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Abstract

This study aims to explain the relationship between determining mudraj (interpolated), which is one of the types of weak hadith, and the art of critiquing hadith texts, which is included in one of the processes of assessing the status of hadith or also referred to as hadith criticism. Based on the authors’ observations, there has never been a connection between determining the mudraj of the text and text criticism in specific studies. The authors employ library research methods and text analysis to identify the approach used by hadith scholars in determining idrāj and mudraj expressions, evaluating the discussed examples, and their relationship with the art of text or matan (text/content) criticism. The study results indicate that the art of critiquing hadith texts has long been rooted in the discussions of hadith science and is highly objective without being influenced by any ideology or thought. At the same time, it can refute baseless accusations that hadith scholars have neglected textual aspects and only focused on the isnad aspect alone.
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INTRODUCTION

Criticism has two meanings; Firstly, it refers to the process of analysing, assessing, and criticising artistic works. Second, it encompasses harsh criticism, condemnation, and rebuke, as outlined in Kamus Dewan’s Fourth Edition. In the science of hadith, it translates to the term "naqd." The term "naqd" itself originates from the root word "naqada," which has several meanings, including highlighting the good and bad of something, observing, giving money, pecking (snake and bird behaviour), and goring (horned animal behaviour) (Ibn Fāris, 1979; Ibn Manẓūr, 1994). Since knowledge of the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) depends on knowledge that can distinguish between Sunnah and bid’ah (making additional things in worship that are not allowed), authentic and weak hadith, mastery of the art of hadith criticism becomes a necessity (Al-A’zami, 1990).

On the other hand, criticism of hadith texts involves examining the matan (text or content) of the hadith to determine its authenticity to the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), as well as verifying the credibility of the narrators who transmitted it. Clearly, criticism of hadith texts indeed serves to preserve the authenticity of the hadith of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), as do other branches of hadith science.

In general, the content of hadith can refer to Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him)’s speeches, actions, or tacit approval. Most people immediately recall this meaning when they hear the word "hadith." However, in the science of hadith, hadith itself consists of two basic components: isnad and matan. Isnad is a genealogy of transmission or the chain of narrators that began with the Prophet's companions and ended with the hadith scholars who documented the hadith, such as al-Bukhari and others. This type of study, also known as “prosopographical research,” is considered a crucial aspect of classical-to-modern hadith science. It delves into the exploration of transmitters and the historical context that shaped their existence. Fuat Sezgin’s comprehensive collection of Arabic texts, titled Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums (1967–2007), consists of.
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thirteen volumes that are organised chronologically and geographically. It also includes tabaqat of Muslim intellectuals from various fields of study.

When we consider historical development as early as the second/eight centuries, al-Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820) emphasised the significance of isnād comparison in a methodological sense. The need to gather the lineages of every tradition provided a structured foundation for the science of hadith criticism. In addition to al-Shāfiʿī, Muslim (d. 261/875) is also considered one of the earliest scholars who delved into the realm of ḥadīth collection and criticism. He meticulously expounded upon his views regarding the trustworthiness of transmitters and the careful selection of traditions. In two of his works, he presented his method: The well-known Muqaddimah (Introduction) to his Šaḥīḥ and Kitāb al-Tamyīz. Even though the sanad of Kitāb al-Tamyīz (Book of Discrimination) was commenced with Makkī b. 'Abdān, it clearly reflects the ideas presented in the Muqaddimah, which it further elaborates on. Therefore, we can consider the Tamyīz as the expression of the ḥadīth criticism of Muslim, as passed down by his students. The text contains a diverse range of examples that shed light on the intricate processes of Muslim's approach. In his exploration of al-Taqāsim wa-l-anwāʾ ("Divisions and Categories"), also known as Šaḥīḥ Ibn Hibbān, Fawwaz (2020) opines Ibn Hibbān's theory of hadith authentication as a pioneering attempt to systemise the authentication of hadith in the first three centuries of hijra. In general, Ibn Hibbān's theory of authenticity was founded on a series of formulas related to transmission and knowledge, which primarily focused on the scrutiny of isnād.

Meanwhile, the hadith's matn is the expression that comes after the chain of isnad. Essentially, hadith criticism means distinguishing between Šaḥīḥ (authentic) and daʿīf (weak) hadith and evaluating the narrators of hadīth as trustworthy or otherwise. Beyond the shadow of doubt, the concept of "matn criticism" has gained admiration in discussions about the evaluation of ḥadīth. This term refers to the examination and critique of the content of the ḥadīth text, rather than focusing on the critique of its genealogy of transmission, which is also known as sanad criticism. In our perspective, the term “content criticism” seems to better capture the essence of what Western scholars have referred to as “matn criticism.” This concept revolves around the notion that there might be certain issues or concerns with the contents or significance of the hadith. Apart from matn criticism, textual criticism, or content criticism, the term “maʿnā or maʿnawi criticism” was used by Husaini (2017) when discussing the scholarship of al-Ḥāfīz al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/107).

Writing in an age of information avalanche, the focus of scholars on the text or content of hadith has become increasingly prominent, reflecting the growing public interest in hadith studies. This trend is evident in the proliferation of scholarly works dedicated to this subject. For instance, a book titled Matbaj Naqḍ al-Matn ‘inda ‘Ulumāʾ al-Ḥadīth al-Nahawī was authored by Šalih al-Din ibn Aḥmad al-‘Idlibī (2013), contributing to the discourse on the methodology of Hadith criticism as he famously proposes four quadrants framework; it is consistent with the commandments of the Quran; in harmony with authentic hadith; logical in light of common sense and historical context, and its phrasing does not resemble typical prophetic statements. Muḥammad Tāhir al-Jawābī (1986) further enriched this field with his work Juhūd al-Maḥṣūlāt fi Naqḍ Matn al-Ḥadīth al-Nahawī al-Sharīf which explores the efforts of Hadith scholars in critiquing the content or text of the Prophet’s Hadith. Another significant contribution is by Muhammad Mustafa A’zarni (1990), who penned Manbaj Naqḍ al-Matn ‘inda al-Maḥṣūlāt a comprehensive guide on the methodology of Hadith criticism as practiced by Hadith scholars. This work offers readers an insight into the historical progression and context of the critical methodology in Hadith studies.

It is interesting to observe that traditional Sunnī Hadith scholarship has produced numerous compilations of notable Hadith critics or individuals who have played a significant role in the development of Hadith criticism. Certainly, hadith scholars were not just a collector of ḥadīth, but also a critic who held steadfast to traditions. Nevertheless, an early hadith critic could scrutinise the matn of a hadith without delving into its significance. As an illustration, a critic like al-Dāraqūṭnī (d. 385/995) could raise an objection to the phrasing of a Prophetic tradition narration due to its deviation from a more widely accepted version, even though the underlying meaning of the narration remains unchanged. One can also gain an understanding of how the status of a particular hadith is determined and appreciate the dedicated efforts of hadith scholars in preserving the integrity
of the hadith. The work also acknowledges and addresses criticisms from specific groups within the Muslim community and Orientalists who argue that the critical approach to Hadith employed by the hadith scholars has certain flaws, which in turn questions the authority of Hadith as a legislative source (Fadzlan and Roslimah 2022). Brown (2012) discussed fifteen examples of explicit content criticism that originated from the early stages of the Sunni Hadith tradition, specifically the third/ninth centuries. Although occurrences like these are rare, they do highlight the presence of critical analysis during the early period.

**Technical Approach**

Likewise, early hadith scholars possess a deep intellectual curiosity, allowing them to carefully analyse the contents of a hadith in order to determine its authenticity (Kawaid et al., 2021). Within this context, we encounter a profound awareness of historical inconsistencies, a keen perception of logical contradictions, and above all, a deep comprehension of the historical, legal, and theological foundations that serve as benchmarks for evaluating individual accounts. Content criticism encompasses all of these things. Similarly unexplored, the stance of hadith scholars on significant aspects of theoretical accumulation, including the interpolated words, phrases or texts. In the field of hadith sciences, the term *mudraj* refers to the interpolation or insertion or addition of words in the text of a hadith that are not originally part of the authentic words or meaning of the Prophet.

As inference from this acumen, this study will focus on understanding, forms, methods, and reasons for the occurrence of *idraj* in *hadith* texts. *Al-idraj* is the process of insertion that occurs during the transmission of *hadith*. *Mudraj* refers to the insertion of a phrase into the original narration, whether in the chain of transmission or the content. In other words, *mudraj* is not part of the *hadith*, and considering it as such leads to incorrect attribution to the Prophet Muhammad. If the inserter or *mudraj* intentionally engages in *idraj* with the intention of misleading listeners and attributing something baseless to the Prophet Muhammad, it is akin to the action of fabricators of *hadith* who attribute something fabricated to the Prophet Muhammad.

At the outset, our exploration will delve into the realm of *mudraj*, a concept that encompasses the art of hadith criticism in a broader context. Subsequently, we shall endeavour to construct a comprehensive map of this intricate subject. When delving into the topic of *mudraj*, it is fascinating to explore the role of hadith criticism in the works of classical scholars. This exploration leads to a reflection on how *mudraj* is identified in the hadith collections. Presented below are some translated samples. It is anticipated that these examples, together with the subsequent debate and analysis, will reveal an extra aspect of strength or quality in these works. A glance at the earliest *mudraj* work, such as *al-Fašl li al-Wašl al-Mudraj fi al-Naqṣ* of al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (463AH/1071CE), depicts the subject of interpolation in the *isnad* and/or *matn* of *ḥadīth*, which reflects an application of both *sanad* and *matn* criticism. Yet Husaini (2017) remarks,

It manifests the traditionists’ postulate that any problem in the *matn* of ḥadīth can be traced back to an explicit or implicit problem in the *isnad*. Hence, al-Khaṭīb had exhibited that the ability to present *matn* criticism in the form of isnad criticism constructs a sign of a true expert in ḥadīth and grants a compelling authority to a ḥāfiẓ. The concept of *takhrīj al-ma’nā* can be attested to inform the undercurrent of al-Khaṭīb’s work. This was later clarified by Ibn Ḥajar as he argued that one could not notice the interpolated words, phrases or texts except after an extensive learning of established, speculative and possible meanings.

**History of Hadith Text Criticism in Islamic Studies**

There are accusations that hadith scholars neglect the textual aspect of hadith and only focus on the isnad aspect, resulting in some hadith being deemed *ṣaḥīḥ* despite conflicting with facts (Amin, 2012). Throughout history, scholars have engaged in deep contemplation and responses to the hadith criticism. These responses have evolved and developed over time, spanning from the classical era to the present day. This was done in response to various groups and attacks. The responses and explanations can be examined from two perspectives at least; one aimed to highlight the traditional scholarship within the complex dynamics of the expert community, while the other aimed to promote the critical systematic concept that Sunni hadith scholars believed was most successful in preserving the authenticity of hadith (Ahmad 2021). Considering all aspects, the hadith
scholars found great satisfaction in the societal recognition they received for their insightful theoretical postulation and spiritual advocacy, which demonstrated their mastery of the art of content criticism. In his extensive responses to the negligence of hadith scholars towards content criticism, Hammām Sa’īd (1987) offers the nine following arguments:

Criticism of the matn (content) is a recognised skill in the science of hadith and existed before discussions on isnad and al-Jarh wa al-Ta’dil (lit. criticism and accreditation). The Ṣabābah (companions) were pioneers in the science of matan criticism. ‘Ā’ishah (may Allah be pleased with her) was among those who extensively reviewed and critiqued hadith reported to her, and these reviews were documented by al-Zarkashi in his work titled al-Ijābah li ʾIrād mā Istadrakatu “ʾA’ishah ’alā al-Ṣabābah. Most of ‘Ā’ishah’s reviews were not related to the isnad but rather closely related to the text of the hadith, which contradicted the Quranic text, authentic hadith, and Shariah principles.

The existence of fiqh (legal or jurisprudence) schools of thought in Islamic history is the result of interaction with Quranic and Hadith texts, as well as fiqh figures’ high level of critical analysis skills in evaluating and understanding legal evidence.

Similarly, the existence of theological schools of thought and political ideologies in Islamic history is the result of a critical understanding of Quranic and Hadith texts.

The science of Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth (contradictory of hadith) is entirely based on the criticism of hadith texts, and many synonymous figures with it, such as al-Shāfi‘ī through his work Ikhtilaf al-Ḥadīth, al-Ṭabarī through his work Taḥdīb al-ʾĀthār, and Ibn Qutaybah through his work Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth.

The science of Ṭalal al-Ḥadīth (hidden flaws in hadith) focuses on matan criticism, and many hadiths are considered munkar (rejected) and not established, even though their isnad appears authentic.

The authentication of Hadith Manḍā’ (fabricated hadiths) is based on textual criticism before their isnad is evaluated. This is because some fabricators matched false texts with authentic isnads, which can only be identified through a study of the hadith text.

The isnad is only part of the conditions for the validity of a hadith, and it is not the only condition for a hadith to be considered sahih.

Criticism of narrations by hadith scholars means evaluating both the isnad and the text simultaneously. Errors by narrators may occur in the wording of the narration, such as mistaking the mawqiṣ (halted) for marfū’ (raised) or mispronouncing the hadith text.

Research into primary hadith sources, such as al-Kutub al-Sittah, demonstrates the seriousness of hadith scholars in their skill of text or matn criticism. The filtration of hadiths performed by al-Bukhārī, the selection of themes, and the reviews of the aṣḥāb al-Sunan al-Arbā’ah (the authors of the four canonical hadith collections) on the hadiths recorded in their works highlight their expertise in the field of hadith criticism.

In accordance with the data, 59.8 percent of respondents took extra courses, financial education, or program disciplines, while 40.2 percent did not. It demonstrates that the majority of entrepreneurs have the financial knowledge to run their enterprises. Criticism has two meanings; firstly, it refers to the process of analysing, assessing, and criticising artistic works. Second, it encompasses harsh criticism, condemnation, and rebuke, as outlined in Kamus Dewan’s Fourth Edition. In the science of hadith, it translates to the term "naqda." The term "naqda" itself originates from the root word "naqada," which has several meanings, including highlighting the good and bad of something, observing, giving money, pecking (snake and bird behaviour), and going (horned animal behaviour) (Ibn Fāris, 1979; Ibn Manzūr, 1994). Since knowledge of the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) depends on knowledge that can distinguish between Sunnah and bid′ah (making additional things in worship that are not allowed), authentic and weak hadith, mastery of the art of hadith criticism becomes a necessity (Al-ʿAzāmi, 1990). On the other hand, criticism of hadith texts involves examining the matn (text or content) of the hadith to determine its authenticity to the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), as well as verifying the credibility of the narrators who transmitted it. Clearly, criticism of
hadith texts indeed serves to preserve the authenticity of the *hadith* of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), as do other branches of hadith science.

In general, the content of hadith can refer to Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him)’s speeches, actions, or tacit approval. Most people immediately recall this meaning when they hear the word "hadith." However, in the science of hadith, hadith itself consists of two basic components: *insad* and *matan*. *Insad* is a genealogy of transmission or the chain of narrators that began with the Prophet’s companions and ended with the hadith scholars who documented the hadith, such as al-Bukhari and others. This type of study, also known as “prosopographical research,” is considered a crucial aspect of classical-to-modern hadith science. It delves into the exploration of transmitters and the historical context that shaped their existence. Fuat Sezgin's comprehensive collection of Arabic texts, titled *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* (1967–2007), consists of thirteen volumes that are organised chronologically and geographically. It also includes *tabaqat* of Muslim intellectuals from various fields of study.

When we consider historical development as early as the second/eight centuries, al-Shâfi’î (d. 204/820) emphasised the significance of *insad* comparison in a methodological sense. The need to gather the lineages of every tradition provided a structured foundation for the science of hadith criticism. In addition to al-Shâfi’î, Muslim (d. 261/875) is also considered one of the earliest scholars who delved into the realm of ḥadīth collection and criticism. He meticulously expounded upon his views regarding the trustworthiness of transmitters and the careful selection of traditions. In two of his works, he presented his method: The well-known *Muqaddimah* (Introduction) to his *Ṣaḥḥah* and *Kitāb al-Tamyīz*. Even though the *sanad* of *Kitāb al-Tamyīz* (Book of Discrimination) was commenced with Makkî b. Ḥabībān, it clearly reflects the ideas presented in the *Muqaddimah*, which it further elaborates on. Therefore, we can consider the *Tamyīz* as the expression of the ḥadīth criticism of Muslim, as passed down by his students. The text contains a diverse range of examples that shed light on the intricate processes of Muslim’s approach. In his exploration of al-Taqāsim wa-l-amwa’ (“Divisions and Categories”), also known as *Ṣaḥḥah Ibn Hibbān*, Fawwaz (2020) opines Ibn Ḥibbān’s theory of hadith authentication as a pioneering attempt to systemise the authenticity of hadith in the first three centuries of hijrā. In general, Ibn Hibbān’s theory of authenticity was founded on a series of formulas related to transmission and knowledge, which primarily focused on the scrutiny of *insad*.

Meanwhile, the hadith’s *matn* is the expression that comes after the chain of isnad. Essentially, hadith criticism means distinguishing between *ṣaḥḥah* (authentic) and *ḍawīf* (weak) hadith and evaluating the narrators of *ḥadīth* as trustworthy or otherwise. Beyond the shadow of doubt, the concept of "*matn* criticism" has gained admiration in discussions about the evaluation of ḥadīth. This term refers to the examination and critique of the content of the ḥadīth text, rather than focusing on the critique of its genealogy of transmission, which is also known as *sanad* criticism. In our perspective, the term “content criticism” seems to better capture the essence of what Western scholars have referred to as “matn criticism.” This concept revolves around the notion that there might be certain issues or concerns with the contents or significance of the hadith. Apart from *matn* criticism, textual criticism, or content criticism, the term “‘*ma`nā* or *ma`nawī* criticism” was used by Husaini (2017) when discussing the scholarship of al-Ḥāfīz al-Khaṭīb al-Baghḍādī (d. 463/107).

Writing in an age of information avalanche, the focus of scholars on the text or content of hadith has become increasingly prominent, reflecting the growing public interest in hadith studies. This trend is evident in the proliferation of scholarly works dedicated to this subject. For instance, a book titled *Manhaj Naqd al-Matn ‘inda ‘Ulama’ al-Ḥadith al-Nabawī* was authored by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ibn Ḥamād al-‘Idlibī (2013), contributing to the discourse on the methodology of Hadith criticism as he famously proposes four quadrants framework; it is consistent with the commandments of the Quran; in harmony with authentic hadith; logical in light of common sense and historical context, and its phrasing does not resemble typical prophetic statements. Mūhammad Ṭāhir al-Jawābī (1986) further enriched this field with his work *Jubād al-Muhaddithin fī Naqd Matn al-Ḥadith al-Nabawī al-Sharīf* which explores the efforts of Hadith scholars in critiquing the content or text of the Prophet’s Hadith. Another significant contribution is by Muhammad Mustafa ʿAẓamī (1990), who penned *Manhaj Naqd al-Matn ‘inda al-Muhaddithin* a comprehensive guide on the methodology of Hadith criticism as practiced by Hadith
scholars. This work offers readers an insight into the historical progression and context of the critical methodology in Hadith studies.

It is interesting to observe that traditional Sunnī Hadith scholarship has produced numerous compilations of notable Hadith critics or individuals who have played a significant role in the development of Hadith criticism. Certainly, hadith scholars were not just a collector of ḥadīth, but also a critic who held steadfast to traditions. Nevertheless, an early hadith critic could scrutinise the matn of a hadith without delving into its significance. As an illustration, a critic like al-Dāraquṭnî (d. 385/995) could raise an objection to the phrasing of a Prophetic tradition narration due to its deviation from a more widely accepted version, even though the underlying meaning of the narration remains unchanged. One can also gain an understanding of how the status of a particular hadith is determined and appreciate the dedicated efforts of hadith scholars in preserving the integrity of the hadith. The work also acknowledges and addresses criticisms from specific groups within the Muslim community and Orientalists who argue that the critical approach to Hadith employed by the hadith scholars has certain flaws, which in turn questions the authority of Hadith as a legislative source (Fadzlan and Roshimah 2022). Brown (2012) discussed fifteen examples of explicit content criticism that originated from the early stages of the Sunnī ḥadīth tradition, specifically the third/ninth centuries. Although occurrences like these are rare, they do highlight the presence of critical analysis during the early period.

Technical Approach

Likewise, early hadith scholars possess a deep intellectual curiosity, allowing them to carefully analyse the contents of a hadith in order to determine its authenticity (Kawaid et al., 2021). Within this context, we encounter a profound awareness of historical inconsistencies, a keen perception of logical contradictions, and above all, a deep comprehension of the historical, legal, and theological foundations that serve as benchmarks for evaluating individual accounts. Content criticism encompasses all of these things. Similarly unexplored, the stance of hadith scholars on significant aspects of theoretical accumulation, including the interpolated words, phrases or texts. In the field of hadith sciences, the term mudraj refers to the interpolation or insertion or addition of words in the text of a hadith that are not originally part of the authentic words or meaning of the Prophet.

As inference from this acumen, this study will focus on understanding, forms, methods, and reasons for the occurrence of al-īdrāj in hadīth texts. Al-Īdrāj is the process of insertion that occurs during the transmission of hadīth. Mudraj refers to the insertion of a phrase into the original narration, whether in the chain of transmission or the content. In other words, mudraj is not part of the hadīth, and considering it as such leads to incorrect attribution to the Prophet Muhammad. If the inserter or mudraj intentionally engages in ādrāj with the intention of misleading listeners and attributing something baseless to the Prophet Muhammad, it is akin to the action of fabricators of hadīth who attribute something fabricated to the Prophet Muhammad.

At the outset, our exploration will delve into the realm of mudraj, a concept that encompasses the art of hadith criticism in a broader context. Subsequently, we shall endeavour to construct a comprehensive map of this intricate subject. When delving into the topic of mudraj, it is fascinating to explore the role of hadith criticism in the works of classical scholars. This exploration leads to a reflection on how mudraj is identified in the hadith collections. Presented below are some translated samples. It is anticipated that these examples, together with the subsequent debate and analysis, will reveal an extra aspect of strength or quality in these works. A glance at the earliest mudraj work, such as al-Ūṣāl ʿl al-Wṣāl al-Mudraj ḵ al-Naqṣ of al-Ḥāfīz al-Kaṭṭīb al-Bāghdādī (463AH/1071CE), depicts the subject of interpolation in the isnād and/or matn of ḥadīth, which reflects an application of both sanad and matn criticism. Yet Husaini (2017) remarks,

It manifests the traditionists’ postulate that any problem in the matn of ḥadīth can be traced back to an explicit or implicit problem in the isnād. Hence, al-Kaṭṭīb had exhibited that the ability to present matn criticism in the form of isnād criticism constructs a sign of a true expert in ḥadīth and grants a compelling authority to a ḥāfīz. The concept of takhrīj al-maʿānā can be attested to inform the undercurrent of al-Kaṭṭīb’s work. This was later clarified by Ibn Ḥajar as he argued that one could not notice the interpolated words, phrases or texts except after an extensive learning of established, speculative and possible meanings.
History of Hadith Text Criticism in Islamic Studies

There are accusations that hadith scholars neglect the textual aspect of hadith and only focus on the isnad aspect, resulting in some hadith being deemed šahīṭi despite conflicting with facts (Amīn, 2012). Throughout history, scholars have engaged in deep contemplation and responses to the hadith criticism. These responses have evolved and developed over time, spanning from the classical era to the present day. This was done in response to various groups and attacks. The responses and explanations can be examined from two perspectives at least; one aimed to highlight the traditional scholarship within the complex dynamics of the expert community, while the other aimed to promote the critical systematic concept that Sunni hadith scholars believed was most successful in preserving the authenticity of hadith (Ahmad 2021). Considering all aspects, the hadith scholars found great satisfaction in the societal recognition they received for their insightful theoretical postulation and spiritual advocation, which demonstrated their mastery of the art of content criticism. In his extensive responses to the neglect of hadith scholars towards content criticism, Hammām Sā’īd (1987) offers the nine following arguments:

Criticism of the matn (content) is a recognised skill in the science of hadith and existed before discussions on isnad and al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dil (lit. criticism and accreditation). The Šabābāb (companions) were pioneers in the science of matan criticism. ‘Ā’ishah (may Allah be pleased with her) was among those who extensively reviewed and critiqued hadith reported to her, and these reviews were documented by al-Zarkashī in his work titled al-Ijābah li ʿIrād mā Istadrakathu ‘Āʾishah ’alā al-Šabābāb. Most of ‘Ā’ishah’s reviews were not related to the isnad but rather closely related to the text of the hadith, which contradicted the Quranic text, authentic hadith, and Shariah principles.

The existence of fiqh (legal or jurisprudence) schools of thought in Islamic history is the result of interaction with Quranic and Hadith texts, as well as fiqh figures’ high level of critical analysis skills in evaluating and understanding legal evidence.

Similarly, the existence of theological schools of thought and political ideologies in Islamic history is the result of a critical understanding of Quranic and Hadith texts.

The science of Mukhtalif al-Hadīth (contradictory of hadith) is entirely based on the criticism of hadith texts, and many synonymous figures with it, such as al-Shāfiʿī through his work Ikhtilāf al-Hadīth, al-Ṭabarī through his work Tabdīl al-Athār, and Ibn Qutaybah through his work Mukhtalif al-Hadīth.

The science of Ḥadīth Ṭarrīq (hidden flaws in hadith) focuses on matan criticism, and many hadiths are considered muṣkara (rejected) and not established, even though their isnad appears authentic.

The authentication of Ḥadīth Manḍuʿa (fabricated hadiths) is based on textual criticism before their isnad is evaluated. This is because some fabricators matched false texts with authentic isnads, which can only be identified through a study of the hadith text.

The isnad is only part of the conditions for the validity of a hadith, and it is not the only condition for a hadith to be considered šahīṭ.

Criticism of narrations by hadith scholars means evaluating both the isnad and the text simultaneously. Errors by narrators may occur in the wording of the narration, such as mistaking the mawqūf (halted) for marfuʿ (raised) or mispronouncing the hadith text.

Research into primary hadith sources, such as al-Kutub al-Sittah, demonstrates the seriousness of hadith scholars in their skill of text or matn criticism. The filtration of hadiths performed by al-Bukhārī, the selection of themes, and the reviews of the asḥāb al-Sunan al-Arbaʿab (the authors of the four canonical hadith collections) on the hadiths recorded in their works highlight their expertise in the field of hadith criticism.

These arguments or elements integrate various disciplines and, to a lesser extent, hadith scholars in understanding the theoretical construction process. Finding a harmonious equilibrium between different levels of interdisciplinary approaches remains a formidable task for those aiming to make meaningful contributions.
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to the field of hadith study in any domain. Gaining a comprehensive grasp of the diverse range of interdisciplinary methods and their distinctions from disciplinary approaches enhances our comprehension of the intricate process of generating and transferring knowledge. The relationship between text and criticism has expanded the horizons of the hadith, requiring a deeper exploration of epistemology and literature. Hence, one cannot simply accept or dismiss epistemological viewpoints that originated outside the hadith tradition without considering their supposed “incongruity” with Islam solely by referencing passages from the hadith theoretical treatises. However, it is challenging to justify the methodological approach of conceptual issues raised by Muslim scholars who have developed outside the hadith tradition solely through the lens of rationale. Although the subjective tensions inherent in sanad and content criticism have appeared since the early Islamic period, they have manifested themselves with novel salience in the modern age.

The Use of Textual Criticism Skills in Evaluating the Status of Hadith

In short, textual criticism has been utilised by hadith scholars to determine the status of hadith through two methods:

Evaluation of the narrators.

Evaluation of the hadith itself.

The use of textual criticism in hadith study depends on the process of assessing the status of narrators. Typically, the evaluation of narrators relies on the comments of experts in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl (lit. criticism and accreditation) as recorded in books of biographies (al-tarājim) and inquiries (al-su’alāt). However, some critics of narrators are seen using an approach to evaluate the narrators’ histories to be evaluated besides the comments of experts in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl. This is a method of evaluation used by earlier experts in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl. This approach is particularly necessary if the narrator being evaluated falls into the category of al-maskūt fīh (the unspoken), meaning no comments are found about them from previous experts in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl. Evaluating the narrators’ histories to determine the status of the narrator has been a principle followed by Ibn ‘Adī in his work al-Kāmil fī Ḍu’afā al-Rijāl. According to al-Mu’allimi (2012), experts in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl take into account the hadith text when evaluating the narrator. This can be seen through the following comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ṣuḥhaddith bi-l-manākir</td>
<td>He narrates with disapproved (or objectionable) narrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣāḥib manākir</td>
<td>Companion of disapproved narrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘indulu manākir</td>
<td>He has disapproved (or objectionable) narrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munkar al-ḥadīth</td>
<td>One who is criticized for the unreliability of his narrations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because it has become the practice of experts in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl to evaluate the hadith text first in assessing the narrator, no hadith is deemed as munkar (anomalous or unfamous) unless there is certainly a narrator within its chain who is labelled as munkar al-ḥadīth. Consequently, it has become common for hadith evaluators to rely solely on assessing the chain’s status to determine whether a hadith is munkar or not. When they find a narrator in the chain characterized as munkar al-ḥadīth, the hadith is immediately evaluated as munkar without examining the elements of munkar found within its text.

Some hadith scholars who evaluate the hadith text do not explicitly mention the issues found within the text that led to its rejection or being classified as fabricated (mawḍū’). Instead, they only hint at these issues through comments on the narrators who report the hadith. This can be seen in the work of Ibn al-Jawzī, namely al-Mawḍū‘āt. According to al-Durays (2007), the action of experts in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl to criticise the matn when evaluating narrators is due to three main factors:
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Al-mukhālafah (contradiction): The wording of the hadith narrated by the narrator being evaluated contradicts one of the following sources: the Quran, Sunnah, consensus (Ijmāʿ), statements, or actions of the Companions who narrated the hadith.

Al-ta’farrud (isolation): The narrator being evaluated has narrated something that others have not.

Al-iḍṭirāb (disruption): There is confusion in the wording narrated.

Ibn Hibbān (2000) evaluated Abū Zayd, a narrator who reported from Ibn Masʿūd (may Allah be pleased with him), regarding the necessity of performing ablution with nabīḍī (water mixed with dates until it becomes sweet), as someone whose narrations cannot be used as evidence because his narration contradicts verse 6 of Surah al-Māʾidah. Al-Rāmahurmiži (2016) reported that Shu’ba was asked, “How do you know that the sheikh (narrator) was lying?” He replied: “When he reported from the Prophet (peace be upon him): ‘Do not eat pumpkin until you slaughter it first,’ then I knew that he was lying.”

The meticulous analysis and assessment of hadith content serves as the bridge connecting discrepancy of hadith and hadith criticism. The aim of this is to distinguish authentic accounts from those that have been altered or tampered with. Hadith scholars analyse the clarity, coherence, and logical consistency of the narration of the hadith by focusing on the matn, which serves as the main text of the hadith. If anything contradicts well-established Islamic principles or generally acknowledged truths, it is considered dubious material. Based on the general observations, it appears that bias and personal interpretation can have a big impact on textual analysis. However, the internal consistency and coherence of the hadith’s teachings make this point very clear. Taking a holistic approach that accounts for historical and contextual elements in addition to isnad and matn analysis is one technique to possibly decrease subjective biases.

Detecting Forged Hadith, Weak Narrators, And Vice Versa Through Textual Criticism of Hadith

Assessment Of Hadith Status Through Textual Criticism

Before examining the connection between mudraj and criticism, it is beneficial to investigate the associated body of work and its different forms, identifying several epistemological elements to understand why it has become a subject of anatomisation. We can relate this issue to the point as early to the time of Caliph Uthman when forged hadith emerged penetrating, spreading, and circulating into the Muslim community through a variety of channels. Conclusively, forged hadiths are often deemed unreliable and disregarded as sources of Islamic guidance. This statement is often attributed to the Prophet Muhammad, but it is actually a fabricated saying or statement. The consequences of narrating fabricated hadiths include misleading individuals, undermining the credibility of Islamic teachings, and potentially leading to the propagation of false beliefs and practices among Muslims. The material of the book that demonstrates inconsistencies with reason and historical inaccuracies is in direct opposition to the fundamental principles that underpin the faith. One of the most clear indicators of fabrication in hadith is the fact that it reveals the propagation of sectarian agendas, among other predecessors.

Hence, hadith scholars employ specific methods to detect forged hadith, starting with the examination of the hadith text. Once deception is identified in the text, such as it contradicts any reliable source, they utilize the approach of al-sabr wa al-taqsim. It is a process wherein the status of all narrators in a chain is examined, and the narrator with the worst status is most likely considered a forger of hadith. Furthermore, textual criticism of hadith is also used to identify weak narrators or to clear someone from being labeled as weak (al-Idlibī, 2013). Textual criticism of hadith is also used to determine the status of a hadith, whether it is authentic (ṣāḥīḥ) or otherwise. Al-Idlibī (2013) listed several hadiths whose status was deemed not authentic by al-Bukhārī based on his examination of their content.

Imam Aḥmad recorded from Ummu Salamah (may Allah be pleased with her) that the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) said:

*man aballa min al-masjid al-aqṣā bi-ʾumratin, aw bi-ḥajatin, ghuṣra labū mā taqaddama min dhanbibi*
If anyone puts on ihram for hajj or umrah from the Aqsa Mosque [to the sacred mosque], his former and latter sins will be forgiven. (Reported in Musnad Aḥmad, vol. 44, p. 181, no. 26558)

The chain of narration for this hadith was criticised by some hadith scholars due to discrepancies among its narrators, and some of its narrators were also questioned. In commenting on its status, al-Bukhārī said: “He — referring to Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān — did not achieve conformity in narrating this hadith because the Prophet (peace be upon him) established Dhu al-Ḥulayfah and al-Juḥfah as the mīqāt and he chose to enter into the state of ihram from Dhu al-Ḥulayfah.” Al-Bukhārī’s comment is seen based on his examination of the content of the hadith and not solely on the issues found within its chain of narration.

The Absence Of Inconsistencies In Hadith Texts

Let us now turn to selected topics of hadith content criticism, highlighting the precision of hadith scholars in evaluating and critiquing hadith texts. It also demonstrates how content criticism influences the assessment of the status of narrators and hadith. One of the criteria for a ṣaḥīḥ hadith is that its ghayr shādh (should not contain any inconsistencies) in its sanad or matan. The ‘adām al-shudūdī (absence of inconsistencies) can only be confirmed when there is not al-mukhālafah (discrepancy) found in the genealogy of transmission or text of a hadith. Discrepancy, or al-mukhālafah occurs when a narrator reports a narration that differs from the reports of other narrators, whether the narrator is thiqah (trustworthy) or not. According to medieval hadith scholars like Ibn Ḥajar (2021), if the narrator is trustworthy, it is termed shādh. Conversely, if the narrator reports inconsistent hadith that is not credible, it is termed munkar. Discrepancies can be identified through the following steps:

Collecting and evaluating each chain and wording of the hadith.
Examining the Books of ‘Ilal (hidden flaws).
Examining the Books of Tarājim (biographies).
Examining the Books of Shurūḥ (commentaries).
Examining the Books of Takhrīj (retrieval).

Ibn Ḥajar (2021) listed discrepancy, whether in the chain or the content of the hadith, as one of the reasons why the credibility of a narrator is questioned. This suggests a relationship between the study of the transmission chain and the text. In other words, a narrator with peculiar or inconsistent narrations may have their credibility questioned. Discrepancy exists under five conditions:

Al-Idrāj (interpolation).
Al-‘Qalb (inversion).
Addition of a narrator in a connected chain.
Al-‘Idṭirāb (disruption).
Al-Tašīf (misreading).

According to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, instances of misreading fall into two subcategories. The first is a misreading of the text, and the second is an isnad. Alternatively, they fall into two other subcategories. The first is tašīf al-buṣar (visual misreading), which is more common, and the second is tašīf al-sam’ī (aural "misreading").

Forms of Mudraj

There are many forms of idrāj studied by hadith scholars. The author will only focus on the phrases of mudraj involving the hadith text, and they are as follows.

Mudraj at the Beginning Of The Matn

It is a statement other than the hadith that is connected to the beginning of the hadith. Not many examples can be found for this form. Some examples include,
Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (1997) reported with his chain of transmission from Abu Hurayrah (may Allah be pleased with him) that he said: “Abu al-Qāsim (meaning the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him) said: Complete the ṭūḍūʾ (ablution), may the one who does not evenly distribute the water of ablution on the heels of his feet be destroyed with the punishment of Hellfire.” (al-Fāṣil li al-Waṣṣal al-Mudraj, Volume 1, Page 158)

The statement “complete the ablution” is the words of Abu Hurayrah himself, as found in the narrations of most of the students of Shu’bah Ibn al-Ḥajjāj, who is one of the narrators of this hadith and is considered the madār al-ḥadīth (pivot). Among them are Dāwūd al-Ṭayālisī, Wahb Ibn Jarīr, Ādam Ibn Abī Iyās, Ṭāhir Ibn ‘Alī, ‘Ali Ibn al-Ja’d, Muḥammad Ibn Ja’far Ghundar, Hushaym Ibn Bushayr, Yazīd Ibn Zurai’, and Waki’ Ibn al-Jarrāḥ. According to al-Khaṭīb (1997), the mistake happened in the stories told by Abū Qaṭān ‘Amr Ibn al-Haytham al-Quṭaʾī and Shabābah ibn Sawwār al-Fazārī from Shu’bah. They linked Abu Hurayrah’s statement to the beginning of the hadith or thought it was part of the hadith.

**Mudraj in the Middle of The Matn**

It is a statement other than the hadith that is placed in the middle of the hadith’s content for a specific purpose, such as explaining the meaning of the hadith wording. This is an example:

Al-Bukhārī (1993) reported from ‘Āʾishah (may Allah be pleased with her):

"...He (the Prophet) secluded himself in the cave of Ḥirāʾ devoting himself to worship for several nights before returning to his wife's house...". (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Revelation, Volume 1, Page 4, Hadith no: 3)

The word "devoting himself to worship" is a mudraj, meaning a statement that is not part of the hadith, inserted into the middle of the hadith text. It is a statement of al-Zuhrī, one of the hadith narrators, intended to clarify the meaning of "devoting himself to worship."

**Mudraj at the End of The Matn**

It is a statement other than the hadith that is placed at the end of the hadith's content. Most instances of mudraj in the matan fall into this category. An example is:

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (1997) reported with his chain of transmission from Abu Hurayrah (may Allah be pleased with him) that he said:

“The righteous slave will receive double rewards. By the Lord in whose hand is my soul, if it were not for jihad in the cause of Allah, pilgrimage, and serving my mother, I would prefer to die as a slave.” (al-Fāṣil li al-Waṣṣal al-Mudraj, Volume 1, Page 164)

According to al-Khaṭīb (1997), the underlined statement at the end of this hadith is Abū Hurayrah’s own statement, as understood from the narrations of Ḥibbān Ibn Mūsā and ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb. In Ḥibbān’s narration, his statement is as follows:

"By the Lord, in whose hand is the soul of Abū Hurayrah..."

In ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Wahb’s narration, the hadith is reported without the underlined statement. However, the narrator said: “It has been conveyed to us that Abū Hurayrah did not perform pilgrimage until his mother passed away because he always accompanied his mother.” Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī (1984) cited this hadith as an example of mudraj that is impossible to have originated from the Prophet Muḥammad. According to him, it is inconceivable for the Prophet to express a desire to die as a slave. This statement also indicates that the narrator still had his mother alive when he uttered it, whereas the Prophet's mom passed away when he was young. Ibn Ḥajar’s commentary demonstrates the role of textual criticism in determining mudraj, which is one form of al-mukhālafah.

**Identifying Mudraj**

Ibn Ḥajar (1984) listed three methods for identifying mudraj in a text, as follows:
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It deviates from the Prophet Muhammad’s speech.
The Prophet’s companions denied it.
The story is explained by narrators other than the Prophet's companions.
The first method requires research into the hadith text and its appropriateness as a statement of the Prophet or otherwise. This method highlights the role of textual criticism among hadith scholars. An example of this method is Abu Hurayrah’s hadith about the virtues of a righteous slave.

The second method, as reported by al-Khaṭīb (1997), is exemplified by a narration attributed to ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd. He reported that the Prophet Muhammad made the following statement:

"Whoever dies while associating partners with Allah will enter the Fire, and whoever dies while not associating anything with Allah will enter Paradise." (al-Faṣl li al-Waṣl al-Mudraj, Vol. 1, p. 217)

According to al-Khaṭīb (1997), the underlined verse in the above hadith is a statement by Ibn Masʿūd r.a. The error originates from one of its narrators, Aḥmad Ibn ‘Abdul Jabbār al-‘Uṭāridī. His narration contradicts other narrators’ narrations as follows:

In a narration by Aswad Ibn ʿĀmir, for example, Ibn Masʿūd reported from the Prophet Muhammad:

"Whoever associates partners with Allah, Allah will admit him to the Fire."

Then Ibn Masʿūd said:

"And another statement that I say which I did not hear from him is: Whoever dies without associating partners with Allah, Allah will admit him to Paradise." (al-Faṣl li al-Waṣl al-Mudraj, Vol. 1, p. 219)

Ibn Masʿūd’s statement, as reported by many narrators, is maḥbūm al-mukhālafah (counterimplication) derived from a hadith he narrated from the Prophet. Maḥbūm al-mukhālafah, which can be translated as "counterimplication," can be found in Bernard G. Weiss, The Search for God's Law: Islamic Jurisprudence in the Writings of Sayf al-Dīn al-ʿĀmidī. According to Weiss, counterimplication "was not so widely regarded as productive of valid law throughout the legal system."

However, some narrators mistakenly considered it part of the Prophet’s hadith and inserted it into the text. This insertion was eventually recognised by hadith scholars through Ibn Masʿūd’s denial, as reported by al-Khaṭīb, and is known as mudraj. Without Ibn Masʿūd’s denial, which is only known through the chain of transmission, it would not have been possible to identify the mudraj in his hadith because, logically, such a statement could have come from the Prophet.

According to Ibn Ḥajar (1984), it is indeed possible to demonstrate mudraj by utilising the first two approaches. However, illustrating it through the third approach lacks the same level of persuasiveness as the previous two methods, as evidenced by the following example: Imam Aḥmad and Abū Dāwūd reported through Zuhayr Ibn Muʿawiyah, who narrated from al-Ḥasan Ibn al-Ḥurr, that Jābir Ibn ʿ Abd Allāh reported:

"Whoever prays abundantly at night, his face will be beautiful during the day." (Sunan Ibn Mājah, Iqāmat al-Ṣalāh, Vol. 2, p. 358, Hadith no: 1333).

According to al-Ḥākim, as quoted by al-‘Irāqī (1969), Thābit Ibn Mūsā mistakenly thought a statement made in jest by Sharīk Ibn ʿ Abd Allāh was a hadith of the Prophet Muhammad. This misunderstanding caused the statement to be inserted into the hadith.

Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Numayr, as reported by Ibn ʿAdī (1997), stated that Sharīk ibn ʿ Abd Allāh was known for his humour and made the statement as a joke. However, Thābit Ibn Mūsā, who had impaired vision, misinterpreted it as a hadith and reported it as such.
CONCLUSION

*Mudraj in hadith* texts is part of the art of textual criticism pioneered by ancient *hadith* scholars and can be categorised as part of the sciences of Hadith related to texts, such as ghārib al-ḥadīth, sabab wurūd al-ḥadīth, and mukhtālif al-ḥadīth. Simultaneously, the art of critiquing chains of transmission is also necessary in determining mudraj, and thus, the interconnected nature of Hadith sciences complements and enhances each other.

Based on the form and methods of proving mudraj, textual criticism of hadith is essential, particularly when employing the first method, which involves proving the content's appropriateness. The conclusions drawn from this method can be considered definitive and accurate. In other words, researchers can conclude that proven mudraj through the first method is not a statement of the Prophet. However, the other two methods require examination of the text because the factor of content appropriateness fails to filter out mudraj expressions. This strengthens what al-Shāfi‘ī mentioned:

"The truth or falsehood of most *hadiths* cannot be proven except by knowing the veracity or falsehood of their narrators. However, in certain isolated cases, the truth or falsehood can be proven when the narrator conveys something unusual or contradictory to more established and authentic texts, based on abundant evidence."

This demonstrates the fragility of the approach to critiquing *hadith* texts based solely on textual assessment, disregarding matters relating to the genealogy of transmission.

Not all *hadiths* can be assessed for authenticity solely based on textual evaluation. This is because not all truths are sourced from the *hadiths* of the Prophet Muhammad. Truth can also come from the Quran and rationality. When someone who is not a prophet expresses something based on their thorough research of the Prophet's *hadiths*, consistent with Islamic principles, in eloquent and persuasive language, it is difficult for the mind to distinguish that expression from that of a prophet. However, matters beyond the realm of rationality, especially the unseen (al-ghaybiyyah), need to be verified through the truthfulness of their narrators, also known as the genealogy of transmission in the science of hadith.
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