پژوهش‌نامه علوم حدیث تطبیقی
شاپا الکترونیکی: ۲۶۷۶-۶۸۹۲
شاپا چاپی: ۲۶۷۶-۵۲۹۲
https://pht.journals.miu.ac.ir/Home page

تبیین وضع و جعل حدیث: ارزیابی و نقد رویکرد رسلان

امیر جودوی[۱] ✉ و علی تولایی[۲] و محبوبه جعفری ندوشن[۳]

۱. نویسنده مسئول، دانشیارگروه الهیات ومعارف اسلامی، رشته علوم قرآن و حدیث، دانشکده ادبیات وعلوم انسانی،دانشگاه یزد، یزد، ایران، رایانامه: Amirjoudavi@yazd.ac.ir

۲. دانشیارگروه الهیات ومعارف اسلامی، گرایش فقه وحقوق، دانشکده ادبیات وعلوم انسانی، دانشگاه یزد، یزد، ایران، رایانامه: tavallaei@yazd.ac.ir

۳. دانشجوی دکتری رشته تفسیر تطبیقی، گروه الهیات، گرایش علوم قرآن وحدیث، دانشکده ادبیات وعلوم انسانی، دانشگاه یزد، یزد، ایران، رایانامه: mah.jafari@stu.yazd.ac.ir

اطلاعات مقاله

نوع مقاله:
مقاله پژوهشی

تاریخ دریافت:
۱۴۰۳/۱۲/۲۵
تاریخ بازنگری:
۱۴۰۴/۰۱/۲۶
تاریخ پذیرش:
۱۴۰۴/۰۲/۱۷
تاریخ انتشار:
۱۴۰۴/۰۳/۲۷

کلیدواژه‌ها:
جعل حدیث،
رسلان،
وضع در حدیث،
تعارض متنی،
دانش‌های مکمل نقد حدیث.

چکیده

هدف: این پژوهش با هدف ارزیابی و نقد روش‌شناختی دیدگاه‌های ابوعبدالله محمد بن سعید رسلان در کتاب «الوضع فی الحدیث و جهود العلماء فی مواجهته» در تبیین پدیده جعل و وضع حدیث انجام شده است.

روش پژوهش: این مطالعه با بهره‌گیری از روش توصیفی-تحلیلی و بر پایه یک الگوی سه مرحله‌ای نقد (۱. تدوین چارچوب مطلوب و آرمانی، ۲. ارائه رویکرد مؤلف، و ۳. مقایسه عملکرد مؤلف با الگوی مطلوب) به واکاوی اثربخشی اثر رسلان می‌پردازد.

یافته‌ها: نقاط قوت برجسته اثر رسلان عبارت‌اند از: بررسی جامع مراحل تاریخی جعل و گردآوری گسترده دیدگاه‌های علمای متقدم. در مقابل، کاستی‌های کار وی شامل موارد زیر است: ارائه نمونه‌های محدود برای تعریف حدیث موضوع، تأخیر در تعیین زمان آغاز جعل به دلیل پذیرش مطلق قاعده «عدالت صحابه»، محدود ساختن انگیزه‌های جعل به عناوین محدود، ضعف در نقد متنی بیرونی، و بررسی شتاب‌زده و بدون مثال از تعارضات حدیث با قرآن.

نتیجه‌گیری: اگرچه اثر رسلان در گردآوری و گزارش دیدگاه‌های علمای متقدم پیرامون پدیده جعل موفق بوده است، اما به دلیل محدودیت‌های روش‌شناختی و تحلیل نظری، در ارزیابی سیر تاریخی، انگیزه شناسی و نقد متنی احادیث مجعول دچار کاستی‌های جدی است.

استناد: جودوی، امیر؛ و تولایی، علی؛ و جعفری ندوشن، محبوبه (۱۴۰۵). تبیین وضع و جعل حدیث: ارزیابی و نقد رویکرد رسلان. علوم حدیث تطبیقی، ۱۳ (۲۴)، ۲۰۹-۲۳۴.

ناشر: جامعة المصطفی العالمیة.

© نویسندگان.

Comparative Hadith Sciences
https://pht.journals.miu.ac.ir/Home page
ISSN (P): 2676-5292
ISSN (O): 2676-6892

Explaining Forgery in Hadith: A Critical Appraisal of Raṣlān's Approach

Amir Joudavi[1]✉, and Ali Tavallaei [2], and Mahboobeh Jafari Nodoushan[3]

1. Corresponding Author, Associate Professor, Department of Theology and Islamic Studies/Department of Quran and Hadith Sciences-Faculty of Literature and Humanities-Yazd University-Yazd -Iran. Email: Amirjoudavi@yazd.ac.ir
2. Associate Professor, Department of Theology and Islamic Studies/ Department Jurisprudence and Law Orientation - Faculty of Literature and Humanities - Yazd University - Yazd - Iran. Email: tavallaei@yazd.ac.ir
3. PhD student in Comparative Interpretation, Department of Theology/Orientation of Quranic and Hadith Sciences, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran: mah.jafari@stu.yazd.ac.ir

Article Info

Article type:
Research Article

Article history:
Received:
14 March 2025
Received in revised form:
12 April 2025
Accepted:
5 May 2025
Available online:
19 June 2025

Keywords:
Hadith forgery; Raṣlān; Fabrication in hadith; Textual contradiction; Supplementary knowledge for hadith criticism.

ABSTRACT

Objective: This study aims to critically evaluate the methodological framework proposed by Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd Raṣlān in his book *al-Waḍʿ fī al-Ḥadīth wa-Juhūd al-ʿUlamāʾ fī Muwājahatih* for explaining and analyzing the phenomenon of hadith forgery.

Methodology: The research employs a descriptive-analytical approach combined with a tripartite critical model: (1) establishing a normative ideal framework for hadith forgery analysis, (2) presenting Raṣlān's methodology, and (3) comparing his performance against the normative ideal.

Findings: The study identifies major strengths in Raṣlān's work, including a detailed examination of the historical phases of forgery and an extensive synthesis of classical scholarly perspectives. However, key limitations are also revealed: insufficient exemplification of definitions, a delayed timeline for the onset of forgery due to the doctrine of the probity of the Companions (*ʿadālat al-ṣaḥāba*), a narrow categorization of motives, inadequate external textual criticism, and a superficial treatment of hadith-Qur'an contradictions without concrete examples.

Conclusion: While Raṣlān provides a comprehensive survey of classical scholarship on hadith fabrication, his framework exhibits theoretical and methodological limitations that weaken its analytical depth regarding the historical chronology, motives, and textual criticism of forged traditions.

Cite this article: Joudavi, A.; & Tavallaei, A.; & Jafari Nodoushan, M. (2026). Explaining Forgery in Hadith: A Critical Appraisal of Raṣlān's Approach. *Comparative Hadith Sciences,* 13 (24), 209-234.

© The Author(s).
Publisher: Al-Mustafa International University.

1. Introduction

In classical Arabic lexicons, *waḍʿ* denotes the act of putting something down or lowering it, while *wāḍiʿ* refers to something or someone of low status. The verbal noun *waḍʿ* also conveys the meanings of fabrication and contrivance. In this sense, the concept of fabricated Ḥadīth can be related to its lexical meaning in several respects. A fabricated Ḥadīth is a report that lacks an external reality and, like something contrived or artificially constructed, consists of words that have been falsely attributed to their supposed source.

For this reason, fabricated Ḥadīth is regarded as the weakest category of weak Ḥadīth and occupies the lowest level of credibility. The definitions provided by Ḥadīth scholars are generally similar. Fabricated Ḥadīth refers to a false and invented report deliberately produced by a fabricator. It should be distinguished from a report narrated by a liar, since a liar may, on occasion, tell the truth (Falāteh, 1397 AH, 1:107; Qāsimī, 1380 AH, 150; Abū Rayyah, 1975, 92; ʿAjjāj al-Khaṭīb, 1391 AH, 415).

Method and Statement of the Problem

Since the present article examines Raṣlān's treatment and presentation of the subject in his book *al-Waḍʿ fī al-Ḥadīth wa-Juhūd al-ʿUlamāʾ fī Muwājahatihi*, the study first evaluates the formal structure of the work and then examines its content, identifying its strengths and weaknesses. Accordingly, the principal research question is: What are the strengths and weaknesses of Raṣlān's book *al-Waḍʿ fī al-Ḥadīth wa-Juhūd al-ʿUlamāʾ fī Muwājahatihi* with regard to both its formal structure and its content?

In evaluating Raṣlān's approach, it is necessary to establish an appropriate model or criterion against which his treatment can be assessed. Two methods are employed for establishing this model:

1. Independent analytical judgment: determining the criteria of evaluation and measurement independently of Ḥadīth sources and related works.

2. Critical examination of existing works: examining relevant literature and deriving an appropriate model from it.

After examining, classifying, and organizing the principal and subsidiary themes addressed by Ḥadīth scholars, five stages can be identified in their treatment of the phenomenon of Ḥadīth fabrication:

A) Lexical and terminological definition of fabricated Ḥadīth. Most Ḥadīth scholars first discuss the lexical meaning of *waḍʿ* and subsequently explain the technical meaning of fabricated Ḥadīth.

B) The history of the emergence of Ḥadīth fabrication. The question of when Ḥadīth fabrication first emerged is an important issue in the history of Ḥadīth. Although Ḥadīth scholars hold different views on this matter, the majority of specialists in the study of fabricated Ḥadīth have addressed the historical origins of its emergence.

C) The causes and motives for fabricating Ḥadīth. One of the important issues in the study of fabricated Ḥadīth is identifying the causes and motives underlying this undesirable phenomenon. Although Ḥadīth scholars agree on the occurrence of Ḥadīth fabrication as a general phenomenon, they do not share the same view regarding its specific causes and motives.

D) Methods of fabricating Ḥadīth. A number of Ḥadīth scholars have identified and classified various methods by which Ḥadīth reports were fabricated.

E) Identifying fabricated Ḥadīth. Definitively identifying fabricated Ḥadīth is difficult. Fabricated reports may be identified through both their chains of transmission (*isnād*) and their textual content (*matn*). The authors of works on the sciences of Ḥadīth differ in their views concerning the criteria for distinguishing fabricated reports. Among the principal methods of identifying fabrication through the chain of transmission are the narrator's explicit confession to having fabricated a Ḥadīth and evidence that is regarded as equivalent to such a confession.

Another means of distinguishing authentic Ḥadīth from fabricated reports is to examine the content of the Ḥadīth and assess it according to accepted criteria. Textual criticism of Ḥadīth independently of its chain of transmission has a long history. One of the foremost criteria employed in such criticism is comparing the Ḥadīth with the Qurʾan. This constitutes one of the means of identifying fabricated Ḥadīth.

On the basis of the practices of Ḥadīth scholars and the findings outlined above, five stages can therefore be used to evaluate their method of explaining and examining Ḥadīth fabrication:

1. the definition of fabricated Ḥadīth;
2. the history of Ḥadīth fabrication;
3. the motives for fabricating Ḥadīth;
4. the forms or methods of fabricating Ḥadīth; and
5. the identification of fabricated Ḥadīth.

In examining Raṣlān's treatment of the subject, two analytical axes are employed:

1. Examining the general structure and interrelationship of the issues;
2. Examining each stage independently.

In general, a comprehensive framework is used to examine the logical relationship among the issues. At this stage, the accuracy or correctness of individual issues is not the primary concern. Rather, the purpose is to obtain an overall view of the author's treatment and avoid becoming immersed in the details of the content. This is important because one of the fundamental shortcomings of a written work may lie in its overall structure (Barūmand, 1384 SH, 47).

An ideal structure is one in which all the issues discussed are arranged in a logical sequence. Although, under the second analytical axis, each issue is evaluated independently, the same principle continues to apply on a smaller scale. That is, when each component constitutes a coherent unit in itself, its constituent elements should likewise be arranged logically, allowing what has been presented to be compared with what ought to have been presented.

1.1. Examining the General Structure and the Interrelationship of the Stages

The components considered in evaluating the general structure of the book, in addition to the sequence of the five stages outlined above, include the following:

1. The absence of unnecessary additions in this field;
2. The absence of displacement or reversal of the stages; and
3. The absence of dispersion, fragmentation, and repetition among the stages.

These criteria are also applicable to the manner in which some of the stages are presented in different works (Barūmand, 1384 SH, 51, 56).

1.1.1. Positive Points

The author follows the five-stage model outlined above. First, he addresses the definition of fabricated Ḥadīth. Second, he discusses the history of Ḥadīth fabrication. Third, he examines the motives for fabricating Ḥadīth. Fourth, he addresses the forms or methods of Ḥadīth fabrication. Finally, he discusses the identification of fabricated Ḥadīth. In this respect, the author's treatment is consistent with the proposed model and may therefore be regarded as positive. The additional material included in the work either does not play a significant role in explaining Ḥadīth fabrication, can be incorporated into one of the five stages, or constitutes part of the preliminary discussion.

1.2. Examining Each Stage Independently

1.2.1. The Author's Position on the Definition of Fabricated Ḥadīth

Lexicographers have identified several meanings for *waḍʿ*, including lowering, throwing or casting, and placing or attaching something. It also conveys the meanings of lowering and bringing down, as opposed to raising and elevating. The term is used in the Qurʾanic verses in these senses. It may be argued that the four lexical meanings mentioned above correspond, in different respects, to the technical meaning of Ḥadīth fabrication.

A review of the existing literature on the definition of fabricated Ḥadīth leads to the following general understanding: fabricated Ḥadīth is a report consisting of false words, actions, or interpretations that have been attributed to the Infallibles (ʿa.s) (Masʿūdī, 1388 SH, 6).

The definition adopted by Sunni Ḥadīth scholars does not fundamentally differ from this understanding. They likewise regard fabricated Ḥadīth as a report that has been invented and falsely attributed to its purported source. The difference concerns primarily the persons to whom such false reports are attributed and the scope of the attribution. Shiʿi scholars regard reports falsely attributed to the Prophet (PBUHH) and the Twelve Imams as examples of fabricated Ḥadīth. Sunni scholars, however, have generally restricted the scope of this concept and do not apply it in the same manner to reports attributed to the Companions and their Followers. Accordingly, fabricated Ḥadīth consists of words, actions, and reports that have been falsely attributed to an Infallible, regardless of whether the narrator intended to play a role in constructing the content of the report (Masʿūdī, 1388 SH, 6).

Raṣlān first discusses the lexical meaning of *waḍʿ* and then defines fabricated Ḥadīth as a report produced by liars and improperly attributed to the Prophet (PBUHH) (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 14).

Since a proper definition of a category requires both a genus and a differentia, Raṣlān's definition does not constitute a complete definition because it lacks a clear genus. Moreover, he restricts his definition of fabricated Ḥadīth to speech and consequently excludes actions and reports from its scope. In addition, he limits false attribution to the Prophet (PBUHH) and does not include the Companions or the Ahl al-Bayt in the scope of the definition.

1.2.2. Examining the Author's Position on the History of Fabricated Ḥadīth

Sunni and Shiʿi scholars do not agree on when the phenomenon of lying in Ḥadīth first emerged. This disagreement is attributable to the absence of explicit textual evidence and conclusive historical proof. Nevertheless, a common element among these views is the emergence of fabricated Ḥadīth during the first century AH and its subsequent expansion in later periods.

According to one view, Ḥadīth fabrication began during the lifetime of the Messenger of God (PBUHH) and became more widespread after his death. Others maintain that neither lying nor fabrication of Ḥadīth occurred during the Prophet's lifetime and argue that, during the caliphate of the first four caliphs, the Companions would not have dared to fabricate Ḥadīth. The following arguments have been advanced in support of this view:

1. the integrity of the Companions and their fear of God;
2. the perceived distance of the Companions from fabricating Ḥadīth; and
3. the absence of historical evidence establishing such fabrication (Dr. Rafīʿī, 1390 SH, 24–31).

The Prophet's concern regarding the fabrication of Ḥadīth during his lifetime, together with his awareness that false reports would be attributed to him, led him to provide Muslims and the Companions with a criterion by which authentic reports could be distinguished from fabricated ones. This criterion was the Qurʾan. Despite historical evidence concerning Ḥadīth fabrication, differences in the status of the Companions, and the presence among them of individuals of weak faith, hypocrites, and opportunists, it cannot be ruled out that some may have engaged in lying.

There are historically documented reports indicating that some Companions lied. Although the Qurʾan does not directly address the phenomenon of Ḥadīth fabrication, certain verses have been used in discussions of this issue, particularly in relation to individuals who spread false information and attributed lies to the Prophet (PBUHH). Among the relevant evidence is the revelation of Sūrat al-Munāfiqūn and verses such as: *"O you who believe, do not betray Allah and the Messenger or betray your trusts knowingly."*

Reasons for Fabricating Ḥadīth during the Lifetime of the Prophet (PBUH)

A) The well-known prophetic tradition: *"Whoever deliberately lies about me, let him take his seat in the Fire."* The history of Ḥadīth fabrication, according to this view, dates back to the lifetime of the Prophet (PBUHH). Hypocrites and opportunists entered the Muslim community and exploited Ḥadīth by attributing statements to the Prophet of Islam (PBUHH) in pursuit of their own interests and desires. Although relatively few such cases have been identified in the historical record of Ḥadīth, the Prophet (PBUHH) stated: *"False reports attributed to me have become numerous; whoever deliberately lies about me, let him take his seat in the Fire."*

Imam ʿAli (AS) is reported to have cited this tradition as evidence for the existence of fabrication from the time of the Prophet (PBUHH).

B) Numerous narrations from the Infallible Imams concerning the danger of fabrication and the emergence of fabricators: Numerous narrations from the Infallible Imams address the danger of Ḥadīth fabrication and the activities of fabricators. A tradition attributed to Imam al-Ṣādiq (AS), stating that the Ahl al-Bayt (AS) had continually suffered from the falsehood

of others and that even the Prophet (PBUHH) was not safe from the lies and slanders of others, is presented as further evidence that fabrication began during the first decade of the Islamic era.

Accordingly, the claim made by some contemporary scholars that the Companions were uniformly upright, and that anyone who saw and understood the Prophet (PBUHH) should be regarded as righteous and incapable of lying, is not acceptable from this perspective, although the attribution of such a claim does not necessarily constitute a major falsehood (Masʿūdī, 1394 SH, 26).

Historical accounts of Islam also report instances in which false claims were improperly attributed to the Prophet (PBUHH) in pursuit of personal interests. These cases, however, did not necessarily involve the transmission of a fabricated Ḥadīth; rather, they involved falsely claiming to have been commissioned by the Messenger of God (PBUHH) in order to obtain personal benefits.

ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Ḥārith relates that a man fell in love with a woman from the people of Qubāʾ but was unable to marry her. He therefore went to the market, purchased clothing resembling the garments presented as gifts by the Prophet (PBUHH), and wore them. He then went to the woman's family and introduced himself as a messenger of the Prophet (PBUHH), claiming that the Prophet (PBUHH) had given him this garment and authorized him to marry their daughter. One of them responded that, based on their knowledge of the Prophet (PBUHH), he prohibited such conduct and asked how such an instruction could have been issued. Two men were subsequently sent to the Prophet (PBUHH) to inquire about the matter. Upon hearing the report, the Prophet (PBUHH) became angry, and blood was seen on his face. He stated: *"Whoever deliberately lies about me, let him take his place in the Fire."* The Prophet (PBUHH) then ordered that the man be punished; however, before this could be carried out, a snake bit him and killed him.

Based on the foregoing discussion and the aforementioned tradition, although there are different views concerning the precise beginning of Ḥadīth fabrication, some scholars—including Raṣlān—maintain that fabrication began before the sedition of ʿUthmān and that the fabrication of Ḥadīth itself was among the factors that contributed to provoking the sedition.

ʿAbd Allāh ibn Sabaʾ, who is reported to have converted to Islam during the caliphate of ʿUthmān, is regarded in this account as having played a role in the killing of ʿUthmān. Nevertheless, the emergence of Ḥadīth fabrication is placed at approximately 40 AH.

Raṣlān first presents the views of other Sunni scholars, apparently in accordance with his view that the caliphs served as custodians of Ḥadīth. He places the emergence of Ḥadīth fabrication in the period of disputes between Imam ʿAli (AS) and Muʿāwiyah. According to this account, if the collection of the Muṣḥaf without the inclusion of narrations and the burning of copies of narrations took place during the caliphate of the first caliph, the order to refrain from transmitting and quoting narrations, together with the imprisonment of Companions who transmitted Ḥadīth, occurred under the second caliph.

1.2.3. Criticism and Examination of the Author's Position on the Motives for Ḥadīth Fabrication

Ḥadīth fabrication is a reprehensible phenomenon that has occurred within Islamic society, undoubtedly with the intention of achieving particular benefits or objectives. These objectives constitute the motives underlying fabrication. Identifying such motives and uncovering the purposes behind fabrication can assist in recognizing fabricated Ḥadīths and tracing other reports of a similar nature. It can also help prevent the authenticity of genuine Ḥadīths from being questioned merely because of particular historical or contextual circumstances.

Among the motives identified by Ḥadīth scholars, political motives occupy a particularly prominent position. The prioritization of political motives over other motives is attributable not only to the breadth and depth of their influence but also to the large number and variety of fabricated Ḥadīths produced for political purposes. Examples include reports fabricated by the Umayyads and Abbasids to consolidate their rule and justify illegitimate conduct, which had a profound impact on the lives of Muslims.

The extent of politically motivated fabrication suggests that the phenomenon extended beyond the rulers themselves. Scholars who were affiliated with governments and court scholars appear to have played a significant role in this process. The rulers of various governments recognized that one of the most effective means of subjugating believers was to employ religion as an instrument in shaping their beliefs and manipulating the principal sources of religion. Direct textual distortion of the Qurʾan, the most important written source of Islam, was difficult because the Qurʾan had been repeatedly written, recited, and preserved. Consequently, Ḥadīth became an important means through which attempts could be made to influence the second source of religion, although this group did not entirely abandon the Qurʾan and also sought to distort its meaning.

A second category consists of reports fabricated in connection with religion and culture. According to this classification, some fabricated Ḥadīths were attributed to Magians and Jewish extremists who had apparently converted to Islam with the intention of undermining the religion of Islam. For example, the Magians are described as having attributed irrational statements to the Prophet (PBUH) in an attempt to undermine the foundations of religion and spread atheistic ideas by damaging the fundamental beliefs of Muslims. This was an issue that the governments of the period could not apparently ignore. Most of this activity is associated with the period of Muʿāwiyah. During the interval between the decline of Umayyad rule and the rise of the Abbasids, the Magians are likewise reported to have fabricated Ḥadīths, although they apparently achieved limited success.

Exaggeration concerning the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt (AS), together with the belief that the knowledge of the Imams could replace religious duties and obligations, led some individuals toward *ghulūw* (extremism). Followers of certain jurisprudential and theological schools also fabricated Ḥadīths in order to preserve their positions and exclude their rivals. Because such reports could become widely disseminated, their dangers and harmful consequences were considerably greater.

A third category of motives concerns the personal and sensual interests of the fabricator, which may be classified under material motives. Some fabricators produced Ḥadīths in order to preserve their personal standing with rulers or to prevail in personal disputes. Numerous reports that explicitly praise or severely condemn a particular race, language, or geographical region have consequently been suspected of fabrication. Desire for wealth and material prosperity also led some worldly individuals to fabricate Ḥadīths. In addition, some naïve and uninformed individuals fabricated Ḥadīths in an attempt to encourage people to perform good deeds and subsequently incorporated such reports into the transmitted tradition (Masʿūdī, 1388 SH, 30–40; Falāteh, 1397 AH, 1:218; Qāsimī, 1380 AH, 151; Abū Rayyah, 1975, 94; ʿAjjāj al-Khaṭīb, 1391 AH, 417).

According to Raṣlān, religion was originally one until hostility, fanaticism, and sectarianism emerged among Muslims and divided them into different groups. In order to support their respective sects and opinions, these groups resorted to fabricating Ḥadīths. Raṣlān identifies a number of motives for such fabrication, including the following:

1. Promoting opinions without regard for the Qurʾan and Sunnah

According to Raṣlān, the Shiʿa have fabricated Ḥadīths against the Prophet (PBUHH) since an early period and for various reasons. Sometimes such reports were fabricated concerning the *manāqib* (virtues) and merits of Imam ʿAli (AS) and the Ahl al-Bayt (AS), and at other times they concerned the merits of the first two caliphs and Muʿāwiyah. Raṣlān states that the Rāfiḍah are particularly well known among the Shiʿa for extensive fabrication and that they have long been associated with lying. He further attributes to Ibn Taymiyyah the view that scholars regard the Rāfiḍah as the most mendacious group and that their practice of lying has a long history recognized by Muslims (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 28–40).

2. Apostasy and disbelief

Raṣlān identifies apostates—those who do not believe in God and the Hereafter—as another group associated with Ḥadīth fabrication. Ibn Ḥibbān states that heretics profess disbelief and do not believe in God or the Day of Judgment. According to this account, such individuals entered cities, presented themselves as people of knowledge and virtue, fabricated Ḥadīths, and transmitted them. They harbored doubts that led both themselves and others astray, while people of authority transmitted their reports.

According to this argument, although the Qurʾan contains no falsehood and was transmitted continuously from one generation to another without addition or omission, the same cannot be said of the Ḥadīth tradition. Although Muslims required the Ḥadīth, some individuals deliberately manipulated and distorted it in order to confuse Muslims concerning their beliefs and religion.

One of the individuals cited in this context is ʿAbd al-Karīm ibn Abī al-ʿAwjāʾ. Al-Dhahabī is reported to have identified him as the uncle of Maʿn ibn Zāʾidah and as an extreme heretic. Abū Aḥmad al-Bandādī relates that when Ibn Abī al-ʿAwjāʾ was executed, he stated that he had fabricated 4,000 Ḥadīths in which he had declared lawful what was unlawful and unlawful what was lawful. Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-ʿAbbāsī, the governor of Basra, subsequently executed him (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 41–45).

3. Storytellers (*quṣṣāṣ*)

In the language of Islamic law, a storyteller (*qāṣṣ*) is a person who relates accounts concerning events that occurred in the past. Storytelling consists of conveying reports about past events. Preaching, however, differs from

storytelling: preaching is intended to soften the heart. Storytelling and preaching are not inherently objectionable; nevertheless, many accounts that conflicted with the Sharīʿa were transmitted by storytellers. Despite their good intentions, storytellers consequently became subject to criticism and disparagement.

Ibn al-Jawzī states that the greatest calamity in the fabrication of Ḥadīth arose from storytellers who intended to soften people's hearts through such reports. They sought reports that would be appealing and profitable, while paying less attention to authentic collections. Ibn al-Jawzī considers Tamīm al-Dārī to have been the first person to initiate storytelling, doing so during the time of ʿUmar and with his permission. Al-Suyūṭī likewise reports this account from al-Ṭabarānī, who transmitted it through a chain of transmission from ʿAmr ibn Dīnār. According to this report, Tamīm al-Dārī asked ʿUmar for permission to tell stories, but ʿUmar initially refused. Tamīm asked again, and ʿUmar again refused. When Tamīm asked a third time, ʿUmar warned him that if he did so, he would be killed. Al-Haythamī also relates this account. Raṣlān cites Ibn al-Jawzī as transmitting particularly unusual accounts from ʿĀmir al-Shaʿbī (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 45–50).

4. The desire of ignorant ascetics and worshippers to encourage people toward religion

According to Raṣlān, the desire of some ignorant ascetics and worshippers to encourage people toward religious practice constituted another motive for fabricating Ḥadīths. In his view, this group caused particularly serious harm to religion because people tend to view ascetic and devout individuals favorably. Consequently, they did not suspect them of fabrication and readily transmitted the reports they produced.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ states that fabricators of Ḥadīth belong to different categories and that the most harmful among them are those associated with asceticism. Such individuals fabricated Ḥadīths for their own purposes, and people consequently accepted their reports with confidence.

Shaykh Aḥmad Shākir likewise states that the worst and largest group of fabricators consisted of individuals known for asceticism and mysticism whose purpose was to encourage people to perform good deeds, avoid sins, and seek divine reward. According to this account, however, their actions were themselves unrighteous and corrupt.

One of the individuals cited as an example is Ghulām Khalīl Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ghālib al-Bāhilī. He was known for his asceticism and austerity, reportedly subsisting only on beans and grains, and was known as

the ascetic of Baghdad. Abū Dāwūd is reported to have expressed concern that he was the Antichrist of Baghdad. He possessed considerable knowledge and was reportedly capable of answering questions on numerous subjects. He died in Rajab in 275 AH, and the markets of Baghdad were reportedly closed following his death. His coffin was subsequently taken to Basra for burial. Nevertheless, he was accused of extensive Ḥadīth fabrication.

In addition to fabricating Ḥadīths concerning the virtues of the Qurʾan, such ignorant individuals fabricated reports concerning other acts of worship in order to encourage people toward religious practice. One example cited is the following report: *"Whoever performs the dawn prayer in congregation, it is as though he has performed fifty pilgrimages with Adam."*

According to Raṣlān, this group of fabricators claimed that they did not lie except by fabricating Ḥadīths in support of the Sharīʿa and that they did not attribute falsehood to God. However, they could not attribute to the Prophet (PBUHH) something that he had not said, because doing so would constitute lying about God (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 55–66).

5. Partisanship and fanaticism

Raṣlān identifies fanaticism and partisan bias as another factor contributing to Ḥadīth fabrication. Such bias could take the form of partisanship toward a particular imam or toward a particular geographical region.

An example of partisan bias toward an imam is the report concerning Muḥammad ibn Idrīs, described in the cited material as being more dangerous than Satan, in contrast to the report praising Abū Ḥanīfah as the beacon of the community.

Geographical partisanship is illustrated by the following report: "Giza is a garden among the gardens of Paradise, and Egypt is among the treasures of God on earth" (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 67–71).

6. Flattery of kings and rulers

Another motive identified by Raṣlān is the desire to flatter kings and rulers. According to him, some unscrupulous scholars preferred worldly interests to the Hereafter and approached kings, princes, and caliphs with false legal opinions and fabricated statements attributed to the Sharīʿa. They thus dared to lie about the Messenger of God in order to satisfy personal desires and advance political objectives.

Raṣlān cites the example of the fabricator Ghiyāth ibn Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī al-Kūfī. According to the account attributed to Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn, a leading

authority in *jarḥ wa-taʿdīl*, Ghiyāth visited the caliph al-Mahdī, who was fond of pigeons and engaged in pigeon racing. When a pigeon was brought before him, Ghiyāth stated that so-and-so had related to him from the Prophet (PBUHH): *"I only race with pigeons."* Al-Mahdī ordered that Ghiyāth be rewarded. When Ghiyāth rose to leave, however, al-Mahdī stated that he bore witness that Ghiyāth had lied about the Messenger of God. Al-Mahdī then ordered that the pigeons be slaughtered (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 72–75).

7. Other motives

Raṣlān also mentions other motives, including medical claims and a number of miscellaneous motives that cannot readily be incorporated into the preceding categories. Among these are the fabrication of Ḥadīths for the purpose of promoting the sale of goods, such as the reports: *"Eggplant is a cure for every disease" and "Lentils were sanctified through the language of seventy prophets."*

Fabricated Ḥadīths were also sometimes employed to defeat an opponent or take revenge against a particular group. For example, Ibn Ḥibbān, in *al-Majrūḥīn*, relates from Sayf ibn ʿUmar that they were with Saʿd ibn Ṭarīf al-Iskāfī when his son came to him crying. Saʿd asked him what had happened. The boy replied that his teacher had beaten him. Saʿd then swore that he would disgrace them. ʿIkrimah related to him from Ibn ʿAbbās that the Messenger of God (PBUHH) had said: *"The teachers of your children are the worst of them, the least kind to orphans, and the most cruel to the poor"* (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 75–76).

4. The Desire of Ignorant Ascetics and Worshippers to Encourage People toward Religion

Another motive for Ḥadīth fabrication was the desire of some ignorant ascetics and worshippers to encourage people to practice religion. According to Raṣlān, this group of fabricators caused particularly serious harm to religion because people tend to trust those known for asceticism and devotion. Consequently, they were less likely to suspect them of fabrication and would readily disseminate the reports they fabricated.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ states: "The fabricators of Ḥadīth are of various types, and the most harmful among them are those associated with asceticism. They fabricated Ḥadīths for their own purposes; therefore, people accepted their reports with confidence."

Shaykh Aḥmad Shākir likewise states: "The worst and largest group of fabricators consists of those known for asceticism and mysticism, whose purpose is to encourage people to perform good deeds, refrain from sins, and seek divine reward. This was their assumption, although their actions were unrighteous and corrupt."

One such fabricator was Ghulām Khalīl, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ghālib al-Bāhilī. He was an ascetic and austere man whose diet consisted only of beans and grains, and he became known as the ascetic of Baghdad. Abū Dāwūd is reported to have said: *"I fear that he is the Antichrist of Baghdad."* He possessed considerable knowledge and was reportedly able to answer every question. He died in Rajab 275 AH, and the markets of Baghdad were closed because of his death. His coffin was taken to Baṣra for burial. Despite his reputation for asceticism, however, he was a prolific fabricator of Ḥadīths and was described as a liar with a harsh countenance.

In addition to fabricating Ḥadīths concerning the virtues of the Qurʾan, such ignorant individuals fabricated reports about other acts of worship in order to encourage people toward religious practice. An example is the following report: *"Whoever performs the dawn prayer in congregation is as though he has performed fifty pilgrimages with Adam."*

According to Raṣlān, members of this group justified their conduct by claiming that they did not lie except by fabricating a Ḥadīth intended to confirm the Sharīʿah, and that they did not attribute a lie to God. They nevertheless failed to recognize that attributing to the Prophet (PBUHH) something he had not said constitutes a lie against God (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 55–66).

5. Partisanship and Fanaticism

Partisanship and fanaticism also played a role in the fabrication of Ḥadīths. Such bias could take the form of partisanship toward a particular imam or toward a particular region or land.

An example of bias toward an imam is the following report: "Our courageous man is a man named Muḥammad ibn Idrīs, who is more dangerous to me than the Devil; rather, our courageous man is a man named Abū Ḥanīfah, who is the beacon of my community."

An example of bias toward a particular region is the following report: "Giza is a garden among the gardens of Paradise, and Egypt is among the treasures of God on His earth." (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 67–71)

6. Flattery of Kings and Rulers

Another motive for Ḥadīth fabrication was flattery of kings and rulers. According to Raṣlān, some corrupt scholars who preferred worldly interests to the Hereafter approached kings, princes, and caliphs with false legal opinions and fabricated statements, attributing them to the Sharīʿah. They went so far as to lie about the Messenger of God in order to satisfy personal desires and support political objectives. In doing so, they preferred blindness to guidance.

Raṣlān cites the example of the notorious liar Ghiyāth ibn Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaʿī al-Kūfī. Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn, an authority in *al-Jarḥ wa-l-Taʿdīl*, is reported to have stated that Ghiyāth came to the Commander of the Faithful, al-Mahdī, who was fond of pigeons and used to play with them. When a pigeon was brought before him, Ghiyāth said: "So-and-so narrated to us that the Prophet (PBUHH) said: *'There is no competition except in archery and pigeon racing.'"*

Al-Mahdī ordered that he be given a reward. When Ghiyāth stood up, however, al-Mahdī said: *"I testify before you that he lied against the Messenger of God." He then stated, "I caused him to do this,"* and ordered the pigeons to be slaughtered (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 72–75).

7. Other Motives

Raṣlān also mentions other motives for Ḥadīth fabrication, including medical claims and various scattered motives that cannot easily be classified under a single category. Among these were attempts to promote certain goods through fabricated Ḥadīths, such as the statements: *"Eggplant is a cure for every disease" and "Lentils were sanctified by the tongues of seventy prophets."*

On some occasions, fabricated Ḥadīths were also employed to overcome an opponent or to take revenge against a particular group.

For example, Ibn Ḥibbān, in *al-Majrūḥīn*, narrates from Sayf ibn ʿUmar that he was with Saʿd ibn Ṭarīf al-Iskāfī when Saʿd's son came to him crying. Saʿd asked him what had happened. He replied that his teacher had beaten him. Saʿd then said, *"By God, I will disgrace them."* He subsequently claimed: "ʿIkrimah narrated to me from Ibn ʿAbbās that the Messenger of God (PBUHH) said: *'The teachers of your children are the worst of them, the least compassionate toward orphans, and the harshest toward the poor.'"* (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 75–76).

1.2.4. Identifying the Author's Position on the "Methods of Fabricating a Fake Ḥadīth"

The fabricators of Ḥadīth employed various methods and forms, involving both the *matn* (text) and the *isnād* (chain of transmission), in order to fabricate reports and achieve their intended objectives. Knowledge of these methods provides a basis for the critical examination and identification of fabricated Ḥadīths.

The methods used to fabricate Ḥadīths may be summarized as follows:

1. Fabrication of the chain of transmission: The *isnād* of a Ḥadīth may itself be fabricated. Some scholars have regarded this method as a form of invention or fantasy resembling delusion.

2. Attributing the words of others to an Infallible: A fabricator may take a pleasant maxim or comprehensive statement from earlier sages, the righteous predecessors, the Companions, the Followers, the Followers of the Followers, scholars and physicians, or from the scriptures and writings of other religions, particularly those of the People of the Book, and falsely attribute it to an Infallible through a fabricated *isnād*.

3. Providing an authentic *isnād* for a weak report: A fabricator may take a weak Ḥadīth and construct a sound *isnād* for it in order to make the report acceptable and widely circulated.

4. Altering an authentic Ḥadīth: A fabricator may take an authentic Ḥadīth and add or remove words and phrases in order to convey a particular meaning. The occurrence of this type of alteration through negligence or error is also possible.

Raṣlān states that the methods employed by fabricators can be reduced to three methods, which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ introduced in his *Muqaddimah*.

The first method consists of fabricating a statement oneself and attributing it to the Prophet (PBUHH). According to Raṣlān, most fabricated Ḥadīths belong to this category. Al-Tirmidhī states: *"Most of the statements in fabricated Ḥadīths were invented by the fabricator himself, such as those fabricated by Maʾmūn ibn Aḥmad al-Harawī"* (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 79).

The second method of fabricating a Ḥadīth involves taking the words of sages, ascetics, or the Israelites and presenting them as Ḥadīths. An example is the following fabricated report: *"The stomach is the home of disease, and diet is the principal medicine."*

According to Raṣlān, this statement originated with some physicians, and there is neither a basis nor a chain of transmission establishing it as a saying of the Prophet (PBUHH). Those who followed this method did not regard it as problematic to fabricate an *isnād* for a sound statement. Raṣlān associates this group with Abū Muqātil al-Samarqandī (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 80–82).

The third method of fabricating a Ḥadīth is based on illusion and negligence. In this case, the individual does not consciously intend to fabricate a Ḥadīth; rather, the error occurs unintentionally and without deliberate intent to fabricate (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 83).

Accordingly, Raṣlān identifies three forms of Ḥadīth fabrication:

1. Fabrication in the sense that a person formulates a statement himself and attributes it to the Prophet (PBUHH).

2. Taking a statement originating with scholars or other individuals and attributing it to the Prophet (PBUHH).

3. Unintentionally introducing and transmitting an error into a Ḥadīth.

Thus, the forms of Ḥadīth fabrication identified in this discussion involve both documentary (*isnād*) and textual (*matn*) dimensions.

1.2.5. Identifying the Author's Position on the "Criteria for Identifying a Fabricated Ḥadīth"

A Ḥadīth consists of two principal components: the *isnād* (chain of transmission) and the *matn* (text). Accordingly, the validation of a Ḥadīth depends on the critical examination of both its *isnād* and its *matn*. Each of these two forms of criticism has its own methods and rules, which distinguish sound and effective criticism from inappropriate or erroneous criticism.

In examining the criteria for identifying fabricated Ḥadīths, the textual criterion is considered first, followed by the documentary criterion. This order is adopted because even if a Ḥadīth is sound from the perspective of its *isnād* and apparently reaches an Infallible (AS), it cannot be considered valid and acceptable if its *matn* contains a defect.

In examining the *matn*, which takes precedence over examination of the *isnād*, attention must first be given to the possibility of contradiction. Such contradiction may occur either within the Ḥadīth itself, in the form of conflicting statements, or between the content of the Ḥadīth and established knowledge in other disciplines, particularly the Holy Qurʾan.

If a contradiction is established between the content of a Ḥadīth and the Holy Qurʾan, the Ḥadīth is considered, according to this approach, to be entirely false. However, contradiction between the *matn* of a Ḥadīth and the Holy Qurʾan is assessed specifically in light of the authoritative status of the Qurʾan and does not necessarily, in itself, require rejection of the Ḥadīth. Rather, the authors should provide an argument establishing whether the proposition in question is correct or incorrect.

The examination of the *isnād*, through the sciences of *rijāl* and Ḥadīth terminology, likewise provides a means of identifying fabricated Ḥadīths.

According to Raṣlān, the fabrication of Ḥadīths can be identified through three methods:

First method: The fabricator's confession. The first method is for the fabricator himself to confess that he fabricated a Ḥadīth and lied about the Prophet (PBUHH). Raṣlān cites the example of Maysarah ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, whom Abū Dāwūd is reported to have identified as someone who confessed to fabricating Ḥadīths (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 84–85).

Second method: Evidence arising from the narrator's own circumstances. The second method consists of identifying fabrication through evidence concerning the narrator himself. Al-ʿIrāqī provides an example of this method. Suppose a narrator claims to have narrated a Ḥadīth from a particular shaykh. Upon examination, however, it becomes apparent that the narrator was born after the death of that shaykh. In such a case, the narration cannot have been received directly from that shaykh. This does not constitute an explicit confession of fabrication; rather, it is evidence derived from the narrator's date of birth and the chronological circumstances of the alleged transmission. Although the shaykh may have known the Ḥadīth, the narrator could not have received it from him in the manner claimed (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 87).

Third method: Evidence arising from the circumstances of the narrator and the Ḥadīth. The third method involves evidence indicating fabrication through circumstances pertaining either to the narrator, the Ḥadīth itself, or both. An example cited by Ibn Ḥibbān illustrates this method. Ibn Ḥibbān relates that he once asked a narrator, *"In what year did you enter Shām?"* The narrator replied, *"In the year 250 AH."* Ibn Ḥibbān then told him that Hishām ibn ʿAmmār, the person from whom he claimed to have narrated, had died in 245 AH. The narrator responded, *"This is another Hishām ibn ʿAmmār"* (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 88–91).

Among the various evidences used to identify fabricated Ḥadīths, examining the content and characteristics of the Ḥadīth itself is regarded as one of the most important and commonly used approaches. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī discusses this matter in his *al-Nukat*, emphasizing the importance of identifying fabrication through the characteristics of the Ḥadīth itself. Indeed, recognizing a fabricated Ḥadīth from its own characteristics may be more important than determining the status of its narrator. The principal indicators identified in this regard are as follows:

1. Contradiction of the Ḥadīth with the Qurʾan

One indication of fabrication is the contradiction of a Ḥadīth with the text of the Holy Qurʾan. An example is the fabricated report concerning the duration of the world, according to which the world would last for seven thousand years. Since, according to this calculation, the seventh millennium has already been reached, the report would imply that the Resurrection should have occurred fifteen years ago. This is presented as a clear indication of its falsity.

The Qurʾan states: "They ask you concerning the Hour: 'When will it set in?' Say, 'Its knowledge is only with my Lord. None but He will manifest it at its time. It will weigh heavily upon the heavens and the earth. It will not come upon you except suddenly.' They ask you as if you were well informed about it. Say, 'Its knowledge is only with Allah, but most people do not know.'"
(Qurʾan 7:187)

2. Contradiction of the Ḥadīth with an established and authentic Sunnah

Another indicator is the contradiction of a Ḥadīth with an established and authentic tradition. According to this approach, the contradiction must be clear and irreconcilable, such that the two reports cannot be harmonized or reconciled in any manner. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar maintains that a fabricated Ḥadīth may be identified by comparing it with an established and definitive tradition. However, he cautions against relying on a non-definitive tradition for this purpose and maintains that anyone who simply rejects a Ḥadīth on the basis of its contradiction with the Sunnah has made an error (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 91–93).

3. Contradiction with reason, perception, and observation

A further indication of fabrication is contradiction with explicit reason, sensory perception, or established observation. An example of contradiction with reason is a report whose content is such that reason itself rejects its authenticity, such as claims concerning the antiquity or origins of certain objects. An example of contradiction with sensory perception is the report: *"Eggplant is a cure for every ailment."*

An example that contradicts both reason and sensory perception is the report that Noah's Ark circumambulated the House of God seven times and that Noah performed the prayer behind the *Maqām Ibrāhīm* (AS) (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 93–94).

4. Linguistic and stylistic weakness

Another indication of fabrication is the ugliness or weakness of the wording. A fabricated Ḥadīth may be characterized by a lack of eloquence in both its wording and meaning. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ likewise states in his *Muqaddimah* that among the fabricated Ḥadīths are reports whose falsification can be recognized through the ugliness of their wording and meanings (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 96–97).

5. Resemblance to the statements of physicians

Another indicator is the resemblance of the Ḥadīth to statements attributed to physicians. An example is the report concerning a person who complained to the Prophet (PBUHH) about having no children, whereupon he allegedly instructed him to eat eggs and onions (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 97).

6. The presence of an extraordinarily serious matter with only a single narrator

Another indication is that a Ḥadīth reports an important and consequential event while being transmitted by only one narrator. For example, if an enemy were to block the route of pilgrims traveling to the House of God, such an important event would ordinarily be expected to generate widespread reports. If only one person transmitted the account, this circumstance could serve as an indication of fabrication (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 97).

7. Excessive promises or threats for insignificant acts

Another indication is that a Ḥadīth contains excessively great promises or threats in relation to relatively minor acts. An example is the report: *"Whoever performs the noon prayer in such-and-such a manner will receive the reward of seventy prophets."*

The disproportion between the relatively simple act and the extraordinary reward is presented as an indication of fabrication.

8. Inclusion of absurd or unacceptable claims

Another indication is that a Ḥadīth contains absurd statements that no rational person could reasonably accept. Examples include the claim that the superiority of leeks over other vegetables is like the superiority of wheat over other grains, as well as the report: *"Eat salt, for it cures seventy diseases."*

Such statements are presented as indicators of fabrication because of their implausible and unreasonable content (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 98).

9. Contradiction with established historical facts

A fabricated Ḥadīth may also be identified through its contradiction with established historical facts. Al-Dhahabī provides an example in his *Mīzān*, where Suhayl ibn Dhakwān Abū al-Sindī reportedly claimed that he met

ʿĀʾishah on the road to Wāsiṭ. According to the historical chronology cited, however, this is impossible because ʿĀʾishah had died before pilgrims could have passed through the city of Wāsiṭ.

10. Use of a Ḥadīth to support a heretical doctrine

Another indication is that a heretic cites a Ḥadīth specifically to support his own doctrinal position. Examples include reports used to support claims concerning the createdness of the Qurʾan, predestination, and related theological doctrines.

11. Contradiction with the objectives of the Sharīʿah

Finally, a Ḥadīth may be identified as fabricated when its content contradicts one of the established objectives of the Sharīʿah. An example is a report that condemns children and claims that raising a puppy is preferable to raising a child (Raṣlān, 1430 AH, 99).

12. Invalidity Established by Conclusive Evidence

The invalidity of a Ḥadīth should be established on the basis of sound and conclusive evidence. An example is the report claiming that the earth rests upon a rock, which in turn rests upon the horn of an ox; when the ox moves its horn, the rock moves, causing the earth to shake and resulting in an earthquake.

13. A Report Declared False by Multiple Narrators

Another criterion is a report that has been declared false by numerous narrators. Ordinarily, collusion among them to lie or imitate one another is considered unlikely; therefore, their agreement in declaring a report false can serve as an indication of its invalidity.

Summary of Raṣlān's Criteria for Identifying Fabricated Ḥadīths

Raṣlān employs three categories of criteria for identifying fabricated Ḥadīths. He first discusses the criteria related to the examination of the *isnād* and then presents the criteria related to the *matn*.

First: Criteria related to the *isnād*

1. The fabricator's confession to fabrication.
2. Evidence concerning the narrator that establishes or reveals his admission of fabrication.

Second: Criteria related to the *matn*

The textual criteria identified by Raṣlān are as follows:

1. Contradiction with the text of the Qurʾan.

2. Contradiction with the Sunnah and established traditions.
3. Contradiction with reason and experience.
4. Ugliness of wording and meaning.
5. Resemblance of the narrated report to statements attributed to physicians.
6. Reporting an important or major event through a single narration.
7. Containing excessive promises or threats.
8. Containing a ridiculous statement that reason cannot accept.
9. Contradiction with established history.
10. Supporting the views of heretics.
11. Contradiction with the objectives of the Sharīʿah.
12. Containing evidence establishing its own invalidity.
13. Explicit evidence demonstrating the narrator's falsehood.

Critical Assessment of Raṣlān's Approach

Given the priority of textual criteria over documentary criteria, a criticism that may be directed at Raṣlān is that he places the documentary criteria before the textual criteria. This is problematic because if a Ḥadīth is free from defects in its *isnād* but contains a problem in its *matn*, it is nevertheless invalid.

In his discussion of textual analysis, Raṣlān does address the issue of contradiction between a Ḥadīth and the Qurʾan, referring, for example, to the report concerning the duration of the world and to verse 187 of Sūrat al-Aʿrāf (Qur'an 7). However, he does not address contradiction within the wording of the Ḥadīth itself. Nor does he provide a reference to the principle of *ʿarḍ* (comparison/presentation), which has not been employed as the most valid criterion for distinguishing a fabricated Ḥadīth from an authentic one.

Conclusion

As the second source of Muslim religious teachings, Ḥadīth holds particular significance. Throughout Islamic history, however, this valuable heritage has been subjected to various forms of damage, including fabrication. The Imams were among the earliest critics of statements and conduct attributed to the Prophet (PBUHH) and of reports attributed to themselves. Recognizing the phenomenon of Ḥadīth fabrication and its harmful consequences, they actively confronted fabricated reports and their fabricators. They also involved their narrators and students in this effort and assisted them in confronting this phenomenon.

A review of Raṣlān's *al-Waḍʿ fī al-Ḥadīth* on the basis of the proposed analytical model leads to the conclusion that he deals specifically with the phenomenon of Ḥadīth fabrication. In accordance with the proposed model, he addresses all the stages of the fabrication process in his book, which constitutes one of the positive aspects of his work.

However, because Raṣlān approaches the issue primarily from a Sunni perspective, his definition of fabricated Ḥadīth limits its attribution to the person of the Prophet (PBUHH) and does not include the Companions and the Ahl al-Bayt (AS) within this framework.

Regarding the historical emergence of Ḥadīth fabrication, Raṣlān presents various opinions of Ḥadīth scholars. He maintains that fabrication did not occur during the lifetime of the Prophet (PBUHH), based on his acceptance of the uprightness of the Companions. Rather, he argues that it emerged in 40 AH, during the conflict between Imam ʿAli (AS) and Muʿāwiyah.

With regard to the motives for Ḥadīth fabrication, Raṣlān discusses a number of motives but does not identify a single definitive cause.

Concerning the methods of Ḥadīth fabrication, Raṣlān identifies three methods involving documentary and textual fabrication, including complete and partial fabrication. In the area of identifying fabricated Ḥadīths, despite the importance of accuracy and attention to the *matn*, Raṣlān first addresses external and documentary criticism and subsequently turns to textual criticism.

One of the problems concerning the approach of most Ḥadīth scholars in this area, according to the present study, is their insufficient treatment of contradiction between the *matn* of a Ḥadīth and the Qurʾan. Although Raṣlān refers to such contradiction and cites Qurʾan 7:187, he does not adequately address the principle of presenting the Ḥadīth for comparison with the Qurʾan or the issue of contradiction within the wording of the Ḥadīth itself.

References

The Holy Qurʾan. (1390 SH). Translated by Seyyed Muḥammad Riḍā Ṣafavī. Maʿārif Publishing House.

Nahj al-Balāghah. Translated by Shirvānī. Maʿārif Publishing House.

Abū Rayyā, Maḥmūd. (1957). *Lights on the Muḥammadan Sunnah: Defending Ḥadīth*. 6th ed. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif.

Abū Shahbah, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad. (1982). *Al-Wasīṭ fī ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth wa Muṣṭalaḥih*. Al-Azhar Society; ʿĀlam al-Maʿrifah.

Abū Zahū, Muḥammad Muḥammad. (1404 A.H.). *Makānat al-Sunnah fī al-Islām*. Beirut.

ʿAjjāj al-Khaṭīb, Muḥammad. (2012). *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth: ʿUlūmuhū wa Muṣṭalaḥuhū*. 2nd ed. Damascus: Dār al-Fikr.

Ashqar, ʿUmar Sulaymān ʿAbd Allāh. (1424 A.H.). *Al-Waḍʿ fī al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī*. 1st ed. Jordan: Dār al-Nafāʾis.

Barūmand, Muḥammad Ḥusayn. (2005). *Naqd wa Barrasī-yi Rūshhā-yi Tabyīn-i Mashrūʿiyyat-i Qurʾan*. Qom: Arsh Andīsheh.

Bāstānī, Qāsim. (n.d.). "Rūshhā-yi Jaʿl-i Ḥadīth." *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth*, 10(3–4).

Falāttah, ʿUmar ibn Ḥasan ʿUthmān. (1397 A.H.). *Al-Waḍʿ fī al-Ḥadīth*. Damascus: Al-Madrasah al-Ghazālīyyah; Beirut: Maʿhad al-Taṣawwuf; Egypt: Al-Azhar Society.

Hāshim Maʿrūf al-Ḥasanī. (1973). *Al-Ubāt fī al-Akhbār wa al-Akhbār*. Beirut.

Hāshim Maʿrūf al-Ḥasanī. (n.d.). *Dirāsāt fī al-Ḥadīth wa al-Muḥaddithīn*. Beirut: Dār al-Taʿāruf li-l-Ṭibāʿah.

Mardānī, Mehdī. (2018). "A Critical Study of ʿUmar Falāttah's View on the Beginning of the Emergence of the Fabrication of Ḥadīth." *Ḥadīth Sciences*, 68, 29–49.

Masʿūdī, ʿAbd al-Hādī. (2015). *Jaʿl wa Naqd-i Ḥadīth*. 4th ed. Samat Publications.

Momenī, Seyyed Muḥammad Ḥasan. (2018). "An Introduction to the Trend of Ḥadīth Fabrication During the Time of the Messenger of God (PBUH)." *Qurʾan and Ḥadīth Knowledge and Teachings*, 2(6).

Nāṣirī, ʿAli. (2004). *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth (1)*. 1st ed. Sanābil Publications.

Qāsimī, Muḥammad Jamāl al-Dīn. (1380 A.H.). *Qawāʿid al-Taḥdīth min Funūn Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*. 2nd ed. Dār al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyyah.

Qaṭṭān, Mannāʿ ibn Khalīl. (1412 A.H.). *Mabāḥith fī ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth*. 2nd ed. Cairo.

Rāfiʿī al-Muḥammadī, Nāṣir. (1430 A.H.). *Durūs fī al-Aḥādīth al-Mawḍūʿah*. Translated into Arabic by Qāsim al-Bayḍāʾī. 1st ed. Qom: Dār al-Muṣṭafā.

Raslān, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd. (1430 A.H.). *Al-Waḍʿ fī al-Ḥadīth: Juhūd al-ʿUlamāʾ fīhi*. Egypt: Dār al-Furqān.

Ṣāliḥ, Ṣubḥī. (1406 A.H.). *ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth wa Muṣṭalaḥuh: ʿArḍ wa Dirāsah*. 2nd ed. Lebanon: Al-Madrasah al-Ḥaydarīyyah.

Sibāʿī, Muṣṭafā. (1419 A.H./1998). *Al-Sunnah wa Makānatuhā fī al-Tashrīʿ al-Islāmī*. Beirut.

Ṣubḥī Manṣūr Aḥmad. (2005). *Al-Qurʾan wa al-Kāfī Maṣdaran li-l-Tashrīʿ al-Islāmī*. Beirut.

Ṣuflā, Muḥammad Luqmān. (1420 A.H.). *Ihtimām al-Muḥaddithīn bi-Naqd al-Ḥadīth Sanadan wa Matnan*. 2nd ed. Riyadh: Dār al-Dāʿī.

ʿUmar Hāshim, Aḥmad. (1404 A.H.). *Qawāʿid Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth*. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī.

ʿUthmān al-Ṭahānawī, Ẓafar Aḥmad. (1392 A.H.). *Qawāʿid fī ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth*. 3rd ed. Lebanon: Dār al-Qalam.