

Shaykh al-Ansari's Historical-Hadith Perspective and the Formation of Aṣālat al-Ṣudūr in Hadith Evaluation

Mahdi Geramipour

Assistant Professor, Department of Fiqh and Foundations of Law, University of Qom, Qom, Iran. (Corresponding Author). mahdi.gerami.pour@gmail.com

Mohammad Javad Taki

Instructor of Advanced Seminary Courses, Qom Seminary, Qom, Iran; mjtaki@gmail.com

Received: 2024/06/28

Accepted: 2024/11/18

Abstract

Shaykh al-Ansari is among the foremost Imami Shi'ī scholars. In addition to his major works in fiqh and uṣūl al-fiqh, his writings contain significant discussions of hadith evaluation that reveal the precision of his approach, particularly with regard to the methodological foundations of the early Imami scholars. Employing a descriptive-analytical method and a close examination of al-Ansari's works, this study elucidates his historical perspective on hadith and argues that his method of evaluating reports accords with the early Imami approach, in which acceptance depends on attaining confidence that a report genuinely originated from the Infallibles (wuthūq al-ṣudūr), on the basis of internal and external corroborative indicators (qarā'in). In light of the filtering and careful scrutiny that accompanied the transmission of hadith, al-Ansari maintains that most reports originated from the Infallibles. This confidence provides the basis for the doctrine of aṣālat al-ṣudūr, namely, the presumption of a report's provenance from the Infallibles, with respect to reports contained in authoritative hadith collections. Accordingly, the principal function of the isnād, in his view, is to serve as a criterion of preference between conflicting reports. After carefully examining the transmitters and the processes by which reports entered hadith compilations, al-Ansari regards the inclusion of a report in an authoritative hadith collection as an indicator supporting confidence in its provenance. Where strong countervailing indicators undermine such confidence, however, the scholar may seek to re-establish it through external corroborative evidence.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

Shaykh Murtaḍā al-Ansari is one of the most influential Imami jurists and legal theorists, yet his writings also contain a coherent approach to hadith evaluation. Earlier studies have examined aspects of his isnād criticism and procedures for assessing reports, but the relationship between his historical understanding of hadith transmission and his epistemic criterion of confidence has received less direct attention. Al-Ansari does not reduce hadith reliability to the individual evaluation of transmitters; rather, he repeatedly considers the cumulative effect of textual, historical, bibliographical, and rijāl-based indicators in producing confidence that a report originated from an Infallible (wuthūq al-ṣudūr). This study asks how that historical-hadith perspective shapes his treatment of weak chains, the role he assigns to isnād in cases of conflict, and the basis on which aṣālat al-ṣudūr can be formulated for reports preserved in authoritative hadith collections.

Materials and Methods

The study uses a descriptive-analytical, library-based method and is grounded primarily in a close reading of al-Ansari's major works in uṣūl al-fiqh and fiqh, especially Farā'id al-Uṣūl and Kitāb al-Makāsib, together with other relevant treatises cited in the article. The unit of analysis is each passage in which al-Ansari explicitly discusses the reliability of a report, the status of a transmitter, the evidentiary value of a chain, corroborative indicators, conflict between reports, or the historical transmission of hadith books. Relevant passages were identified by thematic tracing across his works and were then compared in order to distinguish general methodological commitments from rulings restricted to a particular legal case.

The analysis proceeds in four stages. First, al-Ansari's use of terms such as thiqa, ma'mūn, ṣādiq, and 'ādil is examined to determine whether wathāqa functions as an independent formal criterion or as one means of generating confidence and sukūn al-nafs. Second, his arguments concerning the authority of solitary reports (khabar al-wāḥid) are analyzed to identify the epistemic threshold he treats as sufficient for legal reliance. Third, his juristic practice is compared with the early Imami understanding of sound reports and with the later fourfold classification of hadith as ṣaḥīḥ, ḥasan, muwaththaq, and ḍa'īf. Particular attention is paid to cases in which a formally weak chain is reinforced by external indicators, juristic practice, transmitted consensus, or the reception of a report among earlier scholars. Fourth, the study reconstructs al-Ansari's historical account of hadith transmission by examining his discussions of audition (samā'), writing, comparison or collation (muqābala), transmission through books, and the caution of early transmitters and compilers. The results of these stages are finally synthesized to explain his confidence in most reports contained in recognized hadith collections and the consequent emergence of aṣālat al-ṣudūr.

Results and Findings

The findings show that al-Ansari's concept of *wathāqa* is broader than the mere truthfulness or moral probity of a transmitter. Reliability is important because it can generate rational confidence, but it is neither the only route to that confidence nor an independently sufficient basis for accepting every report. His reading of the proofs for *khavar al-wāḥid* therefore does not support the authority of every conjectural report as such; the assured scope of those proofs concerns reports that produce a degree of confidence on which rational agents would ordinarily rely.

This orientation places his method close to the early Imami approach. Al-Ansari does not treat the later fourfold classification of *ḥadīth* as the final criterion of acceptance and rejection. In his legal discussions, a formally weak *isnād* may remain usable when other corroborative indicators compensate for its weakness, while a formally sound chain does not automatically settle the legal question. The *isnād* consequently retains an important but non-exclusive function. Its most decisive role appears after an actual conflict between reports has survived semantic and contextual reconciliation: only then do transmitter-based and chain-based preferences become central grounds for preferring one report over another.

A further result concerns al-Ansari's view of the historical transmission of the Imami *ḥadīth* corpus. He portrays transmission as a regulated process involving hearing, writing, collation, controlled book transmission, and caution regarding material received through unreliable channels. On this basis, the recognized status of a *ḥadīth* book, its compiler, and the route by which its material entered the scholarly tradition can themselves function as corroborative indicators. This historical dimension explains why he regards the overwhelming majority of reports preserved in authoritative collections as genuinely originating from the Infallibles, while still allowing that a very small number of false reports may have entered the corpus.

These premises provide the basis for *aṣālat al-ṣudūr*. The principle does not mean that every report is certainly authentic or immune from criticism. Rather, the presence of a report in an authoritative collection can create an initial presumption in favor of its provenance, subject to defeat by strong countervailing evidence. Accordingly, apparent contradiction does not immediately justify doubting provenance. Al-Ansari gives priority to harmonization at the level of meaning; only when such reconciliation fails does the inquiry move to provenance-based preferences and *isnād* evaluation. External evidence—including *rijāl* considerations, juristic fame, transmitted consensus, and the reception of a report among earlier scholars—may then strengthen or weaken the confidence initially generated by the report's transmission context.

Conclusion

Al-Ansari's method of *ḥadīth* evaluation is best described as confidence-centered rather than exclusively *isnād*-centered. Transmitter reliability remains significant, but it operates within a wider evidentiary framework that includes historical transmission,

the authority of hadith books, juristic reception, and other corroborative indicators. His confidence in the provenance of most reports in recognized collections provides the epistemic basis for *aṣālat al-ṣudūr*, while his treatment of conflicting reports explains why semantic reconciliation precedes recourse to chain-based preferences. The resulting model is neither an uncritical acceptance of the transmitted corpus nor a purely formal *rijāl* methodology. It is a contextual and cumulative approach in which the history of transmission contributes directly to legal-hadith evaluation. Al-Ansari's historical-hadith perspective should therefore be regarded as a central component of his broader juristic methodology and as a key to understanding his distinctive theory of hadith reliability.

Keywords: Hadith evaluation; concept of reliability (*wathāqa*); confidence in hadith provenance (*wuthūq al-ṣudūr*); early Imami definition.