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Abstract

Nāṣiruddin al-Albānī (d. 1999) was a Muslim autodidact who devoted most of his life to the close study of prophetic hadiths. Al-Albānī classified as weak hundreds of hadiths considered authentic by most Muslim scholars, including some hadiths found in the Sahih of Muslim. In this essay, I explain al-Albānī’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-Albānī 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 Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir, 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-Albānī’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-Albānī, called here the Abū al-Zubayr hadith, leads us to question the historicity of at least 125 of his hadiths in Muslim’s Sahih.

Introduction

Nāṣiruddin al-Albānī 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-Albānī produced his first work on hadith, a transcription of and commentary on al-‘Irāqi’s al-Mughnī ‘an ḥaml al-ṣafār fī’l ʿasfār fī takhrīj mā fī’l iḥyāʿ min al-akhbār. Al-Albānī 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 Zahiriyya library in Damascus. Nevertheless, in 1961 he was appointed professor of hadith at the Islamic University of Madīna. He died in 1999.1

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

1 See Muḥammad ʻĪd al-‘Abbāsī in Fatāwā al-shaykh al-Albānī wa-
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Al-Albānī was a Muslim who devoted most of his life to the close study of prophetic hadīths. Although he reportedly did not receive an authorization (ijāza) in ḥadīth from any recognized scholar, al-Albānī studied many of the famous hadīth books, including the Sahīhs of al-Bukhārī and Muslim and the Sunan of al-Tirmidhī, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāʿī and Ibn Māja. A prolific scholar, he wrote 117 books including: Silsilat al-ahāḏīth al-ḍaʿīfah waʾl-mawdūʿa wa-atharuhā al-sayyiʿi fi al-ulma,3 al-Tawassul anwāʿuhu wa-aḥkāmuhu,4 Tahdhīr al-sājid min ittikāḥ al-qubūr masājid,5 Hijāb al-marʿa al-muslima fi al-kitāb waʾl-sunna.6 In his works, al-Albānī identified 990 hadīths7 considered authentic by most Muslim scholars but that he considers to be weak. Indeed, he declared weak (taqīf) some hadīths found in the Sahīh of Muslim, one of the most prestigious collections. Not surprisingly, a number of Muslim scholars have responded with critiques. These include: Tānāqūdāt al-Albānī al-wādīḥāt by Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Saqqāf,8 al-Taʿrīf bi-awḥām man qassama al-sunan ilā saḥīh wa-ḍaʿīf by Maḥmūd Saʿīd Mamdūḥ,9 Tābyīn dalālāt al-Albānī, shaykh al-Wahhābiyya al-mutamahdīth by ʿAbd Allāh al-Harārī,10 Bayān awhām al-Albānī by Asad Sālim Tāyyīm,11 and al-Lāmadhhabīyya akhtaru bidʿātīn tuḥaddidu al-sharīʿa al-islāmiyya by Saʿīd Ramādān al-Būṭī.12 In response to this criticism, several scholars have written books in support of al-Albānī.13

---


2 For a list of al-Albānī’s works, see al-ʿAbbāsī, Fatwāwā al-shaykh al-Albānī, 13-9.

3 Beirut: al-Maktab al-islāmi, 1985. This present article is based mostly on this book.


7 This number is based on the calculation in Maḥmūd Saʿīd Mamdūḥ, al-Taʿrīf bi-awḥām man qassama al-sunan ilā saḥīh wa-ḍaʿīf (Dubai: Dār al-buḥūth liʾl-dirāsā al-islāmiyya wa-ḥiyāʾ al-turāth, 2000), vol. 1, 19.


12 Damascus: Dār al-Fārābī, n.d.

13 See for examples, ʿAmm ʿAbd al-Munʿīm Salīm, La difāʿ an ʿaniʾl Albānī fahasbu bal difāʿ an ʿaniʾl salafiyya (Cairo: Maktaba al-tabiʿīn, 1999); idem, al-Manhaj al-salafiʿ inda al-shaykh Nāṣiruddin al-Albānī (Tāntā: Maktabat al-ḍayyāʾ, n.d.).
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 Şahiḥ. I will analyze several hadiths that he declared weak from the perspectives of both the traditional hadith sciences (‘ulum al-hadith) 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 Şahiḥ 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 hadith
The authenticity of hadith 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 isnāds 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 isnâads 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 (pcls). 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, \textit{Zwischen Hadit und Theologie. Studien zum Enstehen prâdestinationanischer Überlieferung} (Berlin/New York 1975).


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


\textsuperscript{21} J. Wansbrough, \textit{The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History} (Oxford, 1978).


\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.25 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”.26 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.27 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 Šāhīh of Muslim. The hadith reads as follows:

---


Al-Albâni’s method of determining the authenticity or lack thereof of a particular hadith is based largely upon the analysis of the isnâd, using information found in the biographical dictionaries. Al-Albâni argues that this hadith is da’îf (weak) by virtue of the fact that one of its transmitters is Abû al-Zubayr. Al-Albâni argues that Abû al-Zubayr’s transmission from Jâbir is interrupted (ghayr mutta’sil) on the grounds that (1) hadith critics label Abû al-Zubayr as a mudallis, i.e., person who suppressed faults in isnâds; (2) and he did not explicitly declare whether or not he heard the hadith directly from Jâbir, but rather used the term “‘an” (on the authority of). It is established in the science of hadith, al-Albâni 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 Abû al-Zubayr. Al-Albâni concludes that the truthfulness of every hadith transmitted by Abû al-Zubayr from Jâbir 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 Abû 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 Abû al-Zubayr from Jâbir, for al-Layth claimed to have transmitted from Abû al-Zubayr only what the latter heard from Jâbir. Of the 360 hadiths transmitted by Abû al-Zubayr from Jâbir 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-Albâni, Silsilat al-ahadîth 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-Albâni, Silsilat al-ahadîth al-da‘ifah, 91. Cf, Lane, Arabic-English Lexicon, part 2, 396.

31 For Abû al-Zubayr, see below.

32 Al-Layth is reported to have said, “I came to Abû al-Zubayr, and he offered me two books. I was upset with them (fa’ngalabtu bi-himâ), and I asked him whether or not he heard this from Jâbir. He [viz., Abû 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-Albâni, 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-ḍa‘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. ‘Āmir: ḍaḥḥaynā ma‘a rasūl Allāh ṣallā Allāh ‘alayhi wa-sallam bi-jadha‘in min al-ḍa‘ni 34 (We sacrificed together with the Prophet a one-year old ram). Another hadith is that of Mujāshī b. Mas‘ūd: Inna al-jadha‘a yuṣī mimmā yuṣī 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. ‘Āmir, al-Albānī argues that it seems to allow the sacrifice of ram that is one-year old (al-jadha‘ min-al-ḍa‘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-nabī ṣallā Allāh ‘alayhi wa-sallam bayna aṣḥābi ẓahayā fa-sārat li–‘Uqba jadha‘atan fa-qultu: yā rasūl Allāh sārat li jadha‘atun qāla ẓahhī bi-hā). 37

33 For the hadiths with “al-Layth—Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir” in their isnāds, see below.
34 Al-Albānī, Silsilat al-ahadith al-ḍa‘ifah, vol. 1, 89.
36 Al-Albānī, Silsilat al-ahadith al-ḍa‘ifah, vol. 1, 94.
Al-Albānī cites another hadith to interpret the hadith of Mujāshi b. Mas‘ūd. On the surface this hadith seems to allow sacrificing a one year old sheep that has hair (al-jadḥa‘ min-al-ma‘zī), but this was not the intention, according to al-Albānī. According to a hadith of al-Barrā’: “My maternal uncle Abū Burda slaughtered an animal for sacrifice before the prayer of ‘id al-aḍhā. 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 jadḥa‘atan min al-ma‘zī.38 The Prophet said, ‘Sacrifice with it, and it is not appropriate for anyone other than you’” (dahha khālī Abū Burda qabla al-ṣalāt fa-qāla rasūl Allāh šallā Allāh ‘alayhi wa-sallam: tilka šātu laḥmin fa-qāla yā rasūl Allāh inna ‘indi jadḥa‘atan min al-ma‘zī fa-qāla ḍaḥḥi bi-hā wa-lā taṣlāḥ li-ghayrika...).39

Al-Albānī argues that the two allegedly authentic hadiths and the hadiths of ‘Uqba and al-Barrā’ confirm the weakness of the hadith of Abū al-Zubayr. Al-Albānī’s method is clear. He first analyzes the isnād of a particular hadith. An unreliable isnād means that the hadith is unreliable. Accordingly, al-Albānī does not feel compelled to interpret a hadith, which, in his view, has an unreliable isnād, as interpretation is an aspect of authentification. However, he does interpret hadiths that have reliable isnāds, when their matns do not correspond to the matns of other reliable isnāds. Al-Albānī’s assessment of the hadith in question as weak is contrary to the opinion of prominent hadith scholars such as Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī.40

The implication of al-Albānī’s method
Of the 960 hadiths reportedly transmitted by Jābir from the Prophet, 360 were further transmitted by Abū al-Zubayr. I examined all of the hadiths that have the Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir link that are recorded in the canonical collections. Muslim records 194 such hadiths, Abū Dāwūd 83 hadiths, al-Tirmidhī 52 hadiths, al-Nasā’ī 141 hadiths, and Ibn Māja 78 hadiths. In fact, the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir 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.
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 hadiths as well? Faithful to the traditional Muslim method of authenticating hadiths, al-Albānī argues that if a mudallīs says: “I heard” (sami’ītu), 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’a” and other words that suggest direct contact? Of the 194 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir link preserved in Muslim’s Šāhic, 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 Šāhic41

<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-hibat</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-lyās</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kitāb al-aqāḥi</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-nikāḥ</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. ṣifat al-janna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kitāb al-manāṣik</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kitāb al-taḥāra</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-faḍā’il</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kitāb al-magḥāzī</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-ṣayd</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 *ḥadiths* with the term ‘*an* recorded by Muslim are found in other canonical collections, such as those of al-Tirmidhi, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāʾi and Ibn Māja. Did these collectors record the *ḥadiths* in which the *iṣnād* contains the term ‘*an’? Yes. Of the 125 *ḥadiths* with the Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir link using the term ‘*an* in Muslim, 33 are also recorded in al-Tirmidhi, Ibn Māja, al-Nasāʾi and Abū Dāwūd, all of them with the term “‘an”, except for one *ḥadith*.42

---

42 For the *ḥadiths*, see Muslim, Ṣaḥiḥ, Kitāb al-buḍūʿ; (1) 29:1. See also Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-ahkām 79:2; (2) 16:7. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-buḍūʿ, 34:1; al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-buḍūʿ, 72; al-Nasāʾi, Sunan, Kitāb al-buḍūʿ, 72:2; (3) 6:4. See also al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-buḍūʿ, 13:2; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṭijrāt, 15:2; (4) 49:2. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-buḍūʿ, 75:1; al-Nasāʾi, Sunan, Kitāb al-buḍūʿ, 78:156; (5) Muslim, Ṣaḥiḥ, Kitāb al-ashriba, 13:4. See also Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-atʿīma, 8:3; al-Nasāʾi, Sunan, Kitāb al-walima (I failed to find the *ḥadith* because the version of al-Nasāʾi’s volumes available to me is incomplete. I refer the reader to Jamāl al-Dīn Abū al-Hajjāj Yūsuf al-Mizzi, Tuhfah al-ashrāf bi-maʿrifat al-atraf [Hayderabad, 1965], vol. 2, 340); (6) 5:4. See also al-Nasāʾi, 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-atʿīma, 15.; (9) Muslim, Ṣaḥiḥ, Kitāb al-adāḥī, 2:1. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-dahāyā, 5:1; al-Nasāʾi, Sunan, Kitāb al-dahāyā, 13:1; Ibn Māja, Kitāb al-adāḥī, 7:4; (10) 5:8. This *ḥadith* is also recorded by al-Nasāʾi, see Sunan, Kitāb al-dahāyā, 36:1; (11) Muslim, Ṣaḥiḥ, Kitāb al-imān, 9:4. See also al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-tafsīr, 77 (al-ghāshṭiya); Nasāʾi, Sunan (al-Tafsīr fi al-kubrā), I was unable to find the *ḥadith* in Nasāʾi’s Sunan, for the version available to me is incomplete. I refer the reader to al-Mizzi, Tuhfah, vol. 2, 302; (12) Muslim, Ṣaḥiḥ, Kitāb al-zakāt, 14:2. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-ʾītq, 9:3; al-Nasāʾi, Sunan, Kitāb al-buḍūʿ, 82:2; (13) 7:8. See also al-Nasāʾi, Kitāb al-zakāt, 9; (14) Muslim, Ṣaḥiḥ, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 13:1. See also Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 239:4; (15) 19:8. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 69:6; al-Nasāʾi, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 464:1; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 183:4; (16) 36:5. See also al-Nasāʾi, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 328:1; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 78:3; (17) 111:4. See also Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 215:6; al-Tirmidhi, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 185; (18) 60:8. It is also found in Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 171:4; (19) 19:9. This *ḥadith* is also recorded by al-Nasāʾi, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, 209:4. Readers are referred to al-Mizzi, Tuhfah, vol. 2, 310; (20) 179:6. This *ḥadith* is also recorded by al-Nasāʾi, Kitāb al-ṣalāt, see al-Mizzi,
What can we infer from this data? What does it mean when one (and the same) \textit{hadith} is transmitted with the term \textit{sami'a} in one case and with the term \textit{'an} in another? What is the significance of the fact that Muslim accepts the \textquotedblleft \textit{sami'a} transmission\textquotedblright{} one-third of the time but accepts the \textquotedblleft \textit{'an} transmission\textquotedblright{} two-thirds of the time? What does this pattern suggest regarding the method used by Muslim to assess the soundness of \textit{hadith}? If \textit{isnād} terminology (\textit{sami'a}, \textit{'an}, etc.) was not decisive for Muslim (in the case of Abū al-Zubayr), on what grounds did he base his assessment that Abū al-Zubayr\textprime{}s transmissions from Jābir are \textit{sahih}? In other words, did the collectors of \textit{hadith} really base themselves on the evidence of the \textit{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 \textit{Aţā'} (d. 114/732), Motzki concludes that \textit{isnād} terminology (\textquotedblleft \textit{sami'a}\textquotedblright{} and its equivalents, or \textit{'an} and its equivalents) was not

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
consistent in the second century A.H.\(^{43}\) 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 sami‘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 (thiqā). 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.\(^{44}\) In only one of these 27 hadiths

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

\(^{44}\) For the hadiths, see (1) Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-buyu‘, 44; (2) Kitab al-buyu‘, 23:2; (3) Kitab al-salat, 19:8. This hadith is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā‘i and Ibn Māja. See Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, Kitab al-salat, 69:6; al-Nasā‘i, Sunan al-kubrā, Kitab al-salat, 464:1; Ibn Māja, Sunan, Kitab al-salat, 183:4; (4) Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-salat, 179:6. This hadith is also recorded by al-Nasā‘i, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfat, vol. 2, 340; (5) Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-salat, 36:5. This hadith is also transmitted by al-Nasā‘i and Ibn Māja, see al-Nasā‘i, Sunan, Kitab al-salat, 328:1; (6) Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-salat, 60:7; (7) Muslim Sahih, Kitab al-ru‘yā, 1:8; (8) Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-ru‘yā, 2:4; (9) Muslim, Sahih, Kitab al-ru‘yā, 3:1. This hadith is also transmitted by Ibn Māja and al-Nasā‘i. See Ibn
does Abū al-Zubayr explicitly state that he received the hadith directly from Jābir.\textsuperscript{45} 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 isnād 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

\textsuperscript{45} Muslim, Šahih, Kitāb al-ru‘yā, 24.
applied the methods of the traditional *hadith* sciences (‘ulūm al-ḥadīth) inconsistently.

*The analysis of the ḥadīth “lā tadḥbaḥū illā musinnat...” according to the method of traditional Muslim scholars.*

*a. Isnād analysis*

The *ḥadīth* is found in several canonical and non-canonical collections.46

---

All transmitters of the *hadith*, from the collectors to Zuhayr b. Mu‘āwiyah (d. 173 A.H.), claim to have received the *hadith* directly from their respective informants, for in their transmission they use the terms *haddathana*, *akhbaranā* and *anba’anā* (all equivalents of *samī’a*). Therefore, the transmission of the *hadith* to this point is, from a Muslim point of view, uninterrupted (*muttaṣil*). All students of Zuhayr, except ‘Abd al-Raḥmān,⁴⁷ report that Zuhayr transmitted the *hadith* directly from Abū al-Zubayr, that is, Zuhayr uses the expression “*haddathana* Abū al-Zubayr”. Zuhayr himself is considered reliable by *hadith* critics.⁴⁸ 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 *mudallis* 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 *mudallis*? Is he really a *mudallis* whose transmission is to be rejected?

⁴⁷ In Ibn Māja, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān says “*anba’anā* Zuhayr ‘*an* Abū al-Zubayr”.

b. 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 ‘Abbās, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. al-‘Āṣ, ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, and Abū Ṭūfayl. Many prominent scholars transmitted from him, including Sufyān al-Thawrī, al-Awzā‘ī, 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 wahuwa là yaḥṣunu an yuṣallīya). 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 (yaḥtāj ilā al-di‘ama). Abū Ḥātim and Abū Zur‘a did not regard his hadīths as a proof-text (hujja). Ayyūb called his hadīths “weak”. Some scholars labeled him a mudallis. Accordingly, his hadīths 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‘ī, and Ibn al-Madini classify him as reliable (thiqa). Al-Rāzī considers his hadīths to be proof texts. Ibn ‘Adi takes him as thiqa by virtue of the fact that Mālik transmitted a number of hadīths from him, and Mālik transmitted from none but a reliable transmitter. He is reliable in himself. ‘Aṭā’ b. Abī Rabāḥ reportedly said, “We attended Jābir’s lecture to listen to his hadīths, and Abū al-Zubayr was the one of us who memorized the most hadīth” (kāna ahfaẓunā li’l-ḥadīth)

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

---


50 Al-Rāzī, al-Jarḥ, 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-jarḥ*), 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 *hadīth*, the *matn* is not completely neglected in traditional *hadīth* scholarship. In this regard, Muslim says, in the introduction to his *Ṣaḥīḥ*:

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* analysis should be taken into account in *hadīth* analysis.

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

---


68 Muslim scholars have established general principles for the criticism of *matns*. 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 Qur’ān, a *mutawātir* hadīth, the absolute consensus of the community (*ijmāʿ* *qat‘i*), or the accepted basic principles of Islam.” For more details, see Muḥammad Zubayr Siddiqi, *Hadīth 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-Barrā‘ 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 ḥadīths 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 Goldziher and Marston Speight; (2) dating on the basis of isnād analysis, which has been particularly developed by Joseph Schacht and G.H.A. Juynboll; (3) dating on the basis of ḥadīth collections, practiced by Schacht and Juynboll; (4) and dating on the basis of isnād-cum-matn analysis, which has been proposed by Harald Motzki and G. Schoeler. 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.

In the present case we must use the second method, for reasons that will become clear below. The ḥadīth 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 ḥadīth 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-Nasā‘ī, Ibn Khuzayma, al-Bayhaqī, 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-Nasā‘ī, 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-Nasā‘ī, 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. Mu‘awiyah (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. Mu‘awiyah, 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,67 regards the isnād system as interdependent and accordingly rejects it as a methodological tool for the analysis of any early Muslim text.68 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 ʿAbd al-Muttalib b. Shuʿayb.69 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 isnāds. 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.”

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. Juynboll would interpret the single strand in our isnād bundle as having been invented outright by the collectors. A cursory look at the isnād bundle of the hadith under scrutiny, however, shows that Zuhayr b. Mu‘āwiya is a real common link. No fewer than ten transmission lines go back to him. Zuhayr has two pcls: Hishām b. ‘Abd al-Malik and Ahmad 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‘āwiya (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‘āwiya 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 isnād bundle. Schacht, Juynboll and others claim that the common link is the

---

71 Juynboll, “Nāfi’, the mawla 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 “Nāfi’, the mawla of Ibn ‘Umar...”, 207-44.
74 Juynboll, “Some isnād-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*

\(^75\) See footnote 24.
\(^76\) Motzki, “The Collection of the Qur’ān...”, 30.
\(^77\) Motzki, “Der Prophet und die Schuldner”, 10.
\(^80\) See also Motzki, “The Prophet and the Cat,” in which he argues that the *hadith* in question is not to be dated to the time of the common link, Ishāq b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Ṭalḥa (d. 130-34 A.H.). The *hadith* was put into circulation by the family of the Companion Abū Qatāda, i.e., in the last quarter of the first century A.H. For another example, see A. Görke, “Die frühislamische Gesichtsüberlieferung zu Hudaybiyya,” Der Islam, 74 (1997), 193-237.
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. 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. 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 *isnād* bundles or supporting *matns*, at least in the canonical collections. It is true that there are other *hadiths* in Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ* and ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s *Muṣannaf* that deal with the permissibility of sacrificing *al-jadha*, but they cannot be taken to corroborate the *hadith* under review, for the *matns* 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 ḥadīth from his informant, Abu al-Zubayr.

**Conclusion**

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

Al-Albānī’s declaring weak the ḥadīths under review, based solely on a negative assessment of the reliability of Abū al-Zubayr, has serious consequences for other ḥadīths, of which al-Albānī was probably unaware. In the case of Abū al-Zubayr, al-Albānī’s method leads to the result that we must question the historicity of at least 125 of his ḥadīths in Muslim’s Ṣaḥīḥ (the number of instances in which the Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir link occurs in this text). The number increases if we include Abū al-Zubayr’s transmissions found in other compilations. Moreover, al-Albānī’s declaring this ḥadīth to be weak, based upon the fact that Abū al-Zubayr used the word “‘an”, does not take into account the likelihood that Muslim and other ḥadīth 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-Albānī accepts as reliable al-Layth’s transmission from Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir confirms my assumption that he did not base his assessment upon a thorough analysis of the ḥadīths, but rather upon the statements of some ḥadīth critics like Ibn Ḥazm and al-Dhahabī. A check of the 27 ḥadīths transmitted by al-Layth from Abū al-Zubayr on the authority of Jābir 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 Ṣahīḥ

Of 22 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir link in kitāb al-buyūʿ of Muslim’s Ṣahīḥ, 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, Ṣahīḥ, kitāb al-buyūʿ, bāb 9, hadith 1 (hereinafter written 9:1). The hadith is also recorded in al-Nasāʿī, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 320; Muslim, Ṣahīḥ, Kitāb al-buyūʿ, 16:2, 31:5; this hadith is also recorded in Abū Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 319, Muslim, Ṣahīḥ, Kitāb al-buyūʿ, 8:14, 23:3, 24:1; the last mentioned hadith (24:1) is recorded also in Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāʿī and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 313, Muslim, Ṣahīḥ, Kitāb al-buyūʿ, 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, Ṣahīḥ, Kitāb al-buyūʿ, 29:1; this hadith is also recorded in Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 322. Muslim, Ṣahīḥ, Kitāb al-buyūʿ, 16:7; this hadith is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, Tirmidhī, al-Nasāʿī and Ibn Māja, see Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 289; Muslim, Ṣahīḥ, kitāb al-buyūʿ, 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-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 317; Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-buḥū‘, 6:4. This hadith is also recorded in al-Tirmidhi and Ibn Mája, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 306. Kitāb al-buḥū‘, 49:1 (it is recorded by al-Nasā’ī, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 291).

In the Kitāb al-hibāt, Muslim records 5 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābīr 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 Jābīr. For the hadiths, see Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-hibāt, 4:10, 3:11, 4:8, 4:9, 4:11.

In the Kitāb al-ashriba, Muslim records 17 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābīr link. In only one of them does Abū al-Zubayr explicitly state that he heard the hadith directly from Jābīr, using the word “sami’a”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-ashriba, 33:2. For the hadith, al-Mizzi refers the readers to Kitāb al-‘ātim, 16:2. The hadith is also recorded in Ibn Mája, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 322. In the other 16 hadiths, he uses the preposition “‘an”. For the hadiths see Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-ashriba, 6:39, 12:8, 12:9, 12:4, 13:4. The last mentioned hadith (13:4) is also recorded in al-Nasā’ī and Ibn Mája, and see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 340; Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-ashriba, 13:3, 6:36, 6:38, 5:4. The last mentioned hadith (5:4) is also recorded in al-Nasā’ī and Ibn Mája, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 340; Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-ashriba, 12:1. The hadith is recorded by Ibn Mája as well, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 341; Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-ashriba, 12:2. It is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhi, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 343; Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-ashriba, 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 Jābīr in the first hadith is “‘an”, while in the latter it is “sami’a”). Kitāb al-ashriba, 34:4, 18:8, 18:7.

In the Kitāb al-salām, Muslim records 10 hadiths with the link. In 4 of them Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “sami‘ara”, suggesting that he heard the hadith directly from Jābīr. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb 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-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 321. For the hadith, however, al-Mizzi refers the readers to Kitāb al-tibb, 19:15. In the other 6 hadiths, Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “‘an”, which makes it unclear whether he heard the hadith from Jābīr or from someone else. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb 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-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 310). Al-Mizzi, however, refers the reader to Kitāb al-tibb, 11:1: Kitāb al-libās, 26:4. This hadith is recorded also by Abū Dāwūd and Ibn Mája, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 338. Again al-Mizzi refers the reader to Kitāb al-tibb, 11:4.

In the Kitāb al-libās, Muslim records 11 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābīr link. In only three of them does Abū al-Zubayr state that he heard the report directly from Jābīr, using the word “sami‘a”. For the hadiths see Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-libās, 20:2, 32:11 and 1:31. The last mentioned hadith (1:31) is also reported by al-Nasā’ī. Al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, 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, Kitāb 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-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 346, Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-libās, 23:2, 28:1. The last mentioned hadith (28:1) is also recorded by al-Tirmidhi, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 319.

In the Kitāb al-adāhī, Muslim records 3 hadiths with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābīr link. In 2 of them, Abū al-Zubayr is reported to have said “‘an”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-adāhī, 2:1. This hadith is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā’ī
and Ibn Māja, 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 “haddathana”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, *Kitāb al-imān*, 34:4, 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-zakāt*, Muslim records 8 *hadiths* with the Abū al-Zubayr-Jābir link. In 3 of them Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “sami‘a”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, *Kitāb al-zakāt*, 7:6, 2, 48:2 (there are two isnāds for this *hadith* and Abū al-Zubayr reportedly used the word “sami‘a” in the first isnād. That is, Muhammad b. al-Muthannā—‘Abd al-Wahhāb—Yahyā b. Sa‘īd—Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir. In the second isnād Jābir reportedly used the word “‘an”. That is, Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba—Zayd b. Luḥbāb—Quorra b. Khālid—Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir.) In the other 5 he said “‘an”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, *Kitāb al-zakāt*, 7:7. This *hadith* is recorded by al-Nasā‘ī, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 311; Muslim, *Sahih*, *Kitāb al-zakāt*, 14:2. This *hadith* is recorded also by Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā‘ī, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 289; *Kitāb al-zakāt*, 1:9, 14:1, 48:1.


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-talāq*, Muslim records 2 *hadiths* with the chain, one of which uses the term “‘an”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, *Kitāb al-talāq*, 4:10. For the other he uses “sami‘a”. See Muslim, *Sahih*, *Kitāb al-talāq*, 7. This *hadith* is also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā‘ī and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 314. In the *Kitāb shifat al-janna*, 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-manāṣik*, Muslim records 27 *hadiths*, only 9 of which use “sami‘a”. For the *hadiths* see Muslim, *Sahih*, *Kitāb al-manāṣik*, 53:2, 17:33 (also

In the Kitāb al-tahāra, Muslim records 3 hadiths with the Jābir—Abū al-Zubayr chain. Two of them use the term “samīʿa”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-tahāra, 17:3 (also recorded by Abū Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 297), 8:6, and one uses the term “an”. (Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-tahāra, 28:1 [also recorded by al-Nasāʾi and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 339]).

In the Kitāb al-Adāb, Muslim records 4 hadiths with the link. In two of them, Abū al-Zubayr explicitly states that he received the hadiths from Jābir, using the verbs “haddathana” (Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-adāb, 14:14) and “samīʿa” (Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-adāb, 25:12). In the two others, he uses the term “an”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-adāb, 16:1, 34:3 (the last is also recorded by Dāwūd, see al-Mizzi, Tuhfa, vol. 2, 340).

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

In the Kitāb al-maghāzī, Muslim records only one hadith with the chain, using the term “samīʿa”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-maghāzī, 49:3. In the Kitāb al-hudūd, Muslim records two hadiths with the chain. In one of them, Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “samīʿa”. See Muslim, Sahih, 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, Sahih, Kitāb al-hudūd, 2:4.

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

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

In the Kitāb al-rūʿyā, Muslim records 5 hadiths with the chain. Only one of them uses the term “samīʿa”. See Muslim, Sahih, Kitāb al-rūʿyā, 2:4. It is also
recorded by al-Nasāʿī and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 339. The other 4 ḥadīths use the term “‘an”. See Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-ruʿyā*, 2:3. The text of this ḥadīth (2:3) which uses the term “‘an” is similar to that of the ḥadīth 2:4 which uses the term “samīʿa”. The first has a long version, while the latter has a short one. *Kitāb al-ruʿyā*, 2:5, 1:8, 3:1. The last mentioned ḥadīth (3:1) is also recorded by Ibn Māja and al-Nasāʿī. See Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 339.

In the *Kitāb al-ṣiyām*, Muslim records 2 ḥadīths with the Jābir—Abū al-Zubayr chain. In one of them, Abū al-Zubayr says that he listened to Jābir (samīʿa Jābir). See Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-ṣiyām*, 4:3. In the other one, he uses the term “‘an”. See Muslim, *Kitāb al-ṣiyām*, 4:2.

In the *Kitāb al-janāʿīz*, Muslim records 7 ḥadīths with the chain. Abū al-Zubayr says that he heard it directly from Jābir in four of them. See Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-janāʿīz*, 32:2, 50, 24:7, 24:8. In the other 3 ḥadīths, Abū al-Zubayr says “‘an”. See Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-janāʿīz*, 32:1. The text of this ḥadīth is identical with that of ḥadīth 32:2; however, the isnād and terms used are different. In the isnād of the first (Abū Bakr—Hafi b. Ghiyāth—Ibn Jurayj—Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir) we find the term “‘an” between Abū al-Zubayr and Jābir. In the isnād of the second (Ḥarun b. ‘Abd Allāh—Hajjāj—Ibn Jurayj—Abū al-Zubayr—Jābir) we find “samīʿa”. For other ḥadīths see *Kitāb al-janāʿīz*, 32:3 (this ḥadīth is also recorded by al-Nasāʿī and Ibn Māja, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 289), 22:6 (also recorded by al-Nasāʿī, see al-Mizzi, *Tuhfa*, vol. 2, 290).

In the *Kitāb al-dḥabā`īh*, Muslim records 2 ḥadīths with the chain. Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-dḥabā`īh*, 6:2, 12:6. Abū al-Zubayr heard directly from Jābir in both cases.

In the *Kitāb al-Qadar*, Muslim records 2 ḥadīths with the chain. In both cases Abū al-Zubayr used the term “‘an”. See Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-Qadr*, 1:13, 1:14.

In the *kitāb al-ʿisti’dhān* (for this chapter, I follow al-Mizzi’s edition), Muslim records 4 ḥadīths. In 2 of them Abū al-Zubayr uses the term “samīʿa” (Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-isti’dhān*, 2:5, 14:9) and in the other 2 he uses “‘an” (see Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-isti’dhān*, 18:1, 21:6).

In the *Kitāb al-tawba*, Muslim records 3 ḥadīths with the chain, all of them with “samīʿa”. See Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-tawba*, 31:10, 30:5, 13:15.

In the *Kitāb al-ʿītq*, Muslim records only one ḥadīth in which Abū al-Zubayr says that he heard it directly from Jābir. See Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Kitāb al-ʿītq*, 5:1.