

poems in Ḥaddād's large oeuvre were published only posthumously in *al-A'māl al-kāmila* ("The complete works").

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *Aḥrār warā' al-quḍbān*, Cairo 1952; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *Hanibnī l-sadd*, Cairo 1956; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *Bi-quwwat al-fallāḥīn wi-b-quwwat il-ummāl*, Cairo 1967; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *al-Misahḥarātī*, Cairo 1968, 1989²; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *Min nūr al-khayāl wa-ṣun' al-ajyāl fī ta'rīkh al-Qāhira*, Cairo 1982; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *al-Ḥadra al-zakīyya*, Cairo 1984; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *al-Ḥaml al-filasṭīnī*, Cairo 1985; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *Ash'ār Fu'ād Ḥaddād*, Cairo 1985; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *Diwān al-qarājūz*, Cairo 1987; Fu'ād Ḥaddād, *al-A'māl al-kāmila*, 7 vols., Cairo 2006; Noha Radwan, Palestine in Egyptian colloquial poetry, *Journal of Palestine Studies* 9/1 (2011), 61–77; Noha M. Radwan, The land speaks Arabic. *Shi'r al-ʿammiyya* and Arab nationalism, in Ramzi Baalbaki, Saleh Said Agha, and Tarif Khalidi (eds.), *Poetry and history*, Beirut 2011; Noha M. Radwan, *Egyptian colloquial poetry in the modern Arabic canon. New readings of shi'r al-ʿammiyya*, New York 2012; Khayrī Shalabī, *Muqaddima li-dirāsāt fann al-mawwāl ʿind Fu'ād Ḥaddād*, in *Fu'ād Ḥaddād fī dhikrāh* (Cairo 1987), 16–27.

NOHA RADWAN

Ḥadīth, Ibāḍism

Like other Muslims, **Ibāḍīs** have long employed **ḥadīth** (in the general sense of what was related about the Prophet and his community) in seeking to understand how Islam should be understood and practised (Wilkinson, *Ibāḍism*, 126). Up to the sixth/twelfth century, however, Ibāḍīs preserved attitudes towards **ḥadīth** that, on the one hand, remained closer to earlier Islamic approaches to it, but, on the other hand, increasingly diverged from Sunnī and later Shiʿī norms concerning **ḥadīth**. Since the sixth/twelfth century, Ibāḍīs have progres-

sively adopted Sunnī standards for **ḥadīth**. This has resulted in the now central role played by Ibāḍī **ḥadīth** in the articulation of their communal identity.

What is considered the standard Ibāḍī **ḥadīth** collection is known by several names, most commonly *al-Ḥami' al-ṣaḥīh* ("The sound collection") but also *Musnad al-Rabī' b. Ḥabīb*. As the latter title indicates, the collection is traced, allegedly without interruptions, to the early Basran Ibāḍī Imām al-Rabī' b. Ḥabīb al-Farāhīdī (d. c.175/791), although the work survives only in an arrangement (*tartīb*) by the North African Ibāḍī scholar Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf b. Ibrāhīm al-Warjlānī (d. 570/1174–5). Al-Warjlānī's *Tartīb al-Musnad* is in four parts, containing a total of 1005 **ḥadīth**. While most of these **ḥadīth** can be found also in the standard Sunnī collections, some of the material in the third part addresses characteristically Ibāḍī concerns, such as the imāmate and refutations of the Qadariyya (Wilkinson, *Ibāḍī ḥadīth*, 233). The main transmitter in the first two parts is Abū 'Ubayda Muslim b. Abī Karīma, a leader from the first half of the second/eighth century, via the purported founder of the Ibāḍiyya, Jābir b. Zayd (d. first half of the second/eighth century). Al-Rabī' b. Ḥabīb provides, through a variety of sources, most of the materials in the third part. The fourth part is a kind of appendix, including **ḥadīth** transmitted by the last Basran Ibāḍī Imām Abū Sufyān Maḥbūb b. al-Ruḥayl (spelt also al-Raḥīl) (d. mid-third/ninth century), and the Rustamid Imām al-Aflaḥ b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb (r. 208–58/824–72), as well as *maqāli'* traditions (those with "broken" *isnāds*, chains of transmitters) from Jābir b. Zayd (Wilkinson, *Ibāḍī ḥadīth*, 233).

As this list of transmitters indicates, Ibāḍīs (or those claimed as Ibāḍīs) were

engaged in the collection and transmission of *ḥadīth* from an early period. Indeed, Ibādīs identify the fount of their movement, Jābir b. Zayd, as a transmitter of *ḥadīth*, and Jābir is considered a reliable *ḥadīth* authority by Sunnī authors, who downplay his rumoured connections to the Ibādiyya (Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, 2:406). Jābir b. Zayd purportedly collected in a *dūwān* (notebook) *ḥadīth*, along with various legal opinions, from the Companions of the Prophet and his colleagues. Although it does not survive, Ibādīs consider Jābir's *dūwān* to be one of the first—perhaps the first—Ibādi collection of *ḥadīth*, claiming that this collection made its way even into the library of the ʿAbbāsid caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd (r. 170–93/786–809) (Ennāmi, 86). Similarly, Ibādīs claim other early figures, such as Abū Nūḥ Ṣāliḥ b. Nūḥ al-Dahhān and Ḥayyān b. al-Aʿraj, as Ibādi traditionists, and these men likewise enjoyed status among the Sunnīs as reliable transmitters of *ḥadīth* (Ennāmi, 86). Other traditionists, such as the above-mentioned al-Rabīʿ b. Ḥabīb and Abū Sufyān Maḥbūb b. al-Ruḥayl, although not known among Sunnīs are considered important transmitters by Ibādīs.

Another early Ibādi legal compendium, *al-Mudawwana* (“Register”) by Abū Ghānim Bashīr b. Ghānim al-Khurāsānī (d. beginning of the third/ninth century), preserves *ḥadīth* transmitted from seven of Abū ʿUbayda's pupils via Hānim b. Maṣūʾ (an early Ibādi collector) and from the Egyptian Ibādi community, which Abū Ghānim visited on his way to present the work to the Rustamid Imām ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (Wilkinson, Ibādi *ḥadīth*, 248–9). *Ḥadīths* from the Prophet, his Companions, and their Successors can likewise be found scattered throughout other early Ibādi legal works, such as

the *Aqwāl* (“Legal pronouncements”) of Qatāda b. Diʿāma al-Sadūsī (d. 118/736), a student of Jābir b. Zayd whose text was preserved by Ibādīs; the *Risāla fī l-zakāt* (“Epistle on *zakāt*”) of Abū ʿUbayda; and the *Āthār* (“Communal traditions”) and *Futyā* (“Legal opinions”) by al-Rabīʿ b. Ḥabīb (Francesca, 249; Wilkinson, Ibādi *ḥadīth*, 241ff.). Many early Ibādi epistles (*siyar*) also contain both Prophetic and non-Prophetic *ḥadīth*.

Examination of Ibādi *ḥadīth* in these early sources shows that Ibādīs initially accorded *isnād*-style transmission lines little importance. Ibādi *ḥadīth* are thus frequently presented directly, introduced by phrases such as *qāla rasūl Allāh...* (the Prophet of God said...), *jāʾa min al-nabī...* (it came from the Prophet...), or *jāʾa ʿan al-Ṣiddīq* (it came from Abū Bakr...), or they contain an abbreviated identification of their source, for example, *ḥaddathanī rajul min ahl Khurāsān rafaʾa al-ḥadīth ilā Anas b. Mālik...* (it was related to me by a man from the people of Khurāsān, who ascribed the report to Anas b. Mālik...) (Francesca, 249–50). A few exceptions (in the form of *ḥadīth* with limited *isnāds*) can be found in Abū Ghānim's *al-Mudawwana* and in what can be reconstructed of *al-Ḥāmiʿ* (“Legal compendium”) by the Basran scholar Abū Ṣufra ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ṣufra (d. latter part of the second/eighth century) (Wilkinson *Ibādism*, 387–8).

Underlying the general Ibādi preference for sparse *isnāds* is a view of correct practice (*sunna*) that is based on the cumulative actions and attitudes of the community, a position common among early Muslims. In other words, Ibādīs seem to have preserved an early Islamic position on what constituted proper *sunna*, whereby the model for right living was preserved by the actions (*ʿamal*) of the community

rather than being found primarily in texts that were traceable to verifiable authorities (i.e., *ḥadīth* with *isnād*) (Dutton, 16). The early Ibāḍī view of *ḥadīth* was thus that they did not need extensive *isnāds* because they were transmitted, and thus “guaranteed,” by the true community of Ibāḍī Muslims and reflected in their actions. *Ḥadīth* remained part of the general accumulation of consensual opinion (*āthār*) that was passed down from generation to generation. Early Ibāḍī *ḥadīth* were thus not “collected” as such but tended to occur as part of the early juridical, theological, and epistolary writings of Ibāḍī luminaries.

Early Ibāḍī attitudes towards *ḥadīth* as part of the *āthār* also account for how *ḥadīth* seem to hold no special, elevated place in early Ibāḍī writings. *Ḥadīth* appear alongside, or as part of, other forms of knowledge (such as legal opinions), as but one aspect of the collective tradition. In fact, Abū ‘Ubayda held that specific knowledge of the *ḥadīth* was not required for a person to be considered a reliable source of knowledge (*‘ilm*) and legal opinions (*fiqh*) (Ennāmi, 87). Nor was it necessary to know the exact wording of the *ḥadīth*, so long as its spirit was preserved: Abū ‘Ubayda was quoted as saying that “it does not matter to change the position of the words of the Traditions of the Prophet or of the *Āthār* by bringing them forward or putting them back if the meaning is the same” (Ennāmi, 87). One early Ibāḍī, Shabīb b. ‘Aṭīyya (d. after 134/752), even criticised Ibn Mas‘ūd (d. 29/650), a proto-Sunnī *muḥaddīth* (transmitter of *ḥadīth*), for abandoning the *sunna* by overusing (*ḥāshan*, literally “stuffing” extraneous meanings into) the *ḥadīth* (Kāshif, 2:364).

By the late fourth/tenth century, Ibāḍīs in Oman seem to have been converging

increasingly on Sunnī norms of *ḥadīth* scholarship. The scholar Ibn Baraka (d. late fourth/tenth century), for example, used the terminology of *ḥadīth* criticism (e.g., *marāsīl*, a *ḥadīth* reported by a Successor but lacking information on the Companion informant; *maqāṭi‘*) in a way that made clear his knowledge of such jargon and his expectation that his audience would be familiar with it (Wilkinson *Ibāḍism*, 375). Yet this growing conjunction of Sunnī and Ibāḍī norms did not result in a dramatically expanded use of *isnād* among Ibāḍīs of that era, nor did it produce a widely used compendium of Ibāḍī *ḥadīth*.

Al-Warjlanī’s *Tartīb al-musnad*, with its exclusive focus on *ḥadīth* and its relatively complete *isnād* chains, thus represents a dramatic break in what was apparently the standard Ibāḍī attitude towards *ḥadīth* before the sixth/twelfth century. From a historical perspective, the work presents some problems. First, its sources are not altogether clear, as there is little to indicate the existence of a discrete collection of *ḥadīth* by al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb that could have been “arranged” by al-Warjlanī. More likely, al-Warjlanī culled *ḥadīth* from several works, such as Abū Ghānim’s *al-Mudawwana* and Abū Ṣufra’s writings. Second, as early Ibāḍī *ḥadīth* tend to be accompanied by short *isnāds* or none at all, it is unclear where al-Warjlanī obtained his comparatively detailed *isnāds*. Wilkinson (*Ibāḍī ḥadīth*, 245) concludes that al-Warjlanī engaged in some *isnād* fabrication, but al-Warjlanī may have seen himself simply as filling lacunae that appeared obvious to him.

As al-Warjlanī wrote at a time when Ibāḍī learning was moving closer to the standards of Sunnī scholarship, his *Tartīb* must be viewed as part of the process of what Wilkinson has called “madh-

habization” (*Ibādism*, 413ff.). Specifically, Ibādīs of the sixth/twelfth century, having gradually imbibed more and more Sunnī scholarship in the centuries following the collapses of their imāmates in North Africa and Oman, came to view the norms of Sunnism as increasingly relevant in their own scholarship. Many Ibādī scholars consequently set about aligning Ibādism with Sunnī criteria. Al-Warjlānī’s student, Abū ‘Ammār ‘Abd al-Kāfī (d. before 570/1175), for example, was influential in systematising North African imāmate theory in such a way that it could postulate a chain of Ibādī Imāms extending back to the earliest periods in Basra, thereby providing an unbroken chain of authority through the earliest Basran Ibādīs back to the Prophet and early Companions (Gaiser, 213). More to the point, al-Warjlānī wrote an exposition on the sources of law, *al-‘Adl wa-l-inṣāf fī ma’rifat uṣūl al-fiqh wa-l-ikhtilāf* (“Equity and equanimity in the understanding of the sources of jurisprudence and in the differences [between jurists]”), in which he outlined the use of the Qur’ān, *sunna*, and *qiyās* (analogical reasoning) as sources of Islamic law and engaged the field of *ḥadīth* criticism. He was thus undoubtedly interested in seeing early Ibādī attitudes towards *ḥadīth* and its transmission give way to more “standardised” (i.e., Sunnī) methods of *ḥadīth* collection and criticism, and he provided precisely that in his *Tartīb*. The *Tartīb* also allowed Ibādīs to use their own, independent *ḥadīth* corpus and claim that it pre-dated all other collections (Wilkinson, Ibādī *ḥadīth*, 234).

Despite al-Warjlānī’s effort to bring Ibādī *ḥadīth* practices into line with Sunnī standards, Ibādīs (especially Omani Ibādīs) continued well into the late mediaeval period to provide *ḥadīth* with

minimal *isnāds*. In fact, al-Warjlānī’s *Tartīb* seems to have had little influence on Ibādī *ḥadīth* practices until the *nahḍa* period (eleventh-thirteenth/seventeenth-nineteenth centuries), when it garnered several commentaries, including Abū Sitta al-Qaṣabī’s (d. 1088/1677) *Ḥawāshī al-tartīb* (“Commentaries on the *Tartīb*”), ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Ibrāhīm al-Thamīnī’s (d. 1808) *Mukhtaṣar Ḥawāshī al-Tartīb* (“Abridgement of [al-Qaṣabī’s] *Commentaries on the Tartīb*”), ‘Abdallāh b. Ḥumayd al-Sālimī’s (d. 1914) *Sharḥ al-Ḥamī‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ* (“Explication of the sound collection”), and Muḥammad b. Yūsuf Aḥfayyish’s (d. 1914) *Tartīb al-Tartīb* (“Arrangement of the Arrangement”). In fact, al-Qaṣabī’s *Ḥawāshī al-Tartīb* became one of the first books to be published by Ibādīs. It was printed by the Zanzibar Press, which was promoted by the Ibādī sultan Barghash b. Sa‘īd (r. 1870–88) (Wilkinson, Ibādī *ḥadīth*, 231).

Since the *nahḍa* period, the Ibādī *ḥadīth* collection has played a key role in how Ibādīs position themselves in relation to other Muslims. On the one hand, the assumed antiquity of their collection allows them to claim that they are the oldest Islamic community (*madhhab*). On the other hand, the fact that many of the *ḥadīth* in *al-Ḥamī‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ* can be found in the standard Sunnī collections makes it easier for Ibādīs to emphasise Islamic unity and to mitigate the differences between their group and other Sunnīs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- M. H. Custers, *Al-Ibādīyya. A bibliography*, 3 vols., Maastricht 2006; Yasin Dutton, ‘*Amal v ḥadīth* in Islamic law. The case of *Sadl al-yadayn* (holding one’s hands by one’s sides) when doing the prayer, *ILS* 3/1 (1996), 13–40; ‘Amr K. Ennāmi, *Studies in Ibādism (al-Ibādīyah)*, Tripoli 1972; al-Rabī b. Ḥabīb al-Farāhīdī, *al-Ḥamī‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ musnad lil-imām*

al-Rabīʿ b. Ḥabīb, Muscat 2003; Ersilia Francesca, Early Ibādī jurisprudence. Sources and case law, *JSAI* 30 (2005), 231–63; Adam Gaiser, The Ibādī “stages of religion” re-examined. Tracing the history of the Masālik al-Dīn, *BSOAS* 73/2 (2010), 207–22; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-iahdhīb*, Beirut 1996; Sayyida Ismāʿīl Kāshif, *al-Siyar wa-l-jawābāt lil-ʿulamāʾ wa-āʾimmat ʿUmān*, 2 vols., Muscat 1989; ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥumayd al-Sālimī, *Sharḥ al-jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥūh. Musnad al-imām al-Rabīʿ b. Ḥabīb b. ʿUmar al-Farāhīdī al-Azdī*, 3 vols., Muscat 2004; Yūsuf b. Ibrāhīm al-Warjilānī, *al-ʿAdl wa-l-inṣāf fī maʾrifat uṣūl al-fiqh wa-l-ikhtilāf*, 2 vols., Muscat 1984; John Wilkinson, Ibādī *ḥadīth*. An essay on normalization, *Der Islam* 62 (1985), 231–59; John Wilkinson, *Ibādism. Origins and early development in Oman*, Oxford 2010.

ADAM R. GAISER

al-Ḥammāmī

Al-Ḥammāmī, al-Naṣīr (= Naṣīr al-Dīn) b. Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Munāwī (609–712/1212 or 1213–1312) was a Cairene bath operator and poet whose epigrams, riddles, and strophic poems were widely acclaimed. He was one of several Ayyūbid and Mamlūk poets who, despite their humble origins and limited scholarly training, not only became popular with the middle classes but also captured the attention of elite *udabāʾ* (littérateurs). He was born in Munyat Banī Khaṣīb (hence the *nisba* al-Munāwī), but at some stage he moved to Cairo, where he earned his living by running bathhouses and composing poetry. He continued his work as a bath operator (*ḥammāmī*) until old age enfeebled him. Most sources assume that he died in 712/1312–3 (al-Kutubī; Ibn Ḥijja, 3:289; Ibn Taghrībirdī; Ibn Iyās), but the dates 704/1304–5 (al-Ṣafādī, *Aʿyān*), Muḥarram 708/June–July 1308 (Ibn Ḥajar), and other, less probable dates are also given.

Al-Ḥammāmī belongs to a group of Egyptian poets who are credited with developing the succinct and sophisticated style introduced by al-Qāḍī l-Fāḍil (529–96/1135–1200), which typically makes extensive use of the *tawriya* (double entendre), a rhetorical trope highly popular in his day (Ibn Ḥijja, 3:198, 288). Other members of this group were the butcher-poet Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Jazzār (601–79/1204–81) and, most prominently, the scribe and poet Sirāj al-Dīn al-Warrāq (615–95/1218–1296), with whom al-Ḥammāmī exchanged riddles and other poems. In his old age al-Ḥammāmī met with Ibn Nubāta al-Miṣrī (686–768/1287–1366), who was to become the master of this style in the next generation (Ibn Ḥijja, 3:333).

Al-Ḥammāmī did not compile a *ḍiwān* (collection of poetry), but a number of his poems are preserved in anthologies and bio-bibliographical works. Besides epigrams, for which he was most admired (Ibn Taghrībirdī, 17), he composed strophic poetry, both in the form of *muwashshah*, in standard language, and in the form of *zajal*, in the vernacular. A *zajal* on the bankruptcy of one of his bathhouses is transmitted by al-Kutubī (215–6) and al-Ṣafādī (Weintritt).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Durar al-kāmina* (Hyderabad 1392–6/1972–6²), 6:159–61; Ibn Ḥijja al-Ḥamawī, *Khizānat al-adab wa-ghāyat al-arab*, ed. Kawkab Diyāb (Beirut 1421/2001), 3:214–5, and index; Ibn Iyās, *Badāʾiʿ al-zuhūr*, ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā (Beirut 1431–3/2010–2²), 1/1:443, and index; Ibn Taghrībirdī, *al-Manhal al-ṣāfi*, ed. Muḥammad Muḥammad Amīn (Cairo 1984–2009), 12:17–20; al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-wafayāt*, ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Beirut 1973–4), 4:205–19; al-Ṣafādī, *al-Wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*, vol. 27, ed. Otfried Weintritt (Beirut 1418/1997),