CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

A. Conclusions

In order to answer what reveal in the statement of problem, here is the conclusions of its study:

- 1. Goldziher's advocacy of skepticism has pointed out on the content of the text when judhing the authenticity of hadīth. Goldziher's thesis that the traditions ascribed to the Prophet and the Companions contained in classical collection of hadīths are not authentic reports of these persons but rather reflect the doctrinal and political developments of the first two centuries after Muḥammad's death is base primarily on analysis of the content of hadīth (matn).
- 2. Abbott's work—in way to refute Goldziher scepticism about the authenticity of hadīth—has been attacked in two fronts. Her first attempt, having analyzed early documents (papyri) of early Islam and compared them with the canonical collections in the present day, Abbot concluded that hadīths were committed to written from very shortly after the death of Muḥammad, or even during his lifetime. And as a further guarantee of their reliable transmission, hadīths were then mainted in written form until they were finally compiled in the classical collections. As the second work, she noted that the phenomenal growth of hadīth is not due to growth

in content (that is fabrication of *ḥadīth*) but due to progressive increase in the parallel and multiple chains of transmission (*isnād*).

3. Abbott's theory implicated her contemporaries, such as Fuat Segzin, MM. Azami, and M. Hamidullah whom in many ways they have resembled evidences of Abbott. However their arguments are the unconvincing argument for their countepart. G.H.A. Juynboll noted that they seem to rely too heavily on much of the information given in *isnāds* and in books about *isnād* concerning the three oldest *tabqāt*. On the other hand, their arguments seem too contrived and circular. Because there was no guarantee that the *common link* of each text will not fabricate their *riwāyah*. In this point is fascinating step to see what have noted by Harald Motzki about the authenticity of *ṣaḥṭifah* Abd ar-Razzāq. With historical-tradition approach, Motzki successes to prove that *ṣaḥṭifah* Abd ar-Razzāq is a reliable early text.

B. Suggestions

The question of when and where aḥādīth—espesially those of the Prophet—arose in nearly as old as the ḥadīth itself. Abbott—and the other Muslims scholars—tried generally, but not exclusively, to check the part of transmission of the traditions (isnād) and the transmitter (rijāl) mentioned in each isnād. On the other hand, Goldziher and his contemporaries have pointed out that this method of ḥadīth criticism is unreliable. In this point,

Muslims scholars should to find another method which held the *isnād* and Muslims *isnād* criticism in tackling the problem of dating *aḥādīth*.

However Abbott's theory has no escape from lack, we have to apreciate it. It caused by her willing to make her opus as a starting point for her next generation. It was indicate by her words to Muhsin Mahdi when he visited her in the spring of 1974 in her apartment on the Midway, "There are very few young scholars willing to undertake the hard labor involved in the study of Arabic papyri and I want to write a critical review that will encourage this able young author to continue in this field and enhance it."

¹ Muhsin Mahdi, Muhsin Mahdi, in foreward of *Journal of Near eastern Studies*, 40 (3), (1981), 163.