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Abstract:
Ṣaḥābaḥ is the first generation who believe to the Prophet Muḥammad [p.b.u.h] and accepted the teachings of Islam (the hadits of the Prophet) directly from Him. They are very obedient to the Prophet so that they may not dare to betray and lie intentionally in the narration of hadits. They are ‘adil generally. Muslims believe that whole companions have ‘adâlah quality, which is famous by a dictum: kullu ṣaḥābaḥ ‘udūl. Furthermore, this belief has come as something approved theologically. This concept becomes stronger when the hadith criticism, traditional scholars are more oriented sanad which has implications for the placement of narrators personality in a position that can not be ignored. This is clearly different from Juynboll, he is one of the Orientalists who came from Netherland who developed the theory of common link. The conclusion of this research that Juynboll denies the method of hadith criticism. He claims that this theory occurred in the evolutive schema, and is the creation of muḥaddits. On the other hand, the author views that the denial of Juynboll for collective ta'dil is one of the instruments to strengthen the theory of common link.
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Introduction
Companions are very enthusiastic to listen to the Prophet. Although not allowed to record what they have heard from him (simply for the sake of avoiding the mixing of hadits with the Qur’an), they memorize it by heart and put it into practise meticulously. Their enthusiasm is also demonstrated by the fact that when someone fails to attend the Prophet’s lectures, he will ask others to relate the Prophet’s words so that his information keeps “up to date”.

Interesting to note that Muslim scholars have came to an agreement that every companion of the Prophet Muḥammad [p.b.u.h.] reaches the level of ‘udūl. Derived from the term ‘adl, an ‘udūl man is the one who fully possesses intellectual capacity, neither committed a grave sin nor disposed to minor sins quite often, has excellent memory, and fully aware of the responsibility in transmitting the prophetic tradition. ‘Adâlah, then, is an
indispensable quality of ṛawi (transmitter), and the one who reaches this level is called ṭiqāḥ (trusted). The concept of ta’dil has been exercise by a number of leading hadits scholars on each narrator found in the chain of sanad, except on those in the first generation, i.e., the companions of the Prophet. This is so because their moral integrity continuously shaded by such a primary living moral standard, namely, the Prophet Muḥammad [p.b.u.h.], whose personal characteristics generates a higher moral milieu for the life of his companions. In this regard, the scholars feel no need to examine the ṣadālah quality of the companions because, as the muḥaddits in said, kullubum ṣadāil. Be that as it may, however, the idea of ṣadālah al-ṣaḥābah becomes an object of critique at the hand of Juynboll, an Orientalist of Netherland origin. He does not accept the traditional methods of hadits criticism that prizes the companions of the Prophet in such a higher statue solely based on scriptural justification. Juynboll argues that such a favor to the companions should be further examined in light of their historical life, an open arena where one could commit mistakes and misconducts unintentionally or deliberately.

For that reason, Juynboll argues, prior to one’s acceptance of a certain hadits, he must in the first place question the three fundamental aspects related to the process of hadits transmission. That is when, where, and by whom it was transmitted. This is so because “the more transmission lines come together in one transmitter, either reaching him or going away from him,” says Juynboll, “the more this transmitter and his transmission have a claim of historicity”. As such, one should not ignore the historical aspects of that process.

Brief Account of Juynboll; Early Life and Education

His full name is Gautier H. A Juynboll. He was born in Leiden, Netherlands, in 1935. He was a distinguished expert on the early history of ḥadīts. He spent more than thirty years in doing research on issues related to ḥadīts traditions, a vast labor that earned him international recognition.

When he pursued bachelor degree, Juynboll, together with his friends, edited the work which later on became the final half of ḥadīts dictionary, Concordance and Indices of the Muslim Tradition. From 1965 to 1966, he lived in Egypt doing research for doctoral dissertation regarding the views of Egyptian theologists against the ḥadīts literature entitled “The Autenticity of the Tradition Literature: Discussion in Modern Egypt”. Funded by the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research, he completed this work in 1969 which earned him the degree of Ph.D. in Literature from the Faculty of Letters, University of Leiden, Netherlands.

Besides those books, Juynboll also has a number of works in the field of ḥadīts in the form of articles, such as (1) “The Date of the Great Fitra”; (2) "On the Origins of Arabic Prose: Reflections on Authenticity"; (3) "Syu’bāḥ b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/776) and His Position Among the Tradition of Basra"; dan (4) "An Excursus on the Ahl al-Sunnah in Connection with Van Ess, Theologie und Gesellschaft, vol. IV".

---

3M. Syuhudi Ismail, Kaʿdah Kesahihan Hadits: Telaah Kritis dan Tinjauan dengan Pendekatan Ilmu Sejarah (Jakarta: Bulan Bintang, 1995), h. 113.
4al-Suyūṭī, Tadhrib al-Rawi, h. 108.
5Ibid, h. 209.
6See Komaruddin Amin, Mengaji Kenalai Kesahihan Metode Kritik Hadits (Jakarta: Hikmah, 2009), h. 163.
9Soon after the dissertation was published by E.J. Brill in the same year.
His Position among Western Scholars of Islamic Studies

The discourse of the *ḥadīts* in the West always refer to the name of Goldziher (Hongaria) and Schacht (Austria), Juynboll (Netherlands), Motzki (Germany) and several other names. In view of the orientalists, the first two names considered as Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (*warrior of ʿulūm al-ḥadīts*) or Ibn Ḥajar in the Islamic world. Meanwhile, Juynboll and Motzki considered (more or less) like Muḥammad Ṣyākir, al-Albānī, al-Saqqāf or al-Ghumarī in the Islamic world. Both generated Goldziher and Schacht died left the global influence, and generated a school of skepticism in Western. At the time of Goldziher (*Mohammedanische Studien*, 1890) and Schacht (*The Origins* 1950), the majority of Western scholars did not say that they were skeptical about Islamic literature, including the *ḥadīts*. The discourse of the early Islamic period (first century) considered untouchable because of lack of available sources. In general, the skeptic group argues that the knowledge and information about the early days of Islam (first century of Hijra) are only perceptions of the third century Muslim scholars. The existing literature is no more than a reflection of the conflict map that can not reflect the reality as described by the source itself.10

Revisionist stream tends to draw the conclusion that denies the validity of the historical descriptions that based on the facts from Islamic sources. Whereas traditional group are those who did not recognize the conclusions of revisionist group and also rejected the validity of the method of source criticism used by revisionists. Therefore, the revisionist and traditional flow are two streams that have never met each other, because the first classify second stream as a flow of undertaking religious studies and literature, not the study of history. It is of course difficult to be accepted by the traditional flow.11

Ignaz Goldziher and Joseph Schacht are two *ḥadīts* reviewers who can be categorized as revisionist, on the other side the traditional flow was represented by Fuat Sezgin, Nabia Abbott, and Azami.12

In that context, Juynboll’s thought needs to be laid: whether he adhered to revisionist or traditional? Or does he try to find a middle way (middle ground) between the two? Before determining the position of Juynboll’s ideas in the thought of the modern tradition in the Western world, the author will describe the views of thinkers who represent the two major tendencies.13

Opinions of Goldziher and Schacht certainly caused harsh response from the group of traditional – as found in the works of Sezgin, Abbott, and Azami. Fuat Sezgin argued that the process of recording *ḥadīts* has been started since life span of the Prophet and continued with isnād muttashil until the advent of the large

---

12 Ali Masrur, “Teori Common Link”, h. 32.
13 Ibid,
collections of ḥadīts in the 3 H/4 M. Thus, actually the process of writing the ḥadīts was been practiced much earlier than was understood by Ignaz Goldziher.

Based on the context of thought of modern ḥadīts reviewer in the West, a number of figures had different opinions from Juynboll’s thought. Some perceived him as the progressors of Goldziher and Schacht, but some put Juynboll’s thought in a central position between the revisionists and the traditional.

The Definition of ‘Adālah al- Ṣahāba

The word Ṣahāba originated from the word ṣāḥib literally means accompany, keep company with, or associate with. It is said that ṣāḥibtu Ṣabītan fa anā ṣāhib (I have accompanied him, so I am a companion). The plural form of the word ṣāḥib is asḥāb which means accompanying someone else in a particular time.

Among Muslim scholars, there are various opinions about the definition of Ṣahāba. Some Muslim scholars define Ṣahāba by focusing on the time in which they meet the Prophet for a while, or for a specific period as in one month or one year. The others argue that the most important thing in the definition of Ṣahāba is the acceptance of ḥadīts from the prophet or the participation in a battle lead by the Prophet. Generally, ulama’ argued that Ṣahāba is everyone who met the Prophet and believed in his precept and died as a Muslim. This opinion is the opinion of the majority of Muslim scholars (jumhūr al-‘ulamā). From the definitions above, it can be concluded that everyone who lived in the age of the Prophet, whether he or she was an children or an adult, who met the Prophet for a while, whether or not he or she had time to talk together with the Prophet, who followed in the battle with the Prophet or not, or even if he or she has done an murtad and came back to be Muslim and died as a Muslim, he or she is Ṣahāba.

‘Adālah, it is the good character of a person who submits to the rules of God (taqwa) by performing whatever He commands and leaving whatever God forbids. ‘Ulamā’ said that a rāwī is ‘adīl if the rāwī has a strong commitment to commitment to perform his or her religious practices and leaves whatever attitudes and practices which make him fall into being a bad person.

Al-Syāfi’i said that al-rāwī and al-‘adīl is a rāwī who is trustworthy in his religious practices, Abū Yūsuf argues that everyone who is free from sin punished by hell, and his charity is much than his sin, he can be categorized as ‘adīl.
‘Ulamā’s View on ‘Adālaḥ al-Ṣaḥābah

As the objects of revelation, the companions were fallible human beings in need of guidance. An example is the criticism expressed in the Qur’ān of those who were involved in building the Masjid al-Ḍirār.24 To pretend that all of the Companions were ‘udul therefore seems to contradict the very purpose of revelation, without which any understanding of the Qur’ānic verses becomes difficult, if not impossible.

Another disturbing aspect in the discussion of the ‘adālaḥ of the Companions was the ambiguity among the Traditionists themselves. The latter were also trapped by this contradiction. Ibn ‘Abd al-Bār, for instance, tries to establish that all the Companions were ‘udul and in support of this view, like his fellows, quotes the Qur’ānic verses and the Prophetic traditions. But how, after having established this fact, could he report that Bujayr ibn ‘Abdullah, for example, stole a leather bag belonging to the Prophet? On one hand he wanted to establish that the Companions were ‘udul so that all Traditions coming from them should be considered as true. On the other hand he could not deny the fact that there were some Companions who were of dubious morality. In other words, there is a gap between the concept of ‘adālaḥ and historical reality.25

But the most disturbing fact of all is that some of the most important Companions, such as ‘Alī, ‘Aisyah, Ṭalha, al-Zubayr and Mu‘awiya, were involved in the fitnaḥ. This was an event that was devastating for Muslims, resulting in many deaths and in a society that was badly torn apart. How did the Traditionists reconcile the Companions’ involvement in these civil wars with their supposed ‘adālaḥ? How did they explain this apparent contradiction?26

There were various approaches taken within Sunnī circles in an effort to cope with this dilemma. The first was to refuse altogether to discuss the involvement of the Companions in the Fitnaḥ. Ibn Hanbal stresses that it is part of the Sunnah of the previous generation (salaf) to refrain from mentioning this dispute among the companions, (while others said that it was even compulsory (wājīb) to do so).27 Al-Awza‘ī was also among those who held this view.28 “That was the blood of which God had purified our hands, so we should also purify our tongues of it,” says al-Syāfi‘ī. Hence the only thing that could be done was respect them, ask their forgiveness, and talk about them in positive terms.29

---

25Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, al-Isti‘āb, h. 50.
29Ibn Qudāmaḥ, Tāḥrīm al-Naṣṣār, h. 23.
30Al-‘ījī, al-Mawaqif ‘ībah al-Kalīm (Beirut: Ālam al-Kurub, 1983), h. 413.
Another approach was to minimize, or even to negate, the role of the Companions in the Fitnah. In the case of the murder of 'Utsmān it was said that none of the Companions were involved.\(^{32}\) Those who were present at the time had tried to stop the rebels, but were overwhelmed by the rebels' superior forces.\(^{33}\) The Battle of Jamāl furthermore occurred despite the best efforts of the Companions to avoid it;\(^{34}\) it was neither 'Ali's idea, nor Talḥah's, nor al-Zubayr's, but an initiative of the people of Başra.\(^{35}\) At the Battle of Shiṭfīn moreover, less than one hundred Companions were involved on both 'Ali's and Mu'āwiyah's sides.\(^{36}\)

The third approach was to recognize the involvement of the Companions in the fitnah while at the same time exempting them from errors by introducing the concept of ijtihād. The basis for this argument was the prophetic tradition according to which people who exercise ijtihād will always be rewarded. If their ijtihād is correct the reward is doubled, but even if it is not, it will not go unrewarded. Because all groups had exercised their ijtihād, whatever position each decided to take was valid and it did not affect their 'adālah.\(^{37}\)

Firstly, there are some 'Ulamā’ arguing that not all šahābah are ‘adīl especially who were living after the death of the Prophet and after the case of fitnah. Secondly, some ‘Ulamā’ argue that all šahābah cannot be considered ‘adīl. Whether šahābah lived in the time of Prophet Muḥammad [p.b.u.h.] or after they may not have been considered ‘adīl. According to them, it is an obligation to examine the circumstances to determine if šahābah transmitted a hadith from the Prophet.\(^{38}\)

Third, the majority of ‘ulamā’ of hadīts, fiqh, and iṣnād argued that al-šahābah kullahum ‘adīl (all companion are ‘adīl). In this case, ‘adālah al-šahābah means that they have never spoken a lie to the prophet deliberately because of their faith and piety. ‘Adālah is not infallible (ma’sum), but it should not be abl al-bid’ah and abl al-abwa.\(^{39}\)

a. Some verses stating ‘adālah al-šahābah:
1. Al-Baqara (2): 143
   
   كُنْتُمْ خِيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ نِهىَّاسِ
   لا تَسُبُُّا أصحابٓ فهُ أنَّ أحدَكُم أوْفَقَ مثمَ أُحُدٍ ذٌبًا ما بَهَغَ مُدَّ أحدٌِِم َلا وَصِْٕفًَُ
   وَكُىْتُمْ خَْٕرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ نِهىَّاسِ

2. Āli ‘Imrān (3): 110
   
   ََكَرَنِكَ جَعَهْىَاكُمْ أُمَّةً ََسَطًا نِتَكُُوُُا شٍَُدَاءَ عَهَّ انىَّاسِ َََٔكُُنَ انرَّسُُلُ عَهَْٕكُمْ شٍَِٕدًا

b. Some hadīts saying ‘adālah al-šahābah are:

Hādīt transmitted by al-Tirmidžī and Ibn Hibbān from Abdillāh ibn Mugaffal.

32 Nizām al-Dīn, Fawātith Raḥim, 2:156.
33 Al-Nawāwī, Syarh Sahīh Muslim, 7:158.
34 Ibn Katīr, al-Ba‘īs, h. 98.
36 Ibn Katīr, al-Ba‘īs, h. 182.
37 Al-Suyūtī, “Tādrib al-Rāwī”, h. 400-401.
38 Muhammad ‘Ajjaj al-Khatīb, al-Sunnah Qabla al-Tadvin, ed. 2 (Dār al-Fikr, 1971), h. 396.
39 Ibid., h. 394; see also Muhammad Abū Rayyāh, Adwa‘ ‘Alā al-Sunnah al-Muḥammadīyyah (Egypt, Dar al-Ma‘ārif), h. 344.
40 Department of Religious Affairs, Al-Qur’ān and Translation (Semarang: CV. Al-Syifā‘), Al-Baqarah (2): 143.
41 Ibid., Āli ‘Imrān (3): 110.
Juynboll’s Perspective

In the development and stability of the dictum \( \text{al-} \text{ṣahāba} \text{h kullahum 'adāl} \) (all companions are 'adāl) under the umbrella of theological strength. Furthermore, this dictum becomes stronger when it is applied the hadith criticism. The scholars are more sanad oriented, it implicates in the placement of personality narrators in a position that cannot be ignored. Of course, this study, when it reaches the Juynboll’s hand, it will be different inasmuch as he did not accept what is conveyed theologically, he also did not accept traditional methods of hadith criticism. He made deep study of literature to the literature on this phenomenon and produce something different.

What has been shown by Juynboll is that he did a thorough research on a series of classic literature, and applies them in chronological order. Moreover, it shows when and how the dictum appears and how it goes. Research shows that this dictum develops in evolution. What is even more interesting is that the existence of this dictum, according Juynboll, cannot be separated from the figure that is so valuable in the study of hadīts, Abū Hurayrāh.\(^4^2\)

Between the explanations concerning this case, he did an evaluation of the traditional opinion. There are some records that emphasized Juynboll in this regard namely, firstly, this dictum was rooted in the minds of every Muslim, even touching the faith dimension, where people who criticize ‘adālah al-ṣahāba h will receive a negative response and are considered violating the principles of the faith. To prove this, Juynboll cited a fatwā from a leading figure in ‘Irāq, Amjad al-Zahwārī, on 30 May 1967. The fatwā explicitly states that people who critique ṣahāba h are the same with destroying the greatness of Islām.\(^4^3\)

Secondly, methodologically, this dictum gave an enormous influence in the study of hadīts, especially in the discourse of alhāwāl al-runwāh or commonly known as ‘ilm jarīḥ wa ta’dīl. Total reception as shown above can also be seen from the method of the author of rijūl al-ḥadīts which puts friend as a community ṣabāqah is the highest. Moreover, when they do the exploration of companions, they do not do criticize. As hinted in advance, there is a view that it is not good for people who criticize ṣahāba h. On the other hand, it also affects the ḥadīts classification applied by the muḥaddītīn. In the context of tādīl (mudaffā), when there are indications of tādīl done by a ṣahāba h, then they will be accepted because of their ‘adālah. In the context of transmitters’ majhūl, if the position of majhūl narrators in the chain network at the level of ṣahāba h, it will have no impact on the authenticity of the chain, and the authenticity of ḥadīts of course.\(^4^4\) Third, there are two verses are often put forward to support the ‘proverbial’, namely “kuntum khaira ummatin” and “Kadzalika ja’alnahākum ummatan wasātan”. According Juynboll, when he explain the meaning of this verse in the previous book of tafsīr, none of the

\(^{42}\)GHA Juynboll Juynboll, Hadīts Controversy in Egypt, trans. Ilyas Hasan (Bandung: Mizan, 1999), h. 90.

\(^{43}\)G.H.A Juynboll, Muslim Tradition, h. 191.

\(^{44}\)Al-Dzhahabī, Sijār al-Adam al-Nabūḷā, Juz 1 (Beirut: Muasasah Ar-Risālah, 1981), h. 41.
interpretations that explain the meaning of the verse as meaning 'adil in the terminology of 'ilm hadits. Even though Imam al-Ṭabarî interpreted wasathan as 'adil, the meaning of 'adil here is different with the meaning of 'adil in the science of hadits.\(^45\)

Juynboll view of justice is inseparable companions of Abu Hurayrah figure. According to him, born and growing dictum al-ṣaḥābah kullhum 'adil related to the efforts of writers literature of rijal to release Abu Hurayrah from a variety of charges. Furthermore, still according Juynboll, not a literature rijal classic also give attention to other companions Abū Hurairah very similar to what they did to Abū Hurairah itself, not even one that is also approaching. Other friends, who also narrated many traditions such as Anas bin Malik (1584 hadīth), Abdullah bin ‘Abbās (hadīts 1243), Abdullah bin Umar (1979 hadīts), Abdullah bin ‘Amr (378 hadīts), Jabir bin Abdullah (960 hadīts), and Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī (hadīts 496), do not get treatment as Abū Hurairah.\(^46\)

In this case Juynboll also offers common link method which he thought was appropriate to replace the method of classic hadīts criticism. Not only to replace the method of classic hadīts criticism, theory of common link was also meant to reject all of the basic assumptions that became the foundation of other methods. In other words, Juynboll discussed ‘adalah al-ṣaḥābah just in order to strengthen his common link theory.

Furthermore, this theory also brought Juynboll toward conclusion that hadīts which is informed by only one person cannot be accepted. In other words, Juynboll did not accept the validity of the hadīts gharīb (hadīts narrated only by one person). Moreover, through the common link theory Juynboll only accepted hadith supported by sanad which consists of two narrators and each narrators have at least two students and so on.

**The Theory of Common Link at Work**

Verification of common link theory needed to observe its role in proving the authenticity of hadīts and validity of this theory will be examined by applying on hadīts.

In outline, the ways of working of the Common Link theory are:

1. Determine the the hadīts to be examined.
2. Discover traditions in the various collections of hadīts.
3. Collect all the isnād hadīts.
4. Arrange and reconstruct all isnad chain in one isnād bundle.

Detect Common Link, the narrator who considered most responsible for spreading of hadīts.\(^47\)

**Verification of Common Link Theory on Ḥadīts of Sign Of Imān**

The hadīts of the sign of imān chosen to verify this theory. At the least, there are some reasons why writer chosen this hadīts. Firstly, various of isnad chain that support the matan hadīts, if collected and reconstructed to form a bundle isnād, so that indicates there are narrators that act as a common link. Secondly, that hadīts with topic


\(^{46}\)Komaruddin Amin, *Menguji Kembali Keakuratan*, h. 54.

\(^{47}\)Ali Masrur, “Teori Common Link”, h. 80.
above, is the basic ḥadīts which became the basis of the teachings of Islam. Thirdly, in the ḥadīts will be discussed, there is a name Syu'baḥ as one of the narrators. Syu'baḥ’s position in the development of ḥadīts much criticized. Juynboll did not miss to give the objections against Syu'baḥ’s involvements in falsifying of isnād. Even Juynboll did not receive reports from the ḥadīts critics compiled in book of rāwī biography, such as al-Jarh wa al-ta'dil, tahdzīb al-tahdzīb, and lisān al-mizān taken for granted but placing it as a historical account for actually event, which may contain the deficiencies, weaknesses or faults because it has been mixed with various interpretations.

The text of ḥadīts as follows:

لا يؤمن أحدكم حتى أكون أحب إليهم من ولده ووالده والناس أجمعين

Based on the tracking of the ḥadīts, discovered four variants of isnād lines as follows:


---

Thus, in fact since the beginning of the hadīts has been taught by the Prophet Muhammad to few companions. Just because there are some restrictions and obstacles in the hadith narrations activities in early Islam, that activities more privately than publicly. This cause a hadīts that transmitted by single chain stretch from common link to the Prophet and it spread after common link. So, the status of common link is the first person who spread the hadīts not fabricator.

Critique on Juynboll's Analysis

That companion in the view of muḥaddīs got a privileged position than others generation. These features, for Muslims, is a gift given by God to them, because their role cannot be underestimated in the development of early Islam. Undoubtedly, this
was understandable because the mechanism used by the muḥaddīsīn on ḥadīts criticism perceived the personality of a narrator as something very fundamental. ⁴⁹

However, Juynboll did not accept traditional methods of ḥadīts criticism and what was presented theoretically. From the research he did on some literature, he produced something different from the research done by the traditional scholar – for example, Juynboll perceived dictum al-ṣaḥābāh kullubumʿūdāl from historical aspect. Since ‘Ulamā’ argued al-ṣaḥābāh kullubumʿūdāl used the normative theological approach, they do not examine the critical issue.

Furthermore, Juynboll adopted and developed the Schacht’s theory. According to Komaruddin Amin, in accepting a ḥadīt, Juynboll investigated three fundamental questions: when, where, and by whom the relevant ḥadīts was transmitted first. In carrying out the method, he held the basic principles: the more transmission lines come together in one transmitter, either reaching him or going away from him, the more this transmitter and his transmission have a claim of historicity. With such principles, he provided a new model of Common Link which is more complex and detailed. ⁵⁰

In his study of the sanad, Juynboll can be classified to two parts, first, his criticism to Muslims in the concept and their way to develop the sanad analysis, secondly, create the new method of isnad analysis as an alternative. He concluded that the method which has been used by the muḥaddīsīn in analyzing the sanad is weak method. Therefore, it needs to new concept of sanad analysis method to investigate the appearance of matan ḥadīts. ⁵¹

The methods above were already established and formalized by the classic ḥadīts reviewer. However, on Juynboll’s view they were very different, he said that the classical method still cause controversy if it is used to prove the historicity of the tradition attribution to the Prophet. Besides, there are some weak points in this method which are: (1) The occurrences of the method of conventional ḥadīts criticism were considered late. (2) Isnad could be falsified on the whole in accordance with the conditions of the culture and politics of its time. (3) The appropriate matan criticism was not implemented; the focus was only on sanad criticism. ⁵²

In this case Juynboll also offers common link method which he thought was appropriate to replace the method of classic ḥadīts criticism. Not only to replace the method of classic ḥadīts criticism, theory of common link was also meant to reject all of the basic assumptions that became the foundation of other methods.

Muhammad Muṣṭafā Azāmī, a ḥadīth reviewer from King Saud University, he not only questioned about the common link interpretation, but also doubted the validity of the theory. Azāmī tends to stated that common link methods and all the conclusions obtained are irrelevant and unfounded. ⁵³

---


According to ‘Azamī, hadith scholars have realized the problems of own narration (infirad) and implications. However, all of that depends on the quality of narrators. Although the rāwī be aloof in narration, if they are among the narrators are trustworthy (tsiqah mutqin) then the hadith can be declared as munkar. Conversely, if one of the narrators who narrated the hadith with his own is a rāwī al-ṣadiq or below it, so hadith called munkar. Thus, Juynboll’s interpretation who said that the narrators who acts as the common link is fabricator unacceptable. Especially if the narrators is recognized by scholars as a trustworthy person (tsiqah). Similarly, the diving strand is certainly no different. It can be trusted if the line is connected from the collector to the Prophet and all the transmitters in transmission have quality as tsiqah. If not then the hadith is rejected. Thus, the admissibility of a hadith is located at the junction of sanad and the narrators quality, not on quantity, as according to the criteria of Juynboll.

Thus, to decide who is in position the common link, a hadith reviewer have to collect all of isnad chain that found in various of hadith collection so get the conclusion partially. And to avoid the wrong assumption about status of a rāwī.

To respond to a variety of Juynboll’s theories above, let us try to describe logical evidence in the transmission of ḥadīts gharīb which is a type of transmission received since the time of the Prophet Muhammad [p.b.u.h] and continued until the time of companions and generations thereafter. Moreover, the writer will also try to outline the history of the emergence of the opinion which is stated that khabar could be accepted if it is informed by one or more and the responses of ‘Ulamā” to them.

In short, not all friends were always with the Prophet everyday and every time because sometime, they worked in the garden, in the market, went to war or other personal activi ties. Therefore, the statement of ‘Ulamā” about the ‘adālah, “kullu al-ṣaḥābah ‘udūl” should be refined become “kullu al-ṣaḥābah ‘udūl fi al-riwāyah” (‘adīl in transmission) with the reason:

1. The theory “kullu al-ṣaḥābah ‘udūl” is not ijmā” (consensus) of the whole scholars, not only theory of qath”ī (final) but also still ijtihādī (relative).
2. The companions who were close to the Prophet and narrated the ḥadīts certainly are people who love the truth or fair, so they may not lie in the name of Prophet.
3. The majority of friends known through the narrations which they told and therefore they called ‘adīl. The friend who had been dubbed the munāfiq or others, most of them did not narrate the tradition.

Thus, it can be concluded that if there are companions of the Prophet who have committed violations such as drunk or other violations that undermine the ‘adālah, and then they narrated the ḥadīts, a research about that narrations should be conducted, and if there are contradictions to the rules of the validity of matan ḥadīts, narration will be rejected. But if not, it would be acceptable.

Among the reviewer tradition in the West, the most notable reviewer who gave the rebuttal to Juynboll’s idea was Harald Motzki. He criticized Juynboll skeptic assumptions, by saying that the authenticity of ḥadīts was proven since the 1st century
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of Hijra. For Motzki, the Qur’an and the hadits has been studied since the time of Prophet Muhammad [p.b.u.h], and the jurists of (fiqah) Hijāz were proven using the traditions since the first century. He concluded that the possibility of the diversity in transmission through planned falsification was very small, so the sanad and matan hadīth in the books (kutub al-ṣitta) can be trusted.\(^{57}\)

In this light, according to Harald Motzki common link cannot always be stated as forger of hadīth as long as historical data that shows him as the forger of hadīth as long as historical data that shows him as the forger of hadīth as long as historical data that shows him as the forger of hadīth has not been discovered yet. The common link is more appropriate if it is called as the first collector of hadīth, the function are as recorder and narrator in the regular classes. In the other hand, the figure who supported the theory of Harald Motzki is Gregor Schoeler. According to Gregor Schoeler common link should not be understood as forger of hadīth. It proven on hadīts about al-ṣif, has a common link, al-Zuhrī (d.124) and he has the real teacher as informan of hadīts, ‘Urwa ibn al-Zubair (d.94), and did not falsify the hadīts.\(^{58}\)

Differed with Juynboll’s opinion which regarded the theory of common link as a forger or a beginner of hadith, Motzki also interpreted the common link as the first collector of hadīth who collected it systematically. This collector also acted as the recorder and narrator in regular classes. In this light, from that a system of learning will evolve.\(^{59}\)

**Conclusion**

Juynboll adopted and developed the Schacht’s theory. In his study of the sanad, Juynboll can be classified to two parts, first; his criticism to Muslims in the concept and their way to develop the sanad analysis, secondly; create the new method of isnad analysis as an alternative. He concluded that the method which has been used by the muḥadditsin in analyzing the sanad is weak method. Therefore, it needs to new concept of sanad analysis method to investigate the appearance of matan hadīts.

In the development and stability of the dictum al-ṣaḥābā kulluhum ‘adil under the umbrella of theological strength. Furthermore, this dictum becomes stronger when it is applied the hadīts criticism. The scholars are more sanad oriented, it implicates in the placement of personality narrators in a position that cannot be ignored. Of course, this study, when it reaches the Juynboll’s hand, it will be different inasmuch as he did not accept what is conveyed theologically, he also did not accept traditional methods of hadīts criticism. He made deep study of literature to the literature on this phenomenon and produce something different. In this case Juynboll also offers Common Link method which he thought was appropriate to replace the method of classic hadīts criticism. In other words, Juynboll discussed ‘adālaḥ al-ṣaḥābāḥ just in order to strengthen his Common Link theory.
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