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Abstract

In the third century after the Prophet migration (Hijra) two great works (al-Bukhari & Muslim) emerged, and both took the canonical position in Muslim community, due to their methodology and contents.

On the other hand it drew the attention of hadith Muslim and non-Muslim critics to examine their contents, and some critics totally refused their canonical position while others challenged their authenticity by purporting various flaws in both canonical collections. But the case for my study is the indulgence of Muslim in Mutabiat and Shawahid beside application of western approach to hadith literature.

In this paper, I tried to evaluate the aforementioned claim by analysing an instance of Muslim’s collection (Sahih Muslim) that he narrated in Mutabi’at, and it contains on addition, which circulated as an instance of his indulgence.
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INTRODUCTION

Sahih Muslim is one of the most acceptable and reliable sources of hadith in Muslim scholarships, according to the Muslim critics, commemorators and as purported by Imam Muslim that, he collected only the sounds (Sahih) ahadith in his canonical collection, due to his methodology in narrating of traditions some scholars give more value and importance to it than Sahih Bukhari.1

Like Bukhari, Imam Muslim narrated single strands and dive isnads in his book, which drew the attention of Muslim and non-Muslim scholars, and many of them put in question its authenticity. The most famous is G.H.A Juynboll (d. 2010), he believes that, the dive isnad and single strand were fabricated by compilers in case of his unsatisfaction of his partial common link (Pcl) or to support the isnad of common link (cl).2

The coincident about it is that a massive number of these strands are in auxiliary (Mutabi’at) and testimonial (Sahih) of Muslim, and sometimes those traditions which had

2 G.H.A Juynboll, Nafi, the Mawla of Ibn Umar, and his position in Muslim Hadith literature, p 213
single strand or *dive isnad* contra other canonical collections. It paved way to some scholars for charge him on indulgence\(^3\), as well as to promote the scepticism about the authenticity of these types of hadiths in *Sahih Muslim*. Does it mean that *Imam Muslim* indulged in narration of *Mutabi’at* and *Shawahid* or was he really the fabricator of *asnid* as well as *mutun*?

According to the sceptics the well-known instance for the Muslim contra other canonical collections in *Mutabi’at* and *Shawahid* is the hadith of weeping on the deceased. In Muslim tradition it’s clearly mentioned that the dead would be punished in the grave because of the lamentation of his family on him, but *Bukhari* as well as other compilers of canonical collections narrated the same tradition without (*fi qabrihi*)\(^4\).

The aforementioned instance proves the claim that, *Muslim* indulged in narrating of hadiths in *Mutabi’at* and *Shawahidas* well led credence to the purporting of *G.H.A Juynboll* that dive and single strands are fabricated by the compiler.

Consequently it is necessary to analyse the above instance as well as the connotation and position of *Mutabi’at* and *shahid* in hadith canonical collection particularly in *Sahih Muslim*.

Before dealing with the abovementioned claims, the following is a glance on methodology of *Muslim* in his compilation, and the connotation and appearance of *Mutabi’at* and *Shahid* in hadith canonical collections.

**IMAM MUSLIM’S LIFE AND WORK**

The full name of Imam Muslim is *Abul-Hussain ʿAsakiruddin Muslim bin Hajjaj AlQushairi An-Naisaburi*. He belonged to the *Qushair* tribe of the Arab clan *Rabi’ah*. He was born in 202 or 206 in Nishapur, a town of Iran.\(^5\)

Imam Muslim voyaged far and wide to collect the traditions in the countries of Arabia, Egypt, Iraq and Syria, and benefited from the conspicuous Hadith scholars of that time by attending the lectures and classes of those knowledgeable persons. His teachers included *Ishaq bin Rawaih* (d.238), *Ahmad bin Hanbal* (d.241), *Ubaidullah Al-Qawariri* (d.235), *Qutaibah bin Said* (d.240), *Abdullah bin Maslamah* (d.221), *Harmalah bin Yahya* (d.243) and others.\(^6\)

---


\(^4\) Ibid


\(^6\) Al-Sam’ani (d.562), *Kitab al-Ansab*, vol. 10, p. 429.
Later he settled down at Nishapur, where he came into connection with Imam Bukhari. Seeing the enormous knowledge and deep insight of him in the Ahadith of the Prophet, Imam Muslim endured attached with him until the end of his life. He also attended the lectures of another scholar of Hadith, Muhammad bin Yahya AdhDhuhli, but when the variance of opinion arose between Imam Bukhari and Muhammad bin Yahya on the subject of the creation of the Holy Qur'an, Imam Muslim favoured Imam Bukhari and left the company of Muhammad bin Yahya.  

Imam Muslim compiled many books and treatises on Hadith; the most important of his works is the compilation of the Hadith collection Al-Jami `Al-Sahih, which is famously known as Sahih Muslim. Some scholars of Hadith opine that in some respects it is the best and most authentic collection of Ahadith. Imam Muslim laboriously collected 3,00,000 Ahadith, but after a critical study, he selected only 4,000 of them for this collection. Other contributions of Imam Muslim on the subject of Hadith are:

- Al-Asma 'wal-Kuna
- Irfadus Syamiyyin
- Al-Arqaam
- At-Tamyiz
- Hadith Amr ibn Syu'aib
- Rijalul' Urwah
- Al-Musnad al-Kabir etc.  

Many students learned the Science of Hadith from Imam Muslim. Those who became famous and occupied a prominent position are: Abu Hatim Razi (d.277), Musa bin Harun (d.294), Ahmad bin Salamah (d.286) Abu `Isa Tirmidhi (d.279), Abu Bakr bin Khuzaimah (d.311) and Abu Awanah (d.316).

Imam Muslim died at the age of fifty-seven in (d. 261) and was buried in the suburbs of Nishapur.

**MUSLIM’S METHODOLOGY IN HIS COMPILATION**

*Imam Muslim* compiled his Sahih on the order of 'book and chapter'. But in view of the wideness of the book, they did not write their titles. Later, the scholars of hadith

---

7 Muhammad Saddique Khan (d.1307) Al-Taj Al-Mukallal Min Jawahir Mathir Al-Taraz Al-Akhar Wal'awwal, The Ministry of Awqaf and Islamic Affairs, Qatar 2007, p. 119.
10: Khairuddin al-Zarkali (d. 1396) al-A'lam vol.7 p. 221.
categorised it into chapters or sections with their titles. Among all, the classification of Imam Nawawi (d.765) is the best.

Imam Muslim did not rely chiefly on his personal findings but consulted the great scholars of his age, as he himself says: "I did not record the Hadith that was reliable to me, but I only recorded the traditions that were agreed upon by scholars."\(^{11}\)

Also, he would present all traditions to Abu Zur'ah Razi (d.264) and reject the ones about which Abu Zur'ah points out any deficiency and choose the ones which were approved by him. He says: "Whatever traditions I put in this collection are with proof and whatever I rejected are also with proof."\(^{12}\)

He paid so exclusive attention to the compilation that he himself stated: "If the scholars of Hadith will keep on writing Ahadith for two hundred years then also they will have to depend on this book."\(^{13}\)

Besides, Imam Muslim takes particular care in reporting the exact words of the narrators and points out even the minor differences in the wording of their reports. He has also frequently kept in view the difference between the two well-known methods of narration, Haddathana (he narrated to us) and Akhbarana (he informed us), due to his opinion that the first method used only when the teacher is narrating the hadith and the student is listening to him, while the second method of expression implies that the student is reading the hadith in front of his teacher.\(^{14}\)

In addition, Imam Bukhari, sometimes mentions the kunya and sometimes full names of narrators, particularly in the Syrians transmitters. This creates a genus of confusion, which Imam Muslim had averted.

Imam Muslim considered only such traditions to be genuine and authentic as had been transmitted to him by an unbroken chain of reliable authorities up to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and were in perfect harmony with what had been related by other narrators whose trustworthiness was unanimously accepted and who were free from all defects. He divided narrators and sub-narrators into 3 levels:\(^{15}\)

1. Those people who were absolutely authentic in their memory and character with no deficiency of any kind. They were identified to be honest and trustworthy.


\(^{13}\) Ibid, vol. 1, p. 83.

\(^{14}\) Qadi ayyad, *Ikmal al-mu’lim bi fawa’id Muslim*, vol. 1, p. 186; al-Nawawī (d. 676), *Al Minhaj bi Sharh Sahih Muslim*, vol. 1, p. 21.

\(^{15}\) Muslim (d.261) *Sahih Muslim*, Ahya al- turas al- Arabi Lebanon, vol. 1, p. 4; al-Nawawī (d. 676), *Al Minhaj*, vol. 1, p. 23.
2. People of slightly lesser memory and perfection than the previous category, yet still trustworthy and knowledgeable, not liars by any extent. Examples of people in this category include `Ata ibn Said and Layth ibn Abi Sulaim.

3. People whose honesty was a subject of dispute or even discussion. Imam Muslim did not concern himself with such people. Examples in this category include Abdullah ibn Maswar and Muhammad ibn Said al-Maslub.

From the first genre of transmission he narrated hadiths in usul, while from the second in Mutabi`at and shahid, but he did not concern himself to the third one

The aforementioned premises reflect his extreme care in the transmission of a hadith. That’s why Imam Muslim preferred to record only that hadith which, at least, two reliable tabiu (Successors) had heard from two Companions and this principle is observed throughout the subsequent chain of narrators in his collection.

THE IMPlication OF MUbABI’AT AND ShAWAHID

The both terminologies are exclusively discussed in hadith terminologies (Mustalah al-Hadith) lexicons. And the Muslim scholars mentioned multiple reasons for the Mutabi`at and Shawahid, but the main purpose of narrating a hadith in Mutabi`at to trace the value of hadith in asal, and also to find out that, anyone of his contemporaneous had the same tradition or not, If no body narrated the same tradition then try to search out that, someone narrated the same narration from his Shiekh al-shiekh or not. And so on to the end of isnad, it’s called Mutabi` (singular of mutabi`at), but if there isn’t analogous an isnad for the same matan, then try to find a similar hadith in context to it, and it’s called Shahid (singular of shawahid).16

Ibn salah who’s an expert of hadith terminologies stated the purpose of Mutabi`at17 to point out that the narrator (in asl) only narrated or someone else too. The narrator is well-known or not? 18

So it’s clear that Muslim scholars commonly and Imam Muslim particularly don’t narrate hadith in Mutabi`at or shawahid to support the sanad of common links, but there are various purposes for its narration, as identifying the position of narrator, to collect all chains (Truq) etc.19

17 In hadith terminologies dictionaries there are two types of Mutabi`at one is called Muatabi`at al-naqisah and the second is called Mutabi`at al-tamah. Ibn Salah (d.643), Marifat uloom al-hadith, Dar al-Maktaba al-almia 2002, p. 174.
18 Ibn Salah , Uloom al-hadith, pp. 74-75.
According to Imam Muslim’s methodology he devoted Mutabi’at to those narrators who belong to the second genre, so it may be injustice to say that Muslim scholars fabricated dive and single strands to support the hadith sanad of common links.

ANALYSIS OF HADITH “weeping on the deceased” & JUYNBOLL’S THEORY

The hadith about weeping on the deceased cited the compilers of canonical and pre-canonical compilations with different expressions, in some traditions the -weeping on the deceased- expressed on (buk’a)\textsuperscript{20} while in some on (nniah’a).\textsuperscript{21}

The informant of this hadith from the Prophet (peace be upon him) in first generation as well as in second generation is differ, but most of them cited the narration of Ibn Umar from Umar bn al-khattab which are contain on the addition (fi qabrihi), Here is a glance of these isnads in the different collection beside the sanad of that hadith which Imam Muslim reported in principle (asl)


Hadith: (The deceased is punished due to his family's weeping over him)

Prophet (PBUH)

\[ \downarrow \]

Umar

\[ \downarrow \]

Abdullah bn Umar

\[ \downarrow \]

Saeed bn Musayib

Hisham,

Abu bakar bn Hafs

\[ \downarrow \]

Nafi

Qatadah

Abu Usama

Shuba

\[ \downarrow \]

Abdullah

\[ \downarrow \]

Shuba

\[ \downarrow \]

Ubaid

\[ \downarrow \]

Ali bn al-Ja’ad (d.230)

\[ \downarrow \]

M. bishar

\[ \downarrow \]

Musnad

Aswad Ibn Umar

Abu Abdan

Abu Bakar

\[ \downarrow \]

Abu bakr bn Abi shayba (d.235)

\[ \downarrow \]

Abd an

M. bn Jafar

I bn Adi

\[ \downarrow \]

I bn Bishar

\[ \downarrow \]

Al-Bukhari (d.256)

\[ \downarrow \]

I bn Bashar

M. bn Musana

I bn Abi Shayba

M. bn Abdullah

\[ \downarrow \]

Muslim (d.261)

Note: Imam Muslim recorded the stand of Nafi, Ibn Umar in principle (asl), while the rest in auxiliary and testimonial.
The superficial review of the aforementioned diagram shows that, Imam *Muslim* was not only the one compiler that he cited this hadith with addition, but before him like *Ali ibn Ja‘ad* (d.230), *Abu Bakar ibn Abi Shayba* (d.235) also cited the same hadith with addition of (*fi qabrihi*) in his compilation, and the *Sanad* go back to *Saeed ibn Musayib* who was the alleged pupil of *Abdullah Ibn Umar*.

The same narration narrated *Ali bn al-Ja‘ad* (d.230) from Shub‘a and the sanad goes back to *Abu Bakar Ibn Hafs*, and *Imam Bukhari* narrated from *Hisham on single strand*, and both were the colleague and contemporaneous of *Ibn Musayib*. So it means that, the same tradition with addition was in circulation in preceding generation with different strands from *Ibn Umar*, and putting the responsibility of addition on *Imam Muslim* shoulders is injustice.

The *common links* theory first introduced by *Josef Schacht* (d.1969), but later on developed by *G.H.A Juynboll* beside introducing other terminologies, which are new for the classical theologian, the decisive difference between *Schacht* and *Juynboll* lies in how to identify the *common links*. *Juynboll* requires that a *common link* has several partial *common links*. 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*. So applying the same method or theory on the abovementioned sanad Shub‘a is looking like *common link* because the *sanad* spread after him, but according to *Juynboll* theory and requirements for *common link*, it is not a true *common link* due the absences of *partial common links*, we may say it *seeming common link*.²²

In addition, *Juynboll* has another term “*Dive*” single strand that goes from the compiler to the sheikh of common link, and bypass the *common link*: *Juynboll* believes that, it is factious and fabricated by the compiler to support the *sanad* of *common link*.²³ But the crucial point in his theory is, that these dives *Muhadithun* citing in the *Mutabi‘at* as he discussed in detail in his prominent work on the terminologies in hadith science.²⁴

In the same case *Shu‘ba* is *seeming common link*, and the strand of *Muslim* from *M. Ibn Musana* is a *dive*, but it does not prove the assumption of *G.H.A Juynboll* that *dive sanad* is fabricated by compiler due to his unsatisfaction of partial common link or to support the *common link*, because both are in *Mutabi‘at* and there isn’t *common link* in the principal narration (*asl*).

And its implausible to think about it, that *Muslim* fabricated the strand of *M. Ibn Musana* for the commonly purporting purpose, because the same narration cited his alleged

---

²² See for the term *G.H.A Juynboll*, Nafi, the mawla of *Ibn Umar*, and his position in *Muslim* Hadith literature 208-216
²³ *Ibid*
²⁴ See *G.H.A Juynboll*, *Reappraisal of some technical terms in Hadith literature* p(315-322)
teacher Ibn Abi shayba in his collection (Musannaf) and the Imam Muslim does not have only this tradition on sanad that Shub’a is the main informant in it, but he has an another permanent sanad which goes back to Naﬁ who is also the student of Ibn Umar.

The rigorous study of Muslim isnads shows the flaws of those critics, who asserted that Muhaddithun in general and Muslim in particular narrating the single strand or dive isnad to support the common link, but as we can see the chain of hadith, which Imam Muslim cited in principle (Asl) and the isnad does not contain on common link, that therefore Imam Muslim narrated these single strands to support him.

In addition Shu’ba is seeming common link, and the strand of Muslim from M. Ibn Musanna is a dive, but it doesn’t prove the assumption of G.H.A Juynboll that dive isnad is fabricated by compiler due to his unsatisfaction of partial common link or to support the common link, in the same case Muslim doesn’t need to fabricate a strand because the hadith of Shu’ba took place in his alleged master Ibn Abi Shaybah’s book (Musannaf), and the Muslim hasn’t only this tradition on isnad that Shub’a is the main informant, but he has an another permanent isnad which goes back to Naﬁ whose also the student of Ibn Umar.

Subsequently on the methodology of Muslim the objective from Mutabia’t and Shawahid is to inform the reader from those sands which he has from the second genre of narrators as well as to collect the sound isnads of same matan in one place, or in another words to support the matan nor to the common link as the western scholars claimed.

CONCLUSION

Muslim and al-Bukhari have received the canonical position in the muslim community, and both are most acceptable and trustable to them after the Holy Quran. It’s sound clear that their compilations aren’t solely contained on the Mutabia’t and Shahid but most of compilers give place into this type of narrations.

The accusing of Muslim on the indulgence in Mutabi’at and Shawahid is an utterance without examining his work, in the abovementioned studied instance its emerged that this claim is baseless, because the tradition contains on addition (fī qabrihi) didn’t cite only Imam Muslim, but its available in the other canonical and pre canonical compilations.
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