Annemarie Schimmel Kolleg

ASK Working Paper 18

Mohammad Gharaibeh

The Buldāniyyāt of as-Saḫāwī (d. 902/1496) A Case Study on Knowledge Specialization and Knowledge Brokerage in the Field of Ḥadīṯ Collections

Author's addresses

Dr. Mohammad Gharaibeh

Annemarie-Schimmel-Kolleg
"History and Society during the Mamluk Era, 1250-1517"
Heussallee 18-24
53113 Bonn
Telephone: 0228/7362941
Fax: 0228/7362964
Website: www.mamluk.uni-bonn.de
Email: gharaibeh@mamluk.uni-bonn.de

The *Buldāniyyāt* of as-Saḫāwī (d. 902/1496)
A Case Study on *Knowledge Specialization* and *Knowledge Brokerage* in the Field of Ḥadīṯ Collections

by Mohammad Gharaibeh

Mohammad Gharaibeh received his doctorate in 2012 from the Department of Islamic Studies (Islamwissenschaft) of Bonn University. Since 2011, he is the scientific coordinator of the Annemarie Schimmel Kolleg. At the Kolleg, he is currently preparing his post-doctoral project which explores the interrelation between social structure and intellectual outcome in the fields of ḥadīṯ studies in the later Mamluk times.

Among his publications are:

- *Zur Attributenlehre der Wahhābīya unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften Ibn ʿUṯaimīns (1929-2001)*, Berlin 2012.
- "Brokerage and Interpersonal Relationships in Scholarly Networks. Ibn Ḥaǧar and His Early Academic Career," in: *Everything is on the Move: The "Mamluk Empire" as a Node in (Trans-)Regional Networks*, ed. Stephan Conermann, Göttingen: Bonn University Press 2014.
- "Šaǧarat ad-Durr. Die einzige Sultanin Ägyptens," in: M. Eldamaty, F. Hoffmann und M. Minas-Nerpel, *Königinnen in Ägypten. Akten der Konferenz in Berlin, Kulturabteilung der Botschaft der Arabischen Republik Ägypten, 19. Januar 2013*, Vaterstetten: Verlag Patrick Brose 2014.
- „Zur Glaubenslehre der Salafīya," in: *Salafiyya. Auf der Suche nach dem wahren Islam*, ed. Behnam Said und Hazim Fouad, München: Herder 2014, 104-129.
- "Zum Verhältnis von Wahhabiten und Salafisten," in: *Salafismus in Deutschland. Ursprünge und Gefahren einer islamisch-fundamentalistischen Bewegung*, ed. Thorsten Gerald Schneider, Bielefeld: Transcript 2014.

Abstract

This paper offers new approaches to analyze *ḥadīṯ* collections and to make them useable for social and intellectual history. While focusing on the so called *buldāniyyāt* (geographical *ḥadīṯ* collections) – a sub group of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections – the study asks for the new forms of knowledge that an author includes into his collection to make it innovative for his *reference group*. Since the idea of what an innovative work should be like heavily depends on the *shared ideas* of the *reference group* to which an author belongs and/or for which he writes, a thorough analysis of the structure and content of the collection reveals something about this very reference group and its shared ideas. Putting their contributions in the light of previous works, authors usually choose a strategy of *knowledge specialization* or *knowledge brokerage* to develop innovative moments in their work. Therefore a comprehensive study of a scholarly pieces needs to contextualize both the social context of the author and the intellectual references he makes. In this paper, the focus shall lie on the *buldāniyyāt* of Šams ad-Dīn Muḥammad as-Saḫāwī (d. 902/1496) that will be compared with previously written *buldtāniyyāt* and situated in the intellectual context of his time.

1. Introduction

To gain recognition and status within an intellectual community, a young and aspiring scholar needs to prove his scholarly acumen and capability by compiling scholarly pieces. These works should add forms of knowledge to the intellectual landscape that are perceived by the community as new and innovative. Hence the scholar needs to consider mainly two things whilst compiling a work. First, it is important for him to refer to the (present) *shared ideas* of the *reference group* to which he belongs and/or for which he writes. These *shared ideas* represent the *cultural capital* of the group and include ideas about how a work has to look like, what an innovative work is and what a work needs to include or to refer to etc. Second, and resulting from the first point, he also needs to regard the previously written works in the field to set his work apart from them and to contribute something *new* and *innovative*. Generally spoken, two main tendencies can be observed, when it comes to intellectual developments: *knowledge specialization* and *knowledge brokerage*. While *knowledge specialization* leads to a more detailed and specialized work in one aspect of knowledge, *knowledge brokerage* can be described as a (re)combination of different aspects of knowledge or setting old knowledge in a new context. The intellectual products of both are perceived by the community as new and innovative forms of knowledge.

This paper will show how Šams ad-Dīn Muḥammad as-Saḫāwī (d. 902/1496) rose to the challenge of compiling an innovative *ḥadīṯ* collection that should meet the expectations of his community. The analysis focuses on the *buldāniyyāt* – a sub group of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collection that can be translated as geographical forty *ḥadīṯ* collection[1] – that lists the Prophetic *ḥadīṯs* according to the cities in that the scholar heard the *ḥadīṯ*. For the purpose of the paper, first, the *buldāniyya* of as-Saḫāwī will be compared to previous ones, namely those of Abū Ṭāhir as-Silafī (d. 576/1180), Abū l-Qāsim ʿAlī Ibn ʿAsākir (d. 571/1175), Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī al-Bakrī (d. 656/1258). The comparison will reveal the characteristics of the *buldāniyya* text group in general, as well as the peculiarities of each collection with which the authors tried to present a different and innovative collection. Having accomplished that, it is possible to point out the means with which as-Saḫāwī, on the one hand, tried to build on the text group and, on the other hand, to contribute something new and innovative. Using the results of the comparison, second, the study sets the results in the context of the intellectual landscape of his time, namely Cairo of the 9th/14th century, to answer the question of why as-Saḫāwī chose these very peculiarities and not other.

The paper will give a short introduction into the theoretical and methodological approaches used following by a history of the *arbaʿīnāt* and *buldāniyyāt* under the aspect of *knowledge specialization* and *brokerage*. Then, the analysis and comparison will focus on the aspects of the structure and the content of the *buldāniyya* mentioned. It will be shown that the *buldāniyya* of as-Saḫāwī differ from the other collection by an increasing *specialization* through *borkerage* represented by a more detailed *isnād* analysis, a larger variety of *isnāds*, an increasing number of cities included, and the inclusion of non Prophetic sayings and poems into the collection.

This paper is part of a larger study (post doctoral project) and is still in progress. Hence the interpretations and results are of preliminary character and require further investigation.

---

[1] I followed the translation of Garrett Davidson in his PhD thesis *Tradition*, 249.

2. Theoretical and methodological remarks

2.1. Reference Group and Shared Ideas

It is a wide spread assumption that ideas are developed by individuals and geniuses. However, from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge, it is rather groups of intellectuals or individuals within groups who develop ideas through intellectual interactions, like reading circles, discussions, lectures, schools etc.[2] This assumption emphasizes the importance of the intellectual landscape of an intellectual in general, and his closer community in particular. While usually assuming that *the* intellectuals can be perceived as one "class", "stratum" or "layer" of the society, other sociological approaches propose to imagine the society much more fragmented,[3] meaning that individuals enter and leave several more or less distinctive "units" of interaction groups (or networks) in their daily life. Intellectuals, too, are engaged in several networks of *alliances* and *rivalries* – besides normal daily life interaction. Assuming that intellectual's actions are mostly, even if not necessarily always, driven by the motivation to gain status within a certain group, a *reference group* shall be defined as any person or group with whom one has a status-power relationship.[4] These groups are characterized also by the fact that they hold on set of *shared ideas*. The members of the group deem these ideas as true and defend them, not necessarily because of the content or logical adequacy of the ideas but because of the fact that the other members of the social circle supports these ideas.[5] Moreover, the *shared ideas* represent the *cultural capital* of the *reference group* that every member needs to refer to when attempting to gain status or recognition. They contain not only the (present) *state-of-the-art* knowledge but also define the common intellectual (past) sources that are often described as intellectual authorities or traditions.

In the context of Islamic intellectual history, reference groups usually are expressed through *maḏhab* affiliations or schools of thought, like the Baṣrī and Kūfī grammar school or the Egyptian and Syrian school of historiography etc. However, speaking of *reference groups* allows a certain flexibility that the use of *maḏhab* affiliation usually embezzle. Because, in some – if not in most cases, scholars are engaged in different fields of knowledge, and therefore in different reference groups and have access to a variety of *shared ideas*. This also means, that, like in the case of *ḥadīṯ* studies, members of distinctive *reference groups* are engaged in one field forming a new *reference group* with a much more heterogeneous set of *shared ideas*.

2.2. Recombinant Knowledge Growth

Starting from the question why certain domains of (mostly technical) knowledge grow fast while others grow slowly or stagnate, economic theorists and theorists of the sociology of knowledge developed the concept of *recombinant knowledge growth*. This concept states that nearly every new (form of) knowledge always derives from recombinations of existing

---

[2] This is mainly a contribution of Randall Collins to the sociology of knowledge. See his *Sociology of Philosophies*. For a comprehensive overview of the different theories and approaches of the sociology of knowledge see Knoblauch, *Wissenssoziologie* and Maasen, *Wissenssoziologie*. For an introduction into the approach of Collins see also Savelsberg, *Collins*.

[3] Zur Fragmentierung der Gesellschaft und zur Vorstellung einer komplexen Kultur in Gesellschaften siehe DiMaggio, „Cultur," 264-265.

[4] See Kemper, *Status*, 34. Status is defined as "[…] the rank or standing in amount of worth or prestige or other designation of merit and value that attaches to a person or social position in a group." Ibid, 13.

[5] Kemper, 34.

knowledge.[6] Further, depending on what kind of knowledge has been (re)combined new knowledge can be identified either as *knowledge specialization* or *knowledge brokerage*. If the new knowledge is a recombination of *homogeneous knowledge* it is described as *knowledge specialization,* while a recombination of *heterogeneous knowledge* is described as *knowledge brokerage*.[7] Hence the process of *knowledge specialization* is characterized by an increase of efficiency and produces more specialized knowledge. By contrast *knowledge brokerage* combines knowledge across disparate domains and yields novelty and thereby boosts knowledge generation.[8]

While this concept has been developed in the fields of technical knowledge and economic theory, it offers a fruitful approach for the study of intellectual changes in the field of humanities. Here too, developments in the history of ideas and concepts seem to be mostly driven by recombination of existing knowledge and leads either to a process of *knowledge specialization* or *knowledge brokerage*.

Hence, *knowledge specialization* yields to scholarly pieces that are characterized by *comparatives*. They use to be longer than the previous one, include more material, focus on certain aspects but enlarge the discussion on it, show a greater variety of examples, are based on more sources, reveal more specialized aspects of a topic and so on. With regard to the study of the Islamic intellectual history this development can be observed on several fields of knowledge. Let it be the field of historiography, grammar, poetry, *fiqh* or the *ḥadīṯ* studies. Biographical dictionaries for example start with a collection of important personalities and end up collecting persons from a certain *maḏhab*, profession or city.

However, one problem of the process of *knowledge specialization* is that not only is the amount of possible and meaningful combination of homogenous knowledge is limited,[9] the community will accept only a certain level of a specialization until it perceives the product as *too much of everything*. That could be for example, that the work has become too long, or the focus too narrow, the examples are too many or the interpretations too far so that the specialization does not fulfill the original purpose anymore and the knowledge growth slows down or even stops. By contrast, *knowledge brokerage*, through combining heterogeneous knowledge, brings ideas of one field into another or – when the understanding of *knowledge brokerage* is expanded – sets old ideas in a new context.[10] It provides new ideas and material that can be combined with existing knowledge and again yields new forms of knowledge. This becomes especially important when a process of *knowledge specialization* has been driven so far, that the knowledge has become too homogeneous and the knowledge growth has come to an end. Then, *knowledge brokerage* reopens the way for knowledge growth. Therefore, a balance of *knowledge specialization* and *knowledge brokerage* leads to the highest and effective knowledge growth.[11]

---

[6] Carnabuci, Bruggeman, *Knowledge Specialization*, 608.
[7] Carnabuci, Bruggeman, *Knowledge Specialization*, 608.
[8] Carnabuci, Bruggeman, *Knowledge Specialization*, 608.
[9] See for this argument Carnabuci, Bruggeman, *Knowledge Specialization*, 617
[10] For this understanding Hargadon, *Brokering Knowledge*, 41.
[11] See for this argument Carnabuci, Bruggeman, *Knowledge Specialization*, 631.

2.3. Methodological Concept of this Paper

For the purpose of this study, both concepts will be combined and two main conclusions can be drawn. First, the set of *shared ideas* within a reference group form a set of mostly *homogeneous knowledge*. Hence, knowledge growth within a *reference group* will be characterized by a process of *knowledge specialization*. This is true for works that are compiled by members of one group for the same group. *Knowledge brokerage* will only appear if heterogeneous knowledge from outside the group is brought in, successfully integrated in the new environment as well as successfully accepted by the members of the group. This happens either if the *knowledge specialization* process has gone so far, that a further specialization would not make sense anymore and the group feels the need of importing new ideas of other fields of knowledge or from another reference group. Or, if members from another *reference group* join the first group and bring with them existing knowledge in a new environment that is hence perceived as new (and heterogeneous) knowledge.

Second, the wide spread assumption that there is a transregional or even a transtemporal knowledge of one field is irritating and does not meet the fact of the *sociality of ideas and knowledge*.[12] Rather, even the set of ideas of one field of knowledge exists within the set of shared ideas of a *reference group*. This is not to say that every knowledge is just regional or temporal. Ideas, books and intellectuals spread and travel transregionally and transtemporally, but they do so as travelling concepts and within networks and become therefore always part of the *shared ideas* of a reference group or become a member of this group.[13] On the one hand, it follows that what is usually described as the knowledge of a field is actually the interpretation of one reference group that can either correspond or differ from the interpretation of another reference group. And on the other hand, it follows that new ideas that are developed in another region or time do not exist in the perception of a *reference group* until they are integrated into the set of shared ideas, and therefore are not considered in the intellectual output before their integration.

The present study is, hence, driven by the idea that the intellectual output tells something about the *reference group* and the set of *shared ideas*. Moreover, an analysis of both, the group structure and the ideas, reveal why the work is composed as it is. In addition, the analysis also shows if the author decided to specialize more (*knowledge specialization*) in a field and thus to recombine homogeneous knowledge of the *shared ideas* of a reference group or to recombine heterogeneous knowledge (*knowledge brokerage*) from outside the reference group.

However, it should be noticed that due to the preliminary character and the initially state of this project only few aspects can be regarded in this paper.

---

[12] This is actually the study interest of the sociology of knowledge see Knoblauch, *Wissenssoziologie*, 14.
[13] For the concept of „travelling concepts" see Neumann, *Travelling Concepts*, 1-22.

3. From the Forty Ḥadīṯ Collections to the Buldāniyyāt – A History of Knowledge Specialization and Knowledge Brokerage

It is striking how many *ḥadīṯ* collections have been gathered in the form of the *arbaʿīnāt*, the forty *ḥadīṯ* collection.[14] Inspired by the Prophetic ḥadīṯ – even if it was deemed *ḍaʿīf* – "*Whoever memorizes/preserves for my community forty hadīṯs from my Sunna, I will be his intercessor on the Day of Judgment*"[15] the genre of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collection became one of the most popular form of *ḥadīṯ* collections till the present days. When and by whom exactly the first collection has been written is hard to tell.[16] However, for a history of this text group from the perspective of *knowledge specialization* and *knowledge brokerage* it is not necessarily important who really wrote the first collection. Rather it matters, whom a certain reference group perceived to be the first author of this collection.[17] The oldest preserved collection seems to be the one of Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aslam aṭ-Ṭūsī (d. 856) with the title "*k. al-Arbaʿīn ḥadīṯan.*" He arranged the collected *ḥadīṯ* according to the chapters of the larger *ḥadīṯ* collection.[18] The following collections of the 9th century seem to be arranged topically like the one of aṭ-Ṭūsī.[19] A first process of *knowledge specialization* in combination with *knowledge brokerage* seems to have taken place in the second half of the 10th century with the collection of Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Muqarrab al-Baḥdādī al-Karḫī (d. 974).[20] The title of the work reveals a specialization in the topic and a brokerage in the structure. His "*k. fīhi Arbaʿūn ḥadīṯan ʿan arbaʿīn šayḫan fī arabʿīn maʿnan wa-faḍīla*" contains forty different topics what is actually a specialization with regard to the previous collections, but also is transmitted by forty different scholars. Here the growing importance of the *isnād*, that is characteristic for the post-canonical period,[21] were brought into the collection reflected by the fact that the author gathered forty traditions each of which was transmitted by a different narrator (*šayḫ*).[22]

Both kinds of variations, the topically and structurally (meaning variations in the *isnād*), experienced further specialization processes being reflected in works such as the "*k. al-*

---

[14] Therefore it is more astonishing how little this genre has been subject of studies. There are only a few books devoted to this genre such as Marco Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, and Mourad, Lindsay, *Intensification*. A longer and comprehensive chapter on the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections has been written by Davidson, *Tradition*. He sets the text group of the *buldāniyyāt* together with the *ʿawālī* collection in the context of the post canonical period and points out the rising importance of the *isnād* within those collections. See ibid, 234-278 with a short sub chapter on the *buldāniyya* 249-254. A PhD thesis on the forty *ḥadīṯ* collection is currently prepared ==by Swantje Bartschat in Münster.==

[15] See Brown, *Ḥadīṯ*, 55; Davidson, *Tradition*, 235; Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, 309-313 gives further information for the meaning and function of the number forty in the Islamic culture. See also as-Silafī, *al-Buldāniyya*, 35, who lists a lot more narrations and variations of *ḥadīṯs* about the advantages of the forty collections 34-37.

[16] Davidson identifies ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (d. 181/797) to have been the first scholar to compose a collection of forty *ḥadīṯ*. See idem, Tradition, 235.

[17] Since this study focuses on the *buldāniyyāt*, the history of the development of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collection will be drawn only for purpose of study and not in a detailed manner.

[18] See Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, 314.

[19] Schöller names the collections of ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. Abī Dāra al-Marwazī (d. 912) and Abū l-ʿAbbās al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān an-Nasawī (d. 916), 314. See for the collection of an-Nasawī also Davidson, *Tradition*, 235. How far all three authors, aṭ-Ṭūsī, al-Marwazī and an-Nasawī, were connected with each other, hence belonged to one *reference group* and shared the same ideas has still to be studied.

[20] Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, 315.

[21] See for this Brown, *Ḥadīth*, 46-49.

[22] See Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, 315; al-Muqarrab, *Arbaʿūn*.

Arbaʿīn fī šuyūḫ aṣ-ṣūfiyya"[23] that contains in every *isnād* one important Ṣūfī, or the "*al-Arbaʿūn fī aḫlāq aṣ-ṣūfiyya*" that is topically devoted to the Ṣufīsm.[24] The production of forty *ḥadīṯ* collection witnessed then a peak during the 11th century that was accompanied by an increase of a specialization process. In the 12th century, this development came to an end. However, the most interesting fact of this development till the 12th century is that it was almost exclusively an undertaken of scholars from Iran and Irak.[25]

The phenomenon of this regionality can be explained with the concept of *reference groups*, their *shared ideas* and the *recombinant knowledge growth* concept. Certainly, the authors of these collections were either personally connected to each other or their ideas and concepts travelled between the intellectual centers of Iran and Irak, became part of the set of shared ideas of the different reference groups and, thus, lead to a recombination of more or less homogeneous knowledge. This explanation, though further studies need to be done, is supported by the findings of Brown's study on the canonization process of the *ṣaḥīḥ* works of al-Buḫārī and Muslim. He could prove that the genre of the *ṣaḥīḥ* collections as well as the whole *ṣaḥīḥ* movement was more or less an undertaken of Šāfiʿī scholars from Iraq and Iran.[26] Only from the second half of the 12th and the beginning 13th century on, both movements, the *ṣaḥīḥ* movement and the text group of forty *ḥadīṯ* collections, were taken up in Syria and later in Egypt to witness another popularity. This went hand in hand with the general transition of *ḥadīṯ* studies in particular, and probably of the other fields of Islamic studies in general, from Irak and Iran to Syria and Egypt.[27]

For the history of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections, this development is crucial and the emergence of the first *buldāniyya* is associated with one particular scholar, who travelled from Isfahān to Alexandria via Bagdad and Cairo, i.e. Abū Ṭāhir as-Silafī. Bringing *ḥadīṯ* material from Iran and Iraq that hasn't existed in Syria and Egypt before, as-Silafī became a key figure in the process of transmission of knowledge from Isfahan to Alexandria.[28] When he was requested to compose an innovative collection, all he needed to do was recombining his existing knowledge of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections in Isfahan with the fact he was characterized by in the new context, namely the fact that he traveled much.[29] The result of this *knowledge brokerage* was the first *buldāniyya*[30] that actually was composed as a forty *ḥadīṯ* collection that contains *ḥadīṯs* from forty different cities. Soon his *buldāniyya* spread in Egypt and Syria and the Damascene contemporary scholar Ibn ʿAsākir took up this new text sort. Then, the *buldāniyya*, that was a result of *knowledge brokerage* and that provided the field of forty *ḥadīṯ* collections with a fresh ideas, became subject of its own specialization process. While the

---

[23] Collected by Abū Saʿd Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī al-Harawī al-Mālīnī (d. 412/1022), see Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, 316.

[24] Collected by Abū ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn as-Sulamī, see Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, 316.

[25] See Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, 319.

[26] Brown, The Canonization, 135-144.

[27] For the growing importance of Syria and later Egypt for the *ḥadīṯ* studies from the second half of the 12th century on see Lucas, Constructive Criticism, 101-112.

[28] See Lucas, *Constructive Criticism*, 103; Schöller, *an-Nawawī*, 319.

[29] Davidson, *Tradition*, 250.

[30] As-Saḫāwī identifies ʿAtīq b. ʿAlī b. Dāwūd as-Samanṭārī (d. 464/1071-2) a student of Abī Naʿīm al-Iṣbahānī to have been the first scholar to compose a geographical forty *ḥadīṯ* collection (*buldāniyya*) that apparently hasn't been preserved. See as-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 32.But even if as-Samanṭārī has been the first author and as-Silafī was aware of this previous collection, it would not change the fact that the *buldāniyya* of as-Silafī was perceived as the first collection in Egypt and hence was a product of a knowledge brokerage, since he brought existing knowledge into a new context.

collection of as-Silafī do not have a certain topical arrangement and its main characteristic is the fact that each *ḥadīṯ* is narrated from a different city, Ibn ʿAsākir prides himself for collecting forty *ḥadīṯ* from forty narrators from forty cities from forty Companions on forty topics (what is also the title of the collection, *Arbaʿūn ḥadīṯan ʿan arbaʿīn šaʿḫan min arbaʿīna madīna li-arbaʿīna min aṣ-ṣaḥāba*).[31]

From then on, several *buldāniyyāt* were composed by scholars while the number of them was relatively small compared to the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections. During the seventh/thirteenth and the eighth/fourteenth century, the *buldāniyya* enjoyed increasing popularity while during the ninth/fifteenth century only few *buldāniyya* were composed. It seems that the last couple of them all have been compiled by members of a reference group in Cairo and Damascus. Al-Mizzī, aḏ-Ḏahabī and al-Birzālī were all connected – in this order – through a teacher-student relationship in Damascus. The same is true for al-ʿIrāqī, Ibn Ḥaǧar and as-Saḫāwī (d. 902/1496), who all were active in Cairo.[32] However, between Cairo and Damascus has been an active exchange of knowledge and ideas so that it can be assumed that to a certain extent the scholars of the two cities shared the same ideas and knowledge. Probably the last *buldāniyya* of certain significance were composed by Ibn Ṭulūn (953/1546), also a Damascene scholar of the late Mamluk and early Ottoman period.[33]

4. al-Buldāniyyāt *of as-Saḫāwī – Comparison and Analysis*

Unfortunately, not every *buldāniyya* has been preserved to be studied. From the 22 *buldāniyya* that as-Saḫāwī mentioned in introduction to his *buldāniyya*[34] only four are printed and another four were preserved in form of manuscripts.[35] For the present study only three

---

[31] See Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Buldāniyya*.
[32] See Davidson, *Tradition*, 252-253.
[33] See Davidson, *Tradition*, 253.
[34] Those are ʿAtīq b. ʿAlī b. Dāwūd as-Samanṭārī (d. 464) a student of Abū Naʿīm al-Iṣbahānī, Abū Ṭāhir Aḥmad b. Muḥammad as-Silafī (d. 576), Abū l-Qāsim ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Hibat Allāh b. ʿAsākir (d. 571), Abū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm aš-Šīrāzī al-Baġdādī (d. 585), Abū l-Barakāt Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Anṣārī al-Mūṣilī (d. 600), Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. ʿAlī Abī ṣ-Ṣayf al-Yamānī (d. 607) who compiled a buldāniyya of forty man from forty different cities that he heard from in Mecca, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir b. ʿAbd Allāh ar-Ruhāwī al-Ḥanbalī (d. 612/615), Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Azadī al-Ǧayānī (?), Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasam b. Muḥammad b. Abī l-Futūḥ Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAmr al-Bakrī an-Naysābūrī (d. d. 656/1258), Abū l-Muẓaffar Manṣūr b. Sulaym as-Sakandarī aš-Šāfiʿī (d. 673), Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusaʿn b. ʿAbduk al-Kanǧī aṣ-Ṣūfī (d. 684), al-Ǧamāl Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh aẓ-Ẓāhirī al-Ḥanafī (d. 696), aš-Šafar Abū Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Muʾmin b. Ḫalaf ad-Dimyāṭī (d. 696), al-Quṭb Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Karīm b. ʿAbd an-Nūr al-Ḥalabī al-Ḥanafī (?), al-ʿAlam Abū Muḥammad al-Qāsim b. al-Bahāʾ Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Birzālī (d. 739), aš-Šams Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. ʿUṯmān aḏ-Ḏahabī (d. 748), aš-Šams Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ǧābir al-Wādiyāšī al-Mālikī (d. 749), aš-Šaraf Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Wānī al-Ḥanafī (749), Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Saʿīd b. ʿUmar as-Sīwāsī (d. 749), at-Taqī Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr b. ʿArrām as-Sakandarī (d. 777), az-Zayn Abū l-Faḍl ʿAbd ar-Raḥīm b. al-Ḥusayn (806) who collected only thirty five *ḥadīṯ* and was not granted to finish the collection, aš-Šihāb Abū l-Faḍl Aḥmad b. ʿAlī Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449) who did not finish either his collection. See as-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 32-41.
[35] Besides the *buldāniyya* of al-Bakrī there is the *buldāniyya* of ar-Ruhāwī (only a small part of it), the one of ʿAbd al-Salām b. Muḥammad al-Andarastānī entitled "*Kitab al-arbaʿin al-buldaniyah*" available in Princeton, Garrett Yahuda 3526Y, and a *buldāniyya* in Gotha, Pretsch Nr. 613, of which the author is not mentioned.

buldāniyyāt will be recognized. Those are the buldāniyyāt of as-Silafī[36], Ibn ʿAsākir,[37] al-Bakrī.[38]

Although the comparison of only three other collections with that of as-Saḫāwī seems little, it still make sense to so for one good reasons. The study aims to answer the question how as-Saḫāwī compiles his *buldāniyya* to be an innovative one in relation to the previous *buldāniyyāt* and with regard to the idea of innovation of his reference group. For this, the analysis focuses on processes of *knowledge specialization* and *knowledge brokerage* and how the *reference group* influenced as-Saḫāwī's compilation. However, to be able to reconstruct the process of knowledge recombination it is important to know what the existing knowledge was that as-Saḫāwī specialized in or recombined with heterogeneous knowledge. In other words, it is more important to know what as-Saḫāwī has actually read and what was part of the *shared ideas* of his *reference group*. These information are giving in his introduction. While he list up 22 scholars who compiled a *buldāniyya* it turns out that only a few of them has reached as-Saḫāwī. Only the *buldāniyya* of as-Silafī, which has reached him through sound chains of transmission (*ittaṣalat binā bi-l-asānīd al-bayina*),[39] the one of Ibn ʿAsākir which as-Saḫāwī has heard and read (*samiʿtuhā wa-qaraʾtuhā*),[40] the one of ar-Ruhāwī of which as-Saḫāwī said that he heard only a part of it (*wa-qad waqaʿa lī baʿḍuhā bi-s-samāʿ al-muttaṣil*),[41] the one of al-Bakrī that as-Saḫāwī read through two different narrations (*wa-qad qaraʾtuhā bi-sanadayn*)[42] and finally the one of aḏ-Ḏahabī that he read in the handwriting of aḏ-Ḏahabī (*raʾaytu bi-ḫaṭṭihī*).[43] The information about the other collections, as-Saḫāwī apparently took from secondary sources such as biographical dictionaries or *mašyaḫāt* but did not see the collections themselves. Even the *buldāniyya* of his teacher Ibn Ḥaǧar has not been finished as a complete product and hence might had given as-Saḫāwī some inspirations but cannot be used for a comparison. Therefore, a comparison of as-Saḫāwī's *buldāniyya* with that of as-Silafī, Ibn ʿAsākir and al-Bakrī will bring meaningful and significant results.[44]

4.1. A Geographical Forty Ḥadīṯ Collection or Geographical (Ḥadīṯ) Collection?

When does a singular experiment become a text group of its own right, is a question that is not always easy to answer. Probably the best way to come close to an answer, though, is by asking the authors for their perception of their own contribution.

With regard to the *buldāniyyāt*, all four authors give a detailed description of how they perceive their work. While the first three authors, as-Silafī, Ibn ʿAsākir and al-Bakrī, refer to genre of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections, as-Silafī and Ibn ʿAsākir do so in a way that shows that they see their work as a variation of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collection. The (sub)title of their work already supports this assumption. The *buldāniyya* of as-Silafī bears the (sub)title "*al-Arbaʿūn al-mustaġnī bi-taʿyīn mā fīhi ʿan al-muʿīn*" and is an indication of the criteria of the

---

[36] His *buldāniyya* has been edited and printed as-Silafī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*.
[37] Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Buldāniyya*.
[38] That hasn't been edited now, al-Bakrī, *al-Buldāniyya*.
[39] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 33.
[40] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 33.
[41] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 35.
[42] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 36.
[43] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 38.
[44] As for the *buldāniyya* of ar-Ruhāwī and aḏ-Ḏahabī, the first one only a small part has survived and the second could not be considered for the present paper but will be included in the larger study.

collection.[45] Ibn ʿAsākir who wrote his *buldāniyya* as a reaction of as-Silafī's entitled his collection "*arbaʿūna ḥadīṯan ʿan arbaʿīn šayḫan min arbaʿīn madīna li-arbaʿīn aṣ-ṣaḥāba*" and also pointed to the criteria of his collection already reveals the innovative characteristic of his collection. He chose forty *ḥadīṯ* whose transmitter came from different cities and in addition each *ḥadīṯ* is also transmitted from the Prophet by forty different Companions (*ṣaḥāba*). Moreover Ibn ʿAsākir searched for *ḥadīṯ* that were devoted to forty different topics. In addition, both the authors refer in their preface to the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections.[46] Then they list a number of forty *ḥadīṯ* collections pointing out the characteristics of these collection to explain why their collections form an innovation within the text group of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections.[47]

Therefore, it actually can be questioned whether the main title "*al-Arbaʿūna al-Buldāniyya*" (of the editions) and the designation as such found in biographical dictionaries and historical works is an implication of the authors of the those dictionaries at a stage where this subgroup has already became famous as *buldāniyyāt*.

A change in perception is already noticeable in the work of al-Bakrī. Even though the beginning of the manuscript is lost and the (sub)title of the work is unknown, al-Bakrī names the criteria of his collection. Having already compiled a forty *ḥadīṯ* collection that was a compilation of forty *ḥadīṯ* from forty forty *ḥadīṯ* books,[48] al-Bakrī refers in the introduction of this collection explicitly to the text group of geographical forty *ḥadīṯ* collections. Hence, he just mentioned those previous collections that were compiled according to the criterion of forty different cities.[49] As a result of this analysis of the criteria of the previous collections, he explains the innovative characteristic of his collection, i.e. to include only those *ḥadīṯ* that were narrated by forty different narrators from forty different cities from forty different *ṣaḥāba* and from forty different *tābiʿīn*.[50]

A fundamental change, however, took place in the work of as-Saḫāwī. While al-Bakrī has already perceived the *buldāniyya* as a distinctive text group different from the normal forty *ḥadīṯ* collection still the main common characteristic of his collection and those of his predecessors was the reference to the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections. All of them, as-Silafī, Ibn ʿAsākir and al-Bakī, understood their collection as a variation of the *arbaʿīnāt* even though al-Bakrī perceived the *buldāniyya* already as a distinctive sub group of the *arbaʿīnāt*. Therefore, all authors referred to the *ḥadīṯ* that praised the memorization of forty *ḥadīṯ* and emphasized the importance of this genre. As-Saḫāwī, however, followed a totally different approach. He did not bring the *buldāniyyat* together with the *arbaʿīnāt*, hence sees them not as al-Bakrī did as a sub group of the *arbaʿīnāt*, but as distinctive and independent text group. According to as-Saḫāwī the main characteristics of this text group is not the collection of forty *ḥadīṯ* but the

---

[45] To answer the question what exactly the criteria of his collection were it is necessary to analysis the collection in detail and to study of expectations of his reference group that he tried to meet with his collection. However, this would go beyond the scope of this paper.

[46] See as-Silafī, *al-Buldāniyya*, 28; Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Buldāniyya*, 36.

[47] See as-Silafī, *al-Buldāniyya*, 29-30; Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Buldāniyya*, 36-38.

[48] This collection is available as a printed edition. See al-Bakrī, *al-Arbaʿīn*.

[49] He mentions five previous collections. Besides those of as-Silafī and Ibn ʿAsākir, which he identifies as the first geographical forty ḥadīṯ collection, he lists one of Abū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm aš-Šīrāzī al-aṣl al-Baġdādī d-dār (d. Ramaḍān 585) who arranged the cities alphabetically, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir b. ʿAbd Allāh ar-Ruhāwī who arranged the cities according to the chronology of his travel route, and an unknown man from Egypt whose collection was not much innovative. See al-Bakrī, *al-Buldāniyya*, 15.

[50] Al-Bakrī, *al-Buldāniyya*, 16.

geographical aspect of the works. This is why he did not refer in his introduction to the *ḥadīṯ* that praised the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections nor did he mention in any other way that the *buldāniyya* belongs to the *arbaʿīnāt*. Instead, he emphasizes the regionality of *ḥadīṯ*s that could lead in some cases to the fact that some *ḥadīṯ* were spread only in certain regions or cities.[51] Declaring this aspect as the main characteristic of the *buldāniyyāt*, as-Saḫāwī actually projects his perception onto the previous collection and designates them as *buldāniyyāt*.[52]

Because of this fundamentally different perspective two main differences can be observed in comparison to the previous collections that are perceived as results of *knowledge specialization* through *knowledge brokerage*, i.e. the number and content of the collection of as-Saḫāwī.

The first striking structural feature of the *buldāniyya* of as-Saḫāwī is the number of the narrations he collected. Since the other collections understood themselves as sub-texts of the forty *ḥadīṯ* collections, they collected forty *ḥadīṯ*s – even if the exact number could be a bit more or less than forty *ḥadīṯ* as it is the case for al-Bakrī's collection who lists forty one *ḥadīṯ*s.[53] This is also true for the *al-buldāniyyāt* that as-Saḫāwī mentioned in his introduction.[54] All of them were entitled or at least identified later as "*al-Arbaʿūn al-buldāniyya*." As-Saḫāwī, by contrast, did not limit his *buldāniyya* to forty narrations and thus deviated purposely from the forty *ḥadīṯ* genre tradition. He actually doubled the number and includes in his collection eighty narrations, hence also eighty cities. With this he brings new forms of knowledge into the field of the *buldāniyyāt* making them a distinct and independent text group.

The second and probably more striking feature of the *buldāniyya* of as-Saḫāwī is the content, i.e. the medium that was collected. The previous collections all collected Prophetic *ḥadīṯ*, mostly sayings but in some cases also descriptions of the Prophetic deeds. Since both, the sayings of the Prophet and the description of his deeds, belong to the *sunna* of the Prophet, all collections are clearly devoted to the study, transmission and collection of the Prophetic *sunna*. As-Saḫāwī, however, deviates from this line. Not only did he set himself apart by compiling about eighty narrations, he even add poems and sayings as well as anecdotes of other scholars to his collection. From the eighty narrations/cities in total fifty four are *ḥadīṯ*, twenty four poems and two anecdotes/sayings of scholars.[55]

Both aspects, the increased number and the heterogeneous content, are examples of how as-Saḫāwī brings new knowledge in the field of the *buldāniyyat* (*knowledge brokerage*), transforms slightly the characteristics of this text group and presents a more specialized collection than his predecessors (*knowledge specialization*). In addition to that, his collection is full of further specialization aspects that could only be indicated in the present paper. He presents more information on the cities he visits, including the mention of important scholar who visited the city as well. He discusses in a more detailed way the *taḫrīǧ* of the *ḥadīṯ*s and

---

[51] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 41.

[52] This supports the assumption that no transregional and transtemporal knowledge of one field of knowledge exists but instead ideas and concepts always were transformed and interpreted by a *reference group* even though it refers to past ideas and knowledge.

[53] See al-Bakrī, *al-Buldāniyya*. This is also true for the *al-Arbaʿūna al-ʿušāriyya* of az-Zayn al-ʿIrāqī (see al-ʿIrāqī, *al-ʿUšāriyya*). Slightly deviating from the number of forty was probably not perceived as a shortcoming with regard to the condition of the gerne.

[54] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 32-41.

[55] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*.

integrates more collections in his analysis. The *isnād* variation is much larger and he mentioned for example an *isnād* in which all narrators were from Damascus (*dimašqiyūn*), or in which the first six were from Alexandria (*iskandariyūn*). He also includes a discussion on the elevation (*ʿulūw*) of the *asānīd* he cites.

4.2. *Between the Conventions of the Text Group and the Shared Ideas of the Reference Group*
So far, the focus of the study lied on the aspect of how as-Saḫāwī composed an innovative collection with regard to the *knowledge specialization* and *knowledge brokerage* processes. In what follows, it will be shown how the particular concretization of this process were deeply influenced by the *shared ideas* of his *reference group*, i.e. the idea of the reference group of how a collection should be opened.

The following analysis focuses on the first *ḥadīṯ* that as-Saḫāwī included in his collection with which he opens is collection. The comparison of the previous collections shows clearly that the first city to mention was Mecca and the second Medina. The explanation for this is as simple as convincing from the perspective of a Muslim scholar. Mecca is the first of two 'holy' cities in Islam and houses the Kaʿba, God's house. The second holy city is Medina, the city of the Prophet where he is buried. As-Silafī, Ibn ʿAsākir and al-Bakrī begin their collection with these two cities and cite *ḥadīṯs* they collected there. The convention of beginning with these two cities was taken so seriously by al-Bakrī that although he did not hear any *ḥadīṯ* in Medina he put the city on the second place of his collection. He admits that he entered Medina four times but did not get to hear a *ḥadīṯ* in it. In order to keep to the order of the Holy Cities, he narrates from a scholar from Medina that he met in Mecca, so that his collection did not lack Medina and its blessing. However, at the same time, to fulfill the criterion of including only narrations he heard in the city in question and to collect forty *ḥadīṯ*, he mentioned an additional city with his *samāʿ* in his collection that therefore consists of forty one *ḥadīṯ* instead of just forty.[56]

To keep to the order of the Holy Cities, the selection of the opening *ḥadīṯ* is already limited. While scholars usually chose a *ḥadīṯ* that suits the collection with regard to the topic and content, it is more or less 'unpredictable' what *ḥadīṯ* a scholar would find in Mecca or Medina. Hence, the criterion of the city was more important than the criterion of the content. All the better if both criteria could be combined. At the present state of the analysis of the *buldāniyyāt*, only Ibn ʿAsākir seemed to have been able to combine both criteria. He opens his collection with the famous *ḥadīṯ* "The deeds are according to the intention" (*innamā l-aʿmāl bi-n-niyyāt*).[57] While he is convinced that every collection and work of other disciplines should begin with this ḥadīṯ,[58] al-Buḫārī (d. 256/870) seems to be the first who used it instead of an introduction.[59] Ibn ʿAsākir explain the importance of this *ḥadīṯ* by citing a saying of aš-Šāfiʿī in which he said that this *ḥadīṯ* contains about third of the knowledge (*yadḫulu fī ḥadīṯ al-aʿmāl bi-n-niyyāt ṯuluṯ l-ʿilm*).[60] In addition, he cites later scholars who confirm the practice of beginning a work with this *ḥadīṯ*.[61] However, the combination of both criteria

---

[56] Al-Bakrī, *al-Budāniyya*, 18.
[57] Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 47-48.
[58] Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-buldāniyyāt*, 50-51.
[59] See al-Buḫārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, chapter 1, sub chapter 1, first *ḥadīṯ*.
[60] Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 50.
[61] Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 51.

forced Ibn ʿAsākir to include a narration of this *ḥadīṯ* that was not the shortest he possessed, wherefore he adds higher narrations he collected during his long scholarly life.[62]

The practice of beginning a collection or a work with the *"al-Aʿmāl bi-n-niyyāt"-ḥadīṯ* that Ibn ʿAsākir felt obliged to, was still valid in the time of as-Saḫāwī. He emphasized that it was common to open a collection with this *ḥadīṯ* (*kamā annahū stuḥibba l-ibtidāʾ bi-ḥadīṯ innamā l-aʿmāl bi-n-niyyāt*).[63] However, by contrast, as-Saḫāwī begins his collection neither with the city Mecca nor with this *ḥadīṯ*. Instead he started with a narration that confirms the importance of the *isnād* in the post-canonical period, i.e. the *musalsalāt bi-l-awwaliyya*. This *ḥadīṯ* belongs to a sort of *ḥadīṯs* that are transmitted always in a certain context (*musalsalāt*).[64] Its chains are characterized by either a deed, a state or a word and saying of the narrator or the Prophet that has nothing to do with the *ḥadīṯ* itself and that was passed down during the act of narrating the *ḥadīṯ*.[65]

In the case of the *buldāniyyāt* of as-Saḫāwī, it is the *ḥadīṯ al-musalsal bi-l-awwaliyya* that opens his collection.[66] It is a *ḥadīṯ* that has always been transmitted first, so that it is the first *ḥadīṯ* that every transmitter heard from his *šayḫ*. This *ḥadīṯ* has gained certain popularity among the Cairene scholars (and probably elsewhere too), so that as-Saḫāwī decided to open his collection with it. In addition, he must have felt that the need to start with this *ḥadīṯ* is more important than the criterion of the *buldāniyya* text group to begin with Mecca. As a matter of fact it is not easy to receive this *ḥadīṯ* during a *ḥadīṯ* session in general and even more difficult to influence where to here this *ḥadīṯ*. Since as-Saḫāwī heard this *ḥadīṯ* in Jeddah his collection doesn't begin with Mecca but with Jeddah.[67]

His decision to deviate from the criterion of starting with Mecca that the previous collections have in common, can be explained through several reasons. First, since the characteristic of the *ḥadīṯ al-musalsal bi-l-awwaliyya* is to be narrated first, it fits to be the opening *ḥadīṯ* of a collection. Second, this way when the collection is read in later sessions, the *musalsal bi-l-awwaliyya* is still the first *ḥadīṯ* and the students hearing the collection can narrate the *ḥadīṯ* also as the first.

However the third explanation is to prove that the practice to begin with this *ḥadīṯ* was part of the *shared ideas* of the *reference group* of as-Saḫāwī. For this, the *reference group* is represented by two dimensions: *intellectual alliances* represented by vertical ties of a student-teacher relationship and *intellectual rivalries* represented by horizontal ties to acquaintances – or to scholars of the 'same level'.

With regard to the *intellectual alliances*, the present paper will focus on the main teacher of as-Saḫāwī Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī and his teacher's teacher Zayn ad-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī (d. 806). The argument is that the feeling of group membership and solidarity that determines the identity of a person rises through the reference to shared ideas and common cultural capital.[68]

---

[62] Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, 48-49.
[63] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyya*, 50.
[64] See for this too Brown, *Ḥadīth*, 46.
[65] as-Saḫāwī, *Šarḥ at-taqrīb*, 432.
[66] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyya*, 46-47.
[67] As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyya*, 43-50.
[68] See Savelsberg, *Collins*, 28 who explains the concept of „interaction rituals" that has been developed by Goffman and has been used by Collins. See also Kemper, Status, 34, who argues there in reference to Pascal that members of a group share the same ideas not because of the content or logical adequacy of these ideas but because of who in one's social circle supports these ideas.

Even though it was not possible for Ibn Ḥağar hear the *ḥadīṯ al-musalsal bi-l-awwaliyya* he let his wife to hear this *ḥadīṯ* from his principal teacher az-Zayn al-ʿIrāqī.[69] Az-Zayn al-ʿIrāqī himself began his study with his principle teacher al-Mīdūmī with this *ḥadīṯ*.[70] In Addition, al-ʿIrāqī decided to open his collection of *ʿušāriyyāt* – *ḥadīṯ*s with chains that contains only ten narrators to the Prophet – with the *ḥadīṯ al-musalsal bi-l-awwaliyya* that actually did not meet the conditions of the collection.[71]

With regard to the intellectual rivalries, the paper will focus on the intellectual production of other scholars of the same level as as-Saḫāwī. The argument is that since contemporaries find themselves in a struggle over recognition, status and the access to cultural capital,[72] references to the same ideas and its development to show the own superiority over the others is very likely. In the case of as-Saḫāwī and his *buldāniyya*, his Cairene contemporary al-Ğalāl as-Suyūṭī (d. 911) attached even more importance to the *musalsalāt* gathering a whole collection that contains all sorts of *musalsalāt* available,[73] opening his collection with the *musalsal bi-l-awwaliyya*.[74]

That the collection of as-Suyūṭī might be an example of another knowledge specialization process and that it reveals something about the intellectual dynamics of the intellectual scene in Cairo is indeed a study of its own. However, more importantly both intellectual direction, vertical and horizontal, show clearly that the *ḥadīṯ al-musalsal bi-l-awwaliyya* was part of the *shared ideas* and *cultural capital* of the reference group, that beginning with it was a common practice and that referring to it was necessary for a successful new and innovative work in an attempt of gaining status and recognition. Therefore, it can be stated that as-Saḫāwī was influenced or even determined is his decision to open his collection with this *ḥadīṯ* by his reference group.

5. Conclusion

To classify *ḥadīṯ* collections under a general term such as the *buldāniyya* or even as the forty *ḥadīṯ* collection harbors the risk of neglecting the details which make every collection a unique one. Even if the authors themselves refer to text group or a genre does not mean that the follow the conventions of the text group without any attempt of innovation. In this paper, the concept of *recombinant knowledge growth* with its two variations, *knowledge specialization* and *knowledge brokerage*, has been proved to be a promising concept to study developments of text groups and genres in general as well as the analysis of one particular work. In addition, it could be shown that independently of the strategy, either specialization or a brokerage, the author's concrete design of his work depends heavily on the *shared ideas* of his *reference group*.

For the case study, the comparison and analysis revealed that as-Saḫāwī chose a combination of *knowledge specialization* and *knowledge brokerage* for his collection. By increasing the number of the cities and narrations that the collection contains and by including poems and anecdotes in addition to Prophetic *ḥadīṯ*, he was able to specialize in the field of the

---

[69] As-Saḫāwī. *al-Ğawāhir*, 3:1208.
[70] Al-ʿIrāqī, *al-Arbaʿūn al-ʿušāriyya*, 124.
[71] Al-ʿIrāqī, *al-Arbaʿūn al-ʿušāriyya*, 124-125.
[72] See Savelsberg, *Collins*, 28-29.
[73] As-Syūṭī, *Ğiyād al-musalsalāt*.
[74] As-Syūṭī, *Ğiyād al-musalsalāt*, 73-77.

buldāniyyāt where nearly all kinds of possible (re)combinations of homogeneous knowledge have already been done. In addition, it could be shown, that his decision not to start with Mecca and instead opening his collection with the *ḥadīṯ al-musalsal bi-l-awwaliyya* was a reaction of the *shared idea* within his *reference group* of how to open a collection. An analysis of both, his vertical and horizontal social and intellectual ties, supported this finding. In the end, as-Saḫāwī succeeded in creating an innovative collection and in working with the *cultural capital* of his *reference group*. The result of it was more of a geographical (*ḥadīṯ*) *isnād* collection than a sub group of the forty ḥadīṯ collection.

6. Bibliography

al-Andarastānī, ʿAbd al-Salām b. Muḥammad, *Kitab al-arba'in al-buldaniyah*, Princeton, Garrett Yahuda 3526Y

al-Bakrī, Ṣadr ad-Dīn Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muḥammad, *Arbaʿūn al-buldāniyya*, Tübingen MaVI141-1.

al-Bakrī, Ṣadr ad-Dīn Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muḥammad, *k. al-Arbaʿīn ḥadīṯan. Al-Arbaʿīn min arbaʿīn ʿan arbaʿīn*, ed. Muḥammad Maḥfūẓ, 2nd ed., Beirut: Dār al-Ġarb al-Islāmī 1983.

Birgit Neumann, "Travelling Concepts as a Model for the Study of Culture," in Brigit Neumann and Ansgar Nünning (ed.), *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture*, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter 2012, 1-22.

Al-Buḫārī, Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḫārī*, ed. Dār as-Salām and Dār al-Fayḥāʾ, 2nd ed., Riyadh/Damascus 1999.

Brown, *Ḥadīth. Muhammad's Legady in the medieval and Modern World*, Oxford: Oneworld 2009.

Brown, Jonathan, The Canonization of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. The Formation and Function of the Sunnī Ḥadīth Canon, Leiden: Brill 2011.

Carnabuci, Gianuca and Jeroen Bruggeman, "Knowledge Specialization, Knowledge Brokerage and the Uneven Growth of Technology Domains," Social Forces 88/2 (2009), 607-641.

Collins, Randall, The Sociology of Philosophies. A Global Theory of Intellectual Change, Cambridge 1998.

DiMaggio, Paul, „Cultur and Cognition," *Annual Review of Sociology* 33 (1997), 263-287.

Garret Davidson in his PhD thesis *Carrying on the Tradition. An Intellectual and Social History of Post-Canonical Hadith Transmission*, Chicago 2014.

Hargadon, Andrew B., "Brokering Knowledge. Linking Learning and Innovation," *Research in Organizational Behavior* 24 (2002), 41-85.

Ibn ʿAsākir, *al-Arbaʿūn al-buldāniyya, Arbaʿūn ḥadīṯan ʿan arbaʿīn šayḫan min arbaʿīn madīna li-arbaʿīn ṣaḥāba*, ed. ʿAbdū al-Ḥāǧǧ Muḥammad al-Ḥarīrī, Beirut 1993.

Al-ʿIrāqī, Zayn ad-Dīn ʿAbd ar-Raḥīm b. al-Ḥusayn, *k. al-Arbaʿīn al-ʿušāriyya*, in al-Muqrīʾ, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān, *k. al-Arbaʿīn fī l-ǧihād wa-l-muǧāhidīn*, ed. Badr b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Badr, 2nd ed., Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm 1995, 101-235.

Kemper, Theodore D., *Status, Power and Ritual Interaction. A Relational Readin of Durkheim, Goffman and Collins*, Burlington: Ashgate 2011.

Knoblauch, Hubert, *Wissenssoziologie*, 2nd ed., Konstanz: UVK 2010.

Lucas, *Constructive Criticism, Ḥadīth Literatur, and the Articulaion of Sunnī Islam*, Leiden: Brill 2004.

Maasen, Sabine, *Wissenssoziologie*, 2nd ed., Bielefeld: Transcript 2008.

Mourad, Suleiman A. and James E. Lindsay, *The intensification and reorientation of Sunni jihad ideology in the Crusader period. Ibn 'Asākir of Damascus (1105-1176) and his age, with an edition and translation of Ibn 'Asākir's The forty hadiths for inciting jihad*, Leiden 2013.

al-Muqarrab, Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn Abū Bakr Aḥmad Ibn al-Ḥusayn Ibn al-Ḥasan al-Karḫī al-Baġdādī, *k. fīhi Arbaʿūn ḥadīṯan ʿan arbaʿīn šayḫan fī arabʿīn maʿnan wa-faḍīla*, ed. Ṣalāḥ b. ʿIyāḍ aš-Šallāḥī, Beirut 1999.

As-Saḫāwī, *al-Buldāniyyāt*, ed. Ḥusām b. Muḥammad al-Qaṭṭān, Riyadh: Dār al-ʿAṭāʾ 2001

As-Saḫāwī, Šams ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān, *al-Ǧawāhir wa-d-durar fī tarǧamat Šayḫ al-Islām Ibn Ḥaǧar*, ed. Ibrāhīm Bāḫis ʿAbd al-Maǧīd, 3 vols., Beirut: Dār al-Ḥazm 1999.

As-Saḫāwī, Šams ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān, *Šarḥ at-taqrīb wa-t-taysīr li-maʿrifat sunan al-bašīr an-naḏīr*, 2nd ed., Amman: ad-Dār al-Aṯariyya 2008.

Savelsberg, "American Criminology meets Collins. Global Theory of Intellectual Change and a Policy-Oriented Field," Sociological Forum 26/1 (2011), 21-44.

As-Silafī, Abū Ṭāhir Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, *al-Arbaʿīn al-buldāniyya, al-Arbaʿīn al-mustaġnī bi-mā fīhi ʿan al-muʿīn*, ed. ʿAbd Allāh Rābiḥ, Damascus: Dār al-Bayrūtī 1992.

As-Suyūṭī, Ǧalāl ad-Dīn ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr, *Ǧiyād al-musalsalāt*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAwwāma, Jeddah: Dār Nūr al-Maktabāt 2002.

Unknown, *buldāniyya*, Gotha, Pretsch Nr. 613.