

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Muslim scholars have engaged with the science of ḥadīth criticism in the study of *mutawātir* ḥadīth since the early times. For Muslim scholars, *mutawātir* ranked as the highest classification of tradition in ḥadīth criticism. The originality of *mutawātir* is guaranteed without the need to examine its chain of narrators. In *Taysīr Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*, *mutawātir* is defined as narrated by a large number of *narrators* which according to custom is impossible for them to agree to lie.¹ The same goes in *‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth Aṣīluhā wa-Mu’āṣiruhā* in which *mutawātir* is defined as narrated by a large number of *narrators* in each *tabaqa* of the *isnād*, which according to custom is impossible for them to agree to lie.² Also, Dr. Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ in his book *‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth wa-Muṣṭalaḥuh* defines *mutawātir* as *ṣaḥīḥ* ḥadīth narrated by groups of narrators which according to custom it is impossible for them to agree to lie, with an equal number of narrators from the beginning, to the middle until the end of the *isnād*.³

A similar definition is given by ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb in his book *Al-Sunnah Qabla al-Tadwīn*, where he defined *mutawātir* as ḥadīth narrated by a number of *narrators* which according to custom it is impossible for them to agree to lie about the narrated ḥadīth. It is also narrated by an equal number of narrators from the first to the last *isnād* and that number is not reduced on each and every *tabaqa* (level) of its *isnād*.⁴ While in *Al-Sunnah wa-Makānatuhā fī al-Taṣhrī’ al-Islāmī*, Mustafā al-Sibā’ī defines *mutawātir* as

¹ Maḥmūd al-Ṭaḥḥān. (2005). *Taysīr Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Fikr. p. 17.

² Abū al-Layth al-Khayrābādī. (2011). *‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth: Aṣīluhā wa-Mu’āṣiruhā*. Selangor: Dār al-Shākir. p. 133.

³ Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ. (2003). *‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth wa-Muṣṭalaḥuh*. Bayrūt: Dār al-‘Ilm lil-Malāyīn. p. 146.

⁴ ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb. (1988). *al-Sunnah Qabla al-Tadwīn*. Qāhirah: Maktabah al-Wahbah. p. 122.

narrations that are related by a group of upright and trustworthy narrators who also related from a group of upright and trustworthy narrators, and so on, until the narration ends at the Prophet s.a.w.⁵ All the definitions of *mutawātir* by these Muslim scholars clearly show the reliability of *tawātur* narrations.

On the other hand, orientalists have also long been interested in the study of ḥadīth especially issues relating to the authenticity or originality of ḥadīth. This study focuses on orientalists in the field of ḥadīth studies, who critically study the science of ḥadīth, especially *mutawātir* ḥadīth. As defined by Edward Wadie Said in his well-known book, *Orientalism*, an orientalist is anyone who teaches, writes about, or researches the Orient and this applies whether the person is an anthropologist, sociologist, historian or philologist, either in its specific or its general aspects, and what he or she does is orientalism.⁶ His definition of an orientalist is widely used in many works, and one of the works is an article written by Maarij Shakoor and Faseeha Umar titled '*A Critical Analysis of the Concept of Orientalism*'. They quoted this definition and stated that the concept of orientalism addresses the dimensions of the vast study of Islam by the orientalists, the western non-Muslim religious and political thinkers, which can be declared as the western think tank.⁷ Thus, focusing on the ḥadīth scope of studies, orientalists in this field of study are those who teach, write and research about ḥadīth.

Two prominent figures of orientalists in the ḥadīth field of study are Ignaz Goldziher and Joseph Schacht. Both of them have produced two major works worthy of consideration which are Ignaz Goldziher's *Muslim Studies* and Joseph Schacht's *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*. These works have contributed remarkably in

⁵ Mustafā al-Sibā'ī. (2003). *al-Sunnah wa-Makānatuhā fī al-Tashrī' al-Islāmī*. Riyāḍ: Dār al-Salām. p. 235.

⁶ Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books. p. 2.

⁷ Shakoor, M. & Umar, F. (2018). A Critical Analysis of the Concept of Orientalism. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*, 51, p. 46.

carving the Westerns' perspectives regarding ḥadīth until most Westerns' writings on ḥadīth studies generally revolve around the results of both studies.⁸ Joseph Schacht with his *Isnād* Analytical Study and theories focused on approaching the *isnād* or the chains of narrators of the ḥadīth, whether they are attributable to the Prophet s.a.w or there are any doubtful narrator or history along the chains. Meanwhile, Ignaz Goldziher referred to the *matn* or the contents of the ḥadīth, and whether the ḥadīth are reliable enough until Muslim scholars approved the narrations to provide rulings on legal and religious matters.⁹

The science of ḥadīth criticism has been widely examined by orientalist for many purposes, while Muslim scholars and academicians rose to defend and argue the criticisms given by those orientalist. Hence, Muslim scholars and orientalist clearly have their own perspectives regarding *mutawātir* ḥadīth as evidenced in many of their works. The value of *mutawātir* ḥadīth as a legitimate source has been a topic discussed not just by Muslim scholars but also orientalist. They share their ideas about *mutawātir* ḥadīth in their works that shaped different views about ḥadīth tradition. There are three aspects that could be regarded as the main points in the discussions or arguments about *mutawātir* ḥadīth which are the reliability of the *isnād*, the existence and the knowledge created by *mutawātir*. Hence, this study will set out to analyse all the perspectives from the scholars which will be discussed through these three related main aspects to justify the validity of *mutawātir* ḥadīth.

⁸ Salem, M. (2014). Western Works and Views on Ḥadīth: Beginnings, Nature, and Impact. *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 46, p. 206.

⁹ Fauzi Deraman & Arif Chasanul Muna. (2001). Kritik Terhadap Metode Kajian Sanad G.H.A Juynboll: Tumpuan Terhadap Teori Common Link dan Single Strand. *Al-Bayan Journal of al-Quran and al-Hadith*, 5 (5), pp.72-73.

1.2 Problem Statement

Orientalists have long been interested in practising the science of ḥadīth criticism in the studies of *mutawātir* ḥadīth. They have their own theories and methodologies to argue the credibility of *mutawātir* ḥadīth even though this type of ḥadīth ranked as the most authentic ḥadīth type with strong chains of narrators. By attacking the highest-ranking ḥadīth, they believe that the whole Muslim ḥadīth tradition could be questionable. As deduced by G.H.A. Juynboll by using his Common Link theory, if even the most well-known *mutawātir* ḥadīth cannot be justified as authentic, then the whole notion of *mutawātir* ḥadīth is no guarantee for the historicity of a ḥadīth ascription to the Prophet s.a.w.¹⁰ The same goes to Wael B. Hallaq who applied probability theory in his arguments. He concluded that if the particulars are dubious, then the whole is equally so,¹¹ which means that if *tawātur* narrations are dubious, hence the same goes for the whole tradition of ḥadīth. These arguments, however, will be elaborated further in Chapter 3 of this research. Orientalists' ideologies in arguing *mutawātir* ḥadīth have been spread through their works to create doubts and misunderstanding among Muslims.

Although a considerable number of Muslim scholars have been rebutting those ideologies in their works, all the arguments are scattered in different pieces of their works and are not totally focused on *mutawātir* ḥadīth. For example, the books *Al-Sunnah wa-Makānatuhā fī al-Tashrī' al-Islāmī* by Mustafā al-Sibā'ī¹² and *Al-Sunnah Qabla al-Tadwīn* by 'Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb¹³ both contain discussions about *mutawātir* ḥadīth and rebuttals towards orientalists. However, the discussions did not totally focus on

¹⁰ Juynboll, G. H. A. (1983). *Muslim Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press. p. 98.

¹¹ Hallaq, W. B. (1999). The Authenticity of Prophetic Ḥadīth: A Pseudo-Problem. *Studia Islamica*, 89, pp. 81-82.

¹² Mustafā al-Sibā'ī. (2003). *al-Sunnah wa-Makānatuhā fī al-Tashrī' al-Islāmī*. Riyāḍ: Dār al-Salām.

¹³ 'Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb. (1988). *al-Sunnah Qabla al-Tadwīn*. Qāhirah: Maktabah al-Wahbah.

mutawātir but were on *ḥadīth* in general. There are also other studies refuting the orientalist's theories such as Bekir Kuzudişli's article, *Ḥadīth of Man Kadhaba 'Alayya and Argumentum e Silentio*,¹⁴ which clearly refuted the methods used by orientalists in arguing the well-known *mutawātir* ḥadīth.

The same goes for all the perspectives and discussions about *mutawātir* ḥadīth by various Muslim scholars in each of their published books. For example, Muslim scholars' perspectives about the existence of *mutawātir* could be found separately in many books such as *Tadrīb al-Rāwī fī Sharḥ Taqrīb* by Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī,¹⁵ *Ma'rifah Anwā'i 'Ilm al-Ḥadīth* by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ,¹⁶ *Al-Iḥsān fī Taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* by Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī¹⁷ and few other ḥadīth books. There are also quite numerous contemporary studies that have been devoted to these scholar's rebuttals on ḥadīth, however, less attention has been paid to focus only on discussions about *mutawātir* ḥadīth. For example, Fahad A. Alhomoudi in his PhD dissertation titled *On The Common Link Theory*,¹⁸ pointed out flaws in Schacht's and Juynboll's evidence for the Common Link theory based on *ḥujjah* by Muslim scholars but the discussion was not solely about *mutawātir* narrations only.

Besides, there are similarities and differences between perspectives from Muslim scholars and orientalists which may cause misunderstanding or wrong interpretation if it is not clarified clearly. Although there are few articles discussing perspectives from Muslim scholars and orientalists, such as *Orientalists' Perceptions on al-Ḥadīth and*

¹⁴ Kuzudişli, B. (2007). *Ḥadīth of Man Kadhaba 'Alayya and Argumentum e-Silentio*. *Ḥadīth Tetkikleri Dergisi*, 5 (2), pp. 47-71.

¹⁵ Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. (1994). *Tadrīb al-Rāwī fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī*. Riyād: Maktabah al-Kauthar.

¹⁶ Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. (2002). *Ma'rifah Anwā'i 'Ilm al-Ḥadīth*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah.

¹⁷ Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī. (1988). *al-Iḥsān fī Taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Bayrūt: Muassasah al-Risālah.

¹⁸ Alhomoudi, F. A. (1998). *On The Common-Link Theory*. (Doctoral dissertation) McGill University, Canada.

the Answers from Islamic Perspectives by Mohd. Muhiden,¹⁹ none was found to focus on *mutawātir* ḥadīth. Hence, in this study, all the perspectives from Muslim scholars and orientalist are gathered and analysed comparatively to clarify all the similarities and differences besides understanding the reasons behind them.

1.3 Research Objectives

The objectives of the researcher in doing this research are as follows:

1. To explore the conceptions of the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth among Muslim scholars.
2. To assess the arguments put forth by orientalist regarding the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth.
3. To analyse the similarities and differences between the viewpoints of Muslim scholars and orientalist concerning the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth.

1.4 Research Questions

To explore this study, the researcher answers the following research questions:

1. What are the conceptions of the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth among Muslim scholars?
2. How do orientalist argue the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth?
3. What are the similarities and differences between the viewpoints of Muslim scholars and orientalist concerning the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth?

1.5 Significance of the Study

Muslim scholars have their own perspectives and principles on the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth, while orientalist' have their own invented theories to refute them.

¹⁹ Mohd. Muhiden Abd. Rahman. (1997). Pandangan Orientalis Terhadap al-Hadith dan Jawapannya dari Perspektif Islam. *Jurnal Usuluddin*, 5, pp. 75–85.

All these are compiled and presented in this study to provide a complete reference when discussing Muslim scholars' and orientalist's perspectives on *mutawātir* ḥadīth. All the gathered perspectives are also simplified in chart or table forms which are much simpler and easier to be referred. These comparison tables may provide better understanding and views for the readers, thus hopefully will be useful and serve as an easier future reference.

Then, all the perspectives are analysed comparatively to uncover the similarities and differences between them. The results from this analysis may give a deep understanding of the comparison between the perspectives and the reasons behind them. This also may help to avoid any misunderstanding regarding the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth. As for society in general, this knowledge should be widely spread so that they can learn and not misunderstand Prophetic ḥadīth. Besides, for Muslim society, these will help them in preserving ḥadīth tradition especially *mutawātir* ḥadīth which are compulsory for Muslim to believe. Although considerable research has been devoted to these scholars' opinions on ḥadīth, which will be elaborated further in the literature review, rather less attention has been paid to the perspectives about *mutawātir* ḥadīth. Therefore, it is anticipated that this research would generate a great deal of interest among academicians, researchers, and students in the field of ḥadīth, especially for those searching information regarding scholars' perspectives about *mutawātir* ḥadīth.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

This study is all about the scholars' perspectives regarding *mutawātir* ḥadīth. As this study focuses on arguments or criticisms of ḥadīth, other sources or fields of Islamic studies such as the Qur'ān, *Sīrah* or *Fiqh* are not included. While referring to the title, this study only focuses on *mutawātir* ḥadīth, which have strong chains of narrators and

proved as *ṣaḥīḥ* by *muḥaddithūn* or ḥadīth scholars, and do not include ḥadīth *ahad*, *gharīb* or other ḥadīth with weak chains of narrators. Only perspectives about *mutawātir* ḥadīth are analysed in this study, while other types of ḥadīth may be mentioned if there is any related discussion. *Mutawātir* ḥadīth is chosen to be discussed in this study because, despite being the highest in the ranking of ḥadīth tradition, orientalists argue that this type of ḥadīth is still questionable and dubious. They even easily claimed that if *tawātur* narrations are not truly authentic, hence the same goes for the whole tradition of ḥadīth. These arguments are discussed in this study to verify the theories and methods used by the orientalists until they can make such a claim. Moreover, the criticisms towards those orientalists' ideologies and perspectives from Muslim scholars about *mutawātir* ḥadīth are also presented in this study.

Besides the limitations about the type of ḥadīth, the researcher also has some limitations about the scholars in this study. The term Muslim scholars here does not imply all of them, the same goes to the orientalists where the perspectives are not gathered from all of them. Hence, Muslim scholars here only refer to some *muḥaddithūn* and contemporary ḥadīth scholars. To be specific, most of the scholars mentioned in this study had written well-known ḥadīth books as most of their opinions and views discussed are taken from those great books. The few noble scholars named in this study are Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Ibn Hibbān al-Bustī, Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī, ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb and Muṣṭafā al-A‘ẓamī, while many other scholars are also added to be discussed based on the specific topic in this study. The same goes to the orientalists, this study mostly focuses only on those who had their own works, either books or articles, arguing about ḥadīth. As this study discusses their methodologies and theories in rebutting *mutawātir* ḥadīth, hence the orientalists selected to be discussed in this study have their own

invented methods and theories. This study focuses on three main orientalists, Joseph Schacht, G.H.A. Juynboll and Wael B. Hallaq.

1.7 Literature Review

The three main aspects focused in this study are the *isnād*, the existence and the knowledge created by *mutawātir* ḥadīth. The discussion about *isnād* of *mutawātir* ḥadīth is often related to the minimum limit number of narrators, as taken up by Nandang Husni Azizi in his dissertation titled *Manhaj al-Suyūṭī wal-Zabīdī fī Ithbāt Tawātur al-Ḥadīth: Al-Muqārīna bayna Kitāb al-Azhār al-Mutanāthirah fī al-Akhbār al-Mutawātira wa Luqaṭ al-Laālī al-Mutanāthira fī al-Aḥādīth al-Mutawātira*, which clearly made a comparison between two great works of well-known scholars. Both *al-Azhār* by al-Suyūṭī and *Luqaṭ al-Laālī* by al-Zabīdī have different characteristics and methods in determining the successiveness of each narration. Al-Suyūṭī did not apply the limit number of narrators for *mutawātir* ḥadīth as his minimum standard for all the 113 narrations which he determines as *tawātur*. While al-Zabīdī used ten as the minimum standard for all 71 *mutawātir* ḥadīth narrated in his book.²⁰

Then, there is Mohammad Ahmad Shaelan in his PhD dissertation titled *Ishkāliya al-Ḥadīth al-Mutawātir min Khilāl Kitāb al-Katānī Dirāsa Taḥlīliya Tārīkhīya*. In his research, he analysed ḥadīth in *Naẓm al-Mutanāthirah min al-Ḥadīth al-Mutawātirah* by al-Kattānī to evaluate how far those narration in the book have met the standard of *tawātur*. His research strikes a middle ground that *tawātur* can be obtained with few narrators more than *mashhur* ḥadīth, if it is attached with reasonable evidence.²¹ One of

²⁰ Nandang Husni Azizi. (2021). *Manhaj al-Suyūṭī wal-Zabīdī fī Ithbāt Tawātur al-Ḥadīth: Al-Muqārīna bayna Kitāb al-Azhār al-Mutanāthirah fī al-Akhbār al-Mutawātira wa Luqaṭ al-Laālī al-Mutanāthira fī al-Aḥādīth al-Mutawātira*. (Dissertation) Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia.

²¹ Mohammad Ahmed Shaelan Al-Buraiki. (2016). *Ishkāliya al-Ḥadīth al-Mutawātir min Khilāl Kitāb al-Katānī Dirāsa Taḥlīliya Tārīkhīya*. (Doctoral dissertation) International Islamic University, Malaysia.

the issues discussed in both of these dissertations is the number of narrators in the *isnād* of the ḥadīth which are regarded as *tawātur* by the authors of the books of *mutawātir* ḥadīth collections. There are different opinions on the minimum limit number of narrators for the ḥadīth accepted to be categorized as *mutawātir* ḥadīth. In this present study, all the opinions from Muslim scholars regarding the minimum limit number are gathered to see the differences between them. Muslim scholars tend to focus on the number of narrators when discussing the *isnād* of *mutawātir* ḥadīth. All the Muslim scholars' perspectives about the reliability of *isnād* are then compared with the perspectives from orientalist to be analysed comparatively.

From the orientalist's perspectives, the reliability of *isnād* can be argued with their own invented theories. A German orientalist, Joseph Schacht, with his *Isnād Analytical Study*, presented a few types of theories in dealing with the reliability of Prophetic ḥadīth. Schacht in his book, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* proposed the theory of Common Link which was then adapted by many orientalist such as Michael Cook and Harald Motzki.²² A Dutch orientalist, Gautier H. A. Juynboll was the one responsible for elaborating further and applying this theory to argue the validity of *mutawātir* ḥadīth in his book, *Muslim Tradition*.²³ Besides arguing the authority, he also argued the terms of *mutawātir* in his article, *(Re) Appraisal of Some Technical Term in Ḥadīth Science*.²⁴

Mokhtar et al. in their article, *G.H.A Juynboll and His Methodology in Dealing with Prophetic Tradition: A Re-Appraisal*, mentioned that Juynboll argues the *isnād* of ḥadīth by expanding and analysing the theories of Back Projection, the Spread of *Isnād*,

²² Suwarno, R. W. (2018). Kesejarahan Hadis dalam Tinjauan Teori Common Link. *Jurnal Living Hadis*, 3 (1), p. 93.

²³ Juynboll, G. H. A. (1983). *Muslim tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

²⁴ Juynboll, G. H. A. (2001). *(Re) Appraisal of Some Technical Terms in Ḥadīth Science*. *Islamic Law and Society*, 8 (3), pp. 303-349.

Family *Isnād*, Single Strand and Common Link. In fact, these theories were already found by past orientalists before him such as Marston Speight, D.S Margoliouth, Henri Lammens and Leo Caetani.²⁵ The above theories were used by orientalists in arguing the *isnād* of ḥadīth in general, hence, this present study seeks to explore which theories used by orientalists focused on arguing the reliability of *mutawātir* ḥadīth's *isnād*.

There are also studies that discuss *mutawātir* ḥadīth's existence. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī in his book *Tadrīb al-Rāwī fī Sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī* pointed out that there are many ḥadīth can be categorised as *mutawātir* ḥadīth and listed down examples of the ḥadīth.²⁶ The same goes to al-Suyūṭī, al-Kattānī and al-Zabīdī who had put effort into collecting *mutawātir* ḥadīth in their books of *mutawātir* ḥadīth collections.²⁷ On the other hand, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in his book *Ma'rifah Anwā' al-ʿIlm al-Ḥadīth* suggested that *mutawātir* ḥadīth are very difficult to be traced as it is almost cannot be found.²⁸ While Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī gave a more extreme opinion in his book, *al-Iḥsān fī Taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* by claiming that it is impossible to find *mutawātir* ḥadīth or even 'azīz ḥadīth.²⁹ Another Muslim scholar who also went with the same opinion is Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī as he stated in his book, *Al-Taḳyīd wa-l-ʿIdāh* that even the ḥadīth of *man kadhaba* cannot be considered as *mutawātir* ḥadīth.³⁰ Opinions from these Muslim scholars are gathered in this present study to see the differences and compare with orientalists' perspectives about the existence of *mutawātir* ḥadīth.

²⁵ Asmilyia Mohd Mokhtar, Ahmad Yunus Mohd Noor & Zaizul Abd Rahman. (2018). G.H.A Juynboll and his Methodology in Dealing with Prophetic Tradition: A re-appraisal. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 9 (8), p. 1116.

²⁶ Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. (1994). *op.cit.*, p. 190.

²⁷ Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. (n.d.). *al-Azhār al-Mutanāthirah fī al-Akḥbār al-Mutawātirah*. (n.p.). Al-Suyūṭī. (n.d.). *al-Fawā'id al-Mutakāthirah fī al-Akḥbār al-Mutawātirah*. (n.p.). Al-Suyūṭī. (1985). *Qaṭf al-Azhār al-Mutanāthirah*. Bayrūt: al-Maktab al-Islāmī. Abī al-Faīdh Muḥammad Murtadhā. (n.d.). *Naẓm al-Laali al-Mutanāthirah fī al-Aḥādīth al-Mutawātirah*. (n.p.). Ibn Ja'far al-Kattānī. (n.d.). *Naẓm al-Mutanāthirah min al-Ḥadīth al-Mutawātirah*. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Salafiya lil-Ṭabā'a wal-Nashr.

²⁸ Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. (2002). *op.cit.*, pp. 372-373.

²⁹ Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī. (1988). *op.cit.*, p. 156.

³⁰ Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿIrāqī. (1984). *al-Taḳyīd wa-l-ʿIdāh*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Ḥadīth. p. 231.

The idea of its non-existence has been well agreed upon by orientalists as they came out with several theories to argue about *mutawātir* ḥadīth. Bekir Kuzudişli in his article, *Ḥadīth of Man Kadhaba 'Alayya and Argumentum e Silentio*, analysed how the orientalists, Joseph Schacht and Juynboll evaluated the ḥadīth of *Man kadhaba*, one of the most well-known *tawātur* narration by using *argumentum e silentio*, the argument in silence method.³¹ In *Muslim Tradition*, Juynboll not only applied this method to the *Man kadhaba* narration, but also to the *Niyāḥa* ḥadīth, another example of *tawātur* narration. Therefore, this present study discusses the application of the *argumentum e silentio* method on both of these *mutawātir* ḥadīth before inserting other scholars' rebuttals towards this method.

Then, epistemological issues between *mutawātir* and *āḥād* narrations also become one of the topics pointed out by scholars as been discussed in a few articles such as *Masāil al-I'tiqād Bayna Akhbār al-Tawātur wal-Āḥād*³² and *Arguments of Ḥadīth Mutawātir and Ḥadīth Āḥād in the 'Aqīda*.³³ In both articles, the authors emphasized that there are obvious differences of opinion in accepting *mutawātir* and *āḥād* narrations in matters of '*aqīda*', although one major principle of being faithful to *sunna* is to accept both *mutawātir* and *āḥād* ḥadīth. Muslim scholars have their own perspectives regarding the knowledge created by *mutawātir* ḥadīth which are discussed in this present study. The perspectives are gathered and explained before being compared with perspectives from orientalists. The theory used in discussing the knowledge created by *mutawātir* ḥadīth is the theory of 'probability'. Wael Hallaq in his article titled *The*

³¹ Kuzudişli, B. (2007). Ḥadīth of Man Kadhaba 'Alayya and Argumentum e-Silentio. *Ḥadīth Tetkikleri Dergisi*, 5 (2), pp. 47-71.

³² Mish'ān Muḥī 'Alwān & Asmā' & 'Abd al-Qādir 'Abd Allah. (2013). *Masāil al-I'tiqād Bayna Akhbār al-Tawātur wal-Āḥād*. *Research and Islamic Studies Journal*, 31, pp. 303-354.

³³ Aminudin Basir, Radzi Othman, Azwira Abdul Aziz, & Mohamad Sabri Haron. (2012). Arguments of Hadith Mutawatir and Hadith Ahad in the Aqeedah. *Advances in Natural and Applied Sciences*, 6 (6), pp. 704-710.

Authenticity of Prophetic Ḥadīth: A Pseudo-Problem suggested probability theory by comparing *mutawātir* ḥadīth and *aḥad* ḥadīth, together with the concept of certainty which are *ẓannī* (guesswork) and *qaṭʿī* (certainty).³⁴ However, as far as we know, there is no study discussing this theory by Wael Hallaq. Hence, this study seeks to explain further how this theory works in arguing the knowledge created by *mutawātir* ḥadīth.

Muslim scholars have done great work in refuting the orientalist's theories. The books of *Al-Sunnah wa-Makānatuhā fī al-Tashrīʿ al-Islāmī* by Mustafā al-Sibāʿī and *Al-Sunnah Qabla al-Tadwīn* by ʿAjjāj al-Khaṭīb contain discussions about *mutawātir* ḥadīth and rebuttals towards orientalist's, although the discussions are not totally focused on *mutawātir* but on *ḥadīth* in general. There are also quite numerous present studies have been devoted to these scholars' rebuttals. For example, Alam Khan in his article, *A Critical Study of Juynboll Approach to al-Mutawātir*, clearly criticized orientalist's perspectives about *mutawātir* ḥadīth. Alam Khan did not just refute Juynboll's arguments about the term *mutawātir*, but also Juynboll's theories about *tawātur lafẓī* and *tawātur maʿnawī*. Juynboll's claims about ḥadīth compilation and his analysis about the *isnād* of *mutawātir* ḥadīth were also discussed and rebutted in this article.³⁵ The scholars' rebuttals on orientalist's perspectives are also discussed and compiled in this present study, not just focusing on Juynboll, but also on other orientalist's with their theories which are discussed in this study.

Based on the lists of works reviewed before in books, dissertations or articles, lots of perspectives and opinions regarding the *isnād*, the existence and the knowledge created by *mutawātir* ḥadīth can be found scattered in those different pieces of works.

³⁴ Hallaq, W. B. (1999). The Authenticity of Prophetic Ḥadīth: A Pseudo-Problem. *Studia Islamica*, 89, pp. 75-90.

³⁵ Khan, A. (2021). A Critical Study of Juynboll Approach to al-Mutawātir. *The Journal of Gumushane University Faculty of Theology*, 20 (1), pp. 368-392.

Therefore, in this present study, all the perspectives from Muslim scholars and orientalist on *mutawātir* ḥadīth are compiled and analysed comparatively to see the similarities and differences between them. Although there are a few articles that discuss the perspectives of Muslim scholars and orientalist, none was found to focus on *mutawātir* ḥadīth. An article written by Mohd. Muhiden titled *Orientalists Perceptions on al-Ḥadīth and the Answers from Islamic Perspectives*, attempted to examine the orientalist's views on ḥadīth as well as the *isnād* as a mechanism for accepting and scrutinising the soundness of a ḥadīth. The discussion ended with answers as advanced by Muslim scholars against the orientalist's critical view.³⁶ This article discussed perspectives on ḥadīth in general, while in this present study, all the perspectives are gathered focusing on discussions about *mutawātir* ḥadīth. The perspectives are not just compiled but also simplified and analysed comparatively to provide a deeper understanding of the topics discussed.

1.8 Research Methodology

This study is conducted using the qualitative research methodology. The term 'qualitative research' refers to any type of research that produces findings not arrived at by statistical procedures or other means of quantification.³⁷ This study focuses on gathering perspectives, views and opinions from scholars about *mutawātir* ḥadīth which will be analysed comparatively. Data for this study are gathered from printed and online sources which contain multiple information about this research subject. Data will be collected by using a content analysis method or more specific, documentary analysis. Content analysis could be defined as the systematic examination of texts and visuals,

³⁶ Mohd. Muhiden Abd. Rahman. (1997). Pandangan Orientalis Terhadap al-Hadith dan Jawapannya dari Perspektif Islam. *Jurnal Usuluddin*, 5, pp. 75–85.

³⁷ Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. California: Sage Publications. p. 34.

media, or material culture to analyse their prominent manifest and latent meanings.³⁸ Bowen defined documentary analysis as a systematic procedure for reviewing or assessing documents either for printed or online material.³⁹

In order to ensure the credibility of this study, the researcher only uses primary and secondary sources, proven as published academic writing, and written by academic scholars, for both printed and online sources. The perspectives of Muslim scholars were mostly collected from both early and contemporary ḥadīth books. For example, early ḥadīth books such as *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth: Ulūmuhu wa Muṣṭalāḥuhu* by ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb⁴⁰ and *Al-Taḡyīd wa-l-‘Īdāh* by Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī,⁴¹ then contemporary ḥadīth books such as *Taysīr Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth* by Dr. Maḥmūd Ṭaḥḥān⁴² and *‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth Aṣīluḥā wa-Mu’āṣiruhā* by Dr. Muḥammad Abū al-Layth Khayrābādī.⁴³ Meanwhile, the perspectives of orientalist were gathered from the orientalist’s original works such as *Muslim Tradition* by G. H. A. Juynboll⁴⁴ and *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* by Joseph Schacht.⁴⁵

The step in the data analysis for this study involved the application of comparative analysis methodology. The elemental purpose of comparative analysis is to search for similarities and differences.⁴⁶ However, a comparison not only uncovers variances between social entities, but also exposes unique aspects of a particular entity, or in this

³⁸ Saldana, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press. p. 10.

³⁹ Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9 (2), p. 28.

⁴⁰ ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb. (1989). *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth: Ulūmuhu wa Muṣṭalāḥuhu*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Fikr.

⁴¹ Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī. (1984). *al-Taḡyīd wa-l-‘Īdāh*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Ḥadīth.

⁴² Maḥmūd al-Ṭaḥḥān. (2005). *Taysīr Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*. Bayrūt: Dār al-Fikr

⁴³ Abū al-Layth al-Khayrābādī. (2011). *‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth: Aṣīluḥā wa-Mu’āṣiruhā*. Selangor: Dār al-Shākir

⁴⁴ Juynboll, G. H. A. (1983). *Muslim tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

⁴⁵ Schacht, J. (1979). *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

⁴⁶ Mills, M., Van De Bunt, G. G., & De Bruijn, J. (2006). Comparative Research: Persistent Problems and Promising Solutions. *International Sociology*, 21 (5), p. 621.

research, uncovers unique aspects of each perspective of the scholars about *mutawātir* ḥadīth. Hence this method was conducted to address the main research questions, are there any similarities or differences between the perspectives of Muslim scholars and orientalist on the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth and also focused on each of the other research questions. All data, methods and analysis procedures are organised around the research questions of this study. Overall, all the methods taken had helped the researcher to be able to analyse critically all the contents of the data and gather all the information.

1.9 Research Organisation

This study is divided into five chapters as outlined in the table of contents. The first chapter is an introductory section which sets out and establishes the background of the study. Chapter Two employs a descriptive analysis of Muslim scholars' perspectives and principles on the authority of *mutawātir* ḥadīth as presented in their works, particularly early and contemporary scholars' ḥadīth books collections. Those opinions are discussed based on three aspects, the *isnād*, the existence and the knowledge created by *mutawātir* ḥadīth. When discussing the reliability of the *isnād*, Muslim scholars tend to discuss about the exact minimum limit number of narrators for the ḥadīth defined as *mutawātir*. In terms of its existence, there are differences in their opinions on whether *mutawātir* ḥadīth does not exist, or exists with a too small number, or this type of ḥadīth is quite a lot in number with some examples to be discussed further in the chapter. Then regarding the created knowledge, the discussion goes around how *mutawātir* ḥadīth, either *lafẓī* or *ma'nawī*, necessitates certainty and definite knowledge.

Chapter Three continues a similar analysis from the previous chapter but towards orientalist. The orientalist's perspectives are discussed based on the same three aspects. When discussing the reliability of the *isnād*, ḥadīth orientalist G.H.A. Juynboll

elaborates further on Joseph Schacht's work in Common Link and Single Strand theories.⁴⁷ Juynboll uses both theories to argue his different opinions from Muslim scholars regarding the *isnād* of *mutawātir* ḥadīth. About its existence, Juynboll uses the method of *argumentum e silentio* to prove the non-existence of *mutawātir* ḥadīth. For discussion about the knowledge created, another orientalist Wael Hallaq with his probability theory compares *mutawātir* and *aḥad* ḥadīth with the concept of certainty to argue the knowledge created by *mutawātir*. These theories and methods used by orientalists are defined and elaborated further in this chapter to explore how orientalists applied these methods to argue the credibility of *mutawātir* ḥadīth.

Chapter Four revisits perspectives from both Muslim scholars and orientalists to be compiled in a simplified chart form. Then, the perspectives from both groups of scholars are analysed comparatively to discover the similarities and differences between them. By applying this method, it is easier to analyse the reasons why there are similarities and differences between their perspectives. The fifth or the last chapter provides the conclusion and recommendation from this study that summarise the principal findings of the study by revisiting its original objectives and research questions.

⁴⁷ Fauzi Deraman & Arif Chasanul Muna. (2001). *op.cit.*, pp. 72-73.