

CHAPTER V

CLOSING

A. Conclusion

From the analysis applied, the researcher can draw some following conclusions:

1. Harald Motzki who comes in the middle of skeptical scholars who developed a method that is responsible to be based on the quality and quantity of transmission. Then, Motzki arrives with his own method that tries to reduce Western skepticism to be more balance in judgment, and also managed to influence Western scholars in order to not trap on common link himself. Therefore, Motzki's method which is departed from their own skeptical Western scholars' method, but with different interpretation from them, and tries to undermine their skeptic.
2. Motzki conducts the ḥadīth analysis with the aim of dating ḥadīth analyzes ḥadīth through the aid of one of his methods, *isnād cum matn* analysis. This method is applied just for complex or interconnected ḥadīth transmissions, because this method is focused on the existence of common link and matn investigation. The common link considered as important part of analysis means that this method is departed from the theory of Motzki's predecessors. However, his interpretation of common link phenomenon and his dating method shows his differences from his predecessors. His dating is not stopped on the common link himself; even it will also be possible to be passed onto common link's informants if there is a reason for it.

Harald Motzki has same instrument of ḥadīth research (sanad, matn, and biographical dictionaries) to Muslim hadith critic, but with different process of analyzing method. It is because Western scholars don't fully trusted to Muslim scholars of *rijāl* books, especially *jarḥ wa ta'dīl*, but it doesn't mean that he disobeys these two data sources. The two sources just become secondarily, and he mainly based on the text or matn investigation. While Muslim scholars really trusted *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* as his main instruments of

analysis. Motzki's concern mainly on the *matn* lets him deeply in investigating the '*illa*' of *Matn* in order to know the reliability of transmissions leading to the authenticity of ḥadīth, without neglecting biography information as secondary. While Muslim scholars concern on *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* let him deeply investigate the reliability of transmission in order to know the authenticity of ḥadīth.

Motzki's method of *isnād cum matn* analysis is that the quality of a transmitter is not only based on comments or judgments of scholars about such transmitters. Comments about it are being secondary evidence. The quality of transmitters is primarily determined mainly by *matn* or texts of ḥadīth themselves. Then, the aim of his *matn* investigation is to open the differences and the similarities in the variation of texts. So, it will be known the independency of each text in every transmission.

The method of *isnād cum matn* analysis is managed to guess quality of ḥadīth based on its *matn*, even quality of *sanad* can be estimated through its *matn*. Analysis of *matn* is not whether it is about the contrary to the Qur'an, logic, or later Islamic legal, but it is about the extent to which a transmitter distorted text history in the process of transmission, textually different from the text history of others. But before textual or *matn* analysis is done, it must be firstly mapped by *isnād* bundle.

3. Motzki's result of analysis leads to the authenticity of ḥadīth in question. He actually still admits the existence of authentic ḥadīth. But the term of 'authentic ḥadīth', according to him, is very different from Muslim and other Western scholars. The term of 'authentic ḥadīth' is not always labeled to the ḥadīth which is reached back to the Prophet. It is suitable with his dating purpose that the title of his article "*The Muṣannaf of 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan'ānī as a Source of Authentic Aḥādīth of the First Islamic Century*", 'authentic aḥādīth of the first Islamic century' doesn't mean that the ḥadīth is really reached back to the Prophet, but it means that the ḥadīth really

existed in that century. It is still uncertainty whether or not it was from the Prophet.

He would state that a Prophetic ḥadīth is called as ‘authentic ḥadīth of the first Islamic century’ if its origin can be dated in all probability on this century but not with certainty to the Prophet himself. His statement of ‘an authentic tradition of the first half of the second Islamic century’ is for a Prophetic hadith which can only securely be dated on first half of the second Islamic century because of problematic sanads or matns. If the tradition is really able to be traced back to the Prophet, it will be called as ‘an authentic tradition/ḥadīth of the Prophet’. Therefore, he doesn’t reject and still believe the existence of authentic ḥadīth from the Prophet, because his Method is able to prove it.

From the method which is applied by Motzki, it will be known about authenticity criteria as his parameter to determine hadith authenticity. From the analysis toward his method of *isnād cum matn* analysis, it is able to be summarized that his authenticity criteria are as follow:

1. Common link must be found.
2. Transmitters in sanad must be interconnected.
3. Transmitters of the hadith must be reliable.
4. Text variants of single hadith must be independent among each other.

B. Suggestion

This discussion still need additional elaboration for understanding the Western Method, especially in Harald Motzki’s Method. This study is just the beginning or introduction of one of popularly Western scholars’ ḥadīth studies. There are still a lot of Western material studies who still remain untouched among Muslim scholars. It is hoped that Muslim scholars especially in this institute always follows the development of Western ḥadīth studies. It will become correction, correspondence, and discussion from other views. Therefore, Muslim discussion of ḥadīth is not circular and stagnant.

the researcher in all modesty also wants to suggest for high institutes which involve ḥadīth studies as part substance of their discussion, especially in ḥadīth studies major, to be more welcome for the sake of the future academic development. Somehow, the method of ḥadīth critic which is developed in Muslim or Western academic world is the result of a seriousness of intellectual effort. Therefore, miss and remain it not to be accessed in our discussion area is academic dereliction unfortunately being a pity.

Since today, almost all of our discussions about Western ḥadīth studies are still finished on skeptical Western scholars, such as Ignaz Goldziher, Joseph Schacht, and A.J Wensinck. However, the thought of the scholars mentioned is outdated but our studies is still enough discussing around their thought, although there are fresh and younger idea of ḥadīth studies with different perspective from them.

Nowadays, Muslim must open their mind and also not be skeptic in receiving Western view of ḥadīth. New thought and Method in Western ḥadīth studies was developed, and skepticism is not being basis of their discussion of ḥadīth studies. Western Scholars, like Harald Motzki, Gregor Schoeler, Sebastian Gunther, and Yasin Dutton must be discussed to inspire and dig new thought or idea about ḥadīth studies for the sake of the ḥadīth studies advance.

Besides, this discussion still needs further studies surrounding the evidence of the reliability of the method of *isnād cum matn* analysis. *Isnād cum matn* analysis promoted by Harald Motzki must be proven its reliability by applying it in a case of ḥadīth to be analyzed with the aid of this method. It will be more significant to compare between Muslim ḥadīth critic and Motzki's *isnād cum matn* analysis in conducting a case of ḥadīth. In addition, it is also important to compare the thought and Method among Western scholars to check how far their development of ḥadīth studies.