Rational Foundations of Criticism on Ḥadīth & Sources: Comparative Study on Research Methodology of Moḥadithīns & Orientalists

*Yasir Farooq

**Dr. Mahmood Ahmad

***Dr. Muhammad Mansha Tayyab

Abstract

With the narration and compilation of the hadīth, Moḥadithīns made special efforts against the liars and in identification of unauthentic aḥādīth. As a result, such principles were developed that any ancient and modern nation of the world is unable to have its precedent. In particular, the narrations that have been examined on the basis of chain criticism (science of excavation) are their own example. Moḥadithīns determined that any ḥadīth narrated by the holy Prophet (pbuh) would be examined on some strict terms. Then, to achieve this target, numerous sciences of ḥadīth have been developed. In the beginning, some orientalists also praised these principles and sciences of the ḥadīth. Later on, most commentators came to the conclusion that the number of correct aḥādīth was far less than that mentioned by Muslim critics in the authentic collections of aḥādīth. Mostly orientalists criticized the principles of the aḥādīth, calling them inaccurate and incomplete rationally and logically. They claimed that the authenticity of a ḥadīth checked on the basis of these principles, is doubtful and they reviewed the ḥadīth on some self-made principles. This article is a comparative study on research methodology of Moḥadithīns and orientalists regarding foundations of criticism on ḥadīth.

Key word: Orientalists, Moḥadithīns, Rationality, Sources of ḥadīth, Rationalists, Ṣiḥat e ḥadīth.

....

* Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, Govt. Municipal Degree College, Faisalabad, Pakistan. yasirfarooq797@gmail.com
** Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan. Email: chmahmoodss@gmail.com
*** Lecturer, Ph.D. Department of Islamic Studies, University of Punjab, Lahore.

Introduction:

Along with the revelation on the holy Prophet (*pbuh*) the companions had begun to practicing on *ḥadīth*[1] with subject to the obligations of the holy Quran. Because the holy Quran emphasizes the obedience of the holy Prophet (pbuh) in several places and the holy Prophet (pbuh) also kept his companions attention towards this, although the covenant was not arranged as regularly and extensively as the holy Qur'an. However, it has now come to an endless proof that some *aḥadīth* were written in the life of holy prophet (PBUH) and in the period of his *khulafā-e-Rāshdīn*[2], as mentioned in the booklet of *Hammam bin Munabbeh*[3] published by *Dr. Ḥamīdullah*[4]. As well as, *Dr. Muṣṭafā A'zami*[5], *Fawad Sezgin*[6] and *Nabia Abbott*[7] have also registered its affirmation.[8]

With the passage of time & after the period of the holy prophet (pbuh) the work on *ḥadīth* began to accelerate as different nations entered to Islam. Throughout this period of memorization, compilation of *ḥadīth* in written as well as criticism regarding authentication of *ḥadīth* had continued in its initial and simple forms.[9] After the assassination of third *Caliph 'Uṭhmān bin 'Affān* (RA), various political and religious groups resorted to *ḥadīth* for their own purposes.[10] The *Mohadīthīns*[11] started the practice of criticism on the way of deriving *ḥadīth* and introduced a useful science of *Asmā-al-Rijāl*[12] based on their knowledge.[13] *Moḥadithīns* based on the historical analysis of the *Chain of ḥadīth,* for the identification of liar narrators & unproved *aḥādīth*. It was an unprecedented feat which mentioned the names of narrators, lineages, names, titles, places of birth and even the details of their death. There was complete introduction of the narrators so that it may not doubted with any other.

Moḥadithīns decided that everything mentioned by holy prophet (pbuh) would be accepted on the basis of few principles, so that anybody could not attribute any unproved quotation or act to him (pbuh). Everything that is attributed to the prophet (pbuh) is religion, its research is necessary, otherwise lie will be mixed in religion. In this scenario only truthful and honest narrators were considered reliable. False & unfaithful people were disqualified. They established rules & regulations for the research of a text and established their limits & conditions. In the light of these rules & regulations, *aḥādīth* were ordered and ranked in many classifications such as *Ṣaḥīḥ*[14], *ḥasan*[15], *dh'aīf*[16], *marfo'u*[17], *mawqūf*[18], *maqto'u*[19], *musnad*[20], *munqat'e*[21]/disconnected.

Orientalists started their basic discussions about *ḥadīth* in 17th century. They realized during the study of *Sīrah*[22] that according to the Muslims, 2nd main source after the holy Quran, is *ḥadīth*. They started to criticize *ḥadīth* in the 19th century[23] and based their investigation on the idea of Muslim critics who had previously established the principles regarding *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *dh'aīf aḥādīth.* Initially, some researchers even partially praised the principles of *Moḥadithīns* but eventually most often came to the conclusion that the principles on which the *Moḥadithīns* decided the authenticity & weakness of *aḥādīth,* were faulty and inappropriate. So the collection of *aḥādīth* narrated by the holy prophet (pbuh) on the basis of these rules, is doubtful.[24] When orientalists conducted their research, they came to the conclusion that in collection of *aḥādīth* authenticated by *Moḥadīthīns*, the number of true narrations/*aḥādīth* is very few.[25]

According to *William Muir*[26] and *Von Kremer*[27], almost half *aḥādīth* are originally narrated by the holy prophet (pbuh). *Joseph Schacht*[28] and *Juyn boll*[29] said that this

number is also based on exaggeration. Almost entire collection of *aḥādīth* is fictitious and unreliable. Suppose if some of these narrations are prophetic, those are so mixed up with the unauthentic traditions that are impossible to identify.[30]

The principles on which the orientalists have declared the collection of *aḥādīth* unreliable, which was accepted as reliable by *Moḥadīthīns,* majority of the western scholars have accepted it with the name of research. Moreover, a large number of their eastern pupils' deniers of *ḥadīth,* impressed by orientalists, think that results presented by them are based on such principles which are more powerful and authentic than *Moḥadīthīns*. So, Muslims should now give up the repetition of their authenticity and also acting on *aḥādīth*. As they claimed:

> *"Criticism of Europe is strongly opposed to the testimony is critique of Islam. Europe does not see at all whether the narrator is honest or dishonest. An unreliable narrator narrates an incident that seems to be true according to the present circumstances, the statement is very consistent, does not disconnect from anywhere, according to Europe the authenticity of the incident will be recognized"[31]*

The following is a comparative overview of the principles of both scholarly parties so as to know why there is so much contradiction in the results and as to whose principles are right and whose are wrong!

Utmost Faith on Believes:

The fundamental & important difference between the principles of *Moḥadithīns* and orientalists is the faith and belief. The principles of *Moḥadithīns* are based on revelations and prophecy.[32] They believe that holy prophet (pbuh) is the messenger of *Allah* and all such narrations are true by principle, which may not be possible for a non-prophet but can be possible with the prophet (pbuh). These includes the faith on unseen and metaphysics, the prophecies of the future, the signs of the later sects i.e. *Khawārij(/ties)[33]*, *Qadariyyah[34]* etc. Signs of the wars happening in future, the events of previous nations described by revelations of holy Prophet (pbuh), and the miracles.

Moḥadithīns are convinced to use their intellect, to trust it and to develop it as well as with some of its limitations. A Muslim is bound to guide his intellect in the guidance of the creator of (this) universe rather than relying on his mere intellect. He cannot free his intellect to extent that he begins to object to his creator and his instructions. Because there are so many jurisdictions where the intellect, science and logic become helpless. It is desirable in Islam to use rationalism in the interpretation of revelation, but it may not be contradict to him. An attempt to understand the revelation using intellect is good but Islamic teachings cannot by devised with intellect. In Islam, the reasoning of the argument is that the saying of *Allah* or *Prophetic narrations*, should come to the forefront after confirming their authenticity. The rational and logical justifications are for further support but the base of Islam is the revelation of *Allah*.

The holy Quran has mentioned in many places the condemnation of those who do not use their intellect.[35] It is mentioned in the signs of fabrication by *Moḥadithīns* that the tradition contrary to the common sense is false ever.[36]However, there are limits to use the intellect, especially the access of intellect is impossible in the cases of miracles and metaphysics. Furthermore, intellect cannot be the ultimate standard because each person has his or her own intellect. Whose wisdom will we trust? Moreover, the

principles laid down by *Moḥadithīns* to criticize *Chain* & text of *ḥadīth* are in accordance with intellect. *Dr. Muṣṭafā A'zamī* writes that the scholars have used intellect in four places:

> *"(i) At the time of deriving (تحمل) ḥadīth, (ii)At the time of narrating ḥadīth, (iii)At the time of trial on ḥadīth, (iv) while imposing the order of Ṣaḥīḥ or dh'aīf on ḥadīth"*[37]

The evaluation of current western criticism methods took place under secularism. Therefore, they are deniers of metaphysics and believe only in physics. In their view, this evaluation is a testament to their intelligence, ingenuity and rationality. That's why they think the holy prophet (pbuh) as a common man, wrong in the claim of prophet hood and holy Quran is as his own words. They check the *ḥadīth* of the holy prophet (pbuh) on the same scale in which the speeches of common people are weighed. Because in their view, the position of the holy prophet (pbuh) was, of an ordinary person. Who has no feature of revelation nor has he been made know to the unseen. There is nothing unusual in the holy prophet that distinguishes him from the rest of mankind. The result of this is that when a *ḥadīth* is conveyed to the holy prophet (pbuh) in which a prediction is given or an event is reported that will happen to the Muslims in future, according to their principles that *ḥadīth* has been fabricated after this incident.[38] Because the holy prophet (pbuh) cannot inform about anything before it has happened. They also declare wrong to all those narrations in which miracle of the holy prophet (pbuh) is mentioned because no human being can understand it and its no material justification is possible.[39]

Rationalism began as a movement in response to the deteriorating concept of religion in the west and its powerful effects are continued. They have made scientific progress in the field of knowledge artistic practice following the revival of revivalist sciences, in which the same rationalism is intensely derive. The scientific method of research is called the one that meets the requirements of data logic and rationalism. In this style of research, no matter the weight of the unseen, religion and revealed ideas. That is why, revelation based research is not considered a formal and authoritative research in the west. Therefore, Will Durant has ordered/claimed the miraculous of *aḥādīth,* unauthentic.[40] *Gold Ziher* has rejected the *aḥādīth* of prayer only for the sake of memorization of *Abu Hurairah (RA)*[41] without any argument because it is irrational[42] for him to do so. *Muḥammad Akram virk* writes:

> *"A thorough study of human history shows that the real battle has always been between the heavenly revelations and the rational ideas of the materialists. Intellect is a weak and helpless guide that have always subjected human desires and emotions and the truth is that the intellect has always sought the arguments in favor of human emotions and desires, and emotional attitudes and desires he tried to prove rational behavior"*[43]

Maulānā Muḥammad 'Isā Mansūrī writes:

> *"Intellect is only a lawyer not a judge. As the case will be given it will advocate according. It is a two edged sword that cuts on both sides, it can prove religious facts as well as invalidate them. It is up to the lawyers counsel and intelligence to support or deny which aspect of the case he wants to"*[44]

Although it is also a matter of discussion whether the western studies are based on or against the principles of rationality and nature. Critical studies of western civilization confirm the fact that it is not based on rationality but based on desire and need. As *Maulānā Maudūdī* writes:

> *"The western modern renaissance was actually a rebellion against intellect and nature. It broke the rationality and turned to emotions and materialism; relying on sense rather than intellect, rational instructions, logical reasoning and natural theosophy were rejected and material conclusions were declared as real. That dismissed the guidance of nature and make guide to desire and need"[45]*

The confession of the miracles and revelations of *Moses* and *Jesus* and *Denial* of the Holy Prophet *Muḥammad* (pbuh) also refutes their logical and rational style of research and is the proof that their style of research is based on desire.

Nature of principles (Mutually agreed or differed):

The principles laid down by *Moḥadithīns* for the research of *Chain* and text of *ḥadīth* are the essence of nearly a thousand years of research and are considered credible with maximum scholars. In the light of these, the decision of the *Ṣiḥat* and *Dh'uf[46]* of narrations is issued. There are no significant difference between the dissenters and the laterals in these principles. For example, in the book of *Abu 'Amr 'Uthmān bin Ṣalāḥ*, the definition of the *Ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth* is as under:

"اما الحديث الصحيح فهو الحديث المسند الذى يتّصل اسناده بنقل العدل

عن العدل الضابط الى منتهاه ولا يكون شاذًّا ولا معلّلا"[47]

> *"Ḥadīth Ṣaḥīḥ, which is connected from beginning to end of chain, with subject to affirmed of righteous and strict memorizer, and not have any sickness and hidden defect"*

All the *Moḥadithīns* are agreed to this definition. Many of its terms conclusion were made. In the commentary, severed other books on this science have defined the definitions of *Ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth*. But no one has disagreed with these five basic terms of *ḥadīth e Ṣaḥīḥ*. Same is the case with the other principles. The terms of the study are often agreed upon including those of the unbeliever, the evildoer, the perpetrator of the deceit, and the liar deliberately. However, there is a slight disagreement in detail as some accept the tradition of unknown narrator, while the majority has rejected it.[48] Similarly, it is a matter of *Mursal[49]* of *Tabi'i* that is acceptable with some *Moḥadithīns* rejected with some, while according to some acceptable with some terms.[50] As far as the objection is concerned that *īmāms* whom compiled *aḥādīth,* did not trust each other research that while all of them have mentioned the *ḥadīth* in their books by making abridge on their terms and rejected the remaining *aḥādīth*. According to the Muslims point of view, this objection is based on misunderstanding. *Moḥadithīns* were not against the authenticity of the rest of *aḥādīth,* no one rejected the *aḥādīth* mentioned in the book of other authors which were not in accordance with the principles of his own book. They have collected all kinds of *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *dha'īf aḥādīth* according to their taste. Someone have collected only *Ṣaḥīḥ,* and other one compiled *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *hasan*. No one claims that he has collected all the *Ṣaḥīḥ* narrations and the rest are *dha'īf*.

Contrary to the *Moḥadithīns*, there are basic differences and contradiction between the principles of orientalists. The new theories continue to deny the first ones, everyone has his own rules and others are against it, everyone suspects or disagree on a clear theory. *William Muir* acknowledged the authenticity of some *aḥādīth* though not equal to the *Moḥadithīns*.[51]

Juyn Boll, *Gold Ziher*, *Joseph Schacht* and their supporters regarded all the collection of *aḥādīth* as untrustworthy, for them firstly the whole collection of *aḥādīth* is fake, which is the result of the collection and multifaceted efforts of the Muslims. Even if there are rare narration(s) which are true, but they are so mixed in *dha'īf* that its identification is almost impossible. According to *Juyn boll*:

> *"The earliest origins of standardized ḥadīth cannot be traced back earlier than, at most, to the seventies or eighties of the first century. What had preceded this was, as we have seen above, still unstructured and still unstandardized material of edifying contents (qisās, tarhīb wal targhīb) or with a political slant (faḍa'l & mathālib)"*[52]

J. Fueck[53], *Harald Motzki*[54], and *Nabia Abbott,* denied their findings and said, most of the collection of *aḥādīth* is correct with regard to the holy prophet (pbuh), as *Nabia abbot* writes:

> *"This study advances the thesis that Schacht's premise, that portions of the asnad which extend into the first half of the second/eighth and the first/seventh century are without exception arbitrary and artificially fabricated is untenable, at least in this degree of generalization"*[55]

One of the reasons for the refusal of proved and true *aḥadīth* by most orientalists is that the collection of *aḥādīth* started in later times, while *Gold Ziher* acknowledges that many companions were likely to keep their own Manuscripts of *aḥādīth*.[56]

According to the investigation by *Nabia Abbott*, the collection of *aḥādīth* had begun in the time of the holy prophet (pbuh). She writes in the preface of her book:

> *"Analysis of the content and the chains of transmission of the traditions of the documents and of their available parallels in the standard collections, supplemented by the results of an extensive study of the sources on the sciences of tradition, 'Ulum al-hadīth, lead me to conclude that oral and written transmission went hand in hand almost from the start, that the tradition of Muhammad as transmitted by his companions and their Successors were, as a rule, scrupulously scrutinized at each step of the transmission, and that the so-called phenomenal growth of Tradition in the second and third centuries of Islam was not primarily growth of content, so far as the ḥadīth of the Companions are concerned, but represents largely the progressive increase of parallel and multiple chains of transmission"*[57]

John Burton[58], *Noel Coulson*, *Juyn Boll* and *David Powers* have rejected the claim of *Schacht* that *aḥādīth* are manipulated in later times.[59] Orientalists are also divided in three major groups about the criticism on the start of chains of *aḥādīth*:

- Chains of traditions originated in the reign of companions before 60-AH. *Springer*[60] and *Nabia Abbott*[61] have this stand.

- Chains of traditions originated between 60-120-AH in the reign of successors (*Tabi'īn*). This is the opinion of *James Robson*[62]*, Harald Motzki*[63] and *Joseph Horovitz*.[64]
- Chains of traditions started between 120-180-AH.Representatives of this point of view are *Joseph Schacht*[65] and *Wans Brough*.[66]

Common link theory has a central place in the principles of *Joseph Schacht*, which makes the *ḥadīth dha'īf*, while *Cook*[67] and *Harald Motzki* have rejected it. According to *Harald Motzki*:

> *"Although cases of intentionally incorrect attributions of opinions can be demonstrated as early as the first century, it has been possible to demonstrate that "typical common links" like 'Amr ibn Dinar, Ibn Jurayj and Ibn 'Uyayna are not generally to be considered as forgers or propagators of contemporary forgeries, as Schacht identified them"*[68]

Gregor Schooler[69] is also against the *Schacht* that CL's archeology goes back to the companions. Another important theory of *Joseph Schacht* is *e-silentio*.[70] That is popular within the scholars of west but has been rejected by many orientalists including *Calder* and *Wans Brough*[71]. *Abbott* has rejected the *Schacht's* theory of *family asnād* in these words:

> *"Viewed against this background the doubts that Schacht, among a few other, has cast on the institution of the family asnad in general and on asnad's in which Nafe' and Salim are central figures in particular do not seem as categorically justifiable as he seeks to make them. Family asnad's stemming from other companions were numerous, as illustrated by the dozen or more encountered in our few fragmentary papyri"*[72]

According to *Schacht* and *Juyn Boll* frequency of *asnād* is symbol of fakeness.[73] *Muir* says frequency is the symbol of throughout *connectivity*. [74]

Schacht's theory is that shorts and vague narrations are ancient, but detailed & clear belong to later times, while *Motzki* has proved the opposite.[75] To some orientalists the abundant narrations of *Şighār/latest* companions is the proof that they created *aḥādīth* otherwise the narrations of *kibār/earliest* companions should have been in large number. While *Fueck*[76] and *Robeson*[77] think this symbol is a proof of *Saḥīḥ ḥadīth* rather than falseness*/*lie in *ḥadīth*. From the beginning, most orientalists have raised a major objection to the principle of *Chain* criticism, which *Moḥadithīns* objected only on *Chain*, not on the text of *ḥadīth*. But modern orientalists had to acknowledge the fact that principles of *Moḥadithīns* consist of both *Chain* and text criticism.

Jonathan A. C. Brown[78], in a lengthy article, called it them is conception of *Gold Ziher*, *Robeson, Schacht*, *Guillaume* and *Juyn Boll*, who claimed that the *Moḥadithīns* did not pay attention to *Chain*. He has given detailed arguments that *Moḥadithīns* including *Īmām Bukhārī* (*D 256 AH*)[79] and *Īmām Muslim* (D 261 AH)[80] have paid attention on both *Chain* and text criticism. In short, there are many contradictions in the principles of orientalists and they continue to reject each other's theories.[81] Their condition is consistent with the following verse:

بَأْسُهُمْ بَيْنَهُمْ شَدِيدٌ تَحْسَبُهُمْ جَمِيعًا وَقُلُوبُهُمْ شَتَّى ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ قَوْمٌ لَا يَعْقِلُونَ

> *"Their fight is very hard between them even though you think of as united, but their hearts are actually separated from each other because they are stupid people"*

Not only they deny each other's rules, but they also dispense with their own set of rules. Such as *Gold Ziher* writes about *Īmām Zuhrī* (D 124 AH) that he tried to suppress and seize the madness (regarding compilation and sharing) of *Sunnah* which was touching the boundaries of madness, as he said:

> *"Likewise al-Zuhri (d.124) can still take the liberty of declaring that an extremely lenient decision of the Prophet regarding the law of fasts cannot be taken as a precedent and belongs to the category of special privileges (khasā'is) of the Prophet"*[83]

And he also alleged that *Īmām Zuhrī* used to create *ḥadīth* in regard of *Umayyad* authorities wishes. Even he had given open permission to narrate these *aḥādīth* with subject to his *chain* and name. He writes while arguing that *Īmām Zuhrī*[84] fabricated *aḥādīth* for Caliph '*Abdul Malik bin Marwān*[85]:

> *"The pious theologian Al-Zuhri was given the task of justifying this politically motivated reform of religious life by making up and spreading a saying traced back to the Prophet, according to which there are three mosques to which people may make pilgrimages: those in Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem"*[86]

Gold Ziher has used several pages to prove that *Imam Zuhri* was badly involved in creating *ḥadīth*. While he also says that *Īmām Zuhrī* was highly respected in the *Muslim ummah*.

Gold Ziher says that people outside *Madinah* were so less attached to Islam, even the people of *Baṣrah* did not know how to perform the prayers till the first year and in the *Syria* it was not generally known that the obligatory prayers were only five.[87] But in the second place, *Gold Ziher* also says that when messenger of the holy prophet (pbuh) sent the message of five prayers to a *Bedouin*, he came and questioned about its conformity from holy Prophet (pbuh).[88]

There are many such contradictions in *Schacht's* theory also, his one major claim to reject *ḥadīth* is that *aḥadīth* are the production of later times. While he also says that the jurists were fiercely opposed to the *aḥādīth* in the beginning.[89] But in the second place he sets the principle of recognizing the *dha'īf aḥādīth* that if there was no mention of *aḥadīth* in the discussion of the jurists on a particular issue at any time which he could have submitted in the favor of his opinion this would indicate that *aḥadīth* were devised in later times. In his words:

> *"The best way of proving that a tradition did not exist at a certain time is to show that it was not used as a legal argument in a discussion which would have made reference to it imperative, if it had existed.*[90]*"*

Strangely, if the jurists were against *aḥadīth* why did they refer to the *aḥādīth*? He accused *Īmām Shāfi'ī*[91] of being uncivil and dishonest.[92] But encouraged *Īmām Shāfi'ī* on accusing other jurists of abandoning *aḥādīth*.

Purpose of principles/ (Identification of *Ṣaḥīḥ & Dha'īf*):

A study of the principles of criticism on narrations (both *matn* and *Chain*) of *Moḥadithīns* shows that their purpose was to distinguish between *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *dha'īf*

narrations. That's why, we see that they try as hard as possible to distinguish *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *dha'īf aḥādīth*. Then they place a final decision **(الحكم على الحديث)** on that narration. In the meantime, they do not appear to be take one side. They do not justify the *Ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth* by weakening[93] or the weak/*dha'īf* by making decision of *Ṣaḥīḥ*. It seems to them as much as they thought that the correct narrations should not be wasted by mixing in the *dha'īf* narrations they were also conscious not to mix *dha'īf* with *Ṣaḥīḥ*.

Moḥadithīns did not initiated the excavation of Chain, so that the narrations of their opponents could be rejected by weakening them and the narrations of their purpose could be validated, as *Gold Ziher* has shown skepticism. *Moḥadithīns* did not care about the reproach of any one in this matter nor could any of the relations became a hurdle in this way. There are many examples in the books regarding '*elm e Asmā' al Rijāl* and *Science of excavation/evaluation of ḥadīth* that if a narrator finds a defect in his father or in his son which may cause the deficiency of *ḥadīth*, he declares it freely just for the sake of *Allah* almighty without any regard of relation. *Īmām 'Alī Ibn Al-Madīnī*[94] did not reported narrations from his father '*Abdullah Ibn e Ja'far*[95] and said that he was weak/*dha'īf*. The father of *Imām Waqī' Ibn Al–Jarraḥ*[96] was determined to protect public treasury, when *Imām Waqī'* took a narration from him he would get the support of another narrator as his father was *dha'īf*.[97] In short, the principles of *Moḥadithīns* are like template that examines the true and the weak.

The purpose of the principles of orientalists is not to distinguish between *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *dha'īf* and not to establish distances but to make the maximum collection of *ḥadīth* as weak and unreliable. They try their best to prove all narrations devised by the Muslims of later times or at least (they try) to make their relevancy to the holy Prophet (pbuh) suspicious. That is why, the principles established by *Moḥadithīns* which provide the evidence of the authenticity of a narration, they also take it as the symbol for the acknowledgement of devised *ḥadīth*.

One of the conditions that must be found in the authenticity/*Ṣiḥat* of *ḥadīth* by *Mohadithins,* is that its *Chain* is connected. However, *Schacht* says that as much as a *chain* is free of any deficiency & flawless, it must be coined in the later times. He said:

> *"The gradual improvement of asnad(s) goes parallel with, and is partly indistinguishable from, the material growth of traditions which we have discussed in the preceding chapters; the backward growth of asnad(s) in particular is identical with the projection of doctrines back to higher authorities. Generally speaking, we can say that the most perfect and complete asnad(s) are the latest"*[98]

For *Moḥadithīns*, frequency of *Chains* is a symbol of superiority of narrations, while for orientalists like Schacht, frequency of *Chains* and arguments are fabricated to make a weak *ḥadīth*, acceptable. According to *Schacht*:

> *"Parallel with the improvement and backward growth of asnad(s) goes their spread, which is the creation of additional authorities or transmitters for the same doctrine or tradition. The spread if asnad(s) was intended to meet the objection which used to be made to 'isolated' traditions"*[99]

The result of attempts to make the most of the *aḥādīth* devised is that most attacks of orientalists are on those which the *aḥādīth* based on them, regardless of how strong,

logical and theological principles are? They raised objections on *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* & *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ lil-Muslim*, the major books of aḥādīth. While they do not hesitate to give arguments against the *aḥādīth* from the books such as *Alif laila*[100] and *kitāb Al-ḥaiwān.*[101] They object[102] especially in the *chain*, which is regarded as *gold Chain*[103] by some *Moḥadithīns* among narrators of *ḥadīth.*[104] They object the trustworthy & basic narrators such as *Abū Hurairah,* as *Gold Ziher* writes about *Abu Hurairah:*

> *"I.e. he has a vested interest in handing down the order with the addition that form dogs should be spared as well. This remark of Ibn 'Umar is characteristic of the doubt about the good faith of the transmitters that existed even in the earliest period of the formation of tradition"*[105]

As well as they object on *Īmām Zuhrī, Ibn-Dīnār*[106]*, 'A'mash*[107]*, Sh'ubah bin al-ḥajjaj*[108] and *Sh'abī.*[109] So that they may be able to declare all compiled *aḥādīth* fake and unreliable. *Juyn Boll* Says, the [Certification] status of *aḥādīth* could be made widely suspicious:

> *"If only one of the companion is proved to be untrustworthy, the building of strong Chain based narrations becomes dull"*[110]

Contrary to the *Moḥadithīns*, the principles of orientalists are such that even proven narrations, put into them, it will come out as weak because these principles have been devised only for this purpose. *Syed Ṣabāḥuddīn* says:

> *"Their example is very similar to that of a sanitary inspector a sanitary inspector in most developed city, whether it is Córdoba of Islamic era, Granada, Baghdad, Damascus, or Delhi, Ahmad Abad, or it could be Lucknow of the Mughal era, London or New York. At the moment, the duty of sanitary inspector is to look for places especially where the water is flowing, where the strand is spreading, where the drainage is not properly managed where the swamps have taken place"*[111]

However, many of orientalists have decided to found only defects in *aḥādīth*. Orientalists are claiming that their investigation is established on a logical and rational basis. How strange is their objection! That a person has endured the fastest and nearest revelation of history in the shortest period of only twenty three years! Even today in the time of its demised period, his religion is the fastest growing religion in the world, but there is no authenticity and virtue in him?! Is it possible that his total base depend on lie? It is proved that his opponents are compelled to accept him as truthful and trustworthy! Immediately, how can be possible that after him, his followers as *ummah* are systematically involved in devising intentionally and conformity new *aḥādīth*?

Time & place conformity of principles:

Moḥadithīns who were engaged in the protection of *ḥadīth* and were actively opposed to the deviser of *ḥadīth*, applied the rules and regulations according to the requirements of the time. When orientalists saw them after a thousand years later, they rejected them due to not accordance with their circumstances. Nevertheless, at which time narrations were declared true & weak on the basis of these principles, these principles were fully according to the requirements of the time.

Today if the writing is credible source of security, it is not necessarily in the time of Hadith compilation and narration, and it seems that in the future it will not be able to

maintain its present status.[112] At the time of prophet hood, memorization & practical was a more credible source of scrutiny than scripture for a number of reasons. People's memory was very strong while the booklet was poor, due to no use of points, it wasn't a reliable source than memorization. The memorization of *ḥadīth* was of a great interest of the people and the fact is that more the interest of the human being remembered and preserved it. This is the reason why the *Moḥadithīns* have regarded memorization as a reliable source, and narrators confiscating is one of the principles of correctness of *ḥadīth.*

In this society there were numerous narrators of *ḥadīth* whose judgement was authentic. It was impossible to conceive the holy prophet (pbuh) by the faithful & fair narrators (including all the companions without exemption), so, the truthiness of narrator is also involved in their principles. In the society of orientalists such faithful & fair narrators are not present. So, they cannot rely on the principles of *Moḥadithīns*.

The research of a text through text is a compulsion for narrations that does not have the convenience of *Chains* or narrators. Otherwise, in which narration, the record of all its informers is preserved and passed on to future generation with a regular series of credentials, if this is the case it would not be wisdom to examine such news simply by the text rather than the *Chain*. The narrator is the main protagonist of receiving the narration, so the research of narration will depend on it. *Jews* did not have to back projection objectionable.[113] Such as *F. G. Burtton*[114] writes:

> *"Attributing a contemporary or recently composed book to an ancient prophet or wise man, was common practice"*[115]

Maurice Bucaille describes the condition of their religious books in following words:

> *"Their religious teachings are not only distorted but also unproductive and unreliable"*[116]

This is why Schacht believes that even the authentic narrators of *ḥadīth* will not be considers inadmissible to convert the *maqtū'* or *mawqūf* into the *marfu' ḥadīth*.[117] They have no idea of the respect of holy prophet (pbuh). They consider the companions of the holy prophet (PBUH) as public, so they do not accept the collective modification of those companions.[118]

Orientalist's studies impact(s):

The, people of the west, are living in the material age, so they are convinced to examine *ḥadīth* only on a material scale, except on spiritual base. In the current western society, intellect is just everything, so they formulate principles based on intellect. They also conjecture Islam on them. They take honest and faithful narrators as the people of present society of materialistic approach. *Gold Ziher* and *Schacht* think that like a common man of today *Īmām Bukhārī & Īmām Muslim* can also tell a lie. Therefore, there is no weightage of truthiness and righteousness of narrators in their principles. They just regard the memory of the *Moḥadithīns* and the Arabs, as insecure as the memory of a person who relies on writing and computers. It is also a reality that *huffāẓ-e-Qur'ān* (memorizers of holy Qur'ān) are still widely in the world, otherwise orientalists would never admit that a ten years old child can remember such a large book of another language. They could interpret it as a Muslim myth because they had never experienced & witnessed it. There is no custom in any knowledge of the world

today, as science of the excavation of *ḥadīth* and *'Elm Asmā' al –Rijāl* etc. It is impossible for any *ummah/*nation to roll so much. This is why, orientalists believe that all past narrations and reports have the same nature, so they base the research of text rather than recognizing of the *Chain*. Today, the sources of life have changed and the principles of the orientalists also have changed according to them and they do not consider the principles of *Moḥadithīns* valid because they do not see useful result of their implementation in their time & society. As if one accustomed to traveling on today's transport claims, how can it be possible to travel by horse or camel from *Makkah* to *Madinah*? However, it is not surprising act according to the circumstances of that day.

Result of Study and findings:

The study illuminates that ancient Muslim scholar's i.e. *Moḥadithīns* principles are more valuable and practical rather than orientalist's principles which are totally based on rational and logical foundations. As well as, they think that the sources of *ḥadīth* and early Islamic personalities are not more reliable for considering the *aḥādīth* authentic. It is primarily fictitious that they are claiming in right perspectives of these principles, because they just think that *Moḥadithīns* have made these principles only for the sake of fame and maximum compilation of *aḥādīth* which is also beyond to ground realities. This study also proves that *Moḥadithīns* have a great contribution to preserve the sources and practically memorization of *aḥādīth.* It is also a reality that *Moḥadithīns* believes on fundamental & important difference between the principles of *Moḥadithīns* and orientalists is the faith and belief. The principles of *Moḥadithīns* are based on revelations and prophecy. Their efforts shows that their purpose was to distinguish between *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *dha'īf* narrations. That's why, we see that they try as hard as possible to distinguish *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *dha'īf aḥādīth*. Then they place a final decision on that narration not like orientalists whom they made principles to reject *aḥādīth* and to blame on their sources. This study also concludes that orientalists based on their rational and logical thinking which is not appropriate for examining the revealed or divined sources especially narrations of prophets of Allah.

---

[1]Whatever is transmitted from the holy Prophet (pbuh) of his actions, sayings, tacit approvals, or physical Characteristics. Scholars of Islamic Law do not include the physical appearance of the Prophet in their definition. The word '*ḥadīth'* is singular. Its plural is: *Aḥādīth. Ḥadīth* contains on two parts*; Chain* and *text. Chains* is the combination of narrators from beginning to end which must be connected throughout. And second one; *text* is the basic quotation transmitted from the holy Prophet (pbuh) which is obliviously called *ḥadīth.*
[2]First four Caliphs (/companions) of holy Prophet (pbuh).

[3] A well-known student of famous companion *Abu Hurairah* (RA). One of the oldest written *ḥadīth* books is the booklet of *Hammam bin Munabbih*. It contains 138 Ahadith. It was compiled before 58 AH. See: Kailānī, Abdul Raḥmān, *Ā'īna e Pervaiziyyat*, (Lahore: Maktabah al-salam, 2010), P: 533-534

[4] Dr. Ḥamīdullah: (9th February, 1908- 17th December, 2002). He was a double doctorate, Mohadīth, jurist, scholar of Islamic Law. He was author of over 250 books and also fluent in 22 languages including Urdu (his mother tongue). See: Sheikh, Rashīd, *Dr. M. Ḥamīdullah*, (Lahore: Al-Mīzān Publishers, 2003)

[5]Dr. Muṣṭafā A'zami was a contemporary Indian *ḥadīth* scholar. He is famous for his critical work on the theories of fellow Islamic Western scholars Ignaz Gold Ziher, David Margoulith and Joseph Schacht. See: Qāsmī, M. Najīb, *Dr. Muṣṭafā A'zami and his services of ḥadīth*, Dar ul uloom (Monthaly), 5:98 (2014), PP: 57-64

[6]Fuat Sezgin: (24 October, 1924 - 30 June, 1918). He was a Turkish Orientalist, specialized in the history of Arabic Islamic Science. His PhD. dissertation is on the sources of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. He argued that *Al-Bukhārī*'s edition of collected *ḥadīth* was based on written sources dating back to the 7th century as well as oral history. His best known publication is containing on 17 volumes (*Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums*), a standard reference in the field.

[7]Nabia Abbott: (31 January, 1897 - 15 October, 1981) An American scholar of Islam. Her famous book is "Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri I, ii, iii'. She argued that *ḥadīth* was an original practice in Islam, held in written form until they entered the canonical books. See: Ṣabāḥuddin, Abdul Raḥmān, *Islām aur Mustashriqīn*, (A'zam Garh: Shibli Academy, 2011), P:104

8 Various books and Articles of above mentioned scholars of current era confirm that *ḥadīth* is a reliable source of Islamic teachings. Because it is being preserved and written down from very early period of Islam.

[9]As researches of various modern scholars such as *Dr. Ḥamīdullah* and Fuat Sezgin etc. have proved its authenticity.

[10] Al Dḥahbī, Muḥammad bin Aḥmad, *Mīzān al a'itidāl*, (Beirut: Dar al M'arifah,1962),Vol:1, P: 304

[11]The term *Moḥadīthīns* (plural *Moḥadīth* often translated as Traditionalists) refers to a specialist who describes and knows *ḥadīth*, its famous narrators and chains. See: Al Ṭaḥḥān, Dr. Maḥmūd, *Taisīr Muṣṭalaḥ al Ḥadīth*, (Karachi: Maktabah al-Bushrā, 2006), P: 11

[12]A science of '*ḥadīth Studies'* in which narrators of *ḥadīth* recognized as well as their complete biography to prevent /protect *ḥadīth* form lie and any other doubt might be from such a narrator.

[13]It is also called the science of evaluation of *ḥadīth*. Muslim bin Hajjāj, *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, (Riyādh: Darussalam, 2000), Preface: 03

[14]*Ḥadīth Ṣaḥīḥ* is one which has a continuous *asnād,* made up of trustworthy narrators, narrating from trustworthy narrators, which isfound to be free from any irregularities or defects" See: Philips, Dr. Bilal, *Usool al ḥadīth, (Riyādh: IIPH, ny), P:37*

[15]*Ḥasan ḥadīth* is transmitted by upstanding narrators in a continuous chain of narration, free from any hidden defects or conflict with superior texts. Except that it contains a narrator or narrators whose accuracy is inferior. Such a *ḥadīth* is regarded as *hasan*. In other words, a *ḥadīth* is considered *ḥasan* if it fulfills all the requirements of *Ṣaḥīḥ* except *Ḍabt* (accuracy). See: Philips, Dr. Bilal, *Usool al ḥadīth, P:41*

[16]This is a *ḥadīth* in which any one or more of the five conditions of *Ṣaḥīḥ* or at least *ḥasan* have not been met. Sometimes it is called *Mawḍ'ū (*fabricated*):* If the defect in the narrator is that he is known to lie on the holy Prophet (pbuh), his *aḥādīth* are classified as *Mawḍ'ū*. Technically, a *Mawḍ'u* narration is not *aḥādīth* at all, but a lie attributed to the holy Prophet (PBUH). It is referred to as a *ḥadīth* figuratively. See: Philips, Dr. Bilal, *Usool al ḥadīth,* P: 45, 63

[17]*Marfo'ū ḥadīth*: A *ḥadīth* attributed to the holy Prophet (pbuh) and a Companion narrates it.

[18]*Mawqūf' hadith*: A narration from the Companion of holy Prophet (pbuh) only.

[19]A narration attributed to *Tāb'ei*.

[20]*Ḥadīth* of the holy Prophet (pbuh), the transmission of which is traceable in uninterrupted ascending order to the first person who transmitted or reported it, so as to corroborate its authenticity.

[21]*Ḥadīth* in which one or more narrators have been deleted/skipped at random from the middle of the chain of narrators. *Ḥafiz Ibn Ḥajar* added in this term that "the break could occur at more than one place in the chain". See: Philips, Dr. Bilal, *Usool al ḥadīth, P: 55-56*

[22] Arabic word *Sīrah* means to travel or to be on a journey. In Islamic perspective, it refers to the biography of holy Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh). Ghazi, Dr Maḥmūd Aḥmad, *Muḥādhirāt e Sīrat*, (Lahore: Al-Faisal Publishers, 2012), P: 16

[23]Motzki, Harald, *Ḥadīth: Origins and Developments,* (Variorum: Alder shot, ash gate, 2004), Introduction.

[24]For detail see the books of Ignaz Gold Ziher, '*Muslim Studies'* and Joseph Schacht, '*The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence'*.

[25]Noth, Albert, *Common Features of Muslim and Western hadith Criticism, The Formation of The Classical Islamic World*, 28 (2004) PP: 309-316

[26]Muir William, *The Life of Muhammad*, (London: Smith Elder & CO. 1878)

[27]Kremer, Von, *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (English: *History of the prevailing ideas of Islam*), (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1868)

[28]Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1953)

[29]Juyn boll, G. H. A., *Muslim Tradition,* (London: Cambridge University press, 1983)

[30]Muir William, *The Life of Muhammad*, P: xlix

[31]Ṣabaḥuddin, Abdul Raḥman, *Islam aur Mustashriqin*, (A'zam Garh: Shibli Academy, 2011), V:1, P:13

[32]Al-Najam: 03

[33] The earliest Islamic sect, which traces its beginning to a religio-political controversy over the Caliphate.

[34] Classical Islamic theological school, which asserted human free will in decision making and as justification for God's power to blame or punish humans. Human's capacity to make choices makes them responsible for the outcome of their actions and absolves God of responsible for evil in the world. Many of this school's doctrines were adopted by *M'otazilah*. The position was rejected by the dominant *Ash'arī* theology".

[35]Al-Baqrah : 23, 73, 76, 222

[36] Ibn Al-Jawzi, Abdul Reḥman bin Ali, *Al-Mawḍo'aāt*, (Riyādh: Aḍwa-al-Salaf, 1998), Vol:01, P:106

[37]A'zamī, Dr. Mustafa, *Manḥaj al Naqd 'end al-Mohadīthīns*, (Riyādh: Arabic Printing Company, 1982), P:83

[38]Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P: 117

[39]Will Durant, *Age of Faith*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1950), Vol: IV, P: 211-212
[40]Ibid

[41] Al-Dhahbī, Muḥammad bin Aḥmad, *Tadhkirah Al-Huffaz,* (Beirut: Dar Iḥyā Al-Thurāth al-Arbi, 2001), Vol:01, P:34

[42]A'azmī Dr. Muṣtafā, *Al-Sunnah wa makanatuha fi al tashri'e al islamī*, (Beirut: Al-maktab al-Islami, 2009) P: 326

[43]Virk, Muhammad Akram, *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah ki Aāḥdith pr munkīrīn e ḥadīth aur mustashrīqīn ky aitirāḍāt ka 'ilmī jāyeza*, *(PhD. Dissertation)*, (Lahore: Dept. of Islamic Studies, University of the Punjab, 2007), P: 8

[44]Mansūrī, Muḥammad ʻIsā, *Maghrib aur ʻAlam e Islam ki fikrī wa Tahdhībī Kashmakash*, (London: World Islamic Forum, 2000), P: 8

[45]Maudūdī, Abu Al-ʻAlā, *Tanqīhāt,* (Lahore: Tarjumān Al-Quran, 1999), P: 103

[46]The Status of *dhaʼīf hadith* the reason, on which *hadith* is considered *dhaif*.

[47] Ibn Al-Ṣalaḥ, ʻUthmān Bin Abdul Reḥman, *Muqaddamah Ibn Al-Ṣalaḥ*, (Damascus: Dar-Al-Hikmah, 2002), P: 7

[48]Ibn e Ḥajar, Aḥmad bin Ali, *Nuzhah Al-Naẓar Sharah Nukhba Al-Fikr,* (Multan: Fārūqī Publisher, 2000), P:87

[49]A *Mursal* is *ḥadīth* in which the last narrator (i.e. *Ṣaḥābī*/ companion of holy prophet) has been deleted / skipped from *Tabiʼi*. Its plural is: *Marāsīl*.

[50] Al-ʻUlāī, Khalīl bin Aḥmad, *Jāmʼ Al-Teḥṣīl fī Aḥkām Al-Marāsīl*, (Beirut: Alam Al-Kutub, 1407 AH), P:86

[51]Muir , William, *Life of Muhammad*, P:24

[52]Juyn Boll, G. H. A, *Muslim Tradition*, (London: Cambridge University press 1983), P: 23

[53]Fueck, J., *The Role of Traditionalism in Islam*, (Oxford: Studies on Islam, 1981), P: 99-122

[54]*Ḥadīth*: Origins and Developments edited by Harald Motzki

[55]Abbott, Nabia, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri II Quranic Commentary and Tradition*, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1964), P: xiii

[56] Gold Ziher, Ignaz, *Muslim studies, Vol: II*, Translated by C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern George (London: Allen And Gunwin,), Vol: 2, P: 22

[57]Abbott, Nabia, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri II Quranic Commentary and Tradition*, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1964), P:2

[58]Burton, John, *Hadith Literature: Collection and Transmission of Hadith*, P: 289-98

[59]Hadith: *Origins and Developments* edited by Harald Motzki P: xxvi

[60]Sprenger, *Über das Traditionswesen bei den Arabern"* (np: ZDMG ,1856), P:1-17

[61]Abbott Nabia, *Studies in Arabic literary papyri II Quranic Commentary and Tradition*, P:1

[62]Robson, James, *The Isnād in Muslim Tradition*, (Glasgow: Glasgow University Oriental society, 1953), P:15-26

[63]Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1953), P:119

[64]Horovitz, J. *Alter und urspruang des Isnad*, (Der Islam: 8), 1918, P: 43

[65]Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P: 37

[66]Wansbrough, John, *Quranic Studies, Sources and Methods of Scriptural interpretation*, (Oxford: Oxford University press, 1977), P:179

[67]Cook Michael, *Eschatology and the Dating of Traditions*, *Princeton papers in Near Eastern Studies*, I (1992), P: 23-47

[68]Motzki, Harald, *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*, P: 297

[69]Scheoler, Greagor, English translation: by Gwendolyn Gold bloom in: *Ḥadīth: Origins and Developments*, ed. H. Motzki (Cambridge: Aldershot, 2004), P: 67-108.

[70] Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P: 22

[71]Motzki, H. *Hadith: Origins and Developments*, P: xli

[72]Ibid, P: 36

[73]Nabia abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary papyri*, P: 36

[74]Muir, William, *The Life of Mohammad*, P: lxviii-lxxv

[75]Motzki, Harald, *The Murder of Ibn Abi I-Huqayq*, P: 22

[76]Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P: 196-199

[77]Robson, James, *The Isnād in Muslim Tradition*, P: 15-26

[78]Jonathon Andrew Clavel and Brown is an American scholar of Islamic Studies. He has authored several books and also published many articles on Hadith. See: Islamic Law and Society, Vol 15, No 2 (2008), PP: 23-44

[79]Major collector and transmitter of *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, one of six works of hadith widely recognized as authentic and canonical and considered the most authoritative source of hadith. (Oxford Islamic Studies online)

[80]Well known scholar who was one of the chief authorities on the *hadīth after Bukhārī.* He has also compiled *aḥādīth* book *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ*

[81]Brown, A. C. Jonathan, *How We Know Early Hadith Critics Did Matn Criticism and Why It's So Hard to Find, Islamic Law and Society*, 15: 2 (2008), PP: 143-184

[82]*Al-Ḥashr*: 14

[83]Gold Ziher, Ignaz, *Muslim Studies*, Vol: 2, P: 31

[84]Muḥammad bin Muslim bin Shihāb Al-Zuhrī. An upright scholar, a great narrator of *ḥadīth*. When he died, (may Allah have mercy upon him), there was no one on the surface of the earth more knowledgeable than him. See: Ṣalaḥuddīn, Ali 'Abdul-Mawjūd, *The Biography of Īmām Al-Zuhrī*, Translator: 'Abdul-Rāfi', (Riyādh: Darussalam Publishers, 2006)

[85]**'Abd Al-malik Ibn Marwān**, (646/647-705), 5th caliph of the Umayyad Arab dynasty (685-705) centered   in Damascus.   He reorganized and   strengthened   governmental administration and throughout the empire, adopted Arabic as the language of administration.

[86]Gold ziher, Ignaz, *Muslim Studies*, Vol: 2, P: 44-45

[87]ibid, Vol: 2, P: 39

[88]ibid, Vol: 2, P: 59

[89]Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P: 57

[90] Ibid, P: 140

[91]Abū ʿAbdullah Muḥammad bin Idrīs Al-Shāfiʿī, 767–820 was a theologian, writer and scholar. He was the first contributor of the principles of Islamic jurisprudence ('Uṣūl al-fiqh). He was one of the four great Īmāms, whose legacy on juridical matters and teaching eventually led to the Shafi'ī school of *fiqh* (or Madh'hab). See: *Shafi'ī's* Abū ʿAbdullāh Muḥammad bin Idrīs, *Al-Risālah*, Translated by Mājid Khaddūrī, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961)

[92]Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P: 321-322

[93] Placing the decision of *dhu'f*

[94]Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn 'Abdullāh ibn Ja'far al-Madīnī (778 /161– 849/234)) was an Islamic scholar in the science of *ḥadīth*. He has been considered by many Muslim specialists in *ḥadīth* to be one of the four most significant authors in the field. See: Al-Dhahbī, Muḥammad bin Aḥmad, *Tadhkirah al-Huffāẓ* , (Ḥyderābād: Dā'irah al-Ma`arif al-`Uthmaniyyah, 1957)

[95]Ibn e Ḥibbān, Muḥammad, *Kitāb Al-Majrūḥīn*, (Aleppo: Dar Al-Wa'ye, 1396), Vol: 02, P:15

[96]Imām Waqī' Ibn Al–Jarraḥ b. Malīḥ al-Ruʾāsī, Abū Sufyān, famousʿIrāḳī traditionist, b. Kūfa 129/746-197/812 where his father was head of the *bayt al-māl*. He was schooled in the Islamic sciences, above all *ḥadīth*, through his father, and transmitted not only from this last but also from many ʿIrāḳī and nonʿIrāḳī scholars of the 2nd/8th century.

[97] Ibn e Ḥajar, Aḥmad bin 'Alī, *Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb,* (Beirut: Dar Al-Qalam, 1992), Vol: 02, P: 67

[98]Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P:165

[99]Iibid, P: 166

[100] A famous book of Arabic stories with unknown writer now translated in many other languages, means "One thousand and one night".

[101] A book containing complete history and authentic information about the life of animal's authored by Allama Muḥammad Mūsā bin Īsā Kamāluddīn al Damīri (D 1405 AH).

[102] Gold ziher, *Muslim Studies*, Vol: 2, P: 119

[103] A tradition narrated by the chain of "Mālik by Nafe' by Ibn 'Umar by Messenger of Allah" is called golden chain by *Moḥadithīns*.

[104] Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P: 176-177

[105] Gold Ziher, Ignaz, *Muslim Studies*, Vol: 2, P: 56

[106] A famous *tabi'i*, Malik is called a reliable traditionalist, and is said to have transmitted from such authorities as *Mālik bin Anas* and *Ibn e Sīrīn*. He was the son of a Persian slave from *Kābul* who became a disciple of *Ḥasan al-Baṣrī*.

[107] Abū Muḥammad Sulaimān bin Mehran A'mash, One of the six great scholars of *ḥadīth*.

[108] Abū Bistām *Sh'uba bin al-ḥajjāj*, Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl Bukhārī got/derived two thousand *Ahadith* from him.

[109] Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, P: 174

[110] Juyn, Boll, *The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), P: 13

[111] Ṣabaḥuldīn, 'Abdulraḥman*, Islam aur Mustashrīqīn:* Vol: 01, P: 16

[112] Madnī, Hassan, *Fitnah Inkār e ḥadīth, Mohaddis* (Monthly)*,* 34:8 (2002), (Lahore: Mohaddis library), P: 4

[113] Bernard M. Allen, *The Story Behind the Gospels*, (London: Fundations books, 1926), P: 5

[114] The writer of a famous book A History of the Bible.

[115] Burton, F. G, *A History of the Bible*,(Leiden: Brill, 2003), P: 89-90

[116] Bucaille, Maurice, *The Bible and Quran,* (Karachi: Īdārah Al-Qur'ān, wa 'Ulūm Al-Islamiyyah, 1981), P: 64

[117] Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence,* P: 156

[118] *Ḥadīth Origins and Developments*, ed. by Harald Motzki P: xvii ; Juyn Boll, *Muslim Tradition*, P: 191