

Mudraj Hadith and Its Relationship with the Art of Hadith Text Criticism

Helimy Aris¹, Muhammad Fawwaz Bin Muhammad Yusoff², Amran Bin Abdul Halim³, Nazri Muslim⁴, Jamsari Alias⁵ and Norazila Mat⁶

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 idraj 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.

Keywords: *Mudraj, Text Critique, Verification Of Hadith Status, Methodology Of Hadith Scholars.*

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'zamī, 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

¹ Faculty of Quranic and Sunnah Studies Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia,,Email: helimy@usim.edu.my

² Faculty of Quranic and Sunnah Studies Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia,,E-mail: fawwaz@usim.edu.my

³ Faculty of Quranic and Sunnah Studies Universiti Sains Islam Malaysia,E-mail: ahmadfauzi@uutm.edu.my

⁴Pusat Pengajian Citra/Institute of Ethnic Studies Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM) E-mailnazrim@ukm.edu.my

⁵Pusat Pengajian Citra/Institute of Islam Hadhari Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM)

⁶Faculty of Economics and Management Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM)

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-Shāfi‘ī (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-Shāfi‘ī, 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 *Ṣaḥīḥ* and *Kitāb al-Tamyīz*. Even though the *sanad* of *Kitāb al-Tamyīz* (Book of Discrimination) was commenced with Makki 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-Taqāsīm wa-l-anwā‘* ("Divisions and Categories"), also known as *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, Fawwaz (2020) opines Ibn Ḥibbān's theory of hadith authentication as a pioneering attempt to systemise the authentication of hadith in the first three centuries of *hijrah*. In general, Ibn Ḥibbān's theory of authenticity was founded on a series of formulas related to transmission and knowledge, which primarily focused on the scrutiny of *isnad*.

Meanwhile, the hadith's *matn* is the expression that comes after the chain of *isnad*. Essentially, hadith criticism means distinguishing between *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic) and *ḍa‘īf* (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‘navī* criticism" was used by Husaini (2017) when discussing the scholarship of al-Ḥāfiẓ 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 ‘Ulamā’ al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī* was authored by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn 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 Ṭāhir al-Jawābī (1986) further enriched this field with his work *Jubūd al-Muḥaddithīn fī Naqd Matn al-ḥadīth 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 A'zami (1990), who penned *Manhaj Naqd al-Matn ‘inda al-Muḥaddithīn* 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-Dāraquṭnī (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 Sunni 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-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 *mudrij* 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-Faṣl li al-Waṣl al-Mudraj fi al-Naql* of al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdaḍī (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-Khaṭīb 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 *ḥāfiẓ*. The concept of *takebrj al-ma'na* 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 *isnād* aspect, resulting in some hadith being deemed *ṣaḥīḥ* 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 advocacy, which demonstrated their mastery of the art of content criticism. In his extensive responses to the neglect of hadith scholars towards content criticism, Hammām Saʿīd (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-Taʿdīl* (lit. criticism and accreditation). The *Ṣaḥābah* (companions) were pioneers in the science of *matan* criticism. ʿĀʾishah (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 Irād mā Istadrakathu ʿAʾishah ʿalā al-Ṣaḥābah*. Most of ʿĀʾishah'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 *Hadīth* 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-Shāfiʿī through his work *Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth*, al-Ṭabarī through his work *Tabḍīb al-Āḥbār*, and Ibn Qutaybah through his work *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*.

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

The authentication of *Hadīth Mawḍūʿ* (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 *hadīth* text.

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

Criticism of narrations by *hadīth* 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 *maḥḥūf* (halted) for *marfūʿ* (raised) or mispronouncing the *hadīth* 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-Arbaʿah* (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 "*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 *bidʿah* (making additional things in worship that are not allowed), authentic and weak hadith, mastery of the art of *hadīth* criticism becomes a necessity (Al-Aʿzamī, 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 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-Shāfi'ī (d. 204/820) emphasised the significance of *isnad* 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-Shāfi'ī, 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 *Ṣaḥīḥ* 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-Taqāsīm wa-l-anwā'* ("Divisions and Categories"), also known as *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, Fawwaz (2020) opines Ibn Ḥibbān's theory of hadith authentication as a pioneering attempt to systemise the authentication of hadith in the first three centuries of *hijrah*. In general, Ibn Ḥibbān's theory of authenticity was founded on a series of formulas related to transmission and knowledge, which primarily focused on the scrutiny of *isnad*.

Meanwhile, the hadith's *matn* is the expression that comes after the chain of *isnad*. Essentially, hadith criticism means distinguishing between *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic) and *ḍa'īf* (weak) hadith and evaluating the narrators of *hadith* 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-Ḥāfiẓ 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 *Manhaj Naqd al-Matn 'inda 'Ulamā' al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī* was authored by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn 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 Ṭāhir al-Jawābī (1986) further enriched this field with his work *Jubūd al-Muḥaddithin fī Naqd Matn al-ḥadīth 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 A'zami (1990), who penned *Manhaj Naqd al-Matn 'inda al-Muḥaddithin* 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 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-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 *mudrij* 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-Faṣl li al-Waṣl al-Mudraj fi al-Naql* of al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (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-Khaṭīb 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 ḥāfiẓ. The concept of *takebrj 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 (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 advocacy, which demonstrated their mastery of the art of content criticism. In his extensive responses to the neglect of hadith scholars towards content criticism, Hammām Saʿīd (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-Taʿdīl* (lit. criticism and accreditation). The *Ṣaḥābah* (companions) were pioneers in the science of *matan* criticism. ʿĀʾishah (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 Irād mā Istadrakathu ʿĀʾishah ʿalā al-Ṣaḥābah*. Most of ʿĀʾishah'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-Shāfiʿī through his work *Iktilāf al-Ḥadīth*, al-Ṭabarī through his work *Tabdhīb al-Āthār*, and Ibn Qutaybah through his work *Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth*.

The science of *ʿIlal 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 *Ḥadīth Mawḍūʿ* (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 *ṣaḥīḥ*.

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 *marfūʿ* (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-Arbaʿah* (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

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 evaluation of narrators is part of 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’dil* (lit. criticism and accreditation) as recorded in books of biographies (*al-tarajim*) and inquiries (*al-su’ alā’*). 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’dil*. This is a method of evaluation used by earlier experts in *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dil*. This approach is particularly necessary if the narrator being evaluated falls into the category of *al-maskūt fih* (the unspoken), meaning no comments are found about them from previous experts in *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dil*. 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’allimī (2012), experts in *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dil* take into account the hadith text when evaluating the narrator. This can be seen through the following comments:

<i>yuhaddith bi-l-manākir</i>	He narrates with disapproved (or objectionable) narrations
<i>ṣaḥīb manākir</i>	Companion of disapproved narrations
<i>‘indabu manākir</i>	He has disapproved (or objectionable) narrations
<i>munkar al-ḥadīth</i>	One who is criticized for the unreliability of his narrations

Because it has become the practice of experts in *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dil* 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 (*mandū’*). 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-Mandū’at*. According to al-Durays (2007), the action of experts in *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dil* to criticise the *matn* when evaluating narrators is due to three main factors:

Al-mukhālafah (contradiction): The wording of the hadith narrated by the narrator being evaluated contradicts one of the following sources: the Quran, Sunnah, consensus (*Ijmā'*), statements, or actions of the Companions who narrated the hadith.

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

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

Ibn Hibbān (2000) evaluated Abū Zayd, a narrator who reported from Ibn Mas'ūd (may Allah be pleased with him), regarding the necessity of performing ablution with *nabidh* (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-Mā'idah. Al-Rāmahurmuzī (2016) reported that Shu'bah 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-taqṣīm*. 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 (*ṣaḥīḥ*) 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-masjidi al-aqṣā bi-'umratin, aw bi-hajjatin, ghufira labu mā taqaddama min dhanbibī

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 *‘adam al-shudhūd* (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 *thiqab* (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 *Tarajim* (biographies).

Examining the Books of *Shurūḥ* commentaries).

Examining the Books of *Takbrj* (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-Idraj (interpolation).

Al-Qalb (inversion).

Addition of a narrator in a connected chain.

Al-Idtirāb (disruption).

Al-Taṣḥīf (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 *taṣḥīf al-baṣar* (visual misreading), which is more common, and the second is *taṣḥīf al-sam‘* (aural "misreading").

Forms of *Mudraj*

There are many forms of *idraj* 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: "Abū al-Qāsim (meaning the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him) said: Complete the *mudū'* (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-Faṣl li al-Waṣl 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-Tayālīsī, Wahb Ibn Jarīr, Ādam Ibn Abī Iyās, 'Āṣim Ibn 'Alī, 'Alī Ibn al-Ja'd, Muḥammad Ibn Ja'far Ghundar, Hushaym Ibn Bushayr, Yazīd Ibn Zuray', and Wakī' Ibn al-Jarrāḥ. According to al-Khaṭīb (1997), the mistake happened in the stories told by Abū Qaṭn 'Amr Ibn al-Haytham al-Quṭa'ī 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 'Ā'ishah (may Allah be pleased with her):

"...He (the Prophet) secluded himself in the cave of Ḥirā' devoting himself to worship for several nights before returning to his wife's house..." (*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Revelation, Volume 1, Page 4, Hadīth 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-Faṣl li al-Waṣl 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 Muhammad. 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-mukhalafah*.

Identifying *Mudraj*

Ibn Ḥajar (1984) listed three methods for identifying *mudraj* in a text, as follows:

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 slaves.

The second method, as reported by al-Khaṭīb (1997), is exemplified by a narration attributed to 'Abd Allāh ibn Mas'ūd. 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 Mas'ūd r.a. The error originates from one of its narrators, Aḥmad Ibn 'Abdul Jabbar al-'Uṭāridī. His narration contradicts other narrators' narrations as follows:

In a narration by Aswad Ibn 'Āmir, for example, Ibn Mas'ūd reported from the Prophet Muhammad:

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

Then Ibn Mas'ūd 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 Mas'ūd'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-Āmidī*. 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 Mas'ūd's denial, as reported by al-Khaṭīb, and is known as mudraj. Without Ibn Mas'ūd'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 Mu'āwiyah, who narrated from al-Ḥasan Ibn al-Ḥurr, that Jābir Ibn '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-Ḥākīm, as quoted by al-'Irāqī (1969), Thābit Ibn Mūsā mistakenly thought a statement made in jest by Sharīk Ibn 'Abd Allāh was a hadith of the Prophet Muhammad. This misunderstanding caused the statement to be inserted into the hadith.

Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Numayr, as reported by Ibn 'Adī (1997), stated that Sharīk ibn '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 *gharīb al-ḥadīth*, *sabab wurūd al-ḥadīth*, and *mukhtalif 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-ghaybiyāt*), need to be verified through the truthfulness of their narrators, also known as the genealogy of transmission in the science of *hadith*.

REFERENCES

- Abū Dāwūd, S. (2009). *Sunan Abī Dāwūd. Taḥqīq Shu'ayb al-Arna'ūt*. Beirut: Dār al-Risālat al-Ālamīyah.
- Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal. (2001). *Musnad Aḥmad. Taḥqīq Shu'ayb al-Arna'ūt*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah.
- Ahmad Izzuddin Abu Bakar. (2021). Metode Kitab Syarah Dalam Menetapkan Makna Hadis Berpandukan Dalil: Suatu Penelitian Awal: The Method of Syarah Book in Determining the Meaning of Hadith Based on Evidence: A Preliminary Analysis. *Ma'ālim Al-Qur'ān Wa Al-Sunnah*, 17(2), 58-73. <https://doi.org/10.33102/jmq.v17i2.309>
- Al-'Irāqī, '-R.-H. (1969). *Al-Taḥqīq wa al-'Idāḥ Sharḥ Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*. Al-Madinat al-Munawwarah: Al-'Irāqī, 'Abd al-Rahīm Ibn al-Ḥusayn. 1969. *Al-Taḥqīq wa al-'Idāḥ Sharḥ Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*. Al-Madinat al-Munawwarah: al-Maktabat al-Salafiyah.
- al-A'zamī, M. (1990). *Manhaj al-Naqd 'Ind al-Muḥaddithīn*. KSA: Maktabat al-Kawthar.
- al-Jawābī, Muḥammad Ṭāhir. (1986). *Jubūd al-Muḥaddithīn fī Naqd Matn al-ḥadīth al-Nabawī*, Tunis: Mu'assasah 'Abd al-Karīm Ibn 'Abd Allāh
- Al-Bukhārī, M. (1993). *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī. Taḥqīq Muṣṭafā Dīb al-Bughā*. Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr.
- Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, A. (1997). *Al-Faṣl li al-Waṣl al-Mudraj fī al-Naql. Taḥqīq Muḥammad Ibn Maṭr al-Zabrānī*. KSA: Dār al-Hijrah.
- Al-Mizzī, J.-D. (1992). *Al-Mizzī, Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf. 1992. Tabdhīb al-Kamāl fī Asmā' al-Rijāl. Taḥqīq Bashshār 'Anwād. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah*. Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah.
- al-Shāfi'ī, M. (1938). *Al-Risālah*. Egypt: Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī.
- Amīn, A. (2012). *Fajr al-Islām*. Cairo: Mu'assasat al-Hindāwī.
- Bernard G. Weiss. (2010). *The Search for God's Law: Islamic Jurisprudence in the Writings of Sayf al-Din al-Āmidī*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Brown, J. A. (2012). The Rules of Matn Criticism: There Are No Rules. *Islamic Law and Society*, 19(4), 356-396. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851912X639923>
- Bin Muhammad Yusoff, M. F. (2020). The Authentication of Ḥadīth: Ibn Ḥibbān's Introduction to His *Ṣaḥīḥ*. *Al-Masāq*, 32(3), 294-310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09503110.2020.1712546>
- Bin Muhammad Yusoff, M. F. (2023). Travels and Cities of the Ḥadīth Studies: An Analysis of Buldān in the Islamic Intellectual History. *Al-Bayan: Journal of Qur'an and Hadith Studies*, 21(3), 315-334. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22321969-20230137>

- Bin Muhammad Yusoff, M. F., Ismail M. Y. (2023) Sunni *Ḥadīth* and Continuous Commentaries on the Eschatological Maḥdī: A Literary Analysis. *Religions*, 14(4):499. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14040499>
- Fadzman Abd Kadir, & Roshimah Shamsudin. (2022). Manḥaj Kṛitikan Muḥaddithūn Terhadap Riwayat Sirah Dan Penerapannya Dalam Penulisan Sirah: Methodology Of Criticism By Hadīth Scholars Upon Sirah Narrations And Its Application In Sirah Writing. *Ma'ālim Al-Qur'ān Wa Al-Sunnah*, 18 (1), 47-70. <https://doi.org/10.33102/jmqqs.v18i1.338>
- Ibn 'Adī, A. (1997). *Ibn 'Adī, Abū Aḥmad. 1997. Al-Kāmil fī Ḍu'afā' al-Rijāl. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah.*
- Ibn Fāris, A. (1979). *Maqāyis al-Lughab.* Beirut: Dār al-Fikr.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalāni, A. (1984). *Al-Nukat 'alā Kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.* Al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah: 'Imādat al-Baḥṭh al'Ilmī bi al-Jāmi'at al-Islāmiyah.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalāni, A. (2021). *Nuḣḥat al-Naẓar fī Tandīḥ Nukbbat al-Fikar.* Al-Madīnat al-Munawwarah: 'Abd Allah Ibn Ḍayf Allah al-Rahīlī.
- Ibn Ḥibbān, A. (2012). *Al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ 'Alā al-Taqāsīm wa al-Anwā' min Ghayr Wujūd Qaṭ' fī Sanadibā wa laṭṭubūt Jarḥ fī Nāqilihā.* Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm.
- Ibn Mājah, A. (2009). *Sunan Ibn Mājah.* Beirut: Dār al-Risālat al-Ālamīyah.
- Ibn Manzūr, M. (1994). *Lisān al-'Arab.* Beirut: Dār al-Ṣādir.
- Jamil, Khairil Husaini Bin. (2017). 'Traditional Sunnī Epistemology in the Scholarship of al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Khaṭīb al-Baghḍādī (463 ah/1071 ce).' PhD dissertation, University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Kawaid, A. I. S. D., Amiruddin Mohd Sobali, & Ahmad Izzuddin Abu Bakar. (2021). Faedah Takhrij Hadis kepada Sanad Dan Matan: Satu Kajian Analisis: Benefits of Takhrij Hadīth to Sanad and Matn: An Analytical Study. *Ma'ālim Al-Qur'ān Wa Al-Sunnah*, 17(2), 66-83. <https://doi.org/10.33102/jmqqs.v17i2.285>
- Sa'īd, H.-R. (1987). *Al-Fikr al-Manḥajī 'Ind al-Muḥaddithīn.* Qatar: Ri'āsat al-Maḥākīm al-Shar'iyyah wa al-Shu'ūn al-Dīniyah.
- Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn ibn Aḥmad al-'Idlibī, (2013). *Manḥaj Naqḍ al-Matn 'inda 'Ulamā' al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī, Amman: Dār al-Faṭḥ lil-Dirāsāt wa-al-Nashr.*