Makale / Article

Ḥadīth Indexes of the Ottoman Period before *Concordance (al-Muʿjam al-Mufahras)**

Mustafa Celil Altuntaş**

Abstract

Following the completion of the codification of the science of *aḥādīth*, in an attempt to facilitate access to traditions, *aṭrāf* works began to be penned at an early date. In order to help one find *aḥadīth* more easily, these works were arranged in alphabetic order by the name of the companion or the texts of the traditions. These works played a significant role not only by locating traditions but also by revealing how many works a given tradition is mentioned in. During the period of *mutaaḫḫirūn,* alphabetically ordered compilations took on this task. At the outset of the spread of printing during the 19th century in the Ottoman period, the publication of primary works in the field of ḥadīth gained momentum. In this regard, primary ḥadīth works and commentaries on them, which circulated among the scholars, were printed by publication houses. At the same time, indexes were prepared for the works published during this period. Considering that a given work may have had different editions, in these indexes, places of traditions were referred to by their *kitāb* (chapter) and *bāb* (sub-division). It is quite significant for publishing activities of the Ottoman period that such a method that is still useful today was practised then. Moreover, the same method was used for *Concordance et indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, which was compiled in 1916 under the leadership of Arent Jan Wensinck (d. 1939), and in fact, this method, which allowed one to easily find any given tradition cited regardless of the change in editions, was used in this work as well.

Keywords: *Concordance*, *ḥadīth* indexes, Ottoman, *ḥadīth*, atrāf.

Concordance (el-Mu‘cemu’l-müfehres) Öncesi Osmanlı Dönemi Hadis Fihristleri

Özet

Hadis musannefâtının önemli bir kısmının tasnifinin akabinde muhtevasındaki hadislere ulaşabilmede kolaylık sağlaması açısından "etrâf" türü eserler kaleme alınmıştır. Bu tür eserler sahâbe adına veya hadis metinlerine göre alfabetik olarak tertip edilmiştir. Etrâf çalışmaları hadislerin tespitinin yanında bir hadisin hangi kaynaklarda yer aldığını göstermesi açısından önemli bir vazife de görmüştür. Daha sonraki dönemlerde ise bu vazifeyi etrâf türü çalışmalarla beraber alfabetik olarak tertip edilen derleme eserler üstlenmiştir. XIX. yüzyılda Osmanlı döneminde matbaanın yaygınlaşmaya başlaması ile birlikte hadis alanında temel eserlerin yayın faaliyeti hız kazanmıştır. Bu dönemde temel hadis kitaplarıyla bu eserlerin ulemâ arasında tedâvülde olan şerhleri de yayınlanmıştır. Buna paralel olarak neşredilen eserlerin fihristleri de hazırlanmıştır. Söz konusu fihristlerde aynı eserin farklı matbu nüshaların olabileceği düşünülerek hadislerin kitâb ve bâb içerisinde bulunduğu yerler gösterilmiştir. Daha o dönemde bugün de geçerliliğini koruyan bir yöntemin uygulanmış olması Osmanlı dönemi yayıncılık faaliyeti açısından son derece önemlidir. Ayrıca 1916 yılında şarkiyatçı Arent Jan Wensinck (ö. 1939) önderliğinde hazırlanan *Concordance et indices de la Tradition Musulmane*'da da aynı yöntem takip edilmiş, matbu nüshaları değişse de iktibas edilen hadisi kolayca bulmayı sağlayacak bu yöntem kullanılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Concordance*, hadis fihristleri, Osmanlı, hadis, etrâf.

1. Factors that affected Index Works

The hadīth index works are the works that help hadīth scholars to identify the source of any given hadīth easily. The indexes are prepared on the ground of *isnād*s (chain of transmitters), the first parts of the ahadīth (*awāil*), content and the words of the ahadīth.[1] On the other hand, in early periods the word *atrāf* is used to designate index, and *atrāf* gained the status of a distinct genre of work. During the period of the oral transmission of *ahādīth* (*riwāyāt*), the word *atrāf* meant the written record of the first parts of *ahādīth* in order to facilitate their memorizing and easy recollecting. In a conversation between Ibrāhīm an-Naha'ī (d. 96/714) and his pupil Hammād b. Abī Sulaymān (d.120/738) this issue has been raised, and when Hammād said that the documents at his hand are *atrāf*, Naha'ī responded: "Didn't I forbid you this?"[2] However, Naha'ī is also told to permit writing down of the first parts of *ahādīth* (*kitābatu'l-atrāf*) for recollecting purposes possibly.[3] Bukhārī (d. 256/870) is also said to study the books of the scholars and to memorize *atrāf*.[4] Another example that the word *atrāf* is used to designate index is the piece of information that Daraqutnī (d. 385/995) prepared the *atrāf* of his own *Muwatta'*.[5] All these evidence show that the idea of writing *atrāf* (index) during the period of the oral transmission of *ahādīth* was serving to recollect any given *hadīth* easily while transmitting.

After the period of the collection and codification, the hadīth studies are to a large extent based on the source works written in this period. The *mustadrak*, *mustakhraj*, *mukhtasar* and *zawāid* are studies on these basic works. In these works, the main and most important area of the study for the hadīth scholars has been to identify in which source any given hadīth is mentioned. Therefore, either in commentaries or in *zawāid* works the reference to all sources of hadīth is one of the objectives.

While *atrāf* works served the need in earlier times as mentioned above, they were replaced by index studies in the modern period. Pre-modern *atrāf* works exhibit completely different qualities than the logic of contemporary index works. We need to keep in mind that in early periods the chain of transmission (*isnād*) was as essential as the text of hadīth for a *muhaddīth*. Therefore the method used to identify *ahādīth* had been to list the names of the *sahāba* transmitters alphabetically. That today we search for a hadīth with a keyword as opposed to early periods which carried out the same task with the name of the transmitter (*rāwī*), points to a shift in the understanding of *hadīth* apart from a change in the

---

1   Yūsuf Abdurrahmān Mar'ashli, *Ilmu fihristi'l-hadīs*, Dāru'l-ma'rifa, Beirut, 1986, p. 9.
2   Zahabī, *Siyaru a'lâmi'n-nubalā*, Dâru'l-hadîs, Cairo, 2006, V, 528.
3   Zahabī, *Siyaru a'lâmi'n-nubalā*, V, 528.
4   Zahabī, *Siyaru a'lâmi'n-nubalā*, X, 91.
5   Zahabī, *Siyaru a'lâmi'n-nubalā*, VII, 152, 173.

method. Because in the *takhrīj* practice of the classical period, the name of the transmitting *sahābī* matters, and that hadīth is attributed to him/her. A hadīth with the same wording and attributed to another *sahābī* or transmitter is counted as another hadīth. However today the sources that mention the wording or text of any given hadīth are taken into consideration and the name of the transmitter is disregarded in *takhrīj* practice. So it could be said that there has been a shift from the *isnād* and transmitter/ *sahābī* centred *takhrīj* method to the text-based *takhrīj* method.

Together with *atrāf* works, the works that list *ahādīth* alphabetically could also be counted among the index works. It was Kudāī (d. 454/1062) who first compiled *ahādīth* alphabetically and without chains of transmission in his *Shihābu'l-akhbār*. Then Sāgānī's (d. 650/1252) *Mashāriqu'l-anwār* compiled *ahādīth* based on syntax (*nahw*) and again alphabetically. These two works probably because of their practical use had been important texts in the education of hadīth science in some periods. Following these two works, Suyūtī's (d. 911/1505) *al-Jāmi'u's-saghīr* had been the most basic sourcebook the 10th (16) century onwards as it contained more than ten thousand *ahādīth* listed alphabetically. The fact that the works which quote or compile *ahādīth* during the Ottoman era generally refer to *al-Jāmi'u's-saghīr* and that many commentaries on it were made, is a clear sign supporting the work's centrality.[6]

We know that many publishing houses were founded in the last quarter of the 19th century Ottoman era and that important works were published. But the publication of religious works was not welcomed immediately, it took some time. For the first time it was shaykh al-Islām Yenişehirli Abdullah Efendi (d. 1156/1743) who permitted the publication of books, but on the condition that they are dictionaries, or books about instrumental sciences such as logic, *hikma*, and astronomy (*hay'a*). In his fatwa and consequently in the Sultan's edict (*farmān*) it was specially stated that the works about religious sciences shall not be published. After long years in 1803, Imām Birgivī's *Risāla* had been the first religious work published. On the other hand, shaykh al-Islām Yasincizāde Abdülvehhāb Efendi's (d. 1248/1833) *Khulāsatu'l-burhān fi itā'ati's-sultān* containing twenty-five *ahādīth* had been the first hadīth work published in 1247/1832.[7] However not to publish the basic hadīth works and al-Qur'ān al-Karīm was still the rule observed. It is reported that the prohibition with respect

---

6   The clearest example of this situation is that the *ahādīth* in *Binbir Hadis* authored by Mehmed Arif Bey (d. 1897), are quotations from *al-Jāmi'u's-saghīr*. See. Mustafa Celil Altuntaş, "Suyûtî'nin *el-Câmi'u's-Sağîr*'inin Osmanlı Hadis Eğitimindeki Yeri", *Sahn-ı Semân'dan Dârulfünûn'a Osmanlı'da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası (Âlimler, Müesseseler ve Fikrî Eserler) - XVII. Yüzyıl*, İstanbul, 2017, pp. 341-365.

7   Mustafa Celil Altuntaş, *Osmanlı Döneminde Hadis İlmi*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Unpublished PhD thesis, İstanbul, 2018, pp. 417-425.

to the publication of all religious works is lifted in 1873[8] but before that, Ahmad Ziauddin Gümüşhanevi (d.1310/1893) had already published his *Rāmuzu'l-ahādīh* containing more than seven thousand *ahādīth* on his own expenses in the year 1275/1858-59. This work is the first hadīth compilation that is published in Istanbul. In a document dating 1276/1860, it is stated that "up till now there is no such publication of *ahādīth'al-nabawiyya.*"[9] This document explains why the publication of hadīth works with the permission/support of the state came so late during the Ottoman era. In this period, the ban was basically for the publication of Qur'ān and hadīth texts. It is also known that before the lift of publication ban in 1873 some hadīth commentaries and *usūl* texts were published.[10] These information answers why *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* was published for the first time in Delhi (1850-1853) and Leiden (1862) and not in Istanbul or in another part of the Ottoman empire.

The increase in the publishing house activities after the second half of the 19th century made both basic hadīth sourcebooks and their commentaries available for a wider public. For the purposes of identifying the sources of *ahādīth* compiled in the published works, either separate indexes were published or they were embedded in the introductory parts of the books. At this point, we need to mention some of these published works as they were used in the indexes during this period. Among them is *Sahī -i Bukhārī* first published in India in the years 1850-1853, in Leiden in 1862 and many times in Egypt. Moreover, Ömer Ziyâeddin Dağıstānī (d. 1920) compiled and published the *qawlī ahādīth* of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* under the title *Sunenu aqwāli'n-nabawaiyya mina'l-ahādīthi'l-Bukhāriyya* in 1308/1890-91.[11] The work offers shortened versions (*ikhtisār*) of 4541 *qawlī ahādīth*. Following these publications, another edition was published with the support of II. Abdülhamid (1876-1909) in Bulaq in 1313/1895. Afterwards, *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* was published by Mehmed Zihni Efendi (d. 1332/1913) in *Istanbul* in the publishing house Matbaa-i Amire.[12]

We know that there had been several publications of *Sahīhayn* commentaries

---

8   Necmettin Gökkır, *Tanzimattan Günümüze Din-Devlet İlişkileri ve Siyaset Bağlamında Mushaf Basımı*, M.Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı, İstanbul, 2015, p. 23.

9   BOA, MVL. 356/51.

10   İsmail Hakkı Bursevī's commentary on Nawavī's forty *hadīth*s, *Sharhu'l-arba'īna hadisan* was printed in 1253/1837-38 and Ahmed Fatih Efendi's translation of *Nuhbatu'l-fikar* was printed in 1261/1845.

11   Ömer Ziyaeddin Dağıstānī, Sunenu aqwāli'n-nabawiyya mina'l-ahādīthi'l-Bukhāriyya, Mahmud Bey Matbaası, İstanbul, 1308.

12   For detailed information see Mehmet Özşenel, "Sahîh-i Buhârî neşirleri: Sehârenpûrî neşri ile II. Abdülhamid neşrinin karşılaştırılması", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 2013, vol: XI, no: 21, pp. 454-484; Ali Albayrak, "Mehmed Zihni Efendi Örneğinde Sahîh-i Buhârî Baskılarının Tashihi", *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 54 (2018), pp. 45-78.

in the 19th century. Qastallanī's (d. 923/1517) *Irshādu's-sārī* was published many times since 1267/1850-51 onwards. Nawavī's (d. 676/1277) commentary on *Sahīh-i Muslim* was published in Cairo (1271/1854-55) and in Lucknow (1285/1868-69) as a separate work, and on many occasions as an appendix to Qastallanī's *Irshādu's-sārī*. Ibn Hajar's (d.852/1449) *Fathu'l-Bārī* was published in Delhi in 1307/1890 and then in Bulaq in 1300/1882-83. 'Aynī's (d. 855/1451) commentary *'Umdatu'l-qārī* was published in Istanbul at Matbaa-i Amire publishing house in 1308-311/1890-94. Following the publication of these hadīth books and their commentaries, some index studies were carried out in the Ottoman era. In these indexes, we notice that not only the mention of any given hadīth in the sourcebooks but the references in the commentaries were taken into consideration. This attitude shows a different perspective than the contemporary attitude. This attitude is important as it bears witness to the fact that in the Ottoman period the commentaries were studied and taken as ground rather than the hadīth texts.[13]

2. Hadīth Indexes of the Ottoman Period

The indexes which were published following the publication of the basic hadīth sourcebooks are a clear sign of the motivation to cover a need in the field of hadīth science. Already before the introduction of the publishing houses, the manuscripts contained indexes sometimes even more than fifty pages at their beginning. These indexes can be regarded as the seed of the modern index studies. But the indexes of the manuscripts fall out of the scope of this article; this issue requires a separate and wider examination. The importance of the Ottoman indexes is that they are the first examples of the indexes which are still of interest for publication today. That *Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn* as we shall mention below, published in Beirut in 1975, shows that the work is still of high and relevant scientific quality even in such later times.[14] Below we shall mention the Ottoman

---

13 Our intention is not to say that only the commentaries were studied in the madrasas, rather we mean that the study of the commentaries was an inseparable part of the hadīth teaching. If we examine the hadīth translations during the Ottoman period this situation becomes clearer. For example, if we look at the translations of *Mashāriqu'l-anwār,* we understand that they are indeed, to a large extent, translations of *Mabāriqu'l-azhār* even if they seem to be translations *Mashāriqu'l-anwār*. Kadrī Bigavī, in what is considered to be his translation of *al-Jāmi'u's-saghīr* indeed translated Munāwī's *al-Taysīr* which is a commentary on *al-Jāmi'u's-saghīr*. For detailed information see Mustafa Celil Altuntaş, "Osmanlı Hadis Eğitiminde Meşâriku'l-Envâr", *Osmanlı'da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası: İstanbul'un Fethinden Süleymaniye Medreselerinin Kuruluşuna Kadar*, 2015, pp. 147-178; idem, "Suyûtî'nin el-Câmi'u's-Sağîr'inin Osmanlı Hadis Eğitimindeki Yeri", pp. 341-365.

14 For a general overview of these published indexes by Abdulfattāh Abū Gudda see Abū Abdurrahmān Ahmād b. 'Ali b. Shu'ayb al-Nasā'î, *Sunan al-Nasā'î*, ed. Abdulfattāh Abū Gudda, Dâru'l-bashāir'l-Islāmiyya, Beirut, 1988, IX, 5-11 (in the footnote).

period indexes in chronological order and then we shall introduce *Concordance* with its general qualities.

2.1. al-Nujūmu'd-darārī ilā Irshādi's-sārī

Ahmed Hamdullah Efendi b. İsmâil Hāmid Efendi (d. 1317/1899-1900)[15] worked out his *al-Nujūmu'd-darārī ilā Irshādi's-sārī* which is an index for *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* after the publication of Qastallānī's *Irshādu's-sārī* in Cairo in 1267/1850. He made a thorough examination of *Irshādu's-sārī* and worked out an index. Ahmed Hamdullah Efendi initially sorted out approximately 90 thousand words and then eliminated the repeated ones, and he formed his work with 28 chapters, 600 sub-divisions and 19.327 words. He started working on it while he was in the office in the district of Bayındır and completed it within a time scope of seven years while he was serving in Şumnu *Qādī* Office. He sorted out the 90 thousand words that happen in *ahādīth* and referred them to the pages of Qastallānī's commentary *Irshādu's-sārī*. His work was greatly appreciated by the community of scholars at that time and granted several notes of appreciation (*taqrīz*). Among them is Muhaddith-i Dāru's-Saāde (Istanbul) Abu'l-Qāsīm al-Maghrībī.[16] As goes without saying, the appreciation by a scholar who is called as the *muhaddith* of Istanbul is a great honour in this respect. Moreover, his work is granted written appreciation by the shaykh of Galata Mawlawīhāne Kudretullah Efendi, the shaykh of Thessaloniki İki Lüle Dergah Ali Rıza Efendi, Abdurrahman Sami Pasha, Tırnova Governor Hilmi Pasha, Bab-ı Seraskerī record office manager Sun'ī Efendi, the shaikh of Fındıklı Dergah Ahmed Şevki Efendi, Hafız Bosnevizade Mehmed Zihni Efendi, Tırnova vice governor Mehmed Fevzi Efendi. [17]

After the completion of his work, Ahmad Hamdullah Efendi made three copies with his handwriting and he sent three copies to Ragıb Pasha Library, India and Egypt respectively. The copy he sent to Ragıp Pasha Library is most probably

---

15 Ahmed Hamdullah Efendi is of Ankara by descent. His father İsmāil Hāmid Efendi served as secretary in various judging offices. While he was serving as secretary at Tophane Court he got married to Fatma Zekiye Hanım, and Hamdullah Efendi was born on 16 Zilhicce 1225/12 January 1811. After the completion of his education, he served as a vice in Judging Offices. The courts he served are as follows by order: Tophane, Terkos, Avrethisarı, Edremit, Bayındır, Eskişehir, İzmir, Üsküdar, Şumnu, Eyüp, Üsküdar, Galata. Later on, he served as *qassam* in the Treasury, he worked as a petitioner (*arzuhalci*). During the office time of shaykh al-Islam Ahmed Esad (d. 1889) he was appointed as a member of Meclis-i Tetkikat-ı Şer'iyye and he kept this post till his death. See Ahmed Hamdullah, *al-Nujūmu'd-darārī ilā Irshadi's-sārī*, Beyazıt, 1033 (at the beginning of the work there is a biography of the author with his handwriting); Bursalı Mehmed Tahir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, Matbaa-i Âmire, İstanbul, 1333, I, 248-249; Bağdatlı, *Hediyye*, I, 195; Selahattin Yıldırım, "XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Muhaddisleri ve Eserleri", *Din Eğitimi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2004, no: 13, p. 306.

16 Ahmed Hamdullah, *al-Nujūmu'd-darārī.*

17 Ahmed Hamdullah, *al-Nujūmu'd-darārī* (in the intrduction).

the one in Beyazıt Library. The copy he sent to Egypt is today in Daru'l-Kutubi'l-Mısriyye.[18] He asked for support to send a copy to India and appealed to Bab-ı Ali with a letter. The copy was sent to the Madrasa of Diyobend with the assistance of Bab-ı Ali and the Consulate of Bombay. The Diyobend Madrasa sent a letter of gratitude in Persian on 22 Rebīulāhir 1295/25 April 1878. Ahmed Hamdullah Efendi added this letter to the beginning of his work. The letter states that the work reached them with the assistance of Consul Hüseyin Habīb Efendi.[19]

Ahmad Hamdullah Efendi wrote an Arabic introduction to his own copy which outlines a manual on his work. He explains that he observed the order of letters and organized his work in 28 chapters and that the chapters had 600 sub-divisions (*fasl*) making use of 19.327 words. He appointed a letter for each 10 volumes: 1st volume (ك), 2nd volume (ي), 3rd volume (ب), 4th volume (يع), 5th volume (حا), 6th volume (س), 7th volume (سا), 8th volume (من), 9th volume (سع), 10th volume (عا). The most distinct character of Hamdullah Efendi's work is that he sorted out and recorded more than 10 thousand words in *Sahīh-i Bukhārī*. He states that he got official permission from the Ministry of Education (*Maarif Nezareti*) for the printing of his work on 10 Rebīulāhir 1290/7 June 1873. As we do not have any printed version of the work, we understand that it is not published.

2.2. Fihristu Mukhtasari'l-Bukhārī

This work is the index for Ömer Ziyâeddin Dağıstānī's (d. 1920) *Sunenu akwāli'n-nabawaiyya mina'l-ahādīsi'l-Bukhāriyya* which is a compilation of *qawlī ahādīth* from *Sahīh -i Bukhārī*.[20] In this index, Ömer Ziyâeddin Dağıstānī enlisted the beginning parts of all 4541 *ahādīth* in his *Sunenu akwāli'n-nabawaiyya mina'l-ahādīsi'l-Bukhāriyya* alphabetically and referred to the relevant pages for each hadīth. The fact that his work enumerates *ahādīth* from 1 to 4541 and enlists them alphabetically shows the need for the enumeration of *ahādīth* developed with the introduction of printing and that index works were carried out.

2.3. Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn

Mehmed Şerīf b. Mustafa et-Tokādī (d. 131371895-96), who was a Fatih public lecturer (*dersiām*), served as a teacher and chair shaykh in several schools

18 Muhammad Khayr Ramadān Yūsuf, *Mu'jamu'l-muallifīna'l-muāsırīn fī āsārihimi'l-mahtūta wa'l-mafqūda wa mā tubi'a minhā aw huqqiqa ba'da wafātihim wafayāt (1315-1424 h) (1897-2003 m)*, Maktabatu'l-Malik Fahd al-Wataniyya, Riyad, 2004, I, 58.

19 Ahmed Hamdullah, *al-Nujūmu'd-darārī.*

20 Ömer Ziyâeddin Dağıstānī, *Sunenu akwāli'n-nabawaiyya mina'l-ahādīsi'l-Bukhāriyya*, Mahmûd Bey Matbaası, İstanbul, 1890; this index which appears in the beginning of the work is recorded as a separate work at Atatürk Kitaplığı. See *Fihristu Muhtasari'l-Bukhārī 'alā hurūfi'l-mu'jam*, Atatürk Kitaplığı, 1841.

and mosques.[21] Tokādī says that he prepared the work with the intention to facilitate finding any given hadīth easily in printed or unprinted copies of the works.[22] In the introductory part while explaining his method of referring to the source of a hadīth he uses the phrase "*Bukhāri-i sharīf with vowel signs*", so we understand that he made use of a printed version.[23] Tokādī for the first time enlisted the names of the transmitter *sahāba* alphabetically and gave the numbers of *ahādīth* each *sahābī* transmitted in *Sahīh-i Bukhārī.* According to his account, the work covers 3730 divisions and 2602 *ahādīth* without reiteration.[24] The number of *ahādīth* is the same as Ibn Hajar's enumeration. Tokādī quoted Ibn Hajar's relevant sentences at the beginning of the index.[25] Ibn Hajar points out that the difference in Ibnu's-Salāh's (d. 643/1245) enumeration (approximately 4 thousand without repetition) might have been originated due to his count of *ikhtisārs* as different *ahādīth*.[26]

In one volume, 192 pages are reserved for *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* index and 52 pages for *Sahīh-i Muslim* index. This comprehensive index offers firstly an account of how many *ahādīth* are in the chapters (*kitāb*) and sub-divisions (*bāb*) of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī*, and then it enlists the names of *sahāba* alphabetically and gives the numbers of their transmissions. As an index, the volumes and pages of the *ahādīth* whose beginning parts are compiled in the commentaries of Ibn Hajar, 'Aynī and Qastallānī are referred to. But here again, only the part of any given hadīth that belongs to the Prophet (*qawlī hadīth*) are taken to the index. The work uses the same method which was used by Concordance, namely referring to the relevant book and sections of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī.* In its "Miftāhu Sahīh-i Muslim" section, the work compiles *ahādīth* alphabetically and refers to the relevant volumes and pages of the printed versions of *Sahīh-i Muslim* and

---

21 For his biography see Osman Bilgen, "Mehmed Şerif bin Mustafa et-Tokadi ve "*Miftahu's-sahihayn*" isimli eseri", *Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Tokat Sempozyumu Bildiriler*, 2012, vol: III, s, 277-282.

22 Mehmed Şerīf et-Tokādī, *Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn*, p.1.

23 Mehmed Şerīf et-Tokādī, *Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn*, p. 8. Tokādī mentions that the hadīth with the phrase (اَتَيْنَا بِالْمِفْتَاح) (Bukhārī, "Maghāzī", 77) appears in "*Harekeli Buhârî-i şerifin 5. cildinin 117. sayfasında (at the 5th volume and page 117 of Bukhāri-i sharīf with vowel signs*". The hadīth is cited at 5th volume and page 176 of Bulaq edition, and at 5th volume and page 125 of Zihni Efendi's Matbaa-i Âmire edition. If there is no mistake in the page number provided, it seems Tokādī made use of another edition which was available before the Bulaq version printed in Egypt.

24 Mehmed Şerīf et-Tokādī, *Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn*, p. 4.

25 Ibn Hajar, *Hadyu's-sārī*, ed. Muhibbuddīn al-Khatīb, Dāru'l-Ma'rifa, Beyrut, 1379, p.477.

26 Ibnu's-Salāh presents the figure 4 thousand as an opinion and says that the sahābī and tābī'ūn sayings are included in this figure. See Ibnu's-Salāh, *Ma'rifatu anwā'i 'Ulūmu'l-hadīth*, ed. Nurettin Itr, Dāru'l-Fikr, Syria, 1986, p. 20.

Nawawī's commentary.[27] Tokādī also noted down which printed versions he made use of. As the work provides this information, he says it could be referred to while using manuscripts as well.[28]

2.4. Miftāḥuʾl-Bukhārī

Mehmed Şükrü b. Hasan el-Ankarāvī (d. after 1313) penned his *Miftāḥuʾl-Bukhārī* after the publication of *Saḥīḥ-i Bukhārī* in Bulaq in 1313/1895. In his work, he recorded the beginning parts of *aḥādīth* and referred them to the relevant book and section of *Saḥīḥ-i Bukhārī*. He took into consideration that there might be volume and page differences in the publications, so he referred to *aḥādīth* with their places in the chapter (*kitāb*)/sub-divisions (*bāb*). For the purposes of practicality, he also used signs to identify the volume for any given hadīth in the Bulaq printed edition. The index covers only the chapter/section numbers of *Saḥīḥ-i Bukhārī*. It does not include commentaries unlike Tokādī's index. We can say that the most important feature of the work is that it enumerates all mentions of any given hadīth in *Saḥīḥ-i Bukhārī*.[29]

It is worth to note that Ankarāvī Mehmed Efendi wrote an extensive introduction where he expressed his decision to disregard citing the page numbers either in manuscripts or in the printed works in favour of referring to the chapter names and relevant sub-divisions.[30] It is noteworthy because it shows that the method we use today and named as "*Concordance* reference system" was already in use.

3. *Concordance* (*al-Muʿjamuʾl-mufahras*)

The last volume of *Concordance et indices de la Tradition Musulmane* was published in 1969. The project started in 1916 and led by Arent Jan Wensinck (d. 1939). Many orientalists from different nationalities including Josef Horowitz (d. 1931), Johann Fück (d. 1974), and Alfred Guillaume (d. 1965) contributed to the project. Its index was published in 1988.[31] During the process of publication, Muhammad Fuʿād Abdulbāqī (d. 1968) identified the mistakes and he was included in the committee. In the introduction of the first volume,

---

27 The copies Mehmed Şerīf et-Tokādī made use of in his index are as follows: *Saḥīḥ-i Bukhārī*, Egypt, 1296; Qastallānī, *Irshāduʾs-sārī*, Egypt, 1293; Ibn Hajar, *Fathuʾl-Bārī*, Egypt, 1301, ʿAynī, *ʿUmdatuʾl-qārī*, Şirketi Sahafiye-i Osmāniye, İstanbul, 1309; *Saḥīḥ-i Muslim*, Egypt, 1290; Nawawī, *al-Mihāj*, Egypt, 1293 (at the margins of Qastallānī's *Irshāduʾs-sārī*, which was printed in Egypt in 1293).

28 Mehmed Şerīf et-Tokādī, *Miftāḥuʾs-Saḥīhayn* (in the interior of the cover).

29 Mehmed Şükrü Ankaravī, *Miftāḥuʾl-Bukhārī*, Sahafiye-i Osmāniye, İstanbul, 1313.

30 Ankarāvī, *Miftāḥuʾl-Bukhārī*, pp. 4-5.

31 İbrahim Hatiboğlu, "el-Muʿcemüʾl-Müfehres li-Elfâziʾl-Hadîsiʾn-Nebevî", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/el-mucemul-mufehres-li-elfazil-hadisin-nebevi (13.12.2018).

Wensinck praised the invaluable contribution of Muhammad Fuʻād Abdulbāqī and expressed his gratitude.[32] But only in the third and fourth volumes, his name appears on the covers among the contributors. It was printed five hundred copies and not out for sale. For this reason, access to the work had been limited. Later, its offset prints were made without permission for the first time in Beirut.[33] In the following years, it is printed in Istanbul as well.

The driving motivation behind *Concordance* had been the increase in the publishing activities and the publication of both the fundamental hadīth texts and their commentaries. The works like *al-Jāmiʻu's-saghīr* compiled *ahādīth* according to their first letters, so to find a hadīth in these works requires the knowledge of the first letters of *ahādīth*. On the other hand, to find a hadīth in the fundamental hadīth texts which classify *ahādīth* according to their contents and topics requires knowledge of *fiqhu'l-hadīth.* So selecting a keyword and showing the places it occurred in *ahādīth* is considered to be much more useful. Therefore, the keywords in the *ahādīth* are taken as titles and enlisted alphabetically; the derivate forms of the words are listed under the relevant title and *ahādīth* are cited as to which chapter they belonged. The simple-past verbal case (*mazī-mujarrad*) of the word are used for the titles and their present and imperative forms are listed under each title. They gave priority to active participle (*al-ism al-fāʻil*) over passive participle (*al-ism al-mafʻūl*), the active verb (*maʻlūm*) over the passive (*majhūl*), and the simple verb (*mujarrad*) over the complex verb (*mazīd*). They recorded the verbs in the order of the nominative, the genitive and the accusative. And again they followed the order of the singular (*mufrad*), the dual (*muthannā*), and the plural (*jam*).[34] The most striking feature of *al-Muʻjami'l-mufahras* is that it provides the number of the sub-divisions (*bāb*) so that one can find a hadīth among *ahādīth* listed under that sub-division.

The committee added errata and addendum for the first three volumes at the end of each volume: three pages for the first volume and one page each for the second and third volumes. The subsequent volumes do not have errata and addendums. Saʻd el-Marsafī (d.2018) wrote a book for the errata of *Concordance*. In his book, he identified a variety of different errata: distortion of the phrase, errata in reference to the sources, errata in reference to the chapters, errata in reference to the sub-divisions, putting the word under improper place, confusing the alphabetical order of the word, and not being inclusive sufficiently while

32 Arent Jean Wensinck, *Concordance et indices de la tradition musulmane, el-Muʻjamu'l-mufahras li-alfazi'l-hadīth'n-nabawī*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1936, I, x.

33 J. J. Witkam, "Mashrūʻu talifi'l-*Muʻjami'l-mufahras li-alfāzi'l-hadīthi'n-nabawī* arzun tārikhuyyun" (tr. Muhammad Tahtah), in Wensinck, *al-Muʻjam*, VIII, s, (ط).

34 Abū Muhammad Abdulmahdī b. Abdulkādir Abdulhādī, *Turuqu takhrīji hadīthi Rasūlillāh*, Dāru'l-İʻtisām, Cairo, pp.87-88; Yūsuf Abdurrahmān Marʻashli, *ʻIlmu fihristi'l-hadīth*, pp. 87-90.

referring to *ahādīth*.[35]

Wensinck's index studies are not limited to *Concordance*. Before Concordance, he wrote an index named *A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition* as a practical guide to using the hadīth and *sīra* sources of the early periods of Islam. This work is translated into Arabic with the title *Miftāhu kunūzi's-sunnah*.[36]

In *Concordance*, a specific sign is assigned for each of *Kutub-i tis'a* to notify in which book a given hadīth is cited together with notifications of chapters and divisions. Yūsuf Abdurrahmān Mar'ashli claimed that it was Mustafa b. 'Ali b. Muhammed al-Bayyūmī al-Mısrī (d. 1352/1933) who practised the index making based on the keywords in *ahādīth*, and that the orientalists followed him in this respect.[37] In that case, this work must be el-Mısrī's *Dalīlu fahārisi'l-Bukhārī li'l-kutub wa'l-abwābi'l-asāsiyya.* The fact that this work was published in similar dates with *Taysīru'l-manfa'a* and *Concordance* shows that the idea of the enumeration of *Sahīh -i Bukhārī* sub-divisions was common in that period. According to the index, *Sahīh -i Bukhārī* had 126 chapters (*mabhath*)[38] and 7040 *ahādīth*. Moreover, the index tells the number of divisions each book had and the number of *ahādīth* in these divisions. Therefore we can assume that the divisions were enumerated as well. This reference system is still used today, and the index provides references to the volumes of three separate publications of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* in Egypt.[39] Of the quotation from Mar'ashli it is understood that the Ottoman indexes were not taken into consideration.

While *Concordance* studies were going on, other index studies were being done as well. Rıdvān Muhammad Rıdvān prepared an index entitled *Fahārisu'l-Bukhārī.* He dedicated his work to Muhammed Zāhid al-Kawtharī (d. 1952) and the work is published with a note of appreciation by Kawtharī. In this index, *ahādīth* are not enumerated continuously, but rather with each chapter enumeration starts anew. The work listed *ahādīth* of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* with the greater part of the beginning of their texts without chains of transmission (*sanad*). It also mentioned if any given hadīth was cited in another sub-division.[40]

---

35 Sa'd al-Marsafī, *Adva' 'alâ ahtâi'l-mustashriqīn fī Mu'jami'l-mufahras li-alfāzī-hadīth'n-nabawī*, Dāru'l-Kalam, Kuwait, 1408-1988.

36 İbrahim Hatiboğlu, "Miftāhu künûzi's-sünne", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/miftahu-kunuzis-sunne (14.12.2018).

37 Mar'ashli, *'Ilmu fihristi'l-hadīth*, p. 10.

38 The reason for there being more chapters (*mabhath*) of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* compared to contemporary editions might be due to increase of the titles for the purpose of finding a given hadīth more easily. Some sub-divisions (*bāb*) like chapters (*kitāb*) were listed under these *mabāhith*.

39 Mustafā 'Ali al-Bayyūmī, *Dalīlu fahārisi'l-Bukhārī li'l-kutub wa'l-abwābi'l-asāsiyya*, Matba'atu's-Sāwī, Cairo, 1352/1933.

40 Rıdwān Muhammad Rıdwān, *Fahārisu'l-Bukhārī, Dāru'l-Kitābi'l-'Arabī*, Cairo, 1370.

4. Enumeration of Sub-Divisions in the Ḥadīth Books

The answer to the questions who and when for the first time enumerated the sub-divisions in the ḥadīth books is of great importance for our study. The enumeration of the sub-divisions emerged as a need following the spread of the publication activities. However, in this period the enumeration was not standard, and different methods of enumeration were used.

Before the appearance of the printed versions of the ḥadīth books, some of the copies had the numbers for the sub-divisions or the *aḥādīth*. In the *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* known as Nuwayrī (d. 733/1333) recension, whose facsimile edition has been published recently, all sub-divisions are enumerated continuously. The enumeration excludes the first section of *Sahīh* namely *Bābu bad'i'l-wahy* and starts from *Kitābu'l-imān*.[41] That it has 3453 sub-divisions[42] is indicated in the 32-page index at the beginning of the work.[43] In the manuscript, each division is enumerated and that facilitated the practical use of the work. The copy was completed in the year 725/1325. Therefore, we understand that the enumeration had an earlier history.

The general opinion is that enumeration of sub-divisions started with *Concordance*.[44] However, the works we mentioned above show that it is not the case, and the enumeration had an earlier history than *Concordance*. So, it would be proper to examine the indexes and edition of ḥadīth works which enumerated the sub-divisions before *Concordance*.

4.1. Leiden Edition of Sahīh-i Bukhārī dated 1862/1868

When we examine the *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* editions before *Concordance*, we see that the Leiden edition[45] enumerated the sub-divisions. That *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* with division numbers was published as early as 1862 and that this practice was

---

41 In the manuscripts of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* ''Bābu bad'i'l-wahy'' was not considered as a chapter. It started to be considered as a chapter and assigned a number together with the printing.

42 The number of the sub-division of Sahīh-i Bukhārī differs according to the scholars' enumerations. There is the number 3453 in Nuwayrī recension, and Abdulfattāh Abū Gudda said he counted 3261 *aḥādīth* and he claimed that Muhammad Fu'ād Abdulbāqī gave the same number. See Abdulghanī el-Ghunaymī al-Maydānī, *Kashfu'l-iltibās 'ammā awradahu'l-Imamu'l-Bukhārī 'ala ba'di'n-nās*, ed. Abdulmajīd Mahmūd Abdulmajid - Abdulfattāh Abū Gudda, Maktabu'l-Matbū'āti'l-Islāmiyya, Haleb, 1993/1414, p. 6, note 2.

43 Bukhārī, *el-Jāmi'u's-sahīh*, Süleymaniye Library, Fazıl Ahmet Paşa, 362; *Kitabu'l-Jāmi'i's-sahīh (an-nushatu'l-musawwara 'ani'n-nushati'l-mahfūza bi-Maktabati Köprülü bi-Istanbul wa'l-muarriha sene 725 H)*, prepared and presented by Muhammad Mustafā al-A'zamī, Azami Publishing House, Riyad, 2013/1434.

44 al-Marsafī, *Adva'*, p. 10.

45 The first three volumes were published by M. Ludolf Krehl (d. 1901) in 1862-1868 in Leiden and the fourth volume was published by T. W. Juynboll (d. 1948) in 1908.

not followed by many publications till *Concordance* could be explained on the ground that this European edition did not gain widespread circulation in the Muslim world.[46] There is a copy of this edition in the Süleymaniye Library, so one can assume that the authors of the Ottoman indexes were aware of the Leiden print. However, considering the collection to which the edition belonged, we can say that it was brought to Istanbul on a later date.[47] There are no differences between the sub-division numbers of the Leiden edition and those of recent editions. So we can say that both the *Concordance* contributors and Muhammad Fu'ād Abdulbāqī followed the Leiden edition's enumeration. Therefore, we can conclude that with respect to *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* the pioneering work in terms of the enumeration of the sub-divisions (bāb) starting anew with every chapter (kitāb) and the wide acceptance of this style in other editions was the Leiden edition prepared by Ludolf Krehl.

4.2. Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn and Miftāhu'l-Bukhārī

As it has been said previously, the idea of the enumeration of sub-divisions was already in practice in the Ottoman period before *Concordance*. Here the important question is if the Ottoman authors made use of the Leiden edition or not. When these works are compared, it could be seen that there are many differences between the enumeration of Leiden edition and that of the Ottoman indexes. The enumeration of the Leiden edition is exactly the same one used today, but it is not matching with the Ottoman indexes. Therefore, we should say that the Ottoman authors used their own enumeration system.

The sub-division enumeration, considering especially the printed editions, was used for the first time by the orientalists with the publication of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī*. On the other hand, the Ottoman scholars used different enumeration style while preparing indexes, they endorsed this as a reference (*takhrīj*) system and pioneered in the practice of referring to *ahādīth* with their sub-division numbers within the chapters.[48] Although the sub-division enumeration was carried out for the first time by the orientalists, Tokādī and Ankaravī had already used this as a reference system.

---

46 There are no sub-division numbers in the edition known as Sultaniye which was printed in Bulaq with the support of Sultan Abdülhamid and in the Matbaa-i Âmire edition of Mehmed Zihni Efendi.

47 Süleymaniye Library, Hüseyin Kazım Collection, 449. The collection was donated to the library by Hüseyin Kāzım Kadrī (d. 1934) and most probably he got hold of the copy during his Germany visit.

48 We understand that Ankaravī ve Tokādī acquired a printed copy while they were preparing indexes with the sub-division enumeration. If we could find out which printed copies these two scholars made use of in their indexes, then we can be in a better position to analyse their works.

4.3. Taysīru'l-Manfa'a

Muhammad Fu'ād Abdulbāqī published his *Taysīru'l-manfa'a bi-kitābay Miftāhi kunūzi's-sunna wa Mu'jamu'l-mufahras li-alfāzi'l-hadīsi'n-nabawī* as a practical guiding manual to use *Concordance* and *A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition*. There, he enumerated the sub-divisions of *Kutub-i tis'a* except for *Musnad*. He published his book before the publication of *Concordance* in 1936. He completed the enumeration of the *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* in 1353/1935, and he completed the enumeration of the eighth book, *Muwatta'* in 1356/1938.[49] The works of Muhammad Fu'ād Abdulbāqī could be said to pave the way for the acceptance and spreading of the method of enumeration in the Muslim world. Together with *Concordance*, his works can be seen as the efforts for the standardisation of the enumeration of the sub-divisions of eight books. We understand that during the process of *Concordance* project, the work of the enumeration was assigned to him. The publication of the first volume of his *Taysīru'l-manfa'a* before *Concordance* could be explained on this ground. Wensinck's mention of the supports of Muhammad Fu'ād Abdulbāqī in the first volume of *Concordance* also supports this impression.[50] There seems to be an initial paradox between *Taysīru'l-manfa'a*'s being a practical guide to *Concordance* and its publication before *Concordance*, but the seeming paradox is explained by his contribution to *Concordance* and working out his work at the same time.

5. Comparison of *Concordance* with the Ottoman Indexes

A similar job like that of Concordance was already carried out by Ahmed Hamdullah Efendi with its word index and by Tokādī and Ankaravī with their reference to the *ahādīth* with the sub-division numbers. Tokādī and Ankaravī's works differ from *Concordance* as they listed *ahādīth* alphabetically. *Concordance* followed a different path: it sorted out the words occurring in *ahādīth* and listed these words alphabetically together with references to the relevant sources and sub-divisions.

In the following an example will be given to point out the difference: The hadīth "The signs of the hypocrites are three: They lie when they talk, they are not loyal to their promises, and they betray what is entrusted to them"[51] is referred in the following manner:

> Tokādī, *Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn*: Bukhārī, "Īmān", 21; "Hadīsu'l-ifk", 16; "Wasāyā", 9; "Adab", 69.[52]

---

49 Muhammad Fu'ād Abdulbāqī, *Taysīru'l-manfa'a bi-kitābay Miftāhi kunūzi's-sunna wa Mu'jamu'l-mufahras li-alfāzi'l-hadīsi'n-nabawī*, Dāru'l-hadīth, Cairo, 1988/1409.

50 Wensinck, *Concordance*, I, IX.

51 آيَةُ الْمُنَافِقِ ثَلَاثٌ: إِذَا حَدَّثَ كَذَبَ، وَإِذَا وَعَدَ أَخْلَفَ، وَإِذَا اؤْتُمِنَ خَانَ.

52 Tokādī, *Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn*, p.3.

Ankaravī, *Miftāhu'l-Bukhārī*: Bukhārī, "Īmān", 24; "Shahādāt", 30; "Wasāyā", 8; "Adab", 69.[53]

Wensinck, *Concordance*: Bukhārī, "Shahādāt", 28; [Muslim, "Īmān", 107, 109; Tirmizī, "Īmān", 14].[54]

As we can see the most striking difference in Tokādī's and Ankaravī's is that they refer to all relevant chapters in *Sahīh-i Bukhārī*. On the other hand, *Concordance* refers only to one chapter in *Sahīh-i Bukhārī*. This could be regarded as insufficiency of *Concordance* in referring to all the occurrences of a given hadīth in *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* and also academically as a negative aspect in terms of taking into consideration the indexes prepared before *Concordance*. As we have clearly shown, Tokādī and Ankaravī used their own enumeration and did not follow any previous work in this respect. It is also seen that Ankaravī's enumeration was more successful and close to contemporary style.

Conclusion

Finding the sources of *ahādīth* and identifying the relevant chapters and sub-divisions in these sources is one of the important issues of the hadīth science. From earlier periods on, both *atrāf* works and the works organized in alphabetical order dealt with this need. In modern times, together with the introduction of printing technology, this need became much more visible, and the printed works provided indexes. Ottoman scholars followed an index method combining both the hadīth sources and their commentaries. Certainly, this indicates that the Ottoman scholars gave priority to the reading of commentaries over the hadīth texts themselves. Another point is that the interaction between the scholars in the Muslim world is quite high as opposed to general opinion. Ahmed Hamdullah Efendi who served in various judging offices wrote an index sorting out 90 thousand words from Qastallānī's commentary and sent his work to Egypt and India. This is a clear example of lively interaction.

After the publication of *Sahīh-i Bukhārī* in 1313/1895, two index works were done in Istanbul. In both of these works, *ahādīth* are referred to with their sub-division numbers. We can say that the printing activities reached a mature level in the last periods of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, Ankaravī's and Tokādī's system of referring to *ahādīth* with sub-division numbers is still in use today. The generally accepted opinion is that enumeration of sub-divisions was first carried out by the orientalists in *Concordance*. On the contrary, we have seen that this method had already been used in the Ottoman indexes. We can safely say that long before *Concordance* which started as a project in 1916, Ottoman scholars made use of a numerical reference system for *Sahīhayn* in 1895. The importance

---

53 Ankaravī, *Miftāhu'l-Bukhārī*, p. 9.
54 Wensinck, *Concordance*, VI, 525.

of *Concordance* lies in that it provided a key word based reference system applied to all of *Kutub-i tis'a* instead of the alphabetical system of the Ottoman indexes applied only to *Sahīhayn.*

Bibliography

Abū Muhammad Abdulmahdī b. Abdulkādir Abdulhādī, *Turuqu takhrīji hadīthi Rasūlillāh*, Dāru'l-İ'tisām, Cairo, nd.

Ahmed Hamdullah, *al-Nujūmu'd-darārī ilā Irshadi's-sārī*, Beyazıt, 1033.

Albayrak, "Mehmed Zihni Efendi Örneğinde Sahîh-i Buhârî Baskılarının Tashihi", *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 54 (2018), 45-78.

Altuntaş, Mustafa Celil, "Suyûtî'nin el-Câmi'u's-Sağîr'inin Osmanlı Hadis Eğitimindeki Yeri", Sahn-ı Semân'dan Dârulfünûn'a Osmanlı'da İlim ve Fikir Dünyası (Âlimler, Müesseseler ve Fikrî Eserler) - XVII.Yüzyıl, İstanbul, 2017, 341-365.

Osmanlı Döneminde Hadis İlmi, İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, İstanbul, 2018.

Ankarāvī, Mehmed Şükrü, *Miftāhu'l-Bukhārī*, Sahafiye-i Osmāniye, İstanbul, 1313.

Bağdatlı İsmail Paşa, *Hediyyetü'l-ârifîn*, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı, Ankara, 1951.

Bilgen, Osman, "Mehmed Şerif bin Mustafa et-Tokadi ve "Miftahu's-sahihayn" isimli eseri", *Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Tokat Sempozyumu Bildiriler*, 2012, cilt: III.

Bukhārī, *Kitabu'l-Jāmi'i's-sahīh (an-nushatu'l-musawwara 'ani'n-nushati'l-mahfūza bi-Maktabati Köprülü bi-Istanbul wa'l-muarriha sene 725 H)*, prepared and presented by Muhammad Mustafā al-A'zamī, Azami Publishing House, Riyad, 2013/1434.

Bursalı Mehmed Tahir, *Osmanlı müellifleri*, Matbaa-i Âmire, İstanbul, 1333.

Gökkır, Necmettin, *Tanzimattan günümüze din-devlet ilişkileri ve siyaset bağlamında mushaf basımı*, M.Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı, İstanbul, 2015.

Hatiboğlu, İbrahim "Miftâhu künûzi's-sünne", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/miftahu-kunuzis-sunne (14.12.2018).

"el-Mu'cemü'l-Müfehres li-Elfâzi'l-Hadîsi'n-Nebevî", *TDV İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/el-mucemul-mufehres-li-elfazil-hadisin-nebevi (13.12.2018).

Ibnu's-Salāh, *Ma'rifatu anwā'i 'Ulūmu'l-hadīth*, ed. Nurettin Itr, Dāru'l-Fikr, Syria, 1986.

Mar'ashli, Yūsuf Abdurrahmān, *İlmu fihristi'l-hadīs*, Dâru'l-ma'rifa, Beirut, 1986.

al-Marsafī, Sa'd, *Adva' 'alâ ahtâi'l-mustashriqīn fī mu'jami'l-mufahras li-alfāzī-hadīth'n-nabawī*, Dāru'l-Kalam, Kuwait, 1408-1988.

al-Maydānī, Abdulghanī el-Ghunaymī, *Kashfu'l-iltibās 'ammā awradahu'l-Imamu'l-Bukhārī 'ala ba'di'n-nās*, ed. Abdulmajīd Mahmūd Abdulmajid - Abdulfattāh Abū Gudda, Maktabu'l-Matbū'āti'l-Islāmiyya, Haleb, 1993/1414.

Muhammad Fu'ād Abdulbāqī, *Taysīru'l-manfa'a bi-kitābay Miftāhi kunūzi's-sunna wa Mu'jamu'l-mufahras li-alfāzi'l-hadīsi'n-nabawī,* Dāru'l-hadīth, Cairo, 1988/1409.

Muhammad Khayr Ramadān Yūsuf, *Mu'jamu'l-muallifīna'l-muāsırīn fī āsārihimi'l-mahtūta wa'l-mafqūda wa mā tubi'a minhā aw huqqiqa ba'da wafātihim wafayāt (1315-1424 h) (1897-2003 m)*, Maktabatu'l-Malik Fahd al-Wataniyya, Riyad, 2004/1425.

al-Nasā'ī, Abū Abdurrahmān Ahmād b. 'Ali b. Shu'ayb, *Sunan al-Nasā'ī*, ed. Abdulfattāh Abū Gudda, Dâru'l-bashāir'l-Islāmiyya, Beirut, 1988.

Ömer Ziyaeddin Dağıstānī, *Sunenu aqwāli'n-nabawiyya mina'l-ahādīthi'l-Bukhāriyya*, Mahmud Bey Matbaası, İstanbul, 1308.

Fihristu Muhtasari'l-Bukhārī 'alā hurūfi'l-mu'jam, Atatürk Kitaplığı, 1841.

Özşenel, Mehmet, "Sahîh-i Buhârî neşirleri: Sehârenpûrî neşri ile II. Abdülhamid neşrinin karşılaştırılması", *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi*, 2013, cilt: XI, sayı: 21, 457-84.

Rıdwān Muhammad Rıdwān, *Fahārisu'l-Bukhārī, Dāru'l-Kitābi'l-*'Arabī, Cairo, 1370.

et-Tokadī, Mehmed *Şerīf, Miftāhu's-Sahīhayn*, Şirket-i Sahafiye-i Osmaniye, Dersaâdet, 1313.

Yıldırım, Selahattin, "XIX. Yüzyıl Osmanlı Muhaddisleri ve Eserleri", *Din Eğitimi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2004, sayı: 13, 263-315.