Abstract

Nāṣiruddin al-アルバムī (d. 1999) was a Muslim autodidact who devoted most of his life to the close study of prophetic hadiths. Al-アルバムī classified as weak hundreds of hadiths considered authentic by most Muslim scholars, including some hadiths found in the Ṣaḥīḥ of Muslim. In this essay, I explain al-アルバムī’s method of determining that a hadith is either authentic or spurious; discuss the implications of his method when applied to other hadiths; and examine the hadiths declared weak by al-アルバムī from the perspective of both the traditional hadith sciences and non-Muslim methods of dating a hadith. Based on an analysis of 360 hadiths found in the canonical collections that were transmitted by Abī al-Zubayr from Ja‘bir, I argue that Muslim did not regard the transmission terminology used by the Successors as a decisive criterion for determining whether or not a transmitter is reliable. This argument calls into question al-アルバムī’s method, for he used terminology as the decisive criterion for assessing the validity of transmissions. Our reexamination of one hadith declared weak by al-アルバムī, called here the Abī al-Zubayr hadith, leads us to question the historicity of at least 125 of his hadiths in Muslim’s Ṣaḥīḥ.

Introduction

Nāṣiruddin al-アルバムī was born in Ashkodera, capital of Albania, in 1914. As a young boy, he moved to Damascus, Syria where he finished elementary school. At the age of twenty, influenced by the journal “al-Manār”, al-アルバムī produced his first work on hadith, a transcription of and commentary on al-‘Irāqī’s al-Mughnī ʿan ḥaml al-asfār fiʾl asfār fi takhrīj mā fiʾl iḥyāʾ min al-akhbār. Al-アルバムī did not receive a formal education in the study of hadith, but rather was an autodidact who studied the subject on his own in libraries, especially the Zahiriyā library in Damascus. Nevertheless, in 1961 he was appointed professor of hadith at the Islamic University of Madina. He died in 1999.¹

¹ I am grateful to Stefan Wild, Harald Motzki and David S. Powers for valuable comments on the first draft of this article.

See Muḥammad ʿId al-ʿAbbāsī in Fatāwā al-shaykh al-アルバムī wa-
Al-Albānī was a Muslim who devoted most of his life to the close study of prophetic hadiths. Although he reportedly did not receive an authorization (ijāza) in hadith from any recognized scholar, al-Albānī studied many of the famous hadith books, including the Šaḥīḥs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim and the Sunan of al-Tirmidhī, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāʾī and Ibn Māja. A prolific scholar, he wrote 117 books, including: Silsilat al-ahādīth al-qaʿīfah waʾl-mawḍūʿa wa-atharuhā al-sayyiʿ fi al-umma, al-Tawassul anwāʾuḥu wa-ahkāмуḥu, Tahdhir al-sājid min ittiḥāḍ al-qubūr maṣājid, Hijāb al-marʿa al-muslima fi al-kitāb waʾl-sunna. In his works, al-Albānī identified 990 hadiths considered authentic by most Muslim scholars but that he considers to be weak. Indeed, he declared weak (taḍīf) some hadiths found in the Šaḥīḥ of Muslim, one of the most prestigious collections. Not surprisingly, a number of Muslim scholars have responded with critiques. These include: Tanāquḍāt al-Albānī al-wādiḥāt by Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Saqqāf, Taʿrif bi-awḥām man qassama al-sunan ilā šaḥīḥ wa-ṣaʿīf by Maḥmūd Saʿīd Māmduḥī, Ṭayībīn dalālāt al-Albānī, shaykh al-Wahḥābiyya al-mutamahdīth by ʿAbd Allāh al-Harārī, Bayān awḥām al-Albānī by Asād Sālim Tayyīm, and al-Lāmadhhabīyya akhṭaru bidʿatīn tuḥaddidu al-sharīʿa al-islāmiyya by Saʿīd Ramaḍān al-Būṭī. In response to this criticism, several scholars have written books in support of al-Albānī.
In this essay I will discuss al-Albâni’s method of determining that a hadith is either authentic or spurious, especially his arguments regarding hadiths found in Muslim’s Sahih. I will analyze several hadiths that he declared weak from the perspectives of both the traditional hadith sciences (‘ulûm al-hadîth) and the non-Muslim method of dating a hadith. By doing so, I hope to determine the extent to which al-Albâni based his assessment on the traditional sciences or deviated from that tradition, and whether or not he was consistent in the application of his method. I also wish to probe the implications of al-Albâni’s method for the assessment of other hadiths, including those found in the Sahih of Muslim. I will argue that al-Albâni’s method is not new, i.e., he does not deviate one inch from the traditional method of Muslim scholarship, although his views certainly differ from those of many Muslim scholars who have participated in this discourse. I shall also argue that, pace his critics, he does apply his method consistently.

Non-Muslim scholars’ views on the authenticity of hadîth

The authenticity of hadîth is a complex issue. Non-Muslims who have addressed this subject invariably note that the major hadith collections and biographical dictionaries emerged several centuries after the events they purport to describe and that the historical reliability of these sources may be undermined by the fact that they were produced by Muslims.¹⁴

Ignaz Goldziher’s Muhammedanische Studien, published in 1890, was unquestionably the most important criticism of hadith produced in the nineteenth century, and his conclusions remained unchallenged until the appearance of Joseph Schacht’s Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence in 1950. Schacht, who focused on legal traditions and their development,¹⁵ advanced the thesis that isnâads have a tendency to grow backwards and also was the first to put forward what has become known as the ”common link theory”. Like Goldziher, he assumed that few, if any, hadiths originated with the Prophet. Through careful study, however, he believed that it is possible to arrive at a rough estimate of when a particular hadith was put into circulation.¹⁶

Schacht’s approach has been adopted by J. van Ess\textsuperscript{17} and has been developed on a large scale by G.H.A. Juynboll, even if the latter disagrees with Schacht on several significant points, as reflected in Juynboll’s method of dating a hadith by posing three questions: Where did a particular hadith originate, when, and who was responsible for putting it into circulation?\textsuperscript{18} By posing these three questions, Juynboll attempts to solve the problems of chronology, provenance and authorship of a hadith. Juynboll’s method of dating a hadith by analysing all of the isnāds associated with a single tradition has become a powerful research tool.\textsuperscript{19} Both Schacht and Juynboll regard the common link as the person who fabricated hadith.\textsuperscript{20} The decisive difference between Schacht and Juynboll lies in how to identify the common link. Juynboll requires that a common link (cl) have several partial common links (pcl). A common link that is not corroborated by more than one partial common links is, according to Juynboll, not a true common link but a seeming common link.

Other scholars who have rejected hadiths as reliable materials for the historical reconstruction of the lifetime of the Prophet and the first century A.H. are John Wansbrough,\textsuperscript{21} Patricia Crone and Michael Cook.\textsuperscript{22}

Opposition to Schacht and his followers may be found in the writings of M. M. Az(a)mi, M. Cook,\textsuperscript{23} and Harald Motzki.\textsuperscript{24} Azmi argues

\textsuperscript{17} Joseph van Ess, Zwischen Hadith und Theologie. Studien zum Entstehen prädestinatianischer Überlieferung (Berlin/New York 1975).


\textsuperscript{19} For a summary of his method, see G. H. A. Juynboll, "Some isnād-analytical methods illustrated on the basis of several women-demeaning sayings from hadith literature," al-Qantara, 10 (1989), 343-83.

\textsuperscript{20} Schacht, Origins, 171-2; Juynboll, "Some isnād-analytical methods", 353.


\textsuperscript{23} On Cook, see further below.

for an early and continuous practice of writing down *hadith*. According to Azmi, the Companions of the Prophet kept written records of *hadiths*, and most *hadiths* were transmitted in written form until the moment when they were included in the canonical collections. Unlike Schacht and Juynboll, Motzki does not regard the common links as the fabricators of *hadiths*, but as “the first systematic collectors of traditions who transmitted them in regular classes of students out of which an institutionalized system of learning developed”. Motzki has also argued that some *hadiths* can be dated to the first century A.H., even if they cannot definitively be ascribed to the Prophet. Schacht and Juynboll denied this possibility.

*The hadiths declared weak by al-Albānī*

To illustrate al-Albānī’s method, I will now analyze the *hadith* of the cow, one of the *hadiths* declared weak by al-Albānī. I have chosen to discuss this *hadith*, not because it is more important than other *hadiths* declared weak by al-Albānī, but merely because it is recorded *inter alia* in the highly regarded *Ṣahih* of Muslim. The *hadith* reads as follows:

---


“La tadhbahū illā musinnatan illā an ya’sūra ‘alaykum fa-tadhbahū jadh’a’tan min al-da’nni”.28 (Sacrifice only a mature cow,29 unless it is difficult for you, in which case sacrifice a ram.)30

Al-Albānī’s method of determining the authenticity or lack thereof of a particular hadith is based largely upon the analysis of the isnād, using information found in the biographical dictionaries. Al-Albānī argues that this hadith is daīf (weak) by virtue of the fact that one of its transmitters is Abū al-Zubayr.31 Al-Albānī argues that Abū al-Zubayr’s transmission from Jābir is interrupted (ghayr muttasil) on the grounds that (1) hadith critics label Abū al-Zubayr as a mudallis, i.e., person who suppressed faults in isnāds; (2) and he did not explicitly declare whether or not he heard the hadith directly from Jābir, but rather used the term “‘an” (on the authority of). It is established in the science of hadith, al-Albānī adds, that the hadith of a mudallis may not be relied upon if he does not state clearly the manner in which he received it, as is true of Abū al-Zubayr. Al-Albānī concludes that the truthfulness of every hadith transmitted by Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir or others, using the term “‘an” and the likes, is to be considered suspended. Stated in different terms, one must cease to rely upon it until the manner in which Abū al-Zubayr heard the hadith is clarified or until a confirming hadith is found. This scepticism does not apply, however, to the transmission of al-Layth b. Sa’d from Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir, for al-Layth claimed to have transmitted from Abū al-Zubayr only what the latter heard from Jābir.32 Of the 360 hadiths transmitted by Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir in the canonical

---


29 A ghanam (sheep) or baqar (goat) that is at least three years old, and a camel that is at least six years old. See al-Albānī, Silsilat al-ahadith al-da’ifah, 91. Cf. Edward William Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon (London, 1863-1893), part 4, 1439.

30 A ram that is at least one year old. See al-Albānī, Silsilat al-ahadith al-da’ifah, 91. Cf. Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon, part 2, 396.

31 For Abū al-Zubayr, see below.

32 Al-Layth is reported to have said, “I came to Abū al-Zubayr, and he offered me two books. I was upset with them (fa’ngalabtu bi-himā), and I asked him whether or not he heard this from Jābir. He [viz., Abū al-Zubayr] said, “I heard some of it and I was told some of it”. I said, “Tell me what you heard of it”. Then he told me, “This is what I have”. See, al-Albānī, Silsilat, vol. 1, 92-3.
collections, only 27 were subsequently transmitted by al-Layth b. Sa‘d.\(^{33}\)

The hadith in question states that it is permissible to sacrifice a ram that is one-year old (al-jadha‘ min-al-da‘ni) in a situation in which a mature cow (al-musinna) is too expensive or difficult to find. Similar is the hadith of ‘Uqba b. ‘Amir: dāhḥaynā ma‘a rasūl Allāh ẓallā Allāh ‘alayhim wa-sallā bi-jadha‘in min al-da‘ni\(^{34}\) (We sacrificed together with the Prophet a one-year old ram). Another hadith is that of Mujāshi b. Maš‘ūd: Inna al-jadha‘a yūfi mimmā yūfi al-thaniyy\(^{35}\) (a one-year old ram accomplishes the same objective that a two-year old does). According to al-Albānī, the last two hadiths are saḥīh, for they have reliable isnāds. However, al-Albānī does not treat them as confirming the hadith of Abū al-Zubayr in order to enhance its quality as saḥīh. Rather, instead of understanding them literally, he engages in ta‘wil (interpretation) of the two reportedly authentic hadiths by quoting other hadiths that have reliable isnāds, while continuing to regard the hadith of Abū al-Zubayr as weak. Al-Albānī prefers to understand the hadith of Abū al-Zubayr literally and is reluctant to subject it to interpretation, because this hadith is not authentic. Interpretation is an aspect of authentification. Therefore, there is no place for interpretation in the case of a weak (da‘if) tradition.\(^{36}\)

With regard to the hadith of ‘Uqba b. ‘Amir, al-Albānī argues that it seems to allow the sacrifice of ram that is one-year old (al-jadha‘ min-al-da‘ni). Permission to sacrifice, however, is given only to ‘Uqba. This permission is based on a hadith related by al-Bukhārī: The Prophet divided sacrifices among his Companions, and ‘Uqba received a ram (jadha‘atun). I [viz., ‘Uqba] said: ‘Oh Prophet, I received a ram’ (jadha‘a). The Prophet said: ‘Sacrifice it!’ (qassama al-nabi ẓallā Allāh ‘alayhim wa-sallā bayna ashābihi ẓallā fa-ṣrarat li-‘Uqba jadha‘atan fa-qultu: yā rasūl Allāh ẓarāt li jadha‘atun qāla ẓarāt bi-hā).\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{33}\) For the hadiths with “al-Layth—Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir” in their isnāds, see below.

\(^{34}\) Al-Albānī, Sīliṣṭa al-ahādīth al-da‘ifah, vol. 1, 89.


\(^{36}\) Al-Albānī, Sīliṣṭa al-ahādīth al-da‘ifah, vol. 1, 94.

Al-Albâni cites another hadith to interpret the hadith of Mujâshi' b. Mas'ûd. On the surface this hadith seems to allow sacrificing a one year old sheep that has hair (al-jadha' min-al-ma'zi), but this was not the intention, according to al-Albâni. According to a hadith of al-Barrâ': “My maternal uncle Abû Burda slaughtered an animal for sacrifice before the prayer of 'Id al-'adha. The Prophet said: ‘That is goat flesh (which has nothing to do with sacrifice).’ He said, ‘Oh Messenger of God I have in my possession jadha'atan min al-ma'zi,” the Prophet said, ‘Sacrifice with it, and it is not appropriate for anyone other than you’” (dahha khâli Abû Burda qabla al-salât fa-qâla rasûl Allâh şallâ Allâh 'alayhi wa-sallam: tilka shâtu lahmin fa-qâla yâ rasûl Allâh inna 'indi jadha'atan min al-ma'zi fa-qâla dahhi bi-hâ wa-lâ taslûh li-ghayrika...). Al-Albâni argues that the two allegedly authentic hadiths and the hadiths of 'Uqba and al-Barrâ confirm the weakness of the hadith of Abû al-Zubayr. Al-Albâni’s method is clear. He first analyzes the isnâd of a particular hadith. An unreliable isnâd means that the hadith is unreliable. Accordingly, al-Albâni does not feel compelled to interpret a hadith, which, in his view, has an unreliable isnâd, as interpretation is an aspect of authentification. However, he does interpret hadiths that have reliable isnâds, when their mats do not correspond to the mats of other reliable isnâds. Al-Albâni’s assessment of the hadith in question as weak is contrary to the opinion of prominent hadith scholars such as Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalâni.

The implication of al-Albâni’s method
Of the 960 hadiths reportedly transmitted by Jâbir from the Prophet, 360 were further transmitted by Abû al-Zubayr. I examined all of the hadiths that have the Abû al-Zubayr—Jâbir link that are recorded in the canonical collections. Muslim records 194 such hadiths, Abû Dâwûd 83 hadiths, al-Tirmidhî 52 hadiths, al-Nasa’î 141 hadiths, and Ibn Mâjâ 78 hadiths. In fact, the Abû al-Zubayr-Jâbir link appears in 548 hadiths, if we take into account the fact that several hadiths are recorded in more than one collection.

38 Ma'z is a kind of ghanam (sheep) that has hair, unlike da'n, the kind of sheep that has wool. Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon, part. 7, 2724.
39 Muslim, Şâhih, Kitâb al-adâlî, 1:6. The hadith is transmitted by Yahyâ b. Yahyâ—Khâlid b. 'Abd Allâh—Mûтарraf—'Amîr—al-Barrâ'.
40 al-Albâni, Silsilat, vol. 1, 91.
If we question Abū al-Zubayr’s transmission from Jābir in the case mentioned above, does this mean that we should question this link in the other 360 ḥadīths as well? Faithful to the traditional Muslim method of authenticating ḥadīths, al-Albānī argues that if a mudallīs says: “I heard” (sami’tu), his transmission is to be regarded as uninterrupted. But if he says “on the authority of” (′an), his transmission is to be rejected or its assessment should at least be suspended until he makes clear that he really heard it from his informant. How often did Abū al-Zubayr use the word “‘an” and how often did he use the word “sami’tu” and other words that suggest direct contact? Of the 194 ḥadīths with the Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir link preserved in Muslim’s Šāhīḥ, Abū al-Zubayr uses the verb “sami’a” and similar terms that imply a direct transmission 69 times, and he says “‘an” 125 times. See diagram 1.

**Diagram 1**

The isnād of the Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir link in Muslim’s Šāhīḥ[^41]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Ambiguous Statement of Abū Zubayr</th>
<th>Explicit statement of Abū al-Zubayr</th>
<th>Number of hadiths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kitāb al-buyū‘</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kitāb al-hībāt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kitāb al-ashriba</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kitāb al-salām</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kitāb al-lībās</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kitāb al- 경우에는</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kitāb al-imān</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kitāb al-zakāt</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kitāb al-salāt</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kitāb al-nikāh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kitāb al-talāq</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>K. sīfat al-janna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kitāb al-manāsik</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kitāb al-tahāra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kitāb al-adāb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kitāb al-fuḍa‘il</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kitāb al-maghāzī</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kitāb al-ḥudūd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kitāb al-imāra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kitāb al-sayd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kitāb al-ru‘yā</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^41]: See the appendix.
Some of the 125 hadiths with the term ‘an recorded by Muslim are found in other canonical collections, such as those of al-Tirmidhi, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā’ī and Ibn Māja. Did these collectors record the hadiths in which the ḫanād contains the term ‘an? Yes. Of the 125 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir link using the term ‘an in Muslim, 33 are also recorded in al-Tirmidhi, Ibn Māja, al-Nasā’ī and Abū Dāwūd, all of them with the term “‘an”, except for one hadith.\

42 For the hadiths, see Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-buyū’; (1) 29:1. See also Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-akhkām 79:2; (2) 16:7. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-buyū’, 34:1; al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-buyū’, 72; al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-buyū’, 72:2; (3) 6:4. See also al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-buyū’, 13:2; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-tijārāt, 15:2; (4) 49:2. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-buyū’, 75:1; al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-buyū’, 78:156; (5) Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-ashriba, 13:4. See also Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-aţ’ima, 8:3; al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-walima (I failed to find the hadith because the version of al-Nasā’ī’s volumes available to me is incomplete. I refer the reader to Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Hajjāj Yūsuf al-Mizzī, Tuhfat al-ashrâbī ma’rifatul-ardāfī, Hyderabad, 1965, vol. 2, 340); (6) 5:4. See also al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-ashriba, 13; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-ashriba, 11:1; (7) 12:1. See also Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-ashriba, 16:1; (8) 12:2. See Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-ashriba, 22:2; Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-aţ’ima, 15; (9) Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-adābih, 2:1. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-đahāyā, 5:1; al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-đahāyā, 13:1; Ibn Māja, Kitāb al-adābih, 7:4; (10) 5:8. This hadith is also recorded by al-Nasā’ī, see al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-đahāyā, 36:1; (11) Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-imān, 9:4. See also al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-tafsīr, 77 (al-ghāshīya); Nasā’ī, Sunan (al-Tafsīr fi al-kubrā). I was unable to find the hadith in Nasā’ī’s Sunan, for the version available to me is incomplete. I refer the reader to al-Mizzī, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 302; (12) Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-zakāt, 14:2. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-‘iţq, 9:3; al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-buyū’, 82:2; (13) 7:8. See also al-Nasā’ī, Kitāb al-zakāt, 9; (14) Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-şalāt, 13:1. See also Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 239:4; (15) 19:8. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 69:6; al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 464:1; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 183:4; (16) 36:5. See also al-Nasā’ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 328:1; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 78:3; (17) 111:4. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 215:6; al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 185; (18) 60:8. It is also found in Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-şalāt, 171:4; (19) 19:9. This hadith is also recorded by al-Nasā’ī, Kitāb al-şalāt, 209:4. Readers are referred to al-Mizzī, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 310; (20) 179:6. This hadith is also recorded by al-Nasā’ī, Kitāb al-şalāt, see al-Mizzī,
What can we infer from this data? What does it mean when one (and the same) *hadith* is transmitted with the term *sami'a* in one case and with the term ‘*an* in another? What is the significance of the fact that Muslim accepts the “*sami'a* transmission” one-third of the time but accepts the “*an* transmission” two-thirds of the time? What does this pattern suggest regarding the method used by Muslim to assess the soundness of *hadith*? If *isnād* terminology (*sami'a*, ‘*an*, etc.) was not decisive for Muslim (in the case of Abu al-Zubayr), on what grounds did he base his assessment that Abu al-Zubayr’s transmissions from Jābir are *saḥīḥ*? In other words, did the collectors of *hadith* really base themselves on the evidence of the *isnād*?

These are difficult questions to answer. Motzki has discussed the significance of transmission terminology in early Islam. Upon the basis of his analysis of the transmission of Ibn Jurayj (d. 150/767) from ‘Aṭā’ (d. 114/732), Motzki concludes that *isnād* terminology (“*sami'a*” and its equivalents, or “*an*” and its equivalents) was not

---

consistent in the second century A.H.\textsuperscript{43} Put differently, certain terms were used interchangeably. It seems that Motzki’s conclusion about Ibn Jurayj’s transmission from ‘Atā’ also applies to the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir link, i.e., Abū al-Zubayr may also have used isnād terminology inconsistently.

The terminological consistency found in the canonical collections, in my view, implies that Muslim did in fact receive some hadiths with the term ‘an and some with the term samī‘a. In other words, Muslim and other collectors did not invent or change the terms. Muslim no doubt considered Abū al-Zubayr to be reliable (thiqa). If so, Muslim would accept Abū al-Zubayr’s transmission as reliable, regardless of whether he claimed to have received it from his informant directly or indirectly. On what ground did Muslim base his assessment of Abū al-Zubayr as reliable? This remains unclear. The fact that Muslim accepted Abū al-Zubayr’s “‘an transmission” suggests that, for him, the terminology used by the first generations (Companions and Successors) did not play a decisive role in determining the reliability of a transmitter. This conclusion undermines al-Albānī’s method, for he uses terminology as a decisive criterion for assessing the validity of transmissions.

Al-Albānī argues that the transmission of al-Layth b. Sa‘d from Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir should not be classified as weak, because al-Layth claimed that he transmitted from Abū al-Zubayr only what the latter heard directly from Jābir. Al-Albānī’s conclusion regarding this line of transmission is based exclusively on Ibn Ḥazm, who made the same point. Al-Albānī does not carry out an analysis of the al-Layth—Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir chain of transmission.

Of the 360 hadiths transmitted by Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir recorded in different canonical collections, 27 hadiths are transmitted from Abū al-Zubayr by al-Layth b. Sa‘d.\textsuperscript{44} In only one of these 27 hadiths

\textsuperscript{43} See Motzki, The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 101-4.

\textsuperscript{44} For the hadiths, see (1) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-bu‘yū‘, 44; (2) Kitāb al-bu‘yū‘, 23:2; (3) Kitāb al-salāt, 19:8. This hadith is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā‘ī and Ibn Māja. See Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-salāt, 69:6; al-Nasā‘ī, Sunan al-kubrā, Kitāb al-salāt, 464:1; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-salāt, 183:4; (4) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-salāt, 179:6. This hadith is also recorded by al-Nasā‘ī, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfat, vol. 2, 340; (5) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-salāt, 36:5. This hadith is also transmitted by al-Nasā‘ī and Ibn Māja, see al-Nasā‘ī, Sunan, Kitāb al-salāt, 328:1; (6) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-salāt, 60:7; (7) Muslim Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-ru‘yā, 1:8; (8) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-ru‘yā, 2:4; (9) Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-ru‘yā, 3:1. This hadith is also transmitted by Ibn Māja and al-Nasā‘ī. See Ibn
does Abū al-Zubayr explicitly state that he received the *hadith* directly from Jābir. This poses a problem for al-Albānī. If al-Layth "heard" the report directly from Jābir, as al-Albānī claims, quoting Ibn Ḥazm, why does Abū al-Zubayr use the term "'an" in almost all of al-Layth's traditions recorded by the *hadith* collectors? Why does Abū al-Zubayr's status as a *mudallis*, whose transmission is either to be rejected or its assessment suspended until it is established that he heard the report directly from his informant, change to that of a non-*mudallis* when his transmission is extended by al-Layth, although the *iṣnād* terminology does not indicate that Abū al-Zubayr heard the *hadith* directly from his informant? Does this mean that we should not understand the terms "sami'a", "'an" etc, as reflecting the mode of transmission, as the *hadith* critics claim they do? Why does al-Albānī accept without question the claim of al-Layth to have transmitted from Abū al-Zubayr only those *hadiths* which the latter heard from Jābir? These questions suggest to me that al-Albānī either failed to consider the entire transmission of al-Layth from Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir, or that he


applied the methods of the traditional hadith sciences ('ulūm al-hadīth) inconsistently.

*The analysis of the hadith “lā tadhbahū illā musinnatan...” according to the method of traditional Muslim scholars.*

a. Isnād analysis
The hadith is found in several canonical and non-canonical collections.\(^{46}\)

---

All transmitters of the hadith, from the collectors to Zuhayr b. Mu‘āwiya (d. 173 A.H.), claim to have received the hadith directly from their respective informants, for in their transmission they use the terms hadathānā, akhbarānā and anba’ānā (all equivalents of sami‘a). Therefore, the transmission of the hadith to this point is, from a Muslim point of view, uninterrupted (muttasil). All students of Zuhayr, except ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, report that Zuhayr transmitted the hadith directly from Abū al-Zubayr, that is, Zuhayr uses the expression ”ḥaddathānā Abū al-Zubayr”. Zuhayr himself is considered reliable by hadith critics. Thus, even though Zuhayr is the only person who transmitted the hadith from Abū al-Zubayr, his transmission, according to the method of traditional Muslim scholarship, is considered uninterrupted.

The next stage is the transmission of Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir. All collectors who recorded the hadith report that Abū al-Zubayr did not specify how he received it from Jābir. Put differently, Abū al-Zubayr is reported to have used the term “‘an”, which implies ambiguity. The reliability of such a transmission, in the view of Muslim scholarship, depends upon the reliability of Abū al-Zubayr in the eyes of hadith critics. It is at this point that al-Albānī classifies the hadith as weak, for, he says, Abū al-Zubayr is a mudalīls and he does not explicitly state how he received the hadith from Jābir. The question may be asked: On what ground does al-Albānī categorize Abū al-Zubayr as a mudallīs? Is he really a mudallīs whose transmission is to be rejected?

47 In Ibn Māja, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān says “anba’ānā Zuhayr ‘an Abū al-Zubayr”.
Abū al-Zubayr Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Tadrus (d. 128 A.H.) was a Meccan scholar who transmitted from Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh, Ibn ‘Umar, Ibn ‘Abbas, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. al-‘Āṣ, ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, and Abū Ṭufayl. Many prominent scholars transmitted from him, including Sufyān al-Thawrī, al-Awzā‘i, Mālik, Shu‘ba, al-Zuhri, and ‘Aṭā‘ (one of al-Zubayr’s teachers). As a transmitter, Abū al-Zubayr received only a few assessments from scholars, some positive and others negative. Shu‘ba, for example, expressed a violent dislike for him. He said to Ibn ‘Abd al-'Azīz, “You take from Abū al-Zubayr when he does not know how to pray well?” (ta’khudh min Abī al-Zubayr wahwaw là yahsunu an yusalliya). Shu‘ba reportedly tore a book belonging to Hushaym because the latter had listened to Abū al-Zubayr. Al-Shāfī‘i said that Abū al-Zubayr was in need of support (yahtdj ild al-di’dma). Abū Ḥātim and Abū Zur‘a did not regard his hadiths as a proof-text (huja). Ayyūb called his hadiths “weak”. Some scholars labeled him a mudallis. Accordingly, his hadiths were to be taken as a proof-text only when he specifically stated that he had heard them directly from his informant.

Although disparaged by some scholars, Abū al-Zubayr was praised by others. Ibn Ma‘īn, al-Nasā‘i, and Ibn al-Madīnī classify him as reliable (thiqa). Al-Ḥāzīrī considers his hadiths to be proof texts. Ibn ‘Adī takes him as thiqa by virtue of the fact that Mālik transmitted a number of hadiths from him, and Mālik transmitted from none but a reliable transmitter. He is reliable in himself. ‘Aṭā‘ b. Abī Rabāh reportedly said, “We attended Jābir’s lecture to listen to his hadiths, and Abū al-Zubayr was the one of us who memorized the most hadith (kāna ahfazunā li’l-hadith).”

Taken at face value, these assessments are irreconcilable. In such a case, we may take recourse to the ‘ulūm al-hadith, according to


50 Al-Ḥāzīrī, al-Järh, vol. 8, 75; Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib al-tahdhib, 9, 441.


52 Al-Dhahabi, al-Kāshif, vol. 3, 84.


54 Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib al-tahdhib, vol. 9, 442-3.

which, if two assessments (one positive and the other negative) are attributed to one transmitter, priority is given to the negative assessment (al-jarh), provided that it is explained; otherwise one relies on the positive assessment (al-ta’dil). However, in my view, this does not help us to determine the reliability of Abū al-Zubayr’s transmission. No general assessment may be applied to Abū al-Zubayr. Each of his traditions must be treated on its own merits.

c. Matn analysis

Although the isnād is a decisive criterion for the authenticity of a particular hadith, the matn is not completely neglected in traditional hadith scholarship. In this regard, Muslim says, in the introduction to his Sahih:

> The characteristic of munkar in the traditions of a [certain] transmitter is that, after a comparison is made, his riwāya (transmission) contradicts, or ... in any case ... hardly corresponds with, the riwāya of other transmitters who have satisfactory memories. If the majority of such a transmitter’s traditions are of this sort, they are left out of consideration, they will not be accepted, nor will they be put to any use.

Muslim’s statement implies that it is possible to assess the quality of a transmitter by comparing his transmission to that of other scholars. I am not going to deal with this issue in detail here. Suffice it to say that matn analysis⁵⁸ should be taken into account in hadith analysis.

According to al-Albānī, the hadiths of ‘Uqba and Mujashi’, which specifically allow the sacrifice of a ram (al-jadha’), have reliable isnāds. Instead of taking them as confirming the hadith in question, however, Albānī interprets them by quoting the hadith of al-Barra’, from which he infers that the permission was not meant to be general.


⁵⁷ Muslim, Sahih, 1:5 (Juynboll’s translation); cf. G.H.A. Juynboll, “Muslim’s Introduction,” 269.

⁵⁸ Muslim scholars have established general principles for the criticism of mats. Zubayr Siddiqi writes: “A tradition must not be contrary to the other traditions which have already been accepted by the authorities on the subject as authentic and reliable. Nor should it contradict the text of the Qurʾān, a mutawātīr hadith, the absolute consensus of the community (ijmāʿ qarṭi), or the accepted basic principles of Islam.” For more details, see Muhammad Zubayr Siddiqi, Hadith Literature, Its Origin, Development and Special Features (Cambridge, 1993) 114-5.
Pace al-Albānī, however, one may also take the hadiths that state the permissibility of sacrificing al-jadha‘ as corroborating the hadith under review. Likewise, one may argue that the hadith of al-Barra‘ does not necessarily prohibit other people from sacrificing al-jadha‘. It may merely indicate that it is recommended to sacrifice a mature cow (al-musinna).

The analysis of the ḥadiths according to the methods of non-Muslim scholars

In order to assess the historicity of a particular tradition, non-Muslim scholars take recourse to methods of dating that they developed themselves. At least four methods of dating have been used in non-Muslim hadith scholarship: (1) Dating on the basis of matn analysis, favored by e.g., Ignaz Goldziher⁵⁹ and Marston Speight;⁶⁰ (2) dating on the basis of isnād analysis, which has been particularly developed by Joseph Schacht⁶¹ and G.H.A. Juynboll;⁶² (3) dating on the basis of hadith collections, practiced by Schacht und Juynboll;⁶³ (4) and dating on the basis of isnād-cum-matn analysis, which has been proposed by Harald Motzki⁶⁴ and G. Schoeler.⁶⁵ In this article I will neither deal with how the methods work, nor undertake an assessment of the extent to which we can place credence in them. This has been carried out in detail by Harald Motzki.⁶⁶

In the present case we must use the second method, for reasons that will become clear below. The hadith in question is recorded in Ibn Ḥanbal’s Musnad. Ibn Ḥanbal gives two isnāds. The matn is identical. Both of his informants claim to have received the hadith from the same source: Zuhayr b. Mu‘āwiya. Both lines are single strand until they reach the Prophet. It is possible that Ibn Ḥanbal

---

⁵⁹ Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien (Halle, 1889-1890).
⁶¹ Schacht, Origins.
⁶³ Juynboll, Muslim Tradition, 93-133.
himself may have fabricated the hadith or may have taken it from someone else who fabricated it. However, the hadith was recorded not only by Ibn Ḥanbal but also by Muslim, Ibn Māja, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāʾī, Ibn Khuzayma, al-Bayhaqi, al-Tamimi and al-Ṭahāwī. The matns are identical; the isnāds are different. How can we explain this pattern? Is it plausible to assume that Muslim, Ibn Māja, al-Nasāʾī, Abū Dāwūd and the other collectors copied the tradition from Ibn Ḥanbal? The presence of different informants in their respective transmissions and those of other collectors does not support this assumption. It seems more plausible to assume that the different lines of transmission are independent. If Muslim, Ibn Māja, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāʾī, and the other collectors had simply copied the matn of Ibn Ḥanbal’s hadith and provided it with different isnāds, why would they have changed the isnād only up to the common link, Zuhayr b. Muʿawiyah (d. 173 A.H.)? Is it a pure coincidence?

There are two explanations for the structure of diagram 2. It either reflects the real process of transmission, which means that the hadith in question goes back to Zuhayr b. Muʿawiyah, who must be the source, i.e., the one who spread the tradition, or the common link is the result of systematic forgery. Many non-Muslim scholars would favor the second assumption. Wansbrough, for example, who considers all early Muslim texts to have emerged much later than previously thought, regulates the isnād system as interdependent and accordingly rejects it as a methodological tool for the analysis of any early Muslim text. Similarly, Michael Cook, who argues against the utility of the common link for the purposes of dating, might explain what happened as follows: Someone living in the second generation following Zuhayr (e.g. Muslim) was the first person to circulate the hadith with his isnād. Muslim’s contemporaries took it from him but did not want to be seen transmitting from a contemporary. Some of them skipped him and replaced his informant with Ahmad b. Shuʿayb. Thus, Zuhayr b. Muʿawiyah may have become a common link without having had anything to do with the hadith in question. Following Cook’s principles of isnād analysis, this exhausts the dating game with regard to the hadith in question.

---

67 Wansbrough, Quranic Studies (Oxford University Press, 1977); idem, The Sectarian Milieu.
68 Wansbrough, Quranic Studies, 140.
69 Cook, Early Muslim Dogma, 109-11.
Partricia Crone also argues against using Schacht’s common link theory for the purposes of dating. This theory is invalidated, she argues, by the Schacht’s observations on the phenomenon of the spread of isnâds. In this instance, Crone follows Cook. She concludes, “In practice traditions cannot usually be dated absolutely and even relative chronologies can be hard to obtain.”\(^{70}\)

Unlike Cook and Crone, both of whom consider the common link phenomenon to be a result of forgery, Juynboll claims that the common link phenomenon can be used to date a particular tradition, but only if the common link has pcls, which themselves have pcls.\(^{71}\) Juynboll would interpret the single strand in our isnâd bundle as having been invented outright by the collectors.\(^{72}\) A cursory look at the isnâd bundle of the hadith under scrutiny, however, shows that Zuhayr b. Mu‘awiya is a real common link. No fewer than ten transmission lines go back to him. Zuhayr has two pcls: Hishâm b. ‘Abd al-Malik and Aḥmad b. Yūnus. In other words, Juynboll would argue that the ascription of the hadith to Zuhayr is historically reliable, indeed unshakable. However, using Juynboll’s method, the structure of the bundle does not allow us to say anything about the names under the common link. Thus, Juynboll would argue that it was Zuhayr b. Mu‘awiya (d. 173 A.H.) who first put the hadith into circulation some time in the last quarter of the second century A.H.

The assumption that Zuhayr b. Mu‘awiya is the common link of our hadith entails that he either fabricated it or was its first systematic collector. To put it differently, it was Zuhayr who put our hadith into circulation. Since Zuhayr died in 173 A.H., we can conclude that this hadith was known in the last quarter of the second century A.H.

Is Zuhayr’s date of death a terminus post quem or a terminus ante quem, that is, can we date the hadith prior to Zuhayr? The answer depends on how we interpret the common link in an isnâd bundle. Schacht,\(^{73}\) Juynboll\(^{74}\) and others claim that the common link is the


\(^{71}\) Juynboll, “Nâfi‘, the mawlâ of Ibn ‘umar, and his position in Muslim hadith literature” *Der Islam*, 70 (1993), 211.

\(^{72}\) For Juynboll’s explanation of the single strand phenomena, see his “Nâfi‘, the mawlâ of Ibn ‘Umar...”, 207-44.


\(^{74}\) Juynboll, “Some isnâd-analytical methods...”, 359, 369. In his later articles,
originator and fabricator of the *hadith* in question. Motzki argues that the common link may be the first systematic collector.⁷⁵

Whereas the methods of Schacht and Juynboll do not allow us to pursue the question of dating any further, Motzki does not reject *a priori* the common link’s claim to have received something from the authority he quotes,⁷⁶ nor does he conclude *a priori* that all of the information or part of it really came from the common link’s informants.⁷⁷ In other words, he does not give a specific answer to the question of whether or not the common link’s informants are historical. Rather, he suggests that this question must be investigated on a case-by-case basis. On the basis of detailed analyses, Motzki has argued that some *hadiths* originated prior to the lifetime of its common link.⁷⁸

In some cases, the dating that he establishes suggests that the tradition in question, or at least its core, reflects events that took place during the lifetime of the Prophet. With regard to the murder of Ibn Abi al-Ḥuqayq,⁷⁹ for example, Motzki has established that the transmission of this event, in which Zuhri is the common link, is rightfully ascribed to the Successor Ka‘b b. Mālik (Zuhri’s informant). This tradition, therefore, is to be dated to the last quarter of the first century A.H.⁸⁰

The core of the tradition is much older, however, going back to reports circulated by participants in the military expedition (ghazwa) that took place during the Prophet’s lifetime. In the present case, however, we cannot date the *hadith* under review earlier than the lifetime of Zuhayr, even using Motzki’s *isnād-cum-matn* method of dating, for no variant texts are available. That is to say, all *matns* of the *hadith*...
are identical. Motzki would probably regard this fact as an indication that the transmission of the *hadith* is not older than Zuhayr.

G. Schoeler has developed a method similar to that of Motzki. He, too, assumes that the common link need not be regarded as the fabricator of a particular *hadith*. His method of dating a particular *hadith* pushes things back before the lifetime of the common link. In his article, "Mūsā b. 'Uqba’s *Maghāzī*," he argues that the common link, Zuhri (d. 124 A.H.), really received the *hadith* in question from 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr (d. 94 A.H.), for several of his traditions go back to 'Urwa, not only in the Zuhri transmission but also in the independent transmission of Hishām, a son of 'Urwa.81 Additionally, analyzing the *hadith al-ifk*, Schoeler argues that the common link, Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri, really received the *hadith* in question from his informant, 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr, and did not fabricate it.82 This *hadith*, therefore, was already circulating in the first century A.H. Motzki and Schoeler are not as sceptical about the historicity of single strand transmissions as Juynboll is, but they are not as optimistic as most Muslim scholars are.

When we apply non-Muslim methods of dating a particular *hadith*, whether optimistic or sceptical, to the *hadith* under review, it seems that we cannot push the date of the *hadith* back further than the lifetime of the common link. There are no corroborating *insād* bundles or supporting *matn*, at least in the canonical collections. It is true that there are other *hadith* in Bukhārī’s *Ṣahih* and ‘Abd al-Razzaq’s *Muṣannaf* that deal with the permissibility of sacrificing al-jadha',83 but they cannot be taken to corroborate the *hadith* under review, for the *matn* are very different. Using non-Muslim methods of dating, it seems, therefore, that Zuhayr’s date of death is the *terminus ante quem*. This view is different from that of al-Albānī, who takes at

---

81 Gregor Schoeler, “Musa b. ‘Uqba’s *Maghāzī*,” 86; idem, Charakter und Authentie, 20, 144, 150.
82 Ibid., 20, 144.
face value Zuhayr’s claim to have received the *hadith* from his informant, Abu al-Zubayr.

Conclusion

Generally speaking, al-Albâni was faithful to the traditional Muslim method of authenticating a particular *hadith*. However, his method for determining that a *hadith* was weak is too general. He classifies the *hadith* under review as “weak” because of Abû al-Zubayr’s alleged tampering with its transmission (*taḍlîs*). Al-Albâni’s assessment of Abû al-Zubayr, however, is not based upon a comprehensive examination of Abû al-Zubayr’s biography, nor upon an analytical study of his transmission; rather, it is based solely on the judgment of *hadith* critics such as Abû Ḥātim, al-Dhahabi and others. The *hadith* critics, however, do not unanimously disparage Abû al-Zubayr; indeed, some of them consider him to be reliable. In other words, we cannot assess Abû al-Zubayr’s reliability on the basis of their opinions. Al-Albâni ignores this fact.

Al-Albâni’s declaring weak the *hadiths* under review, based solely on a negative assessment of the reliability of Abû al-Zubayr, has serious consequences for other *hadiths*, of which al-Albâni was probably unaware. In the case of Abû al-Zubayr, al-Albâni’s method leads to the result that we must question the historicity of at least 125 of his *hadiths* in *Muslim*’s *Sahih* (the number of instances in which the Abû al-Zubayr—Jâbir link occurs in this text). The number increases if we include Abû al-Zubayr’s transmissions found in other compilations. Moreover, al-Albâni’s declaring this *hadith* to be weak, based upon the fact that Abû al-Zubayr used the word “‘an”, does not take into account the likelihood that Muslim and other *hadith* collectors did not regard the transmission terminology used by the early generation of Islam (Successors) as a decisive criterion for determining whether or not a transmitter is reliable. This can be seen from the fact that Muslim, for example, records not only the *sami‘a* transmissions, but also the ‘‘an transmissions of that generation.

The fact that al-Albâni accepts as reliable al-Layth’s transmission from Abû al-Zubayr from Jâbir confirms my assumption that he did not base his assessment upon a thorough analysis of the *hadiths*, but rather upon the statements of some *hadith* critics like Ibn Ḥazm and al-Dhahabi. A check of the 27 *hadiths* transmitted by al-Layth from Abû al-Zubayr on the authority of Jâbir and recorded in the canonical
collections shows that in only one case is Abū al-Zubayr reported to have transmitted directly from Jābir.

If we systematically apply the rules of the traditional hadith sciences, which focus on the quality of transmitters, to the collections of hadiths, we may discover that numerous hadiths, heretofore considered “authentic” may be “inauthentic”. One may ask, however, on what grounds did third and fourth century A.H. scholars base their assessment of the reliability of first and second century A.H. scholars? What was the source of information about the “teacher and student relationship” in the biographical works? Were individual assessments based on real traditions circulated by students of a particular scholar or were they developed on the basis of isnāds? So long as we are unclear about the provenance of the source of information, and so long as this information is regarded as a proof of the reliability of an isnād, the argument is circular. This subject awaits further research. Our analysis of a hadith classified as weak by al-Albānī, using both Muslim and non-Muslim methods, highlights the differences between the two approaches. Muslim scholars place a high value upon what the hadith critics thought about the transmitters. Non-Muslim scholars are skeptical about this type of information or consider it devoid of any value. If they do not reject the hadiths as completely unreliable, they try to use other criteria to date them or to assess their reliability.

Appendix

The Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir links in Muslim’s Sahih

Of 22 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir link in kitāb al-buyū’ of Muslim’s Sahih, only 9 times does Abū al-Zubayr explicitly state that he heard the report directly from Jābir, using the expression “sami’tu” or “sa’altu” Jābir. For the hadiths see Muslim, Šahih, kitāb al-buyū’, bāb 9, hadith 1 (hereinafter written 9:1). The hadith is also recorded in al-Šāfī’i, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 320; Muslim, Šahih, Kitāb al-buyū’, 16:2, 31:5: this hadith is also recorded in Abū Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 319; Muslim, Šahih, Kitāb al-buyū’, 8:14, 23:3, 24:1; the last mentioned hadith (24:1) is recorded also in Abū Dāwūd, al-Šāfī’i and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 313; Muslim, Šahih, Kitāb al-buyū’, 30:7, 17:10 and 29:2.

In the other 13 hadiths, Abū al-Zubayr does not explicitly state that his transmission is from Jābir but rather uses the word “an”. For the hadiths see Muslim, Šahih, Kitāb al-buyū’, 29:1; this hadith is also recorded in Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 322; Muslim, Šahih, Kitāb al-buyū’, 16:7; this hadith is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, Tirmidhī, al-Šāfī’i and Ibn Māja, see Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 289; Muslim, Šahih, kitāb al-buyū’, 42:6, 13:9, 17:13, 17:9, 6:3,
40:2, 23:2, 44, 49:2. The last mentioned hadith (49:2) is also recorded in Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā’ī; see, al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 317; Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-bu‘yū‘, 6:4. This hadith is also recorded in al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 306, Kitab al-bu‘yū‘, 49:1 (it is recorded by al-Nasā‘ī, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 291).

In the Kitab al-hibbat, Muslim records 5 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir link, all of which use the word “‘an”. That is to say, Abū al-Zubayr does not explicitly state how he received the 5 hadiths from Jābir. For the hadiths, see Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-hibbat, 4:10, 3:11, 4:8, 4:9, 4:11.

In the Kitab al-asriba, Muslim records 17 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir link. In only one of them does Abū al-Zubayr explicitly state that he heard the hadith directly from Jābir, using the word “sami‘a”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-asriba, 33:2. For the hadith, al-Mizzī refers the readers to Kitab al-‘a‘ima, 16:2. The hadith is also recorded in Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 322. In the other 16 hadiths, he uses the preposition “‘an”. For the hadiths see Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-asriba, 6:39, 12:8, 12:3, 12:9, 12:4, 13:4. The last mentioned hadith (13:4) is also recorded in Ibn Māja as well, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 340; Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-asriba, 13:3, 6:36, 6:38, 5:4. The last mentioned hadith (5:4) is also recorded in al-Nasā‘ī and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 340; Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-asriba, 12:1. The hadith is recorded by Ibn Māja as well, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 341; Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-asriba, 12:2. It is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 343; Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-asriba, 33:3 (the text of this hadith is identical with that of 33:2. However, the isnād is different and the term linking Abū al-Zubayr and Jābir in the first hadith is “‘an”, while in the latter it is “sami‘a”). Kitab al-asriba, 34:4, 18:8, 18:7.

In the Kitab al-salām, Muslim records 10 hadiths with the link. In 4 of them Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “sami‘a”, suggesting that he heard the hadith directly from Jābir. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-salām, 21:10, 21:11, 33:10, 34:15. The last mentioned hadith (34:15) is also reported by al-Nasā‘ī, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 321. For the hadith, however, al-Mizzī refers the readers to Kitab al-ṭibb, 19:15. In the other 6 hadiths, Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “‘an”, which makes it unclear whether he heard the hadith from Jābir or from someone else. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-salām, 33:8, 26:8, 33:9, 8:1, 26:1 (the last mentioned hadith (26:1) is recorded also by al-Nasā‘ī, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 310). Al-Mizzī, however, refers the reader to Kitab al-ṭibb, 11:1; Kitab al-libās, 26:4. This hadith is recorded also by Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 338. Again al-Mizzī refers the reader to Kitab al-ṭibb, 11:4.

In the Kitab al-libās, Muslim records 11 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir link. In only three of them does Abū al-Zubayr state that he heard the report directly from Jābir, using the word “sami‘a”. For the hadiths see Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-libās, 20:2, 32:11 and 1:31. The last mentioned hadith (1:31) is also recorded by al-Nasā‘ī. Al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 321. In the other 8 hadiths Abū al-Zubayr does not state how he received the hadiths. For the hadiths see Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-libās, 19:2, 23:1, 28:3, 20:3, 19:1, 17. The last mentioned hadith (17) is also recorded by al-Nasā‘ī, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 346; Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-libās, 23:2, 28:1. The last mentioned hadith (28:1) is also recorded by al-Tirmidhī, see al-Mizzī, Ṭuhfa‘, vol. 2, 319.

In the Kitab al-adā‘ī, Muslim records 3 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir link. In 2 of them, Abū al-Zubayr is reported to have said “‘an”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-adā‘ī, 2:1. This hadith is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā‘ī
and Ibn Maja, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 298; Muslim, *Sahih* 5:8. This hadith is also recorded in al-Nasā’ī, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 243. In one of them, he said “sami’a”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-adāhī, 2:2.

In the Kitāb al-imān, Muslim records 12 hadiths. In 5 of them, Abū al-Zubayr uses the word “an”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-imān, 48, 72:13, 6:7, 39:4, 9:4. The last mentioned hadith (9:4) is also recorded by al-Tirmidhi and al-Nasā’ī, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 302. In the other 7 hadiths Abū al-Zubayr uses the words “sami’a” and “haddathanā”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-imān, 34:4, 15:3, 85:10, 22:13, 70:7, 83:6, 39:3. The text of the last mentioned hadith (39:3), which contains the term “sami’a” is identical to 39:4, where we find “an”.


In the Kitāb al-nikāh, Muslim records 8 hadiths with the link. In two of them, Abū al-Zubayr says that he heard the hadiths directly from Jābir. See Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-nikāh, 7:7, 3:7. In 5 hadiths, he uses the word “an”. For the hadiths see Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-nikāh, 22:13, 16:10, 22:18, 16:11, 2:1. The last mentioned (2:1) is also transmitted by Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhi and al-Nasā’ī, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 350. In one hadith, Abū al-Zubayr says, “qāla Jābir”. For the hadith see Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-nikāh, 2:3.

In the Kitāb al-ṭalāq, Muslim records 2 hadiths with the chain, one of which uses the term “an”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-ṭalāq, 4:10. For the other he uses “sami’a”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-ṭalāq, 7. This hadith is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā’ī and Ibn Mājā, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 314. In the Kitāb sīfat al-jannā, Muslim records two hadiths with the chain, one of which uses term “an” (7:5) and the other uses the term “sami’a” (7:4).

In the Kitāb al-mansūk, Muslim records 27 hadiths, only 9 of which use “sami’a”. For the hadiths see Muslim, *Sahih*, Kitāb al-mansūk, 53:2, 17:33 (also...

In the Kitāb al-adab, Muslim records 4 hadiths with the link. In two of them, Abū al-Zubayr explicitly states that he received the hadiths from Jābir—Abū al-Zubayr chain. Two of them use the term “ṣamīʿa”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-tahārā, 17:3 (also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 312), 55:1, 42:2, 17:30, 17:32, 62:7, 62:3, 62:1 (also recorded by al-Tirmidhi, al-Nasāʾī, Ibn Māja and Abū Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, vol. 2, 342), 17:27, 54, 83, 53:1. In the Kitāb al-adab, Muslim records 4 hadiths with the chain, two of which use the term “‘an”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-adab, 16:1, 34:3 (the last is also recorded by Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 340).

In the Kitāb al-fadil, Muslim records 6 hadiths with the chain, two of which use the term “ṣamīʿa”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-fadil, 70:1, 99:3. The other 4 use the term “‘an”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-fadil, 82:3, 3:5, 3:6, 92:4.

In the Kitāb al-maghdż, Muslim records only one hadith with the chain, using the term “ṣamīʿa”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-Maghdż, 49:3. In the Kitāb al-hudūd, Muslim records two hadiths with the chain. In one of them, Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “ṣamīʿa”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-hudūd, 6:6 (also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 319, al-Mizzi refers the reader to 17:6). In the other one, he uses “‘an”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-hudūd, 2:4.

In the Kitāb al-imāra, Muslim records 5 hadiths. In three of them, Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “ṣamīʿa”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-imāra, 1:3 (al-Mizzi refers the reader to Kitāb al-maghdż, 54:3, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 328), 18:4 (al-Mizzi refers the reader to Kitāb al-maghdż, 71:4, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 328), 18:3 (al-Mizzi refers the reader to Kitāb al-maghdż, 71:3, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 328). In two cases he used the word “‘an”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-imāra, 18:1 (al-Mizzi refers the reader to Kitāb al-Maghdż, 17:1, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 341), 18:2, Kitāb al-imāra, 18:2 (al-Mizzi refers the reader to Kitāb al-maghdż, 71:2. The hadith is also reported by al-Nasāʾī, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 306.)

In the Kitāb al-ṣayd, Muslim records 3 hadiths with the Jābir—Abū al-Zubayr chain. In two of them, Abū al-Zubayr uses words indicating direct contact (ṣamāʿ), that is, “ṣamīʿa” (one hadith) and “saʿala” (one hadith). See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-ṣayd, 7:15, 7:16. In one hadith he uses the word “‘an”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-ṣayd, 4:1 (also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 300).

In the Kitāb al-ruʿyā, Muslim records 5 hadiths with the chain. Only one of them uses the term “ṣamīʿa”. See Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, Kitāb al-ruʿyā, 2:4. It is also
recorded by al-Nasâ'i and Ibn Mâja, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 339. The other 4 hadiths use the term “‘an”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-ru'yá, 2:3. The text of this hadith (2:3) which uses the term “‘an” is similar to that of the hadith 2:4 which uses the term “sami’a”. The first has a long version, while the latter has a short one. Kitâb al-ru'yá, 2:5, 1:8, 3:1. The last mentioned hadith (3:1) is also recorded by Ibn Mâja and al-Nasâ'i. See Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 339.

In the Kitâb al-ṣiyâm, Muslim records 2 hadiths with the chain—Abû al-Zubayr. In one of them, Abû al-Zubayr says that he listened to Jâbir (sami’a Jâbir). See Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-ṣiyâm, 4:3. In the other one, he uses the term “‘an”. See Muslim, Kitâb al-ṣiyâm, 4:2.

In the Kitâb al-janâ’iz, Muslim records 7 hadiths with the chain. Abû al-Zubayr says that he heard it directly from Jâbir in four of them. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-janâ’iz, 32:2, 50, 24:7, 24:8. In the other 3 hadiths, Abû al-Zubayr says “‘an”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-janâ’iz, 32:1. The text of this hadith is identical with that of hadith 32:2; however, the isnâd and terms used are different. In the isnâd of the first (Abû Bakr—Haﬁ b. Ghiyâth—Ibn Jurayj—Abû al-Zubayr—Jâbir) we find the term “‘an” between Abû al-Zubayr and Jâbir. In the isnâd of the second (Hârun b. ‘Abd Allâh—Hadjâj—Ibn Jurayj—Abû al-Zubayr—Jâbir) we find “sami’a”. For other hadiths see Kitâb al-janâ’iz, 32:3 (this hadith is also recorded by al-Nasâ’i and Ibn Mâja, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 289), 22:6 (also recorded by al-Nasâ’i, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 290).

In the Kitâb al-dhabâ’ih, Muslim records 2 hadiths with the chain. Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-dhabâ’ih, 6:2, 12:6. Abû al-Zubayr heard directly from Jâbir in both cases.

In the Kitâb al-Qadar, Muslim records 2 hadiths with the chain. In both cases Abû al-Zubayr used the term “‘an”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-Qadr, 1:13, 1:14.

In the kitâb al-isti’dhân (for this chapter, I follow al-Mizzi’s edition), Muslim records 4 hadiths. In 2 of them Abû al-Zubayr uses the term “sami’a” (Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-isti’dhân, 2:5, 14:9) and in the other 2 he uses “‘an” (see Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-isti’dhân, 18:1, 21:6).

In the Kitâb al-tawba, Muslim records 3 hadiths with the chain, all of them with “sami’a”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-tawba, 31:10, 30:5, 13:15.

In the Kitâb al-‘itq, Muslim records only one hadith in which Abû al-Zubayr says that he heard it directly from Jâbir. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitâb al-‘itq, 5:1.