Hadis ve Siyer Araştırmaları
Hadith and Sira Studies

Cilt/Volume: VI | Sayı/Number: 2 | Yıl/Year 2020
hadisvesiyer.info | © Meridyen Derneği

Makale / Article

Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 30 Temmuz 2020
Makale Kabul Tarihi: 23 Aralık 2020

Revisiting *Ḥadīth* Problem: Implications of Forged *Ḥadīth* in a Post-*Shari'ah* World

Syed M. Waqas*

Abstract

Ḥadīth cannot take on the role of the second principal source of Islamic theology and law without a grounding in the belief that the speech of the Prophet is miraculously preserved against human corruption. Such a conviction provides for the sanctification of *hadīth* that begrudges critical inquiry of the brick and mortar of this grand edifice. It may sound like a simple question to an unsuspecting mind whether *hadīth* was reported or created at the outset. There is, however, no facile answer to this question, for such is difficult to definitively determine even for scholars despite their general consensus that the *hadīth* was both reported and created in early Islamic history. This article revisits the problem of the creation of *hadīth* versus its reporting and investigates some of the fundamental issues pertaining to the forgery of *hadīth* that may have far reaching implications and can be relevant even today.

Keywords: Quranism, traditionists, fabrication, harmonization, *hadīth*, sunnah, *tafsīr, ṣaḥīḥ, ḍa'īf, mawḍū', isnād, matn, taṭbīq.*

* *Syed Muhammad Waqas, affiliated with the theology department of Cincinnati Christian University, Ohio (USA), as former graduate student, visiting lecturer of Islam, and research associate, syed.waqas@ccuniversity.edu, orcid.org/ 0000-0003-0867-5400.*

Hadisi Tekrar Düşünmek:
‘Şeriat Sonrası’ Dönemde Mevzû Hadis Meselesinin Tazammunları

Özet

Hz. Peygamber’in sözlerinin tahriften mucizevî şekilde korunduğu inancına dayanmaksızın hadisler kelâm ve fıkhın ikinci temel kaynağı rolünü üstlenemez. Bu kabul, hadisin kutsanmasını sağlamakta ve bu da söz konusu muazzam yapının temel yapı taşlarının eleştiri süzgecinden geçirilmesine yönelik gönülsüzlüğe neden olmaktadır. Hadisin başlangıçtan itibaren nakil mi yoksa vaz‘ mı edildiği sorusu ilk bakışta cevabı açık, basit bir soru gibi görünebilir. Hâlbuki hadislerin başlangıçtan itibaren hem nakledilip hem vaz‘ edildiğine dair genel kabule rağmen konunun uzmanları için dahi bu sorunun kolay bir cevabı yoktur. Bu makale hadislerin nakledilmesi ve vaz‘ edilmesi meselesini tekrar değerlendirmekte, hadis vaz‘ı ile ilgili geniş kapsamlı sonuçları olan ve bugünü de ilgilendiren çok temel meselelerden bir kısmını incelemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kur’ancılık, hadisçiler, uydurma, te’lif, hadis, sünnet, tefsir, sahih, zayıf, mevzû, isnad, metin, tatbik.

I. Introduction

Ḥadīth secures an independent disciplinary status within Islamic studies that is, often, on a par with the Qur'anic studies and has been studied since antiquity under both critical and faithful approaches. Following the critical approach, I will revisit the problem of corruption in *ḥadīth* in an attempt to study and analyze the implications of the phenomenon for the religious ethos of Muslim societies in the post-classical world. The article does not, however, deal with the *ḥadīth* studies' otherwise principal question, namely the issue of the permissibility or impermissibility of transmitting, recording, and redacting the *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* of the Prophet Muḥammad. It is, in fact, acknowledged in the following pages, without questioning or justifying its *raison d'être,* that the *ḥadīth* is an established institution of the socio-legal and spiritual edifice of the Islamic religion and has been received as such by the mainstream Muslim community since the earliest known times in the history of Islam. The crucial question, as well as the thesis, of the present work, therefore, remains centered on the problem of forgery in *ḥadīth,* its historical context, and the influence it has wielded on the evolution of Islamic theology and law. The most widely held Islamic proposition, that the sunnah of the Prophet preserved in the *ḥadīth* provides a juristic context for the shari'ah platform to formulate and regulate laws for the Islamic community, is deemed true for the end goal of positioning a determinate historical inquiry. In the backdrop of what *ḥadīth* has broadly achieved, therefore, the legal framework of shari'ah, the ultimate expression of the Islamic law, is understood to be a conduit for, and predominant character of the legal systems of the state structures under Islamic government throughout history—that which bears partial resemblance with the Catholic canon law in the modern times. Under this pretext, thus, the analytical consideration at work in the article decides to look beyond the rationale of *ḥadīth* collection and canonization into the historical situation of the problem from a historical-critical perspective. It allows for the present research, in principle, to grow out of the constraints of traditional hierarchy of historical argument and exclusively concentrate on the assumptions and problems surrounding the authenticity-versus-corruption debate of *ḥadīth.* I intend to suggest that it is an exception rather than a norm to acknowledge that the debate about the nature and canonical health of *ḥadīth,* which paved the way for the emergence of a discipline, was precipitated by various accounted and unaccounted for factors within a milieu of social, ethnic, and political plurality.

In a rather plain language, I will engage not with the content, character, and/or vitality of the sunnah wired through the mechanics of Islamic community, nor does the following research indulge in a line of inquiry geared towards the origins and role of Islamic law; instead, the article dialogues with the vehicle of *ḥadīth*

treating it exclusively on its own as the receptacle of the sacred teachings—as well as the living example—of the Prophet of Islam whom the Western academia, more often than not, terms with emphasis as the "founder" of Islam. This mammoth subject requires careful choosing of an area to address for arriving at a proper conclusion. Although seeking a solution to the problem of forgery is not in the scope here, determining various contributing factors definitely is. An interlocution with the genre of *ḥadīth,* through the course of early developmental phases, from origin to maturation, makes for a critical exposition of the problem, therefore.

The matn has emerged in recent studies as a constituent of particular historical interest in a critical approach to *ḥadīth* that forms the methodical basis for the hypothesis that puts more weight on the matn than on isnād in the process of critiquing *ḥadīth*. Notwithstanding that it is unlike the general consensus of muḥaddithūn and the thesis projected in a faith-based approach to *ḥadīth,* such a methodology is not without its evaluative significance in a historical-critical appraisal of *ḥadīth.* Living centuries off the isnād-marker age without a direct knowledge of the rijāl involved in narrating *ḥadīth,* there is sufficient scholarly attention to suggest that it is primarily the text which can establish the possibility and historicity of a situation or statement for a research to take place within post-classical paradigm. An engagement with the historically understood role of isrā'īliyāt in exacerbating the problem of *ḥadīth* forgery, moreover, cannot fall out of the article's purview, for a discussion remains in need of building around the contention that the Judeo-Christian influence on *ḥadīth* is more systematically substantiated in the Western critique of *ḥadīth.* It is common knowledge that a strong appeal to the *isrā'īliyāt,* the Islamic Hebraica, is a catalyst factor in the subsequent transition of *ḥadīth* from a political into a theological tool, which, in a historical study, points at a crucial paradigmatic shift in the collective mindset of the Muslim community. The Hebraica element to *ḥadīth* is, therefore, an important object of this investigation.

A. Ḥadīth as a Concept

Closing of the *ḥadīth* canon has transformed *ḥadīth* into a sanctified concept that is owed high esteem as the legacy of the Prophet of Islam, Muḥammad. The legal constituent *ḥadīth* had offered was the lifeline of once judicially functional *shari'ah* of the Islamic world, especially during what the Muslims consider the golden age of Islam. It has, however, reduced into a subordinate legal system, a canon law, in the present age that may well be defined and discerned as a post-*shari'ah* period. The Qur'an, the scripture of Islam, is mainly excluded from the legal context in modernity, for the primary motivation it offers to the Muslim societies is concentrated on spiritual guidance. The use of *ḥadīth,* on the contrary,

still remains relatively valid and relevant within both legal and spiritual contexts, which grants it a rather crucial role in the formation of a modern Islamic society through the transition between the ancient and the modern concepts of community and statehood. The definition of the status and role of *ḥadīth* is, however, fluid rather than stable and thus asks for a critical reevaluation.

Ḥadīth is a technical subject that covers a huge variety and volume of literature as well as a long and complicated history that lends itself to certain fixed historical outcomes, though fluid implications.[1] In other words, it is complex and enormous in addition to being locked in a particular time and space. *ḥadīth* represents a linguistic phenomenon that bears a conspicuous mark of certain peculiar psychological behaviors and socio-cultural characteristics. The traditions of the Prophet, for instance, cannot, by any trajectory of imagination, comment on what does not fit within the spatiotemporal fabric of the *ḥadīth* discourse.[2] But what *ḥadīth* can, nonetheless, do is to function within its limits tracking every thread of the idea of the sacred and sacramental back to the person of the Prophet. And that is, in fact, precisely the bona fide proposition for the rationale of *ḥadīth,* because the discipline is not intended to articulate and accomplish anything beyond identifying, collecting, and authenticating the words and deeds of the Prophet Muḥammad as its end-goal.[3] In order to accomplish such an outwardly simple goal, a complex framework was conceived and developed, so that the meticulous bulwark of linguistic, psychological, and cultural constituents of the Prophet's speech could not be perforated and injected with foreign ideas from the outside.[4] In spite of investing so much care

1 (a) A.F.L. Beeston et al., ed., *Arabic Literature to the End of Umayyad Period* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 271. The editors of this book put various genres within *Ḥadīth* literature under the classes of *ṣaḥīfah, muṣannaf, musnad, ṣaḥīḥ* and analytical stages (see 271-283).

(b) *Ḥadīth* is, on certain occasions, capitalized because the article at times treats the word as a proper noun, especially when it occurs in parallel with the Qur'an as the second source of Islamic law. The word "tradition," on the other hand, will denote both *ḥadīth* and *sunnah.*

2 It is my assumption that the *ḥadīth* cannot reference such phenomena as the weather of contemporary Europe, landscape of the Americas, religious philosophy of China, character of Indus civilization, life around North Pole, wildlife in Australia, and hundreds of other places and phenomena that the Prophet Muḥammad did not have personal, cultural, or intellectual access to.

3 Israr Ahmad Khan, *Authentication of Hadith: Redefining the Criteria* (Herndon, VA: The International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2010), xxi.

4 Ignác Goldziher hints at the tension of worldviews within the process of the fusion of ideas during Islam's early formative period. It was, we may assume, a decisive factor in the genesis of the rationale of *ḥadīth* that it aimed at discerning between

and concern in the sifting of *ḥadīth,* however, the damage that had been done remained beyond repair. As necessity is the mother invention, so was a system of purgation needed to bring the purity of *ḥadīth* back. This did not come entirely true because so many factors contributed to the systematic fabrication of *ḥadīth,* which continued even after the filtering had started and therefore every single aspect of forgery could not be accounted for. I will attempt to explore some of the problem areas in the coming pages with a primary focus on the fabricated material within the canonical collection.

II. *Ḥadīth* as a Subject

The word *ḥadīth* (حديث), meaning "new," is generally used in the Arabic communication as the antonym of *qadīm*, "ancient."[5] In formal Arabic usage, *ḥadīth* functions more frequently as a noun and can mean a number of things, such as a "conversation," "story," and "report," etc., within both religious and secular contexts.[6] It is derived from the root word *ḥadatha,* which means "to happen," "to become new," "to break the news," or "to narrate."[7] The Qur'an mentions the word 23 times under an assortment of contexts and meanings.[8] The Hebrew equivalent of *ḥadīth* is *hadesh* (חדש), meaning "new moon."[9]

Ḥadīth derives its contextual use and meaning from the importance attached to the sayings and conduct of the Prophet Muḥammad within the memory of the community he founded. After the codification of the words and deeds attributed to the Prophet, during the first two centuries of Islamic history, the word *ḥadīth* transcended its lexical meaning and became synonymous with the traditions of the Prophet.[10] It has, therefore, turned out to be a common, legal and otherwise, denominator in the Muslim community's memory ever since the earliest times to refer to the one presumably "perfect" code of life.[11]

---

the Islamic and the un-Islamic by fissuring the ideological matrix of Arabia. See Ignác Goldziher, *Mohammed and Islam*, trans. Kate Chambers Seelye (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1917), 297.

5 Muḥammad Zubayr Ṣiddīqī, *Ḥadīth Literature: Its Origin, Development & Special Features* (Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1993), 1.

6 Muhammad Mustafa Azami, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature* (Oak Brook, IL: American Publication Trust, 1992), 1.

7 Alpha Mahmoud Bah, *Scientific Research and Scholarly Writing in Islam* (Lincoln, NE: iUniversity Press, 2001), 26.

8 Azami, *Studies in Hadith*, 1-2.

9 Alfred Guillaume, *Traditions of Islam: An Introduction to the Study of the Ḥadīth Literature* (London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1924), 10.

10 Zafar Ansārī *in* Azami, *Studies in Hadith,* 3.

11 For instance, it is the orthodox Islamic creed that the Qur'an enjoins on the Muslims to imitate the Prophet. It makes this assertion in *Sūrah Aḥzāb* 33:21, "There has

Concerning the sheer size of Islam's sacred logia, there is an enormous body of canonical literature ascribed to the Prophet under regularly interchangeable denominators of *ḥadīth* and *sunnah*.[12] Muslims recognize both *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* as the *bayān,* "demonstration," of the Qur'an, the book of God, by the Prophet Muḥammad.[13] The word *sunnah*, "a clear path" or "a beaten track," is employed in the discourse of Islamic studies to describe the overall course of the Prophet.[14] It was a common exercise in the pre-Islamic Arabia that the Arabs glorified the practice of the ancient people, most commonly their ancestors, describing their customs as their *sunnah*—the path of the elders.[15] In the Islamic discourse, the term *sunnah* is generally employed in a broader context than *ḥadīth* and refers to the example of the Prophet, *in toto*, discontinuing the tradition the *jāhiliyyah*.[16]

III. Classification

The logia of the Prophet is classed and distributed in various categories, which methodically focus on each report's plausibility, historicity, language, meaning, and tree of narrators.[17] Unlike the recension of the Qur'an, *ḥadīth* has a long history of evolution, transmission, collection, and codification. It is a discipline that witnessed unprecedented amount of scholarly work involving sound knowledge of the subject *(ma'rifatul 'ilm al-ḥadīth)* and application of critical tools *('ilm al-jarḥ wa'l ta'dīl),* and was built upon interdisciplinary approaches, expertise in philology, linguistics and history, and above all systematically derived knowledge of the narrators *('ilm asmā' al-rijāl).*[18]

According to a general consensus of the *muḥaddithūn*, a statement of *ḥadīth* consists of two essential constituents, *isnād,* "chain of narrators," and *matn,* "text."[19] These two constituents are recognized by the *ḥadīth* scholars across the board as integral parts of what is understood as the narration

---

certainly been for you in the Messenger of Allah an excellent pattern for anyone whose hope is in Allah and the Last Day and [who] remembers Allah often." (Trans. Sahih International)

12 Herbert Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam* (Richmond, Surrey: Routledge Curzon, 2000), 6.

13 Khan, *Authentication of Hadith*, xiv.

14 Niaz A Shah, *Islamic Law and the Law of Armed Conflict* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2011), 18.

15 Goldziher, *Mohammed and Islam*, 295.

16 Anver M. Emon, and Rumee Ahmed, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Law* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018), 233.

17 Khan, *Authentication of Hadith*, 30.

18 Beeston et al., *Arabic Literature*, 276-277.

19 Suhaib Hasan, *An Introduction to the Science of Hadith* (Riyadh: Darussalam International Publications, 1996), 11.

of *ḥadīth*, for both function together as the two interlocutors of *riwāyat al-ḥadīth*.[20] *Isnād* pertains to the pedigree of the guarantors, i.e. certification of the narrators of a *ḥadīth* account tracing its origin back to the putative source, the person of the Prophet himself.[21] The *matn*, on the other hand, has to do with the soundness of each narrator's memory, transmission of the text and meaning, and application of the hermeneutical context.[22] The transmission of *ḥadīth in the matn facet* is further divided into two subcategories in accordance with the nature of the text; the first category is called *riwāyat bi'l-lafẓ,* "textus receptus," and the second *riwāyat bi'l-ma'nā,* "received meaning."[23] The above shows that the transmission of *ḥadīth* dialogues with various internal and external components of the narrative framework that all depend on the two fundamental constituents, *isnād* and *matn*.

The study of *ḥadīth,* in spite of all the scholarly expertise and excellence invested in the field, failed to become a perfect science. Historically, the sanctioning of the first official collection of the words and deeds of the Prophet *is credited to the pious Umayyad caliph,* 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz (d. 101/720), known among historians as 'Umar II.[24] The reason for the official provision of the *ḥadīth* collection and patronage to the discipline of *ḥadīth* was the growing concern of the caliph and his like-minds amidst political turmoil and pietistic forgeries that the legacy of the speech and practice of the Prophet would be lost permanently if not preserved. The most distinguished *ḥadīth* scholars of the time who embarked on the *ḥadīth* preservation project on the behest of '*Umar II* were Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥazm (d. 120/737) and Muḥammad ibn Muslim ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742).[25]

According to the traditional blueprint of *ḥadīth,* a statement or deed ascribed to the Prophet is principally required to be in harmony with the content of the Qur'an. There must be an inherent compatibility, it is argued, between the two sources because no such statement that stands in contradiction to the Qur'an, however sound against critical standards, can make a case for an authentic *adīth*.[26] Orthodox Islamic position remains unambiguous that the Qur'an and the

20 Berg, *Development of Exegesis*, 7.

21 Emon and Ahmed, *Oxford Handbook of Islamic Law,* 409.

22 Daniel W. Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 129-130.

23 The literal translation of the two is "narration according to the text" and "narration according to the meaning."

24 Berg, *Development of Exegesis*, 7.

25 Berg, *Development of Exegesis*, 7.

26 Khan, *Authentication of Hadith*, xv-xvi.

Ḥadīth are two—primary and secondary—parts of the divine revelation, and any mutual contradiction, therefore, per the falsification test described in the Qur'an,[27] will invalidate the secondary source.[28] It is generally accepted across the board that the speech and action of the Prophet can in no way contradict with the word of God. The theological principle employed herein dictates that after having embraced the proposition, namely Muḥammad is not only a true prophetic-messenger, but also the seal of the prophecy *(khātam al-nabiyyīn)*, it becomes incumbent on Muslims both theologically and spiritually, not to mention morally, to receive and establish the example of the Prophet as an inerrant model in their lives.[29] The principle rests in the Qur'anic text itself where it is made plain that the rationale of *waḥī,* "revelation," is the foundation of Islam's scriptural edifice and Muḥammad is its ultimate recipient—hence, *the* word-bearer in a Catholic sense.[30] It is, therefore, acknowledged that the word of the Prophet holds equal binding on the Muslim of all ages as does the word of God. The following verse of the Qur'an is almost unanimously employed in the defense of the authenticity and significance of the *ḥadīth.*[31] Nor does he (Muḥammad) speak out of his own desire. But, it is an inspired Revelation sent down to him.[32]

'Umar II's commission marks the inception of the age of collection and canonization of the *ḥadīth* literature generally known as the *tadwīn al-ḥadīth.* The process of *tadwīn* is said to represent the entire phase of the collection and codification of the oral traditions of the Prophet into a written form, gathered by the *ḥadīth* scholars from across the Islamic world and compiled into canonical editions. Such an exercise was primarily intended for extracting theories and legal ruling from the *ḥadīth* in addition to preserving the Prophet's legacy—not to be confused with the *taqnīn al-ḥadīth* that represents the formulation of a legal

27 *Sūrah Nisā* 4:82 – "Then do they not reflect upon the Qur'an? If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction."

28 In Islamic theology, the Qur'an is understood as the *waḥī jalī*, "manifest revelation," whereas the *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* are determined as the *waḥī khafī*, "secret revelation." See Qazi Fazl Ullah, *Science of Hadith* (Dallas, TX: Hund Publishing, 2015), 32, 97.

29 For instance, see *Tafsīr al-Jalālayn* on *Sūrah Aḥzāb* 33:21. Also, check out the commentary on *Sūrahs* 3:31; 4:59, and 24:63 in Seyyed Hossein Nasr et al., *The Study Quran* (New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers, 2015), 1025.

30 In the capacity as such, the Islamic narrative likens the Prophet Muḥammad to Mary, the mother of Jesus, who is called the Word-bearer and God-bearer, especially among the Roman Catholics.

31 Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi, *The Qur'ān and Hadith* (Dar esSalaam, Tanzania: Bilal Muslim Mission of Tanzania), 3-4.

32 *Sūrah Najam* 53:3-4

system.[33] Being a byproduct of the *ḥadīth* compilation, the individual works of the scholars evolved from being crude to fine and transformed the *ḥadīth* narrative from an art into a science of its own within the broader domain of Islamic 'ulūm.[34] Subtle understanding of the subject as well as attention to details was at the core of the *ḥadīth* studies in this period, which, comparatively, the early Muslim community had been rather insensible to.[35]

IV. Islamic Criticism of *Ḥadīth*

If it were to be compacted into one succinct objective, the definitive goal of the *muḥaddithūn* was to arrive at a discernment whether a statement ascribed to the Prophet of Islam did in fact come from his lips. To this end, they developed a thitherto advanced framework of critical inquiry and scientific analysis *to* peruse the available data, which was, in a nutshell, intended to segregate the canonical from the apocryphal.[36] The most celebrated *ḥadīth* compiler, al-Bukhārī, for instance, had almost 600,000 *aḥadīth* in his collection, which he critically plowed through to compile his own compendium of 7275 *aḥadīth*.[37]

The above was a process similar to what the Christian Apostolic Father, Papias of Hierapolis, undertook for collecting such sayings and traditions as attributed to the Christ in circulation among Christians.[38] Unlike Muslim scholars, however, Papias carried out his research on an individual and rather miniscule scale.[39] It would bring a healthy dosage of understanding to the subject of *ḥadīth* and the nature of its inquiry should a comparison be drawn between the work of Papias and that of the *ḥadīth* scholars. Papias' statement about his work, as recorded by Eusebius of Caesarea, merits quotation.

I shall not hesitate also to put into properly ordered form for you (sing.) everything I learned carefully in the past from the elders and noted down well, for the truth of which I vouch. For unlike most people I did not enjoy those who have a great deal to say, but those who teach the truth. Nor did I enjoy those who recall someone else's commandments, but those who remember the commandments

33 Hajed A. Alotaibi, *Minors' Crimes in Saudi Arabia: An Analytical Study on the Saudi Juvenile Justice* (Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2020), 49.

34 Recep Senturk, *Narrative Social Structure: Anatomy of the Hadith Transmission Network, 610-1505* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005), 37. See also Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*, 93.

35 Goldziher, *Mohammed and Islam*, 46.

36 Goldziher, *Mohammed and Islam*, 43-44.

37 Khan, *Authentication of Hadith*, 31.

38 See Monte Allen Shanks, *Papias and the New Testament* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 263-264.

39 Beeston et al., *Arabic Literature to the End of Umayyad Period*, 271-272.

given by the Lord to the faith and proceeding from the truth itself. And if by chance anyone who had been in attendance on the elders should come my way, I inquired about the words of the elders...[40]

A consistently emphasized methodology in the orthodox study of the primary sources of *Islamic religion* is, as noted elsewhere, the invocation of harmony between the logos, the Qur'an, and the logia, the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet.[41] The traditional narrative insists that the words and deeds of the Prophet are no less of an inspiration than the Qur'an itself and must therefore be received as such, namely God-filled.[42] In case a discrepancy arises between the two, as is the case on several occasions where a contradiction disrupts an existing agreement between the narratives of the Qur'an and the *ḥadīth*, methodologically, it will assume a fallacy providing that the *ḥadīth* must have evolved as an independent work outside the sphere of the Qur'an. Such an inference, however, does not hold water within the hierarchies of Islamic theology and law, because it goes against the defined system of faith as the Muslim community has known it. The religious architecture of Islamic faith puts the Qur'an in the foundation and the entire superstructure gets defined through lens of the Qur'anic bedrock. Such a discrepancy as hinted above will, in fact, violate that principle of hierarchy and establish another principle of primary sources' mutual independence and horizontal equation rather than vertical dependence.[43] It will, in turn, cast doubt on the *raison d'être* of the historically actualized discipline of *ḥadīth,* namely the configuration of permissibility, transmission, collection, preservation, and above all canonization. While being in a deadlock as such, speaking from an academic frame of reference, what the orthodox *ḥadīth* scholarship can choose to opt for is either to throw the incompatible *ḥadīth* accounts under a distinctly marked classification or to continue to worship the mythical status of *ḥadīth* unabated. Should the latter be the case, no progress may be envisioned on this subject within a paradigm of modernity for the role of *ḥadīth*, for it will, for obvious reasons, only add to the frigidity of the medieval artifact of *ḥadīth*.

40 Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.39.3-4, in Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006), 417.

41 Khan, *Authentication of Hadith*, 46.

42 Muhammad Taqi Usmani, *Authority of Sunnah* (Karachi, Pakistan: Idaratul Quran wal Uloomil Islamia, 2004), 8-9.

43 The following two books, for instance, deal with the role of *ḥadīth* in the evolution of Islam's legal system and the Muslim jurists' methodical treatment of conflicting reports: Hiroyuki Yanagihashi, ed., *Studies in Legal Hadith* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2019); and Hiroyuki Yanagihashi, *A History of the Early Islamic Law of Property* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2004).

It is noteworthy that no non-literalist stance on the nature and character of *ḥadīth* gets to earn credibility within Islamic scholarship for making a postulate in disagreement with the dogma of the ***ahl al-ḥadīth,*** which, logically, brinks on the fallacy of petitio principii.[44] If opted for the former solution, contrarily, it would spare both jurists and theologians from the labor of engaging with certain enigmatic situations facing off complex legal, civic, and/or social contexts through questionable *ḥadīth* accounts. It is, probably, why the reformist voices in the scholarly echelons of Muslim community have insisted upon working out a pattern in consensus for the end goal of determining an invariably acceptable touchstone and focusing on reevaluating the genuineness of the entire body of *ḥadīth.*[45] Such a demand is intellectually justified, for a solution of the *ḥadīth* problem is wanting in consensus.

It is no secret that the *ḥadīth l*iterature bears an alarming amount of internal discrepancies, which betrays that the fabrication of pious traditions did indeed play out at some point in its early history. Joseph Schacht argues that the problem of the internal contradictions of *ḥadīth is,* in a high degree of probability, a direct result of polemical fabrication intended to rebut a contrary doctrine or practice supported by another report.[46] The ineluctable problem of contradictions, when facing the challenges of evolving Muslim theology in the third and fourth generations after the Prophet, gave birth to the methodological device of *taṭbīq,* "harmonization."[47] All such discrepancies found between the primary and the secondary sources, the Qur'an and the *ḥadīth,* as well as within the body of *ḥadīth* itself came to be systematically deferred to *taṭbīq*—commonly subjecting it to allegory, *ta'wīl*—for a solution sought through the application of harmonization device.[48]

Historical records reveal that two mutually opposing schools of thought emerged early on within the discipline of *ḥadīth,* the so-called *aṣḥāb al-rā'i,*

44 For a study on literalism in *ḥadīth* and the term *ahl al-ḥadīth*, see Khaled Abou El Fadl, *Reasoning with God: Reclaiming Shari'ah in the Modern Age* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014), 262-264.

45 Yvonne Haddad and Jane I. Smith, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of American Islam* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2014), 150. See also Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū Zayd, *Reformation of Islamic Thought: A Critical Historical Analysis* (Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, 2006), 28-29; and Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*, 33.

46 Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1950), 150.

47 Christopher Melchert, *Hadith, Piety, and Law: Selected Studies* (Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press, 2015), 83, 86. See also Berg, *Development of Exegesis*, 158, 223.

48 Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*, 116, 129.

"People of Opinion," and *aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth,* "People of Tradition" or "Traditionists"; the party of "harmonists" was an offshoot of the school of Traditionists that flourished during the second century AH in major religious centers such as Medina.[49] The former, on the other hand, thrived in places like Kufa, Basra, and the outskirts of the empire where forgery had acquired a normative status giving rise to what was termed in a letter addressed to the Umayyad Caliph 'Abd al-Mālik ibn Marwān (d. 86/705) as the "religion of *aḥadīth*."[50] It was, in all likelihood, due to such profound internal contradictions of *ḥadīth*, in addition to the superfluity of the fabricated traditions, that Abū Ḥanīfah (d. 150/767) in particular and his *Ḥanafī* school in general, preferred *qiyās*, "juristic reasoning," over a vast gamut of prophetic traditions. Abū Ḥanīfah, for instance, allegedly made use of only seventeen *aḥadīth* in the process of developing his entire legal system—al-Ḥajjūjī in his edition of ibn 'Abdullah al-'Alawī's work *Al-Futūḥāt al-Ilāhiyyah*, nonetheless, insists that the actual number was 215.[51] The other respected Kufan jurist, Sufyān al-Thawrī *(d. 161/778)*, contrarily, put more weight on the *ḥadīth* than reason in his methodological approach to the Islamic law.[52]

Another clue of forgery stems from a set of problems that, besetting the authenticity of *ḥadīth,* marks up a broader territory. A critical examination will confirm that the canonical *aḥadīth* often yield such details that are anachronistic,[53] scientifically problematic, legally flawed, politically invested, legendary, and above all bearing haggadic influence, to put it in the words of Ignác Goldziher.[54] Moreover, the tradition can also paint a picture of the Prophet and his family from a ludicrously unsacred and mundane perspective portraying them engaged in the minutiae of the world that a traditionally minded Muslim might find offensive and morally repugnant.[55] *Ahl al-Kalām*, who were well established in their scholastic opinion by the period of the grand jurist al-Shāfi'ī, for instance, are said to have

49 Guillaume, *Traditions of Islam,* 71-72.

50 Aisha Y. Musa, *Hadith as Scripture: Discussions on the Authority of Prophetic Traditions in Islam* (London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 38.

51 Khaled Abou El Fadl et al., ed., *Routledge Handbook of Islamic Law* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2019), 227.

52 Christopher Melchert, *The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law: 9th-10th Centuries C.E.* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 1997), 3.

53 Stephen J. Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet: The End of Muhammad's Life and the Beginnings of Islam* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 173-174.

54 Avi Beker, *The Chosen: The History of an Idea, the Anatomy of an Obsession* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 53, 234.

55 For instance, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, "Kitāb al-Ṭalāq"* (Book of Divorce), 63:182. See Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*, 95.

rejected *ḥadīth* altogether on the basis of such corruption declaring that this genre *was* 'filled with contradictory, blasphemous, and absurd traditions.'[56] Fable and folklore, in conjunction with cultural superstition, are yet another problem on the blacklist requiring of historical investigation for locating the origins of the story-telling discourse within early or perhaps pre-Islamic hybrid civic milieu. Instead of getting into the details of individual accounts, I believe the above references suffice to determine the problem.[57]

Historical criticism of *ḥadīth* has, in fact, found currency with the reformist school, characteristically a modern version of *ahl al-Kalām*, called the "Quranists"—also referred to as the *"ahl al-Qur'ān*" and "Modernists."[58] The Quranism approach, however, does not tend to postulate a complete denial of the genre of the *ḥadīth,* principally, as a source of history. The Quranists' modus operandi cannot, in the nature of case, undo the principle of *ḥadīth,* for the Quranists too depend on the *ḥadīth* as a second leg for the apparatus of their argument. The works of prominent Quranists, such as Ghulam Ahmad Parwez, Rashad Khalifa, and Kassim Ahmad, for instance, frequently reference *ḥadīth* and rely upon individual accounts for a counter argument building into a reformist narrative.[59] An absolute rejection of *ḥadīth* will, in fact, do no service to the cause of critical rationalists on the account that it will ***destroy*** a rich legacy and leave them hanging in a historical vacuum. Such a leap will brink on the only available alternative, i.e. developing a revisionist platform to reconstruct the entire narrative of the origins of Islam and making sense of the Qur'an.[60] It is why, notwithstanding his tradition-critical approach, Ignác Goldziher understands the gravity of the crisis arising out of losing *ḥadīth* altogether and thus insists that 'we need not conclude that there is not a grain of truth here and there in ***ḥadīth***

56 Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*, 13-14.

57 I am most certainly not trying to presume that this essay is a novel work in this direction, for ever since the birth of the discipline, scholars have been attempting to address those areas of *ḥadīth* that harbor problems. For an outstanding study on the general introduction and problems of *ḥadīth*, see Jonathan A.C. Brown, *Ḥadīth: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World* (Oxford, UK: Oneworld, 2009).

58 See Emon and Ahmed, *Oxford Handbook of Islamic Law*, 280, 285-290.

59 For instance, see Aziz Ahmad Aziz, *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan 1857–1964* (London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1967), 14.

60 John Wansbrough in his books, *Quranic Studies* and *The Sectarian Milieu*, and Michael Cook and Patricia Crone in their critical work, *Hagarism: The Making of the Islamic World*, have displayed extreme revisionist tendencies questioning the traditional Islamic narrative and building a counter-narrative out of such discrepancies as discussed in this paper. Abdullah Chakralawi, Ghulam Ahmad Parvez, Kassim, Ahmad, and Rashad Khalifa, on the other hand, were a Muslim version of the Western revisionists.

communications.'[61]

In order to protect the purity of the character of *ḥadīth,* the system that developed during the *ḥadīth* age consisted of an intricate network of genres, stratifications, topographies, and typologies mapping the entire body of *ḥadīth.*[62] The *ḥadīth* literature is, for instance, broadly divided into three—more technically four—classes, which are known among scholars as (i) *ṣaḥīḥ, "authentic,"* (ii) *ḥasan*, "good," (iii) *muwaththaq*, "dependable," and (iv) *ḍa'īf*, "weak."[63] Some sunnī scholars instead put *mawḍū',* "fabricated," after *ḍa'īf* as the fourth classification of *ḥadīth* and delete *muwaththaq* from the list.[64]

A ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth, in the opinion of renowned Shāfi'ī *ḥadīth* scholar, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245), is a trustworthy report safely handed down from the Prophet Muḥammad himself. He says:

> A *ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth* is one which has a continuous *isnād*, made up of reporters of trustworthy memory from similar authorities, and which is found to be free from any irregularities (i.e. in the text) or defects (i.e. in the *isnād*).[65]

The category *of ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth* consists of three variants, the so-called *āḥād,* "single isnād," *mashhūr*, "famous" or "widely known," and *mutawātir*, "successive" or "mass transmitted."[66] An important legal scenario in the study of *ḥadīth* is called *qaṭ'ī al-thubūt*, "established in evidence," represented by the grouping of *ṣaḥīḥ al-mutawātir*.[67] They are such traditions that have been reported by so numerous narrators and through so many different chains that the possibility of their agreement on a lie is virtually slash methodically impossible.[68] It is proclaimed among the *sunnī* schools of law that the ruling for a *mutawātir ḥadīth* is the same in terms of authority and authenticity as the one for the scripture, the Qur'an.[69]

After *ṣaḥīḥ* ranks *ḥasan*, which *is* slightly short of *ṣaḥīḥ* in terms of quality.

---

61 Goldziher, *Mohammed and Islam*, 43.

62 Beeston et al., *Arabic Literature to the End of Umayyad Period*, 298.

63 For a comprehensive study of this subject, see 'Abdal Hadi al-Fadli, *Introduction to Hadith,* Trans. Nazmina Virjee, 2nd Ed. (London, UK: ICAS Press, 2011), 8-13.

64 Hasan, *Introduction to the Science of Hadith*, 44.

65 Hasan, *Introduction to the Science of Hadith*, 45.

66 Fazl Ullah, *Science of Hadith*, 103.

67 Tobias Andersson, *Early Sunnī Historiography: A Study of the Tarīkh of Khalīfa b. Khayyāṭ,* vol. 157, *Islamic History and Civilization* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2019), 144.

68 Berg, *Development of Exegesis,* 8.

69 Fazl Ullah, *Science of Hadith*, 103.

According to al-Khaṭṭābī (d. 388/998), a *ḥasan ḥadīth* is not shādh, "irregular," one of the characteristics of *ḍa'īf,* because 'it is the one where its source is known and its narrators are unambiguous.'[70] The *ḥasan ḥadīth* is divided into two commonly accepted kinds which, as ibn al-Ṣalāḥ determines, are (i) *ḥasan lī ghairihī,* one in which the narrator is *mastūr*, "screened" or "unknown," and no prominent *rāvī* narrates from him despite he is not a careless narrator while other *isnād* also exist to confirm the text, and (ii) *ḥasan lī dhātihī,* which is a *ḥadīth* narrated by a truthful and reliable narrator who happens to be a degree weaker in memory.[71] Thirdly, unlike *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḥasan*, *ḍa'īf* has an uncomplicated definition; according to the *muḥaddithūn*, a *ḍa'īf ḥadīth* fails to reach the status of *ḥasan* because of some serious defects.[72] Importantly, a consistent finding about the *ḥadīth* studies is that it is the critique of *ḍa'īf* traditions that gets the most amount of scholarly work dedicated to. Israr Ahmad Khan, for instance, lists twenty substantial works of early Muslim scholars that deal exclusively with the weak traditions.[73] At fourth is the main concern of this paper, *mawḍū',* "fabricated," which, according to al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348), is a *ḥadīth* 'the text of which goes against the established norms of the Prophet's sayings, or its reporters include a liar.'[74]

Muslim scholars of all ages have attempted to address the subject of forgery in *ḥadīth,* given the challenges of their respective eras, which has significantly contributed to the understanding of *ḥadīth* problems both qualitatively as well as quantitatively.[75] The issue of *ḥadīth* forgery has been such a big deal in Islamic history that *ḥadīth* scholar Suhaib Hasan finds it more relevant to list eight main causes of fabrication than naming numerous kinds of spurious *ḥadīth.* His list includes:

1. political differences;
2. factions based on issues of creed;
3. fabrication by *zanādiqah*;
4. fabrication by story-tellers;
5. fabrication by ignorant ascetics;

70 Hasan, *Introduction to the Science of Hadith*, 46.
71 Hasan, *Introduction to the Science of Hadith*, 46-47.; Fazl Ullah, *Science of Hadith,* 107.
72 Brown, *Rethinking Tradition*, 83.
73 Khan, *Authentication of Hadith*, 25-26.
74 Hasan, *Introduction to the Science of Hadith*, 49.
75 Gholamali Haddad Adel, Mohammad Jafar Elmi, and Hassan Taromi-Rad, ed., *Hadith: An Entry from Encyclopedia of the World of Islam* (London, UK: EWI Press Ltd., 2012), 145-151.

6. prejudice in favor of town, race or a particular *imām*;
7. inventions for personal motives;
8. proverbs turned into *aḥadīth.*[76]

V. Historical Criticism

A. Approaching the Problem

Proposing a solution to the problem is, though, not in the purview of the present work, it might still yield the implication to ask for a reorganization and reevaluation of the received canon that has previously governed the spheres of private life and public law in Muslim societies. Such a goal may be sought to accomplish by appropriating sociological and historical data and through the application of textual and historical criticism. Critical areas such as myth and legend motifs, superstition *topoi*, political cultures of the ancient, archaic medical practices, agrarian economic model, circular ethics, primitive rules of warfare, experiential travel and prayer timing, slavery, serfdom, and concubinage, etc., for instance, all need to be revisited under the primary objective of embodying pragmatism within *ḥadīth and* laying the patchwork for Islamic narrative's continuation into the industrial and technological ages. The codification of *ḥadīth,* the one we know as canonical, was a work originally embarked upon in the second century after Islam's origination that, somehow, continued up to the fifth century AH/11th century CE.[77] Credit is owed to the ancient scholars in the first place, for they did not take *ḥadīth* at its face value as a principle and went beyond that in terms of critiquing the oral traditions in circulation 'taking up the challenge enthusiastically.'[78] As they made progress in their work of the *ḥadīth* scrutiny, they began committing to writing the sacred legacy of the Prophet and by the end of the *ḥadīth* age a massive amount of reports, critically retrieved from the pool of collected traditions, had been preserved in writing.[79]

B. Reflection and Introspection

Anthropologically, the undertaking of *ḥadīth* collection deserves to be recognized for the sheer number of individuals involved in the process, which makes it one of the grandest human endeavors of pre-industrial era. On the other

76 Hasan, *Introduction to the Science of Hadith*, 50.

77 Joseph Schacht locates the emergence of *ḥadīth* as a discipline in the second quarter of eighth century C.E., whereas the same is pushed back by Juynboll between 700-720 C.E. See Melchert, *Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law,* 3.

78 Beeston et al., *Arabic Literature to the End of Umayyad Period*, 271.

79 Chase F. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 34-35.

hand, in spite of the painstaking research, criticism, and delivery of the ancient scholars, however, we cannot by any means discount the importance of the application of modern critical tools to *ḥadīth*. And also, it does not suggest either that the work of the *ḥadīth* collectors needs to be rendered as defunct and their standards to be taken into no consideration.

Regarding forgery, the *ḥadīth* literature itself offers a strong testimony in introspection and hindsight that the Prophet had predicted fabrication in his name and had warned his followers against such false traditions that would originate after him. Sunan Dāraquṭnī, a revered book of *ḥadīth* among the *sunnīs*, reports:

The Messenger of Allah said: "Narrators will bring forth traditions in my name. You must put them before the Quran for (verifying) harmony. Whichever appears in harmony with the Quran, you should accept that, and whichever goes against it must be rejected."[80]

Alfred Guillaume, an eminent British Arabist, also quotes a tradition that calls for the adoption of a commonly agreed standard for the canonicity and acceptability of the *ḥadīth.* The Prophet Muḥammad is recorded to have said:

> After my death sayings attributed to me will multiply just as a large number of sayings are attributed to the prophets who were before me. What is conveyed to you as a saying of mine you must compare with the Quran; what is in agreement therewith is from me.[81]

It is not certain whether the Prophet had actually anticipated the creation of false traditions and their ascription to his name. There is a reasonable degree of probability that such admonitions, too, were a product of pious forgeries, which the inventors, perhaps, came up with under pious intentions.[82] One can, however, speculate in relative likelihood that the Prophet was, in fact, aware of the character of oral culture around him and therefore he probably did admonish his followers against the potential threat of forgery. Another historically probable scenario could be that the Prophet actually came across a firsthand forgery situation during his lifetime whence he concluded that his followers, at least some of them, could not help ascribing pious invocations and deeds to his words under personal or even religious motivations. Thus, it triggered a coping

80 Abū'l Ḥasan 'Alī ibn 'Umar al-Dāraquṭnī, ***Sunan Dāraquṭnī,*** No. 209/4.

81 Guillaume, *Traditions of Islam*, 53. On a personal note, I could not locate this report in the canonical collections. *Dāraquṭnī* 209/4 is one such account that appears to be the closest to the report quoted by Guillaume.

82 Goldziher, *Mohammed and Islam*, 49.

mechanism within the *ḥadīth* discourse with such sizzling warnings as of hellfire for projecting falsehood to the Prophet. Bukhārī records a strong admonition in the words of the Prophet: "Ascribing false things to me is not like ascribing false things to anyone else. Whosoever tells a lie against me intentionally, then surely let him occupy his seat in the Hellfire."[83]

If such caveats are accepted to be canonically grounded in the prophetic speech and hence true, it would suggest that the Prophet had himself established an exclusive moral criterion asking for a critical examination of the reports alleged to be his. An important aspect of this standard is that it has one internal dimension—a religious-cum-moral binding on the *rāvī*, "narrator"—and one external dimension—a resolute appeal to the Qur'an for embracing compatibility in *ḥadīth*. By laying it out as such, it was to become a binding on the collective conscience of Muslim scholars that the body of *ḥadīth* and *sunnah* would be judged against this two-dimensional criterion to preclude falsehood from entering the territory of Islam's second most important source after the Qur'an.

It is noteworthy that the attitude of the second Rashidun Caliph, 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, was, more often than not, critical and rational—sometimes even skeptical—towards the narration and acceptance of *ḥadīth;* such was especially true towards those accounts as characteristically of Hebraic provenance.[84] He was particularly not inclined to accept a report attributed to the Prophet as canonical until he could authenticate it from other sources. The plausibility of the content of the report, especially if it concerned beliefs, was yet another considerable matter that factored into his methodology.[85] *'Umar* is recorded by ibn Kathīr to have said in one of his statements: "Narrate less from the Messenger of Allah except that which pertains to action."[86]

The above portrays an overall scenario, which becomes more pervasive with

83 Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, *"Funerals"*, 23:378.

84 *Isrā'īliyāt* are such *Traditions* or, more correctly, fables, legends, and logia that permeated the Arab religiosity originating from the Judo-Christian lore and literature, particularly from the biblical Apocrypha and Talmud. They were inadvertently, and sometimes volitionally, incorporated into the *Hagiographa* of Islam. The main sources of introducing Hebraic lore into the evolving theology and psychology of Islam were the Jewish and Christian converts among whom a few notable names are *Ka'b al-A bār, 'Abdullah ibn Salām,* and *Wahb ibn Munabbih.* See T.O. Shanavas, *Creation And/Or Evolution: An Islamic Perspective* (Bloomington, IN: Xlibris Publication, 2005), 176-177. See also Al-Fadli, *Introduction to Hadith,* 174.

85 Alī Nāsirī, *An Introduction to adīth: History and Sources,* trans. Mansoor Limba (London, UK: MIU Press, 2013), 86.

86 Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāyat wa al Nihāyah,* vol. 8, in Nāsirī, *An Introduction to Ḥadīth*, 86.

the time passage. A third generation theologian and *muḥaddith* Abū ʻĀsim al-Nabīl (d. 212/828) recognizes the problem of *ḥadīth* with a sense of urgency and unequivocally speaks to the crisis facing then an apparently stable Muslim community. His statement reflecting personal displeasure with the *ḥadīth* forgery merits quotation:

> In nothing do we see pious men more given to falsehood than in *ḥadīth*.[87]

A similar opinion was held by many other *muḥaddithūn*, such as al-Zuhrī and Yaḥyā ibn Saʻīd (d. 143/760), both from the generation of *tābi'ūn*, "successors," in the early phase of *ḥadīth* compilation.[88] They lived before the canonical collection of *ḥadīth* in a culture where the creation of pseudo-traditions had gained momentum. The problem continued to grow even much later and the *ḥadīth* scholars of the following generations including Bukhārī, Muslim, ʻAbdul Razzāq, Abū Dā'ūd, Nasā'ī, Tirmidhī, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and others spent decades of hard work collecting and scrutinizing hundreds of thousands of circulating *aḥādīth*.[89] "Certification" was primarily important to their intensive methodology, which was often ignored by the early scholars including the celebrated author of the Mālikī school's manifesto *Al-Muwaṭṭa'*, Mālik ibn Anas (d. 179/795).[90]

C. The So-called Isrā'īliyāt

Ibn Quṭaybah (d. 276/889), the author of Ta'wīl Mukhtalif *al-ḥadīth* and *Kitāb al-Maʻārif,* hesitates to accept a vast number of traditions, especially those originating in an *isrā'īliyāt* context bearing motifs of the Jewish *haggadah* and Christian legend.[91] It suggests that the *Ḥanafī* apologist ibn Qutaybah, like his predecessor Abū Ḥanīfah, had a skeptical disposition towards Hebraic traditions proliferated in Islamic literature, which had rapidly become a profound source of Islam's literary history; various medieval scholars, though with the underpinnings

87 Reynold A. Nicholson, *A Literary History of the Arabs* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), 145.

88 Ibn Khallikan, *Ibn Khallikan's Biographical Dictionary,* trans. Bn Mac Guckin De Slane, vol. 1 (Paris: Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, 1842), 549, footnotes.

89 Madanī, *Preservation of Ḥadīth,* 20, 39.

90 Jonathan Brown explains how later scholars, such as Cordovan *ibn ʻAbd al-Barr* (d. 463/1071) for instance, provided complete *isnād* and context to the entire *Muwaṭṭā'* of *Imām Mālik* except for four different *Aḥadīth*. See Jonathan Brown, *The Canonization of Al-Bukhārī and Muslim* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2007), 231-232.

91 Jacques Waardenburg, ed., *Muslim Perceptions of Other Religions: A Historical Survey* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999), 146-147.

of regret, confirmed the pervasiveness of *isrā'īliyāt* phenomenon.[92] Ibn Khaldūn (d. 808/1406), acclaimed Muslim sociologist and historian, for instance, followed an identical course on the topic of *ḥadīth* in his magnum opus, *Al-Muqaddimah,* and declared that the Judo-Christian converts to *Islam* were equally ignorant about history, being distinct from myth and legend, as were the Arabs themselves.[93] Nowhere was the qualm so clearly felt as was it in the interreligious transaction and transfer of knowledge.

Alfred Guillaume contends that the incorporation of traditions into the Islamic literature borrowed particularly from the Christian Apocrypha—and generally from the Talmud—contributed towards aggravating the problem and thereby left a permanent mark on the conception and praxis of the *ḥadīth*.[94] Ignác Goldziher, on the other hand, proposes that it was primarily the Talmudic platform alone that was employed by the Muslims to provide an expression to Islam's legal and homiletic voices—a semblance of Jewish *halākhic* and *agādic* elementary division.[95]

Stories and statements of foreign origins, particularly emanating from the Apocrypha and the church traditions, were mainly admitted into *Islamic literature* under the century long rule of the Umayyads with their seat at Damascus in Syria.[96] The current discussion, in fact, aims at approximating the size of the problem arisen from the incorporation of such traditions and legends into diluting Islamic thought, because allusions to the Talmudic and Apocryphal writings are traceable within early Islamic literature itself.

'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb wanted to record the traditions (*sunan*) and for this purpose he consulted the Prophet's Companions who also encouraged him to do so. 'Umar reflected on this work for a month, asking for guidance from Allah until his resolve to pursue it became stronger and (he) said, 'I want to put the *sunan* into writing but I remember communities (*aqwām*) before you compiled a book [regarding the *sunnah* of their respective prophets] [sic] and focused their attention to it while disregarding the Book of Allah. By Allah! I will never mix the Book of Allah with anything else.'[97]

---

92 Hasan, *Introduction to the Science of Hadith*, 50-51. See also Ignác Goldziher, *Muslim Studies,* ed. S.M. Stern, trans. C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern, vol. 2 (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1971), 131-132.

93 Shanavas, *Creation And/Or Evolution*, 176.

94 Guillaume, *Traditions of Islam*, 51, 131, footnotes.

95 Goldziher, *Mohammed and Islam*, 46.

96 Hasan, *Introduction to the Science of Hadith*, 50.

97 Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Taqyīd al-'Ilm,* in Nāsirī, *An Introduction to Ḥadīth,* 84.

It becomes obvious from the above account of 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb that he was aware of the Judeo-Christian practice of writing down their religious traditions and putting them on equal footing with their scriptures—the Bible. The Oral Law of the Rabbinic Judaism, such as *Mishnah*, and the Holy Tradition of the church, for instance, offer historical precedents in this particular scenario.

VI. Culture of Political Forgery

An inquiry into the phase of Caliphate's radical transformation into monarchy cannot be left out in a critical appraisal of the history of *ḥadīth*. The regime of the Umayyad dynasty was, it is argued, among the worst propaganda episodes of the history of the *ḥadīth* forgery before the rise of the Abbasids, even though there is room for looking into such assertions as the Abbasid propaganda against the Umayyads, too.[98] Being mutually exclusive, they had their own respective agendas and thereby peculiar techniques for recognizing a prophetic report as authentic or inauthentic. It is believed that some influential Umayyad officials were involved in the creation and spread of false prophetic sayings across the Islamic world and the intent behind such an unscrupulous act was to hail the legitimacy of the Umayyad regime and preach veneration for the their clan as the leaders of the Quraysh.[99] Damascus under the Umayyad rule, for instance, had 172 *ḥadīth* narrators in the generation of tābi'ūn versus the holy sanctuary of Mecca that was inhabited by only 70 *ḥadīth* narrators.[100] Announcers and publishers were sent out to major cities as well as remote provinces of the empire to narrate such—previously unknown—*aḥādīth* as whose subject-matter was inconspicuously centered on authenticating the Umayyad rule and acknowledging the clan as the custodian of Islam.[101] Majority of such canonical or apocryphal accounts that sanctify Syria, Damascus, *Ṣakhrā/al-Aqsā* Mosque of Jerusalem, and/or the Umayyad clan and their dynasty are, scholars suspect, of dubious provenance.[102] It is the reason why the *ḥadīth* collectors including the compiler of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* did not accept any *aḥādīth* bearing the names of certain Umayyad officials on

98 Sayyed M. Deen, *Science under Islam: Rise, Decline, and Revival* (Morrisville, NC: Lulu Press, 2010), 55.

99 Guillaume, *Traditions of Islam*, 49-50; Khan, *Authentication of Hadith*, 19.

100 Senturk, *Narrative Social Structure*, 39.

101 Abū Rayyah, *Abū Hurayrah*, in Al-Fadli, *Introduction to Hadith,* 174. Abū Rayyah maintains that it was *Mu'āwiyah ibn Abū Ṣufyān* who embarked upon the process of propaganda through *ḥadīth*.

102 For instance, *Muṭahhar ibn Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī, ibn Kathīr*, and *ibn Taymiyyah* call all such traditions into question as glorifying Jerusalem, *Ṣakhrā*, and Palestine. See Shelomo Dov Goitein, *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2010), 140-141.

the *isnād*. The transfer of the capital of caliphate from Medina to Damascus was symbolically a rebellion, perhaps at a subconscious level, against the orthodox, piety-centered mindset within *Islam*.[103] The construction of the Dome of the Rock, as reported by various classical historians whereof *Ya'qūbī is one prominent*, was aimed at establishing Jerusalem as the new sanctuary for the annual ritual of the grand pilgrimage, *ḥajj*.[104]

We need to bear in mind that 'Abdullah ibn Zubayr (d. 73/692), the archrival of the Umayyads in the struggle for the caliph's throne, was in control of the two holiest sanctuaries of Islam, Mecca and Medina, during the second civil war (CE 680-92). The Umayyad dynasty, for having been denied political authority over these two holy places, boasted their own claim, though inconspicuously, for a third sanctuary of equal significance to advance their political agenda.[105] The Umayyad officials, for instance, allegedly circulated a *ḥadīth* in which it was stated that Muslims should not 'remove the saddles from their mounts (in the honor of a place) except at three mosques,' namely the holiest stations of *Masjid al-Harām* in Mecca, *Masjid al-Nabawī* in Medina, and *Masjid al-Aqsā* in Jerusalem.[106]

It marked the genesis of a religiously canonized and morally legitimized dynastic rule of Banū Umayyah despite the state's relative secularism and a lavish lifestyle of the court and aristocracy.[107] In fact, their dynastic rule, undeclared secularism, and subscription to the culture of nobility, which gave birth to an oligarchy, make for an ideal prediction in the words of the Prophet: "For thirty

103 a) "Caliphate" at this point converted into a kingdom i.e. the Umayyad Kingdom after the martyrdom of the fourth Rashidun Caliph 'Ali in 40 AH/CE 661. Ḥasan, his son, dropped resistance and gave in to the Umayyad pressure, renouncing the right to be the fifth elected caliph in the line of the Rashidun. This development, being the first disintegration of the institution of *Khalīfatul Rasūl* and departure from the democratic principles, sealed off the future restitution of the Rashidun Caliphate.

(b) The word "Orthodox" is used here in a different context, which implies the *original* Islam preached by the Prophet Muḥammad. The same word has been employed in the rest of the article to mean the developed type of Islamic theology held canonical by the mainstream.

104 K. A. C. Creswell, *A Short Account of Early Muslim Architecture* (Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1958), 17.

105 Amikam Elad, *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic worship* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 1999), 159.

106 Western historians contend that such accounts cater Umayyad agenda, whereas since *Zuhrī*'s name appear in the *isnād*, it cannot be accepted without reservations. See Brown, *Ḥadīth,* 206.

107 Duncan Black Macdonald, *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence, and Constitutional Theory* (Clark, NJ: The Lawbook Exchange Limited, 2008), 88-89.

years, my people will tread in my path; then will come kings and princes."[108] The hatred that grew in the Muslim world, particularly within major religious centers, against the Umayyads after their founder Mu'āwiyah's insurrection against the authority of 'Alī and the assassination of Ḥussain, the grandson of the Prophet Muḥammad, by Yazīd, the son of Mu'āwiyah, to an extent, brought forth a palpable anti-Umayyad sentiment, especially, in the conservative quarters of Muslims.109 In a reactionary mechanism, this sentiment came to surface in such forged *aḥādīth* as: "If you find Mu'āwiyah on my pulpit, kill him."[110] Such profound hatred was, therefore, to be doctored subtly by employing various theological—rather than military—techniques, especially using the Prophet's name. From the perspective of religious psychology, putting words into the mouth of no other than the Prophet Muḥammad himself was by all means the most effective way to keep the restless subjects in peace.[111]

On the literary front, however, the Umayyads accomplished a great deal without realizing their role of being a catalyst in the fusion of multi-religious ideas and an ensuing religio-cultural syncretism.[112] Mega projects of Greco-Roman literature's translation from Greek and Latin into Arabic were commissioned, which impressed a mark on the subsequent development of *Islam*'s theological thought. The rise of the Mu'tazilah was, for instance, partly a result of Muslim intellectual exposure to the Hellenistic *sophia.*[113] Similarly, the availability of the Jewish and Christian literature, particularly the latter, in the Arabic language to the Muslims of Syria, after the adoption of Arabic as the court and official language, hit Muslims with the feeling of being destitute in knowledge.[114] The presence of John of Damascus, his pupil Theodore Abucara, poet laureate al-*Akhtal,* and other influential Christians at the Umayyad court in high offices, furthermore, posed a challenge to the unwrinkled development of a desert-oriented, unexposed Arabian discourse. On the other hand, the underprivileged sects of Byzantine Christians, also being well-versed in the traditional biblical

108 *The Hartford Seminary Record,* Vol. X, (Hartford, CT: Hartford Seminary Press, 1900), 238.

109 Antony Black, *The History of Islamic Political Thought: From the Prophet to the Present* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2001), 19.

110 Brown, *Ḥadīth,* 206.

111 "(T)he pious community was ready with great credulity to believe anything that they encountered as a traditional saying of the Prophet." Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, 133.

112 The regime would pay the storytellers for the spread of multi-religious and foreign ideas, anecdotes, and legends. See Al-Fadli, *Introduction to Hadith,* 174.

113 George F. Hourani, *Reason and Tradition in Islamic Ethics* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 90.

114 Beeston et al., *Arabic Literature to the End of Umayyad Period*, 142.

history and the (so-called heretical) theologies, emerged as yet another threat to the Muslims' self-revelation and claim to ultimate scriptural knowledge.[115] Muslims, still primitive in their religious growth, found themselves inclined to condone the sectarian milieu of Christianity then extant in and around Arabia for understanding Islam's historical event and its salvific role as the final covenant.[116]

After having dethroned the Umayyads in 132/750, their archrivals and successors, the Abbasids, made no mistake in tracking and curbing as many such traditions as were associated with the Umayyad clan, their rulers, and the Syrian legal tradition.[117] *Ḥadīth* scholars were admitted under the Abbasid patronage and were tasked to confiscate all such reports and schools of legal opinion that had to do with the saddle of Damascus, the rule of Banū Umayyah.[118] The Umayyad principle of propagation was nonetheless kept intact and that it was only the ultimate player at the helm of affairs, namely the religious polity and political authoritarianism, which came to be replaced.[119] While rejecting and demonizing the clan of Banū Umayyah, an ambitious enterprise the new dynasty of the caliphs seated in Iraq had instead undertaken was to seek sanctity and glory for the Banū 'Abbās branch of the greater Banū Hāshim, the clan of the Prophet Muḥammad.[120] It was a move that would shift the paradigm of holiness—the corollary of which was rested in spiritual authority—from west to east, i.e. from Syria to Iraq for the future generations of Muslims.

The *ḥadīth* scholarship under the Abbasids developed and popularized a unique style, especially that of diction and theme, which was unlike their predecessors. The overall texture of the genre was changed and the treatment of

115 Nicholson, *Literary History of the Arabs*, 220-221.

116 John Wansbrough uses the same terminology, sectarian milieu, to address the question of the birth of Islam. He insists that the alleged sectarian background was a causative force in the inception and evolution of Islam (see John Wansbrough, *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History*. London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1978). The argument in this paper, however, seeks to emphasize that the sectarian milieu, which emerged after the Prophet, corrupted the systems of theology and law by injecting the spirit of heresy in the *ḥadīth* interspersed in the oral world of Arabic speaking communities.

117 Banū 'Abbās or the Abbasids were the descendants of rich Qurayshī merchant from the clan of Banū Hāshim named *al-Abbās*, the Prophet Muḥammad's uncle. See Guillaume, *Traditions of Islam,* 37, 58.

118 Fathiddin Beyanouni, *The Noble Ḥadīth in Early Days of Islam: A Critical Study of A Western Approach* (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: International Islamic University Malaysia, 2005), 63.

119 Firas Alkhateeb, *Lost Islamic History: Reclaiming Muslim Civilisation from the Past* (London, England: Hurst & Company, 2014), 72.

120 Khan, *Authentication of Hadith*, 19-20.

ḥadīth, particularly the process of scrutiny, was upheld under different terms.[121] In other words, the *ḥadīth* hagiography in its entirety turned out to be such a religious venture in the Abbasids period that could not, by either religious or secular means, get to the position of becoming bipartisan despite any subversive attempts. It would be equally unfair, however, to conclude that these episodes of dynastic patronages, by both the Umayyads and the Abbasids, served no good purpose altogether. The systematic revival of the *sunnah* under the Abbasids, for instance, deserves, at the very least, to be acknowledged in a context of progression. It is this widespread practice of the *sunnah* that the medieval and present Islamic worlds owe their religious life to, for had the Abbasids neglected to recognize the *sunnah* as a system, the Muslim societies, not unlike the Christian West, would have most probably inherited *Islam* only in theory without a developed understanding of its practice.[122]

VII. *Ḥadīth* in a Post-*Shari'ah* Paradigm

In spite of so much work directed at the study and criticism of *ḥadīth throughout history*, this subject has perpetually been in need of measured scholarly attention. The main question of criticism, however, still remains the same whether the authenticity of all canonical collections can be guaranteed in that they all contain reports reaching back to the Prophet himself. And if there is any degree of certainty in ascertaining fact from forgery, what is the ultimate use of a sterilized *ḥadīth* in a post-ijtihād era? Can Islamic *fiqh* evolve beyond the congealed system of shari'ah from its classical threshold where it was left off by the jurists of the four *madhāhib*? How will *ḥadīth,* after all, contribute to the ethos of Muslim societies within the framework of modernity?

In a historical critical approach within the post-Oriental paradigm, basing off either source-critical or tradition-critical model, the study of *ḥadīth* must shift emphasis from *isnād* to the subject-matter in order to conduct a two-step examination, which will center on determining the possibility and plausibility of a reported statement, story, or event.[123] The chain of guarantors, principally remains subordinate to the subject-matter and nature of the text. Even from an orthodox Islamic perspective, the Qur'an is to be acknowledged as the "standard" (*mizān*) in the laboratory testing of the narrative-substance rather than its

121 For a study of the development of *ḥadīth* studies in the Abbasid period, see Guillaume, "The Abbasid Period," *Traditions of Islam,* chapter 3.

122 Michael Cooperson, *Classical Arabic Biography: The Heirs of the Prophets in the Age of Al-Ma'mūn* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 35.

123 See Fred M. Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writings* (Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press, 1998), 9-18.

received perception. It goes without saying that it is the content of a report that will, ultimately, stand the test of the possibility or impossibility of a narrated situation instead of the quality of *isnād*. In other words, laying unnecessary emphasis on the reputation of each narrator in the *isnād* serves to no decisive purpose in a grand scheme of critical inquiry. Such a methodology of *ḥadīth* criticism, as focuses on the *matn*, is in harmony with the statement of classical Muslim sociologist and historian, ibn Khaldūn. Ibn Khaldūn's principal statement on methodology merits quotation in verbatim. The rule for distinguishing what is true from what is false in history is based on its possibility or impossibility.[124]

Ibn Khaldūn's methodology does not fail as a criterion even against critical Western approach to *ḥadīth* because, due to its scientific nature, it is, at least in theory, free from the pitfalls of blind faith, superstition, and circular deductive reasoning. Secondly, by applying this technique to the criticism of *ḥadīth*, the historicity of the Prophet and other important figures of early Islamic history can scientifically be studied and demythologized amidst their legends that, in the views of Ignác Goldziher and John Wansbrough, are part of a pious myth—remote from actual timeline of history.[125] Goldziher, for instance, cites the analogy of the Talmudic utterances of R. Josua b. Lēvī to divulge the motif that 'anything which a keen witted pupil might teach up to the latest period was as if revealed to Moses himself on Sinai.'[126] This analogy offers a context towards developing an understanding presuming that pious belief in the sanctification of early Islamic history and glorification of *ḥadīth* cannot do a service to the objective of situating Islam in its prophetic context, for what is crucial to a prophetic tradition is, in fact, its inherent reasonableness and character of historical plausibility.[127]

Lack of a rationale to develop such a scientific methodology in the early days of *ḥadīth* collection that ibn Khaldūn imminently came up with caused irreparable damage because the mechanism of intercultural syncretism had accumulated such accretions as pre-Islamic pagan and Judeo-Christian lore and superstition extant in the air of Arabia, Levant, and Persia, which came to form an indistinguishable part of the *ḥadīth* corpus.[128] Such a systematic influx of traditions from the religious "other" for narrative, legal, and exegetical purposes, in fact, paved the way for foreign ideas to creep into the historical writings of the *sīrah*, which, in Henri Lammens' view, represented an outgrowth of the

124 Ibn Khaldūn, *Muqaddima,* in Reynold, *Literary History of the Arab,* 438.

125 Shoemaker, *Death of a Prophet,* 1-3.

126 Goldziher, *Mohammed and Islam*, 50.

127 Felicity Crowe, et al., ed., Islamic Beliefs, Practices, and Cultures (New York, NY: Marshall Cavendish, 2011), 117.

128 Al-Fadli, *Introduction to Hadith,* 174; Beker, *Chosen*, 53, 234.

earlier Qur'anic tafsīr and *ḥadīth* studies.[129] So much complexity in the crucible of evolving religious thought before turning into a dogma speaks of the sectarian religious milieu of the Late Antiquity that Islam happened to emerge in.

The second part of the problem has to do with subjective criticism of *ḥadīth*. Inasmuch as the techniques offered by the celebrated scholars of *ḥadīth* are concerned, major flaws will come to surface once they are tested *a posteriori*. Results are predictable if the mainstay methodologies historically adopted by the *muḥaddithūn* are brought against a standard framework of higher criticism, emulating German critique of the Pentateuch, to propose a "documentary hypothesis" for the problem of *ḥadīth.* These subjective criticisms could have been turned into a standard methodology developed through *ijmā';* "consensus," of the scholars of *ḥadīth* in the period of evolution. However, such a goal was not realized. Outside the circles of orthodoxy, on the contrary, there is—and has always been—a wide range of criticism even within the Muslim community directed at the entire system of *ḥadīth,* which does not always remain a captive of piety and subjectivity.[130]

Now coming towards the conclusion, it may be suggested, above and beyond a reductionist implication, that the criticism of *ḥadīth* needs to be appropriated into two broad classes, *in essentia*. Such a classification can be achieved under a radically new approach exercised through an un-conservative critique of *ḥadīth*. These two classes, for instance, may be called *mu'ḍal*, "problematic,"—or even *mawḍū';* "forged"—and *ṣaḥīḥ,* "authentic," for the convenience of keeping traditional *ḥadīth* terminology intact. All of the subsequent categories, according to the nature of the text or chain of certification, which will individually, or even collectively, establish the principle to conventionally declare an account "authentic," "sound" or "weak," may be classed under the relevant category from the two suggested above. Such a new approach to the *ḥadīth* criticism will equip critics to deal effectively with the complications of methodology as well as problems of materials confronted in the *ḥadīth* studies. Only such impeccable *ḥadīth* reports as pass the test of source and historical criticism ought to be considered *ṣaḥīḥ,* whereas other ranks of *ḥadīth* including various degrees of *ḥasan* and *ḍa'īf,* that which bear a systemic glitch, need to be pushed under the class of *mu'ḍal* for precluding them from defining the

129 Donner, *Narratives of Islamic Origins*, 20-21.
b) For a study of the religious "other," see Ilai Alon, Ithamar Gruenwald, and Itamar Singer, ed., "Concepts of the Other in Near Eastern Religions," *Israel Oriental Studies XIV* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 1994), 11-12.

130 For a comprehensive insight into the Quranist paradigm, see Beyanouni, *Noble Ḥadīth in Early Days of Islam*, 2-3.

standards of the *sunnah* of the Prophet, regulating social and spiritual lifestyles, and adducing precedents within modern legal frameworks of Muslim societies.

Another possible outlet may be proposed to this problem through takhrīj, "extraction," of critically authenticated *aḥādīth* from various compendia of the *sunnī* canon to constitute one authentic encyclopedia of the *ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth* alone. Such an approach, though within conventional parameters, has been effectively demonstrated by a modern Pakistani scholar, Muhammad Tahir-ul-Qadri, in his major work on *ḥadīth, Al-Minhāj al-Sawī min ḥadīth al-Nabawī.*[131] His book contains around 1100 *aḥādīth* that are arranged according to their strength in authenticity and the numbers of narrators involved in the isnād tree. A similar work of the past, *Kitāb al-Shifā bi'l ta'rīf Ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā,* is attributed to Andalusian scholar and justice, Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ ibn Mūsā (d. 544/1149), whereas yet another work of this particular genre is a vastly used *ḥadīth* handbook, *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ.* Such works do not, however, formulate a qualitative standard from a Western academic perspective, where criticism is constructed upon skepticism, which is, in the nature of case, bound to excel such traditional norms of belief and piety as always cared for by the Muslim scholars while extracting materials from the *ṣaḥīḥ* of the canon.

131 Muhammad Tahir-ul-Qadri, who originally hails from Pakistan, is based in Canada. The headquarters of his brainchild organization, *Minhāj al-Qur'ān*, also the publisher of *Al-Minhāj al-Sawī min Ḥadīth al-Nabawī*, are located in Lahore, Pakistan.

Bibliography

Adel, Gholamali Haddad, Mohammad Jafar Elmi, and Hassan Taromi-Rad, eds. *Hadith: An Entry from Encyclopedia of the World of Islam.* London, UK: EWI Press Ltd., 2012.

Alkhateeb, Firas, *Lost Islamic History: Reclaiming Muslim Civilisation from the Past.* London, England: Hurst & Company, 2014.

Alon, Ilai, Ithamar Gruenwald, and Itamar Singer, eds. *Israel Oriental Studies XIV.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 1994.

Alotaibi, Hajed A., *Minors' Crimes in Saudi Arabia: An Analytical Study on the Saudi Juvenile Justice.* Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2020.

Azami, Muhammad Mustafa, *Studies in Hadith Methodology and Literature.* Oak Brook, IL: American Publication Trust, 1992.

Aziz, Aziz Ahmad, *Islamic Modernism in India and Pakistan 1857–1964*. London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Bah, Alpha Mahmoud, *Scientific Research and Scholarly Writing in Islam.* Lincoln, NE: iUniversity Press, 2001.

Bauckham, Richard, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006.

Beeston, A.F.L., T.M. Johnstone, R.B. Serjeant, and G.R. Smith, eds. *Arabic Literature to the End of Umayyad Period*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Berg, Herbert, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam.* Richmond, Surrey: Routledge Curzon, 2000.

Beyanouni, Fathiddin, *The Noble Ḥadīth in Early Days of Islam: A Critical Study of A Western Approach.* Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: International Islamic University Malaysia, 2005.

Black, Antony, *The History of Islamic Political Thought: From the Prophet to the Present.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2001.

Brown, Daniel W., *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Brown, Jonathan A.C., *The Canonization of Al-Bukhārī and Muslim.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2007.

Ḥadīth: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World. Oxford, UK: Oneworld, 2009.

Cooperson, Michael, *Classical Arabic Biography: The Heirs of the Prophets in the Age of Al-Ma'mūn.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Creswell, K. A. C., *A Short Account of Early Muslim Architecture*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1958.

Crowe, Felicity, Jolyon Goddard, Ben Hollingum, Sally MacEachern, and Henry Russell, eds. *Islamic Beliefs, Practices, and Cultures.* New York, NY: Marshall Cavendish, 2011.

Deen, Sayyed M., *Science under Islam: Rise, Decline, and Revival.* Morrisville, NC: Lulu Press, 2010.

Donner, Fred M., *Narratives of Islamic Origins: The Beginnings of Islamic Historical Writings.* Princeton, NJ: The Darwin Press, 1998.

Elad, Amikam, *Medieval Jerusalem and Islamic worship.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 1999.

Emon, Anver M., and Rumee Ahmed, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Law.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2018.

el Fadl, Khaled Abou, *Reasoning with God: Reclaiming Shari'ah in the Modern Age.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.

el Fadl, Khaled Abou & Ahmad Atif Ahmad, and Said Fares Hassan, eds. *Routledge Handbook of Islamic Law.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2019.

al-Fadli, 'Abdal Hadi, *Introduction to Hadith.* Trans. Nazmina Virjee, 2nd Ed. London, UK: ICAS Press, 2011.

Goitein, Shelomo Dov, *Studies in Islamic History and Institutions.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2010.

Goldziher, Ignác, *Mohammed and Islam*. trans. Kate Chambers Seelye. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1917.

Guillaume, Alfred, *Traditions of Islam: An Introduction to the Study of the adīth Literature.* London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1924.

Haddad, Yvonne and Jane I. Smith, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of American Islam.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Hasan, Suhaib, *An Introduction to the Science of Hadith.* Riyadh: Darussalam International Publications, 1996.

Hourani, George F., *Reason and Tradition in Islamic Ethics.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Khallikan, Ibn, *Ibn Khallikan's Biographical Dictionary.* trans. Bn Mac Guckin De Slane. Paris: Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, 1842.

Khan, Israr Ahmad Khan, *Authentication of Hadith: Redefining the Criteria.* Herndon, VA: The International Institute of Islamic Thought, 2010.

Macdonald, Duncan Black, *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence, and Constitutional Theory.* Clark, NJ: The Lawbook Exchange Limited, 2008.

Melchert, Christopher, *The Formation of the Sunni Schools of Law: 9th-10th Centuries C.E.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 1997.

Hadith, Piety, and Law: Selected Studies. Atlanta, GA: Lockwood Press, 2015.

Musa, Aisha Y., *Hadith as Scripture: Discussions on the Authority of Prophetic Traditions in Islam.* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Nāsirī, Alī, *An Introduction to adīth: History and Sources.* trans. Mansoor Limba. London, UK: MIU Press, 2013.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein, Caner K. Dagli, Maria Massi Dakake, and Joseph Lumbard, eds. *The Study Quran.* New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers, 2015.

Nicholson, Reynold A., *A Literary History of the Arabs.* New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Rizvi, Sayyid Saeed Akhtar, *The Qur'ān and Hadith.* Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Bilal Muslim Mission of Tanzania.

Robinson, Chase F., *Islamic Historiography.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Schacht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence.* London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Senturk, Recep, *Narrative Social Structure: Anatomy of the Hadith Transmission Network, 610-1505.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Shah, Niaz A, *Islamic Law and the Law of Armed Conflict.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.

Shanavas, T.O., *Creation And/Or Evolution: An Islamic Perspective.* Bloomington, IN: Xlibris Publication, 2005.

Shanks, Monte Allen, *Papias and the New Testament.* Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013.

Shoemaker, Stephen J., *The Death of a Prophet: The End of Muhammad's Life and the Beginnings of Islam.* Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Ṣiddīqī, Muḥammad Zubayr, *Ḥadīth Literature: Its Origin, Development & Special Features.* Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 1993.

Ullah, Qazi Fazl, *Science of Hadith.* Dallas, TX: Hund Publishing, 2015.

Usmani, Muhammad Taqi, *Authority of Sunnah.* Karachi, Pakistan: Idaratul Quran wal Uloomil Islamia, 2004.

Waardenburg, Jacques, ed. *Muslim Perceptions of Other Religions: A Historical Survey.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Wansbrough, John, *The Sectarian Milieu: Content and Composition of Islamic Salvation History*. London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Yanagihashi, Hiroyuki, *A History of the Early Islamic Law of Property.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2004.

ed. *Studies in Legal Hadith.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill, 2019.

Zayd, Naṣr Ḥāmid Abū, *Reformation of Islamic Thought: A Critical Historical Analysis.* Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

The Hartford Seminary Record, Vol. X. Hartford, CT: Hartford Seminary Press, 1900.