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Foreword

The life of the Prophet Muḥammad, the founder of the world religion that is Islam, is a matter of the utmost scholarly significance. It is a subject which generates interest in the widest circles and its significance surely needs no explanation. Biographies of historical personalities must rely on physical remains (i.e. archaeological sites, coins, epigraphy) and/or sources. No such ‘remains’ with specific Islamic characteristics survive from the period and the geographical regions in which Muḥammad was active. The sources which are extant come in the form of texts which, apart from the Qurʾān and a few non-Islamic testimonies, were compiled no earlier than two centuries after Muḥammad’s death.

A striking feature of the most recent scholarship on these texts is the attempt to demonstrate that these sources are more or less historically nugatory. According to one theory, as brilliant as it is misguided, and one which finds its supporters even to this day, these sources constitute a salvation history, pure and simple, a history which can consequently only be the subject of literary and not historical research.

This theory, and ones like it, have exerted an enormous influence on the direction of more recent research. Some scholars argue that we should use only non-Islamic sources, for these are earlier than the Islamic sources; but they provide virtually no information about the life of Muḥammad. One scholar maintains that, in spite of the fact that the sources are hardly reliable and rather remote from the facts, a reconstruction of the Prophet’s life, based on such sources, can nevertheless lay claim to historical probability, sometimes even to a high degree of historical probability. Others deny the very possibility of writing a biography of Muḥammad but maintain nonetheless that it is possible to describe his epoch. One scholar does deal with the life of Muḥammad, opining that, given the problematic state of the sources, applying a combination of common sense and modern heuristic devices to the traditional accounts would be the most useful and productive course of action. Thus we encounter telling titles such as ‘The Quest of the Historical Muḥammad’, echoing Albert Schweitzer’s The Quest of the Historical Jesus (the English translation of Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung). Yet other scholars concern themselves exclusively with method: they seek to prove, through the provision of statistics or similar means, that nothing which the Islamic tradition says is right.
This overwhelming concern with methodology is apparent in an edited volume devoted to the life of Muḥammad and cognate issues which appeared not too long ago: Herbert Berg’s *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (2003). Prior to this, the sources themselves took centre stage, as we can see from the subtitle of a volume which appeared in the same series only three years before Berg’s book: *The Biography of Muḥammad: The Issue of the Sources*, edited by Harald Motzki (2000).

In defiance of the current trend is the procedure of one author who – in spite of everything – has recently written a voluminous book with the title *Muḥammad*: he cocks a snook at the complex of problems pronounced on the issue of the authenticity of the early Islamic tradition and produces – on the basis of the late compilations of the ninth and tenth centuries – yet another biography of Muḥammad of a kind which is all too familiar.

The state of current research, then, is completely unsatisfactory. In my book *Charakter und Authentie* written more than ten years ago I proposed a radically different approach to the study of the life of Muḥammad. I tried to demonstrate that we could reconstruct, on the basis of the sources available, reports which go back to persons in very close contact with Muḥammad, sometimes even to eyewitnesses of the events. I argued, that these reports reflect at least the general outline of the events. In the intervening period between the appearance of that book and this, further studies have exemplified and confirmed my thesis.

Of course my book did not go unnoticed by the international academic community: it was reviewed in many languages, but still it did not gain wide currency. I expect that this is partly to be accounted for by the fact that it was not written in English. I am therefore deeply indebted to Professor James Montgomery of Cambridge. His edition of the English translation of my studies on the oral and the written in early Islam has been instrumental in enhancing the profile of a considerable part of my work. He has undertaken and brought to a successful conclusion this follow-up project, an English translation of a revised edition of the present book, which constitutes a further and possibly more important aspect of my research. I am just as grateful to Dr Uwe Vagelpohl of Berlin who once again performed the difficult task of translation with great skill and exemplary patience. It has been a great good fortune and privilege for me to have the opportunity to work once more with these two scholars.

Thanks are also due to the Degree Committee of the Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies at the University of Cambridge, the managers of the Wright Studentship, for financial support, to the publisher Routledge and the series editor Professor Andrew Rippin, for accepting the work as part of his series.

The text of the first edition was revised in collaboration with the Editor and the Translator and I was able to extend the basic corpus of sources in reference to works which have recently appeared, which were not available to me previously or which had been overlooked. I have also brought the overview and discussion of relevant research up to date and have availed myself of the opportunity to take into account criticisms which were voiced in the reviews of the first edition.

Gregor Schoeler

*Basel, August 2009*
Due to the nature of historical sources ..., we reach the limit of historical certainty when we examine these sources more closely and in a critical way. (Bernheim 1903: 175)

At this point, various doubts arise because oral and written witnesses and authors do not directly report an occurrence but only their understanding of it, i.e. what they understood to have happened and how they conceived of it. Their understandings were influenced, coloured and even distorted through the various modifications of their own personal opinions and preconceptions, voluntary and involuntary. All of these observations are valid and useful but they do not need to leave us discouraged and excessively sceptical. What they teach us is that each source has to be treated differently according to its nature and that we need to apply methodical safeguards and control mechanisms in order to discern what really happened irrespective of the modifications and distortions. … Indeed, in some cases, we will not be able to do this with absolute certainty. (Ibid.: 176–7)

Rather than soberly inquiring how to distinguish between genuine and falsified information and ascertaining the circumstances leading to and explaining falsifications, some of the more sanguine and ingenious thinkers generalized this experience and, in an excess of scepticism, boldly asserted that entire periods of historical tradition were nothing but systematic forgeries. Coins became their most trusted sources; on this basis in particular, they reconstructed the history of the epoch in question according to what they thought likely to have happened. (Ibid.: 180)

Apparently, discarding tradition and freely sketching a radically alternative past on an empty canvas has a special appeal for these scholars. (Ibid.: 181)

Against such scepticism, we have one powerful source of support: the interconnectedness of historical events, their occurrence in continuous sequences of historical developments. The factuality of these sequences is demonstrated by the presence of their consequences in the present, by our immediate experience; and we can use the results of these historical developments as a basis to infer such past events as are necessary to explain them. (Ibid.: 183)

Thus, irrespective of our doubts about some more or less significant details, there is in all of history a broad foundation of secure and unshakeable facts. We should not overlook or underestimate this foundation just because we are accustomed to
taking it for granted. ... In view of this secure foundation, we can calmly appre-
ciate and admit that often, as in every other science, history only offers probabil-
ities, sometimes even only possibilities. (Ibid.: 178)

Oral tradition. This is where error has played its most detrimental role. [In this
context, ‘error’ means] uncritically to regard as historical tradition mythical and
otherwise fabulous narratives which do not contain any historical recollections or
legends which reflect historical events only in a distorted manner; or, even worse,
arbitrarily to accept as historical facts some details in such mythical or legendary
material which seem possible or probable while stripping away anything that
seems all too marvellous and improbable. (Ibid.: 349)

What we are dealing with here, then, is simply the method for recognising the
ahistorical nature of legends and thus avoiding the aforementioned error ... The
most important [methodological principle] belongs to the general field of source
criticism. First and foremost, it requires us to refer back as strictly as possible to
the oldest, comparatively best-attested and most original version of a given trad-
tion. Next, we need to ask whether or to what degree this tradition is credibly
attested. The methodological answer to this question also falls under the remit of
source criticism. In addition to its extrinsic authentication, we have to examine
the intrinsic plausibility of a given tradition. (Ibid.: 350–1)

Common sense has probably always followed this rule: in everyday life, in order
to assess the veracity of a report, we ask the narrator whether he himself wit-
nessed the events he relates or who his source was. Our judgment about the reli-
ability of the report always depends on the trustworthiness of the informant.
(Ibid.: 468)

Accordingly, the verdict about the reliability of a tradition largely hinges on ask-
ing whether the report is direct (a primary source) or through how many and
which ‘channels’ it was transmitted to us ... [Customarily,] we use the term ‘pri-
mary source’ not just in its strictest sense for reports of immediate witnesses to
an event but also for independent reports of contemporaries to an event ... If he
is otherwise reliable, we can assume that an author who was himself a witness to
the events reported can have direct knowledge of them. We can also assume
knowledge of such events on the part of a more distant observer who has recol-
lections of the time at which they took place and who had access to the ‘living
memory’ of other contemporaries. Whenever an informant was further removed
from the events, we have to examine the sources of his information and determine
how direct and immediate they are. (Ibid.: 469)

The sources of oral historians are reminiscences, hearsay, or eyewitness accounts
about events and situations which are contemporary, that is, which occurred dur-
ing the lifetime of the informants. This differs from oral traditions in that oral
traditions are no longer contemporary. They have passed from mouth to mouth,
for a period beyond the lifetime of the informants. (Vansina 1985: 12–13)

Traditions about events are only kept because the events were thought to be
important or significant. A selection process is already underway, starting in fact
with eyewitnesses or contemporary reports. As time passes and the criteria of importance or significance change, the selection process continues. (Ibid.: 118)

Once created, a composition to be memorized is supposed to remain unchanged from recitation to recitation, although in fact, its actual wording will vary over time. (Ibid.: 14)

Memory typically selects certain features from the successive perceptions and interprets them according to expectation, previous knowledge, or the logic of ‘what must have happened’, and fills the gaps in perception. (Ibid.: 5)

Thus a testimony is a tradition as interpreted through the personality of an informant and is colored by his personality. (Ibid.: 64–5)

Weakness in chronology is one of the greatest limitations of all oral traditions. (Ibid.: 56)

The historian must always be on the lookout for unconscious distortions, as well as for the obvious alterations which might have been introduced for fun, profit or esteem. Suspicions should be aroused as soon as characters conform to ideal types. … When, however, traits or anecdotes run counter to fashion, they should be seen as reliable. These data resisted the trend to idealization. (Ibid.: 107)

The body of recent oral tradition is quite rich, quite large, and very diverse, stemming from all the genres. Selection has not yet operated much, reinterpretation has not proceeded very far, relative chronology (mostly through a host of local genealogies) is still good and sources have not been common to large numbers of people yet, so that a certain amount of independence still exists. Oral sources do not share the limitations of oral tradition, which we discussed here, and recent oral tradition – one or two generations beyond the eldest living members in a community – suffered only small damage. But as traditions are older, the problems become bigger, to be at their peak when one deals with traditions of origin. This is the reason why traditions of origin are usually chosen as examples when such effects are discussed though they are not typical. (Ibid.: 192–3)

… even eye- and earwit ness reports have a tendency to impose on events certain traditional motifs and narrative conventions which conform to the expectations of the audience, i.e. to re-shape real events in accordance with oral traditions and thereby also to distort them … Our memory retains more information about specific events than we can remember at one time, but it selects and modifies the content of our recollections. As a rule, we only remember firstly what seems familiar and secondly what seems to make sense; the unfamiliar is altered until it becomes familiar. Unintentionally and without us noticing, histories are manipulated in accordance with the interests, knowledge, likes and dislikes and the states of mind of their narrators. Hence, histories become ever more similar to their narrators. (Röhrich 1988: 90)

… the compilations, which are not simply fictions, contain a wide range of traditions, both ‘good’ and ‘bad’ ones. (Noth 1968: 295)
A central argument … will continue to be that the tradition offers much material which, if in need of careful examination, is still of historical value for the early period. (Noth 1994: 24)

Great civilizations may not easily give up the secrets of their formative eras, but do not lose sight entirely of the momentous events and ideas which brought them into being. (Ibid.: xi)
Introduction

1. The present work

This study differs from my articles on early Islamic tradition\(^1\) not only in terms of subject matter and scale, but also scope. I have expanded the scope of my research to include, in addition to the nature of tradition (the focus of the first two chapters of this study), the problem of authenticity, which will be dealt with explicitly in the third and to a certain extent in the second chapter.

Most importantly, I will not confine myself to examining Arabic biographical literature – though it will be used in the first chapter\(^2\) – but will, in addition, study in particular two Medinese traditions or complexes of traditions on their way from their (real or alleged) original informant to those compilers who included them in works extant today. (For practical reasons, I will start with these latter works and move back in time.)

In analysing the biographical material and through the diachronic study of separate traditions, my primary concern is to distinguish and explicate the successive stages in Medinese transmission. While my articles focus on the nature of the sources of the major compilations of the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries, e.g. al-Buḥārī, Muslim, at-Ṭabarī – I have established that these were for the most part aide-mémoires, collections of lecture notes, and writings in the category of ‘literature of the school (exclusively) for the school’\(^3\) – the present study examines the nature of transmission until, during and after the time of the first generation of collectors in the second half of the first century AH, personalities such as 'Urwah ibn az-Zubayr (d. 94/712 or shortly thereafter) and Abān ibn 'Uṯmān (d. 96/714 or slightly later).

My second concern is the question of the authenticity of early Islamic tradition. It is connected to, but not identical with, the question of its nature. An outline of what I do and do not understand by the term ‘authenticity’ is vital from the outset, even though to do so will anticipate a central finding of my investigation. By ‘authentic’ I do not wish to imply necessarily that the events described in these traditions took place exactly as depicted. We have to take into account both the chronological hiatus between the earliest reports and the reported events (i.e. some 30–60 years), and any distortion introduced through the perspectives of the narrators. Such interference notwithstanding, we can entertain the hypothesis that such accounts, based as they are on the reports of eye witnesses, or (at the very
least) on contemporary reports, reflect, approximately, the main outlines of the actual events, and sometimes perhaps even a few details.

Furthermore, I do not propose that the further transmission of a report, from the collector (e.g. Urwah ibn az-Zubayr) to the diverse compilers of the extant works (e.g. Ibn Ishāq, al-Buḥārī, aṭ-Ṭabarī), occurred without any consequences for the wording (and sometimes also the content) of the tradition. Rather we must reckon with a ‘modification process’ which many traditions underwent. However, when a report exists in more than one transmitted version, I hold that we can, by comparing and establishing the intersections (i.e. the shared material) of the texts, reconstruct, partly or in its entirety, something which approximates to its original version.

Therefore, in this book, ‘authentic’ will be used to describe traditions which were demonstrably collected and disseminated, in a systematic process of teaching, by historical individuals from approximately the last third of the first century AH. Chains of transmitters of such ‘authentic’ traditions indicate historical genealogies of teachers and students: they have not come into existence through the ‘raising back’ of isnāds.

First, let us recall the basic fact that forms the starting point of the debate. With the exception of the Qurʾān, which contains little by way of information about Muḥammad’s life and times, all the extant Islamic sources (at least the literary ones) originated a long time after the events. A few non-Islamic sources appeared earlier (even in the first century AH) but tell us next to nothing about the life of the Prophet. Virtually all our knowledge of Islamic origins is thus based on transmitted accounts, i.e. traditions. The definitive redaction of these accounts did not take place until the third/ninth and fourth/tenth century; thus, the transmission process took 150–250 years before the material was redacted in the works we possess now. How reliable is this transmission?

It is true that, in terms of the precision and fidelity of preservation of its texts, the transmission of material in the early Islamic teaching system is not in any way comparable to the exclusively oral, verbatim transmission, over the course of more than one millennium, of the Hindu Vedas and the Persian Avesta. The Indo-Iranian and the Islamic systems should actually be thought of as two different types of mnemonic preservation. The main difference is that the Muslims did not develop a specific method of relaying texts verbatim (e.g. mechanical rote learning or specific mnemonic techniques) for their tradition (history, ḥadīṯ, Qurʾān commentary). In this respect, they were at a disadvantage not only compared to Hindus and ancient Iranians, but also to the second-century Jewish scholars (tannaim), who had to repeat word by word miṣnah passages they had learned by heart in their schools. The transmission methods of early Muslim scholars (ʿulamāʾ) were in this respect even inferior to those of the transmitters (ruwāt) of ancient Arabic poetry, who – in spite of the liberties they took and were expected to take in recitation and dissemination – were required to know their material more or less exactly, their task facilitated by the metre and rhymes of the poems. Yet, we should not automatically classify the free form of transmission customary in early Islamic historical and legal/dogmatic tradition as flawed and inadequate. A fully
faithful transmission accurately reproducing each aspect of the material in question might not even have been intended.\textsuperscript{12}

A fully verbatim oral transmission (which, however, was always accompanied by a written transmission) became predominant only in respect to one text: the Qur’ān, the book with the highest authority. Even here, verbatim transmission was preceded by an (admittedly brief) period of ‘freer’ transmission.\textsuperscript{13}

Thus, the only method developed in early Islam to ensure a certain degree of precision in passing on historical and legal/dogmatic ḥadīṯ material was the use of written records, which became more and more widespread after the first century AH. But literacy does not automatically or necessarily guarantee authenticity and precision – written material can be as easily manipulated and forged as oral tradition.\textsuperscript{14} Irrespective of how closely related these two problems are, the question of authenticity cannot automatically be equated with the issue of the written or oral nature of transmission: on the one hand, oral transmission does not always lead to inaccuracy, and on the other, written records do not always imply authenticity.

\section*{2. On the reliability of the tradition: From the nineteenth century to c. 1980}

The reliability of the entire early Islamic historical tradition, especially the Sīrah, the biography of the Prophet, has already been the subject of thorough debate in the first quarter of the last century.\textsuperscript{15} Sceptics, such as L. Caetani\textsuperscript{16} and H. Lammens,\textsuperscript{17} invoked Goldziher’s (at the time generally accepted) wholesale rejection of the entire religious tradition (i.e. legal and dogmatic ḥadīṯ) and applied his point of view also to the early historical tradition.

Lammens claimed\textsuperscript{18} that ḥadīṯ (in the strict sense), tafsīr (Qur’ānic exegesis) and sīrah (biography of the Prophet) shared the same source material; he even maintained that almost the whole sīrah material was a product of ḥadīṯ and tafsīr. In other words, the life of Muḥammad was, according to Lammens, made up of biographical reports which were nothing other than freely invented interpretative material inspired by Qur’ānic allusions. For the Medinese period, on the other hand, Lammens accepted a vague historical tradition.\textsuperscript{19} Contrary to this extreme view, T. Nöldeke\textsuperscript{20} and C. H. Becker\textsuperscript{21} took a moderate stance vis-à-vis the usefulness of historical tradition. Becker pointed out that Lammens only quoted traditions supporting his claim (for Lammens, a Catholic priest, those in which Muḥammad appears in a bad light) and discarded whatever material conflicted with it (traditions in which Muḥammad appears in a positive light). Nöldeke demonstrated on the basis of specific examples that, often enough, Caetani and Lammens went too far with their scepticism.

Caetani’s and Lammens’ position continued to exert some influence even in the second half of the last century: its impact on Blachère’s \textit{Le Problème de Mahomet}\textsuperscript{22} is unmistakable. Schacht expressed scepticism with regard to Islamic historical traditions similar to that voiced by Lammens.\textsuperscript{23} However, his starting point was not Lammens’ claim, with which of course he was familiar; rather, he
tried to apply his own findings on the origins of Muslim jurisprudence to the sirah genre.

Until the 1970s, however, Nöldeke’s and Becker’s moderate views were predominant, as we can clearly see in the source critical remarks of the important Muḥammad biographies by F. Buhl, W. M. Watt and R. Paret. The same situation obtains in the field of sirah and Ibn Ishāq research proper. From the first quarter of the twentieth century, we have the studies of J. Horovitz and J. Fück, from the second half, works by A. Guillaume, W. M. Watt and R. Paret (to name only those scholars important for our study).

A second round of the debate on the reliability of the early historical tradition in Islam took place in the 1970s and 1980s. It was heralded by a dispute between A. Noth and Ursula Sezgin about reports covering the time of the early caliphate (and therefore not related to sirah material). Since the issues brought up in their discussion were similar to those we are dealing with in the context of the sirah, I will sum up their respective arguments.

Noth, who specifically deals with Wellhausen’s ‘school theory’, proceeds by analysing separate traditions on the early Islamic conquests. He observes that the traditions were subjected to a process of ‘falsification’ on their long journey from the original informant to the compiler. These falsifications – or rather modifications – come about through summarization, systematization, amplification, abridgement, false chronological and factual arrangement, omission, invention and similar manipulations. In the course of the transmission process, we often observe the emergence of topoi, recurrent stereotypical narrative motifs. On the other hand, Noth emphasizes that there are not only ‘bad’, but also ‘good’ traditions; in spite of his pronounced scepticism, he stops short of rejecting the early Islamic historical tradition as a whole.

Noth’s ideas have exerted a substantial impact on subsequent research in the field of early Islamic historiography. Interestingly enough, its influence was more widespread in Anglophone than in German scholarship. Consider these two examples of authors adopting and extending his approach.

E. Landau-Tasseron has demonstrated on the basis of an episode from the sirah that substantial alterations of historical material were not only caused by tendentious falsification, but by the process of redaction itself (especially in the case of al-Wāqidi).

L. Conrad has explained the emergence of wholly ahistorical reports on historical events (here: the conquest of Arwād Island as described by at-Ṭabarī and al-Wāqidi), which consist of little more than collections of topoi. He was able to examine older Syriac Christian sources, which were chronologically closer to the events and were more faithfully related than in Muslim historiography. In view of our own analysis of material originating from al-Wāqidi, it should be pointed out that Landau-Tasseron’s and Conrad’s findings are in large part determined by the very fact that they chose texts by al-Wāqidi.

Noth’s results were criticized by Ursula Sezgin, who had published a study of her own of the Islamic historical tradition concerning the early caliphate. For present purposes, let us simply concentrate on one aspect of their dispute: their
respective assessments of the passage of separate traditions from the original informant to the compiler. According to Sezgin, we have no reason to posit a ‘falsification process’. She admits that the truth of the original informant’s account – her material frequently consists of (true or alleged) eyewitness reports – is not always above reproach; she does not deny attempts at embellishment, extenuation or similar forms of tampering. But after this first phase, texts were transmitted according to a system which ‘was conditioned on faithful transmission’.

According to her, ‘this means that they [scil. the authorities of the compilers] are bound to their [scil. their transmitters’] wording, which could not be altered without being duly noted’.46 For the later transmission process (after Abū Miḥnaf, d. 157/774), however, she acknowledges the occurrence of shortenings and abridgements, which, she adds, could give rise to a certain bias.48

In her sources, Sezgin did not find any parallel traditions to the Abū Miḥnaf reports she examines; she is thus unable to give any definite answer to the question of the accuracy of transmission from the original informant to Abū Miḥnaf.50

The discussion of the issue of reliability was vehemently pursued in the 1970s and 1980s with the publications of the extreme ‘sceptics’: J. Wansbrough,51 P. Crone52 and M. Cook.53 There were reactions from J. van Ess54 and in particular W. M. Watt55 and R. B. Serjeant.56 Whereas Lammens, as Becker remarked, was not at all consistent in his scepticism (because he discarded only a part of Muslim tradition, i.e. the material in which Muḥammad appears in a positive light!) and whereas Noth had not excluded the existence of genuine, ‘good’ traditions, the sceptics felt compelled to reject almost the whole body of early Islamic tradition.57 For example, Wansbrough dismisses the Islamic account of the redaction of the Qur’ān text in its entirety.58 On the basis of separate examples, Crone maintains that Islamic tradition is unrealistic, full of contradictions, inconsistencies and anomalies.59 She explains this situation on the basis of a combination of historical circumstances (radical religious, political and societal changes following the emergence of Islam) and transmission methods (oral dissemination of short sayings and reports).60

According to Crone, professional narrators (quṣṣāṣ) are to be blamed for modifying and embellishing the material which passed through their hands.61 Cook observes that there are no objective criteria for authenticity in the study of early Islamic literature (first and second centuries AH).62 Both scholars frequently emphasize that, in order to recognize historical truth, we have to consult sources from outside the Muslim sphere (‘external’ evidence), such as archaeological artefacts or non-Muslim texts.63

Before the emergence of the controversies outlined above and still in reaction to the ‘Lammens-Becker position’,64 Watt made a preliminary attempt to confirm the historicity of the main events related in the Sīrah.65 Twenty years later, on occasion of the Strasbourg Colloquium on the life of the Prophet, he again took up
this idea, now explicitly referring to the recent controversy concerning the reliability of the whole corpus of sources for the early history of Islam.66

According to Watt, there is a basic framework of the Sīrah which he calls ‘mağāzī material’. It consists of the following information: ‘the list of maghāzī or expeditions, the group against whom each was directed, the leader and the number of participants and in some cases their names, the results, and the approximate date and relative chronological position; in the case of major events … also … an outline of the battle or other event’.67 This material lies at the basis of Ibn Išíq’s Sīrah and provides its chronological framework. Before being collected and organized by the scholars, the relevant reports, which Ibn Išíq usually (!) presents without isnād, were preserved collectively by the community or at least by some Muslims.68 This material had always been generally accepted and deemed reliable. It is to be sharply distinguished from anecdotes about less significant details of the various expeditions inserted into the framework by Ibn Išíq and invariably equipped with an isnād. It is possible that these anecdotes (which usually deal with minor details of the event and which we could classify as ḥadīths), could frequently be spurious. This material, however, has not been used to any appreciable extent in any of the great European biographies of Muḥammad. The main fault Watt ascribes to Lammens and Becker – and latterly to Cook and Crone as well – was not to have made this fundamental differentiation between (authentic) mağāzī material and (dubious) ḥadīths and anecdotes.

Specific aspects of Watt’s thesis – however plausible it may seem at first blush – are open to criticism. For example, the chronological framework cannot be classified as belonging to the ‘mağāzī material’: in his fundamental study of Ibn Išíq, Fück had already pointed out that the chronology was in large part the work of Ibn Išíq himself.69 Conclusive evidence can be found in a work not available to Watt but which has been edited in the meantime: the Kitāb al-mağāzī of Ibn Išíq’s contemporary Ma’mar Ibn Rāṣid (as transmitted by ‘Abd ar-Razzāq Ibn Hammām a generation later), which lacks a consistent chronological framework.70 In addition, Watt’s ‘mağāzī material’ occasionally contains remarks by Ibn Išíq himself on the events in question or a summary in his own words of the content of the following tradition or chapter (consisting of a number of traditions).71 On the subject of the (alleged or real) absence of isnāds, we should add that the mağāzī material is not always presented without a chain of transmitters.72 Although it seems to be the case that, in the Sīrah (Ibn Hišām’s recension of Ibn Išíq’s work), the documents (the constitution of Medina)73 and lists (e.g. the participants and victims74 of the battle of Badr)75 are invariably cited anonymously by Ibn Išíq,76 some cases of mağāzī material without isnād in the Sīrah could be the result of an intervention on the part of Ibn Išíq’s redactor Ibn Hišām, who might have deleted the isnād. For a number of passages, this can be demonstrated.77

The idea that there was something akin to an authentic ‘basic framework’ of the Mağāzī is not new. Paret showed that the line Ibn Išíq – az-Zuhrī – ‘Urwah ibn az-Zubayr documented genuine teacher–student relationships, not a ‘raising back’ of isnāds, and that ‘Urwah, as the son of one of the Prophet’s earliest
followers, had at least indirect access to events taking place during the lifetime of the Prophet.\(^{78}\) Paret’s student J. von Stülpnagel applied this approach further in his unpublished and therefore largely unnoticed doctoral thesis.\(^{79}\) He maintains that the traditions of ‘Urwah ibn az-Zubayr (transmitted mainly by his student az-Zuhrī and his son Hišām to scholars of the following generation, including Ibn Iṣḥāq) are a ‘useful foundation … for research on the life of Muḥammad’. He adds: ‘One could even say that for this particular field (scil. the Sīrah), the central traditions, which even today serve as the most important piece of evidence, originate from ‘Urwah’s collection.’\(^{80}\) Furthermore, von Stülpnagel himself addressed the question of authenticity and provided some suggestions as to how spurious traditions in the ‘Urwah corpus could be recognized and weeded out.\(^{81}\)

Another attempt to single out historical elements in the Sīrah was made by R. Sellheim.\(^{82}\) He developed a ‘stratification theory’, according to which we can discern three layers in Ibn Iṣḥāq’s material placed one on top of the other: (1) historical events; (2) legendary material; and (3) fallout from factional or dogmatic conflicts. In part, the historical layer is identical with Watt’s ‘maḏāẓī material’, it covers the lists and main events of Muḥammad’s Medinese period.\(^{83}\) Additionally, it includes passages Watt had assigned to a different – although explicitly designated as authentic – class of material, namely ‘documentary material’, e.g. the constitution of Medina. Furthermore, Sellheim wants to add descriptive passages he regards as ‘detailed and close to reality’.

Sellheim’s ‘stratification model’ is open to criticism. First, it confuses rather than clarifies: the Sīrah text does not contain ‘layers’ stacked on top of each other; rather, we have (in the case of ‘layers’ 2 and 3) tendencies which have entered, permeated and altered historical reports (‘layer’ 1).\(^{84}\) The existence of these tendencies had already been pointed out by Nöldeke\(^{85}\) and Horovitz\(^{86}\) (who incidentally quoted more or less the same examples Sellheim uses). It has been accepted for a long time that the embellishment of Muḥammad’s biography with miraculous events began very early, even though it accelerated over the centuries: reports of divine intervention and angelic apparitions may belong to the oldest ‘layer’ of the tradition.\(^{87}\)

In addition, the ‘stratification theory’ neither clarifies nor solves the authenticity issue. It only shifts the problem to another question: what material belongs to the historical ‘ground layer’?\(^{88}\) On this issue, scholars’ views differ widely. Sellheim wants to include all the material classified as historical since Nöldeke, while Crone admits little more than the constitution of Medina.\(^{89}\) In the end, Sellheim has to acknowledge that he cannot offer a simple solution to the authenticity problem.\(^{90}\)

M. Kister\(^{91}\) and some of his students, particularly M. Lecker,\(^{92}\) have been much more successful in their attempt to reach the oldest strata of traditions about the life of Muḥammad. They have unearthed and studied a number of ḥadīths and reports which are at odds with later dogmatic thinking about sensitive theological issues; the material thus collected is highly likely to be old and in parts also authentic. Kister and his students followed an approach already suggested by
J. Fück. In his classical study ‘Die Rolle des Traditionalismus im Islam’ (‘The role of traditionalism in Islam’), he used the same method to argue for his idea of ‘an authentic core of Islamic tradition’. However, Kister did not go beyond studying individual traditions and did not furnish a general theoretical account of his method.

Debates about reliability intensified considerably after the publication of P. Crone’s *Meccan Trade*. R. B. Serjeant’s scathing and insulting review was met by Crone with a fierce, but objective and measured rejoinder. I do not want to get involved in particular arguments here; what I am interested in is the discussion of methodological questions pertaining to the study of ‘oral’ tradition.

Serjeant, like Watt before him, appeals to the following methodological principle of historical science: ‘Methodologically, we cannot but start from the premise that a Tradition is a genuine report of “fact” until it is creditably shown to be false, or partially or wholly invalidated by palpable bias.’ He accuses Crone of ignoring this principle. In her rejoinder, she maintains that, while the rejection of Islamic sources had been her premise in her first book, *Hagarism*, it had been her conclusion in *Meccan Trade*, resulting from careful examination: her analysis of the sources had led to a negative verdict on their credibility.

Somewhat earlier, Cook had commented on the said principle as follows: ‘Yet it may equally be the case that we are nearer the mark in rejecting whatever we do not have specific reason to accept.’ Who is right: Watt and Serjeant or Crone and Cook? Is it possible to treat traditions transmitted over generations without any specific technique or method for verbatim preservation (e.g. the accurate copying of manuscripts, or mechanical rote learning) on an equal footing with ordinary historical sources? Is it not the case that such reports are closer to legends and myths, for which we can only postulate a historical nucleus once we have ‘external’ evidence available, e.g. from archaeology (as was the case with the Trojan War)?

There is no doubt that Becker – and Nöldeke – adduced powerful arguments for their moderate position. But in the end, Becker had to admit that ‘intelligent criticism is particularly difficult to refute, because historical intuition is here confronted with historical intuition’. A similar verdict seems to be the result of the second ‘round’ of discussions. ‘Historical intuition’ may caution many observers against the wholesale rejection of earlier ascriptions as practised by Wansbrough, Crone, Cook and their epigones and point towards a ‘kernel of truth’ in Islamic tradition; on the other hand, the subsequent disputes merely demonstrate how difficult it is to find persuasive arguments against extreme scepticism.

### 3. On the reliability of the tradition: Recent trends

In the following section, I will offer an overview of the contemporary trends and current lines of inquiry into the reliability of the sources on the life of Muḥammad, by reviewing a sample of studies which seem to me particularly important or representative.

Today, the two sides of the debate are frequently distinguished by their attitude toward the sources for early Islamic history: ‘traditionalists’ or ‘sanguine’
scholars on the one hand, ‘revisionists’ or ‘sceptics’ on the other. The most frequently mentioned ‘imāms’ of the former are F. Sezgin and W. M. Watt, sometimes together with N. Abbott and M. M. Azami. The ‘imām’ of the latter is J. Wansbrough, closely followed by P. Crone and M. Cook. The younger generation of revisionists brand themselves as ‘new sceptics’. F. Donner regards this new scepticism as something akin to a scientific paradigm that has superseded the earlier ‘tradition-critical’ paradigm associated with Goldziher, Noth, Kister and his school. He considers H. Lammens as a precursor and J. Schacht as the first exponent of the new scepticism.

‘Sanguine’ scholars or ‘traditionalists’ are those scholars who attach some historical value to the traditional sources about the life of Muḥammad in spite of the fact (which they too do not dispute) that these sources underwent changes in the process of transmission. In a nutshell, they regard the outlines and most important events of the traditional biography of Muḥammad as historically accurate.

‘Revisionists’ maintain that our sources about the early history of Islam almost exclusively reflect the opinions and concerns of later generations. They dismiss the traditional biography of Muḥammad as largely or completely fictitious. Thus, it is emblematic that one representative of the ‘revisionists’ had reprinted, in a volume edited by him and published in 2003, a public lecture held by Wansbrough in 1986 in which the latter summarized his position as follows: historical sources about the seventh century Ḥiǧāz are (purely) literary and exegetical; traditional accounts of early Islamic history have to be read as salvation history; the study and interpretation of such accounts is a matter for literary criticism, not historiography.

The brand of scepticism advocated by Wansbrough and Crone/Cook – a position they, we should remind ourselves, did not invent but revived in the late 1970s, supported with new arguments and put at the centre of an international scholarly debate – was further developed in the 1980s and 1990s. Recently, this scepticism has assumed an even more radical shape. J. van Ess has rightly criticized the arrogance of some of its exponents who attempt to pass off their position as the only intelligent interpretation of the sources. Positive publicity and favourable reception with the public at large, as a result of articles published in the press, sometimes give the (wrong) impression that the ‘new sceptics’ are the dominant force in historical research on the early history of Islam.

Wansbrough still operated with the vague figure of an Arab prophet who, at some time or another, was credited with a number of anonymous logia. In Hagarism, Crone and Cook did not go so far as to deny the existence of Muḥammad as a historical person, even though they downgraded his historical importance and dismissed key reports from the traditional Sīrah as ahistorical. However, some ‘new sceptics’ such as Nevo, Koren and Ohlig go so far as to regard the Prophet of Islam as entirely fictitious.

Some sceptics (Ibn Warraq, Raven) do little more than compile all of the previous arguments against the historical value of Islamic literary sources about the life of Muḥammad (and the first two centuries AH, on the whole). Others (Berg, Calder) add a few new arguments derived from their own research but remain fully committed to the paradigm introduced by their ‘masters’. Calder tries to undermine the traditional account of authorship and geographical origins of some early Arabic works (e.g. Mālik’s al-Muwatta’ and ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s al-Muṣannaf) by pointing out that their written transmission (rather, their dissemination by way of the accurate copying of manuscripts of finalized works) started relatively late and that they are only extant in diverging recensions. These scholars are all but exclusively interested in methodological considerations; some of them operate with statistical analyses, which are of dubious value and sometimes easily refuted; philological work, apparently regarded as an ignoble scholarly pursuit, is rarely in evidence.

Other revisionists (Nevo/Koren, Ohlig), ‘discarding tradition and freely sketching … on an empty canvas’, outline ‘a radically alternative past’, sometimes on the basis of their idiosyncratic interpretations of numismatical, epigraphical or other ‘external’ evidence. They follow the model of the ‘imāms’ who applied the same methods. Nevo and Koren who studied early Arabic inscriptions from the Negev claim that the absence of specifically Qur’ānic phrases in these early inscriptions confirms Wansbrough’s ‘late-dating’ of the final redaction of the Qur’ānic text.

U. Rubin advances a strand of scepticism that is more or less immune to scholarly criticism. He explicitly relinquishes the study of ‘hard facts’ and confines himself to tracing the image of Muḥammad in his community. He undoubtedly succeeds in this undertaking in his book *The Eye of the Beholder*. At the same time, however, he – wrongly, in my opinion – maintains that ‘the belief in a “hard core” of historical facts’ has its origins in (and is little more than) a ‘nineteenth-century fetishism of facts’.

Revisionists also count Noth among their ancestors and allies – wrongfully, in fact: he finally vehemently rejected their accolades. In the second edition of his book *Quellenkritische Studien zu Themen, Formen und Tendenzen frühislamischer Geschichtsüberlieferung* (English title: *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition*), he stressed again ‘that the tradition offers much material, which, if in need of careful examination, is still of historical value for the early period’. The same applies to L. Conrad, Noth’s co-author for the second edition of the book, and to several exponents of the Jerusalem school (Kister, Lecker, Landau-Tasseron).

The successes of English-speaking sceptics, especially the praise received by their ‘imāms’, naturally inspired imitators outside the Anglophone world, particularly in France and Germany. French scholars had a model of their own in R. Blachère’s *Le Problème de Mahomet*, with which the author made an independent contribution to the sceptical paradigm. However, the more recent French exponents of this position, A.-L. de Prémare and J. Chabbi, were obviously motivated by the desire to create their own, ‘Francophone’ counterpart to the achievements of English-speaking sceptics.
Chabbi maintains that a biography of Muḥammad is ‘impossible’ and subsequently explains that M. Cook had already suggested some of the ‘questions of principle’ (‘questions de principe’) she discusses. De Prémare, deeply impressed by Wansbrough’s ideas, displays a strange ambivalence toward early Islamic sources. On the one hand, he thinks that a historical biography of Muḥammad – which may be impossible to produce – is not even required for an understanding of the origins of Islam; in fact, he refrains from compiling one. On the other, he does not want (or is unable) to dispense with the sources, even though he regards them as biased: he intends to use them to ‘capture some of the elements guiding the emergence and formation of Islam’. M. Rodinson had himself failed to establish a stable methodological foundation for his use of the early Islamic source material which he regarded as ‘hardly reliable’ and ‘rather far away from the facts’. This did not prevent him from writing a great biography of Muḥammad, which subsequently became a classic. The writings and ideas of de Prémare and Chabbi have not however become part of the international debate.

 Entirely without scholarly merit are the publications of K.-H. Ohlig, a German ‘revisionist’. He freely admits that he is unable to read the relevant primary sources (because he does not know Arabic and other source languages) but goes on to claim that his lack of qualifications enables him to avoid ‘certain preconceptions (Engführungen)’ and ‘opens his eyes for critical inquiry’. Following Nevo/Koren, he denies the historicity of Muḥammad. In addition, he dates the genesis of the core (Grundstock) of the Qurʾānic text to the eighth century AD, strangely in eastern Iran or in Iraq. He claims that the (allegedly misnamed) ḥiḡrah calendar, for which early ‘external’ evidence does exist, is calculated on the basis of the victory of the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius against the Persians, even though the decisive battle took place six years later in 628, not in 622. According to Ohlig, the name of Muḥammad in the inscription in the Dome of the Rock (‘Muḥammad is God’s servant and messenger’) and other early relics (such as coins or monuments) and sources is in reality an epithet of Jesus (‘the blessed one’, ‘the praiseworthy one’), even though the earliest confirmed reference to Muḥammad in a non-Islamic source dates to 640. Ohlig calls the method that led to these claims ‘historical-critical’ and complains that it has so far not been applied in Islamic studies.

Like the sceptics, those scholars labelled as ‘traditionalists’ or ‘sanguine’ (G. H. A. Juynboll, H. Motzki, M. Muranyi, M. Lecker, G. Stauth, K. Versteegh, E. Whelan and I myself are often mentioned, among others) also fall into several groupings. For a number of them, Juynboll, Motzki and myself among them, the terms ‘traditionalist’ or ‘sanguine’ are entirely out of place. In fact, Juynboll followed the scholarly tradition inaugurated by Schacht while Motzki and I advocate the tradition-critical approach. The same applies for M. Schöller, who made an important contribution to the discussion with his studies on the history of conflict between Muḥammad and the Jews of Medina.

T. Nagel is one exponent of a genuinely ‘traditionalist’ approach. He has recently published two monographs about Muḥammad, only one of which I will discuss: Mohammed: Leben und Legende (Muḥammad: Life and Legend), an
enormously erudite,135 1000-page biography of the Prophet. However, the initial happiness about a work that seems to resume the venerable German tradition of research into the life of Muḥammad soon dissipates: even though he discusses current research on a few pages,136 Nagel is seemingly unaware of some fundamental findings of recent scholarship, especially concerning the history of transmission. He appears knowingly to ignore the results of important new studies that are at odds with his theories.

Nagel maintains that we have to pierce the ‘veil of the unhistorical’137 to approach or comprehend the historical facts of early Islam.138 This veil consists of a tendency to de-historicize the person of Muḥammad (‘The Destruction of History’)139 on the one hand and certain ‘legendary formation principles’ postulated by Nagel on the other, most importantly the ‘demotion of Mecca to the categorically bad’.140 According to Nagel, Muḥammad himself started this process of historical misrepresentation that altered historiography from its very beginning. By factoring in the ‘formation principles’ pervading our sources and by subtracting the distortions caused by them, Nagel hopes to recover the actual events. In addition, the author paints an extremely negative picture of Muḥammad; his entire book is pervaded by an extremely critical attitude towards Islam.

Nagel overestimates the influences of the tendencies he describes – for one, there is no evidence for his alleged de-historicization or elevation of the figure of the Prophet in ʿUrwah ibn al-Zubayr’s corpus of historical traditions and letters (addressed to the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik!)141 – and underestimates the impact of other modifications in the course of transmission history such as ‘un-directed’ and redactional changes to texts.142 For example, he naïvely renarrates the events of Muhammad’s conflict with the Jews of Medina according to the versions transmitted by the late compilers Ibn Hišām and al-Wāqidī143 without taking into account Schöller’s relevant studies.144 Schöller discovered ‘unorthodox’ traditions (mostly on the authority of Ibn al-Kalbī), which describe the events in a very different manner than the ‘orthodox’ reports. They deserved to be taken into account as much as the ‘orthodox’ ones in any attempt to find out ‘what really happened’ (‘wie es eigentlich gewesen’).145 Furthermore, recent scholarship has confirmed the old hypothesis146 that, unlike ḥadīṯ compilations, the sīrah works by Ibn Iṣḥāq and al-Wāqidī contain much material transmitted by popular storytellers (quṣṣāṣ),147 a fact that substantially compromises their historical reliability.

Nagel’s account of events, often mere renarrations of the reports of the later compilers, relies on the assumption (refuted by Noth)148 that we can uncover ‘what really happened’ by comparing and weighing up against each other the various reports recorded in ninth- and tenth-century compilations. He disregards the fact that, first, the later compilations he uses contain a substantial amount of qāṣṣ material; and secondly, that they quote reports that have undergone a long process of modification and were also redacted by the compilers themselves. Given these circumstances, it seems highly unlikely that these sources can be used as a basis for far-reaching theories such as Nagel’s hypothesis of pervasive historical misrepresentation.

One of his most catastrophic errors is his highly positive assessment of al-Wāqidī: Nagel maintains that the latter can be regarded as an almost ‘modern’
historian who allegedly applied methods similar to contemporary empirical standards. However, the fact of the matter is that al-Wāqidī collected and compiled (i.e. wrote up) reports of wildly varying quality from any number of sources. He studiously fails to mention his main source, Ibn Ishāq, a fact already well-known to Wellhausen and Horovitz, and other sources (Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah, Ma'mar ibn Rāshid), which we are only now in a position to identify. Also, he frequently, but not always, supplies false isnāds. To his credit, he created a comprehensive account of the mağāzī with genuine literary qualities which led to the subsequent emergence of numerous pseudo-historical works falsely attributed to him (Kitāb futūḥ as-Šām, Kitāb futūḥ Miṣr). Contrary to Nagel’s thesis, al-Buḫārī’s ḥadīṯ collection, a work that should be fully subject to Nagel’s de-historicization of history, contains two books on the biography of the Prophet which are as historically reliable – if not more so – than any of the sīrah works of the eighth or ninth century.

Even though Nagel advances some good arguments against the position of some of the sceptics in an excursus, his book, which operates with a methodology that we cannot help but call ‘pre-critical’, is unlikely to contribute to a refutation of the ‘new scepticism’. In what follows, I propose to outline some promising approaches and ideas that have already been successfully deployed toward just such a refutation.

4. A paradigm shift?

In terms of the philosophy of science, we could call the new scepticism a ‘paradigm’ (as understood by Thomas S. Kuhn). In general, the life-span of paradigms is short: they are soon ‘exhausted’ and can finally only ‘explain problems for which the solution is assured’. The end of a paradigm’s life span is mostly heralded by a crisis: expectations are disappointed, anomalies occur, more and more new phenomena resist explanation. There are signs that the paradigm of ‘new scepticism’ has now reached this stage. Among the critical symptoms are statements by renowned experts, especially also by former exponents of the paradigm, and recently discovered evidence such as inscriptions, coins and papyri.

Only three years after publishing his much-quoted article ‘The quest for the historical Muhammad’, in which he expressed his unreserved pessimism about our ability to establish any hard facts about early Islamic history, F. E. Peters (1994) wrote – according to Patricia Crone – a thoroughly ‘traditional’ study about the Prophet. R. Hoyland, a former student of Crone and now the pre-eminent authority on non-Islamic sources about early Islam, re-examined the non-Islamic sources Crone and Cook quoted in Hagarism. He shows that they are hardly suitable to support an alternative account of early Islamic history; on the contrary, they frequently agree with Islamic sources and supplement them. A few years ago, Crone and Cook themselves publicly repudiated the central hypothesis advanced in Hagarism. In their most recent publications, leading historians of early Islam such as F. Donner and C. Robinson strike a decidedly critical note when it comes to the ‘new scepticism’.
Among the recent epigraphical, papyrological and numismatical findings challenging the neo-sceptical paradigm, the following should be mentioned:

- ‘ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḡabbān’s discovery in 1999 of the oldest Islamic inscription to date, the graffito of Qāʿal-Muʿṭadil (north-west Arabia). After the basmalah, it runs: anā Zuhayr katabtu zaman tuwuffiya ‘Umar sanat arbaʿ wa-ʾiṣrān, ‘I, Zuhayr, wrote [this] at the time of ʿUmar’s death in the year 24 [644–5].’ Interestingly enough, the author already uses the hiǧrah dating, only a few years after its introduction (between 634 and 644). More interestingly, even sensationally, the graffito mentions ʿUmar (undoubtedly the second caliph) with his exact year of death. Hitherto, scholars have assumed that there was no evidence for any of the Prophet’s companions in external sources; Muʿāwiyah was regarded as the first caliph to be safely attested as a historical figure by such testimonies, both epigraphical and manuscript (in papyri).

- The two earliest known papyri with a hiǧrah dating, both of which originated in the year 22/643.

- We find the first attestation of Muḥammad in an Islamic setting on two Arabic-Sasanian silver coins from the year 66 and 67 AH; in the margin, they feature an abbreviated form of the Islamic profession of faith (bi-sm Allāh Muḥammad rasūl Allāh). Thirteen or fourteen years later, the name Muḥammad is mentioned as a nasab (patronym) on a coin from the year 80 AH with an Arabic inscription which bears the name of the Umayyad general ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad (better known as Ibn al-Ašʿāt). Both Ibn al-Ašʿāt and his father Muḥammad (d. 41/661) were important historical figures and are well known from Islamic historical sources. This fact refutes Ohlig’s ludicrous claim that in first century AH sources, especially the inscriptions on the Dome of the Rock, the word Muḥammad (written MḤMD) is not a personal name but an epithet of Jesus (without any reference to the Islamic Prophet) and should be translated as ‘the praiseworthy one’ or ‘the blessed one’. The first non-Islamic document to mention the Prophet is even older: a Syriac-Christian chronicle written around 640 (according to Hoyland) by Thomas the Presbyter refers to ‘a battle between the Romans and Muḥammad’s Arabs’ (ṭayyāyē d-Mḥmt).

- Inscriptions with an obviously Islamic content (including Qurʾānic phraseology) occur earlier (starting 31 AH) than previously thought.

- A very old, fragmentary Qurʾān manuscript, the ‘Codex Parisino-Petropolitanus’, recently discovered and recognized as a historical document of paramount importance by F. Déroche. On the basis of its writing style and archaic orthography (e.g. qāla consistently written as QL), he dates it to the third quarter of the first century AH. Like the fragments of an ancient Qurʾān manuscript from Ṣanʿāʾ, its text follows the ʿUṯmānic recension. This crucial piece of evidence conclusively puts to rest Wansbrough’s hypothesis that it was not until the year 800 that the Qurʾān assumed the form we know today.
So much for the external evidence which confirms at least some details of the Islamic historical tradition about early Islamic history. This book, however, deals with the Islamic historical tradition itself. More and more representatives of recent scholarship are prepared to admit that, in addition to ‘bad’ reports, Islamic tradition also contains ‘good’ ones. Thus, they distance themselves from the ‘sceptical paradigm’. However, some of them claim (wrongly, as we will see shortly) that ‘what is lacking is a method of extracting that priceless ore from the redactional rubble in which it is presently embedded’ or that ‘no one has yet proposed a reasonable way of distinguishing between authentic and inauthentic’. The author of the last statement, C. Robinson, qualifies his claim in a footnote by admitting that he considers the so-called isnād-cum-matn analysis ‘promising’.

5. Cutting the Gordian knot?

For the historical traditions at least, there seems to be a way out of our dilemma: applying and further developing the approach suggested by Noth. He argues that separate traditions or complexes of traditions are the best starting point for research. The most convincing of all the attempts to isolate authentic traditions presented above seem to me to be those of Paret and von Stülpnagel. It is therefore advisable to start with traditions transmitted by Ibn Ishāq (or Ma’mar ibn Rāṣid) – az-Zuhrī – ‘Urwah ibn az-Zubayr, since this chain indicates a historical genealogy of teachers and students and thus offers the best chance of providing authentic material.

Each selected tradition will be analysed diachronically. To explain my approach, I need to digress a little. It is generally acknowledged that we can almost always recover the content of Ibn Ishāq’s underlying text from reports transmitted on his authority which are preserved in the compilations of later authors (e.g. at-Ṭabarī, Ibn Hišām or al-‘Uṭāridī). (Below, we will find that we can sometimes even reconstruct the very wording of sections of Ibn Ishāq’s text.) It can be shown that an analogous procedure allows us to reconstruct at least the approximate content of reports going back to az-Zuhrī (d. 124/742) a generation earlier, or even the approximate content of reports going back to ‘Urwah ibn az-Zubayr (d. 94/712 or a few years later).

The probability of identifying reports ascribed to ‘Urwah as ‘authentic’, i.e. as actually going back to him and of inferring or reconstructing their approximate content, is especially high with those reports which were independently transmitted by both ‘Urwah’s student az-Zuhrī as well as his son Hišām ibn ‘Urwah (and/or a third transmitter). This is the case for a substantial amount of traditions from the ‘Urwah corpus.

The different shapes of those versions of the same report, which are only to be expected thanks to the abovementioned ‘modification processes’, can serve as evidence for the independence of the two lines of transmission: certain characteristics often allow us to tell whether one of two related texts imitates the other or whether both are derived from a shared archetype.
With ʿUrwah’s reports, we have reached the original (collector) source of the tradition in question; at the same time, we have arrived in the first century after the hiǧrah. Therefore, it is not true that we cannot cross over the magical threshold to the first century AH. By comparing other (unsuspicious) material to ʿUrwah traditions which have been demonstrated to be authentic, we sometimes find ourselves in a position to identify additional authentic traditions.

What about ʿUrwah’s own sources? Not infrequently, the isnāds of ʿUrwah’s traditions stop with his name. But in many cases, they lead back further to ʿĀʾišah, the Prophet’s wife and ʿUrwah’s aunt; in some cases also to one or (seldom) even two other witnesses. Verification becomes impossible at this stage: occasionally, an isnād seems to have originally stopped with ʿUrwah, only to be ‘raised’ at a later date back to ʿĀʾišah or some other authority. For example, the chain of transmitters for some traditions in Hišām ibn ʿUrwah’s version breaks off with ʿUrwah, while continuing to ʿĀʾišah in az-Zuhri’s version.

With Paret, therefore, we have to admit that there is a gap in the earliest Islamic tradition between an event (occurring, say, in the year 10/631–2 or slightly earlier) and ʿUrwah’s activity as collector (probably from about 44/664, when ʿUrwah was about 20 years old). All in all, we are talking about a hiatus of some 30–60 years.

Yet, we have to recall (again with Paret) that ʿUrwah still had the opportunity to consult eye witnesses and contemporaries of many of the events in question – irrespective of whether he mentions his informant in the isnād or not. For this reason, it is much more likely that he asked his aunt ʿĀʾišah about many events she had witnessed, especially one embarrassing affair in which she herself was involved (the so-called slander or scandal story, ḥadīṯ al-ifk), than that he disregarded her testimony. In addition, he was able to collect first-hand reports on numerous incidents occurring (slightly) before, during and after the hiǧrah, e.g. the hiǧrah itself (including the ‘first hiǧrah’ to Abyssinia and the circumstances and events leading to the hiǧrah proper), the Battle of the Trench and al-Ḥudaybiyah. In their attempt to discover the truth, historians have to account for the fact that these texts may have already been altered because of the chronological gap between the narrator and the events and/or the narrator’s perspective; the personal involvement of the latter can also colour or even render his reports substantially biased.

Still, it remains the case that it has been shown that recent oral tradition – dating back one or, according to new findings, sometimes even two generations after the death of a group’s oldest living members – has normally suffered only slight damage. At the very least, such traditions are not to be judged like myths or legends relayed by generations of transmitters. From recent traditions such as that provided by ʿUrwah concerning the hiǧrah and Muḥammad’s Medinese period, the main outlines of events and even a few details can still be recovered.

This, then, is the answer to the extreme scepticism of Wansbrough, Crone and Cook and their epigones. The attitude of Wansbrough’s Quranic Studies and Crone’s and Cook’s Hagarism is but one instance of a tendency which, every now and then since the days of humanism, seems to take centre stage in European
historiography. In his *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (*Introduction to Historical Methodology*), Bernheim described it as follows:

early on in the process of closely criticising historical authors, scholars soon found out that their statements about one and the same event often enough contradicted each other; instead of trying to find out if they could still discover the truth or if there were ways to eliminate the sources of error they had detected, they carried scepticism to extremes by claiming that, due to the unreliability of transmission, there was no way at all to obtain valid information about the past …

Rather than soberly inquiring how to distinguish between genuine and falsified information and ascertaining the circumstances leading to and explaining falsifications, some of the more sanguine and ingenious thinkers generalized this experience and, in an excess of scepticism, boldly asserted that entire periods of historical tradition were nothing but systematic forgeries. Coins became their most trusted sources; on this basis in particular, they reconstructed the history of the epoch in question according to what they thought likely to have happened …

Apparently, discarding tradition and freely sketching a radically alternative past on an empty canvas has a special appeal for these scholars.¹⁹⁴

If there is anything we can reproach Wansbrough, Crone and Cook with, it is their disregard for this ‘principle of sound methodology’ as formulated by Bernheim. However, just as Becker admitted that Lammens had roused him and his generation and had put the Sīrah issue on an entirely new footing,¹⁹⁵ we should acknowledge that these ‘critical thinkers’ have reminded us of some key characteristics of early Islamic tradition:

- On their long passage from the original informant to the compiler of any given work, traditions have undergone a reshaping process (Noth).
- The (absolute) chronology in extant historical sources does not preserve knowledge transmitted from ‘antiquity’; the dates in question are conjectures made by scholars from the generation of Ibn Ishāq or al-Wāqidī or, at the earliest, az-Zuhrī (Noth), some of which were based on wrongly interpreted Qur’ānic allusions (Crone). Thus, varying and wrong dates in historical sources should not come as a surprise.
- Certain traditions, especially some accounts which concern pre-hiǧrah events are legendary and contain qāṣṣ material (Crone), even if transmitted by authorities as reliable as Urwah (e.g. the tradition concerning the first revelation experience, but not that on the two hiǧrahs!). They should therefore be handled with utmost care.
- Credible details, if extracted from legendary contexts, should in principle not be taken to be historical (Crone).
- Finally, to give a concrete example, isnād analysis alone is not sufficient to date a tradition (Cook) or securely to pinpoint a transmitter’s or redactor’s source.
Noth, Crone and Cook certainly deserve credit for having brought these problems to our attention and for having reminded us of many others.

6. Procedure

Before we embark on our text analysis, here are a few words on the procedure and tools employed in this study. At the beginning of each examination of a tradition, I will depict its various lines of transmission in a diagram, starting with their (true or alleged) original informant down to the various compilers, who have included it in their works.196 For the moment, I will assume that the transmitter on whom the different lines of transmission converge (the common link of that tradition) disseminated the tradition by systematic teaching – no more, no less. The validity of this hypothesis stands or falls on the reliability of the isnâds; we will only regard it as confirmed if it tallies with the subsequent analysis of the text of the tradition (matn). In other words: dependencies between different versions of a longer tradition extant in several transmissions (recensions or versions) can often be detected on the basis of a comparison of the texts (mutūn), independently of their isnâds. A stemma indicated by an isnâd can only be accepted if it agrees with a stemma suggested by an examination of the different texts (mutūn).

For the two tradition complexes studied in this book, I will demonstrate that az-Zuhrī must have passed on the traditions in question to numerous students – as we are led to expect by their respective isnâds. His predecessor ʿUrwah had already disseminated the traditions. This can be shown to be highly probable for one of the complexes we will study below (the tradition concerning the first revelation experience) and certain for the second (the scandal story). As long as they are verifiable, the details Ibn Ishâq provides about his sources will be shown to be correct. However, it is safe to say that the isnâds given by al-Wāqidī have frequently been consciously tampered with or forged, as will be shown by our examination of two examples.197

Al-Wāqidī tries to conceal the fact that he used Ibn Ishâq’s Kitâb al-maḡāzī throughout as the main source for his work. This finding, already noticed by two eminent experts on al-Wāqidī, Wellhausen and Horovitz, was disputed by the editor of al-Wāqidī’s Kitâb al-maḡāzī, J. M. B. Jones.198 He maintained that in many cases, in which al-Wāqidī’s version is ‘too similar’ to Ibn Ishâq’s, he did not plagiarize the latter’s work; rather, they both relied on a shared pool of qāṣṣ material. Recent research – including that of Crone and Cook – generally seems to have followed Jones’s opinion. It is therefore all the more remarkable that Juynboll, based on isnâd analyses in his study of the ḥadīṯ al-ifk, came to suspect that al-Wāqidī, in contrast to the isnâd information he furnishes, in fact simply copied Ibn Ishâq’s version.199 Only a comparison of the texts of the two traditions enabled him to confirm his suspicion. With this step, however, he moved beyond the limits of isnâd analysis.

In the following text analyses, I will demonstrate that besides Ibn Ishâq, al-Wāqidī drew on other sources for his version of the ḥadīṯ al-ifk without referring to them either in the isnâd or elsewhere. This is only possible through a
comparison of al-Wāqīḍī’s text with all extant traditions relating to the event, compiled in an exhaustive corpus.

In sum, to assess the dependency of a transmitter or compiler on his source, it is most emphatically not sufficient merely to analyse an isnād. Our chance of success is substantially greater if we assemble a full corpus of available material on an event and, in addition to isnād analysis, carefully compare the texts (‘isnād-cum matn-analysis’).
1 The main Medinese transmitters

Learning and teaching – the use of writing

The systematic study of early Islamic history (primarily the life of the Prophet, based on the collection of reports about it) began with the first generation of ‘successors’ (tābiʿūn) in ‘his’ city, Medina. It is true that, according to Muslim tradition, some of Muḥammad’s contemporaries made notes of his sayings and acts; one of them is reported to have written down an entire speech (ḥuṭḥah). But reports about such occasional records, if they are to be believed, cannot be read as evidence for a truly systematic effort. Such an effort involved deliberately asking various people, especially surviving companions of the Prophet (ṣaḥābah), about his life and deeds and compiling these reports in some way. It was only begun by younger representatives of the first generation of successors (tābiʿūn) who had not themselves met Muḥammad, around the last third of the first/seventh and the early part of the second/eighth centuries. Sons and grandsons of the earliest believers, ‘prevented by fate to take part in contemporary political life and estranged from the affairs of the wider world, turned to the study of a glorious past’.

The reports they gathered from various informants and then passed on to inquiring fellow believers were called ḥadīṯ (initially always in the singular), ‘narration’, ‘account’. This is in fact the original meaning of the word, which later came to be used in a more restricted sense.

These activities, which were not limited to historical studies, soon developed into systematic teaching which usually took place in the mosque of Medina. There, the earliest scholars spread their ‘knowledge’ (ʿilm, often used in the same sense as ḥadīṯ) to contemporaries with a thirst for learning (‘students’) by way of lectures and answers to their questions. The emergence of ‘academic’ instruction, which in the following generations attracted believers from the entire Muslim world to Medina and soon radiated to other urban centres, came about for a number of historical reasons, among which were: the conclusion of the first wave of conquests; the eclipse of Medina’s political role after the Battle of al-Ḥarrah in 63/683; and the end of the second civil war (60/680–72/692).

1.1 ‘Urwah ibn az-Zubayr

One of the first and certainly the most important of these early ‘historians’ was ‘Urwah ibn az-Zubayr. He was born to a family of noble stock between
23/643–4 and 29/649 and probably died in 94/712–13. His father was the prominent prophetic companion and cousin of Muḥammad, az-Zubayr ibn al-ʿAwwām, who died in the Battle of the Camel (36/656); his mother a daughter of the caliph Abū Bakr; his brother (some 20 years his elder) was the famous anti-caliph ʿAbdallāh ibn az-Zubayr; his maternal aunt was ʿĀʾishah, the favourite wife of the Prophet. ʿUrwah is said to have transmitted reports from all his relatives – especially ʿĀʾishah – and many other companions of the Prophet and members of the successor generation (e.g. ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿUmar, ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAbbās, Abū Hurayrah, ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ). Muslim tradition therefore regards him as a pre-eminent authority on early Islamic history, particularly the life of the Prophet.

Of ʿUrwah’s collection activities we are told that he once sent a messenger to three companions of the Prophet, one of which was Ǧābir ibn ʿAbdallāh (d. 73/692–3 or a few years later),12 to inquire about an event relating to the ḥiǧrah.13 It goes without saying that he would have consulted his aunt ʿĀʾishah;14 he is said to have recorded reports he received from her in writing.15

As scarce as reports about his teaching are, they are particularly valuable for the insight they give us into the very beginning of systematic instruction in Medina and in Islam in general. Of his lectures, we read that people used to come together to listen to his ḥadīṯ (kāna yataʿallafu n-nās ʿalā ḥadīṯi-hi).16 ‘Urwah taught in public – in the Medina mosque17 – as well as in his private family circle. During ‘public’ events, he did not want his sons to interrupt by asking questions, but they were allowed to ask him once they were alone.18

He was already accustomed to reciting his fiqh material arranged by subjects: first came traditions on divorce (talāq), then divorce at the insistence of a wife (ḥulʿ), then the pilgrimage (ḥaǧǧ) etc. – indeed a precursor of the taṣnīf,19 which became common practice only at a later date. His sons were asked to repeat the ḥadīths he recited;20 this marks the beginning of the later institution of muḍākarah.21

In these early years, lecturing from memory was a matter of course. Tradition explicitly points out, however, that ‘Urwah possessed ‘law books’ (kutub fiqh), i.e. written notes of his legal ḥadīths and opinions, although he is reported to have burned them on the day of the Battle of al-Ḥarrah,22 much to his later regret.23 According to another version,24 he erased his ‘books’ (entirely?) (maḥawtu kutubi), because for a time, he held the opinion that the Qurʾān should remain the only book. This report also records his subsequent regret over his rash behaviour.

‘Urwah’s (temporary) rejection of written records deserves a closer look. According to this view (which was also held by others, see immediately below), the only (religious) text deserving to be preserved in written form was the word of God, the Qurʾān. Everything else, particularly the words of the Prophet, should only be recorded temporarily, if at all, to aid one’s memory. After learning them by heart, or, at the latest, before the death of their owner, such records were to be deleted or destroyed: they should not be ‘eternal’. This position occupies the middle ground between two extreme doctrines. According to one opinion, no religious ‘knowledge’ (ʿilm) besides the Qurʾān must be put into writing. This view
is traced back to the caliph 'Umar; one of its adherents in Medina at the time of 'Urwah seems to have been Sa'd ibn al-Musayyab (d. 94/713). At the other end of the spectrum, many scholars held that every piece of ‘knowledge’ could be written down without hesitation.

The position between these extremes is accorded its most prominent formulation in a prophetic ḥadīth reported on the authority of Abū Sa'd al-Ḥudrī (d. 74/693 or ten years earlier): ‘Do not write down anything from me except the Qur’ān. If anyone has written down from me anything other than the Qur’ān, let him erase it.’ Some ḥadīth compilations dealing with the pros and cons of written records (taqyīd al-ʿilm) devote a special chapter to this view. In his Taqyīd al-ʿilm, al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baghdādi has an additional chapter on those who later regretted destroying their ḥadīth. His most prominent example is none other than 'Urwah ibn az-Zubayr.

As we can see from the material transmitted on his authority, 'Urwah gave accounts of all of the important events in Muḥammad’s life, thereby laying the foundations of the historiographical subdiscipline of maqāzī. The older sources do not explicitly mention whether he wrote down the historical traditions he collected. He did, however, write letters in answer to written questions by the caliph 'Abd al-Malik. ‘Urwah’s epistles, preserved by at-Ṭabarī and others, will be discussed below. For the moment, suffice it to say that his correspondence illustrates a phenomenon which we will refer to as the ‘court impulse’ in this study and which has been extremely important for the written recording of the Islamic sciences and Arabic poetry.

Only very late sources credit 'Urwah with a Kitāb al-maqāzī or claim him to be the first author of a systematic book on maqāzī (awwal man ṣanāfā fī l-maqāzī). This conflicts not only with the findings of European scholars about the speed of the development of Arabic written literature, but also with Muslim tradition, which connects the emergence of taṣnīf in all fields (including maqāzī) with the generation of Ma’mar ibn Rāṣid (d. 154/770), Ibn Ğurayğ (d. 150/767), Mālik ibn Anas (d. 179/795–6) and Ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767).

We can easily explain how 'Urwah came to be regarded as the author of a (systematically arranged) Kitāb al-maqāzī. Evidently, his students soon collected his traditions and compiled them into (kutub) Maqāzī (li-)‘Urwah ibn az-Zubayr. His foster son Abū ʿAswad Yaṭīm 'Urwah (d. 131/748 or later) is said to have disseminated a Kitāb al-maqāzī on the authority of 'Urwah in Egypt. Ibn an-Nadīm lists a book with this title by al-Ḥasan ibn ʿUṭmān az-Ziyādī (d. 243/857). These ‘books’, in which later scholars collected traditions of earlier authorities, were often ascribed to the respective authorities themselves; we only have to think of the extant so-called Tafsīr Muğāhidī. If we, on the other hand, understand these ascriptions to mean that 'Urwah – similar to his private records on fiqh (see above) – also possessed ‘books’ (i.e. notebooks or collections of sheets) in which he recorded his collected maqāzī traditions, then he most likely wrote a Kitāb al-maqāzī. Whether they were ordered and if so, how, cannot now be determined. Due to 'Urwah’s general disregard for chronology, a fairly consistent chronological order would have been unlikely.
Even as late as ʿAbd ar-Razzāq (d. 211/827) and his Kitāb al-maḡāzī, three generations after ʿUrwah, we only find the very beginnings of a chronological arrangement of historical ḥadīths; many of his traditions are derived from ʿUrwah via az-Zuhri and Maʿmar.

1.2 Ibn Šihāb az-Zuhri

ʿUrwah, regarded by some as the founder and first leader of the ‘historical school’ of Medina, had many students who transmitted his traditions. One is his son Hiṣām ibn ʿUrwah (d. 146/763), another his foster son Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, called Yatīm ʿUrwah (d. 131/748 or later). Among them, the most important is Ibn Šihāb az-Zuhri (d. 124/742). In addition to ʿUrwah, he studied under the pre-eminent authorities of the day (Ṣaʿīd ibn al-Muṣayyab, Abān ibn ʿUṯmān, etc.) and used to question informants from outside scholarly circles, young and old – not only in public gatherings (maḡālīs), but also in the houses of the Anṣār in Medina. A contemporary reports that ‘he even consulted the wives (of the Anṣār)’.

Reports about az-Zuhri’s use of writing seem to be contradictory: according to one transmitted on the authority of his student Mālik ibn Anas, he denied writing down traditions. ʿIkrimah ibn ʿAmmār (d. 159/775–6), az-Zuhri’s contemporary, writes that he along with az-Zuhri and others came to al-ʿAraǧ to hear hadīths from him. Al-ʿAraǧ made copies of the Qurʾān. In contrast to the others, az-Zuhri at first did not make written notes. Later on, however, he wrote down a long hadīth on a piece of the same material used by al-ʿAraǧ for his Qurʾān copies (i.e. probably parchment), but erased it after reading it out.

On the other hand, we find several reports about az-Zuhri writing down numerous traditions in the process of collection without immediately destroying them. His student Maʿmar ibn Rāṣīd relates the following story on the authority of another traditionist and companion of az-Zuhri, Ṣāliḥ ibn Kaysān (d. after 140/757–8):

Ibn Šihāb (az-Zuhri) and I met while collecting traditions (naṭlubu al-ʿilm). We agreed to write down the practices (of the Prophet) (as-sunan). We then wrote down whatever we heard on the Prophet’s authority. Later, we also wrote down whatever came from his companions …

According to another of az-Zuhri’s companions, az-Zuhri used to have tablets (alwāḥ) and sheets (suḥuf) on him at all times, attracting people’s ridicule; he used to write down whatever he heard.

The contradiction between these reports is less pronounced if we picture the following development: advocating at first the widespread position that traditions should not be written down at all or only retained in writing for a short time before memorizing them, az-Zuhri was for various reasons gradually constrained to make more and more use of written records. In what follows, this will be confirmed on the basis of additional reports.
In accordance with contemporary practice, az-Zuhri at first transmitted his knowledge only through lectures. Naturally, students had to attend them in person. Listeners occasionally desired to gain access to his material in a more convenient manner. One of his most important students, al-Layth ibn Sa’d (d. 175/791),62 is said to have asked once: ‘O Abū Bakr, if you would only write and compile these books for the benefit of the people (law wa-da’ta ... wa-dawwanta), you would be rid of all this labour!’ Az-Zuhri’s reply was: ‘Nobody has spread this knowledge farther and has been more generous with it than me’,63 meaning that everybody with a desire to learn his material could hear his ḥadīṯ from him and that a ‘written edition’ of his collection for students or a wider audience was unnecessary.

A report traced back to Sufyān aṭ-Ṭawrī (d. 161/778)64 reveals that there were valid reasons for the desire to get convenient access to az-Zuhri’s records: aṭ-Ṭawrī once came to az-Zuhri and wanted to hear traditions. The latter, however, was disinclined to recite. After a gentle rebuke by Sufyān (‘Would you have liked to come to your own teachers and be treated like this?’), az-Zuhri went into his house, handed him a ‘book’ (his lecture notes) and told him to transmit it on his authority. (This is a method of transmission which was later called munāwalah.) The conscientious Sufyān remarked that he had not transmitted a single letter of it.65

From these reports, we can infer that az-Zuhri possessed private notes which were originally only meant for his own use (lecture notes); after a while, he would pass them to others as a matter of convenience. Confirmation for the fact that he authenticated his material in a fairly careless fashion comes from other accounts.66 He was allegedly seen to authorize transmission of ‘books’ (scil. containing his ‘knowledge’) given to him without demanding them to be heard from him or read out to him. Forced by the pressure of an ever increasing number of students, az-Zuhri therefore used (perhaps as the first scholar to do so?) methods of transmission which in theory never gained full recognition but in practice always played an important role: kitābah, iḡāzah, munāwalah.67 Undoubtedly, az-Zuhri’s original position, according to which written records were to be avoided or only produced as short-term aides-mémoires, to be destroyed after use, proved to be impracticable over time. For his period, we have to distinguish between

1 unsystematic records for purely private purposes;
2 more or less elaborate lecture notes, which could be handed out to students for copying, but which were still only intended to be recited by a teacher;68 and
3 writings penned for a smaller or larger circle of laypersons, i.e. for reading (in particular official collections, produced by order of the caliphal court, and for the exclusive use of the court; real ‘books’).

Az-Zuhri accepted – or was unable to prevent – that his work gave rise to collections which belonged not only to the first, but also the second category; the line between the two is somewhat fuzzy.69 Az-Zuhri’s toleration of the emergence and even production on commission of writings of the third type, however, marked an important step towards a genuinely written literature. At the time, the audience
for these writings consisted almost entirely of members of the court: the caliph, princes and attendant nobles. Collections and books by az-Zuhri prompted by this ‘court impulse’ will be discussed below.70

By compiling and writing down ḥadīṯ collections commissioned by court, az-Zuhri breached a decades-old taboo against the production of (permanent) written religious works besides the Qur’an. His qualms are amply illustrated by his repeated urge to justify himself.71 The best known of his explanations was that he was compelled by the Umayyads. After setting the precedent, he could not very well prohibit others from compiling permanent written (ḥadīṯ-) collections.

Thus, after az-Zuhri, the opposition against recording ḥadīṯ in writing slowly disappeared in Medina. In spite of continuing support from certain legal scholars, e.g. Zayd ibn Aslam (d. 136/753),72 even az-Zuhri’s own students no longer felt bound by it: the historian Ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767) and the jurist Mālik ibn Anas (d. 179/795–6) were among the earliest Medinese scholars to write systematically arranged works (muṣannafāt) which even had their own titles (Kitāb al-muwatṭa‘ and Kitāb al-maḥāz).

Two of az-Zuhri’s students report that their teacher had only one or two books in his house, one a book with his tribal genealogy,73 the other containing some material on his tribal genealogy and poetry.74 The second report adds a remark by az-Zuhri denying that he kept in his house anything written down. Yet, the ḥadīṯ collections (dafāʿir) he wrote (i.e. dictated to scribes) by order of the court and which were removed from the library after the death of the caliph al-Walīd II (125/743) are said to have amounted to several camel loads.75

These reports need not contradict each other: apparently, according to the opponents of written records, to which az-Zuhri ultimately belonged, it was worse to possess and leave behind books (especially religious ones) oneself than to dictate or otherwise produce them and give them to others. In this context, we should remember the strong sentiment which mandated the destruction of such records (at the latest) on their owner’s death.76

We have two roughly comparable accounts about the Baṣrian traditionist and theologian Saʿīd ibn Abī ‘Arūbah (d. 156/773).77 He is reported on the one hand not to have owned a book and to have lectured from memory,78 on the other, he is said to have had a scribe who accompanied him everywhere and wrote his books.79

Az-Zuhri specialized in ḥadīṯ, law and history, especially maḥāzī. The relatively old muṣannaf work of ‘Abd ar-Razzāq ibn Hammām (d. 211/827) gives us some insight into the nature and form of the collection about the life of the Prophet which az-Zuhri passed on to his students. ‘Abd ar-Razzāq’s work contains a ‘book’ called (Kitāb) al-Maḥāzī; he derived almost all of the material collected therein from his teacher Māmar ibn Rāṣid (d. 154/770), who has to be regarded as the compiler or actual originator of this Kitāb al-maḥāzī. Māmar in turn draws roughly half of his traditions from his teacher az-Zuhri. The reports which are traced back to him are for the most part very long narratives called ḥadīṯ.80 Mostly, but not always, they have an isnād.81 At the beginning of the text of the respective traditions, some of the more important events (e.g. Badr and Uḥud) are dated.82
Yet az-Zuhri’s text was certainly not a well-ordered book unlike the one created by his student Ibn Ishāq. Like 'Abd ar-Razzāq-Ma'mar’s Kitāb al-mağāzī, it was probably no more than a collection of historical ḥadīth in some sort of order. But together with A. A. Duri, one could maintain that, after 'Urwah’s pioneering efforts, ‘Zuhri gave the first definite frame to the Sīra and that he drew its lines clearly, to be elaborated later in details only.’

1.3 Muḥammad ibn Ishāq

Muḥammad ibn Ishāq (d. 150/767–8), who was to become the most important authority in the field of mağāzī, studied the life of the Prophet even more thoroughly than his teacher az-Zuhri. In addition, he also studied fiqh, tafsīr and genealogy and transmitted ḥadīths relevant to these fields.

He was taught by, among others, his father Ishāq ibn Yasār and his two uncles; from his father, he received some material on the mağāzī. His most important teacher, however, was az-Zuhri. In addition, he attended the lectures of a number of other eminent scholars, e.g. 'Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ḥazm (d. 130/747 or later) and 'Āsim ibn 'Umar ibn Qatādah (d. 120/737). Interestingly, his informants included several members of 'Urwah’s family (two sons, two nephews, one grandnephew) and clients of the Zubayrid family such as Wahb ibn Kaysān (d. 127/744–5 or slightly later) and Yazīd ibn Rūmān (d. 130/747). For the most part, his authorities are scholars, but he also quotes ‘men from family X’ or ‘members of the Y tribe’. Converted descendants of the Jewish tribes expelled by the Prophet from Medina are said to have given Ibn Ishāq information about his respective campaigns. In addition, he had a reputation for transmitting from Jews and members of the ahl al-kitāb in general. Through research among ‘the people’, Ibn Ishāq extended the corpus of material which was transmitted in lecture circles at the time. One problem awaiting a satisfactory answer is the identity of those informants referred to by him as ‘someone I do not suspect has told me’ – the next link in the line of transmitters is generally a named and often well-known personality. Ibn Ḥibbān sums up Ibn Ishāq’s informants as follows: ‘Because of his desire and craving for knowledge (i.e. traditions), he used to record (material) from those who were higher than him, equal to him and lower than him.’

Ibn Ishāq’s generation in Medina no longer shied away from writing down traditions. This is explicitly noted in the context of a scandal provoked by his visits to the wife of Hišām ibn 'Urwah in order to collect knowledge (ṭalab al-'ilm): ‘The people of Medina regard writing as permitted’. Of course, students were expected to check the text of a tradition they had ‘merely copied’ (i.e. from a notebook) against a version they had ‘audited’ in a lecture course held by an authorized transmitter. This, however, did not always happen: Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal claimed that Ibn Ishāq was so keen on traditions that ‘he took peoples’ “books” and “inserted” them into his own’ (kāna ... ya ḥuṣu kutub an-nās fā-yaḍa'u-hā fī kutubi-hī). In the same manner, Ibn Ishāq’s own lecture notebooks were copied and disseminated among his students: we learn that the ‘books’ on mağāzī
and other subjects which Ibn Isḥāq transmitted from his father were passed around for copying and excerpting. In the field of fiqh, literacy seems to have attained such a high standard in contemporary Medina that we can already discern a ‘literature of the school for the school’. This development goes hand in hand with the remarkable emergence of books with regular titles (e.g. al-Muwatta’). The Muṣannaf of ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Abdallāh al-Māḍīṣūn (d. 164/780–1), a predecessor of Mālik ibn Anas’ Muwatṭa’, seems to have been disseminated quite widely in student circles: Mālik’s students brought a copy of this work to their teacher and showed it to him. Seeing the book, he felt compelled to write his own legal work, the Muwatṭa’. The achievements of al-Māṣūn and Mālik ibn Anas in the field of fiqh in Medina were paralleled by Ibn Isḥāq in the field of maḡāzī: he created a Muṣannaf i.e. he systematically arranged reports (ḥadīths) and documents about the Prophet’s life in an elaborately structured work (divided into chapters). His book easily surpasses the efforts of contemporary scholars: we now have the Kitāb al-maḡāzī of the Yemeni (originally Baṣrīan) Maʿmar ibn Rāṣid (d. 154/770) in the recension of his student ʿAbd ar-Razzāq and are able to compare it with Ibn Isḥāq’s text.

In parts of Maʿmar’s Kitāb al-maḡāzī, we find a rough chronological order in the succession of specific events in the life of the Prophet: after prehistory (digging the Zamzam well, the story of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib), we read about events in Mecca, then Medina; incidents relating to the period of the orthodox caliphs are dealt with after Muḥammad’s death; military campaigns are treated in roughly the ‘correct’ sequence (i.e. the sequence recognized in later chronologies): Badr (2/624) – ʿUḥud (3/625) – the Battle of the Trench (5/627) – Banū Qurayṣah (5/627) – Ḥaybar (7/628) – conquest of Mecca (8/630). But the treaty of al-Ḥudaybiyah (6/628) is inserted before the Battle of Badr; Biʾr Maʿūnah (4/625) occurs after the conquest of Mecca and the Battle of Ḥunayn (8/630). In addition to the chronological order, however, we can also discern something akin to a pragmatically approach: after finishing his account of these, as it were, official events, Maʿmar goes back in time and his narration starts again before the ḥijrah with the exodus to Abyssinia, this time concentrating on (mostly) private aspects of the Prophet’s life (e.g. the ḥijrah, the story of ʿĀʾishah’s slander) including his death.

Ibn Isḥāq’s Kitāb al-maḡāzī is superior to Maʿmar’s ‘book’ of the same name on several counts: it has a more consistent chronological structure and it adds introductory notes and comments. The former frequently date events and sum up the subsequently quoted material and the latter connect individual traditions. These and other devices produce a coherent narrative, a feature which is absent or only rudimentarily developed in Maʿmar’s text. Even more remarkable and unique for his time, Ibn Isḥāq structured his material in the light of a particular concept: he integrated “the account of the Prophet and the new faith into the history of divine revelation since the beginning of the world”. Subsequent Muslim scholars recognized Ibn Isḥāq’s distinctiveness. Ibn Ḥibbān wrote: ‘he belonged to the people who excelled in composing coherent narratives’ (wa[-huwa] min ʾahsan an-nās siyāqan li-l-ʾaḥbār). In modern
scientific parlance, Horovitz expressed the same idea as follows: ‘The material in traditions transmitted to him by his teachers, which he enlarged with numerous statements collected by himself, Ibn Isḥāq compiled into a well-arranged presentation of the life of the Prophet.’ Thus, Ibn Isḥāq’s Kitāb al-mağāzī is – to use two appropriate Greek terms – more of a syngramma than a hypomnēma, even if it was not intended (originally) for written dissemination in lay circles, but for oral delivery (lecture or dictation) to his students.

We have some details of the transmission method used by Ibn Isḥāq to pass on his own work. Yūnus ibn Bukayr (d. 199/815), one of his students and transmitters, relates:

All of Ibn Isḥāq’s narrative (ḥadīṯ) is ‘supported’ (musnad) because he dictated it to me (amlā-huʿalayya) or read it out to me (qaraʿa-huʿalayya) or reported it (from memory?) to me (ḥaddata-niʿbi-hū); but what was not ‘supported’ was recited [by a student] before Ibn Isḥāq (qirāʾah qurīʿalāʿībn Isḥāq). A change in the mode of ‘publishing’ only came about through the ‘court impulse’. According to a frequently quoted report in al-Ḫaṭīb al-Baḡdādī’s Taʿrīḫ Baḡdād, the caliph al-Manṣūr (r. 136/754–158/775) ordered Ibn Isḥāq to ‘write a book from the creation of Adam to the present day’ for the crown prince, the later caliph al-Mahdī. In addition to this work, entitled al-Kitāb al-kabīr, Ibn Isḥāq is said to have produced, also at the behest of the caliph, an abridgement (muḥtaṣar) of his book.

The information provided in the Taʿrīḫ Baḡdād is confirmed and supplemented by the following report from Ibn Saʿd:

Ibn Isḥāq was the first to collect (ḡamaʿa) and compose (allaifa) the mağāzī ([the book of] the Campaigns) of the Messenger of God. He moved away from Medina at an early point [the terminus post quem is 32/749–50]; none of them (scil. his students) apart from Ibrāhīm ibn Saʿd (d. 182/798 or a year later) had transmitted from him. He was (later) in the Ğazīrah [142/759–60 or slightly later] with al-ʿAbbās ibn Muḥammad and went (not much later) to Abū Ǧaʿfar (al-Manṣūr) in al-Ḥīrah. He then wrote for him (kataba la-hū) the mağāzī. The people of Kifāh therefore heard from [i.e. were taught by] him, just as the people of the Ğazīrah had heard from him when he stayed with al-ʿAbbās ibn Muḥammad; [later,] the people of Rayy also heard from him; thus, his transmitters from these lands are more numerous than the Medinese who transmitted from him.

The most obvious interpretation of this text would be as follows: from his time in Medina onwards, Ibn Isḥāq collected (ḡamaʿa) reports about the life of the Prophet. He started disseminating them in lectures in Medina (with only a small
number of students) and kept lecturing during his ten-year absence from his hometown and during his stay with the governor of Čažūrah, al-ʿAbbās. It was only at al-Manṣūr’s behest that he recorded his collection in his exhaustive syntagmatic historical work, the Kitāb al-kabīr (or Kitāb as-sūrah\textsuperscript{126} or Kitāb al-maḡāzī in the broader sense).

We cannot exclude the (never explicitly documented) possibility that Ibn Isḥāq had already redacted parts of his collections – e.g. as Abbott assumes, the maḡāzī proper – as a coherent narration and transmitted the material in this form\textsuperscript{127} before the intervention of the caliph. But we can establish on the basis of our sources that, before the redaction for the court, the publication of his material was restricted to his personal lectures, whereas he now, for the first time, produced a proper book for use by lay people (albeit only a small court circle).

The new mode of publication by no means replaced the old one: according to Ibn Saʿd’s report (confirmed by other sources), after finishing his redaction – perhaps even during it – Ibn Isḥāq continued to lecture on the Kitāb al-maḡāzī or dictate it to his students; at first (unsurprisingly) in Kūfah close to al-Ḥīrah, later in Rayy. Thus, in spite of its being a syngamma and a systematically arranged work (muṣannaf) and in spite of the fact that Ibn Isḥāq produced (at least one) conclusively edited copy of it for court use, the Kitāb al-maḡāzī is only extant in the numerous, more or less substantial and more or less divergent recensions by different students. As ‘literature of the school [exclusively] for the school’,\textsuperscript{128} it belongs to the class of works of which Nyberg once said: ‘Since they, as it were, lacked their own literary life, they were quickly lost, but the material they contained was used extensively’.\textsuperscript{129} The fact that Ibn Isḥāq held lectures on the (now edited) Kitāb al-maḡāzī does not rule out the possibility that he transmitted further historical traditions, especially ones relating to the life of Muḥammad, which did not enter the Kitāb al-maḡāzī. We also find traditions on Ibn Isḥāq’s authority, one version of which was included in the edited book, while another was transmitted outside it.\textsuperscript{130}

Ibn ‘Adī (d. 365/976),\textsuperscript{131} an eminent ḥadīṯ scholar, approvingly comments on the beneficial effect Ibn Isḥāq’s book is supposed to have had at court:

Even if Ibn Isḥāq’s only merit had been to turn the rulers away from devoting themselves to useless books and direct their attention to the study of the campaigns of the Messenger of God (maḡāzī rasūl Allāh), his mission in Mecca (mabʿat) and the beginnings of creation (mubtada’), this (alone) would qualify him for the renown which he was the first to merit. Others after him also wrote systematically arranged books (ṣannafa-ḥā) (about this subject), but they did not reach Ibn Isḥāq’s standard in this field.\textsuperscript{132}

The ‘useless books’ mentioned here were most probably works written by secretaries (kuttāb, ‘scribes’) for the caliphs since the end of the Umayyad era.\textsuperscript{133} They may also have included the first translations from Greek or Syriac. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the library of the first ‘Abbāsid caliphs contained books by ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Kātib (d. 132/750) and Ibn al-Muqaffa’ (d. c.139/757), but no biography of the Prophet!
Of non-Arab, mostly Persian extraction, these ‘scribes’ had established themselves since the end of the Umayyad era as a second scholarly class after Arab scholars. Their works differed from the products of the latter in spirit, content and form. To a large extent, they were translations from Persian, e.g. the (lost) Arabic version of the Ḥuday-nāmak by Ibn al-Muqaffa’ or his (extant) version of Kalīlah wa-Dīnnah; partly, they were original works (e.g. ’Abd al-Ḥamīd’s Rasāʾīl or Ibn al-Muqaffa’a’s Kitāb al-adab al-kabīr and his Risālah fī ṣ-ṣaḥābah). These original works are also thoroughly Persian in spirit. Formally, they were proper books or epistles, i.e. finalized written works, which could be stored in the libraries of the caliph and his nobles.¹³⁴

Thus, under al-Manṣūr, the ’Abbāsid caliphal court was, in spite of the alleged piety of the ruling family, scandalously devoid of books on the glorious Islamic past, while it boasted of writings on pre-Islamic Persian history, fables and mirrors for princes, perhaps even the first copies of works translated from Greek or Syriac. The reason: Arab scholars were accustomed to disseminating their knowledge through lecture circles without preserving it in conclusively edited books.

Excursus: The ‘court impulse’¹³⁵

The Umayyads wished to preserve knowledge about the Arab past and to have records of the Prophet’s words and deeds in their libraries. In earlier times, they invited scholars, who either did not have any written records or did not want to part with them, to hold lectures at the court. Scribes were charged with making notes.¹³⁶ Later – from ’Urwa’s generation onwards – we read about letters from caliphs to scholars containing questions which were answered in writing. One generation later – from the time of az-Zuhrī onwards – reports begin to inform us about large collections compiled on behalf of rulers and governors.

Muʿawiyah (r. 41/661–60/680) is reported to have given instructions that the (pseudo-) historical tales about Arab antiquity and early history in general, which the Yamani ’Abid ibn Šaryah (d. after 60/680) would recount at his behest,¹³⁷ be recorded in writing. He is also said to have instructed a scribe to write down sayings of the Prophet recited by Zayd ibn Ṭabīt (d. c. 45/666)¹³⁸ in answer to his (the caliph’s) questions.¹³⁹ Zayd, however, is said to have erased the record. While he was governor of Medina, the future caliph Marwān (r. 64/684–65/685) once reportedly expressed the desire to have a scribe record sayings of the Prophet preserved by Abū Hurayrah.¹⁴⁰

On the occasion of the conflict between the Northern and Southern Arab tribes under the Umayyads, Muʿawiyah’s governor in ’Irāq, Ziyād ibn Abīhi, was credited with being the first to commission a Kitāb al-maṭālib (‘Book of the Evil Deeds [scil. of the Arabs]’), apparently because of the ignominies he suffered as a result of his modest, non-Arab origins. He allegedly handed the book to his son with the following words: ‘Take this (book) as a help against the Arabs, for then they will leave you alone’.¹⁴¹

Al-Walīd ibn Yazīd (r. 125/743–126/744) is said to have collected poetry and reports about the early history and genealogy of the Arabs. To that end, he seems to have asked for the records of some learned transmitters (ruwāt); in any case,
we learn that, once they had been copied, he distributed them to Ḥammād ar-Rāwiyah (d. between 155/771 and 158/774) and Ġannād. Apart from Arab history, the Umayyads were also interested in the life of the Prophet. The heir to the throne and future caliph Sulaymān (r. 96/715–99/717) is said to have ordered a contemporary of ʿUrwah, Abān ibn ʿUṭmān (d. 96/714 or a few years later), to write down for him ‘the life (siyar) and campaigns (maḡāzī) of the Prophet’. A written version (which Abān had already produced before Sulaymān’s order) was given to ten scribes for copying. However, Sulaymān had the parchment leaves destroyed a little later because he wished to consult his father, the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 65/685–86/705). ʿAbd al-Malik apparently opposed maḡāzī stories for a long time. According to a parallel report, he ordered the burning of a ḥadīṯ al-maḡāzī he had seen in the hand of one of his sons (Sulaymān?) and advised him to study the Qur’ān and heed the sunnah. Thus, he had originally held the view that the Qur’ān should remain the only (religious) book of Islam. Later, he seems to have changed his mind: his interest in maḡāzī is documented by his written questions to ʿUrwah, answered by the latter in letters preserved by aṭ-Ṭabarī and others.

Az-Zuhrī is reported to have received a commission by the Umayyad governor Ḥālid al-Qasrī (d. 126/743–4) to write a book about genealogy and then another one on maḡāzī. A few days later, he is said to have interrupted his work on the genealogy book at the behest of al-Ḥālid to concentrate on the maḡāzī material. The report does not tell us whether he finished the maḡāzī work. Az-Zuhrī is also reported to have written an annalistic Asnān al-ḥulafāʾ, the first work of its kind; aṭ-Ṭabarī quotes two short passages from it.

After entering the service of the Umayyads, az-Zuhrī was frequently asked to provide written ḥadīṯ material. For ʿUmar II (r. 99/717–101/720), he allegedly compiled a large-scale ḥadīṯ collection (tadwīn); at the behest of Hišām ibn ʿAbd al-Malik (r. 105/724–125/743), he was required to dictate large quantities of ḥadīths for the education of the caliph’s sons. In one report, we hear about 400 traditions, which he dictated identically twice from memory to a scribe with a month intervening between the two dictations. Another report tells us that his dictation of ḥadīṯ material for the princes lasted an entire year.

All of these books and collections, however, with the one notable exception of ʿUrwah’s letters, disappeared with the fall of the Umayyads – if they were ever finished. Since these writings were produced in a single or at most a few copies for the caliphal library and the exclusive use of the ruler and his family, they could not, with the one exception mentioned above, be transmitted further. The ʿAbbāsids had to start again from scratch.

1.4 Transmitters of Ibn Isḥāq’s Kitāb al-maḡāzī:
Yūnus ibn Bukayr, Ziyād al-Bakkāʾī, Salamah ibn al-Faḍīl

Similar to the writings discussed above, Ibn Isḥāq’s al-Kitāb al-kabīr (Kitāb as-sūrah or Kitāb al-maḡāzī in the wider sense) did not survive in the complete
version produced for the caliphal library. What we have are more or less extensive reworkings and parts of the text which have reached us via later transmission by his students. In addition, there are numerous separately transmitted traditions, which do not seem to come from the edited work.155

Apart from the (lost) text commissioned by the court, Ibn Išāq thus did not intend his work to be published in writing for literary lay circles, but meant it to be orally recited to his students. The fact, however, that the Kitāb al-maḡāzī had been composed as a well-arranged and structured work becomes sufficiently clear from the later transmissions and recensions we have.

The most detailed information about Ibn Išāq’s transmission method comes from a report by his student Yūnus ibn Bukayr, which has been quoted above.156 The Kūfīan Ziyād ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Bakkā’ī (d. 183/799),157 another of his students, received the work twice in dictation.158 According to another report,159 al-Bakkā’ī is said to have sold his house and accompanied Ibn Išāq on his journeys until he had heard the Kitāb al-maḡāzī from him (in its entirety). The transmission line Ibn Išāq > al-Bakkā’ī is particularly important, because the redactor Ibn Hišām received his entire Ibn Išāq material from al-Bakkā’ī.160

A third student, Salamah al-Fadl (d. 191/806–7),161 claimed to have ‘heard’ (samī’tu) the Maḡāzī twice from Ibn Išāq,162 i.e. he received it through samā’ (lectures) (fa-kāna yaqūlu: ḥaddaṭa-nī bi-hī). In addition, he is said to have copied for Ibn Išāq the entire text of the work. It was then collated by Ibn Išāq against his own autograph copy (fa-nasaḥa li-bn Išāq al-Maḡāzī fa-ārada-hū Ibn Išāq). Salamah was also reported to have inherited his teacher’s written material;163 therefore, he was credited with having produced the most complete ‘books’ on the maḡāzī.164 At-Ṭabarī received most of his Ibn Išāq material from him. Ibn Sa’d notes that besides the Maḡāzī, Salamah also transmitted the Kitāb al-mubtada’ on the authority of Ibn Išāq.165

1.5 Redactors and adaptors of Ibn Išāq’s

Kitāb al-maḡāzī: Ibn Hišām, al-ʿUṭāridī, at-Ṭabarī

The ‘books’ of Ibn Išāq’s students are not preserved in their original form. The earliest material we have are works by his student’s students. The Egyptian (originally Baṣrī) ʿAbd al-Malik ibn Hišām (d. 218/834 or slightly earlier),166 a student of Ibn Išāq’s student al-Bakkā’ī,167 produced an abridged recension, not of the entire work, but mainly the mabat and maḡāzī parts.168 Together with occasional additions from other sources, he introduced (carefully marked) commentaries of his own. His ‘epitome’, entitled Sīrat Muḥammad rasūl Allāh,169 is extant in numerous manuscripts and serves today as our most important source for the life of Muḥammad.

At the beginning of his work,170 Ibn Hišām explained the principles governing his choice of texts.171 He wanted to exclude, for example, stories in which Muḥammad did not play a role; certain verses and objectionable passages; material which could offend people; and traditions not confirmed by his teacher al-Bakkā’ī.
Aṭ-Ṭabarî also redacted a large amount of Ibn Iṣḥāq-material – mostly, but not exclusively, on the authority of Ibn Ḥumayd Salamah. His traditions are taken not only from the mab‘ât and maḏazı, but also from the muḥtada‘ and ḥulafā‘ sections. The texts, however, were not collected in a book specifically dealing with the life of the Prophet, but were entered into his monumental Ta‘rīḫ and Taḥṣīr.

The situation is different again in the case of the reworking produced by the Kūfan ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār al-ʿUṭāridī (d. 272/886),172 studied by A. Guillaume173 and, more recently, M. Muranyi.174 Al-ʿUṭāridī’s material is derived from the maḏazı version of Ibn Iṣḥāq’s student Yūnus ibn Bukayr, who supplemented it with material collected from other authorities. Ibn Ḥaǧār writes: ‘He [scil. Yūnus ibn Bukayr] took Ibn Iṣḥāq’s text and linked it with (other) traditions (kāna ya ḥuḍu Iṣḥāq fa-yuṣilu-hū bi-l-aḥādīth).’175

Thus, the biographical literature speaks of Ibn Bukayr’s Ziyādat al-maḏāzī.176 This is a case in which a ṛawī’s addition to a transmitted work of a substantial amount of material collected by him almost impels us to regard him as an ‘author’ in his own right. This frequent phenomenon has already been treated elsewhere; there, I have proposed the term ‘adaptor’ (in German, Bearbeiter) for this type of transmitter/author.177

1.6 The subsequent transmission of Ibn Hišām’s Sīrah

To round off our survey, we will add a few remarks on the further transmission of a redacted version of the Kitāb al-maḏāzī, focusing on Ibn Hišām’s book.178 We now leave the early phase of the Islamic transmission system (first/seventh–second/eighth centuries) and enter its mature and late phase (after the third/ninth century).179

Ibn Hišām’s edited version of the Kitāb al-maḏāzī, his Kitāb sīrat rasūl Allāh, was also at first transmitted through the lecture system.180 Yet, since Ibn Hišām produced a ‘fixed’ text, which became the basis of the further transmission, we can be relatively certain that it did not undergo any substantial modification.

Good manuscripts open with ‘introductory’ isnāds detailing the chain of transmitters (riwāyah), which links the last owner of the manuscript, idealiter without interruption, with its reductor (here: Ibn Hišām) and beyond him with the author (here: Ibn Iṣḥāq). In this way, an entire book is regarded as something akin to a single tradition and supplied with an isnād. The technical terms (alfāẓ) of introductory isnāds (aḥbara-nā, qara tuʿalā, etc.) mostly indicate oral – better: ‘heard’ or ‘audited’ – transmission. As a rule, the mode of transmission of conclusively edited works (‘fixed texts’) was qirāʿah, i.e. a qārī (a ‘reader’, mostly a student) read out the work to its author or an authorized transmitter.181 In the process of reading out, the copy of the reader but also those of other students who attended the lecture session, could and should be ‘monitored’ (collated and corrected) by the author or transmitter of the work. In practice, however, some time often elapsed between ‘hearing’ a book in a lecture and producing one’s own written version (mostly by using as exemplar the copy of another member of the circle).182
According to the introductory isnāds (riwāyah) of all three of the manuscripts used by Wüstenfeld for his Sīrah edition, the Mālikī traditionist Abū Saʿīd ‘Abd ar-Raḥīm ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Barqī (d. 286/899) transmitted the entire work on the authority of its redactor Ibn Hišām; according to the isnāds of two of these manuscripts, al-Barqī read it out to Ibn Hišām (qirā‘ah). From al-Barqī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh ibn Ġa‘far ibn al-Ward (d. 351/962) received the text and transmitted it to several students by ‘reading (it) out in his own voice’ (qirā‘atan min lafẓihī).

In the introduction (muqaddimah) to his classical commentary on Ibn Hišām’s Sīrah, ar-Rawḍ ‘al-unuf al-bāsim, ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn ‘Abdallāh as-Suhaylī (d. 581/1185) provides an introductory isnād for his book. It also leads to Ibn al-Ward and al-Barqī; therefore, these two scholars must have played a central role in the systematic transmission and dissemination of the book.

This is the introductory isnād (riwāyah) of the Leipzig manuscript; the chain of transmitters leads via the redactor (Ibn Hišām) all the way to the author himself:

al-ġuz‘ al-awwal min Sīrat sayyidī-nā rasūl Allāh (ṣ), ḥaddaṭa-nā ... Ahmad ibn ‘Awn Allāh ... qāla ḥaddaṭa-nā bi-hī ... ‘Abdallāh ibn Ġa‘far ibn al-Ward qirā‘atan min lafẓihī, qāla ḥaddaṭa-nā ... ‘Abdarraḥīm ibn ‘Abdallāh ... ibn Abī Zur‘ah az-Zuhrī al-Barqī, qāla ḥaddaṭa-nā ... ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Hišām ... qāla ḥaddaṭa-nā Ziyād ibn ‘Abdallāh ... al-Bakkā‘ī ‘an Ibn Ishāq

The first part of the biography of our lord the Apostle of God. Aḥmad ibn Awn Allāh reported to us ... he said: ‘Abdallāh ibn Ġa‘far ibn al-Ward reported it to us by reading (it) out in his own voice; he said: ‘Abdarraḥīm ibn ‘Abdallāh ... ibn Abī Zur‘ah az-Zuhrī al-Barqī reported to us; he said: ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Hišām reported to us; he said: Ziyād ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Bakkā‘ī reported to us, on the authority of Ibn Ishāq

At this late stage of the Islamic transmission system, it was usual practice for the transmitters’ own contributions to be confined to commentaries and glosses on the now ‘stable’ text; these contributions were for the most part clearly distinguished from the transmitted text. In the notes to his Sīrah edition (volume II), Wüstenfeld documented the marginal notes he found in his manuscripts. Variants found in different manuscripts of the text of Ibn Hišām’s Sīrah are throughout graphical in nature or of a kind regularly occurring in written transmission.

1.7 Written and oral transmission in the early Medinese teaching system

In the preceding discussion, I have tried to pinpoint the transmission methods of the members of a particularly important line of transmitters (‘Urwhah < az-Zuhrī < Ibn Ishāq < al-Bakkā‘ī < Ibn Hišām), mostly on the basis of biographical literature, but, where possible, also on the basis of extant texts. This diachronic
survey has produced important findings concerning the nature and development of the early Islamic transmission system in Medina. I focused specifically on the transmitters’ views regarding the use of writing and the gradual emergence and expansion of literacy. My findings so far can be summed up as follows.

According to traditional accounts, scholars in Medina in the second half of the first century AH had strong reservations against writing down religious traditions. This led, for example, to the alleged erasing of ‘Urwah’s records, which he had produced as a mnemonic aid. In Medina, these reservations persisted (in theory) into the following generation of which az-Zuhri was the most prominent representative, but they did not have any practical consequences: az-Zuhri wrote or dictated numerous kutub. The following generation, that of Ibn Ishāq and Mālik ibn Anas, saw the emergence of the first muṣannaf works. Written recording was now generally regarded as permissible, even normal, in Medina. The situation was different in ‘Irāq, especially in Baṣrah (but also in Kūfah): muṣannifūn such as Sa‘īd ibn Abī ‘Arūbah (d. 156/773, a contemporary of Ibn Ishāq)191 and Wakī ibn al-Ǧarrāḥ (d. 197/812)192 still felt that they had to maintain the pretence that they managed without the help of written records.193

The use of writing by scholars is not automatically equivalent to the production of proper books for wider literary circles (a reading public). We have to picture the development in early Islam as follows: written records were at first produced as mnemonic aids (in ‘Urwah’s generation); then, lecture notes appeared (with az-Zuhri,194 perhaps even with ‘Urwah); and only with the muṣannafūn (Ma‘mar ibn Rāṣid, Mālik ibn Anas and other scholars of their generation) did writings become ordered works (in the case of these authors, works divided into chapters). With its coherent narrative structure and the overarching idea which frames its composition, Ibn Ishāq’s Kitāb al-maḡāzī is unique among the muṣannafūt.

The muṣannaf works of Mālik, Ibn Ishāq and their contemporaries still did not qualify as ‘literature’ proper – they lacked widespread dissemination to a reading lay public – but they were rather a ‘literature of the school for the school’. In Ibn Ishāq’s generation, the publication of these muṣannafūt took place in student circles through oral presentation (recitation or dictation).

At an early stage (until c. 800 CE, sometimes even later), Islamic scholars did not, of their own accord, produce editions of their collections intended for a wider lay audience, a reading public. Such conclusive redactions of books as were written were due to commissions – or pressure – from the court. The edited versions of the maḡāzī collections compiled by az-Zuhri for Ḥālid al-Qasrī and by Ibn Ishāq for al-Manṣūr addressed a restricted group of readers at the court. Thus, they existed outside the normal transmission process and did not survive.

Does Ibn Ishāq’s Kitāb al-maḡāzī constitute ‘historiography’ and literature proper? For the finalized edition Ibn Ishāq is said to have submitted to the caliphal court, the answer has to be ‘yes’. The material he passed on to his students and which we today only have in the different versions they transmitted, however, was exclusively ‘literature of the school for the school’; it was largely linked to his personal lectures. It only became ‘historiography’ and literature
proper through its redaction by the students of his students and later scholars on
the basis of lecture notes, dictated material, copies of written records etc.

I will now try to assess the role and extent of orality in early Islamic historical
tradition with the help of the material discussed so far. The following remarks
operate with the terminology developed in ethnological and historical research on
the oral transmission of reports about events (oral tradition research). The key
terms are ‘oral history’ and ‘oral tradition’.

In his study Oral Tradition as History, an easily accessible overview of oral
tradition research, J. Vansina defines ‘oral history’ as follows: ‘The sources of
oral historians are reminiscences, hearsay, or eyewitness accounts about events
and situations which are contemporary, that is, which occurred during the lifetime
of the informants.’ Oral traditions, on the other hand, ‘are no longer contempo-
rary. They have passed from mouth to mouth, for a period beyond the lifetime of
the informant.’ Thus, they are ‘memories of memories’.

ʿUrwah – like other scholars of his generation – received some of his material
from contemporaries of the reported events, but some also from informants who
could only offer ‘memories of memories’. Reports he attributed to ʿĀʾišah consist
of both her own experiences and the stories of others she passed on. Therefore,
his sources were partly testimonies of ‘oral history’, partly ‘oral traditions’.

The oral character of his sources would not be in question even if some of his
authorities owned a booklet (ṣaḥīḥah) to record the words of the Prophet or oth-
ers. The majority and most important of his informants did not own such written
records. ʿĀʾišah especially, who, according to the isnāds, contributed two-thirds
of ‘Urwah’s material, answered her nephew’s questions orally and told him her
stories.

However, the form of the ‘Urwah material available to us is not the form it had
when he recited it. What we have today reached us via az-Zuhrī and other schol-
ars of that generation; even their versions are extant only in further
transmission. Since ‘oral history’ becomes ‘oral tradition’ after a generation,
‘Urwah’s reports received by az-Zuhrī and his contemporaries would have to be
treated as ‘oral tradition’. At this point, however, we have to ask whether the bulk
of az-Zuhrī’s sources can be regarded as oral. This might be correct for one part
of his material, which he drew from non-scholarly informants or acquired in
answer to his questions. But for the rest, the label ‘oral’ is problematic.

First, of course, because some scholars of the previous generation such as
‘Urwah, but also az-Zuhrī himself, had written records which they used for trans-
mittting traditions (orally). Secondly, az-Zuhrī’s (and Urwah’s) material differs
from what we normally understand to be ‘oral tradition’ (specifically structured
narrations in a society without a writing system) because of the systematic
impulse behind its collection.

Our understanding of science is of course different from theirs; still, scholars
of this era also strove to find out what actually happened, not what people thought
had happened. Their endeavour to establish a chronology, noticeable in az-Zuhrī
(But at best only rudimentary in ‘Urwah’s material), also arose from this system-
atic impulse: it is not characteristic of oral tradition. ‘Lecture system’ would be
an appropriate term for this mode of transmission created by early Islam (by the
generations from 'Urwah to Ibn Ishāq), which was ‘no longer’ purely oral, but
‘not yet’ purely written.

The lecture system neither supplanted oral transmission in one fell swoop nor are the two categories clearly distinguishable from one another in each case. As a kind of ‘disciplined’oral tradition, it increasingly crystallized in a number of places out of a purely oral tradition and grew to monopolize transmission over time. In the generation of Ibn Ishāq and the other muṣannifūn, this process had not yet been completed.

Ibn Ishāq continued to collect oral traditions (from members of his family and his tribe); he asked questions and recorded the answers. But he drew the largest part of his material, especially reports on the principal events of early Islam, from the lecture system, e.g. many traditions from the lectures of az-Zuhrī, who in turn had received them from 'Urwah.

The oral dimension was never entirely displaced in the Islamic transmission system, even after genuine historiographical and other works such as Ibn Hīšām’s Śīrah, a recension of Ibn Ishāq’s Kitāb al-maḡāzī, became available. It was preserved, at least as an ideal, down to the latest phase of the transmission system: all works, even the conclusively edited ones, were supposed to be disseminated not only through copying, but by samā‘ and qirā‘ah, hearing and reading out – although this did not happen very often in practice.

1.8 Summary

So far, our study has led to the following conclusions:

- From its very beginnings down to its latest stage, systematic teaching in Islam mainly consisted of the lecture system: the teacher – or his proxy – recited, students ‘heard’.
- Orality of transmission in the lecture system was in the beginning a reality and intentional; only the Qur’ān was to be ‘scripture’.
- In its mature and late stage, orality was retained in the Islamic teaching system in some aspects or at least stipulated (‘heard’ or ‘audited’ transmission) for finalized books.
- Literacy infiltrated the system at a very early stage (written aides-mémoires) and grew steadily in importance (lecture notes; then, ‘literature of the school for the school’).
- The composition of proper books (and the compilation of large collections) received a decisive boost from the ‘court impulse’.
- Finally, literacy became the more important vehicle of transmission, even though this fact was never fully acknowledged.
2 The text in the transmission process

Muḥammad’s first revelation (the *iqra’* narration)

In the first chapter, I collected information about the nature of the early Islamic tradition mainly from biographical literature. Now, I will test and supplement our findings on the basis of two case studies. I will document the fortunes of traditions chosen from two tradition complexes on their way from their (assumed) first narrator to their redaction in a work extant today.

In keeping with our interests in the first chapter, I will focus on tradition complexes which come with a chain of transmitters beginning with ʿĀʾišah and leading via ʿUrwh and az-Zubārī to Ibn ʿIshāq. The first of our case studies, intended for the most part to give us insight into the philological issues of early Islamic historical tradition (stability or variability of the text in the course of transmission; literal vs. free transmission of the text), concentrates on one – or several – tradition(s) reporting Muḥammad’s first revelation experience. Central to them is the so-called *iqra’* narration. The reports relate the following incident: ‘An angel’ (later identified as Nāmūs or Gabriel) appears to Muḥammad and summons him (according to the main transmission: forces him) to recite, showing him the first five verses of sūrah 96 which begins with *iqra’ bi-smi rabbi-ka*. In the course of the narration, we also encounter the Prophet’s wife Ḥadīṯah, who comforts her husband, disconcerted and troubled as he is by his vision, and her cousin Waraqah ibn Nawfal, who predicts his future and final triumph.

Our study is based on an extensive corpus (as exhaustive as possible) of traditions narrating the incident as outlined above (or in a similar manner). In accordance with our previous remarks, we will focus our attention on traditions reported on the authority of ʿUrwh ibn az-Zubayr (from ʿĀʾišah) as the original informant. Additionally, we have to consider a number of traditions with different *isnāds* which are similar enough to the ʿUrwh tradition to presume a close relationship or even an identical origin.

The traditions in question have been studied by Sellheim, Juynboll, Motzki and Rubin. I have adopted the method of ḥadīṯ analysis developed by Juynboll, who improved upon and refined Schacht’s approach. As an extension to Juynboll’s method, I supplement his formal analysis with an examination of the contents of the traditions, including careful textual comparisons.

Sellheim also undertook such a study of the contents of the traditions. He did not, however, operate on the basis of a corpus, but only with a few selected
versions of two traditions; drawing sweeping conclusions from the differences between these unsystematically examined versions, he arrived at several problematic results.  

Rubin and Motzki mainly focused on the interpretation of Sūrat al-ʿalaq. Thus, their publications deal with questions which are not central to our concerns. Still, some of their findings are of relevance and will be indicated in the notes.

In the past, the iqraʾ-narration has been studied by Nöldeke and Schwally, Buhl, Andrae, Bell, Widengren, Paret, Lohmann, Rudolph, von Stülpnagel, and Watt. In addition, almost every book which deals with Muḥammad in some detail comments on his first revelation. Due to their importance for the study of the history of transmission, we must pay special attention to the discussion in Sprenger’s biography of the Prophet. In what follows, we will go back to Sprenger’s findings on one very important point.

A great number of compilers have preserved versions of the relevant tradition(s), among them Ibn Hišām, at-Ṭabarī, ‘Abd ar-Razzāq, Ibn Saʿd, al-Buḥārī, Muslim ibn al-Ḥaǧǧāǧ and at-Tirmiḏī. The largest group has an isnād such as n.n. < az-Zuhrī < ‘Urwah < ‘Āʾišah. The relevant ḥadīths all begin with ‘The first (signs) of revelation appearing to the messenger of God were true dream visions in his sleep. Each dream vision he experienced came unto him like the crack of dawn’ (the wording may display minor modifications).

2.1 The Zuhrī recension

2.1a Content, nature and lines of transmission

Before I proceed, I will outline the contents of the most complete version of the recension, transmitted by ‘Abd ar-Razzāq (< Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī < ‘Urwah < ‘Āʾišah):

1 Muḥammad’s true dream visions appearing ‘like the crack of dawn’ as the first marks of his prophethood; his religious practices (taḥannuṭ) in solitude atop mount Ḥirā’ (taḥannuṭ narration).

2 Unexpected appearance of the angel (who calls Muḥammad ‘messenger of God’*) in a cave on mount Ḥirā’.

3 (Direct speech of Muḥammad:) The angel’s request to recite (iqraʾ) and Muḥammad’s refusal: ‘I am not one to recite’ (mā anā bi-qāriʾ). The angel presses Muḥammad. The scene is repeated twice. After pressing Muḥammad for a third time, revelation of sūrah 96: 1–5 (iqraʾ narration).

4 Muḥammad’s dread and return to Ḥadiḡah. His exclamation: ‘Wrap me up’ (zammilū-nī). His dread subsides (Ḥadiḡah narration I).

5 Muḥammad’s conversation with Ḥadiḡah (‘I fear for my soul’). Ḥadiḡah comforts him. Her praise (expressed in parallel phrases of Muḥammad) (Ḥadiḡah narration II).

6 Muḥammad’s and Ḥadiḡah’s visit to Waraqah ibn Nawfal. (Information about Waraqah.*)
7 Discussion with Waraqah. Waraqah’s identification of the angel as the Nāmūs and his prophecy: the expulsion and eventual triumph of Muḥammad.

a (List of revelations directly following on sūrah 96: sūrah 68, sūrah 74, then 93.*)

8 Report about Waraqah’s subsequent death (Waraqah narration).

9 (Temporary) suspension of the revelation (fatrah narration).

10 (The angel appears anew.*) Muḥammad’s intention to commit suicide. During his attempt to throw himself off the mountain, Gabriel appears (on the horizon**) and addresses Muḥammad as ‘messenger of God’ (ufūq narration).

11 Calming and prevention of Muḥammad’s suicide by the angelic vision.32

12 ([New tradition33 with the isnād Ma’mar < az-Zuhrī < Abū Salamah ibn ‘Abd ar-Rahmān (d. 94/712–13 or 10 years later)34 < Ėlūbīr ibn ‘Abdallāh (d. 73/692–3 or later)35 < Muḥammad:] The Prophet’s own report about the fatrah (temporary suspension of the revelation). At its end vision of the angel of Ḥirā’, sitting on a throne on the horizon [ufūq narration].36 Dread and return of Muḥammad; his exclamation zamāli-nī ... fā-daṭṭirū-nī, ‘Wrap me up, wrap me up!’ Revelation of sūrah 74.)

The nature of this report concerning Muḥammad’s first revelation experience is wholly determined by the ‘eerie vision in the cave’.37

In Figure 2.1 the transmission lines of the ḥadīṯ according to their isnāds are outlined. If we compare the isnāds given by the compilers, we notice that all of them converge on az-Zuhrī. For example, Ibn Isḥāq received the tradition from his teacher az-Zuhrī, as did Ma’mar ibn Rāṣid, the teacher of ‘Abd ar-Razzāq. Before az-Zuhrī, the transmission follows a single strand, originating with Ṭāʾīʾisah and passed on by ‘Urwah to az-Zuhrī. Thus, the diagram consists of two distinct parts with az-Zuhrī as their link. With Schacht/Juynboll, we can label az-Zuhrī the ‘common link’, CL, of the chain.

Since so many independent compilers trace the ḥadīṯ back to az-Zuhrī (and only to him), we can, for the time being, assume that it was he who disseminated it. The following analysis of the respective texts will confirm our assumption.

2.1b Motifs

For our study, Andrae’s findings are fundamental: the complete version of the report is a conglomerate consisting of four main elements or motifs (Andrae calls them ‘legends’): the tahāmmuṭ narration (Muḥammad’s solitary devotional practices on mount Ḥirā’); the iqra’ narration (in the strict sense) (the appearance of an angel who forces Muḥammad to recite sūrah 96: 1–5); the Waraqah narration and the ufūq narration (the appearance of an angel on the horizon addressing Muḥammad as prophet).38 In addition, Lohmann proposes a distinction between the following three elements:39 dream visions; the Ḥadiḡah narration
Figure 2.1 The Zuhrī recension of the *iqra’* narration
(I. the zamāilā-nī motif; II. Ḫadiğah’s comfort and praise of Muḥammad) and the fatrāh (temporary suspension of the revelation) narration. It should be pointed out that the fatrāh narration, if it occurs at all in traditions according to az-Zuhrī, invariably contains the ufuq motif and that the angelic vision concluding the fatrāh is, in the Zuhrī transmission, always occasioned by Muḥammad’s intention to commit suicide.

For az-Zuhrī, the iqra` narration is at the centre of the first revelation experience. The ufuq narration, which in other transmissions serves as the framework for the first revelation, plays only a minor role.

Proof for the conglomerate nature of the tradition is the fact that practically all of its components occur in isolation or connected with other motifs in other transmissions. Below, we will have to inquire whether the elements were combined by az-Zuhrī (as Andrae maintains) or by an earlier authority.

Distinct from this question is another one, to which we will turn first: how did az-Zuhrī’s transmitters treat his text? Did they always transmit his complete version or only parts of it?

2.1c The text stock

Some transmitters passed on az-Zuhrī’s traditions as a whole, some in shortened or fragmentary form. In addition to the arrangement of the text and some characteristic variants, it is the text stock of the respective versions in particular which differentiates them. For example, all transmitters depending on Ibn Isḥāq (Ibn Ḥiṣām, al-ʿUṯārīdī and at-Tirmīḍī) present only the first part, roughly four sentences, until min an yahluwa waḥda-hū (section 1 of our outline). Thus, we can infer that their model, Ibn Isḥāq’s version of the Zuhrī tradition, already took this abbreviated form. We call this the short version I (SV I).

Al-Balāḏurī, transmitting directly from Ibn Sā’d, has another, slightly longer, short version (SV II), which corresponds to sections 1 and 2 of our outline. It is derived from Ma’mar ibn Rāšid (and another of az-Zuhrī’s students) via Ibn Sā’d’s teacher, al-Wāqidī. In his Aḥbār Makkah, al-Azraqī included a version of medium length (MV I) covering sections 1–3. Via two transmitters, it also leads us back to Ma’mar.

In addition to SV II mentioned above, al-Balāḏurī also knows the last part of the tradition according to Ma’mar, the so-called fatrāh annex (which he does not transmit on the authority of Ibn Sā’d). This part of the Ma’mar version occurs separately in at-Ṭabarī as well.

We do not know who was responsible for the various abbreviations: was it Ma’mar himself, who, in different lectures, recited versions of varying length or sometimes only parts of the tradition? Or later transmitters, e.g. al-Wāqidī (in the case of his SV II)? The latter is more likely, since the shortenings seem to have been introduced in the process and for reasons of redaction. Ma’mar, however, who transmitted directly from the CL, az-Zuhrī, knew his complete version and passed it on: his student ‘Abd ar-Razzāq and transmitters depending on him (Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Ḥībbān) received a complete text.
It was not only Maʿmar, but also two of az-Zuhri’s other students who transmitted long versions of the story, ʿUqayl ibn Ḥālid (d. 141/758–9 or slightly later)\(^{53}\) and Yūnus ibn Yazīd al-Aylī (d. 159/775–6).\(^{54}\) Yet, the Muslim (and Bayhaqī) transmissions\(^{55}\) of Yūnus’ version lack sections 8–11 and al-Buḥārī’s transmission\(^{56}\) of the ʿUqayl version is missing sections 10–11 of our outline. In both cases, the last part is left out. It reports Muḥammad’s intention, during the fatrah, to commit suicide and his hindrance by a second angelic vision (fatrah annex). While this passage apparently never formed part of the ʿUqayl version, we find a full Yūnus version including the fatrah annex in Abū ‘Awānah’s Musnad.\(^{57}\)

ʿUqayl’s long version (which, however, does not have the fatrah annex, cf. above immediately) occupies a prominent place in al-Buḥārī’s Ṣaḥīḥ: as the third tradition in its first chapter entitled Kayfa kāna bad’ al-waḥy it is placed at the very beginning of the entire work.\(^{58}\) But more frequently, the version according to ʿUqayl was transmitted in an abbreviated form without sections 1–3 of our outline. This fragmentary version and no other, which al-Bayhaqī quotes verbatim in his Dalā’il an-nubūwah,\(^{59}\) has reached Muslim ibn al-Ḥaǧǧāǧ.\(^{60}\) After presenting Yūnus’ full and unmixed version (without fatrah annex) in the chapter Badʿ al-waḥy of his Ṣaḥīḥ,\(^{61}\) Muslim explicitly points out the fragmentary character of the ʿUqayl version, then quotes the missing piece and indicates its characteristic variants. On the other hand, al-Buḥārī, in addition to ʿUqayl’s full version, also knows the latter’s version with the fragmentary beginning.\(^{62}\) It seems as if both versions were passed on side by side for a time\(^{63}\) (until Yaḥyā ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Bukayr, d. 231/845).\(^{64}\)

In al-Buḥārī, we find complete texts of the tradition twice more, but both times in combined versions: in the Kitāb at-tafsūr on the authority of ‘Uqayl and Yūnus (without fatrah annex) and in the Kitāb at-taʿbū on the authority of ʿUqayl and Abū ʿAbd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar (with fatrah annex). In the following discussion, we will label as LV I the long versions according to Maʿmar, ‘Uqayl and Yūnus, which exhibit (apart from the fatrah annex) few textual differences. Because of their resemblance, al-Buḥārī could easily have combined these versions.

Yet another long version, reported by at-Ṭabarī\(^{65}\) on the authority of az-Zuhri’s student an-Nuʿmān ibn Rāṣid\(^{66}\) via three transmitters, varies substantially from LV I in both text stock and arrangement. Therefore, we have to treat it separately from LV I\(^{67}\) and will label it LV II.

In addition, there is a fragmentary version (FV) transmitted by Abū Dāwūd at-Ṭayālisī\(^{70}\) on the authority of another of az-Zuhri’s students, Ṣāliḥ ibn Abī l-Aḥḍar.\(^{71}\) It consists of two fragments, which at-Ṭayālisī lists as two separate ḥadīths, nos. 1469 and 1467. They contain the beginning of the text (sections 1 and 2) and the events after Muḥammad’s return to Ḥadīḡah except for the fatrah annex (sections 4–7 of our outline).

Finally, we have to return again to the last part of our tradition, the fatrah annex (sections 9–11). Maʿmar’s version of it has been transmitted separately at least twice: at-Ṭabarī, who does not know Maʿmar’s full version, transmits the fatrah annex with the isnād Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Aʿlā (d. 245/859–60)\(^{72}\) <
Muḥammad ibn Ṭawr (d. 190/805–6)⁷³ < Maʿmar. Al-Balāḏurī⁷⁴ transmits the annex with the isnād Šurayḥ ibn Yūnus < Sufyān (which one?) < Maʿmar.⁷⁵ Immediately after this annex, ʿAbd ar-Razzāq, ʿat-Ṭabarī, al-Balāḏurī and also Abū ʿAwānah quote a further tradition on the fatrah incident and the revelation following it, sūrah 74. The first three compilers transmit this report on the authority of Maʿmar, while Abū ʿAwānah adds it according to Yūnus. In ʿAbd ar-Razzāq and Abū ʿAwānah, it is preceded by the new isnād az-Zuhrī < Abū Salamah ibn ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān < Ėbīr ibn Abdallāh < Prophet. ʿat-Ṭabarī and al-Balāḏurī add it without a separate isnād.⁷⁶

2.1d The arrangement of the text

The two long versions (LV I and II) differ in the sequence of events: in LV II, the passage reporting Muḥammad’s return to Ḥadīḏah and his plea to be wrapped up (section 4 in our outline) precedes the revelation experience (section 3). Between these two sections, we find in LV II the section describing the second coming of the angel and Muḥammad’s intention to commit suicide (section 10). In LV I, this report is part of the fatrah annex.

The report about Waraqah’s death (section 8) and the temporary suspension of revelation (section 9) are missing in LV II. The version has a different ending: it mentions the revelations following that of sūrah 96: 1–5 (section 7a).

According to Andrae’s and Lohmann’s analysis, the order of main motifs in LV I is therefore as follows:

Dream visions—taḥannūṯ—appearance of the angel—iqra’—Ḥadīḏah I and II—Waraqah—fatrah (suicidal intentions and ufq),

whereas in LV II, it is:

Dream visions—taḥannūṯ—appearance of the angel—Ḥadīḏah I—suicidal intentions—ufq (barely elaborated)—iqra’—Ḥadīḏah II—Waraqah.

The differences in textual arrangement lead to substantial differences in the meaning of the respective versions. We cannot ascertain with any certainty whether both arrangements originated with az-Zuhrī – it is conceivable that he recited different versions of the story on different occasions – or whether the responsibility lies with a transmitter between az-Zuhrī and ʿat-Ṭabarī or, finally, with ʿat-Ṭabarī himself. I will return to this question below.⁷⁷

2.1e Do the texts correspond verbatim or only thematically?

This issue requires us to dig somewhat deeper. It makes sense to begin the analysis with some more recent texts, comparing versions resulting from a later branching (i.e. one occurring ‘above’ the main branch in Figure 2.1, the CL az-Zuhrī),⁷⁸ and then to go back in history, comparing texts which originated from an earlier
branching point, until we arrive at the versions which share the main branching point only, the CL az-Zuhri.

2.1e(α) The ‘Abd ar-Razzāq branch; further branches on the same level

Of all PCLs of the second generation after the CL, the ‘Abd ar-Razzāq branch is most suitable for analysis: his own version is extant in its ‘original’ form and we have a number of sub-versions depending on it (Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Ibn Ḥibbān, al-Bayhaqī, Abū Nu‘aym and al-Wāḥidī). Comparing these texts with each other, we observe few variants and a high degree of literal concordance. Al-Wāḥidī has a truncated end without the Waraqah narration and subsequent material. It can easily be explained on redactional grounds: these sections were uninteresting for al-Wāḥidī, whose main concern was the ‘occasions of revelation’ (āshāb an-nuzūl). In addition, we find few rearrangements (in some sub-versions, the parallel phrases of Ḥadīṯah’s praise of Muḥammad are reversed) and deletions of single words or word groups (the three attempts of the angel to make Muḥammad recite are not always elaborated in detail; the abovementioned parallel phrases are not always complete).

Three extant versions emanate from another PCL of the second generation after az-Zuhri, Yūnus ibn Bukayr (d. 199/815), two of them are to be found in al-‘Uṯāridī’s work and one in at-Tirmidhī’s. This instance is less significant than the previous, because it is a short version (SV I) and the text sample is therefore comparably small. Still, it confirms the previous findings: here, too, we find only some minor variants, e.g. an active verbal form in one sub-version of al-‘Uṯāridī (wa-ḥabbaba ilāh ‘azza wa-ġalla ilay-hī l-ḥalwah) instead of a passive form without expression of the subject (wa-ḥubbība ilay-hī l-ḥalwah) in the other ‘Uṯāridī sub-version and in at-Tirmidhī. Interestingly enough, the genre of works from which the versions in question have been taken (a maqāṭī work and a collection of traditions) did not exert any influence on the wording or the length of the tradition. Thus, there is no ‘historical version’ as opposed to a ‘ḥadīṯ version’.

There is not much to say about another PCL of this generation, ‘Abdallāh ibn Wahh (d. 197/812), who transmits on the authority of Yūnus ibn Yazīd < az-Zuhri: the two long, unmixed sub-versions reported on his authority in Muslim’s and Abū ‘Awānah’s work show little variation. The PCL al-Layṯ ibn Sa’d (< ‘Uqayl < az-Zuhri) and sub-versions depending on him will be dealt with below.

To sum up, our samples show that after c. 800, parallel texts display only a minimal degree of variation.

2.1e(β) The Ma’mar branch

Let us now go back one generation. By far the most important PCL of this time is Ma’mar ibn Rāṣid, followed (at a distance) by Ibn Ishāq and Yūnus ibn Yazīd. A fragment (the fatrāh annex), a short version (SV II), a medium version (MV) and a long version (LV I) originate from Ma’mar. The latter is entirely dependent on ‘Abd ar-Razzāq. Thus, Ma’mar’s version has been subjected to
more substantial revisions than the sub-version of ʿAbd ar-Razzāq a generation later. They were probably undertaken by students for redactional reasons.95

In the Maʿmar branch, the transmissions of Ibn Saʿd, al-Azraqī and ʿAbd ar-Razzāq (as a representative for the entire ʿAbd ar-Razzāq branch) are good candidates for comparison. In the short passage he transmits,96 Ibn Saʿd has two additional sentences compared to the remaining transmissions: fa-makatá ... wa-lam yakun sayʾahhabba ... A comparison with the Ibn Ishāq branch97 reveals that the sentences are part of the original text stock of the tradition. Since Ibn Saʿd < al-Wāqidī transmits the Zuhār version not only via Maʿmar, but also via another transmitter, there are two possible explanations for the extra material:

1. Maʿmar still retained the extra material. ʿAbd ar-Razzāq discarded it.
2. Maʿmar had already discarded the material. Ibn Saʿd < al-Wāqidī received it via the other transmitter from the original Zuhār version.

The second explanation is more likely, because the extra material is missing in al-Azraqī’s version, which also depends on Maʿmar. On the other hand, at-Ṭayālīsī, who does not depend on Maʿmar, preserved a chunk of the first additional sentence (fa-kāna yamkutu l-ayyām), even though he substantially shortens and divides the tradition into two pieces.

Al-Azraqī’s version (MV) generally shows few differences to the versions of the ʿAbd ar-Razzāq branch. These differences (apart from the abridged end) would not be more far-reaching than those between the respective versions of the ʿAbd ar-Razzāq branch if al-Azraqī did not have a surprise in store at the end of the text: after the angel’s third request to recite, Muḥammad says mā aqraʾu instead of mā anā bi-qāriʿ. In this regard, al-Azraqī’s version matches the Zuhār version preserved by at-Ṭabarī (LV II) and another version of the first revelation experience (LV III), which will be treated below: they all transmit the answer in the form mā aqraʾu.98

The edited texts of al-Balāḏurī’s and Ibn Saʿd’s versions are available to us. In spite of the fact that the former was a student of the latter and that both authors conclusively redacted their works, we find that the texts are not as similar as we would expect. On the one hand, al-Balāḏurī’s version, which matches Ibn Saʿd’s wording at the beginning and the end, has been shortened in several places. This is not surprising; redactional considerations frequently mandated shortenings. More surprising is the fact that, in al-Balāḏurī’s version, one of the passages he deleted (or omitted) from Ibn Saʿd’s (his teacher’s) version is the additional material Ibn Saʿd transmitted as compared to the ʿAbd ar-Razzāq branch (except for wa-yamkutu).

On the other hand, al-Balāḏurī has different extra material99 compared to Ibn Saʿd: the parenthetical insertion wa-t-tahannut ... which belongs to the original text stock of Maʿmar. Thus, our observation confirms Goitein’s finding100 that al-Balāḏurī does not quote a version identical with the edited version from Ibn Saʿd’s Ṭabaqāt, but apparently transmits a partially different version he had written down from his teacher (ḥaddatā-nā) in a lecture session.
To compare the *fatrah* annex in its different guises in the Maʿmar transmission, we will have a closer look at two of the three known versions: those of ʿAbd ar-Razzāq and Muḥammad ibn Ṭawr.101 This is the text according to ʿAbd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī (from ʿAbd ar-Razzāq’s *Muṣannaf*).102

"wa-fatara l-waḥy fatratan ḥattā ḥazina rasūl Allāh (ṣ)-fī-mā balaḥa-nā-ḥazanan
gādā min-hu mirārān kāy yataraddā min ruʿūs šawāḥiq al-ḡibāl.
fa-lammā awfā bi-ḏūrwaṭ ḡabal tabaddā la-hū Ǧibrīl (ʿas)
fa-qāla: yā Muḥammad, yā rasūl Allāh ḥaqqaṁ,
fa-yaskunu li-ḏālīka ḡaʾ ʿšu-hū wa-taqīrru nafsu-hū, fa-raqʾaʿa.
fa-iḏā ṭalāt al-ay-hi fatrat al-waḥy ḍāda li-mīṯl ḍālīka,
fa-iḏā awfā bi-ḏūrwaṭ ḡabal tabaddā la-hū Ǧibrīl (ʿas) fa-qāla la-hū mīṯl ḍālīka.
qāla Maʿmar, qāla az-Zuhrī, fa-ahbyara-nī Abū Salamah ibn ʿAbdarrāḥmān ʿan ḡābir ibn ʿAbdallāh,
qāla: samīʿu rasūl Allāh wa-huwa yuḥaddītu ʿan fatrat al-waḥy.
fa-qāla fī ḫāḍīṭī-hi: bayna anā amṣī samīʿu ʿan fatrat al-waḥy,

The revelation was temporarily suspended, so that the messenger of God – according to what we have heard – became very sad. Therefore it occurred to him on a number of occasions that he should throw himself off the peaks of high mountains. When he reached the summit of the mountain, Gabriel appeared to him. He said: ‘O Muḥammad, O true messenger of God!’ Therefore, his agitation subsided and his soul calmed down and he returned (home). When the suspension of the revelation persisted, he did the same again: When he reached the summit of the mountain, Gabriel appeared to him and said the same to him. Maʿmar said: az-Zuhrī said: Abū Salamah ibn ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān told me on the authority of ḡābir ibn ʿAbdallāh that he said: ‘I heard the messenger of God speak about the suspension of the revelation. He said in his narration: “While I was walking along, I heard a voice from heaven…”’

The *fatrah* annex according to Muḥammad ibn Ṭawr < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī (from ʿAbd-ar-Razzāq’s *Tafsīr*):103

"fatara l-waḥy ʿan rasūl Allāh (ṣ) fatratan fa-ḥazina ḥazanan
fa-ḡaʿala ya dū ʾilā šawāḥiq ruʿūṣ al-ḡibāl li-yataraddā min-hū.
fa-kulla-mā awfā bi-ḏūrwaṭ ḡabal ʿibtaddā la-hū Ǧabrāʾ īl (ʿas)
fa-yaqūlu: inna-ka nabī Allāḥ
fa-yaskunu ḡaʾ ʿšu-hū wa-taskunu nafsu-hū."
The revelation to the messenger of God was temporarily suspended and he became very sad. He started to run to the high summits of the mountains to throw himself off. Whenever he reached the summit of a mountain, Gabriel appeared to him. He said: ‘You are the Prophet of God.’ Then, his agitation subsided and his soul calmed down. The Prophet used to talk about this and said: ‘While I was walking along one day, I saw the angel …’

Apart from their similar meaning and some literal matches, the texts differ substantially in their wording, more so than the several Ma’mar versions of the beginning of the tradition (e.g. the versions of al-Azraqī and ‘Abd ar-Razzāq). The third Ma’mar version of the fatrah annex, that of al-Balāḏurī, contains additional variants, but it is closer to that of at-Ṭabarī than to that of ‘Abd ar-Razzāq (i.e. it lacks the new isnād introducing the Prophet’s direct speech).

Our analysis of the transmission of the tradition from the PCL Ma’mar leads to the following results: parts of the text were passed on fairly literally (riwāyah bi-l-lafz), e.g. the beginning, other parts rather freely (riwāyah bi-l-ma’nā), e.g. the fatrah annex. All in all, the Ma’mar branch displays a much higher degree of variation than the ‘Abd ar-Razzāq branch one generation later.

2.1e(γ) The Ibn Isḥāq branch

The next PCL on our list is Ibn Isḥāq. As pointed out above, all transmitters depending on Ibn Isḥāq present only the first part (roughly four sentences) of the tradition. In the case of this PCL, we have to compare the Yūnus ibn Bukayr version (represented by the almost identical texts of at-Tirmidī104 and al-‘Uṭāridī105 with the Bakkaṭī version (in Ibn Hiṣām’s redaction).106 Apart from literal correspondences, e.g. in the first and last sentences, we also find variants. Al-Bakkaṭī > Ibn Hiṣām preserves the important phrase ar-ru’ā/ar-ru’yah aṣ-ṣādiqah, which belongs to the oldest elements of the tradition; it is absent from the Yūnus ibn Bukayr transmission. On the other hand, it seems as if Ibn Hiṣām omits the sentence fa-makaṯa ... an yamkuṯa, which belongs to the original Zuhrī version. But a very similar sentence (fa-makaṯa rasūl Allāh (ṣ) yarā wa-yasma’u mā sā ‘a llāh an yamkuṯa) occurs in the following tradition,107 where it does not belong. It is perhaps a transmission error on Ibn Hiṣām’s part: the sentence might have ‘shifted’ a little in his written notes.

Redactional reasons may have prompted Ibn Isḥāq to terminate the full narration after only a few sentences. Two traditions further on, he includes a very similar (perhaps originally identical) story (LV III)108 about the first revelation experience; Ibn Isḥāq could have abridged the previous version to avoid repetition. The indefatigable at-Ṭabarī quotes both traditions in their entirety.109
2.1e(δ) The Zuhrī branch

We now come to the CL proper, az-Zuhrī branch. We have studied so far (LV I according to the Zuhrī transmitters Maʿmar, Yūnus, ʿUqayl and SV I according to Ibn Ishaq), we can postulate a similar, if not identical archetype. This cannot be said for Ṭ-Ṭabarī’s version (LV II, on the authority of the Zuhrī transmitter an-Nuʿman ibn Rāṣid).110 We have already identified the main difference between LV I (e.g. in ʿAbd ar-Razzāq, Ibn Ḥanbal, al-Buḥārī, Muslim ibn al-Ḥaǧǧāǧ) and LV II (in at-Ṭabarī).111 the varying arrangement of two passages and the resulting modification of the meaning of the text. In addition, LV II abridges (the three requests of the angel are mentioned but not elaborated) and deletes material (background information about Waraqah is missing). Moreover, we find numerous variants. The most interesting example is the wording of the Prophet’s answer to the requests of the angel: throughout, it is mā agraʿu instead of mā anā bi-gārī’. Equally conspicuous is the (almost) literal match at the end of the text (in Waraqah’s last announcement).

How these two divergent versions might have come about can only be determined after we have analysed a third, analogous, tradition (LV III) concerning the first revelation experience, one which does not depend on az-Zuhrī.

2.1e(ε) The variants and their discussion in Muslim ḥadīṯ criticism

To conclude our analysis of the Zuhrī recension for now, I will discuss some variants which the compilers had already pointed out and noted. After quoting the full text of the tradition (without the fatrah annex) according to Yūnus ibn Yazīd,112 Muslim ibn Ḥaǧǧāǧ conscientiously lists variants113 he found in the versions of ʿAbd ar-Razzāq > Maʿmar and Layṯ < ʿUqayl. Muslim explicitly states that the latter comes without the beginning (section 1–3 of our outline). In addition, it is said to contain the following variants: yarḡūfu fuʿādu-hū instead of Yūnus’ tarḡūfu bawādīru-hū and ay ibn ʿammi instead of Yūnus’s ay ʿammi. He lists the following variants for Maʿmar > ʿAbd ar-Razzāq: lā yuḥṣinu-ka llāh instead of Yūnus’s lā yuḥṣī-ka llāh and, again, ay ibn ʿammi instead of Yūnus’s ay ʿammi. Muslim’s statements are generally in line with our findings in the relevant texts.

The two variants postulated for the Ṭ-Ṭabarī transmissions (yarḡūfu fuʿādu-hū and ay ibn ʿammi) are indeed present in it; see the relevant texts in al-Buḥārī’s Ṣaḥīḥ114 and al-Bayhaqī’s Dalāʿ ilī115 (who both quote the report on the authority of ʿUqayl). We also notice that, in al-Bayhaqī’s Ṭ-Ṭabarī version, the beginning of the tradition is absent, which is fully in accordance with Muslim’s claim.116 Al-Buḥārī, too, in the chapters ʿahdīṯ al-anbiyāʾ and at-tafsīr of his Ṣaḥīḥ, lists several short versions of the Ṭ-Ṭabarī transmission, two of which lack the initial passage as well.117 It is, however, not missing from the long Ṭ-Ṭabarī version al-Buḥārī quotes in the chapter kayfa kāna badʾ al-wahy and which covers the entire text of the ḥadīṯ except for the fatrah annex.118 It is also part of another short version included in the chapter at-tafsīr.119 Both versions were probably passed on side by side for a time.120
The edited text of 'Abd ar-Razzāq’s Muşannaf has, as Muslim claims in the case of the 'Abd ar-Razzāq < Ma'mar version, the variants tarğufu bawādiru-hū and ay ibn 'ammi. But contrary to Muslim’s assertion, it does have lā yuhzī-ka llāh (and not lā yuhzinu-ka llāh).\(^{121}\)

In further sub-versions of the 'Abd ar-Razzāq version, we at least once find yarğufu fu‘ādu-hū (in al-Wāḥidī)\(^{122}\) in addition to the more common tarğufu bawādiru-hū (e.g. in Āḥmad ibn Ḥanbal\(^{123}\) and Abū Nu‘aym).\(^{124}\) Moreover, each text has yuhzī-ka llāh.

A very interesting variant not signalled by Muslim, but by al-Buḥārī’s commentator Ibn Ḥaḡar, is al-kitāb al-ibrānī/ak-kitāb al-ārabi and yakubu min al-inqīl bi-l-ibrānīyah/bi-l-‘ārabiyyah (concerning the script Waraqah ibn Nawfal can read).\(^{125}\) Only al-Buḥārī in the unmixed, complete ‘Uqayl version\(^{126}\) and aṭ-Ṭayālīsī in a version according to Ṣāliḥ ibn Abī l-Aḥdar\(^{127}\) have al-kitāb al-‘ibrānī. Elsewhere, the tradition always reads al-kitāb al-‘ārabi, even in the other mixed versions quoted by al-Buḥārī (on the authority of Yūnūs + 'Uqayl\(^{128}\) and Ma’mar + 'Uqayl)\(^{129}\) as well as in al-Bayhaqī’s ‘Uqayl version which is shortened at the beginning.\(^{130}\)

Āḥmad ibn Ḥanbal\(^{131}\) noticed that ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Mubārak, who transmitted on the authority of both Ma’mar and Yūnūs, was uncertain whether ar-ru yā aṣ-ṣādiqah or ar-ru yā aṣ-ṣāliḥah was the correct reading. But the latter variant was transmitted by al-Buḥārī on the authority of ‘Uqayl.\(^{132}\)

In some of the cases outlined above, the textual differences are caused by graphical variants which occur independently from particular transmissions. This clearly applies to the pair yuhzī-ka/yuhzinu-ka, which can only result from careless punctuation or the retroactive addition of diacritical points in an unpointed (or only partially pointed) transmitted text. Also, aṣ-ṣādiqah/aṣ-ṣāliḥah is more of a graphical than an aural variant. As for fu‘ādu-hū vs. bawādiru-hū, the former is a typical lectio facilior in copying a (probably unpointed) text and can hardly depend on an aural mishap.

A graphical variant could also be behind (al-kitāb) al-‘ibrānī/ak-‘arabi and bi-l-‘ibrānīyah/bi-l-‘ārabiyyah: the respective first variants are akin to a lectio difficilior. Thus, they occur much less frequently than the second.

Traditionists studying the shape of particular ḥadīṯ texts were mainly interested in graphical variants. Their emergence shows how justified, but at the same time how theoretical, the traditionists’ demand for ‘heard transmission’ (ar-riwāyah al-masmū‘ah) really was: the variants in question could never have arisen in ‘heard transmission’. Therefore, the actual transmission practice must have assumed a quite different form: it very often consisted of ‘mere copying’ (al-kitāba). By the generation of the teachers of the canonical ḥadīṯ compilators al-Buḥārī (810–70), Muslim (817–75) and even as early as Āḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (780–855) writing had actually become the preponderant medium of transmission in teaching.

Traditionists did not even notice smaller omissions and rearrangements of the text. One surprising example of this practice is the following: aṭ-Ṭabarî, who asserts that he had received this tradition (LV II) via an-Nu’mān as well as via Yūnūs (LV I) (but only quotes LV II in full),\(^{133}\) must have noticed the substantial
differences in arrangement and wording between the two texts, but does not mention them at all. On the other hand, he indicates the (admittedly important) fact that Yūnus does not have an additional passage given by an-Nu‘mān which specifies that sūrah 68 was the second oldest revelation, etc. (section 7a of our outline).

Muslim, who states$^{134}$ that the initial part of the 'Uqayl version known to him was missing,$^{135}$ does not signal that the Yūnus version known to him lacked the fatrah annex. In his Buḥārī commentary, Ibn Ḥaḡar on the other hand claims$^{136}$ that the annex only occurred in Maʿmar’s version.

2.2 Evidence for a possible ‘Urwah recension

2.2a The traditions according to Hišām ibn ‘Urwah <‘Urwah

We can confidently assert that az-Zuhri himself disseminated the tradition in question in his lectures. The content of the original Zuhrī version can be reconstructed with some certainty from later transmissions; its wording, however, only partially and approximately.

Did az-Zuhri actually hear the tradition from ‘Urwah? This question can only be answered on the basis of transmissions by another or several of ‘Urwah’s students who also passed on the tradition or parts of it on the authority of ‘Urwah, but independently from az-Zuhri. In fact, there are such traditions. Three of them are attributed to ‘Urwah’s son Hišām.

Tradition 1

On the authority of ‘Affān ibn Muslim (d. 220/835)$^{137} <$Ḥammād ibn Salamah (d. 167/783–4),$^{138}$ Ibn Sa’d quotes the following report by ‘Urwah’s son Hišām from his father:

The messenger of God said: ‘O Ḥadīghan, I see light and hear a voice. I fear I am a kāhin’ (diviner, soothsayer). Hereupon, she said: ‘God does not do this to you, o son of ‘Abdallāh. You speak truthfully, you deliver that which is committed to your trust [scil. to its owners] and you bind tightly the ties of relationship (by kind behaviour to your relatives)’ (taṣduqu l-ḥadīṯ wa-tu’addī l-amānah wa-taṣīlu r-raḥīm$^{139}$).$^{140}$

The contents of this tradition correspond exactly to point 5 of the Zuhrī recension, i.e. to the element of the conglomerate we named ‘Ḥadīghan narration II’. Did this tradition (SV III) in fact originate with ‘Urwah? Most likely yes. Its isnād contains evidence of its authenticity: it stops with ‘Urwah, i.e. it has not been ‘raised’ back to ‘Ā’ishah. On all accounts, this is a tradition which is independent of the Zuhrī recension – an imitator of the recension would also have imitated the isnād and named ‘Ā’ishah as original informant. The shape of the text, when compared to that of az-Zuhri, provides more evidence for its independence and
potential authenticity: with the transmission methods practised in the days of Urwah,141 substantial textual differences between versions transmitted on one and the same authority are only to be expected. In contrast to – and in more detail than – az-Zuhrī, Muhammad says in Hišam ibn Urwah’s version not only that he ‘fears for his soul’, but that he fears he has become a kāhin (diviner, soothsayer) because of his visions (‘light’) and auditory sensations (‘voices’). This could be a genuine feature of the original Urwah tradition attenuated by az-Zuhrī in his version.

On the other hand, it is remarkable that the three parallel phrases of Ḥadīghah’s praise (taṣduqu l-ḥadīṯ etc.) in the Zuhrī version are preserved verbatim in this text.

Admittedly, in its extant version, this report is extremely short. Most of all, it lacks the main ingredient: the account of the revelation experience with the iqra’ motif. Did ‘Urwah disseminate the tradition in this short form142 or has it been abridged at a later stage of transmission? We cannot answer this question with any certainty, but the second possibility seems more likely: first, ‘Urwah’s historical ḥadīths in particular are normally not short, but of considerable length.143 Secondly, Ibn Sa’d only quotes such short or abridged ḥadīths in the relevant chapter on ḍikr musūl al-wahy: the Zuhrī recension also occurs in an extremely shortened form in this chapter. Most likely, therefore, Ibn Sa’d was responsible for the abridgement. We can thus assume that Hišām ibn ‘Urwah heard and transmitted a more extensive version from his father – in other words, the present tradition is most probably a fragment of a longer report by ‘Urwah.

The next tradition clearly demonstrates that Hišām ibn ‘Urwah indeed received more information about the beginnings of the revelation from his father and passed it on.

Tradition 2

Az-Zubayr ibn Bakkār (d. 256/870)144 transmitted the following report on the authority of Muṣ‘ab ibn Abdallāh (d. 233/848)145 < ad-Daḥḥāk ibn ’Utmān (d. 180/796)146 ’Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn Abī z-Zinād147 < Hišām ibn ’Urwah < ‘Urwah:

Ḥadīghah bint Ḥuwaylid used to (visit and) tell Waraqah what came to the Prophet [i.e. what he received] according to his own [scil. the Prophet’s] report. Waraqah said: ‘By God, if what he claims is really true, then the great Nāmūs visits him, the Nāmūs of Jesus, about which the People of the Book only provide information at a (high) price. And if he [Muḥammad] proclaims (his message) during my lifetime, then, I will support him for the sake of God.’

This is part of the Waraqah narration, corresponding to element no. 7 of the Zuhrī recension. In this tradition as well, the isnād stops with ‘Urwah, suggesting that it was transmitted independently of the Zuhrī recension. Additional support for this claim comes from the text of the tradition: given the substantial differences
between the two, the tradition cannot have been derived from the Zuhrī recension. Interestingly, in this tradition, Ḥadiģah alone goes to visit Waraqah. In the Zuhrī recension, she is accompanied by Muḥammad. In this respect, Hišām’s report parallels Ibn Isḥāq’s recension of the Waraqah motif (which is not traced back to ‘Urwah).

One feature of Hišām’s tradition we do not encounter in other versions of the Waraqah narration is Waraqah’s claim that the ‘People of the Book’ only provide information about Nāmus ‘at a price’ and that he is the Nāmus of Jesus (other versions identify him as the Nāmus of Moses).

For our purposes, it is particularly significant that this second fragment suggests that Hišām also heard from his father ‘Urwah about the celestial apparition and, by extension, the transmission of a first revelation: Waraqah’s mention of the Nāmus as the reason for the apparition requires that there must have been another, prior report about the event. However, this fragment does not contain any firm evidence for ‘Urwah’s claim that sūrah 96: 1–5 was the first revelation.

The person responsible for abridging the text and removing the preceding report was also in this case most likely the compiler. For az-Zubayr ibn Bakkār, the story about the first revelation is only relevant for the information it contains about Waraqah ibn Nawfal.

 Tradition 3

Al-‘Uṭāridī transmitted the following report on the authority of Yūnus (ibn Bukayr) < Hišām ibn ‘Urwah < ‘Urwah (< Ḥadiģah); in at-Ṭabarī, it comes with the isnād Abū Kurayb (Muḥammad ibn al-‘Alā’) (st. 247/861)149 < Wakī < Hišām ibn ‘Urwah <‘Urwah:

Gabriel delayed (the revelation) to the Prophet. This considerably saddened him [scil. the Prophet]. Then, Ḥadiģah said: ‘Because of the sadness we notice in you, I believe that your Lord hates you.’ Thereupon, the following was revealed: ‘By the white forenoon and the brooding night! Thy Lord has neither forsaken thee nor hates thee …’ (sūrah 93).150

This tradition explicitly names Gabriel as the bearer of revelations, further evidence that Hišām ibn ‘Urwah heard a report from his father also about the transmission of a first revelation. The report refers to the period after the fatrah (temporary suspension of the revelation) which, according to this tradition, ended with the revelation of this message, sūrah 93.

The three traditions discussed above demonstrate that the Hišām ibn ‘Urwah recension contains various elements we also find in the Zuhrī recension, namely:

1 the Ḥadiģah II narration (corresponding to element 5 of the Zuhrī recension);
2 the Waraqah narration (element 7); and
3 the fatrah narration (element 9).
We can safely infer that it contained an additional shared element:

4 a narration about the first revelation mediated by an apparition which Waraqah identifies as Nāmüṣ (element 2) and the Prophet, somewhat later, as Gabriel (element 3).

We still have to admit, however, that none of the three fragments contains firm evidence for 'Urwah’s claim that sūrah 96: 1–5 was the first revelation.

2.2b The Ibn Lahī‘ah recension

We have at our disposal two more recensions of our tradition traced back to 'Urwah. First, we will turn to the version reported on the authority of Ibn Lahī‘ah (d. 174/790)\textsuperscript{151} < Abū l-Aswad Yaḥī‘ 'Urwah (d. 131/748 or slightly later)\textsuperscript{152} < 'Urwah. For this version, however, the transmission situation is extremely problematic. We only have two different, late versions: a more elaborate text mixed with other recensions from al-Bayhaqī’s Dalā‘il (LV IV)\textsuperscript{153} and a fragmentary version in two parts (SV IV) in Ibn Ḥaǧar.\textsuperscript{154}

At first, al-Bayhaqī quotes a ḥadīṯ for which he does not provide an isnād; he simply states fī-mā balaġa-nā (‘according to what we have heard’). After the text of the tradition, he adds a note to the effect that Abū Lahī‘ah reported this tradition on the authority of Abū l-Aswad < 'Urwah (the isnād is not ‘raised’ back to ‘Ā’išah!) but shortened it in a few places and made certain additions in others. (One of the additions which al-Bayhaqī later claims did not originate from 'Urwah is the narration of the opening of the chest, which has been placed before the revelation experience.) Clearly, we have to be very cautious in interpreting this information.

I will nevertheless attempt to reconstruct the tradition al-Bayhaqī ascribes to 'Urwah (LV IV):

1 Muḥammad’s dream visions.

2 His fear. Conversation with Ḥadīṯah on the subject. Ḥadīṯah encourages the Prophet.

3 Appearance of Gabriel at the highest point of Mecca (ufuq narration). He asks Muḥammad to sit down on a (short-pile, yellow-green) carpet encrusted with jacinths and pearls (bisāṭ ka-hay‘at ad-durnūk fī-hi l-yāqūt wa-l-lu‘lu’) and proclaims the glad tidings. Muḥammad calms down. [Addendum: according to the addition of al-Bayhaqī mentioned above, 'Urwah allegedly reported in this place that Gabriel dug a well and taught Muḥammad the ablutions and the prayer ritual.\textsuperscript{155}]


5 Muḥammad returns to Ḥadīṯah and reports the revelation experience.

6 Ḥadīṯah again encourages him (as before, but more elaborate).
She visits ‘Addās, a Christian slave of ‘Utbah ibn Rabī’ah ibn ‘Abd Šams, to make inquiries about Gabriel. ‘Addās provides the requisite information.

Ḥadīgah visits Waraqah ibn Nawfal. The narrator informs us about the Christian Waraqah and the hanīf Zayd ibn ‘Amr ibn Nufayl (already dead at this point).

Waraqah’s prediction (here expressed more in the form of a supposition) and his promise to obey and support Muḥammad. Waraqah’s death.

This is the full short version (SV IV) in literal translation:

The beginning of the mission [lit.: the affair] of the messenger of God was that, in a dream, he saw Gabriel in Aḡyād. He then went out to relieve himself. Gabriel called him: ‘O Muḥammad, O Muḥammad!’ The messenger of God looked three times to his right and left but did not see anybody. Then, he raised his eyes and beheld! He [scil. the angel] stood, having drawn one of his legs to the other (ṯānī iḥdā riḡlay-hi ‘alā l-uḥrā), on the horizon (ufuq narration) and said: ‘O Muḥammad: [I am] Gabriel, Gabriel!’ to calm him down. Thereupon, the Prophet fled. When he met other people and glanced up, he could no longer see anything. Then he ran away from the people. …

Thereupon, Gabriel called him and he [scil. Muḥammad] fled. Now, Gabriel appeared to him from (Mount) Ḥirā’. [Ibn Ḥaḡar reports:] ‘Then, the story of his (scil. the angel’s) request to recite is related: “Recite in the name of your Lord!” All the while, Muḥammad beheld Gabriel; he had two wings of jacinth, which dazzled the eyes … In the recension of Abū l-Aswād’s Maǧāzī (that he transmitted) on the authority of ‘Urwah (it reads) that he [scil. Muḥammad] said: “How shall I recite (kayfa aqraʾu)”.’

Obviously, the revelation experience as reported in this tradition (most of all in LV IV) has a markedly different character than in the previously analysed traditions: it is a ‘more intimate encounter than the eerie vision in the cave’. Note in this context the valuable carpet which the angel provided for the future Prophet’s comfort! When we compare it with the Zuhrī > ‘Urwah recension in particular, we notice several differences. In both versions reported on the authority of Ibn Lahī‘ah, the angel (in SV IV: Gabriel) appears – after the introductory dream, but before the revelation of the sūrah – to the Prophet on the horizon (ufuq motif) more precisely at the highest point of Mecca or in Aḡyād. Thus, in this version the ufuq motif precedes the iqraʾ motif. The latter appears in a modified and, in a few details, shortened form: the cave is omitted; the angel does not force Muḥammad and only once requests him to recite (the latter at least according to the long version). The short version preserves the reference to Mount Ḥirā’ from the original iqraʾ narration. The taḥannuṭ motif, which in az-Zuhrī’s version follows directly after the dream motif, is absent. Instead, LV IV apparently contains an extra motif: Gabriel teaches Muḥammad the ablutions and the prayer ritual. In addition, we notice conspicuous amplifications and
embellishments compared to the original story: in the short version, the angelic vision is enriched with fantastic details; in the long version, the carpet is elaborately described.

Characteristic for this recension is, however, Muḥammad’s reaction to the request of the angel to recite:

\[ \textit{kayfa aqr'a'u}, \]
\[ \textit{how shall I recite?} \]

In spite of the differences between the Zuhrī recension (LV I/II) and this recension (LV IV/SV IV) and between the two Ibn Lahī’ah versions compared to each other and irrespective of their additions and embellishments, we clearly still have the same story, which ultimately came from ‘Urwah. Central motifs and their sequence generally agree in both versions and between the Ibn Lahī’ah recension and that of az-Zuhrī < ‘Urwah: Muḥammad’s dream visions—arrival of the angel—his request to recite—revelation of sūrah 96: 1–5. Additionally, the long version (LV IV) shares the following motifs with the Zuhrī < ‘Urwah recension (LV I/II): Muḥammad seeking Ḥadīṯah’s advice and her encouragement; her first answer here and there is abšir; fa-inna ilāh [lā] yaṣna u bi-ka illā ĥayran, ‘rejoice, for the Lord only does what is good for you’; the visit to Waraqah and his prophecy and promise to help the future Prophet.162

We should not draw too far-reaching conclusions from this problematic version. It illustrates the fact that, apart from the usual unconscious and unintended modifications, conscious and intentional interventions are also sometimes part of the transmission process: alterations, embellishments and fantastic amplifications. Muslim ḥadīṯ criticism puts the responsibility squarely on Ibn Lahī’ah’s shoulders: he was classified as ‘weak’ (ḍaʿīf).163 In any case, we can draw the following two conclusions:

1 Our ḥadīṯ on the first revelation experience is traced back to ‘Urwah not only via two lines of transmission (az-Zuhrī and Hišām ibn ‘Urwah), but (at least) three (together with Abū l-Aswad Yaṭīm ‘Urwah). The long, combined tradition (the conglomerate) is ascribed to ‘Urwah by not one, but two transmitters, namely az-Zuhrī and Abū l-Aswad.

2 The three recensions (or at least the Zuhrī and the Hišām recensions) are sufficiently different from each other to render reciprocal dependencies (imitation) unlikely. A common source and different transmissions, taking into account the contemporary ‘free’ transmission practices, however, are very likely.

Thus, it becomes more and more probable that it was not az-Zuhrī, but ‘Urwah who first transmitted the conglomerate and that the former actually received it from the latter. In all likelihood, our tradition concerning the first revelation experience was already known and disseminated in the first century AH.
2.2c The tradition according to Yazīd ibn Rūmān < 'Urwah

While I will not analyse a third, very late tradition about the first revelation experience ascribed to 'Urwah – a conglomerate which partly differs from the versions we know – as an additional piece of evidence for the existence of a 'Urwah recension, I will at least introduce it for the sake of completeness.

Despite its different narrative frame, the (abbreviated) iqra’ narration is clearly recognizable in this ḥadīṯ,164 which is traced back via Yazīd ibn Rūmān (d. 130/747),165 a client of the Zubayrid family, to 'Urwah < Ā‘išah. This conglomerate combines the following motifs/narrations: the ufuq narration (in this version, Ḥadīqah plays a part: during the angelic vision, she prompts Muḥammad to conceal his head under her clothing, etc.);166 the iqra’ narration (linked to a report about Gabriel digging a well and teaching Muḥammad the ablutions and the prayer ritual); a narrative of how the stones and trees greeted the future Prophet; a report about Ḥadīqah’s conversion. Here are the relevant passages in translation:

One day, the messenger of God saw a figure (šaḥṣan) between heaven and earth in ḇiyād al-Āṣgar. Gabriel appeared to him, greeted him and spread a precious carpet encrusted with jacinths and chrysolites (fa-basaṭ bišāṭan karīman mukallan bi-l-yāqūt wa-z-zabarqad). He then dug up the ground, from which a well sprung up … He brought to him the glad tidings of his prophethood and revealed to him: ‘Recite in the name of your Lord, who has created …’

The parallels to the previously discussed long version according to Ibn Lahī’ah < Abū l-Aswad < 'Urwah are remarkable, most of all the shared combination of motifs: Gabriel sits the Prophet down on a precious carpet and, after digging the well, teaches him the ablutions and the prayer ritual. It is highly likely that one recension depends on the other or that they influenced each other (imitation).167

2.3 Is Ā‘išah the original informant?

As we have seen, az-Zuhrī’s version of the iqra’ narration was most likely based on 'Urwah and the latter had probably already reported it in conjunction with a conglomerate identical or very similar to that later transmitted by az-Zuhrī. But did 'Urwah actually receive the ḥadīṯ from Ā‘išah?

In principle, it would certainly have been possible for 'Urwah to discuss Muḥammad’s first revelation experience (which, however, took place long before her birth)168 with his aunt Ā‘išah169 and that he therefore felt justified in naming her as his informant.

In support of this version of events, we could quote a relatively early report which transmits the iqra’ narration – as part of yet another conglomerate (this one narrating inter alia the legend of the opening of the chest)170 – on the authority of Ā‘išah, but not ‘Urwah. The ḥadīṯ171 is part of at-Ṭayālīsī’s Musnad172 and later enters into Abū Nu‘aym’s Dalā’īl an-nubūwah.173

If we took into account only these two sources for the ḥadīth, Ḥammād ibn Salamah would be the CL (he seems to have collected and disseminated several versions of the story about the first revelation experience).177 However, we have to allow for the possibility that the conglomerate was already compiled and disseminated by Ḥammād’s ‘predecessor’ al-Ǧawnī.178 The absence of additional isnād testimonies prevents us from confirming this hypothesis.

The ḥadīth consists of the following elements: the taḥannūṭ narration; the story of the greeting of the future Prophet by stones and trees; the ufūq narration; the legend of the opening of the chest, which clearly occupies centre stage and frames the iqra’ narration; (again) the story of the stones and trees.

In this tradition, the iqra’ narration is closer to az-Zuhrī’s version (and to another version to be discussed below) than to that of Ibl Lahīḥah: it ‘still’ contains the (older) motif of pressing the Prophet but does ‘not yet’ contain the (more recent) carpet motif. In translation, the relevant passage is as follows:179

He then put a seal on my back, so that I felt the touch of the seal [end of the legend of the opening of the chest]. He then said to me: ‘Read180 in the name of your Lord!’ But I had never read something written before (wa-lam aqra’ kitāban qaṭṭu). He grabbed me by the throat so that I was about to cry and then said to me: ‘Read in the name of your Lord … ’ He (Muḥammad) said: ‘I will never forget any (of this). He then weighed me against a man and I outweighed him … ’

Admittedly, the tradition is not a very strong argument in favour of ‘Ā’išah as ‘Urwah’s original informant. The anonymous ‘man’ – or one of the transmitters listed after him in the isnād such as al-Ǧawnī – does not need to have committed any conscious act of forgery; he may only have recombined several narratives and motifs circulating at the time. He may even have been convinced that he was reporting a tradition (or several of them) originating with ‘Ā’išah. The general ‘an between the anonymous ‘man’ and ‘Ā’išah in the isnād indicates that the transmitter does not claim that any personal contact between the two had taken place.

It is, however, still very doubtful whether the redactor of the conglomerate did not know one of the versions originating from ‘Urwah. The ‘raising’ of the isnād back to ‘Ā’išah could have happened on the basis of the familiarity of the transmitter with the Zuhrī recension, but it could also have taken place spontaneously.181

The canonical collections did not include the tradition; one of the reasons might have been the anonymous transmitter ‘an ‘Ā’išah. Incidentally, Abū Nu‘aym’s later version replaced him with a known historical figure, al-Ǧawnī’s teacher Yazīd ibn Bābanūs. (This is of course a characteristic case of an isnād being improved!)
However, there is one substantial argument against ʿĀ’išah as ʿUrwah’s original informant which outweighs the evidence presented so far: the fact that not all recensions reported on the authority of ʿUrwah have an isnād leading back to her. In addition, there are strong indications that ʿUrwah’s report did not originate from ʿĀ’išah, but a source different from the one named by az-Zuhrī.

2.4 The Ibn Isḥāq recension

For the following discussion, we will come back to an observation made by Sprenger. In his study of the first revelation experience, he noted that a recension which covers the same narrative ground and which is similar, in places up to the point of identical wording (LV III), to the Zuhrī recension (LV I/II) must draw on the same source despite its different isnād.182 The report in question (LV III) is transmitted by Ibn Hišām183 and at-Ṭabarī184 on the authority of Ibn Isḥāq; in Ibn Hišām’s work, it follows almost immediately upon the parallel tradition SV I, reported according to az-Zuhrī < ʿUrwah < ʿĀ’išah with only one other short tradition intervening, which reports the greeting of Muhammad by stones and trees (cf. below, p. 61). We have conjectured that Ibn Isḥāq shortened one of the two reports (SV I) due to their similarity. LV III can also be found in the ʿUṭāridī redaction of Ibn Isḥāq’s work185 which Sprenger did not know. There, it occurs in the same position as in Ibn Hišām’s text, albeit without an isnād. The reasons for its omission remain to be investigated.186

2.4a Transmission, content, motifs and character

The tradition in question has the isnād Ibn Isḥāq < Wahb ibn Kaysān (d. 127/744–5 or 129/746–7)187 < ʿUbayd ibn Ṭumayr (d. 68/687–8);188 cf. Figure 2.2. Ibn Isḥāq explains that Wahb was a client of the Zubayrid family and that ʿAbdallāh ibn az-Zubayr (d. 73/692), ʿUrwah’s older brother and at the time anticaliph in Medina, asked ʿUbayd (a qāṣṣ, i.e. preacher and popular teller of tales)189 in a public gathering to relate the Prophet’s first revelation experience.

These are the contents of the story according to the most complete version reported by at-Ṭabarī:

1 Muḥammad’s yearly, month-long religious observances on Mount Ḥirāʾ (in accordance with pre-Islamic customs of the Qurayš): before returning home, he feeds the poor and visits the Ka’bah (taḥannuṭ narration).
2 Unexpected appearance of Gabriel on Mount Ḥirāʾ during Ramaḍān of the year of his mission; Muḥammad accompanied by his wife (Ẓadīqah).
3 (Direct speech of Muḥammad:) Appearance of the angel at night in his sleep with a brocade cloth with an inscription.190 Twice,191 the angel asks him to read or recite (iqra’); twice, Muḥammad is beset by the angel (who presses and harasses him with the cloth)192 and answers: ‘I do not read/recite!’ or ‘What shall I read/recite?’ (mā [dā] aqrā’u).193 After that, revelation of sūrah
96: 1–5, which Muḥammad repeats. The angel disappears and Muḥammad wakes up (iqra’ narration).

4 Muḥammad fears he is a poet or possessed by a demon. He climbs a mountain with the intention of committing suicide.

5 Unexpected apostrophe from heaven (aural apparition): ‘O Muḥammad, you are the messenger of God, and I am Gabriel!’ and vision: Gabriel in human shape on the horizon. Muḥammad refrains from killing himself. The vision persists for some time (ufuq narration).

6 Ḥadiḡah sends envoys to search for Muḥammad. The angel disappears and Muḥammad returns home.

7 Muḥammad goes to Ḥadiḡah and embraces her. The couple’s conversation (‘Where have you been?’ etc.) He says that he fears he is a poet or possessed by a demon. She vehemently contradicts him and encourages and praises him (with parallel phrases). Her hope that Muḥammad is ‘the prophet of this people’ (Ḥadiḡah narration II).

8 Ḥadiḡah visits her cousin Waraqah. Narrator gives information about the latter.

9 Ḥadiḡah’s conversation with Waraqah about her husband’s experience. Waraqah assumes that the angel was the ‘great Nāmūs’ and Muḥammad the ‘prophet of this people’.

Figure 2.2 The Ibn Ishāq recension of the iqra’ narration
Hadīqah’s return to her husband and her report about her visit to Waraqah. Muhammad feels relieved by it.

Muhammad and Waraqah meet at the Ka’bah. Muhammad describes his experience. Waraqah identifies Muhammad as ‘the prophet of this people’ and the angel as the ‘great Namūs’. He predicts the Prophet’s expulsion and expresses his desire to help him, whenever possible (Waraqah narration).

Muhammad’s return. He feels relieved by Waraqah’s encouragement.

In general, we can say that in this recension (LV III), the story is more elaborate than az-Zuhri’s recension (LV I/II). It contains more details and narrative padding and some repetitions. Its most conspicuous characteristic is that the ‘eerie encounter’ (the Prophet is also forced to recite!) happens at night in his sleep and not while awake. Thus, it is ‘a kind of nightmare’.

2.4b The different versions: Ibn Hišām, al-ʿUṭāridī, at-Ṭabarī

Of the three versions belonging to the Ibn Ishāq recension, those of at-Ṭabarī195 and Ibn Hišām196 resemble each other most closely. Variants are for the most part little different from what we would expect in normal written transmission197 and could be mapped in a critical apparatus. But Ibn Hišām abridges Ibn Ishāq’s text. His abridgements affect mainly two passages in sections 4 and 7 of our outline. In at-Ṭabarī’s and al-ʿUṭāridī’s unabridged versions of the Ibn Ishāq recension, Muhammad states (referring to the vision) that he fears he is a poet or is possessed by a demon (twice, in sections 4 and 7); in the former passage (section 4), directly after the vision, he expresses his intention to commit suicide. In Ibn Hišām’s abridged version, these passages are eliminated. Abridgements affecting section 7 also remove Hadīqah’s praise (expressed in parallel phrases) with which we are familiar from the Zuhri and Hišām ibn ‘Urwah recensions (LV I/II and SV III). In at-Ṭabarī’s and al-ʿUṭāridī’s unabridged versions, the praise takes the form min sidq hadīti-ka wa-ʿizm amānati-ka, etc.

Without doubt, these were conscious deletions. In accordance with the principle Ibn Hišām set out in his introduction,198 he eliminated passages he considered objectionable and material which could offend people.199 Conclusive evidence for this explanation is the fact that, in the text following the respective abridged passages, Ibn Hišām had to remove sentences which refers back to the deleted event (‘This kept me from realizing my intention’ in section 5 and ‘This partly allayed the fear which I felt’ in section 12). These are not unconscious, ‘innocent’ modifications frequently affecting oral transmission, but intentional redactional interventions.

The ʿUṭāridī version200 of the Ibn Ishāq recension differs more from the two other versions than they do from each other. The main difference is probably due to an error in transmission: al-ʿUṭāridī’s version lacks an isnād, so that its text seems to continue the previous, shorter tradition (reporting the greeting of the future Prophet by trees and stones) and share its isnād. It is unlikely that al-ʿUṭāridī consciously conflated the two texts; there is no reason why he should have suppressed the ‘correct’ isnād.
A second fact confirms that the loss of text was most likely caused by a transmission error: we find more gaps in the text at the beginning in a passage immediately after the missing Isnād. (These gaps, however, do not affect important components of the tradition.) In addition, the text between the two largest gaps displays the highest degree of variation compared to the parallel passages in Ibn Hišām and at-Ṭabarī. The latter of the two gaps concerns the ‘brocade cloth with an inscription’, which the angel carries in the parallel text; this, however, may be a conscious deletion by the redactor, al-ʿUṭāridī.

In any case, the text after this initial passage (from the revelation of the sūrah onwards) is, except for a few minor variants and gaps, almost identical with at-Ṭabarī. Even the sections about the Prophet’s fear of being possessed and his suicide plan, suppressed by Ibn Hišām, appear in the text – a verbatim match with at-Ṭabarī.

Comparing the three versions derived from Ibn Ishāq, we can say that they are all based on one (largely) homogeneous text by Ibn Ishāq. In this archetype, three traditions on the beginnings of revelation followed each other in this order: SV I–another ḥadīth on the greeting of trees and stones–LV III. This sequence was preserved in the redactions of Ibn Hišām and al-ʿUṭāridī.

In Ibn Hišām’s redaction, however, Ibn Ishāq’s text was consciously reworked (and shortened in some key passages); in al-ʿUṭāridī’s redaction, parts of the text have been poorly transmitted. The third redaction, that by at-Ṭabarī, preserved it most faithfully, perhaps even (almost) in its original form. A reconstruction of Ibn Ishāq’s archetype is therefore in this case possible. A purely oral or a purely written transmission from Ibn Ishāq to the redactors can be excluded: the former cannot explain the substantial parallels (verbatim correspondences covering long passages) in the texts of the three versions, the latter (understood as the closest possible reproduction of a finalized written original) cannot explain the variations we still find. The safest course would be to follow the biographical sources and explain variations on the one hand with the peculiarities and shortcomings of the teaching system they describe in some detail (e.g. text loss in dictation) and, on the other, with conscious redactional interventions on the part of the transmitters, who had their own ideas about the text.

Excursus: Caedmon and Muḥammad

The Scandinavian studies expert K. von See pointed to an exact parallel to the reports about Muḥammad’s first revelation experience in the Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum (completed in 731) (IV, 24) by the Venerable Bede (d. 735 in north-east England): the story of the illiterate lay brother Caedmon who received the gift of praising God in the language of the people, i.e. English. The details of the report – dream vision of an angel; the angel calls Caedmon by name and asks him to sing (‘canta mihi aliquid’; cf. iqra’ in Ibn Ishāq’s recension); the first request is refused (‘nescio cantare’; cf. mā aqraʾu); after the second request, Caedmon asks what he is supposed to sing (‘quid debeo cantare’; cf. māḏā aqraʾu ?); the third is followed by the angel’s recitation of a song about the Creator – closely resemble
those of the iqra’ narration. Bede’s report is closer to the recension of Ibn Ishāq (the vision takes place while Caedmon is asleep) than to the Zuhrī version. The dependency of Bede’s story on the Arabic report is irrefragable; von See suggests that the transmission could have taken place sometime between 726 and 730, a period of peaceful coexistence between Muslims and Christians in Europe. Von See’s discovery is extremely important for the contentious debate about the existence and extent of medieval ‘literary’ contacts between Europe and the Orient. For our purposes, Bede’s story confirms that the report about Muḥammad’s first revelation — in the form taken up and elaborated by Ibn Ishāq (the qīṣṣah version) — already existed decades before the definitive edition of Ibn Ishāq’s Kitāb al-maġāzī (established at the behest of the caliph al-Manṣūr; after 760) and was spread in this form throughout the world. It stands to reason that the quṣṣāṣ, lay preachers migrating with the Muslim armies across the straits of Gibraltar, were the agents of the widespread dissemination of the story into Christian Europe.

2.4c Relation to the Zuhrī recension: a common source?

The differences between the Ibn Ishāq and Zuhrī recension are striking and have been studied previously by a number of scholars:

1 The most substantial difference has already been discussed above: the character of the iqra’ motif. In Ibn Ishāq, the revelation takes place during a kind of nightmare while Muhammad is asleep. In az-Zuhrī, he is awake and in a cave. In addition, az-Zuhrī does not mention the brocade cloth with writing.

2 The tahannut motif is more elaborate in Ibn Ishāq: he reports Muḥammad’s stay on Mount Ḥirā’ according to the customs of the Qurayš who practised tahannut there for a month each year. In az-Zuhrī, the Prophet is simply inspired by ‘love for solitude’. While, according to Ibn Ishāq, Muḥammad arrives at Mount Ḥirā’ with his wife, az-Zuhrī has him ascend alone, only returning to Mecca occasionally to stock up on supplies. Furthermore, az-Zuhrī does not know that Muḥammad feeds the poor on Mount Ḥirā’ and subsequently visits the Ka’bah as described by Ibn Ishāq.

3 In spite of their agreement on its function to keep Muḥammad from killing himself, the treatment of the ufug motif differs substantially between the two redactions. Ibn Ishāq describes the vision (Gabriel on the horizon) and Muḥammad’s conduct in particular (being rooted to the spot, following the vision with his eyes) in some detail, whereas az-Zuhrī reports the story in a very reduced form. He does, however, provide details in the fatrah annex, transmitted not on the authority of ‘Urwah, but of Abū Salamah.

4 Twice, Ibn Ishāq relates that after the vision, Muhammad thought that he was a poet or possessed by a demon. Az-Zuhrī simply mentions — in a much attenuated form — that he feared for himself.

5 Ḥadīqah’s sending out envoys to look for Muḥammad, reported by Ibn Ishāq, is missing in az-Zuhrī.
6 Ibn Ishāq has Ḥadīgah express her hopes that Muḥammad will be the prophet of his people. She then visits Waraqah alone; he confirms her hopes. On returning from Ḥirā’, Muḥammad meets Waraqah at the Ka’bah and receives his prediction. In az-Zuhri’s recension, Ḥadīgah does not talk about Muḥammad’s future. They visit Waraqah together to hear his prediction.

In the above passages, Ibn Ishāq’s report is more detailed than az-Zuhri’s. The following two motifs on the other hand are only included by az-Zuhri:

1 The ‘true dream visions’ at the beginning of the story. The motif could be a reminiscence of the fact that, in the version (probably) closer to the original, the revelation took place in a dream.

2 The zamūnū motif (Ḥadīgah I). In both versions of the Zuhri recension, we read that the Prophet runs to Ḥadīgah and exclaims: ‘Wrap me up! Wrap me up!’ Ibn Ishāq does not mention the incident.

Overall, Ibn Ishāq’s narration contains much more (sometimes highly picturesque) detail (the brocade cloth with writing, elaborate description of the angelic vision and Muḥammad’s conduct) and narrative embellishments (Muḥammad’s feeding of the poor and his yearly pilgrimage, Ḥadīgah sending envoys, the couple’s conversation (‘Where have you been?’) with Muḥammad embracing Ḥadīgah). In addition, there are repetitions (Ḥadīgah expects that Muḥammad is the prophet of his people; Waraqah confirms this twice, at first with the provision that Ḥadīgah’s report is true, then definitively after hearing Muḥammad’s own report; repetition of the pilgrimage narration). Some of the repetitions have a formulaic ring:

Ḥadīgah: fa-wa-llaḏī nafs Ḥadīgah bi-yadi-hī innī la-arǧū an takūna nabī ḥāḏihi l-ummah

Ḥadīgah: So, by Him in whose hand rests the soul of Ḥadīgah, I expect that you will become the prophet of this community

Waraqah: wa-llaḏī nafs Waraqah bi-yadi-hī ... inna-hū la-nabī ḥāḏihi l-ummah

Waraqah: By Him in whose hand rests the soul of Waraqah, he surely is the prophet of this community

Waraqah: wa-llaḏī nafsī bi-yadi-hī inna-ka la-nabī ḥāḏihi l-ummah

Waraqah: By Him in whose hand my soul rests, you are the prophet of this community

fa-iḏā qaḏā rasūl Allāh ġiwāra-hū ... kāna avwal mā yabda’u bi-hī ... al-ka’bah qabla an yadhūla bayta-hū ġa-yaṭṭūfu bi-hā ... šumma yarǧū u ilā baytī-hī

So when the Messenger of God had completed his period of seclusion the very first thing which he was in the habit of doing was (to go to) the Ka’bah,
before he even entered his own home, to circumambulate it and then to return to his own home

\( fa-lamm\overline{a} \) qaḍā rasūl Allāh ġiwrā-hū \( \ldots \) bada’ā bi-\( l-\)ka’bah \( fa-\)tāfa bi-hā

So when the Messenger of God had completed his period of seclusion, he began at the Ka’ba and circumambulated it

\( Ḥ\)adīḡah’s praise of her husband (expressed in parallel phrases) is less of a formula than an example of ‘typical phraseology’\(^{209}\) we also find elsewhere.\(^{210}\)

Our findings fit in very well with the information that the underlying report was related by a qāṣṣ (preacher, narrator of edifying tales) in a public gathering. The story is, as it were, more qiṣṣah than ḥadīṯ. Az-Zuhri’s tendency to confine himself to the essentials makes his report more of a ḥadīṯ.\(^{211}\)

In spite of their different narrative character and specific divergences on some of the details, the two recensions share a number of important features. Most of all, the motifs combined in the conglomerates are generally the same and are even similarly arranged. This applies especially to LV I and LV III.

- LV I: Dream visions—\( taḥ\)annuṭ—appearance of the angel—\( ih\)ra’—\( Ḥ\)adīḡah I and II—Waraqah—plan to commit suicide + \( u\)fuq (= fatrah);
- LV III: —\( taḥ\)annuṭ—appearance of the angel—\( ih\)ra’—plan to commit suicide + \( u\)fuq—\( Ḥ\)adīḡah II (comfort and praise) —Waraqah.

In LV II, the sequence departs substantially from the model above:

- LV II: Dream visions—\( taḥ\)annuṭ—\( Ḥ\)adīḡah I (zammīlū-nī)—plan to commit suicide—\( ih\)ra’—\( Ḥ\)adīḡah II (comfort and praise) – Waraqah.

Even (almost) verbatim parallels are not uncommon. In two prominent places, LV II and LV III have the same wording as opposed to LV I. In both texts, Muḥammad’s reply to the request of the angel is:

\( mā \) (gā) \( a\)qra’ū

What am I to recite?

compared to

\( mā \) anā \( b\)i-qāri’

I am not one to recite

in LV I. Moreover, LV II and LV III agree better in the formulation Muḥammad uses to express his intention to kill himself. We read:

\( an \) atraḥa nafsī \( m\)in ḥāliq \( m\)in ḡabal (LV II),

that I might cast myself from the top of a mountain
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which is similar to

\[\textit{la-a’midanna ilâ ḥāliq min al-ḡabal fa-l-aṭraḥanna nafsī min-hu} \ (LV \ III).\]

I shall make for the top of a mountain and shall cast myself from it.

Compare this to

\[\textit{kay yataraddā min ru’ūs šawāhīq al-ḡibāl} \ (LV \ I)\]

in order that he might fall from the peaks of lofty mountains.

It is also remarkable that in LV II and LV III, the angel is either from the very start identified as Gabriel (LV III) or introduces himself as Gabriel after a short while (LV II). In LV I, he remains anonymous and is only identified in the \textit{fatrah} annex.\textsuperscript{212}

Considering the similarities and parallels discussed above, Sprenger’s insight that, in spite of their different \textit{isnāds}, the Ibn Ishāq recension of the \textit{iqra’} narration (LV III) and the az-Zuhārī < ‘Urwah recension (LV I/II) have come from a common source,\textsuperscript{213} is perfectly plausible. Not surprisingly, Nöldeke/Schwally agreed with Sprenger;\textsuperscript{214} Sellheim simply takes the identity of the two ḥadīths for granted and Juynboll regards az-Zuhārī’s tradition as a ‘reshaping’ of the original ‘Ubayd version. Sprenger’s second assumption that LV III most likely has the ‘correct’ original informant (‘Ubayd ibn ‘Umar)\textsuperscript{215} is also very suggestive and was, independently of Sprenger, also posited by Juynboll. The decisive argument in Sprenger’s favour is that he is able to explain how LV I/II could have shifted to ‘Ā’išah as the original informant without charging az-Zuhārī or ‘Urwah with conscious forgery.

Sprenger maintains that an attribution for the tradition as extravagant as that made by Ibn Ishāq deserves to be trusted.\textsuperscript{216} (In fact, forgers preferred to produce ‘smooth’, innocuous \textit{isnāds}!) Secondly, he assumes that Wahb, who must have been very young at the time the story was related by ‘Ubayd, could only have received it indirectly from ‘Ubayd, but directly from his patron ‘Urwah, in whose family the story was originally narrated (and doubtlessly passed on). It would still be inappropriate to accuse Wahb of fraud, because

1 in his time, transmitters were not obliged to provide a complete \textit{isnād}, and links could be omitted;
2 he could very well have remembered that ‘Ubayd recited the story in his (scil. Wahb’s) early youth.

But according to Sprenger, Wahb’s version draws on ‘Urwah’s formulation.\textsuperscript{217} In my opinion, we should not insist so much on ‘Urwah as Wahb’s original informant (as Sprenger has done) but, more generally, envisage a Zubayrid ‘family tradition’ as the source on which both of them could have drawn.

However, az-Zuhārī states that ‘Urwah transmits on the authority of ‘Ā’išah. As we have seen, this attribution is missing in Hišām ibn ‘Urwah’s tradition (SV III)
and in one of the two versions from Ibn Lahīʿah < Abū ʿAbdallāh. Sprenger believes that, as in the previous case, ʿUrwah’s story in its extant form did not originate with ʿĀʾišah just as Wahb’s did not (immediately) come from ʿUbayd. However, ʿUrwah could have remembered that ʿĀʾišah had talked about the incident (although it took place long before her birth). He might therefore have felt justified in naming her as his informant. So much for Sprenger. More probable, I assume, would be the following: ʿUrwah did not name a source for the tradition he passed on to az-Zuhrī (something we observe quite frequently with him); later, az-Zuhrī, convinced that, as with so much of ʿUrwah’s material, the tradition originated from ʿĀʾišah, added her name to the isnād—incorrectly, but without any intention to deceive his audience.

Sprenger also argued that ʿUrwah’s actual source was probably a tale by ʿUbayd narrated at the court of his brother ʿAbdallāh. His assumption would remain true even if ʿUrwah did not receive this tale, as Sprenger believes, directly from ʿUbayd, but, as I assume, only later and indirectly via a member (or members) of the Zubayrid family.

On the basis of these considerations, we can establish the following:

- LV I/II and LV III draw on the same source.
- The underlying report they are based on was already assembled in this particular compound form (the ‘conglomerate’ we find in the Zuhrī and very similar Ibn Ishāq recensions) in the first century AH by ʿUbayd ibn ‘Umayr.
- From the Zubayrid family, where it was recited by ʿUbayd, it was passed on to both ʿUrwah ibn az-Zubayr (and from there to his son Hišām and his master student az-Zuhrī, etc.) and Wahb ibn Kaysān (from whom Ibn Ishāq received it).

Following this hypothesis, the reconstructed transmission lines would be as in Figure 2.3.

2.5 The ‘purged’ ʿUrwah recension

Keeping in mind that the Hišām ibn ʿUrwah recension (SV III and the two related traditions) is fragmentary, that the Ibn Ishāq recension (LV III) preserves numerous traits of the qiṣṣah (tale of a popular narrator) and, finally, that the Ibn Lahīʿah recension (LV IV) was conspicuously reworked in transmission (transforming the ‘eerie encounter’ into an ‘intimate meeting’), we can assume that az-Zuhrī’s version is closest to ʿUrwah’s. This also extends to his choice of diction: ʿUrwah, who cultivated a sober style, had probably already purged the story of its qiṣṣah elements. Wahb ibn Kaysān, on the other hand, apparently retained these elements or even expanded them.

Still, we have to allow for the possibility that az-Zuhrī also introduced modifications, mostly on redactional grounds. A glance at the two different versions transmitted on his authority gives us sufficient cause for suspicion. Similarities between the respective passages in the two other transmissions (LV IV, also LV
III) demonstrate that the ufūq motif was elaborated in more detail in 'Urwah’s text than in az-Zuhrī. (Az-Zuhrī makes up for this apparent omission by presenting the full motif in the fatrah annex added later.) Most certainly, az-Zuhrī toned down the madness (or kāhin) motif. It must have appeared in full in 'Urwah’s text, as we can see from its parallel appearance in versions of Hišām ibn 'Urwah (SV III) and 'Ubayd ibn 'Umayr (LV III); the only conceivable direction would lead from the more graphic to the more innocuous form, not vice versa. It is unclear whether 'Urwah included the zammilā-nī motif in the Ḥadīṯah narration: it is only preserved by az-Zuhrī and does not occur in the two other transmissions (LV III and LV IV).

It is likely that 'Urwah (and not az-Zuhrī) had already described the revelation of sūrah 96: 1–5 as taking place while Muḥammad was awake, because this detail also occurs in Ibn Lahi‘ah (LV IV and SV IV). Possibly, 'Urwah retained mention of the cloth used by the angel to strangle the Prophet: through a process of reinterpretation, this motif could have become the motif of the carpet the angel sits Muḥammad down on in one of the Ibn Lahi‘ah versions. This motif shift might very well have been the reason for the alteration of the nature of the whole scene, away from an eerie encounter to an intimate meeting. We at least notice that the shift of motif is closely connected with the change of atmosphere.

We cannot safely reconstruct the exact sequence of motifs in 'Urwah’s version, e.g. whether the iqra' motif preceded the ufūq motif (the order also differs in the two Zuhrī versions!). In cases such as this, we always have to take into account that early historians and transmitters did not always follow the same procedure or sequence every time they recited their material.

Bearing all these considerations in mind, we can at least identify the following motifs as part of 'Urwah’s lectures on the first revelation experience:
Muḥammad’s dream visions—the ṭaḥannūṭ narration—the ufūq narration (aural and visual apparitions: the angel on the horizon, who greets Muḥammad as prophet)—the Ḫadījah narration (Muḥammad’s fear of being possessed or a kāhin)—his suicide plan—comfort and praise from Ḫadījah—the iqra’ narration (the revelation, probably while awake—repeated request by the angel to recite—repeatedly, Muḥammad declines—he is pressed by the angel—finally, the revelation takes place)—the Waraqah narration.

The iqra’ narration could also have preceded the ufūq narration. In that case (as in LV III), the ufūq motif (and not the Ḫadījah motif) would have served to prevent Muḥammad from committing suicide.

On the basis of two or more parallel versions in the different transmissions, we can postulate a few sections of ‘direct’ speech for the original ‘Urwh version.

In ‘Urwh’s tradition, Muḥammad replies after the angel’s request to recite (iqra’): mā agra’u (I do not recite/what shall I recite?) as in LV II and LV III, and not mā anā bi-qāri’ as in LV I. (The answer kayfa agra’u, how am I to recite?, found in LV IV and SV IV is certainly not original, but is easier to explain on the basis of mā agra’u than mā anā bi-qāri’ (I am not one to recite)!) Further, Muḥammad says about his idea to kill himself either:

\[
\text{la-a’midanna ilā ḥāliq min al-ḡabal fa-l-āṭrāḥanna nafsī min-hu}
\]

I shall make for the top of a mountain and shall cast myself from it (LV III)

or

\[
\text{āṭrāḥu nafsī min ḥāliq min ḡabal}
\]

I shall cast myself from the top of a mountain) (LV II)

or something similar to this.

Ḥadījah’s reaction to Muḥammad’s report about his angelic vision is:

\[
\text{inna llāh lā yaf’alu bi-ka ḡālika (God would not treat you in this manner) (SV III)}
\]

or

\[
\text{mā kāna llāh li-yaf’ala bi-ka ḡālika (God is not one to treat you in this manner) (LV III)}
\]

or

\[
\text{abšir fa-wa-llāh lā yaf’alu llāh bi-ka illā ḥayran (Look, by God, God would not treat you in any way but well [a good one]) (LV IV).}
\]
Finally, ‘Urwah had already transmitted Ḥadiğah’s praise (in parallel phrases)\(^{223}\) which agrees in four versions (LV I, LV II, SV III, LV III):

\[
\text{inna-ka la-taṣilu } r-	ext{riḥm wa-taṣduqu } l-	ext{ḥadīṯ wa-taqrī } d-	ext{dayf wa-tuʿīnu } ‘\text{alā } nawaḥib al-ḥaqq}
\]

For you bind tightly the ties of realtionship, you speak truthfully, you shelter the guest and you help in cases of recurring obligations.\(^{224}\) (LV I/II, version of ʿAbd ar-Razzāq)

\[
\text{inna-ka taṣduqu } l-	ext{ḥadīṯ wa-}‘\text{addī } l-	ext{amānāh wa-taṣilu } r-	ext{riḥm}
\]

You speak truthfully, you deliver that which is committed to your trust (scil. to its owners) and you bind tightly the ties of relationship (by kind behaviour to your relatives (SV III).

\[
\text{min } ṣidq ḥadīṯi-ka wa-}‘\text{um amānati-ka wa-}ḥusn ḥulqi-ka wa-}ṣilat riḥmi-ka
\]

For the truthfulness of your speech, the might of your trust, the fineness of your character and the tautness of your ties of relationship (LV III).

### 2.6 The Zuhrī recension again: The two versions

After our hypothetical reconstruction of ʿUrwah’s text, we can now ask how the two substantially different versions of az-Zuhrī might have emerged. We have to remember that apparently they both were consciously reworked versions: their differences did not arise accidentally out of the transmission process. We will not be able to reach definitive conclusions, but we can at least establish two hypothetical explanations.

Before tackling the overall divergence between the texts, we will turn to one particular problem: how did the text shift from the (ambiguous) phrase \(mā aqra‘u\) (‘I do not recite/what shall I recite?’) in LV II to the (unequivocal) formulation \(mā anā bi-qārī‘\) (‘I am not one to recite’) in LV I (theoretically, the reverse development would have been possible as well)? This question can be answered with some certainty;\(^{225}\) in any case, we have textual evidence on this issue and do not have to rely solely on speculation.

In accordance with the results of the previous discussion, the following explanation presupposes that \(mā aqra‘u\) is the original form of Muḥammad’s reaction to the request of the angel, transmitted by az-Zuhrī on the authority of ʿUrwah. There is another (late) version of ʿUqayl’s transmission of the Zuhrī recension (appearing only in al-Bayhaqī).\(^{226}\) In it, az-Zuhrī replaced the customary beginning of the tradition according to ʿUrwah with a different initial passage, which he reports on the authority of another teacher, Muḥammad ibn an-Nuʿmān.\(^{227}\) The literal translation reads as follows:

\[(al-Layṭ < ʿUqayl < az-Zuhrī;) Muḥammad ibn an-Nuʿmān ibn Baṣīr al-Anṣārī, who lived in Damascus, reported to him [scil. az-Zuhrī] that the angel came to the messenger of God and said: ‘Recite!’ He [scil. the Prophet] said: \]
I then replied: “I am not one to recite” (mā anā bi-qārī’). The angel did the same with me again, then released me and said: ‘Recite!’ I replied: ‘I am not one to recite.’ The angel did the same with me again, then released me and said: ‘Recite in the name of your Lord …’ (sūrah 96: 1–2) – Muḥammad ibn Nuʿmān said: ‘Thereupon, the messenger of God returned with it [scil. his report of the events].’ – Ibn Śihāb az-Zuhrī said: ‘I heard Ῥwah ibn az-Zubayr say that ‘Āʾišah, the Prophet’s wife, said: “He then returned to Ḥadīṯah etc”.’ (There follows the rest of the tradition as transmitted by az-Zuhrī < Ῥwah < ‘Āʾišah).

Should this – admittedly late – tradition be authentic, then az-Zuhrī would, in addition to Ῥwah, have had a second source for his report of the revelation experience (or a part of it): Muḥammad ibn Nuʿmān. The latter would have transmitted Muḥammad’s reaction to the request of the angel as mā anā bi-qārī’ (I am not one who will/is able to recite). It is definitely possible that az-Zuhrī, while redacting LV I, replaced ‘Ṛwah’s phrase mā aqrā’u as it appears in (the older) LV II with mā anā bi-qārī’ under the influence of Muḥammad ibn an-Nuʿmān. This interpretation of events would also explain the hybrid version preserved by al-Azraqī: he transmits the Zuhrī tradition in Maʿmar’s version, but on the authority of one of Maʿmar’s students other than Ῥabd ar-Razzāq, Ῥabdallāh ibn Muʿād as-Ṣanʿānī (d. 181/797–8). In his version, Muḥammad answers the angel’s request twice with mā anā bi-qārī’ and the third time with mā aqrā’u. Perhaps for a time, az-Zuhrī (and, on his authority, Maʿmar) recited a harmonizing version joining the two different replies he received from Ῥwah and Muḥammad ibn an-Nuʿmān. Still unexplained, however, is the puzzling fact that in most of his lectures, az-Zuhrī only mentioned Ῥwah and not – together with him – Muḥammad ibn an-Nuʿmān as his source for LV I (and the ‘harmonizing’ version).

This is an attempt to account for one element of the wider issue. We will now return to our main question: how can we explain the different character of the two Zuhrī versions?

Our first attempt assumes that LV I is the older version and the only one az-Zuhrī passed on. Possible evidence for this scenario would be its almost verbatim transmission by several independent transmitters (Maʿmar, Ῥqayl, Yūnus). Therefore, variations in LV II preserved by aṭ-Ṭabarī would have been introduced by one of the transmitters between az-Zuhrī and aṭ-Ṭabarī or by the latter himself. The redactor and compiler aṭ-Ṭabarī, however, would hardly have been responsible for the reworking: as we have seen in the case of LV III, he presents his material in a very exact and faithful manner. A more likely candidate would be az-Zuhrī’s student an-Nuʿmān ibn Rāšid. Muslim ḥadīṯ criticism judged him harshly: according to Ῥḥmad ibn Ῥanbal, he transmitted manākir (objectionable material). Ibn Ῥḏī, on the other hand, states that he possessed ‘a notebook (with material) on the authority of az-Zuhrī’ (nusḥah ‘an az-Zuhrī), which was said to be correct. Thus, an-Nuʿmān could have been behind the modifications. But interventions by later transmitters cannot be categorically excluded.
This hypothesis does not provide a good explanation of obviously older, original motifs in LV II, i.e. motifs agreeing with LV III, especially Muḥammad’s answer in the form mā agraʾū. One could only assume that the redactor of LV II knew LV III or a related text and recast his Zuhrī version in accordance with it.

The second explanation assumes that the two different versions (LV I and LV II) indeed originated in this form (roughly) with az-Zuhrī, i.e. they were neither the work of ‘Urwah nor a transmitter after az-Zuhrī. According to this hypothesis, LV II was az-Zuhrī’s older version. He did not substantially alter ‘Urwah’s material, but restructured it and cast it in a different, better shape. The central motifs, albeit partly split (the Ḥadīṯah motif) or reduced (the ufuq motif), were rearranged into a narratively clever and psychologically plausible sequence:

First call of the angel (‘O Muḥammad, you are the messenger of God’)–Muḥammad’s fear and escape to Ḥadīṯah, culminating in his exclamation ‘Wrap me up!’ (zammīlū-nī) (Ḥadīṯah I motif)—his fear subsides—second call of the angel—suicide plan—appearance of the angel who now identifies himself as Gabriel and addresses Muḥammad again as messenger of God (substantially reduced ufuq motif)—revelation of sūrah 96: 1–5 (including assault scene) (iqrāʾ motif)—second escape of Muḥammad to Ḥadīṯah (Ḥadīṯah II motif) etc.

Two incremental developments drive the narrative: Muḥammad’s ever more intense reactions to the two aural apparitions (after the first: escape to Ḥadīṯah; after the second: intention to kill himself) and the progression from the two aural apparitions to the angelic vision with the revelation on the third occasion.

Az-Zuhrī reports in this version that Muḥammad exclaims zammīlū-nī (‘wrap me up!’) at Ḥadīṯah’s place after the first aural apparition. It is not clear whether this motif is derived from ‘Urwah’s version or added by az-Zuhrī (perhaps based on another source), since it is not part of the other ‘Urwah version (including the Ibn Isḥāq < Wahb recension, LV III). What is clear, however, is that az-Zuhrī unwittingly abetted another revelation scenario which contradicted his own account. In his days, traditionists were most decidedly not in agreement as to what was the first portion of the Qurʾānic passages other than sūrah 96: 1–5; according to one widespread opinion, sūrah 74 with its initial verse yā ayyuhā l-muddāṯṭir (‘You who wrap yourself up’)232 was the first revelation.233 Apparently in conscious opposition to az-Zuhrī, this view was supported by his contemporary Yahyā ibn Abī Kaṭīr (d. 129/746–7 or slightly later).234

The Ḥadīṯah235 quoted in its defence has the following isnād: n.n. < Yahyā ibn Abī Kaṭīr < (Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn Qāriḍ az-Zuhrī)236 < Abū Salamah ibn ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān (d. 94/712–13 or ten years later)237 < Ġābir ibn ‘Abdallāh (d. 73/692–3 or later;238 he invokes the Prophet himself as his source). It explicitly stresses the chronological priority of sūrah 74 over sūrah 96 and combines the tahannūt (only briefly alluded to), ufuq and Ḥadīṯah narrations. In detail, the sequence is as follows: aural apparition (hearing a call) and vision (Muḥammad
sees an angel on the horizon, which in this text is sitting on a throne)—Muḥammad’s escape to Ḥadīghah, his exclamation, ‘Wrap me up!’ (daṭṭirū-nī)—revelation of sūrah 74.

Juynboll assumes that az-Zuhrī, in an attempt to counter Yahyā’s ‘attack’, spread a tradition adapted to the opposing tradition with the same isnād which suggests that Yahyā’s ḥadīth was correct, but describes events occurring after the fatrah (temporary suspension of the revelation). He calls it az-Zuhrī’s ‘fatrah trick’. Az-Zuhrī accommodates Yahyā’s ‘theory’ to a certain degree by admitting that sūrah 74 in a sense is a ‘first’ revelation, but only the first revelation after the fatrah, not the first revelation of them all. So much for Juynboll, who we can largely follow on this matter.

It is very well possible that az-Zuhrī reworked his original version of the tradition according to ‘Urwah < ‘Ā‘iṣah after Yahyā’s attack and adjusted it to the newly introduced fatrah motif. This, in my opinion, is one possible reason for the differences between the two Zuhrī versions of the tradition.

At the end of the presumably earlier version LV II, az-Zuhrī still quotes the Prophet to the effect that the next revelation after sūrah 96 was 68, followed by 74. A fatrah (temporary suspension of the revelation) is not yet mentioned. In contrast, three transmissions (by Ma’mar, Yūnus, ‘Uqayl) of the second version of our tradition (LV I) invariably contain an adjunct of varying length, which always begins with ‘Then, revelation was temporarily suspended’, wa-fatara l-waḥy (fatrah annex). Yet, adding the annex was not enough. To support his position regarding the primacy of sūrah 96, az-Zuhrī had to change the structure and sequence of motifs of his first, ‘psychologizing’ version. Most importantly, he had to shift the positioning of one motif, Muḥammad’s flight to Ḥadīghah (taking place prior to the revelation of sūrah 96), to another place in the story. Since this motif culminated with Muḥammad’s exclamation zammlū-nī, it would have led people to expect a revelation beginning with yā ayyūhā l-muzzammil/muddattīr (sūrah 73 or 74). This section was now placed after the revelation experience (the exclamation might have been intended to prepare the next revelation after the fatrah). In addition, az-Zuhrī moved Muhammad’s desperation and suicide plan to the time of the fatrah (perhaps to provide a convincing reason for the next appearance of the angel).

Should this explanation be correct, LV II would have been az-Zuhrī’s older and LV I his later version, adjusted to accommodate the fatrah trick. The higher degree of similarity between the wording of the (possibly earlier) version LV II and the Ibn Ishāq < Wahb (< ‘Urwah) version LV III as compared to the ‘purged’ (possibly later) version LV I also suggests that this explanation is valid.

2.7 The probable archetype: The narration of the qāṣṣ ‘Ubayd ibn ‘Umayr

‘Ubayd ibn ‘Umayr’s (d. 68/687–8) narration is at the root of Wahb’s and probably also ‘Urwah’s version. We can establish the following at least highly probable assumptions:
In his story, 'Ubayd explicitly singled out or at least implied sūrah 96: 1–5 as the initial revelation. This is confirmed by an awā'il tradition independent of our tradition, which was transmitted by Ibn Abī Šaybah,245 al-Balāḏurī,246 Ibn Sa'd247 and at-Ṭabarī248 with the isnād n.n. < Šu'bah ibn al-Ḥaggāq (d. 160/776)249 < 'Amr ibn Dinār (d. 125/742–3 or a year later)250 < 'Ubayd. In his Tafsīr,251 'Abd ar-Razzāq has the isnād Ibn 'Uyaynah < 'Amr ibn Dīnār < 'Ubayd.

2 'Ubayd’s story was already a long version, i.e. an elaborately composed ‘conglomerate’, since it would have been expected from a popular narrator to entertain and edify his audience with a long, well structured and exciting tale.

3 The qiṣṣah elements of the story preserved in the Ibn Ishāq < Wahb recension (which are, except for small remnants, missing in az-Zuhri’s text; they were probably already reduced by 'Urwa) were drawn from the story delivered by the qāss 'Ubayd.

Did the ‘popular narrator’ ‘Ubayd invent the story? Hardly – if the information Ibn Ishāq gives about its presentation at the court of Abdallāh ibn az-Zubayr is correct,252 ‘Ubayd related it ‘in front of people who were familiar with the events. He would have been able to embellish the truth (or whatever Abdallāh and his circle regarded as the truth), but he could not substantially deviate from it.’253

2.8 Other variants of the iqra’ narration

As Sprenger had already pointed out254 and as Juynboll and Rubin have demonstrated again more recently,255 there were other transmitters who, at around the same time ‘Ubayd disseminated the story, spread parts or variations of the narration. However, the high degree of resemblance in motifs and motif sequence we find in the traditions according to az-Zuhri < 'Urwa on the one hand and Ibn Ishāq < Wahb < 'Ubayd on the other is unique.

There is for example one tradition in multiple transmissions258 which is traced back to the original informant Abdallāh ibn Šaddād (d. 81/700).259 Common link of the respective isnāds is Abū Ishāq Sulaymān as-Ṣaybānī (d. 129/746–7 or later),258 a contemporary of az-Zuhri. Similar to the versions ultimately derived from 'Ubayd,259 but in a much shorter form,260 the tradition relates the story from Gabriel’s appearance until Waraqah’s prophecy. Juynboll believes that Abdallāh ibn Šaddād formulated his tradition following 'Ubayd (but without quoting him as his source).261 Rubin, on the other hand, maintains on the basis of the contents of the tradition that 'Abdallāh ibn Šaddād’s version is older.262

A further similar, but even shorter variant appears in Ibn Ḥaǧar’s Buḥārī commentary.263 It allegedly formed part of the Sūrah composed by Ibn Ishāq’s contemporary Abū l-Mu’tamir Sulaymān ibn Ṭārḥān at-Taymī (d. 143/760)264 and reads as follows:

(Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-A’lā [d. 245/859–60]265 < Mu’tamir ibn Sulaymān [d. 187/803 or 804]266 < Sulaymān at-Taymī:) Gabriel came to the Prophet on Mount Ḥirā’ and made him recite: ‘Recite in the name of your Lord!’ He

We will insert here a description of a further tradition, again a conglomerate, which deals with the subject of Muḥammad's first revelation experience.\(^{267}\) It differs somewhat from the other traditions studied so far: it lacks the iqra' narration. We will nevertheless analyse this text because the conglomerate displays, in spite of the missing iqra' narration, surprising similarities in motifs and wording to the conglomerates ultimately originating with ʿUrwa ibn az-Zubayr or ʿUbayd ibn ʿAmr.

As we can see in Figure 2.4, the common link (CL) of this (frequently quoted) tradition is the Kūfan Abū Ishāq ʿAmr ibn ʿAbdallāh as-Sabīṭī (d. 127/745),\(^{268}\) a contemporary of az-Zuhrī and Wahb. He reports on the authority of Abū Maysarah ʿAmr ibn Šuraḥbīl,\(^{269}\) a contemporary of ʿUbayd. As-Sabīṭī must have transmitted the tradition from memory and mainly in his family; the versions of his two sons and his grandson differ substantially in wording while preserving the same meaning (riwāyah bi-l-maʿnā). Thus, the tradition received a stable form only a generation after the CL or even later.\(^{270}\)
Almost identical in wording are the two sub-versions originating from Isrā‘īl ibn ‘Amr we find in Ibn Abī Šaybah and al-Wāhidī; the latter, however, substantially shortens the tradition. Practically identical in both wording and text stock are the two versions derived from Yūnus ibn Bukayr, a transmitter living two generations after the CL (as-Sabī‘ī). They were preserved by al-‘Uṭāridī and as-Suḥaylī.

The main difference between this ḥadīṭ on the one hand and the previously discussed ḥadīṭs (on the authority of az-Zuhrī < ‘Urwh and Ibn Ishāq < Wahb < ‘Ubayd) on the other is the occasion and character of the first revelation. The starting point of the revelation experience is not the ‘assault’ of the angel in the cave on Mount Ḥirā’, but an aural apparition (an angelic voice calling Muḥammad when he is alone, without any vision), i.e. in a way, a reduced ufūq narration. Even more importantly, the first revelation is not sūrah 96: 1–5, but the Qur’ān’s first sūrah, the Fātihah. Accordingly, the angel does not request Muḥammad to recite (iqra‘), he merely says qul, ‘speak’. In addition, Muḥammad visits Waraqah in the company of Abū Bakr (not his wife Ḥadiǧah) and the revelation experience proper is situated between this and a second visit to Waraqah.

Apart from these differences, we notice striking resemblances in the motifs and formulations of the respective texts (we even find verbatim parallels!). After the aural apparition, Muḥammad tells Ḥadiǧah that he thinks he is going insane. She replies:

\[
\text{mā kāna Ilāh li-yaf‘ala bi-ka ḍālika}
\]

God is not one to treat you in this manner.

There are remarkable similarities in wording especially compared to the Ibn Ishāq version. The remark above is followed by Ḥadiǧah’s praise of her husband, expressed in parallel phrases:

\[
taṣduq l-ḥadīṯ wa-tu‘addī l-amānah wa-taṣilu r-riḥm
\]

You speak truthfully, you deliver that which is committed to your trust [scil. to its owners] and you bind tightly the ties of relationship (by kind behaviour to your relatives)

They are in part identical to the parallel passages in the recensions of az-Zuhrī and Hišām ibn ‘Urwh. Waraqah tells Muḥammad that the Nāmūs of Moses has come to him (Jesus is also mentioned), predicts the rejection and enmity he will suffer from his fellow countrymen and expresses his desire to live long enough to assist him in his struggle – similar to what we read in the other versions known to us.

2.9 The basic components of the traditions about the first revelation

Apparently, by the second half of the first century, a set of fixed motifs were already in existence which could be combined with different versions of the
‘story about Muḥammad’s first revelation experience’. Accounts identifying surah 96: 1–5 as the initial revelation are usually linked with the iqra’ narration (the story of the angel requesting or forcing Muḥammad to recite, set in a cave atop Mount Ḥirā'); whenever surah 74 is the first revelation, it is linked with the ufūq narration (the story of the appearance of the angel on the horizon). Other set motifs could be injected into the narrative, e.g. the taḥannūṭ motif and/or the Waraqah narration into the account centred around surah 96 as the initial divine message. The ufūq narrative, however, could also be combined with the iqra’ narrative and thus linked to surah 96. Finally, we also find a combination of motifs normally characteristic for an account involving surah 96 as the first revelation which is linked to surah 1 as the initial divine message. These motifs could (to a large extent) be freely assembled and applied to the first revelation experience in different configurations and degrees of elaboration and length.

In his study of the early futūḥ traditions, Noth made similar observations. He writes: ‘One composed traditions by combining more or less independent narrative motifs, which were integral parts of the futūḥ tradition, to a whole [in the manner of a mosaic]’272 and also notes a ‘collage-like combination of heterogeneous tradition material’. According to Noth, the concept of history of the transmitters reflected in their approach273 ‘aimed less at a flawlessly accurate account of events than delivering attractive and memorable images’ – a very apt description indeed for the procedures followed by early transmitters in composing their versions of the Prophet’s first revelation experience!

ʿUbayd ibn ʿUmayr combined a considerable collection of motifs (the taḥannūṭ, Ḥadīghah, iqra’, ufūq and Waraqah narrations) which circulated at the time, customarily associated with the beginnings of revelation and regarded to be true. The result was a coherent, edifying and entertaining story. Additionally, as a qāṣṣ, he probably embellished and extended certain elements. Subsequently, this story, which he also related in the Zubayrid family circle, was spread by members of this family as a ‘family tradition’. In some cases, its specific composition was preserved comparatively well in transmission (e.g. as transmitted by ʿUrwa > az-Zuhra and Wahb > Ibn Ishāq; also to a certain degree by ʿUrwa > Abū l-Aswad > Ibn Lahīʿah); in others, it was heavily abridged (in ʿUrwa > Hišām ibn ʿUrwa) or reduced to an awāʾil tradition or even dismantled and some of its elements recombined with other motifs (in ʿUrwa > Yazīd ibn Rūmān).274

Other (contemporary or later) transmitters described the circumstances and occasion of the revelation of surah 96 similarly and occasionally employed the same motifs. It is sometimes difficult to decide whether they drew on the same sources independently or depended on (i.e. imitated) each other, since the only material we have for comparison are variously modified transmissions, not the original versions. There is no need for us to offer a definite account of the dependencies between the texts; we do not have to side with either Juynboll, who claims that ʿAbdallāh ibn Šaddād merely imitated ʿUbayd’s story,275 or Rubin, who regards the version of the former as the more original text on the basis of its contents.276 We have to keep in mind, however, that independent composition becomes less likely with the growing length of shared motif sequences and a
higher degree of similarity in the elaboration of the motifs.\textsuperscript{277} Thus, we can be sure that the Zuhrī < ‘Urwah and Ibn Isḥāq < Wahb recensions were \textit{not} composed independently of each other. What we wanted to demonstrate was that their probable shared source was ‘Ubayd ibn ‘Umayr’s account presented at the Zubayrid court.

\section*{2.10 A factual core of the traditions about the experience of the first revelation?}

Do the traditions about the first revelation experience contain a factual core? We at least cannot exclude that Muḥammad talked about the beginnings of revelation in his Medinese period and that his account – or parts or motifs of it – became the basis for later stories or legends. Some scholars took that position;\textsuperscript{278} von Stülpnagel even considered it possible ‘that ‘Urwah’s (purged) text … reproduces the version of the first revelation Muḥammad himself deemed best in his Medinese period’.\textsuperscript{279} In accordance with Lammens’ theory,\textsuperscript{280} other scholars maintain that the \textit{iqra’} narration grew out of an interpretation of the first verses of \textit{sūrah 96} (as much as the \textit{ufuq} narration allegedly developed out of an interpretation of \textit{sūrah 53}, especially verses 6–10, and \textit{sūrah 81: 23}).\textsuperscript{281}

At this point, we can proceed no further. In terms of the study of oral tradition, the transmission-historical situation which has emerged from our analyses has to be described as follows: even the oldest, more or less safely identifiable informants for the story (‘Ubayd ibn ‘Umayr; even more so ‘Abdallāh ibn Ṣaddād and Abū Maysarah)\textsuperscript{282} received the account through \textit{hearsay}, not from an immediate witness or a contemporary of the event. What they report are ‘memories of memories’ and therefore oral traditions.\textsuperscript{283} The events in question did not take place during their lifetime, but long before their birth. The claim that the Prophet himself reported his first revelation experience in this way and that he himself designated \textit{sūrah 96: 1–5} as the first revealed text is therefore nothing more than a \textit{hypothesis}.\textsuperscript{284} There exist, and already existed in early Islam, other hypotheses on this issue.\textsuperscript{285}

In Chapter 3, I will analyse a tradition for which the oldest safely identifiable informant recorded and passed on the report of a \textit{contemporary} source, probably the affected person herself; hence, it constitutes ‘oral history’.

\section*{2.11 Summary}

The findings of this chapter largely concern transmission history. They are as follows:

- Stories about Muḥammad’s ‘first revelation experience’ with a varied, but nevertheless restricted stock of fixed motifs (e.g. the \textit{ufuq}, \textit{iqra’} and Waraqah narrations), which could be freely recombined, were already known and passed on in the second half of the first century AH. One version must have travelled to Europe already in the year 93/711 or slightly later and was reworked as part of a Christian legend in England in the first quarter of the second/eighth century.
One of these stories disseminated in the first century AH formed part of the repertoire of a qāṣṣ. It was a conglomerate consisting of a particular combination of taḥannūt, iqra’, ufūq, Ḥadīḥah and Waraqah narrations and identified sūrah 96: 1–5 as the initial revelation.

Representatives of the first generation of scholarly transmitters, ‘Urwah in particular, took up the conglomerate and reshaped it stylistically, rendering the qīṣṣah into a ḥadīt.

After the first generation of scholarly transmitters (‘Urwah > Hišām ibn ‘Urwah, ‘Urwah > az-Zuhrī, etc.), the ḥadīt underwent substantial changes, e.g. variations in its wording (riwāyah bī-l-ma’nā was the predominant mode of transmission), structural modifications for redactional reasons (sometimes substantial abridgements, rearrangements, decomposition) and tendentious alterations (embellishment, palliation through reworking of motifs).

After the second generation (az-Zuhrī > Ma’mar, az-Zuhrī > Ibn Isḥāq, etc.), further, but less substantial changes took place. They mainly affected the wording or consisted of other, redactional modifications. These changes decreased over time: verbatim transmission of certain passages (riwāyah bī-l-lafż) can already be observed from az-Zuhrī onwards (but not for his contemporary as-Sabī‘ī!). It becomes more frequent, but still not the rule, with the third generation (Ibn Isḥāq > al-Bakkā‘ī, Yūnus ibn Bukayr; Ma’mar > ‘Abd ar-Razzāq) and is more or less generally followed starting with the fourth generation (‘Abd ar-Razzāq, al-Bakkā‘ī, Yūnus ibn Bukayr).

Alterations did not come to an end even after the fourth generation (al-Bakkā‘ī > Ibn Hišām), but they were generally confined to abridgements, which occasionally changed the meaning of the text (e.g. in Ibn Hišām).
3 The issue of authenticity

The tradition of the slander against ‘Āʾišah (ḥadīṭ al-ifk)

Our second case study centres on the ḥadīṭ al-ifk, the tradition (better: tradition complex) about a slanderous allegation against ‘Āʾišah. This ‘scandal story’ was studied by Wansbrough in his Sectarian Milieu and in Juynboll’s article ‘Early Islamic society’. Spellberg devoted a chapter of her book Politics, Gender and the Islamic Past to the subject, approaching it from a gender studies perspective. The ḥadīṭ has also been treated by Buhl, Abbott, von Stülpmagel, Widengren and others. In the following discussion, I will deal explicitly with Wansbrough. As in the previous chapter, Juynboll’s method of isnād analysis has exerted a substantial influence on our procedure; in addition, we will concur with his general assessment of the tradition (its authentic core).

Wansbrough’s analysis is based on the three best known recensions of the tradition. With the help of the ‘form-critical method’ (developed in Old Testament studies), its concepts and terminological tools, he means to prove a particular hypothesis, namely that the texts illustrate the development from a loosely structured narration to a concise normative exemplum, from mythical to normative content, from qīṣṣah to ḥadīṭ. He posits Ibn Isḥāq’s (d. 150/767) recension as the basic form of the story. As its most developed form, he identifies al-Buḥārī’s (d. 198/815) text, which allegedly serves an exclusively (and expectedly) paradigmatic purpose. Between the two, he situates the version of al-Wāqidi (d. 207/823), who refines Ibn Isḥāq’s text without giving it al-Buḥārī’s reductive character. For now, we will leave Wansbrough’s hypothesis aside and will return to it later.

3.1 The Zuhrī recension

The first step in our analysis of the tradition will once again be to compile as exhaustive a corpus of recensions and versions of the story as possible. We will arrange it according to isnāds, which accompany most of them. Among other things, it turns out that the Buḥārī version quoted by Wansbrough forms part of a very large group of texts which draw on the report of Ibn Šihāb az-Zuhrī (d. 124/742). According to al-Buḥārī’s commentator Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī, a total of eighteen transmitters report it on the authority of az-Zuhrī.

Thus, az-Zuhrī is the common link (CL) of the stemma (cf. Figure 3.1). For the moment, we can therefore assume that az-Zuhrī disseminated the story in this
Figure 3.1 The Zuhrî recension of the ḥadîth al-ifk
form. Ibn Ishāq also reports the tradition on the authority of az-Zuhri, but he claims to have mixed his material with the reports of two additional informants. First, we will turn to the unmixed versions transmitted only on the authority of az-Zuhri. Its contents in this recension (according to the version of ‘Abd ar-Razzāq) are as follows:

1. As is his custom, the Prophet has his wives draw lots among themselves before a raid. ‘Ā’ishah’s lot wins: she is permitted to accompany the Prophet.
2. On its return, the army stops overnight near Medina. ‘Ā’ishah walks off to relieve herself and loses her necklace. Searching for it takes some time, but she finds it at last. In the meantime, the army has left without her. The carriers did not notice that she was not in her palanquin.
3. ‘Ā’ishah reasons that women at that time were very lightweight on account of their sparse diet.
4. She finds her necklace. A young straggler by the name of Ṣafwān ibn al-Mu’āṭṭāl discovers her, puts her on a camel and escorts her to the army.
5. (a) ‘Ā’ishah is wrongfully accused in Medina for the incident; (b) ‘Abdallāh ibn Ubayy ibn Sa pill is named as one of the slanderers.
6. Immediately after her return, ‘Ā’ishah falls ill and thus remains ignorant of the scandal. Only Muḥammad’s unwonted indifference towards her arouses her suspicion.
7. During a nightly walk to relieve herself, she meets Umm Misṭaḥ, the mother of one of her accusers by the name of Misṭaḥ. Umm Misṭaḥ informs her about the scandal.
8. The Prophet allows his young wife to return to her parents’ home.
9. She discusses the scandal with her mother Umm Rūmān, who is already aware of the news, and spends the night and the following morning in tears.
10. Muḥammad consults with ‘Āli and Usaymah on what to do next. He questions a servant by the name of Barīrah about ‘Ā’ishah; her report is entirely positive.
11. In a public speech (ḥutbah), the Prophet comments on the scandal.
12. Immediately afterwards, a conflict erupts between the Banū ʿAwāṣ whose leader and spokesman is Sa’d ibn Mu‘āḏ and the Banū ʿHasraṯ whose leader is Sa’d ibn ʿUbādah. The latter’s arguments are countered by Usayd ibn Ḥudayr, another tribesman of the Banū ʿAwāṣ.
13. Muḥammad visits the griefstricken ‘Ā’ishah, who still remains in her parents’ home, and asks her to repent. She defends herself and insists on her innocence.
15. ‘Ā’ishah’s father Abū Bakr threatens to withhold his future support from his relative and client Misṭaḥ, one of the accusers. Revelation of sūrah 24: 22. Abū Bakr retracts his threat.
16. ‘Ā’ishah praises the Prophet’s wife Zaynab, sister of Ḥamnah, one of her detractors. Unlike her sister, Zaynab has only good things to say of ‘Ā’ishah.

The story occurs several times in different chapters of al-Buhārī’s Sahih, three times in full. Each of these versions credits a different transmitter of az-Zuhri: in the Kitāb as-ṣahādāt, the source is Fulayḥ ibn Sulaymān (d. 168/784), in the
Kitāb at-tafsīr, it is Yūnus ibn Yazīd (d. 159/775); and in the Kitāb al-mağāzī, it is Sāliḥ ibn Kaysān (d. after 140/757–8). The oldest extant work to contain a version of the story derived from az-Zuhrī is, according to my knowledge, the Musannaf of ʿAbd ar-Razzāq ibn Hammām as-Šanānī (d. 211/827), who transmits on the authority of his teacher Maʿmar ibn Rāṣid (d. 154/775) < az-Zuhrī. One of the many scholars to quote the ʿAbd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar version is Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) in his Musnad. In their Tafsīr, at-Ṭabarī25 and an-Nasāʾī26 include versions which are also transmitted from Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī, but traced not via ʿAbd ar-Razzāq, but another of Maʿmar’s students, Muḥammad ibn Ṭawr (d. 190/805–6 or somewhat earlier). The story also appears in Muslim’s Šaḥīḥ; he merges Maʿmar’s version with another version (reported according to Yūnus ibn Yazīd) and indicates at the end variants from two further versions (Fulayḥ ibn Sulaymān and Sāliḥ ibn Kaysān).

Altogether, the versions listed above are very similar (especially the Maʿmar and Yūnus versions; this might have been why Muslim merged them). Motif stock and sequence are identical in each text. In addition, their wording is very similar, even identical at times. Nevertheless, we observe a small amount of amplifications (or additions), deletions (or omissions), minor rearrangements and the occurrence of synonyms, etc. in some versions. Additions in particular sometimes give a version its very own flavour. Since so many transmitters have, independently of each other, reported the story on the authority of az-Zuhrī and since their versions display exactly the amount of differences to be expected on the basis of contemporary transmission methods, the most likely explanation is that az-Zuhrī passed on the tradition in the form we have extant in several versions or at least in a very similar form.

We can therefore establish a first important preliminary result: the scandal report according to al-Buḥārī was disseminated in this form not two, but one hundred years after the incident. On the basis of the resemblances between the different versions, we can even reconstruct with some accuracy substantial portions of the original wording of the Zuhrī recension.

3.2 The Ibn Isḥāq recension

Let us now turn to the Ibn Isḥāq recension, keeping in mind that the original text of his report is lost. What we have are three later versions of his report transmitted according to students of his: in Ibn Ḥiṣām’s Šīrāḥ (reporting on the authority of al-Bakkāʾī), in at-Ṭabarī’s Taʿrīḫ (according to Salamah ibn al-Fadl) and in ʿUmar ibn Šabbah’s Taʿrīḫ al-Madīnah al-munawwarah (on the authority of Ibn ʿUlayyah). They are similar enough to ignore their minor variants for the purpose of this study.

Apart from his teacher az-Zuhrī, Ibn Isḥāq lists two more sources for his story. The relevant ḣsnāds are:

1 Ibn Isḥāq < Yahyā ibn ʿAbbād < (his father) ʿAbbād ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn az-Zubayr < ʿĀʾišah; and
2 Ibn Isḥāq < ʿAbdallāh ibn Abī Bakr (d. 130/747 or later) < ʿAmrah bint ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān (d. before 100/718) < ʿĀʾišah.
Ibn Isḥāq claims to have merged the three reports. The contents of Ibn Isḥāq’s recension are as follows:\(^{41}\)

1 (= 1) As is his custom, the Prophet has his wives draw lots among themselves before a raid (in this version, we learn that it is against the Banū l-Muṣṭaliq). ‘Ā’īšah’s lot wins: she is permitted to accompany the Prophet.
2 (= 3) ‘Ā’īšah reasons that women at that time were very lightweight on account of their sparse diet. She was carried in a palanquin.
3 (= 2) On its return, the army stops over night near Medina. ‘Ā’īšah walks off to relieve herself and loses her necklace. Searching for it takes some time, but she finds it at last. In the meantime, the army has left without her. The carriers did not notice that she was not in her palanquin.
4 (= 4) Ṣafwān ibn al-Mu’attal discovers ‘Ā’īšah and escorts her to the army.
5 (= 5a) ‘Ā’īšah is wrongfully accused on account of the incident.
6 (= 6) Immediately after her return, ‘Ā’īšah falls ill and thus remains ignorant of the scandal. Only Muḥammad’s unwonted indifference towards her arouses her suspicion.
7 (= 8) The Prophet allows her to return to her parents’ home.

(see Figure 3.2) Ibn Isḥāq claims to have merged the three reports.
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Figure 3.2 The Ibn Isḥāq recension of the ḥadīṯ al-ifk

---

\(^{41}\) The contents of Ibn Isḥāq’s recension are as follows:
During a nightly walk to relieve herself she meets Umm Miṣṭaḥ. The latter informs her about the scandal. She discusses the scandal with her mother Umm Rūmān, who is already aware of the news. In a public speech (ḥuṭbah), the Prophet comments on the scandal. 'Aʾišah names the main slanderers. These are 'Abdallāh ibn Ubayy, Miṣṭaḥ and Ḥamnah. Immediately after Muḥammad’s ḥuṭbah, a conflict erupts between the Banū l-Aws whose spokesman is Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr (!) and the Banū l-Ḫazraḡ whose spokesman is Saʿd ibn ʿUbādah. Muḥammad consults with 'Alī and Usāmah on what to do next. He queries a servant by the name of Barīrah about 'Aʾišah. Muḥammad visits the griefstricken 'Aʾišah, who still remains in her parents’ home, and asks her to repent. She insists on her innocence. Revelation of sūrah 24: 11ff. which establishes 'Āʾišah’s innocence. The Prophet delivers another ḥuṭbah, in which he recites the revealed verses. He then orders corporal punishment ḥadd to be carried out against Miṣṭaḥ, Ḥassān ibn Ṭābit and Ḥamnah. (With a new isnād:) Abū Ayyūb and his wife talk about 'Āʾišah’s innocence. 'Āʾišah recites verbatim the verses revealed about her (sūrah 24: 11ff.) and explains them.

As we can see above, Ibn Ishāq’s recension partially matches that of az-Zuhrī – we even find verbatim agreements. In other parts, however, the recensions display a substantial amount of variation. Some motifs are rearranged and, most importantly, we find several additional motifs. The chronological presentation is striking: the scandal is placed at the end of the raid against the Banū l-Muṣṭaliq (also called al-Muraysiʿ after the location), which, according to Ibn Ishāq, took place in the year 6 AH. This is not the case in all the versions which only follow the Zuhrī recension. In addition, Ibn Ishāq puts Muḥammad’s visit to ‘Āʾišah and his permission for her to return to her parents (7) before ‘Āʾišah learns about the scandal through Umm Miṣṭaḥ (8); the Prophet’s consultation with 'Alī and Usāmah and the questioning of Barīrah (14) take place after his ḥuṭbah (10) and the conflict between the Banū l-Aws and the Banū l-Ḫazraḡ (13). Finally, Ibn Ishāq reports a second ḥuṭbah (17), in which Muḥammad announces the revelation and orders corporal punishment against the three slanderers (interestingly, ‘Abdallāh ibn Ubayy is not included). A new element Ibn Ishāq adds to a motif both recensions share is 'Alī’s use of violence against the servant Barīrah to intimidate her and force her to tell the truth about ‘Āʾišah. There are other divergences as well.

The issue of authenticity
If we examine Ibn Ishāq’s claim to have used two other sources alongside the Zuhrī recension, we find that there is enough evidence to confirm that he used the first of these two extra sources; the same is at least likely in the case of the second. The rest cannot be assessed, because the material specific to Ibn Ishāq has not turned up in any other source.

One of the motifs in Ibn Ishāq’s version missing in the Zuhrī recension, the second ḥuṭbah of the Prophet and the subsequent punishment of the three slanderers, occurs in a separate tradition which Ibn Ishāq also transmitted outside his Kitāb al-maḡāzī. Its isnād traces the tradition through ‘Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr < ‘Amrah to ‘Ā’īshah. Thus, it is one of the chains of transmitters which – as part of a collective isnād – precede the ḥadīth al-ifk in the Kitāb al-maḡāzī. This is one version of the text:

(Ibn Abī ‘Adī [Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm, d. 192/807–8 or two years later]46 < Ibn Ishāq < ‘Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr < ‘Amrah < ‘Ā’īshah:) When my innocence was revealed, the Messenger of God mounted the minbar, related (what had happened) and recited the Qur’ān (i.e. the revelation in question). When he came down, he ordered that two men and one woman receive corporal punishment (ḥadd).

Two other versions47 name the slanderers. In one of them, we read:

(an-Nufaylī ['Abdallāh ibn Muḥammad, d. 234/848–9]48 < Muḥammad ibn Salamah al-Bāḥīlī [d. 192/807]49 < Ibn Ishāq < ‘Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr … :) He then ordered that two men and one woman of those who had uttered the abomination (receive corporal punishment): Ḥassān ibn Ṭābit and Mistaḥ ibn Uṯāṭah. An-Nufaylī says: And it is said that the woman was Ḥamnah bint Ḥaḥš.50

In Ibn Ishāq’s recension of the slander story in his Kitāb al-maḡāzī (as transmitted by Ibn Hišām) which contains this passage (17) as an additional element compared to the Zuhrī recension, it takes the following form:

He [scil. the Prophet] then went out to the people. He spoke to them and recited to them the Qur’ān, which God had revealed to him about it. He then ordered that Mistaḥ ibn Uṯāṭah, Ḥassān ibn Ṭābit and Ḥamnah bint Ġaḥš – and they were among those who had uttered the abomination – receive their corporal punishment (ḥadd).51

A tradition going back to the same Ibn Ishāq and passed on by him separately (i.e. outside of the Kitāb al-maḡāzī) is, of course, in itself no proof that he actually received a corresponding tradition, included in his Kitāb al-maḡāzī, from the source he quotes instead of inventing it. But the tradition according to ‘Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr was also transmitted independently of Ibn Ishāq, e.g. in ‘Abd ar-Razzāq’s Muṣannaf and his Tafsīr52 (see Figure 3.3). In the Muṣannaf, it takes the following form:
ʿAbd ar-Razzāq < Ibn Abī Yaḥyā [Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad, d. 184/800 or 191/806–7]53 < ʿAbdallāh ibn Abī Bakr < ʿAmrah < ʿĀʾishah.) She [scil. ʿĀʾishah] said: when God had revealed her innocence (barāʿa-ta-hā), the Prophet inflicted corporal punishment upon those who had uttered that (abomination) about her (ḥadda ... allaḏīnā qālū mā qālū fīhā).

In another version independent of Ibn Isḥāq, the slanderers – the males at least – are named:

Bakr:) The messenger of God ordered Ḥassān and Miṣṭah to be beaten. Abū Āṣim said: ‘I asked him [scil. al-Ḥasan ibn Zayd]: “And the woman?” He answered: “The woman also received corporal punishment.”56

Clearly, Ibn Ishāq used an additional source: the tradition he mentioned in the collective isnād, received from ‘Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr. Thus, he did not forge a tradition. The designation of two male culprits, Ḥassān ibn Ṭābit and Miṣṭah, noticeably excluding ‘Abdallāh ibn Ubayy who is named in the Zuhrī recension, is another element which obviously originated with ‘Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr.

Ibn Ishāq’s use of an additional source probably also applies to the other passage in his account of the scandal for which we have a parallel tradition under his name outside of the Kitāb al-mağāzī. In this case, however, we have not yet found a transmission independent of Ibn Ishāq to confirm our hypothesis. The passage does not consist of additional material not found in the Zuhrī recension, but a parallel or doublet of a motif already reported by az-Zuhrī.

The isnād of the text is: Ibn Ishāq < Yahyā ibn Ṭābi’ < ‘Abbad ibn ‘Abdallāh < ‘Ā’ishah. (a) In the version transmitted independently of the Kitāb al-mağāzī we read:

The messenger of God summoned ‘Alī and Usāmah ibn Zayd and asked them for advice. Usāmah spoke very well (of me); he said: ‘We only know good things about your wife. This is absurd and a lie (hāḏāl bāṭīl wa-l-kāḏīb).’ ‘Alī on the other hand said: ‘There are many women. You can repudiate her (wa inna-ka la-qādir an tastaḵra). Just ask the maid; she will tell the truth!’59

(b) In the version included in the Kitāb al-mağāzī (according to Ibn Hišām) we read:

He summoned ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and Usāmah ibn Zayd and asked them for advice. Usāmah spoke very well (of me) and (also) expressed this. He said: ‘O Messenger of God! We only know good things about your wife and one only knows good things about her. This is a lie and absurd.’ But ‘Alī said: ‘O Messenger of God! There are many women. You can take another instead of her (inna-ka la-qādir ʿalā an tastaḵhlīfa). Just ask the maid, she will tell you the truth!’60

For comparison, this is the parallel text in the Zuhrī recension:

Since a revelation failed to occur, the messenger of God summoned ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and Usāmah ibn Zayd to ask their advice about a divorce from his wife. She [scil. ʿĀʾishah] said: ‘Usāmah told the messenger of God what he knew about the innocence of his [scil. the Prophet’s] wife and what he himself knew about her love (for him). He said: “O Messenger of God, she is your wife and we know only good things (about her).”’ But ‘Alī said: ‘God has not been stingy to you (lam yuḍayyiq Allāh ʿalāy-ka). There are many other women besides her. If you ask the maid, she will tell you the truth.’61"
Obviously, Ibn Ishāq followed Yahyā’s transmission in the *Kitāb al-maḡāzī*, not that of az-Zuhrī. It is unlikely that he invented the former, since both traditions are identical in meaning. Why should he have bothered to forge a doublet with the same meaning? Therefore, we have to assume that, for some reason, he liked Yahyā’s tradition better and preferred it. Perhaps he was prompted by the fine phrase ‘absurd and a lie’ and the succinctness of Yahyā’s version.

There is another tradition Ibn Ishāq reported, outside of the *Kitāb al-maḡāzī*, on the authority of Yahyā ibn ‘Abbād < ‘Abbād ibn ‘Abdallāh < ‘Āʾishah. It also mentions the scandal. This tradition links the scandal story with another *sabab an-nuzūl* (occasion of revelation) narrative, which was – strangely enough – also triggered by ‘Āʾishah’s loss of a necklace: the revelation of the sand ablution verse (*tayammum*), surahs 4:43 and 5:6.62 The (alleged or true) transmitter after ‘Āʾishah, ‘Abbād ibn Abdallāh ibn az-Zubayr, was actually her great nephew. He is said to have passed on a report from ‘Āʾishah which begins as follows: ‘When the said incident with the necklace had occurred and the slanderers (*ahl al-ifk*) had said this and I (subsequently) left with the Prophet on another raid, my necklace again fell off …’63

This tradition represents one piece of evidence, but admittedly no strong proof, for the idea that Yahyā ibn ‘Abbād was one of Ibn Ishāq’s informants for the slander story (or parts of it). Be that as it may, these are our results at this stage:

- Ibn Ishāq drew, for his own recension of the story, mainly on the Zuhrī recension. The latter must already have had the structure which is known to us today. Incidentally, this demonstrates that the Zuhrī recension was already known about one century after the event.
- Ibn Ishāq supplemented his recension with material from other traditions or elements thereof.
- (At least) one of these secondary traditions is extant in a transmission independent of Ibn Ishāq.

**Excursus: Chronology**

To conclude our discussion of this recension, we have to answer an important chronological question:64 why did Ibn Ishāq link the scandal story with the raid against the Banū l-Muštaliq?65 This synchronization puts the incident, in Ibn Ishāq’s recension, in the year 6/627.66 The link and chronological arrangement is foreign to both the (original) Zuhrī recension and a recension according to Hišām ibn ‘Urwah.67 Yet, Ibn Ishāq and al-Buḥārī claim that it was az-Zuhrī who connected the scandal story and the raid in question in a separate tradition. In this context, Ibn Ishāq68 quotes the following *isnād*: ‘somebody I do not suspect’69 < az-Zuhrī < ‘Urwah < ‘Āʾishah. Al-Buḥārī’s70 authority is an-Nu’mān ibn Rāṣid < az-Zuhrī. At any rate, the synchronicity of the raid and the scandal story is often found with the generation *following* az-Zuhrī, to which Ibn Ishāq also belonged. Apart from Ibn Ishāq and an-Nu’mān ibn Rāṣid,71 the following transmitters combine *ifk* narration and raid:
1 Aflaḥ ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Muğirah, who quotes the Zuhrī recension in a special, amplified form.72
2 Abū Uways (d. 167/783–4),73 who claims to transmit on the authority of Hišām ibn ʿUrwah. In fact, his text is a slightly paraphrased and expanded version of az-Zuhrī’s account.74
3 Al-Walīd ibn Muḥammad al-Muwaqqātī (d. before Ramaḍān 182/798);75 his version adds all sorts of dubious material to the Zuhrī text.76
4 Al-Wāqīdī (cf. below p. 91).

In addition, we have a few apocryphal reports on the ʿĀʾishah affair not transmitted according to az-Zuhrī < ʿUrwah; their motifs, however, suggest that they depend on the Zuhrī recension, which they embellish with a large amount of questionable material:

5 A tradition traced back to ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿUmar as the original informant.77 It is closely related to (3) above.
6 A tradition traced back to Abū Hurayrah as the original informant.78

Nevertheless, the synchronization was not universally accepted. According to at-Ṭabarī,79 Ibn Iṣḥāq himself transmitted an alternative chronology (on the authority of ʿAbd al-Wāḥid ibn Ḥamzah,80 apparently outside of the Kitāb al-maḡāzī) placing the incident at the time of the ’umrat al-qadāʾ (Pilgrimage of Fulfilment) (i.e. in the year 7/629). Locating the incident, as Ibn Iṣḥāq does in his Kitāb al-maḡāzī, at the end of the raid against the Banū ʿUṣṭāliq in 6 AH raises the following difficulty: Saʿd ibn Muʿāḍ,81 who according to both the Zuhrī and Hišām ibn ʿUrwah versions82 led the Banū Ḥazraḵ, cannot have been alive at this point. He died after the Battle of the Trench (Šawwāl 5 AH) from injuries he sustained during the fight; or, to be more precise, he died after the next raid against the Banū Qurayẓah (5 AH), the tribe the mortally wounded Saʿd condemned to a horrible fate. Muslim ḥadīṯ scholars were aware of this problem,83 as was Ibn Iṣḥāq. He solved it by replacing Saʿd ibn Muʿāḍ (who, according to his chronology, cannot have been alive at this point) with Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr84 (the latter also appears in the Zuhrī recension, but plays a role only at a later point). In all probability, Ibn Iṣḥāq replaced Saʿd ibn Muʿāḍ with Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr not on the basis of some tradition (unknown to us), but his own reflection. This alteration does not have anything to do with historical forgery: as a historian, Ibn Iṣḥāq thought that he had to intervene and correct the tradition. Al-Wāqīdī’s solution for the same problem involves a more substantial reshuffling of events: he places the Battle of the Trench (taking place in Ḏū l-Qaʿdah of the year 5 AH in his reckoning)85 and the raid against the Banū Qurayẓah (Ḏū l-Qaʿdah and Ḏū l-Ḥiḡgah 5 AH) immediately after the raid against the Banū ʿUṣṭāliq (according to him in Šaʿbān 5 AH).

It is not so much the chronological problem itself which concerns us here; perhaps, it cannot be solved anyway. That such a problem could arise at all reminds us that the oldest collectors, ʿUrwah and his generation, did not care too much (if
at all) about chronology. In that respect, they resemble their informants, who passed ‘oral traditions’ to them. The lack of a reliable chronology is in fact almost definitely a sign of oral traditions. Thus, the oldest collectors handed down the reports they had assembled without any chronological structure. When an awareness of and interest in chronology began to emerge two generations later (in the generation of Ibn Ishāq, to some extent already that of az-Zuhri), scholars had to rely on their own speculation and intuition. Since tradition did not provide dates, historians themselves began to investigate them and often arrived at different results. Some of their findings do not withstand a critical inspection. Nevertheless, the previous discussion should lead to one important result: an often contradictory, unreliable and sometimes wrong chronology does not allow us automatically to conclude that a tradition is equally problematic.

3.3 The Wāqidī recension

Thus far, the early Islamic tradition system has in general made a good impression on us: when verifiable, isnāds have turned out to be correct and traditions were transmitted over long periods of time without radically changing their meaning. Our analysis of the third recension of the scandal story, that of al-Wāqidī, will demonstrate that this good impression should not be generalized and that without careful inspection, chains of transmitters cannot be taken at face value.

3.3a Contents and motif stock

0 The original informant, ‘Ā’išah’s great nephew ‘Abbād, asks her to relate what happened to her on occasion of the raid against the Banū l-Muṣṭaliq. ‘Ā’išah begins her story.

1 (= 1) As is his custom, the Prophet has his wives draw lots among themselves before a raid. The winning lot is drawn by ‘Ā’išah and Umm Salamah: they are permitted to accompany the Prophet.

2 (+) After the raid, the army stops at a place without water. Nobody has any water for the ritual ablutions. ‘Ā’išah loses her necklace. The search for it delays the army. People get restless. Abū Bakr strongly reprimands his daughter. Revelation of the sand ablution verse (sūrah 4:43, 5:6), which allows believers under certain circumstances, e.g. when out of water, to perform the ablutions with sand, etc.

3 (= 3) ‘Ā’išah reasons that women of her time are very lightweight on account of their sparse diet. Like Umm Salamah, she is carried in a palanquin by two men.

4 (= 2) On its return, the army stops over night near Medina. ‘Ā’išah walks off to relieve herself and loses her necklace. Searching for it takes some time, but she finds it at last. In the meantime, the army has left without her. The carriers did not notice that she was not in her palanquin.

5 (= 4) Ṣafwān ibn al-Mu’attāl discovers ‘Ā’išah and escorts her to the army.
ʿĀʾishah is wrongfully accused for the incident, namely by ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy.

Immediately after her return, ʿĀʾishah falls ill and thus remains ignorant of the scandal. Only Muḥammad’s unexpected indifference towards her arouses her suspicion.

During a nightly walk to relieve herself, she meets Umm Mīṣṭaḥ. The latter informs her about the scandal.

The Prophet allows her to return to her parents’ home.

She discusses the scandal with her mother Umm Rūmān, who has already heard about it.

Muḥammad consults with ʿAlī and Usāmah on what to do next. He queries a servant by the name of Barīrah about ʿĀʾishah.

Muḥammad also questions his wife Zaynab. ʿĀʾishah praises Zaynab, who has only good things to say of ʿĀʾishah. Muḥammad questions a third woman; the results are identical.

In a public speech (ḥutbah), the Prophet comments on the scandal.

Immediately after Muḥammad’s ḥutbah, a conflict erupts between the Banū l-Aws whose leader and spokesman is Saʿd ibn Muʿāḏ and the Banū l-Ḥazraḏ whose leader is Saʿd ibn ʿUbādah. The latter’s arguments are countered by Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr, another tribesman of the Banū l-AWs. The clash between the two tribes is described in great detail.

Muḥammad visits the griefstricken ʿĀʾishah, who still remains in her parents’ home, and asks her to repent. She insists on her innocence.

Revelation of sūrah 24: 11ff.

(With a new isnād:) Abū Ayyūb and his wife talk about ʿĀʾishah’s innocence.

(With a new isnād:) The same conversation about ʿĀʾishah’s innocence between another man and woman.

(Anonymous tradition, introduced with qālū (they said):) The Prophet reconciles the leaders of the two tribes which clashed after the ḥutbah.

3.3b The isnād

Al-Waqidī provides the folio wing chain of transmitters: al-Waqidī < Yaʿqūb ibn Yahyā ibn ʿAbbād < Ṭisā ibn Maʿmar < ʿAbbād ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn az-Zubayr < ʿĀʾishah (cf. Figure 3.4). We immediately notice the similarity – but not identity – of this isnād with one of the three isnāds quoted by Ibn Ishāq (Yaḥyā ibn ʿAbbād < ʿAbbād < ʿĀʾishah). In both cases, ʿĀʾishah’s transmitter is her great nephew.
Abbād. Moreover, al-Wāqidī’s immediate informant is the son of Ibn Ishāq’s immediate informant, who in turn is a grandson of ‘Ā’ishah’s transmitter and great nephew, ‘Abbād.

If we accept al-Wāqidī’s information for the moment, we find that his recension allegedly relies on the same ultimate source named in one of the three traditions quoted by Ibn Ishāq, i.e. ‘Abbād ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn az-Zubayr. If that were the case, we would have to be able to identify in al-Wāqidī’s text certain motifs as well as motif elaborations and links we know from the Ibn Ishāq recension but which are absent from the Zuhrī recension. This is indeed the case, e.g. in the scene in which Muḥammad asks ‘Alī and Usāmah for advice. In Ibn Ishāq’s recension, this motif in its specific guise was very likely derived from Yahyā ibn ‘Abbād < ‘Abbād.94

Even more importantly, this is also the case for one main characteristic of the Wāqidī recension: the link between two different incidents in which ‘Ā’ishah lost her necklace (each time giving rise to a revelation). As we have seen above,95 the same connection was established in an Ibn Ishāq tradition transmitted outside the Kitāb al-maġāzī, reported on the authority of Yahyā ibn ‘Abbād < ‘Abbād < ‘Ā’ishah. Al-Wāqidī has not only reproduced this connection, he has also placed the two instances in the context of the same raid,96 while Ibn Ishāq explicitly assigned them to different raids. Moreover, Ibn Ishāq placed the scandal before the event which gave rise to the tayammum revelation; whereas al-Wāqidī has reversed this sequence.

3.3c Al-Wāqidī’s actual sources

There is no need to follow this lead any further: al-Wāqidī is misleading us – certainly intentionally. A comparison of the texts demonstrates that he does not quote Ibn Ishāq’s informant, but (in addition to other sources) his Kitāb al-maģāzī itself.97 In many places, he follows the Ibn Ishāq recension, partly verbatim, partly by slightly paraphrasing the text. In numerous other places, he also replicates az-Zuhrī’s recension of the story in the same way.

As can be seen from our outline, the sequence of motifs generally agrees with that of the Zuhrī recension. Where they differ, al-Wāqidī mostly follows the Ibn Ishāq recension: like the latter, he places ‘Ā’ishah’s musings on the sparse diet and modest weight of women (3) before the account of the army’s nightly stop (4). In contrast to az-Zuhrī, but similar to Ibn Ishāq, ‘Ā’ishah’s positive verdict on Zaynab, the other wife of the Prophet, constitutes not an annex, but part of the main narration. However, Ibn Ishāq situates it after the ḥutbah and the subsequent list of slanderers; al-Wāqidī after the questioning of Barīrah (11).

The following observation gives us the decisive piece of evidence for the fact that al-Wāqidī indeed plagiarized Ibn Ishāq: immediately after his report about the punishment of the three slanderers (Ibn Ishāq 17), Ibn Ishāq adds a tradition according to ‘his father < a man of the Banū Nağgar’ concerning a conversation about ‘Ā’ishah between the Nağgarī Abū Ayyūb and his wife Umm Ayyūb (Ibn Ishāq 18). Al-Wāqidī quotes the text of the same tradition – almost verbatim – also after the report of the punishment of the slanderers, but inserts between the
two reports a very short tradition of less than two lines on the authority of Saʿīd ibn Čubayr. He has altered the family isnād Ibn Iṣḥāq uses to introduce the Abū Ayyūb tradition: in his version, the informant relating the conversation of the couple is not ‘a man of the Banū Nağgar’, but – a clever detail! – Abū Ayyūb’s mawlā called Aflah.

In addition to Ibn Iṣḥāq and az-Zuhrī, al-Wāqīḍī used at least one other source (cf. Figure 3.4.) Even at the beginning of his report, it becomes clear that his sources were not limited to the Zuhrī and Ibn Iṣḥāq recension of the scandal story. He writes that not only ʿĀʾishah’s but also Umm Salamah’s lot was drawn before the raid on the Banū l-Muṣṭaliq (1): a further characteristic trait of his recension.

Our corpus contains two other closely related traditions which also contain this motif. One of them,98 closer to the Wāqidī recension, stems from a student of az-Zuhrī, al-Walīd ibn Muḥammad al-Muwaqqarī (or al-Muwaqqirī) (d. before Ramadaṇ 182/798).99 He reports the story on the authority of az-Zuhrī; strangely, he continues the isnād in a single line through ʿUrwah to ʿĀʾishah.100 A closer look at his version, which contains a number of extra motifs101 compared to the Zuhrī versions known to us, reveals that our suspicion was correct: this – problematic – Zuhrī version was in fact al-Wāqidī’s third main source. In both texts,102 the maid (when questioned) says of ʿĀʾishah: ‘She is finer than the finest gold’ (inna-hā/hiya atyab min ṭayyib aḏ-ḏahab).103 This formulation is absent from both az-Zuhrī and Ibn Iṣḥāq. Again, in both texts, Umm Misṭaḥ says:104 ‘You do not know it, but the stream has already carried you away’ (mā tadrīna wa-qad sāla bi-ka s-sayl); there is no equivalent in the other two recensions. Finally, ʿAlī advises the Prophet in both texts105 in no uncertain terms: ‘God has made (it) lawful and pleasant to you. Divorce her and marry another (woman)’ (wa-qad aḥalla llāh la-ka wa-aṭṭāba, fa-ṭalliq-hā wa-nkāḥ ḡayra-hā). In az-Zuhrī, ʿAlī is less direct; in Ibn Iṣḥāq, his choice of words is different.106

Figure 3.5 illustrates how al-Wāqidī follows each of the texts in turn. The text of the Zuhrī recension is marked with boldface, the Ibn Iṣḥāq recension in italics, the Muwaqqarī version is underlined, additions by al-Wāqidī and formulations of his own are given in normal type.

On closer inspection, we find that al-Wāqidī picked from each version exactly the most memorable expressions, the most prominent turns of phrase. From az-Zuhrī, he took ʿAlī’s declaration, ‘God has not been stingy to you’ (lam yuḍayyiq Allāh ‘alay-ka), though not without a slight variation in the wording; from Ibn Iṣḥāq, he preferred Usāmah’s statement: ‘This is absurd and a lie’ (ḥāḏā l-bāṭil al-kaḍib); an outstanding contribution of al-Muwaqqarī was, as we have seen above, the formulation, ‘she is finer than the finest gold’.107

Most of al-Wāqidī’s report was derived from these three sources, but there remains a certain amount of unaccounted-for material. Some of it can be found in other traditions dealing with the scandal story, e.g. the request by ʿĀʾishah’s young relative opening al-Wāqidī’s text: ‘O mother, tell us your story concerning the al-Muraysī raid’ (ḥadditi-nā yā ummah ḥadīṭa-ka fi ḡazwat al-Muraysi). It occurs at the beginning of another, apocryphal tradition about the incident traced back to al-Aswad ibn Yazīd.108 We read: ‘O mother of the believers – or: O mother – tell
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me, how it was – the affair with the lie, that is’ (yā umm al-mu’minin aw yā ummatāh a-lā tuḥaddīf-nī kayfa kāna ya’ni amr al-ifk).

A characteristic sentence in al-Wāqīdī’s extensive description of the conflict between the two Medinese tribes – a scene missing in al-Muwaqqarī’s text – has a parallel in another apocryphal tradition which is closely related to
al-Muwaqqarī’s account and reported on the authority of ʿAbdallāh ibn ʿUmar.109

According to the text, Saʿd ibn ʿUbādah, leader of the Ḥazrag, said the following to Saʿd ibn Muʿāḏ, leader of the Aws: ‘You sought to obtain a blood-revenge which existed between us in pre-Islamic times (īnna-mā ẓalabta-nā bi-duḥūl kānat bayna-nā wa-bayna-kum fī l-ġāhiliyyah).110 In al-Wāqidi’s account,111 we find a passage with parallel meaning and partially matching the wording of the previous quotation: wa-lākinna-ka tāʾuqūt-nā bi-duḥūl kānat bayna-nā wa-bayna-ka fī l-ġāhiliyyah (‘But you seek to take a blood-recompense which existed between us in pre-Islamic times’). This scene is much more elaborate and detailed in al-Wāqidi than in any other version known to us. Some of the additional material not occurring in other sources could consist of (explanatory) additions by al-Wāqidi, e.g. ʿĀʾishah’s statement concerning ʿAlī and Usāmah: ‘One was gentler (alyan) than the other’.112 Nevertheless, he probably used further sources here and there; finally, some of these additions could have been the products of his imagination.

Excursus: Al-Wāqidi’s use of his sources and his relation to Ibn Isḥāq

Al-Wāqidi’s use of his sources was studied in the nineteenth century. In the preliminary remarks to his abridged edition of the Kitāb al-maḡāzī, Wellhausen wrote:

al-Wāqidi never cites Ibn Isḥāq among his informants, but here, he has, as it were, borrowed the framework from him and inserted his own additions. These additions invariably interrupt the main narration. … Proposing that al-Wāqidi used Ibn Isḥāq as his source does not exclude that he collected other, independent testimonies for the reports of the latter and sometimes modified them accordingly.113

Wellhausen’s last claim in particular has been corroborated by our analysis of the sources for the scandal story.

In his dissertation De Wāqidiī libro qui Kitāb al-Maḡāzī inscribitur, Horovitz conclusively demonstrated on the basis of ten passages that ‘Ibn Isḥāq’s book was frequently al-Wāqidi’s source’, even if he never explicitly quoted him.114 Our study has unearthed further evidence. Yet, the well-founded results of Wellhausen and Horovitz have in recent times been called into question by the editor of the Kitāb al-maḡāzī, J. M. B. Jones, in his article ‘Ibn Isḥāq and al-Wāqidi’. In her book Meccan Trade, Crone has adopted his position (not, however, on the basis of her own source analysis). Summing up his argument, she writes:

Wāqidi did not plagiarize Ibn Isḥāq, but he did not offer an independent version of the Prophet’s life, either: what he, Ibn Isḥāq, and others put together were simply so many selections from a common pool of qāṣṣ material.115
For the story analysed above – and the entire Wāqidī text – we can safely conclude that this position has become untenable. Our source analysis has identified in al-Wāqidī’s text numerous individual characteristics (wording, motif stock, motif elaboration and sequence) of the recensions and traditions of az-Zuhrī, Ibn Ishāq and al-Muwaqqarī. The evidence for al-Wāqidī’s use of these recensions and traditions as his source is overwhelming, even if he often varies or paraphrases the wording and even if he occasionally includes additional material, the origin of which remains unclear.

Having studied the Wāqidī recension, we can now establish the following results: in addition to authentic traditions accompanied by accurate ascriptions to authorities, there are a number of inauthentic traditions. In the case of al-Wāqidī’s account of the scandal story, falsification does not apply to the contents (even though a number of ‘false’ motifs slip into his text due to his use of inauthentic traditions) as much as it does to the information on his sources. We can confidently assert that this information was consciously and intentionally forged.

Excursus: The Wansbrough hypothesis – some remarks on the application of the ‘transmission historical method’ to early historical texts

We are now in a position to assess Wansbrough’s hypothesis on the development of the scandal story.116 Our findings show that this development took place in a manner almost diametrically opposed to his account:

1 The version he calls the ‘Buḥārī recension’ and which he assumes to be the latest in terms of chronology and development is in fact closest to the basic form of the story, the Zuhrī recension. It frequently matches its very wording (cf. the ’Abd ar-Razzāq version). The character of the report, interpreted by Wansbrough as ‘reductive’ and thus ‘paradigmatic’ (he categorizes it as ḥadīṯ, ‘tradition’ as opposed to qiṣṣah, ‘narration’), has to be explained differently: the tradition is an unmixed and barely modified form of the story which came into circulation at a relatively early date (the second generation of the Medinese school). Its redactor, az-Zuhrī, cultivated a terse and sober style.117

2 The version he identifies as the ‘basic form’, the Ibn Isḥāq recension, is in fact (as Ibn Isḥāq himself informs us) a Zuhrī version expanded with material from other traditions. Wansbrough’s classification of this text as a qiṣṣah (a ‘narration’ as opposed to ḥadīṯ, paradigmatic ‘tradition’) is not surprising given the fact that the narrative character of the report becomes more prominent through the addition of new motifs and details.

3 The Wāqidī recension Wansbrough interpreted as an intermediate step in the development from the recension of Ibn Isḥāq to the alleged ‘Buḥārī recension’ is in fact furthest removed from the basic form, since it merges material of the Zuhrī and Ibn Isḥāq recensions on the one hand with material of further (inauthentic) traditions on the other. Al-Wāqidī’s inclusion of
additional narrative motifs and his clever composition of the material as well as his desire for a stylistically pleasing narration led Wansbrough to regard it as a ‘refined’ version of Ibn Ishāq’s text.

Few literatures allow us to reconstruct the history of transmission as easily and as successfully as the Arabic-Islamic does. One reason is the sheer amount of material available for comparison; another the existence of chains of transmitters (asānīd) as part of most traditions. To ignore these chains would mean to discard one of the most important tools we have. Yet, they cannot be used uncritically. Often enough, the part of the isnād (chronologically) after the CL is historically valid, the part preceding it (normally a single strand) a later addition and ahistorical (with or without fraudulent intentions). Al-Wāqidi constitutes one example of the use of falsified or at least heavily manipulated chains of transmitters.

Ihsād analysis alone is not sufficient to spot these falsifications. Frequently, a comparison of the contents of different traditions belonging to one tradition complex is necessary to identify them. The chances of successfully carrying out such a study are best when based on a comprehensive corpus of traditions belonging to such a complex.

Wansbrough’s analysis of the scandal story illustrates the problems caused by picking only the best known traditions of a complex. He rashly adopted concepts and methods developed in Old Testament studies and applied them to three cases which had not first been placed in their proper historical transmission context. Another example for such a procedure is Sellheim’s study of the first revelation experience.118

3.4 Az-Zuhri’s informants

The next and decisive question is that of the sources quoted by az-Zuhri. Its answer is central to our concern: if we were able to prove that he received the report from the informants he cites, we would have demonstrated that the scandal story was already in circulation in the first century AH. In his isnād, az-Zuhri not only quotes the usual single informant, but four (‘Urwah, Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyab, ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Utbaḥ, ‘Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ), each of whom reports on the authority of ‘Āʾishah.

For Juynboll, who calls such configurations ‘inverted common links’,119 the existence of four transmitters is evidence for the historicity of a tradition. Without commenting on Juynboll’s argument, we should keep in mind that in the entire Sīrah (to be more precise: in Ibn Hišam’s recension of the work), Ibn Ishāq apparently used such a multiple (or ‘collective’) isnād comparatively rarely120 and only for major historical events (Badr, Uḥud, the Battle of the Trench, Tabūk) or important incidents (e.g. the raid against Ka’b ibn al-Aṣrāf and the Banū Ḥaṭṭar). The ‘Āʾishah affair, for which Ibn Ishāq’s transmitter, az-Zuhri, already provided a collective isnād, also falls under this category.

There are several reasons why we should not a priori brand as falsified Ibn Ishāq’s and az-Zuhri’s references and why we can assume that they probably
received their material from the informants they name: first, it was highly likely that Ibn Isḥāq and az-Zuhri were in fact able to find more than one informant for these events; secondly, according to the contemporary standards of ḥadīth scholars, the provision of more than one transmitter (or the quotation of a collective iṣnād) was not a requirement. At any rate, we have no grounds to assume forgery at least for the main outline of the events. This is, of course, not yet valid proof. We can, however, prove that at least one of az-Zuhri’s informants, ‘Urwah ibn az-Zubayr, disseminated the story in the first century AH: there is a recension of the story, also reported on the authority of ‘Urwah, which is traced not through az-Zuhri, but another prominent student of ‘Urwah, his son Hīšām.

3.5 The Hīšām ibn ‘Urwah recension

In contrast to az-Zuhri, Hīšām ibn ‘Urwah transmits from one informant only, his father ‘Urwah. The latter in turn reports, as in the Zuhri recension, on the authority of his aunt Ā’īšah. Hīšām’s recension has been transmitted frequently, if not as frequently as az-Zuhri’s. It is extant in (at least) three complete and one or two122 abridged versions (see Figure 3.6).

The complete versions are traced back to Hīšām’s students Abū Usāmah (201/816–7),123 Ḥammād ibn Salamah (d. 167/783–4)124 and Yūnus ibn Bukayr (d. 199/814–15),125 the incomplete version126 to Yaḥyā ibn Abī Zakařyā’ (d. 188/803–4 or two years later).127 According to Ibn Ḥaḍār,128 there were more versions. The following major authorities included versions of the recension in their compilations: al-Buḥārī,129 Muslim,130 at-Tirmidhi,131 at-Ṭabarānī,132 Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal133 and ‘Umar ibn Șabbah.134 Furthermore, aḍ-Ḍahabī quotes the only instance (known to me) of the Yūnus ibn Bukayr version135 and at-Ṭabarānī has the two other versions side by side.136

3.5a Contents and motif stock

First of all, an outline of the contents of the version al-Buḥārī reports on the authority of Abū Usāmah.137

1 (= 11) In a public speech (ḥutbah), the Prophet comments on the scandal.
2 (= 12) Immediately afterwards, a conflict erupts between the Banū l-Aws and Banū l-Ḥazraǧ. The only person named is the leader of the Aws, Sa’d ibn Mu’āḍ.
3 (= 7) During a nightly walk to relieve herself, Ā’īšah meets Umm Miṣṭaḥ. The latter informs her about the scandal.
4 (= 8) The Prophet sends Ā’īšah to her parents’ house in the company of a slave.
5 (= 9) She discusses the scandal with her mother and her father Abū Bakr. He sends her back to the Prophet’s house.
6 (= 10) Muḥammad queries an (unnamed) maid about Ā’īšah.
7 (+) (a) The (unnamed) companion of Ā’īšah comments on the slanderous allegations. (b) She mentions the fate of this companion.
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8 (= 13) Muhammad asks ʿĀʾishah to repent in her parents’ presence. She insists on her innocence.
9 (= 14) Revelation of sūrah 24:11ff.
10 (= 16) ʿĀʾishah praises the Prophet’s wife Zaynab, sister of Ḥamnah, who has only good things to say of ʿĀʾishah.
11 (= 5b) ʿĀʾishah lists the main culprits. These are Miṣṭaḥ, Ḥassān ibn Ṭābit, Ḥamnah and ʿAbdallāḥ ibn Ubayy.

3.5b Its characteristic traits and its relation to the Zuhrī recension

The outline above largely covers the same ground as az-Zuhrī’s story. The main difference is the absence in Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwah’s recension of the preceding events, i.e. the tale of the necklace and its loss on the way back from a raid. It is unclear whether Ḥišām is unfamiliar with the necklace story (because he did not hear it from his father) or whether he consciously dropped it (perhaps because he takes it for granted). Whatever the case, his narration does not begin until the return to Medina. Other differences concern more or less prominent details, such as the role of Abū Bakr, for example. He sends his daughter back to the Prophet’s house (5), so that the revelation takes place in ʿĀʾishah’s house, not that of Abū Bakr (as related by az-Zuhrī).

Additional material not found in the Zuhrī recension are the statements of Ṣafwān ibn Muʿāṭṭal (who in this recension remains unnamed), ʿĀʾishah’s companion and also victim of the slanderers, about the allegations and ʿĀʾishah’s remark on his future fate (7b).138

The anonymity of a number of persons named in the Zuhrī recension is a conspicuous characteristic of the Ḥišām recension. They include Ṣafwān, ʿAlī and Usāmah (the entire advice scene is missing). The person intimidating the maid is not identified as ʿAlī, but ‘one of his [scil. the Prophet’s] companions’. The name of the maid, Barīrah in the Zuhrī recension, is not mentioned; the different versions of Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwah’s recension describe her as Nubian (Ḥammād) or black (Yūnus ibn Bukayr) or simply as one of ʿĀʾishah’s servants (Abū Usāmah). In the context of the conflict between the Banū Ḭazraḡ and Banū Ḭuzayr, only the first speaker, Saʾd ibn Muʿāḍ, is named; the other two, Saʾd ibn ʿUbadah and Usayd ibn ʿḤudayr, are not known to Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwah.

In addition, all Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwah versions share the motif of ʿĀʾishah finding her father at home, praying on the rooftop (Ḥammād and Yūnus ibn Bukayr) or reciting the Qurʾān (Abū Usāmah) and the maid’s statement, ‘I only know about ʿĀʾishah what the goldsmith knows about the choicest gold’. A final characteristic of the recension seems to be that, during her nightly walk and her conversation with ʿĀʾishah, Umm Miṣṭaḥ stumbles several times (not once only, as az-Zuhrī reports) and curses her son several times. This repetition, however, was (later?) deleted from several sub-versions of the two main versions.
Three versions: Ḥammād ibn Salamah, Abū Usāmah, Yūnus ibn Bukayr

Compared to the different versions of the Zuhrī recension, the degree of variation between the three Hišām ibn ‘Urwah versions is noticeably higher. Yet, differences generally only affect the sequence of motifs, their degree of elaboration and the choice of words. The motifs themselves are almost identical throughout. Here and there, we find reductions in the motif stock: Yūnus ibn Bukayr’s version lacks the list of culprits (11), the Zaynab motif (10) and ‘Ā‘išah’s remark on the future fate of her companion (7b). Ḥammād ibn Salamah also does not have the Zaynab motif (10). He has, on the other hand, an addition not found in the other versions: a conciliatory remark by ‘Ā‘išah about Ḥassān ibn Ṭḥibit, one of the slanderers.

The sequence of motifs according to Ḥammād is as follows: (1a) – 6 – 1b – 2 – 11 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 8 – 9 – 7 – 12, Yūnus ibn Bukayr’s version has 6 – 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 – 8 – 9 – 7 – 12. Thus, contrary to Abū Usāmah, both Ḥammād and Yūnus ibn Bukayr place the motif of the maid’s questioning (6) at the beginning of the text. The extant Abū Usāmah texts, however, are not consistent in their sequence. One group (discussed above, p. 100ff.: Abū Usāmah in al-Buhārī, at-Tirmiḏī and also at-Ṭabarānī) place the questioning of the maid (6) and the statement by ‘Ā‘išah’s companion (7) before Muḥammad’s call on his wife to repent (8) and the revelation of sūrah 24: 11 (9). In the other group (Abū Usāmah in Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal and at-Ṭabarānī), the sequence is reversed (8 – 9 – 6 – 7), so that we arrive at an arrangement which is closer to that of the Ḥammād and Yūnus ibn Bukayr version (8 – 9 – 7).

Except for the absences of motifs mentioned above, Yūnus ibn Bukayr’s report is at times somewhat more detailed than Ḥammād’s in its choice of words and the elaboration of certain narrative elements. Ḥammād does not have whole sections such as Umm Rūmān consoling her daughter (‘beautiful wives are always the target of the envy of co-wives’) and does not mention the slave accompanying ‘Ā‘išah to her parents’ house. The fact that these elements of Yūnus’ version also appear in Abū Usāmah’s version demonstrates that they belonged to the original text stock of Hišām ibn ‘Urwah’s recension.

The texts of Abū Usāmah and Yūnus ibn Bukayr resemble each other most closely in their wording.

ʿUrwah’s letter to ‘Abd al-Malik: Another version of the Hišām ibn ‘Urwah recension

Finally, we have to discuss a letter ‘Urwah sent to the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik on the subject of the slander affair. The letter was also transmitted via Hišām ibn ‘Urwah; Hišām’s transmitter was Abān ibn Yazīd al-ʿAṭṭār. Thus, it is another version of the Hišām recension after all. The letter can be found in at-Ṭabarānī’s Ṭafsīr, quoted as the first tradition in the context of his interpretation of sūrah 24: 11. The text is very short: ‘Urwah merely answers the question of the caliph about the identity of the small group of people ‘who brought forward the
lie’ (sūrah 24: 11). He lists Ḥassān ibn Ṭābit, Miṣṭah and Ḥamnah. Strangely, the name of ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy is absent from the list.

This is evocative of a similar episode which took place a generation later. The caliph al-Walīd, son of ʿAbd al-Malik, is said to have asked az-Zuhrī a similar question, namely ‘who took the lead among them’ (scil. in the slander affair) while at the same time suggesting that ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib was this person. Az-Zuhrī is said to have dismissed this allegation in no uncertain terms and, on the authority of his informants Urwah, Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyab, ʿAlqamah and ʿUbayd Allāh, identified ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy as the main culprit.152 Perhaps, ʿAbd al-Malik’s letter to Urwah was written with the same intention in mind; conspicuously, Urwah emphasized in his reply that his sources did not name anyone else.

For our purpose, it remains to be seen why Urwah did not include ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy in the list of culprits in his letter while accusing him of being the ring-leader of the slanderers in the Abū Usāmah version. The sentence in question takes on different guises in the Hišām ibn Ṣalmān version: in the Ḥammād ibn Salamah version, we read:

Among those bearing the brunt of the blame were Ḥassān ibn Ṭābit, Miṣṭah ibn ʿUtāṭah and Ḥamnah ibn ḅahā. We know of the names of no others. It [scil. the affair] was discussed in the presence of ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy; he [listened to it, distorted it even more and] then spread it.153

This report agrees in its substance and even some turns of phrase with the text of the letter. There, however, the last sentence about ʿAbdallāh ibn Ubayy is absent. Since the text of the letter was passed on in lecture courses, this sentence could have been lost in the process of transmission.

Excursus: A method to distinguish between authentic and inauthentic versions of a tradition

Before discussing one more (alleged) Hišām ibn ʿUrwah version, a few remarks on method are in order. As we have seen, our corpus contains, among other material, two tradition complexes reported on the authority of ʿUrwah which differ significantly in details, but agree in their general outline: the recensions of az-Zuhrī and Hišām ibn ʿUrwah. Since these two recensions share a number of important characteristics (part of the motif stock and the elaboration of certain key motifs; to a certain degree also their arrangement), but also show a considerable amount of variation in the details (e.g. in their degree of elaboration and their wording); since this type of variation is only to be expected with the mode of transmission practised at the time (in the first century AH and frequently still in the second, material was presented from memory);154 and finally, since we are dealing with two demonstrably independent transmissions, we have to assume, in the absence of convincing proof to the contrary, that these transmissions are genuine.

Conversely, we should be suspicious of the authenticity of those traditions in our corpus which display too high a degree of resemblance in motif stock,
characteristics, sequence and wording to the Zuhrī and Hišām recensions without tracing them back to the corresponding transmitters, i.e. az-Zuhrī or Hišām ibn ‘Urwah.

3.5e An inauthentic Hišām ibn ‘Urwah version

The principle just outlined proves to be quite helpful at this stage of our study: there is a version reported according to Hišām ibn ‘Urwah155 and transmitted by one Abū Uways,156 who is said to have been a student of az-Zuhrī (!). It does not display even a single one of the characteristics of the Hišām recension but all of the important ones of the Zuhrī recension. Similar to the latter, the tradition begins with the drawing of lots and contains the entire story of the loss of the necklace and many additional embellishments. Like az-Zuhrī, Abū Uways reports the names of the people who remain anonymous in Hišām ibn ‘Urwah (Ṣafwān, ‘Alī, Usāmah, Sa’d ibn ‘Ubādah, Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr). On the other hand, the tradition contains not a single of the characteristic traits listed for Hišām’s transmission above,157 e.g. the maid’s statement: ‘I only know about ‘Ā’īšah what the goldsmith knows about the choicest gold’.

Therefore, we can safely say that this tradition is an inauthentic Hišām ibn ‘Urwah version: its originator, Abū Uways, took a Zuhrī version, embellished it and added a false isnād.

3.6 The ‘purged’ ‘Urwah recension

What exactly did ‘Urwah himself report about the ‘Ā’īšah scandal? We are now in a position to reconstruct the gist of his story by comparing the two recensions, one by az-Zuhrī and one by Hišām, both traced back to ‘Urwah, but transmitted independently of each other. ‘Urwah’s lecture on the scandal must have contained at least the following motifs: ‘Ā’īšah being apprized of the scandal by Umm Miṣṭaḥ during her nightly walk to releave herself; Muḥammad’s permission for ‘Ā’īšah to return to her parents’ house; his questioning of a maid; his public speech; the subsequent conflict between the Banū l-Aws and the Banū l-Ḥazraḡ; Muḥammad’s asking ‘Ā’īšah to repent and her defence; the revelation of sūrah 24: 11; finally, Abū Bakr’s reaction against the slanderer Miṣṭaḥ and the revelation of sūrah 24: 22.

It is unclear whether ‘Urwah knew and transmitted the initial part of the story, the loss of the necklace, a motif only reported by az-Zuhrī, not by Hišām. If he did, we would have to assume that, for whatever reason, Hišām discarded it while az-Zuhrī preserved it. If he did not, az-Zuhrī would have extracted the initial part missing in ‘Urwah’s story from a report from one or more of his three other informants. Our corpus contains one report traced back to one of them, ‘Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ ‘and others’.158 However, it also lacks the initial part.159 We also have to consider the possibility that ‘Urwah related the story in different forms on different occasions, sometimes including the initial part, sometimes omitting it. Due to the considerable differences between the transmitted recensions, we are not in a position to reconstruct verbatim the original form(s) of his tradition. Only for short passages, primarily some speeches, can such a reconstruction be attempted.
One such passage is Umm Rūmān’s consolation speech to her daughter, reported in a very similar form in both the Zuhrī and Hišām recensions:

Az-Zuhrī on the authority of ʿUrwah (in ʿAbd ar-Razzāq): 

\[ay \text{ bunayyah hawwinī} \text{ alay-ki fa-}\text{wa-la-lāh la-qalla-mā kānāt imraʾah qaṭṭu wādīʾatan} \text{ inda raḡul yuḥibbu-hā wa-la-hā ḏarāʾīr illā akṭarā} \text{ alay-ḥā} 160\]

My little daughter, don’t get excited! It is rarely the case, by God, that a chaste woman, living with a man who loves her and who has several co-wives is not the object of their attention.

Hišām ibn ʿUrwah on the authority of ʿUrwah (in al-Buḥārī): 

\[yā \text{ bunayyah ḥaffidi} \text{ alay-ki š-šaʾn fa-inna-hū wa-}\text{la-lāh lā-qalla-mā kānāt imraʾah qaṭṭu ḥasnāʾ} \text{ ʿindā raḡul yuḥibbu-hā la-hā ḏarāʾīr illā ḥasadna-hā wa-qīla fī-hā} 161\]

My daughter, take it easy! It is rarely the case, by God, that a beautiful woman, living with a man who loves her and who has several co-wives, is not the object of their envy and gossip.

Without a doubt, we have here, in parts even in its very wording, the original tradition of ʿUrwah! Another such passage is ʿĀʾišah’s speech in defence of herself to the Prophet, where we find several literal matches in both recensions.

### 3.7 Is ʿĀʾišah the original informant?

Did ʿUrwah receive most of his material from his aunt ʿĀʾišah, as he claims? In the case of the scandal story, this is very likely: why would ʿĀʾišah not have talked to her nephew about an incident which concerned her personally to such a degree? If, contrary to expectation, it was not ʿĀʾišah herself, but somebody else who informed ʿUrwah about the incident, there is a good chance that this person would have been a contemporary of the events. Thus, ʿUrwah’s account of the scandal story is at least a contemporary report, i.e. ‘oral history’, if not an eyewitness report.

In any case, it has become clear that in the second half of the first century AH, ʿUrwah created a redaction of the story with a strongly apologetic slant in favour of the protagonist, a close relative of his. He then transmitted the report to (at least) two students, az-Zuhrī and his son Hišām.162 Both transmitters gave the story their very own characteristic shape, in which it was, via further transmitters and with certain modifications, handed down to the compilers of the canonical hadīṯ collections, the historian at-Ṭabarī and many others.

### 3.8 Inauthentic and problematic imitations of the main recensions

The ‘main recensions’ discussed so far, i.e. those of Hišām ibn ʿUrwah, az-Zuhrī, Ibn Ishāq and al-Wāqidī, can be said to belong to one family: they are derived, at least in large part, from the same source, ʿUrwah.
Keeping in mind the individual characteristics of these recensions frequently allows us to spot false ascriptions, falsified *insād* and invented material.\textsuperscript{163} Several allegedly independent recensions can now be identified as ‘embellished’, sometimes forged imitations (based mostly on the Zuhrī recension).\textsuperscript{164}

1 The Abū Uways version,\textsuperscript{165} an alleged transmission of the Hišām recension, but in fact a paraphrased and somewhat extended Zuhrī version.

2 A tradition\textsuperscript{166} traced back to ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Umar (d. 73/692–3)\textsuperscript{167} with the following *insād*: ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn Ḥallād ad-Dawraqi < Sa’dān ibn Zakarīyā’ ad-Dawraqi < Ismā‘īl ibn Yaḥyā ibn ‘Abdallāh at-Taymī\textsuperscript{168} < [Muhammad ibn ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān] Ibn Abī Ḥi’b (d. 158/774–5 or the following year)\textsuperscript{169} < Nāfī’ [Mawlā Ibn ‘Umar] (d. 117/735 or a few years later)\textsuperscript{170} < Ibn ‘Umar. It is in fact an extensively ‘enhanced’ Zuhrī version (it begins with the drawing of lots) sharing many secondary motifs with the Muwaqqarī version.\textsuperscript{171} With the version of Abū Hurayrah (no. 5) and the exegetical comments of Muqāṭīl ibn Sulaymān (no. 7), it shares the motif that Ṣafwān ibn al-Mu’āṭṭal used to linger in the camp after the army’s departure and to collect lost items and restore them to their owners (a rational explanation of why Ṣafwān remained in the camp!)

3 A tradition\textsuperscript{172} ascribed to ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Abbās (d. 68/687–8 or a year later)\textsuperscript{173} with the following *insād*: Salamah ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Yaḥyā ibn Salamah ibn Kahīl < his father (Ibrāhīm) < his father Ismā‘īl ibn Yaḥyā ibn Salamah ibn Kahīl\textsuperscript{174} < his grandfather Salamah ibn Kahīl (d. 122/739–40 or a year later)\textsuperscript{175} < al-Ḥasan al-‘Arabī < Ibn ‘Abbās. Overall, an abridged Zuhrī version (it also begins with the drawing of lots) with one added characteristic from another *ifk* recension (the fainting motif).\textsuperscript{176}

4 A tradition\textsuperscript{177} reported on the authority of al-Aswad ibn Yazīd (d. 74/693–4 or a year later),\textsuperscript{178} transmitted by ‘Abdān ibn Ḥāmid < Zayd ibn al-Ḥurayṣ < ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad al-Muḥāribī (d. 195/810–11)\textsuperscript{179} < Abū Sa’d ibn al-Baqqāl (d. after 140/757–8)\textsuperscript{180} < ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn al-Aswad (d. 99/717–18 or a year later)\textsuperscript{181} < al-Aswad. It combines motifs from a completely unrelated complex of traditions (‘Ā’išah’s early marriage) with an abridged Zuhrī version with various additional motifs.\textsuperscript{182}

5 A tradition\textsuperscript{183} ascribed to Abū Hurayrah with the following *insād*: ‘Amr ibn Ḥalīfah al-Bakrāwī\textsuperscript{184} < Muḥammad ibn ‘Amr\textsuperscript{185} < Abū Salamah ibn ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān (d. 94/712–13 or ten years later)\textsuperscript{186} < Abū Hurayrah. It is close to the Zuhrī recension (it begins with the drawing of lots), but shares with the Ibn Isḥāq recension the chronological link between the *ifk* episode and the raid against the Banū l-Muṣṭaliq. On the other hand, it shares with the version of Ibn ‘Umar (no. 2) and the exegetical comments of Muqāṭīl ibn Sulaymān (no. 7) the motif that Ṣafwān ibn al-Mu’āṭṭal used to linger in the camp after the army’s departure and to collect lost items and restore them to their owners.

For three further traditions, I am not sure whether they depend on az-Zuhrī and/or Hišām or are independent. In the case of the first two examples listed below, the
former possibility seems more likely, since their respective motif stock hardly

goes beyond that of the two main recensions:

6 A tradition in at-Ṭabarî187 and reported on the authority of 'Alqamah ibn
Waqqāṣ.188 Its isnād: Sufyān ibn Wakī (d. 247/861)189 < Muḥammad ibn Biṣr
(d. 203/818–19)190 < Muḥammad ibn 'Amr ibn 'Alqamah191 < Yahyā ibn 'Abd
ar-Raḥmān ibn Ḥāṭib (d. 104/722–3)192 < 'Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ and others.193

The tradition shares the range of reported events – excluding the entire prelude with the loss of the necklace – and other motifs with Hišām ibn 'Urwah, but at the same time contains other motifs and traits typical for az-Zuhrī, e.g.,

several personal names unknown to Hišām. One noteworthy difference
between the tradition and the two main recensions is the statement of the maid (here, she is ‘Abyssinian’ instead of ‘Nubian’, or ‘black’, as Hišām reports) about 'Ā'ishah: ‘'Ā'ishah is finer than the finest gold’ (la-'Ā'ishah atyab
min ṭayyib ad-ḏahab). Such a statement is absent from az-Zuhrī’s text, while Hišām’s differs in its choice of words.194 I assume that the author of this tradition formulated it on the basis of the Hišām recension but was also familiar with the Zuhrī recension. Incidentally, the original informants mentioned in the isnād, 'Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ and others, remind us of az-Zuhrī’s ascription (‘Alqamah + 'Urwah etc.).

7 The exegetical comments on 'usbatun min-kum (sūrah 24:11)195 in the
Qur’ān commentary of Muqātil ibn Sulaymān (d. 150/767).196 Without citing a chain of authorities, Muqātil relates the events before the return of 'Ā'ishah and the army to Medina. If at all, he could therefore only draw his material from one of the two main recensions, that of az-Zuhrī. Ignoring the abridgements – one element which did not survive is ‘Ā'ishah’s justification for her losing the necklace (mentioning ‘Ā'ishah’s need to relieve herself might have struck the redactor as indecent197 – the version in general strongly resembles that of az-Zuhrī. But we also find an additional motif: about Ṣafwān ibn al-Mu'aṭṭal, we learn that he used to linger in the camp after the army’s departure to collect lost items and restore them to their owners. This motif, undoubtedly developed as a rational explanation why Ṣafwān remained in the camp, can also be found in the Ibn 'Umar tradition and in the Abū Hurayrah tradition (cf. above, no. 2 and no. 5).198 Since Muqātil does not adduce an isnād, the relation between the three reports remains unclear.

8 A tradition extant in two versions, one199 with the isnād ‘Abdallāh ibn Wahb
(d. 197/812)200 < 'Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn Zayd ibn Aslam (d. 182/798)201 < Zayd
ibn Aslam (d. 136/753),202 the other, a substantially different version,203 reported on the authority of Muḥammad ibn Zayd ibn Aslam < [Zayd ibn Aslam? < ] Ibn Sa’d ibn Raḥah (?). It relates Muḥammad’s ḥutbāh, which here takes place after the revelation,204 and the subsequent conflict between the Banū l-Aws and Banū l-Ḫazraǧ. Like az-Zuhrī (and unlike Hišām ibn 'Urwah), the transmitter knows Sa’d ibn 'Ubādah and Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr in addition to Sa’d ibn Mu‘ād; furthermore, he reports the statements of a fourth person, Muḥammad ibn Salamah. The characteristic trait of both versions of
the tradition, however, is a new motif: the conflict between the two tribes is settled through the revelation of sūrah 4: 88: ‘How is it with you, that you are two parties touching the hypocrites, and God has overthrown them for what they earned?’

3.9 The Ḫuṣayn recension: An independent transmission?

Finally, we will look at a recension of the story which probably emerged independently of the recensions of the ’Urwhah ‘family’. Parallels and differences between these transmissions about the same incident can provide additional findings on the nature and authenticity of early Islamic historical transmission.

3.9a One version in translation

The hadīth is quoted in, among others, al-Buḫārī’s Sahīh (several times and in different transmissions) and the Musnads of at-Ṭayālisī and Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal. Thus, Muslim hadīth scholars regarded it as ‘sound’. This is the literal translation of one of the Buḫārī versions:

(isnād: al-Buḫārī < Mūsā ibn Ismāʿīl [d. 229/837–8] < Abū ’Awānah < Ḫuṣayn ibn Ṭāhā ibn Ṭāhā < Abū Wā’īl < Marsūq ibn al-Aḍa [d. 63/682–3] < Umm Rūmān, ‘ʿAʾishah’s mother:) ‘While I sat together with ‘ʿAʾishah, a woman of the Anṣār entered and said: “May God do to X this and to Y that!” Umm Rūmān asked: “What are you talking about?” — She (the Anṣār woman) answered: “My son is one of those who spread the story.” — She (Umm Rūmān) asked again: “What are you talking about?” — She (the Anṣār woman) answered: “This and that” — ‘ʿAʾishah then said: “Has the Messenger of God heard this yet?” — She (the Anṣār woman) answered: “Yes.” — “And Abū Bakr?” — “Yes (he too).” — Thereupon, she [scil. ‘ʿAʾishah] fainted. When she recovered, fever took her with violent trembling. I threw a cloak over her and covered her with it. Then, the Prophet arrived and asked: “What is wrong with that (woman)?” I answered: ‘O Messenger of God, a fever has taken hold of her.’ He replied: “Perhaps because of the story people tell?” — She said: “Yes.” Then, ‘ʿAʾishah sat up and said: “By God, if I swear (that I did not do it), you will not believe me and if I admit it, you will not pardon me. You and I are like Jacob and his sons: ‘And God’s succour is ever there to seek against that which you describe (and which is not true).’” — She [scil. Umm Rūmān] continued her report: ‘He then left and said nothing. God revealed her innocence. Thereupon, ‘ʿAʾishah said: “Praise be to God, but not to anybody else and (certainly) not to you (Muḥammad)”’.

3.9b Origin and transmission

As Muslim hadīth scholars correctly pointed out, the common link in the isnād of this tradition is Ḫuṣayn ibn Ṭāhā ibn Ṭāhā as-Sulāmī, a traditionist from Kūfah.
They also noticed the fact that the isnād is defective: Masrūq is said to have been born after the death of Umm Rūmān, the mother of ʿĀʾishah. The defectiveness of the isnād is significant, because it makes conscious forgery highly unlikely. We still cannot tell if it is correct on the strength of this observation; Ḥuṣayn marks the chronological limit of our analysis. Nevertheless, it will be shown on the basis of internal criteria that the tradition is probably authentic.

But first, some remarks on its subsequent transmission. The extant versions vary little in motif stock, elaboration and sequence; this is not surprising given the brevity of the tradition. Yet, one of the versions, that quoted by Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (ʿAlī ibn ʿĀṣim < Ḥuṣayn), is somewhat longer. At the end, it contains the motif of Abū Bakr’s oath to withdraw his support from Mistaḥ (here unnamed) and the following revelation of sūrah 24: 22.

Like Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwaḥ (but unlike az-Zurqī) the common link, Ḥuṣayn, was not able to establish a more or less ‘stable’, fixed text of his tradition, because the extant versions vary substantially. Not even in the generation after Ḥuṣayn did the tradition receive its final form: the texts of at-Ṭayāliṣī and al-Buḥārī, who both transmit the ḥadīṭ on the authority of Abū ʿAwānah < Ḥuṣayn, vary considerably in length and wording. The most exact matches are, once again, in sections reporting direct speech.

Again, we observe that we cannot generalize our findings about the, as it were, verbatim transmission of passages of Zurqī traditions to cover the entire field of contemporary transmission practices. Other scholars of his generation such as Hišām ibn ʿUrwaḥ, Abū Isḥāq as-Sabīʿī and Ḥuṣayn apparently still lectured from memory and/or presented different versions of their traditions on different occasions. This conclusion is echoed by Muslim biographical works, which frequently remark on az-Zurqī’s habit of assiduously writing everything down, whereas they remain silent on whatever written records Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwaḥ might have produced. Finally, until the third/ninth century, the written transmission of ḥadīṣ was still frowned on in Kūfah, where Ḥuṣayn taught. Even a muṣānnif such as Wakīʿ ibn al-Ǧarrāḥ (d. 812) is said not to have possessed a book.

3.9c Text features – motif stock

In some characteristic details, Ḥuṣayn’s recension of the story differs from the versions ultimately based on ʿUrwaḥ’s text. Its motif stock is even smaller than that of the Hišām ibn ʿUrwaḥ recension. Except for the revelation itself, the events take place exclusively in ʿĀʾishah’s home (i.e. in the house of of Muḥammad or Abū Bakr?). This also applies to ʿĀʾishah finding out about the scandal with the help of an (anonymous) ‘woman of the Anṣār’. (The transmitter knows neither the name of Umm Mistaḥ nor that of her son: a strong indicator for the fact that he was not familiar with the Zurqī recension!) Since ʿĀʾishah learns about the scandal in her home, the motif of her nightly walk to relieve herself is absent. Often, the description is organized on the lines of scenes: the flow of events proceeds largely by way of dialogue.

A new motif of this version is ʿĀʾishah’s fainting fit after hearing about the scandal and being covered with a cloak by her mother. It is the characteristic motif of
this recension. Lastly, the revelation takes place not in the presence of ʿĀʾišah and her family, but at an unspecified location, apparently outside the house.

Besides these differences, there are several elements this recension shares with those ultimately going back to ʿUrwhah and az-Zuhri. They pertain to the two central motifs of the story: the slander and the revelation. They also include ʿĀʾišah’s clever speech in her own defence (here culminating with her quote from the Joseph surah) and her defiant statement against Muḥammad after the revelation (here in an even bolder formulation than in the other recensions!) A motif shared by this recension and that of Hišām ibn ʿUrwhah and absent from the Zuhri recension is ʿĀʾišah’s question, immediately after she finds out about the scandal, whether Muḥammad and Abū Bakr already know. Finally, Ḥuṣayn’s tradition seems to presuppose some knowledge about the incident on the part of his audience (‘She answered: “This and that”’).

Thus, in all probability, this recension is an independent transmission of the story – irrespective of whether it ultimately originated with Umm Rūmān or not. The fact that it does not match or sometimes apparently attempts to correct the other recensions may in fact be an indicator for its independence and authenticity.

In our tradition complex, tampering with the story (which is, after all, historical) is achieved by means of extension, addition of (partly) fantastic embellishments or by supplementing it with secondary elements, mixing several extant versions, rather than through manipulation of the main motifs. This will be illustrated with the help of another example below.

3.9d Inauthentic imitations of the Ḥuṣayn recension

Our corpus contains two more traditions which report ʿĀʾišah’s fainting fit after finding out about the scandal. The common link of one of these ḥadīths,222 is ‘Attāb ibn Bašīr (d. 190/805–6 or slightly earlier),223 one generation after Ḥuṣayn, who reports on the authority of Ḥuṣayf ibn Abdar-Raḥmān (d. 136/753–4 or slightly later)224 < Miqsam (d. 101/719–20)225 < ʿĀʾišah. In this case, we will quote Muslim ḥadīt criticism, which happens to comment on this tradition. Ibn ʿAdī writes:

This ‘Attāb ibn Bašīr transmitted a notebook (nusḥah) from Ḥuṣayf. In that notebook, there were ‘unacknowledged’ (i.e. objectionable) traditions and texts, including the tradition (about the story) of the lie (ḥadīt al-ifk), which he transmitted on the authority of Ḥuṣayf from Miqsam from ʿĀʾišah. He added formulations (alṭāẓan), which no one else passed on except ‘Attāb, on the authority of Ḥuṣayf . . .”226

This last observation is absolutely correct: the tradition contains a number of speeches, expressions and (unimportant) details not found anywhere else in our corpus. A few examples: Umm Miṣṭah trips over a ‘bone or thorn’ and she asks ʿĀʾišah: ‘When was the last time the Messenger of God “recognized” you?’. ʿĀʾišah replies: ‘The Messenger of God treats his wives as he sees fit.’ Abū Bakr says to the Prophet: ‘What do you intend (to do) with this (woman), now that she
has deceived you and compromised me?’ The first thing the Prophet says to Barīrah is: ‘Do you testify that I am the Messenger of God?’

More important is the fact – unnoticed by Ibn ʿAdī – that ʿAttāb apparently contaminated and harmonized two versions of the story: when he inserts the fainting fit motif from Ḥuṣayn into the Zuhri recension he is, for the most part, imitating and adapting the motif to its new narrative framework. As in the Ḥuṣayn recension, ʿĀʾišah faints after finding out about the scandal (fa-ḥarrat maqṣīyan ʿalayya, I fell to the ground in a faint; cf. fa-ḥarrat maqṣīyan ʿalay-hā, she fell to the ground in a faint, in the Ḥuṣayn version), but, as in az-Zuhri, she learns about the scandal outside the house on her way to relieve herself, where she meets Umm Miṣṭaḥ, who is named in this version. Thus, Umm Rūmān has to hear about the accident (fa-balaqa amrū ummī, my mother heard about what had happened to me), before she hurries to her daughter’s side and carries her into her (i.e. Abū Bakr’s) house – an exceedingly artificial and unlikely scenario.

If we ignore the absence of the beginning of the story and the additions outlined above, we find that the remaining motifs (Muḥammad exhorts ʿĀʾišah; he sends for ʿAlī and Barīrah; Barīrah’s testimony regarding ʿĀʾišah turns out to be positive; he queries Usāmah; revelation of sūrah 24:11; ʿĀʾišah’s defiant reaction, here slightly attenuated) generally match those of the Zuhrī recension. Conspicuously, ʿAttāb at the end (echoing az-Zuhri’s text verbatim) adds the following remark: ‘And when he came to her, he used to say: “How is that (woman) there?”’

The other tradition containing the fainting fit227 is reported on the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās.228 Except for the fainting fit motif, which was in all likelihood derived from Ḥuṣayn, it is modelled after the Zuhri recension.229

3.10 Authentic and inauthentic traditions

Authentic230 and inauthentic traditions (i.e. those which were consciously tampered with, embellished, falsely ascribed and/or contaminated) can very often be distinguished through comparison on the basis of a complete corpus.231 Contradictions between several transmitted versions, however, are not necessarily evidence against their authenticity (as defined above): our experience tells us that – without having to consult the systematic findings of research in the fields of folk narration and oral tradition – a report on an event which was transmitted by various people over two or more generations takes on different forms according to the interpretations and personal concerns of its transmitters. Oral tradition research explains this phenomenon as follows: ‘Memory typically selects certain features from the successive perceptions and interprets them according to expectations, previous knowledge, or the logic of “what must have happened,” and fills the gaps in perception.’232

The more transmitters are involved in passing on a ‘message’ (i.e. a report about an event), the stronger this effect will be: toposi emerge. These can even develop during the first generation of transmitters: folk tale research has shown that
even eye- and earwitness reports [‘oral history’] have a tendency to impose on events certain traditional motifs [= topoi] and narrative conventions which conform to the expectations of the audience, i.e. to re-shape real events in accordance with oral traditions ... 

Thus, even in the case of authentic traditions, we should not expect to have objective reports on actual events. What we have are ‘memories’ at best, if not actually ‘memories of memories’.

There is no reason, however, to be too sceptical regarding the events narrated in the traditions. In the case discussed above, we have no reason to doubt the outlines of the ʿĀʾishah story, even though – or rather because – they have been transmitted in very different forms. As Vansina writes, ‘recent oral tradition – one or two generations beyond the oldest living members in a community – suffers only small damage’. 

In addition, some traits or anecdotes run counter to the customary pattern (ʿĀʾishah as the ‘mother of the believers’). According to Vansina, these very elements and anecdotes should be trusted: ‘When, however, traits or anecdotes run counter to fashion, they should be seen as reliable. These data resisted the trend to idealization’. 

The earliest Muslim collectors of historical reports, the generation of ʿUrwah and the one following it, seem to have been aware of the fact that what they received were not objective reports about actual events, but rather (often inconsistent) ‘memories of memories’. We know this for certain about later compilers and historians, e.g. al-Buḥārī, who often assembled several traditions about one and the same event in his compilation entitled as-Ṣaḥīḥ, ‘The Authentic’, even though they contradict each other in some details. One example is the ʿĀʾishah story we have analysed above: the Ṣaḥīḥ includes the versions of az-Zuhri, Hišām ibn ʿUrwah and Ḥuṣayn. At-Ṭabarī went even further: he indiscriminately collected whatever material he could find (except, of course, such traditions he regarded as absolutely false).

We are now in a position to assess the theories of Crone/Cook and Noth. Crone and Cook rightly stressed the inconsistencies affecting early Islamic historical transmission: chronology is often contradictory and cannot be conclusively reconstructed; events reported by historians which date back to a too distant past (e.g. events a long time before the hiḍrah such as the revelation experience, and especially those antedating Muḥammad’s birth) cannot be automatically accepted as historical facts; specific, sometimes apparently important elements in accounts of historical events cannot have happened as reported. All these points are of course extremely important. ‘Conservative’ historiographers, including Watt (to name only one of the most prominent exponents), often treated the material in an overly credulous manner.

Still, we cannot dismiss out of hand the entire body of Islamic historiography about the first century AH as inauthentic and therefore worthless for modern research. In this study, we have tested a method which often allows us to shorten the time span of around two centuries between an event and our available historical sources by half or reduce it even further. We are almost always in a position to
reconstruct with some certainty Ibn Ishāq’s (d. 150/767) redaction on the basis of the Ibn Ishāq recensions transmitted by Ibn Hišām (d. c. 218/834), at-Ṭabarānī and others. Often enough, we can go back one more generation to az-Zuhārī (d. 124/742), Hišām ibn ʿUrwah (d. 146/763) and other contemporary scholars. Whenever they independently (this is a necessary condition!) transmit a report from an authority a generation earlier – e.g. ʿUrwah – we can even reconstruct the gist of this report by comparing its different versions (which often vary substantially in their details). Thus, we have advanced backwards into the second half of the first century AH, the beginning of the collection activities of Muslim scholars. It is therefore wrong to claim that we cannot step over the ‘magical threshold’ of the first century AH.237

Once we have reconstructed the report of the earliest collector, we should remember that the material does not represent objective descriptions of actual events, but only ‘oral tradition’ or, at best, ‘oral history’. As we know from folk tale and oral tradition research, such reports contain alterations, biases, topoi. Noth deserves due credit for being the first scholar to recognize the importance of this fact for the field of early Islamic historiography – purely by analysing and interpreting the sources and without the help of the results provided by recent research in the disciplines mentioned above.

Further ‘purification’ of the report, this time from topoi, bias, stylizations, etc., may be necessary to arrive at a text that is closer to the ‘truth’. On the basis of such a ‘purified’ report from the earliest securely identifiable transmitter, we are able to spot further unsuspicious traditions through comparisons within our corpus.

For ‘purified traditions’ of a collector (and its parallel traditions) reporting events dating back several (three or more) generations, we have to leave the question of the historicity of these events unanswered without additional evidence from other sources. In such a case, the contents of the tradition should be treated as a hypothesis.

Should, on the other hand, such a tradition (and its parallels) be concerned with an event dating back only one or two generations – for example this applies to many of the major events of Muḥammad’s Medinese period – we can as a rule assume that the report correctly reflects at least the main outlines of the event.

3.11 Summary

What exactly are the results of our study for our knowledge of the early Islamic transmission system, its nature and its authenticity?

1 By the second half of the first century AH, scholars such as ʿUrwah ibn az-Zubayr started systematically to collect reports about major events of early Islam. Even though the use of writing was still controversial in the first two centuries AH – some scholars wanted to restrict it to the Qur’ān alone – they often possessed written records to aid their memories. The material these scholars assembled and passed on to their students in lectures (as a rule from memory) consisted of – to use the terminology of recent oral tradition research – oral traditions on the one hand, and also of reports of oral history.
(accounts by contemporaries of an event) on the other. Thus, these early collectors received information which was not objective, but rather interpreted in the light of and coloured by the personal concerns of one or more successive informants. From our own daily experience, we know that ‘memory typically selects certain features from the successive perceptions and interprets them according to expectation, previous knowledge, or the logic of “what must have happened,” and fills the gaps in perception’. Research into oral tradition has systematically analysed this common experience. Therefore, reports about events which in themselves are historical often contain elements and motifs which did not take place as stated or can be identified as topoi.

Normally, however, we have no reason to doubt the historicity of the main outlines of reports which emerged one to two generations after the death of the oldest living members of a community at the time an event took place. In particular, this holds for reports of contemporaries which the early collectors were occasionally able to obtain (‘oral history’), since, according to oral tradition research, ‘recent oral tradition … suffers only small damage’. To doubt the historicity of the main outlines of events reported in such traditions would be excessively sceptical. Thus, what 'Urwah and other 'historians' of his generations heard and transmitted about important events of early Islam – say, from the time of the first hiǧrah to Abyssinia – should roughly conform to historical facts, particularly in cases (such as the scandal about 'Ā‘išah) when a story ‘run[s] counter to fashion’, the described events ‘should be seen as reliable. These data resisted the trend to idealization.'

According to what I have just said in point (1), it is only to be expected that reports of several different collectors about the same historical event differ to a greater or lesser extent in their description of details. These should not be ascribed to (conscious) forgery, but are most probably the result of defective memory, unintentional and unconscious alterations, introduction of bias, etc. on the part of their informants. Later historians were aware of this phenomenon; one way of dealing with it was simply to present different reports with contradictory details side by side (e.g. in al-Buḫārī and aṭ-Ṭabarī).

We do not have all these reports in the form transmitted by 'Urwah and his contemporaries. It took another one or two generations, i.e. until the second half of the second/eighth century, for them to assume roughly (but often not exactly) the form we know today. During this period, the modification process continued, but not in the same way and not as intensively as before: in addition to instances of riwāyah bi-l-maʾnā (transmission through sense) instead of riwāyah bi-l-lafẓ (verbatim transmission), these modifications are for the most part redactional in nature (rearrangements of motifs, abridgements, marked or unmarked additions). We are often in a position to reconstruct the contents of a tradition redacted and passed on by an early transmitter by comparing independently transmitted recensions. This new quality and slowing down of the modification process reflects changed transmission methods: the oral transmission practised until the first systematic collectors (e.g. from 'Ā‘išah to 'Urwah) was supplanted by a kind of lecture
system, in which the use of writing as a mnemonic aid for students and teachers played an increasingly important role. The fact that az-Zuhrī’s recensions of specific reports were less extensively modified in transmission than parallel traditions originating with his contemporaries (as-Sabī‘ī, Hišām ibn ‘Urwah, Ḥuṣayn ibn ‘Abd ar-Rahmān) simply shows that in az-Zuhrī’s generation the impact of writing differed substantially from one member of this generation of transmitters to the next. This insight is borne out by the biographical literature, which abounds with remarks about az-Zuhrī’s enthusiasm for writing down material (from a certain point in time on).

Even by the time of the generation of scholars flourishing before the second half of the second/eighth century (Ibn Isḥāq, Ma’mar), the modification process had not come to a halt. At this point, however, modifications generally become more marginal and minor: stylistic adaptations, the use of synonyms, abridgements (among them ones that introduced biases), etc. There are still cases of non-verbatim reproductions capturing only the meaning of a text. Again, the increased deceleration and new quality of the modification process reflect a change in transmission methods: compilers now produced elaborately arranged written works (muṣannafāt), dictated them to their students (like Ibn Isḥāq) or even handed out their manuscripts for copying. We can now already discern a ‘literature’, but not yet a literature for a wider circle of readers; rather, it was a ‘literature of the school for the school’.

‘Urwah’s generation was only slightly (if at all) interested in chronology. This interest emerged with the next generation – az-Zuhrī is already said to have authored an annalistic work – and reached its climax with the generations of Ibn Isḥāq and al-Wāqidi. Their chronological framework almost never draws on transmitted information (traditions), but relies on their own reasoning; it is therefore often contradictory and in parts wrong.

The process of modification only stops with the historians of the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries (Ibn Hišām, al-Wāqidi, al-Balāḏurī, at-Ṭabarī). They edited and published the works and traditions they had received (e.g. in dictation courses) in book form (thus, they produced ‘fixed texts’). The normal transmission of ‘fixed texts’ came to pass by way of copying manuscripts, and the only forms of modification which took place were variants typical of written transmission and redactional changes. The orality Islamic scholars still insisted on, and which was expressed e.g. in the terminology of introductory isnāds at the beginning of ḥadīṯ collections, historical and other works, related to ‘heard/audited transmission’ (samā‘, qirā‘ah).

At any stage of the transmission process, tampering, false ascriptions, fictitious references (isnāds), insertion of inauthentic material and other conscious alterations could occur. Detailed textual comparisons allow us to identify such interventions in the case of frequently and independently transmitted traditions. Thus, in a study of a tradition complex, it is not enough to pick a handful of versions of a tradition, e.g. the best-known ones. Rather, we have to assemble and analyse an exhaustive corpus of all available versions.
In this book, I have described and tested a procedure based – according to a postulate formulated by Noth – on the analysis of separate traditions. I combined the *isnād-cum-matn* analysis with Paret’s important discovery that the transmission line Ibn Isḥāq < al-Zuhārī < ‘Urwah represents a genuinely *historical* teacher–student relationship rather than a fictitious line generated by ‘raising back’ *isnāds*.1 In the introduction to this book, the procedure is described in detail;2 in the fictitious dialogue below, it will again figure prominently. It has enabled us to identify and single out ‘good’ (Noth), i.e. ‘authentic, reliable’ traditions, among the *sirah* material.3 In what follows, I would like to take up a number of issues that were raised in the reviews of the German original of this book.

1. Reviews of the first edition

Internationally, my study met with a largely positive reaction. Experts from the USA, Israel, Italy, France and Germany wrote substantial reviews.4 I wrote a detailed rejoinder in reaction to H. Berg’s negative, but polite and measured review, which (as was to be expected) criticized my book from the point of view of Crone’s sceptical ‘school’.5 I do not want to repeat the details of my counter-arguments, which can be found in my rejoinder; however, I would like to respond to the following claim made by Berg:

> A more convincing strategy would have been to look at apparently related traditions and analyze their contents without recourse to their *isnāds*. If the contents displayed a consistent correlation with their *isnāds*, then at least some of the information contained in the *isnāds* might be authentic.6

First of all, Berg’s statement is correct: a consistent correlation between *isnāds* and *mutān* (texts) is indeed a strong indicator for the *isnād*’s authenticity, a fact Andreas Görke has demonstrated in an important study.7

But Berg is apparently unaware that I, without of course being aware of his suggestion, began by following the very same procedure in my first case study, which dealt with the *iqra*’ narration: in the first stage, I compiled a (maximally comprehensive) *thematic* corpus (without taking *isnāds* into account) of traditions
reporting that an angel appeared to the Prophet and summoned him to recite the first revelation. In the second stage, I provisionally limited my analysis to traditions reported on the authority of al-Zuhřī <ʿUrwh <ʿĀʾishah. This limitation made sense not just because of the similarity of the isnāds but also of theme, motifs and, for some passages, even wording: traditions traced back to al-Zuhřī <ʿUrwh (ʿĀʾishah) share certain characteristic motifs and verbal parallels, e.g. all of them begin with the phrase awwal mā budiʾa bi-hī and agree that sūrah 96: 1–5 was the first revelation. No tradition with a different isnād describes this event in the same manner. In the third stage, I studied traditions about the same event which come with similar (but not identical) isnāds (Hišām ibnʿUrwh <ʿUrwh; Abū l-Aswād YaṭīmʿUrwh <ʿUrwh <ʿĀʾishah etc.) and found that they correlated also in their contents with parts of the traditions of the first group. On this basis, I concluded that they – as the isnād indicates – derive from the same source. Finally, in the fourth stage, I analysed traditions with similar contents as those transmitted on the authority of al-Zuhřī <ʿUrwh <ʿĀʾishah (some of them so similar that they must have had the same source) but with a different isnād. This phenomenon was of course in need of explanation and I attempted to give one. As in the case of the iqraʾ narration, my examination of the scandal story also proceeded from a maximally comprehensive corpus of traditions dealing with the event, not only those with the isnād ʿUrwh <ʿĀʾishah. In fact, I not only anticipated Berg’s suggestion that I take the contents of the relevant traditions as my starting point; I applied this method in a much more sophisticated manner than he required.

In his review, Rubin put forward a serious objection to an aspect of my study of the iqraʾ episode. He noted that the tradition according to Hišām ibnʿUrwh (specifically the only known version at the time, Tradition 1)” merely provides reports about Muhammad’s visions (‘light’) and auditory sensations (‘voices’) and his fear of being a kāhin (followed by Ḥadīghah’s praise and comforting words). It omits the actual revelation experience including the transmission of the first revelation – which al-Zuhřī identified as sūrah 96: 1–5, other transmitters as sūrah 1 – through an angel. Rubin infers from its absence that the version transmitted on the authority of Hišām ibnʿUrwh (as well as another tradition with similar content traced back to ʿAmmār ibn ʿAbī ʿAmmār < Ibn ʿAbbās) preserves the original narration, in which the narrative motifs follow biblical rather than Qurʾānic conventions. He maintains that this original story, which was initially not connected with the Qurʾān, could only have been linked with the narration of the revelation of sūrah 96: 1–5 (in al-Zuhřī) or sūrah 1 (in other traditions) at a later stage. In the meantime, however, two more traditions traced back to Hišām ibnʿUrwh have come to light, both of which correspond to other elements of the Zuhřī recension (which is, when compared to the Hišām recension, more elaborate): Ḥadīghah narration II; Waraqah narration; appearance of the angel; identification of Nāmūs or Gabriel as the bearer of the first revelation[s]; ʿfatrah narration. This means that we now have proof that Hišām’s version did indeed contain some of the key figures and motifs of the Zuhřī version which Rubin claims as missing, especially the reference to Nāmūs or Gabriel as the bearer of the first revelation. On the other hand, we have to admit that we (still) cannot prove that Hišām regarded sūrah 96: 1–5 as the initial revelation.
2. Subsequent research on the `Urwah corpus

This book discusses two traditions transmitted on the authority of `Urwah extant in at least two transmission lines that are demonstrably independent of each other (those of al-Zuhrī and Hišām ibn `Urwah). We were able to show that by using `Urwah traditions as a starting point, there is a very good chance of identifying ‘good’ traditions, i.e. traditions already circulating in the first century AH. Görke has carried on this work with his analysis of two more traditions reported on the authority of `Urwah: one about the treaty of al-Ḥudaybīyah, the other (undertaken in cooperation with me) about the ḥiǧrah. The findings of these two studies, both of which were published in English, confirm those of the preceding ones in all important respects. Also, in these two cases, on the basis of reports passed on by two or more `Urwah transmitters (reports which differed in their particulars), we were invariably able to reconstruct the gist of the original `Urwah tradition (or at least parts of it) from the material which they all had in common.

The crowning achievement of our work was a study of the complete corpus of sīrah traditions traced back to `Urwah, supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation and undertaken with the help of another collaborator, lic. phil. Tanja Duncker. In addition to the events from the life of the Prophet listed above, this (recently published) study examines the following key events of early Islamic history transmitted on the authority of `Urwah: the Battles of Badr and Ḥudaydah and the Battle of the Trench (the latter including the raid against the Banū Qurayzhah) and the conquest of Mecca. We were able to demonstrate conclusively for some of the traditions reporting these events, and with a very high degree of probability for others, that `Urwah was their ultimate source. In other cases, the corpus allowed us to recognize and filter out doubtful material or material that was wrongly ascribed to him – e.g. through inadvertent mishaps in transmission or intentionally.

The study confirmed an impression suggested by the findings of this book: that Hišām ibn `Urwah and al-Zuhrī are `Urwah’s two most important and reliable transmitters. We can always demonstrate that their versions are independent of each other. With other transmitters of `Urwah’s traditions, especially Abū l-Aswad and Yazīd ibn Rūmān, we need to be more careful: their transmissions often rearrange and embellish `Urwah’s original reports, as we have seen in the case of their traditions about the first revelation experience. Often, elements of their traditions cannot unequivocally be traced back to `Urwah.

`Urwah’s report about the hiǧrah turned out to be particularly well documented. We were even able to distinguish elements originating with `Urwah but not reported on the authority of Āʾišah from elements for which the latter is cited as the ultimate source. As with the scandal story discussed in this book, we can safely say that in other cases, too, `Urwah reports the gist of Āʾišah’s own recollections. Even though `Urwah’s accounts of these events of early Islamic history are not eyewitness reports or contemporary reports, they are often based on such reports. By compiling and analysing the `Urwah corpus, we have been able to reduce the ‘gap in the historical tradition of early Islam’ to a few decades.
3. A fictitious dialogue

THE SHAYKH: Dear Ṭālib, you rightly point out that the different recensions of Ibn Ḥasan’s *K. al-maḡāzī* often display considerable textual variation. It is also true that Ibn Ḥasan’s students, transmitters and redactors frequently adapted and revised the material they received from their master. But, dear Ṭālib, I am sorry to say that your reasoning is flawed when you infer from all of this that we are unable to say anything definite about Ibn Ḥasan’s original text. By comparing the extant recensions, especially those of Ibn Hišām, al-Ṭabarī and Yūnus ibn Bukayr, we notice that the three authors largely parallel each other, often down to their very wording. Of course, we also frequently encounter textual differences, variants, omissions, rearrangements, perhaps even distortions. But consider our discussion of Ibn Ḥasan’s recension of the first revelation experience: we discovered that there was a single, largely uniform source text on which all three versions were based.

THE ṬĀLIB: Venerable Shaykh, I concede that to some extent, you are right. Patricia Crone’s statement that ‘[Ibn Ḥasan’s] work survives only … in the recension of Ibn Hishām who died … about 200 years after the Prophet. Consider the prospect of reconstructing the origins of Christianity on the basis of the writings of Clement or Justin Martyr in a recension by Origen’ is, in its first part, simply false; in the second, her parallel is inapplicable. The shared material of the different transmissions traced back to Ibn Ḥasan must contain either all or parts of the material he put down in writing or disseminated through teaching. However, Master, consider this: Ibn Ḥasan’s account postdates the events it describes by a century or more.

THE SHAYKH: The rule you have just formulated, Ṭālib, allows us to go back two generations further. Bear in mind that many reports Ibn Ḥasan cites on the authority of his most important teacher, al-Zuhrī, were also transmitted by other contemporary compilers, especially ʿAbd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar ibn Rāšid, Mūsā ibn ʿUqbah and Mālik ibn Anas – again on the authority of al-Zuhrī. Even though the different versions of the same Zuhrī tradition transmitted by the three compilers often vary in their textual form and narrative details, we can always establish an intersection (shared material) which contains original Zuhrī material. As an aside, let me add that the existence of characteristic, divergent versions indicates that these traditions – in our case, those of al-Zuhrī – were passed on independently and through different lines of transmitters. But, whenever, in this early period, traditions transmitted by two or more students on the authority of the same teacher are overly similar, it seems likely that the students copied from each other and not that they have passed on their teacher’s words. This is the phenomenon called the ‘spread of traditions’.

THE ṬĀLIB: Shaykh, even though your explanation of the transmission of material from the generation of al-Zuhrī onwards has convinced me, we still have to account for a gap in transmission: al-Zuhrī died toward the middle of the second/eighth century. Even many sceptics would not deny that we can establish
some historical facts about figures and events of the second century. But by stepping back one more generation, we arrive in the first century. The ‘imāms’ of the sceptics all agree that we are unable to make any statements about this period.

THE SHAYKH: Tālib, remember that al-Zuhrī transmitted many important traditions, particularly those about historical events, from his teacher ‘Urwah ibn al-Zubayr. These traditions …

THE TĀLIB: Excuse me for interrupting you – I assume that one could hardly prove that ‘Urwah was indeed the source for the material al-Zuhrī credits him with …

THE SHAYKH: Indeed one can! There were other transmitters of ‘Urwah’s traditions besides al-Zuhrī, most prominently his son Hišām. For a large part of ‘Urwah’s historical (and legal) reports, we have versions from both of his main transmitters. It is true that they may display a considerable degree of variation. Yet, by establishing the intersection (the shared material) of an ‘Urwah tradition as transmitted by al-Zuhrī and Hišām ibn ‘Urwah …

THE TĀLIB: … we are in fact able to determine what ‘Urwah himself reported about an event! Your arguments have convinced me. But – there is still a gap of 30 years or more between the events and the lifetime of ‘Urwah, who was born about 20 years after the hiǧrah (23/643–4 or a few years later) and probably did not start collecting and teaching traditions before 664. ‘Urwah was not an eye witness of any of the events he reports.

THE SHAYKH: Dear Tālib, you are of course absolutely right. ‘Urwah’s accounts do not reflect ‘the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth’. But consider this: as the son of a cousin of the Prophet and one of the earliest Muslim believers and as a nephew of Muḥammad’s wife ‘Ā’ishah, ‘Urwah was in touch with people who were actual eye witnesses of the events of his life. His informants, all contemporaries of the Prophet, may have given him information that was sometimes subjective, sugar-coated, wrongly remembered or even unconsciously distorted. But it is unlikely to have been made up entirely out of thin air. And even though ‘Urwah’s reports may have been interpreted and coloured by his personality and selected by his memory, the process of selection and modification had not yet progressed too far. Most importantly, ‘Urwah also reports traits and stories which have resisted idealization. As an example, he relates that during the Battle of Uḥud, Muslim fighters also killed one of their own called al-Yamān who they mistook for an enemy fighter – even though his son called out to them that they were attacking his father.25

THE TĀLIB: What, then, were the events of the Prophet’s life ‘Urwah reported about?

THE SHAYKH: He reported about all of the important events.

THE TĀLIB: Would it not be possible to reconstruct the outlines of a first-century biography of the Prophet on the basis of a comprehensive corpus of ‘Urwah traditions?
THE SHAYKH: Indeed it would.

THE ṬĀLIB: And would we not have to assume that the reports of this proto-sīrah were of a very different nature than later reports? Take the example of miracle stories: do they play a prominent role in 'Urwah’s account?

THE SHAYKH: They do not – the earlier material contains hardly any miracle stories about Muḥammad. Let me give you an example: the difference between early and later reports comes out most strongly when we compare 'Urwah’s account of the hiǧrah with one preserved in a Heidelberg papyrus fragment from the early third/ninth century ascribed to Wahb ibn Munabbih.26 There is not a single miracle story in the former whereas the latter cites no fewer than five! Also, the picture of Muḥammad painted in 'Urwah’s traditions has not yet been subjected to the sort of elevation we already notice in many of Ibn Ishāq’s reports (traced back to informants other than 'Urwah). Take some other examples: consider the descriptions of the Battle of Badr, al-Ḥudaybiyāh and the conquest of Mecca which we find in 'Urwah’s letters to the caliph 'Abd al-Malik and in his historical traditions.27 There is no evidence whatsoever for the kind of development toward salvation history which Wansbrough claims to find in third-century sources – least of all in 'Urwah’s account of the Battle of Uḥud in which he relates that Muslims inadvertently killed a fellow Muslim – what does that have to do with salvation history?

THE ṬĀLIB: Venerable Shaykh, let me ask you one last question. As we know, today’s Sunnī radical extremists view early Muslim society as it is described in Islamic historical tradition as an ideal and a model they strive to emulate. By abandoning Wansbrough’s revolutionary conclusion that early Islamic history is salvation history pure and simple without any historically valid core, are we not making a common cause with these Sunnī radicals? Do we not end up by supporting them?

THE SHAYKH: Not at all. It is absurd to equate the so-called (and falsely so, at that) ‘traditionalist scholars’ with allies of traditionally minded or even extreme fundamentalist Muslims on the one hand and ‘revisionists’ with progressive scientists on the other. The discovery of a scientific method which allows us to come closer to ‘what really happened’ (L. von Ranke) and to establish a ‘foundation of secure and unshakeable facts’, ‘irrespective of our doubts’ (E. Bernheim), may also mean that our findings sometimes confirm the outlines of what Muslim believers had accepted as fact all along. Whenever this is the case – as, indeed, it is here – scholarly honesty requires us to declare that Muslim tradition is not always as unreliable as many Western scholars have assumed.

THE ṬĀLIB: I have been taught and have long believed that the reports of the sīrah were merely expressions of salvation history and purely fictitious. Please allow me some more time to reconsider my position before I agree completely with what you say.

THE SHAYKH: Of course, I fully understand – it is extremely difficult to abandon a paradigm we have been in the thrall of for a long time.
Appendix 1

The corpus

The following corpus presents the complexes of traditions discussed in this book. It is arranged systematically, according to recension, version and derivative version. This system will very often allow for the authenticity of any given tradition to be checked. When the state of dependence expressed in the isnād can also be established by evidence in the texts, then this becomes a strong indication for the authenticity of the transmission. The system provides a positive result when all derivative versions of a tradition (e.g. all the derivative versions bundled under I A 1.1.1) exhibit greater textual similarity among themselves than any degree of similarity exhibited by the version to which they belong (in this case I A 1.1) to other versions of the same recension (e.g. to I A 1.4, 1.5 or 1.6). Should the text of a version exhibit too much similarity to the text of another version of the same recension, then the reason may be a direct dependency of one text on the other. This means that a transmitter may have copied the text of a fellow transmitter as opposed to receiving it from a teacher by way of ‘audition’ (samāʿ), as the isnād would have it (this is the phenomenon which has been termed the ‘spread of traditions’).

An example of authentic transmission is provided by the bundle I A 1.6 (Ibn Ishāq’s version of the Zuhrī recension). In this instance, all the derivative versions of 1.6 (i.e. 1.6.1 (at-Tirmidī and al-ʿUṭāridī from Ibn Ishāq) and 1.6.2 (Ibn Hisām from Ibn Ishāq)) contain only the first four sentences of the text of the Zuhrī recension. This indicates that the originator of the version, Ibn Ishāq, had himself shortened the Zuhrī recension in this way. There is other evidence that Ibn Ishāq did in fact do so (cf. above p. 48).

An example of inauthentic transmission is provided by II C.4. In this instant, the tradent, Abū Uways, states that he is transmitting on the authority of Hishām ibn ʿUrwah (II A.4). The genuine Hishām ibn ʿUrwah recension is represented in at least five versions which all, with some variations, exhibit the same characteristics. The tradition given by Abū Uways does not actually exhibit these characteristics but rather different ones, among them those which belong clearly to the Zuhrī recension.
Appendix 1: The corpus

I Muḥammad’s first revelation: The iqra’ narration

A. Recensions definitely or probably derived from the same archetype

1. The Zuhrī (< ‘Urwaḥ) recension

1.1 The version of Maʿmar ibn Rāṣid < az-Zuhrī

1.1.1 ‘Abd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī


Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 232–3)

Muslim (1972: II, 206–7) (abridged)


al-Wāḥidī (n.d.: 5) (end missing)

al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 135ff.)

Abū Nuʿaym (1950: 168ff.)

1.1.2 ‘Abdallāh ibn Muʿāḏ < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī (end missing)

al-Azraqī (1858: 426–7)

1.1.3 Muḥammad ibn Ṭawr < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī (only the fatrah annex)

al-Balāḏūrī (n.d.: XXX, 78)


1.1.4 Sufyān (which one?) < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī (only the fatrah annex)

al-Balāḏūrī (n.d.: I, 108)

1.1.5 al-Wāqidī < Maʿmar + Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdallāh < az-Zuhrī (abridged; only the beginning)

Ibn Saʿd (1905–40: I/1, 129)

al-Balāḏūrī (n.d.: I, 105)

1.2 The version of Layṯ ibn Saʿd < ‘Uqayl ibn Ḥālid < az-Zuhrī

al-Buḥārī, Sahih in Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: I, 52ff.)

al-Buḥārī, Sahih in Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: XVIII,379) (abridged; only the beginning)

al-Buḥārī, Sahih in Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: XIII, 171) (abridged; beginning missing)

al-Buḥārī, Sahih in Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: XVIII, 380) (abridged; beginning missing)

Muslim (1972: II, 204) (abridged; beginning missing)

al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 139–40) (abridged; beginning missing)

al-Wāḥidī (1994: IV, 527–8) (abridged; only the iqra’ narration)

1.3 The version of ‘Abdallāh ibn Wahb < Yūnus ibn Yazīd < az-Zuhrī

Abū ʿAwānah (1362–3 AH: I, 120ff.) (with fatrah annex)

Muslim (1972: II, 197ff.) (without fatrah annex)
1.4 The version of Ṣṣāliḥ ibn Abī l-Aḥḍar < az-Zuhrī
at-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: 206 and 207) (two fragments: beginning and end)

1.5 The version of an-Nu’mān ibn Rāṣid < az-Zuhrī

1.6 The version of Ibn Iṣḥāq < az-Zuhrī (abridged; only the beginning)
1.6.1 Yūnus ibn Bukayr < Ibn Iṣḥāq < az-Zuhrī
at-Tirmidī (1978: V, 257)
al-‘Uṯāridī (1858–60: 151)
1.6.2 al-Bakkāʾī < Ibn Iṣḥāq < az-Zuhrī
Ibn Hišām (1858–60: 151)

1.7 The contaminated version of ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Mubaḥrah < Yūnus + al-Layṯ < ‘Uqayl < az-Zuhrī
al-Buḫārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 18, pp. 369ff.)

1.8 The contaminated version of al-Layṯ < ‘Uqayl + ‘Abd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī

1.9 The contaminated version ‘Abdallāh ibn al-Mubaḥrah < Yūnus + Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī
Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 153) (abridged; only the beginning)

1.10 The tradition az-Zuhrī < Muḥammad ibn an-Nu’mān (only the beginning)
[al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 139)]

2. The ‘Urwah [< ‘Āʾišah] transmission
2.1 The Zuhrī < ‘Urwah recension (cf. above A.1)
2.2 The (fragmentary) Hišām ibn ‘Urwah < ‘Urwah recension
Appendix 1: The corpus

Ibn Sa’d (1905–40: I/1, 130) (first fragment)
az-Zubayr b. Bakkār (1999: 419 (no. 720) second fragment)
Abū l-Farağ al-Iṣfahānī 1285 AH: III, 14 = 3rd edn, III, 120 (second fragment)
al-‘Uṭāridī (1978: 135) (third fragment)
at-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XXX, 127–8) (third fragment)

2.3 The Ibn Lahṭah < Abū l-Aswad < ‘Urwah recension

2.3.1 Long version
al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 142–3)
Ibn Kaṭār (1932–9: III, 13–14)
as-Suyūṭī (1967: I, 231–2)
Ibn Sayyid an-Nās (1986: I, 112) (wrong isnād)
(cf. also Ya’qūbī 1960: II, 22–3)

2.3.2 Short version
Ibn Ḥaḍar al-‘Asqalānī (1978: pt 1, 54)
Ibn Kaṭār (1980: IV, 249)

2.4 The tradition according to Yazīd ibn Rūmān < ‘Urwah

Abū Nuʿaym (1950: 174)

3. The Ibn Ishāq (< Wahb < ‘Ubayd) recension

3.1 The al-Bakkāṭ < Ibn Ishāq version

3.2 The Salamah ibn al-Fadl < Ibn Ishāq version

3.3 The Yūnus ibn Bukayr < Ibn Ishāq version
al-‘Uṭāridī (1978: 120ff.)
al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 146ff.)

3.4 The al-Wāqidī [< Ibn Ishāq] version (abridged)
al-Balāḏurī (n.d., vol. 1, p. 110f.)

4. The rağul < ‘Āʾīšah tradition
at-Ṭayālisī (1321 AH: 215–16)
Abū Nuʿaym (1950: 171)
5. The probable archetype: the narration of 'Ubayd ibn 'Umayr

5.1 The Ibn Ishāq < Wahb < 'Ubayd recension (cf. above A.3)

5.2 The awā'il tradition according to 'Amr ibn Dīnār < 'Ubayd

5.2.1 In the Šu'bah ibn al-Ḥaǧǧāq < 'Amr ibn Dīnār transmission
al-Balāḏurī (n.d.: I, 110)
Ibn Sa'd (1905–40: I/1, 130)
at-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XXX, 139)

5.2.2 In the Ibn 'Uyaynah < 'Amr ibn Dīnār transmission
'Abd ar-Razzāq (1991: II, 313)

[5.3 The transmission according to 'Urwh [< 'Ā'išah] (?) (cf. above A.2)]

6. The contaminated tradition according to 'Amr ibn Dīnār [< 'Ubayd ibn 'Umayr?] + az-Zuhri [< 'Urwh < 'Ā'išah?]

'Abd ar-Razzāq (1991: II, 313)

B. The tradition according to Abū Salamah ibn 'Abd ar-Raḥmān < Ġābir ibn 'Abdallāh

1. The version according to Yaḥyā ibn Abī Kaṭīr

1.1 al-Awzā'ī < Yaḥyā

Muslim (1972: II, 207–8)
an-Nasā'ī (1990: II, 477–8)
Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: III, 377)
Abū 'Awānah (1362–3 AH: I, 113–14)
al-Balāḏurī (n.d.: I, 107)
Ibn Ḥibbān (1973–83: I, 51)
at-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XXX, 78)
al-Wāḥidī (n.d.: 7)
al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 155)

1.2 'Alī ibn al-Mubārak < Yaḥyā

al-Buḥārī, Sahīh in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-'Asqalānī (1978: pt 18, 323)
Muslim (1972: II, 208–9) (abridged)
at-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XXX, 78)
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1.3 Šaybān ibn ’Abd ar-Raḥmān < Yaḥyā
Muğāhid (1989: 682)
an-Nasāʾī (1990: II, 478–9)

1.4 Abān ibn Yazīd al-‘Aṭṭār < Yaḥyā
al-Balāḍurī (n.d.: I, 109)

1.5 Ḥarb ibn Ṣaddād < Yaḥyā
al-Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 1, 323–4)
at-Ṭayālīsī (1321 AH: 235)

1.6 The contaminated version according to al-Awzāʾī + ‘Alī ibn Mubārak < Yaḥyā
Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: III, 306)

1.7 Unidentified version
aḍ-Ḍahabī (1987: I, 125)

2. The version according to az-Zuhrī (cf. A.1.1 and above, p. 43f.)

2.1 Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī
at-Tirmiṣī (1983: V, 100)
ʿAbd ar-Razzāq (1991: II, 262)
al-Wāḥīdī (n.d.: 7)
al-Balāḍurī (n.d.: I, 109)
al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 138)

2.2 Yūnus ibn Yazīd < az-Zuhrī
at-Ṭabarī (1879–91: ser. 1, pp. 1155–6) = al-Ṭabarī (1988: 76) and (1321 AH: XXX, 78)
Abū ʿAwānah (1362–63 AH: I, 112)
Muslim (1972: II, 205–6)

2.3 al-Layt < ʿUqayl < az-Zuhrī
al-Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 13, 40)
al-Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 18, 326)
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2.4 Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥafṣah < az-Zuhrī


2.5 Ṣāliḥ ibn Abī l-ʿAḥdar < az-Zuhrī

aṭ-Ṭayālisī (1321 AH: 235)

2.6 The contaminated version al-Layṭṭ < 'Uqayl + 'Abd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī

al-Buḥārī, Ṣahīh in Ibn Ḥaḍr al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 18, 325)

2.7 Unidentified version

aḏ-Ḍahabī (1987: I, 125)

C. Probably independent transmissions (sample)

1. The transmission according to Sulaymān aš-Šaybānī < Ibn Ṣaddād

aṭ-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XXX, 139)
al-Balāḏurī (n.d.: I, 108)

2. The transmission according to Sulaymān at-Taymī

Ibn Ḥaḍr al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 1, 54)

D. Late contaminated and harmonized compilations
drawn from several recensions (sample)

1 al-Ḥarkūšī, Šaraf an-nabī; ms. London, British Museum, Or. 3014, fol. 24a–25a
2 al-Ḥalabī (1320 AH: I, 233ff.)
II The tradition of the slander against ʿĀ‘išah: The ḥadīṯ al-ifk

A. Recensions based on the same archetype

1. The recension of az-Zuhrī (<ʿUrwaḥ + ʿAlqamah + Saʿīd + ʿAlqamah + ʿUbayd Allāh)

1.1 The version according to Maʿmar ibn Rāsid < az-Zuhrī

1.1.1 ʿAbd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī


Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 194ff.)


at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 50ff.)

1.1.2 Muḥammad ibn Ṭawr < Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī


Abū Yaʿlā (1986: VIII, 322ff.)

at-Ṭabarānī (1321 AH: XVIII, 63ff.)

an-Nasāʾī (1990: II, 112ff.) (incomplete end)

1.2 The version according to Fulayḥ ibn Sulaymān < az-Zuhrī

al-Buḫārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 11, 89ff.)

ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 Ḥ/1991: 311ff.)


Abū Yaʿlā (1986: VIII, 322ff.)

at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 61ff.)

al-Bayhaqī (1344–55 AH: VII, 302) (only the beginning)


1.3 The version according to Yūnus ibn Yazīd < az-Zuhrī

al-Buḫārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 18, 57ff.)

al-Buḫārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 11, 64) (incomplete)


Abū Dāwūd (1950: IV, 324) (abridged)

al-Bayhaqī (1985: IV, 64) (?)

al-Bazzār (2003–9: XVIII, 171ff. no. 153/129)

at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 56ff.)

aḍ-Ḍahabī (1987: II, 273ff.)

1.4 The version according to Ibrāhīm ibn Saʿīd < Ṣāliḥ ibn Kaysān < az-Zuhrī

al-Buḫārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 16, 3ff.)
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al-Buḫārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 17, 249) (incomplete)
an-Nasāʿī (n.d.: 39ff.)
an-Nasāʿī (1990: I, 599) (incomplete end)
Ibn ʿHanbal (1313 AH : VI, 197–8)
Ibn ʿHanbal (1313 AH : VI, 198) (abridged)
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 88ff.) (slightly abridged)
Muslim (1972: XVII, 114) (only excerpts)
Abū Yaʿlā (1986: VIII, 339ff.)
Abū Yaʿlā (1986: VIII, 348ff.) (slightly abridged)

1.5 The version according to ʿʿUqayl ibn Ḥalid < az-Zuhrī
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 92ff.)

1.6 The version according to Isḥāq ibn Rāsid < az-Zuhrī
Ibn ʿAsākir (1995: V, 120ff.)
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 78ff.)
ʿUmar ibn ʿAbdallāh (1368 Ș/1991: 318) (abridged)

1.7 The version according to Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Abī ʿAtīq < az-Zuhrī
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 69ff.)

1.8 The version according to Muḥammad ibn Ṭawr < Ibn ʿUrāyq < az-Zuhrī (slightly extended)
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 66ff.)

1.9 The version according to ʿʿAṭṭāʾ ibn Abī Muslim al-Ḥurāsānī < az-Zuhrī
Ibn ʿAsākir (1995: XXIX, 331ff.)
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 74ff.)

1.10 The version Mālik ibn Anas < Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd + ʿUbayd Allāh ibn ʿUmar < az-Zuhrī
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 83ff.)

1.11 The version according to Ṣāḥīḥ ibn Abī l-Ĥḍar < az-Zuhrī
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 102ff.)
1.12 The contaminated version of Maʿmar + Yūnus < az-Zuhrt
Muslim (1972: XVII, 102ff.)

1.13 The contaminated version of Ṣāliḥ ibn Kaysān + Yūnus < az-Zuhrt
al-Buhārī, Ṣāliḥ in Ibn Ḥaḍr al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 17, 249) (abridged)

1.14 The version according to Yaʿqūb ibn ʿAṭṭā + Ziyād ibn Saʿd < az-Zuhrt

1.15 The extended version (with narrative frame: az-Zuhrt with the caliph al-Walīd ibn ʿAbb al-Malik)
1.15.1 Maʿmar < az-Zuhrt
ʿAbb ar-Razzāq (1991: II, 44)
al-Buhārī, Ṣāliḥ in Ibn Ḥaḍr al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 16, 7f.)
ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 ʿ/1991: 337–8)
aḍ-Ḍahabī (1987: II, 278)
al-Bayhaqī (1985: IV: 72)

1.15.2 Aflaḥ ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn al-Muḡrah < az-Zuhrt
aṭ-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 97ff.)
(?) ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 ʿ/1991: 339) (abridged)
aḍ-Ḍahabī (1987: II, 278)
al-Bayhaqī (1985: IV: 73)

1.15.3 Aflaḥ + Ismāʿīl ibn Rāfī < az-Zuhrt
aṭ-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 103) (abridged)

2. The recension of Ibn Ishāq (< az-Zuhrt + Yahyā ibn ʿAbbād + ʿAbdallāh ibn Abī Bakr)
2.1 The version according to al-Bakkāʾī < Ibn Ishāq

2.2 The version according to Salamah ibn al-Faḍl < Ibn Ishāq
aṭ-Ṭabarānī (1321 ʿ/1801: XVIII, 66) (abridged)

2.3 The version according to Ibn ʿUlāyāh < Ibn Ishāq
ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 ʿ/1991: 328ff.)
3. The Wāqidī recension

al-Wāqidī (1966: II, 426ff.)
Ibn Sa’d (1905–40: II/1, 46–7) (short summary)
(?) al-Balāḏurī (n.d.: I, 342) (short summary)

4. The Hišām ibn ‘Urwa (< Urwah) recension

4.1 The version according to Abū Usāmah < Hišām

al-Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 18, 97ff.)
Muslim (1972: XVII, 114ff.) (abridged)
at-Tirmiḍī (1983: V, 13ff.)
Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 59–60)
at-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XVIII, 66–7)

4.2 The version according to Ḥammād ibn Salamah < Hišām

ʿUmar ibn Ṣabbah (1368 Š/1991: 325ff.)
Abū Dāwūd (1950: IV, 481) (abridged)
Abū Ya‘lā (1986: VIII, 335ff.)
al-Bayhaqī (1344–55 AH: VII, 101)
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 106ff.)
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 129) (abridged)
al-Wāḥidī (1994: III, 310) (abridged)

4.3 The version according to Yūnus ibn Bukayr < Hišām

aḍ-Ḍahābī (1987: II, 270ff.)

4.4 The version according to Yaḥyā ibn Abī Zakarīyāʾ < Hišām (incomplete)

al-Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 28, 110)

4.5 The epistle version: Abān ibn Yazīd al-ʿAṭṭār < Hišām

aṭ-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XVIII, 61; cf. p. 63)

B. Independent transmissions

1. The tradition of Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr [< Amrah < ʾĀʾišah]

1.1 The version according to Ibn Iṣḥāq < Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr

1.1.1 Ibn Abī ʾAdī < Ibn Iṣḥāq
aṭ-Tirmiḍī (1983: V, 17)
1.1.2 Ibn Bukayr < Ibn Ishāq
al-Bayhaqī (1344–55 AH : VIII 250)
aḏ-Ḏahabī (1987: II, 279)

1.1.3 Muḥammad ibn Salamah < Ibn Ishāq
Abū Dāwūd (1950: IV, 226)
al-Bayhaqī (1344–55 AH : VIII, 250)

1.2 The version according to Ibn Abīī  Yaḥḥāyā < 'Abdallāh ibn Abī Bakr
'Abd ar-Razzāq (1991: II, 46)

1.3 The version according to aḏ-Ḍahhāk ibn Maḥlād < al-Ḥasan ibn Zayd < 'Abdallāh
ibn Abī Bakr
'Umar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 338)

2. The first tradition (querying of 'Alī and Usāmah) of Ibn Ishāq < Yahyā ibn 'Abbād <
'Abbād ibn 'Abdallāh < 'Ā 'isah
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 122)

3. The second tradition (ifk + tayammum) of Ibn Ishāq < Yahyā ibn 'Abbād < 'Abbād ibn
'Abdallāh
'Umar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 348)
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 121)

4. The recension of Ḥuṣayn ibn 'Abd ar-Raḥmān (< Abū Wā’il < Masrūq < Umm
Rūmān)

4.1 The version according to Ibn Fuṣayl < Ḥuṣayn
al-Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaḍār al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 13, 166)
Ibn Ḥibbān (1988–91: XVI, 22)

4.2 The version according to Abū 'Awānah < Ḥuṣayn
al-Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīḥ in Ibn Ḥaḍār al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 17, 249–50) (abridged)
at-Ṭayālīṣī (1321 AH: 231–2)
4.3 The version according to Sulaymān ibn Kaḍīr < Ḥuṣayn
al-Buḥārī, Sahīh in Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 18, 91)

4.4 The version according to Abū Čaʿfar ar-Rāzī < Ḥuṣayn
Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 367–8)

4.5 The version according to ʿAlī ibn ʿĀṣim < Ḥuṣayn
Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 367–8)

4.6 The version according to Suwayd ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz < Ḥuṣayn
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 122)

5. The tradition of Warqāʾ < Ibn Abī Naḡīḥ < Muḡāhid
Muḡāhid (1989: 490)
at-Ṭabarānī (1321 AH: XVIII, 63)

6. The report in Sufyān at-Ṭawrī’s Qurʾān commentary
Sufyān at-Ṭawrī (1983: 182)
ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 336)

7. The tradition according to Saʿīd ibn Ǧubayr

7.1 The mursal tradition
Sufyān at-Ṭawrī (1983: 182)
ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 338)

7.2 The tradition of Ḥuṣayf < Saʿīd ibn Ǧubayr
Sufyān at-Ṭawrī (1983: 182)
ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 338)

C. Dubious and inauthentic imitations of the main recensions

1. The tradition according to an-Nuʿmān ibn Rāḥid < az-Zuhrī < ῾Urwh < ʿĀʾiṣah
al-Bayhaqī (1985: IV, 63)
ad-Ṣahābī (1987: II, 269)

2. The tradition of al-Ｗalīd ibn Muḥammad al-Muwaqqari < az-Zuhrī < ʿUrwh < ʿĀʾiṣah
ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 318ff.)
3. The tradition according to ‘Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ and others’
at-Ṭabarānī (1321 AH: XVIII, 67–8)

4. The tradition of Abū Uways < Hiṣām ibn ‘Urwah
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 111ff.)
al-Hayṯamī (1982: IX, 232ff.)

5. The tradition according to Nāfi’ < ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Umar
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 125ff.)
al-Hayṯamī (1982: IX, 237ff.)

6. The tradition according to ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Abbās
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 123–4)

7. The tradition according to al-Aswad ibn Yazīd
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 118ff.)
al-Hayṯamī (1982: IX, 230–1)

8. The tradition according to Abū Hurayrah
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 129) (abridged)

9. The tradition according to ‘Attāb ibn Baṣīr < Ḥuṣayf < Miqsam < ‘Ā’ishah
‘Umar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 323ff.)

10. The tradition according to Abū Salamah < ‘Ā’ishah
Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 30)
Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 103)
at-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 21)

11. The report in Muqātil ibn Sulaymān’s Qurʾān commentary
Muqātil ibn Sulaymān (1979–87: III, 187ff.)
12. The version according to Zayd ibn Aslam/Ibn Sa’d ibn Rafah

‘Abdallāh ibn Wahb (1993: pt 1, fol. 22a, 13–22b, 1)

D. Later contaminated and harmonizing compilation from numerous recensions

al-Ḥalabī (1320 AH: II, 292ff.)

E. Legendary reworking of the material in the style of popular mağāzī works

Ḥadīṯ al-ifk; manuscript Berlin Ms. or. oct. 1459, fol. 156a–170b

1 Further secondary sources, poems etc. about ‘Ā’ишah and the Ḥadīṯ al-ifk in particular can be found in the bibliography of Spellberg (1994: 27ff.).
2 Schoeler (1990: no. 311).
Appendix 2
List of sigla

I Termini technici

CL: common link of a tradition; the transmitter after which the isnād of a tradition branches out; the main branching point of an isnād.
PCL: partial common link; a transmitter at a secondary branching point in the isnād of a tradition.

II Versions of traditions reporting the first revelation experience

FV: fragmentary version; a version of the Zuhrī (<ʿUrwaḥ <ʿAʿišah) recension in two fragments reported on the authority of Ṣāliḥ ibn Abī l-Aḥḍar (aṭ-Ṭayālisī 1321 AH: 206, 207; cf. Corpus, I A.1.4).

SV I: short version I; the first four sentences or so of the Ibn Ishāq version of the Zuhrī (<ʿUrwaḥ <ʿAʿišah) recension (Ibn Hišām 1858–60: 151 = Ibn Ishāq 1980: 105 and others; cf. Corpus, I A.1.6).

SV II: short version II; a Maʾmar + Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdallāḥ version of the Zuhrī (<ʿUrwaḥ <ʿAʿišah) recension which consists only of the first few sentences (Ibn Saʾd 1905: I/1, 129; al-Balāḏurī n.d.: I, 105; cf. Corpus, I A.1.1.5).

SV III: short version III; the tradition reported on the authority of Hišām ibn ʿUrwaḥ <ʿUrwaḥ (Ibn Saʾd 1905: I/1, p.130; cf. Corpus, I A.2.2).


LV II: long version II; the other of the two long versions of the Zuhrī (<ʿUrwah <ʿAʾišah) recension which was transmitted only once (mā aqraʿu version) by an-Nuʿmān ibn Rāṣid < az-Zuhrī (aṭ-Ṭabarī 1879–1901: ser. 1, pp. 1147ff. = al-Ṭabarī 1988: 67ff. = 1321 AH: XXX, 138–9; cf. Corpus, I A.1.5).


LV IV: long version IV; the long version of the Ibn Lahīṭah (< Abū Ӏl-Aswad <ʿUrwah) recension (the kāyfa aqraʿu version) (al-Bayhaqī 1985: II,142–3 and others; cf. Corpus, I A.2.3.1).

MV: intermediate version; a text of the Maʿmar version of the Zuhrī recension reported on the authority of ʿAbdallāh ibn Muʿāḍ (al-Azraqī 1858: 426–7; cf. Corpus, I A.1.1.2).
Notes

Introduction

1 Schoeler (2006).
2 On the historical value of the Islamic biographical sources about the first two centuries AH see Schoeler (2002: 363ff.). I argued that this corpus, written much later than the events, gives us on the whole a generally correct picture about the teaching and learning methods in early Islam – in spite of the contradictions and distorted and falsified individual stories that it may contain.
3 Cf. p. 28 with n. 111 and pp. 29, 35f. Cf. also Günther (1994: 197ff.) who calls such writings ‘Verfasserwerke’ (roughly: ‘systematic compositions’), which occupy an intermediate position between ‘conclusively edited works’ and ‘lecture notes’.
4 The period of the genesis and the date of the final redaction of the Qurʾānic text are also hotly contested. In fact, Wansbrough’s ‘late-dating’ – he put it as late as the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century CE (Wansbrough 1977, 2004) – rendered it one of the most controversial issues of the debate.
5 With the possible exception of a recently discovered inscription which mentions and dates the death of the caliph ʿUmar; cf. p. 14.
6 Already correctly pointed out by Crone (1980: 3ff.) and Cook in his epilogue to the conference on Voix et calame en Islam médiéval, organized by the Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes in Paris (March 1993). (This epilogue is not in the published version; cf. Cook 1997.)
7 Cf. the excellent study by von Hinüber (1990).
9 As Cook indicates in his remarks referred to in n. 6.
11 For this reason, the authenticity of ancient Arabic poetry is less of a problem than that of the religious tradition, even though the former took at least as long as the latter to be put into its final written form (in works of the third/ninth century). The thesis of Margoliouth/Ṭāḥā Ḥusayn according to which ancient Arabic poetry is a global falsification is nowadays obsolete. On the question of the authenticity of ancient Arabic poetry cf. Wagner (1987–8: I, 12–29); Bauer (1992: I, 8ff.); Schoeler (2006: 65ff. = 1992a: 7ff.).

Caetani (1905–7: 18ff., esp. 57).

Esp. Lammens (1910).

Lammens (1910); cf. Becker (1913 and 1912: 54ff.).

Lammens (1910: 28).

Esp. in Nöldke (1914 and 1907).

Cf. the references listed in n. 18.

Blachère (1952).

Cf. Schacht (1949, 1953).

In his well-known Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence (1950).


Paret (1980: 151ff., esp. 153). Their views of course differ in some respects. For example, we can see from their divergent assessment of traditions pertaining to sīrah 96, Paret is more critical than Watt; cf. Paret (1980: 47ff.) and Watt (1953: 40ff.).

Horovitz (1927–8). ‘The basic thesis of Horovitz’ study is that written transmission of material about the life of the Prophet can be traced back to the generation of the tābiʿūn, those Muslims who had known Companions of the Prophet, but have never associated with Muḥammad himself’ (L. Conrad in the Introduction to Horovitz (2002: p. xxvii)).


Guillaume (1955), esp. the introduction; cf. also his articles listed in the Bibliography.

Cf. the Bibliography.

Paret (1954).

Al-Samuk (1978: 4ff.) presents an overview of the most important works in the field of sīrah research until c.1978. Additional works up to the middle of the 1990s can be found in the bibliographies of Jarrar (1989), Rubin (1995) and Motzki (2000).


According to Wellhausen, traditions fall into two basic groups: material transmitted by Meccan and Medinese (Ḥiḡāzī) authorities, e.g. Ibn Ishaq and al-Wāqidi, and material transmitted by ‘Irāqi scholars, e.g. Abū Mīḥnaf and Sayf ibn ‘Umar. Wellhausen gives precedence to the former of these two groups (the subject of the present study) and classifies the material transmitted by the latter as ‘legendary’. Noth, on the other hand, has shown that judgements should be based on separate traditions, not schools, since, as he points out, both of these putative schools often adduced the same traditions.

Cf. Noth (1973a: 12ff. = 1994: 6). As will become obvious, I concur with Noth on this and most other points he makes. Yet, since we are not confronted with intentional and conscious forgeries, I would prefer the terms ‘modification’ or ‘reshaping process’. That this is in line with Noth’s own ideas can be seen in the following quotation from the most recent English edition of his book (Noth 1994: 6): ‘As used in this book, the concept of “falsification” refers to the results of the work of the transmitters, and not to their motives. That is, it is not meant to convey the notion that tradents and authors worked with the deliberate and consistent aim of producing false or misleading narratives of past events, but rather to assert that the results of the ways in which they handled their material was to give a picture of historical events which was highly distorted, or even entirely wrong.’
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86 Horovitz (1914). The title of his article is ‘Zur Muḥammadlegende’ (‘On the Muḥammad legend’).
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100 Becker (1912: 542).
102 On the problems (or shortcomings) of this classification, see Motzki (2003: esp. p. 257); Görke/Schoeler (2008: 7–8).
108 We should keep in mind that the labels ‘sanguine’ and ‘traditionalist’ were coined by their critics, not by the scholars thus classified; as we will see, they are not appropriate. Note that Bernheim (1903: 180; cf. above, p. xi) referred to his sceptics as ‘sanguine’, whereas the new sceptics label ‘traditionalists’ as ‘sanguine’!
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112 Ibn Warraq (200b); Raven in EJ.
114 Calder (1993). Cf. esp. the reviews by Motzki (1998) and Muranyi (1997) and the more recent comments by Motzki (2003a), Görke (2003: index, s.v. Calder), Muranyi (2003: 327) and Melchert (2003: 308ff.). The latter writes: ‘Although he [scil. Y. Dutton] exaggerates their similarity [i.e. that of the eight extant recensions of the Muwat’ta] to one another, they do make it impossible to maintain that the familiar text is so distinctively Andalusian as Calder makes out’ (Melchert 2003: 308).
115 They are better explained on the basis of the characteristic features of transmission in the Islamic lecture system; cf. Schoeler (2006: 28–61, esp. 33 and 44).
117 Bernheim (1903: 181), identified this phenomenon as a recurring constant of historiography.
118 Cf. e.g. the critical remarks by Donner (1998: 62–3), esp. ‘the gradual penetration of a pre-existing monothestic discourse by Qur’anic phraseology over the course of a few centuries is exactly what we might expect to find, as the Qur’ān became gradually better known among Arabic-speaking monotheists in Syria’.
121 Noth (1994: p. xi). See also the final sentence of his preface; it is quoted in this book as the last of the introductory quotations.
123 Blachère (1952).
124 See p. 3.
125 According to the subtitle (‘La biographie impossible de Mahomet’) of her article ‘Histoire et tradition sacrée’ (Chabbi 1986).
126 Cook (1983).


The source in question is a west-Syriac chronicle by Thomas the Presbyter. He writes that in 634, ‘a battle between the Romans and Muḥammad’s Arabs’ took place. Cf. Hoyland (1997: 120).


Nagel (2008a, 2008b).

Particularly the substantial appendices (Nagel 2008a: 873–979).


Ibid. 842.

Ibid. 728ff., 731ff.

‘Die Vernichtung der Geschichte’ (ibid. 837–8); see also Nagel (1994), titled ‘Ḥadīṯ – oder die Vernichtung der Geschichte’ (‘Ḥadīṯ – Or, The Destruction of History’). The hypothesis behind this label is highly problematic and, in the generalized form Nagel advances it, simply wrong. A. Görke (forthcoming: 12ff.) has demonstrated that the chief witness Nagel (1994: 127) cites to support his idea (a hadīt according to which a believer is permitted to eat game while in a state of ḥārām as long as he did not personally hunt it) illustrates the exact opposite of what Nagel claims: it is, in fact, an old and widespread, legal hadīt. The first historical work to quote it is that by al-Wāqidi!


Ibid. 9–10; Landau-Tasseron (1986, 2004).


The account of these events included in the ‘Urwah corpus also corresponds only partially to that of later, ‘orthodox’ compilations: ‘Urwah seems to have been unaware of the battles with the Banū Qaynuqā‘ and the Banū Naḍīr; cf. Görke and Schoeler (2008: 263).

Jones (1959). Cf. also pp. 73f., 77f.


Nagel (2008a: 298, 904).


Cf. p. 97.


Studies by Landau-Tasseron (1986), Lecker (1995a) and others have established that ‘the historical material’, as arranged by al-Wāqidi, ‘underwent considerable changes not only as a result of tendentious forgeries but also through the mere process of redaction’ (Landau-Tasseron 1986: 270; italics mine). Nagel, who quotes some of these studies, must have been aware of this. He occasionally lets on that he is aware of al-Wāqidi’s procedure, e.g. in the context of the latter’s linking of two events in which ‘Ā’īsah allegedly lost her necklace (cf. above, pp. 89, 91 and 93 with n. 96) he
calls the connection ‘quite clumsy’ (p. 365). Such observations, however, did not affect his overall evaluation of al-Wāqīḍī.

154 Cf. e.g. Sezgin (1967–2007: I, 296), who lists a large number of novelistic futūḥ (as well as other) works circulating under al-Wāqīḍī’s name.


160 Hoyland (1997: 4, 591 ff.).

161 See n. 106.

162 In a chapter titled ‘Critique of the skeptical approach’, Donner (1998: 25–31) points out that the Islamic sources contain many often starkly diverging reports about schisms and doctrines of numerous early, heterodox sects and sub-sects: e.g. gnostic traditions in early šī‘īte literature. ‘These divergent traditions … in not a few cases survived to our own days.’ Hence, Donner argues, it is a priori very likely that at least some traces of all important events and theological views of early Islamic history, including the genuinely authentic, have survived (p. 28).

163 Robinson (2003b: 122) concludes ‘one can no longer assume that all Prophetic ḥadīth are forged and that there is no authentic material in the sīrah’.


165 The new evidence conclusively dispatches Koren and Nevo’s (1991: 100) claim that ‘nor do they [scil. the local sources before the eighth century] mention any caliph before Mu’āwiyah, who by contrast is clearly a historical figure’.


171 Hoyland (2006: 406 ff.).

172 F. Dëroche (2009).

173 Von Bothmer et al. (1999: 46).


175 Robinson (2003: 122).

176 H. Motzki and I developed the isnād-cum-matn analysis independently of each other at about the same time; J. H. Kramers and J. van Ess are among our predecessors. Normally, this method contents itself with demonstrating ‘that many traditions … were not invented by the compilers, but have a history (including forgeries) which can be retraced to a certain point in time [in the case of traditions going back to ‘Urwh, often as far as back in the last third of the first/seventh century!]’. Cf. Motzki (2010: 235).

177 Noth (1968: 295; also 1971: 198).

178 In practice, Kister and some of his students also applied this method in some of their studies; cf. above p. 7 f.

179 The authenticity of the selected traditions has of course to be demonstrated in each case.
It should be remembered that at least six traditions traced back to az-Zuhri via Mūsā ibn ʿUqbah (d. 141/758) contained in the Berlin fragment of Mūsā ibn ʿUqbah (the manuscript contains 20 traditions in all; cf. Sachau 1904) can be found – traced back to az-Zuhri via Māʿmar ibn Rāṣid – in the Kitāb al-mağāzī, part of `Abd ar-Razzāq’s Muṣannaf. They are as follows: no. III = az-Zuhri (1980: 101); no. IV = p. 103; no. VI = p. 66; no. VII = p. 94; no. XV = p. 94; no. XVI = p. 93. Thus, what we actually have here are traditions going back to az-Zuhri. Schacht’s claim that ‘it is impossible to regard the original stock of the Kitāb al-Maghāzī, consisting of traditions related by Mūsā on the authority of Zuhrī, as authentic statements by the latter’ (Schacht 1953: 292) is simply wrong. Cf. also the exemplary study by Motzki (1991a), who shows that numerous traditions and legal statements ascribed to az-Zuhri, in both Mālik’s Muwatṭa’ and ʿAbd ar-Razzāq’s Muṣannaf, must in fact originate with him since they entered these compilations by independent paths of transmission.

This is of course only one – albeit a particularly safe – method to identify authentic ῦUrwah material. Another would involve compiling an exhaustive corpus of ῦUrwah’s traditions. Such a collection would substantially simplify the elimination of flawed material, alterations and forgeries. Von Stülpnagel made a first attempt almost 50 years ago; for ῦUrwah’s historical traditions, this has been tried by Duri (1983: 79–90) and more recently by Mursī (1995). The discovery and publication of many old sources containing ῦUrwah material unavailable to past scholars (e.g. ʿAbd ar-Razzāq, Ibn Abī Șaybah) meant that a new compilation was needed. Such a compilation has recently been published, cf. Goerke and Schoeler (2008).

Not only for historical traditions alone, but legal/ritualistic and exegetical material as well. These are the two groups of material we encounter in the corpus; cf. von Stülpnagel (1956: 54 and 122); Görke/Schoeler (2008: 14–17). For an outstanding legal tradition transmitted on the authority of ῦUrwah by both az-Zuhri and Hišām ibn ʿUrwah see Juynboll (2007: 645, s.v. ῦUrwā b. az-Zubayr). Juynboll holds that ‘dating it to the middle of the first/seventh century at the earliest is plausible’.

As already shown by Motzki (1991b, 1991c).

An example for such a procedure can be found on pp. 109–11.


He is reported to have been born between 23/643 and 29/649. By 63/683, he is already said to have destroyed his law books; cf. p. 21.

Cf. p. 6f.

Following the dispute between, on the one side, Nöldke and Becker, and Lammens and Caetani on the other, the majority of scholars relegate most (or at least a substantial part of) events occurring before the hiǧrah to the realm of legend. Yet, Nöldke provided arguments in favour of the historicity of the ‘first hiǧrah’; cf. Nöldke (1914: 163).


Ibid., 192–3 and above, p. 113f.

Bernheim (1903: 175, 180–1).

Becker (1913: 269).

That is, we will apply the isnād analysis according to Schacht and Juynboll; cf. Schoeler (2006: 130 with additions on p. 141 = 1989b: 244).
197 We do not mean to say that each of al-Wāqīdī’ s isnāds is false; the information he gives about his sources, however, is always to be regarded as suspect. On al-Wāqīdī as compiler, cf. Lecker (1995a, 1995b).

198 Cf. p. 97ff.

199 Cf. Chapter 3, n. 97.

1 The main Medinese transmitters


3 According to Ibn Sa’d (1905–40: II/2, 123), ‘Abdallāh ibn ‘Abbās (d. c. 68/687; cf. Sezgin 1967–84: I, 25) was said to have been seen carrying around ‘tablets’ (alwāḥ), on which he recorded the Prophet’s deeds. The report is ascribed to Abū Rāfī‘; on this alleged mawla of the Prophet, cf. Ibn Ḥağar al-’Asqalānī (1974–5: XII, 100).


5 Cf. Horovitz (1927–8: pt 1, 535ff. = 2002: 1ff. ); Duri (1983: 23ff.); von Stülpnagel (1956: 15): ‘It was only in … this generation that schools arose in which the transmission of knowledge was not left to chance but was the product of systematic work.’

6 Cf. Fück (1925: 1; also 1939: 2–3) and Watt (1983: 41).

7 Cf. Juynboll (1983: 9ff.); cf. also n. 16.

8 Other fields included Qur’ānic exegesis, jurisprudence and questions of religious ritual.


10 According to Fück (1939: 2–3).


16 Al-Fasawī (1981: I, 552); Abū Nu’aym (1932–8: II, 176); Ibn Ḥağar al-’Asqalānī (1984–5: VII, 164); ʿad-Ḏahabī (1985: IV, 431). Von Stülpnagel (1956: 15, n. 1) collected this and other references for the early use of the word ḥadīṯ and pointed out that it initially occurred only in the singular; cf. e.g. above, p. 25 with n. 80 and p. 28.

17 Cf. the references in ʿad-Ḏahabī (1985: IV, 424–5).


19 The systematic arrangement of material according to subject matter, which was later applied to books divided into chapters. Cf. p. 27.


22 An unsuccessful insurrection of the Medinese against the Umayyads in 63/683.
30 al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baḡdādī (1931: 60).
31 al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baḡdādī (1975: 58ff.).
32 Cf. Fück (1925: 7) and von Stülpnagel (1956: 54).
33 Cf. pp. 31, and 103ff.
35 Von Stülpnagel (1956) also maintained that ‘Urwah did not write a book ‘in the strict sense’ on maḡāzī; he stressed the relatively small number of traditions originating with him: ‘Even if we grant that half of ‘Urwah’s work has been lost, his “book” would still be only a quarter of the size of Ibn Iṣḥāq’s work’ (p. 115). ‘In addition, the extant material hardly suggests that ‘Urwah’s book could have constituted a self-contained literary work’ (p. 116).
36 Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1931: 60).
38 Ibid. 91.
39 Ibid. 457.
40 Ibid. 288.
41 Ibid. 284–5.
42 ad-Ḍahabī (1985: VI, 150); al-Aʿẓamī has made an attempt to reconstruct it, cf. ’Urwah ibn az-Zubayr (1981).
46 ’Urwah’s contemporary Abān ibn ʿUṯmān, another early authority on maḡāzī, is also said to have possessed such a book; cf. Schoeler (2006: 81 with n. 504 = 1992a: 32, with n. 165).
47 Some of the events reported by ‘Abd ar-Razzāq in the maḡāzī section of his Muṣannaf on the authority of Maʿmar < az-Zuhrī < ’Urwah are indeed dated and located in a chronological framework, e.g. the Battle of Badr, ‘Friday, the 16th or 17th of Ramaḍān’ (without giving a year!) (‘Abd ar-Razzāq 1970–2: 62) or ʿUḥud, ‘Šawwāl, around six months after the attack on the Banū n-Naḍīr’ (‘Abd ar-Razzāq 1970–2: 76). It is, however, unclear whether the dates really go back to ’Urwah; they could just as easily go back to one of his transmitters, perhaps az-Zuhrī. Von Stülpnagel (1956: 60) notes: ‘We are often left with the impression that the dates are later additions; sometimes, we can even prove it. At any rate, it is clear that ’Urwah was not much interested in chronological dates. Perhaps, he was not very well informed about the actual point in time a particular event occurred.’ On chronology, cf. the excursus, pp. 83–91, and Görke and Schoeler (2008: 272 and Index).
49 Cf. p. 27; also the excursus on pp. 89–91.
50 Fück (1925: 7); Loth (1869: 43) called him the ‘greatest transmitter of the younger generation [scil. of successors]’ and the ‘father of the school of Medina’.
52 Ibid. 284–5.
54 Fischer (1980: 69).
60 He was supposed to be older than az-Zuhrī, yet transmitted from him; Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1984–5: IV, 350).
68 This type can be regarded as a precursor of the ‘literature of the school for the school’ which emerged one generation later; cf. n. 111 and pp. 29, 35f.
69 In Greek literature, both types are called hypomnēma.
70 On p. 31.
74 Al-Fasawī (1981: I, 643); Ibn Ṭasākir (1982: 87ff.).
76 Cf. p. 21f.
80 Az-Zuhrī (1980: 62, 71, 76, 78, 80). The term ḥadīṯ occurs only in the singular; cf. above, p. 20 and p. 21, n. 16.
81 Similar to az-Zuhrī’s legal traditions; cf. Motzki (1991a: 6).
82 Cf. p. 22, with n. 47.
83 Cf. p. 27f.
84 Duri (1957: 7).
94 For large parts of the material making up the Kitāb al-mubtada’, this allegation seems to be correct; see the isnāds in ʿṬabarī (1321 AH: XVI, 12 and VI, 10); cf. Fück (1925: 13, n. 2).
95 Cf. Fück (1925: 29, n. 24) and Robson (1955–6: 452ff.). Fück’s assumption seems to me to be the more probable: behind these anonymous informants, he suspects ‘lesser or unknown people, whose name he did not necessarily need to record’. We must always keep in mind that the requirements for an isnād were not nearly as strict in Ibn Isḥāq’s time as they would later become for the traditionists.
98 Ibid. 38.
99 That is, he quoted people’s ‘books’ in his own ‘books’ and later transmitted them as if he had actually heard them read out to him.
100 Ibid. 36.
104 Even though Maʿmar’s work is only available as transmitted and redacted by ʿAbd ar-Razzāq, the comparison is valid: we can confidently rule out the possibility that Maʿmar’s book was better structured and more carefully arranged than his student’s revised version.
105 We should add that in one section of his work (az-Zuhrī 1980: 74–5), Maʿmar provides a short chronological sketch of the most important incidents in the life of the Prophet and the Qur’ānic material revealed on these occasions. He frequently gives exact dates or the amount of time elapsed between events, quoting ‘somebody who heard ʿIkrimah [d. 105/723] say’.
106 For the most part, the material is chronologically ordered. Where appropriate, we also find a genealogical or factual arrangement; cf. Fück (1925: 38).
107 In several cases, Watt (in 1962: 27ff. and 1983: 32ff.) subsumes these introductory remarks without isnād under the heading of ‘maḏzar material’ and counts them towards his postulated basic framework. He regards it as generally historically true in contrast to the following separate traditions and anecdotes, which he assumes frequently to be spurious (cf. above, p. 6). However, Watt seems to overlook the fact
that Ibn Isḥaq often extracted the information contained in this ‘maṣāḥīḥ material’ from the very tradition(s) following it (except for the chronology; cf. above, pp. 89–91). This comes out very clearly in his introduction to the Battle of Badr (Ibn Ḥišām 1858–60: I, 427–8 = Ibn Isḥaq (1980: 289) quoted by Watt himself: most of the content of what Watt calls ‘maṣāḥīḥ material’ has been culled from the following tradition (with a collective isnād: ‘an az-Zuhrī, etc.), some of it verbatim. The situation is even more clear-cut in the chapter on the Battle of Uḥud (Ibn Ḥišām 1858–60: I, 555–6 = Ibn Isḥaq (1980: 370–1) which Watt (1983: 38) also quotes. The ‘sīraḥ material’ in this case consists of nothing more than a tradition (again with a collective isnād: ‘an az-Zuhrī, etc.). Also, we have to keep in mind that his redactor Ibn Ḥišām often shortened Ibn Isḥaq’s isnāds at the beginning of chapters (i.e. exactly where Watt finds his maṣāḥīḥ material). These isnāds are preserved in the parallel transmission by aṭ-Ṭabarī on the authority of Ibn Isḥaq. Examples: Ibn Ḥišām (1858–60: I, 933, -5) = Ibn Isḥaq (1980: 628) = aṭ-Ṭabarī (1879–1901: ser. 1, p. 1710) = al-Ṭabarī 1990: 67); Ibn Ḥišām (1858–60: I, p. 972, -5 = Ibn Isḥaq (1980: 659) = aṭ-Ṭabarī (1879–1901, ser. 1, p. 1756) = al-Ṭabarī 1990: 116); cf. also the remarks of Fück (1953: 196ff.) and Sezgin (1967–2007: I, 253, n. 6).

108 Fück (1925: 106).


110 Horovitz (1927–8: pt 2, 181 = 2002: 89); cf. also Fück (1925: 38ff.).

111 In some previous publications, I have interpreted Ibn Isq’s horovitz (1927–8:pt2,181=2002:89); cf.alsoFück(1925:38ff.).


113 In Ibn Isḥaq (1978: 23).

114 Ibid. 244.

115 Already at this point, we encounter the differentiation of teaching into various types, which were systematized in later handbooks and indicated in an isnād by certain terms (al-fāz): imlāʿ (dictation), qirāʿ (reading aloud (mostly) of students to a teacher), sāmaʿ (lecture); cf. Sezgin (1967–2007: I, 58ff.).

116 This book – more frequently called Kitāb al-maṣāḥīḥ (in a wider sense) or Kitāb as-sīraḥ – allegedly consisted of three parts: (1) the Kitāb al-muḥtadaʿ, covering events from the creation up to Muhammad; (2) the Kitāb al-maʿbāṭ, on Muhammad’s ‘mission’, i.e. his Meccan period up to the hajj; and (3) the Kitāb al-maṣāḥīḥ, on the Prophet’s campaigns, i.e. basically his Medinese period up to his death. A supplementary fourth part, the Kitāb al-ḥulafāʾ, contained information about the reigns of the caliphs until al-Mansūr. Cf. the quotation from Ibn ʿAdi on p. 29, above, and Yāqūt (1923–5: VI, 401); Ibn an-Nadīm (1871–2: 92–3); see also Fück (1925: 34ff., 39ff.) and Sezgin (1967–2007: I, 289). Newby (1989: 33–241) has attempted
to reconstruct the *Kitāb al-mubtada‘* (in English trans.). The author is unaware of a large part of the recent literature on the character of early Islamic tradition (including the important dissertation on Ibn Ishāq by Al-Samuk). The book’s weaknesses and methodological faults have been criticized by Conrad (1993) and Jarrar (1992).

117 Al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baḡdādī (1931: I, 220–1).
119 On this and the following dates, cf. Fück (1925: 32–3).
121 The brother of the caliph al-Manṣūr, at the time governor of the Ḟaṣrāh.
122 Fück (1925: 33, n. 46) pointed out that, instead of al-Ḥīrah, the correct location would have been al-Hāšimīyah, where al-Manṣūr resided before settling in Baḡdād. However, al-Hāšimīyah is very close to al-Ḥīrah (it lies between al-Ḥīrah and Kūfah).
123 Kūfah is very close to al-Ḥīrah.
125 In writing, cf. p. 26f.
126 According to Jarrar (1989: 1ff., esp. 32ff.), the original title was *Kitāb as-sūrah*.
128 Cf. n. 111.
129 Nyberg (1939: 349).
130 Cf. pp. 29, 86, 88, 89.
133 Goldziher (1890: 204) had already correctly indentified the ‘useless books’ as ‘profane literature’, which existed before religious literature. What he mainly had in mind were reports on ancient Arab history and similar material (as discussed on page 30, above) compiled on behalf of the Umayyads. Since these collections, as Goldziher later notes (p. 206), also included texts on the life of the Prophet, his identification is, in my opinion, not entirely correct.
135 For the following cf. Schoeler (2009: 54–64).
136 Cf. e.g. Abbott (1957–72: I, 9ff. and II, 18ff.).
139 al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baḡdādī (1975: 35).
140 Ibid. 41; ad-Dārīmī (1966: I, 122).
145 Al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār (1972: 331ff.).
Notes

(1956: 61ff.); cf. also Sprenger (1869: I, 356ff.; II, 42ff.; III, 142ff.). We have a closer look at one of these letters on p. 103f. Horovitz (1927–8: pt 1, 550 = 2002: 26) noted that ‘Urwhah’s letters represent ‘the oldest monuments of Arabic historical prose’. However, we should not forget that in the process of the transmission of the documents through the lecture system, changes in the original wording, cuts, etc. could have occurred. Cf. Chapter 3, n. 147.


On p. 28.

155 Cf. n. 148.
156 On p. 28.
160 Cf. p. 32f.
167 Al-Bakkā’ī rarely reports on the authority of teachers other than Ibn Ishāq; references can be found in the introduction of Ibn Hišām (1858–60: II, p. xxxiv).
168 Ibn Hišām uses relatively little material from the mubtada’ section, e.g. the genealogy of the Prophet at the beginning of the work; cf. Al-Samuk (1978: 85, n. 4).
171 Cf. the extensive remarks by Fück (1925: 35); also above, p. 33f.
173 Guillaume (1960). The author also provides an overview of the contents of the work.
176 Cf. the references in Muranyi (1991: 219ff.).
179 The distinction can be justified on the grounds of the nature and availability of the material: from the third/ninth century onward, numerous books are preserved, which were for the most part written or compiled by known authors at a particular time and passed on as a whole. For the first/seventh and the second/eighth centuries, most of the available material consists ‘only’ of traditions collected and edited substantially later. Cf. Cook (1992: 23).


Cf. Wüstenfeld’s ‘critical remarks’ in Ibn Hišām (1858–60: II, 1) and his introduction (p. xlix).

Namely ‘Abd ar-Razzāq’s Muṣannaf and the redactions of Ibn Ishāq’s Mağāzī.


Ibid. 96.


Those of his writings produced due to the ‘court impulse’, if we are to believe the traditional reports, had to be proper books. However, all of them were lost.


Cf. p. 106.

Cf. von Stülpnagel (1956: 119). In fact, her share was probably not that large: some isnāds breaking off with ‘Urwh were ‘raised’ back to Ā’išah at a later stage of transmission, sometimes without any intention to commit forgery. Examples can be found on pp. 51 and 58ff. and in Motzki (1991a: 36ff.).

‘Urwh’s letters to ‘Abd al-Malik are not known to us from archives; they were introduced into the lecture tradition by ‘Urwh’s son Hišām, whence they reached at-Ṭabarī and others.

According to the definition of Cobet (1988: 227); cf. also Vansina (1985: 68ff.).


‘Disciplined’ that is, in so far as its exponents: (1) proceeded systematically, e.g. by questioning several witnesses; (2) increasingly stressed chronology; and (3) increasingly used written records to aid their memory.

Cf. the list in Khoury (1983: 11ff.).

2 The text in the transmission process

1 The term was coined by Andrae (1912: 5).

2 M.J. Kister has published two interesting articles on philological details; cf. Kister (1965, 1968).

3 Sellheim (1987).

4 Juynboll (1994).

5 Motzki (1993).

6 Rubin (1993a).

The final outcome of his study, which ignores a large part of the relevant secondary literature (Andrae, Lohmann, Widengren) is also somewhat disappointing (cf. the summary on pp. 12–13). A detailed discussion of his findings is not necessary here; it will suffice to correct its most serious errors. (1) Sellheim is not familiar with the version of the Zuhrī recension transmitted via Ma’mar and ‘Abd ar-Razzāq. In its
extant form, it is at least as old as the oldest version received by Ibn Ishāq from Wahb ibn Kaysan which we find in Ibn Hišām (LV III) and it already represents the full text of the Zuhrī recension (LV I). Thus, Sellheim’s speculation about a redaction of a substantial part of this recension (roughly the part after the first four sentences) at a later date and under the influence of the Ibn Ishāq versions (p. 7) falls flat. (2) As for the recension received by Ibn Ishāq from Wahb ibn Kaysan (LV III), Sellheim does not realize that Ibn Hišām consciously shortened the text in certain places (e.g. Muḥammad toying with the idea of committing suicide) according to a principle he explicitly set out in his introduction (cf. above p. 32). Nor does he realize that al-ʿUṯārī’s text was damaged in places. These two facts explain most of the differences between the various Ibn Ishāq versions. There is thus no need to have recourse to the ‘oral transmission’ Sellheim holds responsible for all divergences. (3) Sellheim regards the absence of the suicide wish in LVI in the fatrah-annex in al-Buḥārī and Muslim as typical of the ‘ḥadīṯ versions’. This is not the case; in fact, its absence depends on the respective transmitters of az-Zuhrī (the fatrah annex is consistently missing in ’Uqayl’s transmission; we generally find it fully – including the suicide motif – in Maʿmar’s transmission; there is, however, one example of the full text with the suicide motif in Yūnus’ transmission). This is confirmed by the fact that al-Buḥārī actually retains the fatrah annex with the suicide motif in another chapter of his Ṣaḥīḥ, in which he follows the ’Abd ar-Razzāq < Maʿmar transmission, i.e. the Kitāb at-taʾbūr of his Ṣaḥīḥ (Ibn Ḥaḍar al-ʿAsqalānī 1978: pt 26, 195ff., no. 6982; here: p. 204, bottom). So it was not the compilers of the canonical ḥadīṯ collections, but the redactor of Ibn Ishāq’s biography of the Prophet, Ibn Hišām, who objected to this passage and removed it! On the other hand, Sellheim deserves praise for introducing in Arabic and Islamic studies (pp. 13ff.) a fascinating discovery of the Scandinavian studies expert K. von See. This scholar pointed to an exact parallel to the reports about Muḥammad’s first revelation experience in the Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum (completed in 731) by the Venerable Bede (d. 735); cf. above p. 62f.

8 Nöldeke (1909–38: I, 78ff.).
9 Buhl (1930: 134–8).
10 Andréa (1912).
11 Bell (1934a).
12 Widengren (1958: 258ff.).
13 Paret (1980: 47ff.).
14 Lohmann (1968).
16 Von Stülpnagel (1956: 130–6).
17 Watt (1953: 39–52, 180ff.).
18 Sprenger (1869: 331–54).
24 Muslim (1972: II, 197ff.).
Notes

26 N.N. denotes the numerous transmitters reporting the ḥadīṯ on the authority of az-Zuhrī; cf. the Corpus, p. 124f.
27 Az-Zuhrī (1980: 43ff.).
28 (Bracketed) elements marked with a * occur in at-Ṭabarī’s version (LV II) only; those with ** occur in the other long versions (LV I) only. Cf. p. 44 for the two versions.
30 The terms ‘tāḥannūt’ narration’, ‘iqra’ narration’ and ‘ufuq narration’ were coined by Andrae and Lohmann; cf. above, p. 40.
31 ‘You make close your ties of relationship (by kind behaviour to your relatives), you tell the information truthfully…’ (la-taṣilu r-raḥīm wa-taṣāduqu l-ḥadīṯ …). Rhetorical figure of parallelismus membrorum. Cf. Kister (1965).
32 In at-Ṭabarī’s version (LV II), the elements appear in the following order: 1—2—4—10—3—5—6—7—7a.
33 Cf. p. 73.
36 The term ufuq legend was coined by T. Andrae; cf. above, p. 40 with n. 38.
37 As Andrae (1912: 16) has correctly pointed out.
38 Andrae (1912: 5–6). He refers to Sprenger (1869: I, 334), who already uses the term ‘conglomerate’.
39 Lohmann calls them ‘pericopes’. The division of the Ḥadīṯah narration into two parts is mine.
40 Lohmann (1968: 417, 441, 449).
41 On pp. 133 and 142.
42 Andrae (1912: 13). Sprenger’s position, which Andrae refers to, is ambiguous: in one place, he claims that az-Zuhrī combined three or four of ‘Urwah’s traditions into a conglomerate. In another place, he (probably correctly) assumes that the tradition was first redacted by ‘Urwah himself and not by one of his students (Sprenger 1869: I, 334, 340).
46 The three additional sentences appended to the Balāḏūrī version (wa-ʿaraḍa la-hū Ǧibrīl … ibn arbaʿīn sanatan) do not belong to the tradition.
47 Al-Azraqī (1858: 427).
49 Aṭ-Ṭabarī (1879–1901: ser. 1, p. 1155 = al-Ṭabarī 1988: 76) and 1321 AH: XXX, 78); cf. above, p. 43f.
50 On Ibn Ishāq’s and al-Wāqidī’s abridgements, see pp. 48 and 46.
51 Az-Zuhrī (1980: 43ff.).
57 Abū `Awānah (1362–3 AH: I, 110ff.).
58 Ibn Ḥaḡar al-`Asqalānī (1978: pt 1, 52ff., no. 3). The short version with the full beginning can be found in pt 18, 379, no. 4955.
60 Muslim (1972: I, 205).
61 Ibid. II, 197ff.
63 Otherwise, we would have to assume that another transmitter added the missing beginning, perhaps Yahya on the basis of the Yūnus version?
64 Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1984–5: XI, 208). The complete ʿUqayl version is always traced back to Yahyā ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Bukayr, but the latter also seems to have been aware of the version with the fragmentary beginning. However, this assumption only holds true if the Yahyā listed in the relevant isnād in al-Bayhaqī (al-Bayhaqī 1985: II, 139) is indeed Yahyā ibn ʿAbdallāh ibn Bukayr.
69 Cf. pp. 44, 49, 70.
70 At-Ṭayālisī (1321 AH: 206–7).
72 Ibid. IX, 257.
73 Ibid. 76.
75 Note that this isnād differs from the one which accompanies the beginning of the same tradition!
76 Since the new isnād occurs independently in the transmissions of two of az-Zuhrī’s students, it must have originated with az-Zuhrī himself. The following tradition by az-Zuhrī is also transmitted separately by other Zuhrī students; cf. p. 73, with n. 240.
77 Cf. p. 70ff.
78 Following Juynboll’s terminology, we will call branching points of the second and third degree ‘partial common links’, PCL.
79 That is, in his (edited) Muṣannaf; cf. az-Zuhrī (1980: 43ff.).
81 Ibn Ḥibbān (1973–83: I, 48ff.).
82 Al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 135ff.).
83 Abū Nuʿaym (1950: 168ff.).
84 Al-Wāhidi (n.d.: 5).
85 The ʿAbd ar-Razzāq sub-versions transmitted by al-ʿAbd ar-Razzāq transmission in its original form but are mixed with other transmissions (ʻUqayl, Yūnus).
87 Ibn Ishāq (1978: 120, 132).
90 On p. 49.
92 Al-Balāḏūrī (n.d.: I, 105, no. 191); Ibn Sa’d (1905–40: I/1, 129).
93 Al–Azraqī (1858: 427).
94 Cf. p. 45.
95 Cf. pp. 42 and 46.
96 Ibn Sa’d (1905–40: I/1, 129).
98 Cf. pp. 59ff. and 70ff.
99 A further apparent addition – three additional sentences at the end of the tradition (wa-araḍa ... ilā arba‘īn sanah) – is actually not part of the tradition.
100 Al-Balāḏūrī (1936: 18 (Engl.)).
101 Cf. pp. 42 and 43f.
102 Az-Zuhrī (1980: 44–5). This Ma‘mar sub-version quoted by ‘Abd ar-Razzāq is very similar in wording to the Yūnus sub-version quoted by Abū ‘Awānah. In ‘Abd ar-Razzāq (1991: II, 267, no. 3377), the text has been abridged and partially paraphrased.
103 Aṭ-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XXX, 78); the text in 1879–1901: ser. 1, p. 1155, differs slightly from this version.
105 Ibn Isḥāq (1978: 120, 132); cf. above, p. 45.
107 Ibid.
111 Cf. p. 44.
112 Cf. p. 43.
113 Muslim (1972: II, 204–5).
114 Ibn Ḥaḍar al-‘Asqalānī (1978: pt 1, 55, no. 3; here 58); the former variant (yavīfu fu’ādī-hū) also occurs in the short version covering the said text: Ibn Ḥaḍar al-‘Asqalānī (1978: pt 13, 171, no. 3392).
116 Ibid.
118 Ibid., pt 1, 52ff., no. 3.
119 Ibid., pt 18, 379, no. 4955.
120 Cf. the discussion on p. 43 above.
122 al-Wāḥidī (n.d.: 5–6).
123 Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 233).
126 Ibn Ḥaḍar al-‘Asqalānī (1978: pt 1, 57–8, no. 3).
127 Aṭ-Ṭayālisī (1321 AH: 206, no. 1467).
129 Ibid., pt 26, 204, no. 6982.
130 Al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 139).
131 Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 153).
132 Ibn Ḥaḡār al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 1, 53, no. 3). In the mixed transmission according to ʿUqayl + ʿUyun (pt 18, 370, no. 4593), al-Buḥārī has as-ṣādiqaḥ; the mixed transmission according to ʿUqayl + Maʿmar contains both variants, once as-ṣādiqaḥ (pt 18, 379, no. 4956) and once as-ṣāliḥah (pt 26, 198, no. 6982).


134 Muslim (1972: II, 205).

135 Al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 141) even notes that al-Buḥārī, unlike other compilers, quoted in his ʿUqayl version the full initial passage missing elsewhere (or substituted with a different version; cf. above, p. 70): wa-ṣāda fī awwal ḥadīṯ ʿUrwah ʿan ʿAʾīšah mā rawaynā-huʿan Maʿmarʿan az-Zuhrī.

136 Ibn Ḥaḡār al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 26, 204–5). Like Muslim, Ibn Ḥaḡār therefore never knew the complete ʿUyun version with fatrah annex (as found in Abū Ṭawānah).


140 Ibn ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s uncle; Sezgin (1967–2007: I, 271ff.).


142 As proposed by Andrae (1912: 6–7).

143 Cf. the ʿUrwah traditions analysed on pp. 82ff. and 100ff. Long historical traditions on the authority of ʿUrwah are very frequent, e.g. in ʿAbd ar-Razzāq (az-Zuhrī 1980). Some examples on the authority of az-Zuhrī < ʿUrwah: ibid. 50ff. (Ḥulaybīyah), 76ff. (Uḥud), 96ff. (the first hīrahah to Abyssinia). In Ibn Abī ʿSaybah’s maqāʿīṣ chapter of his Muṣannaf, they are also fairly frequent (and often reported on the authority of Hišām ibn ʿUrwah < ʿUrwah). Cf. von Stülpnagel (1956: 33, 36) and esp. Görke and Schoeler (2008: 18ff.).

144 A member of the Zubayrid family; cf. Sezgin (1967–2007: I, 317ff.).

145 Az-Zubayr ibn Bakkār’s uncle; Sezgin (1967–2007: I, 271ff.).


147 Ibid. 396.


150 Al-ʿUṯāridī (1978: 135); at-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XXX, 127–8). The narration follows at-Ṭabarī’s text. Except for the fact that Ḥadīṯah herself is the narrator of the ʿUṯāridī report (cf. the ḥisnād), there are fewer differences between the two versions.


153 Al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 142–3), reproduced also in as-Suyūṭī (1967: I, 231–2, 233) and Ibn Kaṭīr (1932–9: III, 13–14). Both texts are accompanied by incorrect ḥisnāds, which can be explained with a misunderstanding due to an unclear expression in al-Bayhaqī’s reference. This or a very similar version is the source for al-Yaʿqūbī’s report about the first revelation experience (quoted without ḥisnād) (al-Yaʿqūbī 1960: II, 22–3; cf. above, p. 55 with n. 158). The connection can be inferred from al-Yaʿqūbī’s use of a characteristic motif (the carpet) and the corresponding terminology. Clearly dependent on LV IV is Ibn Sayyid an-Nāṣ’s almost literally identical parallel tradition (Ibn Sayyid an-Nās 1986: I, 112), which, however, has a different (incorrectly transmitted or forged) ḥisnād leading back to ʿAbdallāh ibn Abī Bakr as the original informant.
The first part— with few variants but slightly more elaborate—is also quoted in Ibn Kaṭīr (1980: IV, 249).

The first paragraph of the following fragments follows the somewhat more detailed version in Ibn Kaṭīr, who gives the following isnād: Ibn Wahb < Ibn Lahī’ah < Abū 1-Aswad < ‘Urwh < ‘Ā’īsah. The second paragraph follows Ibn Ḥaḍar’s version.

Or Ġiyād, a place in Mecca. Cf. the relevant article in Yāqūt (1866–70).

According to Andrae (1912: 16). He makes his statement in connection with the report as given in al-Ya‘qūbī (1960: II, 22), which obviously depends on our or a very similar version of the story (cf. n. 153). Al-Ya‘qūbī’s text runs as follows: ‘He [scil. Gabriel] brought him a (short-pile, yellow-green) carpet (durnūkan), one of the carpets of Paradise, and had him [scil. Muhammad] sit on it. He told him that he was the messenger of God and that he brought him (knowledge) from God. He taught him: “Recite in the name of your Lord” …’

However, SV IV does not explicitly confirm this secondary motif for the Ibn Lahī’ah recension.

Up to this point, this recension agrees with LV II.


The short version (SV IV) displays remarkable similarities to a tradition we discuss (pp. 59–62), which possibly can also be traced back to ‘Urwh (LV III): both share certain traits in the description of the angelic vision (a more elaborate rendition of the ufuq narration).


Incidentally, the different traditions which make up this conglomerate can be found separately, but in close proximity to each other, in Ibn Ishāq (the iqra’ narration, the story about the greetings of the future Prophet by stones and trees, the Ḥadīghah narration linked to the ufuq motif, the report about Ḥadīghah’s conversion, the report about the introduction of the ablutions and the prayer ritual: Ibn Hišām (1858–60: 151–8 = Ibn Ishāq 1980: 105–13). This raises the suspicion that the composition of the conglomerate could have been inspired by a chapter in Ibn Ishāq’s work. Should our suspicions be correct, the conglomerate could not have been combined before the middle of the second/eighth century. But this does not mean that it does not contain traditions and motifs originating from ‘Urwh.


As Sprenger (1869: I, 340) assumes. The following scholars regard ‘Ā’īsah as a possible or likely original informant: Watt (1953: 41) (but he qualifies his claim by stating that not all passages necessarily originated with her) and Lohmann (1968: 417–18), who observes: ‘In this case, we are probably not in a position to doubt the reported incident’.


Ibid. 21ff.

At-Ṭayālisī (1321 AH: 215–16, no. 1539).
Notes

177 Cf. Ibn Sa‘d (1905–40:I/1,130);above p.51.
178 This is the opinion of Birkeland (1955: 23).
179 Aṭ-Ṭayālīsī (1321: 215–16, no. 1539). In Abū Nu‘aym’s version, the text is slightly different: ‘He then put a seal on my back, so that I felt the touch of the seal in my heart. He then said to me: “Read!” But I had never read something written. Also, I did not find what I was supposed to read. He then said (again): “Read!” I answered: “What shall I read? I do not read (mā aqra‘u)!” He then said: “Read in the name of your Lord who has created”, until he had finished five of its [scil. the sūrah’s] verses. I did not forget any (of this) anymore. He then weighed me against a man and I outweighed him’. Notice the (secondary?) reappearance of mā aqra‘u from LV I and LV III (cf. above, p. 59ff.).
180 The terms iqra’ and qara’tu must surely be understood in the sense of ‘read’; this follows from the subsequent use of the word kitāb.
181 Since the story of the greeting of the future Prophet by the trees and the stones occurs in this conglomerate, we also have reason to believe that in this case the redactor was familiar with Ibn Ishāq’s work, since Ibn Ishāq inserted this story between his two versions of the iqra’ narrative (cf. n. 167).
182 Sprenger (1869: I, 339).
186 Cf. p. 61.
190 Bi-nama min dībāq fi-hi kitāb. Motzki (1993: 11) translates ‘with a brocade cloth in which a piece of writing [= the celestial original of the sūrah? G. S.] was [wrapped]’. His interpretation makes very good sense.
191 In Ibn Ḥišām’s version, the angel makes his request four times, three times in al-‘Uṯāridī’s version.
192 Only Ibn Ḥišām has this detail.
193 In aṭ-Ṭabarī’s text, Muḥammad replies mā aqra‘u the first time around and mā ǧā aqra‘u the second time. Ibn Ḥišām has mā aqra‘u the first three times and finally mā ǧā aqra‘u. In al-‘Uṯāridī, we read mā aqra‘u three times.
194 As Lohmann (1968: 425) aptly observes.
197 The most important variants are indicated in the notes to our outline of contents above.
198 Cf. p. 32.
199 This is the reason why the deletions were definitely carried out by Ibn Ḥišām and not by his teacher al-Bakka‘ī (another potential candidate).
201 Al-‘Uṯāridī (1978: 121, around ll. 1–8).
We can safely ignore a short, two-line summary of the Wāqidī recension (in al-Balāḏurī n.d.: I, 110, no. 208). Here as well as in other cases (cf. pp. 93ff. and 97ff.), al-Wāqidī does not acknowledge that he knows the tradition from Ibn Ishāq. Instead, he inserts an invented or false transmitter between Wahb and himself. Juynboll labels such occurrences as ‘diving’ (scil. under the CL).

Von See (1983).

Ibid. 232.

Cf. p. 65.

Cf. p. 28.

Cf. Kister (1968: 225–6) and Lohmann (1968: 424–5) for the following remarks.

Cf. p. 61.


In the sense of the term ḥadīṯ in which it is used today; but cf. pp. 20 and 21 with n. 16, p. 25 with n. 80.

Finally, we should point out an interesting parallel between LVIII and the short version of the Ibn Lahīʿah recension (SV IV, cf. p. 55): the description of the angelic vision on the horizon (ufuq motif). On the basis of the resemblance, we can infer that the ufuq motif was at first more elaborate than in the extant az-Zuhrī < ‘Urwaḥ recension. Az-Zuhrī was probably responsible for reducing its prominence.

Sprenger (1869: I, 399).


Cf. p. 67.

Sprenger (1869: I, 340).

Ibid. 339.

This has also been pointed out by Buhl (1930: 136).

Perhaps after a query by az-Zuhrī.

Incidentally, ‘raising’ an isnād which stops with ‘Urwaḥ up to ‘Āʾišah is so self-evident and happens so often that any transmitter could have done it independently of az-Zuhrī. Cf. also von Stülpnagel (1956: 119).


On account of the qiṣṣah-like structure of the story Wahb transmitted from ‘Ubayd, I am, in this case, disinclined to follow Sprenger, who claims that ‘Urwaḥ was Wahb’s immediate source. Should Sprenger be correct, we would have to assume that ‘Urwaḥ kept most of the qiṣṣah elements in ‘Urwaḥ’s narration or that Wahb reintroduced them after their suppression by ‘Urwaḥ. Both explanations appear unlikely to me.

Cf. n. 31.


Its answer is interesting also from the point of view of later theological developments. Since Muḥammad’s illiteracy was upheld almost dogmatically later on, religious scholars preferred the version with the unambiguous reply mā anā bi-qiṣāṭī (‘I am not one who will/is able to read’) in LV I; cf. e.g. Lohmann (1968: 427). In addition, the tradition had the advantage of the ‘good’ isnād leading back to ‘Āʾišah (this, however, also applies to LV II).

Al-Bayhaqī (1985: II, 139); for the ‘Uqayl transmission, cf. above, pp. 43 and 49.

Notes

228 Al-Azraqî (1858: 427).
230 Cf. p. 46.
233 Andrae (1912: 16).

240 Cf. pp. 40 (no. 12), 43 and 47f., where the tradition is added (as is generally the case in the Maʾmar transmission) to the ʾiqrāʿ narration (on the authority of ʿUrwhah < Āʾīsah). The text is independently transmitted, e.g. by aṭ-Ṭayālīsî (1321 AH: 235, no. 1688 at the end) on the authority of Shāliḥ ibn Abī l-Āḥḍar; al-Buḥārī in Ibn Haǧar al-ʾAsqalānî (1978: pt 18, 325–6, nos. 4925–6), both on the authority of ʿUqayl > al-Layṭ; Muslim (1972: II, 205–6) on the authority of Yūnus > ʿAbdallāh ibn Wabh and ʿUqayl > al-Layṭ; aṭ-Ṭabarî (1879–1901: ser. 1, pp. 1155–6 = al-Ṭabarî 1988: 73–4); aṭ-Ṭayālīsî (1321 AH: 235, no. 1688); Muḥāhid (1989: 682, art. sūrat al-muḍḍatṭîr), etc.; cf. the Corpus, p. 127 (B.1).

241 Apparently, Juynboll regards the preambles of both Yahyā’s ‘counter tradition’ and az-Zuhrī’s ‘counter-counter tradition’ as pure fiction or manipulations by the rival transmitters. In my opinion, however, only the formulations referring to the other tradition are ‘manipulated’, not the contents of the traditions. But it is beyond doubt that az-Zuhrī attempted to harmonize the two doctrines/traditions relating to the first revealed sūrah.
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244 Cf. p. 65.
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247 Ibn Saʿd (1905–40: I/1, 130).
248 aṭ-Ṭabarî (1321 AH: XXX, 139).
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253 Sprenger (1869: I, 341).
254 Ibid. 34ff.
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32 Cf. p. 24ff.
35 ʿUmar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 328ff.).
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42 According to Ibn Ḥaḡār al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 18, 75), this detail also appears in the version reported on the authority of Abū Uways < Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwah. It is, however, not to be found in the available printed texts of the Abū Uways version (at-Ṭabarānī 1984–6: XXIII, 111–12, here 113 = al-Hayṭāmī 1982: IX, 233).
43 Cf. p. 88ff.
Cf. the second *isnād* on p. 83.


Ibid IX, 171.


‘Abbād is the son of ’Abdallāh ibn az-Zubayr.


Discussed on pp. 100ff.


Notes

76 'Umar ibn Šabbah (1368 Š/1991: 319); cf. p. 95f.
81 For him cf. the relevant article by Watt (in EI2, VIII, 697–8).
82 Cf. p. 100f.
84 For him cf. Watt (in EI2, VIII, 697–8).
Al-Wāqīḍī ignores the respective expression in Hišām ibn 'Urwah’s version: ‘I only know about Ā'isah what the goldsmith knows about the choicest gold’ (cf. p. 102); he does not seem to know his recension at all.


Aṭ-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 124ff.) = al-hayṭāmī (1982: IX, 237ff.). This tradition was also – rightly – dismissed by ḥadīth scholars: its transmitter Ismā‘īl ibn Yaḥyā at-Taymī was deemed to be a ‘liar’.


Ibid. 430.

Al-Wāqīḍī (1882: 12–13).

Horovitz (1898: 9ff.).


Cf. p. 88.

Cf. Duri (1957: 8): ‘Zuhrī’s traditions are generally sober factual accounts given in a simple, fairly candid, and concise way’.

Cf. p. 38, n. 7.


This argument was already put forward by Juynboll (1992: 689).

Including ‘Urwah’s letter to ‘Abd al-Malik, which was also transmitted via Hišām ibn ‘Urwah; cf. p. 103ff.

Ḥammād ibn Usāmah (Kūfah); Ibn Ḥaḡar al-‘Asqalānī (1984–5: III, 3); aḏ-Ḍahabī (1963: I, 558). His version and that of Abū Usāmah’s were the most frequently transmitted of the Hišām versions. Cf. the Corpus, p. 133.


Ibn Ḥaḡar al-‘Asqalānī (1978: pt 18, 58ff.). One of them, the Abū Uways version, is definitely not authentic; cf. p. 105.


At-Tirmiḏī (1983: V, 13ff.) (Abū Usāmah version). At-Tirmiḏī, after quoting Hišām ibn ‘Urwah’s text in its entirety, only points to the existence of the Zuhrī recension and adds that Zuhrī’s recension was longer and more complete than Hišām’s.

Aṭ-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XVIII, 66–7) (Abū Usāmah version), also in abridged form, ibid. 62).

Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 59–60 (Abū Usāmah version)).

‘Umar ibn Šabbāh (1368 Š/1991: 325 (Ḥammād ibn Salamah version)).

Aḏ-Ḍahabī (1987: pt 2, 270ff.).

Aṭ-Ṭabarānī (1984–6: XXIII, 106ff. (Ḥammād ibn Salamah version) and 108ff. (Abū Usāmah version)).
137 Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 18, 97ff., no. 4757). It is almost identical to at-Tirmīḍī’s version (at-Tirmīḍī 1983: V, 13ff.); Muslim abridges the text.

138 One of az-Zuhrī’s transmitters, Ṣāliḥ ibn Kaysān, regarded these and other additional details in the Ḥišām recension as important enough to add them to the text of his Zuhrī recension, identifying ʿUrwa as the source of this material; cf. Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 16, 3ff., no. 4141; here 4 and 7); Muslim (1972: XVII, 114 (abridged)); an-Nasā’ī (n.d.: 39ff.). Cf. n. 31.

139 The biographical literature provides a possible explanation: while az-Zuhrī is reported to have used written records and even loaned them to his students for copying, we find no such information about Ḥišām.

140 Since we have only one instance of the Ibn Bukayr version in our Corpus (in ad-Ḍahabī’s Taʾrīḫ al-ʾIslām, a late source), textual lacunae and abridgements in the process of later written transmission could very well be the reason for some or all of the missing motifs.

141 (1a) means the first sentence of the ḥuṭbah motif.

142 Yet, Ḥammād separates the first sentence of the ḥuṭbah motif (1a) from the rest and places it at the beginning of his tradition (even before the account of the questioning of the maid). This could mean that Abū Usāmah’s sequence, which starts with the ḥuṭbah, was the original arrangement.


144 That is, the chronologically earlier questioning and what follows from it are appended after the revelation motif.

145 Cf. the possible explanation in n. 140.

146 Cf. n. 122.

147 On the transmission of written documents (treaties and official letters), which the compilers had normally not seen themselves (e.g. in archives), but which they usually received like normal traditions through the lecture system, cf. Schoeler (2006: 83 = 1992a: 34–5); Noth (1973a: 60ff., esp. 68 and 71ff. = 1994: 62ff., esp. 72–3, 76ff.).


150 Somewhat later (ibid. 62), aṭ-Ṭabarānī quotes an abridged Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwa version on the authority of Abū Usāmah and finally (ibid. 66), the complete text of that version.


154 Cf. p. 21.


157 On p. 102.

158 Aṭ-Ṭabarānī (1321 ʿAH: XVIII, 67–8); cf. also above, p. 108(6).

159 The story of the lost necklace also occurs in the Ḥišām ibn ʿUrwa tradition. Here, however, it is linked with the revelation of the sand ablution verse (tayammum), sūrah 4:43 and 5:6 and seems originally to have been narrated about ʿUrwa’s mother Asmāʾ rather than Āʾīšah but later ‘transferred’ to the latter. Cf. Görke and Schoeler.
The motif of the loss of the necklace might then have been recycled in the slander story as a welcome explanation for the delay which led to ‘Ā’išah’s return to Medina in the company of Ṣafwān. This development must have taken place at a very early stage of the transmission.


The Qur’anic verses linked by tradition to the ḥadīṯ al-ifk, sūrah 24: 11ff., cannot have been the seed of the tradition (for the purposes of the ‘Lammens-position’; cf. p. 3). It would be absurd to claim that an elaborate story involving the denunciation and rehabilitation by God of the Prophet’s favourite wife could have been developed out of the cryptic allusions to nameless people made by these verses.

We should keep in mind that Muslim ḥadīṯ scholars already recognized some of these traditions as inauthentic (nos. 2, 3, 4); cf. the notes on the traditions listed on pp. 107–109.
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184 Not identified.
185 Not identified.
187 Aṭ-Ṭabarī (1321 AH: XVIII, 67–8).
189 Ibid. IV, 109.
190 Ibid. IX, 64.
191 Ibid. 333.
192 Ibid. XI, 218.
193 Cf. p. 105.
194 A parallel statement of the maid can be found in al-Muwaqqarī’s ‘problematic’ Zuhrī version and, derived from it, in al-Wāqīdī (cf. above, p. 95). It is possible that al-Muwaqqarī received his formulation from the ‘Alqamah tradition discussed above. Its originator might have obtained it by modifying the maid’s statement as found in the Hišām ibn Urwah recension (‘I only know about Ā’išah what the goldsmith knows about the choicest gold’; cf. p. 102).
195 Muqṭā'il ibn Sulaymān (1979–87: III, 187ff.).
197 We merely read: ‘She remembered (in her palanquin) a piece of jewelry she owned and which she had left in the camp’, etc. (p. 188).
198 Interestingly, we do not find it in al-Muwaqqarī’s tradition, which in other aspects closely resembles the Ibn ʿUmar version; cf. p. 95.
204 Cf. Ibn Iṣḥāq’s version on p. 85(17).
205 Trans. by A. J. Arberry.
206 Ibn Ḥaǧar al-ʿAsqalānī (1978: pt 13, 166, no. 3388) (according to Ibn Fuḍayl); pt 16, 9–10, no. 4143 (according to Abū ʿAwānah); pt 17, 249–50, no. 4691 (according to Abū ʿAwānah, abridged); pt 18, 91, no. 4751 (according to Sulaymān ibn Kaṭīr).
207 aṭ-Ṭayālisī (1321 AH: 231–2) (according to Abū ʿAwānah).
Notes

218 Ibn Ḥanbal (1313 AH: VI, 367–8).
219 In at-Ṭayālisī’s text, the first sentence is absent. This could, however, be an error in the manuscript tradition of his Musnad. Al-Buḥārī has preserved a more extensive version of the text.
227 Cf. p. 107(3). This tradition, too, is rejected by Muslim ḥadīṯ scholars: it contains a transmitter (probably Yahyā ibn Salamah ibn Kahīl; cf. n. 174) who is characterized as ‘rejected’ (matrūk).
228 Cf. the remarks above on p. 107(4) (with n. 182) on a further apocryphal tradition borrowing a motif from the Ḫūṣayn recension.
229 For our definition of authenticity cf. p. 1f.
230 As we have seen (p. 107(2, 3)), among others, the ḥadīṯ ‘according to Ibn ʿAbbās’ and another one ‘according to Ibn ʿUmar’ are easily recognized as imitations of the Zuhārī version, since they contain the same motifs (beginning with the drawing of lots) in the same sequence, but supplement them with various fantastic additions.
231 Vansina (1985: 5).
233 Vansina (1985: 192–3). In our case, we are in a position to reconstruct a version of the story approximately as it was told by a family member (ʿUrwah) one generation after the events (cf. p. 105).
235 This debate dates back to the first quarter of the previous century; cf. p. 3f. Nöldeke (1914) marshals a number of good arguments against Lammens’ excessive scepticism.
236 In his Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz (1991b) (=The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence, 2002), Motzki arrived at a similar result, but by a different route.
238 Ibid. 5.
239 Vansina explains that ‘[s]election has not yet operated much, reinterpretation has not proceeded very far, relative chronology … is still good, and sources have not yet become common to large numbers of people, so that a certain amount of independence still exists’ (ibid. 192–3).
240 Nöldeke (1914: 163) provides two arguments in favour of the historicity of the so-called first ḥijrah, the flight of numerous of Muḥammad’s early adherents to Abyssinia: the reports in question are compatible with what we know about the situation in contemporary Abyssinia; furthermore, they contain Ethiopian terms. For a more recent point of view cf. Görke and Schoeler (2008: 76–7).
Afterword

1 After much further research, we can now refine Paret’s finding: the transmission line Ma’mar < al-Zuhrī < ‘Urwah is preferable to Ibn Ishāq < al-Zuhrī < ‘Urwah.
2 See pp. 15–19.
3 Something Peters and Robinson – the latter generally also aware of research published in languages other than English – appear to have lost sight of. Some exponents of extreme scepticism such as Ibn Warraq and Nevo/Koren are not even aware of the existence of this method and the studies which present and test it. It is unclear whether their neglect stems from an inability to read German, or an inability to answer the challenge to their scepticism posed by this method, or both.
5 Schoeler (2002b).
7 Görke (2003b).
8 Rubin (1997).
9 See p. 51f.
10 Ibn Sa’d (1905–40: I/1, 130). It is difficult to decide whether the narrators of the two similar traditions worked with a shared pool of motifs and combined them independently or whether ‘Ammār depended on ‘Urwah’s version (the reverse seems unlikely to me; Ibn ‘Abbās is, unlike ‘Urwah, a ‘mythical’ figure!).
11 See pp. 52–4.
12 See now Görke and Schoeler (2008: 27–32 and esp. 35–6).
14 Görke and Schoeler (2005).
16 E.g. Ibid. 121–2, 142–3, 248, 254, 272.
17 Ibid. 253–4.
18 Ibid. 256.
19 Paret (1954).
20 This dialogue, a rejoinder to the dialogue ‘The nature of literary evidence: A dialogue on methodology’ in Ibn Warraq (2000a: 38–43), is modelled on the fundamental personal relationship in Islamic educational practice, that between the master (the shaykh) and the disciple (the ṭālib).
22 See p. 61f.
26 Ibid. 269.
27 Ibid. 78–124, 186–244.
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Abū Dāwūd as-Siḡīstānī 81 (Fig. 3.1), 87 (Fig. 3.3)
Abū Dāwūd at-Ṭayālīsī, see at-Ṭayālīsī
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Abū Ishāq, see Sulaymān aš-Šaybānī
Abū Maysarah, see 'Amr ibn Ṣuraḥbīl
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Abū Nuʿaym 41 (Fig. 2.1), 45, 50, 57f., 162n179
Abū Saʿīd (Saʿīd) al-Baqqāl, Saʿīd (Saʿīd) ibn al-Marzubān 107, 170n108, 173n180
Abū Saʿīd al-Ḥudrī 22
Abū Salamah ibn 'Abd ar-Raḥmān 40, 44, 47, 63, 72, 107
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chronology xiii, 6, 17, 22f., 25, 27, 36, 89–91, 113, 116, 149n47, 151n105, 151n106, 168n64, 168n66, 169n88; see also K. al-maģāzī (Ibn Išāq and Ma‘mar)
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Cobet, J. 155n199
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conglomerate 40, 42, 56, 57f., 161n167
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Constitution of Medina 6, 7
court impulse 25, 28, 30–31, 35, 37
Crone, P. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 16f., 17, 18, 97, 113, 117, 120, 142n57
ad-Dabābī 87 (Fig. 3.3), 100, 101 (Fig. 3.6)
ad-Dahlī ibn Mahlād 87f., 87 (Fig. 3.3)
ad-Dahlīk ibn ‘Uṯmān 52
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ad-Dawraqī, see ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn Ḥallād and Sa‘dān
dāwūd ibn al-Miḥbar 58
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fainting fit of ‘Āišah (motif) 107, 109f., 111, 112, 173n182
falsification process, see transmission process
falsifications (conscious alterations) 116
fatrah (temporary suspension of the revelation) narration (f. annex) 40, 42, 43f., 45, 46–48, 49, 51, 53, 63, 65f., 68, 72f., 118, 156n7, 164n241; ‘fatrah trick’ 73
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Fulayḥ ibn Sulaymān 81 (Fig. 3.1), 82, 83, 94 (Fig. 3.4), 167n31
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K. futūḥ aš-Šām (Ps.-al-Wāqidī) 13
al-Ġabbān (Ghabban), ‘Āli ibn Ibrāhīm 14
Ǧābir ibn ‘Abdallāh 21, 40, 44, 47, 72
Gabriel (angel) 38, 39f., 44, 47f., 49, 52, 53–56, 57, 59, 60–62, 63–66, 69, 70–73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 118, 161n155, 161n158
Ǧannād 31
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al-Ǧawmī, Abū ʿImrān ’Abd al-Malik ibn Ḥabīb 58
al-Ǧazīrah 28f.,
genealogy, 25, 26, 31
Ǧiyāḍ al-aṣārīr, see Aṯyād
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gramma (systematic composition; teaching text) 152n111
graphical variants 50
Greek, translations from 29f.
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Ḥāṣān ibn Ṭābit (poet, slanderer of Ṣāḥib) 85, 86, 88, 92, 100, 102, 103, 104
al-Ḥaṭṭāb al-Ḡadādī 22, 28
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al-Ḥayṭāmī, Ibn Ḥaḡar 172n168, 172n174, 173n180
al-Ḥażrag, Banū 82, 85, 92, 100, 102, 105, 108
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ḥiḍrāḥ 16, 27; calendar 11, 14, 168n64; ’Urwaḥ’s tradition on the h. 21, 119, 122
hiḍrāḥ to Abyssinia 16, 27, 115, 147n191, 175n241
Ḥirāʾ (mount), 39f., 55, 59, 63, 74, 76, 77
al-Ḥirāḥ (city near Kūfah) 28f.
Ḥišām (caliph) 31
Ḥišām ibn Ῥṣūl 7, 15, 16, 23, 51–54, 61, 66, 67, 68 (Fig. 2.3), 76, 77, 79, 81 (Fig. 3.1), 89, 90, 99–106, 101 (Fig. 3.6), 113, 114, 116, 118, 119, 120, 123, 155n198, 167n31, 171n139, his wife 26
Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum (Bede), 62f.
history of transmission, see transmission
Horovitz, J. 4, 7, 13, 18, 28, 97, 141n28, 154n148
Hoyland, R. 13, 14, 145n132
al-Ḥudaybiyah, treaty of 16, 27, 119, 122
ḥulafāʾ-nāmak 30
K. al-Ḥulafāʾ (last part of, or supplement to, Ibn Ishāq’s K. al-mağāṣī) 33, 152n116
Ḥunayn, battle of 27
Ḥuṣayf ibn ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān 111
Ḥuṣayn ibn ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān as-Sulamī 109–111, 112, 113, 116, 173n182
ḥuṭbah (sermon, public speech) 20, 82, 85, 86, 92, 93, 100, 105, 108
hypomnema (notes, note book, aide-mémoire) 28, 152 n111; see also lecture notes
Ibn (al-)Abbās, see ʿAbbās ibn ʿAbbās
Ibn Abī ʿAdī, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm 86, 87 (Fig. 3.3)
Ibn Abī Ḍīʾb, Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān 107
Ibn Abī l-Ḥadīd 166n4
Ibn Abī ʿṢāḥib 74, 75 (Fig. 2.4), 76, 101 (Fig. 3.6)
Ibn Abī Yahyā, Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad 84 (Fig. 3.2), 87, 87 (Fig. 3.3)
Ibn ʿAdī 29, 71, 111f.
Ibn al-ʿAṣaʾṯ, ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad 14
Ibn Bukayar, see Yūnus
Ibn Ġurayyāq 22
Ibn Ḥaḡar al-ʿAsqalānī 33, 50, 51, 54, 74, 80, 100, 165n282
Ibn Ḥaḡar al-Hayṭāmī, see al-Hayṭāmī
Ibn Ḥanbal, see Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Hanbal
Ibn Ḥibbān 26, 27, 41 (Fig. 2.1), 42, 45
Ibn Hiṣām, ʿAbd al-Malik 6, 12, 15, 32–34, 39, 41 (Fig. 2.1), 42, 48, 59, 60 (Fig. 2.2), 61–62, 79, 81 (Fig. 3.1), 83, 84 (Fig. 3.2),
mā anā bi-qārī’ (‘I am not one to recite/read’); Muḥammad’s reaction to the angel’s request) 39, 46, 49, 65, 69, 70f., 164n225
mā aqra’u (‘what shall I recite/read; I do not recite/read’) 46, 49, 59, 62, 65, 69, 70–72, 162n179, 162n193
mā āq ra’u (‘what shall I recite/read’) 59, 162n193

K. al-maṣ ba’at (second part of Ibn Iṣḥāq’s K. al-maṣaḥīḥ) 29, 33, 152 n116, maṣāḥīḥ (sing. maṣāḥ) (scholarly sessions) 23
K. al-maṣaḥīḥ (Abān ibn ʿUṯmān) 31
K. al-maṣaḥīḥ (ʿAbd ar-Razzāq) 23, 25f.
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (Abū l-Aswād) 55
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (ʿAbdāl l-Aswād) 6, 18, 25–30, 31–33, 35, 63, 86–89, 90, 120; beneficial effect at court 29; coherent narrative 27f., 29; consistent chronological structure 27; edited for the court (as al-Kitāb al kабîr) 28f., 35; edition did not survive 29, 31f., 35; extant in divergent recensions 29, 31f., 35f.; ‘literature of the school for the school’ 29, 35f.; as a source of al-Wāqidī’s 93, 97–98; systematically arranged work 28f., 32; unique among muṣannafāt 27f., 35; see also Ibn ʿIṣḥāq
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (Ibn Iṣḥāq) in the narrower sense) third part of the K. al-maṣāḥīḥ 32, 33, 152 n116
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (Maʿmar ibn Rāṣid) 6, 25, 27, 147n181; has partly a rough chronological structure 27, 151n105;
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (Mūsā ibn ʿUqba) 147n181
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (ʿUrwah) no K. al-m. ‘in the strict sense’) 22, 149n35
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (al-Wāqidī) 18
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (az-Zuhrī) 25f., 31
maṣāḥīḥ material (Watt) 6, 7, 151n107
al-Māğiṣūn 27
al-Mahdī (caliph) 28

Mālik ibn Anas 10, 22, 23, 25, 27, 35, 120, 147n181
Maʿmar ibn Rāṣid 6, 13, 15, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 35, 39, 40, 41 (Fig. 2.1), 42–44, 45–48, 49f., 71, 73, 79, 81 (Fig. 3.1), 83, 116, 120, 147n181, 151n104, 156n7; his transmission on the authority of az-Zuhrī preferable to that of Ibn Iṣḥāq 15, 175n1
manākīr (sg. munkar) (objectionable hadīths) material 71
al-Manṣūr (caliph) 28f., 30, 35, 63, 153n122
Margoliouth, D. 140n11
Marwān (caliph) 30
Maryam (Coptic concubine of Muḥammad) 166n4
Māṣūq ibn Aḥpa 109, 110
K. al-maṣāḥīḥ (Ziyād ibn Abīhi) 30
Mecca, conquest of 27, 119, 122
Medina, 6, 82, 84, 91; mosque 20, 21; opposition to writing down hadīths disappeared after az-Zuhrī 25
Melchert, Ch. 144n114
methodological principle of historical science 8, 17
Miqaṣ im Buṣrā/Nāqadah 111
miracle stories, absent from ‘Urwah corpus 122, 143n87; occur in accounts ascribed to Wahb ibn Munabbih 122
miṣāḥah 2
Miṣṭaḥ ibn ʿUṯṭāḥ (slanderer of ʿĀʾishah) 82, 85, 86, 88, 92, 102, 104, 105, 110
mnemonic techniques 2
Moses 53, 76
Motzki, H. x, 11, 38f., 146n176, 147n181, 162n190, 174n237
Muʿāwaṭ (caliph) 14, 30
K. al-muḥātāda (part of Ibn Iṣḥāq’s K. al-maṣāḥīḥ) 29, 33, 152n116, 154n168
muṣāḥakahar (informal exchange of hadīths) among students, characterized by recapitulation) 21
Muḥammad (Prophet) passim
Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Aʿlā, Abū Kurayb 41 (Fig. 2.1), 44, 53, 74, 81 (Fig. 3.1), 167n30
Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr 107
Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr ibn ʿAlqamah 108
Muḥammad ibn al-ʿAṣʾāʾ (ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān ibn al-ʿAṣʾāʾ’s father) 14
Muḥammad ibn Bīr 108
Muḥammad ibn Iṣḥāq, see Ibn Iṣḥāq
Muḥammad ibn an-Nūmān 70f.
Muḥammad ibn Salamah 108
Muḥammad ibn Salamah al-Bāḥilī 86, 87 (Fig. 3.3)
qisṣah (story, narrative) 63, 65, 67, 74, 79, 80, 98, 163n222; see also ḥadīth
al-Qummī, `Alī ibn Ibrāhīm 166n4
al-Qurān 2, 3, 22, 118; late dating 104n4; redaction of 5; Codex Parisino-Perpontianus 14; ancient fragmentary
codex from San`ā 14; `Uṯmānic recension
14; the only book of Islam 21, 25, 31, 37, 114
Qurayyās 59, 63
Qurayyāzah, Banū 27, 90, 119
qūṣṣās, see qāṣṣ
Rasāʾīl (epistles) (`Abd al-Ḥamīd) 30
Raven, W. 9ff.,
K. ar-rāwī al-unuf (as-Suhaylī) 34
rāwī (plural rāwī) transmitter; especially of
ancient Arabic poetry and ʿaḥbār 2, 30, 33
Rayy (a city) 28f., records, written, see notebooks
reliability of transmission, see authenticity
`Revisionists’ see Sceptic approach 9
Risālah fī ʿṣ-sāḥābah (Ibn al-Muqaffā) 30
riwāyah, see isnād, introductory
riwāyah, see transmission, transmission
process
riwāyah bil-laft (verbatim transmission)
48, 76, 79, 115
riwāyah bil-maṣnāʿ (transmission conveying the
sense) 48, 75, 79, 115
riwāyah masmūʿah, see samāʿ
Robinson, C. 13, 15, 146n163, 175n3
Rodinson, M. 11
Rohrich, L. xii
Rubin, U. 10, 38f., 74, 77, 118
Rudolph, K. 39
ruwāt, see rāwī
samāʿ (a transmission method: ‘audition’;
lecture given by a teacher), riwāyah
masmūʿah (‘audited’ transmission) 21, 28,
32, 37, 50, 116, 123, 152n115
sand ablation verse, see tyammum verse
sceptic approach 3f., 5, 9, 17, 122; new
scepticism 9–11, 13; extreme forms 9ff.;
as a paradigm 13, 122
Schacht, J. 3, 9, 11, 38, 40, 147n181
Schloer, G. 11, 146n176
Schöller, M. 11, 12
school theory (Wellhausen) 4, 141n35
Schwally, F. 39, 66
Schwartz, A. x
Sellheim, R. 7, 38f., 66, 99, 156n7
Serjeant, R. B. 5, 8
Sezgin, F. 9
Sezgin, U. 4f.
sheets (ṣuḥuf), 23, 36; see also lecture notes
shīʿi opinions about the hadīth al-ifk 166n4
as-Sirah (life, biography of Muḥammad)
3, 4, 7, 17, 26, 122
K. Sirat rasūl Allāh (Ibn Ḥiṣām) 6, 7, 12,
32–34, 99; fixed text 33; glosses and
commentaries on the text 34; transmitted
through the lecture system by qirāʾah
33f.; see also Ibn Ḥiṣām
K. Sirat rasūl Allāh (Ibn Istāq) = K. al-Maġāzī
29, 31, 153n126; see also K. al-Maġāzī
Spellberg, D. A. 80, 166n4
spread of traditions 120, 123
Sprenger, A. 39, 59, 66f., 74, 157n22, 163n222
Stauth, G. 11
stratification model 7, 143n84
Ṣubḥah ibn al-Ḥaǧǧāq 74
Sufyān (utc.) 44
Sufyān ibn Saʿd al-Ṭawrī 24
Sufyān ibn Ḥudayyib, see Ibn Ḥudayyib
Sufyān ibn Ḥudayyib 108
as-Suhaylī, `Abd ar-Raḥmān ibn `Abdallāh 34,
75 (Fig. 2.4), 76
ṣuḥuf, see saḥīfa and lecture notes
ṣubḥah an-nuzūl, see asbāb an-nuzūl
as-Sabīlī, see `Amr ibn `Abdullāh
Saʿd ibn al-Marzuqān, see Abū Saʿd (Saʿd)
al-Baqqāl
Saʿd ibn Muʿāqqal 82, 90, 92, 97, 100, 102, 108
Saʿd ibn `Ubdallāh 82, 85, 92, 97, 102, 105, 108
Saʿd ibn Zakāriyāʾ ad-Dawraqi 107
Ṣafwān ibn al-Muʿāṭṭal 82, 84, 91, 102, 105,
107, 108, 170n101, 172n159
ṣaḥābah (the companions of the Prophet)
20, 23
ṣaḥīfa (pl. ʿṣuḥuf) (‘a flat, smooth surface
prepared for writing’; a leaf, sheet) 23,
36; see also lecture notes
Saʿd ibn Abī Arābīrah 25, 35
Saʿd ibn ʿUmayyah 92, 95
suicide, Muḥammad’s intention to commit 40, 42, 43, 44, 47, 60, 61, 62, 65f., 69, 72; in al-Buḥārī’s Sahīḥ 156n7; absence of this motif in Ibn Ḩiṣām’s Sīra 156n7
Sulaymān (caliph) 31
Sulaymān as-Šaybānī, Abū Is̲̲āq 74
Sulaymān ibn Ṭāhir al-Taymī, Abū l-Muṭamir 74
Sunna, Sunan 23, 31
Surahib ibn Saʿd 143n75
Surah Ḥāʾim ibn Yūnus 44
Syriac, translations from 29f.
at-Ṭabarānī 100, 101 (Fig. 3.6), 103
at-Ťabarī 1, 2, 4, 15, 22, 31, 32f., 39, 41 (Fig. 2.1), 42, 43f., 46, 47f., 49, 50, 53, 59, 60 (Fig. 2.2), 61–62, 71, 74, 81 (Fig. 3.1), 83, 84 (Fig. 3.2) 90, 94 (Fig. 3.4), 100, 101 (Fig. 3.6), 103, 106, 108, 113, 114, 115, 116, 120; transmits from all sections of Ibn Is̲̲āq’s K. al-maḡāzī 33
Tābīʿūn (‘successors’; the members of the generation that followed the companions of Muḥammad) 20
tablets (al-wāḥib) 23
Tabūk 99
tadhīn (large scale collections of ḥadīths) 24, 31
tafsīr (Qurān exegesis) 3, 26
Tafsīr (at-Ťabarī) 33
Ṭāḥā Ḥuṣayn 140n11
tahānmasut (particular religious practices), tahānmats narration 39, 40, 44, 55, 58, 59, 63, 65, 69, 72, 77, 79
talab al-ilm (‘search for religious knowledge’, i.e. collecting traditions) 26
Tammām 2
taqyīd al-ilm (‘shackling of knowledge’. i.e. writing down of ḥadīt) 22
Ṭārīḫ Baḡdād (al-Ḥaṭṭīb al-Bağdādī) 28
Ṭārīḫ ar-rusul wa-mulūk (at-Ťabarī) 33
taṣnīf (a method of collecting materials in compilations divided in thematic chapters) 21, 22, 25, 27, 29, 35, 116, 148n19
at-Ţayallīsī 41 (Fig. 2.1), 43, 46, 50, 57f., 109, 110
tayammum verse (sand ablation verse) 89, 91, 93, 172n159
at-Taymī, see Ismāʿīl ibn Yahyā
Teaching system, see lecture system
tendencies in the Sīra material, de-historicization 12; embellishments with miracles 7, 122; fallout from factional or dogmatic conflicts 7
Thomas the Presbyter 14, 145n132
at-Tirmidhī 39, 41 (Fig. 2.1), 42, 45, 48, 100, 101 (Fig. 3.6), 103, 123, 171n131
Topics (Aristotle) 152n111
topoi 4, 112–114, 115
tradition(s), historical; anecdotal t.s 6;
chronological arrangement of t.s 22;
modifications (reshaping, falsifications) in 4f., 17, 104, 115ff., 119, 141n36;
oral t. 36f.; t.s transmitted separately (outside of definitively redacted works) 86, 88, 89, 90, 93; see also ḥadīt
‘traditionalist’ approach (‘sanguine’ scholars) 8f., 11–13, 122
translations from Middle Persian, Greek and Syriac 29f.
transmission, transmission process 2; errors in 61f., 119; faithful t. 5, 104, 119;
modifications (reshaping, falsifications) in 2, 4f., 17, 104, 115ff., 119, 141n36;
redactional changes in 4, 12, 116, 145n153; verbatim t. 2, 3 (see also riwāyah bil-lafḍ) ; written documents 171n147
transmission historical method 98f., 166n9, transmission system, see lecture system
Trench, battle of the 16, 27, 90, 99, 119
typical phraseology 65
ʿUbayd Allāh ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUtbah 81 (Fig. 3.1), 84 (Fig. 3.2), 94 (Fig. 3.4), 99, 104
ʿUbayd ibn ʿUmayr 59, 60 (Fig. 2.2), 66f., 68 (Fig. 2.3), 73f., 75, 77f., 163n222
ufūq narration (appearing of the angel on the horizon) 40, 42, 44, 55, 57, 58, 60, 63, 65, 67, 68f., 72f., 76, 77, 78, 79, 161n162, 163n212
Uḥud, battle of 25, 27, 99, 119, 121, 122, 151n107.; date of 149n47
ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (caliph) 31
ʿUmar ibn al-Ḥaṭṭāb (caliph) 14, 22, 140n5, 168n64
ʿUmar ibn ʿṢabḥah 81 (Fig. 3.1), 83, 84 (Fig. 3.2), 87 (Fig. 3.3), 94 (Fig. 3.4), 100, 101 (Fig. 3.6)
az-Zubayr ibn Bakkār 52f.
Zubayrid family 57, 59, 66, 67, 68, 68
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