

THE DIFFERENCES IN HISTORICAL METHODOLOGY BETWEEN JUYNBOLL AND MOTZKI RELATED TO HADITH

Hacer AYAZ**

ÖZET: Müslüman hadis geleneği ve İslam kökenli Batı akademik çalışmaları, geçmiş hakkındaki raporların sahihliğini ölçme ve değerlendirme yaklaşımları açısından birbirleriyle taban tabana zıtlık göstermektedirler. Tarihsel kaynakların güvenilirliği soruları kendilerini ilgilendirir ve onlar bu anlamda kritik öneme sahiptirler. Bununla beraber, bu çalışma özellikle Batı Hadis bilginlerinin hadislerin güvenilirliğinin değerlendirilmesi konusundaki yaklaşımları üzerinde durmaktadır. Bu çalışmada, G.H.A. Juynboll ve Harald Motzki'nin hadis ile alakalı olarak, tarihsel metodolojileri arasındaki farklılıklar analiz edilmiştir. Bu çalışmanın ilk bölümünde, Juynboll'un metodolojisini anlayabilmek için Schacht'ın çalışmaları incelenmiştir, çünkü Schacht'ın tarihsel yaklaşımı Juynboll tarafından geliştirilmiştir. İkinci kısımda, Juynboll'un common link methodu analiz edilmiştir, üçüncü kısımda ise, Motzki'nin *isnad-cum-matn* methodu incelenmiştir. Çalışmanın son bölümü sonuç kısmından oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı hadis ile alakalı olarak, Juynboll ve Motzki'nin tarihsel metodolojileri arasında büyük ve önemli farklılıklar olduğunu göstermektir. Ayrıca, Harald Motzki'nin Batı hadis bilginleri arasında, Müslüman hadis alimleri gibi aynı "saygı" yı göstererek hadisleri inceleyen ilk batılı hadis bilgini olduğu söylenebilir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Ortak bağlantı, *isnadlar*, kısmi ortak bağlantı, *isnad-cum-matn*

ABSTRACT: The Muslim hadith tradition and the Western academic study of Islamic origins show diametrically opposed approaches to evaluating the authenticity of reports about the past. Both are critical, in that they concern themselves with questions of the reliability of historical sources. However, this paper focuses on approaches of the Western hadith scholars in assessment of the reliability of the hadiths. In this paper, differences between in historical methodology between G.H.A. Juynboll and Harald Motzki in relation to hadith are analysed. In the first part of this study, the works of Schacht is analysed in order to understand Juynboll's methodology because the approaches of Schacht has been elaborated by Juynboll. In the second section, the methodology of Juynboll is analyzed. In the third part of this paper, the historical methodology of Motzki is examined. The final part of this study is conclusion. The aim of this paper is to illustrate that there are significant differences between in historical methodology between Juynboll and Motzki in relation to hadith. Moreover, it can be fairly argued that Harald Motzki is the first Western hadith scholars to examine hadiths with the same 'respect' like Muslim hadith scholars.

Keywords: Common Link, *isnads*, partial common ink, *isnad-cum-matn*

1. INTRODUCTION

The legacy of the Prophet is known as the Sunna, and, although it can be argued that in terms of reverence, it is accepted second after the Qur'an. Sunna is the glass through which the holly book is understood and interpreted. In this regard, in Islamic progress the Sunna has ruled over the Qur'an, stating, shaping and adding to the Qur'an. It can be said that for much of Islamic history, the unit through which the Sunna was transmitted, saved and understood has been hadith (Brown, 2009, p.3). Hadith is an anecdote reporting that the Prophet Muhammed (s.a.w) did or said something, or without comment, allowed something to occur, therefore permitting it. It can be said that a hadith has two parts: the *matn* (the report) and the *isnad* (headnote), checking the account by listing the report line of transmission (Reinhart, 2010, p. 414).

** Arş. Gör., Erzincan Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, hayaz@erzincan.edu.tr

It can be fairly argued that hadith has a crucial role in Muslim society and Islamic science. Furthermore, it can be argued that reliability of the hadiths is one of the most significant issue for both Muslim and Western hadith studies. It can be said that Western scholarship provided different answers on the questioning of the historical worth of hadith late nineteenth century. Views range from an extensive acceptance of these traditions as historical sources to conclude rejection. Hadiths are refused due to the fact that they are accepted to have been affected by later religious, political and legal developments.

It can be said that Muslim hadith evaluation judged the reliability of a given tradition firstly from the viewpoint of its *isnad*. By contrast, Western scholarship, with its goal of assessing the historical worth of a tradition, has restricted its consideration essentially to the text. The second approach was prompted by the belief that the *isnad* is usually clearly fictional. This view was shared by Ignaz Goldziher who is one of the founding fathers of Western hadith studies. However, it can be argued that one of the few scholars, in Western hadith studies, Joseph Schacht tried to find methods which include the *isnad* as a principle to value the sources (Motzki, 2010, pp.47-8).

It can be argued that Western hadith scholars G. H. A Juynboll and Harald Motzki also focus on the *isnads* in order to analyse the reliability of the hadiths. This essay will analyse works of both Juynboll and Motzki in order to understand the differences in historical methodology between them. Firstly, the works of Schacht will be briefly examined. Secondly, the methodology of Juynboll and Motzki will be critically analysed. The final part of this essay will be conclusion.

2. SCHACHT'S SCEPTICAL APPROACH TO ISNAD CRITICISM

Goldziher had brought the European historical critical tradition to hold on hadith literature and had concluded that an important number of hadiths that Muslims believed were authentic were actually forged as part of the articulation of Islamic legal, political, dogmatic, and historical worldviews. Western criticism of hadiths was brought to a new level by a German scholar named Joseph Schacht (Brown, 2009, p.210).

It can be said in order to understand the Juynboll's methodology, the works of Schacht should be analysed because the approach of Schacht has been elaborated by Juynboll (Brown, 2009, p.213). Schacht argued that hadiths cannot be accepted in any way in order to report the life of Prophet (s.a.w). While Goldziher focused on political propaganda and sectarian agendas. Moreover, Schacht concentrated on especially on the function of hadiths in Islamic law. He analysed the *isnads* and diachronic tradition of hadith collection and use. Schacht stated that legal hadiths do not show the certain details of the life of Prophet (s.a.w). Rather, they were ascribed to the Prophet by the later schools of law in order to assist to their principles (Brown, 2009, p. 211). It can be said that for the legal hadiths, he states the theory of the Common Link. Schacht argued that for the hadiths which he selected for analysis, the hadith is transmitted by sole one chain until a sure point various generations after the Prophet (s.a.w). After this transmitter which is named Common Link, the hadith fans out to more chains of transmission. As in the eight century, there was a process of *isnads* growing backwards, and then it seems plausible for fabrication his *isnads* back to the Prophet (s.a.w).

Schacht argued that everything before the Common Link is made up, which clarify why the hadith merely fans out extensively after Common Link. Furthermore, he states that as well as to the back growth of *isnads* leading to an enormous rise in the number of hadiths, jurists and hadiths, jurists and hadith scholar also fabricated 'parallel' *isnads* in order to aid avoid the arguments of Mu'tazilites. It can be said that Mu'tazilites refused to use of hadiths with a limited number of chains of transmission (Brown, 2009, p. 213).

The Differences In Historical Methodology Between Juynboll And Motzki Related To Hadith

By the way, it can be argued that one of the most important Muslim hadith scholars is Mustafa al- Azami criticised the Schacht's methodology. Azami argues that Schacht used and also relied on a few number of sources in order to achieve extensive generalization (Azami, 2000, p. XVI). Azami states that Schacht built his conclusion on the Muwatta' of Malik and the Umm of al-Shafi'i, but Schacht instituted the results of his study on the whole hadith literature (Azami, 2000, p.218). Furthermore, Azami also blames Schacht of essentially misunderstanding the actualities of early Islamic legal scholarship (Azami, 2000, pp.239-42). Schacht's argument *ex silentio*, which means that an argument is a conclusion based on the absence of statements in historical documents, where a scholar failing to point out a hadith or all *isnad* must not have existed at the time, is weakened (Azami, 2000, p.219-21).

3. JUYNBOLL'S COMMON LINK METHODOLOGY

It can be argued that in the life of Prophet (s.a.w), while accepting that the origins of what became hadith literature no doubt happened, Juynboll adds that 'certainly it is unlikely that we will ever find even a moderately successful method of proving with incontrovertible certainty the historicity of the ascription of such to the prophet but in a few isolated instances'. According to Juynboll, too many Companions were mentioned with such huge numbers of clearly forged traditions that it is no longer practical to assume of a guaranteed way to shift authentic from falsely attributed material (Juynboll, 1983, p.71).

Juynboll argued that if it is beyond the historian's purpose to confirm that the Prophet did say something, one can confirm that he did not say something. It can be said that he does this by dating when the hadith came into existence. It can be argued that based on Schacht's Common Link theory, Juynboll points out that the more people transmit a hadith from a scholar, 'the more historicity that moment has' (Juynboll, 1996, p.352). According to Juynboll, in an *isnad*, any links that lack such multiple attestations are of dubious historical reliability, particularly in light of the assumed admiration that early Muslim had for hadiths and their saving.

It can be said that Juynboll asks, if the Prophet (s.a.w) had certainly declared a certain hadith in the existence of his faithful followers, how do we clarify why he should select to transmit his saying about an issue to just one companion, and why this companion should select to transmit it to just one successor (Juynboll, 1996, p.353)? It can be said that for Juynboll, then, the only historically valid moment in the transmission of a hadith happens with a Common Link. Since, it is unbelievable that an actual hadith could be transmitted by sole one *isnad* from the Prophet, anything before this Common Link must have been fabricated (Juynboll, 1996, p.353).

It can be said that in his case-by-case examines of many hadiths, Juynboll establishes a jargon for defining the different phenomena of *isnad* fabrication. He illustrated in his some *isnad* figures, two other transmissions of the hadith besides that of the Common Link, one through the source of Common Link and another through a second Companion. Since there is no historical way in order to prove existence of these two alternative transmissions, according to Juynboll, they must have been forged by someone to provide an alternative chain of transmission, possible with a more exalted *isnad*, to that of Common Link. Juynboll entitles the alternative transmissions 'Diving' *isnads* (Brown, 2009, p.215). He believes that a hadith which has no Common Link, sole a set of unconnected 'diving' chains, in any sense, is not historically datable (Juynboll, 1996, p.215). It can be argued that like Goldziher and Schacht, Juynboll completes that the 'programmatic' production of hadiths began after the death of the Companions, with the normalization of the *isnad* form taking place in the 680s and 690s (Juynboll, 1983, pp.5-10). It can be said that while Schacht had described the back growth of an *isnad* if he establish a Prophetic hadith in a collection like Sahih al- Bukhari that had appeared in an earlier collection

as a statement of a Companion or Successor, Juynboll generalised this conclusion (Brown, 2009, p. 216).

It can be said that beyond the back growth of *isnads*, Juynboll analysed a range of other concepts progressed by Muslim hadith scholars. Juynboll challenges the origin of the *isnad* which is Muslim scholars believed one of the most reliable *isnad*. This is: the Prophet (s.a.w)-Ibn 'Umar- Nafi'- Malik, by arguing that the transmitter Nafi', the patient of Ibn 'Umar, did not actually exist as a major hadith narrator. Juynboll argued that Nafi' cannot be founded as a Common Link, and declaring to the fact that the previous transmission critic Ibn Sa'd did not express him as a remarkable hadith transmitter, then Juynboll points out that Malik and other early scholars made up Nafi' as an effective tool for fix their legal opinions in the words of the Prophet (Juynboll, 1996, pp.238-9).

4. MOTZKI'S *ISNAD-CUM-MATN* METHODOLOGY

It can be said that in Western hadith studies, Harald Motzki is one of the most significant scholar. Motzki argues that the forgery of hadiths on the huge range assumed by Orientalist and Revisionist would have been averted by the general oversight of hadith scholars (Motzki, 2005, p.235). It can be fairly argued that Motzki is the first Western scholar to deal with hadiths the same 'respect' as Muslim hadith scholars did (Brown, 2009, p.226).

It can be said that works of Motzki offers three essential criticism of early Western hadith scholarship. Firstly, he points out that the argument e silentio which is relied on by Schacht, Juynboll and Crone is unreasonable. Secondly, Motzki illustrates that Common Links are much earlier than previous thinking, dating some to the time of Companions in the second half of the 7th century. Thirdly, he states that instead of being accomplished hadiths forgery, major hadith transmitters like al-Zuhri and Ibn Jurayj were in broad faithfully passing on reports from the early generation (Brown, 2009, p. 226).

Motzki states that we should not expect to see numerous *isnads* from the Successors back to the Prophet. After all, *isnads* sole came into use during the generation of Successors in the late 600s/ early 700s. He argues that even for those early hadith transmitters and legal scholars who gave *isnads* to the Prophet (s.a.w) at that time, it was merely requirement to give *isnad* for a hadith, not a bundle as become usual in the second half of the 700s. Like for Juynboll's view that Muslims obsessively transmitted hadiths, hundreds of students joining their teachers' hadith dictation lessons. It can be argued that in common sense demonstrates us that there are numerous reasons why history keep one person's transmission from the teacher rather than those many of students. Since, sole a small proportion of a teacher's pupils go on became teachers themselves; therefore it is not incredible that sole one of a hadith transmitter's students would go on to become a transmitter (Motzki, 2010, p.58).

It can be said that Juynboll had argued that merely the transmission of one to many can be accepted a historically documented 'moment' in the life of a hadith. However, Motzki states that if we sole accepted transmission from one person to a numbers of people historically certain, so why do we have merely a few hadith collections or Partial Common Links? If we accept that the hadith came into existence with the common Link, then after the Common Links we should see thousands of chains of transmission in the fourth and fifth generation. However, it can be said that there are so few Partial Common Links actively offers that Common Links and Partial Common Links were the exception instead of the rule in the transmission of hadiths. Furthermore, it can be argued that their absence thus cannot be defined as evidence for hadith not existing at the time (Motzki, 2010, pp. 59-60).

The Differences In Historical Methodology Between Juynboll And Motzki Related To Hadith

It can be argued that one of Motzki's main criticisms of Schacht's and Juynboll's work is few number of sources from which they drew hadiths in concluding the Common Link. Motzki shows on a much larger and more differing body of sources including early ones like the *Musannaf* of 'Abd al-Razzaq al-Sa'ani and later ones such as al-Bayhaqi's *Dala'il al-nubuwwa* (Brown, 2009, pp.227-8). Motzki illustrates that the Common Links for the hadiths he examines certainly belong to the time of the Companions in the second half of 7th century, by consulting a much broad range of sources than these earlier scholars. It can be said that Motzki's 'large-scale' examines of hadith transmission is found on a method of analysing the *isnad* and *matn* together which is named as *isnad cum matn* analysis. Motzki describes that this process relies on three assertions:

- 1 Variation of a tradition are (at least moderately) the result of a transmission's progress.
- 2 The *isnads* of the variation reflect (at least moderately) the real path of transmission.
- 3 If variation texts (*matns*) of a tradition emerging from the same Common Link are in fact related enough, then it seems to be an authentic transmission's moment. On the other hand, if they are not related enough, this is the outcome of either inattention or planned use of the material (Motzki, 2000, p.174).

According to Motzki, to resolve whether the main information found in the text of the hadith begun from before a Common Link, you must see if different Common Links all have the same main *matn*. This desires a two-step technique:

- 1 Examining the factors of the different *matn* variations from all transmission chains emerging from one Common Link.
- 2 Comparing the results about the common element from that Common Link to the *matn* factors of other Common Links (Motzki, 2000, p.182). In terms of Common Link phenomenon, Motzki argued that the argument that in the *isnad* bundles, the important Common Links were the first systematic collectors and professional teachers of traditions discloses why single strands are found before the Common Link and why the larger part of Common Links are not at the level of the Companion of the Prophet, but belong to the three later generations (Motzki, 2010, p.54).

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be said that in Western scholarship in relation to hadith, the *isnads* analysing is taken into consideration first by Schacht in order to examine authenticity and historical value of hadiths, in this regard, he produced new which is Common link. It can be argued that after Schacht, some western scholars study on the *isnads* such as Juynboll and Motzki, particularly; Juynboll built his methodology on Schacht's approach. It can be said that there are some important differences between Juynboll and Motzki in historical methodology relation to hadith. Firstly, in terms of Common link, Juynboll believed that before the Common Link, all transmitters were made up. Juynboll argued that the more people narrated a hadith from a transmitter, the more declaration there is that the hadith really existed at the time. Therefore it must have been forged at some earlier date. However, Motzki argued that the important Common Links in the *isnad* bundle were actually the first systematic collectors and professional teachers of tradition. Secondly, Juynboll's belief is that transmission of a tradition merely to a single person is unlikely. However, Motzki argued that if we sole think transmission from one person to a number of people historically reliable, so there should be more numbers of Partial Common Link, but we have sole a few Partial Common Links. Moreover, Motzki argued that there could be many reason for single *isnads*. He states that the geographical distance between individual transmitters might have played its part and it can be said that the tradition interpreted by the single strand could have been passed on by people who lived or worked for a while on the

margins of Islamic scholarship. Another possible reason of the single strands is that sole a small percentage of pupils go on to become teachers themselves.

It can be argued that Juynboll relied on a few numbers of sources and by using these limited sources he believes that all diving chains of transmission, all corroborating chains, and indeed any chain of transmission which does not emerge from Common Link are forged. However, it can be fairly argued that Motzki studies on a much more extensive and more differing body of sources. Finally, it can be argued that Harald Motzki's *isnad-cum-matn* methodology is certainly a middle position between the scepticism of Goldziher and Schacht and also Motzki is the first Western hadith scholars to consider hadiths with the same 'respect' like Muslim hadith scholars did.

BIBLIOGRAPY

- Azami, M. (2000). *Studies in Early Hadith Literature*. Kuala Lumpur: Islamic Book Trust.
- Brown, A.C. J. (2007). *The Canonization of al- Bukhari and Muslim*. Leiden: Brill.
- Brown, A.C. J. (2009). *Hadith Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World*. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Juynboll, G.H.A. (1969). *The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature: Discussions in Modern Egypt*. Leiden: Brill
- Juynboll, G.H.A. (1973). 'The Date of Great Fitna'. *Arabica*. 20(2). pp.142-159.
- Juynboll, G.H.A. (1983). *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early Hadith*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Juynboll, G.H.A. (1996). *Studies on the Origins and Uses of Islamic Hadith*. Aldershot, Variorum.
- Juynboll, G.H.A. (2001). '(Re) Appraisal of Some Hadith Technical Terms'. *Islamic Law and Society*. 8(3). pp.303-349.
- Juynboll, G.H.A. (2007). *Encyclopedia of Canonical Hadith*. Leiden. Boston: Brill.
- Motzki, H. (1991). 'The Musannaf of 'Abd al-Razzaq al-San'ani as a Source of authentic Ahadith of the First Century A.H'. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*. 50(1). pp.1-21.
- Motzki, H. (2000). 'The Murder of Ibn Abi Huqaya'. In *the Biography of Muhammad*, ed. Harald Motzki. Brill-Leiden. pp. 170-239.
- Motzki, H. (2005). 'Dating Muslim Traditions: a Survey'. *Arabica*. 52(2). pp. 204-253.
- Motzki, H. (2010). *Studies in legal, Exegetical and Maghazi Hadith*. Boston. Leiden: Brill.
- Report, A. K. (2010). 'Juynbolliana, Gradualism, the Big Bang, and Hadith Study in the Twenty- First Century'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*. 103(7). pp. 413-441.