

THE IMPACT OF ORIENTALISTS ON GHĀMIDĪ'S THEORIES

Alam KHAN*

Abstract

Jāved Ahmad Ghāmīdī is a prominent scholar of Farāhī- Islāhī School of thought. Due to his unorthodox approach to Islam, his works welcomed in the contemporary literate class of Indo-Pak subcontinent. The superficial study of Jāved Ahmad Ghāmīdī reveals that he quenched his theories from the classical Islamic Sources and did not refer to the Modern European Scholarship. However, the profound comparative study of Ghāmīdī's piece of work shows that he studied fundamental theories like "the variant of readings, the sources of the religion, the division of Prophetic hadiths, and reproof on the essential narrators of hadith" on the methodology of Orientalists. This study contains some instances from Jāved Ahmad Ghāmīdī's theories and on their roots that prove who introduced these theories and how Ghāmīdī developed them.

Keywords: Hadith, Ghāmīdī, Orientalists, Variant readings, Sources, Religion.

ORYANTALİSTLERİN GHĀMIDĪ'NİN TEORİLERİ ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ

Öz

Cavit Ahmet Ğāmīdī, Farāhī-Islāhī Fikrī Medresesi'nde önde gelen alimlerdenidir. Onun İslam'a karşı alışılmadık yaklaşımı nedeniyle, eserleri Pakistan-Hindistan Altkıtası'nın çağdaş eğitimcileri arasında takdir görmüştür. Onun çalışması yüzeysel bir şekilde incelendiğinde, kendi teorilerini Klasik İslami kaynaklardan istifade ederek sunduğu ancak Modern Avrupa İlmi Çalışmaları'ndan faydalanmadığı görülmektedir. Bununla birlikte, onun çalışması derin ve karşılaştırmalı bir şekilde incelendiğinde, Kur'an-ı Kerim'deki kıraat farklılıkları, temel dini kaynaklar, Peygamber hadisinin ayrımı, önemli hadis rivayilerinin tenkiti gibi hususlarda Oryantalistlerin metodolojisiyle çalıştığı anlaşılmaktadır. Bu çalışma, Ğāmīdī'nin teorileri, teorilerinin kökenleri, bu teorilerin kim tarafından tanıtıldığı ve bunların Ğāmīdī tarafından nasıl geliştirildiği gibi konulara dair bazı örnekleri içermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hadis, Ğāmīdī, Kıraat Farklılıkları, Kaynaklar, Din.

INTRODUCTION

Jāved Ahmad Ghāmīdī¹ put in question the primary sources of Islam, and he believes that Nature, the tradition of Prophet Abrāham, and early Holy Scriptures are also the sources of Islam. He relucted the different recitation of the Holy Qurān and reprehended those sources that prove the theory of variant readings. He thinks that the Holy Qurān revealed on one Qirāat

Atf: Khan, Alam. "The Impact of Orientalists on Ghāmīdī's Theories / Oryantalistlerin Ghāmīdī'nin Teorileri Üzerindeki Etkisi". *gıfad: gümüşhane üniversitesi ilahiyat fakültesi dergisi / the journal of gümüşhane university faculty of theology* 19 (Ocak / january 2020/1): 20-28.

* Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Gümüşhane Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi, Hadis ABD, El-mek: alamiui09@gmail.com, **ORCID:** 0000-0003-4527-8754.

¹ Jāved Ahmad Ghāmīdī was born in 1951 near Sāhiwāl Punjab Pakistan. He studied the classical sciences along Arabic and Persian in the traditional system. He is the founder of al- Mawid institute for research, and a prominent scholar of Farāhī- Islāhī school of thought in Indo - Pak subcontinent. See: Ammar Baksh, "Javed Ahmad Ghāmīdī: A Brief Introduction to his Life and Works", Date of access, 21 September 2019, <http://almawridindia.org/Javed-Ahmad-Ghāmīdī-a-brief-introduction-to-his-life-and-works/>.

(reading), and the other seven or ten are the temptation of non-Arab scholars.² He endeavoured in his studies to introduced the new sciences of the Holy Qurān and Sunna. Thus, he mentioned different principles for both and called them the rudimentary-principles for the understanding of the Holy Qurān and Sunna. Among these principles, he divided the second source of Islamic law into Hadith and Sunna while, graded the Sunna only as a source of Islam and avoided the division of early scholars in this regard.³

A critical study of his definition shows that he ascribed the Sunna to the Prophet Abrāhīm that modified, reformed, and added by the Prophet Muhammad. Similarly, Ghāmidī criticised the essential narrators of Prophetic hadiths like az-Zuhrī (d. 124/742), who has a significant part in the narration and codification of hadith, but Ghāmidī vague his position in hadith literature and questioned his trustworthy status in Muslim Scholarship⁴.

The superficial review of Ghāmidī's works and theories show that it is the result of his extensive research, and all opinions that he built are the synthesis of the fundamental source of Islam. However, the profound study of Ghāmidī's works reveals that he did not quench his studies only from the classical sources he benefited on a significant scale from the Orientalism School of Thoughts.

The strange thing is that Ghāmidī never bothers to refer in his works to such sources, while the root of his every controversial theory goes to the prominent Orientalists of the 19th century. He has the capability of writing a simple and self-explanatory Urdu and took the benefit of this capability to translate the works of the Orientalists, mix up them with Farāhī-Islāhī school of thoughts, and develop them on new methods.

1. THE SOURCES OF RELIGION

The Muslim Scholarship believes that the Holy Qurān, Hadith, Ijmāa, and Qiyās are the essential sources of religion. When the European Scholarship focused on Islam, they commenced the investigation of these primary sources and developed different theories about its authenticity and historical provenance.

In the 19th century, Ignāz Goldziher (d. 1339/1921)⁵ was the first Orientalist who studied the primary sources of Islam systematically and challenged their authenticity. He developed new theories and different methods for the study of Islam and its origins, which got the attention of researchers in Modern and Classical Scholarship. Ignāz Goldziher relucts the distortion of old scriptures as well as believes that the Prophet Muhammad had a close

² Ghāmidī, Javed Ahmad, *Mizān*, (Lahore: al-Mawrid, Topical printing Press, 2014), 29-32.

³ Ghāmidī, *Mizān*, 14-15.

⁴ Ghāmidī, *Mizān*, 31.

⁵ Ignāz Goldziher (1850 –1921) was a Hungarian Jewish Orientalist. He is considered the founder of Islamic studies in Europe. See for his detail biography: Abdur Rehman al-badavī, *Mawsūatu'l Mustashriqīn*, (Beirut: Dār al-Ilam, 1993), 119-126.

relationship with the Christian and pious Jewish scholars (Ruhbān and Āhbār), he learned from them and forwarded to his adherents.⁶

In other words, he believe that the source of Prophet Muhammad's information is Christian and Jewish scholars. He discussed this theory in different cognate topics to the origin of religion. Moreover, he reached the conclusion that Christianity and Judaism are the source of Islam and called the Christian and pious Jewish scholars the teachers of the Prophet because they were literate, and had the full erudition of the old and new testament in the Arab peninsula⁷.

The same theory developed the British-German Orientalist Joseph Schācht (d. 1388/1969)⁸ in his studies about the origins of Islam, he counted the different stages of Islamic legislation and determinately reached the same conclusion of Ignāz Goldziher that Islamic law profoundly influenced by the canon of the Jews and Church and other encompassed religions of that time⁹.

Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī also developed the same theory in his study and called the early Holy Scriptures the source of religion.¹⁰ Even ignored the details of Goldziher and Schācht's theories in his conclusion that the Prophet Muhammad was the student of Christian and Jewish Philomaths, and they were the primary sources of his information or Islamic law influenced through the canons of Judaism and Christianity. However, the common point in their theories is that the Qurān, Sunna, Ijmāa, and Qiyās are not only the sources of religion as the majority of Muslim Scholarship believe.

2. THE DIFFERENT READINGS OF THE QURĀN

The science of reading the Qurān is a perpetual department of the Qurānic studies. It contains the necessary knowledge about the recitation of the Qurān in different ways, which got the Muslims through the narration system generation to generation from the Prophet Muhammad.

In the early 19th century, the European Scholarship fixated on the Qurān and its related sciences. They studied the history of the Qurān and its readings in their works. The variation of the readings is one of those subjects that through its research, the orientalist developed their sceptical theories about the Holy Qurān. They described the Qurān and its reading as a contradictory, turbulent, and unsteady and challenged the prophecy of the Prophet Muhammad and revelation, as well as they, relucted the authenticity of the seven or ten readings.

⁶ Ignāz Goldziher (d. 1339/1921), *al- Aqīda ve-Sharia fi al-Islām*, Arabic translation: Muhammad Yūsūf Mūsā, Ali Hussain Abdul Qādir, Abdul Aziz, (Cairo al- Gabalaya St. Opera House, 2013), 12, 24, 26.

⁷ Ignāz Goldziher, *al- Aqīda ve-Sharia fi al-Islām*, 13, 19, 20, 24, 29.

⁸ Joseph Schācht (1902 –1969) was a British-German Orientalist, he was the leading scholar of Islamic Jurisprudence in Europe. Abdur Rehman al-badavī, *Mawsūatu'l Mustashriqīn*, 252-253.

⁹ Schacht, Joseph, "Foreign Elements in Ancient Islamic Law." *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, 32(3/4), (1950), 9-17.

¹⁰ Ghāmidī, *Mizān*, 48.

The orientalist who specialised in the Qurān and its sciences are numerous. However, the Théodor Noldeke (d. 1348/1930)¹¹ considered the first one who indited the historical background of the Holy Qurān and its readings in his comprehensive studies. He criticised the variation of the readings (Iktilāf al-Qirāat) in it and presented a comparative study of the Mushaf Abdullāh b. Masud (d. 32/652), Ubeyy b. Kab (d. 30/651), and Uthmān b. Afān (d. 35/655).¹²

Ignaz Goldziher followed the same method of Noldeke in his study about the Qurān and mentioned his name with great reverence when referring to him. Even bothe are contemporaneous. Goldziher developed his sceptical approach and predicated his theory on the writing style of Arabic in the early centuries, which was different from nowadays. He believes that the variation of the readings occurred due to the concrete form of writing in which the Arabic characters were free of dots. Consequently, he relucted all those Prophetic hadiths that prove the variation of the readings.¹³

The famous Australian Orientalist and philologist Arthur Jeffery (d. 1378/1959)¹⁴ has the same approach that the variation of readings emerged due to the Arabic style because the text of Mushaf Uthmān compiled without any dots and signs, the readers were reciting it according to their understanding. It signifies that Theodor Noldeke, Ignāz Goldziher, and A. Jeffery agreed that the variation of readings emerged after the death of the Prophet Muhammad.

Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī discussed the same subject on the same method in his studies and put in question the authenticity of variant readings. He developed the same theory of the orientalist that the Qurān revealed on one reading (Qirāat) that has the reading of Mushaf Uthmān, which is reciting in many territories of the Glob, and relucted the other famous seven or ten readings in the classical Islamic sources. Ghāmidī narrated the well-kenned hadith of Umar b. al-khitāb and Hishām¹⁵ that justified the authenticity of variant readings and

¹¹ Theodor Nöldeke (1836 -1930) was a German orientalist and scholar. His research interests ranged over old Testament studies, Semitic languages, and Arabic, Persian, and Syriac literature. Nöldeke translated several important works of oriental literature and during his lifetime, was considered an important orientalist. He wrote numerous studies (including on the Qur' ān) and contributed articles to the Encyclopædia Britannica. *TDV İslām Ansiklopedisi'nin* (Istanbul, 2007), 33: 217-218

¹² Noldeke, *Theodor* (d. 1348/1930), *The History of the Qurān*, ed: Friedrich Schwally, Gotthelf Bergsträßer, Otto Pretzl. Translated: Wolfgang H. Behn. (Boston: Brill, 2003), 389-532.

¹³ Ignāz Goldziher (d. 1339/1921), *Mazāhib at-Tafsir al-Islāmī*, Arabic: Abdul Halim an- Najār. (Egypt: Maktaba al-Khānjī, 1955), 7-16.

¹⁴ Arthur Jeffery (1892- 1959) was a Protestant Australian known for the Semitic languages he was Professor from 1921 at the School of Oriental Studies in Cairo, and from 1938 until his death jointly at Columbia University and Union Theological Seminary in New York City. See for his detail biography and approach to the Qurānic studies: Mesut, Okumuş, "Arthur Jeffery ve Kur' an Çalışmaları Üzerine", *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*. Cilt XLIII, (2002), Say 2 s.121-150.

¹⁵ Narrated `Umar b. al-Khattāb: I heard Hishām b. Hakim b. Hizām reciting Surat-al-Furqān in a way different to that of mine. Allah's Messenger had taught it to me (in a different way). So, I was about to quarrel with him (during the prayer), but I waited till he finished, then I tied his garment round his neck and seized him by it and brought him to Allah's Messenger and said, "I have heard him reciting Surat-al-Furqān in a way different to the way you taught it to me." The Prophet ordered me to release him and asked Hishām to recite it. When he recited it, Allah's Apostle said, "It was revealed in this way." He then asked me to recite it. When I recited it, he said, "It was revealed in this way. The Qurān has been revealed in seven different ways, so recite it in the way that is easier for you." Mamar b. Rāshid (d. 153/770), *al-Jāmi*, ed: Habib ur Rahman al- Azāmī, (Pakistan: al- Majlis al- Ilmī, 1403), 11: 218. al- Bukhārī, Abū Abdillāh Muhammad b. Ismāil (d. 256/870), *Mukhtasr Sahīh al- Bukhārī*, (KSA: Maktaba al- Maārif, 2002), 3: 335.

commented on it that it is a nugatory and meaningless hadith even it narrated in canonical books of hadith. Furthermore, he criticised the text of hadith regarding seven readings that it may interpret on the seven languages and pronunciations of Arabs. However, the text of hadith refuses it because both narrators Umar and Hishām belong to the same tribe of Arabs, which denotes that the concept of variation among them is not possible. Hence, Ghāmidī reached the same conclusion of early orientalists in his work that the variant readings of the Qurān emerged later and called it the temptation of non-Arabs¹⁶.

3. THE DIVISION OF PROPHETIC HADITHS

The Prophetic hadiths have great importance in Muslim Scholarship. It is a great legacy that we received from the Prophet Muhammad. Hence, the Muslim Scholars paid great attention to the Prophetic hadiths at different times and compiled it through narration and transcription system. Concurrently, they developed various sciences for the conservation and preservation of hadith. The Principle of Hadith is one of those sciences which emerged in the early stages of hadith compilation. However, it systematically codified in the 4th century after Hijra. The book of al-Rāmhurmuzī (d. 360/971), Hākīm al-Nisāburī (d. 405/1014), Abū Nu‘aim al-Isfahānī (d. 430/1039), and al-khatīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071) considered the early studies in this department. They divided the Prophetic hadiths into al-Musnad, al-Mawqūf, Mūtawātir and Ahād, and did not differentiate among Hadith and Sunna.¹⁷

It is a well-kenned fact that when the orientalists elongated their research to the second primary source of Islamic law and studied hadith and its related sciences. They published various studies in hadith and its sciences, which got the attention of Oriental and Islamic Schools of Thoughts. Ignāz Goldziher was the first Orientalist who studied the hadith with a new method and compiled a study that published in (1889-1890). He devoted the second volume of his Muslim studies to the Prophetic Hadiths that contains on his theories about hadith. Goldziher divided hadith into Hadith and Sunna and accentuated that hadith emerged in later time as a result of religious and political conflict among Muslims in the early centuries.

Goldziher explicated the linguistically and idiomatically meaning of Sunna and disapproved with those scholars who believe that the term of hadith and Sunna are identical or relatively synonymous as well as Goldziher relucted that hadith does not refer to the Prophet Muhammad, nor it is an Islamic term because it was present in Jāhiliyya which corresponded to the tradition of the Arabs and the customs and habits of their antecedents. Moreover, he believed that in this sense, the term Sunna was still used in Islamic times by those Arab communities, which had been very little affected by Muslim religion¹⁸.

Besides, Goldziher does not accept the prophecy of the Prophet Muhammad, he stated in his study about the creed and Sharia of Islam that Muhammad was a real reformer in the Arab

¹⁶ Ghāmidī, *Mizān*, 30-31.

¹⁷ al-Rāmhurmuzī, Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 360/971), *al-Muḥadith al-Fāsil*, ed: Dr. Muhammad Ajaj al-Khatib, (Beirut: Dār al-Fikar, 1404), 177. al-Hākīm al-Nishāburī, Abū Abdillāh Muḥammad b. Abdillāh (d. 405/1014), *Marīfat ulūm al-Hadith*, ed: Muazzam Hussain, (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmia, 1977), 17-21. al-Khatib al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. ‘Ali (d. 463/1071), *al-Kifāya fi ilmi’r-Rivāya*, ed: Abū Abdillāh al-Suraqī, (KSA: al-Maktabtu’l Ilmia), 16.

¹⁸ Ignāz Goldziher (d. 1339/1921), *Muslim Studies*, Translated from German. C. R. Barbar and S. M.Stern. George Allen and Unwin LTD, (London: Ruskin House Museum Street), 2: 17- 40.

peninsula, he wants the reformation of Prophet Abrāham religion which was not present in its pristine form at that time. Hence, he believes that what the Prophet Muhammad delivered to his adherents was not new; all these instructions and provisions had already subsisted in the religion of Prophet Abrāham¹⁹.

Josep Schācht followed the same approach even he fixated on the Sanad (Chain) of hadith in his studies but corroborated the Goldziher conclusion that the term Sunna did not refer to the Prophet Muhammad. He elaborated his theory about Sunna that it is nothing more than precedent, way of life, and fortified his argument by Goldziher research that he explicitly stated that this is an originally pagan term taken over and adapted by Islam. However, he believes that Imām Shāfi (d. 204/819) was the first Muslim theologian who ascribed the Sunna to the Prophet Muhammad at a later time.²⁰

Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī developed the same theory and divided the Prophetic hadiths into Hadith and Sunna, and called the Sunna as a source of religion. The profound comparative study of Ghāmidī and Goldziher's theories about hadith shows that he cleverly took the research of Goldziher and put it in a new frame. He took the same steps as Goldziher in the division of Prophetic hadiths and its definition.

Ghāmidī accedes with Goldziher on the role of the Prophet Muhammad that he is nothing more than a reformer, as he defined the Sunna on the tradition of Prophet Abrāham, that Prolonged the Prophet Muhammad as a religion to his adherents after the reformation, modification, and addition in it, which is identically tantamount concept of Goldziher that graded the Prophet Muhammad as a reformer of the religion of Prophet Abrāham. The difference between Ghāmidī and Goldziher is only the arrangement of wording and language. In other words, Ghāmidī defined the Sunna on the Goldziher's words with minor changes.²¹

4. CRITICISM ON THE KEY NARRATORS OF HADITH

The Isnad system is the characteristic of this Ummah. The Muslims preserved their Islamic Heritage through Isnad. Therefore, the Islamic Scholarship highly fixated on the study of Isnad in the codification and transcription of Prophetic hadiths. They efficiently differentiated the hadiths from fabricated narrations by the research of Sanad. The Oriental School of Thought studied the Isnad system and sniped those prominent narrators that have a part in the transmission of hadith like Abū Hureyra, Nāfi, and az-Zuhrī.

Imām az-Zuhrī is a prominent Muslim theologian. He was the first one who formally codified the Prophet hadith in the period of Umar b. Abdul Aziz. It is a sound fact that the maximum hadith reached the later scholar through his channel, and he was the one who gives great importance to the Isnad system in his time. Ignāz Goldziher kenneed all these facts and his position in the transmission of hadith. Thus, he targeted al-Zuhrī in his work (Muslim Studies), he believes that az-Zuhrī had good relations with the Umayyads, and he was justifying their

¹⁹ Ignāz Goldziher, *al-Aqida ve-Sharia fi al-Islām*, 13-19.

²⁰ Schācht, Joseph (d. 1388/1969), *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, (London Oxford University Press, Ely House), 58.

²¹ Ghāmidī, *Mīzān*, 14.

politically motivated reform of religious life by fabricating hadith. He fortified his thesis on the narrating of az-Zuhrī confrontation from the classical sources that he firmly admitted that these emirs forced us on the writing of hadith for them. Hence, he called him the fabricator of hadith.²²

G.H.A Juynboll (d. 1431/2010)²³ followed the same method and developed Goldziher's theory about az-Zuhrī in his studies. Moreover, he endeavoured to perplex the Muslim and Oriental Scholarship about the historical subsistence of az-Zuhrī. He claimed that he collected one hundred twenty narrators named az-Zuhrī in the biographical sources, which indicated that the name of az-Zuhrī fabricated on a large scale. G. H. A Juynboll refers to Imām Mālik (d. 179/795) that he was aware of confusion about the narrator called al-Zuhrī. Consequently, he preferred in all his narrations to call him by name Ibn Shihāb, whereas all the other Muhadithūn referred to him as az-Zuhrī.²⁴

Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī also took the same narrator and criticised him in his study while he did not refer to those sources in the science of hadith, which are plenary of the testamental statements of early authorities about az-Zuhrī, that he is a trustworthy narrator of hadith.²⁵ Ghāmidī followed the Goldziher and G. H. A Juynboll's approach and ambiguous az-Zuhrī position and called him Mudalis as he stated in his comment on the Sanad of famous hadith that testify the variant readings of the Qurān, that it narrated through Ibn Shihāb az-Zuhrī channel while the early authorities of the science of hadith believe that he committed *Tadlis* and *Idrāj* in the narrating of hadith.²⁶

CONCLUSION

Indisputably, the concept of Orientalism transmuted in the 19th century due to the full concentration of orientalist on the primary sources of Islam. The aim of their study of Qurān and Sunna was the re-codifying of Islamic History on a developing method, but when they started the study of the primary sources of Islamic History, they left the History and focused on source criticism. They published numerous studies about the fundamental sources of Islam, which have a high impact on Muslim and Oriental scholars. Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī is one of those Muslim scholars that followed the same steps of Orientalist in the study of Islam. However, as it descried that Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī does not refer in his studies to the European Scholarship that made it perplexed for his readers to trace his primary source of Study.

The study showed that the root of the fundamental theories of Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī goes back to the orientalist. He narrated their theories and endeavoured to put it in the Islamic Frame by changing the method and wording as he did in his research about the source of religion. He called the old Holy scriptures the source of religion and ignored the detailed

²² Ignāz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, 2: 44-47.

²³ Gautier Hendrik Albert Juynboll (1935-2010) belongs to the famous orientalist family in Holand. He serves his whole life to the study of hadith and wrote many studies regarding hadith. Khan, Alam, *Takyimu Nazariyyāti Juynboll Havla al-hadis'n Nabavī*, (Trabzon: Kalam Yayınevi, 2019), 17-57.

²⁴ Juynboll, G. H. A (d. 1431/2010), *Muslim Tradition*, (Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 148, 149, 158, 160.

²⁵ az-Zahabī, Abū Abdillāh Muhammad b. Ahmad (d. 748/1347), *Tazkirat al-Huffāz*, (Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-Ilmi, 19981), 1: 83.

²⁶ Ghāmidī, *Mizān*, 31.

research and evidence of Goldziher about it, that Christianity and Judaism are the primary sources of Islam.

Similarly, Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī put in question the authenticity of variant readings of Qurān and fortified his theory from the classical sources while the research proved that it belongs to the early orientalist like Théodor Noldeke, Ignāz Goldziher, and Arthur Jeffery. They were the first introducers and developers of this sceptical approach about the authenticity of variant readings. However, Ghāmidī never mentioned them in the concern subjects.

The study showed that Ghāmidī was not the first scholar who divided the Prophetic hadiths into the Sunna and Hadith. Goldziher was the first European scholar who divided hadith into Sunna and Hadith and queried the authenticity of both terms as well as relucted the ascription of Sunna to the Prophet Muhammad. Later, Joesph Schacht developed it and concluded that Shāfi was the first Muslim theologian who ascribed the Sunna to the Prophet Muhammad. Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī followed both orientalist in the division of hadith as well as in the definition of Sunna. It seems that Ghāmidī defined the Sunna on Goldziher's words with minor additions because it is the central theme of Goldziher's thesis that the Prophet Muhammad was a reformer of the Prophet Abrāham religion.

Moreover, it is a known fact that orientalist always questioned the position of those narrators who had a significant part in the transmission of Prophetic hadiths or the maximum hadiths narrated through their Chains. Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī followed the same method and endeavoured to equivocal the position of the same trustworthy narrator and a prominent Muhadith (az-Zuhrī) who had a paramount role in the codification of hadith in the early second century after Hijra.

Predicated on the above instances, it cleared that Jāved Ahmad Ghāmidī is not independent in his studies. The above theories do not belong to him as it understood from his works. He translated the research of orientalist into Urdu and endeavoured to fit it in the Islamic frame with new methods.

REFERENCES

- Abdur Rehman al-badavī, *Mawsūatu'l Mustashriqīn*, Beirut: Dār al-Ilam, 1993.
- al- Bukhārī, Abū Abdillāh Muhammad b. Ismāil, *Mukhtasr Sahīh al- Bukhārī*, KSA: Maktaba al-Maārif, 2002.
- al-Hākīm al-Nīshāburī, Abū Abdillāh Muhammad b. Abdillāh, *Marifat ulūm al-Hadith*, ed: Muazzam Hussain, Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmia, 1977.
- al-Khatib al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Ahmad b. `Ali, *al-Kifāya fi ilmi'r-Rivāya*, ed: Abū Abdillāh al-Suraqī, KSA: al- Maktaba al Ilmia.
- al-Rāmhumuzī, Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. `Abd al-Raḥmān, *al-Muhadith al-Fāsīl*, ed: Dr. Muhammad Ajaj al-Khatib, Beirut: Dār al-Fikar, 1404.
- Ammar Baksh, "Javed Ahmad Ghāmidī: A Brief Introduction to his Life and Works", Date of access, 21 September 2019, <http://almawridindia.org/Javed-Ahmad-Ghāmidī-a-brief-introduction-to-his-life-and-works/>

- az- Zahabī, Abū Abdillāh Muhammad b. Ahmad, *Tazkirat al-Huffāz*, Beirut: Dār al-kutub al-Ilmia, 1998.
- Ghāmidī, Javed Ahmad, *Mizān*, Lahore: al-Mawrid, Topical printing Press, 2014.
- Ignāz Goldziher, *al- Aqīda ve-Sharia fi al-Islām*, Arabic translation: Muhammad Yūsūf Mūsā, Ali Hussain Abdul Qādir, Abdul Aziz Abdul Haq. Cairo: al- Gabalaya St. Opera House. 2013.
- Ignāz Goldziher, *Mazāhib at-Tafsir al-Islāmī*, Arabic: Abdul Halim an- Najār, Egypt: Maktaba al-Khānjī, 1955.
- Ignāz Goldziher, *Muslim Studies*, Translated from German. C. R. Barbar and S. M.Stern. George Allen and Unwin LTD. London : Ruskin House Museum Street.
- Juynboll, G. H. A, *Muslim Tradition*, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Khan, Alam, *Takyīmu Nazariyyāti Juynboll Havla al-hadis'n Nabavī*, Trabzon: Kalam Yayınevi, 2019.
- Mamar b. Rāshid, *al- Jāmi*, ed: Habib ur Rahman al- Azāmī, Pakistan: al- Majlis al- Ilmi, 1403.
- Mesut, Okumuş, "Arthur Jeffery ve Kur' an Çalışmaları Üzerine". *Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*. Cilt XLIII, (2002), Say 2 s.121-150.
- Noldeke, Theodor, *The History of the Qurān*, ed: Friedrich Schwally, Gotthelf Bergsträßer, Otto Pretzl. Translated: Wolfgang H. Behn, Leaden- Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Schacht, Joseph, "Foreign Elements in Ancient Islamic Law." *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, 32(3/4), (1950), 9-17.
- Schācht, Joseph, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, London: Oxford University Press, Ely House.
- TDV *İslām Ansiklopedisi'nin* İstanbul, 2007.