



**Journal of Analytic Divinity**  
<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jad>  
E-ISSN: 2602-3792  
6/2 (Aralık/December 2022), 315-327



**Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories about ̘adith, Author: Dr. Alam Khan,  
(Trabzon: Kalem Publication, 2019).**

Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Deęerlendirme-Eleřtirel Bir  
Çalıřma, Yazar: Dr. Alam Khan (Trabzon: Kalem Yayınevi, 2019)

**Ayře AYTEKİN**

Arř. Gör., Gümüşhane Üni., İlahiyat Fakültesi Temel İslam Bilimleri Bölümü  
Res. Asst., Gumushane University Faculty of Theology, Department of Basic Islamic  
Sciences, Gumushane/Türkiye  
E-posta: ayseaytekin\_03@hotmail.com  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5952-762X

**Makale Bilgisi | Article Information**

**Makale Türü / Article Type:** Kitap Deęerlendirme/ Book Review  
**Geliř Tarihi / Date Received:** 19 Ekim/October 2022  
**Kabul Tarihi / Date Accepted:** 12 Aralık/December 2022  
**Yayın Tarihi / Date Published:** 15 Aralık/15 December 2022  
**Yayın Sezonu / Pub Date Season:** Kıř-Aralık/Winter-December  
**DOI:** 10.46595/

**Cite as / Atıf:** Aytekin, Ayře. "Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories about ̘adith, Author: Dr. Alam Khan, (Trabzon: Kalem Yayınevi, 2019)." *Journal of Analytic Divinity*, (Aralık/December 2022), 315-327.

**İntihal/Plagiarism:** Bu makale, iThenticate yazılımınca taranmıřtır. İntihal tespit edilmemiřtir. This article has been scanned by iThenticate. No plagiarism detected.

**Etik Beyan/Ethical Statement:** Bu çalıřmanın hazırlanma sürecinde bilimsel ve etik ilkelere uyulduęu ve yararlanılan tüm çalıřmaların kaynakçada belirtildięi beyan olunur/It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited (Ayře Aytekin)

**Finansal Destek / Grant Support:** Yazarlar bu çalıřma için finansal destek almadıklarını beyan etmiřtir. / The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

**CC BY-NC 4.0** | This paper is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License

**Yazar Katkıları / Author Contributions:** Ayře Aytekin % 100

**Web:** <http://dergipark.org.tr/jad> | **e-mail to:** editorjand@gmail.com



**Abstract**

Juynboll, who had developed the theories of Orientalists such as Ignaz Goldziher, Joseph Schacht, and James Robson with a new method, combined their techniques in his work and found the opportunity to benefit from Islamic sources more widely, using this style, has been considered as the main reference source in ḥadīth studies related to Orientalism and methods related to the field. Juynboll is a researcher who had gained great fame after Goldziher and Schacht in the field of Orientalism with his works. He had worked on many subjects such as narrators who had transmitted ḥadīth from the first century to the next centuries, and ḥadīth texts accepted by jurists, ḥadīth scholars, and methodologist scholars. Therefore, making a comprehensive study of Juynboll's theories in the fields of ḥadīth and Orientalism is an absolute step to contribute to these fields. This study, which we have aimed to introduce, is a work that has aimed to examine Juynboll's theories from a different perspective, to criticize his theories on Sunnah as evidence, and to contribute to the areas in question within the framework that we have mentioned. This work, which had referenced academic studies on Juynboll written in four languages (the English language, the Arabic language, the Turkish language, and the Urdu language), has differed from other studies by identifying, describing, and criticizing the deficiencies in these studies with its original and brave style. In addition, it has meticulously revealed many theories in this field that had been neglected or not studied for other reasons, with a scientific method. Our aim in this study containing presentation and evaluation is to contribute to a modicum of the inspiration of new and current studies by revealing the place, position, features, differences, and importance of this work in the literature.

**Keywords:** Ḥadīth, Juynboll, Re-appraisal, Western Studies, Orientalism.

**Öz**

Ignaz Goldziher, Joseph Schacht, James Robson gibi Oryantalistlerin hadisle ilgili teorilerini yeni bir usulle geliştiren, aynı zamanda onların tekniklerini kendi çalışmalarında birleştiren ve bu tarzı sayesinde İslâmî kaynaklardan daha geniş bir şekilde istifade etme imkânı bulan Juynboll, Oryantalizm ile ilgili hadis çalışmalarında ve alana dair yöntemlerde temel referans kaynağı olarak kabul edilmektedir. Juynboll, çalışmalarıyla Oryantalizm çalışma sahasında Goldziher ve Schacht'tan sonra büyük ün kazanan bir araştırmacıdır. O, birinci asırdan sonraki asırlara hadis nakleden râviler ve fakihlerin, muhaddislerin ve usulcülerin kabul ettikleri hadis metinleri gibi pek çok konu hakkında çalışmalar yapmıştır. Bu nedenle, Juynboll'un hadis ve Oryantalizm alanlarındaki teorileri hususunda kapsamlı bir çalışma yapmak, bu alanlara katkı sağlayacak mutlak bir adımdır. Tanıtmayı amaçladığımız bu çalışma, Juynboll'un teorilerini farklı bir perspektifle incelemeyi, onun sünnetin delil olması konusundaki teorilerini tenkit etmeyi hedefleyen ve bahsettiğimiz çerçevede söz konusu alanlara katkı sağlayan bir eserdir. Juynboll hakkında dört dilde (İngilizce, Arapça, Türkçe ve Urduca) yazılmış akademik çalışmalara başvuran bu eser, bu çalışmalardaki eksikleri özgün ve cesur tarzıyla tespit, tarif ve tenkit etmesiyle diğer çalışmalardan ayrılmaktadır. Ayrıca, bu alana dair daha önce ihmal edilmiş yahut başka sebeplerle çalışılmamış birçok teoriyi ilmi bir yöntemle titizlikle ortaya koymaktadır. Bu tanıtım ve değerlendirme içerikli çalışmamızdaki amacımız ise bu eserin literatürdeki yerini, konumunu, özelliklerini, farkını ve önemini ortaya koyarak yeni ve güncel çalışmalara ilham olmasına bir nebze de olsa katkı sağlamaktır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Hadis, Juynboll, Yeniden Değerlendirme, Batılı Çalışmalar, Oryantalizm.



## Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories about Ḥadīth

There is no exact date on when orientalism had begun in the West. While the concept of Orientalism had initially encompassed all Eastern languages, cultures, and sects, it had gained a new character in the nineteenth century. Since this period, the Western world had given the name Orientalist to those who were only interested in the Arabic language or Islamic sciences. This conceptual change had been pioneered by Ignaz Goldziher (d.1921). Goldziher, who had published the results of his studies on Sunnah, the second source of Islam, in his two-volume work titled *Muhammadan Studies*, was the first scholar who had written in this field. This work of Goldziher had been accepted as the first Bible in Orientalism. In his book, he had opposed the issue of the authenticity of ḥadīths and he had stated that they had emerged as a result of political and religious conflicts. He had claimed that the narrators like al-Zuhrī (d.124) had fabricated ḥadīths to please the Umayyad caliphs and the Umayyad caliphs for their political interests by drawing a dark picture about the narrators of the ḥadīths. Goldziher had defended that ḥadīth fabrication studies had started with the order of one fabricated ḥadīth containing one of the Umayyad caliphs who was Muawiya b. Sufyān's governor Mughīra, praised 'Uthmān and criticize 'Alī.

After Goldziher, the British Orientalist Joseph Schacht (d.1969) had worked on Sunnah, the second source of Islam, with a different method, and as a result of these studies, he had published a work called *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*. This work of Schacht had been accepted as the second Bible in Orientalism. In this work, the author had concluded that the ḥadīths had emerged due to the fiqh conflicts in Islamic society. In addition, Schacht was skeptical about ḥadīth transmission methods and the acceptance of ḥadīths as evidence. He had presented new theories to studies on ḥadīth and sanad, such as *Common Rāwī and the Role of Rāwī in Ḥadīth Publication*. However, the biggest difference that separates Schacht from Goldziher is that Goldziher had worked on the text and Schacht had worked on sanad.

The approaches of Juynboll, who was born in 1935 in an Orientalist family after Goldziher and Schacht, had started a new era in the history of Orientalism. Juynboll (d.2010), like his ancestors, had wanted to do studies on languages and sects in the East. For this purpose, he had enrolled in the Department of Hebrew and the Arabic Language at Leiden University in 1956 for his undergraduate education. This period had been called "the golden age" in the history of Leiden University because great Orientalists such as Schacht, Drewes (d.1992), and Brugman had given lectures in the Arabic language and Islamic Sciences departments. Juynboll had taken lessons from these valuable Orientalists and had benefited from their knowledge and experience. Juynboll who had been influenced by Schacht had begun his doctoral studies under Brugman's supervision, advising, and

guidance on “The Debates on Ḥadīth in Egypt”. Leiden University, which had lost Schacht in 1969, had graduated Juynboll and had brought him to the world.

Juynboll had included scientific topics such as common narrator, qussās, ḥadīth-i mutawātir, ewāil, and rijāl in his works named *Muslim Tradition and Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth* and in sixteen articles. He had developed the theories of Orientalists such as Goldziher, Schacht, and Robson (d.1981) about ḥadīth with a new method and he had combined their methods in his own work at the same time. In this way, Juynboll had found the opportunity to benefit more widely from Islamic sources.

Juynboll has been accepted as the main source in ḥadīth studies in the methods related to Orientalism today. He had gained great fame after Goldziher and Schacht in Orientalism with his works. There is no doubt among Orientalists about his scholarly work and proven theories on the field of ḥadīth. His studies and theories have been used as a source for research in the West and East. He worked on the narrators who had transmitted ḥadīth from the first century to the next centuries. The most important reason for this is that the narrators are the main factor in whether the ḥadīths are weak or sound. In accordance with this situation, Juynboll had doubted whether famous narrators lived in history and their narrations in ḥadīth books. In addition, Juynboll had commented on the ḥadīth texts accepted by jurists, ḥadīth scholars, and methodologists. For this reason, it is important to conduct a comprehensive study of Juynboll’s theories in the fields of ḥadīth and Orientalism. This study<sup>1</sup> has aimed to introduce Juynboll’s theories and criticize his theories on Sunnah as evidence.

Academic studies on Juynboll written in four languages (English language, Arabic language, Turkish language, and Urdu language) have been used as much as possible in this study. In some of these studies, Juynboll’s theories have not been mentioned at all, and in some, some of his theories have been incompletely included. In this study, the deficiencies have been completed and his unstudied theories have been meticulously put forward with a scientific method. The theories which have been adequately addressed, such as the common narrator and muammarūn, have not been mentioned again in this study, they have been only referred to with footnotes.

This study has consisted of an introduction, two parts, and a conclusion, as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونيل حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll’un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)* (Trabzon: Kalem Yayınevi, 2019), 388 pages. Alam Khan’s work named *تقييم نظريات جونيل حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll’un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)* had been published in Pakistan and India too. We have the aim of declaration of the full name of these books’ references for the readers. See for detailed information:

- Alam Khan, *Istishrāq awar İlmī Hadīth* (Pakistan: Aks Publication, 2021), 332 pages.
- Alam Khan, *Istishrāq awar İlmī Hadīth* (India: Millat Publication, 2022), 334 pages.



➤ In the introduction, the importance of the subject, the reason for its selection, its limitations, and previous studies on the subject in four languages have been discussed. The differences between previous studies and this study, and finally the method of the study have been explained.<sup>2</sup>

➤ In the first part of the study, Juynboll's claims about sanad have been mentioned. There are five subheadings in this section, these are:<sup>3</sup>

❖ In the first sub-title, Juynboll's biography and works have been included, at the same time, it has been stated that he had been influenced by Orientalists such as Goldziher, Schacht, and Robson. In addition, the method used by Juynboll in his studies and the problems in this method had been proven and discussed in six sub-titles with examples.<sup>4</sup>

❖ In the second sub-title, Juynboll's claims about the date of the beginning of jarḥ and ta'dīl in ḥadīth narration and narrators have been discussed. It has been observed that Juynboll's claims were under the influence of Orientalists such as Goldziher, Schacht, Robson, Kaytāni (d.1935), and Horovitz (d.1931). In addition, the differences in the views of these Orientalists about isnād have been explained. As a result of the investigation of these claims, it has been determined that Juynboll had not reached all the narrations about the start date of the sanad. For this reason, he had denied the existence of sanad as the document before the seventieth year of the Hegira. In fact, in ḥadīth and historical sources, after the death of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), in the period of Khulafā-i Rāshidīn, there is information that the Companions such as Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Ā'isha had used the criticism in the ḥadīth, and the Companions such as Abū Hurayra, Ibn 'Abbās and Ibn 'Umar had used the isnād in the narration.<sup>5</sup>

❖ In the third sub-title, Juynboll's claims about *as-Silsilatu'z-zahabiyya* have been mentioned. Juynboll's claims about Nāfi' (d.117), who was in *as-Silsilatu'z-zahabiyya*, that he had not lived after the second century of the Hegira, it was not possible for Mālik (d.179) to narrate ḥadīth from Nāfi' because of the difference between their ages, all the information about Nāfi' had been conveyed only by Mālik, Ibn Sa'd's *Tabaqāt*, which had been considered the first book among the *tabaqāt* books that had survived to the present day, had not had a biography of Nāfi', there has no any mentioning about Nāfi' the works of Imām Kindī's (d.256) work named *Kitāb al-Wulāt wa al-Kuddāt*, Ibn Abdulhakam al-

<sup>2</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 5-14.

<sup>3</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 15.

<sup>4</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 17-57.

<sup>5</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 58-84.

Misrī's (d.257) work named *Futūh al-Miṣr wa al-Maḡhrīb* and Ibn Jawzī's (d.597) work named *Sifāt as-Safwa* about the issue of 'Umar b. Abdulazīz's (d.101) sending Nāfi' to Egypt. *As-Silsilatu'z-zahabiyya* is known to be one of the safest and the most sound sanad among the other Isnāds. Juynboll was not the first to criticize *as-Silsilatu'z-zahabiyya*, and before him, Schacht also had criticized the same issue. Juynboll had developed Schacht's thinking on this subject, albeit on a small scale.<sup>6</sup>

In the research on the claim that there was no one named Nāfi' after the second century of the Hegira, it had been thought that Juynboll had not examined all historical sources. The evidence showing that Juynboll had not reached all the sources was his action to not include narrators like Nāfi' b. Hālid et-Tāhī and Nāfi' b. 'Ali al-Faqīh al-Azerbaycānī who had lived after that period and their narrations in his studies in question.

As a result of the research carried out in *at-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā*, where Juynboll had said that all information about Nāfi' had been transmitted only by Mālik, it had been determined that he had narrated five narrations from 'Ubeydullah, Nāfi' b. Abī Nuaym, Ismā'īl b. Ibrāhīm, Abū Marwān Abdulmālik b. Abdulazīz, Ismā'īl b. Umayya and Muhammad b. 'Umar, yet he had not conveyed any narration from Mālik. In the examination regarding Juynboll's claim that Mālik could not narrate from him due to the age difference between Mālik and Nāfi', it had been concluded that Mālik was at least twenty-four years old at the time of Nāfi's death and this had not constituted an obstacle to the narration. A point that draws attention during the research is that Nāfi' b. Abī Nuaym (d.169) who was a student of Nāfi', coeval with Mālik and had lived more than him had not been mentioned although Juynboll had criticized Mālik due to his age. In the examination of the first works of the *tabaqāt* books as *Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* and the other works such as *Kitāb al-Wulāt wa al-Kuddāt*, *Futūh al-Miṣr wa al-Maḡhrīb* and *Sifāt as-Safwa* on Juynboll's claim that there is no biography of Nāfi', it had been determined that the document that he had used as *Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* had incomplete copies and the proof of this is that there were approximately two and a half pages of a biography of Nāfi' in the fifty-second rank of the third stratum of Ibn Sa'd's (d.230) on *Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* in the Companions who were in Madina. At the same time, it had been seen that he had not paid attention to the contents of *Kitāb al-Wulāt wa al-Kuddāt*, *Futūh al-Miṣr wa al-Maḡhrīb* and *Sifāt as-Safwa* works and the methods of their authors. The authors had mentioned the governors and judges in Egypt in the works of *Kitāb al-Wulāt wa al-Kuddāt* and *Futūh al-Miṣr wa al-Maḡhrīb*. Considering that Nāfi' had not gone to Egypt as a judge or governor, it was natural that the information about him had not taken a place

<sup>6</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadith) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 85-100.



in these works. The book *Sifāt as-Safwa* is the summary of the work called *Hilyāt al-Awliya*. Since the author had not seen Nāfi' as a wali at that time, he had not included him in this work.<sup>7</sup>

❖ The fourth sub-title has contained Juynboll's claims about the most common names among famous narrators. One of the most known and trusted narrators among these names is Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī. According to Juynboll, those who had fabricated ḥadīth had fabricated ḥadīth with the method of using the name of al-Zuhrī. Therefore, it is not possible to determine which of the real person as al-Zuhrī among one hundred and twenty people named al-Zuhrī in the jarḥ and ta'dīl sources at present. Imām Mālik had used the name Ibn Shihāb in his sanad notes instead of the name al-Zuhrī in his *Muwatta* because he had known the confusion about the name.<sup>8</sup>

As a result of the research, it had been concluded that Juynboll had overlooked the fact that al-Zuhrī was not a name but a nickname. Many narrators were known by the nisba of al-Zuhrī belonging to the Banū Zuhra tribe in the periods of the Companions and the Tābi'ūn. However, there was only Sa'd b. Ibrāhīm az-Zuhrī in the stratum of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī in this tribe. According to the narrations of Abū Dāvūd at-Tayālīsī (d.204), Abdurrazzak as-San'āni (d.211), and Ibn Abī Shayba (d.235), Sa'd b. Ibrāhīm had not included with the nisba of al-Zuhrī in the sanad.

In fact, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal had stated that Imām Mālik had used the name Ibn Shihāb instead of the name al-Zuhrī. Ibn Ḥanbal had determined that the ḥadīth scholars had used the name al-Zuhrī and Imām Mālik had used the name Ibn Shihāb in the transcripts of the narrations which they had received from al-Zuhrī, while he was describing the methods of the ḥadīth scholars. However, although this determination of Ibn Ḥanbal had not been put forward to show that Imām Mālik had some doubts about al-Zuhrī, Juynboll had used it in this direction. In the studies carried out, it had been seen that Muhammad b. Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (d.189) had used the name al-Zuhrī in the Isnāds of fifty-two ḥadīths instead of Ibn Shihāb in the *Muwatta* copy that he had transmitted from Imām Mālik, and Imām Mālik had not warned al-Shaybānī about this issue.<sup>9</sup>

❖ In the fifth sub-title, Juynboll's claims regarding the allied (muttafiq rāwī) and subordinate (muftariq rāwī) narrators had been discussed. Before examining Juynboll's claims, four methods had been determined on how to distinguish between muttafiq rāwī and muftariq rāwī, and the works written on this subject had been mentioned. According

<sup>7</sup> Alam Khan, *Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth* (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma), 101-125.

<sup>8</sup> Alam Khan, *Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth* (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma), 126-129.

<sup>9</sup> Alam Khan, *Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth* (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma), 130-145.

to Juynboll, muttafiḳ rāwī and muftariḳ rāwī names in fabricating ḥadīth had presented an opportunity for those who fabricate ḥadīth. In this regard, Juynboll had cited Abū Ḥafṣ b.‘Umar as an example and he had claimed that there were fifteen people with this name in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl (impugning and accrediting) books and that five of them had taken lessons from the same teacher who was Shu‘ba b. al-Ḥajjāj (d.160) in the same period. Juynboll had found it interesting that there were only two narrators named Abū Ḥafṣ b.‘Umar in the book of *Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* which is the basic book of tabaqāt works and he had claimed that Abū Ḥafṣ b.‘Umar was a fabricated name, it was not a real person’s name. When these claims about muttafiḳ rāwī and muftariḳ rāwī had been examined in detail, it had been observed that the experts had not counted Abū Ḥafṣ b.‘Umar as one of the muttafiḳ rāwī and muftariḳ rāwī in their works. It had been determined that Juynboll’s claim that there were five people named Abū Ḥafṣ b.‘Umar who had taken lessons from Shu‘ba b. al-Ḥajjāj was true but these people were not famous with the name Abū Ḥafṣ b.‘Umar. Some of them had become famous with nicknames and some of them had become famous with an identification tags. In the analysis made in Ibn Sa’d’s *Tabaqāt*, which is the source cited by Juynboll, it had been seen that it had been included the biography of Abū Ḥafṣ b.‘Umar al-Havzi who was al-Bukhārī’s teacher and Shu‘ba b. al-Ḥajjāj’s student. It had been understood that Ibn Sa’d had not mentioned Shu‘ba b. al-Ḥajjāj’s other students with the same name because they were ghayri ma’rūf/unfamiliar.<sup>10</sup>

➤ The second part has included Juynboll’s claims about ḥadīth texts. There are four subheadings in this section.<sup>11</sup>

❖ In the first sub-title, the claims about the fatwas of qussās, muzikkirīn, and jurists had been evaluated. According to Juynboll, the stories/qıssa which had been narrated by qussās had become famous as ḥadīth among the people. The fatwās of the jurists in the first period had emerged as the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) in the ḥadīth books of the later periods. In this sub-title, before evaluating Juynboll’s claims in detail, the beginning date of the stories, their connection with ḥadīth fabrication, the stories narrated by the narrators, and the works written by the ḥadīth scholars about the fabricated ḥadīths had been emphasized. Juynboll’s claims that fatwas of the jurists in the first period had been placed as the sayings of the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) in the ḥadīth books in the later periods had been examined and the following conclusions had been reached:<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll’un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 146-174.

<sup>11</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll’un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 176.

<sup>12</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll’un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 177-194.





✚ Juynboll had cited five ḥadīths on the subject of jurisprudence as Sa'īd b. Musayyib's (d.94) fatwas.<sup>13</sup>

✚ According to the study's determination, Ibn Musayyib's fatwas had based on ḥadīths, but, because Juynboll had not carefully examined the early ḥadīth works, he had shown them as Sa'īd b. Musayyib's fatwas.<sup>14</sup>

✚ Another point that draws attention during the research process is Juynboll's misunderstanding of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī's (d.463) sayings about marāsīl and mistranslating of these words based on this misunderstanding.<sup>15</sup>

❖ In the second sub-title, Juynboll's claims about mutawātir ḥadīth had been examined. According to Juynboll, the early ḥadīth scholars had not known the term of mutawātir. For this reason, this term had not included in the works named *al-Muḥaddis u'l-fāsil*, *Marīfatu Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* and *al-Mustakhraj alā Marīfati Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*, which are the first works in ḥadīth methodology. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī had used this term for the first time in his work called *al-Kifāya fi Ilm ar-Rivāya*. As a result of the examination, it had been understood that Juynboll had not differed in the methods of the ḥadīth scholars and the jurists in the first period. In the early periods, the purpose of the ḥadīth studies of the jurists was to make judgments. For this reason, they had made a distinction between khabar al-wāḥid and mutawātir in the ḥadīth. The purpose of the ḥadīth studies of the ḥadīth scholars is to prove whether the narration belongs to the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) or not. For this reason, they had made the distinction between sound and weak in the ḥadīth. This had not meant that the ḥadīth scholars had not known the mutawātir ḥadīth. The fact that scholars such as Imām Shāfi'ī (d.204), al-Bukhārī's (d.256) and al-Tahāwī (d.321) had used the term of mutawātir before al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī had confirmed this inference. Juynboll had doubts about the term of mutawātir, as well as he had ignored the reality of mutawātir al-lafzī and spiritual ḥadīth. When the claims about the mutawātir al-lafzī ḥadīth had been evaluated, it had been seen that Juynboll had mainly used the "Argumentum e Silentio" method in his arguments as a basis but this method was wrong because all of the works in the first period had not reached from the past to the present day. When Juynboll's claims about the documents of the mutawātir al-lafzī ḥadīth had been investigated, it had been understood that he had not examined all the documents and the biographies of the narrators in detail in the *tabaqāt* books, therefore he was suspicious of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa's (d.150) teachers such as al-Zuhri. When Juynboll's claims regarding the emergence date of the mutawātir al-lafzī ḥadīth had been evaluated, it had been deduced that if he had

<sup>13</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 195-197.

<sup>14</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 198.

<sup>15</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 218.

researched in *Musnad* of Abū Dāvūd at-Tayālīsī using the method of common narrator, he could have not reached the conclusion that the mutawātir al-lafzī ḥadīth had appeared for first time in Iraq. When the claims of Juynboll regarding the niyāha ḥadīth, one of the ḥadīths that were considered as spiritual mutawātir ḥadīth had been evaluated, it had been seen that he had made a distinction between “an-Niyāha ala’l-mayyit” and “al-Bukā ala’l-mayyit”, but there is no difference between them in reality. It had been learned that the ḥadīth scholars had counted “al-Bukā ala’l-mayyit” ḥadīths as the mutawātir, not “an-Niyāha ala’l-mayyit” ḥadīths in their works about mutawātir ḥadīth. In addition, it had been observed in Juynboll’s studies that he had made various comments on the documents of the spiritual mutawātir ḥadīth, but he had made statements that were against his own method in these comments. According to Juynboll, if any ḥadīth has the word niyāha, that ḥadīth belongs to the Iraqi region. In the research conducted on the source cited by Juynboll, it had been revealed that the ḥadīths containing the word niyāha had been found not only in Iraqi isnāds but also in Hejaz, but this situation had been neglected by Juynboll.<sup>16</sup>

❖ In the third sub-title, Juynboll’s claims about the ewāil ḥadīths had been evaluated. According to Juynboll, the isnād had started in later periods. He had shown proof of this by using the ewāil ḥadīth. In the examination, it had been understood that Juynboll had not carefully examined the words of Imām Mālik in the ewāil ḥadīths. According to Imām Mālik, al-Zuhrī was not the first person to use the sanad in the ḥadīth, but the first to collect these ḥadīths. According to Juynboll, the first person to narrate ḥadīth in Egypt was Yazīd b. Abī Habīb (d. 128). When all the data had been evaluated, it had been determined that Juynboll had taken Ibn Sa’d’s narrations out of context and behaved as careless during the research of the beginning dates of the narrations of the ḥadīths in Egypt. Before Yazīd b. Abī Habīb, some muhaddīths such as ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Amr, ‘Abdullāh b. al-Ḥārith, ‘Abdullāh b. Sa’d and Maslama b. Makhlad had gone to Egypt and Egyptians had benefited from them. When the claims about the beginning date of the ḥadīth narrations in Andalusia had been evaluated, it had been understood that Juynboll had ignored the historical facts. According to Juynboll, ḥadīth transmission in Andalusia had started from Mu’āwiya b. Ṣāliḥ (d.168), but according to historical information, before Mu’āwiya b. Ṣāliḥ, some muhaddīths such as Abdurrahman al-Ghāfikī (d.114), who was a student of ‘Abdullāh b. ‘Umar had gone to Andalusia. Also, when the claims about the beginning of the science of fiqh in Andalusia had been examined, it had been seen that Juynboll had not researched the history of Andalusia carefully. Because, according to him, the science of fiqh, it had started from Ziyād b. Abdurrahman (d.193). The information in historical sources such as *Tārīkh-i Ibn Yūnus* of Ibn Yūnus (d.347) had transmitted that the Andalusians, before Ziyād

<sup>16</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll’un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 220-275.



b. Abdurrahman had practiced with the fiqh of Imām al-Awzāī (d.157), but the Mālīkī sect had spread after the return of the student of Imām Mālīk who is Ziyād b. Abdurrahman to Andalusia.<sup>17</sup>

❖ In the fourth sub-title, Juynboll's claims about the word fitna in Ibn Sīrīn's (d.110) narration and the date of the beginning of the fitna had been discussed. All of the narrations and all the historical information about fitna had been collected. In the research, it had been concluded that Juynboll had supported Robson's ideas, not Schacht's ideas about the beginning of the fitna. According to Schacht, Ibn Sīrīn's narration had not belonged to him, this narration was fabricated in later periods and had been attributed to him. According to him, the fitna in question had occurred in one hundred and twenty-six of the Hegira, Walid b. Yazīd's fitna. However, according to Robson and Juynboll, the fitna that Ibn Sīrīn had meant was 'Abdullāh b. Zubayr fitna which had emerged in seventy-two of the Hegira. When all of Juynboll's claims and sources on this subject had been carefully examined, it had been understood that he had developed Robson's thoughts differently. When all of the narrations about fitna had been investigated, it had been concluded that Juynboll had not carefully examined these narrations from the early ḥadīth books such as Ma'mar b. Rashīd's (d.153) *al-Jāmī* and from historical sources such as Sayf b. 'Umar at-Tamīmī's (d.200) *al-Fitnatu wa wakatu'l-jamal*. According to the narrations collected about fitna, it had resulted that the events of fitna had repeated many times in the history of Islam but the first fitna in the history and ḥadīth books was not 'Abdullāh b. Zubayr's fitna, the fitna in question was 'Uthmān's fitna. According to the narrations of 'Abdullāh b. Abbās, Habīb b. Maslama and Kays b. Sa'd, it had been understood that the fitna had taken a place in the period of 'Uthmān from the transmission and narration of Ibn Sīrīn.<sup>18</sup>

➤ In the part of the conclusion, all of the results of the study had been transmitted according to academic criteria.<sup>19</sup>

### Evaluation and Conclusion

According to our perspective, this work, which makes a great contribution to the field of ḥadīth as a unique and original work, is a product of labor including high-level language, versatile, interdisciplinary, academically registered for the names of authors and the titles of the works, diverse, colorful and rich bibliography. While Western studies and especially other studies that are directly or indirectly related to this research have taken a place in the literature in parts, this work is a very comprehensive work that has compiled all of the

<sup>17</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 276-301.

<sup>18</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 303-328.

<sup>19</sup> Alam Khan, *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma)*, 329-343.

studies on the subject. This research, which has not just referred to previous studies on the theme and the content, but has analyzed them meticulously, is very valuable, important, effective, efficient, useful, and sufficient for those who want to gain knowledge and conduct academic research.

This research, which has a scientific and critical method, has not always continued to work with a positive or biased point of view while examining previous studies, on the contrary, it has rejected prompts, information, situations, and comments that are not suitable for the academic perspective by proving the issues with necessary and justified reasons where it is necessary. The author, who is very careful in this stance, has not aimed to reject all information completely or to display a harsh and oppositional attitude in unnecessary situations. As a matter of fact, the author's aim in his work is to use a method that includes continence without having a purely critical morality and to present important data. In this framework, the author has not shown a refusal attitude toward the Orientalists, and many researchers have this kind of attitude. On the contrary, he has handled the studies in this field in an objective manner, has appreciated the efforts of those who worked, has respected their service, and has expressed this situation boldly without hesitation.

The high-level status of the work, which has a rich language and bibliography, has raised the academic and scientific level, but this is a difficult degree to benefit from for those who are interested in this subject and who are not official or private researchers, undergraduate students, and newcomers to the academy. Reducing the language of the work, which does not make it possible to address the general public, to a more easily understandable level is a humble recommendation that reminds us that it can be more open to benefit.

The work has many foreign names, concepts, terms, subjects, notions, and sources in terms of its content and theme. It is a suitable suggestion for those who are not familiar with foreign and high-level academic concepts, especially academic terms about Orientalism, to include more explanatory information in footnotes or intermediate words, explanations, and sentences.

The study is a multi-faceted work that has benefited from more than one foreign language and has been completed as a result of serious efforts, bringing a new breath to the academic world, but the use of Turkish resources is at a lower rate than the use of resources in other languages. The inclusion of Turkish resources in the work as much as resources in other languages at a higher rate is a proposal that will show a fairer and more balanced approach to all of the languages, and will also facilitate the way to benefit more.



### Bibliography

Khan, Alam. *تقييم نظريات جونبول حول الحديث النبوي* (Re-Appraisal of Juynboll Theories About Hadīth) (Juynboll'un Hadisle İlgili Teorileri Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme-Eleştirel Bir Çalışma). Trabzon: Kalem Yayınevi, 2019.

Khan, Alam. *Istishrāq awar İlmī Hadīth*. Pakistan: Aks Publication, 2021.

Khan, Alam. *Istishrāq awar İlmī Hadīth*. India: Millat Publication, 2022.