



MODERN HADITH STUDIES

Continued Debates and New Approaches

Edited by **BELAL ABU-ALABBAS,**
MICHAEL DANN and **CHRISTOPHER MELCHERT**

MODERN HADITH STUDIES

CONTINUING DEBATES AND
NEW APPROACHES

♦ ♦ ♦

EDITED BY BELAL ABU-ALABBAS,
MICHAEL DANN AND
CHRISTOPHER MELCHERT

EDINBURGH
University Press

Edinburgh University Press is one of the leading university presses in the UK. We publish academic books and journals in our selected subject areas across the humanities and social sciences, combining cutting-edge scholarship with high editorial and production values to produce academic works of lasting importance. For more information visit our website: edinburghuniversitypress.com

© editorial matter and organisation Belal Abu-Alabbas, Michael Dann and Christopher Melchert, 2020
© the chapters their several authors, 2020

Edinburgh University Press Ltd
The Tun – Holyrood Road
12 (2f) Jackson’s Entry
Edinburgh EH8 8PJ

Typeset in KoufrUni by
Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Stockport, Cheshire,
and printed and bound in Great Britain

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978 1 4744 4179 7 (hardback)
ISBN 978 1 4744 4181 0 (webready PDF)
ISBN 978 1 4744 4182 7 (epub)

The right of the contributors to be identified as author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 and the Copyright and Related Rights Regulations 2003 (SI No. 2498).

CONTENTS

Figures and Tables	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Note on Conventions	ix
Notes on Contributors	x
Introduction	1
<i>Christopher Melchert</i>	
1. <i>Kunnā nakrahu al-kitāb</i> : Scripture, Transmission of Knowledge, and Politics in the Second Century AH (719–816 CE)	9
<i>Pavel Pavlovitch</i>	
2. The History of the <i>Adhān</i> : a View from the Hadith Literature	27
<i>Maroussia Bednarkiewicz</i>	
3. Ibn al-Mubārak, Traditionist	49
<i>Christopher Melchert</i>	
4. Early ‘Traditionist Sufis’: A Network Analysis	70
<i>Jeremy Farrell</i>	
5. The Common Link and its Relation to Hadith Terminology	97
<i>Ali Aghaei</i>	
6. Hadith Criticism between Traditionists and Jurisprudents	129
<i>Mutaz al-Khatib</i>	
7. Hadith Criticism in the Levant in the Twentieth Century: From <i>zāhir al-isnād</i> to <i>‘ilal al-ḥadīth</i>	151
<i>Ahmad Snober</i>	

8. The Reception and Representation of Western Hadith Studies in Turkish Academe <i>Fatma Kızıl</i>	171
9. Can Different Questions Yield the Same Answers? Islamic and Western Scholarship on Shi'i Narrators in the Sunni Tradition <i>Michael Dann</i>	192
Index	215

THE RECEPTION AND REPRESENTATION OF WESTERN HADITH STUDIES IN TURKISH ACADEME

Fatma Kızıl

Introduction

The question of how Western hadith studies have been perceived in Turkey cannot be discussed without reference to the Turkish Republic's broader efforts to rapidly Westernise virtually all spheres of Turkish culture. The newly-established state identified Western civilisation as the telos that guided and organised its multi-faceted reforms. The adoption of *Westernisation*¹ (*Garblulaşma*) as an explicit government policy, and especially the principles of laicism (1928–37) and language reform (1928), reshaped the very essence of the social fabric, with far-reaching effects on virtually all major institutions.² Higher religious education was no exception. The process of Westernisation began before the Republican era.

In many ways, the educational system could even be described as the primary conduit of Westernisation in the late Ottoman era. The moderate proposals for piecemeal adoption of Western technology and institutions advocated by the Ottomans gave way to more forceful demands for a comprehensive adoption of a secularising Western culture and worldview after the Second Constitutional Period (1908–18).³ Şükrü Haniöglu underlines the influence of foreign ideas on so-called *Garbci* ('Westernising') intellectuals of this period, noting that their ideology consisted of a 'peculiar mixture of materialism, scientism, and Social Darwinism'.⁴ Nearly all of the proposals voiced by *Garbci* intellectuals of the Second Constitutional Period, like Kılıçzâde Hakkı⁵ (d. 1960), were implemented in the Republican period. Policies such as the inclusion of women in the public sphere, the closure of Sufi lodges and madrasas, the abolition of *shari'ah* courts, and the adoption of the Latin alphabet were all based on Kılıçzâde's proposals.⁶

It was also during the Second Constitutional Period that new educational institutions facilitated the spread of Western thought and culture among the Ottoman intellectual class. Halil İnalçık points out the importance of

secondary (*idadi*) schools in this respect. The French language had already been the primary conduit for Western thought throughout the late Ottoman period, but the *idadi* schools greatly expanded French literacy among the intellectual class and consequently accelerated the pace of translation into Turkish as well. These schools were also secular, with Muslim and non-Muslim (*dhimmi*) students receiving their education together for the first time.⁷

Another institution that played an important role in the process of Westernising religious education in particular was the *Dârülfünûn*, the first institution of higher education besides the madrasas. The origins of this institution stretch back to 1845, but it was re-opened under the name of *Dârülfünûn-ı Şâhâne* in 1900, together with a four-year branch (faculty) of *Ulûm-i Âliyye-i Dîniyye* (Higher Religious Sciences). In 1914, the branch was abolished, and its students were transferred to the madrasas of *Dârü'l-Hilâfe*.⁸

In the Republican era, a three-year Faculty of Theology was opened at *Dârülfünûn* in 1924. This faculty had been planned as 'a kind of faculty of sociology',⁹ which was conceived as a state apparatus that would bring the religious sphere into line with Republican reforms, but was closed in 1933 due to a dearth of students. Over the past half-century, new faculties¹⁰ have been opened with an ideologically diverse academic staffing. As a result, these faculties drifted from the Republican goal of sustaining a single discourse in unison. Nonetheless, the founding principle of the first faculty continues to contribute to a negative assessment of today's faculties on the part of traditional and conservative elements of society.¹¹

The unresolved issue these faculties face today is the question of how to engage in Islamic studies. To a significant extent, they are characterised by a hybridity that manifests itself on multiple levels. Since there are not two distinct majors such as theology and religious studies, the faculties undertake the mission of educating the clergy, so to speak, along with academics.¹² In addition, the curricula of the faculties consist of classes such as sociology of religion, psychology of religion and history of religions, which treat their subject as a social phenomenon, alongside the traditional subjects of *tafsîr*, *fiqh*, hadith, Islamic theology (*kalâm*), Sufism and Arabic. Both academics with an inclination towards traditional scholarship and the preacher-led groups from outside the academy constantly compare the curricula of these faculties with the programmes of private foundations and informal madrasas that concentrate solely on classical Islamic texts and Arabic. The resulting perception is typically that these faculties and their graduates are not qualified to continue the legacy of classical Islamic scholarship.¹³

Hadith Scholars and Orientalism in Faculties of Theology before the 2000s

The methodological hybridity that has generally characterised the faculties of theology has also significantly affected the study of hadith. In the curriculum of the Faculty of Theology opened in 1924, one of the courses

was 'hadith and history of hadith'. Between 1925 and 1926, İzmirli İsmail Hakkı (d. 1946) taught the course and wrote a textbook for it titled *Târîkh-i hadîs* (1924), which he described as the first of its kind.¹⁴ Traditionalists have claimed that İzmirli's book and the creation of a course on 'the history of hadith' were reflective of a trend towards treating the classical Islamic sciences as ineffective and irrelevant disciplines in general and reducing hadith to mere history in particular.¹⁵ İzmirli's book, however, was largely a regular book of *muştalah al-hadith* in terms of its content and the new course was not just on the 'history of hadith', but rather on 'hadith and history of hadith'.¹⁶

There is no indication that İzmirli's approach to the study of hadith was directly influenced by Western hadith studies, although he is generally regarded as one of the more progressive figures among the so-called 'Islamists' of the late Ottoman era.¹⁷ He was, however, at least tangentially familiar with Islamic studies in the West. He was included in the commission established by the Ministry of Education to prepare a report on the Turkish translation of Reinhart Dozy's (d. 1883) *De Voornaamste Godsdiene: Het Islamisme* (1863) by Abdullah Cevdet (d. 1932).¹⁸ He was also one of the authors of *İslâm-Türk Ansiklopedisi* ('Islamic-Turkish Encyclopedia'), a project conceived of as an indigenous Turkish response to the translation of Brill's *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1913–36) in 1940.

Another important contributor to hadith studies in this period was Babanzade Ahmed Naim (d. 1934). The Directorate of Religious Affairs assigned him the task of translating al-Zabīdī's (d. 893/1488) *al-Tajrid al-şarīh li-aḥādīth al-Jāmi'ī al-şāḥīh*. Although he ultimately completed only the first two of twelve volumes, Ahmed Naim also wrote a one-volume introduction to the work.¹⁹ Under a section titled 'Hiç de Vechi Olmayan Bir Teşki' ('A Meaningless Doubt'), he criticised several assertions of Leone Caetani (d. 1935) concerning the early development of the hadith tradition, including the relatively late advent and foreign origins of the *isnād* and the inefficacy of oral transmission.²⁰

Between the closure of the Faculty of Theology in 1933 and the opening of a new faculty in Ankara in 1949, the only significant academic work on hadith was a single article published by Zakir Kadiri Ugan (d. 1954). Although he was neither a faculty member nor a hadith scholar, Ugan was the author of the only article on hadith in the faculty journal *Dârülfünûn İlähiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, which was published 1925–33. Ugan's article, 'Dinî ve Gayri Dinî Rivayetler' ('Religious and Non-Religious Narrations'), can be regarded as a significant precursor to the debates surrounding hadith that would unfold subsequently in Turkey. Unlike İzmirli and Arapkirli, Ugan is the first scholar who made favourable references to Western scholarship on hadith. Ugan argues that hadith scholars prioritised the *isnād* and neglected *matn* criticism in authenticating hadith.²¹ In this, he echoed one of the well-known assertions of Western hadith scholars, especially Ignaz Goldziher (d. 1921), which was also shared by some Islamic modernists like Aḥmad Amīn (d. 1954) and Maḥmūd Abū Rayyah (d. 1970).²² According to

Ugan, there were unreliable personalities amongst the Companions and the doctrine of the 'collective probity of the Companions' (*ta'ḍīl al-ṣaḥābah*) had led to the acceptance of many fabricated traditions. One of the Companions Ugan was particularly interested in was Abū Hurayrah.²³ On the basis of parallels between the narrations of Abū Hurayrah and Jewish sources, Ugan insisted that Abū Hurayrah must have borrowed from the latter. To support his negative assessment he enumerates several examples of Western scholars whose works contain criticism of this Companion: 'For example, we could mention Goldziher, one of the greatest hadith scholars, Sprenger, de Goeje, Dozy, Baron and Kremer [*sic*], and their followers among Russian scholars: Krackowsky and Krymskiy and so on.'²⁴

The Faculty of Theology in Ankara

When the Faculty of Theology was reopened in Ankara in 1949, courses on core classical subjects such as *fiqh*, hadith, *tafsīr* and Islamic theology were not initially included in the curriculum. For this reason, Ahmet Hamdi Akseki (d. 1951), the Director of Religious Affairs of the period, maintained that the newly opened Faculty of Theology would not be able to train the much-needed clergy.²⁵ Since there were no Turkish scholars with doctoral degrees at the time, Muhammed Tayyib Okıç (d. 1977), a Bosnian scholar, was invited to establish the *tafsīr* and hadith departments of the faculty. Okıç would be the teacher of the first-generation hadith scholars of the Republican era.²⁶ He supervised Talât Koçyiğit (1927–2011) and M. Said Hatiboğlu's doctoral dissertations, the first Turkish dissertations on hadith, completed in 1957 and 1962, respectively. He was also one of the committee members who reviewed Fuad Sezgin's *Buhârî'nin Kaynakları Hakkında Araştırmalar* for his habilitation in 1954.

Having received his doctorate from the Faculty of Letters at the University of Paris (1931), Okıç had an extensive knowledge of Western studies not only on hadith but also on other Islamic disciplines as seen in one of his major works in Turkish, *Bazı Hadis Meseleleri Üzerine Tetkikler* ('Studies on Various Hadith Problems', 1956).²⁷ In this book, Okıç points out the diversity of the conclusions reached by Orientalists on the topic of hadith. In Okıç's opinion, even though they cannot be absolutely impartial, there are several moderate and unbiased Orientalists. For example, he contrasts the biases of figures like Henri Lammens (d. 1937) and Leone Caetani with the relative objectivity of a figure like Goldziher.²⁸ On the whole, it seems that Okıç did not engage in blanket dismissals of Orientalist scholarship, but evaluated its claims on a case-by-case basis. For example, while he objected to Josef Horovitz's (d. 1931) theory regarding the Jewish origin of the *isnād* system by arguing that Horovitz had identified the existence of only a remotely similar system, he also took sides with Horovitz against Caetani's chronology of the *isnād*.²⁹ Unlike Zakir Kadiri Ugan, Okıç seems not to have accepted the majority of Orientalists' critiques of the hadith tradition. He did, however, encourage

his students Talât Koçyiğit and Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu to learn Western languages and study Orientalists' works.³⁰ While these two scholars both began work in this field, they would ultimately take Okiç's encouragement in different directions.

Talât Koçyiğit translated four articles by James Robson (d. 1981) into Turkish,³¹ and also critiqued Goldziher's views in an article titled 'Analysis and Critique of Goldziher's Several Views on Hadith'.³² Since he did not make any comments on Robson's views anywhere in the translations, Koçyiğit's evaluation of Western hadith studies must be gleaned primarily from his article responding to Goldziher.³³ While he was willing to admit that there were objective Orientalists who engaged in dispassionate research, Koçyiğit considered Goldziher to be among those who misrepresented their evidence in order to attack Islam, drawing several examples of this from Goldziher's *Muhammedanische Studien*.³⁴ In one such example, he criticises Goldziher's interpretation of the following report narrated by al-Ṭabarī, according to which Mu'āwiyah said to Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah:

Do not refrain from abusing 'Ali and criticising him, nor from asking God's mercy upon 'Uthman and His forgiveness for him. Continue to shame the companions of 'Ali, keep them at a distance, and don't listen to them. Praise the faction of 'Uthman, bring them near, and listen to them.³⁵

Goldziher interprets these words as an official encouragement to promote and spread hadith reports against 'Alī and to suppress those in favour of him.³⁶ After pointing out that Mu'āwiyah's instruction had nothing to do with hadith, Koçyiğit reaches the conclusion that 'Goldziher distorted the meaning of this report for the sake of a hidden intention'.³⁷

Another objection of Koçyiğit against Goldziher concerned his allegations about the relationship of the prominent hadith scholar al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742) with the Umayyads. According to Koçyiğit, Goldziher wanted to show the existence of hadith scholars who had fabricated traditions in the service of the Umayyads and found al-Zuhrī to be a convenient target. As an example, Koçyiğit discusses Goldziher's argument that al-Zuhrī fabricated the tradition 'Do not travel to any mosques except three: al-Masjid al-Ḥarām, this mosque of mine, and al-Masjid al-Aqṣā',³⁸ in order to justify the religio-political policies of the Caliph 'Abd al-Malik (r. 65–86/685–705), who wished to substitute Qubbat al-Ṣakhrah for the Ka'bah as a pilgrimage site in order to prevent pilgrims from paying homage to the counter-Caliph 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr (d. 73/692) in Mecca. Koçyiğit argues that the notion that al-Zuhrī fabricated the hadith towards this end is not actually stated in Goldziher's source, al-Ya'qūbī's (d. after 292/905) *Tārīkh*, but is rather a speculative inference.³⁹ He also points out that the entire report may be little more than an anti-Umayyad polemic since al-Ya'qūbī was a Shi'i and the report is not corroborated in any other source.⁴⁰ Furthermore, Koçyiğit makes reference to a report in al-Dhahabī's (d. 748/1348) *Tadhkirat al-huffāz* stating that al-Zuhrī

only met with ʿAbd al-Malik in the year 80/699–700, several years after the Second Civil War (60–73/680–692) between ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and the Umayyads.⁴¹ Koçyiğit concludes his article by advocating an approach to Western hadith studies that would combine cautious awareness with a sense of distinct academic and confessional communities: ‘Whatever the outcome of an Orientalist’s studies about our own issues, we must receive it with caution. Of course, we will be aware of their studies, but we will not forget that we have to deal with our own issues by ourselves either.’⁴²

The approach of Okiç’s other student, Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu, to Western hadith studies is substantially different from that of Koçyiğit. Indeed, his dissertation, titled *İslami Tenkid Zihniyeti ve Hadis Tenkidinin Doğuşu* (‘Critical Islamic Thought and the Birth of Hadith Criticism’),⁴³ follows the main arguments of Goldziher concerning the reflection of Islam’s early political conflicts in the hadith tradition.⁴⁴ This was especially the case with respect to traditions in the genres of future tribulations (*fitan*) and Portents of the Last Hour (*ashrāt al-sāʿah*), concerning which he wrote, ‘It can be accepted that the atmosphere of terror created among Muslims by the events after the death of the Prophet gave rise to the majority of the material in this genre, especially that included under the topics of *fitan* and *ashrāt al-sāʿah*.’⁴⁵

In his dissertation, Hatiboğlu also refers to works of Sprenger, Caetani, Goldziher, Henri Lammens⁴⁶ and Duncan Black Macdonald (d. 1943), and quotes their views. He voices criticism against those scholars only in a limited number of instances.⁴⁷ However, in a later paper, Hatiboğlu also accused luminaries of Orientalist scholarship like Snouck Hurgronje (d. 1936) and Joseph Schacht (d. 1969) of engaging in arbitrary and far-fetched interpretations of their sources, arguing that it is necessary to check their original sources because of their biases. Nonetheless, these criticisms are on the whole eclipsed by his generally favourable approach towards Western scholars, especially Goldziher.⁴⁸

The broad category of *fitan* traditions continued to be a subject of Hatiboğlu’s studies. In his 1967 habilitation book *Hazreti Peygamber’in (s.a.v) Vefatından Emevilerin Sonuna Kadar Siyasi İçtimai Hadiselerle Hadis Münasebetleri* (‘Relation of Hadith to Sociopolitical Events from the Death of the Prophet until the End of Umayyads’) he argued again that the Prophet cannot be the source of *fitan* traditions.⁴⁹ In this work and others, we see that Hatiboğlu’s rejection of the authenticity of these traditions is part of a larger theological project. Echoing a debate that has reverberated in modernist circles since the nineteenth century,⁵⁰ he takes the position that the Prophet did not receive any revelation outside of the Qurʾān and rejects the notion of ‘non-recited revelation’ (*wahy ghayr matlūw*), which constituted the classical theological foundation for the authority of the Sunnah.⁵¹

‘Critical Islamic thought’, the main theme of Hatiboğlu’s dissertation, would also become the driving force in his future studies and scholarship. He has continued to promote the critical reevaluation of Islamic sources until today and has influenced a number of modernist scholars who would

later gather around forums and institutions such as the journal *İslamiyat* (1998–2007) and two publishing houses known as *Kitabiyat*⁵² (1997–2009) and *Ankara Okulu Yayınları* (1995–).⁵³ These scholars have focused on the critical re-valuation of classical Islamic scholarship as a whole and not just hadith studies, but nonetheless played a key role in the heated debates over hadith literature that became prominent during the 1990s when scholars from both the traditional and modernist camps came together in a series of symposiums.

Another important scholar connected to the Faculty of Theology in Ankara was Fuad Sezgin. Although Sezgin had worked under the supervision of Hellmut Ritter (d. 1971) until 1949 and spent most of his academic life in Istanbul, he worked at the Faculty of Theology in Ankara in 1951–3. In addition, as was mentioned above, Tayyib Okıç was among the committee members who accepted Sezgin's habilitation in 1954. In his habilitation, *Buhârî'nin Kaynakları*, Sezgin refuted the chronology given by Goldziher for the collection of traditions and emphasised the continuous written transmission of hadiths.⁵⁴ *Buhârî'nin Kaynakları* would become a respected but also neglected work over the subsequent years in Turkey.⁵⁵ In fact, after its first publication in 1956, the second edition was published only in 2001. One of the main reasons for this was that Sezgin left for Germany in 1961 after he was removed from his position at the university due to the military coup of 1960.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, the Faculty of Theology in Ankara trained a generation of scholars who followed developments in Western hadith studies. During this period, translations from Orientalists were published in the faculty journal *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*. In addition, books by scholars like Julius Wellhausen (d. 1918), Goldziher, Schacht and William Montgomery Watt (d. 2006) were translated into Turkish and published by the faculty press.⁵⁶

Hadith Scholars and Orientalism in Faculties of Theology after the 2000s

Parallel to the continued engagement with Western scholarship in Ankara, the field of higher religious education diversified significantly with the opening of the so-called Higher Institutes of Islam (*Yüksek İslam Enstitüleri*) between 1959 and 1982. These institutes were opened specifically for the graduates of *imam-hatip* schools since the Faculty of Theology in Ankara accepted students only from regular high schools.⁵⁷ Unlike the faculty, these institutes followed a curriculum focusing mostly on classical Islamic texts and pedagogical formation. However, in 1982, the institutes were transformed into faculties of theology and started to follow a common curriculum similar to that of the Faculty of Theology in Ankara. After the transformation of the institutes into faculties of theology, the total number of faculties increased to eight, and fifteen new faculties were opened between 1988 and 2008. At the beginning of the fall semester, 2017, there were eighty-one faculties of theology that accepted students.⁵⁸

This transformation in the overall landscape of higher Islamic education has had a significant and varied impact on the academic study of hadith. On the one hand, the increase in the number of programmes for higher education in Islamic Studies has gone hand in hand with significant growth in the number of academic studies of hadith and other topics within Islamic Studies. As for hadith studies, twelve theses were completed in the 1970s, sixty-seven theses in the 1980s, 304 in the 1990s and 505 in the first decade of the new millennium.⁵⁹ On the other hand, the opening of these new faculties also arguably led to a dilution in the presence and significance of Western studies on hadith in the broad sphere of the Turkish academy. The majority of the new theses completed since the 1970s focus either on the authority and authenticity of the Sunnah or on issues defined within the framework of classical hadith scholarship.⁶⁰ Thus, a recent review of theses on hadith completed through 2015 includes the relationship between Orientalism and hadith among the understudied subjects in the Turkish academy that require more attention.⁶¹

There has been, in fact, a small but perceptible increase in engagement with Western hadith studies in the faculties of theology in the past twenty years. This interest is reflected in part in the considerable increase in the number of translations from Western scholars, such as Josef Horowitz, Schacht, Alfred Guillaume (d. 1965), James Robson, Meir Jacob Kister (d. 2010), G. H. A. Juynboll (d. 2010), Harald Motzki (d. 2019) and Gregor Schoeler. It is also reflected in recent doctoral research. A number of dissertations have been written specifically on Western hadith studies, while many others are also shaped by current debates in Western scholarship in terms of their selection of subject matter. One of the most prominent examples of the dissertations responding to Western hadith studies is Bekir Kuzudişli's *Hadis Rivâyetinde Aile İsnâdları* ('Family *İsnâds* in Hadith Transmission'), completed in 2005. Kuzudişli endeavoured to refute Schacht's claim that family *İsnâds* were fabricated, arguing that such *İsnâds* emerged because written documents were kept within the family as souvenirs and handed down to the following generation.⁶² He also objected to Schacht's argument that family *İsnâds* were not 'an indication of authenticity but only a device for securing its appearance'⁶³ by pointing out that hadith scholars did in fact criticise hadiths transmitted through family *İsnâds*.⁶⁴

Another dissertation about Western hadith studies is my own *Hukukî İçerikli Merfû Hadisler Bağlamında Müşterek Râvî Teorisi ve Tenkidi* ('Critique of Common-Link Theory Based on Legal *marfû*^c *aḥādīth*'), completed in 2011.⁶⁵ In this dissertation, I compare Schacht and Juynboll's application of the common-link theory with Harald Motzki's interpretation while employing a case study to shed light on a variety of assertions connected with the common-link theory, such as the material growth of traditions, backward projection, gradual improvement of *İsnâds* and the spread of *İsnâds*. I apply the method of *İsnâd-cum-matn* analysis as developed by Motzki to a selected hadith cluster, but, unlike Motzki, while checking variants with each other,

I give the evaluation and judgements of hadith critics about transmitters' reliability a decisive role. In the end, I argue that *isnād-cum-matn* analysis, as applied in the dissertation, is an improved continuation of the *mu'arāḍah* method discussed in classical hadith scholarship.⁶⁶

The common-link theory and other methods of dating traditions is also the subject of Süleyman Doğanay's habilitation titled *Oryantalistlerin Hadisleri Tarihlendirmeye Yaklaşımları* ('Orientalists' Approach to Dating of Traditions', 2013).⁶⁷ The author is critical of Western scholars' methods of dating hadiths throughout the book and offers several case-by-case refutations of their claims. After the description of the methods, Doğanay reaches the conclusion that Orientalists' approaches are biased and overly sceptical.⁶⁸

Despite this recent trend towards increased engagement with Western scholarship, the majority of dissertations still discuss only Turkish studies and primary and secondary Arabic sources in the compulsory section of the literature review. Goldziher continues to be the first name that comes to mind when one mentions Orientalism and the most well-known scholars after Goldziher are G. H. A. Juynboll and Harald Motzki.⁶⁹ The works engaging Western scholarship surveyed here serve only as representative examples of a larger body of literature that shares the tendency to emphasise the biases of Orientalist studies, their misuse of evidence and their overlooking of important information that does not support their arguments.⁷⁰ Academics who offer a more positive appraisal of Orientalist works are generally labelled by traditionalists as modernists, rendering Western hadith studies a powerful symbolic weapon in the debates over the authority and authenticity of hadith.

Scholarly Camps and Topics of Discussion

Debates over the authority and authenticity of hadith in Turkey have given rise to three main trends in scholarship: Istanbul-based traditionalists; Ankara-based modernists; and finally *Kur'ancılar* (*Ahl al-Qur'ān*).⁷¹ The main issues at stake in the debates among these three trends can be summed up as the status of Sunnah in Islam, the authenticity of hadiths and, lastly, how to correctly understand the Sunnah in the modern world. While there are no hadith scholars among *Kur'ancılar*, the first two groups consist of academics specialising in hadith. Today, in different cities of Turkey, scholars from both camps work together at the same faculties. Even though the distinction between Istanbul and Ankara serves primarily as a synecdoche for the Faculty of Theology at Marmara (formerly Istanbul Higher Institute of Islam) and Ankara University, respectively, in the end, it denotes the approaches taken by individual scholars and not necessarily their geographical locations. The designation *Tarihselci* ('historicalists')⁷² is often used by traditionalists as an umbrella label to describe their opponents. In particular, the term is used to refer to those scholars who argue that rulings and regulations in the Qur'ān and Sunnah are not universal but limited to the historical period

and circumstances of the first Islamic community. It thus occurs mostly in the discussions of scholars of *tafsir* and Islamic law. Fazlur Rahman and Naşr Hâmid Abū Zayd (d. 2010) are the authorities appealed to most frequently by Turkish scholars on this issue. It seems that this fact, in addition to the translation and publication of Fazlur Rahman's (d. 1988) books by the Ankara Okulu publishing house, have played a role in the generalisation of the designation to include all progressive scholars in spite of the significant differences among them.

The *Kur'ancılar* (*ahl al-Qurʿān*) consist primarily of *tafsir* scholars.⁷³ Technically speaking, this group does not reject the Sunnah completely.⁷⁴ Their criterion for accepting Sunnah is that it should be corroborated by the Qurʿān, which leads to the rejection of the great bulk of the Sunnah but not the rejection of Sunnah as such. Although this camp accepts the Sunnah of the Prophet as the best example in principle, they do not specify either its scope or how this example could be materialised in daily life.⁷⁵ Other trends have been more concerned with specifying the limits and scope of the Sunnah. For both traditionalists and modernists, the debate about the authority of the Sunnah has centred on parsing the different roles played by the Prophet and determining the normative implications of his actions in each of those roles. They discuss the extent to which it is possible to separate his Prophetic role from other, mundane roles; whether all of his actions should be considered to be based on non-recited revelation; and what these distinctions mean in terms of the binding nature and universal applicability of the Sunnah.

In the debates over hadith, the questions of authenticity and interpretation are intertwined partly because of perceptions of dissonance between the standards and expectations of the modern world and the Prophet's orders and practices. A case in point is how the three trends discuss the relationship between modern and Prophetic medicine. Scholars who adopt a critical perspective dismiss those hadiths that clash with principles of modern medicine because they reject the possibility of the Prophet's saying something that conflicts with reason or modern science. On the other hand, some modernists, mainly 'historicalists', regard such hadiths as authentic but understand them as the result of the Prophet's human and hence historical knowledge instead of universal and transcendental revelation. Rejecting both perspectives, most of the traditionalists, in turn, believe that the Prophetic medicine has miraculous attributes yet to be discovered by modern science. The views of classical scholars are treated as a repository of material that is drawn on selectively in order to challenge the opposing sides and accuse them of abandoning the Sunnah or the spirit of the Sunnah. While traditionalists argue that rejecting the hadiths regarded as authentic by previous generations will pave the way to abandoning Sunnah altogether, modernists accuse them of not understanding the Prophet or his mission, and hence accepting the hadiths reporting words or deeds that he could not have said or done. Therefore, debates around the authenticity and understanding of the traditions are inextricably bound up with the question of the authority of the Prophet and his Sunnah.

Critical scholars like Mehmet Emin Özafşar, Professor of Hadith at the Faculty of Theology in Ankara, emphasise that hadiths should not be viewed as the words, deeds and tacit approvals of the Prophet, but rather as words, deeds and tacit approvals that have been attributed to him.⁷⁶ According to Özafşar, the reflexive identification of transmitted reports with the Prophet leads to emotional reactions against critical attitudes towards hadith, and hence hinders rational argumentation.⁷⁷

For critical scholars, the notion that content criticism is necessary goes hand in hand with the conviction that *isnād* criticism alone is insufficient to determine the authenticity of a hadith. These scholars have discussed the methods of content criticism extensively, which is referred to in Turkish by the term '*arz*', meaning comparison of the contents of a hadith with the Qurʾān, well-established Sunnah, reason, historical facts and the hard sciences. As a matter of fact, each of these types of *arz* was treated in distinct doctoral dissertations between 1997 and 2008.

The occurrence of a significant number of traditions in the *Şaḥīḥayn* criticised by the modernists on the basis of content criticism also gave rise to discussions about the reliability of these two canonical sources. A paper on the reliability of the *Şaḥīḥayn* by Yaşar Kandemir,⁷⁸ one of the leading scholars of the traditionalists, and its review by Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu can be described as the emblematic works in which the positions of the two opposing camps became crystallised.⁷⁹

Lastly, Hayri Kırbaşoğlu merits mention as the most vocal and prolific author among critical scholars. His 1995 paper consists of a summary of the main arguments of critical scholars.⁸⁰ In this paper, Kırbaşoğlu defends the re-valuation of traditions, and prefers the designation 'progressive' instead of 'modernist'.⁸¹ He states that viewing progressive scholarship as a direct result of Orientalists' influence leads to ignoring the problems originating from the hadith literature itself. Kırbaşoğlu also argues against the acceptance of the classical science of hadith criticism as the final method that cannot be criticised or changed.⁸²

In 2002, Kırbaşoğlu published his *Alternatif Hadis Metodolojisi* ('Alternative Methodology of Hadith'), which drew on the results of the theses he had supervised over the years.⁸³ His main focus in the book was dogmatic traditions that he regarded as either later fabrications or distortions, mostly on the basis of the *argumentum e silentio*.⁸⁴ For example, he reached the conclusion that the so-called hadith of Jibrīl⁸⁵ was not known or not taken seriously by most of the hadith scholars in the first centuries or was regarded as fabricated based on its absence from sources such as Maʿmar ibn Rāshid (d. 153/770?), *al-Jāmiʿ*, Mālik (d. 179/795), *al-Muwattaʿ*, and ʿAbd al-Razzāq (d. 211/827), *al-Muṣannaḥ*.⁸⁶ Having insisted on the importance of content criticism, Kırbaşoğlu argued that this method was used by the leading companions, the Muʿtazilah, and also several *mujtahids*, including Abū Ḥanīfah.⁸⁷ But, according to him, this method was forgotten due to 'the hegemony of the classical science of hadith based on the *ahl al-ḥadīth*/Shāfiʿī school'.⁸⁸ The

work of Kırbaçoğlu, along with other scholars at the Faculty of Theology in Ankara, demonstrates the lasting influence of Mehmet Said Hatiboğlu within the school of Ankara (*Ankara Okulu*).⁸⁹

Conclusion

The first Turkish translation from Western studies of Islam, Dozy's *De Voornaamste Godsdienste: Het Islamisme*, was published in the late Ottoman era. In the Republican era, another work, Caetani's *Annali dell'Islam* was translated into Turkish. While the intellectuals of the Ottoman and Republican eras accepted the necessity of Westernisation in varying degrees, they have taken a critical stance against Orientalists' works since the first translations. The first exception to this critical position was Zakir Kadiri Ugan, who voiced views similar to those of Orientalists about several important aspects of hadith literature. Although his scholarship was not as receptive as that of Ugan, Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu, one of the first-generation hadith scholars of the Republican era, was another exception. Hatiboğlu based his dissertation and habilitation on Goldziher's main thesis about the relation of hadiths to political events of the first two Islamic centuries. On the other hand, Talât Koçyiğit, Hatiboğlu's colleague at the Faculty of Theology in Ankara and the author of the first Turkish dissertation on hadith, remained critical of Western hadith scholarship, and it is still the prevalent attitude among Turkish scholars towards Orientalists' works.

Western hadith studies also have a role in the debates between traditionalist and progressive/modernist hadith scholars. Departure from the prevalent critical attitude against Orientalism is generally associated with Islamic modernism. Even though they might not be as fervent as in the 1990s, debates between traditionalist and modernist hadith scholars continue to be a driving force of academic debate in the field of Islamic Studies in Turkey, mostly because all parties consider defending their position is not just an academic but also a religious duty. The modernists devote nearly all of their attention to collecting problematic material that would justify revisiting the traditions accepted as authentic by scholars of previous generations. Traditionalists, in turn, not only dedicate most of their time to answering or explaining away the questions and criticisms voiced by the modernists, but also deny justified criticisms in order to avoid strengthening the position of their opponents. It seems that primary responsibility for breaking this vicious circle lies with the critical scholars. If they take a revisionist approach to the sources and compose their hadith collections using the new methods they propose in place of classical hadith criticism, it might lead to a more honest discussion between both parties. But it should be noted that sorting through the traditions would inevitably lead to a new *fiqh* and theology as well. Maybe this is why critical scholars in Turkey are unwilling to carry out their proposals.

As for Western influence on modern hadith debates in Turkey, this

influence took the form of a major shift in the worldview especially due to Westernisation of the Second Constitutional Period in which Westernisation of the Republic of Turkey also had its origins. Turkish hadith scholars were inevitably affected by this transformation. On the other hand, it is difficult to determine any direct influence of Western hadith studies except for Zakir Kadiri Ugan and Mehmet Said Hatiboğlu's scholarship. Rather, it could be said that modern hadith discussions in Turkey have always been more of an extension of those in the Indian subcontinent and Egypt, turning progressive hadith scholarship of Turkish academics into a second-hand Islamic modernism.

Notes

1. On Atatürk's (d. 1938) policy of *Garblılaşıma*, see Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, *Atatürk'ün Söylev ve Demeçleri*, 3 vols (Ankara: Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Yayınları, 1997), 3:91.
2. Turkey's first step towards laicism was the exclusion of the sentence 'The religion of the state is Islam' from the Constitution in 1928. Afterwards, in 1937, the principle of laicism was added to the Constitution. The language reforms adopted consisted of purifying Turkish of loanwords and adopting the Latin alphabet instead of the Ottoman Turkish.
3. Şükrü Hanioglu emphasises the difference between the *Garbcılık* of the Second Constitutional and Republican periods and a more general process of Westernisation, which started as early as the reign of Selim III (r. 1789–1807). See M. Şükrü Hanioglu, 'II. Meşrutiyet Dönemi 'Garbcılığı'nın Kavramsallaştırılmasındaki Üç Temel Sorun Üzerine Not', *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi* 31 (2005): 55–64, at 57.
4. M. Şükrü Hanioglu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008), 138.
5. Kılıçzâde was born in Niş (today's Niš in Serbia) and studied in *Mühendishâne-i Berri-i Hümayun*, an engineering school that educated engineer and artillery officers. In the Ottoman era, materialism and positivism were prevalent among students of *Mühendishaneler* (engineering schools) and *Tıbbiyeler* (medical schools). Almost all the prominent figures among the so-called *Garbcılar* (Westernisers) were graduates of these institutions. For Kılıçzâde's life and views, see Celal Pekdoğan, 'Kılıçzâde Hakkı', in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, 44 vols (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988–2013), 25: 415–16.
6. See Hanioglu, *Brief History*, 185.
7. Halil İnalçık, 'II. Meşrutiyet', *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi* 45 (2008): 11–16, at 13. Most of the intellectuals of the late Ottoman period spoke French as a foreign language. This continued in the Republican era; for example, Fuad Köprülü (1890–1966), who was among the graduates of *idadis* during the Second Constitutional Period and later minister of foreign affairs in the Republican era, gave his speech in French at the twenty-second International Congress of Orientalists (R. N. Dandekar, 'The Twenty-Second International Congress of Orientalists, Istanbul,

- 15th–22nd September, 1951', *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 32(1) (1951): i–xxiv, at vii). In one of his interviews, Atatürk also acknowledged French influence on the Ottoman intellectuals by saying 'We all had drunk from the spring of French culture.' See Atatürk, *Atatürk'ün Söylev* 3:89–90.
8. İbrahim Hatiboğlu argued that in the *Dârülfünûn* Muslims learned to look at Islamic issues as 'outsiders' (İbrahim Hatiboğlu, 'Transmission of Western Hadîth Critique to Turkey: On the Past and the Future of Academic Hadîth Studies', *Hadis Tetkikleri Dergisi* 4(2) (2006): 37–53, at 40). This is, however, a simplistic presentation of the issue. For example, the Branch and madrasas of *Dârü'l-Hilâfe* both followed a similar curriculum (Halis Ayhan, *Türkiye'de Din Eğitimi* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 1999), 39).
 9. İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu (d. 1978), the Chancellor of *Dârülfünûn*, described the faculty as 'some kind of faculty of sociology' (M. Ali Kirman, 'Türk Modernleşmesi ve Yüksek Din Eğitimi', in Tahsin Özcan et al. (eds), *Darülfünun İlahiyat Sempozyumu 18–19 Kasım 2009 Tebliğleri* (İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, 2010), 58).
 10. In Turkey, 'Faculty of Divinity' and 'Faculty of Theology' are used interchangeably. I have used the latter exclusively, although some faculties prefer 'Faculty of Divinity' on their websites.
 11. In his speech on re-opening of the Faculty of Theology in 1949, Baltacıoğlu admitted that mistakes had been made in 1924 for political reasons and emphasised the importance of religious formation for character-building (Ayhan, *Türkiye'de Din*, 21). Today, most vocal critics of faculties of theology are preachers and their followers outside the academy. Sometimes, these preachers publicly enter into polemics with various academics, mostly using social media.
 12. While some of these faculty graduates continue their studies at the post-graduate level and become faculty members, most of the graduates work as teachers of religion (a compulsory course in the last year of elementary school, and throughout secondary and high school), imams (only male students) or preachers (both male and female students) under the Directorate of Religious Affairs.
 13. Those who criticise the faculties of theology on the grounds that they are not the continuation of madrasas do not propose any viable alternative. Since they were officially closed in the Republican era, the madrasas continued their activities 'underground', especially in the eastern part of Turkey. Their relative lack of formal organisation prevents them from taking the necessary steps to improve their curricula.
 14. İzmirli İsmail Hakkı, *Hadis Tarihi* (İstanbul: Darülhadis, 2002), 283. This course was also taught by Arapkirli Hüseyin Avni (d. 1954).
 15. For example, see Mehmet Emin Özafşar, 'Hadisin Neliği Sorunu ve Akademik Hadisçilik', *İslâmîyât* 9(1–4) (2006): 147–66, at 158–9; Hatiboğlu, 'Transmission of Western Hadîth Critique to Turkey', 41ff.
 16. See İzmirli, *Hadis Tarihi*, pp. 281–3. İzmirli, for his part, states at the end of his book that the subjects of hadith and history of hadith are the same and that the only difference between them is their classification of the same subject according to topics or periods, respectively.

17. Those who study the intellectual history of the late Ottoman Empire classify intellectuals of this era according to their political–religious positions as Ottomanists, Westernisers, Islamists and Turkists. See İsmail Kara, *Din ile Modernleşme Arasında Çağdaş Türk Düşüncesinin Meseleleri* (İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2012), 39. The Islamists or Islamic revivalists believed that the way of saving the empire was through religious revival. They criticised the radical Westernisation and the materialist scientism of the likes of Bahâ Tevfik (d. 1914) and Abdullah Cevdet (d. 1932), but also argued for the necessity of modernisation in religious disciplines. On İzmirli’s views in particular, see M. Sait Özervarlı, ‘Alternative Approaches to Modernization in the Late Ottoman Period: İzmirli İsmail Hakkı’s Religious Thought against Materialist Scientism’, *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 39 (2007): 77–102.
18. Ali Birinci, ‘İzmirli, İsmail Hakkı’, in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2001), 23:530–3, at 531. Because Dozy’s *Het Islamisme* and Caetani’s *Annali dell’Islam* were translated into Turkish in 1908 and 1924–7, respectively, Dozy and Caetani were among the most well-known Orientalists in that period, for which, see M. Şükrü Hanioglu, ‘Garbcılar: Their Attitudes toward Religion and Their Impact on the Official Ideology of Turkish Republic’, *Studia Islamica* 86 (1997): 133–58, at 139.
19. Ahmed ez-Zebîdî, *Sahîh-i Buhârî Muhtasarı Tecrîd-i Sarîh Tercemesi ve Şerhi*, trans. Ahmed Naim and Kâmil Miras, 12 vols (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1976). The first edition was published 1928–48. Kâmil Miras (d. 1957), the translator of the remaining volumes, revised the drafts of the third volume completed by Ahmed Naim after the latter’s death.
20. ez-Zebîdî, *Sahîh-i Buhârî Muhtasarı* 1:74ff.
21. Zakir Kadiri Ugan, ‘Dinî Rivâyetler’, *İstanbul Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 4 (2002): 207–57, at 221–2, 241. For an attenuation of this claim, see Jonathan A. C. Brown, ‘How We Know Early Ḥadîth Critics Did *Matn* Criticism and Why It’s So Hard to Find’, *Islamic Law and Society* 15 (2008): 143–84. Brown suggests that the term ‘content criticism’ more accurately captures the type of analysis intended by Western scholars than ‘textual criticism’.
22. For Aḥmad Amîn and Abū Rayyah’s views on *matn* criticism, see Aḥmad Amîn, *Fajr al-Islâm* (Beirut: Dâr al-Kutub al-‘Arabî, 1969), 217ff; Maḥmūd Abū Rayyah, *Adwâ’ ‘alâ al-sunnah al-muḥammadiyah* (Cairo: Dâr al-Ma‘ârif, n.d.), 258, 262–5. See also G. H. A. Juynboll, *The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature: Discussions in Modern Egypt* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 43.
23. Ugan, ‘Dinî Rivâyetler’, 241, 243. For Abū Rayyah’s criticisms of the doctrine of the collective probity of the Companions and of Abū Hurayrah, see *Adwâ’*, 180–3, 312ff.
24. Ugan, ‘Dinî Rivâyetler’, 248.
25. Ahmed Hamdi Akseki, ‘Dinî Müesseseler ve Din Eğitiminin Meselelerine Dair Rapor’, in İsmail Kara (ed.), *Türkiye’de İslâmcılık Düşüncesi: Metinler Kişiler*, 3 vols (İstanbul: Kitabevi, 1997), 2:378. The fact that graduates of *imam-hatip* (high schools with extra courses on Islamic sciences) were not accepted to the Faculty shows that its primary purpose was not to train the clergy. For the

- higher religious education of the graduates of *imam-hatip* schools, Yüksek İslam Enstitüleri (Higher Institutes of Islam) were established between 1959 and 1982. In 1982, all the institutes were transformed into faculties of theology.
26. İbrahim Hatiboğlu, 'Okıç, Muhammed Tayyib', in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, 44 vols (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988–2013), 33:336–8, at 337.
 27. E.g., see Tayyib Okıç, *Bazı Hadis Meseleleri Üzerine Tetkikler* (İstanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1959), 5–6, 8–10, 28, 32–3.
 28. Okıç, *Bazı Hadis*, 6.
 29. Okıç, *Bazı Hadis*, 9.
 30. İbrahim Hatiboğlu, 'M. Said Hatiboğlu ile M. Tayyib Okıç'ın İlmi Kişiliği ve Tesirleri Üzerine', *Hadis Tetkikleri Dergisi* 5(2) (2007): 169–82, at 176.
 31. In order of translation dates, these articles are 'The Transmission of Muslim's *Şahih*', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 4(3/4) (1955): 8–20; 'The Transmission of Abū Dāwūd's *Sunan*', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 5(1–4) (1958): 173–82; 'İbn İshāq's Use of the *İsnād*', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 10 (1962): 117–26; and 'Varieties of *Hasan* Tradition', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 11 (1963): 109–18.
 32. Talât Koçyiğit, 'I. Goldziher'in Hadisle İlgili Bazı Görüşlerinin Tahlil ve Tenkid'i', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 15 (1967): 43–55. Talât Koçyiğit's dissertation was *Hadislerin Toplanması ve Yazıyla Tespiti* ('Collection and Writing down of Traditions'). Koçyiğit, who worked in various positions at the faculty until his retirement, played a great role in the standardisation of hadith terminology in Turkish with his books on the history of hadith and hadith methodology. He maintained his traditionalist position in the Department of Hadith at the Faculty of Theology in Ankara, which is labelled as modernist by its traditionalist opponents.
 33. In his article titled 'İslâm Hadisinde İsnad ve Hadis Râvilerinin Cerhi' ('*İsnād* in Islamic Tradition and Criticism of Hadith Transmitters'), Koçyiğit also objects to the chronology of *isnâds* given by Joseph Schacht and argues that the *fitnah* in Ibn Sîrin's famous statement about the origins of the *isnād* is the Second Civil War (60–73/680–92). See Talât Koçyiğit, 'İslâm Hadisinde İsnad ve Hadis Râvilerinin Cerhi', *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 9 (1961): 47–57, at 50.
 34. Koçyiğit, 'I. Goldziher'in Hadisle', 43.
 35. For this report, see Muḥammad ibn Jarîr al-Ṭabarî, *Tārîkh al-rusûl wa-al-mulûk*, ed. Muḥammad Abū al-Faql İbrâhîm, Dhakhâ'ir al-^cArab 30, 11 vols (Cairo: Dâr al-Ma'ârif, 1960–77), 5:253–4, s.a. 51. For the translation, see *History of al-Ṭabarî, vol. 18: Between Civil Wars: The Caliphate of Mu'āwiyah* A.D. 661–680/A.H. 40–60, trans. Michael G. Morony, Bibliotheca Persica and SUNY Series in Near Eastern Studies (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1987), 123.
 36. Ignaz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, ed. S. M. Stern, trans. S. M. Stern and G. R. Barber, 2 vols (London: Allen & Unwin, 1971), 2:44.
 37. Koçyiğit, 'I. Goldziher'in Hadisle', 46.
 38. For the narrations coming from Zuhri in the pre-canonical sources, see 'Abd al-Razzâq b. Hammâm al-Şan'ânî, *al-Muşannaḥ*, ed. Ḥabîb al-Raḥmân al-^cAzamî, 10 vols (Beirut: al-Majlis al-^cİlmî, 1392/1972), 5:132, No. 9158; Abū Bakr ibn

- ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydī, *al-Musnad*, ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad, 2 vols (Damascus: Dār al-Saqā, 1996), 2:181, No. 973; Abū Bakr ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn Abī Shaybah, *al-Muṣannaf*, ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt, 7 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Tāj, 1409/1989), 3:418–19; Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā‘ūṭ et al. (Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah, 1416–21/1995–2001), 12:116, 191, also 13:165. For narrations in *al-kutub al-sittah*, see al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *faḍl al-ṣalāh fī masjid Makkah wa-al-Madīnah 1*, *bāb faḍl al-ṣalāh fī masjid Makkah wa-al-Madīnahi*, No. 1189; Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *al-ḥajj 95*, *bāb lā tushaddu al-riḥāl illā ilā thalāthat masājīd*, No. 511; Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, *al-manāsik 94*, *bāb ityān al-Madīna*, No. 2026; al-Nasā‘ī, *Mujtabā*, *al-masājīd 10*, *bāb mā tushaddu al-riḥāl ilayhi min al-masājīd*, No. 700; Ibn Mājah, *Sunan*, *iqāmat al-ṣalāh 196*, *bāb mā jā’a fī al-ṣalāh fī masjid Bayt al-Maqdis*, No. 1409.
39. In the edition of *al-Tārikh* (ed. M. T. Houtsma, 2 vols [Leiden: Brill, 1883], 2: 311) used by Goldziher, it is said that ‘Abd al-Malik had prevented the people of al-Shām from visiting Mecca because of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr. It is also reported that upon the people’s protest, ‘Abd al-Malik said: ‘Here! Ibn Shihāb transmits to you that the Prophet of God said, “Do not set out on a journey except for three mosques: al-Masjid al-Ḥarām, the *masjid* of mine, and Bayt al-Maqdis.” Bayt al-Maqdis serves as the substitute to you for al-Masjid al-Ḥarām. And this rock which the Prophet is reported to have set his foot on while ascending to Heaven also substitutes for the Ka‘ba.’
40. Koçyiğit, ‘I. Goldziher’in Hadisle’, 50. Koçyiğit’s arguments parallel those of other Western scholars. S. M. Stern, the editor and co-translator of *Muhammedanische Studien*, describes this report as an ‘anti-Umayyad invention’: ‘There is no doubt that in this extreme form, according to which ‘Abd al-Malik intended to substitute the pilgrimage to Jerusalem for the *hajj*, the tradition is an anti-Umayyad invention; yet it is not impossible that the Umayyads had a share in the propagation of traditions supporting the holiness of Jerusalem’ (Goldziher, *Muslim Studies* 2:45). For Goitein’s refutation of Goldziher’s claim, see S. D. Goitein and O. Grabar, ‘al-Ḳuds’, in P. Bearman et al. (eds), *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition (Leiden: Brill, 1960–2004), 5:325.
41. Al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāz*, 4 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, n.d.), 1:109ff. Muṣṭafā al-Sibā‘ī (d. 1964) refuted Goldziher’s claims about al-Zuhrī using similar arguments. See Juynboll, *Authenticity of the Tradition Literature*, 109–12.
42. Koçyiğit, ‘I. Goldziher’in Hadisle’, 55.
43. The dissertation, completed in 1962, was published for the first time in 2015. See Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu, *İslami Tenkid Zihniyeti* (Ankara: Otto, 2016).
44. Hatiboğlu’s translation of the second volume of *Muhammedanische Studien*, based on its French edition, has been published (Ankara: Otto, 2019).
45. Hatiboğlu, *İslami Tenkid Zihniyeti*, 60. He revised his view in his recent book as follows: ‘The evidence we give from Qur’ān and *Sunna*, naturally, will lead us to the conclusion of regarding the reports about future events not mentioned in the Qur’ān as inauthentic’ (Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu, *Hız. Peygamber ve Kur’an Dışı Vahiy* (Ankara: Otto, 2017), 157).

46. Hatiboğlu describes Lammens as a 'fierce enemy of Islam' (Hatiboğlu, *İslami*, 34).
47. He rejects Henri Lammens' claim that 'Umar (d. 23/644) ordered the murder of Sa'd ibn 'Ubādah (d. 14/635) (*İslami*, 35) and Goldziher's well-known argument that Muslims did not consider *mutūn* in their hadith criticism (*İslami*, 112, 134). He also states that *isnād* criticism started well before Goldziher assumed (*ibid.*, 113). According to Hatiboğlu, *isnād* criticism must have started well before the time Ibn Sīrīn (d. 110/729) began to narrate hadiths since he said 'they' instead of 'we' in his well-known saying 'They did not ask about the *isnād*, but when *fitnah* arose they said, "Name for us your men."'
48. M. Said Hatiboğlu, 'Batı'da Hadis Çalışmaları Üzerine', in *Uluslararası Birinci İslam Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Tebliğler ve Müzakereler* (İzmir: Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, 1985), 81–94. Even Goldziher was not completely spared from criticism. For example, Hatiboğlu charges that Goldziher mistakenly believed the customary inclusion of the word '*al-hadith*' at the end of a truncated transmission to be part of it.
49. Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu, *Hz. Peygamber'in Vefatından Emevilerin Sonuna Kadar Siyasi İctimai Hâdiselerle Hadis Münasebetleri* (Ankara: Otto, 2016), 19.
50. See Daniel Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 43, 51–9.
51. Hatiboğlu develops this view in a separate book published in 2009 titled *Hz. Peygamber ve Kur'an Dışı Vahiy* ('The Prophet and Revelation outside the Qur'ān'). On *wahy ghayr matlūw*, see al-Shāfi'ī, *al-Umm*, ed. Rif'at Fawzi 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, 11 vols (Mansoura: Dār al-Wafā', 2001), 3:11; Abū Bakr al-Sarakhsī, *Uṣūl al-Sarakhsī*, ed. Abū al-Wafā' al-Afghānī, 2 vols (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1414/1903), 2:90–1.
52. Since 2009, Otto, the publisher of Mehmed Said Hatiboğlu's works, has continued Kitabiyat's line.
53. Lütfi Sever, one of the founders of the Ankara Okulu Yayınları, previously worked with another publisher Fecr Yayınevi. The first book he published while working at Fecr Yayınevi was Muhammed Abduh's (d. 1905) *Kitāb al-Tawhīd*.
54. M. Fuad Sezgin, *Buhārī'nin Kaynakları Hakkında Araştırmalar* (İstanbul: İbrahim Horoz, 1956; repr. Ankara: Kitabiyat, 2000), 23–6, 53, 59, 81–2, 88–9.
55. Studies on the sources of other hadith collections have started to be carried out recently. For a study on the sources of Muslim's (d. 261/875) *Ṣaḥīh*, see Dilek Tekin, 'Yazılı-Şifâhî Rivâyet Bağlamında Müslim'in Eser Sahibi Hocalarından Rivâyeti', unpublished PhD thesis, Marmara University, 2015.
56. Wellhausen's *Das arabische Reich und sein Sturz* in 1963, W. Montgomery Watt's *Islamic Theology and Philosophy and Muhammad at Mecca* in 1968 and 1986, respectively, Schacht's *An Introduction to Islamic Law* in 1977, Goldziher's *Die Zâhiriten* in 1982.
57. Ali Fuat Başgil (d. 1967), the politician and professor of law who proposed the opening of higher institutes of Islam, made a distinction between theologians educated at the Faculty of Theology and religious scholars to be educated at these institutions. According to Başgil, those who learn the philosophy of

- religion and sociology of religion could become specialists or philosophers but not religious scholars. See Ayhan, *Türkiye'de Din Eğitimi*, 226.
58. A few of these faculties have programmes with courses held only in Arabic. For the experiences of these programmes, see Muhammet Beyler, '*Tajârib kulliyât al-ilâhiyât/al-^çulûm al-islâmiyah fi tadris al-^çulûm al-islâmiyah bi-al-lughat al-^çarabiyah fi jâmi^çât Türkiyah: Birnâmaj al-^çadîth wa-^çulûmihi anmûdhajan'*, *Hadis Tetkikleri Dergisi* 14(1) (2016): 51–73.
59. For the catalogue of the theses in Islamic studies between 1953 and 2015, see İsmail E. Erünsal et al., *İlâhiyat Fakültesi Tezler Kataloğu (1953–2015)* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2017). For an online catalogue, see at: <http://ktp2.isam.org.tr/?blm=arailhtez&navdil=tr>.
60. Salahattin Polat, 'Modern Dönemde Hadis İlminin Temel Meseleleri', in *Modern Dönemde Dinî İlimlerin Temel Meseleleri – İlmî Toplantı* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2007), 211–48, at 218–19; Halit Özkan, 'Cumhuriyet Dönemi Hadis Çalışmaları: Bir Hasıla', *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 11(21) (2013): 9–39, at 30.
61. Özkan, 'Cumhuriyet Dönemi Hadis Çalışmaları: Bir Hasıla', 31.
62. Bekir Kuzudişli, *Hadis Rivâyetinde Aile İsnadları* (İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları, 2007), 129ff. Nabia Abbott also drew attention to the close relationship between the written documents and family *isnâds*. See Nabia Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri, vol. 2: Quranic Commentary and Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 1, 37.
63. Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950, repr. 1975), 170.
64. Kuzudişli, *Hadis Rivâyetinde Aile İsnadları*, 498ff.
65. Fatma Kızıl, 'Hukukî İçerikli Merfû Hadisler Bağlamında Müşterek Râvî Teorisi ve Tenkidî', PhD thesis, Uludağ University, 2011. The dissertation was published in 2013 with the title *Müşterek Râvî Teorisi ve Tenkidî* (İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi, 2013).
66. Other dissertations on Western hadith studies or that substantially cited Western scholars' works include the following: Sabri Kızılkaya, 'İsnad ve Metin Çözümlemeleri Bağlamında Geleneksel ve Yeni Yaklaşımlar' ('Traditional and New Approaches in the Context of *Isnâd* and *Matn* Analyses'), PhD thesis, Ankara University, 2008; Kudrat Artıkbaev, 'Rus Oryantalistlerin Hadis ve Siyer Çalışmaları' ('Studies of Russian Orientalists on Hadith and *Sıra*'), PhD thesis, Ankara University, 2010; and Sultanbek Aliyev, 'Rus Oryantalistlerin İslâmî İlimlerle İlgili Çalışmaları ve Hadis/Sünnete Yaklaşımları' ('Studies of Russian Orientalists on Islam and Their Approach to Hadith/Sunnah'), PhD thesis, Erciyes University, 2016. In addition, Rahile Yılmaz discusses Orientalists' dating of the *Muwatta'* and their arguments about *mursal isnâds* in her dissertation. See Rahile Yılmaz, 'Modern Hadis Tartışmaları Bağlamında Muvatta'daki Mürsel Rivâyetler' ('Mursal Hadîths in the *Muwatta'* in the Context of Modern Hadîth Discussions'), PhD thesis, Marmara University, 2014.
67. Süleyman Doğanay, *Oryantalistlerin Hadisleri Tarihlendirmeye Yaklaşımları* (İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 2013).

68. Doğanay, *Oryantalistlerin Hadisleri Tarihlendirmeye Yaklaşımları*, 226. Besides the dissertations and habilitations, there are also an increasing number of articles about Western hadith studies after the 2000s. For example, see Halit Özkan, 'The Common Link and Its Relation to the *Madār*', *Islamic Law and Society* 11(1) (2004): 42–77. In this article, Özkan objects to Juynboll's assertion that the term *madār* in classical hadith terminology is the equivalent of the common link. Some of his main arguments are as follows: (a) the dates given for *madārs* go back to nearly forty years earlier than those of Juynboll's first common links; (b) unlike the common link, there could be more than one *madār* for a single hadith and more than one strand below the *madārs*.
69. See Hüseyin Akgün, *Goldziher ve Hadis* (Ankara: Araştırma Yayınları, 2014).
70. For a literature review of Turkish academics' work on Western hadith studies, see Fatma Kızıl, 'Türkiye'de Hadis Çalışmaları ve Oryantalizm', *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 11(21) (2013): 303–31.
71. My use of these labels is based on the usage current among the three competing trends. Curiously, while the first group is described as 'traditionalist' both by the group itself and its opponents, the two other labels are used only by the opponents of the group in question. I have tried to use 'critical scholars' or 'progressive scholars' as much as possible instead of 'modernists', since no scholars referred to as modernist by their opponents accept this designation. As for the traditionalists in Turkey, even though the term 'late Sunnī traditionalists' coined by Jonathan Brown is more precise, I used 'traditionalists' in keeping with the usage of all parties to the debate. See Jonathan Brown, 'Scripture in the Modern World: the Quran and Hadith', in Jeffrey T. Kenney and Ebrahim Moosa (eds), *Islam in the Modern World* (London: Routledge, 2014), 13–33, at 29–30.
72. For the translation of *tarihselci*, I have followed Felix Körner's rendering. But also, as he points out, the 'English rendering (*sic*) do not capture the Turkish coinage precisely': Felix Körner, *Revisionist Koran Hermeneutics in Contemporary Turkish University Theology: Rethinking Islam* (Würzburg: Ergon, 2005), 68.
73. This trend was prominent in Turkey during the 1970s and 1980s in particular (Mustafa Öztürk, 'Dinî Hükümlerin Kaynağını Kur'an ile Sınırlandırma Eğiliminin Kaynakları ve Tutarlılığı', in Cengiz Kallek (ed.), *Dini Hükümlerin Kaynağı ve Dini Metinlerin Anlaşılması Konusundaki Çağdaş Yaklaşımlar Çalıştayı* (İstanbul: İSAM, 2010), 13–67, at 43). The most popular supporter of the discourse of 'Kur'an İslâmî' ('Islam derived only from the Qur'ân') was Yaşar Nuri Öztürk (d. 2016) during the latter half of the 1990s. As a kind of spokesperson of the reformed Islam supported by the secularists during the 1997 military memorandum, he was especially influential outside the academy by means of public television programmes. During that period, he was also the Dean of the Faculty of Theology at Istanbul University. One of the leading institutions promoting the views of the *Kur'ancılar* today is the Süleymaniye Vakfı, which was established by Abdülaziz Bayındır, Professor of Islamic Law at the Faculty of Theology at Istanbul University in 1998 (see the foundation's website at: <https://www.suleymaniyevakfi.org>).
74. In Turkey, those who completely reject the Sunnah of the Prophet are figures

outside the academy such as Edip Yüksel. Yüksel, currently residing in the United States, describes himself as ‘one of the leading names of the Islamic reform movement’, see at: <http://19.org/tr/category/edipyuksel/0-edip-yuksel-kimdir>, last accessed 22 January 2018. Another example is the anonymous group that authored the book *Uydurulan Din ve Kur’an’daki Din* (‘Fabricated Religion vs Religion in the Qur’an’) (İstanbul: İstanbul Yayınevi, 2016), in which they describe legal regulations based on sources other than the Qur’an as fabricated.

75. Öztürk, ‘Dinî Hükümlerin Kaynağını Kur’an’, 45.
76. Öztürk, ‘Dinî Hükümlerin Kaynağını Kur’an’, 152.
77. Özafşar, ‘Hadisin Neliği ve Akademik Hadisçilik’, 149.
78. M. Yaşar Kandemir, Professor of Hadith in the Faculty of Theology at Marmara University until his retirement in 1999, is currently working at the Centre for Islamic Studies (İSAM). He oversaw all the entries on hadith and wrote a great many of them in *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (‘Turkey Religious Affairs Foundation Encyclopaedia of Islam’) (1983–2016), consisting of forty-four volumes and two supplements. Betül Avcı, who studied its entries on Christianity, concludes that the encyclopaedia, despite certain shortcomings, tends to let the Christian tradition speak for itself rather than adopting an Occidentalist approach. See Betül Avcı, ‘Contemporary Turkish Research on Christianity: a Critical Study of *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi* Articles, and Dissertations Conducted between 1988 and 2010 at the Faculties of Theology at Marmara and Ankara Universities’, PhD thesis, Pontifical Gregorian University, 2012, 72. For the online open-access version of the encyclopaedia, see at: <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr>.
79. M. Yaşar Kandemir, ‘Sahihayn’a Yöneltilen Tenkitlerin Değeri’, in İsmail Lütfi Çakan (ed.), *Sünnetin Dindeki Yeri* (İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 1998), 335–76; Hatiboğlu, Mehmed Said, ‘Müslüman Âlimlerin Buhârî ve Müslim’e Yönelik Eleştirileri’, *İslâmî Araştırmalar* 10(1–4) (1997): 1–14.
80. M. Hayri Kırbaçoğlu, ‘Hadis İlminde Metodoloji Sorunu’, *Sünnetin Dindeki Yeri* (İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 1998), 427–97.
81. Kırbaçoğlu, ‘Hadis İlminde Metodoloji Sorunu’, 430.
82. Kırbaçoğlu, ‘Hadis İlminde Metodoloji Sorunu’, 432–3.
83. M. Hayri Kırbaçoğlu, ‘Alternatif Hadis Metodolojisi’, in İsmail Kurt and Seyit Ali Tüz (eds), *İslami İlimlerde Metodoloji/Usul Meselesi* (İstanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 2005), 777–99, at 779.
84. M. Hayri Kırbaçoğlu, *Alternatif Hadis Metodolojisi* (Ankara: Kitabiyat, 2002), 149–50, 343, 354, 359.
85. Bukhārī, *Şahih, imān* 37, *bāb suʿāl Jibril ilā al-nabī ʿan al-imān wa-al-islām wa-al-iḥsān wa-ʿilm al-sāʿah*, No. 50.
86. Kırbaçoğlu, *Alternatif Hadis Metodolojisi*, 354.
87. Kırbaçoğlu, *Alternatif Hadis Metodolojisi*, 173.
88. Kırbaçoğlu, *Alternatif Hadis Metodolojisi*, 173.
89. For example, Kırbaçoğlu holds similar views to those of Hatiboğlu about ‘non-recited revelation’ and hadiths about the future tribulations (*fitan*) and Portents of the Last Hour (*ashrāʿ al-sāʿah*). See *Alternatif Hadis Metodolojisi*, 198, 212–15.