

## CHAPTER III

### HARALD MOTZKI'S BIOGRAPHY AND METHOD

#### A. Biography of Harald Motzki

He was born 1948 in Berlin, Germany. His father, Guenther, was a merchant and his mother, Brunhilde, was a businesswoman. He married with Brigitte. She was a schoolmistress. He was grown up as catholic. He was graduated from Humanistic Academic High school, classical branch with the languages Latin, classical. Then, he continued his study at Study of Comparative Religions, Semitic Languages, Biblical Studies, Islamic Studies and European History in Bonn (Germany), Paris (France) and Cologne (Germany) from 1968-1978. Therefore, in his basic academic, he concerned around studies of classical area.

He got his M.A. degree in 1974 at Bonn University with the major of Comparative Religions. Then, he got his PhD in 1978 at Bonn University concerning in Islamic Studies with the thesis *Dimma und Égalité – Die nichtmuslimischen Minderheiten Ägyptens in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts und die Expedition Bonapartes (1798-1801)*, Bonn/Wiesbaden 1979, 562 pp. under his Supervisor, Prof. Dr. Albrecht Noth, Greek and French, at Saarbruecken (Germany) in 1959-1968.

Then, He come in Research fellow at the Institute for Historical Anthropology (Freiburg/i. Br.) 1979-1983; Research on the topics “*Children, Youth and Family in Islam*”. Then, he becomes Assistant professor at the Institute of History and Culture of the Middle East (University of Hamburg/Germany). In 1989, he finished his Postdoctoral qualification with the habilitation dissertation *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz. Ihre Entwicklung in Mekka bis zur Mitte des 2./8. Jahrhunderts*, published Stuttgart 1991 (english translation: *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence. Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools*, Leiden/Boston 2002).

He also gets award because of his works. In 1980, he awarded with Heinz-Maier-Leibnitz-reward of the German Federal Minister of Education and Science for his dissertation *Dhimma and Equality. The Non-Muslim Minorities of Egypt during the 2nd Half of the 18th Century and the Expedition of Bonaparte* (1798-1801) (written in German); In 2012: he become 'One of the Winners of the 19th World Prize for the Book of the Year of the Islamic Republic of Iran' for his book *Analysing Muslim Traditions. Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīths*.

He continued his academic career becoming Professor for Islamic Studies at the University of Hamburg 1989-1991. Then, he is Professor for Islamic Studies at the University of Nijmegen/The Netherlands 1991-2011. His research areas are in Religion, law and social structure of Islam, especially in the early and classical periods (until the 18<sup>th</sup> century). He effused his concern only on academic field. He has no involvement in non-academic organizations at all.

The most important teacher in the field of Islamic studies has been his thesis advisor Albrecht Noth, author of *The Early Historical Tradition. A Source-Critical Study*, 1994 (apart of many other publications, most of the written in German). He retired in 2011 for reasons of health.<sup>1</sup>

The role of Harald Motzki in ḥadīth studies was really considered among Western Scholars. According to Kamarudin Amin<sup>2</sup>, discourses of Islamic studies

---

<sup>1</sup> This biography data is based on the information from Harald Motzki's email, h.motzki@ru.nl, on 11/3/2013 and 16/3/2013

<sup>2</sup> Prof. Dr. Phil. H. Kamaruddin Amin, M.A, a professor in the field of ḥadīth studies in Adab and Humanities faculty, Islamic State University of Alauddin, Makassar. He was born in Bontang, January 5<sup>th</sup>, 1969. He is Indonesian scholar who concerns on Western ḥadīth studies. His academic background (Master graduate from Rijks Universitet te Leiden, Netherland, and postdoctoral graduate from Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms Universitaet Bonn, Germany) shows that he is very familiar to the atmosphere of Western ḥadīth studies proven by his PhD dissertation, *The Reliability of Hadith Transmission. A Rcxamination of Hadith Critical Methods*, Bonn 2005 (March). See Kamaruddin amin, *Western Methods of Dating vis-a-vis Ulumul Hadis*, it was presented by Kamaruddin Amin in honor of his acceptance professor title at the graduation ceremony and Inauguration Period of December 2010, Islamic State University of Alauddin, Makassar. It was retrieved on September 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013 from <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&ret=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&cad=rja&ved=0CFQQFjAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fkamaruddinamin.uin->

in the West always refer to both of Goldziher and Schacht, and also refer to GHA Juynboll and Harald Motzki who is still alive. From the view of the influences, Western scholars regard the two names mentioned firstly (Goldziher and Schacht) as Ibn Ṣalāh (great expert of ḥadīth study) or Ibn Ḥajar in Muslim. GHA Juynboll and Harald Motzki are regarded as Muḥammad Shākīr, Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albani, al-Saqqāf, or al-Ghumārī in Muslim.<sup>3</sup>

## B. Works of Harald Motzki

### Article

- *Methods of Dating Early Legal Traditions. Introduction* (2012) In: Islamic Law and Society, 19, 1 – 10
- *Motzki's Reliable Transmitter. A Short Answer to P. Gledhill* (2012) In: Islamic Law and Society, 19, 194 – 199
- *The Traditions About the Murder of Ibn Abī l-Huqayq* (2012) In: Görke, A.; Motzki, H.; Schoeler, G. (ed.), *First Century Sources for the Life of Muhammad? A Debate.*, 42 – 57.
- *Ewig wahre Quellen? Wie glaubwürdig sind die Hadithe? Die klassische islamische Hadith-Kritik im Licht moderner Wissenschaften* (2010) In: Schneiders, T.G. (ed.), *Islamverherrlichung. Wenn die Kritik zum Tabu wird*, 57 - 72
- *Le Coran - 'Des théories alternatives'* (2010) In: Philosophie Magazine. Hors-Série, 6, 91 - 92. ISSN 2104-9246.
- *Aandacht voor kinderen in het klassiek islamitisch recht* (2010) In: *Kruining, P.* (ed.), *Teksten van het op 18 september 2009 te Leiden gehouden 27e RIMO-symposium*, 11 - 18
- *Zij moeten hun omslagdoeken over hun décolletés slaan...* (Koran 24:31) (2009) In: *ZemZem*, 5, 65 - 72. ISSN 1574-6577.

---

alauddin.ac.id%2Ffiles%2Fpidato.docx&ci=2CwqUvjjC-jZigftpICgAQ&usg=AFQjCNFJKHKy0JD5fderwNFqCsA7oONoJw&sig2=ayseCKMMhrbh3H0bQq62IA&bvm=bv.51773540,d.aGc

<sup>3</sup> Kamarudin Amin, *Problematika Ulumul Hadis, loc. cit.*

- *Jam' wa tadwīn-i Qur'ān: Bāznigari dar dīdgāh hāye gharbī dar partowe tahawwolāti jadīde rawish shinākhī,*” transl. by Murtazā Karīmīniyā (2007) In: Āsimān, Seven Heaven : A Journal of the Center for Religious Studies, 32, 155 - 196. ISSN 9640-1107.
- *Tānīkh gadhānī tafsīr mawsūm bihi Ibn ‘Abbās : čand nuktaḥ-ī takmīlī*”, transl. by Murtazā Karīmīniyā (2007) In: ‘Ulūm-i Hadīth, 11, 31 - 48. ISSN 1561-0098.
- *Hadīth pażūhī dar gharb. Muqaddimahā-ye dar bāb khāstgāh wa tatawwur-e hadīth* (transl. by Murtaza Kariminiya) (2006) In: ‘Ulūm-i Hadīth, 10, 3 - 31. ISSN 1561-0098.
- *Dating the so-called Tafsīr Ibn ‘Abbās: Some Additional Remarks* (2006) In: Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 147 - 163. ISSN 0334-4118.
- *Musannaf-i ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-San‘ānī: manbaī barāye ahādīth-i mu‘tabar qarn nakhust-i hijrī,*” transl. by Shāḍī Nafīsī, ed. by Murtazā Karīmīniyā (2006) In: ‘Ulūm-i Hadīth, 11, 95 - 122. ISSN 1561-0098.
- *Dating Muslim Traditions. A Survey* (2005) In: Arabica, 52, 204 - 253. ISSN 0570-5398.
- *Mag een Duitse moslima met hoofddoek les geven op een openbare school? (2005) In: Recht van de Islam, 22, 31 - 39. ISSN 0920-2188.*
- *Das Kopftuch - ein Symbol wofür?* (2004) In: Religion, Staat, Gesellschaft, 5, 175 - 201. ISSN 1438-955x.

#### Book

- *Leven met andersdenkenden: lessen uit de vroege geschiedenis van jodendom, christendom en islam* (2011)
- *Bidāyāt al-fiqh al-islāmī wa-taṭawwuruḥu fī Makka ḥattā muntaṣif al-qarn al-hijrī al-thānī/al-mīlādī al-thāmin,* transl. by Khayr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Hādī & Jurj Tāmir (2010) In: Maktabat Niẓām Ya‘qūbī al-khāssat al-Baḥrayn. Dirāsāt wa-buḥūth

- *Analysing Muslim Traditions. Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (2010) Authors: Motzki, H.; Boekhoff-van der Voort, N.; Anthony, S.W.
- *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics: Presented to Kees Versteegh on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (2007) Authors: Ditters, W.E.; Motzki, H. In: *Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics*; 49
- *Batıda hadis çalışmalarının tarihi seyri* (History of Ḥadīth Research in the West), ed. Bülent Uçar (2006).
- *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz. Ihre Entwicklung in Mekka bis zur Mitte des 2./8. Jahrhunderts*, 1991 (english translation: *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence. Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools*, Leiden/Boston 2002)

#### Report

- *Gutachten für ein Habilitationsverfahren der Universität Basel*, 4-9-2009 (2009)
- *Evaluation of the scholarly work of a colleague for the University of Arizona*, 1-9-2009 (2009)
- *Historisch-kritisch onderzoek van de Sīra van de profeet Muhammad: Wat levert het op?* (2009)
- *Aandacht voor kinderen in het klassiek islamitisch recht* (2009)
- *Beelden van de islam in het christendom* (2007)
- *De Tafsīr Ibn ‘Abbās – wie is de auteur?* (2007)
- *De koran als leidraad* (2007)
- *De koran als rechtsbron* (2007)
- *De opkomst van de islam en de relaties van de moslims met jodendom en christendom* (2007)
- *Openingstoespraak bij de internationale conferentie ‘Salafism as a Transnational Movement’* (2007)
- *Zwischen Liebe und Hass – Die Beziehungen der Muslime zu Juden und*

*Christen* (2007)

- *Op zoek naar de wortels van de koranexegeese* (2006)
- *Warum tragen muslimische Frauen Kopftücher?* (2005)
- *Moderne denkbeelden over jihad* (2005)
- *Probleme der Datierung islamischer Überlieferungen* (2005)
- *De hoofddoek - een symbool waarvoor?* (2004)
- *Was bedeutet das Kopftuch muslimischer Frauen?* (2004)
- *De hoofddoeken van moslimse Frauen: oorsprong en originele betekenis* (2004)
- *The jurisprudence of Ibn Sihab az-Zuhri : a source-critical study* (2001)<sup>4</sup>

### C. Dating Ḥadīth Method

Harald Motzki has reviewed the existing methods of dating ḥadīth used in research related to ḥadīth. He has been classified into four groups: 1) a date method using matan, 2) a date by which the ḥadīth emerged in the collection, 3) dating on the basis of sanad, and 4) the method using matn and sanad. In each group, the approach is not always the same and can be further classified. In addition, it must be said that scholars often use a combination of different methods. For each method, he present one or more representatives experts and discuss their approach. It is startpoint of Motzki's Method on establishing his method, he seems influenced with their thought.<sup>5</sup>

#### 1. Dating on the Basis of the Matn

##### a. First Steps in Dating Ignaz Goldziher

According to Motzki, one of the most famous figure using the dating in Matn basis is Ignaz Goldziher in his article "*Ueber die Entwicklung des Hadīth*", published in 1890 in the second volume of *Muhammedanische Studien*. In this article, Goldziher mentions that there is something called

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.narcis.nl/person/RecordID/PRS1238422/Language/en>, retrieved on September 9, 2013.

<sup>5</sup> Harald Motzki, *Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey*, in *Journal Arabica*, tome LII, p. 204-253, (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2005), p. 206

sanad but he did not specify it much further. His remarks on the origins of ḥadīth are only based on their matns and other criteria. Two types of dating can be distinguished in the article of Goldziher: *first*, general dating, i.e., dating from the ḥadīth as a whole, *second*, dating from certain ḥadīth or ḥadīth.<sup>6</sup>

Apart from the general dating, Goldziher sometimes tries to pin down the origin of certain ḥadīths or some of its elements. In this case, accordingly, Goldziher doesn't explicitly state which criteria he uses to date on the basis of the occurrence of Ḥadīth in collection distinguished between earlier and later ḥadīths. Some of his examples reveal his methodological principles. In fact, it is as followed:

- 1) Anachronisms suggest that the text came from a time later than recognized.
- 2) Ḥadīths whose contents clearly show a secondary stage in the development of problems are younger than the less developed content.
- 3) When the Prophet or the early Muslim appears in a ḥadīth in unfavorable light, this ḥadīth can be accepted as authentic and early ḥadīth.
- 4) Reproaches among opponents against each other has probably kernel history.

In short, Motzki states that Goldziher's dating method on the basis of their matans is very simple. The conclusion about the origin of the ḥadīth seems often come from intuition and appear quite arbitrary. Therefore, the validity of the ḥadīth by general dating to a certain ḥadīth seems as limited as that of a rule of thumb it employs.

#### b. Joseph Schacht's Dating with the Matn

As in the case of Goldziher, Motzki also distinguishes Schacht's

---

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 210

methods between his dating ḥadīths method in general and in individual ḥadīths. But unlike Goldziher, Schacht's general dating is not only based on matns but the result of a combination of different methodological approaches: 1) a hypothetical reconstruction of the development of legal theory during the second Islamic century, based on study of al-Shāfi'i's (d. 204 AH/820 M) theoretical treatise, 2) dating ḥadīth method based on the collection in which they first appeared, 3) a comparison ḥadīth matns respectively, and 4) a comparison of their sanad.<sup>7</sup>

This sequence shows that the method of Schacht dating on the basis of matn is only after other methods have been used. Even so, one must uncover Schacht's work place when he was dating by using matn. This is even more urgent because of the method is adopted by many scholars after him. The most important of them are: 1) the ḥadīth should firstly be dated to put it (the problem and solution) into the development of the law as it has been reconstructed. 2) Ḥadīths which have legal maxims short form are earlier than narratives. 3) Anonymous maxims are earlier than that ascribed to a particular authority. 4) A brief statement is earlier than detailed one. 5) The texts containing implicit problems are earlier than those explicitly explained.

The first rule indicates that Schacht's dating based on the contents of a ḥadīth is depended on assumptions regarding the general development of Islamic legal thought and views about certain legal issues in question. This assumption comes from the study of matter using a different methodological approach to the analysis of matns. Arguing in this way gives the appearance of circular reasoning.

Furthermore, the other four methodological rules are secondary generalization. They are the results of studies in which legal ḥadīths elsewhere and methodological approaches play a major role. To give an

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211



example: The second premise makes no sense as it is, because the legal principles can be formulated on the basis of reports of legal cases and their solutions and thus become secondary. This premise depends on the elsewhere Schacht and cannot claim independent and universal validity. It can only be used as a work hypothesis to be able to prove false on the basis of the legal ḥadīth that Schacht has not been studied and/or when some other places proved false.<sup>8</sup>

c. Form Analysis and Dating: Marston Speight

Motzki points speight's article, "*The Will of Sa'd b. A. Waqqas: Growth of a Tradition*" as representative example of his method. He tried to reconstruct the chronological development of ḥadīth of the Prophet by comparing its matns variant. Speight research is from the assumption that all textual variants are part of the oral ḥadīth before they are codified in a written compilation. His method consists of the following steps: First, he constructs a corpus of nineteen ḥadīths which he regards them as variants associated with their content. Second, he set the text according to their complexity. Third, he analyzed each text in relation to: the level of development, the internal cohesion of its elements, an indication of the style and vocabulary as this may suggest an earlier or later stages of development of the text. And final, Speight classifies texts from the point of view of related content. On the basis of all these measures, it will establish the chronology of nineteen ḥadīths.<sup>9</sup>

On Motzki's attention, Criticism of the dating method used by Goldziher, Schacht and Speight on the basis of matns should not lead to the conclusion that matns are worthless for dating purposes. Criticisms conducted here are only shows that the premises and methods used by scholars is not safe. In this case, Speight approach is a step in the right

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 212

direction. According to Motzki's experience, it is rarely possible to find enough indication to date matns of ḥadīth alone. All the same, the analysis can and, sometimes, has to contribute to the ḥadīth dating. But it can be best when used in combination with other methods of dating.<sup>10</sup>

## 2. Dating on the Basis of the Occurrence of Ḥadīths in Collections

Once again, in Motzki's view, Joseph Schacht was the first using this method of dating in a systematic way. Schacht explains that the best way to prove that the ḥadīth was not there at any given time is to show that it is not used as a legal argument in a discussion that will make reference to the importance, if it has existed.

His second method is known as *e silentio* argument that, according to Motzki, has two weakness points, theoretical and practical. On the theoretical side, the fact that the ḥadīth is not used by such a scholar may have several reasons; the non-existence is only one of them. The simplest explanation may be that this person is not yet know the ḥadīth. Of course, this is not the same as having no ḥadīth at all. People may also have a reason which prevents him from citing the ḥadīth. On the practical side, the weak point in the Schacht's reasoning is that -in many cases- it is unknown whether or not reflects the actual source of legal disputes. Whether collections of legal ḥadīths are compiled as complete arsenals of legal ammunition to be used in disputes or whether they contain a personal choice of the compiler is not a matter which one can be known with complete certainty.<sup>11</sup>

Motzki also mentions G.H.A. Juynboll who have used the same method in his article, "*The man kadhaba Tradition and the Prohibition of Lamenting the Death*", which was published in his book, *Muslim tradition*. In the care of the *man kadhaba* ḥadīth, Juynboll applied the method to a ḥadīth that is not clearly legal in character. His dating of it will be discussed in the following

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 214

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 215

section. Juynboll check first “in what the early collections are available in the print edition” The ḥadīth in question” is not found and those in which it is found”. He proceeds in two steps. First, he investigates a collection compiled in Hijaz, Egypt, then Iraq. In short, He investigates *Muwaṭṭa’* of Mālik and *Jāmi’* of Ibn Wahb which are considered as older one. Unfortunately, He doesn’t find the ḥadīth in both of books, but he find the ḥadīth in al-Shāfi’i’s works and al-Ḥumaidi’s *Musnad* which are later one. He thinks those transmitters mentioned in the sanad of ḥadīth who died in the 180s and 190s are responsible for it. The sanad by which they trace back to the prophet are correspondingly fabricated.<sup>12</sup>

### 3. Dating on the Basis of the Sanad

#### a. Sanad Analysis of a Single Ḥadīth

##### 1) Schacht on Sanad Analysis

He was neither the first nor the only one to recognize the potential of sanad for dating purposes. He should be credited with popularizing methods. He explained in a chapter of his book, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, titled “*the Evidence of Isnād*”. Schacht proposes five rules that will be applied when someone tried to set a date by sanad ḥadīths: 1) the most perfect and complete sanad is the latest. 2) If there are sanads of a ḥadīth which stops at the later transmission, for example, at the level of the Successors, besides sanads which reach back to the higher authority, the last sanad is secondary. This is the result of what he called “backward growth of isnād”. 3) Sanad variants that appear in the source attached with “additional authorities or transmitters” is fabrications. Schacht calls it “*spread of isnād*”. 4) “The presence of significant common link in all or most of the Sanads of a particular ḥadīth would be a strong indication that it has come in the time of its common link. 5) Sanad variants

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 216

which bypass the common link are later.<sup>13</sup>

Then, Motzki criticizes Schacht theory that the sanads ḥadīth contained in the source are generally more complete than no doubt true. This fact is also known by Muslim ḥadīth scholars. They also know that sometimes defective sanads is improved. But all this should lead to the conclusion that all or most of the early ḥadīth must have defective sanads or should it encourage believing that the beginning of the ḥadīth with non-disconnected sanad cannot exist.

## 2) Juynboll's Method of Sanad Analysis

Motzki points on Juynboll's article "*Some Isnād-Analytical Methods Illustrated on the Basis of Several Women-Demeaning Sayings from Ḥadīth Literature*", published six years later, that considers more value to the common link for dating purposes. Clearly, in the time between the books and articles that have gained extensive experience with this method.<sup>14</sup>

Schacht and Juynboll agree with the interpretation of common links and part of the back of common link sanad to the previous authorities. Common link, according to Juynboll, is the originator of the ḥadīth, or put it otherwise, the ḥadīth "is his own, or (if someone else) he was the first to put it in so many words". As Juynboll said that single strand from a common link to the Prophet was transmission invented by the common link". He further stated that the (real) common link appears only on the level of the Successors and beyond. Juynboll seems to consider this report as a methodological rule, not as a statement of historical facts.

This is clear of his view that the contents of the ḥadīths may be

---

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 220

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 244

older than the date arrived on the basis of a common link. Since this cannot be proven that, according to him, it is not possible to go back in the dating before the common link. However, Juynboll obscures his methodological interpretation of the common link by statements which follow Schacht. For example, he claimed that the common link must be regarded as the originator of the ḥadīth. So far, there is little difference between Juynboll and Schacht.<sup>15</sup>

b. Source Reconstruction on the Basis of Sanads

According to Fuat Sezgin, this method works as follows: First, all the sanads given in the compilation, such as *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, arranged according to their youngest transmitter (the informant of al-Bukhārī). Second, the sanads of those among the youngest transmitter who are often mentioned by the compiler (al-Bukhārī) should be examined further for whether the transmission lines, they have the names in common. If they do not, they should think of themselves as authors who have used the compiler source. If they do, their last common name of their sanads which contains the same transmitter, must be considered the author of the previous source (while other common names indicate the transmitter only).<sup>16</sup>

Harald Motzki also uses this method in his work, *Die Anfänge der Islamischen jurisprudence*. In this book, he investigate the sanads found in ‘Abd al-Razzāq Muṣannaf to recover earlier sources which are frequently goes back to the main transmitters, Ma‘mar ibn Rashīd, Ibn Juraij, Sufyān al-Thauri, and Ibn ‘Uyaina. The conclusion is that ‘Abd al-Razzāq receives the texts in the lectures of the four scholars through the aid of biographical ḥadīths. This investigation wants to prove that ‘Abd al-Razzāq doesn’t ascribe his ḥadīths arbitrarily to his informants by trying to

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 224

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 225

find the indications of forgery or the opposite in his transmissions.<sup>17</sup>

#### 4. Dating with Sanad and Matn

The sanad investigation needs to be completed by matns analysis applied not only to the reconstruction of the source, but also applied to dating a single ḥadīth. This understanding has been seen in an article by Jan Hendrik Kramer, published in 1953, and Joseph van Ess' book, *Zwischen Hadīt und Theologie*, published in 1975. Methods of the two studies do not appreciate it very much so far. Kramer article and the effect of van Ess' contribution is cut short by Cook method critics. The recent revival of this method seems to have both the insight that a combined approach could lead to more reliable results than the sanad or matns investigation alone, and to an uneasiness with the actual development of sanad analysis which tended to become a too artificial interpretation of sanad bundles.

The combination method can be called *isnād cum matan* analysis. Among several possible approaches, it starts from the assumption that there must be a correlation between sanad variants and matn variants of the ḥadīth. If they are really part of the process of transmission, it will lead to such clues of evidence. The scholars who support this assumption believe that such a correlation cannot be the result of systematic forgery because the correlation phenomenon is so widespread that almost every transmitter should participate in fraud. The fact that there is often a correlation between the various strands of the bundle branches and sanad ḥadīth, on the one hand, and on the other hand, various variants of the matns allows checking sanad analysis by matns or otherwise.<sup>18</sup>

In this way, reliability of the date established on the basis of sanad analysis and the relative chronology established on the basis of the matn analysis can be confirmed each other. The soundness of the conclusions grows

---

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 248

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 251

with the number and diversity variants available. Through this method, the risk of uncertainty will be considerably reduced that a common link which is the result of sanad forgery remains undetected.<sup>19</sup>

#### D. Basic Aim of Harald Motzki's Dating

According to Harald Motzki, the aim of historical events reconstruction in Western ḥadīth studies including him is to find criteria that would allow safe assessment at their historical value. Meanwhile, the reconstruction of the original sources or original words is impossible.<sup>20</sup> If the reconstruction projects that dealt with textual ḥadīth are only transmitted by the script, there will be no wrong in the reconstruction of the original source. In such cases, the reconstruction method has proved valuable. However, the question remains whether it could lead to the same conclusion which is clear in the context of special transfer methods used in the early of second A.H. or eighth century C.E. that incorporates both written and oral transmission in a like seminar setting. In the ḥadīth case transferred entirely from manuscript must compete with one another by copying errors, regardless of arbitrary interference with the text in an attempt to fix it.

Motzki also realize that the transmission is for the most part written and oral, the errors and repairs are possible cases. But the form of Islamic transmission practiced in the second/eighth century left the presence of the right characteristics for the transmitter in some *mutūn* open to many different interpretations. For example, the transmitter may not have passed on the words of the text received from their sources *verbatim*. This may be because they do not write it down immediately or because they have to quote from memory. They may feel justified in using synonyms or expand the text. Finally, they may have reduced the text to a single issue to answer certain questions. All of this could

---

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 252

<sup>20</sup> Harald Motzki, *Whither Hadith Studies* (it is English version of his article published in *Der Islam* 73 (1996) under the title “*Quo Vadis Hadith Forschung?*”), in Harald Motzki *et.al*, *Analysing Muslim Traditions; Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghazi Hadith* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), p. 48

explain the variation among some text bundles.<sup>21</sup>

The knowledge about the education system of the period could lead to suspect, on the other hand, that the teacher reported the text at different times in different words. This can be happened because the teacher thought that the words of the text are less important than its content. Another possible explanation would be the possibility that he memorized everything and teach only from the (sometimes failing) memory, or that he does not have to hand-written notes or do not want to use them at that time. Thus, the ḥadīth text reconstruction is only to specifies that to whom the text is really go back, even it is not the original ḥadīth text that may never exist.<sup>22</sup>

For the early history of Islam, ḥadīth is certainly a very important source, if only for the reason that there are not many other sources available. Source criticism is a prerequisite of a historical reconstruction, one methodological achievements of modern historical study. Source criticism sets out to evaluate the resources available by checking the authenticity, originality and accuracy of the source information. Two examples can illustrate the importance of source criticism. Consider a document which, although it intend to be a title Genoa of the ninth century C.E., can be proven that it has been compiled in Rome in the eleventh century from the same era. Therefore, it is fabrication. Therefore, the reliability of information on Genoa from the ninth century is uncertain. However, this document can be used as the source for the purpose and practice of falsifying documents in Rome in the eleventh century. It also can be considered as the documents transmitted by writing for long periods of time. Obviously, it can undergo any number of changes. That is, this part can be removed, added or distorted, intentionally or not. Such changes must be taken into account and documented (if possible) if we want to extract the original intent of the document. It is the task of source criticism.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p.119

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 120



One of the goals of source criticism is dating the documents. When trying to determine the level of reliability of sources, historians usually ask the question how far the source of events that tell us in space and time is, what the date and place of sources origin that assign itself is really correct. Therefore, dating source is the first step in determining what historical use can be made of it. The method can be used to date the source depends on the character of the source in question. Consequently, methods of dating are many and varied. In fact, the history of each discipline develops its own methods. Experts working in the field of early Islam also develop a method adapted from their disciplines. Now whether the different methods they use in dating reliable ḥadīth is a matter of dispute. But it is a dispute in which the participants are few, given that the number of scholars engages in the critical study of dating methods is small. All the same, it is a dispute about the first importance for any scholar working in the field of early Islam.<sup>23</sup>

It is quite different for the aim of Muslim ḥadīth criticism. For centuries, Muslim scholars have devoted themselves to the study of ḥadīth due to various reasons. Legal theorists, for example, look in the ḥadīth text as sources of law. Others tried to find moral and religious inspiration in them. Others saw in the ḥadīth important source for the early Islamic history.

However, interest of scholars in the West has been less varied. Their interest in Islamic ḥadīth is almost exclusively historical. They seek the knowledge of ḥadīth, basically to find out what really happened in the past. This is true not only in terms of ḥadīth claimed recapitulation of historical events, but also to the ḥadīths touching legal, interpretation (exegetic) and theological matters. In short, the purpose of the western scholars concentrated on the ḥadīth as a source of the reconstruction of the history of Islam: the historical events, the historical jurisprudence, the ideas and religious institutions, and the

---

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 205

interpretation of the al-Qur'ān.<sup>24</sup>

### E. *Isnād cum Matn* Analysis

One of the methods suggesting by Harald Motzki in conducting ḥadīth dating research is the method of *isnād cum matn* analysis. By conducting this method to a single ḥadīth encountered in different sources, he attempts to identify the disseminator or originator of the ḥadīth in question. The *isnād cum matn* analysis is focused on transmissions that are interconnected.<sup>25</sup> The transmission history of a single ḥadīth or of a complex of related ḥadīths will be allowed to be reconstructed. This also allows for the common links to be surpassed and by conducting so to fill in a part of the gap in the transmission about original Islam.<sup>26</sup>

#### 1. Terms of Chain Analysis

##### a. Common link (CL)

The single person found at the end of that sanad network.<sup>27</sup>

##### b. Partial common links (PCLs)

Transmitters who are referred to as direct source.<sup>28</sup> Juynboll required there must be at least three transmitters, while Motzki is enough at least two transmitters.

---

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 204

<sup>25</sup> Harald Motzki, *Theme Issue: Methods of Dating Early Legal Traditions; Introduction*, in *Journal Islamic Law and Society*, Vol. 19, 2012, p. 1-10 (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2012), p. 4

<sup>26</sup> Harald Motzki, *al-Radd 'ala al-Radd; Concerning the Method of Hadith Analysis* (it English version published in *Der Islam* 78, 2001 under the title “*Ar-Radd 'ala ar-Radd; - Zur Methodik der Hadit-Analyse*”), in Harald Motzki *et.al*, *Analysing Muslim Traditions; Studies in Legal, Exegetical, and Maghazi Hadith* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), p. 213

<sup>27</sup> Harald Motzki, *Review of G.H.A. Juynboll. Encyclopedia of Canonical Hadith*, in *Journal Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 36 (2009), p. 539-349 (the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Faculty of Humanities, Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 2009), p. 541

<sup>28</sup> Harald Motzki, *The Prophet and the Debtors, a Hadith Analysis under Scrutiny* (it is English version of his article published in *Der Islam* 77 (2000) entitled “*Der Prophet und die Schuldner; eine Hadith-Untersuchung auf dem Prüfstand*”) in Harald Motzki *et.al*, *Analysing Muslim Traditions; Studies in Legal, Exegetical, and Maghazi Hadith* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), p. 153

c. Single strand

A single transmission line that runs from the collector to the public or even link to previous sanad link.<sup>29</sup>

d. Dives

Single strands that bypasses the common link.<sup>30</sup>

e. Spiders

Sanad structures consisting of only a single strand that eventually intersects at the transmitter (only in Juynboll theory).<sup>31</sup>

## 2. Concept of Chain Analysis

It is important that sanads is not divided into several branches immediately after the Prophet. In most cases, they spread just after a succession of three to four transmitters who form a single strand. The transmitter after whom the transmission chains divide into several branches Schacht called “common link”.<sup>32</sup> Motzki proposes an explanation for a phenomenon of common link. It is better to look at the common link as the first major collector and professional teachers of knowledge in general and of ḥadīths of the people who lived in the first century of Islam in particular.

This makes it easier to understand a single strand under a common link as well. It is sanad given by a first systematic collector. He wrote ḥadīths in the first Islamic century and transmitted them in a study circle or ‘lectures’. With the sanad as stated first collector from whom he received a certain ḥadīth, that is, from where Successor, and the last of whom, in turn, allegedly received. It is conceivable, in view of the chronology of the birth of sanad, the

---

<sup>29</sup> Harald Motzki, *Theme Issue: Methods of Dating Early Legal Traditions; Introduction*, *op. cit.*, p. 4

<sup>30</sup> Harald Motzki, *Review of G.H.A. Juynboll. Encyclopedia of Canonical Hadith*, *op. cit.*, p. 539

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 539

<sup>32</sup> Harald Motzki, *Whither Hadith Studies?*, *op. cit.*, p. 50

collector asks his informant of his source and was told the name of ḥadīth or, at least, a few names. But it is also possible that the collector did not make this investigation of his informant. He just put the name that seems most likely.

Thus, Single strand are the consequence of the fact that the early collectors usually only provide a source (and thus only one sanad) for ḥadīth. The reason may be that they are simply transmitted the ḥadīths they are considered the most reliable and/or that there was as yet no requirement that some authorities and their informants will be quoted.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, a single strand does not mean that this is the only transmission in which the ḥadīth is circulated. That is, it does not mean that no one other than those mentioned in the sanad know that ḥadīth.

The single strand means that a common link in the spread of the ḥadīth mentioned only one transmission path. Other paths which the same matn may have taken have dead because they are not passed on by the beginning of the first collectors. In some cases, later compiler or the disciples of the early collectors sought further strands of transmission of certain ḥadīth that can survive in oral ḥadīth or with a small collector. If they succeeds keeping one or more strands, it will “dive” under common link.<sup>34</sup>

One cannot rule out the possibility and the feasibility of that a ḥadīth transmitted by a common link is received from a person designated by a common link as his authority, whatever one may think of the remainder of the sanad.

The historicity of the sources cited by the common link cannot or can only very rarely be determined solely by the analysis of a sanad bundle. Close examination of the various versions of the matn and sources claimed would prove more productive. But greater certainty about the reliability of the

---

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52

common link can only be obtained by examining a large body of matns which allegedly link back to this common link.<sup>35</sup>

Theoretically the number of single strands of a sanad bundle should be far greater than the number of strands that are connected with the other strand. This is due to the relatively small amount of sources available for reconstruction of ḥadīth transmission lines. This further suggests that the hypothesis which the transmission is usually from one person to many people cannot estimate the methodological requirement that says that only those strands in the beam can be considered as the original sanad, or historically preserved, which shows this pattern. Since these pieces, especially the intertwined for generations, is the exception rather than the rule, is not wise to consider this just as authentic and considered as a single strand ahistorical character as long as they have not been proven intertwined.<sup>36</sup>

Just like a strand can run from a partial common link via a single transmitter to another common partial common link on the basis of our model quantitatively is more likely that the sanad should be delivered through two or three single transmitter for partial common link or collector.

A sanad bundle lists the various strands found in the works of later collectors. This means that the sanad bundle should be traced down from above, from the later collectors, and not traced upwards from below from the common link. Each later collectors mention one or more strands that he himself received or claimed to have received a certain ḥadīth. Therefore, a single strand, assuming it is not found, does not mean that a single transmitter passed on a ḥadīth to only one single pupil who in turn transmitted it to only one single pupil. It rather means that a later collector names a chain of transmitters for a ḥadīth that does not cross the strands of the other known collectors.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 53-54

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57

There may be many reasons for this in addition to the discovery of the sanad. Motzki have already mentioned the possible impact of the relatively limited amount of sources available in relation to the possibility of a relatively large number of transmitters in the reconstruction process of transmission. The geographical distance between individual transmitters may have played its role. The ḥadīth represented by a single strand can be passed on by the people who lived and worked for a while in the outskirts of Islamic scholarship. The reputation enjoyed by the transmitters as teachers will be reflected in the number of their disciples and the number of teachers who in turn emerged from the ranks of students. Only a small percentage of teacher's disciples go on to become teachers themselves. Common sense tells us that there are many reasons why a ḥadīth has been preserved for a while with the transmission from one person to another, instead of many to many.<sup>37</sup>

Similarly, explanations can be found why the strands of the various later collectors occasionally cross at levels where it theoretically is highly unlikely. It have been already mentioned that some of them in the explanation for the existence of a single strands in the sanad bundles. Here, the same reasons hold, albeit in the opposite direction. Hence, single transmitters between partial common links, and single strands over several generations should be regarded as normal cases. Juynboll's requirement that "the historicity of strands manned by single transmitters has to be rejected for reasons of overwhelming historical improbability", is not "based on simple logic" at all, but on an interpretation of the sanad bundle that goes in the wrong direction. All chains of transmitters should be read "downwards" that is, starting with the collections, not only single strands. A network of intertwining strands reflects particularly favorable conditions or even the ideal process of transmission. To label those sanad bundles or parts thereof which fail to confirm to the ideal as unhistorical and inventions of the later collectors is

---

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58

unreasonable and it is contrary to the research rationale.<sup>38</sup>

There is, moreover, a further weakness in the theory that, while the intertwined ḥadīths of the same collectors are to be accepted as historically tenable, “single strands above the common link level in the upper half of the bundle can best be attributed to the various collectors in whose collections they end up. The rule that the historical reliability of a ḥadīth is greater, the more it is intertwined within a network of strands is only true if one can exclude the possibility that intertwined strands can also arise through forgeries. No such certainty exists. If the later collectors were ready and able to falsify individual sanad strands -as Juynboll assumes they were one may or one must also assume that they could invent strands which ran through several partial common links. They clearly knew possible key transmitters of a ḥadīth and it would not have been difficult for them to create additional asānīd which ran through these persons.<sup>39</sup>

### 3. Method Steps of *Isnād cum Matn* Analysis

The *isnād cum matn* analysis as it is applied in the studies proceeds in five steps: a) All the variants of a ḥadīth which can be found are compiled. b) Drawing a bundle of all sanad variants. c) Whether the common link can be considered really as the collector or professional disseminator has to be checked by a matn analysis. It consists in compiling the texts belonging to the different transmission lines in order to make possible a synoptic comparison of one to the other. d) Groups of matn variants and groups of sanad variants are to be compared to check whether there is a correlation or not. e) Conclusion is described.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 59

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 60

<sup>40</sup> Harald Motzki, *Dating Muslim Traditions, op. cit.*, p. 251; Motzki also stress their method steps as followed: 1) All known records of the ḥadīths in question that contain an sanad are compiled. (2) Chains of transmitters are listed in order to note possible common transmitters (partial common links and common link) in the various generations. (3) A comparison of the texts must investigate whether the transmission history suggested by the sanads is also covered by the

a. All the variants of a ḥadīth which can be found are compiled

If one intends to draw the far-reaching conclusions from sanad bundles that someone does the only responsible approach is to base them on all accessible ḥadīths, especially the ḥadīths that are found in the “pre-canonical” collections. While the value of the “post-canonical”<sup>41</sup> collections can be disputed, since their authors had the opportunity of raiding the “canonical” collections to invent new ḥadīths, this does not hold for the collections whose authors lived before the “canonical” collectors.<sup>42</sup>

To obtain a definitive picture of the emergence and development of the several variants of this ḥadīth one would have to conduct a systematic analysis of the corresponding ḥadīths within the “post-canonical” collections as well. This time-consuming effort is usually neglected with the excuse that the later collections contain nothing new but merely reproduce what is known from the “pre-canonical”<sup>43</sup> and “canonical” collections. Even if this is often the case one cannot generalize. It often happens that the “post-canonical” collections are found to contain ḥadīths which go back to lost or not yet discovered “pre-canonical” collections and for some reason have not been included in the “kutub al-sitta”.

---

text variants. (4) The following rule is applied to the reconstruction of the process of transmission or creation: whenever two or more variants (of matn and/or sanad) tally against a variant that is recorded only once, then the version that has multiple references will be preferred. See Harald Motzki, *The Prophet and the Debtors; a Hadith Analysis under Scrutiny*, *op. cit.*, p. 147

<sup>41</sup> By post-canonical collections he means the collections composed after *al-kutub al-sitta* as for instance al-Ṭabari’s *Tahdhīb al-Athar* or al-Ṭabarani’s *al-Mu’jam al-Kabīr* or al-Baihaqi’s *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*. Retrieved from Motzki’s email on November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

<sup>42</sup> Harald Motzki, *Whither Hadith Studies?*, *op. cit.*, p.76

<sup>43</sup> It means the hadith compilations which do not belong to the six “canonical” collections and are usually ascribed to scholars living roughly between 150-250 H/767-864 M. Motzki includes among them some works which are not pure hadith collections, but works of jurisprudence containing many hadith, such as the *Kitab al-Umm* of al-Shāfi‘i and the *Waḍiḥa* of Ibn Habib. See Harald Motzki, *The Prophet and The Cat: on Dating Mālik’s Muwatta’ and Legal traditions*, in *Journal Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 36 (2009) pp. 18-83 (the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Faculty of Humanities, Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 2009), p. 46



Therefore, the possibility cannot be denied that some variants of our ḥadīth will be found in the later collections which may lead to a revised judgment on those ḥadīths for which there is too little text in the early compilations to make a reasonable comparison. When investigating a single ḥadīth or a complex of ḥadīths, therefore, the aim must be to include as complete as possible a corpus of all available variants of a text and its sanads.<sup>44</sup>

b. Drawing a bundle of all sanad variants

Sanad variants are composed in form of a diagram in order to document the transmission process as it is reflected by the transmission lines and to detect partial common links and a common link. In accordance with the interpretation proposed, when discussing the common link phenomenon in the preceding section, the common link is, provisionally, assumed to be the collector and professional disseminator.<sup>45</sup> So, it will become possible when all the sanads of the ḥadīth in question are gathered and visualized in a sanad bundle.<sup>46</sup>

c. Determining common link and partial common link

Common link is hold important part in this Method, he is transmission key in determining who is the ḥadīth can be traced back certainly. In determining real common link, it will involve network and variants of matn investigation. Partial common links as direct transmitters in which the some variants of transmission goes back to them should be investigate first in determining real common link. If indicated common link after investigation, in the fact, is not real common link, it will be named as seeming common link.

---

<sup>44</sup> Harald Motzki, *Whither Hadith Studies?*, *op. cit.*, p. 121

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 251

<sup>46</sup> Harald Motzki, *Review of G.H.A. Juynboll. Encyclopedia of Canonical Hadith*, *op. cit.*, p. 541

d. *Mutūn* investigation from partial common link

Such a uniform matn with identical wording is rather a common phenomenon, even in shorter ḥadīth texts. As long as the longer the matn, the more variations in the wording. Textual variations of “one” ḥadīth may be due to reasons other than later manipulation. If reports are handed down from one generation to another, they are bound to change. These changes are, as everyone knows from everyday experience, most significant in the case of oral transmission.<sup>47</sup>

Distortions in content decrease the more the process of transmission are standardized and/or the more reports can be firmly attributed to lasting “carriers”, for instance by writing them down. The standardization of transmission only developed gradually within the first three Islamic centuries. This is true both for the development and application of set rules for the transmission of ḥadīths and for the use of writing and the use of the book as additional means of carrying information alongside oral transmission. Accordingly, variations in the ḥadīths must have been relatively large in the beginning but decreased with time.<sup>48</sup>

This investigation starts with all variants of ḥadīths which go back to one particular immediate transmitter of common link through considering the similarity to each other and sharing characteristic features. Then, the immediate transmitters of common link who are linked with the collections by several sanad strands will -due to their individual textual ḥadīth- be regarded as genuine partial common links if their individual textual ḥadīth is really ascribed to them. This is true, even if their sanad bundles consist only of single strands or spiders, and it will not imply a judgment on the historical authenticity of their relationship to real common link.

e. Conclusion

---

<sup>47</sup> Harald Motzki, *Whither Hadith Studies?*, *op. cit.*, p. 90

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 91

If a correlation exists, then conclusions can be drawn regarding the original matn transmitted by the common link and the one responsible for whatever changes have occurred in the course of the transmission after the common link.<sup>49</sup> Mainly, the conclusion describes the variants of texts from Partial common link, who is the real common link, to whom the all variants of texts are really goes back, and when the ḥadīth will be dated.<sup>50</sup>

#### 4. The Cases of His Method Application

Harald Motzki actually has two kinds of Method of dating ḥadīth. According to him, it possible to conduct ḥadīth research with the aid of methods followed:

##### a. The Method of Source Reconstruction

Harald Motzki conducts the research of ḥadīth with the aid of the first method, the method of source reconstruction, as shown in his works, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*<sup>51</sup> and *The Jurisprudence of ibn Shihāb az-Zuhri*<sup>52</sup>. With this method, it will enable researchers to reconstruct the sources of a ḥadīth collection. It means that one will be able to reconstruct

---

<sup>49</sup> Harald Motzki, *Dating Muslim Traditions, op. cit.*, p. 251

<sup>50</sup> Harald Motzki, *al-Radd ‘ala al-Radd; Concerning the Method of Hadith Analysis, op. cit.*, p. 212

<sup>51</sup> Harald Motzki, *Die Anfänge der Islamischen Jurisprudenz. Ihre Entwicklung in Mekka bis zur Mitte des 2./8. Jahrhunderts*, 1991 (English translation: *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence. Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools*, Leiden/Boston 2002), this work is based on an early ḥadīth collection, ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s *Muṣannaf*. He showed that it is possible to reconstruct even earlier collections that were used by ‘Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211/827) but lost in their original form. Motzki managed to prove that the ḥadīths preserved in the *Muṣannaf* is not by forger activity. The question of whether ‘Abd al-Razzāq really get the ḥadīths from his informants is answered by Motzki based on text-internal and external evidence: (1) the conspicuous profile of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s source, (2) the differing source profiles of the material that ‘Abd al-Razzāq ascribes to his informants, (3) peculiarities of the *asānid* and *mutūn*, (4) biographical transmissions that confirm the source analysis conclusion. See Harald Motzki, *Theme Issue: Methods of Dating Early Legal Traditions; Introduction, op. cit.*, p. 5

<sup>52</sup> Harald Motzki, *The Jurisprudence of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri; A Source-Critical Study* (it is English version published in *Der Islam* 68 (1991) entitled “*Der Fiqh des –Zuhri: die Quellenproblematik*”), in Harald Motzki *et.al, Analysing Muslim Traditions; Studies in Legal, Exegetical, and Maghazi Hadith* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010); this article also can be retrieved from the online publications of the University of Nijmegen, [http://webdoc.ubn.kun.nl/mono/m/motzki\\_h/juriofibs.pdf](http://webdoc.ubn.kun.nl/mono/m/motzki_h/juriofibs.pdf)

the source of large number of texts which go back to one early transmitter and which are found in a single ḥadīth collection. For example, the *aḥādīth* which are ascribed by ‘Abd al-Razzāq to Ibn Juraij or the ḥadīths ascribed by Ibn Juraij to al-Zuhri.

Based on the large numbers of ḥadīths which are attributed to single informant to single person, it is possible to determine whether they really originate from this informant and whether the informant’s statement regarding the origin of the material is trustworthy. It is much harder or even impossible in the case of a single ḥadīth collected from various collections.<sup>53</sup> Through this method, it will be able to establish that two transmissions by al-Zuhri (one about ‘Umar and the other about the Prophet) go back to the generation which older than al-Zuhri.<sup>54</sup> However, the researcher will not discuss about this method further. It is because of that researcher only focused on the method of the *isnād cum matn* analysis that have been explained above.

#### b. The Method of the *Isnād cum Matn* Analysis

*Isnād cum matn* analysis is second method of Harald Motzki which is researcher focuses on. Actually this method is conducted largely by two western scholars, Harald Motzki and Gregor Schoeler. But, Motzki is more widely in using and elaborating this method in ḥadīth investigation. There are some cases of ḥadīth investigation which he applies this method to solve the problem. He in conducting ḥadīth research with the aid of this method always chooses legal, exegetical, and maghazi ḥadīths as his research object. He has been applied this method for legal ḥadīths, such as in the ḥadīth of *The Prophet and the Cat*, *Zakat al-Fitr*, and *the Prophet and the Debtors*. While in exegetical ḥadīth, he investigates ḥadīths exegesis of the word *al-Muqtasimun* by Ibn Abbas in Qur’an 15:90-91, and *The Murder*

---

<sup>53</sup> Harald Motzki, *ar-Radd ‘alā ar-Radd*, *op. cit.*, p. 212

<sup>54</sup> Harald Motzki, *The Jurisprudence of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri*, *op. cit.*, pp. 30-45

of *Ibn Abi al-Huqayq* as maghazi ḥadīth.

In the article, *The Prophet and the Cat: on Dating Mālik's Muwaṭṭa' and Legal Traditions*, Motzki applied the method *isnād cum matn* analysis on the ḥadīths of the Prophet and the cat.<sup>55</sup> Actually these ḥadīths will not be found in the canonical compilation of al-Bukhārī (d. 256/869) and Muslim (d. 261/864). But, it can be found in a lot of the other canonical ḥadīth compilations, such as Ibn Mājah (d. 273/886), Abu Dāwūd (d. 275/888), al-Turmudhi (d. 279/892), and al-Nasā'i (d. 303/915). It also can be found in pre-canonical ḥadīth compilations, such as *Muwaṭṭa'* Mālik from both Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā al-Laithi (d. 234/848) and al-Shaibāni (d. 189/804), *Sunan* al-Dārimi (d. 255/868), *Musnād* of Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), the remains of the *Muwaṭṭa'* versions of Suwaid ibn Sa'īd (d. 240/854), *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abi Shaiba (d. 235/849), *Kitāb al-Waḍiḥa* of 'Abd al-Mālik ibn Ḥabīb (d. 238-39/852-53), *Muḥaḍi al-Muwaṭṭa'* of Yaḥyā ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Bukair (d. 231/845), *Kitāb al-Ṭahūr* of Abu 'Ubaid (d. 224/838), the extant part of the *Muwaṭṭa'* recension of 'Abd Allāh ibn Maslama al-Qa'nabi (d. 221/826), *Musnad* of al-Humaidi (d. 219/834), *Muṣannaf* of 'Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211/826), *Kitāb al-Umm* of al-Shāfi'i (d. 204/819) and *Sunan* al-Baihaqi (d. 458/1066).<sup>56</sup>

This research article, besides its function as model of ḥadīth research with the aid of *isnād cum matn* analysis, it is also dedicated to refuse

<sup>55</sup> One of the texts ḥadīth variants is below:

42 - وحدثني عن مالك عن إسحاق بن عبد الله بن أبي طلحة عن حميدة بنت أبي عبيدة بن فروة عن خالتها كبشة بنت كعب بن مالك وكانت تحت بن أبي قتادة الأنصاري أنها أخبرتها: أن أبا قتادة دخل عليها فسكبت له وضوءاً فجاءت هرة لتشرب منه فأصغى لها الإناء حتى شربت قالت كبشة فرآني أنظر إليه فقال أتعجبين يا ابنة أخي قالت فقلت نعم فقال إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال إنها ليست بنجس إنما هي من الطوافين عليكم أو الطوافات قال يحيى قال مالك لا بأس به إلا أن يري على فمها نجاسة. الموطأ لأبي يحيى الليثي ج 1 ص 22.

<sup>56</sup> Harald Motzki, *The Prophet and the Cat: on Dating Mālik's Muwaṭṭa' and Legal Traditions*, op. cit., p. 34

Norman Calder's theory of *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik. Calder<sup>57</sup> thinks that *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik from Yaḥyā al-Laithi is originated by Mālik, but it is not really his work. In short, Mālik is not the author of *Muwaṭṭa'* from Yaḥyā al-Laithi.<sup>58</sup> His arguments are based on *e sailentio* arguments that will be rejected by Motzki through this article.

In short, he firstly investigates the ḥadīths which goes back to Mālik ibn Anas as their common link (d. 179/795) then he evaluates whether or not Mālik is really common link. Then, he looks at the other transmitters than Mālik in the same level (Sufyān ibn 'Uyaina, Hishām ibn 'Urwa, and 'Alī ibn al-Mubārak with also observing each of their transmissions) whom their informant are same with Mālik, Ishāq ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ṭalḥa. He compares the variants of matns from their ḥadīth in order to look for independency of each their ḥadīth texts by observing features and characteristics specifications of each matns. It is aimed to investigate and decide that Ishāq ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ṭalḥa is their common link and, therefore, Mālik is changed to be partial common link and the three others. He, then, investigates the transmission of Ishāq ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ṭalḥa toward his companion informant, Abū Qatāda. He finds that upward transmission of Ishāq ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ṭalḥa is kind of *isnād family*<sup>59</sup>.

Motzki also find other transmitters who directly receive ḥadīth from Abū Qatāda and they, thus, don't pass through *isnād family*. Abu Qilāba, Ikrima and Ṣaliḥ *mawla* of Ibn Ṭaw'ama are they who bypass from *isnād family* and directly receive from Abū Qatāda. Each of the three

---

<sup>57</sup> Norman Calder, who died in 1998, was Senior Lecturer in Arabic at the University of Manchester, England.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19

<sup>59</sup> It is circulated by Abū Qatāda's family, Ishāq ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ṭalḥa – Ḥumaida bint 'Ubaid ibn Rifā'a – Kabsha bint Ka'b ibn Mālik – Abū Qatāda – The Prophet. Humaida bint 'Ubaid ibn Rifā'a is wife of Ishāq ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ṭalḥa and niece of Kabsha bint Ka'b bin Mālik, while Kabsha bint Ka'b ibn Mālik is wife of 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Qatāda (son of Abū Qatāda).

transmitters mentioned is investigated by its sanad and matn. The result is that transmission lines of Abū Qilāba and Ṣāliḥ, accordingly, cannot be considered as reliable transmission, but ‘Ikrima who have three transmission lines is considered as reliable. Thus, ‘Ikrima is the common link of this version. So, there are two common links, Ishāq ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ṭalḥa as a Medinese scholar who propagates the ḥadīth in Ḥijāz, and Ikrima as a Bashris scholar who propagates the ḥadīth in baṣrah.

The result of this research article after analyzing of all ḥadīth transmission lines available is that Ishāq’s ḥadīth contains Abū Qatāda’s behavior and saying quote of the Prophet to legitimize his behavior, while Ikrima’s ḥadīth just quotes Abū Qatāda’s behavior. So, the ḥadīth of the Prophet and the cat is ascribed to Abū Qatāda, but saying quote of the prophet by Abū Qatāda that is propagated by his family cannot be decided. In all probability, according to him, the prophetic ḥadīth is propagated by his son and his daughter-in-law, in the second half of the first Islamic century.<sup>60</sup>

In his article, *The Prophet and the Debtors*, he applied *isnād cum matn* analysis on ḥadīth about the Prophet who sold a man who had become indebted after defrauding another man. However, the fraudulent debtor was freed by the deceived creditor before his sale had become effective, and he then used the named *Surraq*. This article actually is to oppose Irene Schneider’s article research on these ḥadīths who said that this ḥadīth is kind of fabrication. Motzki, therefore, managed to show the weakness of her analysis method by conducting *isnād cum matn* analysis. And he also gets different result from Schneider relating these ḥadīths.

In Short, Motzki finds twenty six of the ḥadīth *The Prophet and the debtors*. They are found in *Al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarani, *Ṭabaqāt* of

---

<sup>60</sup> Harald Motzki, *The Prophet and the Cat: on Dating Mālik’s Muwaṭṭa’ and Legal Traditions, op. cit.*, pp. 29-74

Ibn Sa‘d, and *Syarḥ Mushkīl al-Athār* of al-Taḥāwī, *Sunan* of Al-Dāruquṭni, *Sunan* of al-Baihaqī, *Mustadrak* of al-Hākīm al-Naisāburi, *al-Kāmil* of Ibn ‘Adī, and *al-Nāsikh wa al-Mansūkh* of al-Naḥḥās.

In short, Motzki, in the research, finds some of indicated common sources, Muslim ibn Khālīd al-Zanji, ‘Abd al-Ṣamad, and Ibn Lahī‘a. Then he investigates its matns and sanads, and, thus, he is able to conclude that each matns which are go back to al-Zanji can really be traced back to him by its matns confirmation of features characteristics, and ‘Abd al-Ṣamad as well. Both of al-Zanji and ‘Abd al-Ṣamad (through his informants, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Dinār) goes back to the same informants, Zaid ibn Aslam (a Madinese scholar). In addition, there are also found ḥadīths going back to two of Zaid ibn Aslam’s sons that get them from their father (after conducting sanad and matn investigation as well). Therefore, Zaid ibn Aslam can be identified common link who received the ḥadīth from Surraq himself.<sup>61</sup> While, two ḥadīths of Ibn laḥī‘a which separate from Zaid ibn Aslam’s ḥadīths are kinds of single transmission toward the companion, Abu ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qaini, and Motzki investigates these ḥadīths by their sanad and matn which the result is that this ḥadīth is defective in their sanad.

The above Motzki’s analysis about the prophetic ḥadīth of *Surraq* shows that the case of *Surraq* as told in the ḥadīths is really occurred in the Prophet era. However, the Prophet behavior of selling free person is contrary with the later consensus by Muslim scholars. For this reason, according to him, these ḥadīths was neglected by canonical ḥadīth compilers who considered them as abrogated by the exegetes, and categorized by legal Muslim scholars as ḥadīths that are singular, transmitted by unreliable person, or contrary to the consensus (*ijma* ʿ). But,

---

<sup>61</sup> In transmissions of ‘Abd al-Ṣamad and two sons of Zaid, Zaid ibn Aslam directly get the hadith from Surraq, while in transmissions of Khālīd ibn Muslim al-Zanji, they have medium transmitter, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Baylamani, between him and Surraq.



Motzki states that the fact that the majority of Muslim scholars rejected this ḥadīth for dogmatic reasons does not mean that the result of this ḥadīth analysis is wrong. He shows that there are also a few of early Muslim scholars who still convince the authenticity of these ḥadīths. They resolved the contradiction between these ḥadīths and the *ijma'*, which is based on the Qur'an and differing ḥadīths, with the concept of abrogation (*naskh*).<sup>62</sup> With the concept, the Prophet decision for selling a debtor is abrogated by the al-Qur'an's verse 280 of *al-Baqāra*.<sup>63</sup>

Motzki also refers to al-Ṭahāwī's explanation of the ḥadīth that he rejects the thought of other scholars that it is irrelevant whether the ḥadīth in question is authentic or not, since the legal scholars do not act according to this ḥadīth anyway. al-Ṭahāwī impresses that the legal provision (*ḥukm*) of this ḥadīth was common in early Islam, since it belonged to the law of the earlier Prophets.<sup>64</sup> Further, he explains the developments of debt

<sup>62</sup> The reference of Motzki's explanation can be seen in Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Murādi al-Naḥḥās, *al-Nāsikh wa al-Mansūkh* (Kuwait: Maktabah al-Falāh, 1408 H), pp. 261-262.

<sup>63</sup> وَإِنْ كَانَ ذُو عُسْرَةٍ فَنَظِرَةٌ إِلَىٰ مَيْسَرَةٍ وَأَنْ تَصَدَّقُوا خَيْرٌ لَّكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ (البقرة: 280)

“If the debtor is in a difficulty, grant him time till it is easy for him to repay. But if you remit it by way of charity that is best for you if you only knew”

<sup>64</sup> As proof, al-Ṭahāwī quotes a story from the hadith about al-Khiḍr who voluntarily allowed himself to be sold into slavery in order to be able to offer alms to a poor slave. It is found in *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarani (7530) and *Mushkīl al-Athar* of al-Ṭahāwī (1618):

حدثنا عمرو بن إسحاق بن إبراهيم بن العلاء بن زريق الحمصي ثنا محمد بن الفضل بن عمران الكندي ثنا بقرية ( ح ) وحدثنا الحسن بن علي المعمر بن علي بن ميمون الرقي ثنا سليمان بن عبيد الله الخطاب ثنا بقرية بن الوليد عن محمد بن زياد الألهاني عن أبي أمامة رضي الله عنه : أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال لأصحابه : ألا أحدثكم عن الخضر ؟ قالوا : بلى يا رسول الله قال : بينا هو ذات يوم يمشي في سوق بني إسرائيل أبصره رجل مكاتب فقال : تصدق علي بارك الله فيك فقال الخضر : آمنت بالله ما شاء الله من أمر يكون ما عندي شيء أعطيكه فقال المسكين : أسألك بوجه الله لما تصدقت علي فإني نظرت السيماء في وجهك ورجوت البركة عندك فقال الخضر آمنت بالله ما عندي شيء أعطيكه إلا أن تأخذني فتبيعي فقال المسكين : وهل يستقيم هذا ؟ قال : نعم الحق أقول لقد سألتني بأمر عظيم أما إني لا أحييك بوجه ربي يعني قال : فقدمه إلى السوق فباعه بأربع مئة درهم فمكث عند المشتري زمانا لا يستعمله في شيء فقال له : إنك إنما ابتعتني التماس خير عندي فأوصني بعمل قال : أكره أن أشق عليك إنك شيخ كبير ضعيف قال : ليس يشق علي قال

servitude in pre-Islamic and early Islamic jurisprudence.<sup>65</sup>

---

: فقم فانقل خذ فانقل هذه الحجارة وكان لا ينقلها دون ستة نفر من يوم فخرج الرجل لبعض حاجته ثم انصرف وقد نقل الحجارة في ساعة فقال : أحسنت وأجملت وأطقت ما لم أرك تطيقه قال : ثم عرض للرجل سفر فقال : إني أحسبك أميناً فاحلفني في أهلي خلافة حسنة قال : فأوصني بعمل قال : إني أكره أن شق عليك قال : ليس يشق علي قال : فاضرب من اللبن لبتي حتى أقدم عليك قال : فمضى الرجل لسفره فرجع الرجل وقد شيد بناءه فقال : أسألك بوجه الله ما سبيلك وما أمرك ؟ قال : سألتني بوجه الله ووجه الله أوقعني في العبودية فقال الخضر : سأخبرك من أنا ؟ أنا الخضر الذي سمعت به سألني مسكين صدقة فلم يكن عندي شيء أعطيه فسألني بوجه الله فأمكنته من رقبتي فباعني وأخبرك أنه من سئل بوجه الله فرد سائله وهو يقدر وقف يوم القيامة جلده ولا لحم له عظم يتقعقع فقال الرجل : آمنت بالله شققت عليك يا نبي الله ولم أعلم فقال : لا بأس أحسنت وأبقيت فقال الرجل : بأبي أنت وأمي يا نبي الله احكم في أهلي ومالي بما أراك الله أو أخبرك فأخلى سبيلك فقال : أحب أن تخلى سبيلي فأعبد ربي فحلى سبيله فقال الخضر : الحمد لله الذي أوقعني في العبودية ثم نجاني منها.

<sup>65</sup> Harald Motzki, *The Prophet and the Debtors*, op. cit., p. 125-208