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Abstract

The narrator ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih al-Samman is one of the Muslim transmitters (rijal Muslim) that has been criticized by the scholars of hadith from the time of al-‘Uqaily (d. 323/934) until the Ibn Hajar’s (d. 852/1449) period. ‘Abdullah narrated two hadith in Sahih Muslim and since Muslim b. al-Hajjaj (d. 261/875) placed his narration as the argumentation hadith (usul al-hadith), it has invited criticism among the scholars. Many debates among the scholars of hadith in determining ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih’s stance and status originated from al-Bukhari’s critique of munkar al-hadith towards him and concluded by Ibn Hajar’s critique of layyin al-hadith or lenient in hadith against him. The polemic degraded the canonical status that has been achieved by the Sahihayn and has continuously been the subject of much criticism and debate among the scholars during the 14th century until the present time.
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Lenient Terminological Questions

There are many so-called technical terms used by the scholars of hadith in qualifying the transmitters of hadith. Among them are hafiz, thiqah, saduq, etc. One of the controversial qualifiers was introduced by Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani (d. 852/1449) in his book Taqrib al-tahdhib is lenient in hadith or layyin. This term has sparked off many debates among the scholars of hadith in determining this meaning according to the regulations made by Ibn Hajar himself. The lenient in hadith transmitters in Taqrib’s two volumes is actually a summarized version of Tahdhib al-Tahdhib’s twelve volumes with a total of 111 lenient transmitters whom narrated hadith in the six canonical hadith books namely Sahih al-Bukhari, Sahih Muslim, Sunan Abi Dawud, Sunan al-Tirmidhi, Sunan al-Nasa’i and Sunan Ibn Majah.

Out of this total only one lenient transmitter was found in Sahih al-Bukhari in the form of commentary (ta’lqat) and actually he did not narrate a prophet’s hadith but rather an interpretation of surah Fatir, verse 21. In Muslim’s Sahih there are five lenient transmitters with 12 numbers of hadith. The rest are gathered in a large number in the Four Books (al-Sunan al-Arba’ah) with 59 in Abu Dawud’s Sunan with 95 hadith, 44 in the Jami’ of al-Tirmidhi with 67 hadith, 17 in Sunan al-Nasa’i with 31 hadith and 54 in Sunan Ibn Majah with 79 hadith. This shows that the al-Nasa’i’s collection of Sunan was deemed more reliable after the Sahihayn in terms of the smallest numbers of its transmitters that had been criticized although the majority of hadith scholars had usually placed Abu Dawud’s collection of Sunan at third rank after al-Bukhari’s and Muslim’s collection. Ibn Hajar in his Taqrib also lined Abu Dawud’s Sunan after the Sahihayn, followed in descending order.
by the collections of al-Tirmidhi, al-Nasa’i and Ibn Majah. But Ibn Hajar in his book al-Nukat did say that in whole, the al-Nasa’i’s Sunan was the smallest number of book that contained the weak hadith and discredited transmitters (Ibn Hajar, 1984).

Table 1: Lenient in Hadith Transmitter in Six Canonical Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>No. of Lenient Transmitters</th>
<th>No. of Hadith Narrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sahih al-Bukhari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sahih Muslim</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sunan Abi Dawud</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sunan al-Tirmidhi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sunan al-Nasa’i</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sunan Ibn Majah</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of lenient transmitters without recurring in Six Books was 111 and the sum of hadith narrated by them without recurring was 222. In the case of 111 of the biographical entries for lenient transmitters, the term lenient or layyin appears at the end of the transmitters’ names as an evaluation made by Ibn Hajar’s and the conditions for such of these transmitters consist of first; they narrated a small number of hadith, second; a problem of the particular chain of transmission is not approved caused by him and the third one; his narration does not have any support chain (mutabi’ah) from other transmitters or in technical terms known to tafarrud because it denote a lack of corroboration. Out of 222 hadith narrated by the lenient transmitters in the Six Books, it was discovered that 112 of their hadith were narrated through support chains and 110 were narrated alone or individually (tafarrud). Most of these narrators originated from the seventh level of generation who died between the years 145 to 180 Hijri. 18 narrators are qualified to be evaluated as acceptable (maqbul) with three of them are trustworthy (thiqah) as they are transmitters of Muslim and two are truthful (saduq). One of lenient transmitter that is qualified to be judged as trustworthy is ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih who is the subject of research.

‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih the Narrator

His full name was ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih al-Samman al-Madani. This narrator actually had four names whereby the three other names were ‘Abbad b. Abi Salih, ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan and ‘Abbad b. Dhakwan. This was due to his father who had two names; Abi Salih and Dhakwan and so did him; ‘Abdullah and ‘Abbad which ‘Abbad was his surname. However ‘Ali b. al-Madini (d. 234/849) said that ‘Abdullah and ‘Abbad were two different individuals. al-Khatib al-Baghdadi (d. 463/1071) said that ‘Ali al-Madini was confused when he said that ‘Abdullah and ‘Abbad were two different persons whereas ‘Abdullah was actually ‘Abbad and not a different individual. This confusion does clarify why ‘Ali al-Madini had critique ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih as weak (da’if) and in the same time praised ‘Abbad b. Abi Salih as trustworthy and reliable (thiqah thabtun). This is because ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih was more known through his surname ‘Abbad. The scholars who had a same view with al-Khatib were Ahmad b. Hanbal, al-Bukhari, Yahya b. Ma’in, Abu Hatim and Abu Dawud al-Sajistani (al-Khatib, 1407H). Any say that differentiated ‘Abdullah from ‘Abbad is a weak opinion that has not much basis.
Al-Dhahabi (d. 748/1348) while interpreting the narrator ‘Abbad b. Abi Salih stated that ‘Abbad was also called ‘Abdullah and al-Suyuti mentioned that this was in accordance with the mutual consensus of a majority of clerics. Al-Dhahabi stated that this narrator passed away between the years 121 until 130 Hijri and had a relationship to Suhail b. Abi Salih. This narrator belonged to the Successor generation (tabi’in) and his father’s name was Dhakwan. That is why he was later referred to as ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan (al-Dhahabi, 1995). He has narrated two hadith in Six Canon Hadith Books (al-Kutub al-Sittah) and one hadith in Musnad Ahmad and Sunan al-Darimi. Ibn Hajar after analyzed all the evaluation made by earlier scholars of hadith before him then concluded this narrator ‘Abdullah as lenient in hadith or layyin al-hadith (Ibn Hajar, 2004).

Analysis of First Hadith


All these four narrations by Muslim, Abu Dawud, al-Tirmidhi and Ibn Majah met at the same narrator Husyaim with the same transmitters ‘Abdullah from his father Abi Salih from Aburairah. Abi Salih or Dhakwan (d. 101/720) was a trustworthy and reliable narrator (thiqah thabtun) so does Husyaim b. Basyir (d. 183) unless he always narrated the mursal reports and commit tadlis (those in which a Successor quotes the Prophet without citing a Companion) (Ibn Hajar, 2004). According to al-Tirmidhi this hadith was hasan gharib and that’s why the chains transmitted from al-Tirmidhi and Abu Dawud was in the form of ‘an ‘anah (reported indirectly from his source via the vaguer phrase “from/according to”). However in the chains of Muslim and Ibn Majah it was clearly stated that Husyaim narrated this hadith directly as he has heard it from ‘Abdullah in the form of al-sama‘ (denote face-to-face transmission). So this alternative transmission had prevented the hadith from being unauthentic due to a presumed break in the chain of transmission (‘illah tadlis). As a result all four narrations were deemed as sound or sahih by al-Albani and Ahmad Syakir.
jiddan) because the narrator ‘Abdullah b. Sa’id al-Maqburi but this hadith was sound or sahih through the narration by ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih. The second chain came from the narration of al-Mizzi with a transmission from Abu Bakr al-Nahsyali from ‘Abdullah b. Sa’id from his grandfather Abi Sa’id Kaysan al-Maqburi from Abu Hurairah (al-Mizzi, 1980). This chain also has a defect from the narrator ‘Abdullah b. Sa’id because he was condemned by hadith scholars as matruk wahin (one whose tradition is abandoned) although both his father and grandfather have heard hadith from Abu Hurairah. His father Sa’id b. Kaysan was a trustworthy narrator (thiqah) and his grandfather Kaysan Abu Sa’id al-Maqburi was a trustworthy and reliable narrator (thiqah thabtun). The third supported chain is from the narration of Ibn al-Muqri’ from Muhammad from Abu Harun Isma’il b. Muhammad from Muhammad b. ‘Ali from ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Abi al-Zinad from his father ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan Abi al-Zinad from al-A’raj from Abu Hurairah (Ibn al-Muqri’, 1998).

The hadith is considered sound or sahih as narrated by Muslim and the chain by Ibn Majah was evaluated as sound report by al-Albani. Muslim had narrated two hadith from ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih and he had placed both of these hadith as the primary narrations (usul al-hadith) which showed that ‘Abdullah from the view of Muslim’s evaluation was a trustworthy narrator (thiqah). This hadith is supported by the narration of Ibn Abi Syaibah from Yazid b. Harun from Abi al-‘Ala’ from Abi Hasyim from Ibrahim b. Yazid al-Nakha’i (Ibn Abi Syaibah, 1988). This supported chain is considered mursal from Ibrahim al-Nakha’i (d. 95/714) because he quoted the hadith directly from the Prophet without citing a Companion. Although it is presumed break in the chain of transmission (maqtu’) but it still has an element ascribed to the Prophet (marfu’).

Analysis of Second Hadith

Al-Bukhari’s Stance on ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih

The majority of the hadith scholars had evaluated and considered ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih as a trustworthy narrator (thiqah) such as Yahya b. Ma‘in, al-‘Ijli, al-Saji, al-Azdi, Muslim, Abu Dawud, al-Dhahabi and also contemporary researchers such as Ahmad Syakir and Dr. Nu‘aim As‘ad. Only a few of them who had deemed ‘Abdullah as an untrustworthy narrator like Ibn Sa‘d, al-Saji, al-Azdi and ‘Ali b. al-Madini who had critique him as not strong (laysa bi al-qawiy) and this was a sign of weakness (tad‘if) from him. Ibn Hajar also shared a same point of view with ‘Ali b. al-Madini in evaluating this particular narrator but his evaluation is based upon the critique (tajrih) originated from al-Bukhari towards ‘Abdullah.

This is because al-Bukhari mentioned in his text al-Tarikh al-Saghir that this narrator was refused in hadith (munkar al-hadith) and this critique was a strongest sign of weakness (tad‘if) from him (Ibn Hajar, 1984). An analytical study towards the text in al-Tarikh al-Saghir that was referred to by Ibn Hajar found that al-Bukhari had mentioned about this matter as such: [wa qala] 'Abd al-Samad [haddathana] ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan [haddathana] Muhammad b. al-Munkadir ['an] Jabir [fi al-adhan] munkar al-hadith.

The narrator ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan that was referred by al-Bukhari as munkar al-hadith as mentioned above was not really ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan that was the subject of study and Muslim transmitter. This founding is based on several facts: (a). al-Bukhari had introduced the narrator ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih with his surname ‘Abbad in al-Tarikh al-Saghir. He also preferred to use ‘Abbad as introductory name rather than ‘Abdullah. This is why it was stated in al-Tarikh al-Kabir that al-Bukhari had repeated the interpretation of ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan under the name of ‘Abbad. al-Bukhari also when interpreting Suhaib the relative of ‘Abbad said: “And he is Suhaib b. Dhakwan, from the slave of Juwairiyah and he was siblings to ‘Abbad, Salih and Muhammad, all were sons of Abi Salih and all of them lived in Medina” (al-Bukhari, 1986). This shows that ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan is not ‘Abbad or ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan thus they are two different individuals.

(b). al-Bukhari had differentiated between ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan and ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan in both of their biography in his al-Tarikh al-Kabir. After a thorough revision of al-Tarikh al-Kabir, al-Bukhari started his interpretation of the narrator ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih with the number 229, he said: “He is ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih al-Samman, the hadith was narrated by him from his father who was narrated from Abu Hurairah from the hadith of the Prophet Muhammad: Your oath should be about something regarding which your companion will believe you, which was narrated from Husyaim, he was also called ‘Abbad”. Later al-Bukhari interpreted the narrator ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan with the number 230 the one who he had critique with munkar al-hadith, he said: “‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan [qala] ‘Abd al-Samad [haddathana] ‘Abdullah [haddathana] Muhammad b. al-Munkadir: munkar al-hadith fi al-adhan”. After that, he interpreted the narrator ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan Abu al-Zinad with the number 231 (al-Bukhari, n.d.). Mahmud Ibrahim Zaid in his commentary on the narrator ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan stated that ‘Abdullah the one who had been critique with munkar al-hadith from al-Bukhari was not one of the transmitters in al-Tahdhib books and this mean he was none of the narrators in Six Books. al-Bukhari had mentioned in the text of al-Tarikh al-Kabir that these two narrators were different individuals and al-Dhahabi had also mentioned the same thing in his text Mizan al-I‘tidal (al-Bukhari, 1986).

(c). al-Bukhari’s critique munkar al-hadith was not found in the process of interpreting ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan neither in the al-Tarikh al-Saghir nor in al-Tarikh al-Kabir.
If this was the narrator that he was directing his critique of munkar al-hadith to, thus he should have clearly indicated it. Dr. Nu’aim As’ad had come to a conclusion in his article, after doing an extensive search on the critique of munkar al-hadith, that: “al-Bukhari’s critique of munkar al-hadith upon this narrator was never found in any printed text” (Nu’aim As’ad, 2004). Thus, he concluded that the narrator is indeed thiqah. Clearly the abovementioned evidence has shown that al-Bukhari did not critique any in his interpretations of Abdullah b. Abi Salih otherwise he had only brought forward the hadith from this narrator. al-Bukhari directed the critique of munkar al-hadith while interpreting the other narrator particularly in his hadith al-adhan.

(d). The chain of transmission of hadith al-adhan that was referred by al-Bukhari has proven that Abdullah b. Dhakwan that had been critiqued was not Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan. The hadith al-adhan that was mentioned by al-Bukhari narrated as followed: [wa rawa] Abdullah b. Dhakwan [wa huwa munkar al-hadith qala sami’tu] Muhammad b. al-Munkadir [yuhaddithu ‘an] Jabir [gala]: Prophet Muhammad was asked who among mankind will enter paradise first? The Prophet answered: The Prophets, then the martyrs followed by the muezzin of my mosque and then the other of the muezzins depending on their good deeds in this world (al-Bayhaqi, 1410H). Abdullah b. Dhakwan who narrated this hadith had been criticized as refused (munkar) by Ibn ‘Adi and confused (wahin) by al-Dhahabi and this hadith is a forge report (mawdu’). The names of teachers and students mentioned in the chain did not match the names of teachers and students of Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan. Abdullah b. Abi Salih only narrated hadith from three men namely his father Abu Salih or Dhakwan, Sa’id b. Jubair and al-Mughirah b. Abi Burdah but Muhammad al-Munkadir as mentioned in the above chain was not included in the list of his teachers. While six other narrators who transmitted hadith from him were Jabir b. Salim, Abdullah b. al-Walid, ‘Abd al-Malik b. Juraij, Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahman, Musa b. Ya’qub and Husyaim b. Basyir but ‘Abd al-Samad was not considered the one who narrated hadith from Abdullah b. Abi Salih.

The confusion of identity arose because the narrator had four names; Abdullah b. Abi Salih, Abdullah b. Dhakwan, ‘Abbad b. Abi Salih and ‘Abbad b. Dhakwan. Furthermore there were also four other narrators whom shared the same spelled-name Abdullah b. Dhakwan; firstly Abdullah b. Dhakwan Abi Salih Salih who is the subject of research, secondly Abdullah b. Dhakwan who had been criticized munkar al-hadith by al-Bukhari, thirdly Abdullah b. Dhakwan Abu al-Zinad the trustworthy narrator (thiqah) and fourthly Abdullah b. Dhakwan the unknown narrator (majhul). The problem in determining the character of the narrators especially when they have the same name is considered an individual practice of judgment and independent reasoning (ijtihad) that is based upon a strong proved and probable knowledge (zan). Thus this will often result in getting accurate finding or inaccurate one.

There is a possibility that Ibn Hajar had only transferred the critique from the compilation of narrators’ books (kutub al-rijal) before him. This is because Ibn Hajar did not mention the critique of munkar al-hadith by al-Bukhari when he was interpreting ‘Abbad b. Abi Salih al-Samman and Abdullah b. Abi Salih Dhakwan al-Samman in his other book entitled Lisan al-Mizan (Ibn Hajar, 1988). Studies have proven that the Muslim’s hadith was indeed narrated by Abdullah b. Dhakwan by Abdullah b. Salih and not by Abdullah b. Dhakwan that was critiqued by al-Bukhari. Abdullah ‘Ubaid b. Ali in his commentary also insisted that Abdullah b. Dhakwan who was critiqued by al-Bukhari munkar al-hadith was not considered one of the narrators of al-Tahdhib, that mean he was none of the narrators in Six Books include the Sahih Muslim (al-Bukhari, n.d.).
Dr. ‘Abdullah b. Muhammad Hasan and al-Syarif Hatim b. ‘Arif in their research had also discovered that ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih the Muslim transmitter is not the narrator critiqued munkar al-hadith by al-Bukhari. According to al-Syarif Hatim, Ibn Hajar transferred the critique munkar al-hadith towards ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih into al-Tahdhib, even though al-Bukhari did not mention that to this particular narrator (al-Marastan, 1422H). Dr. ‘Abdullah said that the critique munkar al-hadith that al-'Uqayli had copied from al-Bukhari is considered a mere confusion (wahm) because what he said was to a different ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan, and not this particular ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan, a Muslim transmitter (‘Abdullah, 2003). The critique by ‘Ali b. al-Madini towards him as ‘he is nothing in this’ (laysa bisya ‘fi hadha) was directed to a different hadith narrated by him and not this particular hadith narrated by Muslim.

There is a high possibility that the error in differentiating or identifying the narrator munkar al-hadith by al-Bukhari upon the Muslim transmitter was due to the book of al-Du’afa’ written by al-'Uqayli. al-'Uqayli had copied the critique by al-Bukhari while he was interpreting ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih, the narrator of Muslim. Then the hadith scholars after al-'Uqayli had only transferred the information in the book of al-Du’afa’ into their respective corpus of Prophetic traditions. Hamdi b. ‘Abd al-Majid in his commentary on al-Du’afa’ says: “I had not found it (the munkar al-hadith critique) in all three texts of al-Bukhari’s works (al-Kabir, al-Awsat and al-Saghir). al-Bukhari was actually critiquing the character of ‘Abdullah b. Dhakwan that had been narrated by Muhammad b. al-Munkadir in the hadith about the azan” (al-'Uqayli, 1984). This is the reason why al-Zirkili in interpreting al-'Uqayli had mentioned the words of Ibn Nasir al-Din reminded that al-Du’afa’ al-Kabir by al-'Uqayli was the most dangerous piece of work (musannafat khatirah) (al-Zirkili, 1980).

Conclusion

Based on the abovementioned study, this narrator deserves to be evaluated at the very least with accepted narrator (maqbul) or even the trustworthy one (thiqah). As mentioned by Ibn Abi Hatim with sanad from Muhammad al-Duri whereby I heard Yahya b. Ma’in said, ‘Abbad b. Abi Salih is ‘Abdullah b. Abi Salih and he is thiqah (Ibn Abi Hatim, 1952). In addition, the critique by al-Bukhari munkar al-hadith towards him was never clearly mentioned and the critique made by ‘Ali b. al-Madini is not clearly explained (al-jarh al-mubham).

Furthermore, according to al-Khatib that Ibn al-Madini was actually confused in differentiating between ‘Abdullah and ‘Abbad although they were actually the same person. Muslim also had narrated this hadith in the fundamentals section of his collection (hadith usul) which is most of his transmitters were acceptable and thiqah because Muslim had studied and reviewed every particular hadith from his transmitters. Ibn Hajar himself in introduction of Fath al-Bari stated: “Actually each author should bear in mind that narration from the author of Sahih books (takhrij Sahib al-Sahih) towards any transmitters showed that they are in the condition of approval (ta’dil) and accuracy (dabt)” (Ibn Hajar, 1992). The consensus of the umma on the Sahihayn provided the key to authorizing these two works as relied upon book and reach canonical standard according to the Sunni hadith scholars.
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