



**Riwayat : Jurnal Studi Hadis**

issn 2460-755X eissn 2502-8839

Tersedia online di: [journal.iainkudus.ac.id/index.php/riwayat](http://journal.iainkudus.ac.id/index.php/riwayat)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21043/riwayat.v8i1.15276>

## THE DYNAMICS OF *SHAHIH AL-BUKHARI* COMMENTARIES WITHIN THE OTTOMAN ACADEMIC LIFE

**Muh Amiruddin**

*Institut Agama Islam Negeri Kudus, Kudus, Indonesia*

*amiruddin@iainkudus.ac.id*

### Abstract

The Ottoman Empire was one of the centers of Islamic power for nearly seven centuries. A very long time in power and covering a vast territory made the Ottoman the center of Islamic civilization for a very long time. The education, culture, and civilization of the Ottoman were built on the madrasa system established from the time of the Seljuks and the scientific knowledge that was widespread in Anatolia through the madrasas. This madrasa system had previously been found in Egypt and Damascus. The development of education is also related to the development of hadith studies in the Ottoman, especially the study of *Sahih al-Bukhari*. This study aims to determine the development of the study of *Sahih al-Bukhari* in the Ottoman period. This study using literary research showed that the first Commentary written on *Sahih al-Bukhari* in the Ottoman was a work called *al-Kawsar al-Jari* written by Molla Gurani in the fifteenth century. In addition, a total of six commentaries were written, one in the late fifteenth century and the other in the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century, many hadith scholars from Islamic scientific centers began to come to Istanbul, especially after Egypt entered the rule of the Ottoman Turks. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, seven studies were carried out on *Sahih al-Bukhari*. Especially the study of special qualities in the nineteenth century which is pleasing in terms of the science of hadith. The most important indicator is the study of the methodology and commentary of hadith which appears together with the educational activities of scholars who have a high level of accumulation of hadith.

**Keywords:** hadith, commentary, Ottoman, Sahih al-Bukhari

## Abstrak

**Dinamika Pensyarahan *Shahih al-Bukhari* dalam Dunia Akademik Turki Usmani.** Turki Usmani adalah salah satu pusat kekuasaan Islam selama hampir tujuh abad. Waktu berkuasa yang sangat lama dan meliputi cakupan wilayah kekuasaan yang luas membuat Turki Usmani menjadi pusat peradaban Islam dalam masa yang sangat lama. Pendidikan, budaya, dan peradaban Utsmaniyah dibangun di atas sistem madrasah yang didirikan oleh Seljuk dan pengetahuan ilmiah yang tersebar luas di Anatolia melalui madrasah. Sistem madrasah ini sebelumnya telah banyak ditemukan di Mesir dan Damaskus. Perkembangan pendidikan tersebut juga berkaitan dengan perkembangan studi hadis di Turki Usmani, khususnya studi atas *Shahih al-Bukhari*. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui perkembangan studi terhadap *Shahih al-Bukhari* di Turki Usmani. Studi dengan metode kepustakaan ini menunjukkan bahwa komentar pertama yang ditulis tentang *Shahih al-Bukhari* di Ottoman adalah karya bernama *al-Kawsar al-Jari* yang ditulis oleh Molla Gurani pada abad kelima belas. Selain itu, sebanyak enam komentar telah ditulis, satu pada akhir abad kelima belas dan yang lainnya pada abad keenam belas. Pada abad ketujuh belas, banyak ulama hadis dari pusat-pusat keilmuan Islam mulai berdatangan ke Istanbul, terutama setelah Mesir masuk dalam kekuasaan Turki Usmani. Pada abad kedelapan belas dan kesembilan belas, tujuh studi dilakukan pada *Shahih al-Bukhari*. Khususnya studi kualitas khusus pada abad kesembilan belas yang menyenangkan dalam hal ilmu hadits. Indikator terpentingnya adalah kajian metodologi dan syarah hadis yang muncul bersamaan dengan aktivitas pendidikan ulama yang memiliki tingkat akumulasi hadis yang tinggi.

**Kata kunci:** hadis, syarah, Utsmaniyah, *Shahih al-Bukhari*

## Introduction

Ottoman education, culture and civilization was built on the madrasa system established by the Seljuks and the scientific knowledge that became widespread in Anatolia through madrasahs. The madrasahs, which were established for the first time in the Seljuk period to provide a more systematic education and training, and *dar al-hadith*, the first examples of which was seen in Egypt and Damascus, increased rapidly during the Principalities period, while some of the famous scholars of the period transferred to the Ottoman administration, which increased its political and military power in the region. Dawud al-Kaysari (751/1350) and Molla Fanari (834/1431) are some of them.

On the other hand, although the regions where Ibn Malak and his son Muhammad ibn Malak and Syihabuddin Siwasi, who grew up in Anatolia and became prominent with their hadith studies, were transferred ordinarily to the Ottoman administration, these scholars did not come into close contact with the Ottoman

administration and preferred to stay in their principalities. Some historians such as Tasykopru and currently some researchers deal with the work of these scholars in the Ottoman period.

In fact, since the borders of the Anatolian principalities and the Ottoman state were very variable before the conquest of Istanbul, it is somewhat difficult to separate the scientific studies developed in the territories in question. However, since we are trying to determine the connection between Ottoman scientific thought and hadith studies, the period before the conquest of Istanbul should be evaluated in terms of Bursa and Edirne as the regions of Ottoman. For this reason, the works of hadith scholars who grew up in the Ottoman geography or came to this geography and contributed to the Ottoman hadith activities will be discussed within the framework of Ottoman hadith studies. On the other hand, the studies of scholars who grew up in the Principalities will be evaluated within the period of the Principalities. It has been effective in making such a distinction, that during the researches, some issues showing that the hadith studies that emerged within the Principalities, which were the continuation of the Anatolian Seljuks, were more advanced than the Ottomans.

Although the studies carried out during the Principalities period and the research of the cultural environment in which the authors grew up and lived are beyond the scope of our subject, the results we will obtain in this regard will provide us with important information about the state of hadith sciences in Anatolia and will provide the opportunity to make a comparison between the hadith activities of the period of Principalities and the Ottoman Empire.

### **The Ottoman's Early Studies on *Shahih al-Bukhari* from Fifteenth to Nineteenth Centuries**

The first of the commentaries written on *al-Jami' al-Shahih* in the Ottomans is the work named *al-Kawsar al-Jari* written by Molla Gurani. A total of six commentaries were written on Bukhari, one in the late fifteenth century and the others in the sixteenth century, right after Gurani. It can be thought that the tradition of writing annotations on *Shahih al-Bukhari*, which was common among the fifteenth century Egyptian hadith scholars, was influential in the sudden acceleration of these studies. However, we believe that Gurani's commentary, who completed his scientific education by taking lessons from Ibn Hajar at a time when the annotation studies in Egypt reached its peak, and

who ascribed *al-Kawsar al-Jari* to the Ottomans, was effective in the transfer of this tradition to the Ottomans. Because, before Gurani, an annotation written on *Shahih al-Bukhari* in Anatolia, including the Principalities Period, could not be determined. Before *al-Kawsar al-Jari*, a total of five annotations were made, two of them on *Masyariq al-Anwar* and three on *Mashabih al-Sunna*, within the scope of annotation work in Anatolia. Before Gurani, no commentary on *Shahih al-Bukhari* is known both in the Ottoman Empire and in Anatolia. Therefore, in the fifteenth century it can be said that the work named *al-Kawsar al-Jari* by Gurani, who was an influential figure in the Ottoman scientific circles in the second half of the century and who had been a sheikh al-Islam for eight years in the last quarter of this century, is the first Bukhari commentary in the Ottomans. The commentaries written on *Shahih al-Bukhari* in the Ottoman showed a rapid development in two periods. The first is in the sixteenth century after Gurani wrote his commentary, and the second is in the eighteenth century. Here, we will first try to examine the lives and works of *Shahih al-Bukhari* commentators in the second half of the fifteenth century and the sixteenth century.

### *Shahih al-Bukhari Commentaries in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries of Ottoman*

We mentioned above that there was an increase in the annotations written on *Shahih al-Bukhari* in the Ottoman after Gurani. The first example of this started with the commentary of Molla Lutfi (899/1494) in the type of *ta'liq*.

#### 1. *Syarh al-Jami' al-Shahih li al-Bukhari*

The author of the work is Lutfullah ibn Hasan al-Tokadi, who is famous with the name "Molla Lutfi". He worked as a lecturer in Bursa Sultan Murad, Filibe and Edirne Dar al-Hadith (Bursalı, n.d., vol. 1, p. 382; Gökyay & Özen, 1987, p. 255; Tasykopruolu, n.d., pp. 169–171; Zirikli, 2002, vol. 5, p. 242). It is reported that the author, who wrote twenty works in the field of language, logic, theology and tafsir, also wrote a partial commentary on *Shahih al-Bukhari* (Bursalı, n.d., vol. 1, p. 382; İsmail Paşa, 1951, vol. 1, p. 840; Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 554). However, no copy of the work has been found so far (Gökyay & Özen, 1987, p. 257; Sandıkçı, 1991, p. 58). Katib Celebi counted this work among *Shahih al-Bukhari's ta'liqs* (Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 554). Molla Lutfi completed his madrasa education with Sinan Pasha, the son of Hizir Bey, one of the famous teachers of the time (Tasykopruolu, n.d., p. 169). Sinan Pasha and his student,

Molla Lutfi, are scholars with strong theology (Ocak, 1998, p. 23). We can say that this work is not a versatile study in terms of hadith sciences.

## 2. *Ta'liqat al-Buhari al-Syarif*

The work was written by Syamsuddin Ahmad ibn Sulaiman ibn Kamal Pasha (940/1533). Ibn Kamal is one of the most well-known scholars among the Ottoman scholars with his duties and works. During the first period of his education in religious sciences, Ibn Kamal took lessons from Molla Lutfi in Edirne Dar al-Hadith, and later on from prominent scholars of the time such as Molla Kastalli (Kasthallani) Muslihuddin Mustafa (901/1496), Hatibzada Muhyiddin (901/1496), and Molla Muarrifzada. As mentioned above, Molla Lutfi is the second lecturer of Edirne Dar al-Hadith and is a scholar with a strong philosophical side (Tasykoprule, n.d., pp. 226–227). We even know that in Dar al-Hadith, he had Ibn Kamal read the poems of *Syarh al-Matali*' from logic (Ocak, 2002, pp. 19–21; Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p. 24).

Ibn Kamal Pasha, who well known as Kamalpashazada and was seen as one of the greatest representatives of Ottoman scientific thought in the first half of the sixteenth century, was compared with scholars such as Taftazani and Sayyid Syarif Jurjani at a younger age. From time to time, he was likened to al-Suyuti in terms of the multiplicity of his works and the breadth of his knowledge of various sciences, and even there were those who considered him superior to al-Suyuti in terms of his comprehension of issues, reasoning and cadence (Turan, 2002, pp. 238–239). However, there is no such attempt by him to speed up Ottoman hadith studies. In this regard, Guler stated that Ibn Kamal Pasha's attention to the sciences of wisdom such as theology, logic, jurisprudence, and methodology, and that he did not show much attention to the sciences of transmission, even Ibn Taimiyya (728/1327), Alusi (1270/1853) and Laknawi (1304/1886). He stated that he mentions a narration, which he considers as a hadith in *Syarh Ahadith Arba'in*, without making any interpretation, and includes some philosophical-mystical annotations and explanations (Güler, 2003, pp. 81–82).

Ibn Kamal, wrote about two hundred works on fiqh, theology, philosophy and history (Çelebi, 2002, p. 245). In addition to these works, his works on hadith in the form of forty hadiths or a commentary on a few hadiths, and a commentary on *Shahih al-Bukhari* in the form of *ta'liq* have been written, but these copies has not been found so far. However, Ibn Kamal Pasha has a treatise on the subject of *Kayfa kana bad' al-*

wahy, the first chapter of *al-Jami' al-Shahih* (Bursalı, n.d., vol. 1, p. 353; İsmail Paşa, 1951, vol. 1, p. 141; Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 554; Sandıkçı, 1991, p. 64).

### 3. *Faidh al-Bari fi Syarh al-Bukhari*

The work was written by Zaynuddin Abu al-Fath, Abdurrahim ibn Abdurrahman ibn Ahmad ibn Hasan al-Abbasi al-Hamawi (963/1556) (İsmail Paşa, 1951, vol. 1, p. 563; Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 551; Sandıkçı, 1991, p. 67; Zirikli, 2002, vol. 3, p. 345). The author, who was born in Cairo in 867/1463, took lessons from Muhyiddin al-Kafıyeji (879/1474), (Abu'l-Fadl) Muhibbuddin ibn al-Syihna (890/1485), Burhanuddin al-Laqqani al-Maliki (890/1485) and many other scholars during his education there. (Efendi, 1852, p. 410; Ibn al-Imad, 1993, vol. 10, p. 486). In addition, Shahih al-Bukhari He heard from two musnid al-Izz al-Sahrawi and Abdulhamid al-Harastani (879/1474) and read *Shahih al-Bukhari* to Badruddin ibn Nabhan (889/1484) (Ibn al-Imad, 1993, vol. 10, p. 486). Tasykoprolu recorded that Abdurrahim al-Abbasi obtained many *'ali isnads* during his hadith education in Egypt. (Tasykoprolu, n.d., p. 246). During the Sultan Bayazid period, Abbasi, who came to Istanbul with the envoy of Sultan Gawri, presented the commentary he wrote to *Shahih al-Bukhari* to the Sultan (Ibn al-Imad, 1993, vol. 10, p. 487; Süreyya, 1998, vol. 3, p. 329), and the sultan had a Dar al-Hadith built in his name. The lectureship of Dar al-Hadith was given to him, but Abdurrahim al-Abbasi rejected this offer and returned to Egypt. After the conquest of Egypt (1517), he came back to Istanbul and died here (Ibn al-Imad, 1993, vol. 10, p. 487-488; Tasykoprolu, n.d., p. 246; Zirikli, 2002, vol. 3, p. 345).

Katib Celebi states that in *Faidh al-Bari*, *Kutub al-Khamsa* is referred to, and strange words are explained in the chapters opened at the end of each hadith, and sometimes *fiqh* explanations are included (Kastallani, 2009, vol. 1, p. 61-62; Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 551). A copy of the commentary is available in the Sulaymaniyya Library. Abdurrahim al-Abbasi's knowledge of hadith carries the characteristics of the Egyptian hadith world, like Gurani, who came to the Ottoman geography half a century before him. In this respect, it can be said that *Faidh al-Bari* is different from the commentaries written by Ottoman authors.

### 4. *Syarh al-Jami' al-Shahih li al-Bukhari*

The commentary belongs to Muslihuddin Mustafa ibn Syaban al-Galiboli al-Sururi (969/1562) (Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 554). Originally from Gallipoli, Sururi

was educated by the leading scholars of the period, especially Tasykopurlu's father Mustafa Efendi, and then Muhyiddin Fanari (954/1547). After the death of Muhyiddin Efendi, he left the teaching profession and chose the path of Sufism, but returned to his duty as a lecturer in the face of Vizier Kasim Pasha's threat to demolish the madrasa. Sururi, who has works on literature and poetry as well as *fiqh* and *tafseer*, could only complete the commentary on *Shahih al-Bukhari* only halfway. A copy of the commentary has not been found so far. (Bali, n.d., p. 345; İsmail Paşa, 1951, vol. 2, p. 434; Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 554; Sandıkçı, 1991, p. 68; Zirikli, 2002, vol. 7, p. 235).

#### 5. *Ta'liqat ala Shahih al-Bukhari*

This work in *Ta'liq* type belongs to Zanbillizada Fudhail ibn Ali ibn Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Jamali al-Aksarayi (991/1583). Fudhail Celebi, the eldest son of Zenbilli Ali Efendi, took lessons from his father's students, Molla Shalih al-Amasi and Abu al-Suud Efendi (982/1574) (Lekesiz, 1991, p. 23). He served as a judge in important town centers such as Baghdad, Aleppo and Mecca after his term as a *syekh* (Koca, 1996, p. 207). The author, who wrote various works on *fiqh* and *nahw* (Zirikli, 2002, vol. 5, p. 153), made a study of *ta'liq* on *Shahih al-Bukhari* (Bursalı, n.d., vol. 1, p. 475; Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 554; Süreyya, 1998, vol. 4, p. 24). A copy of the commentary has not been found so far (Sandıkçı, 1991, p. 68).

Scholars such as Fudhail Celebi were appointed as judges to big cities such as Jerusalem and Aleppo after a certain period of teaching in madrasahs. Therefore, it can be said that bureaucratic duties were influential in the fact that an important part of the works written by the Ottoman scholars consisted of works on *fiqh* and *nahw*.

#### 6. *Ta'liqat ala Shahih al-Bukhari*

The work belongs to Husein ibn Rustam al-Kafawi al-Rumi (1010/1601). It was no much information about Husein al-Kafawi's teachers. However, it is mentioned in the sources that he studied at the madrasahs in Istanbul at the end of the reign of Sultan Sulaiman the Magnificent and that he completed his teaching with Kara Dawudzada Mustafa Efendi. Kafawi, who was knowledgeable in mathematics, astronomy, and music as well as in religious sciences, also went through mystical education. It is mentioned that the author, who is famous for his works that he wrote in the form of biography, memoirs, and poetry, took notes as a compliment to *Shahih al-Bukhari* and *Shahih Muslim*. It is estimated that these notes are the explanations written while reciting

*Shahih al-Bukhari* in Sulaymaniyya Dar al-Hadith, because Kafawi gave lectures in the Sulaymaniyya Dar al-Hadith in 1003/1595, after Yawuz Salim period (Akpınar, 2002, pp. 186–187).

Katib Celebi states that Kafawi has a study of *Shahih al-Bukhari* from the *ta'liq* type (İsmail Paşa, 1951, vol. 1, p. 321; Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 554), Tahir Bursalı stated that the commentary continued until the hadith of “Gusl” (Bursalı, n.d., vol. 1, p. 324; İsmail Paşa, 1951, vol. 1, p. 321). However, the copies of both works have not been identified until now (Akpınar, 2002, p. 187). Kafawi Husein Efendi's two studies on hadith are in the form of notes taken in the margins of the textbook of Sulaimaniyya Dar al-Hadith, which is a source of *qadi* (judge). Probably, the author could not continue this work when he was appointed as a judge, and the notes have not been brought to light until now due to the fact that they are in the margin of the textbook.

In the sixteenth century, there were a few more studies in which certain sections in *Shahih al-Bukhari* were annotated, although they were not fully annotated. The first of these is Muhyiddin Saydi Celebi's (931/1525) treatise containing a brief explanation of one hundred hadiths he selected from the narrations related to the topic of administration in *Shahih al-Bukhari*. In this study, interpretations are given in this sense, taking into account the administrative aspects of the hadiths. In the comparisons we have made on the sources of Saydi Celebi, we refer to the commentators such as al-Khattabi (388/998), Ibn Battal (449/1057), Nawawi (676/1277) and Tibi (743/1343), who generally benefit from the commentary of Kirmani (786/1384). the references made with Kirmani's commentary. It has been determined that they are on the same issues (Çelebi, 2000, p. 59; Kirmani, 2009, vol. 1, p. 154).

The second study about Bukhari is *Syarh al-Tsulatsiyyat al-Bukhari* by Muhammad Shah ibn Muhammad ibn Hasan al-Rumi (939/1533) (Bursalı, n.d., vol. 1, p. 388; Sandıkçı, 1991, p. 63; Tasykopruolu, n.d., p. 230). The provisions in the hadiths are emphasized. A copy of the work is available in the Sulaimaniyya Library, but it is said to have been published in India (Sandıkçı, 1991, p. 70). The third work, which is a partial commentary, is Mustafa ibn Muhammad al-Kastamoni's (981/1573) work named *Syarh Awail Shahih al-Bukhari* (Sandıkçı, 1991, p. 136).

After the explanations we have given about the features and authors of the sixteenth century *Shahih al-Bukhari* commentaries, we can make the following evaluation; After the commentary named *al-Kawsar al-Jari* written by Gurani to *Shahih*



*al-Bukhari*, there is a vitality in the studies on *Shahih al-Bukhari* in the Ottomans. The most important indicator of this is that *Shahih al-Bukhari* studies, which started with Gurani, started to turn into a tradition that continued with Molla Lutfi right after the author. It is not known exactly when Molla Lutfi wrote his work. However, it is highly probable that Molla Lutfi, who is estimated to have been born in 850/1446, started his commentary after Gurani, who finished *al-Kawsar al-Jari* in 874/1469. The tradition of writing annotations on *Shahih al-Bukhari*, which started with Gurani and continued with Molla Lutfi, started in the later period, especially in the sixteenth century. It was continued by scholars such as Ibn Kamal, Sururi, Zambilili Fudhail Celebi, and Kafawi.

We do not have enough information to say that the only reason why Ottoman scholars turned to *Shahih al-Bukhari* was the commentary written by Gurani. On the other hand, it is undeniable that the teaching of *al-Jami' al-Shahih* in accordance with the tradition of narration in the Edirne Dar al-Hadith, which came into operation in the middle of the fifteenth century, contributed to the annotation studies in the sixteenth century. His contribution to the annotation works of the century cannot be denied. In addition, Sultan Bayazid II's incentives against the event are also famous. Therefore, it is not a remote possibility that Gurani, who is a scientist who has proven himself among the scientific circles with these characteristics, will be a source of inspiration for the Ottoman commentators after him (Özcan, 2005, pp. 240–241).

It is understood that Gurani made some contributions, although not very much, in the expansion of the resources of Ottoman scholars, whom we estimate to have had limited hadith sources in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Because, in the library of Edirne Dar al-Hadith, which was built five or six years before Gurani came to Anatolia, only the commentary of Ibn al-Mulaqqin (804/1401) is mentioned as *Shahih al-Bukhari* commentary. Gurani, who came to Anatolia shortly after the establishment of Dar al-Hadith, is one of the important figures who carried the hadith accumulation of Egypt to the Ottomans, as he was the student of the most important *Shahih al-Bukhari* commentary, Ibn Hajar. Probably Molla Gurani was the first to bring the commentary of Ibn Hajar to the Ottoman Empire. In addition, Gurani, who gifted a Kirmani copy that he copied while compiling his annotation to Sultan Muhammad al-Fatih, recorded that the copy he finished in 874 was the first Kirmani commentary in the Sultan's library. These are works that were not used much in Ottoman hadith studies before them. Gurani contributed to the enrichment of the hadith sources of the period by

means of the resources he used in *al-Kawsar al-Jari*, and also played an important role in the spread of the hadith accumulation he received in Egypt among scientific circles (Yıldız, n.d., p. 107).

When we compare Gurani's commentary with other commentaries written in the next century, we see that his work has a different place from the others. First of all, Molla Lutfi, Ibn Kamal, Fudhayl Celebi, Sururı, and Husayn al-Kafawi's works on *Shahih al-Bukhari*, who attempted to write an annotation on *Shahih al-Bukhari* in the sixteenth century, were introduced by Katib Celebi as *ta'liq* and did not evaluate them in the annotation category. In addition, some of them could not be completed by the authors. If we leave the comparison of *al-Kawsar al-Jari* with other commentaries in terms of method or sources, it has the feature of being the first of two *Shahih al-Bukhari* commentaries written in the Ottoman classical period and transferred to the present day. Because among the commentaries and *ta'liq*s we introduced above, *al-Kawsar al-Jari* is one of the two completed commentaries (Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 554).

In terms of content, it can be said that it is more organized than the commentary of Abbasi, who came to Istanbul a century later. Because Katib Celebi described Abbasi's commentary as follows:

*“The author has arranged his work in a strange style. As he said in the introduction of the work, he rearranged the hadiths according to the method in Ibn al-Athir's Mosque. In addition, he isolated the hadiths from their attributions, put a letter in front of each hadith in the margins of the pages, and pointed to the narrations found in the other five books of Kutub al-Sitta, one of the Bukhari hadiths, with letters that have the character of symbols. Gharib has opened a chapter at the end of each chapter on the explanation of words”.*

No research has been done so far on the evaluation of the content of Abdurrahim al-Abbasi's work, which is understood to be a different commentary due to his style and method. For this reason, it has not been possible to compare the commentaries of Gurani and al-Abbasi in terms of content or sources (Katib Çelebi, 1941, vol. 1, p. 551).

Although a rapid period of attempt was made about Bukhari annotation in the Ottoman scientific environment after Gurani, most of these studies were not completed. Due to the negativities such as the limited scope of the commentaries, the fact that the Ottoman scholars could not complete *Shahih al-Bukhari* commentaries, and most

importantly, the central authority did not seriously consider these attempts, the attempts in this century could not provide the formation of a vitality that would save the Ottoman hadithism from its stagnant structure. On the other hand, the unproductive movements we saw in the studies in this century reflected negatively on the next century and the scientific circles of the seventeenth century did not even feel the need to study *Shahih al-Bukhari*.

### *Hadith Studies around Sixteenth Centuries of Ottoman Academic Life*

The commentaries of *Shahih al-Bukhari*, which we have examined above, are in the sixteenth centuries. These are hadith works written by Ottoman scholars of the sixteenth century. Apart from these, the most important hadith studies of this period were written by Birgiwi Muhammad Efendi. Here, first of all, we will try to determine the value attributed to hadith studies among the scientific activities in this century, based on the characteristics of the commentaries written by the most important personalities of the sixteenth century. Five of the six Bukhari commentaries compiled by Ottoman scholars in the sixteenth century were written by scholars who were strong in *fiqh* and *kalam*. Because, except Abdurrahim al-Abbasi, other Bukhari commentators completed their hadith education in madrasahs that focused on *fiqh* and *kalam*. No information could be found that they took lessons from scholars who were experts in hadith.

Among the sixteenth century scientific studies, we encounter the following picture in the inadequacy of all hadith commentaries in general and *Shahih al-Bukhari* commentaries in particular: These commentaries consist of the notes that the authors took while they were teaching *Shahih al-Bukhari* in the high-ranked Edirne or Sulaimaniyya Dar al-Hadith. In fact, since these notes on the margin of the book were not an independent work, they could not be preserved in later times and disappeared over time. The fact that the studies remained at such a simple level and that in-depth hadith studies could not be written raises the idea that the Ottoman education system did not have a program that would train muhaddith as known in the Islamic world, and that almost all of the above authors, whom we know with their commentaries, did not have the hadith formation in the religious literature. We would like to present here the results of a study that significantly supports this idea. A research that categorizes the works of the authors who were lecturers in the Sahn al-Saman Madrasahs in the

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; It has been clearly revealed that the hadith studies among the works written by the scholars of Sahn are almost non-existent, and that the hadith studies in the scientific environment in the largest madrasah of *Dawla al-Aliyya* remained weaken.

In the research, the works of the lecturers who worked in Sahn madrasahs were examined in two different categories as copyright and annotation type. As a result of the research, the figures revealed for the works related to hadith are very surprising. It is because the number of works written by the mudarris, who served in the Sahn madrasahs between 1470 and 1730, even for a short time, was only one in the type of copyright, and six in the type of commentary. 61.7% of the 234 works written in copyright type in a period of about three centuries are works with religious content. Of these, 20.5% are related to *fiqh*, 10.7% to creed - *kalam*, 6% to tafseer and 4.7% to ethics. this does not even correspond to 1% (Unan, 2003, pp. 29–30).

In the same study, the works in the type of commentary and annotation within the specified period were evaluated in a different category. According to this, 38% of 336 works are related to *fiqh*, 19% to *aqaid - kalam*, 16.3% to tafseer, 3% to morality and mysticism, and only 1.8% of the studies of lecturers, that is, 6 studies, are related to hadith. A portion of 22% are works in the type of classification (compilation, journal) and translation, but a significant portion of them are composed of *fatwa* journals (Unan, 2003, p. 363).

Among the results of the research, the fact that the works on *fiqh* and *kalam* sciences are in the first and second place has a cause-effect relationship with the education given in madrasahs. Because many of the studies we come across in these two branches of science are large and small *ta'liq* and annotation works written on the basic textbooks read in madrasahs. Like, “the people around him would definitely take influence from him, transfer them to his works, and these scientific developments would not disappear” (Koçkuzu, 1983, p. 338).

In addition, it is noteworthy that the authors working on hadiths did not take part in especially high-ranked Dar al-Hadiths. Because the hadith commentaries, which can be considered important, were written by the scholars who did not work in the madrasahs specific to hadith sciences, rather than the higher-level Dar al-Hadiths such as Edirne and Sulaimaniyya. For example, Birgiwi Muhammad Efendi, the lecturer of the Birgi Dar al-Hadith, Abdurrahim al-Abbasi and Muhammed Shah, *Shahih al-*

*Bukhari* commentators, are the names who did not take part in the Edirne and Sulaimaniyya Dar al-Hadith and stand out with their hadith studies. This situation confirms the views expressed above that the Dar al-Hadiths could not make the expected contribution to the sciences of hadith.

Some researchers have tried to explain the low number of Ottoman scholars' works on hadith by linking the importance that the scholars gave to guidance and education. However, we would like to underline the following here. From the data above, as far as we understand, although the lecturers who worked in Sahn al-Saman for nearly three centuries wrote many works on *fiqh* and theology, even astronomy and mathematics, it is not inexplicable that the percentage value of hadith among them remained at the level of 1-2%. The scarcity of hadith studies is not related to the time devoted to guidance and education. Because some syeikhs who were busy with preaching and guidance, wrote voluminous works on hadith, the lecturers who took part in high-ranked Dar al-Hadiths did not have a serious study on this subject (Lekesiz, 1991, pp. 23–24). As a result, we can state the following determinations here;

1. *Fiqh* and *kalam*, which dominated the intellectual life of the Ottoman Empire from the very beginning, dominated the madrasa programs in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Therefore, hadith studies in the Ottoman scientific environment also followed a weak course.

2. High-ranking dar al-hadiths and madrasahs negatively affected hadith studies because they created the human resources needed by the state in administrative positions. As can be seen above, the work of many professors working in the Sulaimaniyya Dar al-Hadith was left unfinished. In addition, the hadith studies of professors in high-ranked madrasahs are less than those of scholars who do not work in educational institutions or work far from the center. Here, the thought comes to mind that the hadith studies are very weak since there is no practical equivalent in the administrative system. The examples below confirm this (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p. 24).

3. The central authority, especially during the Fatih period, supported the discussions on method and *kalam* and never failed to reward the studies in this direction (İnalçık, n.d., p. 534). Although Bayezid paved the way for hadith studies, it was insufficient because the continuity of these activities could not be ensured. Because the discussions around the *tahafut* started in the period of Fatih, eighteenth century (Ocak, 2002, pp. 18–19). In the later periods, especially during the stagnation period, instead of

starting an innovation in intellectual life, there was always a longing for the past (the Law period) (Lekesiz, 1991, p. 26). Therefore, hadith studies in this period did not follow a different course from the previous periods.

Birgiwi Muhammad Efendi, who is known as the most important name of the sixteenth century Ottoman hadith activities, is important in terms of reflecting the hadith understanding of the period, with his original studies on hadith and his method in the sciences of narration. Although he does not have major works on hadith such as Bukhari and Muslim, the works he wrote are more important than the above commentary studies. It could not be determined that Birgiwi Muhammad Efendi received an education on hadith during his education life (Yüksel, 2011, p. 34). Meanwhile, he became the head of the Dar al-Hadith that Sultan Salim II's teacher Ataullah Efendi had made in Birgi and served as the lecturer of Birgi Dar al-Hadith until the end of his life. Birgiwi's use of copious amounts of narration material in *al-Tariqat al-Muhammadiyah*, which he wrote during his teaching period, and his presentation of a religious understanding based on sunna is a remarkable situation in terms of Ottoman hadith studies (Martı, 2008, pp. 31–37; Pakalın, 1993, vol. 2, p. 210).

Examining the value of the hadiths that Birgiwi used in *al-Tariqat al-Muhammadiyah* and some of his treatises in terms of narration sciences, Martı states that the author focuses on the interpretation of the text rather than the scriptures of the hadith and tries to create an understanding of morality based on the sunna, but does not use Birgiwi in a classical way. He also points out that it is impossible to qualify as a hadith (Martı, 2008, pp. 157–158).

It is a known fact that Birgiwi, who devoted his life to understanding and living the sunna, opened an important period in terms of Ottoman hadith studies and was a turning point in the shaping of later Ottoman hadithism, although he did not have hadith formation as much as a hadith. The notion that Birgiwi Muhammad Efendi was not a muhaddith in the known sense in the Islamic world, in a way, means that no muhaddith were trained in the Ottoman scientific environment (Martı, 2008, pp. 73–86; Yüksel, 2011, p. 58).

We know that most of the works of authors, except Birgiwi Muhammad Efendi, consisted of short notes written in the margins of the book. Therefore, his hadithism is important in terms of determining the hadith understanding of the period. Because, we would like to remind you that it is impossible to find a hadithist in the Ottomans if we

do not accept him as an Ottoman hadith due to the weak news or the small number of fabricated news that Birgiwi uses in his works. Birgiwi actually is an author who will best explain the situation of hadith in the Ottomans of the sixteenth century and give us the most important clues on this subject. Birgiwi's evaluation as a moralist due to reasons such as his use of weak news, not criticizing the dignitaries, and prioritizing the text rather than the hash leads to a kind of ignorance of the deficiencies in the hadith activities of the period. Although he focused on moral issues, in fact, Birgiwi represents an Ottoman muhaddith in the sixteenth century academic life. The fact that his works do not fully carry the hadith format is actually due to the problems in the hadith understanding of the period rather than Birgiwi himself (Marti, 2008, pp. 155–156). In the hadith activities of the period, the weaknesses starting from the education manifest themselves in the deficiencies during the writing as seen in Birgiwi.

On the other hand, the value of the hadiths that Birgiwi used in his works and the diversity of their sources. It contains important information about the hadiths of the sixteenth century. In his research on the subject, Marti stated that Birgiwi worked in a narrow area due to his limited resources and even used narration books such as *Shahih Ibn Hibban* and *Mu'jam al-Thabarani* from secondary sources. It is an extremely accurate determination that the resources are limited. However, the limitedness of resources is not unique to Birgiwi. The lack of resources is mainly related to the lack of a deep-rooted hadith accumulation based on the past such as Hijaz, Egypt and Damascus due to the geographical and political position of the region. As it will be stated below, the transfer of the accumulation of knowledge in the regions that hosted hadith sciences to Istanbul since the first century of *Hijra* took a few centuries after the conquest of Egypt and the transfer of the caliphate to Istanbul. On the other hand, the timing of the intensive use of the sources of narration and *rijal* by the Ottoman scholars has not been determined so far (Marti, 2008, pp. 138–139).

Hadith studies after the sixteenth century are not very relevant to our subject. However, the fact that the hadith activities were very weak in the fifteenth and sixteenth century Ottomans, and that the scholars were in many ways known in other Islamic countries. Negative opinions about being behind the format of the hadith necessitated the examination of hadith studies to a certain extent since the seventeenth century. Because some researchers, in the last few centuries, madrasas and Dar al-Hadith or informal education. Based on the density of hadith books read in their institutions, they

argue that from the beginning, a level of hadith education was given in Ottoman madrasas that would not fall behind other Islamic countries. In order to see how realistic such a hypothesis is, it is necessary to investigate the source of the hadith accumulations of Ottoman scholars in the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and to determine to what extent there is a connection between the recent hadith activities and the early hadith studies.

### **The Development of Hadith Activities between Seventeenth-Nineteenth Centuries and the Works on *Shahih al-Bukhari***

The scholars who were brought to Istanbul from the region for the first time with the conquest of Egypt by Yawuz Sultan Salim (923/1517), and then the scholars who visited Istanbul from the Hijaz, Egypt and Damascus region or went to these regions for their administrative duties, were able to study the hadith science centers. his accumulation began to spread first to the capital, Istanbul, and from there to other Ottoman cities. coincides with the second half of the century. In this century, the teachers who had the knowledge of the Hijaz, Egypt and Damascus region increased their influence and, unlike the previous periods, some developments were experienced in the hadith sciences as predicted (Uzunçarşılı, 1988, p. 293).

One of the most important hadith scholars who visited Istanbul at the end of the seventeenth century is the North African origin Muhammad ibn Muhammad ibn Sulayman al-Rudani (1094/1683). Rudani is a hadith scholar who was educated in various science centers such as Morocco, Algeria, Egypt, Damascus, Medina and Mecca. He settled in Mecca after various scientific journeys in the Hejaz, where he came for a pilgrimage for a while. Ottoman Vizier Mustafa Bey, who went on a pilgrimage in 1080/1670, attended Rudani's lectures and invited him to Istanbul. Rudani also came to Istanbul in 1081/1670, met with Koprulu Fadhl Ahmad Pasha, one of the viziers of the period, and was respected here. Rudani dismissed the *sharif* of Mecca while he was in Istanbul, had Barakat ibn Muhammad replaced him, and he was appointed to the responsibility of Mecca Haramayn affairs. Rudani remained in this position until the death of the vizier who appointed him to this task (Hatiboğlu, 2010, p. 86; Kawsari, 1993, p. 28; Yücel, 2008, pp. 184–185).

Likewise, the famous muhaddith Ajluni (1162/1749), who visited the center of the caliphate in 1707 and stayed there for a year, was appointed as the teacher of the



Damascus Umayyad Mosque while he was in Istanbul and continued this duty for more than forty years until his death (Yardımcı, 1988, p. 327). The famous hadith certification known as *al-Arbaun al-Ajluniyya*, which he collected from forty different books, became widespread among Ottoman scholars and was transferred to Zahid al-Kawsari (1952), three centuries after his arrival in Istanbul (Kawsari, 1993, p. 62). One of the important names in Ottoman hadith studies is Hibatullah al-Ba'li (1224/1809). Hibatullah al-Ba'li came to Istanbul for the first time in 1173/1760 and returned to Damascus after staying for a while. The author, who later came to Istanbul again, died here (Zirikli, 2002, vol. 8, p. 75).

Some chains of narration about the *Sunan* of Abu Davud, Tirmidhi and Nasai, who are among the most important works in the tradition of narration, became widespread in the Ottomans through Hibatullah al-Ba'li. Muhammad Es'ad Imamzada (1267/1851) and Ayasofya Sheikh Yusuf ibn Ismail (1264/1848) are some of the names who took hadith lessons and *icaza* from Hibatullah al-Ba'li (1224/1809) (Kawsari, 1993, pp. 12–13). In fact, Yusuf ibn Ismail is considered as a special student of Hibatullah al-Ba'li (Kawsari, 1993, p. 24). On the other hand, an important part of the chain of transmission of Alasonian Ali Zainal Abidin (1336/1917), one of Kawsari's teachers, comes through Hibatullah al-Ba'li. Hibatullah al-Ba'li played an important role in his reading among Ottoman scholars. For example, *Inala al-Thalibin li Awali al-Muhaddithin*, *Kifaya al-Rawi ve al-Sami'*, *Kifaya al-Muttali'* and *Nihaya al-Mutathalli'* are a few of them (Kawsari, 1993, pp. 25–28).

One of the muhaddith who came to Istanbul and contributed to the nineteenth century Ottoman hadith studies is Arwadi (1275/1858). Arwadi came to Istanbul in 1849 and taught hadith in Hagia Sophia for two years. Gumusyhanawi (1311/1893), who was a nineteenth century Ottoman muhaddith and sufi, met Arwadi here and read hadith from him (Kawsari, 1993, p. 48).

Above, we have narrated some studies that show the effects of some hadith scholars who came to Istanbul from the seventeenth century on the progress of Ottoman hadith studies, as well as the lectures they gave in official and unofficial educational institutions. Here, in the last few centuries, we see that experts in the field of hadith have visited the center of the caliphate. These hadiths contributed to the reading of some hadith books and the dissemination of some hadith books among scientific circles in accordance with the tradition of narration, especially while they were in

Istanbul. On the other hand, the majority of the hadith books of different nature seen in the *ijaza* of Zahid al-Kawsari took their place in education and training through the hadiths such as Rudani, Ajluni, Hibatullah al-Ba’li and Arwadi, whose biographies were introduced above. He took his place in education and training by means of hadith scholars like Arwadi. This clearly shows that the reading of different types of studies on the sciences of hadith in accordance with the tradition of narration in the Ottoman geography began at the end of the seventeenth century and spread among scientific circles in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. (Atay, 1983, pp. 106–114). It shows that it has spread among scientific circles in the centuries.

The visits of scholars with a high level of hadith accumulation since the end of the seventeenth century to Istanbul contributed to the increase of the influence of hadith sciences in the field of education, and these activities also reflected positively on *Shahih al-Bukhari* studies, and the tradition of writing annotations on *Shahih al-Bukhari* in the sixteenth century was revived in the eighteenth century. In this century and in the nineteenth century, seven studies were made on Bukhari. Especially the studies of special quality in the nineteenth century are pleasing in terms of hadith sciences. The most important indicator of this is the hadith methodology and commentary studies that emerged together with the educational activities of scholars who have a high level of hadith accumulation. It is beyond the limits of our work to introduce all the works of these two centuries here. For this reason, we will confine ourselves to mentioning only the studies on *Shahih al-Bukhari*.

*Shahih al-Bukhari* studies in the eighteenth century are as follows; (Sandıkçı, 1991, pp. 74–80);

1. Ibrahim Fitri al-Bukhari Edirnewi (1135/1723), *Syarh Shahih al-Bukhari*.
2. Aricizade Bekir ibn Ali Fardi Kayseri (1145/1732), *Hasyiah ‘ala al-Bukhari*.
3. Yusuf Efendizada, Abu Muhammad, Abdullah Hilmi ibn Muhammad al-Ahiskawi al-Amasi al-Islamboli (1167/1754), *Najah al-Qari fi Syarh Shahih al-Bukhari*.
4. Muhammad ibn Mustafa Hamid Akkirmani al-Kafawi (1174/1760), *Hasyiyah ‘ala Shahih al-Bukhari*.
5. Nuruddin Abu al-Yaman Ismail ibn Abdillah al-Uskudari (1182/1768), *Muhtashar al-Jami' al-Shahih li al-Bukhari*.

6. Abu Bakr Hasan al-Amidi (Kucuk Ahmad Zada) (1190/1776), *Syarh al-Bukhari*.
7. Said ibn Muhammad ibn Mustafa ibn Usman al-Hadimi al-Rumi (1213/1798), *Syarh al-Jami' al-Shahih li al-Bukhari*. Hadimi's commentary on Bukhari up to half. The author stayed in Medina for a long time and died there.

Studies on *Shahih al-Bukhari* in the nineteenth century (Sandıkçı, 1991, pp. 62–142);

1. Abdullah Sıdkı Efendi, *Miftah al-Bukhari*.
2. al-Sayyid Hasan ibn Hasan Shafizada (1279/1862), *Asami Ruwat Shahih al-Bukhari*.
3. Muhammad Sukri ibn Ismail al-Ankarawi (after 1305/1888), *Miftah al-Bukhari*.
4. Muhammad Syarif al-Tukadi (1308/1890) *Miftah al-Shahihayn*.
5. Muhammad Rasim ibn Ali ibn Riza ibn Sulaiman al-Malatyawi (1316/1899), *Kimya al-Sa'ada fi Syarh al-Jami' al-Shahih li al-Bukhari*.
6. Ahmad Hamdullah ibn Ismail al-Ankarawi (1317/1899), *al-Nujum al-Darari ila Irsyad al-Sari*. Ankarawi made an index study on Kastallani's Bukhari commentary named *Irsyad al-Sari*.
7. Umar Dziyauddin Dagestani (1921), *Sunan Aqwal al-Nabi 'an Zubdat al-Bukhari*. Dagestani's work was published in Istanbul on 1308/1893.

Here, only the studies on Bukhari are included. However, in the Ottoman scientific environment of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there were many studies on hadith, apart from *Shahih al-Bukhari*. Sadik Cihan, who made a special study on the methodology written by the Turkish hadith scholars in the Ottoman period; He determined that three works in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and a total of twenty works of hadith methodology were written in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Seven of these twenty works are in copyright type and the remaining thirteen works, eight are Nuhbah al-fikar commentaries and five are commentaries on Birgiwi's treatise on hadith methodology. It is significant that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the increase in studies on hadith methodology and the increase in the intensity of hadith courses in the madrasa curriculum coincided with the same periods (Cihan, 1976, pp. 127–136). As it has been tried to draw attention from the very beginning, it is not a very consistent approach in terms of Ottoman hadith studies to actually evaluate the teaching and scientific studies in formal or informal educational

institutions completely independently from each other and not take into account the correct proportion between teaching and copyright. Because the intensity of the hadith lessons in the education programs is strongly reflected in the scientific studies, and the distribution of the *usul al-hadith* works written by the Turkish hadith scholars by centuries clearly confirms.

On the other hand, in the examinations about the curriculum of the madrasahs above, we have mentioned some findings that the hadith method books began to be seen clearly in the programs of the seventeenth century for the first time and then diversified in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As a matter of fact, the fact that the hadith methodology and other courses increased in the madrasa programs and the dates when scholars from the Hijaz, Egypt and Damascus region came to Istanbul and gave hadith lessons there coincided with the same periods, that the origins of Ottoman hadithism in the last two centuries did not go back to the early periods, and that the hadith accumulation of the last period in Hijaz and Egypt. There are clear findings showing that it is fed from. In addition, these similarities show that it is not the right approach to make a retrospective inference about the early Ottoman hadithism without determining the source of the hadith accumulation of recent scholars.

## Conclusion

The first of the commentaries written on *al-Jami' al-Shahih* in the Ottomans is the work named *al-Kawsar al-Jari* written by Molla Gurani. A total of six commentaries were written on Bukhari, one in the late fifteenth century and the others in the sixteenth century, right after Gurani. It can be thought that the tradition of writing annotations on *Shahih al-Bukhari*, which was common among the fifteenth century Egyptian hadith scholars, was influential in the sudden acceleration of these studies. Since the seventeenth century, scholars who were brought to Istanbul from the region for the first time with the conquest of Egypt by Yawuz Sultan Salim, and then the scholars who visited Istanbul from the Hijaz, Egypt and Damascus region or went to these regions for their administrative duties, were able to study the hadith science centers. his accumulation began to spread first to the capital, Istanbul, and from there to other Ottoman cities. In the eighteenth and nineteenth century, seven studies were made on *Shahih al-Bukhari*. Especially the studies of special quality in the nineteenth century are pleasing in terms of hadith sciences. The most important indicator of this is the hadith

methodology and commentary studies that emerged together with the educational activities of scholars who have a high level of hadith accumulation.

## References

- Akın, H. (1968). *Aydınöğulları Tarihi Hakkında Bir Araştırma*. Ankara.
- Akpınar, C. (2002). Kefevî Hüseyin Efendi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 186–187).
- Altıkulaç, T. (1999). İbnü'l-Cezerî. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 551–557).
- Armağan, A. M. (1994). Tire'nin Türk Kültüründe Yeri. In M. Şeker (Ed.), *Türk Kültüründe Tire* (pp. 15–19). Ankara.
- Atay, H. (1983). *Osmanlılarda Yüksek Din Eğitimi Medrese Programları İcâzetnâmeler Islahat Hareketleri* (1st ed.). İstanbul.
- Baktır, M. (1994). Tireli İbn Melek ve İlmi Muhiti Hakkında Bazı Tesbitler. In M. Şeker (Ed.), *Türk Kültüründe Tire* (pp. 33–42). Ankara.
- Baktır, M. (1999). İbn Melek. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 175–176).
- Bali, A. ibn. (n.d.). *al-'İkd al-Manzum fı Zıkr Afadil al-Rum*.
- Baş, E. (2010). Şeyhzâde. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 97–98).
- Bursalı, M. T. E. (n.d.). *Osmanlı Müellifleri I-III* (A. F. Yavuz & İ. Özen, eds.). İstanbul: Meral Yayınevi.
- Çakan, İ. L. (1991). Atûfî Hayreddin Hızır. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 99–100).
- Çelebi, İ. (2002). Kemalpaşazâde (Eserleri). In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 245–247).
- Çelebi, M. S. (2000). *Buhârî'de Yönetim Esasları* (M. Erdoğan, trans.). İstanbul.
- Cihan, S. (1976). *Osmanlı Devrinde Türk Hadisçileri Tarafından Yazılan Usulü Hadis Eserleri, Risâleleri ve Nuhbetü'l-Fiker Üzerine Yazılan Şerh ve Tercüme*. Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, (1), 127–136.
- Dartma, B. (2005). Şihâbuddin es-Sivâsî: Hayatı ve İlmi Şahsiyeti. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(2), 89–106.

- Demirel, H. R. (2005). Şihâbuddin es-Sivâsî'nin Hayatı, Eserleri ve Hadis Usûlüne Dair Riyâdu'l-Ezhâr fi Cilâi'l-Ebsâr İsimli Eseri. *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi*, 9(2), 107–116.
- Efendi, M. M. (1852). *Hadaïq al-Syaqaiq*. Istanbul: Matbaa al-Amira.
- Gökay, O. Ş., & Özen, Ş. (1987). Molla Lütü. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (p. 255). Ankara.
- Güler, Z. (2003). Vesîle ve Tevessül Hadislerinin Kaynak Değeri. *Tasavvuf İlmî ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi*, (10), 45–98.
- Hatiboğlu, İ. (2010). Süleyman Fâzıl Efendi. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 86–87).
- Ibn al-İmad, A. al-F. A. ibn A. al-H. (1993). *Syadzârât al-Dzahab fi Akhbar man Dzahab I-X* (1st ed.; M. Arnavud & A. Arnavud, eds.). Beirut.
- İnalçık, H. (n.d.). Mehmed II. In *İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 506–535).
- İsmail Paşa. (1951). *Hadiyyat al-Arifin Asma' al-Muallifin wa Atsar al-Mushannifin I – II*. Istanbul.
- Kastallani, A. al-A. Ş. A. ibn M. ibn A. B. (2009). *İrşâd al-Sari li şarh Sahih al-Buhari I – XV* (2nd ed.; M. A. Al-Halidi, ed.). Beirut.
- Katib Çelebi, M. ibn A. (1941). *Kasyf al-Dzunun an Asami al- Kutub ve al-Funun I-II* (Ğ. Yaltkaya & K. R. Bilge, eds.). Istanbul.
- Kawsari, M. Z. A.-. (1993). *Al-Tahrir al-Wajiz fima Yabtaghihi al-Mustajiz* (1st ed.; A. Abu Ghudda, ed.). Aleppo.
- Kirmani, Ş. M. ibn Y. ibn A. (2009). *al-Kawakib al- Darari fi Syarh al-Jami' al-Shahih li al-Bukhari I-XXV* (A. I. Inaya, ed.). Beirut.
- Koca, F. (1996). Fudayl Çelebi Zenbillizâde. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (1st ed., pp. 207–208). Istanbul.
- Koçkuzu, A. O. (1983). *Hadis İlimleri ve Hadis Tarihi*. Istanbul.
- Lekesiz, M. H. (1991). Osmanlı İlmî Zihniyeti: Teşekkülü, Gelişmesi ve Çözülmesi Üzerine Bir Tahlil Denemesi. *Türk Yurdu*, 11(49), 20–31.
- Martı, H. (2008). Osmanlı'da Bir Dâru'l-Hadîs ğeyhi Birgivi Mehmed Efendi. Istanbul.
- Merçil, E. (1991). Aydınoğulları. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 239–241).

- Muhtar, C. (1994). Dilci İbn Melek. In M. Şeker (Ed.), *Türk Kültüründe Tire* (pp. 49–52). Ankara.
- Ocak, A. Y. (1998). Düşünce Hayatı (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar) I-II. In E. İhsanoğlu (Ed.), *Osmanlı Devleti ve Medeniyeti Tarihi* (pp. 159–193). İstanbul: IRCICA.
- Ocak, A. Y. (2002). Klasik Dönem Osmanlı Düşünce Hayatı. In H. C. Güzel (Ed.), *Türkler* (pp. 15–26). Ankara.
- Öngören, R. (2002). Kutbüddin İznikî. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 585–486).
- Özcan, T. (2005). Molla Arap. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 240–241).
- Pakalın, M. Z. (1993). *Osmanlı Tarih Deyimleri ve Terimleri Sözlüğü I – III*. İstanbul,
- Sandıkçı, S. K. (1991). *Sahîh-i Buhârî Üzerine Yapılan Çalışmalar*. Ankara.
- Sülün, M. (2010). Şehâbeddin Sivâsî. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 418–420).
- Süreyya, M. (1998). *Sicill-i Osmanî yahud Tezkire-i Meşâhir-i Osmâniyye I –IV* (A. Aktan, ed.). İstanbul.
- Tasykoprulu, A. ibn M. (n.d.). *Al-Syaqaiq al-Nu'maniyya fı Ulama' al-Dawla al-Usmaniyya*. İstanbul: Dar al-Sa'ada.
- Turan, Ş. (2002). Kemalpaşazâde. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 238–240).
- Unan, F. (2003). *Kuruluşundan Günümüze Fâtih Külliyesi*. Ankara.
- Uzunçarşılı, İ. H. (1988). *Osmanlı Devletinin İlmiye Teşkilatı*. Ankara.
- Yardım, A. (1988). Aclûnî. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 327–328).
- Yaşaroğlu, M. K. (2006). Musannifek. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 239–240).
- Yıldız, S. (n.d.). Fatih'in Hocası Molla Gürânî ve Tefsiri. In *Sahaflar Kitap Sarayı*. İstanbul.
- Yılmaz, H. K. (1990). *Tasavvufî Hadîs Şerhleri ve Konevî'nin Kırk Hadis Şerhi*. İstanbul.
- Yücel, A. (2008). Rudânî. In *Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi* (pp. 184–185).
- Yüksel, E. (2011). *Mehmed Birgivi'nin (929-981/1523-1573) Dinî ve Siyasî Görüşleri*. Ankara.
- Zirikli, H. (2002). *al-Alam Kamus Tarajim li Asyhar al-Rijal wa al-Nisa' min al-Arab wa al-Musta'ribin wa al-Müstesyriqin I-VIII* (15th ed.). Beirut.

This page is intentionally left blank