CHAPTER II

ḤADĪTH AUTHENTICITY

A. Meaning of Ḥadīth Authenticity

Ḥadīth is one of fundamental Islamic sources, which is still remained until now. As foundation of Islamic regulation, Ḥadīth becomes real basic support of Muslim activity that explains detail of Al-Qur’ān. Ḥadīth also still need detailed analytic and examination because Ḥadīth is historical object from early Islamic era, so Ḥadīth must be investigated. Investigation of Ḥadīth conducting by classic Muslim scholars in early Islamic years ago is to select which one of Ḥadīths that is originally from the Prophet. The Ḥadīth term used to express that Ḥadīth is originally from the Prophet is called Ḥadīth sahiḥ.

According to many Muslim scholars, they used the term sahiḥ on Ḥadīth that can be referred to the Prophet. The term authentic is very close to the study about history that still exists until now. Because of that Ḥadīth is from the classical era, it is kind of historical material which must be able to be proven its originality. Knowing that Ḥadīth was not documented in formal writing in early Islamic era, it triggers questioning about the authenticity of Ḥadīth. The codification of Ḥadīth was done by Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri in Umayyad era under the order of the caliphate al-Makmūn. There is long distance between the Prophet and the codification. Comparing to al-Qur’ān, it is agreed by Muslim about the authenticity of al-Qur’ān. It is because al-Qur’ān was written formally in the Prophet era continuing with codification in Abū Bakr and ‘Uthmān era.

As explained above, Ḥadīth is not written formally in early, so most of Ḥadīth in early Islamic era was transmitted orally by transmitter trough teaching. Ḥadīth is also transmitted as traditions implemented practically by companions of the Prophet that is followed by the next generations. In this case, whether

---

1 Badri Khaeruman, Otentitisas Hadis; Studi Kritis atas Kajian Hadis Kontemporar (Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya, 2004), pp. 5-6
hadith is authentic or not is depended on the reliability of its transmitters. So, early classical hadith scholars emphasize identification of authentic hadith depend on who the transmitters are and what the level of their reliability is.²

Existence of transmitter is important in judging the authenticity of hadith, while transmitter is a human that can make mistake. For example, transmitter possibly forgets important part of hadith, misunderstanding about the meaning of hadith, miss listens the words of hadith, etc. So, the question is about that possibility making mistake is able to be a reason of that hadith is non-authentic. If possibility making mistake becomes tendency to refuse authenticity of hadith, there are no authentic hadith still remaining in this world. Not only hadith is refused, but also al-Qur’ān can’t be trusted. Therefore, hadith scholars never include impossibility making mistake as part of authentic hadith requirements.³

In other case, hadith sahīḥ can be identified through conducting hadith critic. There are two kinds of hadith critic because of that hadith is consist of two parts, matn and sanad. Critic of sanad hadith basically analyzes personal quality and intellectual capacity of transmitters involving in chain of sanad, and what the way used by transmitters in sanad. According to Badri Khaeruman, almost all of hadith transmitters are criticized by critic experts.⁴ Main purpose of hadith critic is to determine the authenticity of hadith exactly and to decide validity of that hadith in order to establish its authority.⁵ To do some critic hadith, the first thing that has to be known is criteria of authentic hadith. Criteria of authentic hadith must be considered as manual reference to establish critic Method. According to Hasan Asy’ari Ulama’i, a researcher has to understand about measuring rod of the authenticity of sanad and matn before
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² M. Syuhudi Ismail, *Kaedah Kesahihan Sanad Hadis* (Jakarta: PT. Bulan Bintang, 1995), p. 120
⁴ Badri Khaeruman, *op. cit.*, p. 36
⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6
conducting ḥadīth critic.⁶ Classical ḥadīth scholars, such as al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Ibn Ḥibbān, and others, collected many ḥadīths in their collecton book.

According to ḥadīth scholars of *muta’akhkhirīn*, for example Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (1245 AD) and al-Nawāwī (1277 AD), ḥadīth is classified into three kinds; they are *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, and *ḍa’īf*. In the middle of third century in the four *madhāhib* era, ḥadīth is classified into two kinds, *maqbul* and *mardūd*, while Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal classified into *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḍa’īf*.⁷

Since in al-Turmuḍḥi era, classification of ḥadīth had been divided into three as above. This is because ḥadīth *ḍa’īf* relating to ‘*amaliyya* in early classification is still collaborated between usable and non-usable ḥadīth. Then, usable ḥadīth is knowingly called as ḥadīth *ḥasan*. In addition, ḥadīth *ḥasan* almost has similarity with ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ*. The difference between both of them is just level of transmitters’ reliability. Transmitters of ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ* are more reliable than ḥadīth *ḥasan*. So, criteria of ḥadīth *ḥasan* is almost similar with criteria of ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ*.⁸

The term *ṣaḥīḥ* used by scholars in the field of ḥadīth study is often translated in English with the term ‘authentic’. Ḥadīth scholars use the term of authentic to show that the ḥadīth is *ṣaḥīḥ*, it means that the ḥadīth is able to be referred toward the Prophet. Islamic scholars such as M. Mustafa Azami usually use term authentic to translate *ṣaḥīḥ* in English word.⁹ Ali Mustafa Yakub makes chapter “Mendeteksi Otentisitas Hadis” that contains materials about criteria of ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ*.¹⁰ ‘ʿAbd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī, an Islamic ḥadīth scholar from
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⁸ Dr. Umi Sumbullah, S.ag, *Kritik Hadis; Pendekatan Historis Metodologis* (Malang: UIN-Malang Press, 2008), p. 44
⁹ According to him, ḥadīth is divided into two groups: Accepted (*maqbul*) and rejected (*mardūd*). The accepted one may be divided into *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic) and *ḥasan* (agreeable). While the rejected one is also divided into two groups: Rejected as such, but may be accepted if it acquired strength from outside, and rejected totally. See M. M. Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature* (Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust, n.d.), p. 61
Shi‘a Ithnā ‘Ashariyya’s sect, used the term ‘authentic’ to translate term ُṣāḥīḥ in English, although there is little differentiation of ḥadīth ُṣāḥīḥ’s definition between Shi‘a Ithnā ‘Ashariyya and Sunni. It means that ‘authentic’ is usually used to translate ُṣāḥīḥ in English.

In Western research study, they create methodologies to analyze ḥadīth. They analyze ḥadīth in order to know its authenticity. So, their judgment for ḥadīth is authentic or inauthentic. They are Difference from Muslim ḥadīth scholars who grade ḥadīth into three levels because Muslim scholars analyze ḥadīth in order to be used as practical of Islamic teaching. While, analyzing ḥadīth according to Western scholars is to investigate ḥadīths which one of them can really be ascribed to the early authority based on historical responsibility.

Ḥadīth studies around Western scholars just separate ḥadīth into authentic and inauthentic. Authentic ḥadīth means that the ḥadīth can be proven that it is genuinely from collector until the early responsible author without forgery, falsification, fabrication, or fictitiousness among involved transmitters. So, authentic ḥadīth is not only ḥadīth that is referred to the Prophet, but also a person in transmission, such as companion, successor, or successor of successor. If the ḥadīth doesn’t able to be ascribed to the Prophet, it must be made by transmitter in its chain. Therefore, according to Western scholars, inauthentic has same meaning with the ḥadīth that is experienced fictitiousness. Comparing with Islamic ḥadīth terminology, fabricated ḥadīth (non-authentic ḥadīth) has
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11 According to Shi‘a sect, ḥadīth ُṣāḥīḥ is the tradition whose chain of transmission is consecutively linked to the Ma‘ṣūm, narrated by one veracious imāmī to other, on all the levels. Quality of ḥadīth, accordingly, is graded into four groups: ُṣāḥīḥ (authentic), ḥasan (Good), muwaththaq (dependable), and da‘īf (weak). See ‘Abd al-Hādi al-Fadlī, *Introduction to Hadith* (London: Islamic College for Advance Studies Press (ICAS), 2002), p. 25.

12 H.A.R. Gibb uses term ‘sound’ to translate ُṣāḥīḥ in English. But, it seems rare for using term ‘sound’ in the field of ḥadīth studies. According to him, ُṣāḥīḥ (sound) is tradition whose sanad is carried back without interruption to a companion by a chain of narrators each of whom is trustworthy. See H.A.R. Gibb, *Mohammedanism* (n.p.:n.p, n.d.), p. 77.
same meaning with ḥadīth mauḍū’, and ḥadīth mauḍū’ is one kind of ḥadīth daʿīf.¹³

B. Urgency of Ḥadīth Authenticity

Muslim Scholars in early Islamic years realized that ḥadīth authenticity is really important in order to keep Islam to be pure. Authenticity of ḥadīth is something must be concerned firstly because it is susceptible to be made falsification or forgery.¹⁴ Distinguishing between false and authentic ḥadīth is grand purpose of ḥadīth expert in classical era, therefore they made some criteria to justify that the ḥadīth is authentic or not. If a Muslim implements ḥadīth, especially legal ḥadīth, based on false or fabricated ḥadīth and this Muslim says that it was tradition from the Prophet, it will spread digression among Muslim society.

Such culture of ḥadīth critic demonstrates that there are many statements from Muslim people saying that the ḥadīth is ṣaḥīḥ, but the ḥadīth in fact is ḥadīth daʿīf after conducting detail research. Even there are many ḥadīths mauḍū’ that was state as if that it is ḥadīth ṣaḥīḥ, but, through conducting some critic ḥadīth, they don’t qualify to be called as ḥadīth ṣaḥīḥ. Many of ḥadīth daʿīf and ṣaḥīḥ was spread into Muslim people. It will raise neither negative nor positive impact to them depends on the content of that ḥadīths.¹⁵

Existence of historical event is taken quite into consideration around early Muslim scholars. Through this event, the truth of historical event will ward every digression (bid’a) from real Islamic teaching on the future. So, the purity of Islam as the prophet meant will be eternal until the end of time.¹⁶
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¹³ Mahmūd al-Ṭahhān, Taisīr Muṣṭalāh al-Ḥadīth, op. cit., p. 75
¹⁶ Badri Khaeruman, op. cit., p. 6
Hadīth gains emphasis concern because its position as formally script of the Prophet. Doubtful on hadīth authenticity will endanger its position. If a hadīth is stated to be not authentic, it will automatically affect to hujjīyya of that hadīth. This term can be described as authority of the evidence. The authority of hadīth tells idea that the hadīth is hujja. It means that hadīth can be used as strong evidence or a solid argument in Islamic legal issues, or issues which need exemplary of the Prophet as principles guiding human act. Admitting hujjīyya of the hadīth means that accepting such a binding to commit the hadīth. While, suspecting hujjīyya of the hadīth—in any case—means that there is dissatisfying to rigid doctrines, and also there are efforts to look for ways in loosening the shackles.

For hadīth which don’t relate to legal issues and only give historical information about the Prophet, was disobeyed by its critic experts because the information was historically wrong and wasn’t able to be proven by sensory and ratio perception. So, it will raise a doubtful on its historical authenticity and will not be used as basic sources in the field of research relating to the theme of hadīth.\(^{17}\)

Hujjīyya of hadīth can be determined by knowing quality of hadīth, while quality of hadīth can be concluded from hadīth research or critic. In conducting hadīth critic, hadīth scholars made criteria of authentic hadīth as a manual to select hadīth. Hadīth in its relation to hujjīyya is very close to its historicity when it appeared. Historicity of hadīth is recognizable from chain of transmission. Hadīth mutawātir that was spread widely by transmitters of hadīth through many chains of transmission is commonly agreed as authentic hadīth by hadīth scholars. It is convinced that the transmitters of the hadīth are impossible to do tricks or manipulations toward the hadīth. Therefore, the authority of this kind of hadīth is absolutely undoubted (qat‘iy)\(^{18}\), but the existence of hadīth

\(^{17}\) G.H.A. Juynboll, op. cit., p. 14

\(^{18}\) M. Syuhudi Ismail, Hadits Nabi menurut Pembela, Pengingkar, dan Pemalsunya, op. cit., p. 107
mutawātir unfortunately just have little number, and almost all of them don’t
drag in legal affair.\textsuperscript{19}

In the other hand, ḥadīth \textit{aḥād} is kind of ḥadīth which is not able to reach
level of \textit{mutawātir}. It just has one or more chains of transmission but still need to
be questioned about its authenticity. Some researches or critics of ḥadīth are
needed in this kind of ḥadīth in order to decide that the ḥadīth is authentic or
not. Ḥadīth scholars are on debate around the authority of this kind of ḥadīth.\textsuperscript{20}

According to Muslim scholars, all of ḥadīth \textit{mutawātir} is \textit{sahīḥ} or
authentic, and also can be \textit{hujja} or authoritative for all of Islamic studies majors.
However, ḥadīth \textit{sahīḥ} from category of \textit{aḥād} can be \textit{hujja} for all of Islamic
studies majors, except ‘aqidah major. In ‘aqidah major, they are on debate in
considering its \textit{hujja}. For ḥadīth \textit{ḥasan}, it is debatable among them in
determining its \textit{hujja}, but commonly for them still admitting its \textit{hujja}. For ḥadīth
\textit{daʾīf}, Muslim scholars generally reject it to be \textit{hujja}.\textsuperscript{21}

C. Thought Development of Ḥadīth Authenticity

1. Thought Development of Ḥadīth Authenticity in Classical Islamic
   Scholarship

\textit{Dirāya} ḥadīth studies during the post-codification has developed quite
rapidly, along with the development of \textit{riwāya} ḥadīth studies. At the
beginning of the codification, this study was introduced by the scholars that is
still mixed with the works of those who have other concentrations, such as
\textit{riwāya} studies and other studies as it was done by al-Shāfiʿi in his book \textit{al-
Risāla}, then Muslim in his \textit{Muqaddima} of his \textit{sahīḥ}, and also al-Turmuḍhi in
his book, \textit{al-Ilal}.

In further development, when each Islamic studies had separated each
other and been independent from its major in fourth Islamic century, Ḥadīth
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studies had become an independent discipline. This occurs due to the rise of new studies increasingly. Then cultures interaction among each other also increasingly encourages their efforts to do bookkeeping.

In the field of ḥadīth studies, this development is marked by the rise of al-Qadhi Abū Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ramahurmuzi (d. 360 H) through his book ʿAl-Muḥaddith al-Fāṣīl Baina al-Rāwi wa al-Wāʾi, which contains some important branch of the ḥadīth studies. But his effort was not maximized, because there are many other important branches of the ḥadīth studies that have not been covered in the work. Nevertheless, al-Ramahurmuzi was recognized as the first compiler of ḥadīth studies with adequate coverage of the discussion. His work was a breakthrough in the ḥadīth studies and the most prominent work among others that exist in his time. Then, ḥadīth scholars started to codify dirāya ḥadīth studies separately from other studies.22

Ḥadīth scholars of al-mutaqaddimūn 23 doesn’t yet provide explicit definition about authentic ḥadīth. They generally only provide an explanation of the indication of reliable information, such as:

a) Do not be accepted a ḥadīth, but that comes only from the thiqa people.

22 Maḥmūd al-Ṭaḥḥān, Ṭaisīr Muṣṭalāḥ al-Ḥadīth, (Beirut: Dār al-Qurʾān al-Kārim, 1979), pp. 10-11
23 Al-Mutaqaddimūn in the field of ḥadīth studies terminologically is ḥadīth scholars who lived during 3rd century and early of 4th century. This description is not in certainty, but still in approximation. Because there is possibility that in early of 4th century, there are mixing among al-Mutaqaddimūn and al-Mutaʿakhkhīrūn. The ḥadīth scholars of al-Mutaqaddimūn are such as Shuʿba, Yahyā ibn Saʿīd al-Qatṭān, ibn Mahdi, Āḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn al-Madīnī, Ibn Maʿīn, Ibn Rahawaiḥ, al-Bukhārī, Abū Zurʿa, Abū Ḥātim, al-Nasāʾī, until the era of al-Dāruqūṭī, al-Khofīlī and al-Baihaqī.

While ḥadīth scholars of al-Mutaʿakhkhīrūn are they who lived after al-Mutaqaddimūn era, i.e. when al-ʿUlūm in a large number of books was established, the matters is held on to those numerous books, and the era of transmission was finished. The example of these scholars are al-Qāḍī ʿIyād, Ibn Ṭaʿīmiyya, Ibn Kāṭīr, ʿAbd al-Ghānī, al-Dhahabī, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, Ibn al-Hajīb, al-Nawāwī, Ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥādī, Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāṣī, Diyaʾ al-Dīn al-Maqdisī, Zākī al-Dīn al-Mundhirī, Shārāf al-Dīn al-Dimyāṭī, Taqī al-Dīn al-Subūkī, Ibn Daqīq al-Ṭīd, al-Mizzī, and scholars who lived after them. See ʿAbd al-Azīz Ṣaghīr Dūkhān, ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth baina al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Mutaʿakhkhīrīn, in Nadwa ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth; ʿUlūm wa ʾAḥfaq, vol. 10 (n.p.: Jamīʿa ʿUmmān li-ʿUlūm wa al-Tiknūfīyya, n.d.), pp. 3-4
b) People who will give an information of the tradition must be investigated their praying worship, attitude and behavior, if their praying, attitude and behavior is not good, then their ḥadīth are not acceptable.

c) People who are not known to have knowledge of ḥadīth cannot be accepted his ḥadīth.

d) People who are used to lie, follow his own desires and do not understand the ḥadīth content cannot be accepted their information.

e) The people who are rejected his testimony do not be accepted their ḥadīth.

The statements explain above are focused on the quality and capacity of the transmitters, because they just said which one should be accepted and denied his information. The statements have not covered the validity of all authentic ḥadīth requirements.\(^{24}\)

Al-Shāfī‘i has suggested a more concrete explanation of the traditions that can be used as evidence. He stated that \textit{al-akhbār al-khāṣṣa} (ḥadīths of \textit{ahād}) cannot be used as evidence, unless the ḥadīth is narrated by the narrators that firm faith, well known for his truthfulness in whatever he reported. He should understand its contents and should know well how the change in expression affects the ideas expressed therein. He should report \textit{verbatim} what he learnt from his teacher, and not narrate in his own words then sense of what he had learnt. He must possess a retentive memory and if he has reported from a book, he should remember his book well. He should refrain from making a report on the authority of those whom he met but from he did not learn anything. His report must be in agreement with what has been reported by those who are recognized to have good memory, if they also have transmitted these report, and apart from the act of concealment defects.\(^{25}\)

Criteria which made by al-Shāfī‘i as above is emphasized on transmitter and ḥadīth transmission method. Criteria which cannot be avoided to determine ḥadīth acceptability is not only transmitters’ capacity but also continuity of transmitters which doesn’t cut off. Relating to content of ḥadīth,

\(^{24}\) M. Syuhudi Ismail, \textit{Kaedah Kesahihan Sanad Hadis}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 121

al-Shāfi‘i seems like doesn’t give detail attention. However, it doesn’t mean that content of ḥadīth isn’t totally disobeyed by him. He still concerns on content of ḥadīth by its requirement to keep original redaction from the Prophet, understand ḥadīth meaning, and know that different redaction will cause different meaning.26

Al-Bukhāri and Muslim don’t give exact definition of authentic ḥadīth, but both of them give standard of ḥadīth authenticity through their explanations. Ḥadīth scholars have conducted observatory between both of their thought. Result of the observatory shows the description of authentic ḥadīth according to them.27 Both of them generally have the same view about description of authentic ḥadīth, but there is dissimilarity between them.

For the other requirements, it can be expressed equally between al-Bukhāri and Muslim. Both of their requirements, according to the research scholars, are: 1) a chain of transmitters should be continued from the first to the last transmitters. 2) The transmitters in the sanad of ḥadīth must be people who should be known their thiqa, in the sense of ḍabṭ and ‘adl. 3) The ḥadīth is avoided from ‘illa and shudhūd. 4) of narrators in the sanad should be in same contemporaneity.

The difference between both of them is only laid on chain of transmitters’ connectivity. It means that transmitters have to meet each other. According to al-Bukhāri, ḥadīth can be accepted if it is discovered that the transmitter of that ḥadīth have really ever met his ḥadīth informant, although their meeting is only one time. Contemporaneity is not enough for al-Bukhāri to be evidence of ḥadīth authenticity. Different from al-Bukhāri, Muslim doesn’t use the meeting of each transmitter to their informants as one of ḥadīth authentic requirements. Contemporaneity is enough for him to prove chain of transmitters’ connectivity.28 So, al-Bukhāri is tighter than al-Muslim in this matter.

26 Kamaruddin Amin, Menguji Kembali, op. cit., p. 18
27 Mahmud al-Tahhan, Taysir Muṣṭalāḥ al-Ḥadīth, op. cit., p. 43
28 ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb, Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth, op. cit., p. 206
The scholars of al-muta’akhkhirīn have defined strictly authentic ḥadīth. Their definition is inseparable from the various information that has been put forward by scholars of al-Mutaqaddimīn, especially those presented by al-Shāfī‘i, al-Bukhāri and Muslim.

Ibn Ṣalāḥ (643/1245) in his book, Ulūm al-Ḥadīth,29 one of ḥadīth scholars of al-Muta’akhkhirīn who has a lot of influence among his ḥadīth

29 Famous as Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. This book is a maximum effort in completing earlier works which had existed, such as the works of al-Khāṭīb and other scholars. In his book, he mentions in full 65 branches of ḥadīth material and explains everything in detail. Thus, it may impact to the book that is not quite systematic in accordance with chapter headings.

In the matter of discussion, the works that came later methodologically could not break away to always refer to this book. Popularity of this book is due to the materials which are capable to cover and appreciate all the discussion of ḥadīth. Even this book’s completeness has attracted the scholars, especially those that come after, to give the book comments. There are a lot of books have discussed this book, either ikhtisār (summary), Sharḥ (review), nāẓm (poetry), and mu’رادā (comparison).

In the form of reviews (sharḥ), it emerges some very detailed books give reviews to the ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s book. For example, Al-Taqyīd wa al-Idāh Sharḥ Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ by al-Īrāqī (d. 608 H), Al-Iṣḥāḥ ‘an Naṣṣāt Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ by al-Asqalānī (d. 852 H), and the work of al-Badr al-Zarkashi (d. 794 H) is currently untitled. Being in the form of a summary, it leads to the rise of the book al-Maḥāsin wa al-Isṭīḥlāḥ fi Tadāmīn Kitaːb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ by al-Bulqīnī. Although it is in the form of a summary of the book, but it provides many critical reviews, notes, and some additional explanation.

Still in the form of a summary, it appears the book, which was written by Imam al-Nawawī (d. 676 H), entitled al-Taqriːb wa al-Taisir li al-Sunan al-Bashiːr wa Maʿrifat al-Nadhiːr. Surprisingly, this summary book of the previous books is then reviewed by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 H) in his book entitled Taddīb al-Rawi fi Sharḥ Taqriːb al-Nawawī. Al-Suyūṭī also wrote the book Al-Tadhniːb fi al-Zaːid ‘ala al-Taqriːb that he gives attachments of al-Nawawī’s book deficiency.

Summary of the work of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ continued to be done by the scholars of ḥadīth. Badr al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Jamā‘a al-Kannaːni (d. 733 H), for example, wrote the book Al-Ulāyya al-Rawi fi al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī, which is then reviewed by ‘Īzz al-Dīn Muhammad ibn Abī Bakr ibn al-Jamā‘a with the title, Manhaj al-Sāwī fi Sharḥ al-Ulāyya al-Rawī. Abu al-Fīdā‘ī ‘Imād al-Dīn Ismā‘īl ibn Kathīr (d. 774 H) are also wrote a summary of the work of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ into a book entitled al-Ba‘ith al-Ḥathiːth. Similar efforts are also carried out by Alā‘ al-Dīn al-Mardīnī, Bahā‘ al-Dīn al-Andalūsī, and some other scholars.

In addition in the form of review (sharḥ) and summary (ikhtisār), the work of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ also encourages the scholars to write verse poem that contains basic rules of ḥadīth as stated in the book Muqaddima of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. This effort is known as nāẓm that for the first time carried out by al-Zain al-Īrāqī ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ibn al-Husain (806 H). In fact, he wrote a thousand (Alfiyya) verses in Nazm al-Durar fi ‘Ilm al-Athar then popularly called Alfiyya al-Īrāqī.

Then, al-Īrāqī also gives review to his nāẓm by himself. There are two reviews written by al-Īrāqī, compact review and long winded one. Its compact review entitled Sharḥ Fath al-Mughith bi Sharḥ Alfiyya al-Ḥadīth, while long winded review is remain untitled. In addition, al-Īrāqī’s nāẓm was also stimulated other scholars to provide review of al-Īrāqī’s nāẓm. There are many ḥadīth scholars who wrote a comment on al-Īrāqī’s nāẓm, as if unrelenting idea is not stopped by ḥadīth scholars. Among many reviews works, the work of al-Sakhawi given the same title with written by al-Īrāqī, Fath al-Mughith fi Sharḥ Alfiyya al-Ḥadīth, is the most well-known work.
scholars’ contemporaries and thereafter, has provided a definition or understanding of authentic hadîth is hadîth which continues its sanad (to the Prophet), narrated by 《dabṭ》 and 《adl》 transmitters until the end of sanad, there are no 《shudḥudh》 and 《illa》-in hadîth. 30

From this definition, it can be stated that an authentic hadîth is hadîth which: 1) its sanad continues up to the Prophet. 2) All of its transmitters must be 《dabṭ》 and 《adl》. 3) Its avoided from 《shādḥ》 and 《illa》.

Other hadîth scholars of 《al-muta‘akhkhiri>n》, for example An-Nawâwi, Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalâni, Jalâl al-Dîn al-Suyûtî, Jamâl al-Dîn al-Qâsîmi and al-'Irâqi, has also proposed definition of authentic hadîth. Definition that they put forward, although the wording looks different but the principle is the same as it has been stated by Ibn al-Šalâh above. Hadîth scholars in later periods, such as Maḥmûd al-Ṭâhân, Šubhi Şâlíh (1407/1986) and Muḥammad ‘Ajjâj al-Khâṭîb, also provide such understanding. 31

Look at the popularity of 《Alfiyya al-'Iraqî》, al-Suyûtî, who known as al-Sakhawi’s rival, wrote 《nazm》 of 《Alfiyya》 in hadîth which contains some important additional explanation of the material in 《Alfiyya al-'Iraqî》. Al-Suyûtî also provided review of his own 《nazm》 he made. However, this work which he entitled 《Sharh Al-Bahr al-Ladhi Zakhar fi Sharh Alfiyya al-Athâr》, don’t finished completely. Later today, the work was completed by the original Indonesian scholar, Sheikh Maḥfûd al-Tîrmâsi, Born in Tremas, near Ngawi, wrote a book entitled 《Manhaj Dhawi al-Nadâr fi Sharh Manzûma ‘Ilm al-Athâr》. 30 Redaction of Ibn al-Šalâh is:

أمَا الحديث الصحيح فهو الحديث المسنود الذي ينتمي إنسانه بنقل العدل الضابط عن العدل الضابط إلـى متناه وَلا يكون شاذًا وَلا معنالًا


31 Redaction of al-Nawâwi:

وهو ما اتصل سنده بالعدل الضابطين من غير شذوذ ولا علة


Redaction of Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalâni (d. 852/1449):

وجبر الأحاديث بنقل عدل نâm الضبط مصل السند غير معنال وَلا شاذ هو الصحيح لذاته


Redaction of Jafâl al-Dîn al-Suyûtî (d. 911/1505):

مَسْنُود يَوْصِي بِنَقْل عَدْل ضَابِطٍ عَن عَدْل ضَابِطٍ وَلا مَكْتُومُ السَّلَحَاةْ وَالضَّافِع عَلَى

See 《alfîyya al-suyûtî》, verses 15

Redaction of Jamâl al-Dîn al-Qâsîmi (d. 1332/1914):
Although understanding of authentic hadith that has been put forward by scholars is the same, it does not mean there has been a consensus (ijma). Ibn Kathir (774/1373), for example, argues that the authentic hadith is not only hadith which its sanad concatenate to the Prophet, but also continues to the level of companions or their pupil. Nevertheless, Ibn Kathir admits that the opinion which was followed by scholars in general is opinion that has been expressed by Ibn al-Šalāh and al-Nawawi above.\(^{32}\) In addition, Muḥammad al-Juwaini (478/1085) stated that authentic hadith must be narrated by -at least-two people at every level of its sanad.\(^{33}\) Mahmūd Abū Rayya cites an opinion stating that the authentic hadith is a hadith that in terms of making the soul in a state of calm, and is avoided the awkwardness (shudhūdh) and defect (‘illa). This last second opinion did not have many supporters.

Some fiqh and usūl fiqh scholars doesn’t require free from shudhūdh and ‘illa as a requirement for an authentic hadith. Then, al-‘Irāqi emphasized
authentic ḥadīth must be based on ḥadīth scholars and not by other expert scholars. Thus, al-‘Irāqi rejected scholars of fiqh and usūl al-fiqh above.34

It can be stated that the definition of an authentic ḥadīth which is followed by the majority of ḥadīth scholars that has been put forward by Ibn al-Ṣalāh is followed until now.

Understanding an authentic ḥadīth which was agreed by the majority of the above ḥadīth scholars have covered sanad and matn of ḥadīth. The criteria states that a chain of transmitters in sanad should be continued and all transmitters should be ‘adl and dabt is the criteria for the validity of the chain of transmission, be avoided from shudhūdh and ‘illa is a criterion for the validity of the chain of transmission, as well as criteria for the validity of matn ḥadīth. Therefore, ḥadīth scholars generally stated that if sanad is authentic, its matn is not necessarily authentic. Thus, the validity of ḥadīth is not only determined by the validity of the chain of transmission alone, but by the validity its matn.

From the definition of authentic ḥadīth, scholars agreed upon by the majority of them that major elements of ḥadīth authenticity concepts are:

1. Its sanad continues35
2. The whole narrators in the sanad are ‘adl36

34 Al-Hāfidh Zain al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahim ibn al-Husain al-‘Irāqi, op. cit. p. 20
35 The meaning of sanad connectivity is every transmitter in sanad of ḥadīth accepts content of ḥadīth directly from transmitter above him. This condition must be continued until the end of sanad. So, the transmission connectivity from mukharrij until the companion getting ḥadīth from the Prophet is always continued. See M. Syuhudi Ismail, Kaidah kesahihan Sanad Hadis, op. cit., p. 127.
36 ‘Adl etymologically and terminologically has varieties meaning. Ḥadīth scholars have been discussed about who have capacity and capability of ‘adl. Classical Ḥadīth scholars have different thought in this term. But since the differences thought about the meaning of ‘adl give criteria covering all of the thought: (1) Muslim, it’s because that ḥadīth becomes one of Islamic teaching sources. It means that ḥadīth is Muslim guidance in Islamic practical teaching. How could be non-Muslim is accepted his transmission which contains Islamic teaching. Therefore, the only Muslim who will be accepted his transmission of ḥadīth which contains Islamic teaching. (2) Mukallaf, it means that transmitter of ḥadīth must be sane and adult person. Someone who is in crazy, oblivious, intoxicated or children is excluded. (3) Implementing Islamic teachings, it means that transmitter must be person who always obeys the rule of Islamic teaching. He has to apply what must be obligated and avoid what must be prohibited. It is because someone who doesn’t have commitment in religion teachings is very easy to do some
3. The whole narrators in the sanad are *dabt*\(^{37}\)
4. Ḥadīth sanad was spared from *shudhūd*\(^{38}\)
5. Ḥadīth sanad was spared from ‘illa\(^{39}\)

2. Thought Development of Ḥadīth Authenticity in Western Scholarship

An important figure in the field of ḥadīth is Gustav Weil (1808-1889), who describes in his book *Geschichte der Chaliphen* that all the ḥadīth in al-Bukhārī should be rejected. Shortly after him, Aloys Sprenger (1813-1893) argued in his three-volume book *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammad*, published between 1861 and 1865 that the ḥadīth literature contains more authentic material than the fabricated one.

Another Western scholar who concerns on ḥadīth authenticity literature is William Muir (1819-1905). In the introduction to his book, *The Life of Mahomet*, he intends to a number of criteria to determine the validity of the ḥadīth, and then provide the first examples of an orientalist’s attempt to establish a chronology for them. According to Muir, although the transmitter
often creates distortions in the texts of ḥadīth, ḥadīth literature contains most of the historical facts.

Reinhart Dozy (1820-1883) through his work, *Het Islamisme* (1863) is influenced by both Sprenger and Muir. He explained that about half of the ḥadīths in al-Bukhārī are authentic. According to him, the fact that the writing of ḥadīths was happened in the second Islamic century is the answer why many fictitious ḥadīths is included in the literature.40

Ignaz Goldziher, a well-known figure who is referred by western scholars, is skeptic about authenticity of ḥadīth literature, but he does not agree with Dozy who said that at least half of the ḥadīths in al-Bukhārī should be considered as authentic. Uncovering the overall distrust of ḥadīth authenticity, he claims that most of the ḥadīths are the product of religious, historical and social situations prevalent in the first half of the second Islamic century. For him, this literature consists of all sorts of competing political views. Although he sometimes implies that the ḥadīth literature may contain some amount of authentic hadith, thus he is not clear on this issue.

Moreover, he argues that the importance of tradition as a legitimate source gradually increased. This is a claim that will be taken by later Western scholars, especially by Schacht and his followers, who stated that the prophetic tradition is not a source of reference in early Islamic history. Goldziher describes the picture of Muslim societies where phenomenon of fabricated hadith is widespread, with people often producing fictitious hadith for political or other purposes. He argues that different groups either made a lot of hadiths that support their respective positions, or modify an existing tradition to justify their minds, or censor tradition that has been adopted by others. He also accuses Muslim scholars who just rely solely on the sanad (chain of transmitters) regardless ‘obvious anachronism’ in ḥadīth texts.

---

Starting from Goldziher, According to Ali Masrur, Historical development of ḥadith studies in Western can be classified into four phase. First, early western scepticism which is known later as western revisionists. Second, reaction against scepticism. Thirdly, an attempt to search a middle ground. Fourthly, renewed scepticism. Goldziher until Schacht can be included to the first phase, early western scepticism because these two figures hasitates together the authenticity of ḥadith. Then, the Dutch orientalist, C. Snouck Hurgronje (1857-1936), a contemporary of Goldziher, claims that the ḥadith literature is a product of the dominant groups in the first three Islamic centuries, and thus it reflect their views. Both orientalists agreed on the idea that different groups fabricated many ḥadiths and spread it as a means to get their aims. Likewise, they both claim that the ḥadith literature consists of many elements of the old and the new testament, and Roman law.

According to Hurgronje, when Muslim scholars realize that the foreign elements began to be a threat, they began to sort out and eliminate those that have a negative impact, but they kept the elements that have become an integral part of the Islamic tradition, and then remove the signs which may indicate their original source, calling to the traditions preserved as “Ḥadīth”. Accordingly, Hurgronje’s idea which tells that the roots of the ḥadith can be traced back to the Prophet is totally false and that the life and teachings of the Prophet cannot be reconstructed based on these hadiths. It is a statement that has a logical consequence of a biased view of the ḥadith literature.42

Claim of Goldziher that Muslim scholars cannot see ‘obvious anachronisms’ in the ḥadith texts is also followed by the Belgian orientalist, Henri Lammens (1862-1937). According to him, Muslim scholars largely

---

42 Fatma Kizil, loc.cit.
emphasized their efforts to sanad critique and put enough attention to textual traditions, thus they fail to see the logical and historical impossibility and anachronism in a narrative text. As in many things, he agrees with Goldziher about the allegedly fictitious nature of tradition, and argues that Islamic law is strongly influenced by Roman law. According to Lammens, elements adapted from foreign sources are not only falsely attributed to the Prophet and his companions through creating hadith, but they also have completely assimilated into Islamic law, thus making it seems as if they are genuine and authentic of Islamic legal hadith.

Western scholar who has the idea that Islamic law is a clone of another system is David Samuel Margoliouth (1858-1940). He is greatly influenced by Goldziher and Muir, Margoliouth claims that ḥadīth literature development, as explicated in Goldziher’s studies, has led researchers to be skeptic and to constantly ask what the possible reasons for the fabrication of certain ḥadīth are. Besides influenced by his predecessor, Margoliouth also has a major impact on subsequent scholars, especially Joseph Schacht. In this context, the most effective statement of his ideas is that the concept of “sunna” was originally used to refer to pre-Islamic customs/traditions that have not abolished by al-Qur‘ān.

Other Western orientalists in the pre-1950 is Josef Horovitz (1874-1931), known by his study of Sīra literature. However, as Horovitz himself remarked, it is impossible to completely separate the two of ḥadīth literature. He tried to build a chronology of sanad by Ibn Ishāq’s method (85/704-151/768). According to Horovitz, sanad is appeared firstly in the last quarter of the first Islamic century. Although this is an earlier date for the start of sanad previously given by Western scholars, Horovitz is still skeptic about the sanad in its role in building ḥadīth sources, unlike other Western scholars, such as GHA Juynboll, which traced back sanad by the same date. Likewise, although Horovitz is different from his predecessors on the issue of sanad.

---

43 Ibid., p. 2
44 Ibid., p. 3
chronology, he occupies in common with them in the claim that Islam contains many elements from other religions and cultures. He described Islam as “an area where syncretism dominates”.

The same assertion was also made by the Dutch orientalist, Arent Jan Wensinck (1882-1939), who was a leading member of the famous concordance project. It is reported that while he was working on his PhD dissertation on Prophet Muhammad’s relationships with the Jews in Medina, Wensinck realized the significance of ḥadīths for Islamic theology, and thus started the concordance project in order to make sure that the ḥadīths could be used more efficiently in studies on Islam. He claims that the scope of the provisions of the al-Qur’ān was limited to the Medina context, and with the expansion of Islam beyond the Arabian Peninsula, it emerged the need of different moral and legal sources; Muslims found these in Roman and Jewish law, Christian ethics and asceticism, and Hellenism. Elements taken from these external traditions, according to him, compensated for the missing traditions, and they are contained in the ḥadīth literature. He further claims that this literature includes not only those elements borrowed from the above-mentioned traditions, but also the ḥadīths fabricated by competing groups, as Goldziher argued before him. For this reason, Wensinck sees the ḥadīths as an important source for the history of Islamic theology. Assuming that the al-Qur’ān was authored by the Prophet, he claims that the ḥadīths were produced by Islamic society after him, and that this is the reason why they have been so popular among Muslims.

The Western scholar working on the prophetic traditions, Alfred Guillaume (1888-1965), differs from his predecessors by his claim that the different ways, where the ḥadīths were fabricated, reflect the political and religious tendencies of competing groups. He also argues that only a few of the ḥadīths can belong to the authorities to whom they were attributed, based on mistakes made during the narration process. His work on the ḥadīth literature makes it necessary to mention his name in this context. It can be
observed that all of Western scholars mentioned so far share a common skeptical attitude towards the ḥadith literature.\footnote{Ibid., p. 3}

At this point, the different view of hadith authenticity literature was given by Johann Fueck (1894-1974), who criticizes the skeptical approach of his predecessors. He argued that the Prophet had set an ideal example for Muslims from the beginning. He stresses the uniting, as opposed to dividing, aspects of the ḥadith literature, focusing on independent and neutral ḥadith scholars rather than an idea of competing groups fabricating prophetic traditions.

According to Fueck, those who see the ḥadith literature as simply a collection of views of later generations ignore the deep influence of the Prophet on his believers. They thus fail to see the originality of the ḥadith literature, regarding it instead as a ‘mosaic’ composed of many foreign elements. Consequently, they accept the ḥadiths as fabricated until proven otherwise. For Fueck, however, despite the fact that ḥadith scholars were not completely successful in eliminating fabricated ḥadiths, the ḥadith literature contains many authentic traditions. For when the activities of collecting ḥadith started fifty years after the death of the Prophet, only the younger Companions were still alive and the ḥadith scholars narrated only from them.\footnote{Ibid., p. 4}

The second phase is reaction against scepticism. Nabia Abbott, one of the figures in this phase, have proven the mistake of Goldziher’s opinion. According to Abbott, the collection of traditions was begun early in the lifetime of Muhammad and continuously to the canonical collections. Abbott also said that the development of tradition in a great quantity in the second and the third century after hijrah is not because of the fabrication of the contents of traditions, but because of parallel and multiple growth of sanad.

Azami then adopted Abbott theories to defend traditions from Joseph Schacht’s criticism. Azami stated in his works that there is no reason to reject
sanad system because it is a reliable system. On the writing down of tradition, Azami of the opinion that prophetic tradition was written down in the life time of Muhammad and continuous until the period of canonical collections. Azami also criticized the backward-projection theory that, according to him, it is an invalid theory because it is not based on historical facts. According to him, it is extremely difficult to imagine the fabrication of traditions done by transmitters whose their houses are far away each other.

D. Criteria of Ḥadīth Authenticity

1. Criteria of Ḥadīth Authenticity in Muslim Scholarship

Classical Muslim scholars have created concepts of ḥadīth authenticity which is included in ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth. They make criteria of ḥadīth authenticity because authentic ḥadīth will be known if there is measurement or concept as requirement to be able to call ḥadīth as authentic ḥadīth. Muslim ḥadīth scholars of al-Mutaqaddimūn don’t provide explicit description of ḥadīth authenticity. They commonly just provide explanations about how to get reliable information. Explicit measurement of ḥadīth authenticity was defined by al-Muta‘akhkhirūn who is agreed by majority of them. It can be said that the concept of ḥadīth authenticity according to majority of them is sanad connectivity, Transmitters must be ‘adl and ḍabṭ, there are no shādīh and ‘illa.

But in further Muslim criticism, they think that the above measurements are criteria only for ḥadīth’s sanad. So, it will not be enough to detect ḥadīth authentic. Then, creating new addition of criteria which are related to ḥadīth’s matn is needed. They add some of measurements to get real authentic ḥadīth. So, there should be two criteria of ḥadīth authenticity in which are sanad and matn.

47 Syuhudi Ismail, *Kaedah Kesahihan Sanad Hadis*, op. cit., p. 120.

48 The steps to conduct ḥadīth matan critics, according to A. Hasan Asy’ari Ulama’i, are, firstly, the ḥadīth must be come back to the result of ḥadīth sanad critics, because the matn also must be supported by sanad which is saḥīh. Secondly, investigation of all text which have same meaning. Thirdly, investigation of content of the matn. See A. Hasan Asy’ari Ulama’i, *op.cit*, p. 70. Then, Syuhudi Ismail explains these Hasan Asy’ari steps in more detail. The criteria of matn authenticity according to Syuhudi Ismail are 1) it is not opposite to logic, 2) it is not opposite to
According to A. Hasan Asy’ari, the step which has to be done firstly in investigating quality of hadith is hadith sanad critic. To be able to conduct sanad critic, there are some cases which must be fulfilled by researcher, they are:

1. Know criteria of hadith sanad authenticity.
2. Set of research equipment must be available (for example is transmitters’ biographical data).
3. Understand al-jarh wa al-ta’dil as an analytical tool.

In determining criteria of sanad hadith critics, he uses al-Nawāwi criteria as formal standard (at least criteria which is formalized by hadith scholars), they are sanad connectivity, all the transmitters in sanad must be ‘adl and dābt, and there are no shādh and ‘illa in hadith.

In investigation of sanad connectivity, it was conducted by steps as follow: 1) quote all the name of transmitters, 2) learn the history of their lives, 3) investigate the term in tahammul wa adā’ al-hadith. To know there is the content of Quran, 3) it is not opposite to hadith mutawātir, 4) it is not opposite to Islamic activities which is used by classical scholars, 5) it is not opposite to Islamic certain legal, 6) it is not opposite to hadith ahād which has more authentic quality than the hadith in research. According to him, it’s very hard to conduct sanad critics, because 1) availability of al-riwaya bi al-ma’nā, 2) unlike criteria of sanad critics, there is no unity in the measurement or criteria of matn critics, 3) background of the raising of hadith guidance is often hard to be found, 4) there are hadiths which contain supra-rational understanding, 5) it is very rare of books especially giving sample of matn critics. So, accordingly, the researcher to be fulfilled matn critics, 1) he must be hadith expert, 2) have large and deep knowledge on Islamic teaching, 3) have done enough mutḥala’at activities, 4) he must clever or smart person who really can understand well, 5) have highly knowledge traditions. See M. Syuhudi Ismail, Metodologi Penelitian Hadis Nabi (Jakarta: Bulan Bintang, 1992), pp. 120-121, 26, 130.

49 A. Hasan Asy’ari, op.cit., pp. 25-26
50 Based on ‘ulām al-hadith, there are eight kinds of hadith transmission: (1) Samā‘; it is that pupil attends lecture of his hadith teacher (the above transmitter). This kind of transmission can be simple or followed by diction from memory or script. Terminology which is used in this kind of transmission is sami’tu, hadlathani, akhbaranā, or anba’anā. (2) Qirā’a, it is that pupil reads some hadith that he collects in front of his hadith teacher. Terminology often used is akhbaranā or qara’tu ‘alā. (3) Ḥāza, it is that someone has permission from transmitter to deliver or transmit some hadith which are collected by that transmitter. The terminology uses akhbaranā or ajāzani. (4) Munāwala, it is that getting collection of hadith belonging to a transmitter who has already given his permission to deliver or transmit hadith from that collection. Terminology used is akhbaranā. (5) Mukāṭaba, it is that getting hadith in written from transmitter, either direct or correspondently. (6) ʿIlām al-rāwi, hadith teacher statement of some hadith or hadith book without talking about permission to transmit toward his pupil. Terminology used is
contemporaneity and relation of transmitters and his informant, ‘adl and ḍabṭ of transmitters, and detecting tādlij activity, it can be consulted to Transmitters’ biographical books (kutub al-rijāl). Syuhudi Ismail states that rijāl books which inform biographies, credibility, and others relating to ḥadīth transmitters are very important in sanad ḥadīth research.

2. Criteria of Ḥadīth Authenticity in Western Scholarship
   a. Backward Projection

   Backward projection is concept which tries to understand condition of legal doctrines from both of classical fiqh scholars and ḥadīth scholars in order to ascribe their statements to higher authority in the past. This attempt is applied because classical scholars need to be trusted more toward their next generation as if their doctrines are come from then trustworthy characters from the past. It is based on Joseph Schacht assumption that the caliphates of Umayyad make new idea to employ judge man to solve legal problem Judge Man is selected from person who has special knowledge and ability. So, judge man become solid community and have huge wave of influences. In the second Islamic century, they develop to be the ancient school of law. Central of their ideas is from the living tradition. These issues become ideal tradition or sunna. They often arbitrarily ascribed the living tradition to highest authority in order to get legitimating of their doctrines.

   From above case, ḥadīth scholars begin to rise as an opposition to encounter the ancient school of law’s movement. Ḥadīth scholars have purpose to substitute living traditions which is arbitrarily ascribed to an authority with formal ḥadīths which sources from the Prophet. Ḥadīth

---

akhbaranī or ‘an. (7) Wasiyya, it is that acquiring hadīth collection from transmitter by his own will before his dying. Terminology used is akhbaranī wasiyyatan ‘an or wassānī. (8) Wijāda, someone who finds hadīth from the collection book or script, then he non-authoritatively transmits it. Terminology used is wajadtu, qāla, ukhbirtu, or huddithtu. See ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭib, Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth, op. cit., pp. 151-158

51 A. Hasan Asy’ari, loc.cit.; Syuhudi Ismail, Kaedah Kesahihan Sanad Hadis, op. cit., p. 128

52 M. Syuhudi Ismail, Metodologi Penelitian Hadis Nabi, op. cit., p. 90
scholars are managed to sift detailed information of the prophet by investigating its transmitters and how about the connectivity of informants each other in chain of transmission. In the middle of second century, these formal hadiths disturb and affect to the living traditions which are spread among people. So, it makes conflict between hadith scholars and Judgeman (qādī), but hadith scholars finally become holder of hadith control and succeed in defeating the ancient school of law.

Therefore, between judgeman (qādī) and school of ancient law forge hadith. Sanad is something arbitrarily attached into hadith. Sanad firstly is very simple, and then very simple sanad is improved in order to be perfect in classical hadith collection in the second half of second century. Sanad improvement step by step is directly proportional with development of hadith content. In other word, sanad development backward is similar with doctrines projection backward. It means that it is referred to higher authority. Therefore, backward projection states that the most perfect and complete sanad are the latest.53

b. *Argumentum e Silentio*

This concept is based on the assumption that the best way to prove that the hadith doesn’t exist in certain early era is through a way that the hadith is not used as obligated legal argument that all of legal issue must be referred to it, if it really exists.54 It means that hadith doesn’t exist in certain past era, if it is not used as legal argument. This theory is firstly applied by Joseph Schacht systematically in conducting hadith in order to prove existence of hadith in certain era. This concept not only gets support from other scholars, but is also criticized by other scholars.

Scholars who in line with Schacht and often uses this method to conduct hadith is GHA juynboll and Norman Calder. Both of them affirm this concept in deciding when a hadith, especially legal hadith, exists. According to them, it is because that hadith collector habits usually

54 Joseph Schacht, *op.cit*, p. 140
gathering all of ḥadīth which is collected by his predecessors and then adds it with the recent collection of his own self. In that era, it is such a regulation to cover all of ḥadīth gathered by his predecessors. Therefore, a non-exist ḥadīth in ḥadīth collection can be used as relevance evidence to trace the ḥadīth chronology and source. Moreover if the ḥadīth is famous or popular ḥadīth, its disappearing in a ḥadīth collection will become a very significant evidence to support *argumentum e silentio*’s validity.

In the other hand, Zafar Ishaq Anshari says that *argumentum e silentio*’s assumption will be right, if the validity of these assumptions is required: (1) along early two century ago, when legal doctrines begin to codify, ḥadīths which is used to support the argument must be mentioned consistently. (2) If a ḥadīth scholar knows a ḥadīth, this ḥadīth must be known by all of ḥadīth scholars in that era. (3) All of spreading ḥadīth in certain era must be codified and published widely and carefully kept. Therefore, if someone doesn’t find a ḥadīth in the works of famous scholars, it will be a signal that the ḥadīth is non-exist in that era.

Unfortunately, according to Anshary, these assumptions is not supported and not appropriated with historical truth. Even the ḥadīth codifications nowadays were collected in second century and after. Where codifications or collections is based on some reasons, such as to collect all school of Islamic law will be accepted commonly. So, eventually they feel don’t need to mention his basic argument from such ḥadīths.

c. Common Link

This theory which is stated by Joseph Schacht has been criticized, but G.H.A. Juynboll still deems it to be relevance and considered as responsible scientific discovery. Juynboll, following Schacht’s thought, says that ḥadīth, even stating in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* or *Muslim*, doesn’t mean that the ḥadīth is exactly authentic and has strongly historical basic. Further, he claims that there is no proper method which conducted to determine what the ḥadīth is authentic or not. Relating to sanad, he
agreed with Schacht in accusing the transmitter labeled with common link as a first person who widely spreads ḥadīth.\footnote{Kamaruddin Amin, Menguji Kembali Keakuratan Metode Kritik Hadīs, op. cit., p. 160.}

*Common link* theory is the term for a transmitter who widely spreads ḥadīth to his pupils, then his pupils will share again this ḥadīth to their pupils, and this condition goes on until the last transmitters (*mukharrijūn*). So, where ḥadīth is begun to spread earlier, there *common link* are found. This concept give understanding that the more line of transmission, the more powerful its historical truth. It means that transmission can be authentically trusted is transmission which has branches more than a line of transmission. Meanwhile, the transmission which has only one line of transmission (single strand) will absolutely not be trusted.

*Common link* is usually happened to transmitter in successor (*tābiʿūn*) or successor’s successor (*tābiʿ al-tābiʿīn*) level. While in Companion level even the Prophet itself is seldom to find *common link*. Therefore, the ḥadīth is not, or at least not yet, proven its originality from the Prophet or the Companion, but it is sourced from successor or successor’s successor. This assumption is further strengthens Juynboll’s theory about ḥadīth chronology that ḥadīth which is ended up to successor is elder than ḥadīth which is ended up to the companion or the Prophet.\footnote{Ibid., p. 60}