

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 *ṣahīh*.

According to many Muslim scholars, they used the term *ṣahīh* 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.¹

As explained above, ḥadīth is not written formally in early, so most of ḥadīth in early Islamic era was transmitted orally by transmitter through 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, *Otentisitas Hadis; Studi Kritis atas Kajian Hadis Kontemporer* (Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya, 2004), pp. 5-6

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

In other case, ḥadīth *ṣahīh* can be identified through conducting ḥadīth critic. There are two kinds of ḥadīth critic because of that ḥadīth is consist of two parts, matn and sanad. Critic of sanad ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth transmitters are criticized by critic experts.⁴ Main purpose of ḥadīth critic is to determine the authenticity of ḥadīth exactly and to decide validity of that ḥadīth in order to establish its authority.⁵ To do some critic ḥadīth, the first thing that has to be known is criteria of authentic ḥadīth. Criteria of authentic ḥadīth 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

² M. Syuhudi Ismail, *Kaedah Kesahihan Sanad Hadis* (Jakarta: PT. Bulan Bintang, 1995), p. 120

³ Ali Mustafa Yakub, *Kritik Hadis*, (Jakarta: Pustaka Firdaus, 2004), p. 125

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 collection 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-Turmudhi 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 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī, an Islamic ḥadīth scholar from

⁶ A. Hasan Asy'ari Ulama'i, *Melacak Hadis Nabi SAW; Cara Cepat Mencari Hadis dari Manual hingga Digital* (Semarang: RaSAIL, 2006), p. 25, 69

⁷ Munzir Suparta, *Ilmu Hadis* (Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo, 2008), p. 126

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

¹⁰ Ali Mustafa Yakub, *Kritik Hadis, op. cit.*, p. 124

Shi'a Ithnā 'Ashariyya's sect, used the term 'authentic' to translate term *ṣaḥīḥ* in English, although there is little differentiation of ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ*'s definition between Shi'a ithnā 'Ashariyya and Sunni.¹¹ It means that 'authentic' is usually used to translate *ṣaḥīḥ* in English.¹²

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

¹¹ According to Shi'a sect, ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ* is the tradition whose chain of transmission is consecutively linked to the *Ma'sūm*, narrated by one veracious *imāmi* to other, on all the levels. Quality of ḥadīth, accordingly, is graded into four groups: *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic), *ḥasan* (Good), *muwaththaq* (dependable), and *ḍa'īf* (weak). See 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍli, *Introduction to Hadith* (London: Islamic College for Advance Studies Press (ICAS), 2002), p. 25

¹² H.A.R. Gibb uses term 'sound' to translate *ṣaḥīḥ* in English. But, it seems rare for using term 'sound' in the field of ḥadīth studies. According to him, *ṣaḥīḥ* (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 *ḍa'īf*.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 *ḍa'īf* after conducting detail research. Even there are many ḥadīths *mauḍū'* that was state as if that it is ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ*, but, trough conducting some critic ḥadīth, they don't qualify to be called as ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ*. Many of ḥadīth *ḍa'īf* 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

¹³ Maḥmūd al-Ṭaḥḥān, *Taisīr Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*, *op. cit.*, p. 75

¹⁴ Mustafa al-Siba'i, *al-Sunna wa Makānatuhā fi al-Tashrī' al-Islāmi*, trans. Nurcholish Madjid with the title *Sunnah dan Peranannya dalam Penetapan Syari'at Islam* (Jakarta: Pustaka Firdaus, 1991), p. 56

¹⁵ M. Syuhudi Ismail, *Hadits Nabi menurut Pembela, Peningkar, dan Pemalsunya* (Jakarta: Gema Insani Press, 1995), p. 48

¹⁶ Badri Khaeruman, *op. cit.*, p. 6

Ḥadīth gains emphasis concern because its position as formally script of the Prophet. Doubtful on ḥadīth authenticity will endanger its position. If a ḥadīth is stated to be not authentic, it will automatically affect to *ḥujjiyya* of that ḥadīth. This term can be described as authority of the evidence. The authority of ḥadīth tells idea that the ḥadīth is *ḥujja*. It means that ḥadīth 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 *ḥujjiyya* of the ḥadīth means that accepting such a binding to commit the ḥadīth. While, suspecting *ḥujjiyya* of the ḥadīth –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 ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth.¹⁷

Ḥujjiyya of ḥadīth can be determined by knowing quality of ḥadīth, while quality of ḥadīth can be concluded from ḥadīth research or critic. In conducting ḥadīth critic, ḥadīth scholars made criteria of authentic ḥadīth as a manual to select ḥadīth. Ḥadīth in its relation to *ḥujjiyya* is very close to its historicity when it appeared. Historicity of ḥadīth is recognizable from chain of transmission. Ḥadīth *mutawātir* that was spread widely by transmitters of ḥadīth trough many chains of transmission is commonly agreed as authentic ḥadīth by ḥadīth scholars. It is convinced that the transmitters of the ḥadīth are impossible to do tricks or manipulations toward the ḥadīth. Therefore, the authority of this kind of ḥadīth is absolutely undoubted (*qat'ī*)¹⁸, but the existence of ḥadīth

¹⁷ G.H.A. Juynboll, *op. cit.*, p. 14

¹⁸ M. Syuhudi Ismail, *Hadits Nabi menurut Pembela, Peningkar, dan Pemalsunya, op. cit.*, p. 107

mutawātir unfortunately just have little number, and almost all of them don't drag in legal affair.¹⁹

In the other hand, ḥadīth *aḥād* is kind of ḥadīth which is not able to reach level of *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.²⁰

According to Muslim scholars, all of ḥadīth *mutawātir* is *ṣaḥīḥ* or authentic, and also can be *ḥujja* or authoritative for all of Islamic studies majors. However, ḥadīth *ṣaḥīḥ* from category of *aḥād* can be *ḥujja* for all of Islamic studies majors, except '*aqīdah*' major. In '*aqīdah*' major, they are on debate in considering its *ḥujja*. For ḥadīth *ḥasan*, it is debatable among them in determining its *ḥujja*, but commonly for them still admitting its *ḥujja*. For ḥadīth *ḍa'īf*, Muslim scholars generally reject it to be *ḥujja*.²¹

C. Thought Development of Ḥadīth Authenticity

1. Thought Development of Ḥadīth Authenticity in Classical Islamic Scholarship

Dirāya ḥadīth studies during the post-codification has developed quite rapidly, along with the development of *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 *riwāya* studies and other studies as it was done by al-Shāfi'i in his book *al-Risāla*, then Muslim in his *Muqaddima* of his *ṣaḥīḥ*, and also al-Turmudhi in his book, *al-'Ilal*.

In further development, when each Islamic studies had separated each other and been independent from its major in fourth Islamic century, Ḥadīth

¹⁹ G.H.A. Juynboll, *op. cit.*, p. 15

²⁰ Umi Sumbullah, *op. cit.*, p. 43

²¹ M. Syuhudi Ismail, *Hadits Nabi menurut Pembela, Peningkar, dan Pemalsunya, op. cit.*, p. 88

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-Raḥmān ibn al-Ramahurmuzi (d. 360 H) through his book *Al-Muḥaddith al-Fāsil Baina al-Rāwi wa al-Wā‘i*, 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-Ṭahḥān, *Taisīr Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*, (Beirut: Dār al-Qur‘ān al-Karīm, 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-Muta’akhhirūn*. The ḥadīth scholars of *al-Mutaqaddimūn* are such as Shu‘ba, Yahyā ibn Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān, ibn Mahdi, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn al-Madīni, Ibn Ma‘īn, Ibn Rahawaih, al-Bukhāri, Abū Zur‘a, Abū Ḥātim, al-Nasā‘i, until the era of al-Dāruqūṭni, al-Khofili and al-Baihaqi.

While ḥadīth scholars of *al-Muta’akhhirūn* are they who lived after *al-Mutaqaddimūn* era, i.e. when *al-‘Ulūm* 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 ‘Iyāḍ, Ibn Taimiyya, Ibn Kathīr, ‘Abd al-Ghāni, al-Dhahabi, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, Ibn al-Ḥajīb, al-Nawāwi, Ibn ‘Abd al-Hādi, Ibn al-Qaṭṭān al-Fāsi, Ḍiya’ al-Dīn al-Maqdisi, Zaki al-Dīn al-Mundhīri, Sharaf al-Dīn al-Dimyāṭi, Taqi al-Dīn al-Subuki, Ibn Daqīq al-‘Id, al-Mizzi, and scholars who lived after them. See ‘Abd al-Azīz Ṣaghīr Dukhān, *‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth baina al-Mutaqaddimūn wa al-Muta’akhhirūn*, in *Nadwa ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth; ‘Ulūm wa Afāq*, vol. 10 (n.p.: *Jāmi‘a ‘Ujmān li al-‘Ulūm wa al-Tiknūlūjiyya*, 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-Shāfi‘i has suggested a more concrete explanation of the traditions that can be used as evidence. He stated that *al-akhbār al-khāṣṣa* (ḥadīths of *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 *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-Shāfi‘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, *Kaedah Kesahihan Sanad Hadis, op. cit.*, p. 121

²⁵ ‘Abd Rahman I. Doi, *Hadith* (Kuala Lumpur: A.S. NOORDEN, 1991), p. 16

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 *ḍabt* and ‘*adl*. 3) The ḥadīth is avoided from ‘*illa* and *shudhūdh* 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, *Taysīr Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth, op. cit.*, p. 43

²⁸ ‘Ajjāj al-Khātib, *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth, op. cit.*, p. 206

The scholars of *al-muta'akhhirīn* 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-Shāfi'i, al-Bukhārī and Muslim.

Ibn Ṣalāh (643/1245) in his book, '*Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*,²⁹ one of ḥadīth scholars of *al-Muta'akhhirūn* who has a lot of influence among his ḥadīth

²⁹ Famous as *Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāh*. This book is a maximum effort in completing earlier works which had existed, such as the works of al-Khātib 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), *nazm* (poetry), and *mu'raḍa* (comparison).

In the form of reviews (*sharḥ*), it emerges some very detailed books give reviews to the ibn al-Ṣalāh's book. For example, *Al-Taḥqīd wa al-Idāh Sharḥ Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāh* by al-'Irāqī (d. 608 H), *Al-Ifṣāh 'an Nuqāt Ibn al-Ṣalāh* by al-Asqalani (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-Maḥāsīn wa al-Iṣṭilāḥ fī Taḍmīn Kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāh* by al-Bulqini. 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-Nawāwī (d. 676 H), entitled *al-Taqrīb wa al-Taisīr li al-Sunan al-Bashīr wa Ma'rifat al-Nadhīr*. Surprisingly, this summary book of the previous books is then reviewed by al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 H) in his book entitled *Tadrīb al-Rāwī fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī*. Al-Suyūṭī also wrote the book *Al-Tadhnīb fī al-Zā'id 'alā al-Taqrīb* that he gives attachments of al-Nawāwī's book deficiency.

Summary of the work of Ibn al-Ṣalāh continued to be done by the scholars of ḥadīth. Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Jamā'a al-Kannānī (d. 733 H), for example, wrote the book *Al-Ulayya al-Rāwī fī al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī*, which is then reviewed by 'Izz al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr ibn al-Jamā'a with the title, *Manhaj al-Ṣāwī fī Sharḥ al-Ulayya al-Rāwī*. Abu al-Fidā' 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'īl ibn Kathīr (d. 774 H) are also wrote a summary of the work of Ibn al-Ṣalāh into a book entitled *al-Bā'ith al-Hathīth*. Similar efforts are also carried out by Alā' al-Dīn al-Mardini, Bahā' al-Dīn al-Andalusi, and some other scholars.

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

Then, al-'Irāqī also gives review to his *nazm* by himself. There are two reviews written by al-'Irāqī, compact review and long winded one. Its compact review entitled *Sharḥ Faṭḥ al-Mughīth bi Sharḥ Alfiyya al-Ḥadīth*, while long winded review is remain untitled. In addition, al-'Irāqī's *nazm* was also stimulated other scholars to provide review of al-'Irāqī's *nazm*. There are many ḥadīth scholars who wrote a comment on al-'Irāqī's *nazm*, as if unrelenting idea is not stopped by ḥadīth scholars. Among many reviews works, the work of al-Sakhawī given the same title with written by al-'Irāqī, *Faṭḥ al-Mughīth fī Sharḥ Alfiyya al-Ḥadīth*, is the most well-known work.

scholars' contemporaries and thereafter, has provided a definition or understanding of authentic ḥadīth is ḥadīth which continues its sanad (to the Prophet), narrated by *ḍabt* and ' *adl* transmitters until the end of sanad, there are no *shudhūdh* and ' *illa* -in ḥadīth-.³⁰

From this definition, it can be stated that an authentic ḥadīth is ḥadīth which: 1) its sanad continues up to the Prophet. 2) All of its transmitters must be *ḍabt* and ' *adl*. 3) Its avoided from *shādh* and ' *illa*.

Other ḥadīth scholars of *al-muta'akhkhirīn*, for example An-Nawāwi, Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalani, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭi, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qāsīmi and al-'Irāqī, has also proposed definition of authentic ḥadīth. Definition that they put forward, although the wording looks different but the principle is the same as it has been stated by Ibn al-Ṣalāh above. Ḥadīth scholars in later periods, such as Maḥmūd al-Ṭahḥān, Ṣubḥī Ṣāliḥ (1407/1986) and Muḥammad 'Ajjāj al-Khātib, also provide such understanding.³¹

Look at the popularity of *Alfiyya al-'Irāqī*, al-Suyūṭi, who known as al-Sakhawi's rival, wrote *nāẓm* of *Alfiyya* in ḥadīth which contains some important additional explanation of the material in *Alfiyya al-'Irāqī*. Al-Suyūṭi also provided review of his own *nāẓm* he made. However, this work which he entitled *Sharḥ Al-Baḥr al-Ladhi Zakhar fī Sharḥ Alfiyya al-Athar*, don't finished completely. Later today, the work was completed by the original Indonesian scholar, Sheikh Maḥfūd al-Tirmasi, Born in Tremas, near Ngawi, wrote a book entitled *Manhaj Dhawī al-Naḍār fī Sharḥ Manẓumāt 'Ilm al-Athar*.

³⁰ Redaction of Ibn al-Ṣalāh is:

أما الحديث الصحيح فهو الحديث المسند الذي يتصل إسناده بنقل العدل الضابط عن العدل الضابط إلى منتهاه ولا يكون شاذًا ولا معللاً

See Abū 'Amr Uthmān ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ṣalāh, ' *Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (al-Madīna: al-Maktabat al-'ilmiyya, 1979), p. 10

³¹ Redaction of al-Nawāwi:

وهو ما اتصل سنده بالعدول الضابطين من غير شذوذ ولا علة

See Sharaf al-Dīn al-Nawāwi, *al-Taqrīb wa al-Taisīr li Ma'rifat al-Sunan al-Bashīr al-Nadhīr fī Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth* (Kairo: 'Abd al-raḥmān Muḥammad, n.d.), p. 2

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

وخبر الآحاد بنقل عدل تام الضبط متصل السند غير معلل ولا شاذ هو الصحيح لذاته

See Aḥmad ibn 'Ali ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalani, *Nuzhat al-Naẓār fī Tauḍīḥ Nuḥbat al-Fikar* (Riyadh: Maṭba'a Safir, 1422H), p. 12

Redaction of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭi (d. 911/1505):

مُسْنَدٌ يَوْصِلُهُ بِنَقْلِ عَدْلٍ ضَابِطٍ عَنِ مِثْلِهِ * وَ لَمْ يَكُنْ شَذًّا وَلَا مُعَلَّلًا وَالْحُكْمُ بِالصَّحَّةِ وَالضَّعْفِ عَلَيَّ

See *alfiyya al-suyūṭi*, verses 15

Redaction of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qāsīmi (d. 1332/1914):

Although understanding of authentic ḥadīth that has been put forward by scholars is the same, but it does not mean there has been a consensus (*ijma*). Ibn Kathīr (774/1373), for example, argues that the authentic ḥadīth is not only ḥadīth which its sanad concatenate to the Prophet, but also continues to the level of companions or their pupil. Nevertheless, Ibn Kathīr admits that the opinion which was followed by scholars in general is opinion that has been expressed by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ and al-Nawāwi above.³² In addition, Muḥammad al-Juwaini (478/1085) stated that authentic ḥadīth must be narrated by -at least-two people at every level of its sanad.³³ Maḥmūd Abū Rayya cites an opinion stating that the authentic ḥadīth is a ḥadīth 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 *uṣūl fiqh* scholars doesn't require free from *shudhūdh* and *'illa* as a requirement for an authentic ḥadīth. Then, al-'Irāqi emphasized

الصحيح ما اتصل سنده بنقل العدل الضابط عن مثله وسلم عن شذوذ وعلة

See Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qāsimi, *Qawā'id al-Taḥdīth min Funūn al-Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth* (n.p.: 'Isā Bāb al-Ḥalabi wa Shirka, 1961), p. 79

Redaction of al-'Irāqi (d. 806/1401):

فَالأَوَّلُ الْمُتَّصِلُ الْإِسْنَادِ *** بِنَقْلِ عَدْلِ ضَابِطِ الْفُؤَادِ
عَنْ مِثْلِهِ مِنْ غَيْرِ مَا شُدُّوْذٍ *** وَعِلَّةٍ قَادِحَةٍ فَتُوْذِي

See *al-fiyya al-'Irāqi*, verses 12 and 13

³² Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Lāhim, *Sharḥ Ikhtisār 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* (n.p.: Mauqi' Jāmī' Sheikh al-Islām Ibn Taimiyya, n.d.), p. 16 with redaction:

قلت: فحاصل حد الصحيح أنه المتصل سنده بنقل العدل الضابط عن مثله حتى ينتهي إلى رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وسلم - أو إلى منتهاه من صحابي أو من دونه، ولا يكون شاذاً، ولا مردوداً، ولا معللاً بعلة قادحة، وقد يكون مشهوراً أو غريباً

³³ Al-Ḥāfidh Zain al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥīm ibn al-Ḥusain al-'Irāqi, *al-Taqyīd wa al-Idāḥ Sharḥ Muqaddima Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1970), p. 21 with redaction as below:

قال البيهقي في رسالته إلى أبي محمد الجويني رحمهما الله رأيت في الفصول التي أملاها الشيخ خرسه الله تعالى حكاية عن بعض أصحاب الحديث أنه يشترط في قبول الأخبار أن يروى عدلان عن عدلين حتى يتصل مثنى مثنى برسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ولم يذكره قائله إلى آخر كلامه وكان البيهقي رآه في كلام أبي محمد الجويني فنبهه على أنه لا يعرف عن أهل الحديث والله أعلم

authentic ḥadīth must be based on ḥadīth scholars and not by other expert scholars. Thus, al-‘Irāqī rejected scholars of *fiqh* and *uṣūl 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 *ḍabt* 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 ‘*adl*³⁶

³⁴ Al-Ḥāfidh Zain al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahīm ibn al-Ḥusain al-‘Irāqī, *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 *dabṭ*³⁷
4. Ḥadīth sanad was spared from *shudhūdh*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

forgeries. (4) Keeping his prestige; it means that transmitter must keep his good ethic and attitude in order to keep upholding moral virtue and traditions.

³⁷ *Dabṭ* is the vigilance of transmitter who can remember and understand ḥadīth . He always remembers ḥadīth . So, wherever he wants, he can deliver it. There are two kinds of *dabṭ*, they are: *dabṭ fi al-suṭūr* (*dabṭ* based on his script) and *dabṭ fi al-ṣudūr* (*dabṭ* based on his remember). *Dabṭ fi al-suṭūr*, transmitter must keep his script from distortion, changing, and reducing, while *dabṭ fi al-ṣudūr*, transmitter must know the ḥadīth in sentence and understand its meaning. See ‘Ajjāj al-Khātib, *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth*, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-201

³⁸ Ḥadīth scholars have different meaning about this terminology. There is three significant meaning of *shādh*, they are meanings according to al-Shāfi‘i, al-Ḥākim, and Abū Ya‘lā al-Khāfī. But other ḥadīth scholars commonly and popularly follow al-Shāfi‘i’s meaning.

According to al-Shāfi‘i, ḥadīth is *shādh* when the ḥadīth is only transmitted by transmitter whose *thiqa*, but the ḥadīth is opposed by other ḥadīth which is transmitted by transmitter whose *authaq* (more *thiqa*). Ḥadīth which is transmitted by only one trusted transmitter and not supported by other transmitters can’t be called as ḥadīth *shādh*. In other word, single transmitter (*fard muṭlaq*) will not affect to the reliability of ḥadīth as long as the ḥadīth is transmitted by trusted transmitter. See M. Syuhudi Ismail, *Kaedah Kesahihan Sanad Hadis*, *op. cit.*, p. 139

³⁹ Definition of ‘*illa* according to ‘*ulūm al-ḥadīth* terminology, as stated by al-Nawāwi and Ibn al-Ṣalāh, is a hidden reason which can injury ḥadīth quality. This kind of ḥadīth seems authentic in the first sight, but it in fact is found factors rejecting its authenticity after conducting deep research. ‘*Illa* is not like common definition of injuries, for example lying transmitter or transmitter is not *dabṭ* person, but it is like ḥadīth that is stated as ḥadīth *marfū‘*, but it in fact is ḥadīth *mauqūf*: in other case, a transmitter delivering ḥadīth from his teacher, but in fact he is not his teacher because the transmitter had never met him. See Syuhudi Ismail, *Kaedah Kesahihan Sanad Hadis*, *op. cit.*, p. 147

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-Bukhāri 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-Bukhāri 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.

⁴⁰ Fatma kizil, n.d., *The Views of Orientalists on the Ḥadīth Literature*, retrieved on September 11th, 2013 from http://www.academia.edu/1222341/THE_VIEWS_OF_ORIENTALISTS_ON_THE_HADITH_LITERATURE

Starting from Goldziher, According to Ali Masrur, Historical development of ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth.⁴¹

Then, the Dutch orientalist, C. Snouck Hurgronje (1857-1936), a contemporary of Goldziher, claims that the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīths and spread it as a means to get their aims. Likewise, they both claim that the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth literature.⁴²

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

⁴¹ Ali Masrur, n.d., *Perkembangan Historis Studi Hadis di Barat: dari Fase Revisionis Barat hingga Fase Neo-Skeptisisme*, retrieved on August 25th, 2013 from <http://sejarah.kompasiana.com/2012/07/26/the-historical-development-of-hadith-studies-in-the-western-scholarship-from-western-revisionist-to-renewed-scepticism-by-dr-ali-masrur-mag-a-lecturer-of-ulum-al-hadith-faculty-of-ushuluddin-474230.html>.

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 seem as if they are genuine and authentic of Islamic legal hadith.⁴³

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.⁴⁴

Other Western orientalist in the pre-1950 is Josef Horowitz (1874-1931), known by his study of *Sīra* literature. However, as Horowitz 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 Horowitz, 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, Horowitz 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 Horowitz 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 ḥadīth literature.⁴⁵

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 ḥadīth literature, focusing on independent and neutral ḥadīth scholars rather than an idea of competing groups fabricating prophetic traditions.

According to Fueck, those who see the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth literature, regarding it instead as a ‘mosaic’ composed of many foreign elements. Consequently, they accept the ḥadīths as fabricated until proven otherwise. For Fueck, however, despite the fact that ḥadīth scholars were not completely successful in eliminating fabricated ḥadīths, the ḥadīth literature contains many authentic traditions. For when the activities of collecting ḥadīth started fifty years after the death of the Prophet, only the younger Companions were still alive and the ḥadīth scholars narrated only from them.⁴⁶

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 life time 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

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4

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.⁴⁷ Explicit measurement of ḥadīth authenticity was defined by *al-Muta'akhhirūn* 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 *ḍabt*, there are no *shādh* 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.⁴⁸

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 *ṣahīḥ*. *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 ḥadīth is ḥadīth sanad critic. To be able to conduct sanad critic, there are some cases which must be fulfilled by researcher, they are:⁴⁹

1. Know criteria of ḥadīth sanad authenticity.
2. Set of research equipment must be available (for example is transmitters' biographical data).
3. Understand *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* as an analytical tool.

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

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 *taḥammul wa adā' al-ḥadīth*⁵⁰. To know there is

the content of Quran, 3) it is not opposite to ḥadīth *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 ḥadīth *aḥād* which has more authentic quality than the ḥadīth in research. According to him, it's very hard to conduct sanad critics, because 1) availability of *al-riwāya 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 ḥadīth guidance is often hard to be found, 4) there are ḥadīths which contain supra-rational understanding, 5) it is very rare of books especially giving sample of matn critics. So, accordingly, there are some requirements for the researcher to be fulfilled in conducting matn critics, 1) he must be ḥadīth expert, 2) have large and deep knowledge on Islamic teaching, 3) have done enough *muṭāla'āt* 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 'ulūm al-ḥadīth, there are eight kinds of ḥadīth transmission: (1) *Samā'*, it is that pupil attends lecture of his ḥadīth 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 *samī'tu*, *haddathani*, *akhbaranā*, or *anba'anā*. (2) *Qirā'a*, it is that pupil reads some ḥadīth that he collects in front of his ḥadīth teacher. Terminology often used is *akhbaranā* or *qara'tu 'alā*. (3) *Ijāza*, it is that someone has permission from transmitter to deliver or transmit some ḥadīth which are collected by that transmitter. The terminology uses *akhbaranī* or *ajāzani*. (4) *Munāwala*, it is that getting collection of ḥadīth belonging to a transmitter who has already given his permission to deliver or transmit ḥadīth from that collection. Terminology used is *akhbaranī*. (5) *Mukātaba*, it is that getting ḥadīth in written from transmitter, either direct or correspondently. (6) *I'lām al-rāwī*, ḥadīth teacher statement of some ḥadīth or ḥadīth book without talking about permission to transmit toward his pupil. Terminology used is

contemporaneity and relation of transmitters and his informant, ‘*adl* and ‘*dabt*’ of transmitters, and detecting *tadlīs* activity, it can be consulted to Transmitters’ biographical books (*kutub al-rijāl*).⁵¹ Syuhudi Ismail states that *rijāl* books which inform biographies, credibility, and others relating to ḥadīth transmitters are very important in sanad ḥadīth research.⁵²

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) *Waṣiyya*, it is that acquiring ḥadīth collection from transmitter by his own will before his dying. Terminology used is *akhbaranī waṣiyyatan* ‘*an* or *waṣṣānī*. (8) *Wijāda*, someone who finds ḥadīth from the collection book or script, then he non-authoritatively transmits it. Terminology used is *wajadtu*, *qāla*, *ukhbirtu*, or *huddithtu*. See ‘Ajjāj al-Khāṭib, *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 ḥadīths disturb and affect to the living traditions which are spread among people. So, it makes conflict between ḥadīth scholars and Judgeman (*qāḍī*), but ḥadīth scholars finally become holder of ḥadīth control and succeed in defeating the ancient school of law.

Therefore, between judgeman (*qāḍī*) and school of ancient law forge ḥadīth. Sanad is something arbitrarily attached into ḥadīth. Sanad firstly is very simple, and then very simple sanad is improved in order to be perfect in classical ḥadīth collection in the second half of second century. Sanad improvement step by step is directly proportional with development of ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth doesn't exist in certain early era is through a way that the ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth in order to prove existence of ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth is GHA juynboll and Norman Calder. Both of them affirm this concept in deciding when a ḥadīth, especially legal ḥadīth, exists. According to them, it is because that ḥadīth collector habits usually

⁵³ Ali Masrur, *Teori Common Link, op. cit.*, pp. 38-39

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-existent 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-existent 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.⁵⁵

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 (*tābi'ūn*) or successor's successor (*tābi' al-tābi'in*) 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.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Kamaruddin Amin, *Menguji Kembali Keakuratan Metode Kritik Hadis, op. cit.*, p. 160.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 60