an arrangement we would expect to find traditions bearing a particular colour and evincing a similar tendency brought together, according to the predilection or bias of the original authorities or of the localities made responsible for the traditions. This feature, which is almost inevitable in employing such a method, is a mere accident of the classification, and forms no part of the author's intention. Such a miscellaneous arrangement and the mass of the materials brought together made these Musnads of little general value as works of reference on account of their inconvenience, and led to such an undertaking as that of al-Maḥdisī to bring a more convenient order into the book of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal. It does not diminish the awkwardness of his work, either, that the traditions of the same primitive authority should be found, some in a section classified according to the names of the men, and others in one or more sections classified according to the places in which the materials were gathered ¹).

The order of the Musnad of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, as found in the recently published Cairo edition, is as follows;

Vol. I, pp. 2—195, Traditions of ten Companions of the Prophet, including the first four Khalifs.

Vol. I, pp. 195—199, Four other Companions (principle of separate classification not given).

Vol. I, pp. 199—206, The Ahlu 'l-Bait.

1) Goldziher, *Z. D. M. G.*, L, 469 ff.

Vol. I, p. 206 to the end, Vol. II and Vol. III to p. 400,
The well-known Companions.

Vol. III, pp. 400—503, Traditions of Meccans.

Vol. IV, pp. 2—88, Traditions of Medînans.

Vol. IV, pp. 88—239, Traditions of Syrians.

Vol. IV, pp. 239—419, Traditions of Kûfans.

Vol. IV, p. 419—Vol. V, p. 113, Traditions of Baṣrans.

Vol. V, p. 113—Vol. VI, p. 29, The Anṣâr.

Vol. VI, pp. 29—467, The Women. (In pp. 383—403 of this section are put in some traditions *مسند القبائل* 1).

It should be carefully borne in mind that each one of the sections enumerated, as well as the whole work, is called a Musnad, e. g. The Musnad of the Meccans, the Musnad of the Anṣâr etc. 2). Such is a general description of the long famous Musnad of the Imâm Aḥmed.

Aḥmed's Pupils. We have the names of some of those who heard the Tradition from him, among whom were his teachers Abd al-Razzâk, Ibn Maḥdî and Yazîd ibn Hârûn. Other pupils were Abû'l-Walîd, 'Alî ibn al-Madîni, al-Bokhârî, Muslim, Abû Dâûd, al-Dhuhlî, Abû Zur'â al-Râzî, Abû Zur'â al-Dimashkî, Ibrâhîm al-Ḥarbî, Abû Bekr Aḥmed ibn Moḥammed ibn Hânî al-Tâ'î al-Athram, al-Baghawî, Obaidallah ibn Moḥammed Abû 'l-Kâsim (his last pupil *أخيه* 3), Ibn Abî Dunya, Moḥammed ibn Ishâk al-Ṣaghânî, Abû Ḥâtim al-Râzî, Aḥmed ibn Abi 'l-Hawârî, Mûsâ ibn Hârûn, Ḥanbal ibn Ishâk, Othmân ibn Sa'îd al-Dârimî, Hajjâj ibn al-Shâ'ir, Abd al-Malik ibn Abd al-Hamîd al-Maimûn, Bakî ibn Makhlad al-Andalusî, Ya'qûb ibn Shaiba, Duḥaim al-Shâmî and his own sons Abdallah and Ṣâlih 4). His method of teaching was to read the tra-

1) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 470.

2) Goldziher, Z. D. M. G., L, 472. On the Musnad cf., also, Goldziher, Moh. Studien II, 228, 230, 266, 270.

3) Dhahabî, Liber Class. 8, N°. 18.

4) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. 143. The name *مخلد* in al-Nawawî's list should be *مخلد*; v. de Jong's ed. of Dhahabî's Mushtabih 74, Kamûs, and Abû'l-

ditions from a book rather than recite them¹⁾. He is not known to have taught in any other way except in the case of about one hundred traditions²⁾. He adopted this method notwithstanding the fact that he had everything committed to memory and was generally regarded as being almost the first ḥâfīz of his time. On one occasion when he was delivering the tradition to some of his pupils, after they had learned it by heart, and were preparing to write it, Aḥmed exclaimed, 'the book is the best ḥâfīz' and with that he started up and brought a book³⁾. His wish probably was to verify his memoriter recitation.

Aḥmed does not appear to have taken money from his disciples, either for his services as a teacher or for the writing materials etc. which he furnished⁴⁾.

Relations For al-Shâfi'î he always entertained the most with al-Shâfi'î. affectionate regard. His testimony to him was that none in his day carried an ink-bottle or touched a pen but there was resting upon him an obligation to al-Shâfi'î⁵⁾. For thirty years he declared he had never prayed a prayer without offering in it a petition for his friend, and on his son's asking him what kind of a man al-Shâfi'î was that he should pray for him so regularly, he replied that al-Shâfi'î was like the sun to the world and like good health to mankind⁶⁾. Al-Shâfi'î, too, seems to have had a great

Maḥâsin II. ٣٢٨. *رحيم الشامي* I have added from al-Subkî, p. 133, l. 18, cf. Dhahabî Liber Class. 8, N°. 69.

1) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. ١٤٣.

2) Abû Nu'aim, 139 a, *يقول (عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل) ما*

رايت ابي في حفظه حدثت من غير كتاب الا باقل من مائة حديث

3) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. ١٤٤, cf. Goldziher, Moh. Stud. II, 196, 197.

4) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. ١٤٥, cf. Goldziher, Moh. Stud. II, 181.

5) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. ١٤٣.

6) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. ٧٩. *الامام احمد ما* *وقال الامام احمد ما* *صليت صلاة منذ ثلاثين سنة الا وانا ادعو للشامي كذا في الخلية*

respect and affection for Aḥmed. He is said to have declared, 'O Abū Abdallah, whenever a tradition from the Messenger of God is sound in your judgment, tell it to us that we may conform to it'. Aḥmed is reported as saying that al-Shâfi'î told him that he (Aḥmed) was more learned in the sound traditions than himself, and that his (al-Shâfi'î's) desire was to know from him what he regarded as sound that he might adopt it. Aḥmed's son Abdallah declared that, wherever al-Shâfi'î says in his book 'a trustworthy person told me that', or 'a trustworthy person related that to me', he refers to his father. Abdallah said, further, that the book which al-Shâfi'î composed in Baghdâd was more correct than the book which he composed in Egypt, because, when he was in Baghdâd, he asked Aḥmed and the latter suggested corrections to him, but when he was in Egypt and was inclined to adopt a weak tradition there was no one to correct him ¹⁾. Al-Shâfi'î

للكافظ ابى نعيم وقال الامام الغزالي في الاحياء اربعين سنة وكثرة
دعائه له قال له ابنه اى رجل كان الشافعى حتى تدعوه له كل هذا
الدعاء فقال يا بنى كان الشافعى كانشمس للدنيا والعافية للناس

حدثنا سليمان بن احمد قال سمعت عبد 1) Abū Nu'aim, 140 h, الله بن احمد بن حنبل يقول سمعت ابى يقول قال محمد بن ادريس الشافعى يا ابا عبد الله اذا صَحَّ عندكم الحديث عن رسول الله صلعم فاخبرونا به حتى نرجع اليه حدثنا سليمان [ابن احمد] قال سمعت عبد الله بن احمد يقول سمعت ابى يقول قال لى محمد بن ادريس الشافعى انت اعلم بالاخبار الصحاح منا فاذا كان خير صحيج فأعلمنى حتى اذهب اليه كوفيا كان او بصريا او شاميا قال عبد الله جميع ما حدث به الشافعى فى كتابه فقال حدثنى الثقة او اخبرنى الثقة فهو ابى رحمه الله، قال عبد الله وكتابه الذى صنفه بيمعدان هو اعدل من الكتاب الذى صنفه بمصر وذلك انه حيث

went to Egypt in the year 198, stayed probably two or three months and then returned to Mecca, whence he took his final journey to Egypt in the end of 199 or the beginning of 200. In 'Irâḳ he composed the Book of the Hajj. His first visit to Baghdâd was in the year 195; he left there for Mecca in 197 and returned for a month to Baghdâd in 198¹⁾. Al-Shâfi'î said, 'I left Baghdâd and did not leave behind in it any one greater as a fakîh, or one more pious, self-denying, or learned than Aḥmed'²⁾.

Other Al-Haitham ibn Jamîl, one of Aḥmed's teachers
Contem- in Baghdâd, thought highly of his pupil's authority.
poraries. On one occasion he was told that Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal differed from him in regard to a certain tradition and his reply was, 'My wish is that it may shorten my life and may prolong Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal's life'³⁾. It is worthy of note *Yazīd ibn* that Aḥmed gave apparently unreserved credit to *Hârûn*. Yazîd ibn Hârûn as a traditionist. At one time Mûsâ ibn Ḥizâm al-Tirmidhî was on his way to Abû Suleimân al-Jûzajânî to ask him some question about the books of Moḥammed ibn al-Ḥasan when Aḥmed met him and enquired whither he was going. On learning his object, Aḥmed remarked

كان هاهنا يسأل الشيخ فيُغيّر عليه ولم يكن بمصر من يُغيّر عليه
إذا ذهب إلى خبر ضعيف قال وسمعت أبي يقول استفاد من الشافعي
ما لم نستفد منه

1) De Goeje, Z. D. M. G. XLVII. 115; Ibn Chall. N°. 569.

2) al-Subkî, p. 132, l. 9, حرملته خرجت, قال فيه الشافعي فيما رواه
من بغداد وما خلفت بها افقه ولا اورع ولا ازهد ولا اعلم من احمد
cf. Ibn Chall. N°. 19.

3) Abû Nu'aim, 141 a, حدثت الهيثم بن جميل بحديث عن هشيم
فوم فيه فقيل له خالفوك في هذا قال من خالفني قالوا احمد بن
حنبل قال وددت أنه نقص من عمري وزاد في عمر احمد بن حنبل

that it was a very strange thing that Ibn Ḥizām should be ready to accept the testimony of three persons leading up to Abū Ḥanīfa, and yet refuse that of three authorities forming a chain of tradition to the Prophet. Ibn Ḥizām did not grasp Aḥmed's meaning and asked for an explanation. Aḥmed answering said, "You will not receive the Isnād 'Yazīd ibn Ḥârûn in Wâsiṭ said, Ḥomaid told me from Anas, saying, the Messenger of God said'; and, yet, you receive the Isnād 'Such an one said, Moḥammed ibn al-Ḥasan told us from Ya'kûb from Abū Ḥanīfa". Mûsa adds that he was so impressed by the force of what Aḥmed said that he engaged a boat at once and went to Wâsiṭ to receive the Tradition from Yazîd ibn Ḥârûn¹⁾. When Aḥmed himself went to study with Yazîd, on the other hand, Yazîd ibn Sa'îd al-Kaṭṭân enquired for him, and, on learning where he had gone, exclaimed, 'What need has he of Yazîd?' This was interpreted to mean that Aḥmed was more fit to be the teacher than the scholar of Yazîd ibn Ḥârûn²⁾.

1) Abū Nu'aim, 144 b, (يقول موسى بن حزام الترمذي بترمذ) كنت اختلف الى ابي سليمان الجوزجاني [الكوزجاني Cod.] في كتب محمد بن الحسن فاستقبلني احمد بن حنبل عند الجسر فقال لي الى اين فقلت الى ابي سليمان فقال لي احمد العجب منكم تركتم الى النبي صلعم ثلاثة واقبلتم على ثلاثة الى ابي حنيفة فقلت كيف يابا عبد الله قال يزيد بن هارون بواسط يقول حدثنا حميد عن انس قال قال رسول الله صلعم وهذا يقول ثنا محمد بن الحسن عن يعقوب عن ابي حنيفة قال موسى بن حزام فوق قوله في قلبي فاكتريت زورقا من ساعتى فاخدرت الى واسط فسمعت من يزيد بن هارون

2) Abū Nu'aim, 140 a, قال (عبد الله) سمعت ابي يقول كنت مقبلا على يحيى بن سعيد القطان ثم خرجت الى واسط فسأل يحيى بن سعيد عني فقالوا خرج الى واسط فقال اي شيء يصنع

‘Alî ibn al-Madîni. ‘Alî ibn al-Madîni not only shewed great respect for Aḥmed, but received it, likewise, from him. It is said that when ‘Alî came to Baghdâd he took a leading place among the traditionists, and at such times as men like Aḥmed and Yahya ibn Ma‘în and Khalaf and al-Mu‘aṭṭi were in difference of opinion on any point the voice of ‘Alî was regarded as decisive. Aḥmed out of respect never called ‘Alî by his proper name, but always by his kunya Abu ‘l-Ḥasan ¹⁾. While Aḥmed was regarded as the best faḳîh of his time, Ibn al-Madîni was said to have superior knowledge of the different views held as to traditions ²⁾, and to be the most learned of the doctors of his day, as Yahya ibn Ma‘în was the one who wrote the most, and Abû Bekr ibn Abû Shaiba was the greatest ḥâfîz ³⁾.

Yahya ibn Ma‘în. Of Yahya ibn Ma‘în Aḥmed said, that the hearing of Tradition from Yahya was healing for troubled breasts. He said, also, that Yahya ibn Ma‘în was a man whom God created for the express purpose of exposing the lies of liars; and any tradition which Yahya did not know was no tradition. When he died Yahya left behind him one hundred and fourteen cases and four casks of books. This is in harmony with what has just been said as to his having written more traditions than any of his contemporaries ⁴⁾.

بواسطة قالوا يُقيم على يزيد بن هارون قال وای شیء يصنع عند يزيد
ابن هارون قال ابو عبد الرحمن یعنی ابدی هو اعلم منه

1) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. ۴۴۳, cf. Goldziher Moh. Stud. I. 267.

2) al-Subkî, p. 185, l. 1, وقيل لابی داود احمد اعلم ام على قال,

على اعلم باختلاف الحديث من احمد

3) al-Nawawî, Biog. Dict. ۱۴۴.

4) " " ۹۲۸; the word جیمات should probably be read

جَبَاب, jars, (sg. حَبّ) vid. De Goeje, Gloss. Bibl. Geog.

Al-Husain One of the contemporaries of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal *ibn ʿAlī al-* was al-Ḥusain ibn ʿAlī ibn Yazīd Abū ʿAlī al-Karābīsī. rābīsī († 245 A. H.) This man was well known both as a faḳīh and as a traditionist. At first, he was a disciple of the Ra'y school, but, later, inclined to the views of al-Shāfiʿī, became a student of his teachings and received authorization¹⁾ to teach what he had learned. The Khatīb al-Baghdādī tells that he was much disesteemed (lit. was very rare) as a traditionist because he had acquired a bad name with Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal. This was owing to his strong leaning toward dialectical theology (علم الكلام)²⁾, in general, and, more particularly, to his application of dialectics in order to come to his conclusions touching the Ḳorān. He was a professed believer in the uncreated existence of the Ḳorān, but could not satisfy Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal by his profession of this doctrine, and much less by his utterances on the symbolic expression of the Ḳorān in articulate human sounds (لفظ القرآن)³⁾. He appears to have trifled somewhat in his treatment of subjects that were to minds such as that of Aḥmed in the highest degree sacred and serious. For example, his declared faith in the created nature of the Lafẓ al-Ḳorān was on one occasion told to Aḥmed, who, though the profession was in full accord with his own conviction, declared it heresy, because the process by which it had been reached was that of reasoning and not that of submission to traditional authority. Aḥmed's judgment on him was made known to al-Karābīsī, who changed his declaration of faith and professed that the Lafẓ al-Ḳorān was uncreated as well as the Ḳorān itself. Naturally enough,

1) اجازة cf. Goldziher, Moh. Stud. II. 189.

2) For origin and use of the term كلام vid. Houtsma, De Strijd over het Dogma, 87 f.; cf. Shahrastānī, Haarbr. transl'n II. 388 f.

3) The Lafẓ al-Ḳorān is used here with reference to the enunciation of the Ḳorān in human speaking; in the following paragraph we have taken it to have a wider scope.

this pleased Ahmed no better and he vigorously declared that this, too, was heresy. The whole quarrel, as one can readily see, was with the method of al-Karābīsī, far more than with his theological conclusions¹).

الحسين بن علي بن يزيد ابو علي الكرابيسي كان
اماما جليلا جامعا بين الفقه والحديث تفقه أولا على مذهب اهل
الرأى ثم تفقه للشافعي
(قال داود الاصبهاني) قال لي حسين الكرابيسي لما قدم
الشافعي الى بغداد قدمته فقلت له تاذن لي ان اقرا عليك الكتب فابا
وقال خذ كتب الزعفراني فقد اجزتها لك فاخذها اجازة قال الخطيب
حديث الكرابيسي يعز جدا وذلك ان احمد بن حنبل كان يتكلم
فيه بسبب مسألة اللفظ وهو ايضا كان يتكلم في احمد فتجنب
الناس الاخذ عنه لهذا السبب قلت كان ابو علي الكرابيسي من
متكلمي اهل السنة استاذ في علم الكلام كما هو استاذ في الحديث
والفقه وله كتاب في المقالات قال ابو الخطيب الامام فخر الدين في
كتاب غاية المرام على كتابه في المقالات معول المتكلمين في معرفة
مذاهب الخوارج وسائر اهل الاهواء قلت المروى انه قيل للكرابيسي
ما تقول في القرآن قال كلام الله غير مخلوق فقال له السائل فما تقول
في لفظي بالقرآن فقال لفظك به مخلوق فمضى السائل الى احمد بن
حنبل فشرح له ما جرى فقال هذه بدعة والذي عندنا ان احمد
رضه اشار بقوله هذه بدعة الى الجواب عن مسألة اللفظ ان ليست
مما يعنى المرء وخوض المرء في ما لا يعنيه من علم الكلام بدعة فكان
السكوت عن الكلام فيه اجمل واولى ولا يظن باحمد رحمه الله انه
يدعى ان اللفظ الخارج من بين الشفتين قديم ومقالة الحسين هذه
قد نقل مثلها عن البخاري والشارح بن اسد الماحاسبي ومحمد بن
نصر المروزي وغيرهم وسيكون لنا عودة في ترجمة البخاري الى الكلام
في ذلك ونقل ان احمد لما قال هذه بدعة رجع السائل الى الحسين

Al-Bokhârî. We have interesting evidence of the doctrinal sympathy between al-Bokhârî and Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal. A jealous rival of al-Bokhârî in Nisâbûr charged the latter with heresy on the point of the Lafz al-Ḳorân, and the imputation was taken up by many. But it is clear that al-Bokhârî's silence on the question, from reluctance to be drawn into any reasoning on a point for which there was so little evidence pro or con in Tradition, was the only ground for suspecting his orthodoxy. His belief, as well as that of Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, was that the Ḳorân itself was not created, but the Lafz al-Ḳorân, by which he understood the human acts of writing,

فقال له تلفظك بالقرآن غير مخلوق فعاد إلى أحمد فعرفه مقالة الحسين
ثانياً فانكر أحمد أيضاً ذلك وقال هذه أيضاً بدعة وهذا يدل على ما
نقله من أن أحمد أنما أشار بقوله هذه بدعة إلى الكلام في أصل
المسئلة والا فكيف ينكر اثبات الشيء ونفيه فافهم ما قلناه فهو الحق
أن شاء الله تعالى وبما قال أحمد نقول فنقول الصواب عدم الكلام
في المسئلة راساً ما لم يدع إلى الكلام حاجة ماسة ومما يدل على أيضاً
على ما نقله وأن السلف لا ينكرون أن لفظنا حادث وأن سكوتهم
أنما هو عن الكلام في ذلك لا عن اعتقاده أن الرواة روى أن الحسين
بلغه كلام أحمد فيه فقال لا قولن مقالة حتى يقول أحمد بخلافها
فيكفر فقال لفظي بالقرآن مخلوق وهذه الكفاية قد ذكرها كثير من
الحنابلة وذكرها شيوخنا الذهبي في ترجمة الامام أحمد وفي ترجمة
الكرائيسي فانظر إلى قول الكرايسى فيها أن مخالفها يكفر والامام أحمد
فيما يعتقد أنه يخالفها وإنما أنكر أن يتكلم في ذلك فإذا تأملت ما
سطرناه ونظرنا قول شيوخنا في غير موضع من تاريخه أن مسئلة اللفظ
ما يرجع إلى قول جهم عرفت أن الرجل لا يدرى في هذه المصايق
ما يقول وقد أكثر هو وأصحابه من ذكر جهم بن صفوان وليس قصد
الاجعل الخ

reading, reciting and all other acts connected with the use or preservation of the revelation, was created ¹⁾.

قال الحسن بن محمد بن جابر قال لنا الذهلي لما 1) al-Subki, p. 214, ورد البخاري نيسابور اذهبوا الى هذا الرجل الصالح فسمعوا منه فذهب الناس اليه واقبلوا على السماع منه حتى ظهر الخلل في مجلس الذهلي فحسده بعد ذلك وتكلم فيه قال ابو احمد بن عدى ذكر لي جماعة من المشايخ ان محمد بن اسمعيل لما ورد نيسابور واجتمعوا عليه حسده بعض المشايخ فقال لاصحاب الحديث ان محمد بن اسمعيل يقول اللفظ بالقران مخلوق فامكنوه فلما حضر الناس قام اليه رجل فقال يا ابا عبد الله ما تقول في اللفظ بالقران مخلوق هو ام غير مخلوق فعرض عنه ولم يجبه فاعاد السؤال فاعرض عنه ثم اعاد فالتفت اليه البخاري وقال السقران كلام الله غير مخلوق وافعال العباد مخلوقة والامتحان بدعة فشغب الرجل وشغب الناس وتفرقوا عنه وقعد البخاري في منزله قال محمد بن يوسف الفريدي سمعت محمد بن اسمعيل يقول اما افعال العباد فمخلوقة حدثنا علي بن عبد الله ثنا مروان بن معاوية ثنا ابو ملك عن ربي عن حذيفة قال قال النبي صلعم ان الله يصنع كل صانع وصنعه وسمعت عبيد الله بن سعيد يقول ما زلت اسمع اصحابنا يقولون ان افعال العباد مخلوقة قال البخاري حركاتهم واصواتهم واكسابهم وكتابتهم مخلوقة فاما القران المنلو المثبت في المصاحف المسطور المكتوب الموعى في القلوب فهو كلام الله ليس بمخلوق قال الله تعالى بل هو آيات بينات في صدور الذين اوتوا العلم وقال يقال فلان حسن القراءة ولا يقال حسن القران ولا روى القران وانما ينسب الى العباد القراءة لان القران كلام الرب والقراءة فعل العبد وليس لاحد ان يشرع في امر الله بغير علم كما زعم بعضهم ان القران بالفاظنا والفاظنا به شيء واحد والتلاوة هي المنلو او القراءة

Mohammed Another of Aḥmed's companions, whose highest *ibn Aslam*. compliment was that he resembled the great Imâm, was *Mohammed ibn Aslam Abû Ḥusain al-Kindî al-Tûsî*

في المقروءة فقييل له ان التلاوة فعل القارئ وعمل التالى فرجع وقال ظننتهما مصدرين فقييل له هل لا امسكت كما امسك كثير من اصحابك ولو بعثت الى من كتب عنك واسترددت ما اثبتت وصريت عليه فزعم ان كيف يمكن هذا وقال قلت ومضى فقلت له كيف جاز لك ان تقول في الله شيئا لا يقوم به شرحا وبينا اذا لم تميز بين التلاوة والمثلو فسكت ان لم يكن عنده جواب وقال ابو حامد الاعمش رايت البخارى في جنازة سعيد بن مروان والذهلى يساله عن الاسماء والكنى والعلل ويبر فيه البخارى مثل السلم فما اتى على هذا شهر حتى قال الذهلى الا من يختلف الى مجلسه فلا ياتنا فانهم كتبوا الينا من بغداد انه تكلم في اللفظ ونهيناه فلم ينته فلا تقربوه قلت كان البخارى على ما روى وسناكى ما فيه من قال لفظى بالقران مخلوق وقال محمد بن يحيى الذهلى من زعم ان لفظى بالقران مخلوق فهو مبتدع لا يجالس ولا يكلم ومن زعم ان القران مخلوق فقد كفر وانما اراد محمد بن يحيى والعلم عند الله ما اراده احمد بن حنبل كما قدمناه في ترجمة الكرابيسى من النهى عن الخوض في هذا ولم يرد مخالفة البخارى وان خالفه وزعم ان لفظه الخارج من بين شفثيه المحدثين قديم فقد باء بغضب واثم عظيم والظن به خلاف ذلك وانما اراد هو واحمد وغيرهما من الاتمة النهى عن الخوض في مسائل الكلام وكلام البخارى عندنا محمول على ذكر ذلك عند الاحتياج اليه فالكلام في الكلام عند الاحتياج واجب والسكوت عند [dittography] عدم الاحتياج سنة فافهم ذلك ودع خرافات المورخين واضرب صفحا عن تمويهات الصائين الذين يظنون انهم محدثون وانهم عند السنة واقفون

(† 242 A. H.). This man was an earnest opponent of the Jahmī and Murjī¹⁾ sects, of the former because they professed that

وَمِنْ عَنِهَا مَبْعُدُونَ وَكَيْفَ يَطْلُبُ بِالْبَخَارِيِّ أَنَّهُ يَذْهَبُ إِلَى شَيْءٍ مِنْ
أَقْوَالِ الْمُعْتَزِّلَةِ وَقَدْ صَدَّحَ عَنْهُ فِيهِمَا رَوَاهُ الْفَرِيدِيُّ وَغَيْرُهُ أَنَّهُ قَالَ إِنَّمَا
لَا سَجَهْلَ مِنْ لَا يَكْفُرُ لِلْجَهْمِيَّةِ وَلَا يَرْتَابُ الْمُصَنِّفُ فِي أَنَّ مُحَمَّدَ بْنَ يَحْيَى
لَحَقَّتْهُ آفَةٌ لَلْحَسَدِ الَّتِي لَمْ يَسْلَمْ مِنْهَا إِلَّا أَهْلُ الْعَصَمِ وَقَدْ سَأَلَ بَعْضُهُمُ
الْبَخَارِيَّ عَمَّا بَيْنَهُ وَبَيْنَ مُحَمَّدَ بْنَ يَحْيَى فَقَالَ الْبَخَارِيُّ كَمْ يَعْتَرِي
مُحَمَّدَ بْنَ يَحْيَى لَلْحَسَدِ فِي الْعِلْمِ وَالْعِلْمِ رَزَقَ اللَّهُ يَعْطِيهِ مِنْ يَشَاءُ
وَلَقَدْ ظَرَفَ الْبَخَارِيُّ وَأَبَانَ عَنْ عَظِيمِ حِكَايَةِ حَيْثُ قَالَ وَقَدْ قَالَ لَهُ
أَبُو عَمْرٍو لَلْغَفَّاءُ أَنَّ النَّاسَ قَدْ خَاضُوا فِي قَوْلِكَ لَفْظِي بِالْقُرْآنِ مُخْلَقٌ
يَلْبِأُ عَمْرٍو أَحْفَظُ مَا أَقُولُ لَكَ مِنْ زَعَمٍ مِنْ أَهْلِ نَيْسَابُورٍ وَقَوْمِ أَوَّلِ الرُّقَى
[dittography] وَالرِّيِّ وَهَمْدَانَ وَبَغْدَادَ وَالْكُوفَةَ وَالْبَصْرَةَ وَمَكَّةَ وَالْمَدِينَةَ إِلَى
قُلْتُ لَفْظِي بِالْقُرْآنِ مُخْلَقٌ فَهُوَ كَذَابٌ فَإِنِّي لَمْ أَقُلْهُ إِلَّا إِنِّي قُلْتُ أَفْعَالُ
الْعِبَادِ مُخْلُوقَةٌ قُلْتُ تَامِلْ كَلَامَهُ مَا أَذْكَاهُ وَمَعْنَاهُ وَالْعِلْمُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ إِلَى
لَمْ أَقُلْ لَفْظِي بِالْقُرْآنِ مُخْلَقٌ لِأَنَّ الْكَلَامَ فِي هَذَا خَوْصٌ فِي مَسَائِلِ
الْكَلَامِ وَصِفَاتِ اللَّهِ لَا يَنْبَغِي الْخَوْصُ فِيهَا إِلَّا لِمُضْرُورَةٍ وَلَكِنِّي قُلْتُ أَفْعَالُ
الْعِبَادِ مُخْلُوقَةٌ وَهُوَ قَاعِدَةٌ مُغْنِيَةٌ عَنْ تَخْصِيصِ هَذِهِ الْمَسْأَلَةِ بِالذِّكْرِ
فَإِنَّ كُلَّ عَاقِلٍ يَعْلَمُ أَنَّ لَفْظَنَا مِنْ جُمْلَةِ أَفْعَالِنَا وَأَفْعَالِنَا مُخْلُوقَةٌ فَالْفَاعِلُ
مُخْلُوقٌ وَلَقَدْ أَفْصَحَ بِهَذَا الْمَعْنَى فِي رِوَايَةِ أُخْرَى صَحِيحَةٍ عَنْهُ رَوَاهُ حَاتِمُ
ابْنِ أَحْمَدَ الْكِنْدِيُّ فَقَالَ سَمِعْتُ مُسْلِمَ بْنَ الْحَاجَّاجِ فَذَكَرَ الْحِكَايَةَ وَفِيهَا
أَنَّ رَجُلًا قَامَ إِلَى الْبَخَارِيِّ فَسَأَلَهُ عَنِ الْفِعْلِ بِالْقُرْآنِ فَقَالَ أَفْعَالِنَا مُخْلُوقَةٌ
وَالْفَاعِلُ مِنْ أَفْعَالِنَا وَفِي الْحِكَايَةِ أَنَّهُ وَقَعَ بَيْنَ الْقَوْمِ إِذْ ذَاكَ اخْتِلَافٌ عَلَى
الْبَخَارِيِّ فَقَالَ بَعْضُهُمْ قَالَ [قال dittography] لَفْظِي بِالْقُرْآنِ مُخْلَقٌ وَقَالَ
آخَرُونَ لَمْ يَقُلْ قُلْتُ فَلَمْ يَكُنِ الْإِنْكَارُ الْخ

1) For the doctrines of Jahm ibn Ṣafwān, the founder of the Jahmīa sect, v.

the Korân was created, of the latter because they held that faith was mere profession without the inward trust and experience of the heart. The argument which he adopted toward the Jahmîa was that of the Korân verses in which God speaks in his own person to Moḥammed announcing his Mission, and to Moses declaring himself to be his Lord and the Lord of the worlds. In the former case it is implied that if the *word* of the speaker be not that of God Moḥammed's Mission is called in question. If it be the word of God, then it is eternally potential in him and inseparable from any true conception of him, and, therefore, it must be uncreated. In the case of Moses, if the speaker to him be a creature, then Moses himself and the worlds also, have a second lord, — for one Lord is admitted without question, — and the professors of such a doctrine are at once convicted of Shirk (شرك); but, supposing God to have really spoken, then we have again the proceeding forth of a word which we must not regard as created with its utterance, but rather as an inseparable adjunct of the Divine Knowledge, for how otherwise could the Divine Knowledge become efficient or communicative? The sin of the Jahmîa is their Shirk; this is the result of the reasoning, and without reasoning, from the standpoint of the orthodox apologist, they are guilty, as well, of forging a lie against God (افتراء) by declaring that God did not speak to Moses though the Korân says he did.

Against the Karramiya Murji'a Ibn Aslam maintained the

Shahrastâni Haarbrücker's transl'n I, 89, Houtsma, *De Strijd over het Dogma* &c. pp. 102, 123 f. On the Murji'a v. Houtsma, *De Strijd* &c. pp. 34 ff., 40, Shahrastâni, Haarbrücker's transl'n I, 156 ff. The Murjite belief as presented in Houtsma, p. 36, differs from that set forth by Moḥammed ibn Aslam, but agrees with the second class of the Karramite sects (Houtsma, p. 39) and with the Şifatiya Karramiya (Shahrastâni, Haarbr. transl'n I, 119 ff., especially p. 127). Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, it will be remembered, com-

posed two works bearing the titles, respectively, *كتاب الرد على الجهمية* and *كتاب الإيمان*, vid. p. 19.

doctrine that faith is a gift of God to the heart, a gift of illumination and of spiritual adornment, by means of which it is disposed to believe in God, his angels, his books, his messengers, the resurrection, the day of judgment, the final account, in foreordination to good and evil, in paradise and in hell-fire. This faith is given only to those upon whom God is pleased to bestow it, and is not complete without both the testimony of the lips as, at once, its expression and its confirmation, and the acts of the bodily members as the evidence that the confession of the lips and the antecedent faith of the heart are genuine. The testimony of the lips has for its subjects the things believed on by the heart. These it declares to be true; and, more specifically, it gives the formal confession that there is no God but Allah and that Moḥammed is his Prophet and his Messenger. The acts of the members lie in the performance of such things as God prescribes and in the abstention from such things as he forbids. These points are supported by arguments from the *Ḳorân* and Tradition; but by this man, as by others of the strict orthodox party, there is stress laid, as well, on arguments outside of either of these sources. For example, it is said by Moḥammed ibn Aslam that, should the Murjite view be proved correct, then the Prophet and the first Khalifs, who had not spent their whole lives in the confession of Islâm, but who had had true faith, notwithstanding, might be held inferior to any mere babbler of the sacred formulas who had been occupied long enough with his task. Those (also called Murji'a¹) who held that works were the measure and substance of faith are opposed, too, and the argument of disparagement to the early worthies is applied here, likewise.

Moḥammed ibn Aslam was a believer in the eternal existence of the Divine attributes, but we have no record

1) Called especially *الكرامية* v. De Goeje, Gloss. Bibl. Geog.

of his method of proving his position in this respect, nor have we any exposition of what it involved ¹⁾).

قال الشيخ وأما كلامه في النقص على
المخالفين من الجهمية والمُرجئة فشائع ذائع وقد كان رحمه الله من
المتبينة لصفات الله انها أزلية غير محدثة في كتابه المترجم بالرد على
الجهمية ذكرت منه فصلا وجيزا من فصوله
محمد بن اسلم رحمه الله يقول زعمت الجهمية ان القرآن خلق وقد
اشركوا في ذلك وهم لا يعلمون لان الله قد بين ان له كلاما فقال اني
اصطفيتك على الناس برسالاتي وكلامي وقال في اية اخرى وكلّم الله
موسى تكليما فاختبر ان له كلاما وأنه كلم موسى عليه السلام فقال في
تكليمه آياه يا موسى اني انا ربك فمن زعم ان قوله يا موسى اني انا
ربك خلق وانه ليس بكلامه فقد اشرك بالله لانه زعم ان خلقا قال
لموسى اني انا ربك فقد جعل هذا الزاعم ربا لموسى دون الله وقول الله
تعالى ايضا لموسى في تكليمه فاستمع لما يوحى اني انا الله لا اله الا
انا فاعبدني فقد جعل هذا الزاعم الها لموسى غير الله وقال في اية
اخرى لموسى في تكليمه آياه يا موسى اني انا الله رب العالمين فمن لم
يشهد ان هذا كلام الله وقوله تكلم به واللّه قاله وزعم انه خلق
فقد عظم شركه واقتراوه على الله لانه زعم ان خلقا قال لموسى يا
موسى اني انا الله رب العالمين فقد جعل هذا الزاعم للعالمين ربا غير
الله فاسى شرك اعظم من هذا فتبقى الجهمية في هذه القصة بين
كُفّرين اثنين ان زعموا ان الله لم يكلم موسى فقد ردوا كتاب الله
وكفروا وان زعموا ان هذا الكلام يا موسى اني انا الله رب العالمين من
خلق فقد اشركوا بالله ففى هولاء الايات بيان ان القرآن كلام الله
وفيها بيان شرك من زعم ان كلام الله خلق او قول الله خلق

Mystics and Ascetics. Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal had a predilection in favor of mystics and ascetics, but toward one of these, *Al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī*, he conceived a strong antipathy because this man was said to use reasoning in theological matters. The reconciliation between

او ما اوحى الله الى انبيائه خلق واما نَقَضَهُ رحمه الله على المُرَجَّةِ
 الكَرَامِيَّةِ التي زعمت ان الايمان هو القول باللسان من دون عقد القلب
 الذي هو التصديق فقد صَنَّفَ في الايمان وفي الاعمال الدالَّة على
 تصديق القلب و اماراته كتابا جامعا كبيرا
 فقال رسول الله صلعم
 الايمان ان تُؤمن بالله وملائكته وكتبه ورسله واليوم الآخر وبالقدر
 كله خيرة وشرة الحديث وهذا اول حديث ذكره واستفتح به كتابه
 وبنى عليه كلامه قال محمد بن اسلم فبدأ الايمان من قبل الله
 قُرْبَانًا وَرَحْمَةً وَمَنَّا يَمُنُّ بِهِ عَلَىٰ مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادَةٍ فَيَقْذِفُ فِي قَلْبِهِ
 الْاِيْمَانَ وَ يُكَيِّبُهُ اِلَيْهِ فَاِذَا نَوَّرَ قَلْبَهُ وَزَيَّنَّ فِيهِ الْاِيْمَانَ وَحَبَبَهُ اِلَيْهِ
 آمَنَ قَلْبُهُ بِاللَّهِ وَمَلَائِكَتِهِ وَكُتُبِهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْاٰخِرِ وَبِالْقَدْرِ كُلِّهِ
 خَيْرَةً وَشَرًّا [وهذا الحديث اول حديث ذكره واستفتح به كتابه وبنى
 عليه كلامه قال محمد بن اسلم فبدأ الايمان من قبل الله قُرْبَانًا وَرَحْمَةً
 وَمَنَّا يَمُنُّ بِهِ عَلَىٰ مَنْ يَشَاءُ مِنْ عِبَادَةٍ فَيَقْذِفُ فِي قَلْبِهِ نورا
 a repetition [of preceding matter] يَتَوَرَّ بِهِ قَلْبُهُ وَيُشْرَحُ بِهِ صَدْرُهُ وَيُوَثَّرُ فِي قَلْبِهِ الْاِيْمَانُ
 وَحَبَبَهُ (ويصحبه Codex) السَّيِّئَةِ آمَنَ قَلْبُهُ بِاللَّهِ وَمَلَائِكَتِهِ وَكُتُبِهِ وَرُسُلِهِ
 وَالْيَوْمِ الْاٰخِرِ وَبِالْقَدْرِ كُلِّهِ خَيْرَةً وَشَرًّا وَآمَنَ بِالْبُعْثِ وَالْحِسَابِ وَالْجَنَّةِ وَالنَّارِ
 حَتَّىٰ كَانَهُ يَنْظُرُ اِلَىٰ ذَلِكَ وَذَلِكَ مِنَ النُّورِ الَّذِي قَذَفَهُ اللَّهُ فِي قَلْبِهِ فَاِذَا
 آمَنَ قَلْبُهُ نَطَقَ لِسَانُهُ مُصَدِّقًا لِّمَا آمَنَ بِهِ الْقَلْبُ وَاقْرَأَ بِذَلِكَ وَشَهِدَ اَنْ

them does not seem to have ever been openly effected; but there is a story to the effect that Ahmed took the opportunity of secretly hearing al-Hārith, when the latter with

لا اله الا الله وأنَّ محمدًا رسول الله صلعم وأنَّ هذه الاشياء التي آمن بها القلب حقَّ فاذا آمن القلب وشهد اللسان عملت الجوارح فاطاعت امر الله وعملت بعمل الايمان وأدت حق الله عليها في فرائضه وانتهت عن محارم الله ايمانًا وتصديقًا بما في القلب ونطق به اللسان فاذا فعل ذلك كان مؤمنًا وقد بين الله تعالى ذلك في كتابه أن بدء الايمان من قلبه فقال ولكن الله حبب اليكم الايمان وزينه في قلوبكم وقال افمن شرح الله صدره للإسلام فهو على نور من ربه وقال الذين اوتوا العلم والايمان وقال كتب في قلوبهم الايمان وقال رسول الله صلعم للحارث بن مالك عميد نور الله الايمان في قلبه وقال نور يقذف في القلب فينشرح وينفتح ثم بين الرسول انه تبين على المؤمن ايمانه بالعمل حين قيل له هل له علامة يعرف بها قال نعم الانابة الى دار الخلود والتجافي عن دار الغرور والاستعداد للموت قبل نزوله الا ترون انه قد بين أن ايمانه يعرف بالعمل لا بالقول وقد بين ان الايمان الذي في القلب ينفعه اذا عمل بعمل الايمان فاذا عمل بعمل الايمان تبين علامة ايمانه انه مؤمن فهذا كلامه الذي عليه البناء والكتاب وأنه جعل الاعمال علامة الايمان قال الايمان هو تصديق القلب وأن اللسان شاهد يشهد ومُعبر يعبر عما في القلب لا أن الشاهد المعبر نفس الايمان من دون تصديق القلب على ما زعمت الكرامية وضمن هذا الكتاب من الآثار المسندة و قول الصحابية والتابعين احاديث كثيرة قال محمد بن اسلم قال المرجى الايمان واحد ويتفاضل الناس بالاعمال يُقال للمرجى قولك يتفاضل الناس بالاعمال

his companions had been invited to a feast, and that he was then convinced that his earlier impressions of the man, however just when formed, did al-Hārith some injustice at

خطأ لأنه زعم أن من كان أكثر عملاً فهو أفضل من الذي كان أقل عملاً فعلى زعمه أن من كان بعد رسول الله كان أفضل من رسول الله صلعم لأنهم عملوا بعده أعمالاً كثيرة من الحج والعمرة والغزو والصلاة والصيام والصدقة والأعمال الجسمية ورسول الله صلعم أفضل منهم ثم من كان بعد أبي بكر قد عملوا أعمالاً كثيرة لم يبلغها أبو بكر وأبو بكر أفضل منهم ثم من كان بعد عمر قد عملوا الأعمال الكثيرة التي لم يعملها عمر ولم يبلغها وعمر أفضل منهم ثم من بعد أصحاب رسول الله صلعم من التابعين قد عملوا أعمالاً كثيرة أكثر مما عملته الصحابة والصحابة أفضل منهم وأى خطأ أعظم من خطأ هذا المرجى الذي زعم أن الناس يتفاضلون بالأعمال إنما الفصل بين الله يوتيه من يشاء يفصل من يشاء من عباده على من يشاء عدلاً منه ورحمة فكل من فضله الله فهو أعظم إيماناً من الذي دونه لأن الإيمان قسم من الله قسمه بين عباده كيف شاء كما قسم الرزاق فأعطى منها كل عبد ما شاء ألا ترى إلى قول عبد الله بن مسعود إذا أحب الله عبداً أعطاه الإيمان فالإيمان عطية من الله يعطيها من يشاء ويفصل من يشاء على من يشاء وهو قوله ولكن الله حبيب اليكم الإيمان وزينه في قلوبكم وقال أقمم شرح الله صدره للإسلام فهو على نور من ربه أفلا ترون أن هذا التزيين وهذا النور من عطية الله وورقه يعطى من يشاء كما يشاء ألا ترون أن الناس يَمُرون يوم القيامة على الصراط على قدر نورهم فواحد نُورُه مثل الليل وآخر نُورُه مثل بيت فكم بين الليل والبيت من الزيادة والنقصان فإذا كان نور من خارج

that time. The change in Aḥmed's opinion does not seem to have been complete or to have saved al-Muḥāsibī from loss of credit in Baghdād, for, at his death in 243 A. H., only four people attended his funeral. It is possible that this may, however, be explained as the consequence of some pious wish which he had expressed ¹⁾.

مثل الجبل واخر مثل البيت فكذلك نورهما من داخل القلب على قدر ذلك فالمرجئة والجهمية قياسهما قياس واحد فانّ الجهميّة زعمت أنّ الايمان المعرفة فتحسب بلا اقرار ولا عمل والمرجئة زعمت انه قول بلا تصديق قلب ولا عمل وكلاهما من شيعة ابليس وعلى زعمهم ابليس مؤمن لانه عرف ربه ووحدّه حين قال فبعزتك لاغوينّهم اجمعين وحين قال انى اخاف الله رب العالمين وحين قال رب بما اغويتنى فأتى قوم أبين ضلالة واطهر جهلا واعظم بدعة من قوم يزعمون أنّ ابليس مؤمن فضلوا من جهة قياسهم يقيسون على الله دينه ولا يقاس دينه فما عبت الاوثان والاصنام الا بالقياس فاحذروا يا امة محمد النقياس على الله في دينه واتبعوا ولا تبندعوا فانّ دين الله استبان اقتداء واتباع لا قياس وابتداع

1) v. Shahrastānī Haarbrücker's transl'n I, 97, II, 389. A different view is given of Aḥmed's quarrel with this man in von Kremer, *Herrsch. Ideen des Islāms*, 68, note 1. For his biography v. Ibn Chall. N°. 151. Al-Subkī, p. 230, l. 9. علي

من يتكلم في علم الكلام خوفا ان يجتر ذلك الى ما لا ينبغي ولا شك ان السكوت عنه ما لم تدع اليه الحاجة اولى والكلام فيه عند فقد الحاجة بدعة وكان للحارث قد تكلم في شئ من مسائل الكلام قال ابو القاسم النصرأباني بلغنى ان احمد بن حنبل هجره بهذا السبب قلت والظن بالحارث انه ربما تكلم حيث دعت الحاجة ولكل مقصد والله اعلم يرحمهما الله وذكر الحاكم ابو عبد الله ان ابا بكر احمد بن

With Bishr al-Hâfi († 226) and with al-Sarî al-Sakâtî († 253) Ahmed stood on terms of intimate friendship. He counted it his high privilege, indeed, to have seen some of the most holy men of his time in possession of little else than their piety and poverty. Those whose names are recorded beside the

اسحاق اخبره قال سمعت اسماعيل بن اسحاق السراج يقول قال لي احمد بن حنبل يبلغني ان للثارت هذا يكثر الكون عندك فلو احضرته منزلك واجلسني من حيث ان لا يراى فاسمع كلامه فقصدت للثارت وسانته ان يحضرنا تلك الليلة وان يحضر اصحابه فقال فيهم كثرة فلا نردهم على الكسب والتمر فاتيبت ابا عبد الله فاعلمته فحضر الى غرفة واجتهد في ورده وحضر للثارت واصحابه فاكلوا ثم صلوا القيمة ولم يصلوا بعدها وقعدوا بين يدي للثارت لا ينطقون الى قريب نصف الليل ثم ابتدا رجل منهم فسال عن مسألة فاخذ للثارت في الكلام واصحابه يستمعون كان على رؤوسهم الطير فنادى من يبكي ومنهم من يحس ومنهم من يزعق وهو في كلامه فصعدت [ت] في الغرفة لاتعرف حال ابى عبد الله فوجدته قد بكى حتى غشى عليه فانصرفت اليهم ولم يزل تلك حالهم حتى اصبحوا وذهبوا فصعدت الى ابى عبد الله فقال ما اعلم انى رايت مثل هؤلاء القوم ولا سمعت في علم الحقائق مثل كلام هذا الرجل ومع هذا فلا ارى لك صحبتهم ثم قام وخروج وفي رواية ان احمد قال لا انكر من هذا شيئا قلت تأمل هذه الحكاية بعين البصيرة واعلم ان احمد بن حنبل انما لم يسر لهذا الرجل صحبتهم لقصوره عن مقامهم فانهم في مقام ضيق لا يسلكه كل احد فيخاف على سائله والا فاحمد قد بكى وشكر للثارت هذا الشكر وتلك رأى واجبها وحشرنا الله معهم اجمعين في زمرة سيد المرسلين صلعم

two mentioned are Abdallah ibn Idrîs († 192) Abû Dâûd al-Ḥafarî and Ayûb al-Najjâr ¹⁾.

Dâûd ibn Dâûd ibn [°]Alî, the founder of the Zahirite school, [°]Alî. († 270) was one of Aḥmed's pupils. There was made to Aḥmed a very unlikely report against him to the effect that he had been teaching in Khorasân that the *Ḳorân* was created (by fashioning that which already existed, مَحْدُث), and that his *Lafẓ al-Ḳorân* was created (by being made from nothing مَخْلُوق). This influenced Aḥmed so that he refused to receive him, and we have no knowledge that he afterwards changed his decision; but the Zahirites are known to have been even more strict than Aḥmed on the uncreated nature of the *Ḳorân*, and it may be assumed that Dâûd did not long continue to be suspected by him. It is to be remarked that the informant of Aḥmed was Moḥammed ibn Yaḥya al-Dhuhlî, the same man who in jealousy accused al-Bokhârî of heretical views on the *Lafẓ al-Ḳorân*. Further, it should be noted that the incident is said to have occurred during the lifetime of Ishâḳ ibn Râhawaih († 238 A. H.) when Dâûd must have been a comparatively young man. If the account be true his views must have undergone

ولقي خلقا كثيرا من الصالحين الزهاد وقال الامام ١) ابو بكر المروزي سمعت احمد بن حنبل يقول ما عدل بالفقر شيئا رايت قوما صالحين لقد رايت عبد الله بن ادريس وعليه جبة من لبود وقد اتى عليه السنون والدهور ورايت ابا داود الكفري وعليه جبة مخرقة قد خرج القطن منها يصلي بين المغرب والعشاء وهو يرجع من لجوع ورايت ايوب بن النجار بمكة قد خرج مما كان فيه ومعه رشاء [رشا Cod.] يستقي به بمكة وقد خرج من كل ما كان يملكه وكان من العابدين وكان في دنيا فتركها في يدى يحيى القطان في اناس آخر ذكرهم

change during the remaining years of his life. He was born in 202 A. H. and died in 270 A. H. ¹⁾.

Ibrâhîm In the year 218 A. H. there died in Egypt *ibn Ismâ'îl* Ibrâhîm ibn Ismâ'îl Abû Ishâk al-Baṣrî al-Asadî *al-Muṭalizi*. al-Muṭalizi, known as Ibn 'Ulayya. He was a professor of the doctrine that the Ḳorân was created and had discussions about Fikḥ with al-Shâfi'î in Egypt, and with Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal in Baghdâd about the Ḳorân. Aḥmed regarded him as a dangerous heretic ²⁾. The Ibn 'Ulayya al-Akbar whose name figures in the history of the Miḥna under al-Ma'mûn, appears to have been a different person, who was of orthodox reputation hitherto. Taken together with the similarity of the names, the seeming readiness with which Ibn 'Ulayya al-Akbar complied with the test as to the Ḳorân's creation might suggest, however, that he was in some way related to the party here mentioned. But this is only hypothetical.

1) Goldziher, *Zahiriten*, p. 134. The incident is also found in al-Subkî, p. 232.

2) Abu'l-Maḥâsin I, 647.

The undersigned, Walter Melville Patton, was born in Montreal, Canada, November 12th, 1863; studied at the High School of Montreal, and later at the McGill University and the Wesleyan Theological College in the same city. He obtained in 1890 the degree of Lic. Theol. and in 1891 that of Bacc. Divin. 1891/4 he was engaged as tutor; first, in the Wesleyan College, Stanstead, Canada, for four months, and, then, for three years in the Wesleyan Theological College, Montreal. In 1894 he was a student of the University of Chicago, U. S. A., and in 1894/5 of the University of Heidelberg under MM. Professors Bezold, Merx, Schick and Eisenlohr. In 1895/6 and 1896/7 he studied with M. Professor De Goeje at the University of Leiden, Holland. Since 1891 he has been an ordained clergyman of the Methodist Church in Canada. To all his honored Professors he begs to express the warmest gratitude for the profit derived from their instruction.

WALTER M. PATTON.



PRINTED BY E. J. BRILL, LEYDEN.

ULB Halle

3/1

000 411 167

