## **CHAPTER IV**

## **ANALYSIS**

The theories and methodologies advanced by Goldziher and Abbott have inspired much comment, commendation, and in so doing have determined both the nature and direction of the debate concerning hadīth.

For the contemporaries of Abbott theories, what has revealed by Abbott is a basic for their renewal premises to correct the "oversight" of skeptics. Their work has been attacked by insisting that <code>hadīths</code> were committed to written form very shortly after the death of Muḥammad, or even during his lifetime. And as further guarantee of their reliable transmission, <code>hadīths</code> were than maintained in written form until were finally compiled in the classical collections.

However, their counterpart might have stagnated. They also speak of the critique of Abbot and her contemporaries.

## A. Traditionits vs. Revisionist: Critiques for Nabia Abbott Theories and Her Contemporaries

Abbott's theory of early continuous written hadīth or explosive increase of isnād had expressed some advocacy from the other scholars, such as Fuad Segzin, Muḥammad Muṣṭafa Al-A'zamī, Aḥmad 'Abd ar-Raḥmān

Aṣ-Ṣuwiyyān, and Muḥammad Ḥamidullāh. In many ways their premises resemble that of Abbott. However, their argument differs from hers.

Fuad Segzin argues that there was an early continuous written hadīths. He realized that Goldziher did not have all the current available sources, and in this respect cannot be unduly faulted. However, in a harsher critique, Segzin devotes considerable energy to trying to demonstrate that Goldziher misunderstood some key terms related to the transmission of hadīths.

Segzin lists eight ways in which transmission took place: samā', 99 qirā'ah, 100 ijāzah, 101 munāwalah, 102 kitāhah, 103 i'lām ar-rāwī, 104 waşiyah, 105

Qirā ah (reading to teacher). Reading over to a shaikh what one has heard. It is all the same whether one reads it oneself, or is present, when someone else is reading. The one who recites may do so from memory, or from a written copy. The shaikh may know the material by heart and merely listen; but if he does not know it by heart, he must have his copy in his hand.

One may say, "I give licence to the Muslims,"

102 Munāwalah (handing over). This is of two types, the better of which is combined with a licence to transmit, which is generally agreed to be also the highest type of ijāzah. For instance az-Zuhrī gave his manuscript to several scholars, like Thaurī, Auzā'i and 'Ubaidullāh ibn 'Umar.

103 Kitābah. (correspondence). This means that the shaikh writes to the student when he is

104 I'lām ar-rāwī (to inform about a hudīth The narrator may tell pupil that a certain tradition, or a certain book is what he heard from so and so. Without saying any thing about his transmitting it.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>99</sup> Samā' (listening). Hearing a shaikh's words, which he dictates, or recites without dictating. He may make this recititation from memory, or read it from his book. This is generally held to be the highest form, and the one who hears it may say haddathanā, akhbaranā, anba'anā, sami'tu, or qal lanā fulānā (so and so said to us).

<sup>101</sup> Ijāzah (licence). The first type is to give a specified person licence to transmit a specified amount. The second is to give a specified person licence to transmit something, which is not specified. One may say, "I give you licence to transmit all that I have heard." There is a difference of opinion about the value of this, but the majority are said to consider it perfectly satisfactory. The third is to give licence, merely using a qualification without specifying a person. One may say, "I give licence to the Muslims."

Kitābah. (correspondence). This means that the shaikh writes to the student when he is absent some of his traditions in his own handwriting; or he may write it for him when he is present or may employ someone else to write it for the student as from him.

<sup>105</sup> Wasyah (to entrust someone the book), which may be transmitted on the authority of the one who entrusted the book. For example Abu Quilabah (d. 104) who entrusted his book to Ayyub as-Sakhtiyani.

and wijādah<sup>106</sup>. <sup>107</sup> Segzin states that only first two (listening and recitation, respectively) involved memorization. The others, and often in practice even samā' and qirā'ah, involved written materials. Futhermore, written transmission was as customary as oral transmission. <sup>108</sup> Segzin concludes from this:

Now we must come closer to the fact that these transmission methods reach back in part to the beginning of Islam and that they demonstrate, with the help from references and preserved materials, that from the start exclusively written foundations for the transmission were involved and that the names of the authors are contained in the *isnāds*. 109

Clearly Segzin, like Abbott, has no doubts as to the authenticity of the isnāds. Moreover, he is willing to suggest that from these authorities can be gleaned authors of actual texts.

The main sources of Segzin are *Iṣābah I'lāl* by at-Tirmīdzī, *Tahdzīb* by Ibn Ḥajar, *Tabaqāt* by Ibn Sa'd, and *Jāmī' Bayān al-'Ilm* karya Ibn 'Abd al-Barr. He authenticated by comparing these sources with the text included in other books from other generation. 110

Muḥammad Muṣṭafa Al-A'zamī has attempted to rectify the perceived inadequacies of Western scholarship on hadīth literature. His methods are not altogether different from Abbott's and Segzin's, but his focus is. He is not only out to reclaim the authenticity of hadīth material in the

<sup>106</sup> Wijādah (a late form of verbal noun from wijādah to find). That is to find someone's book without any sort of permission to transmit on anyone's authority. This was not a recognized way of learning a hadīth.

<sup>107</sup> Kamaruddin Amin, Metode Kritik Hadis..., 122.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., 123.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

classical collections, but also out to prove the realibility of *isnād*s which support them.

Azami, like Abbott and Segzin, also note that sthere was already intense literary activity during the time of Prophet, which he himself had strongly encouraged. This continued in both the secular and religious realms during the reign of Umayyads. With this Azami has set the stage for his argument that <code>hadīths</code> were written down even in the time of Muḥammad.<sup>111</sup> He then proceeds to list some of <code>hadīths</code> transmitted by one Companion acquires ten students in the next generation, in the class of Successors, and in turn these ten students have in some cases twenty or thirty students belonging to different countries and provinces. For instance he gave an example of the spread of <code>isnād</code>.<sup>112</sup>

"Abū Hurayrah reported that the Prophet said when anyone amongst you wakes up from sleep, he must not put his hand in the utensil till he has washed it three times, for he does not know where his hand was during the sleeping."

He list at least 13 students of Abū Hurayra transmitted this for him:

- 8 out of 13 belong to Madīnah.
- 1 out of 13 belongs to Kūfah.
- 2 out of 12 belong to Başrah.
- 1 out of 13 belongs to Yemen.

Muhammad Mustafa Azami, Studies in Farly Hadith Literature with a Critical Edition of Some Early Texts, (Beirut: al-Maktabah al-Islāmī, 1968), 1-211.

Muhammad Mustafa Azami, "Isnād and Its Significance", in Ḥadīth and Sunnah—Ideals and Realities. Ed. P.K. Koya, (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Books Trust, 2003), 59-60.

- 1 out of 13 belongs to Syria.

There are 16 scholars who transmitted this tradition from the student of Abū Hurayra.

- 6 out of 16 belong to Madīnah.
- 4 out of 16 belong to Başrah.
- 2 out of 16 belong to Kūfah. 'Irāq.
- 1 out of 16 belongs to Makkah.
- 1 out of 16 belongs to Yemen.
- 1 out of 16 belongs to Khurāsān.
- 1 out of 16 belongs to Hims, Syiria.

The main sources of Azami are *Ṭabaqāt* by Ibn Sa'd, *al-Jarḥ wa at-Ta'dīl* by Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *I'lāl* by at-Tirmīdzī, *al-Muḥaddith* by Ramāhurmūzī, *al-Istī'āb* by Ibn Abd al-Barr, *al-Fihrīs* by Ibn an-Nadīm, *Taqyīd al-'Ilm* by al-Khāṭib al-Baghdādī, *Tahdzīb* by Ibn Ḥajar. 113

The same method by Aḥmad 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Aṣ-Ṣuwiyyān in his book Ṣaḥāif aṣ-Ṣaḥābah also out to do the same method by comparing ḥadīths material in the next document with the previous ones. He list Ṣaḥīfah 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ṣaḥīfah 'Amru ibn Ḥazm, Ṣaḥīfah Samrah ibn Jundub, Ṣaḥīfah Abī Hurayrah as evidence of written ḥadīth in early Islam. 114

<sup>113</sup> Ihid.

<sup>114</sup> Aḥmad, 'Abd ar-Raḥmān Aṣ-Ṣuwiyyān, Şaḥāif aṣ-Ṣaḥābah wa Tadwīn as-Sunnah an-Nahawiyyah al-Mushrifah, (Ḥugūq aṭ-Ṭab'i Maḥfūzah, 1990/1410), 59, 92, 157, 185

In the matter of Abbott and her contemporaries' argument, G.H.A. Juynboll has pointed out, "Abbott seems to rely too heavily on much of the information given in *isnād* and in books about *isnād* concerning the three oldest *tabqāt*" 115

The faith, of course, is the problem for skeptics. The arguments of Abbott, Segzin, Azami, and Ṣuwiyyān rely on biographical materials that were produced symbiotically with the *isnād* to seek to defend. The sources are not independent. And so their arguments seem to their opponents. As a result, we are left with two seemingly diametrically opposed theories for the origin and development of *ḥadāth*s and, hence, of early Islam itself. In this point, their contemporaries, such as M. Hamidullah, commit to prove early continuous written *ḥadāth* by early reliable text.

Hamidullah (1908-2002) discovered the early publicize saḥāfah Ḥammām ibn Munabbih. He authenticated by comparing it with the text included in other books from other generation. He concluded that the narration of the saḥāfah of Ḥammām was carried on from one generation to another, independently and as separate books, but there have been some writers of ḥadāth, who included and incorporated it fully or partly in their works, such as Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Ma'mar, 'Abd ar-Razzāq aṣ-Ṣan'ānī, al-Bukhārī, Muslim, etc. However their method was to classify ḥadāth took different method of saḥāfah Ḥammām. For instance, he observed the following narrations of Ḥammām could be traced under different chapters in

<sup>115</sup> Herbert Berg, The development of Fxegesis..., 21.

the Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī and Ṣaḥīḥ of Muslim, both citing the Ṣaḥīfah of Ḥammām itself, and it is a remarkably impressive fact that there is not an iota of difference between Ḥammām on the one hand, and al-Bukhārī and Muslim on the other. 116

However, the discovery of saḥūfah Ḥammām ibn Munabbih is not an autograph. As a result, the Schachtian noted that there is no guarantee that the real author is Ḥammām ibn Munabbih. For them, it has been possible Abd ar-Razzāq (d. 211/827), as common link (common transmitter), or Ma'mar (d. 153/770) whom are the previous rāwi before Ḥammām fabricate the texts in sahūfah Hammām ibn Munabbih.

Its claim is too ill founded because of it base on hypothesis-speculation rather than analysis study to *matn* and *isnād*. It may be difficult to prove that 'Abd Ar-Razzāq, as the common link, did not forge the *ḥadīth*, but it also not a justification to claim that 'Abd Ar-Razzāq forged his *riwāyāt*.

However, in another way, Ḥamidullah's discovery about Ṣaḥ̄̄̄̄ʃah Ḥammām ibn Munabbih fails to answer his counterpart's question about early reliable text. It caused by his discovery s not an autograph. In this point what has revealed by Harald Motzki about the reliable of Ṣaḥ̄̄̄ʃah 'Abd ar-Razzāq take its significance.

<sup>116</sup> M. Hamidullah, Şahifah of Hammām Ibn Munabbih, 60-61.

## B. Middle Ground's Advocacy of Reliable Early Text

While the skepticism of the former two seems largely justified, these other scholars are loath to accept the full implications of the doubts raised. They are not willing to accept what appears at times to be seemingly naïve position of the latter three.

In a way, some of scholars from its group contribute Abbot's arguments about oral and written transmission of *ḥadīth*. One of them is Harald Motzki. He attempts to rectify what he feels are at times the extravagant and unsubstantiated claims made by Schacht. The method he employs looks at both the contents of the *isnād* and the *matn* to determine the plausibility of fabrication.

Motzki address the source-analytical and tradition-historical approaches and try to show how can ascertain whether, or to what degree, the chains of transmission of aħādīth in muṣannaf of 'Abd ar-Razzāq aṣ-Ṣan'ānī (d. 211/826) are reliable.<sup>117</sup>

On his observation, Motzki take 3,810 single tradition on the basis of a representative—comprising 21 percent of the relevant sections of the entire work—the supposed origins of the texts transmitted by 'Abd ar-Razzāq can be more exactly defined: 32 percent of the material comes from Ma'mar, 29 percent from Ibn Jurayj, and 22 percent from ath-Thawrī. Transmissions from

Harald Motzki, "The Muşannaf of 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī as a Source o Authentic Aḥādīth of the First Century", in Ḥadīth: Origins and Development—The Formation of the Classical Islamic Word, Vol. 28, Ed Lawrence I Conrad, (Trowbridge: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004), 1.

Ibn Jurayj (40 percent) follow. The remaining 13 percent of the texts are said to steam from about 90 different preson (for each only 1 percent or less), among them famous legal scholars of the second century A.H. such as Abū Ḥanīfah (0.7 percent) and Mālik (0.6 percent).<sup>118</sup>

This work contains composite *riwāyāt* (transmissions), but ninety percent of *ḥadīth*s go back to a single transmitter, a common link as it were, which, for Motzki implies a written text. A statistical analysis of 'Abd ar-Razzāqi's informant shows a divergent pattern in their informants, which Motzki states is inconsistent with the arbitrary manufacture of these *ḥadīth*s by 'Abd ar-Razzāq. Futhermore, 'Abd ar-Razzāq accasionally expresses doubtd about his sources and provides anonymous transmissions. This too seems unlikely if these *ḥadīth*s were fabricated.<sup>119</sup>

Having shown to his satisfaction that 'Abd ar-Razzāq did not forge  $\hbar ud\bar{u}ths$ , Motszki asks the same question of 'Abd ar-Razzāq by focusing on a representative selection of  $\hbar ud\bar{u}ths$  going back to Ibn Jurayj (d. 150/767). These  $\hbar ud\bar{u}ths$ , when analysed statistically, demonstrate an uneven and sporadic use of many earlier authorities. This strage distribution of authorities and his obvious willingness to express his own opinion without reference to earlier authorities (that is, his use of ra'y) belie the assumption that ibn Jurayj forged  $\hbar ud\bar{u}ths$ . This is confirmed by an examination of Ibn Jurayj's sources, which reveal much diversity: variance in content (for example, the use of 'an

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>118</sup>*Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 2.

'from', versus the use of *sami'tu* 'I heard'). Each source seems to have an individual character. Motzki argues:

Such a diversity can hardly be the result of systematic forgery, but, rather, must be developed over the course of time. We must therefore—until the contrary is proven—start from the assumption that the traditions for which Ibn Jurayj expressly states a person as his source really came from that informant, and thus Ibn Jurayj's transmission, in my opinion, should be regarded as authentic. 120

Motzki does not stop there, however. He attempts to go to yet another level, focussing on the most frequently cited of Ibn Jurayj's sources, 'Aţā' Ibn Abī Rabah (d. 115/733). Once again he finds evidence against Schacht's theory of the systematic backwards growth of *isnāds*. This evidence consists of two types. What Motzki describes as extrinsic evidence consist of variance in the genres (that is, *responsa* and *dicta* of 'Aṭa'), variance in the types of questions in the responsa (direct, indirect, and anonymous), and variance in the actual postitions taken by Ibn Jurayj's and his teacher 'Aṭa'. That which is discribed as intrinsic refers to Ibn Jurayj's willingness to give his own *ra'y* without projecting it back (that is, Ibn Jurayj's feels he is under no obligation to do so); Ibn Jurayj's commentary on 'Aṭā''s comments (that is, it seems rather implausible that he first invented text, and then commented upon them); his use of third-person, indirect transmission from 'Aṭā' (that is, why would he bother if he were given to forgery?); his occasional uncertainly

<sup>120</sup> Ibid., 8-9.

about the 'Ata"'s wording; his supplying of variant traditions; and his hints of deficiencies of 'Ata'. 121

Motzki goes back yet another level, but 'Aţā''s hadīths primarily employ ra'v (eighty percent). This implies that either did not rely on hadīths or that he did not know many hadīths (perhaps because during his time few were in circulation). Nevertheless, when he examines 'Ata''s transmission from Ibn 'Abbas, he again finds the usual variance in that few data there are. Motzki sees in 'Ata''s infrequent use of earlier authorities, his citations of Ibn 'Abbās in various ways, his willingness to contradict Ibn 'Abbās, and his variation in style and content evidence for the authenticity for these traditions.

Motzki abandons his "variances" argument when he turns to the final level of transmissions. There are just two prophetic *hadīth*s from either Ibn 'Abbas or 'Ata' to draw many conclusions. Motzki turn instead to a specific hadith and concludes that there is ample evidence to suggest that 'Abd ar-Razzāq knew the hadīth. He argues that since 'Abd ar-Razzāq knew of it, it can be dated to at least the second half of the first century A.H., which undermines Schacht's assertion that it is from the second quarter of the second century and his general assertion that the more complete isnāds are the later ones. 122 Moreover, he argues that "since there is only a generation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 12. <sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, 16-20.

between 'Ata' and Muhammad, these texts are very close to the time and the people they report about, and their authenticity cannot be ruled out a priori. 123

In a similar study Motzki addressed that no doubt some hadīths with contain Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī (d. 124/742) as a transmitter are authentic. When Motzki compares the four different lines of transmissions ending in az-Zuhrī (one from each of the two main recessions of the Muwatta' and two from Muşannaf), using a few specific examples where some or all of the text contain related or parallel hadiths, he concludes that these different versions of az-Zuhrī's figh concur in content in most cases and are identical in some. Only rarely do they disagree with one another. Motzki sees in this result strong evidence for trusting the hadiths that end in az-Zuhrī. 124

Motzki has argued, at least in the case of the Musannaf of 'Abd ar-Razzāg, that both the matns and the isnāds which support them can largerly be trusted. That it is not to say that he does not concede that hadiths were forged. Rather he suggests, "the mere fact that aħādīth and asānīd were forged must not lea d us to conclude that all of them are fictitious or that the genuine and the spurious can not be distinguished with some degree of certainty. 125 However, Motzki's comparison on the basis of isnād do seem to preclude systemmatic fabrication. But it is precisely the isnad that the spectics would say have been fabricated and so should not be the basis of any comparison. Moreover, Motzki's observed "consistent individual character"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 21. <sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 23-42. <sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

could be a product of separate fabrications: systemic fabrication need not be systemic fabrication.<sup>126</sup>

<sup>126</sup> Herbert Berg, The Development of Exegesis..., 38.