

# Are Sunnī and Shī‘ī always Clash?: An Examination of Ḥadīth Studies in the Zaydī

Benny Afwadzi

Department of Islamic Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang,  
Gajayana Street No. 50, Malang 65145, Indonesia

Keywords: ḥadīth, al-Ṣan‘ānī, Shī‘ī, unity, Zaydī

Abstract: In the Islamic world, Sunnī and Shī‘ī were the two sects that clashed between one to another, from the discourse of theology until *imāma* and *khilāfa*. Sometimes, the clash of thought made a big conflict between them, for example, Sunnī-Shī‘ī conflict in Sampang Madura, Indonesia since 2006 to 2012, and finally to the expulsion of the Shī‘ī community of this region outside the Madura island. This problem must be solved by the best solution, especially from their own Islamic text books. Based on that reality, I attempted to examine the study of ḥadīth among the Zaydī Shī‘ī (Zaydiyya) by focusing on Muhammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Kahlānī al-Ṣan‘ānī’s thought. By analyzing the two main works of Ṣan‘ānī which discussed of the ḥadīths, *Tawḍīh al-Afkār* and *Subul al-Salām*, and was analyzed with descriptive-analytical method, I found that in the study of ḥadīth, based on al-Ṣan‘ānī’s thought, Zaydī sect opposed *taqlīd*, had a “free thought”, and was not bound by school and ḥadīth literature of certain *madhhab*, both Sunnī and Shī‘ī. Zaydī relied on only ḥadīths that were considered authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*). The opinions of other scholars about *isnād* and *matn* of ḥadīth were examined by Zaydī with own analysis, even against his *madhhab*. This characteristic of thinking had a similarity to the way of thinking among Salafī or Wahhābī who was the strongest school against the Shī‘ī movement. In addition, the Zaydīs works were clearly accepted and studied in Indonesia, especially in *pesantren*, the biggest Islamic country with Sunnī ideology. I argued that the reality should be brought to the reconciliation between Sunnī and Shī‘ī in Islamic world, then they would be united and there would be no prolonged conflict between them.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In the Islamic world, Sunnī and Shī‘ī are the two sects that clash between one to another, from the discourse of theology until *imāma* and *khilāfa* (Afwadzi, 2014). According to the Sunnī fundamentalist in recent times, the Shī‘ī community seems like a “parasite” and the existence must be eradicated. Shī‘ī is considered a destroyer of Islamic teachings with some perceived perversions, such as contract marriage (*muṭ‘a*), the doctrine of *taqiyya*, self-mortification during the anniversary of the Carbala (‘*āshurā* day), and infidel the Prophet’s companions. The judgements to Shī‘ī community sometimes cause a big conflict between them, for example, Sunnī-Shī‘ī conflict in Sampang Madura, Indonesia since 2006 to 2012, and finally to the expulsion of the Shī‘ī community of this region outside the Madura island (Afdillah, 2013; Anshori, 2014; Hilmy, 2015). For some Muslims in

Indonesia, Shī‘ī is also identified with torturers and murderers as well as enemies of the Sunnī community as attributed to Bashshār al-Assad’s regime in Syria. They consider that the war in the country as the war between Shī‘ī and Sunnī (Burhanuddin, 2016; Hidcom, 2016; Ishaq, 2018). The similar opinion is also attributed to the war between Saudi Arabia with the Sunnī’s ideology (Wahhābī) against Yemen (Hūthi) militants with Shī‘ī (Zaidiya) (Haq, 2017; Jurnal, 2017).

Actually, in Islamic theology, Shī‘ī *madhhab* is not a single Islamic school. Shī‘ī is divided into many groups, which do not have the same understanding of the Islamic teachings. According to al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), after the death of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, the Shī‘ī *madhhab* can be classified into four major classes, and then subdivided into smaller groups. The four classes, mentioned by al-Baghdādī, are Shī‘a Ghulāt, Shī‘a Kaysāniya, Shī‘a Zaydiyya, and Shī‘a Imāmiya (al-Baghdādī, n.d.). While in

contemporary era, the Shī'ī *madhhab* that still known there are three sects, namely Shī'a Zaydiya, Ismā'īliya, and Ithnā 'Ashariya. As among Sunnī scholars who have a different opinion, in Shī'ī also occur the same condition, even mutually disbelieve (*takfīr*) between one to another. Among the many Shī'ī sects, there is a sect that has a close connection with Sunnī *madhhab*. The sect is the Zaydī Shī'ī (Zaydiya) that refers to one of the descendants of 'Alī who opposed the Umayyads militantly named Zayd b. 'Alī Zayn al-'Ābidīn b. Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 122/740). The greatest Zaydī, according to al-Baghdādī (n.d.), consists of three groups, i.e. al-Jārūdiya, Sulaymāniya or Jarīriya, and Butriya, even though their existence now is lost in time and the information is only contained in books on Islamic theology (al-Faḍīl, 1985).

According to Zaydī doctrine, 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 40/661) is the most noble companion of the Prophet, beyond Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq (d. 13/634) and 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (d. 23/644). Nonetheless, Zaydī still recognizes the Caliphs of the two companions of Prophet Muhammad. Zaydī sect receives Abū Bakr and 'Umar lawful as Muslim caliphs in Islamic civilization. Based on the understanding, Zaydī reluctant to blame the companions of the Prophet, even more to berate and condemn them. According to Zaydī doctrine, *Taqiyya*, the *imām*'s knowledge of something unseen (*ghayb*), and the concept of *raj'a* are rejected. From some conceptions of the teachings, it is seen that Zaydī is the Shī'ī *madhhab* which is understood to be more inclined to Sunnī (Shihab, 2014).

One of the famous Zaydī Muslim scholar is Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Kaḥlānī al-Ṣan'ānī, and commonly known as Imām al-Ṣan'ānī (d. 1182/1769). He was a Muslim scholar in the 17th century from Yemen, which was a place to develop Zaydī *madhhab*. In the Islamic history, the first Zaydī dynasty in Yemen was spearheaded by al-Imām al-Hādī ilā al-Ḥaqq Yaḥyā b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 298/911), the most important and most powerful figure in Zaydī movement in 284/897 (al-'Ulaymī, 1987). The existence of Zaydī community has been continued in Yemen until the contemporary era, but his follower is not the majority.

## 2 METHODS AND FOCUSES

This article analyzed ḥadīth thought among Zaydī sect which was focused on Imām al-Ṣan'ānī's thought with descriptive-analytical method. Al-Ṣan'ānī, as a modern scholar of ḥadīth (al-Siddieqy,

1973), was an appropriate representation to describe the mindset of the Zaydī sect. The study explored several aspects related to the method of authenticity of ḥadīth and its interpretation which were the two central aspects in the ḥadīth studies. The aspects of ḥadīth's authenticity and the interpretation of al-Ṣan'ānī were examined from two representative books, i.e. *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār* and *Subul al-Salām*. Although both of them only the book of explanations (*sharḥ*), but in these books were written the great ideas of Imām al-Ṣan'ānī. The works of al-Ṣan'ānī and Zaydī in general also helped to construct his thinking.

The studies of the al-Ṣan'ānī's thought or his work had been written by scholars, for instance, the study of Aḥmad Muḥammad al-'Ulaymī (1987) who examined al-Ṣan'ānī and his masterpiece *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār*, Nurliana (2006) who examined the method of excavating the law (*istinbāt al-ḥukm*) al-Ṣan'ānī in *Subul al-Salām*, Ḥasan b. 'Alī al-Qurashī (2008) that examined the sincerity of al-Ṣan'ānī in the field of *da'wa*, 'Alī Muḥammad al-Ṣaghīr Aḥmad (2011) who examined one of al-Ṣan'ānī's books concerning *uṣūl fiqh* entitled *Ijābah al-Sā'il*, and Ahmad Bastari (2016) that focused his study on the book of *Subul al-Salām* as a commentary on the book of *Bulūgh al-Marām*. Meanwhile, the studies of Shī'ī *madhhab* in general or Zaydī and others were very diverse, for example, Sayyid Zayd al-Wazir (2014) who studied the concept of treasures (*māl*) in the Zaydī perspective, Muḥammad Abū Zahra (2005) who examined the main figure of the Zaydī *madhhab* al-Imām Zayd, Alī b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Faḍīl (1985) that explored Zaydī in the theory and practice, M. Quraish Shihab (2014) who expressed many of the Ithnā 'Asharī's doctrines and the basis of the argument to unite with the Sunnī *madhhab*, M. Alfatih Suryadilaga (2009) that studied the concept of science in the first ḥadīth collection of Ithnā 'Asharī *al-Kaḥf al-Kulaynī*, Mohammad Reza Himyari (2014) also studied the concept of reason in *al-Kaḥf*, Zeid B. Smeer (2011) who examined the criticism of Naṣīr al-Qifārī to ḥadīth of the Ithnā 'Asharī and Maria Massi Dakake (2000) who analyzed the doctrines among Shī'a.

The purpose of this paper was conformable to the spirit that was sounded by Quraish Shihab, i.e. to unite between Sunnī and Shī'ī, even though not in the same format. Unification, according to Shihab, did not mean the fusion of the teachings into one, but approaches to be able to "shook hands" between one *madhhab* and the other. Shihab (2014, p.259) asserted after exploring the doctrines of Ithnā 'Asharī: "*Ajakan yang dikumandangkan adalah*

*penyatuan dalam arti membiarkan mazhab-mazhab Islam yang ada tumbuh berkembang, sambil melakukan pendekatan agar kesemuannya dapat bergandengan tangan, berjalan seiring, dan bekerjasama meraih kejayaan bersama serta saling menopang menghadapi musuh bersama”* (The sounded call was the union in the sense of allowing existing Islamic schools of thought to grow, while approaching so that all of them be able to join hands, went together, and worked together to achieve the glory and supported each other against the common enemy).

Nevertheless, I realized that in essence, the difference was the causes an attitude of hostility. If the judging was only the difference, then “the hostile fire would be easily ignited.” Therefore, a shifting paradigm must be made, from the study of differences to an examination of the equation. As previously noted that Zaydī was the Shī'ī sect that closest to Sunnī, it was necessary in this article to conduct a thorough study of the Zaydī's thought, in order to slightly merge the relationship between Sunnī and Shī'ī. Most works on Shī'ī were more focused on Ithnā 'Asharī because in this period, the word “Shī'a” usually referred to the Ithnā 'Asharī Shī'ī, and the sect had a unique doctrine in Islamic doctrines. Although when this topic was examined comprehensively, there was another Shī'ī sect that had great potential to build “*madhhab ukhrawah*” which was often forgotten, i.e. Zaydī. It was the contribution of this simple article expected to academic and social context. I hoped the article became an additional study of “*al-taqrib bayn al-madhāhib*” (closer between Islamic schools) that had been focused to explore the Ithnā 'Asharī doctrines.

### 3 THE BIOGRAPHY OF AL-ŞAN'ĀNĪ

The author of *Subul al-Salām*, a *sharḥ* book of *Bulūgh al-Marām*, was a direct descendant of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib from al-Ḥasan, a figure who chosen to make peace with Mu'āwiyah b. Abī Sufyān (d. 60/680). Al-Shawkānī, (d. 1250/1834) who was also the Zaydī Muslim scholar, informed the genealogy of al-Şan'ānī as follows: Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl b. Şalāḥ b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Ḥifẓ al-Dīn b. Sharaf al-Dīn b. Şalāḥ b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Mahdī b. Muḥammad b. Idrīs b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā b. Ḥamza b. Sulaymān b. Ḥamza b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yaḥyā b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥusayn b. al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm b. Ismā'īl b.

Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (al-Shawkānī, n.d.). The family of al-Şan'ānī was known as the *Amīr*, so he was also titled as *al-Amīr al-Şan'ānī* (al-'Ulaymī, 1987).

The majority of Zaydī Muslim scholars were descendants of the *Ahl al-Bayt* from al-Ḥasan, as well as al-Şan'ānī, and only a few of the descendants of al-Ḥusayn. According to Abū Zahra (d. 1394/1974), this phenomena occurred because the descendants of al-Ḥasan found the freedom movement, the spirit of scholarship, and most importantly the suitability of *imāma* (leadership) in this *madhhab*. In the Imāmī, as Zaydī's closest sect in Shī'a, *imāma* was limited only to the descendants of 'Alī from al-Ḥusayn (Abū Zahra, 2005), while Zaydī did not limit to al-Ḥusayn.

al-Şan'ānī, as one of the great Islamic scholars of the Zaydī sect, was born in a town called Kaḥlān, on the eve of Friday in the middle of Jumādā al-Akhīr in 1099/1688 (al-Shawkānī, n.d.; al-'Ulaymī, 1987; Ḥallāq, 1997) or another *riwāya* in 1059/1649 (Anonim, n.d.). Geographically, according *google map* guide, Kaḥlān was a city located northwest of the state capital of Yemen, Şan'ā, which, when taken in a car about four hours at a distance of 241 KM, whereas with regular travel on foot took about three days to get there ('Abd al-Ḥamīd, n.d.). From this hometown, he had the title of al-Kaḥlānī, that was attributed directly to the city.

In 1107/1696, at the age was eight years old (al-Shawkānī, n.d.) or 1110/1689 in eleven years old ('Abd al-Ḥamīd, n.d.), al-Şan'ānī with his family moved to the capital of Şan'ā. In this city, he studied from several Muslim scholars who lived there, such as Zayd b. Muḥammad al-Ḥasan (d. 1123/1171), Şalāḥ b. al-Ḥusayn al-Akhfash (d. 1142/1730), 'Abd Allāh b. 'Alī al-Wazīr (d. 1147/1734), and 'Alī b. Muḥammad al-'Unsī (d. 1139/1727). From that Yemeni capital, he got the title al-Şan'ānī after al-Kaḥlānī. After studying in Yemen, al-Şan'ānī performed an intellectual traveling to Mecca and Medina. In these two centers of Islamic science, he examined the ḥadīth in the presence of the great Muslim scholars who lived in Mecca and Medina (al-Shawkānī, n.d.).

According to al-'Ulaymī (1987), al-Şan'ānī traveled intellectually to Mecca and Medina for four times. The first traveling took place in the year 1112/1700. At that time, he had settled in Medina and studied from several Muslim scholars, such as 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī al-Ghayth al-Khaṭīb who became the preacher of the Maşjīd al-Nabawī at that time and Ṭāhir b. Ibrāhīm. The second *riḥla* was occurred in 1132/1720 and he studied to Abū al-

Hasan Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Sanādī (d.1138/1726). The third traveling was done in 1134/1722 and successfully studied to Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Asadī and wrote the work titled *al-‘Iddat al-‘Umda*. The year 1139/1727 became his last trip to Mecca. At the time, he was able to study directly to Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī (w. 1134/1722).

The Caliph al-Manṣūr, one of the Yemeni government, gave a task to al-Ṣan‘ānī to be a preacher at the Ṣan‘ā Grand mosque. Then, he transferred his scholarship with teaching, giving *fatwā*, and writing books. Al-Ṣan‘ānī was a productive author in multi-discipline studies, not only related to ḥadīth studies. Many works in Islamic studies were written by him as manifestations of his thoughts, for instance, *Subul al-Salām*, *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār*, *al-Iṣābat fī Ḥaḳīqat al-Mujāba*, *Irshād al-Nuqād ilā Taysīr al-Ijtihād*, *al-Ihrāz limā fī Asās al-Balāghat min Kināya wa al-Majāz* and the other books (Anonim, n.d.). Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Kahlānī al-Ṣan‘ānī died on the 3rd Sya‘ban of 1182 /1769 with the age of 83 years or 123 years according to other *riwāya*.

#### 4 AL-ṢAN‘ĀNĪ’S THOUGHT ON ḤADĪTH

Speaking of the authenticity of prophetic ḥadīth in the thought of al-Ṣan‘ānī, it should be restored to *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār li Ma‘ān Tankīḥ al-Anzār*. The book was a commentary of *Tankīḥ al-Anzār*, a book of ḥadīth sciences written by Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Wazīr al-Yamānī (d. 840/1436), who also adhered to the Zaydī school and originated from the Yemeni country, as well as al-Ṣan‘ānī. In the meantime, to explore how al-Ṣan‘ānī gives an interpretation to ḥadīths, referred to the book of *Subul al-Salām*, which was a commentary of *Bulūgh al-Marām min Adillat al-Aḥkām*. Martin Van Bruinessen (1999) stated that *Bulūgh al-Marām* was the most popular ḥadīth book in the field of Indonesian *pesantren*.

In *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār*, the definition of ḥadīth in the view of al-Ṣan‘ānī was not different from the Sunnī Muslim scholars. Based on Aṭā’ explanation in *Muṣṭalah Ahl al-Ḥadīth*, al-Ṣan‘ānī explained that the ḥadīth was a something derived from the Prophet, or his companions, or subsequent generations, in the form of speaking (*qawli*), action (*fi‘li*), both of them (speaking and action), provision (*taqrīrī*), and character (*ṣīfat*). On the other hand, there was another definition of ḥadīth as a something

that came from the Prophet, and *khbar* was sourced from others (not from the Prophet) (al-Ṣan‘ānī, n.db.). He also divided ḥadīth into three categories, as the Sunnī categories: *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, and *ḍa‘īf*. The understanding of al-Ṣan‘ānī was contrary to the definition of ḥadīth among Ithnā ‘Asharī, who regarded the speakings, actions, and provisions of the twelve *imāms* as a ḥadīth as well because they were considered infallible (*ma‘ṣūm*) as the Prophet Muhammad. Ithnā ‘Asharī also made one more category besides the three categories of ḥadīth (*ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, *ḍa‘īf*), i.e. *muwaththaq* ḥadīth as a strong ḥadīth but was narrated by informants from another school (Suryadilaga, 2009).

#### 4.1 al-Ṣan‘ānī’s thought on *Isnād*

In discussion of *isnād* problem, al-Ṣan‘ānī argued that in *ṣaḥīḥayn* (al-Bukhārī and Muslim) there were some informants whom received a negative opinion (*jarḥ*). However, the list of criticizing informants, in fact, were not criticized absolutely, but there were reasons for the justification. For example, Ayyūb b. Ā’idh in *ṣaḥīḥayn* was known as the Murji‘ī scholar (al-Bukhārī, 2005; Mughlaṭāya, 2001; al-Bāḥī, 1986), Ḥarīz b. ‘Uthmān al-Ḥimṣī (d. 163 H) in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* from the *naṣb* community (haters ‘Alī) (al-Bāḥī, 1986; al-Dhahabī, n.db.; al-Jurjānī, 1997), Khālīd b. Makhlad al-Qaṭwānī (d. 213 H) in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* was mentioned had a *tashayyu’* character (lovers ‘Alī) (al-Baṣrī, 1968; al-Dhahabī, n.da.; al-Dhahabī, n.db.), and Hishām b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Dustuwā’ī (d.152 H) in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* which was mentioned as a Qadarī scholar (al-Baṣrī, 1968; al-Mizzī, 1980). According to al-Ṣan‘ānī, they were still survivors of *bid‘a* in the category of justice (*‘adāla*). Indeed, some of them called their *bid‘a*, until Ibn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 628/1230) stated that some *rijāl* in al-Bukhārī and Muslim were not known their *Islam*. However, according to al-Ṣan‘ānī, the opinion of Ibn al-Qaṭṭān was exaggerated (*ghulūw*), because Ibn al-Qaṭṭān was the Islamic scholar who famous did not narrate the ḥadīth from others than Imām Muslim (al-Ṣan‘ānī, n.db.).

With the view above, al-Ṣan‘ānī sought to defend *ṣaḥīḥayn*, especial *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* as the best ḥadīth book in Sunnī, which incorporated some debatable *rijāl*. According al-Ṣan‘ānī, the *rijāl al-ḥadīth* still survived in the field of informant integrity (*‘adāla*), despite having a *bid‘a*. To clarify al-Ṣan‘ānī’s opinion, al-‘Ulaymī (1987) cited Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī’s explanation (d. 852/1449) in *Hady al-Sārī (muqaddima of Faḥ al-Bārī)*. According to Ibn Ḥajar, the *bid‘a* that could cause

an informant not to be accepted was an informant who got the predicate of *kāfir* or *fāsiq* by agreement of the Muslims in general based on established rules, for example, the Shī'a Ghulāt sect who viewed that God dwelt in the body of 'Alī. Ibn Ḥajar asserted that none of the traditions of those scholars (Shī'a Ghulāt) which could be considered authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*). Sunnī Muslim scholars had different opinions about the *bid'a* of the Khawārij or moderate (not exaggerated) Shī'ī and other sects that violated the meaning of the sunna and prefer to understand it in an esoteric meaning (*ta'wīl*). Some of Sunnī Muslim scholars argued that these informants could be used in ḥadīth on qualifications that they should avoid the lies and their attitude could damage the *murū'a* in the field of religion and worship. Related to the topic, al-Ṣan'ānī also has a position in this way of thinking.

In the study of the Companions of the Prophet, al-Ṣan'ānī criticized the view of Ibn Ḥajar which put companions of the Prophet on the first level defeating the informants were called the most *thiqa* man (*awthaq al-nās*). Textually, this meant that the capacity of Companions included *thiqa ḥāfiẓ* and it had two principles: *'adāla* and *dabt*. However, according to al-Ṣan'ānī, the opinion as argued by Ibn Ḥajar was not without problems, because actually the existence or absence of *ḥifẓ* (memory) was the character in human, including the Companions of the Prophet. In fact, the Prophet himself had ever forgotten the prayers according to a valid history. How, then, could put a Companions higher than the one called *awthaq al-nās*? Companions were human beings who could not eliminate forgetfulness. 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb were narrated by al-Bukhārī ever forgot in the *tayammum* ritual (al-Ṣan'ānī, n.db.).

The view of al-Ṣan'ānī above did not wish to sue the existence of the dictum among Sunnī, "*kull al-ṣaḥābat 'udūl*" (all of the Companions were *'ādil*) as practiced by Ithnā 'Asharī and put them down as the informants ḥadīth in general (Suryadilaga, 2009; Mahmud, 2014). In this context, he only put the position of the Companions like an ordinary human who did not escape the error. The aspect of *'adāla* in the Companions personality had been fulfilled, but the power of memory depended on the intellectual capacity of each Companion and could not be generalized, let alone to be considered better than informant at the first level. If placing the position of the Companions like Ibn Ḥajar argument, it was like placing the Companions in a higher position than the Prophet. The Zaydī community, as was described by King (2012), had a position in the middle between Sunnī and Ithnā 'Asharī theologically and

jurisprudently. In the matter of the Companions, the doctrine of the Zaydī deemed Sunnī exaltation of the Companions was excessive and ignored the evidences of their some faults, whereas the Ithnā 'Asharī doctrine was excessive in denouncing the Companions and glorifying *Ahl al-Bayt*.

## 4.2 al-Ṣan'ānī's thought on Interpretation of Ḥadīth

In the discourse of the interpretation of the prophetic ḥadīth, al-Ṣan'ānī did not bind himself to a particular *madhhab* and was free to choose which he considered superior (*rājih*). One of his interpretation could be seen from his explanation to the ḥadīth concerning the minimum number of people who pray in Friday prayers. The ḥadīth of this subject was mentioned in *Bulūgh al-Marām* as follows, "*an Jābir raḍiya Allāh 'anhu qāla: Maḍat al-sunnat anna fī kulli arba'in faṣā'idan jum'at, rawāhu al-Dārquṭnī bi isnād al-da'if* (From Jābir raḍiya Allāh 'anhu said: it was already a sunna that every forty people and more were obliged to pray Friday. This ḥadīth was narrated by al-Dārquṭnī with a weak *isnād*) (al-'Asqalānī, n.d.; al-Dārquṭnī, n.d.; al-Bayhaqī, 1344 H; al-Bayhaqī, 1991).

In his explanation of the ḥadīth, first, al-Ṣan'ānī explained the full name of the first informant (companion), i.e. Jābir b. 'Abd Allāh. Later, he also provided identification on the weakness of the ḥadīth. According to al-Ṣan'ānī, the ḥadīth was weak because it had an informant named 'Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, which received negative critics from many Muslim scholars. For instance, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) said about his personality "turned away from his ḥadīths, because he was a liar informant and his ḥadīths were fabricated", al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915) said "he was not *thiqa* informant", al-Dārquṭnī (d. 385/995) said "he was a *munkar* informant", and Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965) said "his ḥadīths should not be used as *ḥujja*" (al-Ṣan'ānī, n.da.).

When the topic was examined, there were different opinions among Muslim scholars of Islamic jurisprudence on this issue. Al-Shāfi'ī and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal stated that the minimum number was forty people as mentioned by the ḥadīth. Abū Ḥanīfa said that the number was three people plus *imām* (four persons), while Mālik said less than forty people and was not obliged if only amounted to three or four people (Pamungkas and Surahman, 2015). In *Subul al-Salām*, al-Ṣan'ānī mentioned the argument was used by Abū Ḥanīfa, the Qur'an verse "*fas'auw ilā dhikr Allāh*" (al-Jum'at [62]: 9).

According to him, the verse was addressed to a group of people (*jamā'ah*) and at least from the plural (*jama'*) was three people. Thus, the minimum number of Friday prayers was three people plus *imām* (four persons) and there was no argument that required more requirements than that number (al-Şan'ānī, n.da.).

According to al-Şan'ānī, the opinion of Abū Ḥanīfa could not be received. The reason was not necessarily that the verses addressed to a group of people must be done in the congregation as well. Another school of scholars, said al-Şan'ānī, opposed the necessity of a congregation in Friday prayers based on the word of God “*aqīmu al-ṣalāt wa ātū al-zakāt*” (established prayer and paid zakat). In this context, the payment of zakat was understood not obligatory in the congregation, although the verse was addressed to the group of people with the word plural, ie *ātū*. Therefore, the argument of Abū Ḥanīfa in the view of al-Şan'ānī was considered a weak argument (al-Şan'ānī, n.da.).

Imām al-Şan'ānī asserted that there was no special requirement concerning the minimum number of *jama'at* prayers in the Qur'an and the sunna. The requirement of the Friday prayer was merely a congregation based on the ḥadīth of Abū Mūsa which was narrated by Ibn Māja and Ibn 'Adī, and the ḥadīth of Abū Umāma narrated by Aḥmad and al-Ṭabarānī (al-Shaybānī, 1998; al-Ṭabarānī, n.d.). While in another ḥadīth mentioned that congregation was already done when collected two people, “*al-ithnān jamā'at*” (al-Dārquṭnī, n.d.; al-Bayhaqī, 1344 H; al-Qazwaynī, 2009). Therefore, for al-Şan'ānī, it was sufficient (legitimate) of the Friday prayer with the amount according to the most correct opinion. He acknowledged that in the study of the minimum number of people in Friday Prayer there were some ḥadīths, but these ḥadīths did not have authentic sources (al-Şan'ānī, n.da.).

Based on the explanation, it was seen that al-Şan'ānī took the law, not only on the opinions of earlier Muslim scholars, but also analyzed and gave prior identification to existing opinions. Then, from the existing opinions, he decided which one was the best opinion. In this case, al-Şan'ānī was far from *taqlīd*, and did not care about *fiqhīyya* opinions that had no strong argument in his thought, although the opinion derived from popular *faqīh*, such as Abū Ḥanīfa, Mālik, al-Shāfi'ī, and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal.

## 5 RELATION BETWEEN SUNNĪ AND SHĪ'Ī ACCORDING TO THE ZAYDĪ

The ideology of al-Şan'ānī as a Shī'ī can be explicitly seen, for example, in the book of *Subul al-Salām* when he mentions the name 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. In this case, al-Şan'ānī often gives the mention '*alayh al-salām*' after 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib's name, even his descendants (Zayd b. 'Alī and al-Hādī) also get this mention, whereas other companions are only written with *raḍīya Allāh 'anhu*. Reference to such a model is similar when al-Şan'ānī tells the names of the Prophets, such as Nūḥ, 'Īsā, Ibrāhīm, Dāwud, and Zakariyā. Sometimes, he substitutes the word in the book of *Bulūgh al-Marām*, written with *raḍīya Allāh 'anhu* and replaced with *alayh al-salām* in *Subul al-Salām* related to the name of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (al-Şan'ānī, 1960).

Al-Şan'ānī is one of the most respected Muslim scholars of Shī'a Zaydiyya. The mindset is “free” and is not bound by certain *madhhab* opinions. In the field of Islamic jurisprudence, Zaydī rejects the idea that arises among medieval jurists, namely “the closed door of *ijtihād*.” According to Zaydī, the door of *ijtihād* remains open and never closed, both in the matter of *uṣūl* (foundation) and *furū'* (branch) (Abū Zahra, 2005), even Zaydī forbids *taqlīd* from the problems that can be taken from the Qur'an and the Prophetic sunna, and does not allow *taqlīd* in the field of *furū'*, except for people who are impossible to do *ijtihād* (al-Faḍīl, 1985). In addition, Zaydī is not being exclusive in the reference studies. In the books of Zaydīs, the opinions of Sunnī and Shī'ī scholars are simultaneously and without sectarian sensitivity. They have the view that the four Sunnī *imāms* (Ḥanafī, Mālikī, Shāfi'ī, Ḥanbalī) have an undeniable position (Abū Zahra, 2005).

Zaydī experienced a significant development in the field of Islamic law. There are several logical reasons for Zaydī *madhhab* to flourish in the study of Islamic law. First, the understanding that the door of *ijtihād* remains open and can not be closed in a certain time. The meaning is that in constructing the law, Zaydī does not influenced by the opinions which arise in his own school. Zaydī also freely choose the opinions of Muslim scholars who are considered most appropriate and not necessarily from his own school. Secondly, the spread of various mujtahids in this school to various parts of the country and encourage seeking traditions (ḥadīths) wherever they get. Thus, Zaydī is not only bound by the ḥadīths of the *Ahl al-Bayt*. According

to Zaydī, the ḥadīths which can be the object of *istidlāl* are the ḥadīths that are also recorded in the *kutub al-sittah* and others, so the material of his *istidlāl* is also greatly developed (Abū Zahra, 2005; al-'Ulaymī, 1987).

It seems that the characteristics constitute al-Ṣan'ānī to be pluralist in the field of ḥadīth and escape from certain schools of thought as discussed in previous discussions, even from the formulations of Zaydī's law that developed in its time. Although he is Zaydī, it does not necessarily impinge upon his thinking. In the book of *Subul al-Salām*, al-Ṣan'ānī is seen explicitly disagree and criticize some of Zaydī's law products, which are his own *madhhab*, for example, in the case of the duty of *tahlīl al-lihya* (sifting beard), expelling Jews from Arab lands, raising both hands at the time of *takbīr*, talking accidentally during prayer, and so forth (al-'Ulaymī, 1987). This explanation of al-Ṣan'ānī's thinking means that he has relinquished the hegemony of "ideological interpretation" which often invades the interpretation of Qur'an and ḥadīth texts in medieval times (Afwadzi, 2016). In the explanation of ḥadīth, he emphasizes the basis of his argument on ḥadīth by accommodating various opinions of the *imāms* of the schools and not just relying on a particular school. This kind of understanding arises from the characteristics of al-Ṣan'ānī as a Zaydī figure.

Al-Ṣan'ānī lived in a period of separatism and turmoil in various aspects, both political, social, and economic. This problem happens almost in all Islamic kingdoms, not least in Yemen. In fact, it can be said that this turmoil occurred in all areas of life (*qad aṣāba kulla shay'*). In addition, in the era of this reformist Muslim scholar, there was a factional fanaticism that almost caused him to lose his life (al-'Ulaymī, 1987). At al-Ṣan'ānī time, the Sunnī had flourished in the Yemen region, and implicated the intersection between Shī'ī and Sunnī was very strong. They competed in various fields, from theology to politics (King, 2012). In *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār*, al-Ṣan'ānī cites the opinions of Sunnī Muslim scholars, for example, Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, Ibn Ṣalāḥ, al-Khaṭṭābī, Ibn Khuzayma, Ibn Ḥibbān, and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī. Similarly, in *Subul al-Salām*, he also cites various opinions from multi-*madhhab*, for instance Hanafī, Mālikī, Shāfi'ī, Ḥanbalī, Dhāhirī, and Hādawī.

Although noted as Shī'ī figure, it is realized or not, al-Ṣan'ānī's works are accepted and used as a reference by Sunnī scholars, even in Indonesian *pesantren*. One of his works which is often used by *pesantren* scholars is *Subul al-Salām* to describe the ḥadīths written by Ibn Ḥajar in *Bulūgh al-Marām*

(Bruinessen, 1999). Similarly, software al-Maktabat al-Shāmīla which is usually identical to the product of Salafī or Wahhābī also contains his books, such as *Subul al-Salām* and *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār*.

The Zaydī is also called Hādawiya. In *Subul al-Salām*, al-Ṣan'ānī uses the term. The term is restored to the founder of the first Zaydī dynasty in Yemen, i.e. Yaḥya b. al-Ḥusayn which has the nickname al-Hādī. Then, his followers are called Hādawī. In the country of Yemen, post-al-Ṣan'ānī, there is also another prominent Muslim scholar from Zaydī. He is Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Shawkānī (d. 1250/1834). He writes Islamic text books, for example, *Nayl al-Auṭār (sharḥ al-ḥadīth)*, *Faṭḥ al-Qadīr (tafsīr)*, and *Irshād al-Fuḥūl (uṣūl fiqh)*. These books are received and widely studied in Indonesian *pesantren*, as well as al-Ṣan'ānī's works. In the context of thought, al-Shawkānī refuses the acceptance of opinion from earlier scholars or *taqlīd* to the authority of the religious streams in medieval times, even he claims to be *muṭlaq's mujtahid*.

The anti-*taqlīd* and unbinding of certain *madhhab* mindset in Zaydī's thought is similar to the understanding of Salafī or Wahhābī which is the most violent of Shī'ī, although among them there are two different types of thinking. Hamdeh argues that Muḥammad Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Albānī (d. 1420/1999) is a Salafī figure that strongly rejects *taqlīd* and against *madhhab*. While other figures, such as 'Abd al-'Azīz Ibn Bāz (d. 1420/1999) and Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ al-'Uthaymīn (d. 1422/2001) is only anti-*taqlīd* but not anti-*madhhab*, and both of them are Ḥanbalī. Similar conceptions are also shared by figures who are regarded as inspirations of the Salafī movement, such as Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 775/1350), and Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb (d. 1206/1792) (Hamdeh, 2017). Imām al-Ṣan'ānī is more like the characters in the second scholars typology.

The reality that Zaydī's works are studied in Indonesia, especially *pesantren* and their thoughts are similar to the Salafī or Wahhābī, who are the strongest school against the Shī'ī movement, should be brought as a provision for reconciliation between Sunnī and Shī'ī to be united and there will be no prolonged conflict between them.

## 6 CONCLUSIONS

From the study of Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Kaḥlānī al-Ṣan'ānī's thought, it can be concluded that Zaydī, which is the Shī'ī *madhhab* closest to Sunnī, in studying the ḥadīth is not bound by certain *madhhab*

and certain sect literature, Zaydī thinking is “free” and against *taqlīd*. In accepting and understanding the ḥadīth, Zaydī accepts only the ḥadīths that are considered authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*). The opinions of others about *isnād* and *matn* of ḥadīth also examined by Zaydī with own analysis without having sectarianism, even against his *madhhab*. This way of thinking is similar to the way of thinking that existed among the Salafī or Wahhābī, when the school is the strongest against the Shī‘ī movement. In addition, Indonesian Muslim scholars, especially in *pesantren* that dominated by Sunnī ideology, accept and study the works of the Zaydī, such as *Subul al-Salām* and *Nayl al-Auṭār*. The reality should be brought as a provision for reconciliation between Sunnī and Shī‘ī *madhhab* to be united and there will be no prolonged conflict between them.

## REFERENCES

- ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, M.M., n.d. Tarjamah al-Ṣan‘ānī. In M.b.I.A.H. al-Ṣan‘ānī. *Tawdīḥ al-Aḥkām li Ma‘ān Tankīḥ al-Anzār*. Medīna: Maktabat Salafīya.
- Abū Zahra, M., 2005. *al-Imām Zayd: Ḥayātuhū wa ‘Aṣruhū - Arāuhū wa Fiqhuhū*. Cairo: Dār Kutub al-‘Arabī.
- Afdillah, M., 2013. *Dari Masjid ke Panggung Politik: Studi Kasus Peran Pemuka Agama dan Politisi dalam Konflik Kekerasan Agama antara Komunitas Sunni dan Syiah di Sampang Jawa Timur*. MA Theses. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gajah Mada.
- Afwadzi, B., 2014. [HYPERLINK](#) "javascript:void(0)" Wasiat khilāfah pada Ali bin Abi Thalib: Studi komparatif hadis Ghadīr Khum dalam tradisi Sunni dan Syiah. *Hermeneia: Jurnal Kajian Islam Interdisipliner*, 14(1), pp. 27-49.
- Afwadzi, B., 2016. [HYPERLINK](#) "http://staialanwar.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/itqon/article/view/13/0" Nalar Ideologis Fiqih dalam Tafsir al-Qur‘an: Telaah Konstruksi Tafsir Pada Masa Abbasiyah. *Al-Itqan: Jurnal Studi Al-Qur‘an*, 2(1).
- Aḥmad, ‘A.M.Ṣ., 2011. *Kitāb Ijābat al-Sā‘il Sharḥ Bughyat al-Āmil Naẓm al-Kāfil: Dirāsāt wa al-Taḥqīq*. MA Theses. Kuala Lumpur Malaysia: Malaya University.
- al-‘Asqalānī, I.H., n.d. *Bulūgh al-Marām Min Adillat al-Aḥkām*. Singapore-Jadda-Indonesia: al-Ḥaramayn.
- al-‘Ulaymī, A.M., 1987. *al-Ṣan‘ānī wa Kitābuhū Tawdīḥ al-Aḥkām*. Beirut and Dubai: Dār Kutub al-‘Ilmiya and Dār al-Umma.
- al-Baghdādī, A.M.‘A.Q.b.Ṭ.b.M., n.d. *al-Farq bain al-Firāq wa Bayān al-Firqat al-Nājiyat Minhum*. Cairo: Maktabat Ibn Sīnā.
- al-Bāhī, S.b.K.b.S.A.W., 1986. *al-Ta‘dīl al-Tajrīḥ li Man Kharrāja al-Bukhārī fi Jamī‘ al-Ṣaḥīḥ*. Riyāḍ: Dār al-Liwā‘ li al-Nashr wa al-Tawzī‘.
- al-Baṣrī, M.b.S.A.‘A.A., 1968. *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir.
- al-Bayhaqī, A.B.A.b.H.b.‘A., 1344 H. *al-Sunan al-Kubrā wa fī dhaylihi al-Jawhar al-Nāqī*. Hiederabat: Majlis al-Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif al-Nizāmiyat al-Ka‘inat fi al-Hind bi Buldat Hiederabāt.
- al-Bayhaqī, A.B.A.b.H.b.‘A., 1991. *Ma‘rifat al-Sunan wa al-Athār*. Pakistan-Ḥalb-Damascus: Jāmi‘at al-Dirāsiyat al-Islāmiyah-Dār al-Wa‘y-Dār al-Qutayba.
- al-Bukhārī, M.b.I.A.‘A., 2005. *Kitāb al-Ḍu‘afā‘*. Maktabat Ibn ‘Abbās.
- al-Dārquṭnī, ‘A.b.‘A., n.d. *Sunan al-Dārquṭnī wa bi Dhay‘ihi al-Ta‘līq al-Mughnī ‘alā al-Dārquṭnī*. Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla.
- al-Dhahabī, S.M.b.A., n.da. *al-Mughnī fī al-Ḍu‘afā‘*. Qatar: Idārat Iḥyā‘ al-Turāth al-Islāmī.
- al-Dhahabī, S.M.b.A., n.db. *Mizān al-I‘tidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.
- al-Faḍīl, A.b.‘A.K., 1985. *Zaydiyyat Naẓariyat wa Taṭbīq*. Oman: Jam‘iyyat ‘Ummal al-Maṭābī‘ al-Ta‘āwuniya.
- al-Jurjānī, ‘A.b.‘A.A.A., 1997. *al-Kāmil fī Ḍu‘afā‘ al-Rijāl*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya.
- al-Mizzī, Y.b.Z.‘A.A.H., 1980. *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl Ma‘a Ḥawāshīhi*. Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla.
- al-Qazwaynī, M.b.Y.A.‘A., 2009. *Sunan Ibn Māja*. Beirut: Dār al-Risālat al-‘Ālamiyya.
- al-Qurasyī, Ḥ.b.‘A., 2008. *Ibn al-Amīr al-Ṣan‘ānī wa Juhūdihū fī al-Da‘wah wa al-Iḥtisāb*. MA Theses. Mecca: Jāmi‘at al-Imām Muḥammad b. Su‘ūd Saudi Arabia.
- al-Ṣan‘ānī, M.b.I.A.K., 1960. *Subul al-Salām*. Egypt: Maktabat al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī.
- al-Ṣan‘ānī, M.b.I.A.K., n.da. *Subul al-Salām*. Semarang: Toha Putra.
- al-Ṣan‘ānī, M.b.I.A.K., n.db. *Tawdīḥ al-Aḥkām li Ma‘ān Tankīḥ al-Anzār*. Medina: Maktabat Salafīya.
- al-Shawkānī, M.b.‘A., n.d. *al-Badr al-Tāli‘ bi Maḥāsini Man Ba‘da al-Qarn al-Sābi‘*. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Islāmiya.
- al-Shaybānī, A.b.M.b.H.A.‘A., 1998. *Musnad Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal*. Beirut: ‘Ālam al-Kutub.
- al-Siddieqy, H., 1973. *Sejarah Perkembangan Hadis*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- al-Ṭabarānī, S.b.A.A.Q., n.d. *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*. Cairo: Maktabat Ibn Taymiya.
- al-Wazīr, S.Z., 2014. The Theory of Māl among Zaydīs. In Daftary, & Miskinzoda, G. *The Study of Shi‘i Islam: History, Theology and Law*. New York: I.B. Tauris and Co. Ltd. pp.353-72.
- Anonim, n.d. Tarjamah Muallif. In al-Ṣan‘ānī, M.b.I.A.K. *Subul al-Salām*. Semarang: Toha Putra.
- Anshori, D.S., 2014. Wacana Keagamaan Syiah-Sunni dalam Majalah Tempo dan Suara Hidayatullah. *Litera*, 13(1), pp.14-28.
- Bastari, A., 2016. Eksistensi Kitab Subul al-Salām sebagai syarah Kitab Bulūgh al-Marām. *Al-Dzikra*, 10(1), pp.65-88.
- Bruinessen, M.V., 1999. *Kitab Kuning, Pesantren, dan Tarekat: Tradisi-Tradisi Islam di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Mizan.

- Burhanuddin, Y., 2016. *Perang Suriah, Jangan Sampai Salah Tanggap*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "<http://persis.or.id/perang-suriah-jangan-sampai-salah-tanggap>" <http://persis.or.id/perang-suriah-jangan-sampai-salah-tanggap> [Accessed 30 June 2018].
- Dakake, M.M., 2000. *Loyalty, Love, and Faith: Defining the Boundaries of the Early Shi'ite Community*. Ph.D Dissertation. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Hallāq, M.Ş.H., 1997. Muqaddimah Muḥaqqiq. In al-Şan'ānī, M.b.I.A.K. *Subul al-Salām*. Jadda: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī.
- Hamdeh, E., 2017. Qur'ān and Sunna or the Madhabs?: A Salafī Polemic Against Islamic Legal Tradition. *Islamic Law and Society*, 24(3), pp.1-42.
- Haq, N., 2017. *Arab Saudi Berhasil Gagalkan Serangan Rudal Dari Yaman*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "<https://www.hidayatullah.com/berita/internasional/read/2017/11/06/127289/arab-saudi-berhasil-gagalkan-serangan-rudal-dari-yaman.html>" <https://www.hidayatullah.com/berita/internasional/read/2017/11/06/127289/arab-saudi-berhasil-gagalkan-serangan-rudal-dari-yaman.html> [Accessed 30 June 2018].
- Hidcom, A., 2016. *Yang Perlu Diketahui: Apa Perang Suriah, Rezim Bashar dan Keterlibatan Syiah*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "<https://www.hidayatullah.com/spesial/ragam/read/2016/12/20/108058/yang-perlu-diketahui-apa-perang-suriah-rezim-bashar-dan-keterlibatan-syiah.html>" <https://www.hidayatullah.com/spesial/ragam/read/2016/12/20/108058/yang-perlu-diketahui-apa-perang-suriah-rezim-bashar-dan-keterlibatan-syiah.html> [Accessed 30 June 2018].
- BIBLIOGRAPHY \ 2057 Hilmy, M., 2015. The Political Economy of Sunni-Shi'ah Conflict in Sampang Madura. *Al-Jami'ah: Journal of Islamic Studies*, 53(1), pp.27-51.
- Himiyari, M.R., 2014. *Understanding 'Aql in Readings of Usūl al-Kāfi: Early Shī'ite Hadīth and its Later Interpreters*. MA Theses. University of Virginia.
- Ishaq, T., 2018. *Alumni Suriah Tegaskan Konflik di Suriah Meruncing pada Sunni-Syiah*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "<https://www.kiblat.net/2018/04/08/alumni-suriah-tegaskan-konflik-di-suriah-meruncing-pada-sunni-syiah/>" <https://www.kiblat.net/2018/04/08/alumni-suriah-tegaskan-konflik-di-suriah-meruncing-pada-sunni-syiah/> [Accessed 30 June 2018].
- Jurnal, 2017. *Cegah Houthi Jadi Syiah Hizbullah, Pangeran Arab: Perang di Yaman Akan Terus Berlanjut*. [Online] Available at: HYPERLINK "<https://jurnalislam.com/cegah-houthi-jadi-syiah-hizbullah-pangeran-arab-perang-di-yaman-akan-terus-berlanjut/>" <https://jurnalislam.com/cegah-houthi-jadi-syiah-hizbullah-pangeran-arab-perang-di-yaman-akan-terus-berlanjut/>
- King, J.R., 2012. Zaydī Revival in a Hostile Republic: Competing Identities, Loyalties and Visions of State in Republican Yemen. *Arabica*, 59, pp.404-45.
- Mahmud, A., 2014. Adālat al-Şaḥābah dalam Perpektif Sunnī dan Shī'ah. *Mutawātir: Jurnal Keilmuan Tafsir Hadis*, 4(2), pp.324-41.
- Mughlatāya, 'A, 2001. *Ikmāl Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*. Cairo: al-Fārūq al-Ḥadīthat li al-Ṭibā'at wa al-Nahsr.
- Nurliana, Nurliana, 2006. Metode Istinbath Hukum Muhammad bin Isma'il al-Shan'ani dalam Kitab Subul al-Salam. *Al-Fikra: Jurnal Ilmiah Keislaman*, 5(2), pp.132-72.
- Pamungkas, M.I., Surahman, M., 2015. *Fiqh 4 Madzhab*. Jakarta: Al-Makmur.
- Shihab, M.Q., 2014. *Sunnah-Syiah Bergandengan Tangan, Mungkinkah?: Kajian atas Konsep Ajaran dan Pemikiran*. Jakarta: Lentera Hati.
- Smeer, Z.B., 2011. *Kredibilitas Kritik Nashir al-Qifari terhadap Hadis-Hadis Syi'ah Imamiyah*. Jakarta: Arifa Publishing.
- Suryadilaga, M.A., 2009. *Konsep Ilmu dalam Kitab Hadis: Studi atas Kitab al-Kaḥf Karya al-Kulaynī*. Yogyakarta: Teras.