Exploring Ignác Goldziher's Insights on Hadith Literature and Terminologies

DR GHULAM MUSTAFA
Assistant Professor, Department of Islamic Studies ,
Governoment College (B) lahore.

Ameer Humzah
Assistant Professor &
Ph.D Scholar
Institute of Islamic Studies
University of The Punjab

Abstract

Ignác Goldziher, a revered authority in Western Islamic studies, has left an indelible mark on the understanding of early Islamic literature, particularly on the subject of hadiths. In his scholarship, Goldziher navigated a fine line between highlighting previously unexplored aspects and aligning with established Muslim scholarly observations. He proposed that written hadith materials existed during the first century after the Hijra, resonating with the beliefs of Muslim scholars. However, his stance on the prohibition of writing hadiths as a later fabrication deviates from traditional views. Goldziher's assertion that secular influences shaped independent literary traditions, leading to the development of various genres before religious literature, challenges conventional narratives. His analysis of musnad and musannaf classifications, as well as his distinction between various sūnan works, showcases his in-depth grasp of Islamic textual sources. While Goldziher's interpretations sometimes diverge from Islamic scholarship, his insights remain integral to discussions on early Islamic literature and provide a valuable lens for examining the development of hadith literature and concepts. In this article, Goldziher's views on the written record of ḥadīths, the early period ḥadīth literature, the concepts of kitāb, muṣannaf, jāmiʿ, sunan and musnad will be discussed specifically his book Muhammedanische Studien.
Keywords: Ignác Goldziher, hadith literature, Islamic studies, musnad, mus annaf, sūnan

Introduction

The first roots of Orientalism, which focuses on the study of Islamic history, were established in the 17th and 18th centuries.[1] In the 19th century, there was a significant increase in these studies. During this period, chairs for Islamic studies were established in Western universities, and books, articles, and journals were published.[2]

Master's and doctoral theses were produced as well. Works were written on various topics such as the Quran, the life of Prophet Muhammad, Islamic history and civilization, interpretation (tafsir), Islamic jurisprudence (fiqh), history of Islamic schools of thought, theology (kalâm), and mysticism (tasavvuf). Additionally, numerous studies were conducted on hadith (sayings of Prophet Muhammad), and especially in the last two centuries, books and articles were written about the history of hadith, methodology of hadith studies (usûl), and the literature of hadith.

One of the pioneers in increasing Western interest in hadith studies was Ignaz Goldziher (1850-1921), who identified himself as a sincere Jew.[3] Goldziher was recognized as an authority by his colleagues during his lifetime and was considered an indisputable figure in Islamic studies. In this regard, Leone Caetani (1869-1926) remarked, "He is the true father of contemporary criticism about Islam..."[4]; Gregor Schoeler stated, "Goldziher (after Sprenger) provided the first historical assessment of the development of hadith, which essentially retains its value and continues to inspire admiration to this day"[5]; and Louis Massignon (1883-1962) expressed, "Among Western orientalists (Goldziher) is the indisputable master of Islamic studies," all demonstrating their admiration for Goldziher.[6] Other oriental scholars in Islam also did not hesitate to express their admiration for Goldziher as well.[7]

Goldziher, whose work significantly influenced subsequent orientalists, wrote a two-volume work in German titled "Muhammedanische Studien" which played a crucial role in making hadith science an independent research subject in the West.[8] This work has been translated into various languages. The second volume of the work, which is dedicated to the subject of hadith, covers the following topics: Hadith and Sunnah, Umayyads and Abbasids, Sectarian Conflicts and Hadith in Islam, Reactions against Fabricated Hadiths, Hadith as a Means of Education and Entertainment, Seekers of Hadith, Compilation of Hadiths, Hadith Literature. The section on Hadith Literature extensively covers topics such as the writing, compilation, classification, and later developments of hadiths. At the end of this volume, an essay titled "Respect for Saints in Islam" is included, followed by appendices such as "The Umayyads as Warriors," "Hadith and the New Age," "Imitations of the Qur'an," "Women in Hadith Literature," and "Challenges in Sacred Places." This article will specifically focus on the section related to hadith literature. Goldziher's views will be presented using a descriptive method, and our personal opinions will be included at the end of relevant paragraphs.

1. Preserving Hadith Through Writing

Goldziher asserts that the narrations about the prohibition of writing down hadiths in the sources are not authentic statements of Prophet Muhammad and that there is no indication of a consensus among the companions regarding a ban on writing.[9] As evidence, he mentions the narration from Abu Huraira (d. 58/678), who reports that Amr ibn al-As (d. 43/664) wrote down hadiths. According to Goldziher, the fact that Prophet Muhammad allowed some of his words to be written down apart from the Quran indicates that the recording of hadiths began in the very early stages.[10] In this context, Goldziher argues that it is not feasible for a society that preserves the wise words of ordinary people in written form to leave the words of Prophet Muhammad solely to oral transmission, as this would jeopardize their lasting preservation. These statements suggest that Goldziher believed that the recording of hadiths started during

Prophet Muhammad's lifetime.[11] We believe that Goldziher's view in this regard is often overlooked, and due to reactions towards his other ideas, this important observation has been largely unnoticed. While many other orientalists generally attribute the unreliability of hadiths to their later recording in writing, Goldziher defends the opposite viewpoint, which we consider to be accurate and original.

Goldziher points out that the reason for the narrations in the sources prohibiting writing is due to the conflict between the proponents of reason (ahl-i ra'y) and the proponents of tradition (ahl-i hadith). He suggests that the proponents of reason aimed to establish the idea that writing down hadiths was prohibited in order to remove the obstacle of written documentation that hindered the free development of legal interpretation, and thus contribute significantly to jurisprudence.[12] Therefore, according to Goldziher, the proponents of reason fabricated the narration attributed to Prophet Muhammad, "Do not write anything from me other than the Quran. Whoever wrote anything, erase it immediately." On the contrary, the proponents of tradition invented narrations that permitted writing down everything from Prophet Muhammad.[13] Both groups attributed their own beliefs to Prophet Muhammad's statements, thereby fabricating hadiths to support their respective views.[14] Additionally, Goldziher believes that the debate over whether hadiths were preserved only orally or in written form remained theoretical and did not reflect practical reality until the emergence of meticulously examined collections of hadiths.[15]

As Goldziher suggests, it is true that there are narrations in the hadith sources indicating that Prophet Muhammad prohibited the recording of his own sayings in writing but allowed certain companions special permission to do so. However, this prohibition is not general and consistent; rather, it is rooted in reasons other than ideological concerns. Khatib al-Baghdadi (d. 463/1071) lists reasons such as neglect of the Quran, scarcity of individuals capable of distinguishing between Quranic text and other texts, and a shortage of scholars. Ibn Hajar (d. 852/1449) proposes the possibility of confusion between hadiths and the Quran, the inability of most companions to write, and their broad memories and prepared minds. In this context, by asserting that the narrations regarding the writing and prohibition of hadiths were fabricated due to ideological concerns, Goldziher sharply deviates from the views of Muslim scholars.

2. The First Hadith Books and the Idea Behind It

Goldziher acknowledges the existence of hadith materials recorded in writing during the first century of the Islamic calendar. He contends that the earliest narrations of hadith materials preserved in writing by the companions during the initial ten years after the migration (hijra) form a significant part of the corpus. According to him, many companions carried notebooks for the purpose of learning and instruction, and the content of these notebooks came to be referred to as the text (matn) of hadiths. Goldziher cites examples from the companions' period such as the Sahifah al-Sadiqa of Amr ibn al-Aas, the Sahifas of Sa'd ibn Ubada (d. 14/635), Simurah ibn Jundub (d. 60/680), and Jabir ibn Abdullah (d. 78/697).[16] Based on these statements, it can be said that Goldziher's views on the earliest written hadith texts are quite in line with the general views of Muslim scholars.

Regarding the earliest written hadith texts, Goldziher asserts that the term

'kutub' (books) in the early Islamic period did not literally mean a 'book.' According to him, 'kutub' refers to written materials, notes, or collections of sayings heard and recorded by a Muslim at various times. These notes were taken in a simple manner without any regard to proper organization, and the texts were treated as if they were transmitted orally, or in other words, through recitation. The writings of Ibn Lahi'a serve as examples of such written notes.[17] Goldziher was influenced in this regard by his mentor Aloys Sprenger (1813-1893). Sprenger also attributed the term 'kitab' (book) used for early hadiths to notes kept to aid memory and emphasized the necessity of distinguishing between the term 'book' and notes kept for memory assistance.[18] Considering the usage and possibilities of writing in the early period, it is appropriate to differentiate between memory-assisting notes and works created according to formal writing conventions. Therefore, we agree with both Sprenger's and Goldziher's interpretation of the term 'kutub.'

3. Hadith Literature and Concepts

Goldziher states that despite the prominence of religious motifs in Islamic society, during the initial stages of the development of the Islamic state, the course of literature was not determined by religious elements. According to him, except for the Quran, Islamic literature, at its inception, was primarily secular rather than religious literature.[19] The earliest manifestation of religious literature emerged in the 2nd century. The reasons behind this phenomenon are embedded partly in the different intellectual tendencies of the Umayyad and Abbasid periods. The same phenomena that determined the course of higher social and political life also influenced the transformation of literary quests. Due to its more worldly inclinations, the Umayyad authority was better equipped to promote secular literature.[20] In this context, it became possible to collect pre-Islamic poetry under the influence of Umayyad rulers. However, in the initial phase of Islamic literature, historical information received more attention. It is important to note that Muslim literary historians only describe the activities of Ubaid ibn Shariyya (d. 67/686) in this regard. This person from southern Arabia mainly dealt with legends and stories from the Bible. However, within the Muslim community, this constitutes a section related to history and genealogy and does not fall under religious literature, especially the Islamic literature category. There is only a connection between this literature and religion due to its compilation of data related to the life of the Prophet Muhammad.[21]

Goldziher positions the initial phase of Islamic literature in this manner. He indicates that during the Umayyad era, stories related to Islamic conquests (*Maghazi*) were combined with data obtained from the biography of Prophet Muhammad and put into writing. These were read with entertainment at the palace. In this context, Goldziher cites a narration from Zuhri (d. 124/742). According to this narration, Caliph Abd al-Malik (d. 86/705) saw a Maghazi book in the hands of one of his sons and instructed the burning of the book, while advising adherence to the Quran and the Sunnah. According to Goldziher, the content of this narration suggests the existence of such literature during the early periods. Additionally, Goldziher proposes that during the early periods, literature aligned more with the ancient Arab understanding of wisdom. Wise sayings were recorded in 'Majallah' notebooks. These notebooks were personal collections not intended for the general public. Goldziher also suggests that following this literature, the time came for theologians, with the intricacies of

jurisprudence developing in the shadows of rulers who adopted the image of Prophet Muhammad. He asserts that secular literature, too, gained importance by catering to the demands of theological taste.[22] Based on these statements, it can be concluded that Goldziher believed that due to the secular structure of the Umayyad authority, an independent form of literature emerged early on that was not strictly tied to religion. This suggests that he did not attribute the formation of hadith literature solely to the first century of hijrah. In fact, one could even argue that religious literature, including hadiths, remained in the shadow of this secular literature.

Goldziher examines narrations related to hadith literature and makes certain observations. He mentions that the earliest narration mentioned in the sources regarding this is the report transmitted by Shaybani (d. 189/805) from Imam Malik (d. 179/795), which is frequently used to mark the beginning of hadith literature. In one narration, Umar ibn Abd al-Aziz (d. 101/720) tells Abu Bakr ibn Hazm (d. 120/738), "Search for and record the hadiths or traditions of the Prophet Muhammad, the traditions of Umar, and those from this clan. I fear the loss of knowledge and the departure of scholars." In another narration, Umar ibn Abd al-Aziz had the isolated hadiths, such as those preserved by Amra bint Ubaydillah b. Ka'b b. Malik, recorded. In yet another narration, the caliph commissioned Ibn Shihab al-Zuhri to write down the hadiths.[23] Due to contradictions within various sources and the absence of a compiled collection resulting from the compilation activity, Goldziher does not accept the narration attributing the systematic compilation of hadiths to Umar ibn Abd al-Aziz.[24] He particularly does not regard the narration found only in Shaybani's version of the Muwatta as a starting point. However, it's important to note that Goldziher's assertion that the narration is found only in Shaybani's version of the *Muwatta* is also present in Ibn Sa'd's (d. 230/845) *Tabaqat*.

Goldziher, holding the belief that is formulated in this way concerning the narrations mentioned in the sources, also states that there are positive pieces of information about the origin of hadith literature. In this regard, he conveys the report that Ahmad ibn Hanbal (d. 241/855) attributes to Abdul Malik ibn Jurayj (d. 150/767) in the Hijaz and Said ibn Abi Aruba (d. 156/773) in Iraq as the first individuals to classify existing hadith material according to chapters. He mentions that based on this report, these individuals were presented as pioneers in the field of hadith collection by literary historians. However, Goldziher argues that Ahmad ibn Hanbal's report was misunderstood. According to him, these efforts in the 2nd century of hijra were not related to hadith collections but rather early attempts at arranging legal issues according to various chapters, i.e., they were early attempts at compiling jurisprudential works. These legal works were known at that time by the name "*sunan*." These works were dedicated to various topics in jurisprudence, and some of them were named as "*Kitab al-Sunan fi'l-Fiqh*." Based on the information provided by Ibn al-Nadim (d. 385/995), it can be inferred that the works of Ibn Jurayj and Ibn Abi Aruba were of this kind. "Kitab al-Sunan fi'l-Fiqh," attributed to Makhul (d. 112/730), is one of the early sunan works from the very ancient times that Ibn al-Nadim transmitted.[25]

Goldziher acknowledges the presence of hadiths in these works but argues that these were not compiled for the purpose of transmitting hadiths. According to him, these works correspond to the practical needs of the time when people began to prioritize adherence to the Sunnah in matters of justice and state affairs, and the caliphs sought the opinions of pious scholars regarding public law. Rather than being

informative sources, these works were compilations that served the practical needs of the time. Goldziher also adds that jurisprudential books were not based on in-depth investigations of written hadith sources or practical application. He highlights that the development of these two disciplines was fundamentally contradictory. In his view, the works of Abu Hanifa (d. 150/767) and his students Abu Yusuf (d. 182/798) and Muhammad al-Shaybani, as well as many early works written on the books and chapters of jurisprudence, are jurisprudence-oriented books. The authors of this period did not have the opportunity to extract hadiths from hadith collections like the jurists in the 3rd and 4th centuries of hijra. Therefore, when the authors wanted to make use of hadiths, they had to rely on information obtained from both oral sources and existing written pages.[26]

In conclusion, Goldziher asserts that the development of jurisprudential literature occurred before hadith literature in the 2nd century of hijra.[27] He claims that the works of Ibn Jurayj and Ibn Abi Aruba are jurisprudential books and partly relies on Ibn al-Nadim's account to support his thesis. It should be noted that we do not agree with Goldziher's observation. Ibn al-Nadim labeling the works of Ibn Jurayj and Ibn Abi Aruba as "sunan" does not necessarily prove that these works are jurisprudential books rather than hadith collections. Moreover, Ibn al-Nadim also names many other scholars' works as "sunan," including Ibn Abi Zi'b (d. 159/776), Zaid ibn Qudamah (d. 160/777), Hammad ibn Salamah (d. 167/784), Yahya ibn Zakariya (d. 182/798), and Vaki' ibn al-Jarrah (d. 197/812), and the works of Auzai (d. 157/774), Walid ibn Muslim (d. 195/810), Abd al-Razzaq ibn Hammam (d. 211/826-27), and Ibn Abi Shaybah (d. 235/849) are named as "Kitab al-Sunan fi'l-Fiqh." Early scholars such as Ali ibn al-Madini (d. 234/848-49), Tirmidhi (d. 279/892), and Ramhurmuzi (d. 360/971) who came before Ibn al-Nadim also mentioned these authors as among the first compilers of hadiths. Therefore, we believe that it is not possible to deduce from the titles of the works that all of these works are jurisprudential books. Based on this, we think that Goldziher's assertion that the works of Ibn Jurayj and Ibn Abi Aruba are jurisprudential books due to their titles is incorrect.

4.1 **Muvatta**ʾ

Goldziher argues that Malik ibn Anas' Muvattaʾ is not a collection of hadiths but rather a compilation of legal rulings.[28] According to him, the purpose of Imam Malik was not to obtain and compile authentic hadiths circulating in the Islamic world but rather to clarify and explain the law, jurisprudence, and practices that were accepted in Medina, in accordance with consensus (ijmā) and established practices (sunnah). Additionally, his intention was to establish theoretical principles based on consensus and the Sunnah in cases of uncertainty. Although Muvattaʾ shares some characteristics with hadith collections, it is more aligned with the practices of the Sunnah rather than hadiths themselves. Imam Malik sometimes records the verdicts of recognized authorities on a particular issue without even mentioning a single hadith. He also considers the practical customs and consensus of Medina, along with his personal opinion, to arrive at a conclusion. On the other hand, a master of a hadith school transmits hadiths that are traced back to the Prophet, not legal verdicts. As a native of Medina, Imam Malik's purpose was to serve the practical interests of the Hijaz region. To achieve this goal, he relied on the consensus that had been practiced in his homeland up to that point. However, the consensus in Medina might have been different from the views and customs of other regions. If authentic hadiths contradicted the consensus of

Medina, Imam Malik did not hesitate to prioritize the consensus. Therefore, Imam Malik was not merely a collector of simple hadiths; he was also a jurist who interpreted and applied them.[29] About a third of the hadiths Imam Malik used were mursal (a type of narration where a narrator attributes a statement or an action to the Prophet directly, skipping a generation in the chain of transmission) or even maqtuʿ (a narration where the companion's name is missing). He did not hesitate to use these as legal sources. Furthermore, he didn't focus on critically evaluating the form of the hadiths to strengthen their authenticity through similar narrations. Therefore, he didn't invest time in strengthening the validity of hadiths through the method of corroborating similar narrations.[30] Goldziher's observations about Imam Malik's Muvattaʾ are in line with the views of Islamic scholars and still hold relevance today.

Goldziher also addresses authors other than Imam Malik who compiled Muvattaʾ. He mentions the Muvattaʾ works of Ibrahim ibn Muhammad al-Azami (d. 184/800), Abdullah ibn Wahb (d. 197/813), and Ibn Abi Zi'b al-Amiri. According to Goldziher, the Muvattaʾ attributed to Abdullah ibn Wahb is likely the same as his work "Kitābu'l-Jāmiʿ." Aside from these Muvattaʾ collections, Goldziher points out that there are various other books with the title of Imam Malik's Muvattaʾ, providing examples such as the Muvattaʾ of Abu al-Qasim and Abu Mus'ab. However, Goldziher suggests that it is necessary to avoid considering these works as independent Muvattaʾ collections and including them in the layer of works mentioned earlier.[31] This indicates that Goldziher does not categorize all works with the title "Muvattaʾ" in the same way.

4.2 Musnad

After providing information about works similar to Muvattaʾ, Goldziher proceeds to offer extensive insights into hadith literature. He asserts that the classification of hadiths plays a pivotal role in the development of hadith literature. Similarly, the compilation of hadiths is a crucial component of theological activities within Islam. With the expansion of hadith materials, the organized classification of compiled hadiths became necessary. Authenticated and continuous-chain (muttasıl) hadiths, reaching back to the Companions (sahābah), are grouped under the name of the corresponding Companion. For instance, all hadiths narrated by al-Barā' ibn 'Āzib (d. 71/690) are gathered under his name, followed by the hadiths of another Companion, creating a sequential arrangement. In these arranged collections, the content of the hadiths is not the determining factor; the distinguishing element is the Companion himself. Moreover, the honorific title 'Musnid' was attributed to many individuals who collected such hadiths. The term 'Musnid' has been used to refer to renowned scholars of hadith within specific geographic and temporal contexts, such as 'Musnid of Baghdad,' 'Musnid of Sham,' 'Musnid of Yemen,' 'Musnid of Iraq,' and 'Musnid of Egypt in his time.' The title 'Musnid' was also applied to women scholars who engaged in hadith studies. Additionally, the term has been used to refer to well-known hadith scholars whose fame extended beyond their immediate environment, like Tabarani's 'Musnid of the World.'[32] Overall, Goldziher introduces the concept of Musnid works, where the defining factor is the Companion, and explores the related terminologies.

Goldziher points out three important aspects related to Musnid works.

First: The earliest Musnid works, organized based on various sequences, were further arranged alphabetically to enhance accessibility. This method found extensive application in Ibn Kathir's (d. 774/1373) "Jāmiʿu'l-Masānid wa's-Sunan." Prior to that,

Ibn al-Najjār (d. 643/1245) had compiled a comprehensive Musnad titled "Qāmru'l-Munīr fi'l-Musnadi'l-Kabīr," encompassing all the Companions.[33] These Musnad collections, arranged in an alphabetical order, differ from other Musnads.

Second: Devoted followers of a particular school of thought and their members created new Musnad works by extracting Musnad hadiths from their teachers' compiled works. However, these new works were more focused on jurisprudence (fiqh) rather than hadiths. They were organized based on the materials and sections of the original work and were not directly attributed to the scholars whose names appeared in their titles. For example, "Musnad of Shafi'i" is not organized according to the sequence of Companions. Instead, Imam Shafi'i's students categorized his Musnid hadiths by fiqh topics in his work "Al-Mabsūt." The same approach is evident in "Musnad of Muvatta" and "Musnad of Abu Hanifa."[34] Goldziher emphasizes that these Musnad collections should be differentiated from the earlier ones, as the previous Musnids were organized based on the Companions' early acceptance of Islam, participation in the Battle of Badr, and Islamic virtues.[35]

Third: The term "Musnad" has evolved and expanded to encompass all works related to hadith. During a period when a clear distinction between various methods of recording hadith was not established, works that should accurately be called "jamiʿ" (collection) have also been referred to as "Musnad." Linguistically, this extension of usage, as seen in phrases like "Musnad of al-Bukhari" or "Musnad of Muslim," has become increasingly common. Goldziher suggests that a more accurate terminology would distinguish between these various types of works, as the historical language of the schools employed different terms for these hadith collections and arrangements.[36] He contends that the works of al-Bukhari and Muslim should be referred to as "jamiʿ" rather than "Musnad."

Goldziher does not touch upon another type of Musnad work, which features isnads (chain of narrators) for a hadith book without the actual text. These are initially compiled without isnads and later have isnads added. For instance, al-Kudāʿī (d. 454/1062) initially compiled hadiths without isnads in "Shihābu'l-Ahbār" and later compiled the isnads in a work titled "Musnadu Kitābi'ş-Şihāb." Similarly, Daylamī (d. 509/1115) collected around ten thousand short hadiths without isnads in "Firdawsu'l-Akhbār bi-Ma'sūri'l-Khitāb al-Mukharrij ʿalā Kitābi'al-Shihāb" and his son, Shahrīdār al-Daylamī (d. 558/1161), later compiled the isnads for these hadiths in a work titled "Musnadu Kitābi'l-Firdaws."

4.3 Musannaf, Jamiʿ, Sunan

Goldziher delves into the concepts of musannaf, jamiʿ, and sunan after discussing musnad works, offering the following insights about these terminologies and the hadith collections associated with them:

In a musannaf, the primary consideration is the relevance and thematic similarity of the hadiths. These collections are structured not only around legal and worship matters but also include materials related to biography, history, asceticism, and ethics. Collections containing such diverse materials are referred to as jamiʿ. While musnad works are categorized based on their narrators, musannaf collections are organized according to dominant themes or chapters. Phrases like 'al-musnad wa'l-abvâb' or 'al-shüyûkh va'l-abvâb,' indicating both types of hadith collections with

contrasting themes in biographies and literary histories, are commonly encountered.[37] Baqī ibn Makhled (d. 276/889) developed a special style of musannaf that reflects both types of collections, making his work both musannaf and musnad. More precisely, it represents an attempt to transition from musnad to musannaf. Influenced by Baqī's arrangement, other authors such as Abu'l-ʿAbbās al-Nīsābūrī (d. 313/925), Abu Ishāq al-Isfahānī (d. 353/964), and Assāl (d. 349/960) composed musnad works arranged by chapters.[38]

For an extended period, the concurrent prominence of musnad and musannaf concepts in the literature represents two primary forms of collecting hadiths. Those more interested in the theoretical aspect of the collected hadiths tended to compile musnads, which are compilations intended for personal and private use. On the other hand, those seeking to facilitate practical usage of the collected hadiths arranged musannaf collections. Their goal was to create works that could be directly applied in education and practical life.[39]

Goldziher includes the definition of jamiʿ in the context of musannaf but notes that it does not correspond entirely to the content of all works referred to as jamiʿ in hadith literature. For instance, it is worth mentioning that there are works like Maʿmar ibn Rāshid's (d. 153/770) and Abdullah ibn Wahb's al-Jāmiʿ, which do not align with Goldziher's description. Maʿmar ibn Rāshid's work focuses on narrations related to acts of worship, such as ablution, prayer, fasting, and pilgrimage. On the other hand, Abdullah ibn Wahb's book generally lacks legal content in its narrations. Therefore, Goldziher's definition may not perfectly apply to all works named jamiʿ.

Goldziher points out that due to the dubious nature of the information provided by Muslim authors, there is no clarity regarding the origins of the musannaf literature. He notes that there are more positive data available in the third century of the Islamic calendar, mentioning expressions like "...he was a mudevvin (compiler) and musannif (arranger)" about certain individuals.[40] He adds that the first musannaf work written in Islam was either al-Bukhārī's Sahīh or Musannaf. It is apparent from the method of this book that its purpose was to prepare a comprehensive hadith compilation. Additionally, it aimed to provide readers with all the necessary information in the field of jurisprudence, covering various topics and issues. It has been said that "Bukhārī's jurisprudential summaries are in this [book]."[41] The fact that Bukhārī occasionally provided paragraph headings without suitable hadiths to accompany them indicates this inclination. He meticulously devised a comprehensive framework to include all aspects of jurisprudence, intending to fill in any gaps later. However, in some cases, Bukhārī was unable to fulfill this intention.[42]

Goldziher's information about the characteristics and purpose of Bukhārī's work aligns with the information provided by Muslim scholars. However, his thesis that Bukhārī's work was the first musannaf contradicts the information provided by Muslim scholars. Goldziher published his work "Muhammedanische Studien" in 1890 at the age of 40, but later, after acquiring more data, he changed his stance on this matter. In an article published in 1896, he concluded that musannaf works were written before Bukhārī's Sahīh. His change of opinion was influenced by a narration in Ahmed ibn Hanbal's Musnad, where it was stated, "It was narrated to us in Vakîʿ bin Jarrâh's Musannaf."[43] Goldziher's openness to revising his opinion demonstrates his scientific objectivity and ethical character.

Goldziher also notes that Muslim bin al-Hajjaj, a contemporary of al-Bukhārī, compiled a hadith collection following a similar arrangement and purpose to al-Bukhārī's work. This collection is famously known as "Al-Sahīh" in the Islamic world. Muslim's work is also a musannaf, organized by chapters related to jurisprudential topics, much like al-Bukhārī's Sahīh.[44] However, in the original edition of Muslim's work, there are no titles for various chapters. Like al-Bukhārī, Muslim also aimed to serve jurisprudence with his work, but he left the task of drawing conclusions from the hadith material to the readers. He consistently presents related materials together without duplicating previously used content. His goal is not to equip all aspects of jurisprudence with hadith material as stated in his introduction, but rather to sift through and select authentic and unauthentic material.[45] Goldziher's information about Muslim's work is consistent with classical Islamic sources.

Goldziher also draws attention to the existence of other collections beyond these two Sahīh works. He provides information about other collections as follows: Abū Dāwūd's (d. 275/889) "al-Sunan," al-Tirmidhī's "al-Jāmiʿ," al-Nasāʾī's (d. 303/915) "al-Sunan," and Ibn Mājah's (d. 273/887) "al-Sunan." Although al-Tirmidhī's work is appropriately referred to as "al-Jāmiʿ" based on its content, these works are generally classified under the term "sūnan."[46] Another work within the sūnan category is al-Dārimī's (d. 255/869) "al-Sunan." This book is sometimes named "Musnad" due to the expansion of the term "musnad." While this work is sūnan in terms of its structure and theme, it also contains non-legal hadiths, leading to its occasional designation as "al-Jāmiʿ." The Leiden manuscript of al-Dārimī's work is titled "Kitābuʾl-musnadiʾl-jāmiʿ."[47]

The sūnan works, besides historical, ethical, and dogmatic discourses, encompass collections dedicated particularly to matters categorized as "halāl" (permissible) and "harām" (forbidden), or "aḥkām" (laws). While these works predominantly include jurisprudential hadiths, this is not a universal rule. Dogmatic and theological hadiths are not entirely omitted from these works. For instance, Abū Dāwūd's work includes numerous hadiths on topics like fate, paradise, and hell, which are not directly related to the sūnan system.[48] Moreover, the criteria for sūnan works are more lenient compared to the Sahīh works. Without this flexibility, it would be difficult to find hadiths to support all practical points of law. These two classics of hadith literature only accept narrators who are unanimously acknowledged for their accuracy and reliability, excluding those who could be challenged or suspected in any way. However, Abū Dāwūd and his student al-Nasāʾī deviated from this rule and considered narrators reliable as long as they were not criticized unanimously.[49]

The second-tier works, the sūnans, according to Goldziher, exemplify efforts to collect narrations even for the minutest details of religious laws. These works, encompassing everything seemingly applicable, sometimes include contradictory hadiths within the same section due to their nature. In fact, these collections often quote a series of hadiths that establish a strict norm according to various versions, followed by contrasting hadiths allowing more flexible application of the law in the same context. This way, adherents of opposing teachings can find materials in the hadiths to support their views.[50]

In conclusion, Goldziher acknowledges the content and nomenclature complexities of sources like jāmiʿ, sūnan, musannaf, and musnad. However, he refrains

from providing solutions for the identified issues and limits his discussion to descriptive information.

Conclusion

Goldziher, widely regarded as an indisputable authority in Islamic studies in the Western world, made numerous observations on hadith literature and concepts starting from the early period. In doing so, he sometimes defended things that Muslim scholars hadn't expressed, while at other times he made statements closely aligned with their observations. Goldziher's belief that there were hadith materials recorded in writing during the first century of the Islamic calendar is consistent with the views of Muslim scholars. The idea that the narrations related to the prohibition of writing were not from Prophet Muhammad and were fabricated due to ideological conflicts constitutes a point of departure from their perspective. Therefore, it cannot be said that all of Goldziher's opinions on hadith literature are excessively extreme and unacceptable to any Muslim scholar. Some of the information he provides on this matter does not contradict the assessments of Muslim scholars.

Goldziher held the view that the earliest narrations preserved in writing by the Companions during the first decade after the Hijra were the oldest reports. While having this opinion, Goldziher emphasized, much like his mentor Sprenger, that the term "kutub" used in the early periods of Islam did not signify a literal book in the sense of a formal publication, but rather referred to a Muslim's private notes taken at various times.

Due to the secular structure of the Umayyad rule, Goldziher asserted that an independent literary tradition emerged early on, including pre-Islamic poetry (Jahiliyah poetry) and war chronicles (maghazi literature). Following these literary genres, he claimed that religious literature such as jurisprudence (fiqh) literature and hadith literature came into existence. He attributed the emergence of jurisprudence literature to the 2nd Islamic century and hadith literature to the 3rd Islamic century. Goldziher made this chronological arrangement based on his own deductions.

Regarding the compilation of hadiths, Goldziher rejected the narrated reports, citing contradictions within the narrations themselves and the absence of a compiled collection. Furthermore, he claimed that the transmitted reports on the classification of hadiths were misunderstood. According to him, the works mentioned in the narrations were not hadith collections but rather fiqh (jurisprudence) books arranged according to various chapters of Islamic law. He provided examples in this context by referring to the works of Abd al-Malik bin Jurayj and Saʿīd bin Abī ʿArūbah.

Goldziher stated that works in the field of hadith literature were classified into two main methods: musnad and musannaf. With the usage of the term "musnad," he presented an extensive overview of musnad-type sources. He then addressed the concepts of musannaf, sūnan, and jāmiʿ and the hadith collections referred to by these names. Goldziher included the works named "jāmiʿ" and "sūnan" under the musannaf category. However, he did not evaluate all the works named "sūnan" within the same literary context. He categorized some of these works as related to jurisprudence and others to hadith literature. While attributing the works of Dārimī, Abū Dāwūd, al-

Tirmidhī, al-Nasāʾī, and Ibn Mājah to the field of hadith literature and legal methodology, Goldziher considered the works of Ibn Jurayj and Ibn Abī ʿArūbah to be more focused on jurisprudence than hadith. Furthermore, according to Goldziher, Mālik bin Anas's "al-Muvattaʾ" is not a collection of hadiths but rather a compendium of legal matters. In conclusion, we can say that some of the technical information provided by Goldziher on hadith literature and concepts aligns with the content of works on hadith methodology, while the majority of it differs

(References**)**

[1] Lewis, Bernard. *The question of Orientalism*. New York Review of Books, 1982.

[2] Belhaj, Abdessamad. "Who Defines Islam? Critical Perspectives on Islamic Studies." *Religions* 14.6 (2023): 753.

[3] Jung, Dietrich. "Islamic Studies and Religious Reform. Ignaz Goldziher–A Crossroads of Judaism, Christianity and Islam." *Der Islam* 90.1 (2013): 106-126.

[4] Ahmad, Bilal. "Leone Caetani s Annali dell Isl m on S rah of the Prophet Mu ammad." (2015).

[5] Shah, Mustafa. "Review of'The Oral and the Written in Early Islam'by Gregor Schoeler; translated by Uwe Vagelpohl." *Journal of Qur'anic Studies* 10.1 (2009): 98-128.

[6] Waardenburg, J. (2005). Louis Massignon (1883-1962) as a student of Islam. *Die Welt des Islams*, *45*(3), 312-342.

[7] Djedi, Youcef. "Sociology and Islamwissenschaft: Max Weber and Ignaz Goldziher or the non-encounter." (2011): 312-371.

[8] Ignaz Goldziher, Muslim studies, edited by S.M. Stern, translated from the German by C.R. Barber, S.M. Stern (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1971).

[9] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/198.

[10] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/195-196.

[11] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/9.

[12] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/195-198.

[13] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/198-199.

[14] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/197.

[15] There is a prevailing view among majority of the scholars that there is clear evidence suggesting Prophet Muhammad's approval of the written documentation of hadiths. This viewpoint is based on the fact that numerous companions of the Prophet were known to have written down hadiths, even though there were also narrations prohibiting their written transmission. Scholars who support the permissibility of writing down hadiths argue that Prophet Muhammad's reluctance to have hadiths recorded was primarily to ensure they were not mixed with the text of the Quran. Therefore, they assert that there is no concrete evidence indicating that the prohibition on recording hadiths was based on a specific directive from the Prophet himself, suggesting instead that it may have arisen from personal biases. Furthermore, it is worth noting that scholars who opposed the written documentation of hadiths have themselves contributed to the writing of hadiths. The majority of Prophet Muhammad's hadiths were recorded during the lifetimes of the companions and continued to be documented until the end of the first century of the Islamic calendar.

[16] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/9-11.

[17] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/196.

[18] Karimov, N., and A. Doniyorov. "Conflicting views regarding the hadiths." *IJITEE, ISSN* 2278, no. 3075 (2019): 2090-2094.

[19] According to Goldziher, the Qur'an is the work of Prophet Muhammad, i.e., it is a product of his personal culture. When the Prophet claims that he received revelations from Allah, he is sincere about it, and there is no doubt that the revelations he received are of divine origin. Looking at the Qur'an from this perspective, Goldziher couldn't help but admit his admiration for its literary style, stating that the Qur'an is a masterpiece of world literature.

[20] Abbott suggests that Goldziher underestimated the cultural developments during the Umayyad period, focused on oral transmission, and viewed all written literature from the early period as supporting temporary records. Therefore, Abbott contends that Goldziher hindered the progress of subsequent hadith researchers, as most of them could not surpass his work. (Refer to Abbott, Nabia. Studies in Arabic literary papyri. Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957, 5-64).

[21] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/203-204.

[22] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/205-208.

[23] Goldziher accused Zuhri of fabricating hadiths in favor of the Umayyad caliphs to gain their favor. However, German orientalist Josef Horovitz disagreed with Goldziher's assertion and refuted it with historical evidence. Josef Horovitz's work "The Emergence of Islamic Historiography" challenges Goldziher's claim. (See Berg, Herbert. *The development of exegesis in early Islam: The authenticity of Muslim literature from the formative period.* Routledge, 2013.)

[24] Goldziher argued that, based on narratives similar to the one mentioned, there was no reliable written compilation of hadiths until the middle of the second century of the Hijra. However, scholars like Muhammad Mustafa Al-A'zami and Alfred Guillaume had different opinions. Al-A'zami research in " Dirasat fi al-Hadith al-Nabawi " and Guillaume's book "The Traditions of Islam" suggest that hadiths were recorded in writing after the Umayyad period. (Refer to Amdah, Naila Sa'datul. "Mustafa Azami's Contribution in Rebutting Orientalist Views about The Writing of Hadith." Nabawi: Journal of Hadith Studies 2, no. 2 (2022); Guillaume, Alfred. The traditions of islam: An introduction to the study of the hadith literature. No. 13. Clarendon Press, 1924.

[25] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/210-213.

[26] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/213.

[27] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/208.

[28] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/214.

[29] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/214-215.

[30] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/218.

[31] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/220-221.

[32] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/227-229.

[33] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/230.

[34] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/230.

[35] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/230.

[36] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/231.

[37] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/232

[38] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/261.

[39] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/232.

[40] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/233.

[41] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/235.

[42] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/234-235.

[43] Sprenger argued that the statement by Ahmed bin Hanbal should be understood as referring to "lecture notes" of his students rather than "books." He claimed that written notes existed before Ibn Jurayj, but they were in the form of "lecture notes" rather than books. These written lecture notes were shaped by students and were not printed and published as books. (Refer to Mackensen, Ruth Stellhorn. "Arabic Books and Libraries in the Umaiyad Period." The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures 52, no. 4 (1936): 245-253.)

[44] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/246-247

[45] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/246-247

[46] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/249.

[47] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/259.

[48] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/249-250

[49] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/250.

[50] Goldziher, Muslim studies, 2/253-254.