

Name: J. J. Little

College: Pembroke College

Thesis title: The Hadith of ‘Ā’ishah’s Marital Age: A Study in the Evolution of Early Islamic Historical Memory

Degree: DPhil in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies

*Note to reader: This is the **unabridged** version of the thesis.*

Acknowledgements

I owe thanks to my family, for supporting me through all of my endeavours; my friends and colleagues, for the good times and the great classic hits; Ian D. Morris, for inspiring me to go to Oxford in the first place; Saqib Hussain, Anna-Maria Ramezanzadeh, Marco Brandl, Belal Abu-Alabbas, and Nadia Jamil, for clarifying various textual points; Syed Jaffer Abbas and Omar Mohammed, for helping me locate and access certain hadiths; ‘Alī Jabbār, for his generous assistance in helping me access and understand Šī‘ī works and references; Javad Hashmi, for very kindly reading a draft of this thesis and providing feedback; and Mahā, for her enormous generosity in helping me to double-check all of my transliterations. I also owe thanks to Yasmin Amin, whose work and insights revolutionised my thesis. I further owe thanks to Christian Sahner, Behnam Sadeghi, Pavel Pavlovitch, and Nicolai Sinai, the examiners for my Transfer of Status, Confirmation of Status, and Viva, for their excellent feedback. Finally, I owe special thanks to my supervisor, Christopher Melchert, whose generosity knows no bounds and whose feedback was helpful every step of the way.

Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Contents	iii
Abstract.....	1
Introduction	2
Defining the Hadith	2
Literature Review	4
Mumtaz Moin (1979)	5
Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-'Albānī (1985).....	6
T. O. Shanavas (2002)	7
Gautier Juynboll (2007)	8
Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Munajjid (2009)	9
Kecia Ali (2010)	12
Hussein Abdul-Raof (2012).....	13
Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-'Idlibī (2013).....	14
Asma Afsaruddin (2013)	14
Jonathan Brown (2015)	15
Yasmin Amin (2016)	16
J. J. Little (2016 ff.)	18
Carolyn Baugh (2017)	20
Outline of the Present Work	21
Chapter 1: Methods & Debates.....	22
Dating by Ascription Type	27
Arguments from Silence	30
Dating by Polemical Context and “Counter-Traditions”	38
Tradition-Historical Source Analysis	40
Dating by the “Common Link”	44
Schacht’s Common Link Analysis.....	44
Azami’s Criticism of Schacht	48
Cook’s Criticism of Schacht.....	51
Juynboll’s Refined Common Link Analysis	56

Cook and Juynboll's Criticisms of Each Other	61
Motzki's Criticism of Juynboll.....	65
Motzki's Criticism of Cook	66
Powers' Criticism of Cook	85
Görke's Criticism of Cook	87
Brown's Criticism of Juynboll	88
Motzki <i>et al.</i> 's 'Isnād-Cum-Matn Analysis.....	108
Melchert's Criticism of Motzki <i>et al.</i>	113
Little's Criticism of Motzki <i>et al.</i>	116
Little's Defence of the 'Isnād-Cum-Matn Analysis.....	126
Little's Refined 'Isnād-Cum-Matn Analysis.....	130
The Relationship between CLs and Their Hadiths	133
Conclusion.....	146
Chapter 2: An 'Isnād-Cum-Matn Analysis of the Hadith of 'Ā'īshah's Marital Age	
.....	148
'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 415/1024)	154
al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)	158
'Abū 'Amr b. Ḥamdān (d. 368/979)	159
'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Baḡawī (d. 317/929-930).....	162
'Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Jabbār al-'Uṭāridī (d. 272/886).....	164
'Abū Bakr b. 'Askar al-Tamīmī (d. 251/865).....	169
Hārūn b. 'Ishāq (d. 250/864-865)	171
Sa'īd b. Yaḥyā al-'Umawī (d. 249/863).....	174
'Ishāq b. Rāhwayh (d. 238/853).....	182
'Abū Kayṭamah Zuhayr (d. 234/849)	184
Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā (d. 226/840-841).....	186
'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl (d. 224-225/838-840).....	192
'Ārim b. al-Faḍl (d. 224/838-839)	194
Mūsā b. 'Ismā'īl (d. 223/838)	195
'Affān b. Muslim (d. 220/835).....	197
'Abū Nu'aym al-Faḍl (d. 218-219/833-834)	199
al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhāl (d. 216-217/831-832).....	201
al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī' (d. post-216/831).....	204

Qabīṣah b. ‘Uqbah (d. 213-215/828-831)	205
Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firyābī (d. 212/827)	207
Muslim b. ‘Ibrāhīm (d. 212/827)	208
‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām (d. 211/827)	209
Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823)	215
Muḥammad b. Bišr (d. 203/818-819)	216
‘Abū ‘Aḥmad al-Zubayrī (d. 203/818)	221
Yahyá b. ‘Ādam (d. 203/818)	222
‘Abū ‘Usāmah Ḥammād (d. 201/817)	223
Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah (d. 198/814)	228
Wakī‘ b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 196-197/812)	231
‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah al-Ḍarīr (d. 194-195/809-811)	233
‘Alī b. Mushir (d. 189/804-805)	241
Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (d. 188/804)	244
‘Abdah b. Sulaymān (d. 187-188/803-804)	245
‘Abū al-Jawwāb al-‘Aḥwaṣ (d. turn of the 9th C. CE)	249
Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-‘Asadī (d. turn of the 9th C. CE)	250
Ḥammād b. Zayd (d. 179/795)	252
Ja‘far b. Sulaymān (d. 178/794-795)	254
‘Abṭar b. al-Qāsim (d. 178/794-795)	256
Šarīk b. ‘Abd Allāh (d. 177-178/793-795)	257
‘Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ (d. 176/792)	259
Ḥammād b. Salamah (d. 167/784)	260
Wuhayb b. Kālīd (d. 165/781-782)	270
al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy (d. 169/785-786)	275
‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād (d. 164/780-781 or 174/790-791)	275
Sufyān al-Ṭawrī (d. 161-162/777-779)	280
‘Isrā’īl b. Yūnus (d. 160-162/776-779)	284
Ma‘mar b. Rāšīd (d. 152-154/769-771)	289
Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-‘A‘maš (d. 147-148/764-766)	291
Hišām b. ‘Urwah (d. 146-147/763-765)	295
‘Ismā‘īl b. ‘abī Kālīd (d. 146/763-764)	322
‘Abū Ḥujayyah al-‘Ajlaḥ (d. 145/762-763 or later)	341

Muḥammad b. ‘Amr (d. 144-145/761-763).....	343
‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Uqayl (d. post-140/757-758)	363
’Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far (d. pre-148/765)	365
’Abū ’Ishāq al-Sabī‘ī (d. 127-128/744-746).....	366
Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741-742).....	370
Qatādah b. Dī‘amah (d. 177-178/735-736)	375
‘Amrah bt. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 98/716-717 or 106/724-725).....	378
’Abū Salamah (d. 94/712-713 or 104/722-723)	382
Jābir b. Zayd (d. 93/711-712 or 103/721-722)	384
‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 93-95/711-714 or 101/719-720)	388
Ḥabīb al-’A‘war (d. early 8th C. CE).....	390
al-’Aswad b. Yazīd (d. 75/694-695).....	391
‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās (d. 67-68/687-688).....	393
‘Ā’īshah bt. ’abī Bakr (d. 57-58/677-678)	394
Conclusion.....	399
Chapter 3: A Critical Analysis of the Origins of the Hadith of ‘Ā’īshah’s Marital Age	
.....	403
Recapitulation of the <i>’Isnād-Cum-Matn</i> Analysis	405
Dating by Ascription Type	409
Form Criticism.....	410
Form Criticism and <i>’Isnāds</i>	417
Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the <i>’Isnāds</i>	419
Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the Earliest Madinan Collections.....	433
Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the Earliest Kufan Collections.....	441
Interim Summary and Entailments: Hišām as the Originator of the Marital-Age Hadith	448
A Historical-Critical Analysis of the Marital-Age Hadith’s Context.....	449
A Historical-Critical Analysis of the Origins of the Marital-Age Hadith’s Specific Content.....	460
Conclusion.....	469

Chapter 4: The Spread and Diversification of the Hadith of ‘Ā’ishah’s Marital Age

.....	473
Origin and Growth in Iraq.....	473
Spread to Yemen.....	477
Spread to Makkah	478
Spread to Northern Mesopotamia	479
Spread to Egypt.....	480
Spread to the Levant.....	481
Spread to Persia.....	483
Spread to Khurasan	484
Spread to Transoxania	485
Spread to the West.....	485
Conclusion.....	486

Chapter 5: The Canonisation and Criticism of the Hadith of ‘Ā’ishah’s Marital Age in Sunnism

.....	488
al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870).....	489
Muslim (d. 261/875)	490
Ibn ‘abī Ḳayṭamah (d. 279/892-893)	491
al-Nasā’ī (d. 303/915-916)	492
‘Abū ‘Awānah (d. 316/929)	493
Ibn al-Mundir (d. 318/930)	494
al-‘Uqaylī (d. 322/933-934).....	495
Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965).....	495
al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)	496
al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995).....	497
al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)	498
‘Abū Nu‘aym (d. 430/1038).....	500
Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071)	501
al-Baḡawī (d. 516/1122).....	501
Ibn Qudāmah (d. 620/1223)	502
Ibn Kaṭīr (d. 774/1373).....	503
Badr al-Dīn al-‘Aynī (d. 855/1451)	503
Conclusion.....	504

Chapter 6: Broader Implications for Hadith and Hadith Studies	506
Implications for Modern Methods and Debates.....	506
Implications for Hadith and History	508
Conclusion.....	515
Bibliography.....	519
Primary Sources	519
Secondary Sources.....	526

Abstract

This DPhil thesis explores the origins and development of one of the most famous traditions within the Islamic Hadith corpus: the hadith of ‘Ā’ishah bt. ‘abī Bakr’s marriage to the Prophet at a young age. To this end, I surveyed all of the modern literature pertaining to the great debate over whether—or to what extent—we can date hadiths and their content, culminating in a defence of a specific—rigorous and systematic—version of the *’isnād-cum-matn* analysis. Thereafter, I collated every available version of every hadith pertaining to this topic and subjected them all to an *’isnād-cum-matn* analysis, which allowed me to reconstruct the underlying urtexts or redactions of various earlier tradents (mostly operating from the mid-to-late 8th Century CE), known as “common links”. I then subjected these common-link redactions to various form-critical, geographical, and historical-critical analyses, which produced a striking conclusion: all versions of the marital-age hadith likely derive a single archetype or ur-hadith. This ur-hadith appears to have been created and disseminated by the Madinan tradent Hišām b. ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 146-147/763-765) after he moved to Iraq towards the end of his life, probably as a reaction to local proto-Šī‘ī polemics against his great-aunt, ‘Ā’ishah. Following on from this, I traced the spread and diversification of the hadith across the early Abbasid Caliphate, including the way in which some Hadith scholars reworked its content and/or replaced the original isnad with local and/or familial isnads, thereby naturalising it in their respective regions. Thereafter, I explored the reception of the hadith by the proto-Sunnī Hadith critics, who rejected or criticised some versions, but accepted others, seemingly without a thorough or systematic investigation of their provenance and transmission. Finally, I explored the broader implications of all of this, including the ways in which my findings variously confirm or disconfirm the conclusions and predictions of other scholars, concerning the authenticity of the marital-age hadith in particular and the historical development of Hadith in general. In short, this thesis tracks the provenance and development of a famous and widespread hadith, from its genesis in the sectarian milieu of mid-8th-Century Iraq, to its spread and diversification across the early Abbasid Caliphate, to its canonisation at the hands of the proto-Sunnī Hadith critics.

Introduction

The ‘hadith’ (*ḥadīth*) of the marital age of ‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr (d. 57-58/677-678), the young wife of the Islamic prophet Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh (d. 11/632), is arguably the most well-known hadith beyond Muslim societies and communities. Many versions of this hadith exist throughout the Islamic Hadith corpus, such as the following version recorded in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* the famous hadith-collector Muḥammad b. ‘Ismā‘īl al-Buḵārī:

Muḥammad b. Yūsuf related to us: “Sufyān related to us, from Hiṣām, from his father, from ‘Ā’iṣah, that the Prophet married her when she was a girl of six years, and she was taken to him when she was a girl of nine, and she lived with him nine [years].”¹

The goal of this dissertation is to trace the origins and development of this hadith, with the ultimate goal of evaluating the authenticity of the historical memory contained therein. Such a project necessarily entails navigating the methodological debates within Hadith Studies and the field of Islamic origins more broadly—in particular, the great debate over whether—or to what extent—we can use *‘isnāds* to date hadiths. Consequently, I evaluate and attempt to synthesise Joseph Schacht *et al.*’s Revisionist model of Hadith development and his methods of dating Hadith with Harald Motzki *et al.*’s *‘isnād-cum-matn* analysis, in order to reconstruct the history of the hadith in question. On the basis of this reconstruction, I conclude herein that the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age was first put into circulation by her great-nephew Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr in Kufah between 754 and 765 CE—probably as a response to proto-Šī‘ī polemics and hostility directed towards ‘Ā’iṣah.

Defining the Hadith

Before evaluating the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age, it is important to clarify what is meant thereby. When I speak of a ‘hadith’ or ‘tradition’ in the broad sense, I mean a set

¹ Muḥammad b. ‘Ismā‘īl al-Buḵārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, vol. 3 (Vaduz, Liechtenstein: Thesaurus Islamicus Foundation, 2000), p. 1076, # 5188.

of reports with common features, which is to say, multiple versions of the same story. Thus, when I speak of ‘the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age’, I mean the aggregate or collective body of all those reports that contain either of the following elements: ‘Ā’iṣah was married to the Prophet at a certain age; and her marriage was consummated at a certain age. Hypothetically, all the extant versions constituting a given tradition originated from a single common-ancestor story,² whence they mutated over a century or more of paraphrastic oral transmission and/or interpolation. In the case of the specific tradition under consideration, for example, Gautier Juynboll hypothesised that all of the extant versions originated from a simple original that looked something like this: “The Prophet married me when I was six years old and he consummated the marriage when I was nine.”³

However, reports did not only mutate vertically, but also horizontally, with elements sometimes being transferred *between* traditions. As Schacht once observed: “The circumstantial details of one tradition are often repeated in its successors; traditions are modelled on one another, whether they be counter-traditions or not.”⁴ In other words, we often encounter “the same story, in different settings”, from different figures.⁵ Meanwhile, Gerald Hawting describes the phenomenon of “the linking together of reports which originated independently”,⁶ whilst Juynboll spoke of how “different items” were rolled together to form “composite” hadiths.⁷ Because of this kind of cross-pollination, reports can be part of *spectra* rather than discrete traditions—for example, the marital-age hadith appears to have converged with the tradition of ‘Ā’iṣah and her friends playing with dolls in Muḥammad’s house,⁸ such that both traditions share several reports in common.⁹ Likewise, the incorporation of elements from the tradition of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age into *faḍā’il* reports (along with data

² Or possibly, a *cluster* of common-ancestor stories, if we allow for multiple Companions independently narrating about the same event.

³ Gautier H. A. Juynboll, *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2007), 75, col. 1.

⁴ Joseph F. Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1950), 156.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Gerald R. Hawting, ‘Harald Motzki: *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz: ihre Entwicklung in Mekka bis zur Mitte des 2./8. Jahrhunderts*’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 59, Issue 1 (1996), 142, col. 2.

⁷ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xxviii, col. 1.

⁸ For an anthology of both traditions, see Arent J. Wensinck, *A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition* (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1927), 13, col. 2.

⁹ See the section on Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah in ch. 2 of the present work.

drawn from other traditions) belies a straightforward single-ancestor descent for all of the constitutive versions of said tradition.¹⁰

Even without inter-tradition contamination, a spectrum of sorts can still form when the versions of a given tradition mutate to the point where they no longer all share a common core. For example, several versions of the tradition of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age lack one or the other of the core elements of her engagement and marital consummation,¹¹ although they still discernibly overlap with other versions that do contain these elements. Rather than being a straightforward set of reports with common features, therefore, a tradition might be more precisely envisaged as a continuum of reports with overlapping elements, or a continuum of reports that *mostly*—but not entirely—contain a common core.

Regardless of contaminations from other traditions or the occasional loss of a common core, a tradition—or more specifically, an element or set of elements therein—may still be traceable back to some single source, as is the case with the tradition of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age: on the basis of the critical analysis in Chapter 3 of the present work, it seems likely that this tradition originated with the utterances of Hiṣām in early Abbasid Iraq. Over successive generations of transmission, Hiṣām’s reports accrued new elements: some versions converged with seemingly-independent traditions, whilst others mutated until they ceased to share a common core.

In short, when speaking of ‘the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age’, I have in mind the continuum of overlapping Hadith material that contains or centres around the element ‘Ā’iṣah was married at X age’ and/or the element ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage was consummated at Y age’, most or all of which presumably derives from some kind of single ur-hadith.

Literature Review

Much has been written about this hadith, but very little of it is relevant to my specific research goals: my interest here is not the various Islamophobic polemics and Islamic

¹⁰ See the sections on ‘Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ and ‘Ismā‘īl b. ‘abī Kālīd in ch. 2 of the present work.

¹¹ Some versions—most notably, the sub-tradition associated with ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—lack the ‘consummation’ element, whilst some other versions—some of which are presumably abridgements—lack the ‘engagement’ element.

apologetics that notably surround the hadith, nor the sociological reflections on these debates by Religious Studies academics.¹² Instead, what follows is a summary of some of the serious or notable assessments regarding the hadith's *authenticity*.¹³ This summary is by no means exhaustive, but any literature review of the authenticity-debates over this hadith will rapidly hit the point of diminishing returns, as most of the participants repeat the same claims over and over: the proponents of authenticity cite the numerous independent *ʿisnāds* supporting the hadith and the fact that they mostly derive from ʿĀʾishah herself, whilst the proponents of inauthenticity attack the reliability of the tradents in the *ʿisnāds* for the hadith (especially the common link Hišām) and cite implicit contradictions *vis-à-vis* the chronologies of other reports (entailing that ʿĀʾishah must have been older).

Mumtaz Moin (1979)

In his 1979 biography *Umm al-Muʾminīn ʿĀʾishah Ṣiddiqah*, Mumtaz Moin acknowledged that “the Muslim medieval writers have generally accepted” the dominant hadiths on ʿĀʾishah’s marital age (six/seven at marital engagement and nine at marital consummation), but rejected these hadiths himself due to “careful research” conducted by “modern historians”.¹⁴ On the basis of a certain hadith recorded by Ibn Sa’d (which places the marital engagement at nine) and a chronology inferable from certain other hadiths, these “modern historians” (and Moin himself) concluded that the

¹² That is not to say that such research is not worthwhile; but it is not the focus of the present work.

¹³ I thus disregard those authors who gloss over the question of authenticity. For example, Nabia Abbott, *Aishah, the Beloved of Mohammed* (Chicago, USA: Chicago University Press, 1942), 2 ff., merely regurgitated the narrative recorded in certain hadiths, including her engagement at age six (*ibid.*, 4) and her consummation of the marriage three years later; the extent of Abbott’s analysis was a comment that ʿĀʾishah, “at the most, could not have been over ten years old” (*ibid.*, 7). Even Denise A. Spellberg, *Politics, gender, and the Islamic past: the legacy of ʿĀʾisha bint Abi Bakr* (New York, USA: Columbia University Press, 1994), 39-40, 47, who notes the propaganda function of this hadith, does not really deal with the question of authenticity; instead, she seems to assume the essential historicity of the historical memory contained therein: “As a historical persona, ʿĀʾisha had an edge over her co-wives manifest in her youth and virginity” (*ibid.*, 47). The closest we get is a brief and vague statement that the reports of ʿĀʾishah’s marital age “suggest the variability of ʿĀʾisha’s age in the historical record” (*ibid.*, 40), although the relevant endnote (*ibid.* 204, n. 54) only seems to deal with her varying dates of birth and death.

¹⁴ Mumtaz Moin, *Umm al-Muʾminīn ʿĀʾishah Ṣiddiqah: Life and Work* (Karachi, Pakistan: Royal Book Company, 1979), 7.

marriage of ‘Ā’iṣah must have been consummated when she was thirteen, fourteen, or fifteen.¹⁵

Unfortunately, the chronology of Prophetical biography (*sīrah/mağāzī*) is notoriously incoherent and artificial,¹⁶ and in general, this material is extremely dubious as a historical source for Muḥammad and his contemporaries: the sources in question are (1) non-contemporaneous and postdate the life and times of the Prophet by a century or more, (2) punctuated by magic and miracles, (3) underpinned by Judaeo-Christian themes and motifs and other such artificial literary structures, (4) incoherent in terms of content, (5) diffused with anachronistic doctrines and propaganda retrojected by later competing parties, (6) contradictory with earlier non-Muslim sources in several key respects, and (7) substantially inferred from the Quran (which is to say, exegetical speculation disguised as biography).¹⁷ Adducing a chronological contradiction from such a mess to cancel out the specific hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age thus seems dubious, especially given the conflicting consummation-ages—twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, eighteen, nineteen, etc.—that could be inferred therefrom.¹⁸

Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-’Albānī (1985)

In his 1985 monograph *’Irwā’ al-Ġalīl fī Taḥrīj ’Aḥādīṭ Manār al-Sabīl*, the prominent Salafite Hadith scholar Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-’Albānī concluded that the hadith relating “that ‘Ā’iṣah was married when she was a girl of six” is “sound” (*ṣaḥīḥ*).¹⁹ To justify this conclusion, al-’Albānī noted that this hadith was cited (*’akraja*) by both al-Buḵārī and Muslim, and likewise by ‘Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā’ī, al-Dārimī, Ibn Mājah, Ibn al-Jārūd, al-Bayhaqī, al-Ṭayālīsī, ‘Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, and Ibn Sa’d, from various transmissions (*ṭuruq*) deriving from Hišām, from his father ‘Urwah, from ‘Ā’iṣah herself, who said: “The Prophet married me when I was a girl of six years and

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 7-8.

¹⁶ E.g., Stephen J. Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet: The End of Muhammad’s Life and the Beginnings of Islam* (Philadelphia, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 99-106.

¹⁷ See the references given in Ch. 1.

¹⁸ See below.

¹⁹ Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-’Albānī, *’Irwā’ al-Ġalīl fī Taḥrīj ’Aḥādīṭ Manār al-Sabīl*, vol. 6, 2nd ed. (Beirut, Lebanon: al-Maktab al-’Islāmiyy, 1985), p. 230, # 1831.

consummated the marriage with me when I was a girl of nine years.”²⁰ Al-ʿAlbānī also seemingly approved of the wording (*al-lafẓ*) of the versions recorded by Muslim and al-Ṭayālīsī, which is also similar to a transmission (*riwāyah*) from Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Saʿd: “The Messenger of God married me around the time of the death of Ẹadījah, two or three years before his escape to Madinah, when I was a girl of seven years. Then, after we arrived at Madinah, some women came to me whilst I was playing on a swing, when I had shoulder-length hair; they prepared me and adorned me, then they brought me to the Messenger of God; then he consummated the marriage with me, when I was a girl of nine years.”²¹

T. O. Shanavas (2002)

In a 1999 article in *The Minaret* magazine, the Muslim author T. O. Shanavas argues in a similar vein to Moin that “the age of Ayesha has been erroneously reported in the hadith literature”,²² on the basis of a conflicting chronology inferable from other reports. In addition to these external considerations, Shanavas attacks the hadith on its own merits, in the following way: (1) the *ʿisnāds* of most versions of the hadith converge upon a single tradent named Hišām; (2) despite Hišām’s having lived in Madinah for most of his life, no other Madinans (including Mālik) transmitted this hadith; (3) according to Yaʿqūb b. Šaybah (as cited by Ibn Ḥajar), Hišām’s reporting became unreliable after he moved to Iraq; (4) Mālik (as cited by Ibn Ḥajar) refused to accept reports from Hišām after he moved to Iraq; and (5) according to al-Ḍahabī, Hišām’s memory declined in old age. From these points, Shanavas concludes that Hišām mistakenly invented this hadith in his old age after his transition from Madinah to Iraq, and hence, that “his narrative of Ayesha’s marriage and age are unreliable.”²³

As with Moin above, Shanavas’ appeals to conflicting chronologies are not very convincing, and his claim that *no* Madinans narrated this hadith is also ostensibly wrong—in a few *ʿisnāds* we can find tradents such as Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī and Yaḥyá b.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.* The immediate wording cited by al-ʿAlbānī here is taken from Ibn Ḥanbal.

²² T. O. Shanavas, ‘The Myth of a Proverbial Wedding’, *The Minaret: The Islamic Magazine*, Volume 21, Number 3 (1999), 21, col. 2.

²³ *Ibid.*, 22, col. 1.

‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥāṭib.²⁴ Despite this overgeneralisation, Shanavas makes an excellent point regarding the striking paucity of Madinans in the transmission of this hadith, and his identification of Hišām—and specifically, Hišām in Iraq—as its originator is plausible. Shanavas’ appeal to Hišām’s senility as an explanation for the genesis of this hadith is not very convincing, however; such “conditional appraisals” within the biographical-dictionaries (‘X was reliable until Y occurred’) were often retrospective attempts to rationalise perceived disparities in the quality of a given tradent’s transmissions, rather than accurate historical memories of senility, etc.²⁵ Shanavas’ reliance upon one such conditional appraisal (“when he was old, Hisham’s memory suffered quite badly”) to account for the hadith in question is thus dubious—especially given its salient propaganda value.²⁶

Gautier Juynboll (2007)

In his 2007 *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*, Gautier Juynboll claimed that the tradition of ‘Ā’ishah’s marital age contained a kernel of historical truth, despite the additions by various later tradents:

‘Ā’isha may also be assumed to have said (paraphrase):

- “The Prophet married me when I was six years old and he consummated the marriage when I was nine”,

cf. Mz., XI, no. **15956**, XII, nos. 16809, 16871, 16881, 17066, 17106, 17249, 17751 (*kh*, 63/44, *m*, II, pp. 1038 f, *d*, *s*, *q*, Ṭay., no. 1454, IS VIII, pp. 40-3#, Ḥum., no. 231, IḤ., VI, pp. 118, 280). ‘Ā’isha’s statement is transmitted in a great variety of different wordings for which the early *fuqahā’* and their respective PCLs may be held responsible. For a survey of these wordings, see IS and *m*. In the MC dealing with ‘Ā’isha’s marriage to the Prophet there is one tradition in which the month in which the marriage was concluded is mentioned as Shawwāl, see Thawrī under no. 16355.²⁷

²⁴ These ascriptions are implausible (see chs. 2-3 of the present work), but Shanavas fails to demonstrate this.

²⁵ Eerik Dickinson, *The Development of Early Sunnite Ḥadīth Criticism: The Taqdim of Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (240/854-327/938)* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2001), 99.

²⁶ See Chapter 3 of the present work.

²⁷ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 75.

Juynboll seems to have failed to consistently apply his own methodology here,²⁸ for Hišām is the clear “common link” of this tradition—a parental “single strand” links him to ‘Ā’iṣah, whilst the independent transmissions via the likes of al-’A’maš and ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq are clearly “dives”. *Pace* Juynboll himself, a straightforward Juynbollian analysis should conclude that this tradition was put into circulation by Hišām.²⁹

Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Munajjid (2009)

In a 2009 *fatwā* on ‘certainty regarding the age of the Mother of the Believers, ‘Ā’iṣah’ (published on his IslamQA website), the Salafite scholar Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Munajjid—or someone under his general supervision—argued that the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age is undeniably “sound” (*ṣaḥīḥ*).³⁰ After quoting a question from a lay-believer concerning the age of ‘Ā’iṣah at the time of her marriage, al-Munajjid (or whoever) responded thus:

The determination of the age of ‘Ā’iṣah at the time of the engagement of the Prophet to her at “six years”, and at the time of the marital consummation with her at “nine years”, is not [open to] independent reasoning (*ijtihād*) for the scholars to judge its correctness from its incorrectness. On the contrary, it is a historical transmission solidly established by that which assures its soundness and [makes a] necessity of assenting to it.³¹

Two broad arguments are then outlined by al-Munajjid to substantiate this claim, the first comprising ten points and the second five points. The first is concerned with establishing the authenticity of the marital-age hadith, and largely consists of citations and descriptions of the different versions thereof:

²⁸ See Chapter 1 of the present work.

²⁹ Perhaps Juynboll was relying upon his unfalsifiable “sixth sense” in this instance: Gautier H. A. Juynboll, ‘On the Origins of Arabic Prose: Reflections on Authenticity’, in Gautier H. A. Juynboll (ed.), *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale & Edwardsville, USA: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), 174-175.

³⁰ Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Munajjid *et al.*, Q&A # 124483 (*Taḥqīq fī ‘Umr ‘Umm al-Mu’minīn ‘Ā’iṣah ‘inda-mā tazawwaja-hā al-Nabiyy*), *IslamQA* (31st/January/2009): <https://islamqa.info/ar/124483>.

³¹ *Ibid.* (my translation). For an alternative English translation, see *id.*, Q&A # 124483 (‘Age of the Mother of the Believers ‘Ā’iṣah when the Prophet married her’), *IslamQA* (30th/December/2013): <https://islamqa.info/en/124483>.

1. This information derives from the explicit statement of no less than the subject of the issue herself (*qawl ṣāhibat al-ša'n nafsi-hā*), 'Ā'īṣah (rather than from the speech of someone about her or the description of some historian or traditionist), in an autobiographical hadith recorded by al-Buḵārī and Muslim.
2. This transmission (*riwāyah*) from 'Ā'īṣah was transmitted in the soundest of books after the Quran, namely, the collections of al-Buḵārī and Muslim.
3. This transmission (*riwāyah*) came from 'Ā'īṣah from a number of transmission-paths (*ṭuruq*), and *not* from a single transmission-path, contrary to that which is proclaimed by some of the ignorant—namely:
 - 3.1. The famous transmission-path (*al-ṭarīq al-mašhūrah*) is that from the transmission (*riwāyah*) of Hišām b. 'Urwah b. al-Zubayr, from his father 'Urwah, from 'Ā'īṣah; this is amongst the soundest of the transmissions (*min 'aṣaḥḥ al-riwāyāt*); 'Urwah b. al-Zubayr was the most knowledgeable of people concerning 'Ā'īṣah, because she was his maternal aunt.
 - 3.2. Another transmission-path (*ṭarīq*) from the transmission (*riwāyah*) of al-Zuhrī, from 'Urwah b. al-Zubayr, from 'Ā'īṣah, is recorded by Muslim.
 - 3.3. Another transmission-path (*ṭarīq*) from the transmission (*riwāyah*) of al-'A'maš, from 'Ibrāhīm, from al-'Aswad, from 'Ā'īṣah, is transmitted by Muslim.
 - 3.4. Another transmission-path (*ṭarīq*) from Muḥammad b. 'Amr, from Yaḥyá b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥātim, from 'Ā'īṣah, is transmitted by 'Abū Dāwūd.
 - 3.5. The contemporary Salafite scholar 'Abū 'Ishāq al-Ḥuwaynī has collected the names of those who corroborated (*al-mutābi'in*) 'Urwah b. al-Zubayr, and they were: al-'Aswad b. Yazīd, and al-Qāsim b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, and al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. 'abī Bakr, and 'Amrah bt. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, and Yaḥyá b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥātim.
 - 3.6. Likewise, he collected the names of those who corroborate (*al-mutābi'in*) Hišām b. 'Urwah in the transmission (*riwāyah*) of this hadith, and they were: Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī and 'Abū Hamzah Maymūn, the *mawlá* of 'Urwah.
 - 3.7. Then he named the transmitters from Hišām b. 'Urwah amongst the people of Madinah (at which point, al-Munajjid emphasises to the reader that this hadith was amongst those transmitted by Hišām in Madinah as well), and

they were: 'Abū al-Zinād 'Abd Allāh b. Ḍakwān, and his son 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Zinād, and 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá b. 'Urwah.

3.8. And amongst the people of Makkah: Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah.

3.9. And Jarīr b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḍabbī: from amongst the people of Rayy.

3.10. And amongst the people of Basrah: Ḥammād b. Salamah, and Ḥammād b. Zayd, and Wuhayb b. Kālid, and others.

3.11. At this point, al-Munajjid directs the reader to two online video-lectures by al-Ḥuwaynī on this subject, before clarifying that all of this enumeration is necessary to repudiate the specious argumentation (*ṣubḥah*) of some of the ignorant, who argue that (1) Hišām b. 'Urwah was alone in his transmission and (2) that Hišām was senile in his old age. However, the truth is that this accusation (*tuhmah*) was articulated by no-one but 'Abū al-Ḥasan b. al-Qaṭṭān in his *Bayān al-Wahm wa-al-'Iḥām*, in which he was mistaken.

3.12. al-Munajjid then quotes al-Ḍahabī from his *Mīzān* to the effect that, even though Hišām's memory diminished somewhat in his old age, he never become senile or confused (despite the report of Ibn al-Qaṭṭān to the contrary).

4. Likewise, the story of the marriage of the Prophet to 'Ā'īṣah when she was nine years old was transmitted by people other than 'Ā'īṣah, amongst those who were her contemporaries (*mimman 'adrakū-hā*) and were more knowledgeable than others regarding her:

4.1. Ibn Ḥanbal transmitted a hadith in his *Musnad*, from Muḥammad b. Bišr, from Muḥammad b. 'Amr, from 'Abū Salamah and Yaḥyá, who narrated about how Kāwlah bt. Ḥakīm advised the Prophet to marry 'Ā'īṣah—a hadith including the elements about 'Ā'īṣah's age.

5. This is what 'Ā'īṣah related about herself, and the transmitters related it from her; this was agreed upon by the historians who wrote biographies of 'Ā'īṣah, between which there is no disagreement concerning that. This matter was not the object of independent reasoning (*ijtihād*), for, after a person has spoken directly about themselves (as 'Ā'īṣah did), there is no room for anyone's independent reasoning (*ijtihād*).

Thereafter, al-Munajjid (or whoever) proceeds to cite indirect, chronological evidence to support this hadith (i.e., reports or statements about ‘Ā’iṣah birth-date, death-date, and age at death that are consistent with the hadith), thereby inverting the common strategy employed by Muslim skeptics of the same hadith.

Some of al-Munajjid (or whoever)’s argumentation is particularly weak—for example, he cherry-picks the quote from al-Ḍahabī in which he rationalises or excuses Hiṣām’s senility, downplaying numerous contrary reports recorded elsewhere by both al-Ḍahabī and Ibn Ḥajar. Additionally, in citing expedient reports and statements about ‘Ā’iṣah’s birth-date, death-date, and age at death in the (mostly late) “historical sources”, al-Munajjid (or whoever) is simply begging the question against skeptics: such reports and statements are consistent with having been generated or contaminated by precisely the marital-age hadith, and thus cannot simply be assumed to be independent corroboration therefor. Such a suspicion is supported by recent scholarship on the provenance of biographical data in *rijāl* works, which suggests that the birth-dates, death-dates, and ages of early figures were actually inferred from *’isnāds*, rather constituting some kind of independent set of information with which to evaluate *’isnāds*.³²

In general, however, al-Munajjid makes a good point: contrary to the criticisms of some Muslim modernists and progressives (who wrongly assume that the *’isnāds* of this hadith all converge upon Hiṣām), the marital-age hadith is supported by more than four independent *’isnāds* and is thus at least *maṣhūr*, if not *mutawātir*. It is difficult to see how anyone taking a sanguine approach to Hadith and other early Islamic sources could resist such evidence—only a skeptic invoking some kind of Schachtian spread of *’isnāds* is in any position to reasonably differ with al-Munajjid on this matter and overcome his objections.³³

Kecia Ali (2010)

³² See the references given in the section on Brown’s criticism of Juynboll in ch. 1 of the present work.

³³ For more on the spread of *’isnāds*, see ch. 1 of the present work.

In her 2010 monograph *Marriage and Slavery in Early Islam*, Kecia Ali notes the following in a discussion on marriageability and age in historical Islamic jurisprudence:

The age of nine appears sporadically as a minimum for consummation, majority, or both. This is presumably tied to the hadith, quoted by Shāfiʿī, that put ʿĀʾisha’s age at nine when Muhammad consummated their marriage. It is possible, though I think highly unlikely, that the causal link goes the other way—that is, that the hadith are an attempt to justify consummation from the age of nine.³⁴

Ali’s comment illustrates that it is at least *possible* to conceive of potential motives behind the fabrication of the marital-age hadith, even though her specific scenario is admittedly “highly unlikely”. Ali herself does not elaborate on why it is unlikely, but regardless, the scenario remains a possibility.

Hussein Abdul-Raof (2012)

In his 2012 monograph *Theological Approaches to Qur'anic Exegesis*, Hussein Abdul-Raof reiterated the common appeal to chronological discrepancies described above, arguing that ʿĀʾiṣah may have actually been engaged at age fourteen and married at age eighteen.³⁵ Furthermore, Abdul-Raof is seemingly under the impression the hadith of ʿĀʾiṣah’s marital age was exclusively transmitted via Hiṣām, and adduced the aforementioned biographical reports alleging his unreliability after he moved from Madinah to Iraq. Abdul-Raof also notes the seeming absence of Madinan tradents in the hadith, and the telling absence of the hadith from the *Muwaṭṭaʾ* of Mālik.³⁶ That said, Abdul-Raof ends by citing a counter-opinion affirming Hiṣām’s reliability, rendering his stance on the hadith’s authenticity somewhat ambiguous.³⁷

³⁴ Kecia Ali, *Marriage and Slavery in Early Islam* (Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 76.

³⁵ Hussein Abdul-Raof, *Theological Approaches to Qur'anic Exegesis: A Practical Comparative-Contrastive Analysis* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2012), 215-217.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 217.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-ʿIdlibī (2013)

In 2013, the Sunnī theologian and traditionist Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn b. ʿAḥmad al-ʿIdlibī argued that the hadith of ʿĀʾiṣah’s marital age—exemplified in the versions recorded by al-Bukārī, Muslim, and Ibn Ḥanbal—does not contain a genuine historical memory, insofar as her age is concerned.³⁸ His analysis was nuanced: al-ʿIdlibī acknowledged that the *ʿisnāds* underpinning these hadiths are *ṣaḥīḥ* (per traditional Islamic scholarship), and rejects the erroneous charge that Hiṣām alone transmitted (*tafarrada*) it.³⁹ Instead, he argued that the hadith contradicts a chronology inferable from various other reports, which imply that ʿĀʾiṣah was married at age fourteen and cohabited at age eighteen. Consequently, al-ʿIdlibī concluded that the *matns* of the marital-age hadith contain an error (*wahm*), which he attributes to the potential forgetfulness (*nisyān*) of ʿĀʾiṣah herself, in her old age.⁴⁰ In short, the hadith is *ṣaḥīḥ* in terms of transmission but *ṣāḍq* in terms of content, because it conflicts with established historical evidence (*li-l-qarāʾin al-taʾrīkiyyah al-ṭābitah*).⁴¹

As noted already, the chronology of the *sīrah* and related material is notoriously incoherent and spurious, and the criticisms above apply here also. As for his internal analysis of the hadith in question, al-ʿIdlibī was constrained by his trust in *ʿisnāds*: in the absence of the Schachtian notion of spreading *ʿisnāds*, he was forced to conclude that the hadith—with its multiple, seemingly-independent *ʿisnāds*—must derive from ʿĀʾiṣah herself and, hence, that the erroneous content therein must originate with her.

Asma Afsaruddin (2013)

³⁸ Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn b. ʿAḥmad al-ʿIdlibī, *ʿUmr al-Sayyidah ʿĀʾiṣah Yawm al-ʿAqd wa-Yawm al-Zawāj* (first published online in 2013, then updated in 2014, then again in 2015), available online: <http://shanfaraa.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Hadith-on-age-of-Aisha.pdf>. For a summary of the history and context of this essay, and a translation as well, see Arnold Yasin Mol, ‘Aisha (ra): The Case for an Older Age in Sunni Hadith Scholarship’, *Yaqeen* (3rd/October/2018): <https://app.yaqeen.io/arnold-yasin-mol/aisha-ra-the-case-for-an-older-age-in-sunni-hadith-scholarship>.

³⁹ ʿIdlibī, *ʿUmr al-Sayyidah ʿĀʾiṣah*, p. 2.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

In her 2013 article “Ā’isha bt. Abī Bakr’ in the third edition of Brill’s *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Asma Afsaruddin seems to imply that the dominant version of the marital-age hadith is erroneous, and that ‘Ā’iṣah was actually engaged at age nine and cohabited at age twelve:

‘Ā’isha entered the prophet Muḥammad’s home as his wife about three years before the *hijra* (migration) to Medina, when she was around six or seven years of age, according to most sources. She had previously been promised in marriage to a young relative of hers named Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im, whose family was still pagan. When the prophet Muḥammad, through the good offices of his aunt Khawla bt. Ḥakīm, expressed interest in ‘Ā’isha after the death of his wife Khadīja, in 619, Abū Bakr consulted with the boy’s family. By that time, Jubayr’s parents were against the idea of their son marrying into a Muslim family and the engagement fell through. ‘Ā’isha’s marriage to the Prophet was not consummated until approximately three years later, when she was either nine or ten years old, as the majority of sources report (Ibn Sa’d, 8:58–62; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, 8:139). However, according to the chronology of Ibn Khallikān (d. 681/1282) she would have been nine at her marriage and twelve at its consummation (*Wafayāt al-a’yān*, 3:16), a chronology also supported by a report from Hishām b. ‘Urwa recorded by Ibn Sa’d (d. 230/845; *al-Ṭabaqāt*, 8:61).⁴²

Afsaruddin offers two pieces of evidence for this possible revision, although neither are particularly convincing in and of themselves: an alternative chronology inferred from a late source (see above), and a single version that contradicts nearly all other versions of the hadith.

Jonathan Brown (2015)

In a 2015 interview with Ernie Rea on the BBC, Jonathan Brown predicted that a Motzkian *’isnād-cum-matn* analysis of the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age would likely demonstrate the authenticity of the historical memory contained therein:

Brown: “I think it’s an authentic report – in fact, I think the scholar whose work does represent the state of the field in Western scholarship on

⁴² Asma Afsaruddin, “Ā’isha bt. Abī Bakr’, in Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Everett Rowson, *et al.* (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, THREE (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2007-present), online.

hadith—the German scholar Harald Motzki—if you were to take his methods of dating hadiths, I think you could date that report of Aisha back to actually about the time of Aisha.”

Rea: “A contemporary report, you’re saying?”

Brown: “Yeah, I think that’s accurate. I think even from a non-Muslim perspective it’s a good argument that that goes back to Aisha.”⁴³

In a more recent (2018) online address, Brown asserts that this hadith is “incredibly widely transmitted,” and also implies that no plausible “agenda” for fabricating such a hadith is discernible. Brown further asserts that even if Hišām (the common link) is discounted, a “sahih isnad” still remains (via al-Zuhrī instead). Finally, Brown claimed that “all” of the “variant matns” of this tradition “perfectly” line up with “specific isnads,”⁴⁴ and subsequently elaborated:

Given the massive evidence for a common link and the perfect distribution of matn variances along isnad variances, I think using Motzki’s isnad-cum-matn analysis would conclude that, even for Western scholars using the historical critical method, this report could be dated back to the late 600’s CE – to Aisha’s own lifetime.⁴⁵

This is precisely the task undertaken in Chapter 2 of the present work, where Brown’s prediction is put to the test. On the basis of the *’isnād-cum-matn* analysis undertaken therein, it looks as though Brown’s prediction was wrong: the results indicate that the marital-age hadith cannot be reconstructed as far back as her primary student ‘Urwah, nor his student al-Zuhrī. The reconstruction ostensibly terminates at Hišām, two generations after ‘Ā’īshah.

Yasmin Amin (2016)

⁴³ Jonathan A. C. Brown, interview with Ernie Rea ‘Hadith’, *Beyond Belief*, on *BBC Radio 4* (29th/June/2015): <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b06084kv>.

⁴⁴ Jonathan A. C. Brown, published as a public comment on his Facebook webpage (9th/August/2018): <https://www.facebook.com/jonathanacbrown/posts/10156584464609850>.

⁴⁵ *Id.*, published as a public comment on his Facebook webpage (10th/August/2018): https://www.facebook.com/jonathanacbrown/posts/10156584464609850?comment_id=10156585790664850&reply_comment_id=10156585915604850&comment_tracking=%7B%22tn%22%3A%22R9%22%7D.

In a paper presented at the 2016 BRAIS Conference in London, Yasmin Amin argues—in a similar vein to Moin and Shanavas—that the hadith of ‘Ā’ishah’s marital age is dubious; on the basis of a conflicting chronology inferable from reports recorded in certain “Islamic history books, Sīra works, and biographical dictionaries”, Amin concludes that ‘Ā’ishah “was at least nineteen years old at the time of her marriage.”⁴⁶ In addition to these external chronological considerations, Amin supersedes Shanavas in identifying Iraq as the place where Hišām created this hadith: beyond the reports concerning Hišām’s unreliability and senility in Iraq, Amin also identified the Iraqi background of most of his tradents, the dubious reputations of some among them, and, perhaps most striking of all, the absence of this hadith in the earliest Madinan collections (such as the *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* of Ibn ‘Ishāq, the *Muwatta’* of Mālik, and the *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* of al-Wāqidī).⁴⁷ In explaining the genesis of this hadith, Amin initially suggested a scribal error and a consequent scribal rationalisation, in conjunction with her other arguments about ‘Ā’ishah’s true marital age:

The most plausible explanation is an error in recording or copying. In Arabic her age would be written as six and ten or nine and ten instead of sixteen or nineteen. By omitting the word ten only once, would result in the narrative becoming incomprehensible, as both situations would not make sense. If the original Ḥadīth reported that ‘A’isha was sixteen when she was married and nineteen when the marriage was consummated and the ‘ten’ was lost from the first age reference, why would the Prophet wait thirteen years to consummate the marriage? If it was lost from the second mention of her age, it would make even less sense as she would have been older at the time of the marriage than at the time of its consummation. In either case, the next copyist might have omitted the second word denoting ‘ten’ to make sense of the report.⁴⁸

In addition to this hypothesis, Amin has suggested a tentative alternative: given certain indications of nine as the ideal marital age within Zoroastrian culture,⁴⁹ and given the

⁴⁶ Yasmin Amin, ‘Age is just a number or is it? ‘A’isha’s age between Ḥadīth and History’ – paper presented at the Third Annual Conference of the British Association for Islamic Studies, *Panel 3: Historical and Literary Approaches to Ḥadīth*, the British Association for Islamic Studies, London (11th/April/2016), 1.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 2-3. In addition to her paper and presentation, Amin has elaborated her views to me via private correspondence (beginning in November of 2017).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁹ Touraj Daryaee, *Sasanian Persia: The Rise and Fall of an Empire* (London, UK: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2009), 60; also see Carolyn G. Baugh, *Minor Marriage in Early Islamic Law* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2017), 28-29.

ex-Sasanid character of Iraq and the Persian backgrounds of many of the Iraqi tradents of the hadith in question, it is possible that ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age was revised to conform to a lingering Zoroastrian or Persian tradition. On this view, the fabricator of the hadith was either a paid-off Hišām or one of the Persian tradents.⁵⁰

A drawback of Amin’s initial research was her small sample size: her analysis of the *’isnāds* of the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age was limited to a handful of versions recorded by al-Buḵārī, in which dives around Hišām—and their telling provisional provenance—cannot be detected. Amin’s appeals to the chronology of the *sīrah* and Hišām’s failing memory are also questionable (given the reservations outlined above), but her other points are extremely prescient: the near-total predomination of Iraqi tradents below Hišām is striking and, together with the silence of the earliest Madinan collections, certainly suggests an Iraqi provenance for the hadith. In this respect, Amin’s conclusions—and to some degree, those of Shanavas and Abdul-Raof—find dramatic confirmation in my own research. I differ principally in my explanation of the *motive* or *cause* behind Hišām’s creation, which I now see as sectarian (i.e., proto-Sunnī, anti-Šī‘ī propaganda) rather than cultural (i.e., some kind of Persian or Zoroastrian influence).⁵¹

J. J. Little (2016 ff.)

For several years, I have been considering the possibility that the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age might be inauthentic. This hypothesis was explored more formally in my Masters dissertation at the University of Oxford (2016-2018), in which I initially posited a Madinan and Zubayrid context for the hadith’s creation, with Hišām, al-Zuhrī, and their master (and father, in the case of the former) ‘Urwah. My reasoning ran as follows.

⁵⁰ This hypothesis was conveyed to me via personal correspondence (in November of 2017).

⁵¹ The main problem with this hypothesis is the fact that Hišām—the proposed originator of the hadith in question—was not a *mawlá* with a Persian or Zoroastrian heritage, and although Amin suggests the possibility that he was commissioned to fabricate the hadith by some unknown agent intent on formally integrating their indigenous customs and ideals into Islam, I am not aware of any evidence that Hišām was buyable in this way. Still, there may be a version of this idea—as an influence on Hišām rather than a motive per se—that is salvageable; see Chapter 3 of the present work.

Early Muslim political claimants in the first and second *fitnahs* seem to have derived legitimacy from their female familial connections to Muḥammad—and ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, nephew of ‘Ā’iṣah and leader of the Zubayrid faction in the second *fitnah*, was no exception. Thus, it seems likely that the Zubayrids would have been under pressure, or were at least incentivised, to emphasise the importance of ‘Ā’iṣah to bolster the Zubayrid cause—and, given that they were wont to fabricate or interpolate reports in their favour, it is plausible that they did so in this regard also. This could explain the initial appearance of reports about the uniqueness of ‘Ā’iṣah and her status as the favourite wife of the Prophet. On this view, one of the ways that these propagandists emphasised the specialness of ‘Ā’iṣah was by trumpeting her distinctive status as Muḥammad’s only virgin wife—an emphasis that would have been accentuated by the circulation of reports concerning her young marital age. It is thus unsurprising that the hadith in question is associated overwhelmingly with a locus of Zubayrid tradents—namely, Hiṣām and his father ‘Urwah, the latter of whom was the brother of ‘Abd Allāh and the nephew of ‘Ā’iṣah.⁵²

In November of 2017, however, I was swayed by Amin’s argument for an Iraqi provenance, rather than a Madinan one, or in other words: the hadith was probably created by Hiṣām in early Abbasid Iraq, not ‘Urwah in Zubayrid Madinah. This poses a problem of *relevancy* for my initial Zubayrid hypothesis. The need for a hadith like this would have been greatest *during* the Zubayrid rebellion, which ended when Hiṣām was still a child—it would make more sense coming from ‘Urwah in Madinah under the Zubayrids, rather than Hiṣām in Iraq under the Abbasids. That said, there is a precedent for the fabrication of pro-Zubayrid hadiths by later sympathisers, i.e., “later attempts to redeem the memory of their lost cause as a just one.”⁵³ On the other hand, Hiṣām’s hadith is somewhat indirect for such a cause—this does not preclude a pro-Zubayrid motive, but it does seem less plausible in the light of the hadith’s more direct utility for legitimising ‘Ā’iṣah in her own right. In other words, the intended pro-Zubayrid message or implications of this ‘Ā’iṣah-validating hadith would only be immediately obvious during the Zubayrid rebellion, i.e., a rebellion led by ‘Ā’iṣah’s family. By contrast, who by the Abbasid period would connect the dots between ‘Ā’iṣah

⁵² For more on all of this see, see Chapter 3 of the present work.

⁵³ Mehdy Shaddel, “Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and the Mahdī: Between propaganda and historical memory in the Second Civil War”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 80, Number 1 (2017), 1.

being good with the Zubayrids being good by association? And if the connection would no longer be obvious, why then would someone fabricate this hadith for that purpose? If the marital-age hadith indeed originated with Hišām in Abbasid-era Iraq (as opposed to originating with ‘Urwah in Zubayrid-era Hijaz), then a retrospective Abbasid-era pro-Zubayrid political motive seems like a stretch.

Carolyn Baugh (2017)

In her 2017 monograph *Minor Marriage in Early Islamic Law*, Carolyn Baugh observes that “numerous debates still swirl about the authenticity of the narrative” of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age,⁵⁴ and elaborates in a footnote:

Some of these issues include: The relater, Hishām ibn ‘Urwa, was alleged to have been senile at the time of his narration. Although it is not impossible that Mālik would have accepted the content of the report given early practice, Mālik is one of many jurists who did not rely on this text, which does not in fact occur in any of the early books of jurisprudence except for that of al-Shāfi‘ī and, shortly after him, ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s *Muṣannaf*. Even later jurists such as Ibn Taymīya and Ibn al-Qayyim shy away from it, although it is used by Ibn Qudāma before them.⁵⁵

Although Baugh herself does not really weigh in on the authenticity debate, she nevertheless summarises several of the key issues raised by other authors above, and also adds a new point: the seeming absence of this hadith from early Islamic law, where we might otherwise expect its usage.

Once again, there are many others who have commented upon this issue—but since they tend to repeat points already raised by those cited already, I have opted, for the sake of brevity, to omit them.

⁵⁴ Baugh, *Minor Marriage in Early Islamic Law*, 43.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, n. 101.

Outline of the Present Work

The present work explores the origins and development of the marital-age hadith through six chapters: **firstly**, a preliminary summary of the relevant methodological debates in Hadith Studies, culminating in a defence of at least a version of the *'isnād-cum-matn* analysis; **secondly**, a comprehensive *'isnād-cum-matn* analysis of the hadith, including a systematic reconstruction of its earlier redactions and an identification of those responsible therefor; **thirdly**, a combined form-critical, geographical, and historical-critical analysis of the origins of the hadith, identifying its probable provenance in the sectarian milieu of mid-8th-Century Iraq; **fourthly**, a summary of the hadith's spread and diversification across the Abbasid Caliphate, accounting for the provenance of all of the extant versions thereof; **fifthly**, a summary of the hadith's reception by Sunnī Hadith scholars, including both criticisms of some versions thereof and its overall achievement of canonical status; and **sixthly**, a summary of the broader implications of all of this research for both the modern methods and debates in Hadith Studies, on the one hand, and early Islamic history and the development of Hadith, on the other.

Chapter 1: Methods & Debates

That Hadith are unreliable—that any given *matn* cannot be taken at face value as an accurate datum from the 1st Islamic Century, and that any given *ʿisnād* cannot be taken at face value as an accurate record of a *matn*’s provenance—cannot be seriously contested, for multiple reasons. **Firstly**, there is an overwhelming prior probability based upon the ubiquity of fabrication and pseudepigraphy in Late Antique and Mediaeval religio-historical (pagan, Jewish, and Christian) ascriptions.⁵⁶ **Secondly**, there is the high frequency of contradictions within the Hadith corpus,⁵⁷ which necessitates the occurrence of a huge amount of fabrication, interpolation, and/or

⁵⁶ For this point (at least applied to early Islamic epistles), see Michael A. Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma: A Source-critical Study* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 51. For the prior probability in question, see Richard C. Carrier, *On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason to Doubt* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014), 214 ff.

⁵⁷ Examples of contradictions are legion, but for at least some (within the Hadith corpus construed broadly, including biographical and exegetical Hadith), see: Ignáz Goldziher (ed. Samuel M. Stern and trans. Christa R. Barber & Samuel M. Stern), *Muslim Studies, Volume 2* (Albany, USA: State University Press of New York, 1971), *passim*; Arthur Jeffery, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qurʾān* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2007), 2-4; Schacht, *Origins*, *passim*; Meir J. Kister, ‘The *Sīrah* Literature’, in Alfred F. L. Beeston, Thomas M. Johnstone, John D. Latham, Robert B. Serjeant, & Gerald R. Smith (eds.), *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 362-364; Alan Jones, ‘The *Maghāzī* Literature’, in Alfred F. L. Beeston, Thomas M. Johnstone, John D. Latham, Robert B. Serjeant, & Gerald R. Smith (eds.), *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 351; Michael A. Cook, *Muhammad* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1983), 63-64, 72-73; *id.*, ‘Magian Cheese: An Archaic Problem in Islamic Law’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 47, Number 3 (1984), *passim*; Patricia Crone, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam* (Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press, 1987), esp. ch. 9; John Burton, *An Introduction to the Ḥadīth* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 1994), 143; Patricia Crone, ‘Two legal problems bearing on the early history of the Qurʾān’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 18, Number 1 (1994), *passim*; Francis E. Peters, *Muhammad and the Origins of Islam* (Albany, USA: State University of New York University Press, 1994), 296, n. 17; Albrecht Noth & Lawrence I. Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A Source-critical Study*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, USA: The Darwin Press, Inc., 1994), *passim*; Herbert Berg, ‘Ibn ʿAbbās in ʿAbbāsīd-Era *Tafsīr*’, in James E. Montgomery (ed.), *ʿAbbāsīd Studies: Occasional Papers of the School of ʿAbbāsīd Studies* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters Publishers & Department of Oriental Studies, 2004), 139; Claude Gilliot, ‘Reconsidering the authorship of the Qurʾān: is the Qurʾān partly the fruit of a progressive and collective work?’, in Gabriel S. Reynolds (ed.), *The Qurʾān in Its Historical Context* (London, UK: Routledge, 2008), 98; Parvaneh Pourshariati, *Decline and Fall of the Sasanian Empire: The Sasanian-Parthian Confederacy and the Arab Conquest of Iran* (London, UK: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2008), ch. 3; Gabriel S. Reynolds, *The Qurʾān and Its Biblical Subtext* (London, UK: Routledge, 2010), *passim*; Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet*, 99-106; Andrew L. Rippin, ‘The Search for Ṭuwā: Exegetical Method, Past and Present’, in Carlos A. Segovia & Basil Lourié (eds.), *The Coming of the Comforter: When, Where, and to Whom? Studies on the Rise of Islam and Various Other Topics in Memory of John Wansbrough* (Piscataway, USA: Gorgias Press, 2012), 401-409; Christopher Melchert, ‘Basra and Kufa as the Earliest Centers of Islamic Legal Controversy’, in Behnam Sadeghi, Asad Q. Ahmed, Adam Silverstein, & Robert G. Hoyland (eds.), *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts: Essays in Honor of Professor Patricia Crone* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015), esp. 180-186.

mutation and, therefore, skepticism towards any given hadith.⁵⁸ **Thirdly**, there is the ubiquity of fabrication and interpolation—both reported⁵⁹ *and* demonstrable⁶⁰—in the Hadith corpus, which again casts doubt upon the rest of the corpus.⁶¹ **Fourthly**, there is the rapid, extreme mutation and growth of reports that evidently took place over the course of a century or more of oral transmission,⁶² which means that any given *matn*—regardless of the *’isnād*—is likely at best heavily distorted and at worst obliterated beyond its original form.⁶³ **Fifthly**, there is the belated emergence of Hadith as a genre and corpus, largely during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE, which straightforwardly precludes the authenticity of most ascriptions to the 7th Century CE.⁶⁴ This chronology is the core of what we can call the Revisionist model of Hadith development (along with the premise that Hadith underwent a process of progressive retrojection, from Followers, to Companions, to the Prophet), which is inferable from and corroborated by multiple, independent points of evidence, including: dissonant reports attesting to early, generic notions of *sunnah* (as opposed to a specifically Prophetical one), and early, vague notions of Prophetical *sunnah* (as opposed to one concretely embodied by Hadith); dissonant reports attesting to the origins of the *’isnād*

⁵⁸ For this point, see Christopher Melchert, ‘The Life and Works of al-Nasā’ī’, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Volume 59, Issue 2 (2014), 406, n. 130.

⁵⁹ See the section on Motzki’s criticism of Cook, below.

⁶⁰ E.g., Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, *passim*; Schacht, *Origins*, *passim*; Gautier H. A. Juynboll, *Muslim tradition: Studies in chronology, provenance and authorship of early ḥadīth* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983), *passim*; Pavel Pavlovitch, *The Formation of the Islamic Understanding of Kalāla in the Second Century AH (718–816 CE): Between Scripture and Canon* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015), *passim*.

⁶¹ For this point, see: Schacht, *Origins*, 149; Patricia Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law: The origins of the Islamic patronate* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 33; Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet*, 300, n. 56.

⁶² For the mutation in question, see especially: Patricia Crone, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1980), ch. 1; *ead.*, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 31–33; *ead.*, *Meccan Trade*, esp. ch. 9; *ead.*, ‘Muhammad and the origins of Islam. By F. E. Peters’, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Volume 5, Issue 2 (1995), 270–271; Hiroyuki Yanagihashi, *Studies in Legal Hadith* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2019), *passim*. Also see Hawting, ‘Harald Motzki: Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz’, 142, and Daniel Brown, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 87 ff.

⁶³ For this point, see Cook, *Muhammad*, 67, but much more forcefully argued in Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law*, 31–34, and *ead.*, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2004), 126, n. 3. For a similar point, see Robert G. Hoyland, ‘Writing the Biography of the Prophet Muhammad: Problems and Solutions’, *History Compass*, Volume 5, Number 2 (2007), 587.

⁶⁴ For this point, see Michael A. Cook, ‘Eschatology and the Dating of Traditions’, *Princeton Papers in Near Eastern Studies*, Volume 1 (1992), 24, and Andrew L. Rippin, ‘Tafsīr Ibn ‘Abbās and criteria for dating early tafsīr texts’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 18, Number 2 (1994), 61. Also see the section on ‘The relationship between CLs and their hadiths’, below.

during the second *fitnah*, and the spread and generalisation of the *ʿisnād* and Hadith during the middle of the 8th Century CE; the suspicious abundance of early long-lived tradents (which makes sense in light of the belated rise of *ʿisnāds*); the fact that most of the earliest “common links” operated during the 8th Century CE (which makes sense in light of the belated rise of *ʿisnāds*); the scarcity of Hadith in the earliest Islamic documents; the ascription-pattern of early Islamic epistles (which are almost all attributed to Followers, just as this model predicts); the reported and inferable massive growth of Hadith during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE; the inferable and observable belated use of Hadith, and especially Prophetical Hadith, in early Islamic jurisprudence; the relative paucity of Prophetical Hadith in the earliest Hadith collections, versus their numerousness in the later Hadith collections; and the existence of both non-Prophetical and Prophetical versions of the same hadiths.⁶⁵

These general conclusions are primarily the result of the work of Ignáz Goldziher, Joseph Schacht, Gautier Juynboll, Michael Cook, and Patricia Crone, although many others have contributed relevant evidence therefor. For all of these reasons (and indeed, for any one of them), skepticism obtains: any given *matn* was likely created long after the relevant events and/or distorted in the course of transmission, and any given *ʿisnād* was likely created long after anyone could remember the actual transmission-history of the *matn* in question.

There was quite a range of specific *mechanisms* or *processes* involved in the creation and alteration of Hadith, which are often attested even in traditional Islamic

⁶⁵ For all of this and more, see especially: Joseph F. Schacht, ‘A Revaluation of Islamic Traditions’, *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Number 2 (1949), 143-154; *id.*, *Origins*, *passim*; Gautier H. A. Juynboll, ‘The date of the great *fitna*’, *Arabica*, Volume 20, Fascicule 2 (1973), 142-159; Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, *passim*; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, esp. ch. 1; Cook, ‘Magian Cheese’, *passim*; Gautier H. A. Juynboll, ‘Muslim’s Introduction to his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, translated and annotated with an excursus on the chronology of *fitna* and *bidʿa*’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 5 (1984), 305-308; Patricia Crone & Martin Hinds, *God’s Caliph: Religious authority in the first centuries of Islam* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986), ch. 5; Gautier H. A. Juynboll, ‘Some new ideas on the development of *sunna* as a technical term in early Islam’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 10 (1987), 100 ff.; Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, ch. 2; Gautier H. A. Juynboll, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods illustrated on the basis of several woman-demeaning sayings from *ḥadīth* literature’, *al-Qanṭara*, Volume 10, Issue 2 (1989), 354; *id.*, ‘The Role of *Muʿammarūn* in the Early Development of the *Isnād*’, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Volume 81 (1991), *passim*; *id.*, ‘Some notes on Islam’s first *fuqahā*’ distilled from early *ḥadīth* literature’, *Arabica*, Volume 39 (1992), *passim*; *id.*, ‘Nāfiʿ, the *mawlā* of Ibn ʿUmar, and his position in Muslim *Ḥadīth* Literature’, *Der Islam*, Volume 70 (1993), *passim*; *id.*, ‘Early Islamic society as reflected in its use of *isnāds*’, *Le Muséon*, Volume 107 (1994), 154-155; Robert G. Hoyland, *In God’s Path: The Arab Conquests and the Creation of an Islamic Empire* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015), 137; Pavel Pavlovitch, ‘The Origin of the *Isnād* and al-Mukhtār b. Abī ʿUbayd’s Revolt in Kūfa (66-7/685-7)’, *al-Qanṭara*, Volume 39, Number 1 (2018), 17-48.

scholarship. The *matns* of hadiths were variously: crafted by oral storytellers and preachers—who valued education, edification, and entertainment above all else—from a common stock of material (and reformulated through successive retellings)⁶⁶; inferred into the mouths of early authorities by later jurists, theologians, and exegetes (and updated in the same way according to changing doctrines and understandings)⁶⁷; speculated into being, or created through honest guesswork⁶⁸; formulated by sectaries, regionalists, and others as symbolic or ideal expressions of correct doctrine (i.e., as a kind of convention)⁶⁹; and (mendaciously) fabricated and interpolated by propagandists and apologists for all manner of political, sectarian, regional, and other

⁶⁶ See Cook, *Muhammad*, 66-67; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 11-14, 17, 23, 74; Crone, *Meccan Trade*, esp. ch. 9; Andrew L. Rippin, 'The Function of *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* in Qur'ānic Exegesis', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 51, Issue 1 (1988), 19; Crone, 'Two legal problems', 13-20; Gregor Schoeler (ed. James E. Montgomery & trans. Uwe Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad: Nature and Authenticity* (New York, USA: Routledge, 2011 [originally published in 1996]), 12 and ch. 2, esp. 74, 79; Harald Motzki, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis. A Debate', in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 265-266; Robert G. Hoyland, 'History, fiction and authorship in the first centuries of Islam', in Julia Bray (ed.), *Writing and Representation in Medieval Islam: Muslim horizons* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2006), 31-32; Andreas Görke, Harald Motzki, & Gregor Schoeler, 'First Century Sources for the Life of Muḥammad? A Debate', *Der Islam*, Volume 89, Issue 1-2 (2012), 28-29; Andrew G. Bannister, *An Oral-Formulaic Study of the Qur'an* (Lanham, USA: Lexington Books, 2014), 45-46, 60 (n. 19); Andreas Görke, 'Authorship in the *Sīra* literature', in Lale Behzadi & Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila (eds.), *Concepts of Authorship in Pre-Modern Arabic Texts* (Bamberg, Germany: University of Bamberg Press, 2015), 84; *id.*, 'Between History and Exegesis: The Origins and Transformation of the Story of Muḥammad and Zaynab bt Ḡaḥṣ', *Arabica*, Volume 65, Issue 1-2 (2018), 36, 62; Harald Motzki, 'Historical-Critical Research of the *Sīra* of the Prophet Muhammad: What Do We Stand to Gain?', in Josephine van den Bent, Floris van den Eijnde, & Johan Weststeijn (ed.), *Late Antique Responses to the Arab Conquests* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2022), 83. Likewise, Neal Robinson suggested (in his lecture 'Muhammad, "The Prophet like Moses", and the editing of the Qur'an', presented at the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford, on the 23rd of October, 2018) that the storytellers were responsible not just for most of the *sīrah*, but for much of the Sunnī Hadith canon (including the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*). There has been a tendency to equate these storytellers with the *quṣṣās* of later Islamic memory, but this is clearly a mistake, since the *quṣṣās* were not storytellers per se; cf. Lyall R. Armstrong, *The Quṣṣās of Early Islam* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2017), *passim*.

⁶⁷ See Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, 56; James Robson, 'The *Isnād* in Muslim Tradition', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Variorum, 2004), 166/18 (citing Caetani); *id.*, 'Ibn Ishāq's use of the *Isnād*', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Volume 38, Issue 2 (1956), 449; Harris Birkeland, *Old Muslim Opposition against Interpretation of the Koran* (Oslo, Norway: I Komrnisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1955), 37; Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law*, 33; Herbert Berg, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam: The Authenticity of Muslim Literature from the Formative Period* (Richmond, UK: Curzon Press, 2000), 213; Wael B. Hallaq, *The Origins and Evolution of Islamic Law* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 78; A. Kevin Reinhart, 'Juynbolliana, Gradualism, the Big Bang, and Ḥadīth Study in the Twenty-First Century', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 130, Number 3 (2010), 422; Yanagihashi, *Studies*, *passim*.

⁶⁸ This was explicitly proposed by Robinson in his aforementioned 2018 presentation.

⁶⁹ See Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, 55-56; Schacht, 'Revaluation', 146; Birkeland, *Old Muslim Opposition*, 37; Berg, 'Ibn 'Abbās in 'Abbāsīd-Era *Tafsīr*', in Montgomery (ed.), *'Abbasid Studies*, 132 (citing Gilliot); Rippin, 'The Search for Ṭuwā', in Segovia & Lourié (eds.), *The Coming of the Comforter*, 410; Jonathan A. C. Brown, *Hadith: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, UK: Oneworld Academic, 2018), 76.

causes (whether for personal gain or the greater good).⁷⁰ Meanwhile, the *ʿisnāds* for these *matns* were variously: inferred into being (for example, on the basis of sectarian or regional scholarly lineages, or on the basis of family genealogies)⁷¹; produced through simple guesswork or speculation (i.e., based on what *might* or *could* have happened)⁷²; articulated as symbolic or ideal expressions of the communal or scholarly lineage for correct doctrines (especially along sectarian or regional lines)⁷³; and (mendaciously) fabricated for all manner of reasons—to defend a school, sect, or the like; to attack another school, sect, or the like; to provide the fabricator with a shorter *ʿisnād*; to bolster an existing *matn* or corroborate an existing *ʿisnād*; to justify a revised or corrected *matn*; to provide the fabricator with a novel *ʿisnād*; and so on.⁷⁴ Existing *ʿisnāds* were also altered or interpolated, whether through dishonesty, inference, or some other process: skipping contemporaneous sources in favour of directly citing the sources of these sources, or even older sources; omitting or dropping undesirable tradents, or replacing them with suitable alternatives; adding tradents in order to bridge gaps in transmission, or to supplant the initial source with an even earlier source; and so on.⁷⁵

The relative weight of these various processes or mechanisms is still up for debate, but the general falsity of Hadith entails that some combination thereof—or something like them—must have been at play in the formation of the extant corpus during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE. Regardless, skepticism obtains regarding Hadith: as it stands, any given hadith (*ṣaḥīḥ* or otherwise) should be presumed to be inauthentic or unreliable, until the contrary can be demonstrated.

Can the contrary ever be demonstrated? Of course. The Criterion of Dissimilarity has always been used even by skeptics of Hadith to identify early or archaic material

⁷⁰ See especially Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, *passim*, and Schacht, *Origins*, *passim*.

⁷¹ See Caetani, Robson, Birkeland, Berg, and Reinhart, cited above. Also see Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 67, and Görke *et al.*, ‘First Century Sources’, 28.

⁷² This is already plausibly encompassed in Robinson’s proposal, but for a more explicit statement to this effect, see Harald Motzki (trans. Frank Griffel & Paul Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 52.

⁷³ This seems like a corollary of what was mentioned or suggested above by Goldziher, Schacht, and Brown, and comes across strongly in Birkeland and Berg (in his summary of Gilliot).

⁷⁴ Schacht, *Origins*, *passim*; Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, ch. 11; Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law*, 23 ff.; Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, intro.

⁷⁵ See Schacht, Cook, Crone, and Juynboll, cited above.

preserved in some *matns* (regardless of their *ʿisnāds*),⁷⁶ as have early, independent, corroborating non-Muslim sources.⁷⁷ But absent archaic-looking *matns* or independent corroboration (both of which are rare), is there any way to establish that a given hadith predates the time of the earliest extant collection in which it appears? In particular, can *ʿisnāds* be used, in any way, to date hadiths? Again, the answer is obviously yes: skeptics have long used *ʿisnāds* to date Hadith, in the following ways.

Dating by Ascription Type

It is not uncommon, when one encounters a doctrine expressed in a Prophetical hadith, to find the same doctrine expressed in a Companion hadith and/or a Follower hadith as well. In many instances, the *matn* (or a key wording therein) is the same, and sometimes, even the *ʿisnād* is the same—the only difference being the level at which the *ʿisnād* stops (i.e., with a Follower, or a Companion, or the Prophet). In other words, it is common to find the same doctrines, and even the same hadiths, with differing levels of ascription.⁷⁸

There are two ways to explain this phenomenon: either the hadiths are all genuine, with Followers expressing views and phrases inherited from the Companions, and Companions expressing views and phrases inherited from the Prophet, with instances of each having been preserved; or else doctrines and even specific wordings have undergone multiple retrojections back to different levels of authority.

⁷⁶ For example, concerning the *Ṣaḥīfat Yaṭrib*, see: Patricia Crone & Michael A. Cook, *Hagarism: The making of the Islamic world* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 7; Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 7; *ead.*, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 32. For another example, concerning archaic notions of *hijrah*, see *ead.*, “The First-Century Concept of *Hiġra*”, *Arabica*, Tome 41, Issue 3 (1994), 352-387. For a final example (employing the Criterion of Embarrassment in particular), concerning early failed prophecies, see Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet*, 172-176.

⁷⁷ Crone & Cook, *Hagarism*, ch. 1; Cook, *Muhammad*, 73-74; Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, ch. 1; etc.

⁷⁸ E.g., Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, 148-149 (incl. n. 3); Schacht, ‘Revaluation’, 147; *id.*, *Origins*, *passim*; Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, ch. 11; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, *passim*; Cook, ‘Magian Cheese’, *passim*; Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 29, 124 (nn. 67-68); Juynboll, ‘Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, *passim*; Melchert, ‘Basra and Kufa’, in Sadeghi *et al.* (eds.), *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts*, 178; Görke, ‘Authorship in the *Sīra* literature’, in Behzadi & Hämeen-Anttila (eds.), *Concepts of Authorship in Pre-Modern Arabic Texts*, 73. Also see the numerous examples exposed by the ICMA, cited below.

Various debates have arisen over this issue,⁷⁹ but these can be bypassed by simply reiterating the relevant established background knowledge on the evolution of Hadith types and then applying the Criterion of Dissimilarity. Firstly, our background knowledge: Hadith are absent from the earliest Islamic epistles and other plausible Umayyad-era ascriptions, where only Quranic citations and vague invocations of *sunnah* predominate; Follower Hadith overwhelmingly predominate in *fiqh* and collections from the middle of the 8th Century CE; Companion Hadith predominate in *fiqh* at the turn of the 9th Century CE; and Prophetical Hadith overwhelmingly predominate in *fiqh* and collections from the 9th Century CE onwards.⁸⁰ Moreover, the prioritisation of Prophetical Hadith over all other types of as a source of doctrine was formalised in the legal theory of al-Šāfi‘ī (d. 204/820), which became generalised rapidly over the course of the 9th Century CE.⁸¹ In other words, the citational patterns of Hadith in the 8th and 9th Centuries CE reveal a broad tendency in terms of preference, from Follower Hadith, to Companion Hadith, to Prophetical Hadith. Moreover, in conjunction with the initial absence of Hadith altogether, this is consistent with the successive emergence (i.e., creation) of Hadith types, or in other words, the progressive retrojection of Hadith—first to Followers, then to Companions, then to the Prophet, as a general tendency.⁸²

With all of that in mind, we can now turn to the Criterion of Dissimilarity, which is a staple of modern historical research. The principle is simple: a report that clashes with the orthodoxy or standards of the preservers or collectors of the report is unlikely to have been created by them—for, had they created it, they probably would have done so in accordance with said orthodoxy or standards. Likewise, when two reports conflict, with one being consistent with the orthodoxy or standards of the preservers

⁷⁹ E.g., Harald Motzki (trans. Marion H. Katz), *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002), 18-22; Uri Rubin, *The Eye of the Beholder: The life of Muḥammad as viewed by the early Muslims: A Textual Analysis* (Princeton, USA: The Darwin Press, Inc., 1995), 235-237; Harald Motzki, ‘The Prophet and the Cat: On Dating Mālik’s *Muwaṭṭa’* and Legal Traditions’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 22 (1998), 54; *id.* (trans. Sonja Adrianovska & Vivien Reid), ‘The Prophet and the Debtors. A Ḥadīth Analysis under Scrutiny’, in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 135.

⁸⁰ Schacht, ‘Revaluation’; *id.*, *Origins, passim*; Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma, passim*; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, esp. ch. 1; Crone & Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, esp. ch. 5; Juynboll, ‘The development of *sunna*’; Christopher Melchert, ‘Traditionist-Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 8, Number 3 (2001), 383-406.

⁸¹ In addition to all of the above, see Ahmed El Shamsy, *The Canonization of Islamic Law: A Social and Intellectual History* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

⁸² Again, see all of the above (other than El Shamsy, who rejects this explanation, as discussed below).

or collectors thereof, and the other conflicting therewith, the latter is more likely to be authentic: the latter is unlikely to have been created by the bearers of orthodoxy and standards and thus probably predates them, whereas the former is consistent with having been created in accordance with the emerging or established standard or orthodoxy. In other words, it is more likely that an adherent of an orthodoxy or standard would create the report in accordance therewith than that they would create a report conflicting therewith.⁸³

All of this has important implications for both the *relative* and *absolute* dating of Hadith, based on ascription types. To begin with, it generates a relative dating specifically for parallel versions of the same hadith (which is just to say, it allows us to adjudicate in certain specific cases between *variants* of the same text): when one version of a hadith is ascribed to a later authority, and another version is ascribed to an earlier authority, the former is more likely to represent the original version of the hadith—i.e., more likely to be earlier—than the latter. The reason is simple: the general tendency in early Islamic approaches to Hadith is to prefer earlier and earlier authorities, to the point that the proto-Sunnī Hadith partisans, traditionists, and Hadith critics (operating from around 800 CE onwards) who preserved most of the extant Hadith corpus explicitly prized Prophetical hadiths over Companion hadiths, and Companion hadiths over Follower hadiths. There was thus a long-term, systemic incentive to retroject hadiths back to earlier authorities (and conversely, a pressure against reattributing hadiths from earlier authorities to later authorities), such that the Follower version of a hadith is more likely to be earlier than the Companion or Prophetical version, and the Companion version is more likely to be earlier than the Prophetical version (all else being equal). Or, as Schacht famously put it: “in general we can say: the more perfect the *isnād*, the later the tradition.”⁸⁴

Exactly the same reasoning applies to hadiths with parallel *munqaṭiʿ/mursal* and *muttaṣil* versions, or in other words: the version of a given hadith with a broken or discontinuous *ʿisnād* is more likely to reflect the original—i.e., to be earlier—than the version with an unbroken or continuous *ʿisnād*. Once again, there was a tendency—

⁸³ For example, see Christopher Melchert, *Ahmad ibn Hanbal* (Oxford, UK: Oneworld Publications, 2006), 28.

⁸⁴ Schacht, ‘Revaluation’, 147. Also see: *id.*, *Origins*, 156-157, 165; Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 108; Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 29; Juynboll, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 368-370; *id.*, ‘Some notes on Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 300; Cook, ‘Eschatology’, 24; Melchert, ‘Basra and Kufa’, in Sadeghi *et al.* (eds.), *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts*, 178.

culminating in al-Šāfiʿī and the Hadith critics—to prefer *ittiṣāl*, making it much more likely that a *mursal* or *munqaṭiʿ* hadith was updated or interpolated into a *muttaṣil* hadith, rather than *vice versa*. As Schacht again famously put it, “*mursal* traditions are, generally speaking, older than traditions with full *isnāds*.”⁸⁵

The Criterion of Dissimilarity also provides a kind of absolute dating, based on when certain Hadith types were sought after, and when they lost force. Provisionally, we can date Follower hadiths recorded in later works back to the 8th Century CE at least (since we would not expect anyone to bother creating Follower hadiths any later), and we can date Companion hadiths recorded in later works back to the turn of the 9th Century CE at least (since we would not expect anyone to bother creating Companion hadiths any later), but we cannot—all else being equal—date Prophetical hadiths any earlier than the works in which they are cited (since the incentive or pressure to create Prophetical hadiths existed all the way up until the time of the works in question). In other words, as a rule of thumb,⁸⁶ Follower hadiths predate c. 800, Companion hadiths predate c. 820, and Prophetical hadiths could be as late as whatever work they appear in.⁸⁷

The same reasoning applies to *munqaṭiʿ* or *mursal* hadiths: they probably date to the turn of the 9th Century CE at the latest, since anyone creating a hadith any later than that would not be expected to create one with an *ʾisnād* that would be automatically rejected or disparaged. As Crone put it: “Similarly, a perfect *isnād* is likely to be later than an imperfect one. After all, the better a tradition conforms to the criteria evolved in the time of Shāfiʿī, the more likely it is to date from the time in which these criteria were evolved.”⁸⁸ As with parallel hadiths with different levels of ascription, so too with parallel hadiths with broken and unbroken *ʾisnāds*.

Arguments from Silence

⁸⁵ Schacht, *Origins*, 39. Also see: Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 29; Juynboll, ‘Some notes on Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 300; Cook, ‘Eschatology’, 24.

⁸⁶ Cf. Gerald R. Hawting, ‘The role of the Qurʾān and *ḥadīth* in the legal controversy about the rights of a divorced woman during her ‘waiting period’ (*ʿidda*)’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 52, Issue 3 (1989), 430-445, who argues that, in one particular early debate, a Prophetical hadith is inferably earlier than a conflicting (i.e., counter) Companion hadith.

⁸⁷ Cf. the summary in Juynboll, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 369, which he describes as being “in order of absolute chronology”, even though he fails to add dates.

⁸⁸ Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 29.

It is well-known that hadiths that appear in extant collections (say, in the 9th and 10th Centuries CE) frequently fail to be cited in earlier reported and extant doctrinal debates (say, in the 8th Century CE), even when said hadiths have some direct bearing on the debate in question. If the extant hadiths had existed all along (as purported by their *ʿisnāds*), then it is reasonable to expect that they would have been cited in the relevant debates. Thus, the non-citation of such hadiths is evidence for their initial non-existence, and for the creation thereof at some point between the initial debates and the extant collections. As Schacht put it: “The best way of proving that a tradition did not exist at a certain time is to show that it was not used as a legal argument in a discussion which would have made reference to it imperative, if it had existed.”⁸⁹ This is Schacht’s famous *argumentum e silentio*, which he used to pinpoint the growth of Hadith over the course of the 8th and 9th Centuries CE.

Perhaps the most systematic criticism of this method came from Harald Motzki, who enumerated several reasons for doubting the validity of conclusions derived thereby:

1. Not all the texts that Schacht compares are elements of a legal discussion which would necessarily demand the naming of all usable traditions.
2. A number of compilations are only textual selections.
3. The volume of the surviving sources is only a fraction of the originally existing stock.
4. Given the relatively prolonged regionally separated development of jurisprudence and Tradition, which—as Schacht himself assumes and this work will show—still prevailed in the first half of the second/eighth century, the lack of a text in a regional source says little as long as we have no contemporary sources from the other centers.⁹⁰

There are several problems here. Firstly, Motzki turns Schacht’s appeals to probability into a rigid principle or deduction, requiring only the observation of the possibility to the contrary to refute: thus, Motzki speculates that traditionists or jurists may not have cited all of the Hadith that they knew, as if this constitutes a reason to reject Schacht’s conclusion. This is at best uncharitable: Schacht’s arguments from silence are reasonably understood as *hypotheses* posited to explain the peculiarities of the evidence, not *deductions*. Consider the following example:

⁸⁹ Schacht, *Origins*, 140.

⁹⁰ Motzki (trans. Katz), *Origins*, 21-22. Also see Zafar Ishaq Ansari, ‘The Authenticity of Traditions: A Critique of Joseph Schacht’s Argument *E Silentio*’, *Hamdard Islamicus*, Volume 7, Number 2 (1984), 51-61.

Tradition originating between “Ibrāhīm Nakha‘ī” and Ḥammād

Āthār A.Y. 206: Abū Ḥanīfa—Ḥammād—Ibrāhīm—Ibn Mas‘ūd did not follow a certain practice. *Āthār Shaib.* 37: Abū Ḥanīfa—Ḥammād—Ibrāhīm did not follow it; the same is related from Ibn Mas‘ūd. But there is a tradition from the Prophet to the contrary. *Āthār A.Y.* 207: Abū Ḥanīfa—Ḥammād—‘Abdalkarīm—with an *isnād* going back to the Prophet, that he did follow it. *Āthār Shaib.* 37: Shaibānī—‘Umar b. Dharr Hamdānī—his father—Sa‘īd b. Jubair—Ibn ‘Abbās—Prophet: a tradition in favour of the practice, polemically directed against the other opinion. The same tradition with another Iraqi *isnād* occurs in *Tr. II*, 19 (t).⁹¹

Schacht can be reasonably understood here to be positing the growth of Hadith as the explanation for the peculiarity of Ḥammād transmitting “Not X” from ‘Ibrāhīm (possibly a stand-in for “ancient Iraqi doctrine”), but also transmitting “X” from the Prophet: this can be explained by the creation of the latter as a counter to the former, i.e., subsequent to the former. This would explain why ‘Ibrāhīm or the early authorities of Kufah were seemingly ignorant of—or seemingly defied—an explicit Prophetical hadith to the contrary that was circulating in Kufah (*viz.*, because the hadith did not yet exist), and would also conform with the general pattern of the evolution of ascription types (with Follower Hadith appearing earlier and Prophetical Hadith appearing later). In short, this is a matter of probability: Motzki merely observing that other explanations are *possible* does not suffice as a refutation thereof.

There is however an important caveat here, noted by Crone long before Motzki: it is not unreasonable to expect that early traditionists or jurists would have disregarded *inexpedient* hadiths:

Polemical authors do however often ignore evidence which they dislike, sometimes asserting that no traditions contrary to their own opinion exist at all – an assertion with much the same import as the ‘no doubt’ of modern scholars. The absence of a well known tradition accordingly carries little weight when the tradition goes against the author's views.⁹²

In other words, the non-citation of an inexpedient hadith is arguably not telling as to whether it existed at the time. This is an important restriction on such arguments from silence.

⁹¹ Schacht, *Origins*, 141.

⁹² Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law*, 30.

Another problem with Motzki's criticism of Schacht's arguments from silence is the implausibility of his counter-scenario: it is certainly *possible* that an early jurist or traditionist in a debate might *not* have cited a hadith that would have constituted stronger evidence for his position or won them the argument, even though they knew the hadith. It is possible—but is it *probable*? For example, if a Prophetic hadith (later cited by al-Šaybānī) was circulating amongst the authorities of Kufah before 'Abū Ḥanīfah, is it plausible that 'Abū Ḥanīfah would not have known about it? And if he had known about it, is it plausible that he would have passed over a Prophetic precedent for his position in favour of a mere Follower precedent (in this case, from al-Ša'bī)? It is certainly *possible*, but it does not seem *probable*, especially given the common invocation of *sunnat al-nabiyy* already at that time.⁹³ Schacht's explanation—that the hadith was created at some point between 'Abū Ḥanīfah and al-Šaybānī—thus seems reasonable.⁹⁴

Schacht's case for the early non-citation of expedient Hadith (contrasted with their later citation) as evidence for their growth is further strengthened in some cases by the fact that there are explicit *contemporaneous* declarations about the absence of any other hadiths on a given matter, and explicit *contemporaneous* observations that expedient hadiths would have been furnished had they existed:

The evidence collected in the present chapter has been chosen with particular regard to this last point, and in a number of cases one or the other of the opponents himself states that he has no evidence other than that quoted by him, which does not include the tradition in question. This kind of conclusion *e silentio* is furthermore made safe by *Tr. VIII*, 11, where Shaibānī says: '[This is so] unless the Medinese can produce a tradition in support of their doctrine, but they have none, or they would have produced it.'⁹⁵

In short, Schacht's explanation of such instances of silence are frequently reasonable, and cannot be overturned merely by speculating that some jurists and traditionists were keeping hidden aces up their sleeves.

⁹³ For the development of *sunnah*, see: Schacht, *Origins*, part I, ch. 7; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, ch. 1; Crone & Cook, *God's Caliph*, ch. 5; Juynboll, 'The development of *sunna*'.

⁹⁴ Schacht, *Origins*, e.g., 143.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 140.

A further issue with Motzki's criticism concerns his observation that the failure of an early writer (say, in Madinah) to cite an expedient hadith recorded in later sources but ascribed to a different region (say, Kufah) does not imply the non-existence of the hadith in question at the time of said writer. This criticism is completely reasonable, but also redundant, given that Crone already articulated it several years earlier:

The main shortcoming of this method, however, is that it cannot be properly used until it is too late. Given the voluminous nature of Shāfi'ī's works, the absence of a particular tradition may well be taken to show that it was still unknown in his time; but the development of Ḥadīth after Shāfi'ī is of limited importance for the evolution of substantive law, and before Shāfi'ī the literature is too scanty and above all too local in character for silences to count. The fact that Mālik fails to cite or argue against Iraqi traditions on a particular subject evidently does not mean that the Iraqi traditions did not yet exist. It is true that the lawyers of the old schools had begun to take note of each others' traditions a good deal before they were forced to adopt a common stock of Prophetic traditions and that polemics between them can occasionally be used to establish negative points; but in general other people's traditions still were not sufficiently compelling for this to be the case. Mālik's work can perhaps be used to show that certain Medinese traditions still did not exist in Medina. But before Mālik the argument from polemical silence can rarely be used at all.⁹⁶

In fact, *Schacht himself* had already acknowledged this limitation with his method at the outset, as in the following:

Tradition originating between Auzā'ī and Mālik

See above, p. 70. It is stated there that Abū Yūsuf does not yet know a tradition from the Prophet, although Mālik, his contemporary, does. Whereas this calls for caution in the use of the argument *e silentio*, it also shows that the tradition was not yet widely known in the time of Mālik.⁹⁷

By contrast, many of Schacht's examples of the growth of Hadith are of (for example) earlier Madinans failing to cite expedient hadiths known to later Madinans, when the hadiths in question purport to derive via the peers of the earlier Madinans, or even from these earlier Madinans themselves.⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law*, 30.

⁹⁷ Schacht, *Origins*, 142.

⁹⁸ Also see Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law*, 30, 123 (n. 64).

Another criticism by Motzki is his appeal to lost sources,⁹⁹ which is understandable: if the silence being appealed to in a Schachtian argument is the non-citation of an expedient hadith by merely *one* debater or polemicist, it is easy to imagine various alternative explanations therefor. For example, the debater or polemicist could have failed to incorporate a useful hadith simply by accident,¹⁰⁰ or else omitted it due to space constraints, or because they rejected the hadith as unreliable,¹⁰¹ or because they hated the transmitter, etc. It is only when *numerous* sources all omit a hadith that we can reasonably preclude such idiosyncrasies *overall*, leaving the non-existence of the hadith as the probable explanation. In other words, it is only a *deafening* silence that counts.

Some of these confounding factors can be accounted for, or do not always apply. For example, if someone fails to cite an expedient hadith from someone else whom they reportedly hated, but they otherwise transmitted numerous hadiths from that person, then their hatred therefor cannot be invoked as an explanation for their non-citation of that particular hadith. Likewise, if someone fails to cite a *superior* hadith but still cites an *inferior* hadith for a doctrine or point, then space constraints or similar considerations cannot be invoked—we would still expect a polemicist or debater to cite the better hadith, if it was available to them at the time. Likewise, if early users of Hadith precisely accepted or rejected Hadith based upon their expediency (as was indeed the case in the early regional schools), then rejection of the authenticity of an expedient hadith—as an explanation for someone’s failure to cite it—does not seem very plausible.

However, there is always the chance of some kind of accident having occurred, such as someone simply forgetting to cite an expedient hadith. Therefore, it may be the case that a single non-citation of an expedient hadith is only *weak evidence* for the non-existence of the hadith at that time, whereas multiple or numerous non-citations would be *strong evidence* therefor.

⁹⁹ Likewise, Ansari, ‘Authenticity’, 58: “he might have known a tradition, but owing to the fact that not the entire quantity of traditions known to the jurists has come down-to us, especially of the jurists of the relatively early period of Islam, there is no mention of those traditions in the works presently available to us, even though those traditions might once have existed.”

¹⁰⁰ Likewise, *ibid.*: “the person concerned might have heard and then forgotten the tradition in question”.

¹⁰¹ Likewise, *ibid.*: “he might have heard that tradition, but might not have considered it authentic”.

And yet, the silences themselves are numerous, even if each instance of a silence is often only a single source failing to cite an expedient hadith. In other words, we would have to posit that early jurists and others *repeatedly* forgot to cite expedient hadiths in their debates and polemics, which seems like a stretch.¹⁰² Schacht's explanation thus seems preferable (when the other confounding factors are accounted for), or as he put it: "the well-known incompleteness of our sources does not invalidate the **general conclusions**."¹⁰³

Even if we concede for the sake of argument that the probability of the mere non-citation of an expedient hadith versus its non-existence is intrinsically equal or undetermined, there are extrinsic factors favouring the latter over the former: the pattern identified by Schacht is *consistent* with the growth of Hadith over the course of the 8th and 9th Centuries CE, which is corroborated by reports about the massive growth of Hadith at that time,¹⁰⁴ the absence of Hadith in the earliest Islamic documents and plausible ascriptions,¹⁰⁵ etc. To put it another way, the Revisionist model entails that Hadith must have grown in large numbers during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE, and the silences or non-citations identified by Schacht are consistent with such a growth. Thus, Schacht's growth explanation in any given instance is corroborated in general by other evidence attesting to the massive growth of Hadith in the same time period, giving us a reason to prefer Schacht's explanation over the alternatives.

Moreover, occasional examples of traditionists and jurists failing to cite expedient and proximate Hadith that can be shown to have existed at that time on some other grounds (of which there are assuredly some) do not affect the general expectation, which is to say: we are still justified *in general* in our expectation that traditionists and jurists would have cited expedient hadiths circulating in their circles, given all of the considerations outlined above. Schacht himself made a similar point:

The evidence must, in the nature of things, be cumulative, and whilst care has been taken to verify the presence or absence of the traditions in question in or from the sources available, an occasional oversight or the

¹⁰² I owe thanks to Mahā. for alerting me to this point.

¹⁰³ Schacht, *Origins*, 140. Emphasis mine.

¹⁰⁴ E.g., Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 29; Crone & Hinds, *God's Caliph*, 71; Hoyland, *In God's Path*, 137.

¹⁰⁵ E.g., Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, *passim*; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 38-39; Crone & Hinds, *God's Caliph*, ch. 5.

well-known incompleteness of our sources does not invalidate the general conclusions.¹⁰⁶

In short, when a hadith that later claims to derive from the notables of a given region is not cited by an earlier jurist or polemicist in the same region, even though the hadith would have been expedient for them as a justification or defence of their doctrine, it is reasonable to infer, at least provisionally, that the hadith did not yet exist (at least as later claimed).

An addition to all of the above, a further criticism has been articulated by Ahmed El Shamsy,¹⁰⁷ directed against Schacht and others who “sought to explain the apparent fact that prior to this time [i.e., c. 800 CE], Muslim jurists disregarded Hadith that later on were widely accepted.”¹⁰⁸ According to El Shamsy, this explanation only works by assuming, in an anachronistic or even essentialist fashion, that early jurists were like later jurists:

And far from representing an exercise of “imaginative nerve,” as Crone called it, interpreting the initial marginality of Hadith in law as evidence of their nonexistence at that time displays a curious lack of imagination: it assumes that Hadith reports, if available, could be used only in the way that classical jurists used them, namely, as one of the primary canonical sources of the law. This approach thus reads an essentialized notion of Islamic law, developed on the basis of later literature, back into the early Islamic period and solves the resulting dissonance by postulating the wholesale invention of prophetic traditions.¹⁰⁹

Against such a view, El Shamsy proposes his own, more “convincing” explanation for “the “sudden” integration of Hadith into law from the second/eighth century onward”—namely, “their new significance and role – that is, their canonization.”¹¹⁰ In other words, most of the extant Hadith corpus—or perhaps, at the very least, most of the extant Prophetical canon—existed all along, but it was only after the spread of al-Šāfi‘ī’s legal theory (in which the overriding authority of Prophetical Hadith was

¹⁰⁶ Schacht, *Origins*, 140.

¹⁰⁷ El Shamsy’s other criticisms against the Revisionist model more broadly, such as his appeal to parsimony and to Motzki’s scholarship, are automatically dealt with in the sections on Motzki and Brown, below.

¹⁰⁸ El Shamsy, *Canonization*, 7.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

‘canonised’) that a systematic effort was made to collect and cite Prophetic hadiths.¹¹¹ Naturally, this would invalidate most Schachtian arguments from silence.

Pace El Shamsy, Schachtian arguments from silence—and the Revisionist model of Hadith development more broadly—do not require an anachronistic or essentialist view of early jurists in order to infer or posit the initial non-existence of Hadith (or certain types of Hadith). On the contrary, the expectation that, for example, expedient Prophetic hadiths should have been cited in 8th-Century works and compositions follows from our established background knowledge of their general veneration even at that time. We have ample evidence that *sunnah* was a concept that existed all along (probably even in pre-Islamic Arabia), *and* that the notion of *sunnat al-nabiyy* in particular became popular during the Umayyad period.¹¹² Are we really to believe that early Muslims invested their great men (and the Prophet in particular) with *general authority* or *exemplary status* all along (or in the Umayyad period in particular), *and* that literally thousands upon thousands of opinions and precedents were recorded from the Prophet, then from the Companions as well, then from the Followers as well, and circulated amongst major figures in all the major centres, *but* that early caliphs, governors, judges, jurists, theologians, and rebels (unto the middle of the 8th Century CE) *disregarded most or even all of them* in their proclamations or work? This seems most unlikely.¹¹³ Once again, the simple explanation in general, at least in the case of intra-regional failures to cite expedient hadiths, is that the hadiths in question did not yet exist.

Dating by Polemical Context and “Counter-Traditions”

If a hadith perfectly—i.e., suspiciously—matches a specific context long after the time of the authority featured in the hadith, that is a reason to suspect that the hadith was

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, e.g., 223.

¹¹² For the development of *sunnah*, see: Schacht, *Origins*, part I, ch. 7; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, ch. 1; Crone & Cook, *God’s Caliph*, ch. 5; Juynboll, ‘The development of *sunna*’.

¹¹³ Additionally, Pavlovitch comments (via personal correspondence): “If we take the *kalala* traditions as an example, it would be absurd to posit that hundreds of often contradictory traditions about the meaning and legal implications of this term had been in circulation in the first century for no imaginable purpose, only to be suddenly recovered by vying parties of second-century jurists, piecemeal in different times and different centers of learning throughout Iraq and the Hijaz.”

created during or after—i.e., in response to—that later context. This was famously Goldziher’s approach to dating Hadith,¹¹⁴ which Schacht applied more narrowly in his analysis of polemical hadiths and counter-hadiths:

We often find that traditions are formulated polemically with a view to rebutting a contrary doctrine or practice. Some of these counter-traditions, as we may call them, are obvious; others are cleverly disguised but can be detected by analysis and comparison with parallel traditions. Counter-traditions are of course later than the doctrine or practice which they are meant to rebut.¹¹⁵

In fact, when all of the hadiths (and other early Islamic statements) on a hotly-debated topic are collated and compared, a whole *dialectic*—an elaborate back-and-forth sequence of argumentation—sometimes becomes visible.¹¹⁶ If such hadiths truly represent the sayings and precedents of various Followers, Companions, and the Prophet, is it probable that the events of their lives would just so happen to resemble a dialectic, when viewed holistically? For example, is it probable that the sayings and actions of the Prophet would appear to respond to those of later Companions, and that those of Companions would appear to respond those of later Followers? The obvious explanation for such a pattern—and one that would conform to our established background knowledge on the creation of Hadith and the evolution of Hadith types—is that the relevant hadiths are not authentic, and instead represent successive stages in a protracted argument over the topic in question. In other words, the best explanation is that we have *counter-hadiths* being created for polemical reasons, with each new hadith presupposing or responding to what has come before. Such a sequence—which often coincides with the claiming of earlier and earlier authorities, i.e., an arms-race of ascription—can be discerned based on the increasing specificity, or theological or legal sophistication, of the relevant hadiths: the more a debate goes on, the more complex it becomes; and the more complex the debate becomes, the more nuanced and specific will be the counter-hadiths resulting therefrom.

A *relative* chronology can thus be reconstructed (from the simple or vague to the sophisticated or specific), with hadiths being dated before or after each other

¹¹⁴ Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, *passim*.

¹¹⁵ Schacht, *Origins*, 152.

¹¹⁶ See *ibid.*, 152 ff.

depending upon which part of the overall dialectic they correspond to. Moreover, if any part of the debate can be securely dated to a given point in time on, then those hadiths that reflect later parts of the dialectic can thereby be dated *absolutely* to some point thereafter.

Juynboll noticed a similar pattern of increasing sophistication or specificity more generally (i.e., beyond polemical contexts) in older versus newer *matns*, yielding similar conclusions:

It has frequently been observed that — what I call — alternative strands are brought into circulation under the aegis of a Companion who is younger than the Companion of the strand already in existence. This can be substantiated after a diligent comparison is made of the various *matns* supported by the respective strands: *matns* that go under the names of younger Companions are frequently a bit more elaborate, with embellishments, additions, inserted clarifications and the like, whereas the *matns* supported by the strands with the older Companions are often stark, terse and so concise as to be in need of those embellishments, additions and clarifications. The conclusion seems obvious: the more elaborate a *matn*, the later it was probably brought into circulation.¹¹⁷

Thus, *as a broad heuristic*, vague or simple formulations can be presumed to be earlier (i.e., reflective of an earlier period or stage of development) than specific or sophisticated formulations, especially in polemical contexts.

Tradition-Historical Source Analysis

In his 1991 article ‘The *Muṣannaf* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī as a source of authentic *aḥādīth* of the first Islamic century’,¹¹⁸ his 1991 monograph *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz*,¹¹⁹ and his 1991 article ‘Der Fiqh des -Zuhrī’,¹²⁰ Harald Motzki

¹¹⁷ Juynboll, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 364.

¹¹⁸ Harald Motzki, ‘The *Muṣannaf* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣan‘ānī as a source of authentic *aḥādīth* of the first Islamic century’, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Volume 50 (1991), 1-21.

¹¹⁹ Harald Motzki, *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz: ihre Entwicklung in Mekka bis zur Mitte des 2./8. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner, 1991). The English translation by Katz has been cited already.

¹²⁰ Harald Motzki, ‘Der Fiqh des -Zuhrī: die Quellenproblematik’, *Der Islam*, Volume 68, Issue (1991), 1-44. For an English translation by Barbara Paoli and Vivien Reid, see ‘The Jurisprudence of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī: A Source-Critical Study’, in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 1-46.

developed a “tradition-historical source analysis”¹²¹ for analysing and dating Hadith.¹²² This method resembles a kind of *rijāl* criticism, inferring the general reliability of specific tradents and their transmissions from such signs as: the tradent’s citations of prior authorities are not uniform in quantity (as they would be if they were a forger), with some authorities being cited much more than others; the tradent sometimes indicates uncertainty in their memory (which a forger would not do); the tradent sometimes gives their own opinions (rather than projecting all of their own opinions back to earlier authorities, as a forger would do); the tradent sometimes transmits highly imperfect *’isnāds* (rather than perfecting them, as a forger would do); the tradent’s citations of prior authorities are not uniform in character (as they would be if they were a forger), with different authorities being ascribed different vocabulary.¹²³ Thus, if a tradent and his transmissions manifest such signs (or conform to these “criteria of authenticity”, as Motzki would have it),¹²⁴ it can be reasonably inferred that they were honest and reliable, such that their transmissions from prior authorities can be accepted as authentic.¹²⁵ The analysis can then be repeated on all of the material from an earlier tradent within said transmissions, and if successful, all of the material contained therein from an even earlier tradent, and so on. In this way, Motzki’s “tradition-historical source analysis” allows the prospect of reconstructing veritable corpora of Hadith back to early figures.

Motzki’s argumentation only works by assuming a very specific universal pattern or psychology on the part of forgers—namely, that a forger would forge Hadith *all the time* and *uniformly*, such that any instance or indication of honesty and any major difference in quantity or quality in cited sources can be taken as a clear indication that the tradent in question was not a forger. This is at best a profound misunderstanding of the scenarios, mindsets, and mechanisms envisioned by Schacht *et al.* behind the

¹²¹ Harald Motzki, ‘Motzki’s Reliable Transmitter: A Short Answer to P. Gledhill’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 19 (2012), 194.

¹²² This method is *not* the ICMA, despite the confusion of some scholars thereon, e.g., Sean W. Anthony, ‘Crime and Punishment in Early Medina: The Origins of a *Maghāzī*-Tradition’, in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 388, n. 8; Stephen J. Shoemaker, ‘In Search of ‘Urwa’s *Sīra*: Some Methodological Issues in the Quest for “Authenticity” in the Life of Muḥammad’, *Der Islam*, Volume 85 (2011), 266, n. 23. Cf. Motzki *et al.*, ‘First Century Sources’, 44.

¹²³ *Id.*, ‘The *Muṣannaf* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’, 3-5, 8-9, 11, etc. Also see *id.* (trans. Paoli & Reid), ‘The Jurisprudence of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 1-10, 12-15, 19, etc.

¹²⁴ *Id.*, ‘The *Muṣannaf* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’, 11.

¹²⁵ Thus, *id.* (trans. Katz), *Origins*, 287: “secure facts, that is, on sources whose authenticity is assured.”

creation of Hadith,¹²⁶ which certainly do not specifically predict that forgers—even regular forgers—would lie always about absolutely everything. It is completely plausible, for example, that someone would admit to shortcomings or uncertainty in their Hadith, or present something as merely their own conclusion, in one (relaxed or safe) context, and fabricate or interpolate Hadith in another (competitive, polemical, desperate, or high-stakes) context.¹²⁷ The occurrence of the former in no way precludes the latter, and cannot be used to establish the *general* reliability of the tradent. In fact, it may not even establish the reliability of the tradent in those *specific* cases, since occasional admissions of uncertainty are not necessarily indicative of honesty. It was none other than Schacht who suggested that expressions of “uncertainty on a minor point of wording” in the narration of Hadith can be understood as “pretended scrupulousness” intended “to show that the transmission was correct”.¹²⁸

Moreover, the kinds of mechanisms cited by Schacht *et al.* do not specifically predict that forgers—even regular forgers—would fabricate Hadith uniformly, producing equal quantities of false ascriptions to past authorities. It is completely plausible, for example, that a forger would cite some authorities much more than others, due to any number of reasons: the forger spent more time with those authorities¹²⁹; the forger was part of the same family as those authorities; the forger wanted to refute or convert a specific group who venerated those authorities; the forger wanted to cite authorities famed for certain subjects for his forgery on those subjects¹³⁰; and so on. Thus, the heterogeneous citation of authorities by a tradent is not inconsistent with the tradent in question’s being a forger.

Differences in the overall character of ascriptions to specific authorities are also perfectly consistent with forgery. If a forger was active over the course of several years, for example, then it is completely plausible that his preferences and propensities in

¹²⁶ At worst, it is some kind of appeal to human nature—an appeal that can be refuted by simply observing that even frequent liars sometimes tell the truth and sometimes admit ignorance.

¹²⁷ The various mechanisms behind the creation of Hadith have already been outlined, but it bears repeating that Schacht often referred to polemical pressures and contexts in this regard; see *Origins*, e.g., 152, 156, 186.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 156; also see Christopher Melchert, ‘Motzki, Harald. *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools*’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 11, Number 3 (2004), 408.

¹²⁹ Also noted in Paul J. Gledhill, ‘Motzki’s Forger: The Corpus of the Follower ‘Aṭā’ in Two Early 3rd/9th-Century Ḥadīth Compendia’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 19, Number 1/2 (2012), 166-167.

¹³⁰ For a similar point, see Melchert, ‘Motzki’, 407-408.

ascription would have changed over the course of that time period, resulting (at the end of the process) in heterogeneous material, or distinctive sets of ascriptions to different sources.¹³¹ Alternatively, a clever or mildly-informed forger could craft Hadith in accordance with the known tendencies or reputation of his target (for example, an authority known for a certain style, or renowned as a specialist in certain topics).¹³² Alternatively, if a collector only forged one body of material, and accurately transmitted another body of material from one or more other forgers (whether or not he suppressed them), the resulting collection could be heterogenous in general (i.e., reflecting several different sets of citation-tendencies).¹³³ Therefore, Motzki cannot infer, merely from the fact that a given tradent's ascriptions to different authorities have different or unique characters, that the tradent in question was not a forger: such evidence is consistent with either hypothesis, in general.

We have thus dispensed with all of Motzki's so-called "criteria of authenticity", without even reaching what is arguably the greatest problem therewith: Motzki's approach assumes a false dichotomy—between honestly-transmitted authentic material and dishonestly-fabricated inauthentic material—that falls afoul of the extreme mutation problem mentioned at the outset. If even honest or non-mendacious transmission produced false material on a massive scale (as Crone convincingly argued, for example), then Motzki's appeals to indicators of honesty in some tradents provide no guarantee whatsoever as to the reliability or accuracy of their transmissions.¹³⁴

In short, Motzki's "tradition-historical source analysis" and "criteria of authenticity" cannot be used to reasonably establish the reliability of earlier tradents, let alone the date of specific hadiths, let alone their authenticity.

¹³¹ Gledhill, 'Motzki's Forger', 169.

¹³² Melchert, 'Motzki', 407-408; Gledhill, 'Motzki's Forger', 166-168.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 169-170. Motzki ('*Muṣannaḥ*', 9) dismissed such a scenario as mere "speculation" (as if his own notions about forgery are not also speculative—cf. Melchert, 'Motzki', 407, and Gledhill, 'Motzki's Forger', 170, 190). In doing so, he betrays a deep confusion about the dialectic: Motzki's whole argument only works by positing that his cited pattern of evidence *could not* be produced by forgery, so it only requires a speculation about how forgery *could* produce such a pattern to render his conclusion invalid (if it is meant to be deductive) or *ad hoc* (if it is meant to be abductive).

¹³⁴ Hawting, 'Harald Motzki: *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz*', 142; Hoyland, 'Writing the Biography of the Prophet Muhammad', 587; Gledhill, 'Motzki's Forger', 193. Motzki (e.g., 'Motzki's Reliable Transmitter', 195 ff.) protested against the charge that he assumed a dichotomy, but this merely amounts to him clarifying that he does not envisage *perfect* or *verbatim* transmission in the 8th Century CE. By contrast, the process of early, rapid mutation that has been documented by Crone *et al.* involved *profound changes* to reports (in terms of quotes, settings, characters, doctrines, and so on), to the point that even the *basic gist* is changed.

Dating by the “Common Link”

It is well known that many hadiths have “common links” in their *’isnāds*, which is to say: when all of the *’isnāds* of all of the different versions of a given hadith are compared or overlaid against each other, it is often the case that most of the *’isnāds* converge on a common source—usually someone operating in the first two Islamic centuries. This phenomenon has given rise to perhaps the greatest methodological debate in the field of Hadith Studies over the last half-century: can a hadith be traced back to its common link, and thereby be dated to their lifetime?

I have opted to summarise most of the relevant dialectic chronologically, as follows: Schacht’s common link analysis; Azami’s criticism of Schacht; Cook’s criticism of Schacht; Juynboll’s refined common link analysis; Cook and Juynboll’s criticisms of each other; Motzki’s criticism of Juynboll; Motzki’s criticism of Cook; Powers’ criticism of Cook; Görke’s criticism of Cook; Brown’s criticism of Juynboll; Motzki *et al.*’s *’isnād-cum-matn* analysis; Melchert’s criticism of Motzki *et al.*; my own criticisms of Motzki *et al.*; and finally, my own refined *’isnād-cum-matn* analysis. Thereafter, I address the deeper—and equally-vexed—question of the exact relationship between a common link (henceforth, CL) and their hadith.

Schacht’s Common Link Analysis

In his 1950 *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, Schacht famously attempted to date certain hadiths according to “the lowest common link” in their *’isnāds*, whom he regarded as “responsible for the creation of” the hadith “and the fictitious higher part of the *isnād*.”¹³⁵ Thereafter, the hadith “would normally be taken over” from the CL “by one or several transmitters,” such that “the lower, real part of the *isnād* would branch out into several strands.”¹³⁶ (In Schacht’s schematic, the earliest part of the *’isnād*—

¹³⁵ Schacht, *Origins*, 158.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 171.

e.g., the Prophet—is conceptually the top, whilst the latest part of the *ʿisnād*—e.g., a collector like al-Buḵārī—is the bottom; confusingly, some later scholars reversed this metaphor. Additionally, Schacht’s convention of referring to the “common link” or “common transmitter” as “N.N.” never really caught on in subsequent scholarship.) In other words, the *ʿisnād(s)* extending back from the CL to the Prophet should be presumed to be retrojected—i.e., fabricated—by said CL whilst the *ʿisnāds* branching out from them to the extant collections reflect the hadith’s “real” transmission-history. Accordingly, a hadith can be dated as far back as its CL:

The existence of common transmitters enables us to assign a firm date to many traditions and to the doctrines represented by them. This consideration which takes into account the fictitious character of the higher parts of *isnāds*, must replace the uncritical acceptance at their face value of *isnāds*, as far back as the time of the Companions.¹³⁷

Meanwhile, when some of the *ʿisnāds* ascribed via the CL seem superior to others (e.g., when some cite a *majhūl* and others cite a *maʿrūf*), the superior-looking ones should be presumed to be secondary corrections or refinements of the inferior *ʿisnād* originally disseminated by the CL:

The original promoter N.N. would have provided his tradition with an *isnād* reaching back to an authority such as a Companion or the Prophet, and this higher, fictitious part of the *isnād* would often acquire additional branches by the creation of improvements which would take their place beside the original chain of transmitters, or by the process which we have described as spread of *isnāds*. But N.N. would remain the (lowest) common link in the several strands of *isnād* (or at least in most of them, allowing for his being passed by and eliminated in additional strands of *isnād* which might have been introduced later). Whether this happened to the lower or to the higher part of the *isnād* or to both, the existence of a significant common link (N.N.) in all or most *isnāds* of a given tradition would be a strong indication in favour of its having originated in the time of N.N.¹³⁸

In addition to the secondariness of “improvements” to the *ʿisnād* of the CL, Schacht noted here and elsewhere that those *ʿisnāds* purporting to circumvent the CL

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 175.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 171-172.

altogether should be presumed to be secondary retrojections or fabrications at the hands of later transmitters or collectors:

Parallel with the improvement and backward growth of *isnāds* goes their spread, that is the creation of additional authorities or transmitters for the same doctrine or tradition. The spread of *isnāds* was intended to meet the objection which used to be made to ‘isolated’ traditions.¹³⁹

Likewise:

We sometimes find that *isnāds* which consist of a rigid and formal chain of representatives of a school of law and project its doctrine back to some ancient authority, are duplicated by others which go back to the same authority by another way. This was intended as a confirmation of the doctrine of the school by seemingly independent evidence.¹⁴⁰

Despite this “spread” and “artificial growth” of *isnāds*, Schacht maintained that the CL could be used to date hadiths (as noted above). Schacht never gave a specific argument for why *isnāds* preceding and circumventing CL are inauthentic or, conversely, why CLs are authentic—although a clue to his thinking on this issue can be found in the following passage:

Most of the ‘common transmitters’, whose importance for the dating of traditions we discussed at the end of the preceding chapter, occur in the generation preceding Mālik and his contemporary Abū Yūsuf, **and we have found numerous traditions for which other considerations pointed to the same period of origin.** On the other hand, we have found genuine legal traditions from Companions as elusive as those from the Prophet. We have even seen that the traditions pretending to express the doctrines of the Successors, in the second half of the first century A.H., are to a great extent fictitious. Without attempting a rash generalization, we are therefore justified in looking to the first half of the second century A.H. for the origin of the bulk of legal traditions with which the literary period starts.¹⁴¹

According to Schacht, most CLs are from the generation of al-Zuhrī, which is precisely around the time when systematic *isnād*-use actually arose on Schacht’s view (i.e., the

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 166.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 169.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 176.

middle of the 8th Century CE).¹⁴² Schacht also inferred the growth of most Hadith during this exact time period on the basis of the absence of Hadith in early Umayyad documents,¹⁴³ so the CLs once again fit the bill as the originators and disseminators of the hadiths ascribed to them (such that the *'isnāds* preceding and circumventing them are likely fabricated). In other words, Schacht seems to have regarded the CLs as the probable originators of their hadiths because they were operating in the right place at the right time, so to speak: it cannot be a coincidence that numerous hadiths seem to fan out, in terms of their alleged transmission-history, from figures operating in exactly the time period when we know that Hadith were being mass-created.

That this was Schacht's reasoning also comes across in the following caveat:

We must, of course, always reckon with the possibility that the name of a common transmitter was used by other, anonymous persons, so that its occurrence gives only a *terminus a quo*. This applies particularly to the period of the Successors.¹⁴⁴

This is consistent with the plausibility of the CLs as originators of hadiths being connected to *time period*—thus, the same pattern for an *earlier* period is treated differently. In other words, an apparent CL before the era of the mass-creation of Hadith (i.e., one in the generation of the Followers, or perhaps the early or senior Followers in particular) is suspect. In such situations, Schacht seems to be envisaging a scenario in which a contemporary or student of the CL (i.e., “a person using his name”¹⁴⁵) created the hadith and cited the CL as their authority therefor, after which others borrowed from this “anonymous” creator and cited the CL directly, thereby omitting or suppressing said creator. In other words, Schacht seems to be invoking the spread of *'isnāds* here, in situations where the true creator is reduced to merely a transmitter from the CL (in the resulting *'isnāds*) or suppressed altogether.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 36-37.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 141.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 175.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 158, 159, 168.

¹⁴⁶ The only other way that I can understand Schacht's “anonymous persons” or “person using his name” would be a situation in which someone literally impersonated someone else and transmitted hadiths to hoodwinked students in their name. Since this kind of scenario seems like a stretch (at least as a common occurrence), and since Schacht's proposed “spread” of *'isnāds* provide an obvious alternative explanation for what he meant, the latter seems preferable.

Schacht seemingly acknowledged this kind of spread as a potential explanation for CLs *in any era*, such that a CL is only the *earliest* plausible point back to which a hadith can be dated. Thus, in his first proper formulation of the CL concept, Schacht stated:

These results regarding the growth of *isnāds* enable us to envisage the case in which a tradition was put into circulation by a traditionist whom we may call N.N., **or by a person who used his name**, at a certain time. The tradition would normally be taken over by one or several transmitters, and the lower, real part of the *isnād* would branch out into several strands. The original promoter N.N. would have provided his tradition with an *isnād* reaching back to an authority such as a Companion or the Prophet, and this higher, fictitious part of the *isnād* would often acquire additional branches by the creation of improvements which would take their place beside the original chain of transmitters, or by the process which we have described as spread of *isnāds*. But N.N. would remain the (lowest) common link in the several strands of *isnād* (or at least in most of them, allowing for his being passed by and eliminated in additional strands of *isnād* which might have been introduced later). Whether this happened to the lower or to the higher part of the *isnād* or to both, the existence of a significant common link (N.N.) in all or most *isnāds* of a given tradition would be a strong indication in favour of its having originated in the time of N.N.¹⁴⁷

Schacht thus acknowledged the possibility of spread as an explanation for a CL in any instance, but overall, he seems to have thought that this was particularly a problem in the case of Followers (as noted above). For the following era of the Followers of the Followers, by contrast, Schacht seemed to regard it as plausible that the CL was the actual creator of the relevant hadith.

For Schacht, then, the dating of hadiths via their CLs was something linked to his broader model of Hadith development: it is the coinciding of most CLs with the era of the mass-creation of Hadith that seems to render them plausible candidates for the originators of the relevant hadiths.¹⁴⁸

Azami's Criticism of Schacht

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 171-172. Emphasis mine.

¹⁴⁸ For a similar idea, see Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 73.

One of the earliest systematic critiques of Schacht's ideas about Hadith was articulated by Muhammad Mustafa al-Azami, in the course of several works. Of course, Azami's criticisms in general—along with those of Fuat Sezgin and Nabia Abbott, which were often similar—have been widely and thoroughly refuted,¹⁴⁹ but some of his statements regarding *ʾisnāds* and false ascriptions bear revisiting, for the sake of a complete dialectic.

In his 1968 monograph *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature*, Azami argued that, if the Revisionist model is correct and virtually all Hadith are ultimately false ascriptions, then there should not be any ascriptions to weak or unreliable authorities within the extant corpus (since the motive behind fabrication was for a hadith to be accepted, not rejected):

Why did not all the students choose the most respected personality and put their traditions in his mouth and link them with the most reliable *isnād*? Why did they choose weak and *Matrūk* personalities so often?¹⁵⁰

This objection only works if the creators of Hadith themselves—or their target audiences—regarded those whom they cited to be weak, but this is often an unsafe assumption. Recent research suggests that weak tradents were largely identified as such retrospectively, by later Hadith critics and in later biographical dictionaries—there is usually no good reason to think that such judgements were widespread at the time, let alone held by a prospective fabricator, let alone held by their contemporaneous target audience.¹⁵¹ Thus, Azami was wrong to think that the fabrication of ascriptions to authorities later deemed weak undermines the Revisionist model.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 211, n. 88; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 2-6; Andrew L. Rippin, 'Literary analysis of Qurʾān, *tafsīr*, and *sīra*', in Richard C. Martin (ed.), *Approaches to Islam in Religious Studies* (Tucson, USA: University of Arizona Press, 1985), 156; Berg, *Development*, 18-26; Motzki (trans. Katz), *Origins*, 39-45; Herbert Berg, 'Weaknesses in the Arguments for the Early Dating of Qurʾānic Commentary', in Jane D. McAuliffe, Barry D. Walfish, & Joseph W. Goering (eds.), *With Reverence for the Word: Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010), 329; Christopher Melchert, 'On Schacht's "Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence" by M. Mustafa al-Azami; *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* by Norman Calder', *Journal of Law and Religion*, Volume 15, Number 1/2 (2000-2001), 364-365; and so on.

¹⁵⁰ Muhammad Mustafa Azami, *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature* (Indianapolis, USA: American Trust Publications, 1978), 242.

¹⁵¹ For more on this, see Dickinson *et al.*, cited below.

Azami also argued that Schacht's concept of the spread of *'isnāds* presupposes a geographically-implausible conspiracy amongst the relevant traditionists:

His claim that the *isnāds* were duplicated by others which go back to the same authority by another way providing independent evidence to confirm the doctrine, is absurd. As it has been shown earlier, the transmitters of a single tradition, in so many cases, belong to a dozen different countries and thus their meetings and agreement on this sort of fabrication was almost impossible.¹⁵²

A few pages later, Azami reiterated:

The phenomena of *isnād*, the numbers of transmitters belonging to scores of provinces, thoroughly invalidate the theory of "projecting back", "artificial creations" and similar statements.¹⁵³

The first problem with Azami's objection is the "agreement" (i.e., conspiracy) part: if one transmitter received a hadith from another and then fabricated or interpolated a new *'isnād* for the *matn*, the two need not have colluded.¹⁵⁴ The second problem is that Azami was simply begging the question when he assumed the authenticity of 'independent' ascriptions of the same hadith to tradents in different provinces, such that it is improbable that all the geographically-disparate tradents could have collaborated to fabricate the same hadith or borrowed from each other the same *matn* and created their respective 'independent' *'isnāds* therefor. The authenticity of these 'independent' *'isnāds* unto such tradents *is precisely what was called into question* by Schacht (and, subsequently, Cook and Juynboll). In other words, Azami's objection to the hypothetical spread of *'isnāds* was simply to assume that such *'isnāds* are authentic, from which it follows (of course) that the geographically-disparate tradents cited in these 'independent' *'isnāds* could not have easily or feasibly collaborated in such an effort.

As it happens, the collectors or late transmitters usually posited (by Schacht, Cook, and Juynboll) as the creators of such false, secondary *'isnāds* were often well-travelled and/or resided in the same region as the contemporaries from whom they borrowed.

¹⁵² Azami, *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature*, 243.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 247.

¹⁵⁴ For more on this, see the section below concerning Cook and Juynboll's criticisms of each other.

In these scenarios, there is no mystery as to how the divers in question acquired the hadiths that they ‘corroborated’: Azami’s appeal to disparate geography does not apply here.

Azami continued to advance his question-begging geographical and conspiratorial objection to Schacht and the spread of *’isnāds* in his 1985 monograph *On Schacht’s Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, with the following:

In addition to asking us to ignore the weight of evidence which points to the authenticity of the *isnād* system, Schacht wants us to believe in a physical and psychological impossibility. First, he asks us to accept that *aḥādīth* with substantially the same wording or meaning could spring up in widely separated localities, a possibility now, with modern methods of communication, but hardly feasible several centuries ago. Then he asks us to accept either that these same narrators independently traced their sources back to a common source, or that they were conspirators in a vast confidence trick. Again, contemporary communications and the distances involved militate against such a possibility, let alone what we know of psychology. Surely such gross fabrication would not have gone unnoticed; someone would have come forward to point the finger of suspicion. And yet no one did.¹⁵⁵

Once again, the scenario envisaged by Schacht *et al.* is one of borrowing (which explains the similarity of *matns*) at the hands of late transmitters and collectors (which negates the geography objection). As above, so here: the spread of *’isnāds* does not require conspiratorial collaborations between transmitters, so Azami’s objections fail.

Cook’s Criticism of Schacht

Just as Adam Smith’s work on economics yielded two competing traditions of economic modelling (a labour theory of value, carried forward by David Riccardo and Karl Marx, and a subjective-value theory, carried forward by neo-classical economists), so too did Schacht’s work on Hadith yielded two competing traditions of *’isnād*-analysis and dating: those who accept the utility of the CL for dating the *matn*, and those who remain skeptical of the CL due to the spread of *’isnāds*. The greatest proponent of the latter

¹⁵⁵ *Id.*, *On Schacht’s Origins of Muhammad Jurisprudence* (Lahore, Pakistan: Suhail Academy, 2004), 166.

tradition was Cook, who identified—in his 1981 *Early Muslim Dogma*—an obvious tension in Schacht’s theory and method: if the “spread of *isnāds*” was common, how can we tell the difference between a genuine CL and one that has resulted merely from the convergence of later retrojections?

In outlining this problem, Cook begins by observing that the culture of early Islamic Hadith transmission entailed a régime of pressures and incentives that should make one suspicious of any given ascription therein. “In a traditionist culture,” Cook notes, “the relevant value is not originality but authority: sharp practice consists in falsely *ascribing* my view to a greater authority than myself.”¹⁵⁶ After illustrating the phenomenon of “raising” (i.e., the way in which *isnāds* inferably “grow backwards” over time, as ascriptions to later authorities become ascriptions to earlier authorities),¹⁵⁷ Cook further notes:

Where one *isnād* reaches only to A and a second goes back through him to his teacher, then given the values of the system we are entitled to suspect that the higher *isnād* is secondary, rather than the other way round.¹⁵⁸

Cook then outlines and illustrates the “spread” of *isnāds* “more fully than is done by Schacht,” including the “basic implications” of the phenomenon for the dating of Hadith: if a transmitter (B₂) receives a hadith from a contemporary (B₁), then the values of early traditionism pressure or incentivise him not to cite his contemporary, but rather, to cite his contemporary’s cited source directly (A),¹⁵⁹ or even (if B₂ has “sufficient longevity”) that source’s purported source.¹⁶⁰ As Cook puts it (from the transmitter’s perspective):

But as it happens, I say to myself that, even if I didn’t actually hear it from your teacher, I could have – it goes against the grain to transmit from a mere contemporary. My behaviour here is informed by one of the basic values of the system: an elegant *isnād* is a short one. Ideally, one should have a saying direct from the mouth of the sayers; and failing that, the fewer the intervening links the better.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁶ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 107-108.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 108.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 109.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 110.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 109.

If both transmissions survive (via B₁ and B₂ respectively), then the spread of *ʿisnāds* has created a false CL (A): “Posterity then believes that it has two independent witnesses for the authenticity of the ascription to A,”¹⁶² when in actual fact, the hadith cannot be traced back to—and thereby dated per—this tradent. Likewise, if a transmitter (C₂) receives a hadith from a contemporary (C₁) and omits his contemporary’s cited source (B₁) in favour of another source (B₂) unto the more ultimate source of the original *ʿisnād* (A), then that ultimate source (A) would become a fake CL: “Perhaps it is well-known that I never met your teacher,” posits Cook (again from the transmitter’s perspective), “or he carries no weight in the circles I wish to impress, or I consider his politics objectionable.”¹⁶³ Whatever the case may be, if both transmissions survive (via C₁ and C₂ respectively), then once again, posterity may be tricked into dating the hadith per the wrong tradent (A). This kind of spread could even span multiple generations in terms of the *ʿisnād*, and in addition to the general pressures and incentives of traditionism, could be inspired by sectarianism as well:

Suppose that you are a Shīʿite transmitting a saying of Ibn Masʿūd’s with a string of Shīʿite transmitters; I however am a Murjiʿite, and in taking over your tradition substitute a string of transmitters of my own school.¹⁶⁴

After reiterating Schacht’s point about the taboo against hadiths with “isolated” *ʿisnāds*,¹⁶⁵ Cook concludes by questioning whether the threat of the “spread of *isnāds*” is theoretical or actual, with a clear inclination towards the latter:

In the light of these remarks, it becomes a crucial question whether the spread of *isnāds* was a process operative on a historically significant scale, or just an ingenious idea of Schacht’s. It should be said straight out that the evidence does not let itself to a conclusive answer to the question; and many of Schacht’s own examples of the spread of *isnāds* are proof only to the converted. But some store must be set by the fact that the process as outlined is thoroughly in accordance with the character and values of the system; and the pressure of elegance on truth is something entirely familiar to the traditionists themselves.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 110.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.* Cook (*ibid.*, 114) subsequently speculates about a tradent “appropriating” a hadith “from the Shīʿite camp and naturalising it with an *isnād* of his own school.”

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 110-111.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 111.

In short, Schacht's simple method of dating hadiths per the CL in their *'isnāds* is undermined by the process of the spread of *'isnāds* that he himself outlined—a process that could easily have produced false CLs. As Cook notes, Schacht simply failed to “bring out the nature and implications of the phenomenon with sufficient clarity.”¹⁶⁷ Thus, the method of dating hadith according to CLs is doomed:

To see the significance of the spread of *isnāds* is not to be in a position to remedy it. As already indicated, one of the key features of the phenomenon is a destruction of information which is likely to be irreversible. Schacht's discovery of the spread of *isnāds* is in fact a highly ambivalent contribution to knowledge. It can be seen as the foundation of a new method of *isnād*-criticism; and it can be seen as a neat demonstration that such a method cannot be devised. One ignores Schacht at one's peril, but one also follows him at one's peril.¹⁶⁸

This problem is not just theoretical—in his 1992 article ‘Eschatology and the Dating of Traditions’, Cook compared the results of a Schachtian CL-based dating of three hadith-traditions (i.e., three sets of hadiths converging on three respective CLs) with an alternative dating thereof:

What I want to do in this paper is to put Schacht's method to the test by selecting a field in which traditions *can* be dated on external grounds—grounds which owe nothing to a reconstructed evolution. We can then compare these externally derived results with those obtained by applying Schacht's method to the same traditions.¹⁶⁹

Cook selected three eschatological hadiths for his comparison, since such material can be confidently dated on the basis of its content and specific historical references, independently of *'isnāds*.¹⁷⁰ If Schacht's CLs do indeed represent the point at which a hadith was formulated (i.e., by the CL), then it is reasonable to expect that the lifetime of the CL in such instances would line up with the time period or events inferably reflected in the *matns*. In other words, if a hadith ‘predicts’ a specific event, then the CL should be someone living at the same time of—or soon after—that event, formulating the prophecy-hadith *ex eventu*.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 115.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁹ *Id.*, ‘Eschatology’, 25.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 25-26.

All three of Cook's sample-hadiths fail—or at least perform poorly in—this test, since the relevant CLs do not match—or barely match—the specific eras when the *matns* were inferably formulated: the first hadith inferably originated between 815 and 827 CE, yet the CL (ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīʿah) died in 174/790; the second hadith inferably originated in “the later Umayyad period”, yet both of its CLs (one of whom must have borrowed from and suppressed the other) belong more to the Abbasid period than the Umayyad period, with one (Ibn Lahīʿah) dying in 174/790 and the other (ʿArṭāh b. al-Mundīr) dying in 163/779-780; and finally, the third hadith inferably originated soon after 692 CE, yet the CL (Qatādah b. Dīʿāmah) died in 117-118/735-736.¹⁷¹ In other words, the CL in the first hadith is too early (and thus cannot possibly have formulated the hadith), whilst the CLs in the second and third hadiths are too late (since the CLs were operating many decades after the relevant events, such that the events would not have been topical).

In short, both theoretically and practically, there are strong reasons to doubt that Schachtian CLs can be identified as the creators of specific hadiths, such that they cannot be relied upon to date Hadith. This conclusion was echoed by Crone, who summarised the situation as follows:

The method of the common link is invalidated by the phenomenon which Schacht himself called ‘the spread of *isnāds*’, that is the secondary creation of fictitious authorities for a particular tradition. Using this method one finds that on the basis of other criteria it seems to work at times and at others not; it cannot be used as a method of dating on its own.¹⁷²

Cook and Crone's skepticism was paralleled—seemingly independently—by Norman Calder in his 1993 *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence*, where he rejected the Schachtian method of dating per the CL on similar grounds:

When a hadith (*matn*—the text) came into existence which was accepted by several different factions or groups within Islam they tended each to ‘capture’ the original hadith and provide it with an *isnād* reflecting their group. Since nearly all groups recognized the common heroes of the age of the Prophet, it tends to be at about the level of Successor that *isnāds* start

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 26-33.

¹⁷² Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 30.

converging. This is true even when the hadith emerge and acquire *isnāds* well into the third and fourth centuries.¹⁷³

Calder also outlined the way in which sectarian competition must have driven this spread of *'isnāds*, as one group's opportunistic or motivated criticisms of another group's cited tradents—usually those after the generation of the Followers, since reverence for the Prophet, the Companions, and even the Followers was common—drove them to refine and substitute their *'isnāds*, and *vice versa*.¹⁷⁴

In short, the entailments of Schacht's own theory of Hadith development seemingly preclude his method of dating hadiths via their CLs. Cook thus concluded: "I am sympathetic to critics of this paper who urge that the existence of common links must mean something; but just what it means, I do not pretend to know."¹⁷⁵

Juynboll's Refined Common Link Analysis

The other tradition of analysis emanating from Schacht—the tradition that sought to retain CLs as a viable means to date Hadith—was championed above all by Juynboll, in a series of articles and monographs from 1983 to 2007.¹⁷⁶ Juynboll's work in this respect revolved around three basic tasks: (1) to defend Schacht's CL analysis from Cook's criticisms; (2) to refine and systematise the method; and (3) to apply the method systematically to the extant Hadith corpus.

It is prudent to begin with the technical vocabulary that Juynboll developed for his refined CL analysis,¹⁷⁷ since most of the ensuing discussion presupposes an understanding thereof. They are as follows:

¹⁷³ Norman Calder, *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1993), 236-237.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 237.

¹⁷⁵ Cook, 'Eschatology', 46, n. 74.

¹⁷⁶ Beginning with *Muslim tradition*, continuing with a series of articles (all of which have been collected in *Studies on the Origins and Uses of Islamic Ḥadīth*), and culminating in *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*.

¹⁷⁷ Juynboll's terminology was first properly articulated in his 1989 'Some *isnād*-analytical methods', reiterated in various subsequent articles, and canonised in his 2007 *Encyclopedia*. It is thus the latter that I will chiefly cite for his definitions and concepts.

- **strand** = a segment of *'isnād*, of any length.¹⁷⁸
- **'isnād bundle** = a network of multiple, intersecting *'isnāds* (which emerges or becomes visible when all of the *'isnāds* for a given hadith are overlaid against each other).¹⁷⁹
- **single strand** (henceforth, **SS**) = a segment of an *'isnād* that comprises a succession of individuals, or in other words: an *'isnād* in which one tradent transmitted to only one other, etc.¹⁸⁰
- **key figure** = any converged-upon tradent in an *'isnād* bundle (i.e., a PCL, SPCL, CL, (S)CL, SCL, or spider).¹⁸¹
- **partial common link** (henceforth, **PCL**) = a tradent who is converged upon by at least three non-SSs (i.e., direct collectors and/or other PCLs).¹⁸²
- **(seeming) partial common link** (henceforth, **(S)PCL**) = a tradent who is converged upon by only two non-SSs (i.e., direct collectors and/or other PCLs).¹⁸³
- **seeming partial common link** (henceforth, **SPCL**) = a tradent who is converged upon by a single non-SS (i.e., a direct collector or another PCL) and otherwise only SSs.¹⁸⁴
- **common link** (henceforth, **CL**) = the earliest of those who are converged upon by PCLs when said PCLs are three or more in number.¹⁸⁵
- **(seeming) common link** (henceforth, **(S)CL**) = the earliest of the tradents who are directly converged upon by PCLs, when said PCLs are only two in number.¹⁸⁶
- **seeming common link** (henceforth, **SCL**) = the earliest of the tradents who are directly converged upon by PCLs, when said PCLs are only one in number and corroborated (in their transmission from the SCL) only by SSs.¹⁸⁷

¹⁷⁸ Assumed throughout *Encyclopedia*.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, xviii-xix.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, xviii-xx.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, xx, col. 2.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, xx-xxii.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, xxi-xxii.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, xi-xxii.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, xx-xxii.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, xi-xxii.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, xi-xxii.

- **inverted common link** (henceforth, **ICL**) = a CL who cites a collective *ʿisnād* or multiple strands as their source(s), such that they appear as a bottleneck in the overall *ʿisnād* bundle.¹⁸⁸
- **dive** = a (secondary, false) SS that specifically circumvents (i.e., “dives around”) a PCL or CL.¹⁸⁹
- **spider** = a tradent who is only converged upon by multiple SSs, i.e., successive dives.¹⁹⁰

In short, Juynboll identified and named SSs and PCLs, elaborated and renamed the spread of *ʿisnāds* to diving and dives, and split Schacht’s crude notion of the CL into four distinct CL, (S)CL, SCL, and spider concepts.¹⁹¹ In doing so, Juynboll discovered that most so-called CLs (per the simple Schachtian definition) are actually spiders (per his own definitions), to the point that spiders “easily outnumber” CLs, (S)CLs, and SCLs within the extant Hadith corpus.¹⁹² That said, numerous CLs, (S)CLs, and SCLs still remain, such that Juynboll’s method putatively remains viable as a method of dating Hadith.

Whereas Schacht seems to have regarded CLs to be historical due to their coinciding with the era of the mass-creation of Hadith, Juynboll approached the matter from a completely different angle.¹⁹³ For him (and on his stricter definitions), PCLs and CLs

¹⁸⁸ *Id.*, ‘Early Islamic society’, 179 ff.

¹⁸⁹ *Id.*, *Encyclopedia*, xxii-xxiii.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, xxii-xxiii.

¹⁹¹ Cook (‘Eschatology’, 39, nn. 10-11) notes that Juynboll rejected “Schacht’s anonymous contemporary” in his understanding of the CL. This is so. For Juynboll (as will be seen), the dense citation of the CL precludes the spread of *ʿisnāds*, in which the true source has become obscured. Instead, that sort of scenario (i.e., “Schacht’s anonymous contemporary”) has been moved in Juynboll’s schema to the concepts of the (S)CL, the SCL, and the spider.

¹⁹² Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xxii, col. 1.

¹⁹³ Juynboll (‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 354; ‘The Role of *Muʿammarūn*’, 155; ‘Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 291 (incl. n. 8), 296; ‘Nāfi’, 209-210, 222) certainly pointed out that his CLs all operated after the rise of the *ʿisnād*, but he took this to be a *confirmation* of—and thus *independent* of—his Hadith chronology, rather than the basis or starting-point for their plausibility. On this point, cf. Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 50-51, who rightly objected that the evidence was not adequately explained by Juynboll: if CLs are explained merely by the rise of the *ʿisnād*, then we should expect the first big wave of common links to be senior Followers and perhaps even some junior Companions. That this is so comes across even in Juynboll, ‘Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 296, concerning junior Companions. Despite this, the belatedness of the CLs is in fact explained by (i.e., does corroborate) Juynboll’s chronology: we would not expect CLs to proliferate with the *genesis* of the *ʿisnād*, but rather, with its *spread* and *systematisation*—after all, how could CLs even be visible to us in hindsight, absent widespread and systematic transmission?

are unlikely to have resulted from fabrication or interpolation, since they are directly cited by multiple sources:

When a key figure—as we loosely label every transmitter whose position is assessed in a first attempt to identify a CL if any—who has in a bundle two or more key figures as pupils, the position of the first mentioned key figure becomes consolidated thereby. Or to use the new technical terms: the more favourable the ratio CL/PCLs in a certain bundle appears to be, the more credible is the position of that CL in that bundle.

It may be a source of never-ceasing amazement that there still are various scholars, who maintain that a bundle such as this one does *not* tell us anything. No, they say, nothing tangible can be deduced from it, even with its seemingly clear SS back to the Prophet which, as stated above, constitutes a salient characteristic of any bundle, and in spite of its CL and his six plausible PCLs via transmission strands spreading out to some twelve different sources. Those scholars claim, if they claim anything at all, that a bundle, even one like this one, must have been the handiwork of one or more, otherwise strictly anonymous, unidentifiable *isnād* forgers, busily copied in the course of time by a number of equally unidentifiable fellow-forgers.¹⁹⁴

In other words, Juynboll relied upon the criterion of multiple, direct transmissions to establish the authenticity of the attribution of a *matn* to a putative PCL or CL, since he took such multiplicity to reasonably preclude (for example) Cook's spread of *'isnāds*. In doing so, he inadvertently solved the aforementioned problems raised by Cook regarding eschatological hadiths: all of the key figures in Cook's three sample-hadiths are actually spiders in Juynboll's schema, such that they cannot be considered to be the originators of the hadiths in question. Thus, the ostensible mismatch between these key figures and the external dating of the *matns* turns out to be no problem at all, at least for Juynboll's refined CL analysis.

In contrast to PCLs and CLs, Juynboll straightforwardly rejected the historicity of SSs, based on an argument from silence. For him, the notion that the Prophet could have transmitted a given hadith to only one Companion, and that this Companion in turn could have transmitted the hadith to only one Follower, and that this Follower in turn could have transmitted to only one Follower of the Followers, and so on, only to branch out unto multiple tradents from the CL, is extremely unlikely. Thus, "the

¹⁹⁴ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xx-xxi.

historicity” of SSs “can be considered hardly tenable”¹⁹⁵ and is “difficult to swallow.”¹⁹⁶ SSs are “historically fragile”,¹⁹⁷ and in terms of what explains them, Juynboll claimed: “It may be obvious that this explanation should not be sought in the, in my view, sheer unfathomable coincidence of one man telling one man telling one man etc.”¹⁹⁸ SSs are an “overwhelming historical improbability”,¹⁹⁹ and this improbability is cumulative and applies even in the instance of written transmission: it is “unlikely” that someone passed on their Hadith-notes to “to just one pupil for copying,” and “it is even more unlikely that the lastmentioned passed them on for copying again in the same fashion to another single pupil”, and so on.²⁰⁰ The chances of SSs occurring naturally are “inconceivable”,²⁰¹ and “postulating any measure of transmission historicity” therefor “requires an act of faith of which most dispassionate historians are not capable.”²⁰² Moreover, the ubiquity of such SSs contradicts the broad claims of the Islamic tradition concerning the early transmission of Hadith, according to Juynboll:

When the overall characteristic of *ḥadīth* transmission depicted in all the medieval Islamic *ḥadīth* handbooks, namely, that the early Islamic world was literally teeming with *ḥadīths* transmitted by multitudes of transmitters to even bigger multitudes of younger transmitters — when this characteristic is taken at face value, then the question remain [sic] unanswered why the prophet — as in this case or indeed in the vast majority of cases — should choose to convey his saying about the seductiveness of women to just one Companion, and why this Companion should choose to convey it to just one Successor, and why this Successor should choose to convey it to just one other Successor, who is the cl Sulaymān at-Taymī. Had the majority of *isnād* bundles in Muslim tradition literature shown up blossoms of strands flowering forth from as far down as the prophet and hence from every Companion featuring in that blossom of strands from the prophet, and hence from every Successor featuring in the blossom of strands from each Companion and so on, then *ḥadīth* would indeed have developed in time along the paths described in medieval *ḥadīth* handbooks. But the truth of the matter is that the vast majority of *isnāds* supporting one and the same (part of a) *matn*, only start fanning out from the cl, a transmitter who hails from the second or third generation after the prophet.²⁰³

¹⁹⁵ *Id.*, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 352-354.

¹⁹⁶ *Id.*, ‘Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 297.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 296.

¹⁹⁸ *Id.*, ‘Nāfi’, 209-210.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 212.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 212.

²⁰¹ *Id.*, ‘Early Islamic society’, 154.

²⁰² *Id.*, *Encyclopedia*, xix-xx.

²⁰³ *Id.*, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 353.

Likewise:

Another adage underlying the entire exposé so far is that of refusing to allow for coincidences to have occurred, coincidences which want us to believe that, in a society in which, as all classical sources assert, large numbers of persons supposedly transmitted religious learning to even larger numbers of persons, there are actually thousands of incidents when a single person told another single person, who told another single person, who told another single person that Muḥammad once said or did a particular thing.²⁰⁴

And finally:

It is equally inconceivable to visualise an Islamic world of the second/eighth century, which as all medieval Muslim sources assure us was virtually awash with *ḥadīth* transmission, in which hundreds of separate reports and traditions were passed on by single individuals to single individuals to yet other single individuals to yet other single individuals, and so on.²⁰⁵

In short, Juynboll argued that SSs are unlikely to have occurred, and should thus be presumed to be retrojections by CLs or later tradents or collectors (wherever applicable). By contrast, PCLs and CLs are unlikely to be the results of such retrojections, and can be used to date Hadith. In particular, the CL can be identified as the probable creator of their hadith, since they cannot have received the hadith from the (historically-implausible) preceding SS.

Cook and Juynboll's Criticisms of Each Other

Juynboll's refined CL analysis was already in dialogue with Cook's criticisms—in particular, the implications of the spread of *'isnāds*—from its inception, with Juynboll attempting to respond thereto in the very same article in which he first articulated his method:

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 354.

²⁰⁵ *Id.*, 'Early Islamic society', 154.

This model constructed by Cook may in fact have occurred on a considerable scale and it was certainly a cause for some proliferation of *isnāds*. But to picture this as having been practised simultaneously by sizable numbers of contemporary transmitters without it having left telling testimonies in the *rijāl* sources stretches our credulity to breaking point. The idea of a conspiracy should be dismissed too in my opinion, because there is no trace of conspiratorial practices in *ḥadīth* transmission; had there been conspiracies, they would certainly have left vestiges in the sources. So when a number of people, represented in a bundle as pcls, claim that they all heard a certain tradition from, for example, one particular cl, I believe that what I call the Cook principle does not apply.

Differently put, when several transmission strands are said to issue forth from one man and just for the sake of argument it is maintained on the basis of the Cook principle that those alleged transmission lines are all fakes except one, the ‘coincidence’ has got to be explained that a number of alleged pupils, each presumably for his own individual reasons, and each presumably operating quite independently from his ‘fellow-pupils’, feigns to have heard one and the same tradition from one and the same master. This is a bit much to swallow. It is more feasible to see it as the historical transmission of one *shaykh* to a number of his pupils who all claim that they have heard a certain tradition with that *shaykh*. And Cook is likely to agree that the more transmission lines there are coming together in one point, the less probable it is that his ‘principle’ applies to that point. The ‘knottier’ a transmission point, the more plausible is its historicity.

The situation depicted in the bundle of diagram 2 gives an illustration of this: there is one cl, Sulaymān at-Taymī, who is claimed as teacher by at least six pupils, who are all pcls. These six hail from various centres and were each other’s rivals; that they concocted a conspiracy or, by sheer coincidence, ‘chose’ one and the same master and copied this one and the same man’s strand down to the prophet is very unlikely.²⁰⁶

Juynboll’s arguments against Cook in some respects—ironically—foreshadowed Brown’s arguments against Juynboll,²⁰⁷ with corresponding weaknesses. To begin with, Juynboll argues that, if the spread of *’isnāds* had been as ubiquitous as Cook proposes (such that we must doubt even dense PCL and CL networks), this would have been mentioned in Hadith-related prosopography. Why this should be so is not clear, however. Given that spread of the kind outlined above (borrowing hadiths and suppressing direct sources) would have created the appearance of corroboration, and given that checking for corroboration seems to have been the chief tool of early Muslim Hadith critics, it would have been difficult for later analysts and even contemporaries

²⁰⁶ *Id.*, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 355.

²⁰⁷ See below, in the section on Brown’s criticism of Juynboll.

to detect it (absent an interrogation or confession).²⁰⁸ Therefore, the absence of records of this specific variety of the spread of *ʿisnāds* would not be telling.²⁰⁹ That said, this kind of spread would often fall within the bounds of *tadlīs* (“[lesser] deception”),²¹⁰ and *tadlīs*—along with *rafʿ* (“raising”), *waḍʿ* (“fabrication”), and *kaḍīb* (“falsehood”)—was reportedly ubiquitous.²¹¹ If *major* or *blatant* forms of fabrication and interpolation were widely noticed, then surely this would count as *a fortiori* evidence for *minor* or *subtle* forms of interpolation and tradent-suppression as well? Juynboll’s objection thus founders.

Juynboll also argues that the occurrence of both conspiracies (whereby multiple tradents collaborated in commonly ascribing a hadith to a PCL or CL) and coincidence (whereby multiple tradents happened to independently create and ascribe the same hadith to the same early segment of *ʿisnād*, including the CL) would have been very unlikely. But this was never in contention, as Cook pointed out in his response:

Juynboll regards the creation of a common link through the spread of an *ʿisnād* as unlikely: why should six traditionists “by sheer coincidence” ascribe a given tradition to one and the same master? The answer to this is that what is envisaged by the spread of *ʿisnāds* is a process, not of coincidence, but of imitation; were the transmitters “operating quite independently,” they would not be borrowing the tradition from each other in the first place. Whether the spread of *ʿisnāds* was in fact widespread remains an open question.²¹²

Juynboll himself ultimately conceded that the spread of *ʿisnāds* was ubiquitous,²¹³ but continued to argue that genuine transmission could be distinguished therefrom when

²⁰⁸ Cf. Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 111. For another example (where this kind of *tadlīs* is simply speculated by al-Buḡārī), see Christopher Melchert, ‘The Theory and Practice of Hadith Criticism in the Mid-Ninth Century’, in Petra M. Sijpesteijn & Camilla Adang (eds.), *Islam at 250: Studies in Memory of G.H.A. Juynboll* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2020), 80-81.

²⁰⁹ According to Melchert (via personal correspondence), “the problem of *sariqah*, ‘theft’ in Hadith is “resolutely ignored by modern defenders of hadith & largely so by medieval ones, since their methods were either inadequate for detecting it or would cast doubt on almost all of the hadith corpus.” Likewise, see *id.*, ‘The Life and Works of al-Nasāʾī’, 405: “As practised by al-Nasāʾī and his contemporaries, *ʿisnād* comparison must have been much better at detecting clumsy back projection than clever”. Similarly, Reinhart (‘Juynbolliana’, 439) notes that “it is in the nature of well-done *tadlīs* that it cannot be detected by any method used by Shuʿba, al-Karābīsī, Motzki, or Brown.”

²¹⁰ As noted in Benjamin Jokisch, *Islamic Imperial Law: Harun-al-Rashid’s Codification Project* (Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. K.G, 2007), 253-254, and Brown, *Hadith*, 2nd ed., 258.

²¹¹ See below, in the section on Motzki’s criticism of Cook.

²¹² Cook, ‘Eschatology’, 40, n. 19.

²¹³ Juynboll argued in numerous publications (e.g., *Encyclopedia*, xxii) that “diving strands” or “dives” were extremely common. As both he (‘Some notes on Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 303; ‘Nāfiʿ’, 213, n. 3) and Cook (‘Eschatology’, 39, n. 14) have noted, his “dives” equal Cook’s “spread”.

three or more sources (collectors or PCLs) directly—*without a string of intermediaries*—cite another source (a PCL or CL). In other words, when **three or more** collections directly cite a source, that source is a genuine PCL; when **three or more** collections or genuine PCLs directly cite a source, that source is a genuine PCL; when **three or more** genuine PCLs directly cite a source, that source is a genuine PCL; and the earliest source that is converged upon in such a way within a given *ʿisnād* bundle is a genuine CL.²¹⁴ A source that is directly cited by **only two** collectors or PCLs is thus only a (S)PCL or—in the case the earliest such figure in the *ʿisnād* bundle—a (S)CL.²¹⁵ Meanwhile, a source that is directly cited by **only one** collector or PCL (and otherwise only cited by SS *ʿisnāds*) is a SPCL, or—in the case the earliest such figure in the *ʿisnād* bundle—a SCL.²¹⁶ In either case, the “seeming” PCL or CL in the *ʿisnād* bundle could be the product of genuine transmission, but could also be the product of later collectors or tradents borrowing from and suppressing each other.²¹⁷ Finally, a key figure who is only converged upon by multiple SSs is a spider—a false PCL or CL, created entirely through the spread of *ʿisnāds*.²¹⁸

In short, Juynboll argued that only the direct citation of three or more sources can guarantee that an ascription to a PCL or CL is probably genuine, against the threat of the spread of *ʿisnāds*. According to Juynboll, Cook actually conceded this point to him:

In a personal conversation Cook has conceded that he would not go so far as to claim that his model can be extended to situations as depicted in diagram 2. Rather, in the case of three or more pupils claiming that they heard one and the same tradition from one and the same master, the consideration that the more complex the ‘knot’, the more likely is the historicity of its transmission would come more easily to mind.²¹⁹

Be that as it may, Juynboll’s criterion of three or more direct transmissions (as opposed to four, or five, or six) seems arbitrary. If the borrowing of hadiths and suppression of sources were indeed common (as Juynboll ultimately conceded), then why would we think it unlikely that such a thing could happen twice with the same hadith?²²⁰ In other

²¹⁴ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xx-xxii.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, xxi-xxii.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*

²¹⁷ This point is made clear in *id.*, ‘Some notes on Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 303-304.

²¹⁸ *Id.*, *Encyclopedia*, xxii-xxiii.

²¹⁹ *Id.*, ‘Some *ʿisnād*-analytical methods’, 356, n. 21.

²²⁰ The same question applies to Motzki, ‘The Prophet and the Cat’, 48.

words, why could not two tradents simultaneously and independently borrow from and suppress a contemporary, thereby giving the appearance to posterity of three direct transmissions from said contemporary's source? Are borrowings in general less likely than genuine transmission, in every period of time?²²¹ Even Juynboll's analysis seems paralysed by such uncertainties. That said, he was certainly correct in his claim that higher and higher levels of corroboration render false ascription less and less likely:

The more strands of one particular bundle come together in one transmitter, either converging in him and/or blossoming forth from him, the more that moment of transmission, which can be seen as a 'knot', deserves to be considered historically tenable.²²²

It does seem hard to imagine that, for example, an *'isnād* bundle comprising ten PCLs directly transmitting from a CL is entirely the result of a complex series of fabrications, borrowings, and suppressions, as opposed to genuine transmission from the CL.²²³ The problem of identifying the *sufficient* level of corroboration remains, however, rendering Juynboll's method highly uncertain. In this respect, Cook's skepticism continues to undermine attempts to date hadiths according to CLs.

Motzki's Criticism of Juynboll

Juynboll's refined CL analysis was also criticised by Motzki, on both internal and external grounds. In the first case, Motzki echoed Cook in pointing out that successive shallow dives could easily fulfill Juynboll's criterion for authentic PCLs and CLs (i.e., three direct citations), thus calling into question the validity of this criterion.²²⁴ In other words, Juynboll potentially faced a contradiction in his theory analogous to the

²²¹ In light of the *'isnād-cum-matn* analysis, genuine transmission does seem more common, at least in the sampled material (i.e., from the 8th Century CE onwards, in widely-transmitted hadiths); but since the veracity of the *'isnād-cum-matn* analysis is precisely what is in question (as will become clear below), its findings cannot be cited here. This would beg the question, in that the veracity of the *'isnād-cum-matn* analysis would already be assumed in an argument for the veracity of the *'isnād-cum-matn* analysis.

²²² Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xix.

²²³ For a similar point, see Motzki, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 39.

²²⁴ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 59-60; *id.*, 'G.H.A. Juynboll. *Encyclopedia of canonical ḥadīth*', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 36 (2009), 544.

original problem—the spread of *ʿisnāds*—afflicting Schacht’s. Once again, the question arises: what is the sufficient level of citational density for false ascription to be precluded as an explanation for a PCL or CL?

Stepping outside of Juynboll’s theory, Motzki also argued that Juynboll’s special skepticism towards SSs was based more upon some kind of intuition than any kind of sound statistical argument.²²⁵ In this respect, Motzki had a point—but his counter-proposal that SSs are actually historically expected was also based on arbitrary stipulations, and can likewise be rejected.²²⁶ By contrast, Motzki’s observation that SSs could plausibly—hypothetically—arise in instances of genuine transmission (e.g., through the non-survival of corroborating or converging strands, or because of successive instances of a preference for a famous tradent at the expense of others in a marginal region) is certainly sound,²²⁷ which would seem to render SSs historically neutral.

However, skepticism towards SSs remains warranted (i.e., regardless of Juynboll’s peculiar rationalisation thereof), if one accepts the Revisionist model of Hadith development: if most Hadith—along with their *ʿisnāds*—were falsely created or distorted, then any given *ʿisnād* (SS or otherwise) should be assumed to be inauthentic until the contrary can be demonstrated. Likewise, if *ʿisnāds* as a convention largely only arose during the 8th Century CE, then most *ʿisnāds* purporting to extend back into the 7th Century CE (SS or otherwise) must be inauthentic. Thus, SSs in general are inauthentic by default—the only question is whether an exception can be made for PCLs and CLs.²²⁸

Motzki’s Criticism of Cook

Motzki also criticised Cook’s notion of the ubiquitous spread of *ʿisnāds* (and elements of the Revisionist model more broadly), beginning in his 1998 article ‘The Prophet and

²²⁵ *Id.* (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 55.

²²⁶ Cf. Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 27-31, concerning (among other things) Motzki’s arbitrary stipulation of 5 students per teacher, rather than, for example, 3.

²²⁷ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 52, 58; *id.*, ‘Juynboll. *Encyclopedia*’, 542-543.

²²⁸ For a similar conclusion, see Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 31.

the Cat’ and continuing in his 2005 article ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’. To begin with, Motzki questioned Cook’s premise that early Muslim society was characterised by a “traditionist culture” (i.e., a common régime of pressures that would select for or incentivise both retrojections and the spread of *’isnāds*):

I wonder whether the Muslim educational system during the first and second century after the Hijra is adequately characterised by the label “traditionist culture” in which “the relevant value is not originality but authority”. This is a black and white picture. Was the educational system in early Islam really so one-sided or is it more fairly described as a system in which both values, originality and authority, played a role? Just the first Islamic centuries were characterised by a conflict between both values, a conflict in which authority eventually triumphed, but victory was not yet won at the end of the second century.²²⁹

Motzki’s caveat about early Islamic society *in general* is no doubt correct, but somewhat irrelevant: all that really matters for Cook’s argument is the beliefs and tendencies of early Muslims in the domain of legal and theological justification, and in that respect, it is hard to dispute that “the relevant value” was indeed “authority”. For example, consider the constant invocations of *sunnah* (Prophetical or otherwise) across the board even during the Umayyad period,²³⁰ the overwhelming tendency for the authors of theological epistles in the 8th Century CE to falsely ascribe their works to earlier figures,²³¹ and the fact that the regional legal schools, traditionists, and Hadith partisans of the 8th and 9th Centuries CE transmitted literally thousands upon thousands of legal and theological precedents and statements from the Followers, the Companions, and the Prophet: it is hard to understand such phenomena unless early Islamic society—at least in the legal and theological domain—was dominated by a “traditionist culture”. We thus clearly have a general régime of pressures or incentives to retroject later (legal and theological) beliefs and practices, as Cook suggested.

Motzki proceeds to cite Cook’s illustration of an example of such retrojection (featuring Šu‘bah and ‘Amr), before commenting:

Is it legitimate to draw such a general rule from the anecdote? If we generalise the report about ‘Amr, it says that it could happen that a scholar

²²⁹ Harald Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey’, *Arabica*, Volume 52, Issue 2 (2005), 231.

²³⁰ See the references given at the outset, esp. Crone & Cook, *God’s Caliph*, ch. 5.

²³¹ See Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, *passim*.

ascribed a saying of his informant or teacher to an earlier authority whom the informant had not mentioned. What does this prove? First, the anecdote does not say that it was the opinion of the scholar himself, which he ascribed to an earlier authority, as Cook supposes, calling it a “sharp practice”. Secondly, if the anecdote has a historical value at all and did not result from rivalry between different centres of scholarship, then the anecdote merely proves that such cases of dishonesty or inaccuracy happened. No one would deny that. Yet Cook’s conclusion reaches further; he suggests that it was “a system”, i.e., early Muslim scholars generally behaved in this manner. Based on one anecdote (or even a few more), is such a conclusion warranted?²³²

Motzki here seems to suggest that Cook generalised his “traditionist culture” and especially the consequent expectation that retrojection was ubiquitous from a single anecdote. This is a strawman, as can be easily discerned by revisiting Cook’s introduction of the anecdote in question:

Accordingly, **as everyone knows**, *isnāds* grow backwards. The process whereby, as I shall put it, *isnāds* are ‘raised’ – from oneself to one’s teacher to his teacher and ultimately to the Prophet – **is easily illustrated from traditionist sources. Consider the following anecdote....**²³³

The ‘Amr anecdote was clearly intended to serve merely as an *illustration*—a *single example*—of a phenomenon that is already well-known and well-evidenced in both Islamic and secular scholarship, rather than as a general proof in and of itself. Similarly, in a relevant footnote (for the statement “as everyone knows, *isnāds* grow backwards”), Cook states: “See **for example** Schacht, *Origins*, p. 166.”²³⁴ Again, it is clear that retrojection and the “traditionist culture” behind it are supposed to be established in scholarship—as indeed they are. To begin with, the Islamic *‘ilal* works are replete with explicit identifications of *rafʿ*,²³⁵ and Hadith-related prosopography accordingly “contains countless references to transmitters being castigated for having been *raffāʿūn*, which can be translated as “habitual raisers”.”²³⁶ To this can be added

²³² Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 231-232.

²³³ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 108. Emphasis mine.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, 202, n. 4. Emphasis mine.

²³⁵ This can be seen by perusing any *‘ilal* work (e.g., the *‘Ilal* of al-Tirmidī), but for some recent scholarship thereon, see Jonathan A. C. Brown, ‘Critical Rigor vs. Juridical Pragmatism: How Legal Theorists and *Ḥadīth* Scholars Approached the Backgrowth of *Isnāds* in the Genre of *‘Ilal al-Ḥadīth*’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 14, Number 1 (2007).

²³⁶ Juynboll, ‘Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 299.

the legion of examples of doctrines and often even specific wordings expressed by later figures reappearing as ascriptions to earlier figures (all of which is consistent with mass-retrojection in Hadith), variously collated by Goldziher,²³⁷ Schacht,²³⁸ Juynboll,²³⁹ Cook,²⁴⁰ Crone,²⁴¹ and others,²⁴² including Motzki himself.²⁴³ Clearly, the evidence for a “traditionist culture” in general and mass-retrojection in particular (in the domain of early Hadith at least) is overwhelmingly.

Motzki’s complaint that the ‘Amr anecdote “does not say that it was the opinion of the scholar himself, which he ascribed to an earlier authority, as Cook supposes”²⁴⁴ also seems hollow: what matters (for Cook’s purposes) is the fact not that scholars retrojected their personal opinions, but rather, that they retrojected at all. In other words, it matters little whether scholars were retrojecting their own opinions, or the opinions of contemporaries, or perspectives that they had vaguely inherited from their environment—the point is that they were engaging in *false ascription* on a wide scale. That said, there are reports that depict the widespread retrojection of ‘personal opinion’ (*ra’y*), aligning closely to Cook’s characterisation—for example:

‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd al-Mu’min related to us: “Ibn al-Muqri’ reported to us—he said: “I heard my father say: “Ibn Lahī’ah said: “A heretic (*rajl min ahl al-’ahwā’*) who had repented of his [false] doctrines (*qad raja’a ‘an ra’yi-hi*) spoke to me—he said: “Examine carefully from whom you have taken these Hadith, for verily, whenever we reasoned our way to a doctrine (*kunnā ‘idā ra’ay-nā ra’y^{an}*), we would turn it into a hadith (*ja’alnā-hu ḥadīṭ^{an}*).”””””²⁴⁵

Likewise:

‘Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-Bazzāz reported to us in Basrah: “Yazīd b. ‘Ismā’īl al-Ḳallāl related to us: “Abū ‘Awf al-Buzūrī related to us: “‘Abd Allāh b. ‘abī ‘Umayyah related to us—he said: “Ḥammād b. ‘abī [sic]

²³⁷ Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, 148-149 (incl. n. 3).

²³⁸ Schacht, *Origins*, *passim*.

²³⁹ Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, *passim*; *id.*, ‘Islam’s first *fuqahā’*”, *passim*.

²⁴⁰ Cook, ‘Magian Cheese’, *passim*.

²⁴¹ Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 124, nn. 67-68.

²⁴² E.g., Melchert, ‘Basra and Kufa’, in Sadeghi *et al.* (eds.), *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts*, 178.

²⁴³ See the references given in the section on my refined ‘*isnād-cum-matn*’ analysis, below.

²⁴⁴ Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 232.

²⁴⁵ ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Adī al-Qaṭṭān (ed. Māzin b. Muḥammad al-Sarsāwī), *al-Kāmil fī Du‘afā’ al-Rijāl*, vol. 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Maktabat al-Ruṣd, n. d.), p. 356, # 896. For variants of this hadith, and related reports, see below.

Salamah related to me: “A scholar of theirs—meaning, the hard-line Šī‘īs (*al-rāfiḍah*)—who had repented (*tāba*) said: “Whenever we would congregate and approve of something (*kunnā ‘idā ijtaṃa’nā wa-istaḥsannā šay’an*), we would make it into a hadith (*jā’alnā-hu ḥadīṭan*).”²⁴⁶

Similarly:

'Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ṣadaqaḥ related to us: "Abū Zur'ah al-Dimaṣqī related to us: "Muḥammad b. Qālid related to us, from his father, who said: "I heard Muḥammad b. Sa'īd say: "There is no problem, when there is a good statement (*kalām ḥasan*), for you to fabricate an *'isnād* therefor (*'an taḍa'a la-hu 'isnād^{an}*).""""""²⁴⁷

Motzki questioned the “historical value” of the ‘Amr anecdote (and would no doubt have questioned the others as well), speculating that it might actually be the “result” of “rivalry between different centres of scholarship”,²⁴⁸ but this again misses the point: whether true anecdotes or false ascriptions, such reports are *collectively consistent* with a general memory or impression of mass-retrojection in Hadith on the part of Mediaeval traditionists, which matches the findings of Cook *et al.* (i.e., particular instances of retrojection) and provides yet another reason to be skeptical of *’isnāds* in general. To put it another way, mass-retrojection is *at minimum* plausible, which precludes any kind of assumption of authenticity in approaching Hadith.

Motzki also questioned Cook's evidence for the spread of *'isnāds* (in particular, the skipping or suppression of contemporaries in *'isnāds*), characterising the relevant anecdotes as possessing "doubtful historical reliability".²⁴⁹ Again, however, the point is missed: Cook's spread of *'isnāds* usually coincides with forms of *tadlīs*, and *tadlīs* was reportedly ubiquitous in early Hadith, as has been noted already.²⁵⁰ Thus, even if any particular report impugning a given traditionist as a *mudallīs* is false or polemical, such reports are *collectively consistent* with a general memory or impression of mass-*tadlīs* in Hadith on the part of Mediaeval traditionists, which is in turn consistent with the

²⁴⁶ 'Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Maḥmūd al-Ṭaḥḥān), *al-Jāmi' li-'Aḳlāq al-Rāwī wa-'Ādāb al-Sāmi'*, vol. 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Maktabat al-Ma'ārif, 1983), p. 138, # 162. For variants of this hadith, and related reports, see below.

²⁴⁷ Muḥammad b. ‘Amr al-Uqaylī (ed. Māzin b. Muḥammad al-Sarsāwī), *Kitāb al-Ḍu‘afā’*, vol. 5 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār Majd al-Islām, 2008), p. 273, # 5302. For variants of this hadith, and related reports, see below.

²⁴⁸ Motzki, 'Dating Muslim Traditions', 232.

249 *Ibid.*

²⁵⁰ For more on this, see below.

widespread occurrence of the spread of *ʿisnāds*. Indeed, at times, the Mediaeval Hadith critics envisaged *ʿisnād*-spreading scenarios that were far more elaborate and extensive than Cook’s, as when they insisted that more than a dozen unreliable or mendacious tradents had (collectively or successively) borrowed an anti-Abbasid hadith from each other and falsely ascribed it (via more than a dozen ‘independent’ *ʿisnāds*) back to Sufyān al-Ṭawrī.²⁵¹

Motzki further doubted whether the seeking of the most elegant or economical (i.e., the shortest possible) paths back to the Prophet (later known as *ʿuluww*)—one of the key drivers behind the spread of *ʿisnāds* identified by Cook—was really widespread amongst early traditionist:

Again, he illustrates this with anecdotes to the effect that shorter *isnāds* were preferred to longer ones. However, several of these anecdotes only report that there had been scholars who tried to hear a tradition which they had heard from a colleague (in one case a much younger scholar), from the source himself. It is not mentioned in the anecdotes that they did so in order to have a more elegant *isnād*. It seems somewhat doubtful that in the first half of the second century after the Hijra the elegance of *isnāds* was already an issue. The motive behind the behaviour of those scholars was the desire to transmit from an old and famous scholar themselves instead through a younger colleague because it provided more scholarly prestige.²⁵²

Yet again, Motzki misses the deeper point: what really matters for Cook’s purposes is the fact that there was a pressure or incentive to bypass contemporaries and reach directly back to earlier masters—whether this was the result of a desire for *ʿuluww* or “the desire to transmit from an old and famous scholar” is irrelevant. That said, there is some evidence for a common preference for shorter—or the shortest possible—*ʿisnāds* even in the 2nd Islamic Century, in the form of Şentürk’s sociological study of early traditionist networks.²⁵³ According to Reinhart, Şentürk’s research “complements Juynboll and Cook and confirms the social pressure on *muḥaddithūn* to present the shortest possible *isnād*.”²⁵⁴ Şentürk’s methodology has been called into

²⁵¹ Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 207-213.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, 232-233.

²⁵³ Recep Şentürk, *Narrative Social Structure: Anatomy of the Ḥadīth Transmission Network, 610–1505* (Stanford, USA: Stanford University Press, 2005).

²⁵⁴ Reinhart, ‘Juynbolliana’, 435.

question by Melchert,²⁵⁵ but even without Şentürk, a common valuing of *‘uluww* in transmission can be readily inferred from the extant Hadith corpus. For one thing, the suspicious abundance of centenarians and exceptionally long-lived tradents (*mu‘ammarūn*) cited in *‘isnāds* at the level of Companions and Followers is consistent with later creators of Hadith’s attempting to bridge the pre-*‘isnād* gap between them and the earliest generations with the shortest possible routes, as Juynboll famously argued.²⁵⁶ Sanguine scholars have attempted to explain away this suspicious pattern away by arguing that longer-lived tradents could attain greater fame by dint of operating longer than their fellows, and thereby attain an outsized influence in transmission, etc.,²⁵⁷ but this leaves unanswered the puzzle of the disproportionate abundance of *mu‘ammarūn* at the level of Companions and Followers. This can be explained as a reflection of the *ascriptional tendencies* of traditionists in the 2nd and 3rd Islamic Centuries (falsely extending the lives of early figures and/or gravitating towards those who were actually long-lived, in order to reach back into the pre-*‘isnād* era), as opposed to some kind of historical coincidence. Likewise, the fact that Kufan *‘isnāds* in particular were disproportionately populated by *mu‘ammarūn* is hard to explain as a historical event, but easy to explain as a product of later regional ascriptional tendencies: given that the most venerated Companion in Kufah was the relatively short-lived ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd (d. 32-33/652-654), and the most venerated Follower was the similarly short-lived ‘Ibrāhīm al-Naḳa‘ī (b. 50/670, d. 96/714-715), the Kufans had a greater need to shorten the distance between their forebears and themselves. In other words, the higher rate of early Kufan *mu‘ammarūn* can be explained as a Kufan compensation born from an early desire for *‘uluww*, as opposed to some kind of historical coincidence.²⁵⁸

Even without Juynboll’s observations, a consideration remains in favour of the view that a common desire for *‘uluww* existed even in the 2nd Islamic Century. The transmission of data across the first two Islamic centuries (i.e., from the Prophet to the extant collectors) could have passed through any number of tradents: Companions presumably learned from fellow Companions all the time, and Followers from fellow

²⁵⁵ Christopher Melchert, ‘Narrative Social Structure: Anatomy of the Ḥadīth Transmission Network, 610–1505. By Recep Şentürk’, *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Volume 19, Number 1 (2008), 115-117.

²⁵⁶ Juynboll, ‘The Role of *Mu‘ammarūn*’, *passim*; *id.*, ‘Nāfi’, 222-224.

²⁵⁷ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither Ḥadīth Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 69-70; Brown, *Hadith*, 2nd ed., 19-21.

²⁵⁸ Again, see Juynboll, cited above.

Followers, etc. In other words, if *ʿisnāds* were genuine, and all else were equal, we would expect *ʿisnāds* covering the same time period to be all manner of lengths, with strings of Companions and strings of Followers, etc. And yet, overwhelmingly, we are faced with the following neat schema: traditionist—Follower of the Followers—Follower—Companion—Prophet. This has to be explained—as a general tendency—either by the actual tradents themselves having valued *ʿuluww* and continually sought the oldest available teachers, or else by the creators of Hadith in the 2nd and 3rd Islamic Centuries having constructed *ʿisnāds* with *ʿuluww* in mind. This is not to say that absolutely everyone was obsessed with *ʿuluww* all the time—rather, the point is simply that a desire for *ʿuluww* likely existed amongst many traditionists even in the 2nd Islamic Century, adding to the régime of pressures selecting for or incentivising the spread of *ʿisnāds*.

In addition to the desire for past authority and the desire for *ʿuluww*, Motzki doubts the third component of Cook’s proposed “traditionist culture”—namely, the early taboo against isolated Hadith:

Supposedly, this compelled Muslim scholars to forge *isnāds*. But as in the case of the other two “values of the system”, the assumption that this value played an important role as a driving force in *isnād* forgery is too vague and undifferentiated. Was the objection to “isolated traditions” already an issue in the first century and during the most part of the second century? It seems doubtful that this motive applies to the *isnāds* of this period. In addition, one wonders whether the reservation against *al-ḥabar al-wāḥid* (isolated tradition) affected all sorts of traditions equally or only one genre, namely, legal *Ḥadīṭ*.²⁵⁹

Motzki seems to implicitly concede that demands for multiple or independent *ʿisnāds* were being made from around the middle of the 8th Century CE onward (for which there is clear evidence),²⁶⁰ restricting his skepticism to the first century and a half of Islamic history. However, this is sufficient for Cook’s purposes: if most Hadith (as formal ascriptions) arose during the 2nd and 3rd Islamic Centuries (as is usually posited by revisionists like Cook),²⁶¹ then there would be no reason to expect demands

²⁵⁹ Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 234.

²⁶⁰ For example, see the explicit demands of the regionalists or rationalists for *mutawātir* Hadith, cited in Schacht, *Origins*, e.g., 50-52. Of particular interest is the leading Kufan jurist ʿAbū Yūsuf, operating in the mid-to-late 8th Century CE.

²⁶¹ See the references given at the outset.

for multiple or independent *ʿisnāds* during the 1st Islamic Century in the first place. Moreover, even if such demands primarily existed in the legal domain (or the legal *and* theological domains, as seems more likely), it still adds to the régime of pressures selecting for or incentivising the spread of *ʿisnāds*.

Motzki further complains that Cook provides no direct evidence (“not even an anecdote”) for “the hypothetical case that a transmitter not only conceals his direct informant but also replaces the latter’s teacher by his own teacher”, nor for “the assumption that whole *isnāds* can be fabricated and added arbitrarily to traditions.”²⁶² Even putting aside the catalogue of reports that do attest to—or are at least broadly consistent with—the widespread occurrence of this variety of the spread of *ʿisnāds* (which corresponds to Juynboll’s dives), it should by now be clear that there is a lot of evidence supporting Cook’s early “traditionist culture”, which means that there likely was a set of pressures or incentives selecting for (and thus drastically increasing the probability of) the spread of *ʿisnāds*—at least in the legal and theological domain, in the 2nd and 3rd Islamic Centuries. Consequently, Cook’s skepticism remains warranted: there are strong general reasons to doubt any given CL (at least for legal or theological hadiths), *contra* Motzki.

In light of his preceding arguments, Motzki repeatedly dismissed skeptical explanations for CLs as mere “speculation” and the like,²⁶³ and concluded more generally:

Neither Schacht nor Cook have convincingly shown that “spread of *isnāds*” was really practised on a significant scale. They have only shown that there were several possible ways how *isnāds* could be forged and that Muslim scholars could have had different motives to do so. Apart from possibilities, Schacht and Cook produced only scarce evidence that *isnād* forgery really happened.²⁶⁴

Even if this were the case, the spread of *ʿisnāds* would still remain as at least one of the possible explanations for the phenomenon of CLs, alongside the competing sanguine explanation: both interpretations of the evidence would be equally speculative, absent some kind of independent evidence supporting one against the other. This problem

²⁶² Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 233.

²⁶³ E.g., *id.*, ‘The Prophet and the Cat’, 32 (n. 44), 39, 48, 51, 54, 63.

²⁶⁴ *Id.*, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 235.

was already pointed out by Cook in his initial articulation of the spread of *ʿisnāds*, regarding the phenomenon of *matn* contamination in particular:

Van Ess is not unaware of the vulnerability of his argument to such a counter-hypothesis. But he prefers not to get involved with ‘imponderables’ and to keep clear of ‘speculation’. In the abstract, this is a splendid stance. But in the concrete, it is marred by an element of hypocrisy: why should the hypothesis, implicit in his method, that there was no such thing as contamination, be accounted any more ponderable or less speculative?²⁶⁵

In other words, *at the outset*, both the sanguine explanation and the skeptical explanation for any given set of hadiths have *some* evidence (i.e., *the same evidence*): both are consistent with (i.e., can explain the existence of) the specific *matns*, *ʿisnāds*, or CLs under consideration. What is lacking for the skeptical view (if we accept the criticisms of Motzki *et al.*) is *independent* evidence, *but the same holds true for the sanguine view*. Thus, in this situation, a rejection of the latter in favour of the former only proceeds by simply *assuming* the latter to be correct at the outset, which would be question-begging.

Perhaps in an effort to escape this impasse, Motzki went beyond merely attacking Cook’s skeptical view of *ʿisnāds* and attempted to positively defend the sanguine presumption of reliability regarding CLs. To this end, Motzki appealed to the impossibility of the contrary, arguing that the rise, proliferation, and historical use of *ʿisnāds* are absurd or unintelligible on a skeptical view:

On the basis of mere possibilities and a few instances of the real forgery, it makes no sense to abstain completely from using the *isnāds* for dating purposes. The historians of the European Middle Ages would not abstain from using diplomas as historical sources because there were cases of forgery which are not easy to detect. The intention of the *isnād* system was to assure the reliability of the transmission process. The basic value linked with it was that I have to name the informant from whom I had received the information. Doing otherwise intentionally was forgery and dishonesty. Certainly, this must have been clear to anybody familiar with that system and the whole scholarly community as a whole must have watched to ensure that its norm was not violated. This does not exclude that forgery could happen. But it seems unlikely that it happened at a huge scale in scholarly circles, not to speak of the circles of *muḥaddiṭūn*. If the scholarly *isnād* system was only or mainly used to feign reliability, then the whole

²⁶⁵ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 112.

system of validating traditions by *isnāds* would have become absurd. Al-Šāfi‘ī’s insistence on traditions with reliable *isnāds* would have been pointless and hypocritical if he had been convinced that most traditions available in his time were equipped with fabricated *isnāds*. Was the whole system of Muslim *Ḥadīth* criticism only a manoeuvre of deception? Who had to be deceived? Other Muslim scholars? They must have been aware of the pointlessness and vanity of all the efforts to maintain high standards of transmission, if forgery of *isnāds* was part and parcel of the daily scholarly practice.

It seems, therefore, more appropriate to keep the premise that, generally speaking, the *isnād* system served the expectations of the traditionist. Otherwise, we would expect that they would have quickly abandoned it. Until we have proof to the contrary, we must, therefore, presume that *isnāds* are, in principle, reliable, except, perhaps, around the time when the system came into being.²⁶⁶

In other words, if most or all of the Hadith that Muslim scholars possessed or inherited had *‘isnāds* that had been fabricated, then scholars would have known that; and if they had known that, it is very unlikely they would have demanded, compared, and evaluated *‘isnāds*, since doing so would have been “absurd”, or else some kind of collective conspiracy. Therefore, the fact that they demanded, compared, and evaluated *‘isnāds* means that they did not believe that most or all of their Hadith had fabricated *‘isnāds*; and if they did not believe that most or all *‘isnāds* were fabricated, then it is unlikely that most or all *‘isnāds* were fabricated.

There are several major flaws in Motzki’s argument. To begin with, Motzki’s Mediaeval diploma analogy should be dismissed out of hand: are there reports of thousands upon thousands of diplomas being fabricated? Were diplomas key ammunition for constant polemics and religious argumentation? Were diplomas often stored in people’s memories and constantly exposed to and evaluated in light of other diplomas? This is clearly a terrible analogy: a more apposite comparison—at least for the *use and context* of Hadith—would be Late Antique and Mediaeval religio-historical (pagan, Jewish, and Christian) ascriptions (such as gospels, apocalypses, epistles, and rabbinical sayings), and as it happens, false creation and pseudepigraphy were the norm in this material, as noted at the outset. In other words, a more germane analogy actually favours Cook’s position, not Motzki’s.

²⁶⁶ Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 235-236. For an earlier formulation of this argument, see *id.*, ‘The Prophet and the Cat’, 32, n. 44.

Furthermore, Motzki was straightforwardly wrong when he claimed that, if most Hadith were interpolated or fabricated (such that *ʿisnāds* were “mainly used to feign reliability”), and if Muslim scholars knew this, they would have dispensed with *ʿisnāds* altogether. On the contrary, it clearly *was* the view of many Muslim scholars that *most* Hadith were in some way false (even if they believed that *their* preferred set of Hadith was the exception to the rule), as can be seen in the multitude of Islamic reports—collated over the past century and a half within secular scholarship—attesting to the ubiquity of various kinds of fabrication, interpolation, and dishonesty in Hadith in the 8th and 9th Centuries CE.²⁶⁷ In other words, even early Muslim scholars acknowledged that false creation was the norm in Hadith, yet they persisted in seeking authentic Hadith nonetheless. For example, Šuʿbah b. al-Ḥajjāj famously declared:

I do not know of anyone who scrutinised Hadith [whose investigation was] comparable to my investigation (*mā ʿaʿlamu ʾaḥad^{an} fattaša al-ḥadīṭ ka-taftīšī*). I discovered that three quarters thereof are false (*waqaftu ʿalā ʾanna talāṭat ʾarbāʿi-hi kadīb*).²⁶⁸

In addition to reports about the massive proliferation of dubious Hadith in general,²⁶⁹ there are sweeping generalisations about the unreliability of the Hadith of specific

²⁶⁷ See the observations, examples, and citations in the following: Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, 55-56, 126-127; Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 108, 111; Juynboll, ‘On the Origins of Arabic Prose’, in Juynboll (ed.), *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society*, 173; *id.*, *Muslim tradition*, 20, 60, 62-65, 132-133, 174, 179-181, 185; Crone & Hinds, *God’s Caliph*, 71; Michael A. Cook, ‘Anan and Islam: The Origins of Karaite Scripturalism’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 9 (1987), 166-174; Albrecht Noth (trans. Gwendolyn Goldbloom), ‘Common Features of Muslim and Western *Ḥadīth* Criticism: Ibn al-Jawzī’s Categories of *Ḥadīth* Forgers’, in Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Variorum, 2004), 309-316/1-8; Motzki (trans. Katz), *Origins*, 185; Juynboll, ‘Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 299; Dickinson, *Development*, 102-103, 123-124; Brown, *Hadith*, 2nd ed., 71-79; Hoyland, *In God’s Path*, 137; Pavlovitch, ‘Origin’, 39; Melchert, ‘Theory and Practice’, in Sijpesteijn & Adang (eds.), *Islam at 250*, 80-81, 86; etc.

²⁶⁸ Muḥammad b. ʾAḥmad al-Ḍahabī (ed. Šuʿayb al-ʾArnaʾūṭ & ʾAlī ʾAbū Zayd), *Siyar ʾAʿlām al-Nubalāʾ*, vol. 7, 2nd ed. (Beirut, Lebanon: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 1982), p. 226. Also see ʾAbū al-Qāsim ʾAbd Allāh b. ʾAḥmad al-Kaʿbī al-Balkī (ed. al-Ḥusaynī b. ʾUmar b. ʾAbd al-Raḥīm), *Qabūl al-ʾAḵbār wa-Maʾrifat al-Rijāl*, vol. 1 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-ʾIlmiyyah, 2000), p. 21. Cf. Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 20, for an alternative translation.

²⁶⁹ E.g., ʾAbū Yūsuf, cited in Muḥammad b. ʾIdrīs al-Šāfiʿī (ed. Rifʾat Fawzī ʾAbd al-Muṭṭalib), *Kitāb al-ʾUmm*, vol. 9 (Mansurah, Egypt: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 2001), pp. 188-189 (unknown Hadith have *tazdādu kaṭrat^{an}*). Also see Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān al-Fasawī (ed. ʾAkram Ḍiyāʾ al-ʾUmarī), *Kitāb al-Maʾrifah wa-al-Taʾrīk*, vol. 2 (Madinah, KSA: Maktabat al-Dār, 1989), p. 15 (concerning a sudden proliferation of Prophetical Hadith).

regions,²⁷⁰ accusations of *tadlīs* and worse on the part of many leading traditionists,²⁷¹ frank admissions about the ubiquity of *tadlīs* amongst traditionists in general,²⁷² and paranoid expositions of the mass-fabrication of Hadith by various heretics and sects, including al-Muḳtār's followers,²⁷³ Muḥammad b. Sa'īd al-'Azdī,²⁷⁴ the *'ahl al-qadar*,²⁷⁵

²⁷⁰ E.g., Muḥammad b. Sa'd al-Baṣrī (ed. Eduard Sachau), *Biographien Muhammeds, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht, Band V: Biographien der Nachfolger in Medina, sowie der Gefährten und Nachfolger im übrigen Arabien* (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1905), p. 173 (concerning a flood of unknown Hadith from "the East", i.e., Iraq); 'Abū al-Qāsim (ed. Ḥusaynī), *Qabūl al-'Akbār*, I, p. 163 (the Hadith of the Syrians are *kurāfāt*); *ibid.*, II, pp. 159, 161 (the Kufans *lā ya'taddūna* the Hadith of the People of Syria and most of the Hadith of the People of Basrah); *ibid.*, pp. 162-163 (concerning the interpolation or elaboration of Hadith in Iraq); *ibid.*, p. 164 (concerning the lying of the People of Iraq); *ibid.*, p. 165 (concerning the interpolation of the People of Iraq); *ibid.*, p. 166 (concerning a flood of unknown Hadith from "the East", i.e., Iraq); *ibid.* (there is *daḡal kaṭīr* in the Hadith of the People of Kufah); 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī Ḥātim, *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa-al-Ta'dīl*, vol. 1 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār 'Iḥyā' al-Turāṭ al-'Arabiyy, 1952), p. 29 (the People of Iraq are *'ahl kaḡīb wa-bāṭil wa-zūr*); Ibn 'Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VII, § 1110, p. 158, # 10589 (the Hadith of the Syrians are *ḡa'if*); 'Abū Nu'aym 'Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-'Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-'Awliyā' wa-Ṭabaqāt al-'Aṣfiyā'*, vol. 7 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Fikr, 1996), p. 213, and 'Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baḡdādī (ed. 'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Sawraqī & 'Ibrāhīm Ḥamdī al-Madani), *Kitāb al-Kifāyah fī 'Ilm al-Riwāyah* (Madinah, KSA: al-Maktabah al-'Ilmiyyah, n. d.), p. 361 (in Kufah, only Mis'ar and Ṣarīk *lā yudallisū*).

²⁷¹ E.g., Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (ed. 'Aḥmad Muḥammad Ṣākir), *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān bi-Tartīb al-'Amīr 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Fārisiyy* (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1952), p. 116 (Ḥammād, Qatādah, 'Abū 'Iṣḥāq, 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Umayr, Ibn Jurayj, al-'A'maṣ, Sufyān al-Tawrī, and Ḥuṣaym *kānū yudallisūna*); 'Abū al-Qāsim (ed. Ḥusaynī), *Qabūl al-'Akbār*, I, pp. 275-276, 249-250 (al-'A'maṣ and 'Abū 'Iṣḥāq *'afṣada* the Hadith of Kufah); *ibid.*, p. 286 (Mālik suspiciously *rawā' aṣyā' lam yarwi-hā ḡayru-hu*); *ibid.*, II, pp. 45-46 (Muḥammad b. 'Iṣḥāq is a *kaḡḡāb*); *ibid.*, p. 402 ('Abū 'Iṣḥāq, al-Ḥakam, Muḡirah, al-'A'maṣ, Sufyān al-Tawrī, Qatādah, Ḥuṣaym, Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah, 'Iṣḥāq, Yaḥyā b. 'abī Kaṭīr, Ibn 'abī Najīḥ, Ḥajjāj b. 'Arṭāh, and Ḥumayd al-Tawīl *all yudallisūna*); Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūt *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, pp. 35, 46 (Ḥiṣām b. 'Urwah *'arsala/yursilu* from his father); *ibid.*, VII, p. 113 (al-'Awzā'ī had *ḡadīṭ ḡa'if*); Walī al-Dīn 'Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Raḥīm b. al-'Irāqī (ed. Rif'at Fawzī 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib & Nāfiḍ Ḥusayn Ḥammām), *al-Mudallisīn* (Mansurah, Egypt: Dār al-Wafā', 1995), pp. 69-70, # 40 (Ibn Jurayj was *mukṭir min al-tadlīs*); *ibid.*, p. 101, # 72 (Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd al-'Anṣārī *kāna yudallisū*); Jalāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī (ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad Maḥmūd Ḥasan Naṣṣār), *'Asmā' al-Mudallisīn* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Jīl, 1992), p. 84 (Ibn Ṣihāb al-Zuhrī was *maṣḥūr bi-al-tadlīs*).

²⁷² E.g., 'Alī b. al-Ja'd al-Jawharī (ed. 'Āmir 'Aḥmad Ḥaydar), *Musnad* (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat Nādir, 1990), p. 24, # 50.

²⁷³ E.g., 'Ibrāhīm b. Ya'qūb al-Jūzajānī (ed. Ṣubḥī al-Badrī al-Samarrā'ī), *'Aḥwāl al-Rijāl*, vol. 1 (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, n. d.), pp. 39-40; 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī b. al-Jawzī (ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad 'Uṭmān), *Kitāb al-Mawḡū'āt*, vol. 1 (Madinah, KSA: al-Maktabah al-Salafiyyah, 1966), p. 39.

²⁷⁴ E.g., 'Umar b. 'Aḥmad b. Ṣāhīn (ed. 'Abd al-Raḥīm Muḥammad 'Aḥmad al-Qaṣqarī), *Kitāb Ta'rīḳ 'Asmā' al-Ḍu'afā' wa-al-Kaḡḡābīn* (1989), p. 168. For an alleged confession by this heretic, see: 'Abū Zur'ah 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Amr al-Dimaṣqī (ed. Ḳalīl al-Manṣūr), *Ta'rīḳ 'Abī Zur'ah al-Dimaṣqiyy* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1996), p. 213, # 1147; Fasawī (ed. 'Umarī), *Ma'rīfah*, I, p. 700; Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (ed. Ḥamdī 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafi), *al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḡaddīṭīn*, vol. 2 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Ṣamī'iyy, 2000), § 920, p. 257; 'Abū Nu'aym 'Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-'Iṣfahānī (ed. Fārūq Ḥammādah), *Kitāb al-Ḍu'afā'* (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Qalam, 2010), p. 129, # 208. For another version, see Ibn 'abī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, VII, p. 263; Ibn 'Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, IX, p. 104; Ibn Ṣāhīn (ed. Qaṣqarī), *Ta'rīḳ*, p. 168; 'Abū Zur'ah 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Rāzī & Sa'īd b. 'Amr al-Barḡa'ī (ed. Sa'dī al-Hāṣimī), *'Abū Zur'ah al-Rāziyy wa-Juhūdu-hu fī al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah ma'a Taḡḡīq Kitābi-hi al-Ḍu'afā' wa-'Ajwibati-hi 'alā 'As'ilat al-Barḡa'īyy*, vol. 2 (Mansurah, Egypt: Dār al-Wafā', 1989), pp. 725-726. For yet another version, see: 'Uqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍu'afā'*, V, p. 273, # 5302.

²⁷⁵ E.g., Ibn 'abī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, II, pp. 32-33.

the *zanādiqah*,²⁷⁶ and others.²⁷⁷ Even pious and good men (presumably including proto-Sunnīs) were prolific in Hadith-related mendacity,²⁷⁸ as Yaḥyá b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān²⁷⁹ and ʿAbū ʿĀṣim al-Nabīl²⁸⁰ famously observed. Some early Muslims (in particular, some rationalists and Kārijīs) even seem to have rejected Hadith altogether,²⁸¹ presumably because they regarded the entire corpus to be suspect. Of course, many of these reports—especially those ascribed to early authorities—are ironically probably fabricated,²⁸² but they nevertheless clearly attest to the impressions of early Muslims, traditionists, and Hadith critics that fabrication and interpolation were ubiquitous—and yet, *contra* Motzki’s prediction, most continued to seek, transmit, evaluate, and rely upon Hadith.

But what if *virtually all* Hadith were ultimately false ascriptions, as the Revisionist model suggests—would Motzki’s point still stand? In the first place, Motzki never established his premise that, if most or all *ʿisnāds* were ultimately false, then Muslim scholars would have known that to be the case. Why should we accept this premise? *Contra* Motzki, it is easy to imagine a scenario in which traditionists believed that what

²⁷⁶ E.g., Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Salafī), *Majrūḥīn*, I, p. 58. For the alleged confession of a former *zindīq*, see Ibn ʿAdī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, I, pp. 363-364, # 915, and al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Sawraqī & Madanī), *Kifāyah*, p. 431. For the titanic efforts of the *zanādiqah*, see: al-ʿUqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍuʿafāʾ*, I, p. 88, # 37; Ibn Ṣāhīn (ed. Qaṣṣārī), *Taʾrīk*, p. 40; al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Sawraqī & Madanī), *Kifāyah*, p. 431.

²⁷⁷ There are numerous reports about the confessions of former sectary or heretic, although the identity thereof varies from one version to the next. For the version featuring a *ṣayk la-hum yaʿnī al-rāfiḍah*, see al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Ṭaḥḥān), *Jāmiʿ*, I, p. 138, # 162. For the versions featuring a *ṣayk min al-ḳawārij*, see Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad al-Fīrābī (ed. ʿAbd al-Wakīl al-Nadawī), *Fawāʿid al-Fīrābiyy* (Bombay, India: al-Dār al-Salafiyyah, 1992), # 24; Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (ed. Fuʿād ʿAbd al-Munʿim ʿAḥmad), *al-Madḳal ʾilā Kitāb al-ʾIklīl* (Alexandria, Egypt: Dār al-Daʿwah, 1983), p. 53; al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Sawraqī & Madanī), *Kifāyah*, p. 123; al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Ramahurmuzī (ed. Muḥammad ʿAjjāj al-Ḳaṭīb), *al-Muḥaddiṭ al-Fāsil bayn al-Rāwī wa-al-Wāʿi*, 3rd ed. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 1984), pp. 415-416. For the versions featuring a *rajuḷ min ʾahl al-ʾahwāʾ*, see Ibn ʿAdī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, I, p. 356, # 896; ʿAbū Nuʿaym, *Ḥilyah*, IX, p. 39. For the versions featuring a *rajuḷ min ʾahl al-bidaʿ*, see Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Salafī), *Majrūḥīn*, I, p. 78; al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Sawraqī & Madanī), *Kifāyah*, p. 123.

²⁷⁸ E.g., Ibn ʿAdī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, I, p. 448, # 1138, concerning the infamous Ġulām Ḳalīl.

²⁷⁹ For the common version of this report, concerning *al-ṣāliḥīn*, see: Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī (ed. Naṣar b. Muḥammad al-Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, vol. 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ṭaybah, 2006), p. 10, col. 2; ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAḥmad b. Ḥanbal (ed. Waṣī Allāh b. Muḥammad ʿAbbās), *Kitāb al-ʾIlal wa-Maʾrifat al-Rijāl*, vol. 2 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Ḳāniyy, 2001), p. 448, # 2989; Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad b. al-ʿĀbanūsī (ed. Ḳalīl Ḥasan Ḥammādah), *al-Maṣyāḳah*, vol. 1 (Riyadh, KSA: King Saud University, 1421 AH), p. 52, # 8; Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Salafī), *Majrūḥīn*, I, p. 67; al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Ṭaḥḥān), *Jāmiʿ*, II, p. 199, # 1607; Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad al-Ḍahabī (ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī), *Mizān al-ʾitidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl*, vol. 4 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Maʾrifah, n. d.), p. 58, # 8285. Also see Ibn ʿAdī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, I, p. 339, # 831. For the version about the *ʾahl al-ḳayr*, see Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 10, col. 2. For a version about *man yunsabu ʾilā al-ḳayr*, which does not explicitly mention Hadith, see ʿAbd Allāh (ed. Waṣī Allāh), *ʾIlal*, II, p. 448, # 2988.

²⁸⁰ Ibn ʿAdī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, I, pp. 339-340, # 835.

²⁸¹ Cook, “Anan and Islam”, 166-174.

²⁸² Dickinson, *Development*, 103.

they had inherited was genuine, even if they themselves or their peers were engaging in fabrication: fabrications could accumulate over the generations, with preceding fabrications—say, the fabrications of esteemed figures—being taken for granted as authentic transmissions. For example, suppose that ‘Urwah fabricated some hadiths and passed them on to his students such as al-Zuhrī and Hišām, who in turn fabricated some hadiths and passed them on to their students (along with ‘Urwah’s hadiths), and so on; the students of ‘Urwah could believe that what they had inherited from ‘Urwah was genuine, even if they had added their own fakes; and their students could think the same thing in turn; and so. Motzki is simply *presuming* that something like this did not happen, which is to say: his premise (that traditionists would have known if all *’isnāds* were fabricated) is unsubstantiated.

Perhaps Motzki believed (for whatever unspecified reason) that the “system of Muslim *Ḥadīth* criticism”—the systematic evaluation, comparison, and criticism of *’isnāds*, which Motzki invoked to demonstrate that Muslim traditionists likely did not believe that all or most *’isnāds* were fabricated—allowed Muslim traditionists to somehow identify whether their peers were fabricators.²⁸³ Even if we grant this for the sake of argument, a new problem arises: according to some Islamic reports, Hadith criticism only commenced in the mid-to-late 8th Century CE with Šu‘bah b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 160/777),²⁸⁴ more than half a century after the genesis of the *’isnād*.²⁸⁵ And yet, even this might be too early: according to Eerik Dickinson’s research, most of the 8th-Century traditionists retrospectively identified by 9th- and 10th-Century Hadith critics as founders or early practitioners of Hadith criticism, including Šu‘bah, al-ʿAwzāʿī, Mālik, and Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah, were probably not actually Hadith critics.²⁸⁶ The

²⁸³ This is presumably what he had in mind when he stated (‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 235): “the whole scholarly community as a whole must have watched to ensure that its norm was not violated.”

²⁸⁴ In addition to the declaration of Šu‘bah’s cited above, see Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Muʿīd Kān) *Kitāb al-Ṭiqāt*, vol. 6 (Hyderabad, India: Osmania Oriental Publications Bureau, 1980), p. 446; al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Ṭaḥḥān), *Jāmiʿ*, II, p. 201, # 1612; Ḍahabī (ed. ʿArnaʿūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VII, p. 206. Also see Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 214, n. 102; Juynboll, ‘On the Origins of Arabic Prose’, in Juynboll (ed.), *Studies*, 172; *id.*, *Muslim tradition*, 20.

²⁸⁵ For the chronology of the *’isnād*, see below, in the section on the relationship between CLs and their hadiths.

²⁸⁶ Dickinson, *Development*, 41-44, 57-58, 80-81, 91-92, 127-129. Cf. Scott C. Lucas, *Constructive Critics, Ḥadīth Literature, and the Articulation of Sunnī Islam: The Legacy of the Generation of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿīn, and Ibn Ḥanbal* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2004), 119, 151 ff., who argues to the contrary. Cf. in turn Christopher Melchert, ‘Lucas, Scott C. *Constructive Critics, Ḥadīth Literature, and the Articulation of Sunnī Islam: The Legacy of the Generation of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿīn, and Ibn Ḥanbal*’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 13, Number 3 (2006), 412, who charges Lucas with failing to address Dickinson’s actual arguments. Additionally, Belal Abu-Alabbas, ‘The Principles of Hadith Criticism in the

starting point of Hadith criticism is thus somewhat murky—at the very least, the method only *spread* and *predominated* during the 9th Century CE, more than a century after the genesis of the *ʿisnād*. In other words, Motzki’s “system of Muslim *Ḥadīṭ* criticism” was absent for practically the first two Islamic centuries, during which time *ʿisnāds* could have been fabricated and interpolated freely.

To make matters worse, there is substantial evidence that Hadith critics often relied upon intuition, in the form of (1) rampant contradictions between Hadith critics and (2) reports attesting to the indescribability of their method, or the way in which their method was a matter of taste or instinct.²⁸⁷ For example, consider the following statement attributed to the early Hadith critic ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Maḥdī (d. 198/814):

Knowledge of Hadith (*maʿrifat al-ḥadīṭ*) is inspiration/instinct (*ʿilhām*). Would you say to the knowledgeable man who diagnoses Hadith (*l-ʿālim yuʿallilu al-ḥadīṭ*), “On what basis do you say this (*min ʿayna qulta ḥādā*)?” He has no [such] proof (*lam yakun la-hu ḥujjah*)!²⁸⁸

Needless to say, such reports need not be taken as authentic memories of Ibn Maḥdī *et al.*—their value rather lies in the fact that, even if they are fabricated, they reveal the impressions of some Hadith critics concerning the nature of their discipline.

All of this suggests either that Hadith criticism—the method of systematically demanding, comparing, and evaluating *ʿisnāds*—was itself applied *unsystematically* (being frequently usurped by mere intuition), or else that the method itself often involved a reliance on intuition. Since intuition is (by definition) the absence of a conscious methodology, it allows for untrammelled whims, biases, and invalid

Writings of al-Shāfiʿī and Muslim’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 24 (2017), 335, argues that “the highly developed level of Hadith criticism in the *Risāla*” of al-Šāfiʿī confirms “that Hadith criticism developed already in the generation before al-Šāfiʿī,” specifically, beginning with Šuʿbah. Abu-Alabbas’ conclusion (that Hadith criticism goes back to Šuʿbah in particular) flies in the face of the problems raised by Dickinson, however, which Abu-Alabbas failed to address. An obvious solution to all of this would be that Šuʿbah’s main student and al-Šāfiʿī’s senior contemporary, Yaḥyá b. Saʿīd al-Qaṭṭān (d. 198/813), was the true founder of Hadith criticism, if indeed the method derives from a single architect. In relation to this, consider Ḍahabī (ed. Bijāwī), *Mizān*, I, p. 1.

²⁸⁷ See Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, 143-144; Nabia Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri, Volume 2: Qurʾānic Commentary and Tradition* (Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1967), 74; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 161; Melchert, *Aḥmad*, 56; and esp. *id.*, ‘The life and works of al-Nasāʾī’, 398-400, 405 (in part responding to Lucas, *Constructive Critics*).

²⁸⁸ ‘Abū Zurʿah & al-Barḍaʿī (ed. Hāšimī), *ʿAbū Zurʿah al-Rāziyy wa-Juhūdu-hu*, I, p. 244. Also see Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (ed. ‘Aḥmad b. Fāris al-Sulūm), *Maʿrifat ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīṭ wa-Kammīyyat ʿAjnāsi-hi* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2003), p. 360, # 271. For an alternative version, see ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī Ḥātim (ed. Saʿd b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥumayyid, Kālid b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Juraysī, *et al.*), *Kitāb al-ʿIlal*, vol. 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Maṭābiʿ al-Ḥumaydiyy, 2006), p. 388.

inferences: this is all the more reason to think that the Hadith critics were incapable of consistently identifying fabrications and interpolations.

In short, Motzki's invocation of the "system of Muslim *Ḥadīth* criticism" is misguided, on two counts. Firstly, Hadith criticism arose and spread a century after the rise of the *'isnāds*, allowing ample time for any number of fabricators to acquire a saintly reputation (in the absence of a method that could catch them out), and for the fabrication of multiple, independent *'isnāds* for any number of Hadith (thus allowing fabrications to appear 'corroborated', the usual metric for authenticity in Hadith criticism). Secondly, early Hadith critics frequently resorted to mere intuition, which was incapable of systematically identifying fabrications and interpolations. Consequently, the occurrence of Hadith criticism is perfectly consistent with all *'isnāds* having been ultimately fabricated, *without* Hadith criticism having been a giant farce (*contra* Motzki): Hadith criticism was ill-equipped—given its belated emergence and the frequent reliance on intuition by its practitioners—to identify fabrications and interpolations in the first place.

The final problem with Motzki's argument against Cook's skepticism concerns his claims about the intentions behind *'isnāds*, and the rules surrounding their use:

The intention of the *isnād* system was to assure the reliability of the transmission process. The basic value linked with it was that I have to name the informant from whom I had received the information. Doing otherwise intentionally was forgery and dishonesty.²⁸⁹

Both of these propositions are unjustified, insofar as the 8th Century CE is concerned: it is completely plausible that the intention of the *'isnād* was varied at the very least, and the creation of *'isnāds* was not necessarily mendacious. Indeed, it was already noted at the outset that modern scholarship has posited several ahistorical, non-literalistic, or otherwise non-mendacious mindsets and processes on the part of those who created Hadith. Thus, Goldziher, Schacht, Harris Birkeland, Andrew Rippin, and others have suggested that early *'isnāds* were merely *conventional* or *symbolic*, serving as expressions of the *ideal* communal or scholarly lineage of correct doctrine for any given sect or region; Leone Caetani, James Robson, Birkeland, Herbert Berg, A. Kevin Reinhart, and others have suggested that *'isnāds* were (sincerely) *inferred* or *deduced*

²⁸⁹ Motzki, 'Dating Muslim Traditions', 235.

on the basis of sectarian or regional scholarly lineages, family genealogies, etc.; Motzki himself suggested that *ʿisnāds* were sometimes the product of sheer guesswork or speculation; and so on.²⁹⁰

If indeed such ahistorical or non-literalist approaches to *ʿisnāds* were common during the 8th Century CE, when did they become displaced by the extant, classical notion that *ʿisnāds* are supposed to be literal, ‘passed down as is’ records of the transmission-history of their *matns*? I argue that such a shift (towards literalism or historicism in Hadith) can be identified with the rise of the Hadith partisans (*ʿaṣḥāb al-ḥadīṡ*) and their Hadith critics at the turn of the 9th Century CE, which also coincides with a sharp increase in the reliability or integrity of *matns* in the course of transmission.²⁹¹ As it happens, something similar was already proposed by Robson, who likewise made the inference on the basis of the rise of the Hadith critics.²⁹² This conclusion is corroborated by the studies of Hiroyuki Yanagihashi, who argues that this literalism or historicism began to manifest in the mid-to-late 8th Century CE and obtained amongst traditionists in the early 9th Century CE.²⁹³ Even Motzki himself acknowledged a shift in the norms of transmission during the late 8th and early 9th Century CE, including the belated rise of the Hadith critics.²⁹⁴ In other words, Motzki was exactly right when he said: “Al-Šāfiʿī’s insistence on traditions with reliable *isnāds* would have been pointless and hypocritical if he had been convinced that most traditions available in his time were equipped with fabricated *isnāds*.”²⁹⁵ The only problem is that al-Šāfiʿī and those like him—those who took Hadith literally in a historical sense, prioritising them as a source of doctrine over reasoning and local tradition—only arose towards the end of the 8th Century CE, around a century after the beginnings of Hadith.

In sum, Motzki’s arguments against Cook’s skeptical interpretation of *ʿisnāds*—and the Revisionist model of Hadith development more broadly—fail on multiple counts: Motzki’s claim that Muslim scholars would have known if all Hadith were fabricated is unjustified; Motzki’s invocation of Hadith criticism (as if this would have allowed

²⁹⁰ See the references given at the outset.

²⁹¹ See below, in the section on Little’s defence of the *ʿisnād-cum-matn* analysis.

²⁹² Robson, ‘Ibn Ishāq’s use of the *Isnād*’, 449.

²⁹³ Yanagihashi, *Studies*, 550, 553.

²⁹⁴ Motzki (trans. Paoli & Reid), ‘The Jurisprudence of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 11.

²⁹⁵ Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 235.

Muslims to realise that all Hadith were false, such that they would not have bothered with Hadith at all) is misguided, since the belated emergence of Hadith criticism and the prevalence of intuition therein would have allowed many fabrications and fabricators to go unnoticed; and finally, Motzki's claim that *'isnāds* were always understood in a literal-historical fashion (such that creating *'isnāds* was always regarded as lying) is at best unjustified and at worst false. We thus have no reason to "presume that *isnāds* are, in principle, reliable" (as Motzki would have it), and ample reasons to presume otherwise. Motzki's argument only makes sense after the rise of the Hadith partisans and the Hadith critics around the turn of the 9th Century CE, which arguably coincided with the rise of a literalist or historicist view of Hadith and a sharp increase in the reliability or integrity of Hadith transmission. By this point, however, it was too late: on the Revisionist view, the bulk of the Hadith corpus had already been created, and the creators thereof had already attained the status of saints and masters.²⁹⁶ More importantly (*apropos* Motzki's criticisms of Cook's skepticism in particular), ample time had elapsed for the spread of *'isnāds* to create all manner of false CLs and apparent corroborations, all before Muslim scholars possessed the tools to detect and prevent such an occurrence. Even if the Hadith critics of the 9th Century CE and later were able to police their contemporaries, there is no reason to think that they could consistently identify *past* false ascriptions. Thus, acceptance of the Revisionist model in general, or Cook's spread of *'isnāds* in particular, in no way implies or entails that "the whole system of Muslim Ḥadīṭ criticism" was "only a manoeuvre of deception", *contra* Motzki.

In short, Motzki's arguments against Cook's skepticism are unsound, which means that we are still left with strong reasons to suspect the general occurrence of false ascription and the spread of *'isnāds*. Consequently, the status of CLs as genuine common sources for their hadiths—rather than the product of successive borrowings and retrojections—remains doubtful.

²⁹⁶ For example, most of Schacht's examples of the "growth of traditions" occurred during the 8th and early 9th Centuries CE (*Origins*, part II), and most of Juynboll's "common links" were operating during the 8th Century CE. For the latter, see Christopher Melchert, 'Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīṭ. By G.H.A. Juynboll', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 15 (2008), 408.

Powers' Criticism of Cook

In his 1989 article 'On Bequests in Early Islam', David Powers analysed a hadith with multiple SS *'isnāds* reaching back to the Companion Sa'd b. 'abī Waqqāṣ (d. 55/674-675), arguing that "it was Sa'd himself who first put the report into circulation."²⁹⁷ In other words, according to Powers, this hadith can be traced back to a genuine Companion CL. Powers reaches this conclusion by arguing that the alternative—that the "spread" of *'isnāds* resulted in multiple, parallel false ascriptions unto Sa'd—is less probable:

There are several objections that may be raised to this approach. First, it is odd that the sources contain no evidence to suggest that the one-third restriction circulated as the personal opinion of a Successor rather Prophet. Second, Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ did not die until ca. A.H. 55. It is therefore curious that the alleged fabricator of the report, living at the end of the first century A.H., chose Sa'd to play the role of a man who appears to be on the point of death in the year A.H. 10. Finally, it is either strange or a remarkable coincidence that half a dozen Successors, living in different cities of the Umayyad empire and presumably acting independently of one another, adopted the same story to illustrate the origins of the one-third restriction, tracing it back to the Prophet by means of fabricated *'isnāds*, all of which converge on one and the same Companion. If the one-third restriction was, in fact, invented by an older Successor, one would expect that at least some of the younger Successors would have placed its origins in the context of an exchange between the Prophet and another Companion, thereby creating for themselves something both unique and more easily defensible against charges of mendacity.²⁹⁸

Powers is defending a specific Companion CL, but his arguments could be applied more generally, in any given case, against Cook's spread of *'isnāds* and Juynboll's dives—thus, its inclusion here.

There are several problems with Powers' argument, however. Firstly, Powers' suggestion that, on a false-ascription hypothesis, we would expect to find a Follower-level version of the hadith, is false: it was already Schacht's view that some hadiths were cast into a Prophetical form *from their inception*,²⁹⁹ such that they never

²⁹⁷ David S. Powers, 'On Bequests in Early Islam', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Volume 48, Number 3 (1989), 195 ff.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 195.

²⁹⁹ E.g., Schacht, *Origin*, 254: "the creation and transmission of 'isolated' traditions from the Prophet was the main weapon of the traditionists." Also see Juynboll, 'Islam's first *fuqahā*', 299.

underwent a progressive retrojection—from Follower to Companion to Prophetic ascription—in the manner of so many other hadiths. Thus, the absence of a version of this hadith ascribed to a Follower in no way precludes a false-ascription scenario.

Secondly, the choice of Sa’d as the vehicle for this Prophetic precedent is easily explained by positing that the descendants of Sa’d would have been inclined to target him in their ascriptions, and that his near-death in 10 AH was either created to flesh out the story or else was simply part of his family’s lore at the time of the hadith’s emergence.

Thirdly, as Cook already pointed out to Juynboll, a “spread” scenario does not require a “strange or a remarkable coincidence” (as Powers would have it), since what is envisaged thereby is successive borrowings and dives by tradents who are satisfied with Sa’d’s authority and merely desire, require, or assume parallel paths of transmission thereto.³⁰⁰

Fourthly, Powers’ assertion that those creating dives for this hadith would have jettisoned the original cited source (Sa’d) and ascribed their stolen versions to other Companions (“thereby creating for themselves something both unique and more easily defensible against charges of mendacity”) seems predicated upon a very limited and wooden notion of diving or the spread of *’isnāds*, as if all divers were mechanical, deliberate, and calculating.³⁰¹ In particular, Powers assumes that divers were only motivated by a desire for “unique” transmissions and to defend themselves “against charges of mendacity.” Powers provides no evidence for this axiomatic psychology of divers—why could this not have been an instance in which divers were satisfied with the already-prestigious Companion-source and simply required, desired, or assumed alternative or corroborating *’isnāds* unto him?

Powers also asserts that his preferred hypothesis—that the various ascriptions to Sa’d are authentic—is “simpler and more reasonable” than the skeptical alternative,³⁰² but this simply ignores all of our established background evidence on the ubiquity of false creation in Hadith, the various pressures of early traditionist culture, the belated rise of *’isnāds*, etc., all of which militate against Powers’ view. Despite all of this, Powers maintains that, “with regard to the question of the burden of proof in proving or

³⁰⁰ See above, in the section on Cook and Juynboll’s criticisms of each other.

³⁰¹ Cf. the range of mindsets and motives outlined at the outset.

³⁰² Powers, ‘Bequests’, 197.

disproving the authenticity of prophetic hadith, I believe that the onus lies on those who would deny the authenticity of reports attributed to the Prophet.”³⁰³ *Pace* Powers, the presumption of skepticism remains warranted in the domain of Hadith.³⁰⁴

Görke’s Criticism of Cook

Cook’s above-cited testing of the validity of CLs with three eschatological hadiths has also been criticised by Andreas Görke, on several bases. To begin with, Görke argues that Cook’s first hadith is poorly attested, extremely disparate in wording (“in such a way that one might ask if this is really the same tradition”), and ambiguous in its historical allusions.³⁰⁵ Moreover, Cook’s second hadith is also poorly attested and disparate in wording,³⁰⁶ and both hadiths feature the known Hadith duplicator, interpolator, and diver Ibn Lahī‘ah prominently in their *’isnāds*.³⁰⁷ Accordingly, Görke concluded: “from a methodological point of view, we would not expect to get good results from these traditions. Their *asānīd* are simply not suited for dating a tradition.”³⁰⁸ In other words, the chronological mismatch between the apparent CLs of these two hadiths and the events to which these hadiths allegedly refer is not significant: the events in question may have been misidentified by Cook, and the relevant *’isnāds* are suspect.

By contrast, Cook’s third hadith suffers from none of these problems: “It is attested in several collections, has a clear common link and three partial common links after the common link.”³⁰⁹ Thus, whether one approaches the CL from the perspective of Schacht, Juynboll, or Motzki (see below), it would seem that the CL ought to be genuine.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, 199.

³⁰⁴ Powers seems to have become more skeptical more recently, e.g., Pavel Pavlovitch & David S. Powers, “‘A Bequest May Not Exceed One-Third’: An *Isnād-cum-Matn* Analysis and Beyond”, in Behnam Sadeghi, Asad Q. Ahmed, Adam Silverstein, & Robert G. Hoyland (eds.), *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts: Essays in Honor of Professor Patricia Crone* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015), 135: “Based on our findings – in our view, compelling – Powers is now prepared to withdraw his earlier argument that the one-third restriction was introduced by Muḥammad.”

³⁰⁵ Andreas Görke, ‘Eschatology, History, and the Common Link: A Study in Methodology’, in Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2003), 197.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 198.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 198-199.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 199.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

And yet, the CL in question is Qatādah b. Di‘āmah (d. 117-118/735-736), who operated too late to be the hadith’s fabricator, given its earlier, Zubayrid context. However, *contra* Cook, this in no way invalidates the historicity of the CL: it might be the case that Qatādah created the hadith out of pre-existing eschatological material (i.e., material that was in circulation since the Zubayrid era), or else he may simply have accurately transmitted an earlier hadith (i.e., from his predecessor Mujāhid). Either way, “a common link spreading a tradition that alludes to events recently gone by can be explained and does not invalidate the common link as a means for the dating of traditions.”³¹⁰

Brown’s Criticism of Juynboll

In a 2008 review of Juynboll’s *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*, Jonathan Brown asserted that Juynboll’s iteration of the Revisionist model of Hadith development—more precisely, the collective results or entailments of Juynboll’s relatively skeptical method and assumptions—requires that early Muslim scholars engaged in a colossal amount of lying: first mass-fabricating Hadith, then collectively pretending that they had not done so, without ratting each other out. Such a scenario—such mass-mendacity and widespread collaboration—is deemed to be highly unlikely, for several reasons:

But perhaps the most problematic aspect of Juynboll’s method, in my opinion, is that it collapses under Occam’s razor. Juynboll carries scepticism towards the Muslim *ḥadīth* tradition to such an extreme that the reader is asked to believe in the existence of a web of lies, forgeries and conspiracy so elaborate that it is easier to believe that—from time to time—the Prophet might actually have said some of the *ḥadīths* attributed to him. For Juynboll, anything other than the well-attested *isnāds* emanating from a Common Link is assumed to be a forged chain of transmission. This includes all corroborating transmissions (*mutābi‘āt*) and, using his terminology, ‘Single Strand’ *ḥadīths*, ‘Spiders’ and ‘diving’ chains. Thus the vast bulk of the material sorted through by Muslim *ḥadīth* scholars over centuries and recorded in their voluminous works was not only forged, but all the thousands of scholars from Spain to Iran involved in transmitting and analysing this material from the eighth to the fifteenth centuries were able

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*

to orchestrate, contain and conceal this titanic, common forgery endeavour. Here we must remember that the fiercest critics of Muslim *ḥadīth* transmitters and the jurists who employed their material were other Muslim *ḥadīth* critics and opponent jurists. It is thanks to their collective obsession with documenting the failings of their colleagues' *ḥadīth* transmission that Western scholars even have the raw material needed to perform *isnād* analysis.

It is most unreasonable to assume that many *ḥadīths* attributed to the Prophet are forgeries. While one can certainly question some of the credulity and naiveté of Muslim *ḥadīth* critics, it is unreasonable to entertain that the preponderance of pages filling the thousands of volumes lining any *ḥadīth* library, not to mention the pervasive critical ethos that motivated their production, could have been stuffed there speciously by the continentally-separated, internally-diverse and virulently divided community of pre-modern Muslim *ḥadīth* scholars. Although less glamorous, this suggestion is as far-fetched as that made by Père Hardouin, the eighteenth-century French Jesuit who, relying on numismatic evidence, concluded that all works of classical Greek and Roman literature (with the exception of Cicero's letters and a smattering of other works) had been forged by a cadre of fourteenth-century Italian tricksters.³¹¹

There are numerous problems with this argumentation. To begin with, Brown—in his appeal to parsimony—sets up a false dichotomy between Juynboll's view that most or all *'isnāds* are ultimately "a web of lies, forgeries and conspiracy" and his own view that "the Prophet might actually have said some of the *ḥadīths* attributed to him". This conflates the provenance of *matns* with the provenance of *'isnāds*, which are logically distinct: it is possible that all *'isnāds* are formally false and, at the same time, that many *matns* do derive—via some kind of early, informal or undocumented transmission—from the Prophet's actual statements and actions. Indeed, this was precisely Juynboll's view:

This study does not deny that in all probability the prophet's statements and/or activities may have, at least partially, been reported by one or more of his followers, but it may have become apparent from the foregoing pages that I am sceptical as to whether we will ever be able to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that what we have in the way of 'sound prophetic traditions' is indeed just that what it purports to be.

Differently put, **it seems likely that at least part of the prophetic traditions listed in one or more canonical – or even non-canonical – collections deserves to be considered as a fair representation of what the prophet of Islam did or said, or might have done or said, but surely**

³¹¹ Jonathan A. C. Brown, 'Encyclopedia of Canonical *Ḥadīth*, by G. H. A. Juynboll', *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Volume 19, Number 3 (2008), 395.

it is unlikely that we will ever find even a moderately successful method of proving with incontrovertible certainty the historicity of the ascription of such to the prophet but in a few isolated instances.³¹²

Thus, in addition to a false dichotomy, Brown has not accurately represented Juynboll's position. *Pace* Brown, the key issue of contention here is whether the early provenance of the content of hadiths can be known merely on the basis of *'isnāds*, which is to say, whether—or to what extent—*'isnāds* are *reliable records of transmission*.

Brown's appeal to parsimony can still proceed, but only if we interpret his argument charitably and construct a steelman version thereof, as follows: as an explanation for the existence of most *'isnāds*, the hypothesis of the occurrence of a giant conspiracy amongst early Muslim scholars—to both fabricate most or all *'isnāds* and suppress any mention of this activity—is more complicated than the hypothesis of the occurrence of the concurrently-documented intergenerational transmission of Hadith from the Prophet, the Companions, and the Followers unto the extant Hadith collections. Since Juynboll's skeptical interpretation of *'isnāds* leads to the conclusion that *'isnāds* were mass-created, and given that this in turn entails the occurrence of a giant conspiracy (according to Brown), we ought to prefer a sanguine interpretation of *'isnāds*, generally speaking: the latter is more parsimonious.

It is certainly true that parsimony ("Occam's razor") can be used to adjudicate between competing hypotheses that otherwise equally explain the same set of evidence: the hypothesis with fewer propositions or 'entities' thereby contains fewer potential errors and is thus to be preferred, all else being equal. But Brown never gives an argument for why Juynboll's interpretation of *'isnāds* (as being "a web of lies, forgeries and conspiracy") is less parsimonious—he simply asserts it.³¹³ More importantly, all else is not equal in this instance: parsimony is superseded—as a reason

³¹² Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 71. Emphasis mine.

³¹³ In fact, a skeptical interpretation of an *'isnād* usually consists of *less* propositions than a sanguine interpretation: Juynboll explains an entire SS *'isnād* with a single proposition (i.e., that the *'isnād* is a retrojection or dive), whereas Brown explains each segment therein—each connection from one tradent to the next—with a separate proposition (i.e., that each connection between a tradent is the result of genuine transmission), resulting in a whole series of propositions for each individual SS *'isnād*. Thus, where Juynboll might explain an instance of Mālik—Nāfi'—Ibn 'Umar—the Prophet with the single proposition that it is a retrojection by Mālik, Brown explains the same instance with (1) the proposition that the Prophet related this hadith to Ibn 'Umar and the latter accurately recorded as such, and (2) the proposition that Ibn 'Umar related this hadith to Nāfi' and the latter accurately recorded as such, and (3) the proposition that Nāfi' related this hadith to Mālik and the latter accurately recorded as such, etc. Taken as an aggregate, a sanguine interpretation of *'isnāds* would thus constitute vastly more propositions than a skeptical interpretation.

to prefer a given hypothesis—by other explanatory virtues, such as explanatory scope, predictive novelty, and retrodictive novelty (i.e., independent or corroborating evidence), and is also irrelevant when one of the ‘competing’ hypotheses has been falsified (i.e., conflicts with the available evidence).³¹⁴ Given that Juynboll’s revisionist conclusions about the mass-creation of *’isnāds* are supported by a large amount of independent evidence,³¹⁵ and given that much of this evidence also straightforwardly contradicts the traditional view of *’isnāds* and Hadith more generally,³¹⁶ Brown’s appeal to parsimony is simply irrelevant.³¹⁷

The other elements of Brown’s objection to Juynboll’s conclusions are more substantive, posing first logistical or physical problems, and then evidentiary problems, for mass-mendacity in early Hadith. The first logistical or physical consideration is that of quantity: Brown almost seems to imply in passing that the extant quantity of Hadith (“the vast bulk of the material” and “thousands of volumes”) is an impediment to Juynboll’s view,³¹⁸ as if it is implausible that tens or hundreds of thousands of *’isnāds* could have been fabricated. Actually, the numerousness of the extant Hadith corpus is misleading, in that most of the reports in question are variants of the same hadiths, often deriving in their *’isnāds* from CLs. When duplicates of this kind are accounted for, the Hadith corpus reduces to around 10,000 traditions, by one estimate.³¹⁹ The question thus becomes: could a community collectively falsely ascribe 10,000 short reports or stories? Or, given the geography of early Islam: could the communities of Kufah, Basrah, Madinah, Makkah, and Syria have collectively falsely ascribed 10,000 short reports or stories, with each centre contributing a few thousand

³¹⁴ For example, the hypothesis that Jesus preached that he was God—as an explanation for why later Christians believed that he was God—is simpler than the hypothesis that said belief arose via a protracted theological evolution over the course of many decades. And, as it happens, the simpler hypothesis is clearly false, in light of our earliest evidence; see Bart D. Ehrman, *How Jesus Became God: The Exaltation of a Jewish Preacher from Galilee* (San Francisco, USA: HarperOne, 2014).

³¹⁵ See the summary given at the beginning of this chapter.

³¹⁶ E.g., the scarcity of Hadith in the earliest Islamic documents and plausible ascriptions; the generic and vague notions of *sunnah* that predominated in the first two Islamic centuries; and the reports and other evidence attesting to the belated rise and spread of *’isnāds*. Again, see the sources given at the outset.

³¹⁷ Of course, contradictory evidence can always be explained away by *ad hoc* auxiliary hypotheses, but doing so (1) sacrifices parsimony, (2) starts to move the ailing hypothesis away from falsifiability, and (3) renders the ailing hypothesis less probable than a rival that predicted the newly-discovered evidence in question all along.

³¹⁸ Brown, *‘Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth’*, 395.

³¹⁹ Christopher Melchert, ‘The *Musnad* of Aḥmad ibn Hanbal: How It Was Composed and What Distinguishes It from the Six Books’, *Der Islam*, Volume 82 (2005), 39, n. 42, citing al-Ḍahabī.

each (with Madinah and Kufah contributing the lion's share)? The answer is obviously yes. For example, it would only take 100 people each fabricating 100 hadiths to reach this number (which could be 20 people in each centre), or 200 people each fabricating 50 hadiths (which could be 40 people in each centre). In fact, a plausible sketch of this kind of scenario can be found in none other than Juynboll's *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth* (the work to which Brown is responding), in which approximately 150 (often recurring) CLs are specifically identified as having variously retrojected or falsely ascribed 2,280 hadiths.³²⁰ Even Mediaeval Hadith critics had the impression that a large percentage of the Hadith corpus derives from a small number of figures (albeit envisaged as genuine transmitters rather than fabricators),³²¹ and we have already encountered Islamic reports attesting to lone individuals (albeit heretics and the like) fabricating hundreds, thousands, or even tens of thousands of hadiths (*'isnāds* and all). These reports may well be exaggerations, but it should also be remembered that the suggested scale of fabrication is not unusual in history: as has again been noted already, the overwhelming majority of Christian, Jewish, and pagan religio-historical ascriptions—ranging from epistles to entire books—were fabricated or misattributed by later Christians, Jews, and pagans to earlier authorities. In short, the mere numerousness of the extant Hadith corpus is no barrier to Juynboll's hypothesis of mass-mendacity in early Hadith.

The second logistical consideration is that of the geography of early Islamdom: according to Brown, early Muslim traditionists were scattered across a vast empire ("thousands of scholars from Spain to Iran... continentally-separated"), which makes it extremely implausible that they could somehow collaborate in suppressing any record of their collective mass-fabrication of *'isnāds*.³²² This is extremely misleading: the overwhelming majority of Hadith—even on the traditional view—derive from only a handful of regional centres operating during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE: Iraq (principally Kufah, Basrah, and later Baghdad), Hijaz (principally Madinah and Makkah), and perhaps Syria.³²³ All of these regions were physically fairly close, and

³²⁰ *Id.*, 'Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth', 408.

³²¹ E.g., Lucas, *Constructive Critics*, ch. 4.

³²² Brown, 'Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth', 395.

³²³ E.g., Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 22, 28-29, 44, 62, 73, 75; Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law*, 26; Lucas, *Constructive Critics*, 362; Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet*, 66-67.

travel between them had become common by the end of the 8th Century CE.³²⁴ Geography is thus no obstacle: if most of Islamdom obtained Hadith from 8th-Century Iraq and Hijaz, then it would only take collusion between traditionists within the Iraq-Hijaz circuit to account for most Hadith. However, there is the problem of sectarianism and regional chauvinism within and between these early centres: early traditionists were an “internally-diverse and virulently divided community” (as Brown puts it).³²⁵ But this is again no problem, at least in terms of whether fabricated Hadith *could* spread from one sect or region to another: as it turns out, early Sunnīs, Šīʿīs, Kārijīs, and so on—not to mention Madinans, Kufans, and so on—all borrowed or received Hadith and similar material from each other during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE,³²⁶ so sectarian barriers cease to pose a necessary problem.

In short, all of the physical or logistical problems posed by Brown against Juynboll’s conclusions—and the Revisionist model of Hadith development more broadly—are surmountable, which means that Brown’s attempt to preclude the feasibility of the mass-creation of *ʾisnāds* on these grounds—despite the mountain of evidence supporting Juynboll’s revisionist conclusions—fails. If Juynboll’s Revisionist model assumes or entails the occurrence of a giant conspiracy amongst early traditionists, then it simply follows that we have a mountain of evidence for a giant conspiracy, not that the model is thereby suddenly false.³²⁷

There are however valid *evidentiary* problems with the historical occurrence of such a conspiracy, at least at first glance. Brown’s preferred alternative would not thereby obtain (given that the Traditional model likewise contradicts a lot of evidence), but it would at least substantially level the playing field: we would be left with at least two

³²⁴ Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 66-70; Crone, *Roman, provincial, and Islamic law*, 122, n. 39; Dickinson, *Development*, 52.

³²⁵ Brown, ‘*Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*’, 395.

³²⁶ E.g., Schacht, *Origins*, 260; Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 11, 207-208 (n. 60); Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, ch. 2; Moshe Sharon, ‘The Development of the Debate around the Legitimacy of Authority in early Islam’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 5 (1984), 131, n. 26; Christopher Melchert, ‘P. Crone and F. W. Zimmermann, *The Epistle of Sālim ibn Dhakwān*’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 65, Number 3 (2002), 579; Ulrike Mitter, ‘Origin and Development of the Islamic Patronate’, in Monique Bernards & John Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2005), 70, n. 2 (citing Maher Jarrar); Brown, *Hadith*, 2nd ed., 149-155. Of course, it might be argued that rival sects would only have taken material from each other that was already acceptable to them, but this ignores polemical borrowing (i.e., taking and then reshaping material to suit their needs) and the possibility that a sect simply lacked independent or conflicting material (i.e., much of the material they borrowed could simply have filled in blanks, rather than overriding existing data).

³²⁷ For a similar point in a Christian context, see Carrier, *Historicity*, 276.

competing models, Revisionist and Traditional, both of which explain some evidence and contradict some other evidence.

The primary evidentiary problem for the occurrence of a conspiracy—as posited by Brown—follows from the aforementioned regional and sectarian divisions of early Islam: such divisions generate the reasonable expectation that at least some sectaries or regional chauvinists would have called out or condemned their enemies for fabricating *ʿisnāds*. Even simple professional rivalry could be expected to generate such evidence: after all, “the fiercest critics” of traditionists were other traditionists, as Brown notes.³²⁸ In other words, such divisions and rivalries militate against the occurrence of collaboration, generating instead the reasonable expectation that at least some scholars would have seized upon the mass-mendacity of their rivals or enemies as ammunition in their polemics. Of course, it is reasonable to think that later pious tradents would have suppressed or downplayed accusations against their own venerated forebears,³²⁹ but given the vastness of the Islamic corpus and the prevalence of both hoarding and the acceptance of polyvalence therein, we should still expect at least some traces thereof to have survived. Therefore, the absence of such reports—the absence of reports referring to the mass-fabrication of Hadith and *ʿisnāds* in particular during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE—is evidence against the *occurrence* of the mass-fabrication of Hadith and *ʿisnāds* in particular during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE and, by extension, evidence against Juynboll’s revisionist conclusions.

As we have already seen, however, it has been known for many decades that there are numerous reports reflecting the impressions of early (and even later) Muslim traditionists concerning the mendacious activities of other traditionists and even entire sects and regions, especially during the 8th Century CE: such accusations range

³²⁸ Brown, *‘Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth’*, 395. For a similar idea (collective scholarly oversight), see Abbott, *Studies*, II, 82-83, and Motzki, cited above (in the section on Motzki’s criticism of Cook).

³²⁹ This comes across in some cases in Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 166 ff. For a particularly blatant example of pious bias towards a plausible fabricator, see *ibid.*, 207 ff. For another example (where opinions were divided, but some were still reluctant to impugn harshly), see Maher Jarrar, *Doctrinal Instruction in Early Islam: The Book of the Explanation of the Sunna by Ghulām Khalīl (d. 275/888)* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2020), 21. For an even starker view on tradent data, see John E. Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Amherst, USA: Prometheus Books, 2004), 140: “Ascription is also arbitrary: biographical information on the exegetes is found exclusively in literature composed to impugn or to vindicate (*jarḥ wa-taʿdīl*) or to assess relative merit (*ṭabaqāt*), and as such constitutes merely a pseudo-historical projection of the acceptance or dismissal of their views.”

from *tadlīs* (usually referring to omission or interpolation in *ʿisnāds*)³³⁰ to *kaḍīb* and *waḍʿ* (usually referring to wholesale false ascription),³³¹ not to mention general statements about the unreliability of certain sets of Hadith that imply a belief in the ubiquity of such practices. Of course, as has been noted already, many of these reports—especially those ascribed to early authorities—are no doubt themselves fabrications, but they nevertheless clearly attest to the impressions of some early Muslims, traditionists, and Hadith critics that the fabrication and interpolation were ubiquitous. Likewise, these reports attest to the fact that sectaries and regional chauvinists in particular regarded the Hadith of rival sects or regions as being generally inauthentic (i.e., the product of fabrication, interpolation, and/or a process of mutation on a massive scale). In short, everyone was accusing everyone else of fabricating and interpolating Hadith, which is consistent with *everyone* doing so. (This would of course make everyone hypocrites, but that is certainly not unheard of in such contexts.³³²) Thus, the evidence that Brown claims is absent—evidence consistent with a memory of mass-fabrication and mass-interpolation during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE, the absence of which was invoked by Brown against the historical occurrence of mass-fabrication and mass-interpolation during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE—turns out not to be absent at all. Therefore, there is no need for Juynboll or the Revisionist model more broadly to posit a giant conspiracy between early traditionists of different

³³⁰ According to Mohammad Hidayet Hosain, ‘Tadlīs’, in Martijn T. Houtsma, Arent J. Wensinck, Hamilton A. R. Gibb, Willi Heffening, & Évariste Lévi-Provençal (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islām: A Dictionary of the Geography, Ethnography and Biography of the Muhammadan Peoples: Supplement* (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1938), 222, there are three basic kinds of *tadlīs*: (1) *tadlīs fī al-ʿisnād*, i.e., (1.1) when you pretend that you heard a hadith from your source’s alleged source directly (rather than from your actual source), in the instance where the alleged source is someone from whom you otherwise transmitted Hadith; (1.2) when you deliberately delete or omit problematic tradents from the *ʿisnād* of a hadith that you have received; (1.3) when you cite a false source alongside your true source for a given hadith; (1.4) when you give the false impression, through a kind of verbal trickery, that you heard a hadith directly from a false source; (1.5) when you pretend to have received a hadith from a false source, with that false source’s permission; (1.6), when you explicitly lie that you directly heard a hadith from a false source; and (1.7) when you give false impressions about the extent of your travels for Hadith; (2) *tadlīs fī al-matn* (more commonly known as *ʿidrāj*), i.e., when you deliberately add things into a *matn*, as if what you added also came via the *ʿisnād* of the *matn* in question; and finally, (3) *tadlīs fī al-ṣuyūk*, i.e., when you deliberately refer to your sources vaguely (e.g., by a common *kunyah* or *nisbah*), so that people will mistake them for more famous people. An unqualified accusation of *tadlīs* could refer to any of these, or any combination thereof.

³³¹ I.e., the creation of a new *matn* and the affixing of an existing *ʿisnād* thereto, or the creation of a new *ʿisnād* and the affixing of an existing *matn* thereto, or the creation of a new *matn* with a new *ʿisnād*, or the affixing of an existing *ʿisnād* to an existing but hitherto unrelated *matn*.

³³² Consider for example the irony of religious fabrications that condemn religious fabrication: Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1993), 23.

sects and regions to cover up their mass-mendacity, since early Muslim sectaries and regional chauvinists actually called each other out for this all the time.

It might be counter-argued that all of these reports are merely the product of personal grudges, rather than the product of the belief that so-and-so traditionist or such-and-such region or sect was engaged in mass-fabrication or mass-interpolation, etc. This is certainly possible, but given all of the evidence for mass-fabrication and mass-interpolation during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE (i.e., the evidence accrued by Juynboll *et al.*), the hypothesis that these reports reflect a memory of such activity seems stronger than the grudge alternative, generally speaking. Even if the probability for either hypothesis was equal, however, we would still be left with an array of reports that *could be* memories of mass-fabrication and mass-interpolation, which means that it cannot be positively asserted that no such memories exist. In other words, Brown's objection—that such memories ought to survive in the Islamic sources but do not—cannot be justified.

It might also be counter-argued that most of these assessments are the product of inferences by later Hadith critics based upon their evaluations and comparisons of *'isnāds*, as opposed to inherited memories of the ubiquity of fabrication and interpolation during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE, etc.³³³ This is certainly plausible (at least in the case of the judgements of the Hadith critics concerning *tadlīs*), but such a manoeuvre would immediately backfire for Brown, for it would mean that the dishonesty in question was actually *not* noticed at the time, or else that contemporaneous condemnations thereof were *not* recorded—it fell to later analysts to *infer* the historical occurrence of such dishonesty. And, if the dishonesty of 8th- and 9th-Century traditionists was indeed *not* noticed or *not* recorded, then it would be no

³³³ For example, the failure of traditionists in one region to cite hadiths apparently circulating in another at the same time (according to their *'isnāds*) could be explained (by a later analyst) by positing general inter-regional rivalries, hostilities, or suspicions. Meanwhile, *tadlīs* could be inferred by discovering that X cites Z directly in one *'isnād*, but cites Z via the intermediary of Y in another *'isnād*, such that someone has omitted Y in the first *'isnād*. And so on. This would be no different from the way that birth-years, death-years, teacher-student relationships, and personal tragedies (such as senility, blindness, and loss of books) were inferred from *'isnāds* (as opposed to being the product of independent memories of tradents). See Joseph F. Schacht, 'On Mūsā b. 'Uqba's *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*', *Acta Orientalia*, Volume 21 (1953), 299; Berg, *Development*, 26; Dickinson, *Development*, 99, 116; Melchert, *Ahmad*, 51-54; *id.*, 'Bukhārī and Early Hadith Criticism', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 121, Number 1 (2001), 12; Harald Motzki, 'The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A review article', in Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2003), 245; Melchert, 'Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth', 409; Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 41-42; Melchert, 'Theory and Practice of Hadith Criticism', in Sijpesteijn & Adang (eds.), *Islam at 250*, 75-76.

problem at all for Juynboll or the Revisionist model that no such (authentic) reports from that time have survived.

In short, there are ample reports that are consistent with many early Muslims having thought that everyone else's Hadith were fabricated and interpolated. Moreover, any attempt to dismiss these reports as somehow the product of later inference necessitates that such accusations were not made during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE or did not survive from the 8th and 9th Centuries CE, despite the fact that everyone agrees that such activities did occur to some degree at that time—in which case, the absence of such reports are not indicative of whether there was widespread fabrication and interpolation of Hadith during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE. Either way, Brown's assertion that revisionists like Juynboll require the occurrence a giant conspiracy between early traditionists to suppress all knowledge of mass-fabrication is false: either we have the evidence, or else the absence of evidence is not telling.

The final problem with Brown's argument against Juynboll's conclusions concerns his assumption that the mass-creation of *'isnāds* required mass-mendacity, i.e., that the creation of a false hadith was necessarily an act of dishonesty. In other words, is it even correct to use the English terms 'fabrication' and 'interpolation' when it comes to the creation of Hadith during the 8th and 9th Centuries CE? At first glance, such a question might seem absurd—after all, Juynboll and other key articulators of the Revisionist model employed such terminology and explicitly mentioned mendacity in connection to the creation of Hadith. For example, Goldziher spoke of “the tendentious fabrications of traditions during the first century of Islam”,³³⁴ implied that the creation of Hadith by early Muslim rationalists or regionalists (*'aṣḥāb al-ra'y*) was “dishonest”,³³⁵ and posited pious fraud (i.e., lying for the greater good) as the key mechanism behind the creation of false Hadith:

It is a matter for psychologists to find and analyse the motives of the soul which made such forgeries acceptable to pious minds as morally justified means of furthering a cause which was in their conviction a good one. The most favourable explanation which one can give of these phenomena is presumably to assume that the support of a new doctrine (which corresponded to the end in view) with the authority of Muhammed was the form in which it was thought good to express the high religious justification

³³⁴ Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, 52.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, 82.

of that doctrine. The end sanctified the means. The pious Muslims made no secret of this.³³⁶

Likewise, Schacht spoke of “widespread fabrications” during the 8th Century CE,³³⁷ whilst Cook spoke of “the fabricator” of a specific hadith,³³⁸ a possible “Murji’ite fabrication”,³³⁹ an “anti-Murji’ite fabrication”,³⁴⁰ and of the way in which an early Islamic epistle “was dissociated from its immediate background in Kūfan Murji’ism through the fabrication of *isnāds*”.³⁴¹ Cook devoted an entire chapter to the specific mechanisms behind “the forgery of *isnāds*”,³⁴² in which he identified “the raising of *isnāds*” as a “mode of forgery”, along with “the ‘spread’ of *isnāds*”.³⁴³ Finally, Juynboll (to whom Brown is directly responding) also frequently spoke of the “fabrication” of Hadith,³⁴⁴ including “the large-scale fabrication of ‘proper and sound’ *isnāds* with the prophet at the very end”³⁴⁵ and the fabrication of *matns*:

Fabrication or forgery, that is the deliberately falsely ascribing of invented texts (*matns*), often taking the form of dicta, maxims or slogans, of distinctly anti-Islamic, or un-Islamic, or purely socio-political, or doctrinal, or otherwise objectionable—or, in many cases, perfectly unobjectionable—tenor to revered authorities, whose respectability was expected to guarantee these texts’ acceptance, had begun probably almost immediately after the prophet’s death, if not on a small scale even already during his lifetime.³⁴⁶

As Juynboll made clear, such language (“fabrication”, “forgery”, etc.) denotes forms of lying or mendacity in standard English, i.e., the *intentional* creation of false ascriptions. Consequently, the predication of Brown’s response to Juynboll (and revisionists more generally) upon the assumption that the creation of false Hadith was necessarily mendacious is completely understandable.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, 54-55.

³³⁷ Schacht, *Origins*, 163.

³³⁸ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 42.

³³⁹ *Ibid.*, 75.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 78.

³⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 83.

³⁴² *Ibid.*, 107.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*, 109.

³⁴⁴ Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, e.g., 4.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 75.

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 74.

And yet, there is a problem. Even though Juynboll *et al.* often seem to have envisaged the creation of false Hadith and especially false *'isnāds* as mendacious, the positing of such a mentality is not actually necessary for their view. As we have already seen, many scholars—including Goldziher, Schacht, Crone, and even Juynboll—have proposed all manner of non-mendacious mindsets and processes through which Hadith were falsely created (i.e., without the creators believing that they were lying or thereby breaking some set of rules). Consequently, it cannot simply be assumed that the mass-creation of Hadith required mass-mendacity on the part of those involved (at least during the 8th Century CE); and if mass-mendacity is not necessary for the Revisionist model, then the model also requires no supposition of a giant conspiracy to hide such mass-mendacity. As such, Brown's argument against mass-mendacity in early Hadith (which has already been refuted above) in no way undermines the Revisionist model more generally.

Still, it is not unreasonable to expect that at least some early Muslims would have observed the mass-creation of Hadith (even if done non-mendaciously), and that some of these observations would have survived. But again, this is exactly what we have, in the form of the numerous, aforementioned reports concerning mass-mendacity in early Hadith: such reports are actually consistent with both the mendacious *and* non-mendacious mass-creation of Hadith. From the perspective of early regionalists and sectaries, they were creating Hadith to articulate doctrines and stories that were true, whereas their enemies were creating Hadith to articulate doctrines and stories that were false. It thus makes perfect sense why early regionalists and sectaries would call out their enemies for doing exactly the same kind of thing that they themselves were doing: the enemy was ascribing *false* doctrines and *false* stories unto early Muslim authorities, and thereby lying. In short, early reports about mass-mendacity in Hadith are consistent with the mass-creation of Hadith by early regionalists and sectaries who did not actually think themselves to be liars, or in other words: regardless of whether the early creators of Hadith regarded themselves to be truthful or deceitful, their enemies would be expected to call them liars. Thus, regardless of whether we posit that the creation of Hadith was mendacious, these reports are consistent with the impression of early Muslims (especially during the 8th Century CE) that Hadith were being mass-created.

In sum, every aspect of Brown's conspiracy-related response to Juynboll—and the Revisionist model more broadly—can be set aside. Firstly, Brown's appeal to parsimony is misguided, given that Juynboll's general conclusions are independently corroborated, including by evidence that contradicts the Traditional model, which renders parsimony irrelevant. Secondly, Brown's appeal to the logistical problems or physical impossibilities with a giant conspiracy amongst early Muslim traditionists (to mass-fabricate Hadith and suppress all knowledge thereof) is surmountable, given the relatively small number of participants required, the limited geography of early Hadith, and the evident flow of material between early Muslim groupings. Thirdly, Brown's argument that the Revisionist model requires the improbable occurrence of a giant conspiracy in the first place (given the lack of early testimony regarding the mass-fabrication of Hadith) is predicated upon a false premise, given the existence of numerous reports that are consistent with early impressions of mass-fabrication. Fourthly, Brown's assumption that the mass-creation of false Hadith required mass-mendacity is false or at least unjustified, given the wide range of non-mendacious mentalities and processes posited on the part of early traditionists, all of which allowed the creation of *'isnāds* to occur without the creators thinking themselves to be lying.

Brown repeated some of this questionable argumentation in his 2009 monograph *Hadith* (and again in the 2018 second edition), this time explicitly generalised to the Revisionist model of Hadith development (rather than just Juynboll's conclusions):

The most basic objection to the Revisionist recasting of the whole Muslim narrative of early Islamic history is that it simply asks us to believe too much. We might find it difficult to believe that Muslims could avoid all the pitfalls of historical manipulation, propagandizing, and error in their collection of hadiths, but it seems even harder to believe that a scholarly community stretching from Spain to Central Asia and plagued by intense internecine conflicts could have orchestrated such a colossal historical conspiracy in a time of pre-modern communication.³⁴⁷

Most of the argumentation around this objection consists of summaries of the conclusions of Motzki, Powers, and other so-called "Revaluation scholars", which have been addressed already. In citing these conclusions, however, Brown does derive a further criticism of Juynboll—namely, that most CLs are earlier than he supposed.

³⁴⁷ Brown, *Hadith*, 2nd ed., 259.

Thus, Brown describes Powers as “an early pioneer of what can be termed the ‘large-scale’ identification of Common Links, or the notion that when one collects *all* the available transmissions of a hadith, its Common Link is much earlier than those supposed by Schacht and Juynboll.”³⁴⁸ Similarly, Brown claims that Motzki “demonstrates that Common Links are much earlier than previously thought, dating some to the time of the Companions in the second half of the seventh century.”³⁴⁹ Likewise:

One of Motzki’s central criticisms of Schacht’s and Juynboll’s work is the small number of sources from which they drew hadiths in determining the Common Link. In collecting transmissions of a hadith to locate a Common Link, for example, Juynboll relied principally on the *Tuhfat al-ashrāf* of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Mizzī (d. 742/1341), a work that collects together all the chains of transmission for a hadith but is limited to the traditions and transmissions found in the Six Books (and a few other small books). Motzki draws on a much larger and more diverse body of sources including early ones, such as the *Musannaf* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-San‘ānī (d. 211/827), and later ones, such as al-Bayhaqī’s (d. 458/1066) *Dalā’il al-nubuwwa*. By consulting a much wider range of sources than these earlier scholars, Motzki demonstrates that the Common Links for the hadiths he analyzes actually belong to the time of the Companions in the second half of the seventh century.³⁵⁰

In fact, all of the relevant scholars seem to agree that most CLs belong to the 8th Century CE, or in other words: most CLs are late Followers and the Followers of the Followers. To begin with, Schacht observed: “Most of the ‘common transmitters’, whose importance for the dating of traditions we discussed at the end of the preceding chapter, occur in the generation preceding Mālik and his contemporary Abū Yūsuf”.³⁵¹ Similarly, according to Juynboll:

The first and oldest person with not one but a number of alleged pupils, a person whom all the *isnād* strands of one particular tradition figuring in the collections have in common, is *hardly ever* a Companion, *very rarely* an early Successor, but *virtually always* a late Successor or someone belonging to a generation after that of the Successors.³⁵²

³⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 260.

³⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 261.

³⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 263. Also see *id.*, ‘*Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*’, 395.

³⁵¹ Schacht, *Origins*, 176.

³⁵² Juynboll, ‘Islam’s first *fuqahā*’, 292. Also see *id.*, ‘Nāfi’, 209-210; *id.*, ‘On the origins of poetry in Muslim tradition literature’, in Wolfhart Heinrichs & Gregor Schoeler (eds.), *Festschrift Ewald Wagner*

Likewise, Motzki acknowledged the fact, “already realised by Schacht, that most of the common links we find in *Ḥadīṭ* literature belong to the first three generations active during the second century, i.e., the time between roughly 100 and 175 A.H.”³⁵³ Elsewhere, Motzki reiterated that “most” hadiths “were transmitted by only one transmitter in each of the first three generations and became more widely transmitted only during the eighth century, the phenomenon known as solitary hadith among Muslim scholars.”³⁵⁴ In other words, most CLs are actually Followers of the Followers: “the *isnāds* mostly do not converge in common links at the level of the Successors and Companions but at the levels before them.”³⁵⁵ Likewise, according to Pavlovitch:

To modern scholars working with Muslim traditions, it is a truism that the earliest common links, who are equivalent to Ibn al-Madīnī’s *madārs*, flourished during roughly the same period.³⁵⁶

(The *madārs* in question are Qatādah b. Di‘āmah (d. 117-118/735-736) in Basrah, Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741-742) in Madinah, ‘Abū ‘Ishāq al-Sabī‘ī (d. 127-128/744-746) in Kufah, Yaḥyá b. ‘abī Kaṭīr (d. 129/746-747) in Basrah, ‘Amr b. Dīnār (d. c. 130/747-748) in Makkah, and Sulaymān al-‘A‘maš (d. 147-148/764-766) in Kufah.³⁵⁷) Thus, time and again, “we find single strands that cover the entire first/seventh century.”³⁵⁸ Finally, according to Görke:

More often than not, variants of a *ḥadīṭh* have part of their *isnād* in common – usually the two, three, or four transmitters after the Prophet. The last of these figures, the one in which the *isnāds* merge (or from whom they then

zum 65. Geburtstag. Vol. 2: *Studien zur arabischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag; Beirut, Lebanon: Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft; 1994), 184; *id.*, ‘Early Islamic society’, 154. This is not to be confused with the issue of which CLs created/formulated the most hadiths; see Melchert, ‘*Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīṭh*’, 408-409, thereon.

³⁵³ Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 239.

³⁵⁴ *Id.*, ‘Islamic Law: Transmission and Authenticity of the Reports from the Prophet’, in Stanley N. Katz (ed.), *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Legal History, Volume 3: Evidence—Labor and Employment Law* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2009), 333, col. 1.

³⁵⁵ *Id.*, ‘The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered’, in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 252.

³⁵⁶ Pavlovitch, ‘Origin’, 40.

³⁵⁷ For variants of Ibn al-Madīnī’s famous report, see Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, V, pp. 345, 399; *ibid.*, VII, p. 7; *ibid.*, IX, p. 526.

³⁵⁸ Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 29.

spread out through different ways of transmission), has been dubbed the common link.³⁵⁹

Despite their different approaches and criteria, all of these scholars seem to be in agreement: CLs are overwhelmingly an 8th-Century phenomenon. Already, Brown's notion that Juynboll's CLs have been overhauled by the findings of Motzki *et al.* seems questionable.

Of course, there is not complete agreement between these scholars: Schacht identified CLs above all with the generation of al-Zuhrī and seemed to regard earlier CLs as products of the spread of *ʿisnāds*,³⁶⁰ whereas Juynboll and Motzki both acknowledged at least some Followers operating at the turn of the 8th Century CE as CLs,³⁶¹ although Motzki thought that there were more Follower CLs than Juynboll had supposed.³⁶² That said, Juynboll was still emphatic that there are virtually no Companion CLs,³⁶³ although he did believe that the *contents* of a handful of hadiths could be traced back to one or two Companions.³⁶⁴ Similarly, Pavlovitch seems to observe that there are virtually no Companion CLs:

Even if the CLs were the first major CRs of traditions, one would expect to find cases in which several early CLs cite the same informant, who would be an even earlier CL. In such cases, as noted by Schneider, multiple *isnād* branches may occur already at the level of the Companions. Instead of such cases of early dissemination, we find single strands that cover the entire first/seventh century.³⁶⁵

³⁵⁹ Andreas Görke, '*Ḥadīth* between Traditional Muslim Scholarship and Academic Approaches', in Majid Daneshgar & Aaron W. Hughes (eds.), *Deconstructing Islamic Studies* (Boston, USA: Ilex Foundation, 2020), 46.

³⁶⁰ See above, in the section on Schacht's common link analysis.

³⁶¹ Juynboll, 'On the origins of poetry', in Heinrichs & Schoeler (eds.), *Festschrift Ewald Wagner*, II, 184: "the oldest cls of Muslim tradition literature hail from the last two decades of the first/seventh century." Likewise, Motzki, 'Dating Muslim Traditions', 240, n. 143: "The generation of the earlier *tābiʿūn* (fl. in the last third of the first century A.H. must—at least partially—be added to this category of common links, even if they appear more rarely." However, Motzki (*ibid.*) still acknowledged that most CLs belong to the generation of al-Zuhrī and later.

³⁶² Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 51.

³⁶³ Juynboll, 'Nāfi', 224: "If Anas had ever been found as cl, this would have constituted the until now only observed case of a Companion as cl in the entire tradition literature." That said, Juynboll was open to the *possibility* that 'Anas was a genuine CL, as in 'Some Isnād-Analytical Methods', 369, n. 34; 'Islam's first *fuqahā*', 295; 'Nāfi', 223-224, incl. n. 26. However, Juynboll questioned 'Anas' status as a Companion, complicating the issue.

³⁶⁴ Melchert, '*Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*', 408.

³⁶⁵ Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 29.

Likewise, according to Görke:

While traditional Muslim scholarship assumed that the *ḥadīth* critics by and large had been able to identify those *ḥadīths* that indeed constituted authentic reports of statements and deeds of the Prophet, scholars following the academic approach more or less agree that it is virtually impossible to securely date specific traditions to the time of the Prophet or the first generation of believers. Most studies so far have only been able to date traditions to roughly the turn of the first century of Islam (beginning of the eighth century CE) and to link them to specific figures of the second generation.³⁶⁶

Even Motzki conceded that “the majority of common links are not at the level of the Prophet’s Companions, but belong to the three subsequent generations.”³⁶⁷ All of this seems to conflict with Brown’s sweeping claims about Motzki’s redating of Juynboll’s CLs—in regards to the *general chronology* of CLs at least, Motzki and Juynboll seem to have largely agreed.

Still, Brown is certainly correct that Powers and Motzki have argued for at least some Companion CLs, but there are some problems here. Firstly, Brown’s citation of Powers is simply an equivocation: using Juynboll’s criteria, Sa’d b. ‘abī Waqqāṣ would be a spider, not a CL. In other words, Brown’s contention that the consultation of more sources leads to a different assessment of the CL is simply false in this instance: it is only by *rejecting Juynboll’s criteria altogether* that Companions stand a chance of qualifying as CLs. In this respect, Motzki’s conclusions are more promising: unlike Powers (who wrote his article before Juynboll’s method was available in print), Motzki specifically employed a refined version of Juynboll’s method, as will be discussed below. And yet, even using this refined method, Motzki only identified Companions as CLs in only one or two instances,³⁶⁸ which makes them come across as extreme

³⁶⁶ Görke, ‘*Ḥadīth*’, in Daneshgar & Hughes (eds.), *Deconstructing Islamic Studies*, 47.

³⁶⁷ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 54.

³⁶⁸ Motzki, ‘The Prophet and the Cat’, 64: “Abū Qatāda seems to be, after all, the actual “common link” of the complex of tradition linked with his name”. *Id.*, ‘The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq: On the Origin and Reliability of Some *Maghāzī*-Reports’, in Harald Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad: The Issue of the Sources* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2000), 221-222, 230, 232-234: a “historical kernel” can be trace back to the family of Ka’b b. Mālik. Also see *ibid.*, 231: “We concluded from this that the common skeleton of the versions ascribed to ‘Abd Allāh b. Unays possibly goes back to him, the common link of the *isnād* bundle.”

outliers—again, Brown’s claims about the redating of CLs back to the time of the Companions seem like exaggerations.

That said, it is highly questionable that Motzki identified Companion CLs in the first place: in the instances that I am aware of,³⁶⁹ Motzki actually argued that independent stories *about* Companions could be traced back to their kinsmen and students amongst the Followers, and that the stories in question share a kernel of historical truth.³⁷⁰ In other words, the Companions in question are technically not CLs at all: a CL is the *common source of a tradition*, not a *common event that inspired independent traditions*. In this respect, Motzki’s conclusions are fundamentally the same as Juynboll’s, *contra* Brown: both mostly identified CLs with the late Followers and Followers of the Followers, operating in the middle of the 8th Century CE; both identified some earlier Follower CLs, operating at the beginning of the 8th Century CE; and both identified a handful of instances in which multiple 8th-Century CLs independently preserved a common kernel of historical truth about something a Companion said or did.³⁷¹

Finally, Brown again seems to suggest—or at least implies—that Juynboll’s belief in ubiquitous diving (along with Cook’s belief in the ubiquitous spread of *’isnāds*) is unwarranted or improbable, given the obsessive rigour of the Mediaeval Hadith critics:

Both Muslim and non-Muslim scholars of hadiths have agreed that there are many forged hadiths. In my opinion, explaining how this came about involves understanding the choices made by the Sunni scholarly tradition more than it does doubting the systematic effectiveness of their method of hadith criticism. In theory as well as practice, the Three-Tiered system of demanding a source, investigating its reliability and seeking out corroborating evidence is an effective way of determining the authenticity of a report. Modern reporters, after all, employ a similar method. Juynboll and Cook cited the practice of *tadlīs* as the loophole by which hadiths were attributed to major transmitters or equipped with additional *isnāds*. Juynboll states that *tadlīs* ‘was hardly ever detected.’ But Muslim hadith scholars from the mid eighth century onward were obsessive about identifying which transmitters lapsed into *tadlīs* and when. Shu’ba (d. 160/776) said that ‘*tadlīs* is the brother of lying’ and studied the transmissions of his teacher Qatāda b. Di’āma closely to know when he had heard a hadith directly from the person he was citing and when it was unclear if there was an unspecified intermediary. Yahyā b. Sa’īd al-Qattān

³⁶⁹ I.e., ‘Abū Qatādah and the family of Ka’b b. Mālik; by contrast, Ibn ‘Unays was merely “possibly” a genuine CL.

³⁷⁰ See the sources cited above.

³⁷¹ For two other instances that do not involve even the semblance of Companion CLs, see Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), ‘The Prophet and the Debtors’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*.

(d. 198/813) made sure to identify *tadlīs* even when it was done by as revered a figure as Sufyān al-Thawrī. Later, master critics like ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī (d. 234/849), al-Husayn al-Karābīsī (d. 245/859), and others wrote multivolume books identifying the names of those who committed *tadlīs* and the degree of their laxity.³⁷²

There are three problems with this argument. Firstly, Brown misrepresents Juynboll’s statement about *tadlīs* by quoting him out of context, thereby giving the false impression that Juynboll believed that the Hadith critics “hardly ever detected” *tadlīs* in general or of any kind. By contrast, it is clear—in context—that Juynboll was referring to *a specific form of false ascription* that he subsumed under the label *tadlīs*:

What is more, there is always the possibility, as the case of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī made abundantly clear, I think, that pupils, or anonymous persons using those pupils’ names, contemporaneous or from a later period, simply inserted his name in otherwise fictitious *isnāds* in order to support those ‘traditions’ they sought to bring into circulation. This form of fraud, so widespread during the second/eighth century and known by the general term *tadlīs*, was hardly ever detected. Sometimes we are just fortunate in that the *rijāl* works have preserved the information that such and such was solely responsible for having invented a certain *ḥadīth*, information which makes the caution concerning *tadlīs* committed by (an) otherwise unknown person(s) rather less imperative. But in the case of numerous transmitters listed in *isnāds* supporting traditions from the canonical collections we are not so fortunate. There are still a great number of transmitters dealt with in the *rijāl* works whose reputations are described as being without any blemish, even if on the basis of data adduced from elsewhere it can be proven with undeniable evidence that the material in whose transmission they are said to have been instrumental bears sure signs of fabrication, a fabrication which in all likelihood dates from their lifetimes.³⁷³

Juynboll’s point seems clear: the specific phenomenon of pupils falsely ascribing hadiths to their teachers was inferably ubiquitous (i.e., even amongst allegedly reliable tradents), yet the Hadith critics only indicted a relatively small portion of those guilty. It may be that *sariqah*, *kaḍīb*, or *waḍʿ* are better descriptions thereof than *tadlīs* (such that Juynboll’s statement that this phenomenon was “known by the general term *tadlīs*” is inaccurate), but the fact remains that Juynboll simply did hold the position that Brown attributes to him: Juynboll did not believe that the Hadith critics hardly

³⁷² Brown, *Hadith*, 2nd ed., 269-270.

³⁷³ Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 73.

ever detected *tadlīs* full stop. Indeed, Juynboll repeatedly noted instances of Hadith critics detecting *tadlīs*,³⁷⁴ and further stated: “Extensive reading in the most authoritative, early *rijāl* works leaves one with the impression that lying in and fabrication of *matns* as well as deceit in the composition of *isnāds* (*tadlīs*) were practised much more widely in the Iraqi centres than in Syria, Egypt or the Ḥijāz”.³⁷⁵ Clearly, Brown’s characterisation of Juynboll’s position is mistaken.

The second problem with Brown’s appeal to the obsessive rigour of the Hadith critics in detecting *tadlīs*—invoked against both Cook and Juynboll—concerns the difficulty of detecting the specific forms picked out by the spread of *ʿisnāds* and diving. Ironically, this problem is shared by Juynboll’s criticism of Cook, which has been covered already: absent an interrogation or confession, the borrowing of hadiths, suppression of direct sources, and creation of corroborating *ʿisnāds* was difficult or even impossible to detect.³⁷⁶ This problem has also been pointed out by Reinhart, specifically in response to Brown:

Brown seems very trusting of the early Muslim scholars and, while he appeals to a social climate that deplored deception, he gives little weight to the pressures of the sort we may infer from Şentürk’s *Narrative Social Structures* to “produce” more prestigious *isnāds*. In polemical strife it is perfectly likely that providing stronger, shorter, or confirmatory *isnāds* was a temptation and there is lots of evidence—some from Muslim sources—that they did so. It is appropriate for historians to be suspicious. And it is in the nature of well-done *tadlīs* that it cannot be detected by any method used by Shuʿba, al-Karābīsī, Motzki, or Brown.³⁷⁷

To this can be added a third and fourth problem, already adduced in response to Motzki’s criticisms of Cook: Hadith criticism only predominated during the 9th Century CE, and Hadith critics often resorted to intuition in their evaluations. In the first case, this means that false ascriptions and false corroboration were able to proliferate for at least a century prior to any kind of systematic scrutiny of Hadith; and in the second case, this means that, even after their rise, the Hadith critics were at times ill-equipped to detect false ascriptions.³⁷⁸

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 22 (n. 46), 52 (n. 191), 57, 130 (n. 171), 171, 174, 179 ff. (incl. n. 89), 196 (n. 151), 201, 219, 227-228, 230, 235.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 132.

³⁷⁶ See above, in the section on Cook and Juynboll’s criticisms of each other.

³⁷⁷ Reinhart, ‘Juynbolliana’, 439.

³⁷⁸ See above, in the section on Motzki’s criticism of Cook.

In short, all of Brown's arguments against Juynboll and the Revisionist model of Hadith development more broadly seem unsound: parsimony is irrelevant thereto, given the independent evidence therefor; there are no logistical or physical barriers thereto; no giant conspiracy amongst early traditionists is entailed thereby; and even mass-mendacity is not entailed thereby. Moreover, Brown's sweeping claim that Juynboll's identification of CLs has been overhauled by Motzki *et al.* on the basis of a more thorough collation of data—and, especially, his claim that Companions have thereby obtained as CLs—seems like an exaggeration. Finally, Brown did not accurately represent Juynboll's stance on the ability of Mediaeval Hadith critics to detect *tadlīs* and, in invoking this ability against both Cook's spread of *'isnāds* and Juynboll's dives, did not take into account the belated rise of Hadith criticism and the rôle of intuition therein, both of which severely impaired this ability. Consequently, there is no reason to reject Juynboll's conclusions that CLs retrojected their hadiths and later tradents created dives on a regular basis, at least on the grounds adduced by Brown.³⁷⁹ More importantly, however, Cook's spread of *'isnāds* still remains—at this stage of the dialectic—viable as an alternative explanation for CLs.

Motzki *et al.*'s *'Isnād-Cum-Matn* Analysis

Is there any reason, generally speaking, to accept PCLs and CLs as historical, rather than as products of spreading *'isnāds* or successive dives? Proponents of the CL analysis have usually adopted two approaches in this regard: firstly, they attempt to minimise the threat of spreading and diving in *'isnāds* by appealing to a lack of testimonial evidence therefor; and secondly, they appeal to some kind of additional evidence to corroborate the claims of *'isnāds* concerning the PCL and CL provenance of given hadiths. The first appeal is hopeless in light of the vast testimonial evidence concerning the ubiquity of fabrication, interpolation, and other kinds of dishonesty or unreliability in Hadith in the 8th and 9th Centuries CE,³⁸⁰ but the second has promise. In particular, proponents of the CL analysis have appealed to the patterns of *matns* to

³⁷⁹ By contrast, some of Motzki's other criticisms, which are mentioned by Brown, hold more water; see above, in the section on Motzki's criticism of Juynboll.

³⁸⁰ See above, in the section on Motzki's criticism of Cook.

corroborate the common ascription of *ʿisnāds* to PCLs and CLs, thereby combining a CL analysis with a textual analysis—a synthesis known as the *ʿisnād-cum-matn* analysis (henceforth, ICMA).

One of the earliest forerunners to this approach was Jan Kramers in his 1953 article ‘Une tradition à tendance manichéenne’, who noted that the different versions or “redactions” of a certain hadith “can be separated into several groups in each of which the texts are specifically related. The *isnāds*, moreover, confirm that each of these groups possessed different lines of tradition.”³⁸¹ In other words, similar “redactions” seem to cluster around specific tradents, per their *ʿisnāds*.

Another forerunner to this approach was Josef van Ess in his 1975 *Zwischen Ḥadīṭ und Theologie*, but his method bore the brunt of Cook’s criticisms in *Early Muslim Dogma* and died prematurely.³⁸² In particular, Cook argued against the attribution of particular wordings to particular tradents, or our ability to reconstruct the wordings of particular tradents, given the omnipresent threat of contaminations and borrowings between tradents at any level:

But suppose we envisage instead the following transmission history. Aʿmash put into circulation a version without ‘acts’, and Shuʿba took this over. In the generation after Aʿmash a version with ‘acts’ appeared in Kūfa, and thanks to its greater polemical utility, swept the board there; some Baṣrans transmitting the tradition from Shuʿba were also influenced by it. This accounts for the fact that the Baṣran version with ‘acts’ is transmitted from Shuʿba from Aʿmash, without our having to assume the authenticity of the ascription of the feature in question to either. The process is simple and plausible; it can be described as ‘contamination’, or as a minor case of spread, here affecting not a whole tradition but merely a particular feature of it. We cannot show that this is how it happened; but it is at least as plausible a hypothesis as that put forward by van Ess.³⁸³

And yet, some proponents of the ICMA—or forerunners thereof—persisted. Thus, Juynboll observed (in 1989) “the undeniable individuality of each bundle, with the cl’s particular wording,”³⁸⁴ and further noted (in 1983): “Often we find in the fanning out of an *isnād* after a common link one or more partial common links, who are responsible

³⁸¹ Jan H. Kramers (trans. Matthew Gordon), ‘A Tradition of Manichaean Tendency (“The She-Eater of Grass”)', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīṭ: Origins and Development* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Variorum, 2004), 245/1.

³⁸² Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 250.

³⁸³ Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 112.

³⁸⁴ Juynboll, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 382.

for an *idrāj*, deletion, simplification or other alteration.”³⁸⁵ Subsequently (in 1993), Juynboll elaborated:

In the main, the common link is responsible for the strand from himself to the Prophet as well as for the (protoversion of the) *matn*, while it appears that modified versions of that *matn*, i. e. with or without additional abbreviations or embellishments, can be safely attributed to various pcls when the different wordings of the tradition showing up in the different collections are carefully ^[sic] placed side by side and compared. Although this may at first sound incredible, in a great many instances this procedure proved to be easy as well as fruitful. Finally, once the key figures of the bundle, the cl and the pcls, are traced in the biographical lexicons, then answers can be found as to the remaining questions of when, where and under what circumstances the (various versions of that) *matn* originated.³⁸⁶

Likewise (in 1994):

Juxtaposition and comparison of the various versions of one tradition as they occur in the different collections presented by its *isnād* bundle often enables the researcher to draw certain conclusions as to which pcl can be credited with what alternation to the protoversion. These alterations may be trimmings or embellishments; they may boil down to a paraphrase or an enlargement; they may constitute additions to, or abbreviations of, the protoversion. Time and time again pcls can be observed, moreover, condensing a historical anecdote into a legal maxim or juridical opinion, an ethical dictum or a moral adage. In short, next to the cls, pcls have played a crucial role in giving the *ḥadīth* and *akhbār* collections as we know them now their definitive appearance.³⁸⁷

In short, Juynboll observed that PCLs are often ascribed distinctive sub-traditions (*vis-à-vis* each other), and that the broader traditions ascribed to CLs are likewise often distinctive (*vis-à-vis* those of other CLs with related traditions).³⁸⁸ However, Juynboll

³⁸⁵ *Id.*, *Muslim tradition*, 216.

³⁸⁶ *Id.*, ‘Nāfi’, 212.

³⁸⁷ *Id.*, ‘Early Islamic society’, 155-156.

³⁸⁸ For similar observations, see Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 101 ff.; *id.*, ‘The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq’, in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 192-193; *id.*, ‘The Collection of the Qur’ān: A Reconsideration of Western Views in Light of Recent Methodological Developments’, *Der Islam*, Volume 78 (2001), 27-29; Gregor Schoeler, ‘Foundations for a New Biography of Muḥammad: The Production and Evaluation of the Corpus of Traditions according to ‘Urwaḥ b. al-Zubayr’, in Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2003), 23; Görke, ‘Eschatology’, in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 188; Andreas Görke & Gregor Schoeler, ‘Reconstructing the Earliest *sīra* Texts: the *Hiġra* in the Corpus of ‘Urwaḥ b. al-Zubayr’, *Der Islam*, Volume 82 (2005), 212; Mitter, ‘Origin and Development of the Islamic Patronate’, in Bernardts & Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage*, 76-77;

never integrated this insight into his method systematically, such that his CL analysis remained *ʿisnād*-focused and reliant on his authenticity criterion of dense transmission.³⁸⁹

The ICMA was finally formalised in the mid-to-late 1990s in a series of articles and books by Harald Motzki, Gregor Schoeler, and Andreas Görke,³⁹⁰ who sought thereby to verify the historicity of (at least parts of) some *ʿisnāds* and date (at least parts of) some *matns* back to early Muslim tradents. Motzki summarised this method as follows:

The aim of the *isnād-cum-matn* analysis is to trace the transmission history of a tradition by comparing their variants contained in the different compilations of traditions available. The method makes use of both the text (*matn*) and the chain of transmitters (*isnād*).³⁹¹

The argumentation behind this method is fairly straightforward: “a correlation between *isnād* variants and *matn* variants of a tradition” would be likely “if they were part of a real transmission process”, and conversely “unlikely to be the result of systematic forgery”.³⁹² In other words, “a correlation between the different branches and strands of the *isnād* bundle belonging to a tradition” and “the different variants of its *matn*”³⁹³ is best explained by these hadiths reflecting accurate transmission, at least as far back as the correlation obtains.³⁹⁴

Anthony, ‘Crime and Punishment in Early Medina’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 417; Andreas Görke, ‘The relationship between *maghāzī* and *ḥadīth* in early Islamic scholarship’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 74, Issue 2 (2011), 179, 182-183; Ulrike Mitter, ‘“The Majority of the dwellers of Hell-fire are women”: A short analysis of a much-discussed *ḥadīth*’, in Nicolet Boekhoff-van der Voort, Kees Versteegh, & Joas Wagemakers (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam: Essays in Honour of Harald Motzki* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2011), 448; Görke *et al.*, ‘First Century Sources’, 40; Stijn Aerts, ‘“Pray with Your Leader”: A Proto-Sunni Quietist Tradition’, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 136, Issue 1 (2016), 38; Andreas Görke, ‘Criteria for dating early *Tafsīr* traditions: The exegetical traditions and variant readings of Abū Mijlāz Lāḥiq b. Humayd’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 49 (2021), 308. In my own private studies, I have found this pattern repeatedly, as I hope to demonstrate in future publications.

³⁸⁹ As evident in Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, intro.

³⁹⁰ For the genealogy of the ICMA, see Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 38, 80; Motzki, ‘The Collection of the Qur’ān’, 16; Motzki, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’; Görke & Schoeler, ‘Reconstructing the Earliest *sīra* Texts’, 211-212; Mitter, ‘Origin and Development’, in Bernards & Nawas (eds.), *Patronage and Patronage*, 75-76; Reinhart, ‘Juynbolliana’; Shoemaker, ‘In Search of ‘Urwa’s *Sīra*’, 264, 266; Pavel Pavlovitch, ‘Dating’, in Daniel W. Brown (ed.), *The Wiley Blackwell Concise Companion to the Hadith* (Hoboken, USA: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 2020), 117.

³⁹¹ Motzki, ‘The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq’, in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 174.

³⁹² *Id.*, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions’, 250.

³⁹³ *Ibid.*, 250-251.

³⁹⁴ For other appeals to correlation, see Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 117-118; Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 117-118; *id.*, ‘The Collection of the Qur’ān’, 27-29; Gregor Schoeler, ‘Méthodes et Débats:

Motzki *et al.*'s ICMA is thus a refined or more rigorous version of Juynboll's CL analysis,³⁹⁵ incorporating *matns* to evaluate whether an ascription is genuine. In other words, where Juynboll usually only appealed to corroborating *'isnāds* to authenticate an ascription back to an earlier tradent, Motzki *et al.* also appealed to correlating patterns in *matns* as an independent means to corroborate the ascription. In doing so, Motzki *et al.* dispensed with Juynboll's inherent suspicion of SSs, since even a SS can be validated by being corroborated by other strands in transmitting a distinctive *matn* from a putative PCL or CL.³⁹⁶ Motzki *et al.* also dispensed with Juynboll's criterion of three direct citations:

Unlike Juynboll's pure *isnād*-analysis, an *isnād-cum-matn* analysis – particularly when a tradition complex is as widely attested as the scandal story and when the relevant reports display as long and elaborate texts as in this case – can come up with safe assumptions about the existence of a genuine CL, even if only two transmission lines link the CL with two different transmitters of whom the texts show that their transmissions are independent of each other.³⁹⁷

Instead of appealing to numbers, Motzki *et al.* appeal to corroborating patterns in the *matns*—in particular, when the *matns* form a series of clusters that match the PCLs and CLs depicted by the *'isnāds* of the relevant hadith. In this respect, the ICMA is reminiscent of textual criticism, as Schoeler notes:

For assessing the *isnāds*, suffice it to say here that their correctness—including the correctness of the common link that they display—is not just simply accepted, but rather tested in the investigation against the texts (*mutūn*). The analysis of the texts is done analogously to the investigation of manuscripts whose interdependence is to be ascertained:

Character and Authenticity of the Muslim Tradition on the Life of Muḥammad', *Arabica*, Tome 48, Issue 3 (2002), 366; Görke, 'Eschatology', in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 188; Motzki, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 290, 295; Mitter, 'Origin and Development', in Bernards & Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage*, 76-78; Aerts, "'Pray with Your Leader'", 35-36; Görke, 'Criteria for dating early *Tafsīr* traditions', 308.

³⁹⁵ Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 38, 80; Motzki, 'The Collection of the Qur'ān', 16; Reinhart, 'Juynbolliana', 426, 438-439; Shoemaker, 'In Search of 'Urwa's *Sīra*', 264, 266.

³⁹⁶ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 98, 101, 117-118; *id.*, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 55, 61, 66; *id.*, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 181; *id.*, (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 161-162; Görke *et al.*, 'First Century Sources', 36, 43-44, 51; Harald Motzki, *Reconstruction of a Source of Ibn Ishāq's Life of the Prophet and Early Qur'ān Exegesis: A Study of Early Ibn 'Abbās Traditions* (Piscataway, USA: Gorgias Press, 2017), 75.

³⁹⁷ Görke *et al.*, 'First Century Sources', 36. Also see the other sources just cited.

interdependencies are determined from the structure (abbreviations, additions, gaps) and wording of these texts. If the text analyses show that the *isnāds* correctly indicate the interdependencies and that all of the present versions indeed lead back to a common archetype—the common link of the *isnāds*—then—and only then—can it be regarded as proved that the tradition was disseminated by the transmitter who turned out to be the common link.³⁹⁸

Of course, unlike textual criticism, the ICMA deals heavily with oral transmissions, and is accordingly better described as “tradition criticism”: most of the differences in *matns* are understood to be the product of paraphrase, mishearing, memory distortion, or elaboration, as opposed to scribal errors.³⁹⁹ This brings up a crucial point: the ICMA requires the occurrence of mutagenic, paraphrastic, or error-ridden oral transmission in Hadith. Without *matn*-variations, correlations between *matn*-variations and *’isnāds* would not be possible; and without non-verbatim transmission, there would be no *matn*-variations. Proponents of the ICMA as a viable methodology for dating Hadith thus commit themselves—at *minimum*—to the view that *al-riwāyah bi-al-ma’ná* was the norm in early Hadith transmission. This is precisely why “a real transmission process” predicts “a correlation between *isnād* variants and *matn* variants of a tradition”, as Motzki put it: the ubiquity of non-verbatim oral transmission would mean that each student of a master would transmit his Hadith in their own (unique or idiosyncratic) wordings, and each of their students in turn would do the same, such that if later writers accurately recorded both the *matn* and *’isnād*, we would expect particular wordings to correlate with particular tradents.

Melchert’s Criticism of Motzki *et al.*

All of this yields an apparent paradox, as Christopher Melchert has observed: the ICMA supposes simultaneous precise *and* imprecise transmission.⁴⁰⁰ It requires imprecision

³⁹⁸ Schoeler, ‘Méthodes et Débats’, 360-361.

³⁹⁹ The difference is usually easy to spot. For example, when *jumaymah* occasionally becomes *ḥumaymah* in some variants, we have an obvious scribal error: *jīm* and *ḥā* are much easier to confuse in writing than in hearing. Conversely, when *nakāḥa* becomes *tazawwaja*, it seems likely that this is the result of a paraphrase: these words look nothing alike in writing (making a scribal error unlikely), yet refer to the same concept (which is expected for a paraphrase).

⁴⁰⁰ This problem has been expressed to me by Melchert several times in person, but seemingly not in print.

in the transmission of *matns*, such that variants can arise in the first place; but it also requires precision in the transmission of these variants (i.e., their accurate preservation henceforth), such that they can survive forthwith to give the extant appearance of their correlation with the tradents responsible therefor. If transmission was precise (such that variants could be preserved), then how could variants arise in the first place? And if transmission was imprecise (such that variants could arise), how could variants survive unscathed (without being replaced by new alterations that could obscure any appearance of correlation)?

Let us illustrate with a hypothetical example. Suppose that a CL passed on a hadith to three PCLs (PCL₁, PCL₂, and PCL₃), each of whom in turn passed it on to three further students. The CL's original *matn* comprised the element "A", but because of imprecise transmission, PCL₁ changed the *matn* to "AB". In turn, each student paraphrased this hadith in their own right, resulting variously in "AB1", "AB2", and "AB3". Meanwhile, PCL₂ changed the CL's original *matn* ("A") into "AC" (again thanks to imprecise transmission), and his three students in turn further changed this altered version into "AC4", "AC5", and "AC6", respectively. Finally, PCL₃ changed the CL's original *matn* ("A") into "AD", and his three students further changed this into "AD7", "AD8", and "AD9". All of this would yield a nice match between the *matns* and the *ʿisnāds*, with particular wordings correlating with particular tradents: the "B" element would correlate with PCL₁, the "C" element would correlate with the second PCL₂, and the "D" element would correlate with PCL₃, with the *matns* of the cluster of students around a given PCL being more similar to each other than to those in the other PCL clusters.

For this to work, however, each PCL has to be precise with his retaining of "A" from the CL (such that these hadiths can even be recognised as variants of the same tradition, sharing a common origin), yet simultaneously *imprecise* in his respective addition of "B", "C", or "D" (such that there can be particular wordings to correlate with the PCLs in the first place). Likewise, each student has to be precise in retaining both the original element from the CL and the addition of their PCL-source (such that the clusters of transmissions from each PCL are internally similar yet different from the other clusters), and so on, so forth (for however many generations this transmission occurs).

Why would we expect this happen? Why would the imprecise transmission allowing a PCL to change "A" into "AB" also not allow "A" to be completely replaced by "B", or

“AB” to be replaced by “A1” (losing “B” along the way)? Moreover, if *matns* were being transmitted imprecisely (such that variants could arise in the first place), why would we not expect the *’isnāds* to be altered concurrently? Is it plausible to imagine that transmitters devoted rigour to their memorisation of the *’isnād*, only to slack off into paraphrase, elaboration, or error when it came to the *matn*?

Even putting all of that aside, Melchert’s main criticism of the ICMA arises from the observation that it is possible that fabrication, interpolation, or accidental false ascription—i.e., spreading *’isnāds* or successive dives—could actually produce the kind of pattern sought by the ICMA.⁴⁰¹ Melchert’s main objection is thus straightforward: the assumption of the ICMA that apparent *’isnād-matn* correlation is the product of genuine transmission is at best *ad hoc*,⁴⁰² since the evidence is actually equivocal. Whether a seeming *’isnād-matn* correlation is the product of false ascription or genuine transmission is thus a matter of *probability* rather than *possibility*, since either mechanism could theoretically produce the same pattern of evidence.

For a hypothetical example, suppose that a tradent (T₁) created his own distinctive version of a *matn* and falsely ascribed it to an earlier figure (T₄); then another tradent (T₂) came along, obtained this distinctive *matn* from T₁, and suppressed T₁ from the *’isnād* by directly citing T₄ as his source instead; then along came yet another tradent (T₃), who received the *matn* from either T₁ or T₂ and likewise omitted his direct source in favour of citing T₄ as his source. The result would be three tradents (T₁, T₂, and T₃) who cite the same distinctive *matn* from the same source (T₄), such that a particular wording (the shared *matn*) would appear to correlate with a common source. Rather than being explained as a product of genuine transmission (i.e., T₁, T₂, and T₃ all accurately preserving both the distinctive *matn* and its origin with T₄), such a pattern would instead be the product of an initial false creation and successive borrowings and suppressions (i.e., between T₁, T₂, and T₃). Thus, even the ICMA seemingly cannot

⁴⁰¹ This problem—in addition to being expressed to me several times in person—is alluded to in Christopher Melchert, ‘Harald Motzki with Nicolet Boeckhoff-van der Voort and Sean Anthony, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth*’, *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Volume 57, Issue 2 (2012), 438. Also see Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet*, 84-86, 300 (nn. 55-56).

⁴⁰² By *ad hoc*, I simply mean a “just so” story, i.e., a hypothesis that merely explains the evidence that it was designed or adduced to explain, lacking independent corroboration, such that it remains unjustified *vis-à-vis* any number of alternative possible explanations for the same evidence. This is not to be confused with *ad hoc* auxiliary hypothesis, meaning, a secondary hypothesis that is adduced or devised to explain away evidence that would otherwise falsify an initial hypothesis.

evade the threat of spreading *ʿisnāds* or successive dives, despite having been developed to overcome precisely this problem.

Little's Criticism of Motzki *et al.*

To Melchert's criticisms of Motzki *et al.*'s ICMA, I add several of my own, most of which pertain to specific *versions* or *applications* of the ICMA, in contrast to the general problems outlined above.

To begin with, the early iterations of Motzki's ICMA had a different emphasis to that outlined above: rather than focusing on the recurring correlation of particular wordings with particular tradents, Motzki mostly argued on a case-by-case basis that particular *matns* must share a common ancestry rather than mutual dependence, and that their inferable common source was the CL explicitly depicted in their *ʿisnāds*. In particular, Motzki mostly appealed to a kind of textual-critical expectation of the retention of information in transmission: if X tradent borrowed from Y tradent, and Y's version has Z wording or detail, then X's consequent version ought to contain Z as well; therefore, if X's version lacks Z, it follows that X likely did not borrow from Y, and that the otherwise close similarities between X and Y must be explained by common descent. If, in such a situation, X and Y both cite a putative CL, it is taken to be likely that the common-ancestor version behind both X and Y's versions is the CL's version, such that the CL is genuine.⁴⁰³

⁴⁰³ E.g., Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 119; *id.*, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 33, 43-46; *id.*, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 184, 186-188, 195, 204, 212, 221, 223; Andreas Görke, 'The Historical Tradition about al-Ḥudaybiya: A Study of 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr's Account', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad: The Issue of the Sources* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2000), 247, 258-259; Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 149, 151-152, 154, 170; *id.* (trans. Sonja Adrianovska & Vivien Reid), 'Al-Radd 'Alā l-Radd: Concerning the Method of *Ḥadīth* Analysis', in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 221-222, 226; *id.*, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 239, 256-257; Mitter, 'Origin and Development', in Bernards & Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage*, 87 (n. 70), 114, 126, 130-131; Nicolet Boekhoff-van der Voort, 'The Raid of the Hudhayl: Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri's Version of the Event', in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 307, 362; Harald Motzki, 'Abraham, Hagar and Ishmael at Mecca: A Contribution to the Problem of Dating Muslim Traditions', in Andrew L. Rippin & Roberto Tottoli (eds.), *Books and Written Culture of the Islamic World: Studies Presented to Claude Gilliot on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015), 370, 374-375.

Motzki's reasoning arguably makes sense from the turn of the 9th Century CE onward, when—as we will see—most transmitters sought to more or less retain the information that they had received, and when the rising reliance on written notes was facilitating greater accuracy in Hadith transmission in general.⁴⁰⁴ In such a situation, absent an identifiable motive to alter or omit information, it does seem unexpected that a tradent borrowing from another would lose details contained in the latter's *matn*. However, the same cannot be said for earlier 'transmitters' of Hadith (in the first Islamic century and a half at least), who not only operated in an era of loose, paraphrastic oral transmission (which allowed for the transformation and loss of information), but evidently felt free to alter or even recreate reports.⁴⁰⁵ In such a situation, omissions and especially variations in content between two *matns* would by no means preclude mutual dependency, since paraphrasing, interpolation, or simple memory distortion or error could easily result therein, in an instance of borrowing. In general, it is certainly true—based on the findings of the last few centuries of textual criticism—that information or content is more likely to accrue than be lost, such that the more elaborate version of two competing texts is usually taken to be the later (i.e., embellished) form.⁴⁰⁶ However, that does not mean that a tradent will accurately retain all elements and details when they receive and transmit a hadith, especially in an oral context. In other words, standard textual-critical reasoning is not always applicable to oral transmission, especially when paraphrasing, memory distortion, and contamination are common. Thus, Motzki's appeal to the omission of wordings or details as a means to establish the independence of *matns* is unconvincing, at least regarding transmission before the turn of the 9th Century CE.

In short, Motzki had an unreasonably strict notion of what borrowing or mutual dependency would look like. For example, when evaluating the relationship between two PCLs—Zakariyyā' b. 'abī Zā'idah (d. 149/766-767) and Yūsuf b. 'Ishāq (d. 157/773-774)—within the broader tradition of the CL 'Abū 'Ishāq (d. 127-128/744-746), Motzki noted that the respective PCL redactions are substantially “similar in structure and choice of words”, but that one of them “is shorter or uses other words” in “some places”, which led him to conclude: “The differences between the two

⁴⁰⁴ See the section below, concerning Little's defence of the ICMA; and, also, the conclusion in ch. 2.

⁴⁰⁵ See the references given at the outset, esp. Crone and Yanagihashi.

⁴⁰⁶ E.g., Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 37-39.

versions are such that any dependence on each other is not probable. What they have in common must therefore go back to a common source.”⁴⁰⁷ Why? If the differences between Zakariyyā’ and Yūsuf’s redactions are so minor, surely a borrowing by one from the other, in the era of oral paraphrasing, could produce the same level of similarity and divergence? Why then does Motzki exclude such a scenario?

After enumerating such differences between all four of the PCLs within this tradition from ‘Abū ‘Ishāq, Motzki further concluded:

Our comparison of *matns*, ascribed to different transmitters who all relate on the authority of Abū Ishāq, has brought to light that all of them are independent from each other and must go back to a common source which, according to the *isnāds*, must be Abū Ishāq. Stated differently: The conclusion reached by the analysis of the *isnād* bundle that there is a common link is corroborated by the *matn* analysis; additionally, the *isnād* analysis shows that this common link is Abū Ishāq. The common link is not artificially created by the so-called “spread of *isnāds*”.⁴⁰⁸

Why? Motzki believed that the relevant level of difference between the PCLs must have arisen in the course of transmission *from* the CL *to* the PCLs, but why could the same level of difference not have arisen *between* the putative PCLs? Moreover, what if *several* (anonymous or suppressed) intermediary borrowings separated the borrowing from its original source—surely the two resulting versions (the borrowing and the original, both now claiming a common, earlier source) would notably diverge, despite being the product of mutual dependency rather than common descent? Furthermore, what if an outright storyteller—someone who habitually radically reworked reports—was involved somewhere along the way? Again, Motzki’s appeal to differences between *matns* does not seem like a strong basis for establishing independence.

Motzki further stated, in regards to the tradition of ‘Abū ‘Ishāq:

A striking phenomenon is that, on the one hand, the versions of Isrā’īl and Sharīk resemble each other and, on the other hand, the same is true of the versions of Yūsuf b. Ishāq and Zakariyyā’ b. Abī Zā’ida. If my conclusion is correct that the four versions must go back, independently from each other, to a common source, then the difference between the two types of stories

⁴⁰⁷ Motzki, ‘The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq’, in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 186-187.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 187.

(or the correspondence between two of each) must be explained by supposing that Abū Ishāq related the story in at least two different ways.⁴⁰⁹

Why could we not instead infer (in the given case) that ʾIsrāʾīl and Šarīk borrowed from each other, on the one hand, and Yūsuf and Zakariyyāʾ borrowed from each other, on the other? How does Motzki preclude borrowing amongst the PCLs, in such a situation?

In short, Motzki seems only to have allowed for borrowing in the case of identical or near-identical *matns*, as he indicated in his evaluation of two seemingly-independent transmissions (Ibn Hišām—al-Bakkāʾī and al-ʿUṭāridī—Ibn Bukayr) from a putative CL (Ibn ʾIshāq):

To arrive at more certainty as to whether we are concerned in this concrete case with such a deceptive manoeuvre, we need to examine the *texts* of the relevant transmissions. If a “spread of *isnāds*” were the case, then Ibn Hisham’s and al-ʿUṭāridī’s versions of the narration must to a large extent be identical.⁴¹⁰

This only makes sense if borrowing and suppression—the spread of *ʾisnāds* or diving—only occurred via precise or verbatim oral transmission, or else through the precise copying of written texts. However, if it also occurred between heavy-handed redactors, or via paraphrastic or sloppy oral transmission, or between storytellers, then there is no reason to expect that “the narration must to a large extent be identical” in such an instance. Again, Motzki’s standard for establishing borrowing seems unreasonably high.⁴¹¹

Worse still, Motzki’s assertions of the independence of *matns* sometimes degenerate into little more than tautologies, as in the following instance: “The differences between the two versions are **so many** and sometimes **so substantial**, that

⁴⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 188.

⁴¹⁰ *Id.*, *Reconstruction*, 26. Also see *id.*, ‘The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq’, in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 204; *id.*, ‘The Origins of Muslim Exegesis’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 252, 262; Görke, ‘Eschatology’, in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 189; Mitter, ‘Origin and Development’, in Bernardi & Nawas (eds.), *Patronage and Patronage*, 76-77; Boekhoff-van der Voort, ‘The Raid of the Hudhayl’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 307.

⁴¹¹ This is at least a step up from Motzki’s tendency elsewhere to interpret *all levels of variation* as consistent with genuine transmission, as noted in Melchert, ‘Motzki, Harald. *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence*’, 408: “Motzki continually talks about “demonstrating” that particular hadith reports are historically reliable, but one begins to wonder how many of his affirmations actually falsifiable. When two transmitters quote someone the way, it shows that they have a common source; if differently, that transmissions are satisfactorily independent.”

it is not conceivable that al-Rūyānī's text is based on that of al-Bukhārī or vice versa."⁴¹² All that "so" means here is 'at the right level', which means that Motzki is merely stating: "it is not conceivable that al-Rūyānī's text is based on that of al-Bukhārī or vice versa", because the differences between the two versions are of the "it is not conceivable that al-Rūyānī's text is based on that of al-Bukhārī or vice versa" *level of numerousness*, and of the "it is not conceivable that al-Rūyānī's text is based on that of al-Bukhārī or vice versa" *level of substantialness*. In other words, the versions exhibit a 'they must share common ancestry' level of difference, so they must share common ancestry. In such instances of vacuity, we are left with no inkling as to the criterion for mutual dependency versus common ancestry, i.e., the criterion for what quantity or quality of variation would be sufficient therefor.

In short, Motzki seemed to think that there is some kind of clear or discernible level of variation between *matns* that precludes dependence and thus entails common ancestry, but failed to outline a sound criterion therefor: his assertions of the independence of *matns* were at best unjustified and at worst tautologies.

There are also problems with Motzki's *application* of the ICMA, not just the *version* he was employing. For example, in his 1998 article 'The Prophet and the Cat', Motzki analysed a hadith about the ritual purity of cats and concluded that 'Ishāq b. 'Abd Allāh (d. 132-134/749-752),⁴¹³ 'Ikrimah (d. 104-107/722-726),⁴¹⁴ and 'Abd Allāh b. 'abī Qatādah (d. 95/713-714)⁴¹⁵ were all genuine CLs who disseminated different versions of the hadith, before further concluding that their ultimate common source, the Companion 'Abū Qatādah (d. 54/673-674), was also a genuine CL.⁴¹⁶ Of course, as has been noted already,⁴¹⁷ 'Abū Qatādah is not a CL in the usual sense (i.e., a *common source* whose distinctive redaction was received by multiple relatives and students): he is a *common character* in reports ascribed to three of his relatives and one of his students.

⁴¹² Motzki, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 187. Emphasis mine. For other examples, see *id.*, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 33, 48; *id.*, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 186, 218-219; *id. et al.*, 'First Century Sources', 52; *id.* (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', 152, 162; *id.* (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'Al-Radd 'Alā l-Radd', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 219; *id.*, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 251; Boekhoff-van der Voort, 'The Raid of the Hudhayl', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 376; Motzki, *Reconstruction*, 110.

⁴¹³ Motzki, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 47 ff., 53.

⁴¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 58.

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 70.

⁴¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 64. Technically, this would make 'Ishāq, 'Ikrimah, and 'Abd Allāh PCLs. Then again, if 'Abū Qatādah is technically not a CL, such an emendation would be unnecessary.

⁴¹⁷ See the section on Brown's criticism of Juynboll, above.

In other words, 'Abū Qatādah *cannot* be a CL: only his relatives and students, each of whom allegedly transmitted their own recollection of an event (i.e., their own *report*), could logically be CLs (i.e., each for their own distinctive redaction). And yet, most of the relevant hadiths—'Ishāq's redaction; the SSs of al-Bayhaqī, Ibn Ḥanbal, and al-Muḥalliṣ⁴¹⁸ unto 'Abd Allāh; and al-Ṭaḥāwī's SS to Ka'b—share the same elemental sequence:

1. 'Abū Qatādah
2. ablutions
3. a cat appears
4. the cat is allowed to drink from a water vessel
5. objection/amazement
6. 'Abū Qatādah cites the Prophet's precedent

This is despite the fact that most of these hadiths are supposed to be the words and recollections of *multiple different people*: Kabṣah, the wife of 'Abd Allāh b. 'abī Qatādah (in 'Ishāq's version); 'Abd Allāh himself (in the SSs of al-Bayhaqī, Ibn Ḥanbal, and al-Muḥalliṣ); and Ka'b b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān (in al-Ṭaḥāwī's SS). Why would the independent recollections—the independent *reports*—of three different witnesses to a common event share the same form?

Motzki argues that all of these reports are witnesses to the same event—thus, the common form simply reflects a broadly-accurate memory of the same sequence of events, witnessed simultaneously by multiple people.⁴¹⁹ This is certainly possible, but is it probable, let alone the most probable explanation for this kind of evidence? Anyone familiar with the work of Noth, Crone, and Roohi will immediately recognise an alternative explanation for such a pattern of evidence: stories and narrative material were constantly borrowed and remixed by early Muslim storytellers, such that the common elemental sequence featuring 'Abū Qatādah might simply reflect a reused schema or template, rather than independent recollections of the same

⁴¹⁸ Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Muḥalliṣ (ed. Nabīl Sa'd al-Dīn Jarrār), *al-Muḥalliṣiyyāt wa-'Ajzā' 'Ukrā*, vol. 3 (Qatar: Wizārat al-'Awqāt wa-al-Šu'ūn al-'Islāmiyyah, 2008), p. 373. The reader should note that Motzki seems to have been unaware of this SS. However, for the sake of completeness (and to present the strongest possible case for Motzki), I have included this 'corroborating evidence' in my analysis. For the rest of the sources in question, see Motzki's bibliography.

⁴¹⁹ Motzki, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 63-64, 72.

event.⁴²⁰ Such a scenario is all the more plausible if the hadith indeed originated amongst the relatives and descendants 'Abū Qatādah, since informal borrowings and contaminations are completely expected in the context of family members learning family lore from each other.

Some kind of borrowing or common *narrative* origin (as opposed to an origin in a common *experience of an event*) becomes even more likely when it is noticed that nearly all of these hadiths describe how 'Abū Qatādah allowed the cat to drink in the same way: he “inclined” (*'aṣḡā*) the vessel containing the ablution water. What are the odds that independent recollections would happen to include the same non-essential detail regarding *how* the cat gained access to the water, and that they would moreover use *the same verb* in describing this? There are thus form-critical grounds for suspecting that the CL hadiths about 'Abū Qatādah are not independent of each other: rather than a match between a single, inferable ur-redaction (embodied in all the extant versions) and a CL ('Abū Qatādah), we instead have a mismatch between a single, inferable ur-redaction (embodied in all the extant versions) and two or three allegedly-independent recollections of a single event featuring a common figure ('Abū Qatādah).

However, this kind of deeper, form-critical evaluation is not even necessary in the first place, since the attribution of the aforementioned SSs to the putative CLs 'Abd Allāh and Ka'b are doubtful even on standard *'isnād-cum-matn* grounds: some of these SSs are more similar to certain transmissions from 'Ishāq than they are to each other, sharing particular elements and wordings. In this respect, Motzki already conceded that Ibn Ḥanbal's SS via Mu'ammār unto 'Abd Allāh is “a mixture of borrowings from several different traditions”,⁴²¹ and that al-Ṭaḥāwī's SS unto Ka'b is “modeled on” other ascriptions to Kabšah and 'Abd Allāh, given the presence of distinctive wordings in the suspect hadiths that are present in seemingly unrelated hadiths.⁴²² (On the same grounds, al-Muḥallī's SS back to 'Abd Allāh, which shares extensive wordings with 'Ishāq's recension, must be discarded as a borrowing.) However, according to Motzki,

⁴²⁰ Noth & Lawrence, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition*, 2nd ed.; Crone, *Meccan Trade*, ch. 9; Ehsan Roohi, 'Between History and Ancestral Lore: A Literary Approach to the *Sīra*'s Narratives of Political Assassinations', *Der Islam*, Volume 98, Issue 2 (2021), 425-472; *id.*, 'A Form-Critical Analysis of the al-Rajī' and Bi'r Ma'ūna Stories: Tribal, Ideological, and Legal Incentives behind the Transmission of the Prophet's Biography', *al-'Uṣūr al-Wuṣṭā*, Volume 30 (2022), 267-338.

⁴²¹ Motzki, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 68-69.

⁴²² *Ibid.*, 70-71.

the remaining two ascriptions to ‘Abd Allāh—namely, al-Bayhaqī’s SS via al-Ḥajjāj and Qatādah, and his other SS via Hammām and Yaḥyá—have *matns* that are fundamentally similar: “In both texts, the behavior of Abū Qatāda is described in few words. The content is, on the whole, the same.”⁴²³ Moreover, given that these two ascriptions to ‘Abd Allāh differ notably in wording when they cite the Prophet, Motzki infers that they cannot be borrowed from each other, from which it follows that they must share a common source. Furthermore, since both hadiths do indeed cite a common source (‘Abd Allāh) in their *’isnāds*, this cited common source is likely the *actual* common source for the two hadiths:

The differences between both texts show that they are not dependent on each other. It is not very probable that the text of Qatāda had the *matn* of Yaḥyá as a model or the other way around. If so, how can the substantial similarities of both texts be explained? It seems most appropriate to think that they are derived from a common source and that the differences are due to the transmission process (i.e., oral, or based on written notes). Who could be that source? The most likely candidate is ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Qatāda to whom, according to the *’isnāds*, both transmitters refer as their informant.

In this regard, Motzki has both exaggerated his findings and overlooked key evidence. To begin with, the similarity between al-Bayhaqī’s two ascriptions to ‘Abd Allāh is extremely superficial: whilst it is certainly interesting that both omit the *ṭawwāfīn* element present in ‘Ishāq’s redaction,⁴²⁴ the version from al-Ḥajjāj—Qatādah contains noticeably more elements than the version from Hammām—Yaḥyá, and in general, the two *matns* share no distinctive wordings *vis-à-vis* the transmissions from ‘Ishāq. Moreover, the al-Ḥajjāj—Qatādah version has the sequence *kāna ‘abū qatādah yuṣṣī al-’inā’ li-l-hirr fa-šaribat ṭumma yatawaḍḍa’u bi-hi*, which is extremely similar to ‘Abd al-Razzāq and al-Bayhaqī’s transmissions from ‘Ishāq: the former has *fa-’aṣṣā ‘ilay-hā al-’inā’ allaḍī fī-hi wuḍū’u-hu fa-šaribat ṭumma tawaḍḍa’a bi-faḍli-hā*, and the latter has *fa-’aṣṣā ‘ilay-hi al-’inā’ fa-šariba ṭumma tawaḍḍa’a bi-faḍli-hi*. In this respect, al-Bayhaqī’s SS to ‘Abd Allāh is much more similar to certain transmissions from ‘Ishāq than it is to al-Bayhaqī’s parallel SS unto ‘Abd Allāh, which lacks most of the relevant wordings. Conversely, the Hammām—Yaḥyá version has the sequence *wa-qāla ‘inna*

⁴²³ *Ibid.*, 67.

⁴²⁴ *Ibid.*, 68.

rasūl allāh qāla laysat bi-najas, which is extremely close to some versions of 'Ishāq's redaction (e.g., Mālik's *qāla 'inna rasūl allāh qāla 'inna-hā laysat bi-najas*), but completely absent in al-Bayhaqī's parallel SS. Once again, the ascriptions to 'Abd Allāh are much more similar to certain transmissions from 'Ishāq than they are to each other, which is consistent with the occurrence of borrowing: certainly, they cannot be said to derive in common from 'Abd Allāh, which means that 'Abd Allāh cannot be identified as a probable CL.

Curiously, Motzki at one point considered the possibility that al-Bayhaqī's SSs unto 'Abd Allāh via al-Ḥajjāj—Qatādah and Hammām—Yaḥyá were actually the product of borrowings from 'Ishāq or his students:

...the alleged transmitters of the two versions—Hammām and al-Ḥajjāj—could have created them after the model of the *ḥadīth* of Ishāq b. 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Ṭalḥa and changed the *isnād*. This objection does raise a question as well: if one assumes, for the sake of argument, that this really happened, how did they arrive at the same name for the informant? By chance? Or did they make this forgery together?⁴²⁵

There are several obvious answers to this question. Firstly, there were various pressures for independent *'isnāds* during the 8th Century CE, so if some Iraqians at the time sought local, alternative paths of transmission back to 'Abū Qatādah, and some of their local predecessors were known to have transmitted from 'Abd Allāh b. 'abī Qatādah, he would have been an obvious choice for such retrojections. Secondly, 'Ishāq cited *the wife of 'Abd Allāh* as his source, so it is only natural that *'Abd Allāh himself* would jump out as an obvious alternative source. Thirdly, an initial dive to 'Abd Allāh could spawn parallel dives thereto, either deliberately (i.e., attempts to update or improve the initial dive) or accidentally (i.e., someone could simply mix up the initial dive to 'Abd Allāh with a version of 'Ishāq's *ḥadīth*). We can thus safely put aside any incredulity regarding the existence of multiple SSs unto 'Abd Allāh, as if this could only be explained by his having been an actual CL—on the contrary, the simultaneous or successive creation of parallel ascriptions to him is very easy to envisage, without invoking amazing coincidences or mendacious collaboration.⁴²⁶

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*, 67-68.

⁴²⁶ For more on this, see Schacht, Cook, and Juynboll, cited variously above.

Of course, this still leaves the issue of the unique wording of the citation of the Prophet's precedent in al-Bayhaqī's transmission from al-Ḥajjāj—Qatādah, which differs not just from his parallel SS unto 'Abd Allāh, but also from 'Ishāq's redaction. According to Motzki, this unusual wording ("I am only doing what I saw the Messenger of God do") cannot have been derived from the common wording shared by the Hammām—Yaḥyá version and 'Ishāq ("Verily the Messenger of God said: "Verily it is not impure"). Not a shred of argumentation is given in support of this contention, however: it is simply asserted. *Contra* Motzki, it is easy to envisage such a change occurring (especially during the 8th Century CE, when paraphrastic oral transmission still lingered), since it transforms 'Abū Qatādah's vague citation of something the Prophet said (i.e., without necessarily indicating that 'Abū Qatādah himself heard it directly from the Prophet) into an act that 'Abū Qatādah himself witnessed. A similar motive can explain why some versions of 'Ishāq's redaction have 'Abū Qatādah explicitly state, "Verily I heard the Messenger of God say...": this can be understood as an alternative solution to the same ambiguity.

Finally, we have 'Ikrimah's *mawqūf* hadith (in which no Prophetical precedent is cited), which certainly does not share the same elemental structure as the *marfū'* hadiths of the CL 'Ishāq and his borrowers—might we thus have two independent witnesses to a common event, as Motzki suggests?⁴²⁷ Again, it is certainly possible—but there are reasons to be skeptical. Firstly, 'Ikrimah's hadith can be read as vaguely reporting a continuous or general custom of 'Abū Qatādah's, rather than a specific event: "Abū Qatādah used to (*kāna*) lower (*yudnī*) the vessel [containing water for ablutions] for a cat and it would lap (*yaliḡu*) therefrom, then he would perform ablutions (*tumma yatawaḡḡa'u*) with the leftovers." By contrast, 'Ishāq's hadith reports a specific event, which means that 'Ishāq and 'Ikrimah do not attest to the same event per se. Moreover, even if they are supposed to refer to the same event, 'Ishāq's hadith seems decidedly secondary, given that it is much more detailed and specific and adds a statement from the Prophet. It is thus at the very least highly plausible that 'Ishāq's hadith represents an elaborated and improved version of 'Ikrimah's hadith, calling into question Motzki's conclusion that they represent independent recollections of a common event.

⁴²⁷ Motzki, "The Prophet and the Cat", 63-64.

In short, the early version of the ICMA articulated by Motzki relied upon a certain kind of textual-critical reasoning—to establish the independence of texts—that often cannot be applied to the oral context of Hadith; Motzki’s arguments for the independence of texts often devolved into mere tautologies; and Motzki’s application of the ICMA was sometimes inconsistent and idiosyncratic, as when he disregarded clear textual relationships between hadiths. Even if the ICMA in general can be salvaged, many of Motzki’s specific historical conclusions will have to be rejected.

Little’s Defence of the *’Isnād-Cum-Matn Analysis*

Despite all of this, an important consideration still remains in favour of the ICMA: **the *matns* attributed to particular PCLs and CLs are usually more similar to each other than to the *matns* attributed to other PCLs and CLs.**⁴²⁸ Whilst it is *possible* that this kind of pattern could obtain via widespread and frequent borrowings, suppressions, and paraphrases (of the sort described above), Herbert Berg—following Motzki—argues that such an outcome *overall* seems quite unlikely: fabrications, interpolations, and paraphrases could go in any direction and produce all kinds of evidence, yet this particular pattern shows up again and again. By contrast, genuine transmission would consistently produce this kind of pattern, according to Berg:

Motzki’s argument, however, is valid. If revisionists see no value whatsoever in the contents of the *isnāds*, then the observed correlations between the texts and those *isnāds* requires some alternative explanation. Organic growth and mass fabrication would likely favor randomness, not correlations.⁴²⁹

Be that as it may, there is an obvious solution to Melchert’s first criticism (*viz.*, that the ICMA paradoxically requires simultaneous precise *and* imprecise transmission), in light of the usual chronology involved with putative CLs and PCLs. The transmission of

⁴²⁸ See Juynboll, Motzki, and Mitter, cited above, in the section on Motzki *et al.*’s ICMA.

⁴²⁹ Herbert Berg, ‘The Needle in the Haystack: Islamic Origins and the Nature of the Early Sources’, in Carlos A. Segovia & Basil Lourié (eds.), *The Coming of the Comforter: When, Where, and to Whom? Studies on the Rise of Islam and Various Other Topics in Memory of John Wansbrough* (Piscataway, USA: Gorgias Press, 2012), 281. Similarly, see Motzki, ‘The Collection of the Qur’ān’, 28; *id.*, ‘The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered’, in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 236-237; Mitter, ‘Origin and Development’, in Bernardts & Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage*, 77-78.

Hadith was loose or sloppy during the mid-to-late 8th Century CE, when the CLs passed on their hadiths to their immediate PCLs; then transmission saw a marked increase in precision at the turn of the 9th Century CE, when these PCLs passed on their hadiths to their students (including junior PCLs); and henceforth, variations (at the hands of these students and later scribes) were extremely minor.⁴³⁰ In other words, initial imprecision (on the part of the CLs and their PCLs) allowed for variation to arise in the first place (reflecting the respective idiosyncrasies of each PCL), then subsequent increasing precision (on the part of the students of the PCLs, including junior PCLs) allowed for these variations to be preserved forthwith, etc.

In addition to explaining the common pattern of evidence found by numerous ICMAAs (minimal variation *within* PCL clusters, but substantial variation *between* PCL clusters), this inferable progression from imprecision to precision at the turn of the 9th Century CE (when the senior PCLs were transmitting to their students) coincides with both the generalised acceptance of the recording of Hadith in writing (or at least in personal notes)⁴³¹ and a transition in *ʿisnāds* from generic citations (*ʿan*) to verbatim quotations (*ḥaddaṭa-nā*, etc.).⁴³² As it happens, Motzki and others have already made this connection, at least in passing.⁴³³

This general pattern also provides a tentative solution to Melchert's second criticism (*viz.*, the possibility that spreading *ʿisnāds* could produce apparent *ʿisnād-matn* correlation): the hypothesis of genuine and increasingly-reliable transmission makes better sense *in general* as an explanation for the evidence in question. In other words, as an *explanatory postulate*, the distinctive sub-traditions clustered around

⁴³⁰ For some related evidence and similar observations, see Motzki, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 187-188, 192; Mitter, 'Origin and Development of the Islamic Patronate', in Bernards & Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage*, 77, n. 32; Motzki, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 252; Mitter, "'The Majority of the dwellers of Hell-fire are women'", in Boekhoff-van der Voort *et al.* (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam*, 450. The papyri studied in Abbott, *Studies*, II, are also consistent with this pattern.

⁴³¹ Michael A. Cook, 'The Opponents of the Writing of Tradition in early Islam', *Arabica*, Tome 44, Issue 4 (1997), 476; Gregor Schoeler (ed. James E. Montgomery and trans. Uwe Vagelpohl), *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2006), 116; Melchert, *Aḥmad*, 31-32.

⁴³² Christopher Melchert, 'The Destruction of Books by Traditionists', *al-Qanṭara*, Volume 35, Number 1 (2014), 218-219.

⁴³³ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 91; Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 104, 115-116; Motzki, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 187-188, 192; *id.* (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 143, 161; *id.*, *Reconstruction*, 110-111.

PCLs can be understood to reflect the respective redactions of said PCLs, and the underlying tradition shared by the PCLs can be understood to reflect the preceding redaction of the CL, against the backdrop of increasing precision in transmission due to the concomitant rise and generalisation of writing. Put differently, if the recurring textual pattern of the PCLs and the CLs reflected genuine transmission, then it would have to be an increasingly precise form of transmission (in order to actually explain the pattern); and if indeed transmission was becoming more precise, it would have to be due to something like the rise and generalisation of writing; and as it happens, we have evidence for the spread and predomination of writing in exactly the right time period. Moreover, if transmission was becoming more precise, we would expect to see other signs thereof, i.e., signs of a general increase in precise quotation-practices, or tradents paying closer attention to memorising and transmitting the wordings of hadiths; and as it happens, the rise and spread of tradents reproducing the transmission-terminology of their teachers (for example, *ḥaddaṭa-nā*, as opposed to a vague ‘*an*’) is consistent therewith, and occurred at around the same time as the generalisation—or general acceptance—of the writing of Hadith.⁴³⁴

In short, the hypothesis of widespread genuine transmission in conjunction with increasing rigour or precision coincides with—i.e., is corroborated by—the rise of precise transmission-terminology in *’isnāds* and the rise and predomination of written transmission. Thus, the best *overall* explanation for the pattern in question (i.e., the recurring correlations between particular wordings and specific tradents) is widespread genuine—and increasingly accurate—transmission, at least from around the time of the CLs and PCLs onward. In other words, the best *overall* explanation for this pattern is that the idiosyncrasies or particularities of CLs and PCLs were accurately recorded by subsequent tradents, which means that their redactions can be reconstructed—at least whenever this correlation holds.

This also allows us to sidestep the problem I outlined with Motzki’s approach (i.e., the lack of a clear and sound criterion of establishing textual independence and common ancestry): the only criterion needed for a given set of *matns* to be explained

⁴³⁴ Again, see Melchert, cited above. Of course, tradents sometimes failed in this respect (or lied), since we can infer in plenty of instances (by comparing variants) that a *ḥaddaṭa-nā* remembered by one tradent is remembered as an *’akbara-nā* by another. The important part is not that they remembered 100% accurately, however, but that they began to *attempt* to remember accurately. Or, to be more precise, the evidence is *consistent* with such an attempt, as a general tendency; cf. Melchert, *op cit.*, who sees this trend as a *reaction* against the rise the writing.

as genuine transmissions from a PCL is that they are more similar to each other *vis-à-vis* those ascribed to others (i.e., that the PCL sub-tradition is *distinctive*), such that the *matns* in question can be explained as reflections of the redaction (i.e., the idiosyncrasies or particularities) of the PCL. By contrast, if the sub-traditions of PCLs are not distinctive (i.e., the transmissions from them are not more similar to each other *vis-à-vis* those ascribed to others), then no appeal can be made to a general preservation of the particular wording of the PCLs.

Of course, my defence of the ICMA has severe consequences: if variation was generally insignificant from post-PCL students to subsequent students or later copyists, minor from the PCLs to their students, and major from the CLs to their PCLs, then it is reasonable to expect that such variation was greater still from the Followers to the CLs, and greater still yet from the Companions to the Followers, and so on,⁴³⁵ as even Motzki admits.⁴³⁶ This general progression from imprecision to precision is consistent with Crone's view on extreme and rapid mutation in the oral traditions of the 1st Islamic Century, undermining any expectation that the CL's redaction (in the event that this can even be reconstructed from the various paraphrases of their PCLs) accurately reflects a report or memory passed on from a predecessor.⁴³⁷ Even the CL's cited *'isnād* seems questionable, since even *'isnāds* could in principle be subject to mutation.

In short, my solution to the problem of the seemingly-paradoxical simultaneous need for precise and imprecise transmission on the part of the ICMA—the tendency of

⁴³⁵ For a similar point, see Cook, *Muhammad*, 66-67; Crone, *Meccan Trade*, 223-224.

⁴³⁶ E.g., Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 91; *id.*, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 187-188, 192; *id.* (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 143, 161. Also see *id.*, *Reconstruction*, 13, where Motzki noted some evidence for heavy legendary development during the 1st Islamic Century.

⁴³⁷ Cf. Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *Biography*, 16, 106, 113, 115; *id.*, 'Méthodes et Débats', 361-362; *id.*, 'Foundations', in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 24, 27-28; Görke & Schoeler, 'Reconstructing the Earliest *sīra* Texts', 220; Andreas Görke, 'Prospects and Limits in the Study of the Historical Muḥammad', in Nicolet Boekhoff-van der Voort, Kees Versteegh, & Joas Wagemakers (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam: Essays in Honour of Harald Motzki* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2011), 148. Schoeler and Görke argue that, if we can reconstruct a gist back to 'Urwah, the gist of this gist (i.e., minus any miracles, propaganda, and anachronisms) can be trusted as an accurate historical memory tracing back to Companion eyewitnesses. Inasmuch as mutation and legendary development were at their most extreme during the 1st Islamic Century, this conclusion seems dubious: cf. in turn Chase F. Robinson, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 10; Shoemaker, 'In Search of 'Urwa's *Sīra*', 324-325; *id.*, 'Andreas Görke and Gregor Schoeler, *Die ältesten Berichte über das Leben Muhammads: Das Korpus 'Urwa ibn az-Zubair*', *Der Islam*, Volume 89, Issue 2 (2012), 209-210. Cf. also Sean W. Anthony, *Muhammad the Empires of Faith: The Making of the Prophet of Islam* (Oakland, USA: University of California Press, 2020), 7 (points 3-4).

Hadith transmission to increase in accuracy over time, as corroborated by other points of evidence—is a pyrrhic victory, in terms of the prospect of reconstructing any kind of pre-CL version of a hadith.

Little's Refined *'Isnād-Cum-Matn* Analysis

It should by now be clear that past executions of the ICMA contain imperfections that must be jettisoned: the reconstructed redaction of a CL cannot simply be treated as an accurate transmission from the preceding generation (in light of early rapid mutation); and mere differences between *matns* are insufficient to establish common ancestry, as opposed to direct or mutual borrowing. (Again, it is the general correlation of *particular* elements with *particular* tradents, rather than merely similarities or differences between *matns*, that is best explained as the result of genuine transmission from said tradents.) In other words, only a more skeptical or rigorous version of the ICMA seems sustainable, in light of the problems outlined above.

To begin with, PCLs and CLs are confirmed as genuine if they are associated with a distinctive tradition or sub-tradition within the relevant set of Hadith material, and whatever elements or wordings are shared in common within the tradition or sub-tradition can be reasonably identified as reflecting their underlying redaction.⁴³⁸ SSs are arguably still suspect (especially lengthy ones and those that claim to derive via famous figures), but that suspicion can be set aside or mitigated if the SS is corroborated by other strands in transmitting a distinctive *matn* from a putative PCL or CL.⁴³⁹

This version of the ICMA is also clearly falsifiable: if a close correlation between *matns* and a common ascription to a key figure is indicative of genuine transmission, then a lack of correlation there-between is indicative of erroneous or false ascription. For example, if the *matns* attributed to a putative PCL are more similar to *matns* ascribed to other PCLs than to each other, this is consistent with the putative PCL in

⁴³⁸ Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 146-147; *id.*, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 243.

⁴³⁹ Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 31.

question being a spider (i.e., the target of multiple, independent false ascriptions),⁴⁴⁰ or with most of the transmissions from a PCL having been contaminated by various different sources.

Similarly, if a set of *matns* are extremely similar to each other (e.g., they comprise a distinctive PCL sub-tradition), but the *ʿisnād* attached to one of them claims therefor a completely different provenance (e.g., a SS independent from the relevant PCL), it is highly unlikely that identical or similar wordings and combinations of elements would obtain independently (especially given the early ubiquity of paraphrastic transmission). Therefore, the best explanation for such evidence is the occurrence of false ascription: the tradent has taken a distinctive *matn* and given it a new, independent *ʿisnād* (i.e., it is a dive), or else an old *matn* has been replaced by a new *matn* borrowed from somewhere else (i.e., total contamination), whilst its original *ʿisnād* has been retained.⁴⁴¹

Contaminations or minor borrowings are also detectable by the ICMA: if a specific wording or element associated with a particular PCL shows up randomly in a *matn* attributed to a different tradent, and none of the other transmissions from this tradent exhibit this wording or element, this is best explained by the PCL's version having contaminated or influenced the other.⁴⁴² Conversely, this analysis also exposes

⁴⁴⁰ Similarly, Görke, 'Eschatology', in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 189-191. For an example, see Rudolph Peters, 'Murder at Khaybar: Some Thoughts on the Origins of the *Qasāma* Procedure in Islamic Law', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 9, Issue 2 (2002), 147.

⁴⁴¹ Similarly, Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 104-105; Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 113-117; Mitter, 'Origin and Development of the Islamic Patronate', in Bernards & Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage*, 77, n. 32; Görke, 'Prospects and Limits', in Boekhoff-van der Voort *et al.* (eds.), *Transmission and Dynamics*, 143; Görke *et al.*, 'First Century Sources', 35-36. For examples, see Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 18, 105-112; Motzki, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 58-61, 68-69, 70-71; Görke, 'The Historical Tradition about al-Ḥudaybiya', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 251, 258; Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 157-158; Schoeler, 'Méthodes et Débats', 365-366; Peters, 'Murder at Khaybar', 144-146; Görke, 'Eschatology', in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 189; Mitter, 'Origin and Development', in Bernards & Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage*, 130, incl. n. 235; Görke, 'The relationship between *maghāzī* and *ḥadīth*', 179-180; *id. et al.*, 'First Century Sources', 35-36; Stijn Aerts, 'The Prayers of Abū Muslim and al-Ma'mūn. An Exercise in Dating *Ḥadīth*', *Journal of Abbasid Studies*, Volume 1 (2014), 74; Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 112-113; Motzki, 'Abraham, Hagar and Ishmael at Mecca', in Rippin & Tottoli (eds.), *Books and Written Culture of the Islamic World*, 378; Aerts, '"Pray with Your Leader"', 37-38, 41-42.

⁴⁴² Similarly, Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 104-105. For examples, see Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 113; *id.*, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 57-58; *id.*, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 224; Görke, 'The Historical Tradition about al-Ḥudaybiya', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 258; Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 135, 143, 180, 226-227, 417-418; Aerts, '"Pray with Your Leader"', 37; Görke, 'Between History and Exegesis', 45.

additions, omissions, and other such alterations: if only one PCL has a particular wording or element in their *matn*, for example, then this is best explained as an alteration on their part; if the particularity had originated with the CL, then it is reasonable to expect that at least some of the other PCLs would have transmitted the wording or element as well.⁴⁴³ This also applies to the raising of *ʿisnāds*,⁴⁴⁴ and other kinds of *ʿisnād*-related improvements.⁴⁴⁵

Of course, it is certainly possible that a feature confined to only one tradent still derives from their PCL or CL source, whose particular rendition of the hadith on one occasion just happened not to be preserved anywhere else.⁴⁴⁶ However, this alternative explanation seems generally less preferable, for three reasons: (1) the odds of only one tradent preserving extra elements or details, at least when *several others* received the same report from the same source, must surely be low, and becomes lower still when the addition in question is absent from independent transmissions at *multiple registers* (i.e., absent not just from parallel transmissions from the source, but from parallel transmissions from the source's source); (2) it is simpler (i.e., more parsimonious) to posit a single interpolation, versus multiple omissions; and (3) as a general rule, the accrual of material in transmission is the norm, which again makes an interpolation scenario more likely than an omission scenario, all else being equal.⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴³ Similarly, Görke, 'The relationship between *maghāzī* and *ḥadīth*', 180; *id.*, 'Prospects and Limits', in Boekhoff-van der Voort *et al.* (eds.), *Transmission and Dynamics*, 142-143; *id.*, 'Authorship in the *Sīra* literature', in Behzadi & Hämeen-Anttila (eds.), *Concepts of Authorship in Pre-Modern Arabic Texts*, 72. For examples, see Motzki, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 42-43; *id.*, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 202; Görke, 'The Historical Tradition about al-Ḥudaybiya', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 253, 267; Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 150-151; Görke, 'The relationship between *maghāzī* and *ḥadīth*', 180.

⁴⁴⁴ Similarly, Schoeler, 'Méthodes et Débats', 362-363; Motzki, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 243. For examples, see Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 16, 59, 66-67; Görke, 'The Historical Tradition about al-Ḥudaybiya', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 267; Schoeler, 'Méthodes et Débats', 362-363; *id.*, 'Foundations', in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 25-26; Motzki, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 243, 245-246, 271; Görke, Motzki, & Schoeler, 'First Century Sources', 27-28; Aerts, 'The Prayers of Abū Muslim and al-Ma'mūn', 77; Andreas Görke, 'Remnants of an old *tafsīr* tradition? The exegetical accounts of 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr', in Majid Daneshgar & Walid A. Saleh (eds.), *Islamic Studies Today: Essays in Honor of Andrew Rippin* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2017), 24, 37, 41.

⁴⁴⁵ Similarly, Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 153. For examples, see Motzki, 'The Prophet and the Cat', 52-53; *id.*, 'The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq', in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 179; *id.* (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 153; *id.*, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 257.

⁴⁴⁶ E.g., Görke & Schoeler, 'Reconstructing the earliest *sīra* texts', 219.

⁴⁴⁷ Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 37-39.

In short, the ICMA “allows [us] to determine when and with whom certain variants originated and branched off from the main transmission tree, whereas the common ancestry of the variants is fully accounted for.”⁴⁴⁸ All of this also follows from the basic premises or postulates of my ICMA, in any case: the ICMA only works in the first place by explaining the correlation of particular *matns* with particular PCLs and CLs as being the result of the accurate recording of the provenance of alterations, with the rate of alterations decreasing over time in proportion to the rise of rigorous and especially written transmission. To even identify an ascription to a PCL or CL as genuine, therefore, we must posit their responsibility—whether by paraphrasing, sloppiness, error, or dishonesty—for a particular wording or element. In other words, we *must* identify unique wordings or elements associated with specific tradents as alterations, interpolations, and insertions on their part—this is the only way to beat Cook’s spread of *ʿisnāds*.⁴⁴⁹

Finally, it should be reiterated that none of this precludes the general unreliability of Hadith—on the contrary, “this method does not require general presumptions about authenticity”, as Motzki clarified.⁴⁵⁰

The Relationship between CLs and Their Hadiths

Even if the ICMA—at least as a corroborated explanatory postulate—allows us to trace hadiths back to CLs, an important question remains: *what exactly is a CL?* Are they the creator, fabricator, formulator, redactor, collector, or first influential transmitter of the hadith, or some combination thereof? In other words, what is the specific relationship between a CL and their hadith, beyond the fact that they transmitted the hadith to some PCLs?

⁴⁴⁸ Aerts, ‘The Prayers of Abū Muslim and al-Ma’mūn’, 72.

⁴⁴⁹ We must thus dispense with certain hyper-sanguine attempts to attribute such variants all the way back to the Prophet or the Companions, of the sort mentioned in Christopher Melchert, ‘Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī and Traditional Hadith Criticism’, in Elisabeth Kendall & Ahmad Khan (eds.), *Reclaiming Islamic Tradition: Modern Interpretations of the Classical Heritage* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), 45-46. Such explanations are simply not corroborated by the chronology of writing and transmitter-terminology discussed above.

⁴⁵⁰ Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), ‘The Prophet and the Debtors’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions* 147.

Most of the relevant scholars seem to agree that most CLs belong to the 8th Century CE.⁴⁵¹ Consequently, most of the relevant scholars agree that the CL is *at minimum* responsible for formulating the common or approximate *wording* or *gist* underlying all of the extant redactions of their given hadith. The reason therefor has been mentioned already: mutagenic, sloppy, or paraphrastic oral transmission predominated at precisely the time when most of the CLs were operating. In other words, the transmission of religio-historical information was largely oral and paraphrastic until the end of the 8th Century CE (even after the rise of private notes), which means that even if some version of a hadith can be reconstructed back to a CL *and* be shown to derive from even earlier information, we should assume that this version represents *their formulation* (i.e., *their paraphrase*), rather than that of an earlier figure.

That this is so is actually a *postulate*, or a *corollary of a postulate*, in my refined ICMA (i.e., it needs to be supposed at the outset to make sense of the recurring patterns of the CLs and the PCLs, discussed above), but independently thereof, we still have the research of Crone *et al.* on early rapid mutation in the Islamic oral tradition,⁴⁵² along with various reports attesting to the belated rise and predomination of written transmission.⁴⁵³ To this can be added our established background knowledge concerning oral traditions and historical memory in oral cultures (thanks to the past century of anthropological research), according to which, paraphrasing, remixing, and mutation are the norm.⁴⁵⁴ Finally, consider the fact that, even on a Motzkian approach, we would often not be able to reconstruct the *wording* of the underlying redaction of a CL if we only had any one of the varying paraphrases or remixes thereof by their PCLs: it is only by comparing the different PCL redactions that the original core(s) from the CL can be ascertained—and even then, usually only approximately.⁴⁵⁵ That being so, we should expect the CL's redaction to be no different—or *even worse*, given the tendency for transmission-methods to improve over time—in this regard: just as the

⁴⁵¹ See above, in the section on Brown's criticism of Juynboll.

⁴⁵² See the references cited at the beginning of the present chapter.

⁴⁵³ See Cook, Schoeler, and Melchert, cited above (in the section on Little's defence of the 'isnād-cum-matn analysis).

⁴⁵⁴ For a summary of the relevant scholarship, see Bart D. Ehrman, *Jesus Before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior* (San Francisco, USA: HarperOne, 2016).

⁴⁵⁵ Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 114; *id.*, 'Méthodes et Débats', 361; Görke, 'Prospects and Limits', in Boekhoff-van der Voort *et al.* (eds.), *Transmission and Dynamics*, 143; Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 35-36; Anthony, *Muhammad*, 7.

PCLs altered the *matns* that they received from the CL, so too must the CLs have altered *their* received *matns* (if not to an even greater degree, being earlier), in the event that they even received their *matns* from earlier sources.

Thus, Juynboll described the CL as follows, in relation to their hadith: “In other words: *the saying which he claims was uttered by the prophet is in reality his own, or (if somebody else’s) he was the first to put it into so many words.*”⁴⁵⁶ In subsequent descriptions, Juynboll inferred that the CL of a given hadith “may be held responsible for the *matn* (i.e. the text) of the tradition—at least of its **protoversion**”,⁴⁵⁷ or in other words, “for the proliferation of the text (*matn*) of the report or tradition, or in any case for the transmission of that *matn*’s **most ancient wording**”⁴⁵⁸ or in other words, for “the authorship of **(the wording of)** that tradition”.⁴⁵⁹ In this respect, Motzki *et al.* are in agreement with Juynboll, as Reinhart observes: “But, he says, and even Motzkians agree, **the wording** was probably constructed by the CL.”⁴⁶⁰ Thus, in a response to Irene Schneider, Motzki stated:

When Schneider speaks of the possibility that the common link did not create the transmission out of the blue, but instead processed older material, it corresponds precisely with my own idea of a collector. **It goes without saying that the material was not handed down word-for-word in oral transmission, and that information could be combined, shortened, expanded and changed, as still happened later in the transmission process.**⁴⁶¹

Similarly, according to Görke:

The question whether a tradition was invented or merely transmitted by a common link is more difficult to answer. Historical probabilities might be adduced, but if we argued on that basis we would not need the common link at all. The question is whether the two concepts can be separated *only* by studying the variants themselves. We might escape this problem if we say that **the common link is the person who is responsible for the tradition in the form we have it. He may have used earlier materials, but he is**

⁴⁵⁶ Juynboll, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 353. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁵⁷ *Id.*, ‘The Role of *Mu‘ammarūn*’, 155. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁵⁸ *Id.*, ‘Early Islamic society’, 155. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁵⁹ *Id.*, ‘(Re)Appraisal of Some Technical Terms in *Ḥadīth* Science’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 8, Number 3 (2001), 306.

⁴⁶⁰ Reinhart, ‘Juynbolliana’, 421, n. 20. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁶¹ Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), ‘The Prophet and the Debtors’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 134. Emphasis mine.

the one who gave the tradition a certain form in which it was then transmitted.⁴⁶²

For example, when evaluating an apocalyptic hadith that is traceable back to the Basran CL Qatādah in terms of the *ʿisnāds*, but traceable back a generation earlier in terms of the historical content of the *matn*, Görke—here responding to Cook’s study of eschatological hadiths—postulates that Qatādah is the *formulator* of the extant hadith:

While Qatādah (60/680 to 117/735) lived a little too late to have invented this tradition, Mujāhid (21/642 to 100/718 or 104/722) could well have done so. But as only al-Ṭabarānī records the *isnād* going back to Mujāhid we might dismiss it as a later dive or a case of spreading. We would have to conclude that **Qatādah is responsible for the tradition in the form we have it.**⁴⁶³

Likewise, Jens Scheiner describes the rôle of a CL—the Syrian traditionist Baqiyyah b. al-Walīd—in relation to a particular hadith as follows: “Baqiyya’s function as a common link makes him the first systematic collector of this tradition and **the one responsible for its wording.**”⁴⁶⁴ Similarly, Stijn Aerts states:

In regard to the remaining possible interpretations, I tend toward a middle position (and herein I follow Schneider); viz., it may well be the case that the CL did not create the tradition from scratch but used existing narrative materials, **then shaped and transformed them in such a way that they met the needs of his time.** The CL, thus, is neither a faithful transmitter nor (necessarily) an outright forger.⁴⁶⁵

For a final example, Motzki—in a scenario where he inferred that the CL (in this case, al-Zuhrī) had genuinely received his information from prior sources—cautioned the following:

This statement should not be understood to mean that I claim that al-Zuhrī’s accounts are literally taken over from his informants and that all the details of the two accounts necessarily derive from them; **this does not**

⁴⁶² Görke, ‘Eschatology’, in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 190. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁶³ *Ibid.*, 199. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁶⁴ Jens Scheiner, ‘Single *Isnāds* or *Riwāyas*? Quoted Books in Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Tarjama* of Tamīm al-Dārī’, Maurice A. Pomerantz & Aram A. Shahin (eds.), *The Heritage of Arabo-Islamic Learning: Studies Presented to Wadad Kadi* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2016), 61. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁶⁵ Aerts, “‘Pray with Your Leader’”, 36. Emphasis mine.

seem very probable in view of the mainly oral character of the transmission in al-Zuhri's time.⁴⁶⁶

Indeed, in light of this and in light of instances in which *multiple* distinctive redactions can be traced back to CLs, Motzki *et al.* argued that we cannot trace a single, fixed redaction back to the CL (or at least, the early ones): they probably altered their hadiths in successive retellings.⁴⁶⁷

So far, so good—all of the relevant scholars seem to be in agreement. But a deeper question still remains: should we regard the CL as some kind of transmitter, or some kind of fabricator? There is actually quite a range of plausible scenarios—a whole spectrum of rôles for the CL, from “faithful transmitter” to “outright forger”—to consider:

- **Scenario 1:** The CL transmitted their own paraphrase or remix of a pre-existing (i.e., already-formalised) report, and accurately cited their immediate source(s) therefor.
- **Scenario 2:** The CL transmitted their own paraphrase or remix of a pre-existing (i.e., already-formalised) report, but lied, erred, or otherwise misled in their citation of their immediate source(s) therefor.
- **Scenario 3:** The CL took pre-existing, informal information (gossip, rumours, legends, stories, etc.), formulated it into a report with their own wording, and accurately cited their immediate source(s) therefor.
- **Scenario 4:** The CL took pre-existing, informal information (gossip, rumours, legends, stories, etc.), formulated it into a report with their own wording, but lied, erred, or otherwise misled in their citation of their immediate source(s) therefor.
- **Scenario 5:** The CL formulated their own conclusion, preference, or opinion into a report, and lied, erred, or otherwise misled in their citation of prior source(s) therefor.

⁴⁶⁶ Motzki, ‘The Collection of the Qur’ān’, 31. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁶⁷ E.g., Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 44, 105, 110; Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 120; *id.*, ‘The Prophet and the Cat’, 52-53; *id.*, ‘The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq’, in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 179, 188, 190, 198-199, 207; Görke, ‘The Historical Tradition about al-Ḥudaybiya’, in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 259-260; Motzki *et al.*, ‘First Century Sources’, 46-48.

According to Schacht, the hadith “was put into circulation” by its CL,⁴⁶⁸ who was “the original promoter” thereof,⁴⁶⁹ such that the hadith “originated in the time of” the CL.⁴⁷⁰ More specifically, the CL “must be responsible for the creation of this tradition and the fictitious higher part of the *isnād*,”⁴⁷¹ or in other words, the CL “provided his tradition with an *isnād* reaching back to an authority such as a Companion or the Prophet”.⁴⁷² Schacht thus rejected scenarios 1 and 3, and in light of his view that the formal transmission of reports only arose around the same time as the CLs (i.e., around the middle of the 8th Century CE), he probably also rejected scenario 2. This leaves only scenarios 4 and 5: either the CL “created” their hadith—as a formal ascription back to an earlier source—*ex materia* (scenario 4), or they “created” it *ex nihilo* (scenario 5).⁴⁷³ Schacht is usually thought of as suggesting the latter, and at times he did, as in his view that “the main body of decisions ascribed to” the Kufan Follower ‘Ibrāhīm al-Naḳā’ī “is to a great extent pure *ra’y*, often expressing systematic thought.”⁴⁷⁴ (In other words, later Kufan jurists put their own *ra’y* into the mouth of an earlier authority, which seems like straightforward *ex-nihilo* creation.) Similarly, Schacht argued that the creation of Hadith by jurists and traditionists “partly also represented the means by which definite changes in the accepted doctrine of a school were proposed and supported.”⁴⁷⁵ (In other words, when some jurists or traditionists disagreed with a prevailing view, they would express their disagreement in the form of a hadith, which again seems like *ex-nihilo* creation.) But Schacht often spoke of *ex-materia* creation as well, as in the following instance: “The *isnāds* of the Medinese version have a common link in the traditionist Ibn Abī Dhī’b. But this shows only the origin of the Medinese tradition and not of the legal maxim.”⁴⁷⁶ More broadly, Schacht documented various

⁴⁶⁸ Schacht, *Origins*, 171.

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 172.

⁴⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 158.

⁴⁷² *Ibid.*, 171.

⁴⁷³ Either way, “created” and “creation” are Schacht’s preferred terms, as in *ibid.*, 155, 158-159, 163, 165-167, 171, 248, 253-254, 260. By contrast, he only mentions “fabrications” (*ibid.*, 163), “forgeries” (*ibid.*, 4), and “forged traditions” (*ibid.*, 250) once each.

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁴⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 66.

⁴⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 181.

examples of Iraqi *qiyās*,⁴⁷⁷ Iraqi *istiḥsān*,⁴⁷⁸ and Madinan *qiyās*⁴⁷⁹ reappearing as Hadith, and further stated in regards to Madinan appeals to *raʿy*: “This old *raʿy*, which was originally to a great extent anonymous, as the consensus of Medina of which it formed a part was anonymous, was frequently ascribed to individual ancient authorities.”⁴⁸⁰ In other words, the informally-transmitted opinions of past authorities, which undergirded the vague sense of local consensus in Madinah, were likewise transformed into formal reports (i.e., Hadith were created *ex materia*).

Juynboll took a similar view to Schacht, as we have already seen: the CL is the “originator” of their hadith (as a formal ascription back to an earlier source),⁴⁸¹ but may have drawn upon pre-existing material in the process. For example:

The single strand from the cl down to the prophet does not represent the transmission path taken by a prophetic saying, a path which has a claim to (a measure of) historicity, but is a path invented by the cl in order to lend a certain saying more prestige by means of the first and foremost authentication device of his days: the *isnād marfūʿ*.

In other words: *the saying which he claims was uttered by the prophet is in reality his own, or (if somebody else’s) he was the first to put it into so many words.*⁴⁸²

All of this illustrates an important point: most of the major skeptics in Hadith Studies have agreed *all along* that at least some of the material comprising the extant Hadith corpus derives, in one form or another, from the 1st Islamic Century, and even from the Prophet himself.⁴⁸³ In this respect, therefore, the CL debate is really over *formal and accurate transmission*, i.e., whether we can trust the SS preceding the CLs, such that they can be relied upon to backdate the content of the CL’s *matn* to a particular

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 106 ff.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 111 ff.

⁴⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 117-118.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 113.

⁴⁸¹ In *Muslim tradition*, in general, Juynboll favoured the terms “fabrication” and “forgery” (and their derivatives). In his treatment on “The common-link theory of J. Schacht” in particular, however, Juynboll described the CL as “the probable originator” of their hadith (*ibid.*, 207), or as being “responsible” therefor (*ibid.*, 217). Likewise, in *Encyclopedia* (e.g., ix, xvii, xx-xxi), Juynboll repeatedly used the term “originator” to describe the CL. By contrast, the terms “fabricator” and “forger” (and their derivatives) almost never appear in this work.

⁴⁸² *Id.*, ‘Some *isnād*-analytical methods’, 353.

⁴⁸³ E.g., Ignáz Goldziher (trans. Andras Hamori & Ruth Hamori), *Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law* (Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press, 1981), 38-39; Berg, *Development*, 54, n. 33 (citing Lammens and Caetani); Schacht, ‘Revaluation’, pp. 153-154; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 71; *id.*, ‘Nāfi’, 239; *id.*, ‘Early Islamic society’, 152, 181, 185; Rippin, ‘*Tafsīr Ibn ‘Abbās*’, 61; Reinhart, ‘Juynbolliana’, 422. Also see Crone, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought*, 126, n. 3.

Follower, or a Companion, or even the Prophet. As we have already seen, Schacht and Juynboll answer this question in the negative: the SSs preceding the CLs were likely invented by them, so even if they did create their hadiths *ex materia*, we cannot know (all else being equal) how far back this material goes. Furthermore, absent some kind of special evidence or consideration,⁴⁸⁴ an *ex-materia* creation cannot be distinguished from an *ex-nihilo* creation, which means that, in practice, the content of a hadith cannot be dated any earlier than its CL (once again, all else being equal).⁴⁸⁵

By contrast, Motzki *et al.* preferred to interpret CLs as broadly accurate transmitters of material from their informants amongst the senior (i.e., older) Followers and junior (i.e., younger or longer-surviving) Companions, even if they reworded this received material:

It is better to look upon the common links as the first great collectors and professional teachers of knowledge in general and of traditions about persons living in the first century of Islam in particular.

This makes it easier to understand the single strand below the common link as well. It is the *isnād* given by a first systematic collector.⁴⁸⁶

In other words, according to Motzki, Schacht and Juynboll's explanation of the evidence is *ad hoc*, since a CL and their preceding SS can be explained differently, as a collector rather than a creator. Consequently, Motzki concluded: "There is no reason to reject *a priori* the claim of the common link that he received the tradition or the information on which it is based from the person he names."⁴⁸⁷

⁴⁸⁴ For example, some kind of obvious archaism preserved in the *matn*, or the survival of an earlier, pre-hadith version of the *matn*, or something that would be subject to Criterion of Dissimilarity. Similarly, see Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 170. Conversely, an *ex-nihilo* creation could be inferred by taking into account the broader context of the CL, or from silence or the non-citation of the hadith in earlier sources, or from the suspicious convenience of a *matn* for a specific aim, etc. Similarly, see *id.*, 'The Collection of the Qur'ān', 30; Aerts, 'The Prayers of Abū Muslim and al-Ma'mūn'; *id.*, "'Pray with Your Leader'".

⁴⁸⁵ For a similar point, again see Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 71.

⁴⁸⁶ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 51. Also see *id.* (trans. Katz), *Origins*, 25; *id.* (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 133 ff.; *id.*, 'The Collection of the Qur'ān', 29-30; *id.* (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'Al-Radd 'Alā l-Radd', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 210-214; Görke, 'Eschatology', in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 188 ff.; Motzki, 'The Origins of Muslim Exegesis', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 240; *id.*, *Reconstruction*, 73; etc.

⁴⁸⁷ *Id.*, 'The Collection of the Qur'ān', 30.

In light of all that we have covered thus far, it may be obvious that this criticism does not stand up to scrutiny: Schacht and Juynboll's interpretation of the CL is not *ad hoc*,⁴⁸⁸ and we have good reason to suspect and reject the SSs that precede most CLs. As was noted at the outset, we have various points of evidence (reports of mass-fabrication, the absence of Hadith in the earliest documents and plausible ascriptions, etc.) suggesting that most Hadith—or at least, the first big wave of Hadith—came into being during the 8th Century CE,⁴⁸⁹ which is exactly when most of the CLs were operating: this already gives as a reason to think that the CLs were creators of Hadith.⁴⁹⁰

Moreover, the Revisionist chronology of the *'isnād* in particular generates a significant skeptical entailment, as was again noted at the outset: if Muslims (including senior Companions, junior Companions, and senior Followers) did not mention or record sources in the transmission of historical and religious information until 685 CE or later, and then only did so partially or sporadically until 718 CE or later (such that the transmission of such material unto the CLs was largely informal and undocumented), then most *'isnāds* purporting to extend all the way back into the 1st Islamic Century (via senior Followers, junior Companions, and senior Companions) must be inauthentic in that respect. In addition to having attained something approaching a consensus in modern Hadith Studies, this Revisionist chronology of the *'isnād* was also accepted by Motzki in particular.⁴⁹¹ The skeptical entailment therefrom is thus binding upon most proponents of any form of CL analysis.

Nevertheless:

⁴⁸⁸ Although Juynboll's interpretation of SSs *in general* does seem *ad hoc*, as noted already; see above, in the section on Motzki's criticism of Juynboll.

⁴⁸⁹ See the works of Schacht, Juynboll, Cook, Crone & Hinds, *et al.*, cited at the outset.

⁴⁹⁰ This seems to have been Schacht's approach to the matter, as noted already in the section on him. Similarly, see Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 73.

⁴⁹¹ For the genesis of the *'isnād* in the 680s and 690s CE, see: Josef Horowitz, 'The Antiquity and Origin of the *Isnād*', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Variorum, 2004), 5/155; *id.* (ed. Lawrence I. Conrad), *The Earliest Biographies of the Prophet and their authors* (Princeton, USA: The Darwin Press, Inc., 2002), 26; Robson, 'The *Isnād* in Muslim Tradition', in Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth*, 21-22/169-170; Abbott, *Studies*, II, 75; Juynboll, 'The Date of the great *fitna*'; *id.*, *Muslim tradition*, 18-20; *id.*, 'Muslim's introduction to his *Ṣaḥīḥ*', 305-308; Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 50; Pavlovitch, 'Origin'; etc.

For the spread of the *'isnād* and the rise of its systematic use after 718 CE or around the middle of the 8th Century CE, see: Schacht, *Origins*, 37; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 18-19; Motzki (trans. Katz), *Origins*, 241; Lucas, *Constructive Critics*, 347-348; Motzki, *Reconstruction*, 73; Pavlovitch, 'Origin', 43-44. Also see Motzki (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors', in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 137, and Stijn Aerts, 'Isnād', in Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, & Everett Rowson (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2018), online edition.

Motzki thinks it is possible that common links were able to at least partly remember the person from whom they heard something concerning a *tābi*ʿ, *ṣaḥābī* or the Prophet, or that they wrote down the name(s) of their informant(s) together with the information received from them.⁴⁹²

Furthermore, Motzki speculated that the CLs or “collectors”—as late Followers and Followers of the Followers, operating in the era when the demand for *ʾisnāds* was spreading—*could* have asked their sources (i.e., the senior Followers, or even some junior Companions) for *their* sources, such that some *ʾisnāds* could validly extend back into the 1st Islamic Century (i.e., back to some earlier Companions):

It is conceivable, in view of the chronology of the birth of the *isnād*, that the collector asked his informant for the source of his tradition and was told the name or, at least, some name.⁴⁹³

It is indeed reasonable to think that this happened in at least some cases, given that instances of *ʾisnād*-use, or some demands for sources, were occurring already in the 680s and 690s CE: the aforementioned skeptical entailment applies to **most** *ʾisnāds*, not necessarily all of them.

But even if we posit that the CLs (or “collectors”, as Motzki would have it) operating in the 8th Century CE were able to remember exactly from whom they had received a given datum, Motzki himself questions whether these sources in turn were able to remember their own sources, in an era when “bookkeeping was not yet done as regards from whom precisely which information about the Prophet was received.”⁴⁹⁴ Likewise (in a response to Schneider):

The possibility of going beyond the common link in a methodologically safe manner does not by any means necessarily indicate that the tradition is therefore authentic, i.e., that it goes back to the Prophet, as Schneider alleges I imply. One cannot even be certain that it really originates from the person whom the informant of the common link named as his source. In this case – as in the case of the common link – several possibilities have to be considered: Text or textual elements could indeed have been taken over from the person mentioned; they could have originated from other persons;

⁴⁹² Görke *et al.*, ‘First Century Sources’, 45.

⁴⁹³ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 52.

⁴⁹⁴ *Id.*, *Reconstruction*, 72.

they could have been created by the informant of the common link; or it could be a combination of the possibilities mentioned.⁴⁹⁵

Alternatively, the CL may not even have bothered to ask their informant in the first place, as Motzki again acknowledged: “But it is equally possible that the collector did not make this enquiry of his informant. He simply inserted the name that to him seemed most likely.”⁴⁹⁶ Put simply, “the first three quarters of the first/seventh century” are “the phase of the anonymous and unknown living exegetical tradition”, as Motzki noted in a study of exegetical Hadith in particular.⁴⁹⁷

More importantly, Motzki himself already conceded that “the supplying of an *isnād*” only became *common* after the “beginning” of the 2nd Islamic Century (i.e., *after* 718-719 CE),⁴⁹⁸ which is after the senior Followers and junior Companions (not to mention the senior Companions) were already dead.⁴⁹⁹ Thus, Motzki’s concession to the Revisionist chronology of the *’isnād*—a chronology for which there are multiple, independent points of evidence—still entails that most *’isnāds* purporting to extend back to the Companions must be false or at least unreliable in that respect. In other words, even if the CLs had wanted to ascertain exactly from whom their informants had received their material in turn, it was too late to ask: by the time that most of them began to systematically provide sources, or to respond to the spreading demand for sources, these informants were already dead.

Moreover, even the ascriptions of CLs back to their immediate sources (usually senior Followers) are in doubt. For example, the CL may simply have erred, or cited an *ideal* source rather than their *actual* source, or lied and cited a source—or a sequence of sources—that were expedient at a given time, as Görke has noted: “if the common link was the inventor of the *ḥadīth*, he might well change the *isnād* according to his audience’s expectations.”⁵⁰⁰ Likewise, Motzki acknowledged that “early collectors”

⁴⁹⁵ *Id.* (trans. Adrianovska & Reid), ‘*Al-Radd ‘Alā l-Radd*’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 212.

⁴⁹⁶ *Id.* (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 52. Similarly, see *id.*, *Reconstruction*, 73.

⁴⁹⁷ *Id.*, ‘The Origins of Muslim Exegesis’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 272.

⁴⁹⁸ *Id.* (trans. Katz), *Origins*, 241. In summarising his own work, Motzki (*Reconstruction*, 73) later reiterated: “the custom of asking one’s teachers about their informants arose at the end of the 1st century H., and then slowly spread in the course of the 2nd century H. In Mekka, asking about an *isnād* didn’t begin until the start of the 2nd century, in Iraq even later.”

⁴⁹⁹ For a similar point, see Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 71-73; *id.*, ‘Nāfi’, 209-210, 222.

⁵⁰⁰ Görke, ‘Eschatology’, in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 190-191. For other examples, see *id.*, ‘The Prophet and the Cat’, 52-53, and *id.*, ‘The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq’, in Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad*, 179.

(i.e., CLs) may have “mixed in traditions of their own with the genuine ones, adding fictitious *asānīd*”.⁵⁰¹ For example, in his reconstruction of a hadith back to the CL Saʿīd b. Jubayr, Motzki conceded that “it is also possible that Saʿīd himself composed the story on the basis of various pieces of information circulating after Ibn ‘Abbās’ death and then attributed his narrative to his former teacher in order to give it more authority.”⁵⁰² Elsewhere, he further acknowledged (here speaking of himself in the third person):

Motzki does not rule out the possibility that a common link no longer knew whom he had received the tradition from and simply named a person who seemed to be the most probable source.⁵⁰³

Ordinarily, there is no way to know whether the pre-CL SS is genuine: “Verification becomes impossible at this stage”⁵⁰⁴ and “we cannot prove that the common link really received the tradition from the person he names as his informant”,⁵⁰⁵ at least on the basis of *ʿisnāds*.⁵⁰⁶ Therefore, at minimum, the ascription of the CL to their immediate source is suspect,⁵⁰⁷ whilst any further authorities cited farther back in the *ʿisnād* should certainly be presumed to be the result of inference, guesswork, idealisation, error, lying, or some other form of false creation. Moreover, given the primarily oral and informal character of transmission up until the CLs of the 8th Century CE, it seems highly questionable that they could have remembered specific sources for specific data even if they had tried, or in other words: even their immediate cited sources should be doubted. Once again, the entire SS preceding the CL becomes dubious, or as Shoemaker put it: “An inherent skepticism pertains to the list of transmitters preceding the common link”.⁵⁰⁸

⁵⁰¹ Motzki (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 52-53.

⁵⁰² Motzki, ‘Abraham, Hagar and Ishmael at Mecca’, in Rippin & Tottoli (eds.), *Books and Written Culture*, 370-371.

⁵⁰³ *Id. et al.*, ‘First Century Sources’, 45.

⁵⁰⁴ Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 16.

⁵⁰⁵ Motzki, ‘The Origins of Muslim Exegesis’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 240.

⁵⁰⁶ Compare *id.* (trans. Griffel & Hardy), ‘Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 53; *id.*, ‘The Origins of Muslim Exegesis’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 240; *id.*, ‘Juynboll’, 541-542.

⁵⁰⁷ Also see Görke, ‘Remnants of an old *tafsīr* tradition?’, in Daneshgar & Saleh (eds.), *Islamic Studies Today*, 41: “statements on ‘Urwa’s informants cannot generally be trusted.” Likewise, Aerts, ‘The Prayers of Abū Muslim and al-Ma’mūn’, 74: “The single strand from the Prophet to ‘Ubayd Allāh is difficult if not impossible to verify.”

⁵⁰⁸ Shoemaker, *The Death of a Prophet*, 83.

In short, it is generally agreed that the CL is the formulator of the extant underlying wording or gist of their hadith (i.e., that which can be discerned beneath the various PCL redactions), and that the CLs were amongst the first systematic disseminators of Hadith and citers of *ʾisnāds*. Given various considerations, however, the SSs that usually precede the CLs cannot be trusted: we have good reason to doubt their motivation or even their ability to accurately cite from whom they had received a given datum (assuming *ex-materia* creation in the first place), and even more reason to doubt that they knew, or were able to discover, from whom in turn their predecessors had received *their* data (again, assuming *ex-materia* creation). Moreover, an *ex-materia* creation by a CL cannot ordinarily be distinguished from an *ex-nihilo* creation, to begin with. Generally speaking, therefore, the ICMA cannot get us back beyond the CLs, which means in practice that we cannot usually reach back beyond 718 CE.⁵⁰⁹ *Apropos* all of these considerations, Pavlovitch suggests that “the end of the first century is the earliest point in time at which we may posit the existence of primitive *isnād* transmission. For this reason, even if one were to undertake a meticulous *isnād-cum-matn* analysis of the traditions that in a way or another signal the onset of the *isnād*, one would hardly be able to cross below the threshold of *c.* 100/718.”⁵¹⁰

Finally, it should be reiterated that even if we could know that a CL had created a hadith *ex-materia* or, better yet, had merely reworded or redacted a story or report received from an earlier authority, we would still not be able to trust that their redaction thereof accurately reflected the earlier material or report. The implications of Crone’s research seem inescapable: the 1st Islamic Century was a time of extreme, rapid mutation, distortion, and growth in historical memory and oral tradition, which calls into question the veracity of anything transmitted by the CLs (or at least, the earliest ones, operating in the early 8th Century CE). In other words, “even if they had a starting point in something the Prophet actually said or did,” Hadith have “undergone so many changes in the course of transmission that unless the contrary can be shown, they are best treated as evidence for the debates in which they were used rather than for the views of the figures to whom they were traced.”⁵¹¹ This would be the case *even*

⁵⁰⁹ Of course, our reaching back to ‘Urwah in some instances, as argued by Schoeler and Görke, is a notable exception. In such instances, we can at least reach back to the end of the 1st Islamic Century, or in other words, to around 700 CE.

⁵¹⁰ Pavlovitch, ‘Origin’, 40.

⁵¹¹ Crone, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought*, 126, n. 3.

if the ḥisnād is genuine and even if all of the transmitters were honest, as Hoyland points out:

That is the problem with *isnad* criticism. The same tradition may be transmitted with impeccable *isnads* and still drift wholly away from its original meaning. No one need have cheated; each authority may have transmitted the report faithfully, as they understood it. But by the time it is found in texts that are available to us, often two centuries or so after its genesis, it may have changed almost beyond recognition. This is the principal problem, transformation of a tradition's content in the course of transmission, and not systematic forgery.⁵¹²

(Hoyland speaks of two centuries in this instance, but the worst of the damage was done in the first century of transmission, as Crone emphasised.⁵¹³) Thus, even if the SS preceding the CL can be believed, the CL's *matn*—as an accurate rendition of what came therefrom—cannot be trusted. Once again, the buck stops with the CL.

Conclusion

Even if all Hadith are ultimately fabricated, interpolated, or otherwise ahistorical as formal ascriptions, they can still be subjected to various forms of dating. In particular, any given hadith can be dated by:

External Corroboration: if the content of a hadith is corroborated by an earlier source (usually, a Christian literary source, attesting to early Muslim beliefs and practices), then this content at least can be inferred to have been circulating amongst Muslims since the date of this earlier source.

Archaic Content: if the content of a hadith goes against the grain of the group that transmitted and preserved it, then—based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity—the hadith can be dated to before that group (or at least, to before that group received it).

⁵¹² Hoyland, 'Writing the Biography of the Prophet Muhammad', 587.

⁵¹³ Crone, *Slaves on Horses*, 6.

Ascription Type: a version of a hadith ascribed to a later authority is likely earlier than a version ascribed to an earlier authority. Likewise, a *mursal* or *munqaṭiʿ* version of a hadith is likely earlier than a *muttaṣil* version. Additionally, a Companion hadith—based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity—probably dates back to the beginning of the 9th Century CE at the latest, whilst a Follower hadith probably dates back to the mid-to-late 8th Century CE at the latest.

Unexpected Silence: if it is reasonable to expect that someone would have cited a hadith (because it was extremely germane to their interests, or useful for them in a debate, and supposedly circulated amongst prominent people in their town, or even amongst their own teachers), but they failed to cite the hadith, then it is reasonable to infer, at least tentatively, that the hadith did not yet exist as such.

Polemical Context and Dialectical Position: if a hadith perfectly fits a specific polemical context in the Umayyad or Abbasid periods, this is a reason to suspect that the hadith originated in—or in response to—that context. Additionally, if a hadith and several others, seen from above, appear to form a dialectic, then they can be reasonably explained as a series of back-and-forth counter-ascriptions. More specifically, if a hadith seems to be responding to a specific issue or another hadith, then it can be dated after that issue or hadith. Moreover, a more sophisticated or specific hadith (in dealing with a known doctrinal debate) is probably later (i.e., reflective of a later phase of the debate) than a simple hadith.

ICMA: if a hadith-tradition comprises a series of putative PCLs and a CL, and the *matns* ascribed to each PCL tend to be more similar to each other than they are to those of other PCLs, but all of them share an underlying, distinctive core, this can be reasonably explained by positing these key figures to be actual PCLs and CLs, whose distinctive redactions can be reconstructed.

Chapter 2: An *ʿIsnād-Cum-Matn* Analysis of the Hadith of ‘Ā’iṣḥah’s Marital Age

In light of the preceding chapter, an *ʿisnād-cum-matn* analysis (ICMA) of the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣḥah’s marital age—the reconstruction and dating of earlier versions of the hadith—becomes feasible. Before proceeding thereto, however, it is necessary to reiterate the key concepts and technical terminology involved in such an analysis, given that my usage is not always identical to those variously developed and/or refined by Schacht, Juynboll, and Motzki.

- **(Hadith) report:** an iteration of a hadith, i.e., a specific *matn* and its *ʿisnād* in a given collection.
- **(Hadith) tradition:** used in two senses:
 - **Firstly:** the set of versions or iterations of a given report, or a family of reports (i.e., reports that share a basic core wording or sequence and thus a common ancestry), such as the tradition of a CL (i.e., the family of reports that descend from the redaction of a CL). A subset or sub-family of reports within a broader tradition (e.g., those of a PCL) is a **sub-tradition**.
 - **Secondly,** as a synonym for Juynboll’s ***matn cluster***: the aggregate or corpus of related or overlapping traditions on a given subject (e.g., when the redactions different CLs overlap or seem related),⁵¹⁴ such as the hadith-tradition of ‘Ā’iṣḥah’s marital age *as a collective or whole*.
- **Redaction:** a specific (sometimes hypothetical) version of a given hadith, such as a PCL’s original version, or a CL’s original version.
- **Urtext:** an earlier (hypothetical) text, from which a given set of extant texts derive; a common-ancestor text.
- **ʿIsnād bundle:** the aggregate or combination of all of the *ʿisnāds* within a given hadith-tradition, when overlaid against each other.⁵¹⁵

⁵¹⁴ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xxvii, col. 1.

⁵¹⁵ *Ibid.*, xviii ff., incl. examples.

- **Common link (CL):** the (1) earliest (2) widely-converged-upon tradent within an *ʿisnād* bundle (3) back to whom the transmission of (some version of) the given tradition can be reconstructed or inferred to be probable (i.e., unto whom a correlation between the *ʿisnād* bundle and *matns* obtains).⁵¹⁶ In practice, the CL is usually someone operating during the 8th Century CE. When transmission back to such a figure is dubious or questionable (for example, when a CL is converged upon by PCLs whose *matns* are not more similar to each other than to those of another CL, or when the texts of the PCLs or other transmitters are suspiciously similar,⁵¹⁷ despite our background knowledge about the mutagenic character of oral transmission at that time), that figure is a *seeming* CL. There is usually only one CL for a given tradition, but in theory, there could be several: if two clusters of PCLs and/or direct collectors respectively converge upon two key figures, behind whom only SSs reach back to some earlier source or sources, then it makes sense to say that we have two CLs within a single tradition.⁵¹⁸ The CL partially corresponds with *madār* in Arabic, although the latter also includes seeming CLs and spiders.⁵¹⁹
- **Partial common link (PCL):** a (1) post-CL tradent who is (2) converged-upon within an *ʿisnād* bundle (3) back to whom the transmission of (some version of) the given tradition can be reconstructed or inferred to be probable (i.e., unto whom a correlation between the *ʿisnād* bundle and *matns* obtains).⁵²⁰
- **Single strand (SS):** any instance in an *ʿisnād* where a tradent transmits a hadith directly from a source from whom no other tradents directly transmitted. In practice, the term usually picks out a string of tradents who are successively isolated or uncorroborated in this way, i.e., an instance where a certain report was allegedly transmitted to only one tradent, who in turn transmitted it to only one tradent, and so on.⁵²¹ In theory, a SS could reflect a genuine transmission (whereby direct corroborations happened not to survive), or alternatively, a

⁵¹⁶ For a theoretical example (albeit one that does not incorporate *matns*), see *ibid.*, xix.

⁵¹⁷ In other words, the texts, which were transmitted across an era of greater mutation, are more similar to each other than texts transmitted later are to each other, in an era of less mutation. See Mitter, 'Origin and Development of the Islamic Patronate', in Bernards & Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam*, 77, n. 32.

⁵¹⁸ E.g., Juynboll, 'The Role of Muʿammarūn', 169-170. Also see *id.*, '(Re)Appraisal', 335.

⁵¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 307 ff.; *id.*, *Encyclopedia*, xxv, col. 1.

⁵²⁰ For some theoretical examples (albeit ones that do not incorporate *matns*), see *ibid.*, xix.

⁵²¹ For a theoretical example, see *ibid.*

false ascription—if the Revisionist model of Hadith development is accepted, then presumption should always be the latter, until the contrary can be demonstrated, in any given instance. A SS could be shown to be probably authentic (even against such skepticism) when it is part of a PCL cluster in which the *’isnāds* all correlate with the *matns*, or in other words, when it is corroborated in its transmission of a distinctive *matn* from a potential PCL by other lines of transmission bearing the same distinctive *matn*.⁵²² SSs overlap with the Arabic concepts of *ḡarīb*⁵²³ and *kabar al-’aḥad/al-wāḥid*,⁵²⁴ and usually correspond to *mutābi’āt* and *ṣawāḥid* as well.⁵²⁵

- **Spider:** a tradent who is converged upon only by SSs, when there is no other reason to accept the transmission as genuine, such that the convergence is consistent with being the product of intersecting false ascriptions.⁵²⁶ When there is reason to accept the transmission as genuine, as with a close correlation between the *’isnāds* and the *matns*, such a tradent would constitute a plausible PCL or CL. When the *matns* ascribed to such a tradent are not more similar to each other than they are to those ascribed to other authorities, this is consistent with the tradent’s being a spider.
- **Dive:** a false, secondary *’isnād* that replaces the later segment, or even the entirety, of an existing *’isnād*, thereby ‘diving’ around it.⁵²⁷ When a dive converges with an existing *’isnād*, the converged-upon tradent is a spider (see above). In practice, dives often circumvent CLs and provide alternative (‘corroborating’) paths of transmission back to Followers, Companions, or the Prophet. Dives thus often correspond with the phenomena known as *mutābi’āt* and *ṣawāḥid* in Arabic, although these are envisioned (in traditional Hadith scholarship) as genuine corroborating *’isnāds* rather than false ones.⁵²⁸

⁵²² This has also been acknowledged in Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 31.

⁵²³ Already indicated in Schacht, *Origins*, 173, before “single strand” had become a technical term with Juynboll.

⁵²⁴ Peter C. Hennigan, *The Birth of a Legal Institution: The Formation of the Waqf in Third-Century A.H. Ḥanafī Legal Discourse* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2004), 122, n. 61, explicitly equates “single-strand” with “*aḥad ḥadīths*”.

⁵²⁵ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xxv-xxvi.

⁵²⁶ For a theoretical example (albeit one that does not incorporate *matns*), see Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xix.

⁵²⁷ For some theoretical examples, see *ibid.*, xxii.

⁵²⁸ *Ibid.*, xxv-xxvi.

- **Retrojection:** the process whereby a hadith is falsely attributed back to an earlier source, including the reattribution of a hadith from an initial source to an earlier source (e.g., when the saying of a Follower is transformed into the saying of a Companion). Instances of such are inferable from the existence of hadiths with differing levels of ascription, in conjunction with the Criterion of Dissimilarity: the traditionists and jurists who transmitted and preserved such reports tended to value earlier and earlier sources over the course of the 8th and 9th Centuries CE, so it is more likely that the version ascribed to a later source was reattributed to an earlier source, rather than vice versa.
- **Raising:** a variety of retrojection, known as *rafʿ* in Arabic,⁵²⁹ whereby an *ʾisnād* is retained and simply back-extended or “raised back” to an earlier source. For example, “Hišām—ʿUrwah” becomes “Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah”.
- **Matn alteration:** the process or processes by which a *matn* is changed (most of which are known in traditional Hadith scholarship), including rephrasing (*al-riwāyah bi-al-maʿnā*), rearrangement (*taqdīm wa-taʾkīr*), abridgement (*ikṭiṣār*), omission (*haḍf*), ellipsis (*ʾilḡāʾ*), addition (*ziyādah*), and insertion (*ʾidrāj*).⁵³⁰ Such changes can arise accidentally or deliberately, and in the latter case, the motive can be sincere or mendacious. Whatever the mechanism, the effect of these processes is the same: the *matn* has changed from an earlier version. Alterations in *matns* (as opposed to accurately-preserved earlier wordings) are detectable when tradents transmit texts from sources that differ from the other transmissions from the very same sources, or when particular elements or wordings correlate with particular tradents, which is best explained as the accurate preservation of that tradent’s particular wording or paraphrasing.
- **Contamination:** a specific kind of *matn* alteration, whereby part of one text is added into another, without acknowledgement, or in this case: when elements from one *matn* (transmitted from one source) make their way into a different *matn* (transmitted from a different source), without any corresponding acknowledgement in the *ʾisnāds*. In practice, this is noticeable when an element associated with a particular PCL or CL appears in a *matn* affixed with a

⁵²⁹ *Id.*, *Muslim tradition*, 187.

⁵³⁰ Most are mentioned in R. Marston Speight, ‘A Look at Variant Readings in the *ḥadīth*’, *Der Islam*, Volume 77 (2000), 170.

seemingly-independent *ʿisnād*. Contamination overlaps with *ʿidrāj* and *ziyādah* in Arabic, although both can also signify the invention of new elements (rather than contamination from a different text), and the latter is also used to indicate non-abridgement (rather than the insertion of a foreign element).

- **Tradent insertion:** the process (known as *waṣl* or *tawṣīl* in Arabic,⁵³¹ but lacking an established technical term in English, beyond ‘improvement’) whereby an *ʿisnād* that is discontinuous (*munqaṭiʿ/mursal*) (i.e., missing a necessary tradent) is updated and made continuous (*muttaṣil/mawṣūl*), through the insertion of a suitable tradent or tradents to bridge the chronological gap in question. For example, “Hišām—‘Ā’iṣah” becomes “Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah”. Such occurrences are identified in the same way as raised *ʿisnāds*: continuous *ʿisnāds* were valued over discontinuous ones, so in instances when we find both discontinuous and continuous versions of the same hadith, it is more likely that the former has been altered to create the latter, rather than vice versa.
- **Tradent substitution:** the process (lacking a technical term in both English and Arabic) whereby one or two of the tradents within an existing *ʿisnād* is replaced by a new tradent or tradents, but the rest of the *ʿisnād* is left intact. For example, “Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah” becomes “Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād—ʿAbū al-Zinād—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah”. Such substitutions are detected in the same way as any other kind of interpolation: a tradent transmits something (in this case, a slightly different *ʿisnād*) from a source that is absent in all alternative versions transmitted by others from the same source, which seems improbable if the source had actually transmitted the different *ʿisnād*.

With all of that out of the way, we can now proceed with an ICMA of the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age. The tradition will be analysed one sub-tradition at a time, in order of the putative PCLs, CLs, and authorities with which each is associated: beginning with the latest and working backwards to the earliest, unto ‘Ā’iṣah herself. Given the vast quantity of reports involved in this endeavour, most will only be referred to in summary form, or presented in elemental outlines. All elements will be consistently

⁵³¹ Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 187.

colour-coded, to make the similarities and differences between versions clear at a glance. Reconstructed redactions will be given in full, with uncertain wordings (usually, competing wordings that are equally attested within a given sub-tradition) indicated by bracketed and bolded text. The *ṣalawāt* and other such praising and salutary formulae have been completely disregarded in such reconstructions, for the simple reason that they are the sort of things that pious tradents, scribes, and editors would be expected to insert at any point in the transmission of a hadith, the copying of a manuscript, or the editing and printing thereof, independently or synchronously.⁵³²

Finally, it should be noted up front that there are almost no critical editions of the Arabic works cited forthwith. This is a well-known but rarely-acknowledged problem in Hadith Studies and early Islamic history, and it has potential negative consequences for any ICMA: any relevant hadith in a given manuscript (or printed edition thereof) could be error-riddled, or contaminated in terms of its *matn*, or even entirely the product of a later scribal insertion. For example, suppose that we have three extant versions of the same hadith, each available in a print edition of a Hadith collection based on a single manuscript: one version has the variant *ibnah*, where the other two have *bint*. Based on the superior attestation of *bint* (in two out of three transmissions), we would infer—all else being equal—that *bint* belongs to the urtext underlying these three hadiths, and that *ibnah* is a deviation therefrom. But if the manuscript carrying one of the versions with *ibnah* was actually corrupted (such that the original version thereof actually read *bint* as well), then we would be tricked into inferring the wrong wording for the urtext. By contrast, a critical edition could eliminate many such corruptions and provide a much greater level of certainty that any given hadith actually reflects the form established by the author in question. Thus, if all three hadiths were available in *critical editions* of their respective Hadith collections, we would have far more confidence in inferring which wording belongs to the deeper urtext of the

⁵³² In other words, if all of the versions within a sub-tradition have a *ṣallā allāh ‘alay-hi wa-sallama* in the same place, that could be because they all inherited it from the original version, but it could equally be the product of pious tradents, scribes, and editors—at any level in the transmission—synchronously or independently inserting the formula after any and all instances of the name of the Prophet, whether instinctively (in the case of oral transmission) or systematically (in the case of scribal copying and modern editing). The point is, this kind of piety was widespread, so this is precisely the sort of thing that would be expected to occur on a large scale, predictably effecting a common change in independent versions of the same hadith. Therefore, the presence of such a common feature within a given sub-tradition, in this case, is not necessarily indicative of the original version.

relevant hadiths. Absent critical editions, therefore, any such textual criticism—or in this case, tradition criticism—can only be provisional.⁵³³

'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 415/1024)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Baghdadian tradent 'Abū al-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (situated within the broader 'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl sub-tradition, which in turn nestles within the broader 'Alī b. Mushir sub-tradition), recorded by al-Bayhaqī and Ibn al-Ṭabarī (in his recension of al-Fasawī's *Ta'rik*).

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ & 'Abū Sa'īd b. 'abī 'Amr—'Abū al-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb—Muḥammad b. 'Ishāq—'Ismā'īl b. Ḳalīl—'Alī b. Mushir—Hišām b. 'Urwah—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

'Abū al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faḍl al-Qaṭṭān—'Abd Allāh b. Ja'far b. Darastawayh—Ya'qūb b. Sufyān—'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl—'Alī b. Mushir—Hišām b. 'Urwah—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁵³⁴

Ibn al-Ṭabarī (d. 472/1079)

'Abū al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faḍl al-Qaṭṭān—'Abd Allāh b. Ja'far b. Darastawayh—Ya'qūb b. Sufyān—'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl—'Alī b. Mushir—Hišām b. 'Urwah—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁵³⁵

Al-Bayhaqī cites three different sources for his version, such that the attribution of his wording to 'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān in particular is not assured. However, given that his *matn* and the *matn* in Ibn al-Ṭabarī's version are not just more similar to each other

⁵³³ See also Shoemaker, 'In Search of 'Urwa's *Sīra*', 291-292.

⁵³⁴ 'Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī (ed. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, vol. 14 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Hajar, 2011), pp. 214-215, # 13957.

⁵³⁵ Fasawī (ed. 'Umarī), *al-Ma'rifah wa-al-Ta'rik*, III, pp. 326-327.

than to other transmissions from ʾIsmāʿīl b. al-Ḳalīl and ʿAlī b. Mushir more broadly, but are in fact completely identical (even sharing the same scribal error, *tamarraqa*),⁵³⁶ they must share a more recent common ancestor—this is consistent with both deriving directly from ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān, via written transmission. (Al-Bayhaqī’s other two sources may have transmitted something similar, but absent corroboration, there is no way to tell.) It is thus likely that ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn is a genuine PCL.

ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn’s redaction thus needs no reconstruction, since al-Bayhaqī and Ibn al-Ṭabarī differ only slightly in their texts, over the transmission-terminology reported by ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn in his *ʾisnād*: where al-Bayhaqī has *ʾaḵbara-nā*, Ibn al-Ṭabarī has *ʾabnā* (an abbreviation of *ʾanbaʾa-nā*).

[ʾ**abnā**/ʾ**aḵbara-nā**] ʿabdu allāhi bnu jaʿfari bni darastawayha ḥaddaṭa-nā yaʿqūbu bnu sufyāna ḥaddaṭa-ni ʾismāʿīlu bnu al-ḳalīli [ʾ**abnā**/ʾ**aḵbara-nā**] ʿaliyyu bnu mushirⁱⁿ [ʾ**abnā**/ʾ**aḵbara-nā**] hišām^u bnu ʿurwata ʿan ʾabī-hi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat **tazawwaja-nī rasūlu allāhi wa-ʾanā ibnat^u sittⁱ sinīna^a** **fa-qadimnā al-madīnat^a fa-nazalnā fī banī al-ḥārītⁱ bni al-ḳazrajⁱ** **fa-wuʿiktu fa-tamarraqa** [sic] **šaʿarī fa-ʾawfā jumaymat^{an}** fa-ʾatat-nī ʾummī ʾumm^u rūmāna^a wa-ʾinnī la-fī ʾurjūḥatⁱⁿ wa-maʿī ṣawāhibāt^{un} lī **fa-ṣaraḳat bī fa-ʾataytu-hā wa-mā ʾadri mā turīdu bī fa-ʾaḳaḍat bi-yadī ḥattā waqafat-nī ʿalā bābⁱ al-dārⁱ wa-ʾinnī la-ʾanhaju ḥattā sakana baʿḍ^u nafasī ṭumma ʾaḳaḍat šay^{ʾan} min mā^{ʾin} fa-masaḥat bi-hi wajhī wa-raʾsī ṭumma ʾadḳalat-nī al-dār^a fa-ʾidā niswat^{un} min^a al-ʾanṣārⁱ fī baytⁱⁿ fa-qulna ʿalā al-ḳayrⁱ wa-al-barakatⁱ wa-ʿalā ḳayrⁱ ṭāʾirⁱⁿ fa-ʾaslamat-nī ʾilay-hinna fa-ʾaṣlahna min šaʾnī fa-lam yaruʿ-^{nī} illā rasūlu allāhi ḍuḥ^{an} fa-ʾaslamna-nī ʾilay-hi** **wa-ʾanā yawma-ʾidⁱⁿ bint^u tisⁱ sinīna^a**.

In addition to all of the above, there are two additional reports ascribed to ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn (situated within the sub-tradition of al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhāl, which nestles in turn within the broader sub-tradition of Ḥammād b. Salamah), recorded once again by his students al-Bayhaqī and Ibn al-Ṭabarī.

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faḍl al-ʿAṭṭār—ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar—Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān—al-Ḥajjāj—Ḥammād b. Salamah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

⁵³⁶ Cf. *tamazzaqa* in every single other transmission from ʾIsmāʿīl b. al-Ḳalīl, and ʿAlī b. Mushir more generally. Additionally, *tamarraqa* (as a form of *m-r-q*) does not seem to exist as a verb, whereas *tamazzaqa* makes complete sense (“then illness befell me, then my hair was torn, then it became shoulder-length”).

Marriage, Kadījah's death, Makkah, seven or six; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummated at nine.⁵³⁷

Ibn al-Ṭabarī (d. 472/1079)

[ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn—ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar]—Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān—al-Ḥajjāj—Ḥammād b. Salamah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage, Kadījah's death, Makkah, seven or six; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummated at nine.⁵³⁸

All of the considerations raised above apply here too: these two sources preserve exactly the same *matn*, with slight differences only in the wording of the *ʾisnād*; this is consistent with the accurate preservation of the hadith in writing; and the urtext can be reasonably attributed to ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn. The urtext in question is the following:

[ʾakbara-nā ʿabdu allāhi bnu jaʿfarⁱⁿ qāla] [ḥaddaṭa-nā/qāla] yaʿqūbu bnu sufyān^a [qāla] ḥaddaṭa-nā al-ḥajjāj^u [qāla] ḥaddaṭa-nā ḥammād^{un} ʿan hišāmⁱ bni ʿurwat^a ʿan ʾabī-hi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūlu allāhi baʿda mutawaffā kadījat^a qabl^a makraji-hi min makkat^a wa-ʾanā ibnat^u sabʿi ʾaw sittⁱ sinīn^a fa-lammā qadīmā al-madīnat^a jāʾa-nī niswat^{un} wa-ʾanā ʾalʾabu fī ʾurjūhatⁱⁿ wa-ʾanā mujammamat^{un} fa-hayyaʾna-nī wa-ṣannaʾna-nī tumma ʾatayna bī ʾilā rasūli allāhi wa-ʾanā ibnat^u tisʿi sinīn^a

In addition to all of the above, there are two additional reports ascribed to ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn (situated within the sub-tradition of al-Ḥajjāj b. ʾabī Manīʿ, which ostensibly nestles in turn within the broader tradition of al-Zuhrī), recorded once again by his students al-Bayhaqī and Ibn al-Ṭabarī.

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān—ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar b. Darastawayh—Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān—al-Ḥajjāj b. ʾabī Manīʿ—ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʾabī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

⁵³⁷ ʾAḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Qalʾajī), *Dalāʾil al-Nubuwwah wa-Maʾrifat ʾAḥwāl Ṣāḥib al-Ṣarīʾah*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1988), p. 409.

⁵³⁸ Fasawī (ed. ʿUmarī), *al-Maʾrifah wa-al-Taʾrīḳ*, III, p. 327. Note that the full *ʾisnād*, via ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar and ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn unto Ibn al-Ṭabarī, is cited earlier in the text (*ibid.*, p. 326).

Married 'Ā'īshah; shown in a dream; marriage in Makkah at six; consummation; Hijrah; nine; 'Ā'īshah's genealogy; virgin; 'Abū Bakr's name.⁵³⁹

Ibn al-Ṭabarī (d. 472/1079)

'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān—'Abd Allāh b. Ja'far b. Darastawayh—Ya'qūb b. Sufyān—al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī'—'Ubayd Allāh b. 'abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ—'Abū al-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb—'Abū 'Usāmah al-Ḥalabī—al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī'—'Ubayd Allāh b. 'abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

Shown in a dream; marriage; consummation; Hijrah; nine.⁵⁴⁰

Ibn al-Ṭabarī's version is ascribed to both 'Abū al-Ḥusayn and al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (with two discrete, respective *'isnāds* back to al-Ḥajjāj), but a close examination of the *matn* shows that it repeatedly aligns with the version cited in al-Bayhaqī on the sole authority of 'Abū al-Ḥusayn, *vis-à-vis* two other reports sharing the same dual *'isnād*. In other words, two of the four reports in question evidently reflect one recent common ancestor or underlying redaction, and the other two another, and the relevant *'isnāds* indeed depict two recent sources: 'Abū al-Ḥusayn and al-Ḥākim. It is thus reasonable to conclude that two of these four reports reflect 'Abū al-Ḥusayn's distinctive redaction, and that the other two reflect al-Ḥākim's. Since one of the two reports reflecting one redaction is solely ascribed to 'Abū al-Ḥusayn, the other report reflecting the same redaction probably derives from him as well; and by process of elimination, the remaining two reports (which both reflect a different redaction, and which both share a dual ascription to 'Abū al-Ḥusayn and al-Ḥākim) probably derive from al-Ḥākim.⁵⁴¹

Unfortunately, Ibn al-Ṭabarī's transmission from 'Abū al-Ḥusayn seems to be abridged, which means that half of al-Bayhaqī's transmission therefrom is uncorroborated: there is no way to tell which parts of that section of the *matn* reflect al-Bayhaqī's rewording (say, under the influence of al-Ḥākim's version), and which parts reflect 'Abū al-Ḥusayn's original wording. Still, most of the wording of Ibn al-

⁵³⁹ Bayhaqī (ed. Qal'ajī), *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah*, VII, p. 284. For the *'isnād*, see *ibid.*, p. 282.

⁵⁴⁰ Fasawī (ed. 'Umarī), *al-Ma'rifah wa-al-Ta'rīk*, III, p. 326. For the *'isnād*, see *ibid.*, pp. 319, 323.

⁵⁴¹ For al-Ḥākim's version, see below. That we are dealing here with two discrete ur-redactions is clear: two of the reports have *ba'da kadījah*, absent in the other two; the same two have *qad ra'á*, where the other two have *qad 'uriya*; the same two have *bint*, where the other two have *ibnah*; and finally, the second two have an added *rasūl allāh* in the 'consummation' element.

Ṭabarī's abridged version is identical to the corresponding wording in al-Bayhaqī's version, which is reason to think that the uncorroborated section of the latter is probably well-preserved as well. In other words, as in the preceding transmissions from 'Abū al-Ḥusayn, this hadith was evidently transmitted precisely, in writing, to both al-Bayhaqī and Ibn al-Ṭabarī, resulting in only a handful of discrepancies.⁵⁴² As such, 'Abū al-Ḥusayn's urtext is readily discernible, even if the second half (solely attested by al-Bayhaqī) is less certain:

[*tumma tazawwaja rasūl^u allāhⁱ 'ā'iṣat^a*] wa-kāna rasūl^u allāhⁱ qad 'uriya fī al-[*nawm/manām*]ⁱ marrataynⁱ [*yuqālu la-hu*] hiya imra'atu-ka wa-'ā'iṣat^u yawma-'idⁱⁿ ibnat^u [*sittⁱⁿ fa-nakaḥa-hā rasūl^u allāhⁱ bi-makkat^a wa-hiya bint^u sittⁱ sinīn^a*] [*tumma*] [*'inna/'anna*] rasūl^a allāhⁱ banā bi-'ā'iṣat^a ba'da-mā qadima al-madīnat^a wa-'ā'iṣat^u yawma banā bi-hā rasūl^u allāhⁱ [*ibnat/bint*]^u tisⁱ sinīn^a [*wa-hiya 'ā'iṣat^u bint^u 'abī bakrⁱ bnⁱ 'abī quḥāfat^a bnⁱ 'āmīrⁱ bnⁱ ka'bⁱ bnⁱ sa'dⁱ bnⁱ taymⁱ bnⁱ murrat^a bnⁱ lu'ayyⁱ bnⁱ ḡālibⁱ bnⁱ fihriⁿ*] [*fa-tazawwaja-hā rasūl^u allāhⁱ bikr^{an}*] wa-ism^u 'abī bakrⁱⁿ 'atīq^{un} wa-ism^u 'abī quḥāfat^a 'uṭmān^u].

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

Following the argumentation given above, there are two additional reports ascribed to the Khurasanian tradent 'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ, also known as al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (situated within the sub-tradition of al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī', which ostensibly nestles in turn within the broader tradition of al-Zuhrī), recorded by al-Bayhaqī and Ibn al-Ṭabarī.

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ—'Abū al-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb—'Abū 'Usāmah al-Ḥalabī—al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī'—'Ubayd Allāh b. 'abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān—'Abd Allāh b. Ja'far b. Darastawayh—Ya'qūb b. Sufyān—al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī'—'Ubayd Allāh b. 'abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

⁵⁴² Ṭ. omits *tumma tazawwaja rasūl allāh 'ā'iṣah*; B. has 'uriyya (a scribal error) where Ṭ. has 'uriya; B. has *al-nawm* where Ṭ. has *al-manām*; B. has *yuqālu la-hu*, where Ṭ. interjects with a specification of the narrator; Ṭ. omits most of the 'marriage at six' element; B. has *tumma 'inna* where Ṭ. has 'anna; B. has *ibnah* where Ṭ. has *bint*; and Ṭ. omits 'Ā'iṣah's genealogy, the 'virgin' element, and the specification of 'Abū Bakr's name.

Married ‘Ā’iṣah; after Kadijah; shown in a dream; marriage in Makkah at six; consummation; Hijrah; nine; ‘Ā’iṣah’s genealogy; virgin; ‘Abū Bakr’s name.⁵⁴³

Ibn al-Ṭabarī (d. 472/1079)

‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ—‘Abū al-‘Abbās Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb—‘Abū ‘Usāmah al-Ḥalabī—al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘abī Manī‘—‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

‘Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān—‘Abd Allāh b. Ja‘far b. Darastawayh—Ya‘qūb b. Sufyān—al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘abī Manī‘—‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

Married ‘Ā’iṣah; after Kadijah; shown in a dream; marriage in Makkah at six; consummation; Hijrah; nine; ‘Ā’iṣah’s genealogy; virgin; ‘Abū Bakr’s name.⁵⁴⁴

Given that these two reports are more similar to each other than they are to all the rest, and are in identical, al-Ḥākim’s urtext is easy to discern:

tumma tazawwaja rasūlu allāhi ‘ā’iṣata ba‘da kadījata wa-kāna qad ra‘a fī al-nawm marratayn yuqālu hiya imra‘atu-ka wa-‘ā’iṣatu yawma-‘idⁱⁿ bintu sittⁱ sinīn^a fa-nakaḥa-hā rasūlu allāhi bi-makkata wa-hiya ibnatu sittⁱ sinīn^a tumma ‘inna rasūla allāhi banā bi-‘ā’iṣata ba‘da-mā qadima al-madīnati wa-‘ā’iṣatu yawma banā bi-hā bintu tis‘i sinīn^a wa-‘ā’iṣatu bintu ‘abī bakrⁱ bnⁱ ‘abī quḥāfat^a bnⁱ ‘āmīrⁱ bnⁱ ‘amrⁱw bnⁱ ka‘bⁱ bnⁱ sa‘dⁱ bnⁱ taymⁱ bnⁱ murrat^a bnⁱ ka‘bⁱ bnⁱ lu‘ayyⁱ bnⁱ ḡālībⁱ bnⁱ fihriⁿ fa-tazawwaja-hā rasūlu allāhi bikran^a wa-ismu ‘abī bakrⁱn ‘atīq^{un} wa-ismu ‘abī quḥāfat^a ‘uṭmān^u.

The extremely precise preservation of this hadith is consistent with its having been transmitted from al-Ḥākim to his students in writing, which fits the time period in question.

‘Abū ‘Amr b. Ḥamdān (d. 368/979)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Baghdadian tradent ‘Abū ‘Amr ‘Aḥmad b. Ja‘far b. Ḥamdān (situated within the broader ‘Abd al-Razzāq sub-tradition), recorded by ‘Abū Nu‘aym and al-Bayhaqī.

⁵⁴³ Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, XIII, p. 564, # 13553. For the *‘isnād*, see *ibid.*, p. 562.

⁵⁴⁴ Fasawī (ed. ‘Umarī), *al-Ma‘rifah wa-al-Ta‘rīk*, III, p. 321. For the *‘isnād*, see *ibid.*, pp. 319, 323.

'Abū Nu'aym (d. 430/1038)

'Abū 'Amr b. Ḥamdān—al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān—Fayyāḍ b. Zuhayr—'Abd al-Razzāq—Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī—'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁵⁴⁵

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ [al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī]—'Abū 'Amr b. 'abī Ja'far—al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān—Fayyāḍ b. Zuhayr—'Abd al-Razzāq—Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī—'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁵⁴⁶

These two texts are identical, with two exceptions: 'Abū Nu'aym has Fayyāḍ say *'anba'a*, where al-Bayhaqī has him say *ḥaddaṭa-nā*; and everywhere that 'Abū Nu'aym has *bint*, al-Bayhaqī has *ibnah*. The two hadiths ascribed via 'Abū 'Amr b. Ḥamdān are thus more similar to each other than to other hadiths within the broader 'Abd al-Razzāq sub-tradition, with one striking exception: the *matn* of 'Abū Nu'aym's version is actually more similar to—and indeed, completely identical with—Muslim's version,⁵⁴⁷ despite the fact that both versions claim to derive via independent *'isnāds* unto 'Abd al-Razzāq, and despite the fact that every other variant within the broader sub-tradition exhibits at least some small difference. Since Muslim's version is attested much earlier than 'Abū Nu'aym's, and given also that 'Abū Nu'aym's work is none other than a collection of supposedly corroborating transmissions for Muslim's work (*al-Musnad al-Mustaḥraj 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*), it cannot be ruled out that 'Abū Nu'aym's *matn* was contaminated by—or straightforwardly borrowed from—Muslim's *matn*, rather than deriving via its own *'isnād* all the way back to 'Abd al-Razzāq.

In light of this, al-Bayhaqī's transmission from 'Abū 'Amr b. Ḥamdān cannot be corroborated. Perhaps 'Abū 'Amr really did receive a version of this hadith from the specified *'isnād*, all the way back to 'Abd al-Razzāq, but if so, his exact wording cannot

⁵⁴⁵ 'Abū Nu'aym 'Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-'Iṣfahānī (ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan 'Ismā'īl al-Šāfi'ī), *al-Musnad al-Mustaḥraj 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 4 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, n. d.), p. 87, # 3312.

⁵⁴⁶ Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, XXI, p. 129, # 21024.

⁵⁴⁷ Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 642, # 71/1422.

be reconstructed. Of course, there is another explanation for all of this, with worse consequences: 'Abū 'Amr (or perhaps his immediate source, al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān) was the one actually responsible for borrowing Muslim's *matn* (word for word, based on a written copy) and providing it with a false corroborating *'isnād* back to 'Abd al-Razzāq (via Fayyād b. Zuhayr).⁵⁴⁸ In this scenario, 'Abū Nu'aym simply accurately recorded this false ascription from 'Abū 'Amr (again, word for word), whereas al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, al-Bayhaqī, or some later scribe or editor introduced the slight alterations in al-Bayhaqī's extant version (changing *bint* to *ibnah*).

Either one of these scenarios (borrowing or contamination by 'Abū Nu'aym, or borrowing by 'Abū 'Amr or al-Ḥasan) seems preferable to the scenario that 'Abū Nu'aym and Muslim both somehow managed to preserve exactly the same *matn* independently, despite the intervening centuries and the occurrence of at least small changes in every other transmission from 'Abd al-Razzāq. In other words, perfect *verbatim* transmission was still absent even in the early 9th Century CE, after the rise of writing, such that transmissions from PCLs operating at that time still typically exhibit at least small differences in wording.⁵⁴⁹ Therefore, it is extremely suspicious to find identical *matns* shared by sources claiming independent *'isnāds* all the way back—over the span of several centuries, in one case—to a source operating at the turn of the 9th Century CE. This is unexpected for genuine transmission, but exactly the sort of thing we would expect to see in the case of spreading or diving *'isnāds*. This is not to say that it is *impossible* that Muslim and 'Abū 'Amr could have preserved identical *matns* from a much earlier source—it is simply unexpected.

In short, the ascriptions to 'Abū 'Amr b. Ḥamdān are plagued by doubt: it is at the very least plausible that the *matn* of 'Abū Nu'aym's version of the hadith was contaminated by Muslim's (such that 'Abū 'Amr's exact wording cannot be reconstructed), or else that 'Abū Nu'aym, 'Abū 'Amr, or al-Ḥasan borrowed the *matn*

⁵⁴⁸ All of the relevant tradents were operating in Khurasan, so there is no question of geographical unfeasibility here. It is completely plausible that they could have met and influenced or borrowed from each other.

⁵⁴⁹ In addition to all of the examples that will follow, see the examples and observations in Maroussia Bednarkiewicz, 'The History of the *Adhān*: A View from the Hadith Literature', in Belal Abu-Alabbas, Michael Dann, & Christopher Melchert (eds.), *Modern Hadith Studies: Continuing Debates and New Approaches* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2020), *passim*, concerning variants and transmission in the 9th Century CE.

from Muslim's version and provided it with a false alternative *'isnād* back to 'Abd al-Razzāq.

'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Baḡawī (d. 317/929-930)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Baghdadian tradent 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Baḡawī (situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b. 'Urwah), recorded by 'Abū Nu'aym and Ibn 'Asākir.

'Abū Nu'aym (d. 430/1038)

Muḥammad b. 'Alī—al-Baḡawī—al-'Alā' b. Mūsā—al-Hayṭam b. 'Adī:

Discussion with Hišām b. 'Urwah about Ḳadījah's children; Ḳadījah's death; Ḳawlah arranges the Prophet's marriages to Sawdah and 'Ā'īshah; marriage at six; consummation; Hījah.⁵⁵⁰

Ibn 'Asākir (d. 519/1125)

'Abū al-Qāsim b. Ṭāhir—'Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-'Umarī—'Abū Muḥammad al-Anṣārī—al-Baḡawī—al-'Alā' b. Mūsā—al-Hayṭam b. 'Adī...

'Abū al-Faṭḥ al-Muḍarī, & 'Abū Naṣr b. 'abī 'Āsim b. 'abī al-Faḍl, & 'Abū Muḥammad al-Fāmī, & 'Abū 'Alī al-Mukabbir, & 'Abū al-Qāsim al-Bālakī, & 'Abū Ma'sūm Mas'ūd, & 'Abū al-Muẓaffar al-Fārisī, & 'Abū Muḥammad Ḳālīd—'Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad al-Fārisī—'Abū Muḥammad al-Anṣārī—al-Baḡawī—al-'Alā' b. Mūsā—al-Hayṭam b. 'Adī: Discussion with Hišām b. 'Urwah about Ḳadījah's children; Ḳadījah's death; Ḳawlah arranges the Prophet's marriages to Sawdah and 'Ā'īshah; marriage at six; consummation; Hījah.⁵⁵¹

These two reports are more similar to each other than they are to every other version of the marital-age hadith, sharing as they do a highly distinctive elemental sequence

⁵⁵⁰ 'Abū Nu'aym 'Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-'Iṣfahānī (ed. 'Ādil b. Yūsuf al-'Azzāzī), *Ma'rifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Waṭan, 1998), p. 3205, # 7368.

⁵⁵¹ 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Asākir (ed. 'Umar b. Ġaramah al-'Amrawī), *Ta'rīkh Madīnat Dimašq*, vol. 3 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 1995), pp. 171-173.

and format: a discussion between al-Hayṭam b. ‘Adī and Hišām b. ‘Urwah about Ḳadijah, Sawdah, and ‘Ā’iṣah. The second half of both reports is admittedly extremely similar to a report recorded by Ibn Sa’d and ascribed to Muḥammad b. ‘Amr,⁵⁵² such that all three reports must clearly derive from a recent common ancestor *vis-à-vis* all the rest—but the two ascribed to al-Baḡawī are consistently more similar to each other than they are to the third,⁵⁵³ which is consistent with both of them descending from an even more recent common ancestor (*vis-à-vis* Ibn Sa’d’s report). This matches their common ascription to al-Baḡawī, or in other words: al-Baḡawī is likely a genuine PCL, whose distinctive redaction is reflected in the first two reports.

‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir’s reports are largely identical, with only a few variants (mostly minor additions or omissions) between them.⁵⁵⁴ This is consistent with the hadith’s having been transmitted from al-Baḡawī to his students (and from them unto ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir) in writing, which matches the predomination of written transmission in the relevant time period (i.e., the 10th-12th Centuries CE). Consequently, the relevant section of al-Baḡawī’s urtext—the part pertaining to al-Hayṭam and Hišām’s discussion—survives mostly intact:

ḥaddaṭa-nā al-‘alā’^u bn^u mūsá [ḥaddaṭa/’anba’a]-nā al-hayṭam^u bn^u ‘adiyyⁱⁿ al-ṭā’iyy^u: [...] fa-ḥaddaṭa-nī hišām^u bn^u ‘urwatā^a ‘an ‘abī-hi qāla fa-waladat la-hu ‘abd^a al-‘uzzá wa-‘abd^a manāfⁱⁿ wa-al-qāsim^a qultu li-hišāmⁱⁿ fa-’ayna al-ṭayyib^u wa-al-ṭāhir^u [fa-]qāla hādā mā waḍa’tum ‘antum yā ‘ahlā al-‘irāqⁱ fa-‘ammā ‘ašyāḳu-nā fa-qālū ‘abd^u al-‘uzzá wa-‘abd^u manāfⁱⁿ wa-al-

⁵⁵² Muḥammad b. Sa’d al-Baṣrī (ed. Carl Brockelmann), *Biographien Muhammeds, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht, Band 8: Biographien der Frauen* (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1904), p. 39.

⁵⁵³ ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir have *fa-’atat*, where Ibn Sa’d has *jā’at*; ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir have *al-nabiyy*, where Ibn Sa’d has *rasūl allāh*; ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir have *’innī*, where Ibn Sa’d has *ka-’annī*; Ibn Sa’d adds *kānat*, absent in both ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir; ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir have *’ammā*, where Ibn Sa’d *fa-*; Ibn Sa’d adds *fa-tazawwaja-humā*, absent in both ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir; Ibn Sa’d adds *bi-makkah*, absent in both ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir; and finally, Ibn Sa’d adds *ba’da ḡālika*, absent in both ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn ‘Asākir.

By contrast, Ibn Sa’d agrees with ‘Abū Nu‘aym against Ibn ‘Asākir, and with Ibn ‘Asākir against ‘Abū Nu‘aym, in fewer instances, and with less substantial variants: Ibn ‘Asākir has *fa-qāla*, where Ibn Sa’d and ‘Abū Nu‘aym have *qāla*; ‘Abū Nu‘aym has *’anna-kunna*, where Ibn Sa’d and Ibn ‘Asākir have *’inna-kunna*; Ibn ‘Asākir adds *yā*, absent in Ibn Sa’d and ‘Abū Nu‘aym; ‘Abū Nu‘aym adds *bi-him*, absent in Ibn Sa’d and Ibn ‘Asākir; and finally, Ibn ‘Asākir has *ibnah*, where Ibn Sa’d and ‘Abū Nu‘aym have *bint*.

⁵⁵⁴ ‘Abū Nu‘aym has al-Baḡawī say “al-‘Alā’ b. Mūsá ‘Abū al-Jahm”, where Ibn ‘Asākir has him say “al-‘Alā’ b. Muḥammad b. Mūsá”; ‘Abū Nu‘aym has al-‘Alā’ say *’anba’a-nā*, where Ibn ‘Asākir has *ṭnā*; Ibn ‘Asākir adds *qāla*; Ibn ‘Asākir adds *fa-*; ‘Abū Nu‘aym adds *waladat*; ‘Abū Nu‘aym adds *wa-zaynab*; Ibn ‘Asākir again adds *fa-*; Ibn ‘Asākir has *’inna-kunna*, where ‘Abū Nu‘aym has *’anna-kunna*; Ibn ‘Asākir adds *yā*; ‘Abū Nu‘aym adds *bi-him*; ‘Abū Nu‘aym has *bint*, where Ibn ‘Asākir has *ibnah*; and finally, ‘Abū Nu‘aym has *ba’du lammā*, where Ibn ‘Asākir has *ḥayṭu*. Only the last two variants look like the product of paraphrasing.

qāsim^u wa-waladat la-hu min^a al-nisāⁱ ruqayyat^a [wa-zaynab^a] wa-’umm^a
kultūmⁱⁿ wa-fāṭimat^a fa-halakāt kadījat^u qabl^a al-hijratⁱ bi-ṭalātⁱ sinīn^a fa-
’atat kawlat^u bint^u ḥakīmⁱ bnⁱ al-’awqaṣⁱ al-sulamīyyat^u imra’at^u ’uṭmān^a bnⁱ
maz’ūnⁱⁿ ’ilā al-nabiyyⁱ fa-qālat yā rasūl^a allāhⁱ ’innī ’arā-ka qad daḵalat-ka
kallat^{un} li-faqdⁱ kadījat^a [fa-]qāla ’ajal ’umm^u al-’iyālⁱ wa-rabbat^u al-baytⁱ fa-
qālat ’a-fa-lā ’aḵṭubu ’alay-ka qāla balā ’ammā ’[i/a]nna-kunna [yā] ma’šar^a
al-nisāⁱ ’arfaqu [bi-him] bi-dālīka fa-ḵaṭabat ’alay-hi sawdat^a bint^a zam’at^a
min banī ’āmīrⁱ bnⁱ lu’ayyⁱⁿ wa-ḵaṭabat ’alay-hi ’ā’išat^a [bint/ibnat]^a ’abī
bakrⁱⁿ fa-banā bi-sawdat^a wa-’ā’išat^u yawma-’idⁱⁿ bint^u sittⁱ sinīn^a ḥattā banā
bi-hā [ḥaytu/ba’d^u lammā] qadīma al-madīnatⁱ.

The deeper relationship between al-Baḡawī’s redaction and the report recorded by Ibn Sa’d is addressed below.⁵⁵⁵

’Aḥmad b. ’Abd al-Jabbār al-’Uṭāridī (d. 272/886)

I have collated five reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent ’Aḥmad b. ’Abd al-Jabbār al-’Uṭāridī (situated within the broader tradition of Muḥammad b. ’Amr), four of which appear to be abridgements: the version recorded by al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī only comprises the opening element thereof; one of the versions recorded by al-Bayhaqī lacks some medial elements and the final elements; another version recorded by al-Bayhaqī (in the same work, but in a different chapter) only comprises the final elements; and yet another version recorded by al-Bayhaqī (in a different work) is actually the unabridged (or less-abridged) version of al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī’s version, missing only some final elements. Fortuitously, two full versions are recorded by Ibn al-Sammāk and Maymūn b. ’Ishāq, which are corroborated in each section by at least one of the abridged versions, such that every part of the hadith is attested at least thrice (save the very final element).

Ibn al-Sammāk (d. 344/955)

al-’Uṭāridī—Ibn ’Idrīs—Muḥammad b. ’Amr—Yaḥyá—’Ā’išah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ’Ā’išah and Sawdah; Kawlah brings word to ’Umm Rūmān and waits for ’Abū Bakr; ’Abū Bakr questions the validity of the

⁵⁵⁵ See the section on Muḥammad b. ’Amr, below.

proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; 'Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ'im's son; 'Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ'im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to 'Abū Bakr's relief; 'Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages 'Ā'īshah to him; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah, and passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah's father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah's brother disapproves, but later regrets having done so.

—'Ā'īshah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; swing; age nine; her mother comes; marital preparation; shoulder-length hair; taken to the Prophet; consummation; Sa'd brings food.⁵⁵⁶

Maymūn b. 'Ishāq (d. 351/962-963)

al-'Uṭāridī—Ibn 'Idrīs—Muḥammad b. 'Amr—Yaḥyá—'Ā'īshah:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to 'Ā'īshah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to 'Umm Rūmān and waits for 'Abū Bakr; 'Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; 'Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ'im's son; 'Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ'im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to 'Abū Bakr's relief; 'Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages 'Ā'īshah to him; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah, and passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah's father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah's brother disapproves, but later regrets having done so.

—'Ā'īshah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; swing; age nine; her mother comes; marital preparation; shoulder-length hair; taken to the Prophet; consummation; Sa'd brings food.⁵⁵⁷

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

⁵⁵⁶ 'Uṭmān b. 'Aḥmad al-Daqqāq b. al-Sammāk, in Nābil Sa'd al-Dīn Jarrār (ed.), *Majmū' fī-hi 'Aṣrat 'Ajzā' Ḥadīṭiyyah*, part 5 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Baṣā'ir al-'Islāmiyyah, n. d.), pp. 265-267, # 449.

⁵⁵⁷ Maymūn b. 'Ishāq al-Ṣawwāf, *al-Juz' fī-hi min Ḥadīṭ 'Abi 'Umar al-'Uṭāridiyy wa-Ġayri-hi*, Hadith # 42, available online at the Mawsū'at al-Ḥadīṭ website: <https://hadith.maktaba.co.in/single-book/1304/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D8%B2%D8%A1-%D9%81%D9%8A%D9%87-%D9%85%D9%86-%D8%AD%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%AB-%D8%A3%D8%A8%D9%8A-%D8%B9%D9%85%D8%B1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%B7%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%AF%D9%8A-%D9%88%D8%BA%D9%8A%D8%B1%D9%87/878041/42>

Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb—al-‘Uṭāridī—Ibn ‘Idrīs—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:
Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah.⁵⁵⁸

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

‘Alī b. ‘Aḥmad al-Razzāz—‘Abū Sahl b. Ziyād—al-‘Uṭāridī—Ibn ‘Idrīs—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah;
al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī—Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb [whose wording this is]—al-‘Uṭāridī—Ibn ‘Idrīs—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Kawlah brings word to ‘Umm Rūmān and waits for ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ‘Umm Rūmān informs Kawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ‘im’s son; ‘Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ‘im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ‘Abū Bakr’s relief; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; Kawlah then goes to Sawdah, and passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother disapproves, but later regrets having done so.⁵⁵⁹

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

‘Alī b. ‘Aḥmad al-Razzāz—‘Abū Sahl b. Ziyād—al-‘Uṭāridī—Ibn ‘Idrīs—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Kawlah brings word to ‘Umm Rūmān and waits for ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; elements omitted; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; Kawlah then goes to Sawdah, and passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother disapproves; elements omitted.⁵⁶⁰

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

⁵⁵⁸ Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, vol. 5 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ta’ṣīl, 2014), p. 243, # 4500.

⁵⁵⁹ Bayhaqī (ed. Qal‘ajī), *Dalā’il*, II, pp. 411-412.

⁵⁶⁰ *Id.* (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, XIV, pp. 154-155, # 13863.

‘Alī b. ‘Aḥmad al-Razzāz—‘Abū Sahl b. Ziyād—al-‘Uṭāridī—Ibn ‘Idrīs—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; swing; ‘Ā’iṣah is nine; her mother comes; marital preparation; shoulder-length hair; taken to the Prophet; consummation.⁵⁶¹

When abridgements are accounted for, these texts are largely identical. There are numerous textual variations between them, but these tend to be very minor, and obviously the product of scribal errors: additional or missing conjunctions, particles, and prepositions, abbreviated or elaborated names,⁵⁶² verbs given in different tense or person,⁵⁶³ outright misspellings,⁵⁶⁴ and a few added or omitted words here and there.⁵⁶⁵ There is also some confusion as to who is narrating some versions, although the narration is always coherent.⁵⁶⁶

⁵⁶¹ *Ibid.*, XXI, p. 131, # 21026.

⁵⁶² Bayhaqī (*Dalā’il*) has ‘ā’iṣah, where the rest have ‘ā’iṣah bn ‘abī bakr; Ibn al-Sammāk has al-muṭ‘im bn ‘adiyy, where the rest have al-muṭ‘im; Bayhaqī (*Dalā’il*) has sawdah bint zam‘ah, where the rest have sawdah.

⁵⁶³ Bayhaqī (# 13863) has ‘atat, where the rest have ‘ataytu; Bayhaqī (# 13863) has ḍakara, where the rest have yaḍkuru; Bayhaqī (# 13863) has ḍakarat, where the rest have ḍakartu; Ibn al-Sammāk has kāna, where Maymūn has kānat.

⁵⁶⁴ Maymūn has ‘arjaḥu (a vowel error), where the rest have ‘urajjaḥu; Ibn al-Sammāk has ‘idqayn (a vowel error), where the rest have ‘adqayn; Ibn al-Sammāk has tuṣbī-hi (a consonantal error), where the rest have tuṣību-hu; Bayhaqī (*Dalā’il*) has mawsim (singular) where the rest have mawāsīm (plural); Ibn al-Sammāk has ‘abd allāh bn zam‘ah (a misspelled name), where the rest have ‘abd bn zam‘ah; Maymūn has fī-hinna (a consonantal error), where the rest have fī-him; Maymūn has ḍukira (a consonantal error) and Ibn al-Sammāk has dāra (which appears in other variants of this element, in other sub-traditions).

⁵⁶⁵ Bayhaqī (# 13863) lacks a qālat present in the rest, in two places; Bayhaqī (*Dalā’il*) has a qālat absent in the rest; Bayhaqī (# 13863) has a na‘am, absent in the rest; Maymūn lacks ‘amru-ka, present in Ibn al-Sammāk and Bayhaqī (*Dalā’il*), and Bayhaqī (# 13863) lacks half of the surrounding element as well; Ibn al-Sammāk has sinīn, absent in the rest; Bayhaqī (# 21026) has ya‘nī al-nabiyy, absent in the rest.

⁵⁶⁶ Ḥākim and Bayhaqī # 21026 are both clear in terms of narrator, but so short as for that to be uninteresting. Bayhaqī # 13863 is coherent, with Ḳawlah being explicitly introduced as the narrator at the beginning of a section (with qālat Ḳawlah) and reintroduced as such several times thereafter (with a qālat), speaking after each in the first person (inṭalaqtu, ḥayyaytu, qultu). Ibn al-Sammāk is likewise coherent, with different narrators (Ḳawlah and sometimes ‘Ā’iṣah) always being introduced by a qālat.

The other versions are coherent but confusing, however. In Bayhaqī (*Dalā’il*), Ḳawlah is explicitly introduced as the narrator at the beginning of a section (with a qālat) and several times thereafter (again, with qālat), speaking after each in the first person (‘ataytu, etc.). Things become confusing when an anonymous male narrator is suddenly introduced twice after Ḳawlah (with qāla), before a female narrator is reintroduced four times in short order (with qālat): they cannot all be Ḳawlah, since Ḳawlah is referred to in the third person in the third quote, and after the fourth quote, Ḳawlah is explicitly reintroduced as the narrator (with qālat Ḳawlah). Thereafter, Ḳawlah is explicitly reintroduced as the narrator repeatedly (with qālat) and accordingly speaks in the first person (qultu, etc.). This version is not incoherent (since new narrators are always clearly indicated), but it is confusing, since the identity of the narrator frequently changes and is in some cases unspecified. Perhaps the male narrator is Yaḥyá.

Despite all this, the majority of the corresponding texts are still identical, and textual variants are mostly isolated in one or another version, such that an urtext is easily discernible for the most part:

ḥaddaṭa-nā ‘abd^u allāhⁱ bn^u ‘idrīs^a al-‘awdiyy^u ‘an muḥammadⁱ bnⁱ ‘amrⁱⁿw
‘an yaḥyá bnⁱ ‘abdⁱ al-raḥmānⁱ bnⁱ ḥaṭībⁱⁿ qāla qālat ‘ā’išat^u lammā mātat
ḡadījat^u bint^u ḡulaylīdⁱⁿ jā’at ḡawlat^u bint^u ḡakīmⁱⁿ ‘ilā rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ fa-qālat
yā rasūl^a allāhⁱ ‘a-lā tuzawwija qāla wa-man qālat ‘in šī’ta bikr^{an} wa-‘in šī’ta
ṭayyib^{an} qāla wa-manⁱ al-bikr^u wa-manⁱ al-ṭayyib^u qālat ‘ammā al-bikr^u fa-
ibnat^u ‘aḥabbⁱ ḡalqⁱ allāhⁱ ‘ilay-ka ‘ā’išat^u bint^u ‘abī bakrⁱⁿ wa-‘ammā al-
ṭayyib^u fa-sawdat^u bint^u zam‘at^a qad ‘āmanat bi-ka wa-itta‘abat-ka qāla fa-
uḡkurī-himā ‘alayya qālat fa-‘ataytu ‘umma rūmān^a fa-qultu yā ‘umm^a
rūmān^a māḡā ‘adḡala allāh^u ‘alay-kum min^a al-ḡayrⁱ wa-al-barakatⁱ qālat
wa-ḡāka māḡā qālat rasūl^u allāhⁱ yaḡkuru ‘ā’išat^a qālat intaḡirī fa-‘inna ‘abā
bakrⁱⁿ ‘ātⁱⁿ qālat fa-jā’a ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ fa-ḡakartu ḡālika fa-qāla ‘a-wa-ṭaṣluḡu
la-hu wa-hiya ibnat^u ‘aḡī-hi fa-qāla rasūl^u allāhⁱ ‘anā ‘aḡū-hu wa-huwa ‘aḡī
wa-ibnatu-hu ṭaṣluḡu lī qālat wa-qāma ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ fa-qālat lī ‘umm^u rūmān^a
‘inna al-muṭ‘im^a bn^a ‘adiyyⁱⁿ qad kāna ḡakara-hā ‘alā ibni-hi wa-allāhⁱ mā
‘aḡlafa wa-ḡān qatṭu ta’nī ‘abā bakrⁱⁿ qālat fa-‘atā ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ al-muṭ‘im^a fa-
qāla mā taḡūlu fī ‘amrⁱ ḡāḡihi al-jāriyatⁱ qāla fa-‘aqbala ‘alā imra’ati-hi fa-
qāla la-hā mā taḡūlina yā ḡāḡihi qāla fa-‘aqbalat ‘alā ‘abī bakrⁱⁿ fa-qālat
la‘alla-nā ‘in ‘ankaḡnā ḡāḡā al-fatā ‘ilay-ka ṭuṣību-hu wa-tuḡḡilu-hu fī ḡīni-
ka allaḡī ‘anta ‘alay-hi fa-‘aqbala ‘alay-hi ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ fa-qāla mā taḡūlu ‘anta
fa-qāla ‘inna-hā la-taḡūlu mā tasma‘u fa-qāma ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ wa-laysa fī nafsi-
hi min^a al-maw‘idⁱ šay^{un} fa-qāla la-hā ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ ḡūlī li-rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ fa-l-ya’ti
qāla fa-jā’a rasūl^u allāhⁱ fa-malaka-hā qālat ḡawlat^u ṭumma intaḡaqtu ‘ilā
sawdat^a wa-‘abū-hā šayḡun kabīr^{un} qad jalasa ‘anⁱ al-mawāsīmⁱ fa-ḡayyaytu-
hu bi-taḡiyyatⁱ ‘aḡlī al-jāḡiliyyatⁱ [f/w]a-qultu ‘an‘im ṣabāḡan [fa-]qāla man
‘anti qultu ḡawlat^u bint^u ḡakīmⁱⁿ qālat fa-raḡḡaba bī wa-qāla mā šā’a allāh^u
‘an yaḡūla qālat qultu muḡammad^u bn^u ‘abdⁱ allāhⁱ bnⁱ ‘abdⁱ al-muṭṭalibⁱ
yaḡkuru sawdat^a bint^a zam‘at^a [fa-]qāla kuḡun karīm^{un} māḡā taḡūlu
ṣāḡibat^u-ka qultu tuḡibbu ḡāka qāla [fa-]ḡūlī la-hu fa-l-ya’ti qālat fa-jā’a
rasūl^u allāhⁱ fa-malaka-hā qālat wa-qadima ‘abd^u bn^u zam‘at^a fa-ja‘ala
yaḡṭ[ū/i] ‘alā ra’si-hi al-turāb^a wa-qāla ba‘da ‘an ‘aslama la-‘amru-ka ‘innī
la-safīḡun yawma ‘aḡṭ[ī/ū] ‘alā ra’sī al-turāb^a ‘an tazawwaja rasūl^u allāhⁱ
sawdat^a qālat ‘ā’išat^u tazawwaja-nī li-sittⁱ sinīn^a fa-lammā qadimnā al-
madīnat^a nazalnā al-sunḡā fī banī al-ḡarīṭⁱ bnⁱ al-ḡazrajⁱ qālat fa-‘innī la-
‘urajḡahu bayna ‘adḡaynⁱ wa-‘anā ibnat^u tis‘inⁱ id jā’at ‘ummī fa-‘anzalat-nī
ṭumma maṣat bī ḡattā intaḡat bī ‘ilā al-bābⁱ wa-‘anā ‘anḡaju fa-masaḡat
waḡhī bi-šayⁱⁿ min māⁱⁿ wa-faraḡat jumaymat^{an} kānat lī ṭumma ḡaḡalat bī
‘alā rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ wa-fī al-baytⁱ rijāl^{un} wa-nisā^{un} fa-qālat ḡā’ulā’i ‘aḡlu-ki fa-
bāraka allāh^u la-ki fī-him wa-bāraka la-hum fī-ki qālat fa-qāma al-rijāl^u wa-
al-nisā^u fa-ḡarajū wa-banā bī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-lā wa-allāhⁱ mā nuḡirat
‘alayya [min] jazūr^{in/un} wa-lā ḡubīḡat [‘alayya] min šātⁱⁿ wa-lākin jafnat^{un}

Similarly, in Maymūn, an anonymous male narrator is quoted in between a series of a quotations from Ḳawlah, in two instances—again, this is not incoherent (since the narrator is clearly introduced with a *qāla*), but again, it is a little confusing.

kāna[t] yab‘aṭu bi-hā sa‘du bn^u ‘ubādata^a ‘ilā rasūli allāhi ‘idā [ḍukira/dāra]
bayna nisā’i-hi fa-qad ‘alimtu ‘anna-hu ba‘aṭa bi-hā.

Al-‘Uṭāridī is likely responsible for the wording of this urtext: the reports ascribed via him—the reports from which this urtext was reconstructed—are all more similar to each other than the reports ascribed to other figures within the broader tradition of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr (see below).⁵⁶⁷ This is strengthened by the fact that two of the sources—Ibn al-Sammāk and Maymūn b. ‘Ishāq, who also happen to provide unabridged versions of the report—corroborate each other in transmitting directly from al-‘Uṭāridī, or in other words: al-‘Uṭāridī is converged upon directly by two extant collectors, rather than just the SSs of much later collectors. In light of all of this, al-‘Uṭāridī is likely to be a genuine PCL.

The transmission from al-‘Uṭāridī to his students and unto the extant collections was clearly written rather than oral, given that the extant versions are largely identical (which belies oral paraphrasing), and given also the *scribal* character of most of the variations that arose in the course of this transmission from al-‘Uṭāridī.

‘Abū Bakr b. ‘Askar al-Tamīmī (d. 251/865)

I have collated three reports ascribed to the Baghdadian tradent ‘Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Sahl b. ‘Askar al-Tamīmī (situated within the broader ‘Abd al-Razzāq sub-tradition), recorded by Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā, Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim, and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā (d. 281/894-895)

‘Abū Bakr al-Tamīmī—‘Abd al-Razzāq—Ma‘mar—al-Zuhrī—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁵⁶⁸

⁵⁶⁷ This is true in terms of broad elemental outline, but also with specific wordings: all of the transmissions from ‘Aḥmad have *māta*, where those from Bišr have *halakat* and those from Sa‘īd have *tuwuffiya*; ‘Aḥmad’s have *maw‘id* where the others have *‘idah*; ‘Aḥmad’s have *qūli* where the others have *id‘i*; ‘Aḥmad’s have *malaka-hā*, where Bišr’s have *zawwaja-hā* and Sa‘īd’s have *‘ankaḥa-hā*; ‘Aḥmad’s have *inṭalaqtu*, where Bišr’s have *daḳalat* and Sa‘īd’s have *daḳaltu*; ‘Aḥmad’s have *al-mawāsīm*, where the others have *al-hajj*; ‘Aḥmad’s have *qāma*, where the others have *waṭaba*; etc.

⁵⁶⁸ ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘abī al-Dunyā Muḥammad b. ‘Ubayd (ed. Najm ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ḳalaf), *Kitāb al-‘Iyāl* (Dammam, KSA: Dār Ibn al-Qayyim, 1990), p. 755, # 558.

Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim (d. 287/900)

'Abū Bakr b. 'Askar—'Abd al-Razzāq—Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her.⁵⁶⁹

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—Muḥammad b. Sahl b. 'Askar—'Abd al-Razzāq—Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—Muḥammad b. Sahl b. 'Askar—'Abd al-Razzāq—Ma'mar—Hišām b. 'Urwah—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁵⁷⁰

Whilst the hadiths constituting the 'Abd al-Razzāq sub-tradition in general share a distinctive set of elements *vis-à-vis* all other versions of the marital-age tradition (such that their derivation from 'Abd al-Razzāq is likely), those *within* the putative sub-tradition of the ostensible PCL Ibn 'Askar are not noticeably distinct as a whole. That said, two of those who claimed to transmit this hadith directly from him are extant collectors (Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā and Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim), which strengthens the attribution of the hadith to him. At the very least, it is plausible that this hadith was transmitted by him from 'Abd al-Razzāq, which is to say: Ibn 'Askar is a plausible PCL, but not a definite one.

The wordings of these three reports are very similar, but there are some variants: Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā's version adds two words (*'anna* and *sinīn*) that are absent in the other two, and changes the syntax accordingly; al-Ṭabarānī's version has *rasūl allāh* and *ibnah*, where the other two have *al-nabiyy* and *bint*; Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā's version is missing the word *'ilay-hi* and the entire element of the Prophet dying when 'Ā'iṣah was eighteen, both of which are present in the other two; and al-Ṭabarānī's version lacks the 'dolls' element (present in the other two). Finally (and most dramatically), the entire narrative in al-Ṭabarānī's version has been recast in the first person: *tazawwaja-hā* has become *tazawwaja-nī*, *zuffat* has become *zufiftu*, and every *hiya* has become

⁵⁶⁹ 'Aḥmad b. 'abī 'Āṣim b. 'Amr (ed. Bāsil Fayṣal 'Aḥmad al-Jawābirah), *al-'Āḥād wa-al-Maṭānī*, vol. 5 (Riyad, KSA: Dār al-Rāyah, 1991), p. 399, # 3028.

⁵⁷⁰ Sulaymān b. 'Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī (ed. Ḥamdī 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, vol. 23 (Cairo, Egypt: Maktabat Ibn Taymiyyah, n. d.), pp. 20-21, # 44.

ʿanā. Given that the other two transmissions both refer to *ʿĀʾiṣḥā* in the third person, it seems probable that al-Ṭabarānī, al-Ḥaḍramī, or some now-suppressed tradent reworded the hadith from *ʿĀʾiṣḥā*’s perspective (and dropped the ‘dolls’ element in the process), transforming a story about *ʿĀʾiṣḥā* into a direct quotation from her. (That the third-person perspective is more archaic is also supported by the Criterion of Dissimilarity, since a direct quotation or memory from *ʿĀʾiṣḥā* would be more prestigious and powerful.) Al-Ṭabarānī’s version also includes Hišām b. ʿUrwah in the *ʾisnād*, where the other two only have al-Zuhrī; although ʿAbd al-Razzāq himself probably included Hišām in one of the *ʾisnāds* for this hadith originally (see below), Ibn ʿAskar’s version probably omitted him, since he is absent in both Ibn ʾabī al-Dunyā and Ibn ʾabī ʿĀṣim’s transmissions from Ibn ʿAskar. In other words, al-Ṭabarānī, al-Ḥaḍramī, or some now-suppressed tradent evidently added Hišām back into the *ʾisnād* of their version, presumably due to contamination from alternative transmissions from ʿAbd al-Razzāq that retained Hišām.

Despite all of this, the wordings of these three versions—when they have corresponding elements—are still extremely similar, yielding the following urtext from Ibn ʿAskar:

ḥaddaṭa-nā ʿabd^u al-razzāqⁱ [ḥaddaṭa/ʾakbara]-nā maʿmar^{un} ʿanⁱ al-zuhriyyⁱ ʿan ʿurwat^a ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-hā al-nabiyy^u wa-hiya bint^u sab^{ʿi} sinīn^a wa-zuffat ʾilay-hi wa-hiya bint^u tis^{ʿin} wa-luʿabu-hā maʿa-hā wa-māta wa-hiya bint^u ṭamānⁱ ʿašrat^a.

The near-verbatim preservation of the wording in the three extant versions is consistent with the hadith’s having been transmitted in writing from Ibn ʿAskar to his students, which makes it plausible that the omission of elements (in two of these versions) and transformation of the narrator’s point of view (in one of these versions) was deliberate, rather than the product of sloppy paraphrasing (i.e., in the course of oral transmission).

Hārūn b. ʾIṣḥāq (d. 250/864-865)

I have collated three reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent Hārūn b. 'Ishāq (situated within the broader 'Abdah b. Sulaymān sub-tradition), recorded by Ibn al-Jārūd, Ibn 'abī Dāwūd, and 'Abū Nu'aym.

Ibn al-Jārūd (d. 307/919-920)

Hārūn b. 'Ishāq—'Abdah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁵⁷¹

Ibn 'abī Dāwūd (d. 316/929)

Muḥammad & Hārūn—'Abdah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁵⁷²

'Abū Nu'aym (d. 430/1038)

'Abū Muḥammad b. Ḥayyān—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḥasan—Hārūn b. 'Ishāq—'Abdah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁵⁷³

'Abū Nu'aym's version is actually equipped with multiple *'isnāds*, but since he specifies at the end that the wording thereof (*lafẓ*) is 'Abdah's, the others can be disregarded. Ibn 'abī Dāwūd's *'isnād* for his version gives two intermediaries between 'Abdah and himself: Hārūn, and the Kufo-Egyptian tradent Muḥammad b. Sawwār b. Rāšid. Given that Ibn 'abī Dāwūd and 'Abū Nu'aym's versions of this hadith are more similar to each other than they are to the rest,⁵⁷⁴ and given that both cite Hārūn as their source, it seems probable that Hārūn is the actual source for the wording of Ibn 'abī Dāwūd's version as well, not Muḥammad b. Sawwār. Maybe Muḥammad transmitted exactly the same text, or perhaps something vaguely similar—or maybe his name was simply added by Ibn 'abī Dāwūd into the *'isnād*. Without more versions, there is no way to tell.

⁵⁷¹ 'Abd Allāh b. 'Alī b. al-Jārūd al-Naysābūrī (ed. 'Abū 'Ishāq al-Ḥawaynī al-'Aṭarī), *Kitāb Ġawṭ al-Makdūd bi-Taḥrīj Muntaqā Ibn al-Jārūd*, vol. 3 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabiyy, 1988), p. 44, # 711.

⁵⁷² 'Abd Allāh b. 'abī Dāwūd Sulaymān al-Sijistānī (ed. 'Abd al-Ġafūr 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Ḥusayn), *Musnad 'Ā'iṣah* (Kuwait: Maktabat Dār al-'Aqṣā, 1985), p. 74, # 56.

⁵⁷³ 'Abū Nu'aym (ed. Šāfi'ī), *al-Musnad al-Mustakraj*, IV, p. 87, # 3311.

⁵⁷⁴ In addition to sharing an identical medial element (*wa-daḳala bī wa-'anā ibnat tis' sinīn*), these two versions share the long 'dolls' element (including the part about 'Ā'iṣah's shy friends), to the exclusion of all the rest.

In light of this, however, there is a problem with Ibn al-Jārūd's version: he lacks the 'dolls' element that is present in the other two, which is consistent with an omission on his part. More importantly, the *matn* of his version is completely identical to al-Ṭabarānī's transmission from 'Abdah, despite the fact that al-Ṭabarānī (Tiberian, settled in Isfahan, d. 360/971) claimed therefor a different *'isnād*: Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī (Kufan, d. 297/909), from Hannād b. al-Sarī (Kufan, d. 243/857), from 'Abdah (Kufan, d. 187-188/803-804).⁵⁷⁵ Given that every other transmission from 'Abdah exhibits at least small variations in wording, and given that the alleged transmission of this version from 'Abdah unto al-Ṭabarānī would have occurred over the course of nearly a century, it seems unlikely that both Ibn al-Jārūd and al-Ṭabarānī would preserve *exactly the same wording* in their transmission from 'Abdah. Instead, the reasonable explanation for such a precise match is that both versions derive from a more recent common ancestor than 'Abdah, or one derived directly from the other.

The question then becomes: who is responsible for the wording of the *matn*, and who borrowed from whom? In light of the two (mutually-corroborating) transmissions preserved by Ibn 'abī Dāwūd and 'Abū Nu'aym from Hārūn, Ibn al-Jārūd (rather than his alleged source Hārūn) is probably responsible for the wording of his own version, unless he borrowed it from somebody else. And, since the *matns* of Ibn al-Jārūd and al-Ṭabarānī's versions are *identical*, the transmission or borrowing there-between likely occurred in writing: either Ibn al-Jārūd copied in writing from Hannād or al-Ḥaḍramī, or al-Ḥaḍramī or al-Ṭabarānī copied in writing from Ibn al-Jārūd, or both Ibn al-Jārūd and someone in al-Ṭabarānī's *'isnād* copied from some now-suppressed source in writing. Given that al-Ṭabarānī's version is attested later than Ibn al-Jārūd's, the simplest solution is that the al-Ṭabarānī himself copied the other's *matn* from his book—no doubt encountered during his travels far and wide—and supplied it with an alternative *'isnād* all the way back to 'Abdah. Moreover, the fact that the borrowing likely occurred in writing makes it more likely that the change was intentional (though not necessarily mendacious). Of course, the possibility of contamination or error cannot be discounted.

⁵⁷⁵ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 21, # 48.

Despite all of that, a fairly uniform urtext can be discerned from the available versions, which plausibly derives from the PCL Hārūn (being more similar to each other than to the other transmissions from ‘Abdah):

ḥaddatā-nā ‘abdat^u ‘an hišāmⁱⁿ ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-‘anā [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-daḡala bī wa-‘anā ibnat^u tisⁱ sinīn^a [w/f]a-kuntu ‘al‘abu bi-al-banātⁱ [w/f]a-kunna ṣawāḡibī ya’tīnā-nī [fa-]yanqami’na min rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ fa-kāna rasūl^u allāhⁱ [yudḡilu-hunna/yadkalu] ‘alayya.

Given the close correspondence between Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd and ‘Abū Nu‘aym’s versions, and the fact that the handful of differences between them are consistent with scribal errors,⁵⁷⁶ it seems clear that the transmission of this hadith from Hārūn to students occurred in writing or involved written preservation.

Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá al-‘Umawī (d. 249/863)

I have collated six reports ascribed to the Baghdadian tradent Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá al-‘Umawī (situated within the broader tradition of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr), five of which appear to be abridgements: the version recorded by al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī focuses on ‘Ā’iṣah and only comprises the opening element, a fragment of the second element, part of the third element, and two small medial elements; the first version recorded by al-Ṭabarānī also focuses on ‘Ā’iṣah and comprises the first three elements and two medial elements; the second version recorded by al-Ṭabarānī focuses on Sawdah and only comprises part of the first element and the medial elements related to Sawdah; the version recorded by Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim focuses on Sawdah in exactly the same way; and the version recorded by Hišām b. ‘Ammār only comprises the final elements, focusing on ‘Ā’iṣah. Fortuitously, a full version of the hadith is recorded by al-Ṭabarī, which is corroborated in each section by at least one of the abridged versions, such that every part of the hadith is attested at least thrice (save one medial element).

⁵⁷⁶ These amount to: a gloss (*ta’nī al-lu‘aba* in ‘Abū Nu‘aym’s version, for which ‘Abū Nu‘aym, ‘Abū Muḥammad, or ‘Abd al-Raḥmān is probably responsible); a single variant word (Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd has *ibnah* where ‘Abū Nu‘aym has *bint*); a single added or omitted pronoun (‘Abū Nu‘aym has *hunna*); two variant particles (Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd has *fa-* where ‘Abū Nu‘aym has *wa-*, and Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd has *wa-* where ‘Abū Nu‘aym has *fa-*); and a single added or omitted particle (Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd has *fa-*).

Hišām b. ‘Ammār (d. 245/860)

Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six; Hīrah; men and women gather in the house; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation in the house; no camel or sheep; age nine; Sa‘d brings food.⁵⁷⁷

Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim (d. 287/900)

Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá—Yaḥyá b. Sa‘īd—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah goes to Sawdah and talks to her; Ḳawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.⁵⁷⁸

al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)

Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá—Yaḥyá b. Sa‘īd—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ‘Umm Rūmān and waits for ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ‘Abū Bakr departs; ‘Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ‘im’s son; ‘Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ‘im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ‘Abū Bakr’s relief; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; ‘Ā’iṣah is six; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah and talks to her; then Ḳawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Hīrah; men and women gather in the house; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation in the house; no camel or sheep; age nine; Sa‘d brings food.⁵⁷⁹

⁵⁷⁷ Hišām b. ‘Ammār al-Dimašqī (ed. ‘Abd Allāh b. Wakīl), *Ḥadīth Hišām bn ‘Ammār* (Riyadh, KSA: Dār ‘Iṣbiyyā, 1999), p. 242, # 123.

⁵⁷⁸ Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim (ed. Jawābirah), *‘Āḥād*, V, pp. 413-414, # 3061.

⁵⁷⁹ Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (ed. Michael J. de Goeje and reviewed by Pieter de Jong), *Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari, Volume 4* (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1890), pp. 1767-1770.

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. ʿAbdūs b. Kāmil al-Sarrāj—Saʿīd b. Yaḥyá—Yaḥyá b. Saʿīd—Muḥammad b. ʿAmr—Yaḥyá—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ʿĀʾiṣah and Sawdah; Kawlah brings word to ʿUmm Rūmān and waits for ʾAbū Bakr; ʾAbū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ʾAbū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ʿĀʾiṣah to him; ʿĀʾiṣah is six.⁵⁸⁰

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. ʿAbdūs b. Kāmil al-Sarrāj—Saʿīd b. Yaḥyá—Yaḥyá b. Saʿīd—Muḥammad b. ʿAmr—Yaḥyá—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ʿĀʾiṣah and Sawdah; Kawlah goes to Sawdah and talks to her; Kawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah's father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah's brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.⁵⁸¹

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

Maḳlad b. Jaʿfar al-Bāqarḥī—Muḥammad b. Ḥarb—Saʿīd b. Yaḥyá—Yaḥyá b. Saʿīd—Muḥammad b. ʿAmr—Yaḥyá—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ʿĀʾiṣah and Sawdah; Kawlah goes to ʾAbū Bakr; ʾAbū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ʿĀʾiṣah to him; ʿĀʾiṣah is seven.⁵⁸²

When abridgements are accounted for, these texts are largely identical. Still, there are numerous textual variations between them, such as the usual additional, missing, or variant conjunctions, prepositions, pronouns, and so on, and also a few additional or

⁵⁸⁰ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, pp. 23-24, # 57.

⁵⁸¹ *Ibid.*, XXIV, pp. 30-31, # 80.

⁵⁸² Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, III, pp. 442-443, # 2742.

omitted words of substance.⁵⁸³ There are also quite a few instances of paraphrasing,⁵⁸⁴ and quite a few outright mistakes and misspellings as well.⁵⁸⁵ All of the extant versions are plagued by confused narrator perspectives, which is likely due to the length of the report: at some point in their memorisation, writing, or copying of this lengthy hadith, a transmitter forgot what was happening or who was speaking in the story—usually towards the middle or the end. This usually occurs when either Ẓawlah or ‘Ā’iṣah suddenly begins narrating the story, although the point at which this occurs—the point at which confusion arose and errors obtained—varies from one version to the next.

In Hišām’s abridged version, Yaḥyá is ostensibly the narrator, and ‘Ā’iṣah is referred to by the narrator at the outset in the third person (*qāla nakaḥa rasūl allāh ‘ā’iṣah*, “he said: “The Messenger of God married ‘Ā’iṣah”). And yet, a few words later, without any warning, the narrator abruptly becomes ‘Ā’iṣah, describing her marriage in the first person (*fa-qadimnā al-madīnah*, “then **we** came to al-Madīnah”). The narrator remains ‘Ā’iṣah until the end of the report (*wa-’anā yawma-’idīn bint tis‘ sinīn*, “and **I** was at that time a girl of nine years”). In light of this, it seems probable that Hišām’s version was

⁵⁸³ Hišām lacks *ḥaddaṭa-n[ā/ī]* ‘abī in his *’isnād*, present in every other version; Hišām has a unique introduction to his abridgement, *nakaḥa rasūl allāh ‘ā’iṣah*, absent in every other version; Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim and Ṭabarānī (# 80) lack *bn ‘umayyah*; Ṭabarānī (both versions) lacks *bn qays*; Ṭabarānī (# 57) lacks *qālat wa-mā dāka qālat* (present in Ṭabarī); Ṭabarī has *yurjaḥu bī*, absent in Hišām; Ṭabarī has *fa-ḥarajū*, absent in Hišām.

⁵⁸⁴ Ṭabarī has *qālat la-hu dālika*, Ṭabarānī (# 57) has *dakarāt dālika la-hu*; Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim has *wadidtu ‘annī ‘adkulu ‘alā ‘abī fa-’adkuru dāka la-hu*, where Ṭabarī has *wadidtu udkulī ‘alā ‘abī fa-udkurī dāka la-hu*, such that Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim has turned two imperatives (by Sawdah to Ẓawlah) into two first-person expressions of Sawdah’s own intention, adding *’annī* in the process; Ṭabarī has *du’iyat* (passive), Ṭabarānī (# 80) has *da’awtu* (active); Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim has *yaḥsunu*, where Ṭabarī and Ṭabarānī (# 80) have *tuḥibbīna*; Hišām has *nazalnā fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-ḥazraj fī al-sunḥ*, Ṭabarī has *nazala ‘abū bakr al-sunḥ fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-ḥazraj*; Hišām has *rijāl wa-nisā’ min al-’anṣār*, Ṭabarī has *rijāl min al-’anṣār wa-nisā’*; Hišām has *ṭumma faraqat jummaḥ ‘alayya*, Ṭabarī has *ṭumma waffat jumaymah kānat lī*; Hišām has *daḥalat bī ‘alā rasūl allāh wa-huwa jālis ‘alā sarīri-hi*, Ṭabarī has *’udkiltu wa-rasūl allāh jālis ‘alā sarīr fī bayti-nā*; Hišām has *fī bayti-nā dālika*, Ṭabarī has *fī baytī*; Hišām has *bint*, Ṭabarī has *ibnah*.

⁵⁸⁵ Where everyone else has *hiya*, Ṭabarānī (# 57) has *’anā*, which even contradicts his own version (in which ‘Umm Rūmān is earlier called “the mother of ‘Ā’iṣah” by the story’s narrator, which clearly indicates that ‘Ā’iṣah is not in fact the narrator); where everyone else has *sitt*, Ḥākim has *sab‘*; where Ṭabarī and Ṭabarānī (# 80) have *qultu*, Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim has *qālat* (which also forces *ḥarajtu* and *daḥaltu* to be reinterpreted as *ḥarajat* and *daḥalat*, for Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim’s version to make sense); where Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim and Ṭabarī have *qultu*, Ṭabarānī (# 80) has *qālat* where (despite the subject speaking in the first person a few words earlier, even in Ṭabarānī’s own version); where Ṭabarī and Ṭabarānī (# 80) have *id’ī*, Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim has *ud’u*, despite the object of the command being a woman (Ẓawlah); Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim has *da’at*, despite the subject (Ẓawlah) speaking in the first person a few lines earlier (*ḥayyaytu* and *qultu*), without any intervening explicit change in narrator; where Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim and Ṭabarī have *za’amat*, Ṭabarānī (# 80) has *rafa’at* (an obvious distortion of the *rasm*); where Hišām has *’adqayn* (“two palm-trees”), Ṭabarī has *’irqayn* (“two bunches of grapes”, an obvious distortion of the *rasm*); where Ṭabarī (and most other versions of this element) has *dubīḥat* (feminine), Hišām has *dubīḥa* (masculine), despite the deputy subject being *ṣāḥ* (feminine).

originally explicitly ascribed to ‘Ā’iṣah, and that her absence from the *’isnād* is a rare mistake.⁵⁸⁶

In Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim’s abridged version, ‘Ā’iṣah is ostensibly the narrator at the outset (*‘an ‘ā’iṣah qālat*, “from ‘Ā’iṣah, who said”), describing Ḳawlah and her statements in the third person (*qālat*, etc.). A *qālat* announces Ḳawlah as the narrator, for Ḳawlah then begins to narrate the hadith (*fa-daḳaltu ‘alay-hi fa-ḥayyaytu-hu*, “then I entered upon him and greeted him”, and *qultu*, “I said”), which is all fine and good—but only two lines later, without any warning, Ḳawlah is suddenly being referred to by the narrator in the third person again (*qālat*, “**she** said”, and *da‘at-hā*, “**she** summoned her”).

In al-Ṭabarī’s unabridged version, ‘Ā’iṣah is likewise ostensibly the narrator at the outset (*‘an ‘ā’iṣah qālat*, “from ‘Ā’iṣah, who said”), describing Ḳawlah and her statements in the third person (*qālat*, *jā’at*, *daḳalat*, etc.). A *qālat* later announces Ḳawlah as the narrator, and Ḳawlah begins to describe the events from a first-person perspective (*karajtu fa-daḳaltu ‘alā sawdah fa-qultu*, “I departed and entered upon Sawdah, then I said”)—again, so far so good. The problem arises two lines later, when Ḳawlah’s speech is introduced by a *qālat*, as if she is suddenly being described and quoted by the narrator again, rather than narrating the discussion herself. Another *qālat* is added soon after by the narrator (which might be meant to signify that Ḳawlah is again the one reporting the conversion, and Sawdah’s words in particular), and another after that, clearly introducing the reappearance of Ḳawlah as the narrator (*daḳaltu*, *ḥayyaytu*, *qultu*). This part makes sense. But without warning, in the middle of a back-and-forth between Ḳawlah and Sawdah’s father, Ḳawlah is abruptly reduced to being described and quoted by the narrator (*qālat*), despite beginning the discussion in the first person. Finally, ‘Ā’iṣah is explicitly reintroduced as the narrator in the final section of the hadith, but as quoted by a meta-narrator (*qāla qālat ‘ā’iṣah*), who may be Yaḥyá. Henceforth, the narrator-perspective is consistent, although the meta-narrator reintroduces ‘Ā’iṣah as the narrator after only one element, as if he is quoting two different statements from her in succession.

⁵⁸⁶ In other words, the Criterion of Dissimilarity does not apply here: this seems to be an instance where the *munqaṭi‘* state is simply the product of error. That the *’isnād* of this version is erroneous is also consistent with the absence of *ḥaddaṭa-n[ā/i]* ‘abī therein, despite being present in every other version.

Al-Ṭabarānī's first abridged version (the one focused on 'Ā'īṣah) begins the same way as al-Ṭabarī's: 'Ā'īṣah is the ostensible narrator, and Ḳawlah is described by the narrator. Halfway into the report, however, the narrator refers to 'Ā'īṣah in the third person (*wajadat 'umm rūmān 'umm 'ā'īṣah*, "she found 'Umm Rūmān, the mother of 'Ā'īṣah"). To compound the confusion, Ḳawlah is suddenly narrating in the first person (*raja'a-nī*, "he returned **me**") in the middle of the story, before abruptly reverting back to a character mentioned in the third person by the narrator, only two lines later (*'atat 'abā bakr fa-qāla li-ḳawlah*, "**she** came to 'Abū Bakr, then he said to **Ḳawlah**"). Finally, 'Ā'īṣah is again the narrator at the very end (*wa-'anā yawma-'īdin ibnat sitt sinīn*, "and **I** was at that time a girl of six years"), again without any warning.

In al-Ṭabarānī's second abridged version (the one focused on Sawdah), 'Ā'īṣah is again the ostensible narrator and Ḳawlah is again described and quoted in the third person (*qālat*). Unlike in the previous version, however, Ḳawlah suddenly becomes the narrator almost immediately (*karajtu, daḳaltu, qultu*). Just as abruptly, and only one line later, Ḳawlah is again being referred to in the third person by the narrator (*qālat*). The reader begins to experience whiplash as Ḳawlah again becomes the narrator without any warning (*qultu, daḳaltu, ḥayyaytu*)—again, only one line later. But the rollercoaster is not over yet: only one line later, *again*, Ḳawlah abruptly becomes someone being described and quoted by the narrator (*qālat*); and only one line after *that*, Ḳawlah reverts to being the narrator (*da'awtu-hā*, "**I** summoned her").

Finally, in al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī's abridged version (which focuses on 'Ā'īṣah), 'Ā'īṣah is once again the ostensible narrator at the outset, despite being referred to in the final element in the third person (*wa-hiya yawma-'īdin ibnat sab' sinīn*, "and **she** was at that time a girl of seven years").

It has been argued that abrupt shifts in narrator-perspective—such as those that occasionally occur in the Quran—are actually a deliberate rhetorical device in early Arabic, known as *iltifāt*. This may be so. But since the different versions of this hadith frequently disagree on when 'Ā'īṣah and Ḳawlah are the narrators and when they are simply being described and quoted by the narrator, it seems probable that such incoherence is simply the result of the transmitters of these different versions all independently or synchronously erring or becoming confused, each in different places. This is understandable, since the hadith is quite long (as hadiths go).

And yet, despite all of this, the different versions of this hadith are largely identical (when abridgements are accounted for), yielding the following urtext:

ḥaddaṭa-n[ā/ī] 'abī [[**an muḥammadī bnī**]/[ḥaddaṭa-nā muḥammad^u bn^u]] 'amrⁱw bnī 'alqamata^a 'an yaḥyá bnī 'abdi al-raḥmānī bnī ḥāṭibⁱⁿ 'an 'ā'īṣat^a qālat lammā tuwuffiyat ḡadījat^u qālat ḡawlat^u bint^u ḥakīmī bnī 'umayyat^a bnī al-'awqasī imra'at^u 'uṭmān^a bnī maḡ'ūnⁱⁿ wa-ḡālika bi-makkat^a 'ay rasūl^a allāhī 'a-lā tuzawwija qāla wa-man qālat 'in šī'ta bikr^{an} wa-'in šī'ta ṭayyib^{an} qāla fa-manī al-bikr^u qālat ibnat^u 'aḥabbī ḡalqī allāhī 'ilay-ka 'ā'īṣat^u bint^u 'abī bakrⁱⁿ qāla wa-manī al-ṭayyib^u qālat sawdat^u bint^u zam'at^a bnī qaysⁱⁿ qad 'āmanat bi-ka wa-ittaba'at-ka 'alā mā 'anta 'alay-hi qāla fa-idḡhabī fa-udḡkurī-himā 'alayya fa-jā'at fa-daḡalat bayt^a 'abī bakrⁱⁿ fa-wajadat 'umm^a rūmān^a 'umm^a 'ā'īṣat^a fa-qālat [**'ay/yā**] 'umm^a rūmān^a māḡā 'adḡala allāh^u 'alay-kum min^a al-ḡayrī wa-al-barakatī [**qālat wa-mā ḡāka qālat**] 'arsala-nī rasūl^u allāhī 'aḡṭubu [**'alay-hi**] 'ā'īṣat^a qālat wadidtu intaḡirī 'abā bakrⁱⁿ fa-'inna-hu 'ātⁱⁿ fa-jā'a 'abū bakrⁱⁿ fa-qālat yā 'abā bakrⁱⁿ māḡā 'adḡala allāh^u 'alay-[**ka/kum**] min^a al-ḡayrī wa-al-barakatī 'arsala-nī rasūl^u allāhī 'aḡṭubu 'alay-hi 'ā'īṣat^a qāla [**wa-**]hal taṣluḡu la-hu [**wa-**]inna-mā hiya [**bint^u/ibnat^u**] 'aḡī-hi fa-raja'a[**t/-nī**] 'ilā rasūlī allāhī fa-[[**ḡakarāt ḡālika la-hu**]/[**qālat la-hu ḡālika**]] fa-qāla irja'ī 'ilay-hi fa-ḡulī la-hu 'anta 'aḡī fī al-'islāmī wa-'anā 'aḡū-ka wa-ibnatu-ka taṣluḡu lī fa-'atat 'abā bakrⁱⁿ [**fa-ḡakarāt ḡālika la-hu fa-qāla intaḡirī-nī ḡattā 'arjī'a fa-qālat 'umm^u rūmān^a 'inna al-muṭ'im^a bn^a 'adiyyⁱⁿ kāna ḡakara-hā 'alā ibni-hi wa-lā wa-allāhī mā wa'ada šay'an qatṭu fa-'aḡlafa fa-daḡala 'abū bakrⁱⁿ 'alā muṭ'imⁱⁿ wa-'inda-hu imra'atu-hu 'umm^u ibni-hi allaḡī kāna ḡakara-hā 'alay-hi fa-qālat al-'ajūz^u yā ibn^a 'abī ḡuḡāfat^a la'allā-nā 'in zawwajnā ibnā-nā ibnata-ka 'an tuṣbī'a-hu wa-tuḡkila-hu fī ḡīnī-ka allaḡī 'anta 'alay-hi fa-'aqbala 'alā zawjī-hā al-muṭ'imī fa-qāla mā taḡulu ḡāḡihī fa-qāla fa-'inna-hā taḡulu ḡāka qāla fa-ḡaraja 'abū bakrⁱⁿ wa-qad 'aḡhaba allāh^u al-'idat^a allatī kānat fī nafsī-hi min 'idatī-hi allatī wa'ada-hā 'iyyā-hu] [**f/w**]a-qāla li-ḡawlat^a id'ī lī rasūl^a allāhī fa-da'at-hu fa-jā'a fa-'ankaḡa-hu [**wa-hiya yawma-'idⁱⁿ ibnat^u sittī sinīn^a**] fa-ḡarajtu fa-daḡaltu 'alā sawdat^a fa-qultu yā sawdat^u māḡā 'adḡala allāh^u 'alay-ki min^a al-ḡayrī wa-al-barakatī qālat wa-mā ḡāka qālat 'arsala-nī rasūl^u allāhī 'aḡṭubu-ki 'alay-hi fa-qālat wadidtu udḡulī 'alā 'abī fa-udḡkurī ḡāka la-hu qālat wa-huwa šayḡ^{un} kabīr^{un} qad taḡallafa 'anī al-ḡajjī fa-daḡaltu 'alay-hi fa-ḡayyaytu-hu bi-taḡiyyatī 'ahlī al-jāḡiliyyatī ṭumma qultu 'inna muḡammad^a bn^a 'abdi allāhī bnī 'abdi al-muṭṭalibī 'arsala-nī 'aḡṭubu 'alay-hi sawdat^a qāla kuḡ^{un} karīm^{un} fa-māḡā taḡulu ṣāḡibatū-ki qālat tuḡibbu ḡālika qāla fa-id'ī-hā 'ilayya fa-[**da'at-hā/da'awtu-hā/du'iyat la-hu**] fa-qāla 'ay sawdat^u za'amat ḡāḡihī 'anna muḡammad^a bn^a 'abdi allāhī bnī 'abdi al-muṭṭalibī 'arsala yaḡṭubu-ki wa-huwa kuḡ^{un} karīm^{un} 'a-fa-tuḡibbīna 'an 'uzawwija-ki-hu qālat na'am qāla id'ī-hi lī fa-[**da'at/da'awtu**]-hu fa-jā'a fa-zawwaja-hu fa-jā'a 'aḡū-hā min^a al-ḡajjī 'abd^u bn^u zam'at^a fa-ja'ala yaḡṭū fī ra'sī-hi al-turāb^a fa-qāla ba'd^a 'an 'aslama 'innī la-safīḡ^{un} yawm^a 'aḡṭū fī ra'sī al-turāb^a 'an tazawwaja rasūl^u allāhī sawdat^a bint^a zam'at^a [**qāla qālat 'ā'īṣat^u**] fa-ḡadīmṡā al-maḡīnat^a fa-nazala[nā] [**'abū bakrⁱⁿ**] [[**al-sunḡ^a fī banī al-hāritⁱ bnī al-kazrajī**]/[**fī banī al-hāritⁱ bnī al-kazrajī fī al-sunḡⁱ**]] qāla[t] fa-jā'a rasūl^u allāhī fa-**

daḡala bayta-nā fa-ijtima'a 'ilay-hi rijāl^{un} [[min^a al-'anṣārⁱ wa-nisā'^{un}]/[wa-nisā'^{un} min^a al-'anṣārⁱ]] fa-jā'at-nī 'ummī wa-'anā [fi/'alā] 'urjūhatⁱⁿ bayn^a ['irḡaynⁱ/'adḡaynⁱ] [yurjaḡu bī] fa-'anzalat-nī tumma [[waffat jumaymat^{an} kānat lī]/[faraḡat jummat^{an} 'alayya]] wa-masaḡat wajhī bi-ṣay'ⁱⁿ min mā'ⁱⁿ tumma 'aqbalat taḡūdu-nī ḡattá ['idā] kuntu 'indā al-bābⁱ waqafat [bī] ḡattá ḡahaba ba'ḡ^u nafasī tumma [[udḡiltu wa-rasūl^u allāhⁱ]/[daḡalat bī 'alā rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-huwa]] jālis^{un} 'alā sarīr[[i-hi]/[in fī bayti-nā qālat]] fa-'ajlasa[t]-nī fī ḡijri-hi fa-qālat ḡā'ulā'i 'ahlu-ki fa-bāraka allāh^u la-ki fī-hinna wa-bāraka la-hunna fī-ka wa-waḡaba al-qawm^u wa-al-nisā'^u [fa-ḡarajū] fa-banā bī rasūl^u allāhⁱ fī bayt[i/i-nā ḡālika] mā nuḡirat ['alayya] jazūr^{un} wa-lā ḡubiḡa[t] 'alayya ṣāt^{un} wa-'anā yawma-'idⁱⁿ [bint^u/ibnat^u] tis^q sinīnā ḡattá 'arsala 'ilay-nā sa'ḡ^u bn^u 'ubādat^a bi-jafnatⁱⁿ kāna yursilu bi-hā 'ilā rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ.

Can this urtext (with the caveat that the middle section is poorly attested) be attributed to Sa'īd b. Yaḡyá al-'Umawī, the putative PCL therefor according to all of the relevant *'isnāds*? It seems likely: on the whole, all of the versions of this hadith (whence the urtext was derived) are more similar to each other than they are to the other versions of the broader tradition of Muḡammad b. 'Amr.⁵⁸⁷ In other words, they constitute a distinctive sub-tradition, which is consistent with Sa'īd's redaction's having been preserved, broadly speaking.

Interestingly, there is evidence that Sa'īd himself sometimes transmitted this hadith in an abridged form. Consider the following:

Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim (d. 287/900)

Sa'īd b. Yaḡyá—Yaḡyá b. Sa'īd—Muḡammad b. 'Amr—Yaḡyá—'Ā'iṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to 'Ā'iṣah and Sawdah; Kawlah goes to Sawdah and talks to her; Kawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah's father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah's brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.⁵⁸⁸

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

⁵⁸⁷ This is true in terms of broad elemental outline, but also with specific wordings. For example, all of the transmissions from Sa'īd have *tuwuffiya*, where those from Biṣr have *halakat* and those from 'Aḡmad have *māta*; and Sa'īd's all have *'ankaḡa-hā*, where Biṣr's have *zawwaja-hā* and 'Aḡmad's have *malaka-hā*.

⁵⁸⁸ Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim (ed. Jawābirah), *'Āḡād*, V, pp. 413-414, # 3061.

Muḥammad b. ‘Abdūs b. Kāmil al-Sarrāj—Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá—Yaḥyá b. Sa‘īd—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Kawlah goes to Sawdah and talks to her; Kawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.⁵⁸⁹

Both of these transmissions from Sa‘īd, recorded by Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim and al-Ṭabarānī, are abridged in exactly the same way: in addition to including and excluding exactly the same elements, they redact the wording of the first element in exactly the same way, cutting out the same part about ‘Ā’iṣah down to a word. Since it is extremely unlikely that both Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim and al-Ṭabarānī—Ibn ‘Abdūs received the same hadith and then abridged it in exactly the same way independently, a simple explanation for this pattern would be that Sa‘īd sometimes transmitted his hadith in this abridged fashion.

Abridgements aside, this hadith as a whole was transmitted fairly accurately from Sa‘īd: most of the wording of most of elements are identical, as was noted already. This is indicative of mostly written transmission, as are the various mistakes and misspellings scattered throughout—these are consistent with being scribal errors. That said, there are still many instances of paraphrasing between the extant versions, which suggests a lingering oral component in the transmission.

‘Ishāq b. Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Mervian tradent ‘Ishāq b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanḍalī (better known as Ibn Rāhwayh), recorded by Ibn Qutaybah and al-Dīnawarī.

Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276/889)

‘Ishāq b. Rāhwayh—Yaḥyá b. ‘Ādam—al-Ḥasan:

⁵⁸⁹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIV, pp. 30-31, # 80.

He saw a twenty-one-year-old grandmother; the minimum age of pregnancy is nine;
 ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage was consummated at nine.⁵⁹⁰

al-Dīnawarī (d. post-330/941-942)

’Aḥmad—’Aḥmad b. Muḥammad—’Iṣḥāq b. ’Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanẓalī—Yaḥyá b. ’Ādam—al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy:

He saw a twenty-one-year-old grandmother; the minimum age of pregnancy is nine;
 ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage was was consummated at nine.⁵⁹¹

There are several differences between these two reports, but most are minor additions, omissions, and substitutions and do not affect the meaning.⁵⁹² The only potentially significant variant is the following: Ibn Qutaybah names the source and narrator of the hadith as al-Ḥasan, where al-Dīnawarī specifies him to be al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy. The ambiguous citation in the former could lead one to mistakenly believe that the source and narrator of the hadith is the prominent Basran Qadarī Follower al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728), rather than the prominent Kufan Zaydī theologian and traditionist al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ b. Ḥayy (d. 169/785-786).⁵⁹³

Differences aside, these two reports are largely identical, and are moreover much more similar to each other than they are to any other version of the marital-age hadith. As such, they clearly embody a distinctive tradition, which is consistent with their reflecting in common the underlying redaction of their cited source, Ibn Rāhwayh. Consequently, Ibn Rāhwayh is likely a genuine PCL, to whom the following urtext can be attributed:

[’aḳbara]-nā yaḥyá bn^u ’ādam^a ’anⁱ al-ḥasanⁱ [bnⁱ ḥayyⁱⁿ] qāla ra’aytu jaddat^{an} [ibnat/bint]^a ’iḥdā wa-’iṣrīn^a sanat^{an} qāla wa-’aqall^u ’awqātⁱ [al-]ḥamlⁱ [al-mar’atⁱ] tis^{’u} sinīn^a wa-huwa ’awwal^u [waqt/’awqāt]ⁱ al-waṭ^{’i} wa-daḳala rasūl^u allāhⁱ bi-’ā’iṣat^a wa-hiya bint^u tis^{’i[n]} sinīn^a.

⁵⁹⁰ ‘Abd Allāh b. Muslim b. Qutaybah al-Dīnawarī, *Kitāb ‘Uyūn al-’Aḳbār*, part 4 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabiyy, n. d.), p. 66.

⁵⁹¹ ’Aḥmad b. Marwān al-Dīnawarī (ed. Maṣḥūr b. Ḥasan ’Āl Salmān), *al-Mujālasah wa-Jawāhir al-’Ilm*, vol. 3 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1998), p. 518, # 1133.

⁵⁹² I.Q. has Ibn Rāhwayh say ’aḳbara-nā, where D. has him say [haddaṭa]-nā; I.Q. has ibnah, where D. has bint; I.Q. has ḥaml al-mar’ah, where D. has al-ḥaml; I.Q. has waqt, where D. has ’awqāt; and D. adds sinīn.

⁵⁹³ Suleiman Ali Mourad, *Early Islam Between Myth and History: Al-Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī (d. 110H/728CE) and the Formation of His Legacy in Classical Islamic Scholarship* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2006), 76.

The uniformity of the two extant derivations from Ibn Rāhwayh's redaction is consistent with its having been transmitted in writing, or at least with the aid of written notes (allowing a minor element of paraphrasing), from Ibn Rāhwayh to his students. This is consistent with the predomination of written transmission in the relevant time-period (i.e., the early-to-mid 9th Century CE).

'Abū Kaytamah Zuhayr (d. 234/849)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Perso-Baghdadian tradent 'Abū Kaytamah Zuhayr b. Ḥarb (situated within the sub-tradition of Jarīr, which is nestled in turn within the broader tradition of Hišām b. 'Urwah), recorded by Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā and Ibn 'Abd al-Barr.

Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā (d. 281/894-895)

'Abū Kaytamah Zuhayr—Jarīr—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁵⁹⁴

Ibn 'Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071)

'Abd al-Wārith b. Sufyān—Qāsim b. 'Aṣbaḡ—'Aḥmad b. 'abī Kaytamah Zuhayr—'Abū Kaytamah Zuhayr—Jarīr—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁵⁹⁵

At first glance, these two ascriptions do not constitute a distinctive sub-tradition: Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā's version has an extra element (about dolls and shy friends), and even if that is put aside, the core marital-age elements therein are not strikingly more similar

⁵⁹⁴ Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā (ed. Ḳalaf), *Iyāl*, p. 756, # 559. Cf. 'Abū 'Awānah Ya'qūb b. 'Ishāq al-'Isfarāyīnī (ed. Muḥammad Makkī 'Aṭā' Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Mukarraj 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 11 (Madinah, KSA: al-Jāmi'ah al-'Islāmiyyah, 2014), pp. 384-385, # 4708, in which Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā's original ascription (to Hišām) has been replaced by another (to al-'A'māš), whether due to error or mendacity on the part of 'Abū 'Awānah.

⁵⁹⁵ Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Barr (ed. Sa'īd 'Aḥmad 'A'rāb), *al-Tamhīd li-mā fī al-Muwaṭṭa' min al-Ma'ānī wa-al-'Asānīd*, vol. 19 (Rabat, Morocco: Wizārat 'Umūm al-'Awqāf wa-al-Ṣū'ūn al-'Islāmiyyah, 1988), p. 108.

to each other than to those found in transmissions from other figures (such as Ḥammād b. Zayd, Sufyan b. ‘Uyaynah, and Wakī‘ b. al-Jarrāh).⁵⁹⁶ Still, this core in the two ascriptions is extremely similar: both have ‘Ā’iṣah speaking in the first person; both have *tazawwaja-nī rasūl allāh*; both have *sab‘ sinīn* (although one version is uncertain and adds *sitt* as well); both have *baná bī*; and both have *tis‘ sinīn*. It is thus still *plausible* that these two hadiths reflect ‘Abū Ḳayṭamah Zuhayr’s redaction, even if such an attribution is not certain (as it would be if they shared a distinctive or unique wording *vis-à-vis* all other versions of the marital-age hadith). However, if this is indeed the case, then Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā would seem to have contaminated or interpolated his version with an element that is absent not just from Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s alternative transmission from ‘Abū Ḳayṭamah Zuhayr, but from Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd’s alternative transmission from Jarīr.

Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā’s addition aside, there are still a few differences between these two ascriptions: Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā depicts ‘Abū Ḳayṭamah as merely citing Jarīr on Hišām’s authority (*ḥaddaṭa-nā jarīr ‘an hišām*), whereas Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr has Jarīr being quoted verbatim (*ḥaddaṭa-nā jarīr qāla ‘akbara-nā hišām*); Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā simply has *sab‘ sinīn*, where Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr has an uncertain *sitt ‘aw sab‘ sinīn*; and in two places where Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā has *bint*, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr has *ibnah*. Despite this, an approximate redaction attributable to ‘Abū Ḳayṭamah can still be outlined:

ḥaddaṭa-nā jarīr^{un} [[qāla ‘akbara-nā]/[‘an]] hišām^[u/i] bn^[u/i] ‘urwata^a ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat *tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-‘anā [ibnat/bint]^u [sittⁱ ‘aw] sab^{‘i} sinīn^a wa-banā bī wa-‘anā [ibnat/bint]^u tis^{‘i} sinīn^a.*

If indeed ‘Abū Ḳayṭamah transmitted this hadith (which is at least plausible), he may have transmitted it to his students orally or in writing: on the one hand, the fuzziness around *sitt ‘aw sab‘* could be the product of sloppy memorisation; but on the other hand, if the two significant variants were deliberate (i.e., a transmitter of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s version rephrased the *‘isnād* to have Hišām quoted verbatim, whilst Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā eliminated the uncertainty over *sitt ‘aw sab‘* in his version), then the mere difference between *ibnah* and *bint* is consistent with scribal error, and thus written transmission.

⁵⁹⁶ See the relevant sections.

On a final point, the ‘dolls’ element appended to Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā’s version appears elsewhere as a stand-alone transmission from Jarīr.⁵⁹⁷ This is consistent with Jarīr’s having transmitted two separate hadiths from Hišām (one about ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage, and one about her playing with dolls with her friends), and with Ibn ‘abī al-Dunyā’s having combined the two in one instance.

Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá (d. 226/840-841)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Naysaburian tradent Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá al-Minqarī (within the broader sub-tradition(s) of the PCL ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah), recorded by Muslim and al-Bayhaqī.

Muslim (d. 261/875)

Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá & ‘Ishāq b. ‘Ibrāhīm & Ibn ‘abī Šaybah & ‘Abū Kurayb—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁵⁹⁸

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ [i.e., al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī]—‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb [i.e., Ibn al-‘Aḳram]—‘Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Ḥajjāj al-Warrāq—Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁵⁹⁹

Muslim cites three other direct sources alongside Yaḥyá (*viz.*, Ibn ‘abī Šaybah, Ibn Rāhwayh, and ‘Abū Kurayb), depicting all four as having transmitted this hadith (or at least, something close to it) from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah. As it happens, the independent collections of both Ibn ‘abī Šaybah and Ibn Rāhwayh are extant, along with parallel

⁵⁹⁷ Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Šaḥīḥ*, II, p. 1140, # 81/2440; Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd (ed. Ḥusayn), *Musnad ‘Ā’iṣah*, p. 56, # 9.

⁵⁹⁸ Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Šaḥīḥ*, I, p. 642, # 72/1422.

⁵⁹⁹ Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, XIV, p. 111, # 13776.

transmissions from 'Abū Kurayb, which means that we can compare Muslim's citations therefrom with their originals:

Ibn 'abī Šaybah (d. 235/849)

'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁰⁰

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

'Abū Mu'āwiyah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage married at six; consummation at nine.⁶⁰¹

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁰²

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

[Abū Kurayb] Muḥammad b. al-'Alā' & 'Aḥmad b. Ḥarb—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁰³

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

[Abū Kurayb] Muḥammad b. al-'Alā'—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁰⁴

All of these versions differ markedly from Muslim's: four of them embody the more common sub-tradition associated with 'Abū Mu'āwiyah (with the 'marriage at nine')

⁶⁰⁰ 'Abd Allāh b. 'abī Šaybah (ed. 'Usāmah b. 'Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad), *al-Muṣannaf*, vol. 6 (Cairo, Egypt: al-Fārūq al-Ḥadīth, 2008), p. 245, # 17615; also see *ibid.*, XI, p. 306, # 34452.

⁶⁰¹ 'Ishāq b. Rāhwayh (ed. 'Abd al-Ġafūr b. 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Balūṣī), *Musnad*, vol. 2 (Madinah, KSA: Maktabat al-'Imān, 1990), p. 214, # 722/178.

⁶⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 870, # 1537/995.

⁶⁰³ 'Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Nasā'ī (ed. 'Imād al-Ṭayyār, Yāsir Ḥasan, & 'Izz al-Dīn Ḍillī), *Sunan* (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2014), pp. 772-773, # 3258.

⁶⁰⁴ *Id.* (ed. Ḥasan 'Abd al-Mun'im Šalabī), *Kitāb al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, vol. 5 (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 2001), p. 170, # 5348.

element, in contrast to the ‘marriage at six’ and ‘consummation at nine’ elements contained in Muslim’s version); and the fifth (which shares the ‘marriage at six’ and ‘consummation at nine’ elements with Muslim’s version) lacks the ‘Prophet’s death’ element. In other words, three out of four of Muslim’s cited sources probably did not transmit the hadith that he cites them for. It is certainly *possible* that they transmitted it but failed to mention it in their own collections (in the case of Ibn ‘abī Šaybah and Ibn Rāhwayh), or that they failed to transmit it to anyone else whose transmissions also survived (in the case of ‘Abū Kurayb), but this seems like a stretch: are we really to believe any of them, let alone *all three*, transmitted contradictory versions of the same hadith from the same authority, and that the two of them who recorded versions of this hadith in their own collections *also both* happened to record therein only one version (i.e., *only* common sub-tradition associated with ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah)? The simple explanation is that Muslim lied, erred, or was otherwise being sloppy when he cited these authorities as sources for his version.

And yet, Muslim may not have erred or lied completely (or at least did so in a different way), for as it happens, the very beginning of Muslim’s version (*tazawwaja-hā rasūl allāh*) is similar to one of Ibn Rāhwayh’s transmissions from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, from Hišām (*‘anna rasūla allāhi tazawwaja-hā*), and the whole middle section of Muslim’s version (*wa-hiya bintu sittin wa-banā bi-hā wa-hiya bintu tis‘in*) is *word-for-word identical* to the same hadith in Ibn Rāhwayh,⁶⁰⁵ *vis-à-vis every single other version of the marital-age hadith*. This cannot be a coincidence: Muslim clearly derived most of the wording of his hadith from Ibn Rāhwayh’s transmission from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, and cited Ibn Rāhwayh accordingly. The only problem is that he combined Ibn Rāhwayh’s hadith with another (since Ibn Rāhwayh’s version lacked the element about the Prophet’s death) and omitted or substituted Ibn Rāhwayh’s original *‘isnād* therefor (‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah). The source for both of these components is obvious: the final part of Muslim’s hadith is identical to Ibn ‘abī Šaybah’s transmission from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah (*wa-māta ‘an-hā wa-hiya bint tamān ‘ašrah*),⁶⁰⁶ which also contains the *‘isnād* cited by Muslim (‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A’māš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah)—and, once again, Muslim actually cited Ibn ‘abī Šaybah as one of his sources for this hadith.

⁶⁰⁵ See the citations above.

⁶⁰⁶ Again, see the citations above.

In short, it is plausible that Muslim fashioned his hadith out of a *matn* received from Ibn Rāhwayh and a *matn* and *ʿisnād* received from Ibn ʿabī Šaybah, whilst also omitting Ibn Rāhwayh’s original *ʿisnād* and further citing ʿAbū Kurayb and Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá for good measure. Whilst all of these sources likely transmitted versions of the common sub-tradition of ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah, none of them transmitted Muslim’s version, which looks like a Frankenstein’s monster of Muslim’s own making. This is straightforward contamination and interpolation: ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah never transmitted the hadith that Muslim ascribes unto him

And yet, there is a wrinkle here: Muslim’s fourth source cited for this hadith is Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá and, as it happens, there is an alternative transmission of the version he cites back to Yaḥyá, recorded by al-Bayhaqī. The version recorded by al-Bayhaqī differs only slightly from Muslim’s,⁶⁰⁷ such that the two must be closely related, which leaves only two plausible explanations: either al-Bayhaqī’s version was borrowed from Muslim’s and given an independent *ʿisnād* back to Yaḥyá, or else both Muslim and al-Bayhaqī really did receive this hadith ultimately from Yaḥyá. In favour of the second hypothesis is the fact that each of Muslim’s other three sources are elsewhere shown to transmit something other than what Muslim cited from them—and, as it happens, the one source that *cannot* be shown to have transmitted something different is precisely the *only* source cited in this parallel hadith recorded by al-Bayhaqī. This makes it seem for all the world like Muslim’s only error was citing Ibn Rāhwayh, Ibn ʿabī Šaybah, and ʿAbū Kurayb *alongside* Yaḥyá, since Yaḥyá was the true source of the specific *matn* that Muslim was quoting.

And yet, the fact that only Yaḥyá was cited in this corroborating transmission can be explained alternatively. The collections and transmissions of Ibn Rāhwayh, ʿAbū Kurayb, and Ibn ʿabī Šaybah likely circulated amongst Muslim scholars in the three centuries between them and al-Bayhaqī: in addition to the collections of Ibn Rāhwayh and Ibn ʿabī Šaybah surviving to the present, al-Nasāʾī cites the relevant hadiths of both Ibn Rāhwayh and ʿAbū Kurayb in his famous *Mujtabá* and *al-Sunan al-Kubrā* alike,⁶⁰⁸ and al-Ṭabarānī cites the relevant hadith from Ibn ʿabī Šaybah in his famous *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*.⁶⁰⁹ In other words, all of the information that I outlined above—in particular,

⁶⁰⁷ M. has *bint* where B. has *ibnah*, in two instances; and B. has *sanah*, absent in M.

⁶⁰⁸ Nasāʾī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, pp. 772-773, ## 3255, 3258; *id.* (ed. Šalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, V, p. 170, ## 5346, 5348.

⁶⁰⁹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 24, # 59.

the oddity that three out of four of Muslim's cited sources elsewhere contradict his citation from them—cannot have escaped the notice of at least some classical Hadith scholars. It is thus reasonable to expect that someone would have been motivated to exonerate the great master Muslim (who comes across as dishonest or extremely sloppy in the relevant hadith) by creating a corroborating transmission or dive for Muslim's version. And, since the quandary arises in the first place due to conflicting transmissions from three of Muslim's sources, the best or obvious target for such a dive is the fourth: Yaḥyá.

It is thus at the very least plausible that the corroborating transmission unto Yaḥyá is actually a dive that was created to exonerate Muslim, for which any of the great traditionists comprising the *'isnād* could be responsible: Ibn al-'Aḳram, or al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, or even al-Bayhaqī. The last option seems most probable to me, for three reasons. Firstly, al-Bayhaqī definitely had access to all of the relevant transmissions or collections, being an encyclopaedic mega-compiler of Hadith. Secondly, al-Bayhaqī makes a point of noting that this ascription to Yaḥyá corroborates Muslim, stating immediately after citing it: "Muslim transmitted it in *al-Ṣaḥīḥ* from Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá."⁶¹⁰ This is consistent with his making sure that the dive serves its function. And thirdly, no one else in the entire Hadith corpus before al-Bayhaqī seems to have been aware of this alternative transmission from Yaḥyá, which is suspicious—especially considering that al-Bayhaqī claimed to have received it from an influential and prolific source like al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī.

Thus, not only is the evidence *consistent* with this alternative transmission from Yaḥyá being a dive derived from Muslim, such an explanation is also *corroborated* by the way in which Muslim's version corresponds to the specific wording of two of the other sources that he cited therefor, which is best explained by Muslim's having cobbled together his version therefrom. By contrast, the alternative explanation that this alternative transmission from Yaḥyá is genuine is in tension with the aforementioned facts of Muslim's text.

In short, a reasonable explanation for all of this is that Muslim combined his version out of hitherto discrete transmissions from 'Abū Mu'āwiyah, creating a collective *'isnād* in the process. Then, a later Hadith scholar (plausibly someone like al-Bayhaqī, who

⁶¹⁰ Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, XIV, p. 111, # 13776.

probably noticed that all of Muslim's sources other than Yaḥyá elsewhere contradict his citations from them) took Muslim's version and created a dive therefor back to Yaḥyá. Finally, at some point in this process (or in the later copying of al-Bayhaqī's work), three minor scribal errors occurred in this diving ascription to Yaḥyá.

That said, there is a way to explain the evidence on the view that Yaḥyá genuinely did transmit something close to this hadith: Muslim simply combined multiple transmissions. In other words, Muslim received: a hadith with the elements 'marriage at six', 'consummation at nine', and 'the Prophet's death' from Yaḥyá, citing the *'isnād* 'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah; a hadith with the elements 'marriage at six' and 'consummation at nine' from Ibn Rāhwayh, citing the *'isnād* 'Abū Mu'āwiyah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah; and hadiths with the elements 'marriage at nine' and 'the Prophet's death' from 'Abū Kurayb, Ibn 'abī Šaybah, and perhaps also Ibn Rāhwayh, all citing the *'isnād* 'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah. Muslim then confused their wordings, or deliberately or carelessly combined their wordings, and thereafter acknowledged all four of his relevant masters as the potential or actual sources for the resulting synthesis. Thus, even if Muslim truly derived something similar to his version from Yaḥyá, he combined it with other transmissions from 'Abū Mu'āwiyah, which had different *matns* and, in one case, a different *'isnād*.

Either way, it cannot be the case that Muslim simply transmitted his version from Yaḥyá without any alterations: to conclude otherwise is to disregard not only the fact that specific wordings in Muslim's version are more similar to *matns* in versions from other sources, but also the fact that *Muslim himself explicitly cites those sources for his version*.

In short, it is conceivable that Yaḥyá was a genuine PCL, whose transmissions were recorded by both Muslim and al-Bayhaqī—but if so, it seems probable that the version recorded by Muslim was contaminated or combined with other transmissions. Thus, the following urtext—derivable from Muslim and al-Bayhaqī—may derive from Yaḥyá:

'aḵbara-nā 'abū mu'āwiyat^a 'anⁱ al-'a'mašⁱ 'an 'ibrāhīm^a 'anⁱ al-'aswadⁱ 'an 'ā'iṣat^a qālat **tazawwaja-hā rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱⁿ** **wa-banā** **bī-hā wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u tisⁱⁿ** **wa-māta 'an-hā wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u** **tamānⁱ 'ašrat^a [sanat^{an}].**

However, given the suspicious similarities between Muslim's version in other transmissions from his cited sources, it cannot be discounted that Muslim's version was simple cobbled together from disparate reports, and that al-Bayhaqī's version is simply a dive therefor.

'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl (d. 224-225/838-840)

I have collated three reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent 'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl (situated within the broader 'Alī b. Mushir sub-tradition), recorded by al-Dārimī, 'Abū 'Awānah, and 'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (reconstructed).

al-Dārimī (d. 250/864-865 or 255/869)

'Ismā'īl b. Ḳalīl—'Alī b. Mushir—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hīrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁶¹¹

'Abū 'Awānah (d. 316/929)

al-Rabī' b. Sulaymān—al-Šāfi'ī—Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

'Abū 'Umayyah—'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl—'Alī b. Mushir—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hīrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁶¹²

'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 415/1024)

'Abd Allāh b. Ja'far b. Darastawayh—Ya'qūb b. Sufyān—'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl—'Alī b. Mushir—Hišām b. 'Urwah—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hīrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁶¹³

⁶¹¹ 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm 'Asad al-Dārānī), *Musnad*, vol. 3 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Muḡnī, 2000), pp. 1451-1452, # 2307.

⁶¹² 'Abū 'Awānah (ed. 'Aṭā' Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Šaḥīḥ*, XI, pp. 379-380, # 4698.

⁶¹³ See the section on 'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān, above.

ʿAbū ʿAwānah prefaces his version with two *ʿisnāds*: one via al-Rabīʿ, from al-Šāfiʿī, from Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah, from Hišām, and the other via ʿAbū ʿUmayyah, from ʿIsmāʿīl, from ʿAlī b. Mushir, from Hišām. Given that every other transmission of the marital-age hadith from al-Šāfiʿī and Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah is completely different from this version, and given also that this version is extremely similar to every other version of the marital-age hadith transmitted from both ʿIsmāʿīl and ʿAlī b. Mushir, it is clear that ʿIsmāʿīl and ʿAlī b. Mushir are the actual intended sources of the specific wording of ʿAbū ʿAwānah’s version.

In addition to being more similar to each other overall than to the other transmissions from ʿAlī b. Mushir,⁶¹⁴ these three transmissions via ʿIsmāʿīl are mostly identical in wording. Thus, not only is the attribution of these three hadiths to the PCL ʿIsmāʿīl probable, his precise wording is easily reconstructable:

ʿanbaʿa-nā ʿaliyyu bn^u mushirⁱⁿ ʿan hišāmⁱ bnⁱ ʿurwat^a ʿan ʿabī-hi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a
qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-ʿanā bint^u sittⁱ sinīn^a fa-qadimnā al-
madīnat^a fa-nazalnā fī banī al-hāritⁱ bnⁱ al-ḳazrajⁱ fa-wuʾiktu fa-tamazzaqa
šaʿarī fa-ʿawfā jumaymat^{an} fa-ʿatat-nī ʿummī ʿumm^u rūmān^a wa-ʿinnī la-fī
ʿurjūhatⁱⁿ wa-maʿī ṣawāhibāt^{un} lī fa-ṣaraḳat bī fa-ʿataytu-hā wa-mā ʿadrī mā
turīdu bī fa-ʿaḳaḳat bi-yadī ḥattā ʿawqafat-nī ʿalā bābⁱ al-dārⁱ wa-ʿinnī la-
ʿanhaju ḥattā sakana baʿd^u nafasī ṭumma ʿaḳaḳat šay^{ʿan} min mā^{ʿin} fa-masaḥat
bi-hi wajhī wa-raʿsī ṭumma ʿadḳalat-nī al-dār^a fa-ʿidā niswat^{un} min^a al-
ʿanšārⁱ fī baytⁱⁿ fa-qulna ʿalā al-ḳayrⁱ wa-al-barakatⁱ wa-ʿalā ḳayrⁱ ṭāʾirⁱⁿ fa-
ʿaslamat-nī ʿilay-hinna fa-ʿaṣlahna min šaʿnī fa-lam yaruʿ-ⁿⁱ illā rasūl^u allāhⁱ
ḍuḥ^{an} fa-ʿaslamna-nī ʿilay-hi wa-ʿanā yawma-ʿidⁱⁿ bint^u tisʿi sinīn^a.

The variations that exist between the extant versions of al-Dārimī, ʿAbū ʿAwānah, and ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn amount to a handful of omitted,⁶¹⁵ added,⁶¹⁶ substituted,⁶¹⁷ and

⁶¹⁴ Although there are small differences across all of the transmissions from ʿAlī b. Mushir, those transmitted via ʿIsmāʿīl all have *ʿawfā*, where al-Buḳārī (*Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 767) and Ibn Mājah (# 1876) both have *wafā*. There are also numerous instances where ʿIsmāʿīl’s versions and al-Buḳārī (*ḥattā ʿawqafat-nī* and *wajhī*) agree against Ibn Mājah (*fa-ʿawqafat-nī* and *ʿalā wajhī*), on the one hand, and where ʿIsmāʿīl’s versions and Ibn Mājah (*al-ḳazraj*, and *ṣawāhibāt*, and *wa-mā ʿadrī*, and *bayt*) agree against al-Buḳārī (*ḳazraj*, and *ṣawāhib*, and *lā ʿadrī*, and *al-bayt*), on the other. In all of these instances, ʿIsmāʿīl’s versions retain internal consistency.

⁶¹⁵ Where ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn and ʿAbū ʿAwānah have *hišām bn ʿurwah*, al-Dārimī has only *hišām*; where ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn and ʿAbū ʿAwānah have *ʿatat-nī ʿummī ʿumm rūmān*, al-Dārimī has only *ʿatat-nī ʿumm rūmān*; and where ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn and ʿAbū ʿAwānah have *mā turīdu bī*, al-Dārimī has only *mā turīdu*.

⁶¹⁶ ʿAbū ʿAwānah has a *qālat*, absent in the other two; and where ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn and al-Dārimī have *ʿawfā jumaymah*, ʿAbū ʿAwānah has *ʿawfā šaʿarī jumaymah*.

⁶¹⁷ Where ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn and ʿAbū ʿAwānah have *ʿanbaʿa-nā*, al-Dārimī has *ḥaddaṭa-nā*; where ʿAbū ʿAwānah and al-Dārimī have *ʿan*, ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn has *ʿanbaʿa-nā* or *ʿaḳbara-nā*; where al-Dārimī and ʿAbū ʿAwānah have *bint*, ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn has *ibnah*; where ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn and ʿAbū ʿAwānah have *šaʿarī*, al-

misread words,⁶¹⁸ most of which can be chalked up to scribal errors.⁶¹⁹ All of this, in combination with the general precision of the preservation of this text, is consistent with this hadith's having been transmitted in writing from 'Ismā'īl to his students.

‘Ārim b. al-Faḍl (d. 224/838-839)

I have collated two ascriptions to the Basran tradent ‘Ārim b. al-Faḍl (situated within the broader Ḥammād b. Zayd sub-tradition), recorded by Ibn Sa’d and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn Sa’d (d. 230/845)

‘Ārim—Ḥammād b. Zayd—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁶²⁰

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz—‘Ārim—Ḥammād b. Zayd—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁶²¹

Within the broader Ḥammād b. Zayd sub-tradition, these two versions are slightly more similar to each other than the others, such that they probably share a more recent common ancestor; and this is exactly what the *’isnāds* depict, with both versions descending from Ḥammād’s student ‘Ārim.⁶²² Moreover, Ibn Sa’d transmits from ‘Ārim directly. It is thus reasonable to conclude to that ‘Ārim is a genuine PCL, and that the

Dārimī has *ra’sī*; where ‘Abū ‘Awānah and al-Dārimī have *’awqafat*, ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn has *waqafat*; and where ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn and ‘Abū ‘Awānah have *bint*, al-Dārimī has *ibnah*.

⁶¹⁸ Where ‘Abū ‘Awānah and al-Dārimī have *tamazzaqa*, ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn has *tamarraqa*; and where ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn and al-Dārimī have *’abhaju*, ‘Abū ‘Awānah has *’anhaju*.

⁶¹⁹ A notable exception is the addition of *’anba’a-nā* or *’aḵbara-nā* in ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn’s version (versus the simple *’an* in the other two), which is consistent with being a deliberate interpolation to strengthen the transmission. In other words, ‘Alī b. Mushir is depicted as directly quoting Hišām verbatim in ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn’s version, whereas he is only depicted as vaguely referencing Hišām’s authority in the other two.

⁶²⁰ Ibn Sa’d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42.

⁶²¹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salāfi), *al-Mu’jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 21, # 45.

⁶²² The ‘Ārim sub-tradition has *sab’ sinīn* and *baná*, where ‘Abū Dāwūd has *sab’* and *daḵala*; and *tis’*, where ‘Abū ‘Awānah has *tis’ sinīn*. Additionally, ‘Abū ‘Awānah’s version has a lengthy addendum, absent in the others. For more on this, see the section on Ḥammād b. Zayd, below.

urtext behind these two versions derives from him. Since there are only three differences between Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī,⁶²³ this urtext is easy to discern:

[’**aḵbara/ḥaddaṭa**]-nā ḥammād^u bn^u zaydⁱⁿ ‘an ḥiṣāmⁱ bnⁱ ‘urwat^a ‘an ‘abī-
hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat **tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-’anā [bint/ibnat]^u sab^{‘i}**
sinīn^a wa-banā bī wa-’anā [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{‘in}

The difference between ‘Ārim saying ’*aḵbara-nā* in Ibn Sa‘d’s version and *ḥaddaṭa-nā* in al-Ṭabarānī’s could be due to an error, paraphrase, or interpolation (on the part of either Ibn Sa‘d, ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, al-Ṭabarānī, or a later scribe), or else due to ‘Ārim himself saying ’*aḵbara-nā* one time and *ḥaddaṭa-nā* another. The same goes for the difference between *ibnah* and *bint*. However, the fact that the remaining text preserved by Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī is identical suggests that it was preserved via written transmission from ‘Ārim to his students.

Mūsá b. ‘Ismā‘īl (d. 223/838)

I have collated four reports ascribed to the Basran tradent Mūsá b. ‘Ismā‘īl (situated within the sub-tradition of Ḥammād b. Salamah, which nestles in turn within the broader tradition of Ḥiṣām b. ‘Urwah), recorded by ‘Abū Dāwūd and Ibn ‘abī Ḳayṭamah.

‘Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/889)

Mūsá b. ‘Ismā‘īl—Ḥammād b. Salamah—Ḥiṣām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Bišr b. Ḳālid—‘Abū ‘Usāmah—Ḥiṣām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; Ḥijrah; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine; marital preparation.⁶²⁴

‘Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/889)

Mūsá b. ‘Ismā‘īl—Ḥammād b. Salamah—Ḥiṣām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

⁶²³ Where Ibn Sa‘d *nā* (in context, an abbreviation of ’*aḵbara-nā*), Ṭab. has *tnā* (an abbreviation of *ḥaddaṭa-nā*); and in the two places where Ibn Sa‘d has *ibnah*, Ṭab. has *bint*.

⁶²⁴ ‘Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-‘Aṣ‘aṭ al-Sijistānī (ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd), *Sunan*, vol. 4 (Beirut, Lebanon: al-Maktabah al-‘Aṣriyyah, n. d.), p. 284, # 4933.

Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁶²⁵

Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah (d. 279/892)

Mūsá b. 'Ismā'īl—Ḥammād b. Salamah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage, Kadījah's death, Makkah, six or seven.⁶²⁶

Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah (d. 279/892)

Mūsá b. 'Ismā'īl—Ḥammād b. Salamah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁶²⁷

The first thing to note is that 'Abū Dāwūd's first version (with the dual ascription) should be discarded: the first element (*'inna rasūl allāh tazawwaja-nī wa-'anā bint sab' sinīn*) seems to be 'Abū Dāwūd's own summary, since the wording is dissimilar to all other transmissions from Ḥammād and 'Abū 'Usāmah alike; and most of the hadith is explicitly designated by 'Abū Dāwūd as being from Bišr—'Abū 'Usāmah, not Mūsá—Ḥammād. In other words, only a fragment of this version (*fa-lammā qadimnā al-madīnah 'atayna niswah*) appears to actually derive from Mūsá—Ḥammād. By contrast, 'Abū Dāwūd's second version is exclusively ascribed to Mūsá—Ḥammād and contains a fuller wording, not just the aforementioned fragment. As such, 'Abū Dāwūd's first version should be dispensed with altogether in the present analysis.

Another problem with these ascriptions arises from the fact that Mūsá seems to have split the hadith that he received from Ḥammād in half, transmitting each half separately to both 'Abū Dāwūd and Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah. This is not itself a problem—the problem is that 'Abū Dāwūd only recorded the second half, such that Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah's record of the first half is uncorroborated. Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah's version may not be far removed from Mūsá's original wording, but without other transmissions as points of comparison, we have no sense of exactly what was retained and what was changed in the course of transmission.

For the second half of Mūsá's hadith, we have no such problems: the two reports recorded by 'Abū Dāwūd and Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah are more similar to each other—in

⁶²⁵ *Ibid.*, # 4935.

⁶²⁶ 'Aḥmad b. 'abī Kayṭamah Zuhayr b. Ḥarb (ed. Ṣalāḥ b. Fathī Halal), *al-Ta'rīk al-Kabīr al-Ma'rūf bi-Ta'rīk Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah*, vol. 1 (Cairo, Egypt: al-Fārūq al-Ḥadīṭiyyah, 2004), p. 170, # 400.

⁶²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 387 # 1445.

terms of their specific elemental abridgement—than to all other transmissions from Ḥammād more broadly, which is consistent with both reflecting Mūsá’s distinctive redaction. In other words, Mūsá b. ’Ismā’īl was indeed a PCL, in all probability.

There are of course still differences between ’Abū Dāwūd and Ibn ’abī Ḳayṭamah’s reports, in the form of a few added, omitted, and substituted words⁶²⁸—and in Ibn ’abī Ḳayṭamah’s uncorroborated first half of Mūsá’s hadith, there is also an obvious spelling mistake.⁶²⁹ Since ’Abū Dāwūd and Ibn ’abī Ḳayṭamah’s versions (of the second half) are mostly identical, however, Mūsá’s redaction can be substantially reconstructed, as follows:

[ḥaddaṭa/’aḵbara]-nā ḥammād^u bn^u salamat^a qāla nā hišām^u bn^u ’urwat^a
’an ’urwat^a ’an ’ā’išat^a qālat [tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ ba’d^a mutawaffā
kadījat^a wa-qabl^a maḵraji-hi ’ilā al-madīnatⁱ li-sanataynⁱ ’aw talātⁱⁿ
wa-’anā ibnat^u sittⁱ sinīn^a ’aw sab^{‘i}] lammā qadīmā [mīn^a] al-madīnatⁱ/a/
jā’a[t]-nī niswat^{un} wa-’anā ’al’abu ’alā ’urjūḥatⁱⁿ wa-’anā muḡammamat^{un} fa-
dahabna bī fa-hayya’na-nī wa-ṣanna’na-nī [tumma ’atayna bī rasūl^a
allāhⁱ] fa-banā bī [al-nabiyy^u] wa-’anā [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{‘i} sinīn^a.

Most of the differences between ’Abū Dāwūd and Ibn ’abī Ḳayṭamah’s versions (of the second half) are additions or omissions, without many substitutions or synonyms: this suggests that the hadith was transmitted in writing—or with the aid of written notes—from Mūsá to his two students, but that copying was sloppy, and/or the copyists engaged in a bit of redaction. Most notably, either ’Abū Dāwūd added *tumma ’atayna bī rasūl allāh* to the text, or Ibn ’abī Ḳayṭamah omitted it, or else Mūsá transmitted the hadith with the line in one instance and without it in another.

‘Affān b. Muslim (d. 220/835)

⁶²⁸ A.D. has Ḥammād saying ’aḵbara-nā, where I.A.Ḳ. has him saying nā (i.e., ḥaddaṭa-nā); I.A.Ḳ. omits ’an ’urwah, an obvious error; I.A.Ḳ. has mīn, absent in A.D.; A.D. has jā’a-nī, where I.A.Ḳ. has jā’at-nī; A.D. has tumma ’atayna bī rasūl allāh, absent in I.A.Ḳ.; I.A.Ḳ. has al-nabiyy, absent in A.D.; and finally, A.D. has ibnah, where I.A.Ḳ. has bint.

⁶²⁹ Namely, rasūlā, which should be emended to rasūl.

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufo-Baghdadian tradent ‘Affān b. Muslim (situated within the broader Wuhayb sub-tradition, which is nestled in turn within the broader tradition of Hišām b. ‘Urwah), recorded by Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845)

‘Affān—Wuhayb—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁶³⁰

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. al-‘Abbās al-Mu‘addib—‘Affān—Wuhayb—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁶³¹

In addition to the ascriptions to Wuhayb sharing a distinctive wording *vis-à-vis* all other versions of the marital-age tradition,⁶³² the ascriptions to ‘Affān in particular are more similar to each other than to the other transmission from Wuhayb,⁶³³ which suggests that they share a more recent common ancestor—which perfectly matches the *’isnāds*. ‘Affān is thus probably a genuine PCL, responsible for the urtext or underlying redaction shared by the two ascriptions to him.

There are of course variations between Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī’s ascriptions to ‘Affān, but these are few and minor: a single instance of omission or addition,⁶³⁴ and five instances of substituted words,⁶³⁵ most of which could be chalked up to occasional mild paraphrasing or simple scribal errors. This text is consistent with the hadith’s having been transmitted (at least in part) in writing, from ‘Affān to his students.

Accordingly, most of ‘Affān’s urtext can be reconstructed, although a few of the wordings are uncertain:

[‘**aḳbara/haddata**]-nā wuhayb[[^{un}]/[^u **bn**^u **kālīd**ⁱⁿ]] ‘an hišāmⁱ bnⁱ ‘urwat^a
‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a **’anna** [[**rasūl**^a **allāh**ⁱ]/[**al-nabiyy**^a]] tazawwaja-hā wa-

⁶³⁰ Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42.

⁶³¹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 21, # 47.

⁶³² In addition to sharing the same sequence of elements, the Wuhayb ascriptions all share the unique wording *kānat ‘inda-hu tis’ sinīn*.

⁶³³ Buḳārī’s version has *fa-qāla hišām wa-’unbi’tu ’anna-hā*, absent in the two ascriptions to ‘Affān.

⁶³⁴ Where Ibn Sa‘d has *wuhayb*, Ṭab. has *wuhayb bn kālīd*.

⁶³⁵ Where Ibn Sa‘d has *nā* (in context, an abbreviation of *’aḳbara-nā*), Ṭab. has *tnā* (an abbreviation of *haddata-nā*); where Ibn Sa‘d has *nā*, Ṭab. has *‘an* (which seems more archaic); where Ibn Sa‘d has *rasūl allāh*, Ṭab. has *al-nabiyy*; and in the two places where Ibn Sa‘d has *ibnah*, Ṭab. has *bint*.

hiya [ibnat/bint]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-banā bi-hā wa-hiya [ibnat/bint]^u tis^ʿ
sinīn^a wa-kānat ʿinda-hu tis^{ʿa} sinīn^a.

The variations between Ibn Saʿd and al-Ṭabarānī do not affect the meaning of the hadith, or in other words: most of the variants (ʿaḵbara-nā vs. ḥaddaṭa-nā, rasūl allāh vs. al-nabiyy, and ibnah vs. bint) are equivalent paraphrases. Similarly, the difference between “Wuhayb” and “Wuhayb b. Kālid” does not affect the overall meaning of the hadith, and is consistent with mere abbreviation or specification. The difference between ʿaḵbara-nā and ʿan is the only exception to all of this: the former entails information that the latter does not (i.e., that the transmission was direct), and the change from the latter to the former could be deliberate (i.e., an instance of interpolation). At the very least, a simple ʿan is more likely to be the original wording here.

And yet, when compared with al-Buḵārī’s alternative transmission back to Wuhayb,⁶³⁶ it appears as though Ibn Saʿd’s variants are usually the odd ones out,⁶³⁷ with al-Ṭabarānī more accurately preserving ʿAffān’s transmission from Wuhayb.⁶³⁸ In other words, it may have been Ibn Saʿd who changed ʿAffān’s wording (albeit in minor ways). That said, the relevant variants in Ibn Saʿd’s version could be the product of later scribal errors in the copying of his work.

ʿAbū Nuʿaym al-Faḍl (d. 218-219/833-834)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent ʿAbū Nuʿaym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn (situated within the broader ʿIsrāʾīl sub-tradition), recorded by Ibn Saʿd and al-Balāḍurī.

⁶³⁶ Buḵārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ* III, pp. 1076-1077.

⁶³⁷ Where Ibn Saʿd has *rasūl allāh*, both Ṭab. and Buḵ. have *al-nabiyy*; and in the two instances where Ibn Saʿd has *ibnah*, both Ṭab. and Buḵ. have *bint*.

⁶³⁸ The alternative would be that Wuhayb said *bint*, only for ʿAffān to change it to *ibnah* (as preserved by Ibn Saʿd), only for Muḥammad b. al-ʿAbbās or al-Ṭabarānī to change it back to *bint*. Or alternatively, that Wuhayb said *ibnah* (passed on by ʿAffān to Ibn Saʿd), only for Muḥammad b. al-ʿAbbās or al-Ṭabarānī to change it to *bint*, on the one hand, and for Muʿallā or al-Buḵārī to likewise change it to *bint*, on the other. The simpler explanation is that the original was *bint*, which Ibn Saʿd changed to *ibnah*. The same reasoning applies to *rasūl allāh* vs. *al-nabiyy*. All of this ignores the possibility of contamination, however; see the section on Wuhayb, below.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

al-Faḍl b. Dukayn—'Isrā'īl—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶³⁹

al-Balāḍurī (d. post-270/883-884)

'Abū Bakr al-'A'yan—'Abū Nu'aym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn—'Isrā'īl—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah:

'Ā'īshah was married at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen; she died at sixty-six in 58; she was married as a virgin; she was called 'Umm 'Abd Allāh.⁶⁴⁰

The *matns* of these two reports are more similar to each other in a certain key respect than most other transmissions from 'Isrā'īl,⁶⁴¹ or in other words: a distinctive *matn* correlates with a common ascription to al-Faḍl. This is consistent with both reflecting the particular redaction of al-Faḍl.

However, in another key respect, al-Balāḍurī's version is different from all the rest (including Ibn Sa'd's), having several additional elements tacked onto the end. This is consistent with its being an interpolation or elaboration of al-Faḍl's original, for which al-Balāḍurī or his immediate source ('Abū Bakr al-'A'yan) are plausibly responsible: the addendum provides extra biographical details about 'Ā'īshah, which perfectly matches the interests of a prosopographer or genealogist like al-Balāḍurī.

Even putting this addendum aside, there are still several differences between the *matns*, albeit minor ones: two substituted words, and three or four added or omitted words.⁶⁴² This is consistent with very minor oral paraphrasing in the course of transmission and/or scribal errors (such that a *sinīn* was omitted and an *ibnah* became a *bint*, etc.). Despite this, the outline—and most of the wording—of al-Faḍl's redaction can still be discerned:

⁶³⁹ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁶⁴⁰ 'Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Balāḍurī (ed. Suhayl Zakkār & Riyāḍ Ziriklī), *Kitāb Jumal min 'Ansāb al-'Ašrāf*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 1997), pp. 40-41.

⁶⁴¹ Namely, they both have *māta*, where all the rest have *qubiḍa* or *tuwuffiya*. Additionally, both are uniform in sharing *rasūl allāh* (rather than *al-nabiyy*) and *daḳala* (rather than *banā*).

⁶⁴² In two instances, Bal. has *ibnah*, where Ibn Sa'd has *bint*; Ibn Sa'd has *sinīn* twice, and *sanah*, absent in Bal. Finally, we might add that Ibn Sa'd has *ṭnā* (i.e., apparently quoting al-Faḍl directly), absent in Bal. (which has a generic '*an*', as if the hadith is in al-Balāḍurī's wording).

[ḥaddatā-nā] 'isrā'il^u 'an 'abī 'ishāq^a 'an 'abī 'ubaydat^a qāla tazawwaja
 rasūl^u allāhⁱ 'ā'īṣat^a wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u sitt^{i[n]} [sinīna] wa-daḡala bi-hā
 wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{ci[n]} [sinīna] wa-māta 'an-hā wa-hiya ibnat^u
 tamāniy^a 'aṣrat^a [sanat^{an}].

Both Ibn Sa'd and al-Balāḍurī accurately preserved the gist of the core of al-Faḍl's version, but the variant wordings bely a high level of precision, and al-Balāḍurī (or his direct source) engaged in some major *'idrāj*.

al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhāl (d. 216-217/831-832)

I have collated three reports ascribed to the Basran tradent al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhāl (situated within the sub-tradition of Ḥammād b. Salamah, which nestles in turn within the broader tradition of Hišām b. 'Urwah), recorded by al-'Ājurri, al-Ṭabarānī, and 'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (reconstructed).

al-'Ājurri (d. 360/970)

Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥumayd—Muḥammad b. al-Muṭannā—al-Ḥajjāj—Ḥammād—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah—Prophet:

Girl in silk, Kadijah's death, the girl was 'Ā'īṣah; girl in silk, who is 'Ā'īṣah; girl in silk, who is 'Ā'īṣah.⁶⁴³

al-'Ājurri (d. 360/970)

Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥumayd—Muḥammad b. al-Muṭannā—al-Ḥajjāj—Ḥammād—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah:

Marriage, Kadijah's death, Makkah, seven or six; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation.⁶⁴⁴

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

⁶⁴³ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-'Ājurri (ed. al-Walīd b. Muḥammad Nabīh Sayf al-Nāṣir), *al-Šarī'ah*, vol. 3 (Cairo, Egypt: Mu'assasat Qurṭubah, 1996), p. 470, # 1238/1935.

⁶⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 473, # 1243/1940.

‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz & ‘Abū Muslim al-Kaššī—al-Ḥajjāj—Ḥammād—Hišām—‘Urwah—
‘Ā’iṣah—Prophet:

Girl in silk, Kadījah’s death, the girl was ‘Ā’iṣah; girl in silk, who is ‘Ā’iṣah.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, Kadījah’s death, Makkah, seven or six; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair;
marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁶⁴⁵

‘Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 415/1024)

‘Abd Allāh b. Ja‘far—Ya‘qūb b. Sufyān—al-Ḥajjāj—Ḥammād—Hišām—‘Urwah—
‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, Kadījah’s death, Makkah, seven or six; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair;
marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁶⁴⁶

These three reports are not identical in terms of their constitutive elements: al-Ṭabarānī’s version seems to combine two narratives (one about ‘Ā’iṣah being presented in silk to the Prophet in a dream, and one about ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage), whereas al-‘Ājurri transmits these narratives as two separate reports, and ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (at least as recorded by al-Bayhaqī and Ibn al-Ṭabarī) omits the first one altogether. On this basis, it would seem that al-Ḥajjāj (the common source behind both narratives) was responsible for transmitting them separately, since two out of three of the lines of transmission emanating from him (culminating in al-‘Ājurri and ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn) related them as such. Consequently, al-Ṭabarānī (the odd one out) seems to have joined them back together, or at least, placed them one after the other with a single *’isnād* (rather than repeating the *’isnād* twice).

For all that, these three transmissions are more similar to each other than they are to other transmissions from Ḥammād b. Salamah: they largely share the same sequence of elements (aside from ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn’s omission of the first narrative, the omission of an element in al-Ṭabarānī’s version of the first narrative, and the omission of the final element in the second narrative by al-‘Ājurri), and they share the same distinctive wordings.⁶⁴⁷ In fact, other than the added or omitted elements, these three

⁶⁴⁵ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salāfi), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, pp. 19-20, # 41.

⁶⁴⁶ See the section on ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān, above.

⁶⁴⁷ Thus, where other transmissions of the first narrative from Ḥammād all have *fa-kašaftu-hā* or (in one case) *fa-fattaštu-hā*, al-‘Ājurri and al-Ṭabarānī both omit it. Moreover, where most transmissions of

reports are almost identical, differing in only a handful of instances: some added or omitted particles, prepositions, and words⁶⁴⁸; three substituted prepositions and words⁶⁴⁹; and two straightforward spelling errors.⁶⁵⁰ Additionally (and as mentioned already), there is an extra element in al-ʿĀjurri’s version of the first narrative, which is identical to the preceding element, but which makes sense in context, such that al-ʿĀjurri (or some other tradent before him or copyist him) has duplicated the element by mistake, or else al-Ṭabarānī (or some other tradent before him or copyist after him) has omitted the element by mistake.⁶⁵¹ All of these are consistent with scribal errors, which suggests—along with the fact that the *matns* are otherwise identical—that these hadiths were transmitted in writing from al-Ḥajjāj to his students. As such, al-Ḥajjāj’s urtext is largely discernible, as follows:

ḥaddaṭa-nā ḥammād^u bn^u salamata^a ʿan hišāmⁱ bnⁱ ʿurwat^a ʿan ʿabī-hi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a ʿanna rasūl^a allāhⁱ qāla ʾutītu bi-jāriyatⁱⁿ fī saraqatⁱⁿ min ḥarīrⁱⁿ [min] baʿd^{a/i} wafātⁱ kadījat^a fa-ʾidā hiya ʾanti fa-qultu ʾin yakun ḥādā min ʾindⁱ allāhⁱ yumḍi-hi [qāla] tumma ʾutītu bi-jāriyatⁱⁿ fī saraqatⁱⁿ min ḥarīrⁱⁿ fa-kašaftu-hā fa-ʾidā hiya ʾanti fa-qultu ʾin yakun ḥādā min ʾindⁱ allāhⁱ yumḍi-hi [qāla tumma ʾutītu bi-jāriyatⁱⁿ fī saraqatⁱⁿ min ḥarīrⁱⁿ fa-kašaftu-hā fa-ʾidā hiya ʾanti fa-qultu ʾin yakun ḥādā min ʾindⁱ allāhⁱ yumḍi-hi] [qālat ʿāʾiṣat^u] tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ mutawaffā kadījat^a qabl^a makraji-hi min makkat^a wa-ʾanā ibnat^u sabⁱ sinīn^a ʾaw sittⁱ sinīn^a fa-lammā qadīmā al-madīnat^a jāʾa-nī niswat^{un} wa-ʾanā ʾalʾabu ʾalā ʾurjūḥatⁱⁿ wa-ʾanā muḥammamat^{un} fa-hayyaʾna-nī wa-ṣannaʾna-nī tumma ʾatayna bī rasūl^a allāhⁱ wa-ʾanā ibnat^u tisⁱ sinīn^a.

the second narrative from Ḥammād begin the element about ʿĀʾiṣah’s marital preparation with the *q-h-b* root, al-ʿĀjurri, al-Ṭabarānī, and ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn all begin theirs with *hayyaʾna-nī*; and although two other transmissions from Ḥammād also begin the element with *hayyaʾna-nī*, these in turn differ from the three ascriptions to al-Ḥajjāj in terms of their wordings and even their elements. Cf. Sulaymān b. Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī, *Musnad* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Tawfiq, n. d.), p. 205, # 1454, which has a different order of elements, adds *jāriyah* in the element about shoulder-length hair, and omits the element about Ḳadījah’s death altogether; and ʾAbū Yaʿlā ʾAḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Mawṣilī (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm ʾAsad), *Musnad*, vol. 8 (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Maʾmūn li-l-Turāt, 1989), p. 74, # 4600/244, which adds *ʾilā al-madīnah bi-sanatayn ʾaw ṭalāt* into the first marital-age element, lacks the element about shoulder-length hair altogether, and adds *fa-banā bī* into the final marital-age element.

⁶⁴⁸ ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn only has *ḥammād*, where the other two have *ḥammād bn salamah* (although in one version, ʿĀjurri has *ḥammād yaʾnī ibn salamah*); ʿĀjurri has *min* and *qāla*, both absent in Ṭabarānī; Ṭabarānī has a *fa-*, absent in the other two; ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn has a *baʿda* and an *ʾilā*, absent in the other two; ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn only has *sabʿ ʾaw sitt sinīn*, where the other two have *sabʿ sinīn ʾaw sitt sinīn*; and ʿĀjurri lacks *wa-ʾanā bint/ibnat tisʿ sinīn* at the end, present in the other two.

⁶⁴⁹ Ṭabarānī has *bint* in two places, where ʿĀjurri and ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn have *ibnah*; and ʾAbū al-Ḥusayn has *fī*, where other two have *ʾalā*.

⁶⁵⁰ Ṭabarānī has *ʾitd*, a misspelling of *ʾind* (as found in ʿĀjurri); and ʿĀjurri has *muḥammamah*, a misspelling of *muḥammamat* (as found in the other two).

⁶⁵¹ If the error is scribal, then this would be consistent with *homeoteleuton*.

al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī' (d. post-216/831)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Levantine tradent al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī' al-Ruṣāfī (ostensibly situated within the broader tradition of al-Zuhrī), recorded by al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (reconstructed) and 'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (reconstructed).

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

'Abū al-'Abbās Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb—'Abū 'Usāmah al-Ḥalabī—al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī'—'Ubayd Allāh b. 'abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

Married 'Ā'īṣah; after Kadijah; shown in a dream; married in Makkah at six; consummation; Hijrah; nine; 'Ā'īṣah's genealogy; virgin; 'Abū Bakr's name.⁶⁵²

'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān (d. 415/1024)

'Abd Allāh b. Ja'far b. Darastawayh—Ya'qūb b. Sufyān—al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī'—'Ubayd Allāh b. 'abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

[Married 'Ā'īṣah;] shown in a dream; married [in Makkah at six]; consummation; Hijrah; nine; ['Ā'īṣah's genealogy; virgin; 'Abū Bakr's name].⁶⁵³

These two reconstructed reports are much more similar to each other than they are to all others, such that they clearly constitute a distinctive sub-tradition and reflect a common redaction. This is consistent with their common ascription to al-Ḥajjāj, meaning that al-Ḥajjāj is probably a genuine PCL. In fact, these two reports are mostly identical, aside from a few additions, omissions, and substitutions,⁶⁵⁴ such that al-Ḥajjāj's urtext is easy to discern:

tumma tazawwaja rasūl^u allāhⁱ 'ā'īṣat^a [ba'da kadījat^a] wa-kāna qad [ra'ā/
'uriya] fī al-nawmⁱ marrataynⁱ yuqālu [la-hu] hiya imra'atu-ka wa-'ā'īṣat^u
yawma-'idⁱⁿ [ibnat/bint]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a fa-nakaḥa-hā rasūl^u allāhⁱ bi-makkat^a
wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a tumma 'inna rasūl^a allāhⁱ baná bi-'ā'īṣat^a
ba'da-mā qadima al-madīnatⁱ wa-'ā'īṣat^u yawma baná bi-hā [rasūl^u allāhⁱ]

⁶⁵² See the section on al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, above.

⁶⁵³ See the section on 'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān, above.

⁶⁵⁴ Al-Ḥākim (henceforth Ḥ.) has *ba'da kadījah*, absent in al-Qaṭṭān (henceforth Q.); Ḥ. has *ra'ā*, where Q. has *'uriya*; Q. adds *la-hu*; Ḥ. has *bint* where Q. has *ibnah*, and *vice versa* in another instance; Q. adds *rasūl allāh*; Q. adds *hiya*; and Ḥ. adds both *bn 'amriw* and *bn ka'bi* in the genealogy.

bint^u tisⁱ sinīn^a wa-[hiya] ‘ā’išat^u bint^u ‘abī bakrⁱ bnⁱ ‘abī quḥāfat^a bnⁱ ‘āmīrⁱ [bnⁱ ‘amrⁱw] bnⁱ ka‘bⁱ bnⁱ sa‘dⁱ bnⁱ taymⁱ bnⁱ murrat^a [bnⁱ ka‘bⁱ] bnⁱ lu‘ayyⁱ bnⁱ ḡālibⁱ bnⁱ fihriⁿ fa-tazawwaja-hā rasūl^u allāhⁱ bīkr^{an} wa-ism^u ‘abī bakrⁱn ‘atīq^{un} wa-ism^u ‘abī quḥāfat^a ‘uṭmān^u.

The precise preservation of this hadith is consistent with its having been transmitted from al-Ḥajjāj to his students, and from them unto al-Ḥākim and ‘Abū al-Ḥusayn, in writing, which fits well enough with the relevant time periods: al-Ḥajjāj operated unto the middle of the 9th Century CE, when written transmission predominated.

Qabīṣah b. ‘Uqbah (d. 213-215/828-831)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent Qabīṣah b. ‘Uqbah (situated within the broader Sufyān al-Ṭawrī sub-tradition), recorded by al-Buḵārī and al-Ṭabarānī.

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

Qabīṣah—Sufyān—Hišām—‘Urwah:

‘Ā’īṣah married at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁶⁵⁵

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Ḥaṣṣ b. ‘Umar—Qabīṣah—Sufyān—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah:

‘Ā’īṣah married at nine; together nine years.⁶⁵⁶

Both of these hadiths are, in certain key respects, more similar to each other than to most other versions of the marital-age hadith more broadly: they share both *al-nabiyy* and the rare wording *wa-makaṭat ‘inda-hu tis^{an}*. Neither is unique amongst the transmissions from Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, however, since the distinctive sub-tradition associated with the PCL Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firyābī exhibits both features. Still, where al-Firyābī’s redaction has *‘udkīlat ‘alay-hi*, al-Buḵārī’s transmission via Qabīṣah has *wa-banā bi-hā*: this would be consistent with al-Buḵārī’s preserving Qabīṣah’s

⁶⁵⁵ Buḵārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, III, p. 1081.

⁶⁵⁶ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 23, # 56.

redaction, which is thereby different from al-Firyābī's, but still extremely similar, since both reflect the deeper redaction of Sufyān.

The only problem with this is the fact that al-Buḳārī is alone in attesting to Qabīṣah's unique redaction, since al-Ṭabarānī's transmission from Qabīṣah completely lacks the medial element recorded by al-Buḳārī. Instead, al-Ṭabarānī's version comprises the distinctive dual elements (marriage at nine, the Prophet's death) associated with 'Abū Mu'āwiyah, which is consistent with at least al-Ṭabarānī's version's having been borrowed—through error or mendacity—therefrom, for which al-Ṭabarānī himself or his immediate source Ḥafṣ would be responsible. To make matters worse, the two versions differ in the earliest segment of their *'isnāds*: al-Buḳārī has Qabīṣah—Sufyān—Hišām—'Urwah (which matches most other transmissions from Sufyān), whereas al-Ṭabarānī's version has Qabīṣah—Sufyān—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah, which is again consistent with some kind of interpolation or error.

That said, al-Ṭabarānī's version still has the distinctive wording *wa-makaṭat 'inda-hu tis^{an}* in its second element, rather than the usual *wa-māta 'an-hā wa-hiya bint ṭamān[iy]* *'ašrah* of 'Abū Mu'āwiyah's redaction, or the *wa-kuntu 'inda-hu tis^{an}* found in some other transmissions from al-'A'maš.⁶⁵⁷ Thus, whilst the first element in al-Ṭabarānī's version (*'anna al-nabiyy tazawwaja 'ā'išata wa-hiya bint tis^c sinīn*) is still broadly more similar to 'Abū Mu'āwiyah's first element (*tazawwaja-hā rasūl allāh wa-hiya bint tis^c*), and the overall combination of elements in al-Ṭabarānī's version is likewise still broadly more similar to 'Abū Mu'āwiyah's distinctive combination, the wording of the second element in particular is actually more similar to al-Buḳārī's alternative transmission from Qabīṣah, and other transmissions from Sufyān al-Ṭawrī. This means either that al-Ṭabarānī's version was cobbled together from two hadiths (the redactions of al-Firyābī and 'Abū Mu'āwiyah) and falsely ascribed to Qabīṣah (by al-Ṭabarānī himself or Ḥafṣ), or else that a genuine transmission from Qabīṣah was contaminated (by 'Abū Mu'āwiyah's version), whilst still retaining some of Qabīṣah's original wording.

Thus, whilst it is plausible that al-Buḳārī preserved Qabīṣah's particular redaction of Sufyān's hadith, part of which also survived in al-Ṭabarānī's version, it may also be the case that al-Buḳārī borrowed and falsely ascribed his *matn* to Qabīṣah, only for Ḥafṣ

⁶⁵⁷ See the sections on 'Abū Mu'āwiyah and al-'A'maš, below.

or al-Ṭabarānī to do the same again (only this time, with a substantially revised *matn*). Moreover, even if al-Buḵārī did preserve Qabīṣah's redaction, he may have paraphrased it: absent corroborating transmissions that preserve a common and distinctive sub-tradition, we cannot confirm the exact wording of Qabīṣah's redaction.

Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firyābī (d. 212/827)

I have collated four reports ascribed to the Perso-Palestinian tradent Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firyābī (situated within the Sufyān al-Ṭawrī sub-tradition, which in turn nestles within the broader tradition of Hišām b. 'Urwah), recorded by al-Buḵārī, 'Abū 'Awānah, Ibn Ḥibbān, and al-Ṭabarānī.

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

al-Firyābī—Sufyān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁶⁵⁸

'Abū 'Awānah (d. 316/929)

'Abū al-'Abbās al-Ġazzī—al-Firyābī—Sufyān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁶⁵⁹

Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965)

'Abū 'Arūbah al-Ḥarrānī—Zakariyyā'—al-Firyābī—Sufyān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁶⁶⁰

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

'Abd Allāh b. 'abī Maryam—al-Firyābī—Sufyān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁶⁶¹

⁶⁵⁸ Buḵārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, III, p. 1076.

⁶⁵⁹ 'Abū 'Awānah (ed. 'Atā' Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XI, p. 383, # 4704.

⁶⁶⁰ Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (ed. Šu'ayb al-'Arna'ūt), *al-'Iḥsān fī Tartīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, vol. 16 (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1991), p. 56, # 7118.

⁶⁶¹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, pp. 21-22, # 49.

These reports are more similar to each other than to all other versions of the marital-age tradition,⁶⁶² such that they definitely constitute a distinctive sub-tradition: this is consistent with the accurate preservation of al-Firyābī redaction. In fact, the differences between these four ascriptions are few and extremely minor, comprising only four added, omitted, or substituted words.⁶⁶³ This is consistent with the hadith's having been transmitted from al-Firyābī to his students in writing. Consequently, al-Firyābī's urtext is easily reconstructable:

ḥaddaṭa-nā sufyān^u 'an ḥiṣāmī bnī 'urwat^a 'an 'abī-hi 'an 'ā'iṣat^a 'anna al-nabiyy^a tazawwaja-hā wa-hiya bint^u sittⁱⁿ wa-'udkilat 'alay-hi wa-hiya bint^u tisⁱⁿ wa-makaṭat 'inda-hu tis^{an}.

Muslim b. 'Ibrāhīm (d. 212/827)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Basran tradent Muslim b. 'Ibrāhīm (situated within the Ja'far b. Sulaymān sub-tradition, which in turn nestles within the broader tradition of Ḥiṣām b. 'Urwah), recorded by al-Nasā'ī and 'Abū 'Awānah.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Muslim b. 'Ibrāhīm—Ja'far b. Sulaymān—Ḥiṣām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁶⁶⁴

'Abū 'Awānah (d. 316/929)

al-Ṣāghānī—Muslim b. 'Ibrāhīm—Ja'far b. Sulaymān—Ḥiṣām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁶⁶⁵

⁶⁶² The closest would be the parallel transmissions from Sufyān, but even these differ: the sub-tradition of 'Abū al-Jawwāb al-'Aḥwaṣ has 'Ā'iṣah speaking in the first person, and al-Buḳārī's transmission from Qabīṣah is *munqaṭi'* and has *banā bi-hā* rather than *'udkilat 'alay-hi*.

⁶⁶³ 'Abū 'Awānah has *sufyān al-ṭawriyy*, where the other three just have *sufyān*; Buḳārī only has *ḥiṣām*, where the other three have *ḥiṣām bn 'urwah*; Buḳārī has *sitt sinīn*, where the other three just have *sitt*; and Ibn Ḥibbān has *ibnah*, where the other three just have *bint*. Ironically, al-Buḳārī's version is thus the least accurate out of the four, even though it is still very accurate in general.

⁶⁶⁴ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁶⁶⁵ 'Abū 'Awānah (ed. 'Aṭā' Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XI, p. 383, # 4705.

These two reports do not constitute a distinctive sub-tradition: the *matns* are not more similar to each other than they to other versions of the marital-age tradition more broadly. 'Abū 'Awānah's transmission via Muslim to Ja'far is still more similar to al-Nasā'ī's alternative transmission from Ja'far than to any other hadith,⁶⁶⁶ but Ibn Sa'd's is fundamentally dissimilar from both: it lacks the distinctive *li-sab'* and *li-tis'* present in the other two, and includes a lengthy final element (about dolls and shy friends) that is absent in the other two. Instead, Ibn Sa'd's version is more similar to any of the various other transmissions from Hišām that incorporate both the marital-age elements and the 'dolls' element.⁶⁶⁷ It thus seems probable that Ibn Sa'd (or some now-suppressed tradent) borrowed or at the very least contaminated the *matn* from another source.

That said, there is another transmission from Ja'far (recorded by al-Nasā'ī) that comprises the 'dolls' element alone,⁶⁶⁸ and yet another transmission from Ja'far (recorded by Ibn 'Adī) that contains a rare wording shared by Ibn Sa'd's version (*makāna-kunna*), even though it also contains elements from a completely different tradition (about Solomon's horse).⁶⁶⁹ In other words, it is actually plausible that the 'dolls' element in Ibn Sa'd's version may actually derive from Ja'far after all. Even so, it would still seem that Ibn Sa'd combined two reports that were initially separate: a marital-age report (independently attested by al-Nasā'ī and 'Abū 'Awānah), and a dolls report (independently attested by al-Nasā'ī and Ibn 'Adī). Given the aforementioned dissimilarity between the marital-age elements in Ibn Sa'd's version and those ascribed to Ja'far by both al-Nasā'ī and 'Abū 'Awānah, however, it still seems like Ibn Sa'd borrowed from, or was contaminated by, some other version, in that respect.⁶⁷⁰

'Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām (d. 211/827)

⁶⁶⁶ Nasā'ī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, p. 772, # 3256.

⁶⁶⁷ In particular: Šāfi'ī (ed. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib), *'Umm*, X, p. 141, # 147; Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā (ed. Ḳalaf), *Iyāl*, p. 756, # 559; Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 21, # 46.

⁶⁶⁸ Nasā'ī (ed. Šalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, VIII, p. 179, # 8898.

⁶⁶⁹ Ibn 'Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, V, pp. 620-621, # 8406.

⁶⁷⁰ On the one hand, the line *wa-'anā ibnat sab' sinīn* in Ibn Sa'd's version is identical to another hadith recorded by Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann, *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42), *vis-à-vis* almost all other versions of the marital-age tradition; and on the other hand, the line *daḳala bī wa-'anā ibnat tis' sinīn* is identical to that found in Hārūn b. 'Ishāq's redaction of 'Abdah (see above), which also has the doll element.

I have collated six reports ascribed to the Yemenite tradent ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām, recorded by ‘Abū Bakr b. ‘Askar (reconstructed), Muslim, al-Dabarī, al-Nasā’ī, ‘Abū ‘Awānah, and Ibn Mandah. A seventh report, putatively recorded by ‘Abū ‘Amr b. Ḥamdān, is inadmissible, since it was plausibly borrowed from or contaminated by Muslim (see above).

‘Abū Bakr b. ‘Askar (d. 251/865)

‘Abd al-Razzāq—Ma‘mar—al-Zuhrī—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁷¹

Muslim (d. 261/875)

‘Abd b. Ḥumayd—‘Abd al-Razzāq—Ma‘mar—al-Zuhrī—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁷²

al-Dabarī (d. 285-286/898-899)

‘Abd al-Razzāq—Ma‘mar—al-Zuhrī & Hišām—‘Urwah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁷³

al-Nasā’ī (d. 303/915-916)

Muḥammad b. Rāfi‘—‘Abd al-Razzāq—Ma‘mar—al-Zuhrī & Hišām—‘Urwah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁷⁴

‘Abū ‘Awānah (d. 316/929)

Muḥammad b. ‘Iṣḥāq al-Ṣāḡānī—‘Abd al-Razzāq—Ma‘mar—al-Zuhrī—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

⁶⁷¹ See the section on ‘Abū Bakr b. ‘Askar, above.

⁶⁷² Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 642, # 71/1422.

⁶⁷³ ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣan‘ānī (ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-‘A‘zamī), *al-Muṣannaḡ*, vol. 6 (Beirut, Lebanon: al-Majlis al-‘Ilmiyy, 1970), p. 162, ## 10349-10350.

⁶⁷⁴ Nasā’ī (ed. Ṣalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, V, pp. 242-243, # 5544.

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁷⁵

Ibn Mandah (d. 395/1005)

ʿAḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād—ʿAḥmad b. Maṣṣūr & al-Dabarī—ʿAbd al-Razzāq—Maʿmar—al-Zuhrī & Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁷⁶

All of these reports agree upon the same gist and even much of the same wording, and all of them are more similar to each other than to all the other versions of the marital-age hadith, such that they constitute a distinctive sub-tradition.⁶⁷⁷ This is consistent with all of these reports preserving an underlying recension from their stated common source, ʿAbd al-Razzāq. It is thus likely that ʿAbd al-Razzāq is a genuine PCL, and that this sub-tradition derives from him.

When it comes to reconstructing the *specific* wording of ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s redaction, however, there are some serious problems. There are of course numerous variants in the six reports, including rearranged, added, omitted, and substituted words,⁶⁷⁸ all of which are consistent with paraphrastic transmission. More troubling is the *pattern* of variants: most of them are doubly attested (i.e., present in two reports), but seemingly at random. For example, Ibn ʿAskar shares *sabʿ sinīn* with Muslim, but Muslim in turn shares *ʿanna al-nabiyya tazawwaja-hā* with ʿAbū ʿAwānah and *tisʿ sinīn* with al-Nasāʾī, and al-Nasāʾī in turn shares *nakaḥa al-nabiyy ʿāʾiṣah* with al-Dabarī, and so on. In other

⁶⁷⁵ ʿAbū ʿAwānah (ed. ʿAṭāʾ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XI, p. 385, # 4709.

⁶⁷⁶ Muḥammad b. ʾIshāq b. Mandah (ed. ʿĀmir Ḥasan Ṣabrī), *Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥābah* (UAE: Jāmiʿat al-ʾImārāt al-ʿArabiyyah al-Muttaḥidah, 2005), pp. 940-941.

⁶⁷⁷ Five of the six share exactly the same set of elements in the same order, a sequence *and* combination of elements found in no other version.

⁶⁷⁸ Ibn ʿAskar, Muslim, and al-Nasāʾī all have *ʾaḵbara-nā maʿmar*, where the other three have *ʿan maʿmar*; al-Dabarī, al-Nasāʾī, and Ibn Mandah all include *hišām bn ʿurwah* in their *ʾisnāds*, absent in the other three; al-Dabarī and al-Nasāʾī both omit *ʿan ʿāʾiṣah* from their *ʾisnāds*, present in all the rest; Muslim and ʿAbū ʿAwānah both have *ʿanna* (and a different sentence order, accordingly), absent in all the rest; al-Dabarī and al-Nasāʾī both have *nakaḥa*, where all the rest have *tazawwaja*; Ibn Mandah has *rasūl allāh*, where all the rest have *al-nabiyy*; al-Dabarī and al-Nasāʾī both have *ʿāʾiṣah* as an object, where all the rest have *-hā* and Ibn Mandah has *-nī*; Ibn Mandah has *ʾanā*, where all the rest have *hiya*; where al-Dabarī and Ibn Mandah both have *sitt*, and Muslim and Ibn ʿAskar both have *sabʿ sinīn*, al-Nasāʾī and ʿAbū ʿAwānah both have *sitt sanawātin ʾaw [...] sabʿ*; al-Dabarī has *ʾuhdiyyat* and Ibn Mandah has *dufiʿtu*, where all the rest have *zuffat*; Muslim and al-Nasāʾī both have *tisʿ sinīn*, where all the rest have *tisʿ* only; Ibn Mandah lacks the element *wa-luʿabu-hā maʿa-hā*, present in all the others; ʿAbū ʿAwānah has *tuwuffiya*, where all the rest have *māta*; Ibn ʿAskar and Ibn Mandah both lack *ʿan-hā*, present in the others; and finally, al-Nasāʾī has *sanah*, absent in all the rest.

words, most of the variants are not confined to only one version, which seems unlikely if the variants in question were the product of the respective tradents thereof: it is not very likely that two tradents would make exactly the same change to their versions independently, and even less likely that this would occur over and over.

There are two solutions to this puzzle: either there was frequent contamination between the different transmissions from ‘Abd al-Razzāq,⁶⁷⁹ rendering the precise reconstruction of his urtext largely impossible (since corroborating wordings might actually be borrowed from each other); or alternatively, ‘Abd al-Razzāq reworded his version through successive retellings, such that there is no coherent or fixed urtext to reconstruct in the first place. The gist of the ‘original’ redaction remains the same regardless, but (in the first scenario) some key details are thrown into question: did ‘Abd al-Razzāq cite Hišām as one of his sources, or did he not? Did he relate that ‘Ā’iṣah was engaged to marry the Prophet when she was six, or six or seven, or seven? Even more troubling (in the second scenario) is the prospect that ‘Abd al-Razzāq changed a key detail in his hadith over time. The addition or omission of Hišām could be explained away as mere abridgement, but the alternating ages cannot: was ‘Ā’iṣah six, or six or seven, or seven?⁶⁸⁰

In the first scenario, there is still some prospect of reconstructing a speculative urtext, based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity: unusual and undesirable textual variants are more likely to belong to the original and less likely to be the product of contamination, since it is more likely that an obscure or undesirable version was updated in accordance with a common, popular, or ideal version, rather than vice versa.⁶⁸¹ On this basis, the following approximation obtains:

...ma‘mar^{un} ‘anⁱ al-zuhriyyi ‘an ‘urwat^a [wa-hiṣāmⁱ bnⁱ ‘urwat^a ‘an ‘abī-hi]
qāla **nakaḥa al-nabiyy^u ‘ā’iṣat^a wa-hiya bint^u sittⁱ sanawātⁱⁿ ‘aw sab^{‘in} wa-**

⁶⁷⁹ The geography of the tradents is consistent with this: all of those who transmitted from ‘Abd al-Razzāq (bar al-Dabarī) operated primarily in Iraq and the East, such that they could easily have met and influenced each other’s versions.

⁶⁸⁰ It might be claimed that “six” and “seven” were each just abbreviations of “six or seven”, but if so, this still seems extremely sloppy or dishonest on ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s part—in either instance, he would be giving the impression of precision or certainty on a historical datum that he knew to be uncertain.

⁶⁸¹ Thus: the vague ‘an is likely the original, rather than the specific ‘aḵbara-nā; the ascription to ‘Urwah is likely the original, rather than the ascription via ‘Urwah to ‘Ā’iṣah; the rare *nakaḥa* and *sanawāt* are likely the original, rather than the common *tazawwaja* and *sinīn*; the uncertain *sitt* ‘aw *sab* is likely the original, rather than the certain *sitt* or *sab*, respectively; and finally, *zuffat* is rare in the broader tradition as a whole, so it is plausibly the original (rather than the isolated variants ‘uhdiyyat and dufī‘tu) here.

zuffat 'ilay-hi wa-hiya bint^u tis^{i[n]} [sinīn^a] wa-lu'abu-hā ma'a-hā wa-māta
'an-hā wa-hiya bint^u tamānī 'ašrat^a.

Alternatively, in the second scenario, we can discern several distinct drafts of 'Abd al-Razzāq's hadith. In the earliest version (partially and variously recorded by al-Dabarī, al-Nasā'ī, and 'Abū 'Awānah),⁶⁸² Hišām was probably included in the 'isnād, 'Ā'īshah was probably absent from the 'isnād (making it *munqaṭī*'), the first verb was probably the rare *nakaḥa*, and 'Ā'īshah's marital age was probably uncertain (*sitt sanawāt 'aw sab*'), as in the following:

...ma'mar^{un} 'anī al-zuhriyyi 'an 'urwat^a wa-hišāmī bnī 'urwat^a 'an 'abī-hi qāla
nakaḥa al-nabiyy^u 'ā'īшат^a wa-hiya bint^u sittⁱ sanawātⁱⁿ 'aw sabⁱⁿ wa-zuffat
'ilay-hi wa-hiya bint^u tisⁱⁿ wa-lu'abu-hā ma'a-hā wa-māta 'an-hā wa-hiya
bint^u tamānī 'ašrat^a.

In a subsequent iteration (recorded by 'Abū 'Awānah),⁶⁸³ 'Abd al-Razzāq omitted Hišām from the 'isnād and further raised it from 'Urwah to 'Ā'īshah, whilst also substituting the uncommon *nakaḥa* for the common *tazawwaja*, as in the following:

...ma'marⁱⁿ 'anī al-zuhriyyi 'an 'urwat^a 'an 'ā'īшат^a 'anna al-nabiyy^a
tazawwaja-hā wa-hiya bint^u sittⁱ sanawātⁱⁿ 'aw hiya bint^u sabⁱⁿ wa-zuffat
'ilay-hi wa-hiya bint^u tisⁱⁿ wa-lu'abu-hā ma'a-hā wa-māta 'an-hā wa-hiya
bint^u tamānī 'ašrat^a.

In a final iteration (recorded by Muslim, and in Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā's version from Ibn 'Askar),⁶⁸⁴ 'Abd al-Razzāq further refined the hadith by removing the ambiguity surrounding 'Ā'īshah's marital age and specifying seven in particular, as in the following:

...ma'mar^{un} 'anī al-zuhriyyi 'an 'urwat^a 'an 'ā'īшат^a 'anna al-nabiyy^a
tazawwaja-hā wa-hiya bint^u sabⁱ sinīn^a wa-zuffat 'ilay-hi wa-hiya bint^u tisⁱⁿ
wa-lu'abu-hā ma'a-hā wa-māta 'an-hā wa-hiya bint^u tamānī 'ašrat^a.

⁶⁸² The raising in 'Abū 'Awānah and the 'anna al-nabiyy tazawwaja-hā are both secondary, and the *tuwuffiya* is a unique variant in his transmission, so all must be disregarded for this redaction; the *sinīn* and *sanah* in al-Nasā'ī are absent in the other two, and should be disregarded accordingly; the *'uhdiyat* in al-Dabarī is unique to him; and finally, the specific *sitt* in al-Dabarī seems secondary, *vis-à-vis* the vague *sitt sanawāt 'aw sab*.

⁶⁸³ However, *tuwuffiya* is unique to 'Abū 'Awānah, and has been emended to *māta* accordingly.

⁶⁸⁴ Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā—Ibn 'Askar omits *'ilay-hi*, present in all other versions of this hadith. The two other versions of Ibn 'Askar omit *'anna* and reorganise the first element: Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim has *tazawwaja-hā al-nabiyy*, and al-Ṭabarānī has *tazawwaja-nī rasūl allāh*.

Finally, ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s student al-Dabarī alternatively specified the first element as *sitt*, and Ibn Mandah or one of his intermediaries back to ‘Abd al-Razzāq (‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād or ‘Aḥmad b. Maṣṣūr) took this and further rephrased the entire hadith into an autobiographical quotation from ‘Ā’iṣah (substituting *al-nabiyy* for *rasūl allāh* and the *z-f-f* root with the *d-f-‘* root, and omitting the ‘dolls’ element in the process).

On either scenario, the following wording probably derives from ‘Abd al-Razzāq, as his original formulation (before it was altered and contaminated by successive tradents) or earliest discernible formulation (before he himself altered in successive retellings):

...ma‘mar^{un} ‘anⁱ al-zuhriyyⁱ ‘an ‘urwat^a [wa-hiṣāmⁱ bnⁱ ‘urwat^a ‘an ‘abī-hi] qāla nakaha al-nabiyy^u ‘ā’iṣat^a wa-hiya bint^u sittⁱ sanawātⁱⁿ ‘aw sab^{‘in} wa-zuffat ‘ilay-hi wa-hiya bint^u tis^{‘in} [sinīn^a] wa-lu‘abu-hā ma‘a-hā wa-māta ‘an-hā wa-hiya bint^u tamānⁱ ‘aṣrat^a

In the first scenario, where the tradents from ‘Abd al-Razzāq are responsible for the major variants within this sub-tradition, most of the variants in the first element (substituted words, rearranged sentences, changed details) are consistent with oral paraphrasing, even as the overall uniformity of the other three elements is consistent with written transmission; this might point to parallel or partial oral *and* written transmission at this time, from ‘Abd al-Razzāq to his students, and between these students. In the second scenario, where ‘Abd al-Razzāq himself is responsible for the major variants within this sub-tradition, most of these variants are consistent with oral paraphrasing on the part of ‘Abd al-Razzāq, combined with fairly precise written transmission on the part of his tradents, or in other words: ‘Abd al-Razzāq transmitted his hadith orally (and paraphrased it in successive retellings), whereas most of his students preserved it in writing. Even then, there may have been a few instances of paraphrasing on the part of these students: al-Dabarī seems to have paraphrased *zuffat* as *‘uhdiyat*, and possibly also reduced *sitt sanawāt ‘aw sab‘* to *sitt*; ‘Abū ‘Awānah or his source al-Ṣāghānī seems to have paraphrased *māta* as *tuwuffiya*; and Ibn Mandah or one of his sources rephrased the entire hadith (see above). By contrast, the occasional additions or omissions in the different transmissions can be explained by occasional

scribal errors, either by the aforementioned tradents or later copyists of the relevant collections.⁶⁸⁵

Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Madinan tradent Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidī (from ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Maymūn, from Ḥabīb al-’A‘war), recorded by Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī.

Ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. ‘Umar—‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Maymūn—Ḥabīb:

Ḳadījah’s death; **‘Ā’iṣah shown by angel**; Prophet’s interactions with ‘Ā’iṣah’s family; ‘Ā’iṣah’s birth; **‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage at six**; **marriage to Sawdah**.⁶⁸⁶

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

Muḥammad b. ‘Aḥmad b. Baṭṭah—al-Ḥasan b. al-Jahm—al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faraj—Muḥammad b. ‘Umar—‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Maymūn—Ḥabīb:

Ḳadījah’s death; **‘Ā’iṣah shown by angel**; Prophet’s interactions with ‘Ā’iṣah’s family; ‘Ā’iṣah’s birth; **‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage at six**; **marriage to Sawdah**.⁶⁸⁷

These two reports are more similar to each other than they are to all the rest, and are in fact largely identical, aside from a few additions, omissions, and other minor differences.⁶⁸⁸ As such, these two reports constitute a distinctive sub-tradition, which is consistent with their reflecting the particular redaction of their common source, al-Wāqidī. Consequently, al-Wāqidī is probably a genuine CL, to whom the following urtext can be attributed:

⁶⁸⁵ Specifically: the added *sinīn* in both Muslim and al-Nasā’ī; the missing *‘an-hā* in Ibn ‘Askar; and the added *sanah* in al-Nasā’ī.

⁶⁸⁶ Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 54.

⁶⁸⁷ Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, p. 21, # 6883. For the rest of the *’isnād*, see *ibid.*, p. 20, # 6881.

⁶⁸⁸ I.S. adds *ḥuzn^{an} ṣadīd^{an}*; I.S. has *fa-ba’āta allāh jibrīl fa-’atā-hu*, where Ḥ. has *fa-’atā-hu jibrīl*; Ḥ. has *bi-* and *la-*; I.S. has *ḍālika*, where Ḥ. has *ḍāka*; I.S. adds *yawm^{an}*; I.S. has *yawm^{an} wāḥid^{an}*, where Ḥ. has *yawm^{un} wāḥid^{un}*; Ḥ. adds *’illā*; I.S. adds *dār*; I.S. adds *bi-hā*; I.S. has *wa-* where Ḥ. has *fa-*; I.S. has *fī-mā*, where Ḥ. has *fī-hā*; I.S. has *’annī* where Ḥ. has *’annā*; Ḥ. adds *fī*; I.S. adds *fī ’awwali-hā*; I.S. has *bint* where Ḥ. has *ibnah*.

ḥaddaṭa-n[ī/ā] ‘abd^u al-wāḥidⁱ bn^u maymūnⁱⁿ mawlā ‘urwat^a ‘an ḥabībⁱⁿ
mawlā ‘urwat^a qāla lammā mātat kadījat^u ḥazina ‘alay-hā al-nabiyy^u
[ḥuzn^{an} šadīd^{an}] [[fa-’atā-hu jibrīl^a]/[fa-ba’atā allāh^u jibrīl^a fa-’atā-hu]]
bi-‘ā’iṣat^a fī mahdⁱⁿ fa-qāla yā rasūl^a allāhⁱ ḥādīhi tuḏhibu [bi-]ba’dⁱ ḥuzni-
ka wa-’inna fī ḥādīhi [la-]kalafan min kadījat^a tumma radda-hā fa-kāna
rasūl^u allāhⁱ yaḳtalifu ‘ilā bayti ‘abī bakrⁱⁿ wa-yaqūlu yā ‘umma rūmān^a
istawṣī bi-‘ā’iṣat^a ḳayr^{an} wa-iḥfaẓī-nī fī-hā fa-kāna li-‘ā’iṣat^a bi-
[dālīka/dāka] manzilat^{un} ‘inda ‘ahli-hā wa-lā yaš‘urūna bi-’amrⁱ allāhⁱ fī-hā
fa-’atā-hum rasūl^u allāhⁱ [yawm^{an}] fī ba’dⁱ mā kāna ya’tī-him wa-kāna lā
yuḳṭī’u-hu yawm^[u/a]n wāḥid^[u/a]n [‘illā] ‘an ya’tiya ‘ilā bayti ‘abī bakrⁱⁿ
mundū ‘aslama ‘ilā ‘an ḥājara fa-yajidu ‘ā’iṣat^a mutasattirat^{an} bi-bābi [dārⁱ]
‘abī bakrⁱⁿ tabkī bukā^{an} ḥazīn^{an} fa-sa’ala-hā fa-šakat ‘umma-hā fa-ḍakarāt
‘anna-hā tūla’u [bi-hā] fa-dama‘at ‘aynā rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ [f/w]a-daḳala ‘alā
‘ummi rūmān^a fa-qāla yā ‘umma rūmān^a ‘a-lam ‘ūṣi-ki bi-‘ā’iṣat^a ‘an taḥfaẓī-
nī fī-[h/m]ā fa-qālat yā rasūl^a allāhⁱ ‘inna-hā ballaḡati al-ṣiddīq^a ‘ann[ā/ī]
wa-’aḡḍabat-hu ‘alay-nā fa-qāla al-nabiyy^u wa-’in fa’alat qālat ‘ummu
rūmān^a lā jaram^a lā su’tu-hā ‘abad^{an} wa-kānat ‘ā’iṣat^u wulidat [fī] al-
sanat^[i/a] al-rābi‘at^[i/a] min^a al-nubuwwatⁱ [fī ‘awwali-hā] wa-tazawwaja-hā
rasūl^u allāhⁱ fī al-sanatⁱ al-‘āširatⁱ fī šawwālⁱⁿ wa-hiya yawma-’idⁱⁿ
[bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-tazawwaja-hā ba’d^a sawdat^a bi-šahrⁱⁿ.

The extremely high rate of similarity between the two extant derivations of this hadith is consistent with its having been transmitted in writing from al-Wāqidī to his students, which fits not just the general time period involved (i.e., the early 9th Century CE onward, when written transmission predominated), but with the fact that al-Wāqidī was an early composer of texts (*ṣāḥib al-taṣānīf wa-al-maḡāzī*),⁶⁸⁹ Ibn Sa’d was his personal scribe (*kātib*),⁶⁹⁰ and al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faraj transmitted from him a recension of his *al-Mubtada’ wa-al-Maḡāzī*.⁶⁹¹

Muḥammad b. Bišr (d. 203/818-819)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent Muḥammad b. Bišr (situated within the broader tradition of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr): one recorded in the *Musnad* of

⁶⁸⁹ Dahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūt *et al.*), *Siyar*, IX, p. 454.

⁶⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, X, p. 664.

⁶⁹¹ ‘Abū al-Šayḳ ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad (ed. ‘Abd al-Ġafūr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Balūšī), *Ṭabaqāt al-Muḥaddiṭīn bi-’Aṣḥabān wa-al-Wāridīn ‘alay-hā*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu’assasat al-Risālah, n. d.), p. 200, # 100.

Ibn Rāhwayh, and the other in the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal (as composed or transmitted by his son ‘Abd Allāh).

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

Muḥammad b. Bišr—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—’Abū Salamah & Yaḥyá:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ‘Umm Rūmān and waits for ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ‘Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ‘im’s son; ‘Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ‘im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ‘Abū Bakr’s relief; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; ‘Ā’iṣah is six; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah and talks to her; Ḳawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Hijrah; men and women gather in the house; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; marital consummation in the house; Sa’d brings food; ‘Ā’iṣah is nine.⁶⁹²

‘Abd Allāh (d. 290/903) — Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855)

Ibn Ḥanbal—Muḥammad b. Bišr—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—’Abū Salamah & Yaḥyá:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ‘Umm Rūmān and waits for ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ‘Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ‘im’s son; ‘Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ‘im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ‘Abū Bakr’s relief; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; ‘Ā’iṣah is six; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah and talks to her; Ḳawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

⁶⁹² Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūṣī), *Musnad*, II, pp. 587-590, # 1164/621.

Hijrah; men and women gather in the house; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; marital consummation in the house; Sa'd brings food; Ā'īshah is nine.⁶⁹³

There are numerous differences between these two versions: additional or missing conjunctions, particles, and prepositions, transpositions,⁶⁹⁴ outright misspellings,⁶⁹⁵ the addition or omission of words and sentences,⁶⁹⁶ and most of all, paraphrases (including both substitution with synonyms and elaborations).⁶⁹⁷ Both versions are also characterised by confusion in the narrator's point of view (whether due to interpolation or editorial correction, or paraphrastic or scribal error), but in different places. In Ibn Rāhwayh's version, this occurs when the narrator is suddenly specified

⁶⁹³ 'Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (ed. Muḥammad al-Zahrī al-Ġamrāwī), *al-Musnad*, vol. 6 (Cairo, Egypt: al-Maṭba'ah al-Maymaniyyah, 1895), pp. 210-211.

⁶⁹⁴ Where Ibn Rāhwayh has *'ilā rasūl allāh qālat*, 'Abd Allāh has *qālat yā rasūl allāh*; where Ibn Rāhwayh has *intazirī ḥattā ya'tiya 'abū bakr*, 'Abd Allāh has *intazirī 'abā bakr ḥattā ya'tiya*; where Ibn Rāhwayh has *karaja wa-qāla intazirī*, 'Abd Allāh has *qāla intazirī wa-karaja*; where Ibn Rāhwayh has *'abū bakr fa-'aḳlafa-hu*, 'Abd Allāh has *fa-'aḳlafa-hu li-'abī bakr*; where 'Abd Allāh has *qālat* before the *ijtama'a* element, Ibn Rāhwayh has *qāla* after it.

⁶⁹⁵ Where 'Abd Allāh has *daḳalat bayt 'abī bakr*, Ibn Rāhwayh has *daḳalat bint 'abī bakr* (which makes less sense, if none at all); where Ibn Rāhwayh has *ḥayyat*, 'Abd Allāh has *ḥayyaytu* (first-person singular, despite all the surrounding text being third-person feminine); where Ibn Rāhwayh has *id'ī*, 'Abd Allāh has *ud'u* (despite the fact that the imperative is addressed to a woman); where Ibn Rāhwayh has *da'at-hā*, 'Abd Allāh has *du'iyat-hā* (which makes no sense at all in context); where 'Abd Allāh has *jumaymah* (the usual root in this element), Ibn Rāhwayh has *ḥumaymah*.

⁶⁹⁶ 'Abd Allāh has *yā 'abā bakr*, and *fa-wa-allāh*, both absent in Ibn Rāhwayh; Ibn Rāhwayh has *fa-da'at-hu fa-jā'a*, where 'Abd Allāh has *fa-jā'a rasūl allāh 'ilay-hi*; Ibn Rāhwayh has *fa-lammā qadimnā*, where 'Abd Allāh only has *fa-qadimnā*. It should be noted that these simple additions/omissions may be the product of paraphrasing, as in the examples below.

⁶⁹⁷ Compare: *bint* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *ibnah* ('Abd Allāh); *ittaba'at allaḳī 'anta 'alay-hi* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *ittaba'at-ka 'alā mā taqūlu* ('Abd Allāh); *muṣbi' hādā al-fatā* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *muṣbīn sāhibā-nā* ('Abd Allāh); *'in 'anta zawwajta-hu* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *tazawwaja 'ilay-ka* ('Abd Allāh); *'a-taqūlu mā taqūlu hādīhi* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *'a-qawl hādīhi taqūlu* ('Abd Allāh); *fa-karaja 'abū bakr qad 'aḳraja allāh mā kāna fī nafsi-hi min al-'idati allatī wa'ada-hu* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *fa-karaja min 'indī-hi wa-qad 'aḳhaba allāh mā kāna fī nafsi-hi min 'idati-hi allatī wa'ada-hu* ('Abd Allāh); *fa-zawwaja-hā min rasūl allāh* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *fa-zawwaja-hā 'iyyā-hu* ('Abd Allāh); *wa-hiya yawma-'idin ibnat sitt sinīn* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *wa-'ā'īshah yawma-'idin bint sitt sinīn* ('Abd Allāh); *sawdah ibnat zam'ah* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *sawdah bint zam'ah* ('Abd Allāh); *wa-qad fāta-hu al-ḥajj* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *qad taḳallafa 'an al-ḥajj* ('Abd Allāh); *man 'anti* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *man hādīhi* ('Abd Allāh); *fa-lammā qadima 'abd bn zam'ah min al-ḥajj qāla māḍā šana'a ḥubb zawj sawdah min-hu fa-kāna ba'da mā 'aslama yaqūlu la-'amrī 'innī la-safīh yawma 'ankartu tazwīj rasūl allāh sawdah wa-kāna ḥaṭṭan 'alā ra'si-hi al-turāb* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *fa-jā'a-hā 'aḳū-hā 'abd bn zam'ah min al-ḥajj fa-jā'ala yaḥṭī fī ra'si-hi al-turāb fa-qāla ba'da 'an 'aslama la-'amru-ka 'innī la-safīh yawma 'aḥṭī fī ra'si al-turāb 'an tazawwaja rasūl allāh sawdah bint zam'ah* ('Abd Allāh); *fa-daḳala rasūl allāh* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *fa-jā'a rasūl allāh fa-daḳala* ('Abd Allāh); *wa-jā'a 'ummī wa-'anā fī 'urjūḥah fī 'aḳḳayn tarjaḥu bī fa-'aḳaḳat taqūdi-nī min al-'urjūḥah fa-'anzalat-nī* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *fa-jā'at-nī 'ummī wa-'innī la-fī 'urjūḥah bayna 'aḳḳayn tarjaḥu bī fa-'anzalat-nī min al-'urjūḥah* ('Abd Allāh); *fa-masaḥat wajhī bi-šay' min mā' ṭumma ja'alat taqūdu-nī ḥattā jā'a bī 'inda bāb al-bayt wa-'innī la-'anhaju fa-lammā sakana bī daḳalat bī 'alay-hi wa-'inda-hu rijāl min al-'anšār wa-nisā' fa-'ajlasat-nī* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *wa-masaḥat wajhī bi-šay' min mā' ṭumma 'aḳbalat taqūdu-nī ḥattā waqafat bī 'inda al-bāb wa-'innī la-'anhaju ḥattā sakana min nafasī ṭumma daḳalat bī fa-'idā rasūl allāh jālis 'alā sarīr fī bayti-nā wa-'inda-hu rijāl wa-nisā' min al-'anšār fa-'ajlasat-nī fī ḥijri-hi* ('Abd Allāh); *naḥara lī* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *nuḥirat 'alayya* ('Abd Allāh); *ḍabaḥa lī* (Ibn Rāhwayh), *ḍubihat 'alayya* ('Abd Allāh).

to be male (*qāla*), in the middle of an autobiographical narration from ‘Ā’iṣah. In ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad’s transmission from his father (Ibn Ḥanbal), this occurs when Ḳawlah abruptly becomes the narrator (*ḥayyaytu*, “I greeted”) despite being referred to by the narrator in the third person up until this point (*karajat*, “she departed”; *qālat*, “she said”) and even a few words after this point (reverting back to *qālat*).

Despite all of this, these two reports are more similar to each other than to any others within the broader tradition of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr (see below), sharing the same elements in the same order, and many novel wordings as well, such that they constitute a distinctive sub-tradition.⁶⁹⁸ The absence of more versions of this sub-tradition makes it harder to adjudicate between the textual variants preserved in the two that we do have, but most of the underlying redaction can still be discerned:

ḥaddaṭa-nā muḥammad^u bn^u ‘amrⁱⁿw ḥaddaṭa-nā ‘abū salamat^a wa-yaḥyá
[bn^u ‘abdi al-raḥmānⁱ bni ḥāṭibⁱⁿ] qālā **lammā** halakat ḡadijat^u jā‘at ḡawlat^u
 bint^u ḥakīmⁱⁿ imra‘at^u ‘uṭmān^a bni maẓ‘ūnⁱⁿ **[‘ilā rasūli allāhi qālat]/[qālat**
yā rasūla allāhi] ‘a-lā tuzawwija **[fa-]**qāla man qālat ‘in šī‘ta bikraⁿ wa-‘in
 šī‘ta ṭayyib^{an} **[fa-]**qāla manⁱ al-bikr^u **[fa-]**qālat ibnat^u ‘aḥabbⁱ ḡalqⁱ allāhi ‘ilay-
 ka ‘ā’iṣat^u bint^u ‘abī bakrⁱⁿ qāla **[f/w]**a-manⁱ al-ṭayyib^u qālat sawdat^u
[bint^u/ibnat^u] zam‘at^a **[wa-]**qad ‘āmanat **[bi-ka]** wa-ittaba‘at **[[-ka ‘alā mā**
taqūlu]/[alladī ‘anta ‘alay-hi] qāla fa-idḡabī fa-uḡkurī-himā ‘alayya fa-
 daḡalat bayt^a ‘abī bakrⁱⁿ fa-qālat yā ‘umm^a rümān^a māḡdā ‘adḡala allāh^u ‘alay-
 k*[i/um]* min^a al-ḡayrⁱ wa-al-barakatⁱ **[fa-]**qālat wa-mā ḡāka **[fa-]**qālat
 ‘arsala-nī rasūl^u allāhi ‘aḡṭubu ‘alay-hi ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat intaẓirī **[‘abā bakrⁱⁿ**
ḡattā ya’tiya]/[ḡattā ya’tiya ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ] **[fa-]**jā’a/daḡala ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ fa-
 qālat **[yā ‘abā bakrⁱⁿ]** māḡdā ‘adḡala allāh^u ‘alay-kum min^a al-ḡayrⁱ wa-al-
 barakatⁱ qāla wa-mā ḡāka qālat ‘arsala-nī rasūl^u allāhi ‘aḡṭubu ‘alay-hi
 ‘ā’iṣat^a qāla wa-hal ṭaṣluḡu la-hu ‘inna-mā hiya ibnat^u ‘akī-hi fa-raja‘at ‘ilā
 rasūli allāhi fa-ḡakarāt ḡālika la-hu qāla irja‘ī ‘ilay-hi fa-qūli la-hu ‘anā ‘akū-
 ka wa-‘anta ‘akī fi al-‘islāmⁱ wa-ibnatu-ka ṭaṣluḡu lī fa-raja‘at **[‘ilay-hi]** fa-
 ḡakarāt ḡālika la-hu **[fa-ḡaraja wa-qāla intaẓirī]/[qāla intaẓirī wa-**
ḡaraja] **[fa-]**qālat ‘umm^u rümān^a **[‘anna/’inna]** muṭ‘im^a bn^a ‘adiyyⁱⁿ **[qad]**
 kāna ḡakara-hā ‘alā ibni-hi **[fa-]**wa-**[allāhi]** mā wa‘ada wa‘d^{an} qaṭṭu **[‘abū**
bakrⁱⁿ fa-‘aḡlafa-hu]/[fa-‘aḡlafa-hu li-‘abī bakrⁱⁿ] fa-daḡala ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ
 ‘alā muṭ‘im^a bn^a ‘adiyyⁱⁿ wa-‘inda-hu imra‘atu-hu ‘umm^u al-fatā fa-qālat yā
 ibn^a ‘abī quḡāfat^a la‘alla-ka **[muṣbⁱⁿ ṣāḡiba-nā]/[muṣbī‘^u ḡāḡā al-fatā**
wa-] mudḡilu-hu fi dīni-ka alladī ‘anta ‘alay-hi ‘in **[‘anta zawwajta-hu fa-**
‘aqbala ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ ‘alā al-]/[tazawwaja ‘ilay-ka qāla ‘abū bakrⁱⁿ li-l-]
 muṭ‘imⁱ bni ‘adiyyⁱⁿ **[fa-qāla]** ‘a-**[taqūlu mā taqūlu ḡāḡihi]/[ḡawl^u ḡāḡihi**
taqūlu] **[fa-]**qāla ‘inna-hā **[la-]**taqūlu ḡālika fa-ḡaraja **[‘abū bakrⁱⁿ]/[min**

⁶⁹⁸ Both transmissions from Biṣr have *halakat*, where those from Sa‘īd have *tuwuffiya* and those from ‘Aḥmad have *māta*; Biṣr’s both have *ḡattā ya’tiya*, where those from the other two have *‘ātīn*; Biṣr’s both have a participle (*muṣbī’/muṣbīn*), where the rest have verbs (*tuṣbī/tuṣību*); and Biṣr’s both have *zawwaja-hā*, where Sa‘īd’s have *‘ankaḡa-hā* and ‘Aḥmad’s have *malaka-hā*.

'indi-hi]] [wa-]qad [ʿadhaba/ʿakraja] allāh^u mā kāna fī nafsi-hi min^a
 ['idati-hi/al-ʿidat'] allatī waʿada-hu fa-rajaʿa fa-qāla [yā/li-] qawlat^u idʿī [lī]
 rasūl^a allāhī fa-daʿat-hu fa-zawwaja-hā [[min rasūlī allāhī]/[ʿiyyā-hu]] wa-
 [hiya/ʿāʾiṣat^u] yawma-ʾidⁱⁿ [bint^u/ibnat^u] sittī sinīn^a tumma qarajat fa-
 daḡalat ʿalā sawdat^a [ibnatⁱ/bintⁱ] zamʿat^a fa-qālat [la-hā] māḡā ʿadḡala
 allāh^u ʿalay-ki min^a al-ḡayrⁱ wa-al-barakatⁱ [fa-]qālat wa-mā ḡāka [fa-]qālat
 ʿarsala-nī rasūl^u allāhī ʿaḡtubu-ki ʿalay-hi [fa-]qālat wadidtu udḡulī
 [ʿalā/ʾilā] ʿabī fa-udḡurī ḡālika la-hu wa-kāna ṣayḡ^{an} kabīr^{an} qad ʿadraka[t]-
 hu al-sinn^u [wa-]qad [[fāta-hu]/[taḡallafa ʿanⁱ]] al-ḡajj[u/i] fa-daḡalat
 ʿalay-hi fa-ḡayyat-hu bi-taḡiyyatⁱ al-jāhiliyyatⁱ fa-qāla man [ʿanti/hāḡihi]
 fa-qālat qawlat^u bint^u ḡakīmⁱⁿ qāla [w/f]a-mā ṣaʾnu-ki [fa-]qālat ʿarsala-nī
 muḡammad^u bn^u ʿabdi allāhī [ʾilay-ka] ʿaḡtubu ʿalay-ka sawdat^a [fa-]qāla
 kuḡ^{un} karīm^{un} mā[ḡā] taqūlu ṣāḡibat^u-ki fa-qālat tuḡibbu ḡālika fa-qāla idʿī-
 hā [lī] fa-daʿat-hā fa-jāʿat [fa-]qāla ʿay bunayyat^u ʿinna hāḡihi tazʾumu ʿanna
 muḡammad^a bn^a ʿabdi allāhī bnⁱ ʿabdi al-muḡḡalibⁱ [qad] ʿarsala yaḡtubu-ki
 [ʿalay-hi] wa-huwa kuḡ^{un} karīm^{un} ʿa-tuḡibbīna ʿan ʿuzawwiya-ki[-hi/bi-hi]
 [fa-]qālat naʿam qāla[t] idʿī-hi lī [fa-daʿat-hu] fa-jāʿa [rasūl^u allāhī ʾilay-hi]
 fa-zawwaja-hā [ʿiyyā/min]-hu fa-[[jāʿa-hā ʿaḡū-hā]/[lammā qadima]]
 ʿabdu bn^u zamʿat^a min^a al-ḡajjī [[fa-jaʿala yaḡḡī fī raʾsi-hi al-turāb^a fa-
 qāla]/[qāla māḡā ṣanaʿa ḡubb^u zawjī sawdat^a min-hu fa-kāna]] baʿḡa
 [ʿan/mā] ʿaslama [yaḡūlu] la-ʿamr[i/u-ka] ʿinnī la-safih^{un} yawma [[ʿaḡḡī fī
 raʾsī al-turāb^a ʿan tazawwaja rasūl^u allāhī sawdat^a bint^a
 zamʿat^a]/[ʿankartu tazwij^a rasūlī allāhī sawdat^a wa-kāna ḡaḡ^{an} ʿalā
 raʾsi-hi al-turāb^a]] qālat ʿāʾiṣat^u [fa-[lammā] qadimnā al-madīnat^a [fa-
]nazalnā fī banī al-ḡarīḡⁱ bnⁱ al-ḡazrajī fī al-sunḡ [qālat][[fa-jāʿa rasūl^u
 allāhī fa-daḡala]/[fa-daḡala rasūl^u allāhī]] bayta-nā fa-ijḡamaʿa ʾilay-hi
 rijāl^{un} min^a al-ʿanṣārī wa-nisāʾ^{un} [qāla] fa-jāʿa[t-nī] ʾummī wa-[ʾinnī/ʿanā]
 [la-]fī ʾurjūḡatⁱⁿ [fī/bayn^a] ʿaḡḡaynī tarjaḡu bī [[fa-ʿanzalat-nī min^a al-
 ʾurjūḡatⁱ]/[fa-ʿakadat taḡūdi-nī min^a al-ʾurjūḡatⁱ fa-ʿanzalat-nī]] wa-lī
 jumaymat^{un} fa-[faraḡtu/faraḡat]-hā [w/f]a-masaḡat wajḡī bi-ṣayⁱⁿ min
 māⁱⁿ tumma [ʿaḡbalat/jaʿalat] taḡūdu-nī ḡattā [waḡafat/jāʿa] bī ʿinda [[al-
 bābⁱ]/[bābⁱ al-bayḡⁱ] wa-ʾinnī la-ʾanhaju [ḡattā/fa-lammā] sakana
 [[bī]/[min nafasī tumma]] daḡalat bī [[ʿalay-hi]/[fa-ʾidā rasūl^u allāhī
 jālīs^{un} ʿalā sarīrⁱⁿ fī bayti-nā]] wa-ʿinda-hu rijāl^{un} [[wa-nisāʾ^{un} min^a al-
 ʿanṣārī]/[min^a al-ʿanṣārī wa-nisāʾ^{un}]] fa-ʾajlasat-nī [fī ḡijri-hi]
 [tumma/fa-] qālat hāʾulāʾī ʾahlu-ki fa-bāraka allāh^u la-ki fī-[hā/him] wa-
 bāraka la-hum fī-ki fa-waḡaba al-rijāl^u wa-al-nisāʾ^u fa-ḡarajū fa-banā bī
 rasūl^u allāhī fī bayti-nā mā [[naḡara lī]/[nuḡirat ʿalayya]] jazūr^{un} wa-lā
 [[ḡabaḡa lī]/[ḡubiḡat ʿalayya]] ṣāt^{an} ḡattā ʿarsala ʾilay-nā saʿḡu bn^u
 ʿubādat^a bi-jafnatⁱⁿ kāna yursilu bi-hā ʾilā rasūlī allāhī ʾidā ḡāra fī nisāʾī-hi
 wa-ʿanā yawma-ʾidⁱⁿ [bint^u/ibnat^u] tisʿī sinīn^a.

The attribution of this (approximate) redaction to Muḡammad b. Biṣr is reasonable: the two reports under consideration evidently share a close recent textual ancestor to the exclusion of all others within the broader tradition of Muḡammad b. ʿAmr, which matches the attribution in the *ʾisnāds* of both to the PCL Muḡammad b. Biṣr. This attribution is strengthened by the fact that at least one of the extant sources preserving

this hadith—Ibn Rāhwayh—transmits directly from Muḥammad b. Bišr, rather than via some SS from a distant remove.

The transmission of this hadith from Muḥammad b. Bišr to his students Ibn Rāhwayh and Ibn Ḥanbal (and possibly from Ibn Ḥanbal to his son ‘Abd Allāh) was sloppy, and probably substantially oral: most of numerous variants that arose between the extant versions seem like paraphrases and elaborations (rather than scribal errors), which is characteristic of oral transmission. That said, the general outline and much of the wording of the original elements was accurately preserved, which precludes free oral remixing and may indicate the parallel use of written notes to aid memorisation (e.g., recording rough outlines or summaries).

‘Abū ‘Aḥmad al-Zubayrī (d. 203/818)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent ‘Abū ‘Aḥmad al-Zubayrī (situated within the broader ‘Isrā’īl sub-tradition), recorded by Ibn Mājah and al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī.

Ibn Mājah (d. 273/887)

‘Aḥmad b. Sinān—‘Abū ‘Aḥmad—‘Isrā’īl—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Abd Allāh:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at seven; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁶⁹⁹

al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (d. 463/1071)

‘Umar b. ‘abī Ṭālib—Yūsuf b. ‘Umar al-Qawwās—Muḥammad b. Manṣūr al-Šī‘ī—Naṣr b. ‘Alī al-Jahḍamī—‘Abū ‘Aḥmad—‘Isrā’īl—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Abd Allāh:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁰⁰

⁶⁹⁹ Muḥammad b. Yazīd b. Mājah (ed. Muḥammad Fu’ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī), *Sunan*, vol. 1 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār ‘Iḥyā’ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyyah, 1952), p. 604, # 1877.

⁷⁰⁰ ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (ed. Baššār ‘Awwād Ma’rūf), *Ta’rīk Madīnat al-Salām wa-‘Aḵbār Muḥaddiṭi-hā wa-Ḍikr Quṭṭāni-hā al-‘Ulamā’ min Ġayr ‘Ahli-hā wa-Wāridi-hā*, vol. 13 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ġarb al-‘Islāmiyy, 2001), pp. 148-149.

Although the *matns* of these two reports are broadly similar (with the same set of elements in the same order), they are not consistently more similar to each other than to other transmissions from 'Isrā'īl more broadly.⁷⁰¹ This is consistent with the occurrence of some kind of *tadlīs* or contamination within these two reports, which precludes any kind of confident reconstruction of 'Abū 'Aḥmad's redaction. It is still plausible that he transmitted something similar from 'Isrā'īl (given the broad correlation of the basic set of elements therein with 'Isrā'īl), but his particular wording as a PCL cannot be pinpointed: the entire *matn* of one of these two reports plausibly derived from—or was contaminated by—a different transmission from 'Isrā'īl.

Yahyá b. 'Ādam (d. 203/818)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent Yahyá b. 'Ādam (situated within the broader 'Isrā'īl sub-tradition), recorded by al-Tirmidī and al-Nasā'ī.

al-Tirmidī (d. 279/892)

Yahyá b. 'Aḥmad—Yahyá b. 'Ādam—'Isrā'īl—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—'Abd Allāh: 'Ā'īṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁰²

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

Ibn Rāhwayh—Yahyá b. 'Ādam—'Isrā'īl—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—'Abd Allāh: 'Ā'īṣah was married at six; consummation at nine.⁷⁰³

⁷⁰¹ Both of them share 'an 'abd allāh, al-nabiyy, baná, and sanah; but Ƙ. has qubiḍa al-nabiyy (which makes it more similar to those that likewise have qubiḍa), and Ibn M. has tuwuffiyya 'an-hā (which makes it more similar to those that likewise have tuwuffiyya). Additionally, Ƙ. thrice has ibnah where Ibn M. has bint, and Ƙ. twice has sinīn, absent in Ibn M., all of which adds to their respective similarities to other versions with the corresponding variants. Finally, each version also respectively has a unique wording vis-à-vis all others: Ƙ. has 'anna al-nabiyy tazawwaja, where all the rest have either tazawwaja al-nabiyy or tazawwaja rasūl allāh; and Ibn M. has sab', where all the rest have sitt.

⁷⁰² Muḥammad b. 'Īsá al-Tirmidī (ed. Ṣubḥī al-Sāmarrā'ī, 'Abū al-Ma'āṭī al-Nawwarī, & Maḥmūd Muḥammad Ƙalīl al-Ṣa'īdī), *Ilal al-Tirmidīyy al-Kabīr* (Beirut, Lebanon: 'Ālam al-Kutub, 1989), p. 169, # 296.

⁷⁰³ Nasā'ī (ed. Šalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, V, p. 171, # 5350.

The *matns* of these two reports are not more similar to each other than other transmissions from 'Isrā'īl more broadly. In fact, al-Nasā'ī's noticeably jars with all of the other transmissions from 'Isrā'īl (since it lacks the usual third element), and its *matn* just so happens to be more similar to another hadith transmitted by Ibn Rāhwayh, in his own extant *Musnad*, from Yaḥyá b. 'Ādam, with a different *'isnād* (—'Abū Bakr b. 'Ayyāš—al-'Ajlāḥ—Ibn 'abī Mulaykah—'Ā'iṣah).⁷⁰⁴ Moreover, the *matn* of al-Nasā'ī's version is even more similar to yet another hadith transmitted by Ibn Rāhwayh, in his own extant *Musnad*, from a completely different *'isnād* (—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah),⁷⁰⁵ *vis-à-vis* most other versions of the marital-age hadith more broadly. All of this is consistent with al-Nasā'ī's transmission—via Ibn Rāhwayh back to Yaḥyá b. 'Ādam—being the product of contamination or falsification.

It is still plausible that Yaḥyá b. 'Ādam transmitted from 'Isrā'īl something similar to that which is ascribed to him by al-Tirmidī (given the broad correlation of the basic set of elements therein with 'Isrā'īl), but his particular wording as a PCL cannot be pinpointed without corroborating transmissions.

'Abū 'Usāmah Ḥammād (d. 201/817)

There are two distinct sets of hadiths ascribed to the Kufan tradent 'Abū 'Usāmah Ḥammād b. 'Usāmah (both situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b. 'Urwah), the first of which comprises two reports, recorded by Ibn 'abī Šaybah and al-Buḵārī.

Ibn 'abī Šaybah (d. 235/849)

'Abū 'Usāmah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Kadījah's death; marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁷⁰⁶

⁷⁰⁴ Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūšī), *Musnad*, II, p. 650, # 1238/694, and esp. *ibid.*, p. 1033, # 1784/1242. This version and what appears in al-Nasā'ī share the same two elements, including the wording *rasūlu allāh* (rather than *al-nabiyy*) and *bint* (rather than *ibnah*). In fact, the clause *wa-hiya bint sitt sinīn* is identical. However, they differ in that Ibn Rāhwayh begins with *'anna* (absent in al-Nasā'ī, has *daḡala* (rather than *baná*), and has *sinīn* (absent in al-Nasā'ī).

⁷⁰⁵ Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūšī), *Musnad*, II, p. 214, # 722/178. The first element is similar to al-Nasā'ī's, and the second (*wa-baná bi-hā wa-hiya bint tis*) is identical.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibn 'abī Šaybah (ed. 'Usāmah), *Muṣannaḡ*, XI, p. 341, # 34894.

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

‘Ubayd b. ‘Ismā‘īl—‘Abū ‘Usāmah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā‘išah:

Ḳadījah’s death; marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁷⁰⁷

Both of these reports comprise the same unique sequence of elements (not to mention a rare verb) *vis-à-vis* all other iterations of the marital-age hadith,⁷⁰⁸ which means that they constitute a distinctive sub-tradition. This matches their common ascription to ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, which means that he is likely a genuine PCL whose distinctive redaction is reflected thereby. The rate of variation between these two reports is substantial relative to their shortness, but in absolute terms, consists only of a few additions, omissions, and substitutions.⁷⁰⁹ Consequently, the underlying redaction of ‘Abū ‘Usāmah is substantially reconstructable, as follows:

...hišāmⁱⁿ ‘an ‘abī-hi qāla tuwuffiyat ḳadījat^u qabl^a [‘an yaḳruja/maḳrajⁱ] al-nabiyyⁱ ‘ilā al-madīnatⁱ bi-[ṭalātⁱ sinīn^a fa-labiṭa] sanataynⁱ ‘aw qarīb^{an} min dālika [ṭumma/wa-] nakaḥa ‘ā‘išat^a wa-hiya bint^u sittⁱ sinīn^a [ṭumma/wa-] baná bi-hā wa-hiya bint^u tis^{‘[n]} [sinīn^a].

In light of the extremely short distance between ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and the extant sources (Ibn ‘abī Šaybah having transmitted from him directly, and al-Buḵārī being separated from him by a single intermediary), and in light also of the relevant time period (the early 9th Century CE, when the written transmission of Hadith was just attaining hegemony), the variants are probably the product of oral paraphrasing (rather than scribal error), but of a fairly constrained kind (perhaps based on some written notes).

The second hadith associated with ‘Abū ‘Usāmah was recorded by Muslim, ‘Abū Dāwūd, ‘Abū Ya‘lá, Ibn Ḥibbān, ‘Abū Nu‘aym, al-Bayhaqī, and Ibn al-Muhtadī bi-Allāh.

Muslim (d. 261/875)

‘Abū Kurayb—‘Abū ‘Usāmah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā‘išah:

Ibn ‘abī Šaybah—‘Abū ‘Usāmah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā‘išah:

⁷⁰⁷ Buḵārī, *Šaḥīḥ*, I, p. 767, # 3944.

⁷⁰⁸ I.e., the sequence outlined above, and the verb *nakaḥa*.

⁷⁰⁹ I.A.Š. has ‘an yaḳruja, where B. has maḳraj; B. has bi-ṭalāt sinīn fa-labiṭa sanatayn, where I.A.Š. has only bi-sanatayn; I.A.Š. has ṭumma, where B. has wa-, and vice versa subsequently; and B. adds sinīn at the end.

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.⁷¹⁰

ʿAbū Dāwūd (d. 275/889)

Mūsā b. ʿIsmāʿīl—Ḥammād b. Salamah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Bišr b. Kālid—ʿAbū ʿUsāmah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; Hijrah; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine; marital preparation.⁷¹¹

ʿAbū Dāwūd (d. 275/889)

ʿIbrāhīm b. Saʿīd—ʿAbū ʿUsāmah—...:

Marital preparation.⁷¹²

ʿAbū Dāwūd (d. 275/889)

Bišr b. Kālid—ʿAbū ʿUsāmah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Swing; marital preparation.⁷¹³

ʿAbū Yaʿlā (d. 307/919-920)

ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Rūmī—ʿAbū ʿUsāmah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.⁷¹⁴

Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965)

Al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān—ʿIbrāhīm b. Saʿīd—ʿAbū ʿUsāmah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.⁷¹⁵

ʿAbū Nuʿaym (d. 430/1038)

⁷¹⁰ Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 642, # 69/1422.

⁷¹¹ ʿAbū Dāwūd (ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd), *Sunan*, IV, p. 284, # 4933.

⁷¹² *Ibid.*, # 4934.

⁷¹³ *Ibid.*, # 4936.

⁷¹⁴ ʿAbū Yaʿlā (ed. ʿAsad), *Musnad*, VIII, p. 301, # 4897/541.

⁷¹⁵ Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. ʿArnaʿūṭ), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, XVI, p. 9, # 7097.

Muḥammad b. 'Ibrāhīm—al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Ḥarrānī—Muḥammad b. 'Uṭmān b. Karāmah—'Abū 'Usāmah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'išah:

'Abū Bakr al-Ṭalhī—'Ubayd b. Ġannām—Ibn 'abī Šaybah—'Abū 'Usāmah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'išah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.⁷¹⁶

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ—al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá al-Dārimī—'Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Ishāq—'Abū Kurayb—'Abū 'Usāmah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'išah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁷¹⁷

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ—'Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb—'Aḥmad b. Sahl b. Baḥr—'Ibrāhīm b. Sa'īd—'Abū 'Usāmah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'išah:

'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ—'Abū al-Walīd—al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān—Ibn 'abī Šaybah—'Abū 'Usāmah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'išah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.⁷¹⁸

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

'Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ—al-Ḥusayn b. 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá al-Dārimī—'Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Ishāq—'Abū Kurayb—'Abū 'Usāmah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'išah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.⁷¹⁹

Ibn al-Muhtadī bi-Allāh (d. 465/1073)

'Abū al-Qāsim—Ibn Ziyād al-Naysābūrī—'Ibrāhīm b. Mālik—'Abū 'Usāmah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'išah:

⁷¹⁶ 'Abū Nu'aym (ed. Šāfi'ī), *al-Musnad al-Mustakraj*, IV, pp. 86-87, # 3310.

⁷¹⁷ Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, XIV, p. 109, # 13774.

⁷¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 544, # 14583.

⁷¹⁹ *Ibid.*, XXI, pp. 130-131, # 21025.

Some of these reports are evidently abridgements, but where corresponding wordings are available, they all closely match each other, bar the first version cited by 'Abū Dāwūd (which seems to be partially his own summary and partially a mixture of transmissions from different sources). The *set* of elements comprising these reports are not unique (having substantial overlap with those comprising the sub-tradition of Ḥammād b. Salamah, and being the same as those comprising the sub-tradition of 'Alī b. Mushir), but the *sequence* thereof is,⁷²¹ not to mention in combination with some rare wordings.⁷²² Consequently, it is clear that these reports reflect a distinctive sub-tradition, which matches their common ascription to 'Abū 'Usāmah. He is thus likely a genuine PCL, whose distinctive redaction is reflected thereby, despite the presence of a few variants (mostly substitutions and omissions) scattered throughout each of the relevant reports.⁷²³

And yet, there is a difficulty in pinpointing the original wording of 'Abū 'Usāmah's redaction: several of these reports are equipped with dual *'isnāds*, resulting in a chaotic jumble of converging strands and potential PCLs. As such, it is difficult to pinpoint which strands are meant to indicate the actual transmission-paths of the content of a given report, and which are being mentioned simply to indicate the paths of similar (but unquoted) content. There are also no consistent sub-redactions within this set of

⁷²⁰ 'Abd Allāh b. Ziyād al-Naysābūrī (ed. Kālid b. Hāyif b. 'Urayj al-Muṭayrī), *al-Ziyādāt 'alā Kitāb al-Muzaniyy* (Kuwait: Dār al-Kawṭar, n. d.), p. 478, # 445.

⁷²¹ Most notably, the 'Alī b. Mushir sub-tradition has the 'consummation' element at the end.

⁷²² E.g., most of the reports ascribed to 'Abū 'Usāmah have the unusual wording *li-sitti sinīn*, where those ascribed to 'Alī b. Mushir have the usual *wa-'anā ibnah/bint sitt sinīn*.

⁷²³ 'Abū Ya'lá has *wa-'anā bint sitt sinīn*, where all the rest have *li-sitt sinīn*; 'Abū Ya'lá, Muslim, and Ibn Ḥibbān have *bint*, where all the rest have *ibnah*; 'Abū Nu'aym omits *sinīn*; Muslim, 'Abū Nu'aym, Bayhaqī # 21025, and Bayhaqī # 14583 add *qālat*; Ibn Ḥibbān has *qadima*, and 'Abū Nu'aym, Bayhaqī # 14583, and Bayhaqī # 21025 have *qadimtu*, where all the rest have *qadimna*; Ibn Ḥibbān omits *šahr^{an}*; 'Abū Nu'aym adds *'ummī*; 'Abū Dāwūd # 4936 has *al-'urjūḥah*, where all the rest have *'urjūḥah*; 'Abū Nu'aym has *ma'a*, where 'Abū Ya'lá has nothing and all the rest have *wa-ma'a*; Ibn Ḥibbān has *šawāḥibu lī* and 'Abū Dāwūd # 4936 has *šawāḥibātī*, where 'Abū Ya'lá has nothing and all the rest have *šawāḥibī*; Ibn Ḥibbān omits *wa-*; Muslim has *mā turīdu bī*, 'Abū Ya'lá has *māḍā yurādu minnī*, Ibn Ḥibbān has *māḍā turīdu*, 'Abū Nu'aym has *māḍā yurādu bī*, and Bayhaqī (# 14583 and # 21025 alike) has *mā yurādu bī*; Bayhaqī # 21025 has *hāḍihi hāḍihi* (an obvious scribal error), where all the rest have *hah hah*; Ibn Ḥibbān has *šibh al-munbahirah*, where all the rest have *ḥattā ḍahaba nafasī*; 'Abū Dāwūd # 4936 has *fa-'adḳalna-nī*, where all the rest have *fa-'adḳalat-nī*; 'Abū Nu'aym has *wa-*, where all the rest have *fa-*; 'Abū Ya'lá adds *lī*; 'Abū Nu'aym has *'ašlahat-nī*, where all the rest have *'ašlahna-nī*; Muslim adds *wa-*; Muslim, 'Abū Dāwūd # 4934, and Ibn Ḥibbān have *ḍuḥ^{an}*, Bayhaqī # 14583 has *ta'nī ḍuḥ^{an}*, and the rest have nothing; 'Abū Dāwūd # 4934 has *fa-'aslamat-nī* and 'Abū Nu'aym has *fa-'aslama-nī*, where all the rest have *fa-'aslamna-nī*; 'Abū Ya'lá omits *'ilay-hi*.

reports (of the kind that allowed us to previously distinguish the redactions of 'Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Qaṭṭān and al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī),⁷²⁴ with recurring variants seemingly distributed at random (which could point to ubiquitous contamination between the relevant tradents).⁷²⁵ As such, wordings introduced by PCLs and tradents *after* 'Abū 'Usāmah cannot be easily pinpointed and weeded out of the available set, resulting in more uncertainty in 'Abū 'Usāmah's hypothetical redaction.

Still, these reports are largely identical, which means that most of 'Abū 'Usāmah's underlying redaction can be readily discerned (even if many specific wordings remain uncertain), as follows:

...hišāmⁱ bnⁱ 'urwat^a 'an 'abī-hi 'an 'ā'īšat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ li-sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-banā bī wa-'anā [bint/ibnat]^u tisⁱ sinīn^a [qālat] fa-[qadimnā/qadimtu] al-madīnat^a fa-wu'iktu šahr^{an} fa-wafā ša'ri jumaymat^{an} fa-'atat-nī 'umm^u rūmān^a wa-'anā 'alā 'urjūhatⁱⁿ wa-mā'ī sawāhibⁱ fa-šarakat bī fa-'ataytu-hā wa-mā 'adrī mā[ḍā] yurādu bī fa-'aḳaḳat bi-yadī fa-'awqafat-nī 'alā al-bābⁱ fa-qultu hah hah ḥattā dahaba nafasī fa-'adḳalat-nī bayt^{an} fa-'idā niswat^{un} min^a al-'anšārⁱ fa-qulna 'alā al-ḳayrⁱ wa-al-barakatⁱ wa-'alā ḳayrⁱ ṭā'irⁱⁿ fa-'aslamat-nī 'ilay-hinna fa-ḡasalna ra'sī wa-'ašlahna-nī fa-lam yaru'-'nī 'illā rasūl^u allāhⁱ [ḍuḥ^{an}] fa-'aslamna-nī 'ilay-hi.

Again, the generally precise preservation of this hadith (with very few instances of paraphrasing) is consistent with its having been transmitted in writing from 'Abū 'Usāmah to his students in the early 9th Century CE.

Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah (d. 198/814)

I have collated five reports ascribed to the Kufo-Meccan tradent Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah (situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b. 'Urwah), recorded by al-Rabī' b. Sulaymān (in his recension of al-Šāfi'ī), Bišr b. Mūsā (in his recension of al-Ḥumaydī), and al-'Ājurī.

⁷²⁴ See the relevant sections, above.

⁷²⁵ E.g., 'Abū Ya'lā has *qadimnā*, *māḍā*, and *yurādu*; Bayhaqī # 21025 has *qadimtu*, *mā*, and *yurādu*; Muslim has *qadimnā*, *mā*, and *turīdu*, along with *ḍuḥ^{an}*; 'Abū Nu'aym has *qadimtu*, *māḍā*, and *yurādu*; Bayhaqī # 14583 has *qadimtu*, *mā*, and *yurādu*; and Ibn Ḥibbān has *qadima*, *māḍā*, and *turīdu*, along with *ḍuḥ^{an}*.

al-Rabīʿ b. Sulaymān (d. 270/884)

al-Šāfiʿī—Sufyān—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁷²⁶

al-Rabīʿ b. Sulaymān (d. 270/884)

al-Šāfiʿī—Sufyān—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁷²⁷

al-Rabīʿ b. Sulaymān (d. 270/884)

al-Šāfiʿī—Sufyān—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁷²⁸

Bišr b. Mūsā al-ʿAsadī (d. 288/901)

al-Ḥumaydī—Sufyān—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁷²⁹

al-ʿĀjurri (d. 360/970)

Hārūn b. Yūsuf—Ibn ʿabī ʿUmar—Sufyān—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁷³⁰

Most of these ascriptions to Sufyān do appear to belong to the same vague sub-tradition *vis-à-vis* most other transmissions from Hišām b. ʿUrwah, but they are not unique: the same basic elemental sequence, including the detail of ʿĀʾiṣah being married at “seven” or “six or seven”, can be found in ascriptions to other putative PCLs, such as Ḥammād b. Zayd, Jarīr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, and Wakīʿ b. al-Jarrāḥ. For example, Bišr’s transmission from Sufyān⁷³¹ and one of al-Rabīʿ’s transmissions from Sufyān⁷³²

⁷²⁶ Šāfiʿī (ed. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib), *ʿUmm*, VI, pp. 45-46, # 2210.

⁷²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 429, # 2462.

⁷²⁸ *Ibid.*, X, p. 141, # 147.

⁷²⁹ ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr al-Ḥumaydī (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm ʿAsad al-Dārānī), *Musnad*, vol. 1 (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Saqā, 1996), p. 273, # 233.

⁷³⁰ ʿĀjurri (ed. Sayf al-Nāṣir), *Šarīʿah*, III, p. 472, # 1241/1938.

⁷³¹ Ḥumaydī (ed. Dārānī), *Musnad*, I, p. 273, # 233: *wa-ʿanā bint sitt sinīn ʿaw sabʿ sinīn*.

⁷³² Šāfiʿī (ed. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib), *ʿUmm*, VI, pp. 45-46, # 2210: *wa-ʿanā ibnat sitt ʿaw sabʿ*.

share an uncertainty over “six or seven”, but in this respect, they are more similar to Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s transmission from Jarīr⁷³³ than they are to the other transmissions from Sufyān. Meanwhile, another of al-Rabīʿ’s transmissions from Sufyān, which includes a lengthy final element about dolls and shy friends,⁷³⁴ is in that respect more similar to Ibn Wahb’s transmission from Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād and Saʿīd b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān.⁷³⁵

This problem is only compounded when it is realised that three of the above-cited transmissions from Sufyān actually derive from the same duo, al-Rabīʿ and al-Šāfiʿī, yet differ from each other more than they differ from the rest: one has the unusual wording of *nakaḥa* (where all the rest have *tazawwaja*) and *sitt ʿaw sabʿ* (where most of the others just have *sabʿ*), whilst another has the lengthy addendum about dolls and shy friends (absent in the rest). Either al-Rabīʿ and al-Šāfiʿī were sloppy or forgetful (such that they accidentally distorted or contaminated the hadith in different citations thereof), or else they (deliberately) interpolated it at different times in different ways. Indeed, in the case of the ‘dolls’ element, al-Šāfiʿī or al-Rabīʿ has combined two originally-separate hadiths from Sufyān, from Hišām, which remain discrete in the transmissions of Sufyān’s other students.⁷³⁶

Al-Rabīʿ and al-Šāfiʿī’s idiosyncratic citations aside, it is still at least plausible that Sufyān transmitted a version of this hadith, and that this version is partially preserved across the extant ascriptions to him, but this cannot be demonstrated as with other PCLs: there is no distinctive wording that correlates with his name, which raises the spectre of contamination or spreading *ʿisnāds*. Thus, the following approximation can be synthesised from these ascriptions,⁷³⁷ but cannot be attributed to Sufyān with confidence:

...hišāmī bnī ʿurwat^a ʿan ʿabī-hi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat **tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ**
wa-ʿanā [bint/ibnat]^u sitt^{i[n]} ʿaw sab^{ʿi[n]} [sinīn^a] **wa-banā bī wa-ʿanā**
[bint/ibnat]^u tis^{ʿi[n]} [sinīn^a].

⁷³³ Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (ed. ʿAʿrāb), *Tamhīd*, XIX, p. 108: *wa-ʿanā ibnat sitt ʿaw sabʿ sinīn*.

⁷³⁴ Šāfiʿī (ed. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib), *ʿUmm*, X, p. 141, # 147.

⁷³⁵ ʿAbd Allāh b. Wahb b. Muslim (ed. Rifʿat Fawzī ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib & ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ Mazyad), *al-Jāmiʿ* (Mansurah, Egypt: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 2005), pp. 154-155, # 260.

⁷³⁶ E.g., Ḥumaydī (ed. Dārānī), *Musnad*, I, p. 289, # 262.

⁷³⁷ By discarding the isolated *ʿanna* and *daḳalat ʿalay-hi* in ʿĀjurri, the isolated *nakaḥa-nī al-nabiyy* in Šāfiʿī # 2210, and the isolated ‘dolls’ element in Šāfiʿī # 147. Additionally, the vague *sitt ʿaw sabʿ* in both Šāfiʿī # 2210 and Bišr—Ḥumaydī has been preferred over the specific *sabʿ* in the rest.

Even this might need to be revised, given that al-ʿĀjurī’s version (transmitted via Ibn ʿabī ʿUmar) depicts ʿĀʾiṣah being described in the third person (*hiya*, etc.), in contrast to the first-person perspective recorded by al-Rabīʿ—al-Šāfiʿī and Bišr—al-Ḥumaydī (ʿanā, etc.). Since the former seems more archaic than the latter, we might regard the third-person perspective as the original, although this would entail that al-Šāfiʿī and al-Ḥumaydī reworded their respective versions into autobiographical narrations from ʿĀʾiṣah (or else that Sufyān himself did so in successive retellings of his hadith).

In short, the ascriptions to Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah do not constitute a distinctive sub-tradition *vis-à-vis* ascriptions to all other PCLs, and are even quite divergent from each other in some respects, such that a redaction clearly deriving from Sufyān cannot be ascertained. He may be responsible for some of the wordings preserved across these ascriptions, but this is by no means certain.

Wakīʿ b. al-Jarrāḥ (d. 196-197/812)

I have collated four reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent Wakīʿ b. al-Jarrāḥ, recorded by Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Rāhwayh, and Hannād.

Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845)

Wakīʿ—Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—ʿAbū ʾIṣḥāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷³⁸

Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845)

Wakīʿ—Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁷³⁹

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

Wakīʿ—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

⁷³⁸ Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁷³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁷⁴⁰

Hannād (d. 243/857)

Wakīʿ—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marital consummation at nine; Saʿd brought food.⁷⁴¹

It should be immediately clear that there is no distinctive sub-tradition clustered around Wakīʿ specifically: even the two broadly-similar ascriptions (recorded by Ibn Saʿd and Ibn Rāhwayh) are just as similar as ascriptions to some other PCLs, such as Ḥammād b. Zayd, Jarīr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, and Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah. Thus, even if Wakīʿ actually transmitted some or all of these reports from his alleged sources, it cannot be demonstrated with the present evidence: there is no particular redaction or wording that can be attributed to him.

Of the three ascriptions to him that purport to derive from Hišām, Ibn Saʿd’s version is the most likely to be genuine: in addition to being vaguely corroborated in its elemental outline by numerous other transmissions from Hišām (unlike Hannād’s version), it also contains uncertainty in the core wording (*sitt sinīn ʾaw sab*) and a *munqaṭiʿ* ascription (to ʿUrwah, rather than ʿĀʾiṣah), which makes it seem more archaic than Ibn Rāhwayh’s (unambiguous and *muttaṣil*) version. In other words, the following has the strongest claim to derive from Wakīʿ:

...hišāmī bnī ʿurwat^a ʿan ʾabī-hi ʾanna al-nabiyy^a tazawwaja ʿāʾiṣat^a wa-hiya ibnat^u sittⁱ sinīn^a ʾaw sab^{ʿin} wa-banā bi-hā wa-hiya ibnat^u tis^{ʿin}.⁷⁴²

Again, however, the ascription of this hadith to Wakīʿ cannot be confirmed, absent corroborating transmissions all embodying a distinctive sub-tradition. In other words, absent the inferable presence of an underlying redaction that can be attributed to Wakīʿ, there is always the threat that an ascription is the product of contamination and/or spreading *ʾisnāds*.

⁷⁴⁰ Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūṣī), *Musnad*, II, p. 213, # 721/178.

⁷⁴¹ Hannād b. al-Sarī b. Muṣʿab (ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd al-Jabbār al-Farīwāʾī), *Kitāb al-Zuhd* (Kuwait: Dār al-Ḳulafāʾ li-l-Kitāb al-ʾIslāmiyy, 1985), p. 379, # 738.

⁷⁴² Based on Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

That said, it should be acknowledged that the line *’anna al-nabiyy tazawwaja ‘ā’iṣah wa-hiya ibnah*, present in both of Ibn Sa’d’s ascriptions to Wakī’ (unto both Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah and Sufyān al-Ṭawrī), is unique in the marital-age tradition more broadly. This could be explained as reflecting Wakī’’s particular wording, but could equally be the result of Ibn Sa’d’s own particular wording, especially considering that he lists the two hadiths one after the other: he may simply have worded both in the same way because he wrote them down at the same time. This is complicated by the fact that the nearest similar wording in the relevant corpus is found in an alternative transmission from Sufyān recorded by al-Ṭabarānī: *’anna al-nabiyy tazawwaja ‘ā’iṣah wa-hiya bint*.⁷⁴³ This could be a sign that Wakī’ accurately preserved a wording from Sufyān (in common with what al-Ṭabarānī preserved), which was then recorded by Ibn Sa’d—although this would imply that the same wording was then inserted, by Ibn Sa’d or Wakī’ himself, into Wakī’’s transmission from Hiṣām. Alternatively, al-Ṭabarānī’s version is contaminated or borrowed from Ibn Sa’d or Wakī’’s versions (just as it was clearly contaminated by the ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah sub-tradition in terms of its elemental outline), which again leaves us without a definite answer.

’Abū Mu‘āwiyah al-Ḍarīr (d. 194-195/809-811)

I have collated thirteen relevant transmissions from the Kufan tradent and putative PCL ’Abū Mu‘āwiyah, but not all of them reflect the same sub-tradition of the marital-age hadith: one transmission recorded by Ibn Rāhwayh has ’Abū Mu‘āwiyah citing Hiṣām as his source, where all the rest have him citing al-’A‘maš; and even amongst the latter, there appear to be two distinctive sub-traditions. The first of these (henceforth, sub-tradition #1) is unique, being much more similar to each other than to any other versions of the marital-age hadith: ‘Ā’iṣah was married at nine, and the Prophet died when she was eighteen. The second (henceforth, sub-tradition #2) ostensibly resembles the sub-traditions of Wuhayb, Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, and especially ’Isrā’īl: ‘Ā’iṣah was married at six/seven, the marriage was consummated when she was nine, and the Prophet died when she was eighteen.

⁷⁴³ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salāfi), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*. XXIII, p. 23, # 56.

Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá (d. 226/840-841)

ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁴⁴

Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845)

ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁴⁵

Ibn ʿabī Šaybah (d. 235/849)

ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁴⁶

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁷⁴⁷

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁴⁸

Ibn ʿabī ʿĀšim (d. 287/900)

Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Numayr—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Together nine years.⁷⁴⁹

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAḥmad (d. 290/903)

Ibn Ḥanbal—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

⁷⁴⁴ See the section on Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá, above.

⁷⁴⁵ Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁷⁴⁶ Ibn ʿabī Šaybah (ed. ʿUsāmah), *Muṣannaf*, VI, p. 245, # 17615; also see *ibid.*, XI, p. 306, # 34452.

⁷⁴⁷ Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūšī), *Musnad*, II, p. 214, # 722/178.

⁷⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 870, # 1537/995.

⁷⁴⁹ Ibn ʿabī ʿĀšim (ed. Jawābirah), *ʾĀḥād*, V, p. 396, # 3020.

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵⁰

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

[ʿAbū Kurayb] Muḥammad b. al-ʿAlāʾ & ʿAḥmad b. Ḥarb—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵¹

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

[ʿAbū Kurayb] Muḥammad b. al-ʿAlāʾ—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵²

ʿAbū ʿAwānah (d. 316/929)

ʿAlī b. Ḥarb—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

al-Šāḡānī—Saʿīd b. Sulaymān—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵³

ʿAbū al-Maymūn (d. 347/958-959)

ʿAbū Zurʿah—Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Numayr—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵⁴

al-ʿĀjurri (d. 360/970)

ʿAbū Bakr ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥumayd al-Wāsiṭī—ʿAbū Mūsā Muḥammad b. al-Muṭannā al-Zamin—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; i.e., consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵⁵

⁷⁵⁰ Ibn Ḥanbal (ed. Ġamrāwī), *Musnad*, VI, p. 42.

⁷⁵¹ Nasā'ī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, pp. 772-773, # 3258.

⁷⁵² *Id.* (ed. Šalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, V, p. 170, # 5348.

⁷⁵³ ʿAbū ʿAwānah (ed. ʿAṭāʾ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Šaḥīḥ*, XI, p. 384, # 4707.

⁷⁵⁴ ʿAbū Zurʿah ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAmr al-Dimašqī (ed. Šakr Allāh Niʿmat Allāh al-Qawjānī), *Taʾrīk ʿAbī Zurʿah al-Dimašqīyy*, part 7 (Damascus, Syria: Majmaʿ al-Luḡah al-ʿArabiyyah, 1980), p. 494, # 1288.

⁷⁵⁵ ʿĀjurri (ed. Sayf al-Nāšir), *Šarīʿah*, III, p. 472, # 1242/1939.

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Numayr & Yaḥyá al-Ḥimmānī & Hannād b. al-Sarī & ‘Ibrāhīm b. ‘abī Mu‘āwiyah—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā‘išah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵⁶

Sub-tradition #2 is deeply problematic, for several reasons. Firstly, it is more similar (in terms of elemental sequence) to the sub-tradition of ‘Isrā’īl (see below) than to all the rest within the broader marital-age tradition, which implies that both share a recent common ancestor *vis-à-vis* the rest—yet the *‘isnāds* contradict this.⁷⁵⁷ Secondly, sub-tradition #2 claims descent via exactly the same *‘isnād* as sub-tradition #1 (‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā‘išah), which seems rather odd: is it realistic to envisage two *contradictory* versions of the same hadith being transmitted from *exactly the same sequence of tradents*? Since the *‘isnāds* are identical, how did the contradiction arise in the first place? The obvious resolution (if we stay within the constraints of the *‘isnāds*) would be that ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah himself changed the hadith in successive retellings, transmitting one version to one set of students and another to another.

That said, the attribution of sub-tradition #2 to ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah is by no means assured, since it only has two dubious attestations:

Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá (d. 226/840-841)

‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā‘išah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵⁸

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Numayr & Yaḥyá al-Ḥimmānī & Hannād b. al-Sarī & ‘Ibrāhīm b. ‘abī Mu‘āwiyah—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā‘išah:

⁷⁵⁶ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 22, # 51.

⁷⁵⁷ Whereas one ostensibly derives via ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā‘išah, the other ostensibly derives via ‘Isrā’īl—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—misc. (sometimes ending in ‘Ā‘išah).

⁷⁵⁸ See the section on Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá, above.

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁵⁹

The attribution of the first of these two reports to Yaḥyá is already questionable,⁷⁶⁰ and there are also several problems in the attribution of the second, recorded by al-Ṭabarānī. Firstly, although both reports share the same elemental sequence, the first line of al-Ṭabarānī's version has a different syntax than Yaḥyá's,⁷⁶¹ and (more importantly) differs in the first element on a key detail: 'Ā'īṣah is married at seven, rather than six.⁷⁶² Secondly, none of the four sources cited by al-Ṭabarānī as transmitting sub-tradition #2 from 'Abū Mu'āwiyah—namely, Ibn Numayr, Yaḥyá al-Ḥimmānī, Hannād, and 'Ibrāhīm—are cited anywhere else in the entire Hadith corpus—in any parallel or corroborating transmissions—as having done so. In fact, Ibn Numayr is elsewhere cited as a transmitter of sub-tradition #1 from 'Abū Mu'āwiyah,⁷⁶³ not sub-tradition #2; and Hannād is elsewhere cited as having transmitted from 'Abū Mu'āwiyah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah,⁷⁶⁴ rather than 'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'īṣah. Moreover, both al-Ṭabarānī and his immediate source al-Ḥaḍramī (i.e., the lone attestors of this transmission from these sources) have been implicated in at least two major instances of interpolation already,⁷⁶⁵ which increases the probability that what we have here is yet another example thereof. Once again, it cannot be discounted that we are dealing with some kind of dive.

In short, both of the attestations of sub-tradition #2 are highly suspect, which is to say: not only can it not be positively traced back to 'Abū Mu'āwiyah, we have reason to positively doubt that any iteration thereof is authentic. Ibn Rāhwayh's ascription (that 'Ā'īṣah was married at six and consummated in marriage at nine) via 'Abū Mu'āwiyah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah is also completely uncorroborated, and thus also cannot be traced back to 'Abū Mu'āwiyah. This leaves us with the following, i.e., sub-tradition #1:

⁷⁵⁹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 22, # 51.

⁷⁶⁰ See the section on Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá, above.

⁷⁶¹ Where Y. has *tazawwaja-hā rasūl allāh*, Ṭ. has *'anna rasūl allāh tazawwaja-hā*.

⁷⁶² Where Y. has *sitt*, Ṭ. has *sab'*.

⁷⁶³ By 'Abū al-Maymūn, cited above; and in a strange form, by Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, also cited above.

⁷⁶⁴ 'Abū Nu'aym (ed. Šāfi'ī), *al-Musnad al-Mustaḥraj*, IV, p. 87, # 3311.

⁷⁶⁵ See the entries on the PCLs Ibn 'Askar and Hārūn b. 'Ishāq, above.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁶⁶

Ibn 'abī Šaybah (d. 235/849)

'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁶⁷

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁶⁸

Ibn 'abī 'Āšim (d. 287/900)

Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Numayr—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Together nine years.⁷⁶⁹

'Abd Allāh b. 'Aḥmad (d. 290/903)

Ibn Ḥanbal—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁷⁰

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

[Abū Kurayb] Muḥammad b. al-'Alā' & 'Aḥmad b. Ḥarb—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁷¹

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

[Abū Kurayb] Muḥammad b. al-'Alā'—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

⁷⁶⁶ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁷⁶⁷ Ibn 'abī Šaybah (ed. 'Usāmah), *Muṣannaḥ*, VI, p. 245, # 17615; also see *ibid.*, XI, p. 306, # 34452.

⁷⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 870, # 1537/995.

⁷⁶⁹ Ibn 'abī 'Āšim (ed. Jawābirah), *'Āḥād*, V, p. 396, # 3020.

⁷⁷⁰ Ibn Ḥanbal (ed. Ġamrāwī), *Musnad*, VI, p. 42.

⁷⁷¹ Nasā'ī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, pp. 772-773, # 3258.

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁷²

ʿAbū ʿAwānah (d. 316/929)

ʿAlī b. Ḥarb—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:
al-Ṣāḡānī—Saʿīd b. Sulaymān—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—
ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁷³

ʿAbū al-Maymūn (d. 347/958-959)

ʿAbū Zurʿah—Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Numayr—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—
ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁷⁴

al-ʿĀjurri (d. 360/970)

ʿAbū Bakr ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Ḥumayd al-Wāsiṭī—ʿAbū Mūsā
Muḥammad b. al-Muṭannā al-Zamin—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-
ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; i.e., consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁷⁷⁵

That this sub-tradition truly derives from ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah seems very likely: these versions are generally much more similar to each other than to any others within the broader marital-age tradition (bar a single stray ascription),⁷⁷⁶ which matches their common ascription to ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah. Moreover, three of the extant collections transmit from ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah directly. There is thus little doubt that ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah is a genuine PCL.

⁷⁷² *Id.* (ed. Šalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, V, p. 170, # 5348.

⁷⁷³ ʿAbū ʿAwānah (ed. ʿAṭāʾ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Šaḥīḥ*, XI, p. 384, # 4707.

⁷⁷⁴ ʿAbū Zurʿah (ed. Qawjānī), *Taʾrīk*, part 7, p. 494, # 1288.

⁷⁷⁵ ʿĀjurri (ed. Sayf al-Nāṣir), *Šarīʿah*, III, p. 472, # 1242/1939.

⁷⁷⁶ Cf. ʿUqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍuʿafāʾ*, V, p. 473, # 1/5735. By contrast, Tabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 23, # 56 and the ascriptions to ʿAbṭar (see below) are less similar: both have the same distinctive elemental sequence, but the former has *wa-makaṭat ʿinda-hu tisʿan* and the latter have *wa-ṣaḥibtu-hu tisʿan*, contrast to the usual *wa-māta ʿan-hā wa-hiya bint tamān[iy] ʿašrah* in this sub-tradition.

There are some issues in reconstructing 'Abū Mu'āwiyah's redaction, however: the transmissions from him display numerous variants, including omitted,⁷⁷⁷ added,⁷⁷⁸ and substituted words.⁷⁷⁹ Such variation is of course common, but the *frequency* thereof in such short texts is striking: some are clearly attributable to scribal error,⁷⁸⁰ but others seem indicative of mild oral paraphrasing.⁷⁸¹

Even more striking is the instance of extreme paraphrasing or interpolation by Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim or his source Ibn Numayr, who omitted the first element of the hadith and reworded the second into an autobiographical quotation from 'Ā'īṣah.

Meanwhile, al-'Ājurri, or someone in his *'isnād* unto 'Abū Mu'āwiyah (namely, 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad or Muḥammad b. al-Muṭannā), or possibly even a later scribe, was obviously bothered or confused by 'Abū Mu'āwiyah's text (which has 'Ā'īṣah being engaged for marriage at age nine, rather than the usual six or seven). Accordingly, they added a clarificatory comment into the middle of the hadith:

The Messenger of God married her when she was a girl of nine—**meaning, the time of his consummation of marriage with her [occurred] when she was a girl of nine (*ya'nī waqt dukūli-hi bi-hā wa-hiya bint tis*)**—and he died when she was a girl of eighteen years.⁷⁸²

⁷⁷⁷ Ibn Sa'd, Nasā'ī # 5348, 'Abd Allāh, 'Abū 'Awānah, 'Ājurri, 'Abū al-Maymūn, and Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim all have *qālat*, absent in Ibn Rāhwayh, Ibn 'abī Šaybah (## 17615, 34452), and Nasā'ī # 3258. There is also Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim's extremely deviant version, which omits the first element altogether.

⁷⁷⁸ Ibn 'abī Šaybah (## 17615, 34452) and Ibn Rāhwayh both begin with *'anna* and rearrange their first element accordingly, unlike all the others; Ibn Sa'd and 'Abd Allāh both have *sinīn*, absent in all the rest; 'Ājurri has *ya'nī waqt dukūli-hi bi-hā wa-hiya bint tis* after the first element, absent in all the rest; and Ibn Rāhwayh and 'Ājurri both conclude the final element with *sanah*, absent in all the rest.

⁷⁷⁹ Where Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Rāhwayh, 'Abd Allāh, 'Abū 'Awānah, and 'Ājurri all have *haddaṭa-nā al-'a'maš*, Nasā'ī # 3258, Nasā'ī # 5348, Ibn 'abī Šaybah (## 17615, 34452), and 'Abū al-Maymūn all have *'an al-'a'maš*; where Ibn 'abī Šaybah (## 17615, 34452) and 'Abū 'Awānah both have *al-nabiyy*, all the rest have *rasūl allāh*; where Ibn 'abī Šaybah # 17615 has *ibnah* (in the first element), all the rest have *bint*; where Ibn Rāhwayh has *sitt* and 'Abū 'Awānah has *sab'*, all the others have *tis'*; where Ibn Rāhwayh has *tuwuffiya 'an-hā* and 'Abū 'Awānah has *qabaḍa-hu allāhu*, all the rest have *māta 'an-hā*; where Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Rāhwayh, and Ibn 'abī Šaybah # 17615 all have *ibnah* (in the final element), all the rest have *bint*; and where Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Rāhwayh, Nasā'ī # 3258, Nasā'ī # 5348, and 'Ājurri all have *ṭamāniy*, Ibn 'abī Šaybah (## 17615, 34452), 'Abd Allāh, 'Abū 'Awānah, and 'Abū al-Maymūn all have *ṭamān*. There is also Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim's extremely deviant version, which paraphrases the final element as *kuntu taḥta rasūl allāh tis'an*, completely differently from all the rest.

⁷⁸⁰ Most obviously, *sab'* in 'Abū 'Awānah, which has the same *rasm* as the usual *tis'* in this sub-tradition. It is thus plausible that someone (one of 'Abū 'Awānah's sources, or 'Abū 'Awānah himself, or a later scribe) saw the *rasm* and read what he expected to find (per most other versions of the marital-age hadith more broadly) accompanying the *tazawwaja*, i.e., a *sitt* or a *sab'*. In this case, he saw a *sab'*. Another plausible scribal error is *ibnah* in Ibn 'abī Šaybah # 17615, since elsewhere in the very same collection (# 34452), the usual *bint* can be found.

⁷⁸¹ Most obviously, Ibn Rāhwayh's *wa-tuwuffiya 'an-hā wa-hiya ibnat ṭamāniy 'ašrah sanah* (which contains three substitutions *vis-à-vis* the rest of the sub-tradition) and 'Abū 'Awānah's *wa-qabaḍa-hu allāh* (versus the usual *wa-māta 'an-hā*).

⁷⁸² 'Ājurri (ed. Sayf al-Nāṣir), *Šarī'ah*, III, p. 472, # 1242/1939. Emphasis mine.

This is not necessarily an interpolation *per se*, since the *ya'nī* can be understood to openly signify the editorialising of a tradent or scribe; the only problem is that the tradent or scribe in question is not indicated, which could give the false impression that 'Abū Mu'āwiyah himself made this comment.

Finally, there is a significant mistake or interpolation in Ibn Rāhwayh's version, which has *sitt* instead of the usual *tis'*. This may be the product of sloppy transmission by Ibn Rāhwayh: he may have read or heard *tazawwaja* and expected a *sitt* to follow (per the common version of the marital-age tradition more broadly), and wrote *sitt* accordingly. Alternatively, this may be an emendation by Ibn Rāhwayh, who thought he was correcting an error by 'Abū Mu'āwiyah. Either way, Ibn Rāhwayh himself (rather than some later scribe) was probably responsible for the change, since a subsequent collection ascribes this exact variant to him.⁷⁸³

It thus seems as though the transmission of this text from 'Abū Mu'āwiyah to his students involved some sloppy paraphrasing, even if the gist and much of the same wording was still preserved. On that note, a common underlying text is still clearly discernible:

[ḥaddatā-nā] al-'a'maš^u 'an 'ibrāhīm^a 'anī al-'aswadī 'an 'ā'iṣat^a [qālat]
tazawwaja-hā rasūl^u allāhī wa-hiya bint^u tis'ⁱⁿ wa-māta 'an-hā wa-hiya bint^u
tamān[i/a/iy^a] 'ašrat^a.

This may not be *the* urtext of the hadith (since some of the aforementioned oral variation may hark back to 'Abū Mu'āwiyah himself, such that there is no urtext *per se*), but it does at least represent *a* wording from 'Abū Mu'āwiyah, or in other words, his redaction.

'Alī b. Mushir (d. 189/804-805)

⁷⁸³ 'Abū Nu'aym (ed. Šāfi'ī), *al-Musnad al-Mustakraj*, IV, p. 87, # 3313: "And Ibn Rāhwayh said: "...when she was a girl of six...." Oddly, 'Abū Nu'aym also attributes *sab'* to 'Aḥmad (b. Ḥanbal), despite my 1895 edition of his *Musnad* clearly stating *tis'*.

I have collated three reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent ‘Alī b. Mushir (situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b. ‘Urwah), recorded by ‘Ismā‘īl b. al-Ḳalīl (reconstructed), al-Buḳārī, and Ibn Mājah.

‘Ismā‘īl b. al-Ḳalīl (d. 224-225/838-840)

‘Alī b. Mushir—Hišām b. ‘Urwah—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marrage at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁷⁸⁴

al-Buḳārī (d. 256/870)

Farwah b. ‘abī al-Maḡrā’—‘Alī b. Mushir—Hišām b. ‘Urwah—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marrage at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁷⁸⁵

Ibn Mājah (d. 273/887)

Suwayd b. Sa‘īd—‘Alī b. Mushir—Hišām b. ‘Urwah—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marrage at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁷⁸⁶

All three are more similar to each other than to other transmissions from Hišām (even those that contain a similar set of elements),⁷⁸⁷ and are furthermore largely identical: the variants there-between amount to a handful of omitted,⁷⁸⁸ added,⁷⁸⁹ and

⁷⁸⁴ See the section of ‘Ismā‘īl b. al-Ḳalīl, above.

⁷⁸⁵ Buḳārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 767. The same hadith appears in two other places in abbreviated form, with relevant parts excerpted according to *bāb: ibid.*, III, pp. 1080-1081. Since the *‘isnād* and the available wording of these two are identical to the first, they clearly are just abbreviations or excerpts, which is why I have not included them as different versions or variants in the proceeding analysis.

⁷⁸⁶ Ibn Mājah (ed. ‘Abd al-Bāqī), *Sunan*, I, pp. 603-604, # 1876.

⁷⁸⁷ All of the ascriptions to ‘Alī have *fa-nazalnā fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-ḳazraj*, absent in all of the similar ascriptions to ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and Ḥammād b. Salamah; all of the ascriptions to ‘Alī have *wa-‘anā ibnah/bint sitt sinīn*, where most similar ascriptions to Ḥammād have *wa-‘anā bint/ibnat sitt [sinīn] ‘aw sab’ [sinīn]*, and most of those to ‘Abū ‘Usāmah have *li-sitt sinīn*; all of the ascriptions to ‘Alī have *tamazzaqa* (or, in two instances, *tamarraqa*), absent in all of the similar ascriptions to ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and Ḥammād; most of the ascriptions to ‘Alī have *ṭumma ‘aḳaḳat šay^{an} min mā’ fa-masaḥat bi-hi wajhī wa-ra’sī*, absent in similar ascriptions to ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and Ḥammād; all of the ascriptions to ‘Alī have *yawma-‘id*, absent in all of the similar ascriptions to ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and Ḥammād b. Salamah; etc.

⁷⁸⁸ Where both I. and M. have *hišām bn ‘urwah*, B. has only *hišām*.

⁷⁸⁹ Where both I. and M. have *al-ḳazraj*, B. has *ḳazraj*; where both I. and B. have *fa-wafá*, M. has *ḥattá wafá la-hu*; where both I. and B. have *masaḥat bi-hi wajhī*, M. has *masaḥat bi-hi ‘alá wajhī*; and where both I. and M. have *bayt*, B. has *al-bayt*.

substituted⁷⁹⁰ words, particles, and prepositions. Ironically, al-Buḡārī's version is the most defective out of the three, although the changes in question are of course extremely minor. By contrast, 'Ismā'īl's (reconstructed) version appears to be perfectly preserved, being corroborated in every instance by either al-Buḡārī or Ibn Mājah against the other.⁷⁹¹ (Again, all three agree with each other most of the time.) This could be explained by 'Ismā'īl's version being the true urtext, with both al-Buḡārī or Ibn Mājah's versions deriving therefrom, which would necessitate some kind of *tadlīs* on the part of al-Buḡārī and Ibn Mājah or their immediate sources (Farwah and Suwayd, respectively). There is an obvious alternative to this, however: 'Ismā'īl received his version directly from 'Alī, whereas both al-Buḡārī and Ibn Mājah received theirs via intermediaries. In other words, both al-Buḡārī and Ibn Mājah are more removed from the original source than 'Ismā'īl, so it is only expected that 'Ismā'īl's version would retain a closer wording to the original. 'Alī is thus still plausibly the source, as a PCL.

'Alī b. Mushir's urtext is thus easy to reconstruct (since it is perfectly represented by 'Ismā'īl's version), with the exception of the *'isnād*. The earliest segment of two of the three extant versions is in the voice of the tradent after 'Alī, not 'Alī himself: it is 'Ismā'īl who says, "Alī b. Mushir imparted to us, from Hišām b. 'Urwah, from his father, from 'Ā'išah...", and it is Farwah who says, "Alī b. Mushir related to us, from Hišām, from his father, from 'Ā'išah...". Only in Ibn Mājah's version is the earliest segment of the *'isnād* reported as 'Alī's words: "Hišām b. 'Urwah related to us, from his father, from 'Ā'išah..." The reason for this is simple: the verbatim quotation of the *'isnād* given by a teacher only moved to fixation at the turn of the 9th Century CE. Before then, tradents would usually only record the string of relevant sources in the *'isnād* (i.e., *'an fulān 'an fulān 'an fulān*), not the exact wording of their citation of said sources (e.g., "He said: "He said: "He said..."").⁷⁹² Thus, whilst 'Alī's students quoted his *matn* very accurately, they probably only recorded the gist of his *'isnād*. Accordingly, the wording of the *'isnād* in 'Alī's urtext is not certain, even if the original sequence of tradents is still clear.

⁷⁹⁰ Where both I. and B. have *'an hišām*, M. has *ṭnā hišām*; where both I. and M. have *rasūl allāh*, B. has *al-nabiyy*; where both I. and M. have *ṣawāhibāt*, B. has *ṣawāhib*; where both I. and M. have *wa-mā 'adrī*, B. has *lā 'adrī*; and where both I. and B. have *ḥattā 'awqafat-nī*, M. has *fa-'awqafat-nī*.

⁷⁹¹ In the 10 instances of variations between these three versions, 6 occur in B, 4 in M. and 0 in I.

⁷⁹² Melchert, 'The Destruction of Books', 218.

[*tnā*] hišām^u bn^u ‘urwatā ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat *tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u*
allāhⁱ wa-‘anā bint^u sittⁱ sinīn^a fa-qadimnā al-madīnat^a fa-nazalnā fī banī al-
ḥārītⁱ bnī al-ḳazrajⁱ fa-wu‘iktu fa-tamazzaqa ša‘arī fa-‘awfā jumaymat^{an} fa-
‘atat-nī ‘ummī ‘umm^u rūmān^a wa-‘innī la-fī ‘urjūḥatⁱⁿ wa-ma‘ī šawāḥibāt^{un} lī
fa-ṣaraḳat bī fa-‘ataytu-hā wa-mā ‘adrī mā turīdu bī fa-‘aḳaḍat bi-yadī ḥattā
‘awqafat-nī ‘alā bābⁱ al-dārⁱ wa-‘innī la-‘anhaju ḥattā sakana ba‘ḍ^u nafasī
ṭumma ‘aḳaḍat šay‘^{an} min māⁱⁿ fa-masaḥat bi-hi wajhī wa-ra’sī ṭumma
‘adḳalat-nī al-dār^a fa-‘idā niswat^{un} min^a al-‘anṣārⁱ fī baytⁱⁿ fa-qulna ‘alā al-
ḳayrⁱ wa-al-barakatī wa-‘alā ḳayrⁱ ṭā’irⁱⁿ fa-‘aslamat-nī ‘ilay-hinna fa-
‘aslaḥna min ša’nī fa-lam yaru‘-nī ‘illā rasūl^u allāhⁱ ḍuḥ^{an} fa-‘aslamna-nī ‘ilay-
hī wa-‘anā yawma-‘idⁱⁿ bint^u tis‘ⁱ sinīn^a

The handful of minor variations between ‘Ismā‘īl, al-Buḳārī, and Ibn Mājah are mostly consistent with being mere scribal errors. This, in combination with the otherwise extremely precise preservation of the texts, suggests that the transmission of this hadith from ‘Alī to his students occurred in writing.

Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (d. 188/804)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b. ‘Urwah), recorded by ‘Abū Ḳayṭamah Zuhayr (reconstructed) and Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd.

‘Abū Ḳayṭamah Zuhayr (d. 234/849)

Jarīr—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁷⁹³

Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd (d. 316/929)

Yūsuf b. Mūsá—Jarīr—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁷⁹⁴

As with ‘Abū Ḳayṭamah (discussed previously), so too with Jarīr. These two ascriptions are not strikingly more similar to each other than to those found in other

⁷⁹³ See the section on ‘Abū Ḳayṭamah, above.

⁷⁹⁴ Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd (ed. Ḥusayn), *Musnad ‘Ā’iṣah*, p. 64, # 34.

transmissions, but they are still extremely similar: both have ‘Ā’iṣah speaking in the first person; both have *tazawwaja-nī rasūl allāh*; both have *sab‘ sinīn* (although one version is uncertain and adds *sitt* as well); both have *baná bī*; and both have *tis‘ sinīn*. Other than the uncertainty over *sitt ‘aw sab‘ sinīn*, the only difference between these two reports is that ‘Abū Kayṭamah’s version may have had *ibnah* in two places,⁷⁹⁵ where Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd has *bint*.⁷⁹⁶ It is thus still *plausible* that these two hadiths reflect Jarīr’s redaction, even if such an attribution is not certain (as it would be if they shared a distinctive or unique wording *vis-à-vis* all other versions of the marital-age hadith). That being so, the following redaction obtains:

[‘aḵbara-nā] hiṣām^u bn^u ‘urwat^a ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-‘anā bint^u [sittⁱ ‘aw] sab‘ⁱ sinīn^a wa-baná bī wa-‘anā bint^u tis‘ⁱ sinīn^a.

The general uniformity of the preservation of this hadith (aside from the difference over *sitt ‘aw sab‘ sinīn*) is consistent with its having been transmitted in writing from Jarīr to his students.

‘Abdah b. Sulaymān (d. 187-188/803-804)

I have collated six reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent ‘Abdah b. Sulaymān (situated within the broader tradition of Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah), variously recorded by Ibn ‘abī Šaybah, Hārūn b. ‘Ishāq (reconstructed), Muslim, al-Balāḍurī, al-Nasā’ī (in two versions), and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn ‘abī Šaybah (d. 235/849)

‘Abdah—Hiṣām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁷⁹⁷

⁷⁹⁵ Again, see the section on ‘Abū Kayṭamah, above.

⁷⁹⁶ Since Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd’s version has a kind of collective *‘isnād*, there is no specific *‘isnād* for this particular hadith that can be compared to the wording in ‘Abū Kayṭamah’s version. Thus, if there were some differences between the *‘isnāds* of these two versions, we can no longer detect them.

⁷⁹⁷ Ibn ‘abī Šaybah (ed. ‘Usāmah), *Muṣannaḥ*, XI, p. 316, # 34516.

Hārūn b. 'Ishāq (d. 250/864-865)

‘Abdah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁷⁹⁸

Muslim (d. 261/875)

Ibn Numayr—‘Abdah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁷⁹⁹

al-Balāḍurī (d. post-270/883-884)

‘Amr b. Muḥammad al-Nāqid—‘Abdah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁸⁰⁰

al-Nasā’ī (d. 303/915-916)

Muḥammad b. ‘Ādam—‘Abdah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she still played dolls.⁸⁰¹

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—Hannād b. al-Sarī—‘Abdah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁸⁰²

Al-Ṭabarānī’s version can be discounted from the get-go: the fact that it is identical to one of the versions ascribed via Hārūn b. ‘Ishāq casts grave doubt upon its claim to being an independent transmission all the way back to ‘Abdah, as noted above. As for the remaining five (or six, if we count al-Nasā’ī’s duplicate as another version), can they be reasonably attributed to ‘Abdah? At first glance, most of these transmissions from ‘Abdah do not seem to be more similar to each other than other hadiths within the

⁷⁹⁸ See the section on Hārūn b. ‘Ishāq, above.

⁷⁹⁹ Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 642, # 70/1422. Muslim gives another *’isnād* for this hadith (Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:), but as he says, the wording of the hadith (*al-lafẓ*) is Ibn Numayr’s.

⁸⁰⁰ Balāḍurī (ed. Zakkār & Ziriklī), *Jamal min ‘Ansāb al-‘Ašraf*, II, p. 38.

⁸⁰¹ Nasā’ī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, p. 794, # 3378; for a slightly different wording, see *id.* (ed. Šalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, V, p. 794, # 3378.

⁸⁰² Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 21, # 48.

broader Hišām tradition: there are several other PCL sub-traditions (Ja‘far b. Sulaymān, Ḥammād b. Zayd, Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, Wakī‘ b. al-Jarrāḥ, and Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah)⁸⁰³ and a few SS transmissions⁸⁰⁴ that also comprise the same two elements in the same order (marriage, consummation). On closer inspection, however, most of these other transmissions have ‘Ā’iṣah being married at seven or six or seven,⁸⁰⁵ whereas all of those from ‘Abdah have her being married at six. On this key detail, then, the transmissions from ‘Abdah are more similar to each other than to the rest, which is consistent with his redaction’s having been broadly preserved in the relevant transmissions.

There are some difficulties in the reconstruction of ‘Abdah’s redaction, however, given the variation that exists between the extant transmissions from him: in addition to a relatively high rate of added,⁸⁰⁶ omitted,⁸⁰⁷ and substituted⁸⁰⁸ words, one version (al-Nasā’ī) adds a short element about dolls, and another (Hārūn) adds a long element about dolls. Thus, even though all of the transmissions from ‘Abdah retained the core gist that ‘Ā’iṣah was married at six and consummated in marriage at nine, there was considerable instability when it came to the exact wording thereof. This is consistent with paraphrasing, which makes it probable that the transmission of this hadith from ‘Abdah to his students occurred orally.

Most of the long ‘dolls’ element in Hārūn’s (reconstructed) version is uncorroborated by all the other transmissions from ‘Abdah, such that Hārūn himself is probably responsible for adding the element into his version. The first part of Hārūn’s ‘dolls’ element (*wa-kuntu ‘al‘abu bi-al-banāt*) is corroborated by both of al-Nasā’ī’s

⁸⁰³ See elsewhere, in the present chapter.

⁸⁰⁴ Sa‘īd b. Maṣṣūr al-Ḳurāsānī (ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-‘A‘zamī), *Kitāb al-Sunan*, vol. 1 (Bombay, India: al-Dār al-Salafīyyah, 1982), p. 170, # 515; Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 22, # 50; ‘Abū Nu‘aym (ed. ‘Azzāzī), *Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, I, p. 3208, # 7375; Ibn al-Muhtadī bi-Allāh (ed. Muṭayrī), *Ziyādāt*, p. 478, # 445.

⁸⁰⁵ Moreover, the few that do have ‘Ā’iṣah marrying at six (as in ‘Abdah’s version) have other notable divergences: Ibn al-Muhtadī bi-Allāh and ‘Abū Nu‘aym’s versions both have *li-sitt*, rather than the usual *ḥāl* clause; and al-Ṭabarānī’s version has an embellishment about the chronology. Only Sa‘īd b. Maṣṣūr’s version remains extremely similar to ‘Abdah’s.

⁸⁰⁶ Where Balāḍurī has *‘anba’a hišām bn ‘urwah*, all the rest simply have *‘an hišām*.

⁸⁰⁷ Where one version of Nasā’ī has *sitt*, all the rest (including the other version of Nasā’ī) have *sitt sinīn*.

⁸⁰⁸ Where Muslim has *al-nabiyy*, all the rest have *rasūl allāh*; where Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah, Muslim, ‘Abū Nu‘aym and Ibn al-Jārūd’s versions of Hārūn, and one version of Nasā’ī all have *bint*, Balāḍurī, Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd’s version of Hārūn, and the other version of Nasā’ī all have *ibnah*; where Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah, Muslim, and Balāḍurī have *baná bī*, Hārūn has *daḳala bī*, and both versions of Nasā’ī have *daḳala ‘alayya*; and where Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah, Muslim, and one version of Nasā’ī have *bint*, Balāḍurī, Hārūn, and the other version of Nasā’ī have *ibnah*.

versions, however, which means that we have two transmissions from ‘Abdah that incorporate the short ‘dolls’ element (Hārūn and al-Nasā’ī), and three that lack it (Ibn ‘abī Šaybah, Muslim, and al-Balāḍurī). It could be the case that ‘Abdah’s original hadith incorporated the short ‘dolls’ element, although this raises the question of why three of those who transmitted from him omitted it.

There are two plausible explanations for all of this, and two corresponding ways in which the original redaction(s) could be reconstructed. Firstly, ‘Abdah never transmitted the ‘dolls’ element, which means that it obtained in Hārūn and al-Nasā’ī’s versions via some combination of *tadlīs* on the part of both Hārūn and al-Nasā’ī or his source Muḥammad b. ‘Ādam.⁸⁰⁹ Such a supposition would yield the following redaction from ‘Abdah:

...hišām^{un} ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-‘anā [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-[baná/daḳala] bī wa-‘anā [bint/ibnat]^u tisⁱ sinīn^a.

The other option is that ‘Abdah transmitted two different versions of his own hadith: one containing the ‘dolls’ element (to Hārūn and Muḥammad), and one without it (Ibn ‘abī Šaybah, Ibn Numayr, and ‘Amr b. Muḥammad). Such a supposition yields the following redactions from ‘Abdah:

...hišām^{un} ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-‘anā bint^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-banā bī wa-‘anā bint^u tisⁱ sinīn^a.

...hišām^{un} ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-‘anā [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-daḳala [bī/‘alayya] wa-‘anā ibnat^u tisⁱ sinīn^a wa-kuntu ‘al‘abu bi-al-banātⁱ.

Even if he did, however, it seems probable that the version without the ‘dolls’ element represents his original formulation or transmission, given that the general tendency in

⁸⁰⁹ For example: Muḥammad b. ‘Ādam (Anatolian, d. 250/864-865) received the hadith from ‘Abdah (Kufan, d. 187-188/803-804), then added the short ‘dolls’ element from an alternative transmission from Hišām; then Hārūn (Kufan, d. 250/864-865) borrowed this hadith from Muḥammad (his contemporary), added the additional dolls material thereto (again, from an alternative transmission from Hišām), and further omitted Muḥammad (again, a mere contemporary) from his *‘isnād*. This sort of thing, with exactly this element, actually occurred several times in the transmission of Hišām’s tradition: see the PCL sub-traditions of Ja‘far b. Sulaymān, Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, and Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah, in the present chapter.

the transmission of traditions is the accrual rather than loss of content. In other words, it is at least plausible that ‘Abdah’s inclusion of the ‘dolls’ element reflects a secondary addition to his hadith, borrowed from or contaminated by another famous hadith from Hišām.

‘Abū al-Jawwāb al-’Aḥwaṣ (d. turn of the 9th C. CE)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent ‘Abū al-Jawwāb al-’Aḥwaṣ b. Jawwāb (situated within the sub-tradition of Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, which is nestled in turn within the broader tradition of Hišām b. ‘Urwah), recorded by al-Ṭabarānī and ‘Abū Nu‘aym.

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

‘Ubayd Allāh b. Sa‘d—’Aḥmad b. Zuhayr—al-’Aḥwaṣ—Sufyān—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁸¹⁰

‘Abū Nu‘aym (d. 430/1038)

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad—‘Alī b. al-Ṣabbāḥ—‘Ubayd b. Sa‘d—al-’Aḥwaṣ—Sufyān—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁸¹¹

These two reports are more similar to each other than to all other versions of the marital-age hadith more broadly,⁸¹² such that they constitute a distinctive sub-tradition: this is consistent with both of their reflecting the particular redaction of al-’Aḥwaṣ. In fact, they are identical save for two variants: in two places, al-Ṭabarānī has *ibnah* where ‘Abū Nu‘aym has *bint*. This is consistent with the hadith’s having been

⁸¹⁰ Sulaymān b. ‘Aḥmad al-Ṭabarānī (ed. Ṭāriq b. ‘Iwaḍ Allāh b. Muḥammad & ‘Abd al-Muḥsin b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-Ḥusaynī), *al-Mu‘jam al-’Awsaṭ*, vol. 2 (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ḥaramayn, 1995), p. 301, # 2042.

⁸¹¹ ‘Abū Nu‘aym ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-’Aṣbahānī (ed. Sayyid Kasrawī Ḥasan), *Ta’rīk ‘Aṣbahān / ‘Aḳbār ‘Aṣbahān*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1990), p. 63.

⁸¹² The closest versions are other transmissions from Sufyān al-Ṭawrī; but Firyābī and Buḳārī—Qabīṣah both have *al-nabiyy* where ‘Aḥwaṣ has *rasūl allāh*, and ‘Aḥwaṣ also has ‘Ā’iṣah speaking in the first person (where the other two have her being described in the third person).

preserved very precisely in writing from al-ʿAḥwaṣ to his students and onwards, such that the urtext requires barely any reconstruction:

ḥaddata-nā sufyān^u al-ṭawriyy^u ʿan hiṣāmⁱ bnⁱ ʿurwat^a ʿan ʿabī-hi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a
qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-ʿanā [ibnat/bint]^u sittⁱⁿ wa-ʿudkiltu
ʿalay-hi wa-ʿanā [ibnat/bint]^u tis^{ʿin} wa-makaṭtu ʿinda-hu tis^{ʿan}.

Such uniformity would be suspect for an earlier PCL (i.e., a red flag for later borrowing and the spread of *ʿisnāds*), but since al-ʿAḥwaṣ seems to have been operating at the turn of the 9th Century CE, and transmitted to students who operated squarely in the middle of the 9th Century CE, precise written preservation seems chronologically feasible.

Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAsadī (d. turn of the 9th C. CE)

I have collated three relevant reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAsadī (ostensibly deriving from Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, from Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm, from al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad, from ʿĀʾiṣah), recorded by Ibn ʿabī ʿĀṣim and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn ʿabī ʿĀṣim (d. 287/900)

al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī—Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAsadī—Sufyān—Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; consummation in Ṣawwāl.⁸¹³

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

al-Ḥaḍramī—al-Ḥasan b. Sahl al-Ḥannāṭ—Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAsadī—Sufyān—Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁸¹⁴

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

⁸¹³ Ibn ʿabī ʿĀṣim (ed. Jawābirah), *ʿĀḥād*, V, p. 390, # 3007.

⁸¹⁴ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 22, # 52.

al-Ḥaḍramī—al-Ḥasan b. Sahl al-Ḥannāṭ—Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAsadī—Sufyān—Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Zakariyyāʾ b. Yaḥyá al-Sājī—ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan—Sufyān—Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; consummation in Šawwāl; she was the preferred wife; she preferred women to be consummated in Šawwāl.⁸¹⁵

In al-Ṭabarānī's second report, which has two *ʾisnāds* back to Sufyān, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan is not explicitly cited. However, given that the first *ʾisnād* explicitly cites him as the one transmitting directly from Sufyān, and given that the second *ʾisnād* depicts ʿUmar b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan as transmitting from Sufyān, it seems likely that ʿUmar was supposed to have received his version from his father as well, rather than directly from Sufyān (whom he seemingly never transmitted from). In other words, my edition of the relevant work technically depicts a *munqaṭiʿ* transmission (from Sufyān to ʿUmar), but since ʿUmar's father is depicted as transmitting directly from Sufyān in another *ʾisnād* in the very same hadith, it seems reasonable to infer that he was supposed to have transmitted via his father as well. The *ʾisnād* should be emended accordingly.

With that out of the way, we can turn to the *matns*. In terms of their core two elements, the *matns* of these three ascriptions are more similar to each other than to most other versions of the marital-age hadith: all three have ʿĀʾiṣah narrating in the first person; all three have *rasūl allāh*; all three have *sitt sinīn*; all three have *baná*; and all three have *tisʿ sinīn*. Thereafter, some elemental differences arise: two have the element *wa-baná ʿalayya fī šawwāl*, absent in the remaining one; and one has an additional element about Šawwāl, absent in the other two. All of this is consistent with the core elements reflecting Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan's particular redaction, but with some subsequent abridgements or expansions thereof. Given that two of the three versions have *wa-baná ʿalayya fī šawwāl*, it seems reasonable to infer that this belonged to the original, which is consistent with al-Ṭabarānī or his immediate source al-Ḥaḍramī's having removed it from the version that lacks it. Less certain is the additional element about Šawwāl in al-Ṭabarānī's second version, which could be an

⁸¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 28, # 69.

addition by him or one of the tradents after Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, but could also be part of the original—after all, most other hadiths that contain the first Šawwāl element (*wa-banā ‘alayya fī šawwāl* and similar) also contain the second (*[fa-’ayyū nisā’i-kum kāna ‘aḥzā minnī* and similar).⁸¹⁶ If so, then Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim or his immediate source al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī must have omitted the second Šawwāl element from their version. Alternatively, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan himself may have added or omitted elements from his hadith in successive retellings.

Putting aside these additions or omissions, the elements that are shared by all three versions exhibit quite a few minor variations, in the form of added, omitted, or substituted words,⁸¹⁷ which is consistent with the hadith’s having been transmitted orally from Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan to his students.

Bearing all of this mind, the following redaction can be ascribed, with varying levels of confidence, to the PCL Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan:

ḥaddaṭa-nā sufyān^u ‘an sa‘dī bnī ‘ibrāhīm^a ‘anī al-qāsimī bnī muḥammadīn ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat [tazawwajtu/tazawwaja-nī/tazawwaja bī] rasūl[u/a] allāhⁱ wa-’anā ibnat^u sittī sinīn^a wa-banā bī wa-’anā bint^u tis‘ī sinīn^a wa-banā ‘alayya fī šawwālīn [fa-’ayyū nisā’i-kum kāna ‘aḥzā minnī wa-kānat taṣaḥḥibu ‘an tadḥula nisā’u-hā fī šawwālīn].

Ḥammād b. Zayd (d. 179/795)

I have collated three reports ascribed to the Basran tradent Ḥammād b. Zayd (situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b. ‘Urwah), recorded by ‘Ārim b. al-Faḍl (reconstructed), ‘Abū Dāwūd, and ‘Abū ‘Awānah.

‘Ārim b. al-Faḍl (d. 224/838-839)

Ḥammād b. Zayd—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

⁸¹⁶ See the references in Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 642, col. 2.

⁸¹⁷ I.I.A has *sufyān al-ṭawriyy*, where the other two only have *sufyān*; I.I.A only has *al-qāsim*, where the other two have *al-qāsim bn muḥammad*; I.A.A has *tazawwaja bī*, Ṭ. # 52 has *tazawwajtu* (making *rasūl allāh* the direct object), and Ṭ. # 69 has *tazawwaja-nī*; Ṭ. # 69 has *bint*, where the other two have *ibnah*; I.I.A has *‘alayya*, where the other two have *bī*; and finally, I.I.A has *ibnah*, where the other two have *bint*.

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁸¹⁸

ʿAbū Dāwūd (d. 275/889)

Sulaymān b. Ḥarb & ʿAbū Kāmil—Ḥammād b. Zayd—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven or six; consummation at nine.⁸¹⁹

ʿAbū ʿAwānah (d. 316/929)

Ibn ʿabī al-Ḥunayn—Šihāb b. ʿAbbād—Ḥammād b. Zayd—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; women came to her; she was on a swing; fever and hair; prepared for marriage by women; hair; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁸²⁰

These reports do appear to belong to the same sub-tradition *vis-à-vis* most other transmissions from Hišām b. ʿUrwah, but they are not unique: one of al-Rabīʿ al-Murādī's transmissions from Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah has an extremely similar wording,⁸²¹ as does Ibn ʿabī Dāwūd's transmission from Jarīr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd.⁸²² Still, most versions of this sub-tradition explicitly depict Ḥammād b. Zayd as their source, which matches the fact that the *matns* therein inferably share a recent common ancestor *vis-à-vis* all other versions of the broader Hišām tradition. The underlying urtext thus probably derives from Ḥammād, or in other words: Ḥammād is probably a genuine PCL, whose wording has been preserved in this sub-tradition.

Still, there are some notable variations between the versions preserved by ʿĀrim, ʿAbū Dāwūd, and ʿAbū ʿAwānah, mainly comprising some substituted,⁸²³ added,⁸²⁴ and omitted⁸²⁵ words. There is also a major difference in ʿAbū ʿAwānah's version: following the usual two elements associated with Ḥammād, there is an elaborate account by ʿĀʾiṣah about her experiences on the day of her marital consummation (featuring

⁸¹⁸ See the section on ʿĀrim b. al-Faḍl, above.

⁸¹⁹ ʿAbū Dāwūd (ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd), *Sunan*, II, p. 239, # 2121.

⁸²⁰ ʿAbū ʿAwānah (ed. ʿAṭāʾ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, IX, p. 382, # 4703.

⁸²¹ Šāfiʿī (ed. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib), *Umm*, VI, p. 429, # 2462.

⁸²² Ibn ʿabī Dāwūd (ed. Ḥusayn), *Musnad ʿĀʾiṣah*, p. 64, # 34.

⁸²³ Where ʿĀrim has either *bint* or *ibnah*, ʿAbū Dāwūd has *bint* and ʿAbū ʿAwānah has *ibnah*; where ʿAbū Dāwūd's transmission from Sulaymān b. Ḥarb has *sitt*, all the rest (including ʿAbū Dāwūd's transmission from ʿAbū Kāmil) have *sabʿ*; where ʿAbū Dāwūd has *daḡala*, the other two have *baná*.

⁸²⁴ ʿAbū ʿAwānah adds *sinīn* in the second element, absent in the other two.

⁸²⁵ ʿAbū Dāwūd omits *sinīn* in the first element, present in the other two.

women from the 'Anṣār, a swing, a fever and hair loss, and a marital preparation), followed by a description of how she continued to play with dolls with her shy friends. This particular combination of elements is actually unique: most of them can be found in the sub-traditions of 'Alī b. Mushir, Ḥammād b. Salamah, 'Abū 'Usāmah, and Muḥammad b. 'Amr, but not the 'dolls' element; and whilst numerous transmissions and sub-traditions emanating from Hišām b. 'Urwah contain the 'dolls' element, none of them also contain all the other aforementioned elements. Since none of the other transmissions from Ḥammād b. Zayd contain these elements, and since these elements are akin to those found in other sub-traditions, it seems clear that 'Abū 'Awānah (or Ibn 'abī al-Ḥunayn, or Šihāb b. 'Abbād, or a now-suppressed tradent) has contaminated his transmission from Ḥammād b. Zayd—combining and paraphrasing a distinctive set of elements from one or two other hadiths about 'Ā'iṣah's marriage and adding them into Ḥammād's version.

When all of these variants are accounted for, the following urtext from Ḥammād b. Zayd obtains:

...hišāmⁱ bnⁱ 'urwat^a 'an 'abī-hi 'an 'ā'iṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ
wa-'anā [bīnt/ibnat]^u sab^{ci} sinīn^a wa-banā bī wa-'anā bīnt^u tis^{cin}.

Most of the variants within this sub-tradition are very minor, which is consistent with occasional scribal errors or mild paraphrasing. Most of the text was preserved quite precisely, which is consistent with the hadith's having been transmitted partially or fully in writing, from Ḥammād to his students.

Ja'far b. Sulaymān (d. 178/794-795)

I have collated several reports ascribed to the Basran tradent Ja'far b. Sulaymān that bear consideration (in regards to the broader marital-age tradition of Hišām b. 'Urwah), variously recorded by Ibn Sa'd, al-Nasā'ī, 'Abū 'Awānah, and Ibn 'Adī.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Muslim b. 'Ibrāhīm—Ja'far b. Sulaymān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁸²⁶

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

Muḥammad b. al-Naḍr b. Musāwir—Ja'far b. Sulaymān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁸²⁷

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

Muḥammad b. al-Naḍr b. Musāwir—Ja'far b. Sulaymān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

She still played dolls with her shy friends.⁸²⁸

'Abū 'Awānah (d. 316/929)

al-Ṣāgānī—Muslim b. 'Ibrāhīm—Ja'far b. Sulaymān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁸²⁹

Ibn 'Adī (d. 365/976)

'Abū 'Arūbah—'Ayyūb al-Wazzān—Sa'īd b. Wāṣil al-Baṣrī—Ja'far b. Sulaymān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Taken to the Prophet as a bride; she still played dolls with her shy friends; Soloman's horse.⁸³⁰

If Ja'far did indeed transmit a hadith from Hišām comprising the 'dolls' element (the possibility of which was discussed previously),⁸³¹ he seems to have done so independently of his putative transmission of the marital-age elements therefrom: only Ibn Sa'd depicts the two as having been transmitted together, and even then, the marital-age elements in his version do not match the other ascriptions thereof to Ja'far. If the reports that are exclusively about the dolls are thus put aside, along with Ibn Sa'd's contaminated or borrowed version, we are actually left with a distinctive sub-tradition: the *matns* ascribed to Ja'far by both al-Nasā'ī and 'Abū 'Awānah are more similar to each other than to all other versions of the marital-age tradition more

⁸²⁶ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁸²⁷ Nasā'ī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, p. 772, # 3256.

⁸²⁸ *Id.* (ed. Ṣalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, VIII, p. 179, # 8898.

⁸²⁹ 'Abū 'Awānah (ed. 'Aṭā' Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XI, p. 383, # 4705.

⁸³⁰ Ibn 'Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, V, pp. 620-621, # 8406.

⁸³¹ See the section on Muslim b. 'Ibrāhīm, above.

broadly, which is consistent with both ascriptions reflecting Ja‘far’s particular redaction.⁸³²

There are some differences between these two ascriptions, in the form of a few added/omitted and substituted words,⁸³³ and they also differ slightly in the *’isnād* (i.e., in how they quote Ja‘far).⁸³⁴ However, these are all minor, and could be the result of either scribal errors or extremely mild paraphrasing. As such, Ja‘far’s redaction is discernible, despite some uncertainty in the exact wording:

...hišāmⁱ bnⁱ ‘urwat^a ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī [[**rasūlu**
allāhⁱ]/[al-nabiyy^u]] li-sab^{‘i}[n] [sinīn^a]** wa-daḡala [**‘alayya/bī**] li-tis^{‘i}
sinīn^a]**

‘Abṭar b. al-Qāsim (d. 178/794-795)

I have collated three reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent ‘Abū Zubayd ‘Abṭar b. al-Qāsim (situated within the broader tradition associated with ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq), recorded by al-Nasā’ī, al-Ṭabarānī, and al-Bayhaqī.

al-Nasā’ī (d. 303/915-916)

Qutaybah—‘Abṭar—Muṭarrif—‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at nine; together nine years⁸³⁵

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

al-Ḥaḍramī—Sa‘īd b. ‘Amr—‘Abṭar—Muṭarrif—‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at nine; together nine years⁸³⁶

al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066)

⁸³² In particular, they share the unique combination of *tazawwaja-nī, li-sab‘, daḡala, li-tis‘*.

⁸³³ N. has *rasūl allāh*, where A.A. has *al-nabiyy*; N. has *li-sab‘ sinīn*, where A.A. only has *li-sab‘*; and N. has *‘alayya*, where A.A. has *bī*.

⁸³⁴ In N., the hadith is narrated in the voice of Muḥammad b. al-Naḍr (e.g., *‘an hišām bn ‘urwah*), whereas in A.A., the hadith claims to quote Ja‘far (e.g., *ḥaddaṭa-nā ja‘far bn sulaymān qāla ḥaddaṭa-nā hišām...*).

⁸³⁵ Nasā’ī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, p. 772, # 3257.

⁸³⁶ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, pp. 22-23, # 53.

‘Alī b. ‘Aḥmad—‘Aḥmad b. ‘Ubayd—‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan—Muḥammad b. Sābiq—‘Abṭar—Muṭarrif—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at nine; together nine years; the meaning of *kawṭar* and *buṭnān*.⁸³⁷

These three reports clearly constitute a distinctive sub-tradition: they are all more similar to other—at least in terms of their core elements—than all other versions of the marital-age hadith more broadly,⁸³⁸ which is consistent with all three deriving from and reflecting ‘Abṭar’s particular redaction. There are three relatively minor differences between these versions: the first is an error in a name⁸³⁹; the second could be the product of paraphrase, interpolation, or scribal error⁸⁴⁰; and the third seems like a paraphrase.⁸⁴¹ Al-Bayhaqī’s version exhibits two of these three variants, and further includes a lengthy final element about the meaning of the words *kawṭar* and *buṭnān*. Given the absence of this element in the other two, it is likely an interpolation, which implies dishonesty or extreme sloppiness on the part of someone in al-Bayhaqī’s *‘isnād*.

The general uniformity of this hadith’s preservation (aside from the paraphrase and interpolation in al-Bayhaqī’s version) is consistent with its having been transmitted in writing from ‘Abṭar to his students (or at least, to Qutaybah and Sa‘īd b. ‘Amr). Consequently, ‘Abṭar’s urtext is readily discernible across the three extant ascriptions:

...muṭarrifⁿ ‘an ‘abī ‘ishāq^a ‘an ‘abī ‘ubaydat^a qāla qālat ‘ā’iṣat^u tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ li-tisⁱ sinīn^a wa-ṣaḥibtu-hu tis^{‘an}.

Šarīk b. ‘Abd Allāh (d. 177-178/793-795)

⁸³⁷ ‘Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī (ed. ‘Āmir ‘Aḥmad Ḥaydar), *al-Ba‘ī wa-al-Nuṣūr* (Beirut, Lebanon: Markaz al-Ḳadamāt wa-al-‘Abḥāt al-Ṭaqāfiyyah, 1986), p. 115, # 125.

⁸³⁸ In addition to comprising the rare combination of ‘married at nine’ and ‘the Prophet’s death’ (in terms of elements), all three exhibit the unique phrase *wa-ṣaḥibtu-hu tis^{‘an}*.

⁸³⁹ B. has *‘abī ‘ubayd*, where the other two have *‘abī ‘ubaydah*.

⁸⁴⁰ Ṭ. has *‘an ‘ā’iṣah qālat*, where the other two have *qāla qālat ‘ā’iṣah*.

⁸⁴¹ B. has *wa-‘anā bint tis[‘]*, where the other two have *li-tis[‘]*.

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent Šarīk b. ‘Abd Allāh (situated within the broader tradition associated with ‘Abū ‘Ishāq), both of which are recorded by al-Ṭabarānī.

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. Mūsá b. Ḥammād al-Barbarī—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Šālih al-‘Azdī—Yaḥyá b. ‘Ādam—Šarīk—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Abd Allāh:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁸⁴²

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—Yaḥyá al-Ḥimmānī—Šarīk—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Ā’iṣah:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at seven; consummation at nine.⁸⁴³

There are marked differences between these two versions, in terms of their ascription (‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd vs. ‘Ā’iṣah), the core detail of the first element (*sitt* vs. *sab*), the verb in the second element (*daḡala* vs. *baná*), and even—in the case of the first hadith—a whole extra element (*wa-qubiḍa wa-hiya bint ṭamān ‘ašrah*). In fact, the first version is more similar to certain specific transmissions from ‘Isrā’īl than it is to the second version,⁸⁴⁴ whilst the second version is in turn more similar to any other version of the marital-age hadith that comprises only the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements, especially those with the keywords *sab*‘ and *baná*—in particular, the redactions of Jarīr and Ḥammād b. Zayd, both from Hišām.⁸⁴⁵ In other words, the two ascriptions to Šarīk are not more similar to each other than they are to other versions of the marital-age hadith more broadly. Indeed, one of the transmitters of the first ascription to Šarīk, Yaḥyá b. ‘Ādam, elsewhere transmitted an extremely

⁸⁴² Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, X, p. 184, # 10279. This edition should be emended (to include the missing line *wa-qubiḍa wa-hiya bint*) in light of the 1984 Wizārat al-‘Awqāf wa-al-Shu‘ūn al-Dīniyyah, al-Jumhūriyyah al-‘Irāqīyyah edition (also at # 10279).

⁸⁴³ *Ibid.*, XXIII, p. 23, # 54.

⁸⁴⁴ E.g., Ibn Sa’d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41; ‘Uqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍu‘afā’*, V, pp. 473-474, # 2/5736.

⁸⁴⁵ See the relevant sections (above and below), and esp. Ibn Sa’d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42; Ibn ‘abī Dāwūd (ed. Ḥusayn), *Musnad ‘Ā’iṣah*, p. 64, # 34; Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 21, # 45.

similar hadith from ʿIsrāʿīl (recorded by al-Tirmidī),⁸⁴⁶ which is consistent with someone (including Yaḥyá himself) having taken what Yaḥyá transmitted from ʿIsrāʿīl and retributed it to Šarīk, in order to corroborate ʿIsrāʿīl's transmission from ʿAbū ʿIshāq. Whatever the motive and whoever the culprits, Šarīk looks like a spider, i.e., the convergence of successive dives with disparate *matns*: the ascriptions from him do not reflect any discernible redaction that can be traced back to him.

ʿAbū ʿAwānah al-Waḍḍāḥ (d. 176/792)

I have collated two *faḍāʿil* reports with marital-age elements ascribed to the Iraqi tradent ʿAbū ʿAwānah al-Waḍḍāḥ (who spent time in Wasit but ended up in Basrah), recorded by Ibn Saʿd and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845)

Hišām ʿAbū al-Walīd—ʿAbū ʿAwānah—ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿUmayr—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Special attributes; marriage at seven; angel brought image; consummation at nine; seeing Gabriel; most-beloved; illness; angels.⁸⁴⁷

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

ʿAbū Muslim al-Kaššī—Sahl b. Bakkār—ʿAbū ʿAwānah—ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿUmayr—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Special attributes; marriage at six; angel brought image; consummation at nine; seeing Gabriel; most-beloved; illness; angels.⁸⁴⁸

These two reports are more similar to each other than they are to all others (including related *faḍāʿil* reports) and therefore constitute a distinctive sub-tradition, which is consistent with both reflecting ʿAbū ʿAwānah's particular redaction of the relevant pool of *faḍāʿil* material. That said, there are still numerous differences between the two, in

⁸⁴⁶ Tirmidī (ed. Sāmarrāʾī et al.), *ʿIlal*, p. 169, # 296, which shares ʿan ʿabd allāh, sitt sinīn, daḡala, tisʿ sinīn, and qubiḡa.

⁸⁴⁷ Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 44.

⁸⁴⁸ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, pp. 29-30, # 74.

the form of added, omitted, and substituted words.⁸⁴⁹ Some of these are probably due to scribal errors (such as *yašhad* versus *tašhad*, which share the same consonantal *rasm*), but others (such as *li-tis' sinīn* versus *wa-'anā bint tis' sinīn*, or *marḍa rasūl allāh marḍata-hu* versus *marīḍa rasūl allāh fī baytī fa-marraḍtu-hu fa-qubiḍa*) are consistent with paraphrasing, which would suggest some orality in the transmission of this hadith. Despite this, the gist of the hadith seems well preserved, retaining the same elements in the same order. This would suggest that the oral transmission of this hadith was sloppy but not wild or free, and may be indicative of the parallel use of written notes (i.e., used as a reminder of the basic outline of the hadith). Either way, the two reports agree in the majority of their wording, such that most of 'Abū 'Awānah's particular redaction is readily discernible:

...ʿabdi al-maliki bnī ʿumayrⁱⁿ ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a [ʿanna-hā] qālat ʿuʿtītu [kilāl/kiṣāl]^{an} mā ʿuʿtīyat-hā imraʿat^{un} malaka-nī [rasūl^u allāhⁱ] wa-ʿanā bint^u [sitt/sab^ʿ]ⁱ sinīn^a wa-ʿatā-hu al-malak^u bi-ṣūratī fī kaffi-hi fa-nazara ʿilay-hā wa-banā bī [[wa-ʿanā bint^u]/[li-]]tis^{ʿi} sinīn^a wa-raʾaytu jibrīl^a wa-lam tara-hu imraʿat^{un} ḡayrī wa-kuntu ʾaḥabb^a nisāʾi-hi ʿilay-hi wa-kāna ʾabī ʾaḥabb^a ʾaṣḥābi-hi ʿilay-hi wa-mariḍa rasūl^u allāhⁱ [[marḍata-hu]/[fī baytī fa-marraḍtu-hu fa-qubiḍa]] wa-lam [y/t]ašhad-hu ḡayrī wa-al-malāʾikat^u.

Interestingly, the *ʾisnād* of this hadith is *munqaṭiʿ*, since ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿUmayr (who operated during the middle of the 8th Century CE and died in 136/754) was not remembered as having transmitted directly from ʿĀʾiṣah.⁸⁵⁰ This is consistent with the hadith's having been formulated in the 8th Century CE (for example, by ʿAbū ʿAwānah), when *munqaṭiʿ* hadiths were still acceptable.

Ḥammād b. Salamah (d. 167/784)

I have collated nine reports ascribed to the Basran tradent Ḥammād b. Salamah (situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b. ʿUrwah), recorded by al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhāl (reconstructed), Mūsā b. ʾIsmāʿīl (reconstructed), Ibn Saʿd, Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (in

⁸⁴⁹ I.S. has *ʿanna-hā*, absent in T.; I.S. has *kilāl*, where T. has *kiṣāl*; I.S. has *rasūl allāh*, absent in T.; I.S. has *sabʿ*, where T. has *sitt*; I.S. has *li-tisʿ sinīn*, where T. has *wa-ʿanā bint tisʿ sinīn*; I.S. has *fī baytī fa-marraḍtu-hu fa-qubiḍa*, where T. has *marḍata-hu*; and finally, I.S. has *yašhad* where T. has *tašhad*.

⁸⁵⁰ See Ḍahabī (ed. ʾArnaʾūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, V, pp. 438-441.

his recension of the so-called *Musnad* of al-Ṭayālīsī), Ibn ʿabī ʿĀṣim, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAḥmad (in his recensions of his father's material), ʿAbū Yaʿlā, ʿAbū ʿAwānah, and al-Ṭabarānī.

al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhāl (d. 216-217/831-832)

Ḥammād—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah—Prophet:

Girl in silk, Kadījah's death, the girl was ʿĀʾiṣah; girl in silk, who is ʿĀʾiṣah; [girl in silk, who is ʿĀʾiṣah];

—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage, Kadījah's death, Makkah, seven or six; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁸⁵¹

Mūsá b. ʾIsmāʿīl (d. 223/838)

Ḥammād—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage, Kadījah's death, seven or six; Hijrah; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁸⁵²

Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845)

Yazīd b. Hārūn—Ḥammād—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; swing; shoulder-length hair; playing; marital preparation; image in silk.⁸⁵³

Yūnus b. Ḥabīb (d. 267/880-881)

ʿAbū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī—Ḥammād—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine; her mother; shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.⁸⁵⁴

Ibn ʿabī ʿĀṣim (d. 287/900)

Hudbah b. Kālīd—Ḥammād—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah—Prophet:

Girl in silk, who was ʿĀʾiṣah; girl in silk, who was ʿĀʾiṣah;

⁸⁵¹ See the section on al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhāl, above.

⁸⁵² See the section on Mūsá b. ʾIsmāʿīl, above.

⁸⁵³ Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 40-41.

⁸⁵⁴ Ṭayālīsī, *Musnad*, p. 205, # 1454.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, ʿĀdījah’s death, seven; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁸⁵⁵

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad (d. 290/903)

Ibn Ḥanbal—Ḥammād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, ʿĀdījah’s death, Makkah, seven [or six]; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁸⁵⁶

‘Abū Ya‘lā (d. 307/919-920)

Ḥawṭarah b. ‘Aṣras—Ḥammād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Girl in silk, who was ‘Ā’iṣah;

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, ʿĀdījah’s death, seven; Hijrah; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁸⁵⁷

‘Abū ‘Awānah (d. 316/929)

Muḥammad b. ‘Ismā‘īl al-Ṣā’ig—‘Affān [b. Muslim]—Ḥammād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah—Prophet:

Girl in silk, ʿĀdījah’s death, the girl was ‘Ā’iṣah; marriage, ʿĀdījah’s death, six or seven; consummation at nine; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation.⁸⁵⁸

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

al-Ḥaḍramī—‘Abū Kurayb—Mu‘āwiyah b. Hišām—Ḥammād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, swing.⁸⁵⁹

⁸⁵⁵ Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim (ed. Jawābirah), *‘Āḥād*, V, p. 391, # 3009.

⁸⁵⁶ There are actually two versions of this hadith in two of the works of Ibn Ḥanbal (both actually composed by his son ‘Abd Allāh), with slight differences: *Musnad*, VI, p. 280, and (ed. ‘Abbās), *‘Ilal*, III, p. 243, # 5073. In addition to slight differences in the wording of the *‘isnād*, the version in the latter has *muḥajammah* and *sab‘ sinīn ‘aw sitt sinīn*, where the former has *mujammamah* and *sab‘ sinīn*; *muḥajammah* is gibberish born from a scribal or typographical error, but *sab‘ sinīn ‘aw sitt sinīn* has a better claim to reflecting the original than *sab‘ sinīn*, based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity. Finally, second version has *jā’at-nā*, where the first has the usual *jā’at-nī*.

⁸⁵⁷ ‘Abū Ya‘lā (ed. ‘Asad), *Musnad*, VIII, p. 74, # 4600/244.

⁸⁵⁸ ‘Abū ‘Awānah (ed. ‘Aṭā’ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XVIII, p. 589, # 10747.

⁸⁵⁹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 23, # 55.

The amount of variation between these transmissions from Ḥammād b. Salamah is staggering: some of them have different elemental sequences; some of them add or omit elements present in the others⁸⁶⁰; some of them rearrange the order of words within shared elements⁸⁶¹; some of them differ slightly in their *'isnāds*⁸⁶²; and finally, all of them add, omit, and substitute words and even whole lines within shared elements. (Since the footnote detailing the last-mentioned category of variants would have taken up an entire page *even as a footnote*, I instead opted to outline the relevant information in the main text with a diminished font size, as follows. The normal main text resumes thereafter.)

To begin with, there are variants within the preliminary narrative shared by Ḥajjāj, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, 'Abū Ya'lā, and 'Abū 'Awānah: 'Abū Ya'lā has *'utītu fī-mā yarā al-nā'im bi-jāriyah*, where the other three have only *'utītu bi-jāriyah*; Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim twice has *surfat ḥarīr*, where the other three have *saraqah min ḥarīr*; 'Abū 'Awānah has an added *qāla*, absent in the other three; Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim and 'Abū 'Awānah both have *fa-kašaftu-hā*, where 'Abū Ya'lā has *fa-fattaštu-hā* and Ḥajjāj has nothing; Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim twice has *yaku*, where the other three have *yakun*; 'Abū Ya'lā lacks *hādā*, present in the other three; Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim twice has *qibal*, where the other three have *'ind*; 'Abū Ya'lā and 'Abū 'Awānah both have *marratayn 'aw talāt*, where Ḥajjāj and Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim have the longer ending; Ḥajjāj has an added *qāla*, absent in Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim; Ḥajjāj has an additional, final *qāla tumma 'utītu bi-jāriyah fī saraqah min ḥarīr fa-kašaftu-hā fa-'idā hiya 'anti fa-qultu 'in yakun hādā min 'ind allāh yumḍi-hi*, absent in Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim; and finally, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim and 'Abū Ya'lā introduce the next section with *fa-qālat 'ā'iṣah*, whilst Ḥajjāj may have had *qālat 'ā'iṣah*, and 'Abū 'Awānah has nothing.

⁸⁶⁰ Ṭabarānī only comprises part of the 'married at six/seven' element and part of the 'swing' element (presumably to serve some legal function), and will henceforth be excluded from this count; Ḥajjāj, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, 'Abū Ya'lā, and 'Abū 'Awānah all have the 'dream/silk' element, absent in the rest; Ḥajjāj and 'Abū 'Awānah have the 'Ḳadījah's death' element within the 'dream/silk' element, unlike Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim and 'Abū Ya'lā; Ibn Sa'd and Yūnus lack the 'Ḳadījah's death' element in the middle of the 'married at six/seven' element, present in rest; Ibn Sa'd, Yūnus, and 'Abū 'Awānah lack the 'Hijrah' element, present in the rest; 'Abū Ya'lā lacks the 'hair' element, present in the rest; and Ibn Sa'd has an abridged variant of the 'dream/silk' element at the very end of his version, absent in the rest.

⁸⁶¹ Mūsā, Yūnus, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, and 'Abū 'Awānah have *sitt* then *sab'*, whereas Ḥajjāj and 'Abd Allāh have *sab'* then *sitt*; Ibn Sa'd and Yūnus rearrange the order of the wording of the 'swing' and 'hair' elements, *vis-à-vis* all the rest; and 'Abū 'Awānah has *ṣan[n]a'na-nī* then *hayya'na-nī*, whereas Ḥajjāj, Mūsā, 'Abd Allāh, and 'Abū Ya'lā have *hayya'na-nī* then *ṣan[n]a'na-nī*.

⁸⁶² Mūsā and 'Abū 'Awānah both depict Ḥammād speaking in his own voice and quoting Hiṣām (*ḥaddaṭa-nā hiṣām*), where all the rest have *'an hiṣām*; 'Abū Ya'lā has *'an 'urwah*, where all the rest have *'an 'abī-hi*; those that lack the initial 'dream/silk' element have *'an 'ā'iṣah qālat*, except for 'Abd Allāh (in his *Ilal*), who has *qāla qālat 'ā'iṣah* (although in his *Musnad*, he has the usual *'an 'ā'iṣah qālat*); and finally, those that begin with the 'dream/silk' element have *'an 'ā'iṣah 'anna rasūl allāh qāla*, except for 'Abū 'Awānah, who has *'anna 'ā'iṣah qālat qāla al-nabiyy*.

Moving on to the main marital-age hadith: Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim and 'Abū Ya'lá both begin with *fa-*, and 'Abū 'Awānah begins with *wa-*, absent in the rest; 'Abū Ya'lá and 'Abū 'Awānah both lack *rasūl allāh*, present in all the rest; Ḥajjāj, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, and 'Abd Allāh have *mutawaffá kadījah*, where Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá has *ba'da mutawaffá kadījah*, and 'Abū Ya'lá and 'Abū 'Awānah have *ba'da wafāt kadījah*; Ḥajjāj, Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, 'Abd Allāh, and 'Abū Ya'lá all have a comment about the Prophet's *maḥraj*, absent in Ibn Sa'd, Yūnus, and 'Abū 'Awānah (and of course Ṭabarānī); of these five, Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá and 'Abū Ya'lá have *wa-qabla*, where the other three only have *qabla*; Ḥajjāj has *min makkah*, where the other four instead have *'ilá al-madīnah bi-sanatayn* (or *li-sanatayn*, in the case of Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá); and Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá, 'Abd Allāh, and 'Abū Ya'lá all add *'aw talāt*, absent in Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim (not to mention Ḥajjāj).

Returning to the full set of transmissions: Ḥajjāj, Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, and 'Abū 'Awānah all have *ibnah*, where Ibn Sa'd, Yūnus, 'Abd Allāh, and 'Abū Ya'lá all have *bint*; Ḥajjāj and 'Abd Allāh (in his *Ilal*) have *sab' sinīn 'aw sitt sinīn*, Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá and 'Abū 'Awānah have *sitt sinīn 'aw sab'*, Ibn Sa'd has *sitt sinīn*, Yūnus has *sitt 'aw sab'*, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim has *sitt sinīn 'aw sab' sinīn*, and 'Abd Allāh (in his *Musnad*) and 'Abū Ya'lá have *sab' sinīn*; Yūnus adds *bi-makkah*, absent in the rest; 'Abū Ya'lá has *fa-lammā qadīmā*, where all the rest with this element add *al-madīnah* (or possibly *min al-madīnah*, in the case of Mūsá); Ibn Sa'd has *fa-'utītu* (and has it located after the 'hair' element, unlike all the rest), and Yūnus has *fa-'atat-nī niswah*, whereas Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá and 'Abd Allāh (in the *Musnad*) have *jā'at-nī niswah*, 'Abd Allāh (in the *Ilal*) has *jā'at-nā niswah*, and Ḥajjāj, 'Abū Dāwūd—Mūsá, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, 'Abū Ya'lá, and 'Abū 'Awānah all have *jā'a-nī niswah*; Ḥajjāj, Mūsá, 'Abū Ya'lá, and 'Abū 'Awānah all have *wa-'anā 'al'abu 'alá 'urjūḥah*, where Ṭabarānī (in his super-abridged version, otherwise ignored in this analysis) has *wa-'anā 'alá al-'urjūḥah* (with an added definite article), 'Abd Allāh has *wa-'anā 'al'abu fī 'urjūḥah* (with *fī* instead of *'alá*), Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim has *wa-'anā 'alá 'urjūḥah* (omitting *'al'abu*), Yūnus has *'al'abu 'alá 'urjūḥah* (and omitting *wa-'anā*, and also located after the 'hair' element), and finally, Ibn Sa'd has *wa-kuntu 'al'abu 'alá al-marjūḥah* and (after the 'hair' element and *fa-'utītu*) *wa-'anā 'al'abu 'alay-hā*; Ḥajjāj, Mūsá, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, 'Abd Allāh, and 'Abū 'Awānah all have *wa-'anā mujammamah*, where Yūnus *wa-'anā jāriyah mujammamah* (adding *jāriyah*), Ibn Sa'd has *wa-lī jumma*, and 'Abū Ya'lá omits the element altogether; Mūsá, 'Abd Allāh, and 'Abū 'Awānah have *fa-ḍahabna bī*, and Ibn Sa'd has *fa-'uḳīḍtu*, absent in all the rest; Ibn Sa'd has *fa-huyyi'tu* and Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim has nothing, where all the rest have *fa-hayya'na-nī*; Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim has *fa-dahanū-nī*, and both Ibn Sa'd and Yūnus have nothing, where all the rest have *wa-ṣan[n]a'na-nī*; Yūnus, Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim, and 'Abū 'Awānah have *wa-*, where all the rest have *ṭumma*; Ibn Sa'd has *'udḳiltu 'alay-hi*, and both Yūnus and 'Abū 'Awānah have *'ahdayna-nī 'ilá rasūl allāh*, where all the rest have *'atayna bī rasūl allāh*; Ibn Sa'd has *wa-'udḳiltu 'alay-hi*, and both Ḥajjāj and Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim have nothing, where both Yūnus and 'Abū 'Awānah have *wa-banā bī*, and Mūsá, 'Abd Allāh, and 'Abū Ya'lá have *fa-banā bī*; Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah has *al-nabiyy*, absent in all the rest; Yūnus has *bi-al-madīnah*, absent in all the rest; Ḥajjāj, 'Abū Dāwūd—Mūsá, 'Abū 'Awānah, and Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim all have *ibnah*, where Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah—Mūsá, Ibn Sa'd, Yūnus, 'Abd Allāh, and 'Abū Ya'lá all have *bint*; and finally, Yūnus and Ibn 'abī 'Āṣim both lack *sinīn*, present in all the rest.

One or two of the relevant variants are clearly the product of scribal error,⁸⁶³ but most of them—the reordering, elaborations, substitutions, and paraphrases—are consistent with being the product of loose or sloppy oral transmission.

Despite all of this, it seems likely that Ḥammād was a genuine PCL who transmitted some combination of these elements to some of his students—but what exactly did he transmit? The problem here is not that a distinctive sequence or wording cannot be attributed to him, but rather, the opposite: *multiple, different* sequences and particular wordings are attested for him.⁸⁶⁴ To make matters worse, these distinctive elements and wordings are not coterminous, which is to say: one version may share a distinctive wording with another, which in turn shares a distinctive sequence of elements with another, which in turn shares a distinctive wording with yet another, and so on.⁸⁶⁵ This means either that there was a storm of alteration and contamination occurring between Ḥammād’s students, and/or that Ḥammād changed the hadith in the course of successive retellings. In light of the oral mode of transmission that still predominated in the generation of Ḥammād, the latter scenario at least seems highly plausible. That being so, the reconstruction of a single redaction from him is out of the question. Instead, only discrete units of Ḥammād’s hadith (i.e., elements, or sets of elements), transmitted at different times in different combinations, can be identified. Some of these may be the product of later alteration and contamination between Ḥammād’s students, but much of it likely goes back to him—after all, they often

⁸⁶³ Namely, *surfah* in Ibn ‘abī ‘Āṣim, which is probably a distortion of *saraqah*; and *ṣana‘na* versus *ṣanna‘na*, the difference being an added or omitted *ṣaddah*.

⁸⁶⁴ For example, none of Ḥammād’s transmissions mention the Banū al-Ḥārīṭ b. al-Ḳazraj, nor how ‘Ā’īṣah become ill, nor her playing companions, nor her mother, nor how she was led to a house, nor how she was breathless, nor how she was washed, nor the blessings said over her, nor how she was surprised, nor the time of day, nor the word *yawma-’idīn*—all of which are present in the analogous transmissions of ‘Alī b. Mushir, and much of which are present in the analogous transmissions of ‘Abū ‘Usāmah. In other words, even when the closest transmissions to Ḥammād’s (within the broader marital-age tradition) are examined, the versions of the analogous elements in the transmissions from Ḥammād are consistently more similar to each other than they are to the others.

⁸⁶⁵ E.g., *ba’d wafāt ḳadījah* in the silk/dream narrative; *marratayn ‘aw talāt* in the silk/dream narrative, versus the extended (repetitive) ending; the silk/dream narrative as a whole; the ‘Ḳadījah’s death’ element; the placing of the ‘should-length hair’ element in the middle of the ‘swing’ element, versus after the ‘swing’ element; the placing of the ‘consummation at nine’ element directly after the ‘marriage at six/seven’ element, versus after the ‘marital preparation’ element; the addition versus omission of the ‘Hijrah’ element; and finally, the addition versus omission of *fa-banā bī* in the ‘consummation at nine’ element. Each of these features is attested at least twice.

comprise distinctive wordings and sequences, which is consistent with their common ascriptions to Ḥammād reflecting his various particular wordings and formulations.

To begin with, Ḥammād sometimes prefaced his hadith with a narrative about ʿĀʾiṣah being shown to the Prophet in silk in a dream, which began as follows:

...hišāmⁱ bnⁱ ʿurwat^a ʿan ʾabī-hi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a ʾanna rasūl^a allāhⁱ qāla **ʾutītu bi-jāriyatⁱⁿ fī saraqatⁱⁿ min ḥarīrⁱⁿ...**

Thereafter, he sometimes added the following element:

...baʿd^a wafātⁱ kadījat^a...

Thereafter, he would continue:

...fa-kašaftu-hā fa-ʾidā hiya ʾanti fa-qultu ʾin yakun hādā min ʿindⁱ allāhⁱ yumdi-hi...

Thereafter, he would sometimes conclude this narrative with the following line:

...marrataynⁱ ʾaw talāt^{an}.

Other times, rather than just stipulating that the scenario occurred twice or thrice, he would actually narrate the second occurrence, as follows:

...ʾumma ʾutītu bi-jāriyatⁱⁿ fī **[[saraqatⁱⁿ min]/[sarfātⁱ]]** ḥarīrⁱⁿ fa-kašaftu-hā fa-ʾidā hiya ʾanti fa-qultu ʾin yaku[n] hādā min [qibalⁱ/ʿindⁱ] allāhⁱ yumdi-hi.

On some occasions, he may even have repeated this element a third time (although this is only attested in one report, such that the wording is uncorroborated), as follows:

[...ʾumma ʾutītu bi-jāriyatⁱⁿ fī saraqatⁱⁿ min ḥarīrⁱⁿ fa-kašaftu-hā fa-ʾidā hiya ʾanti fa-qultu ʾin yakun hādā min ʿindⁱ allāhⁱ yumdi-hi.]

Thereafter, Ḥammād would switch the narratorial point of view from the Prophet to ʿĀʾiṣah (with a *fa-qālat ʿāʾiṣah*), or alternatively—in those instances where he omitted

the preliminary narrative about dreams and silk altogether—he would begin the hadith with the following *ʿisnād*:

...hišāmⁱ bnⁱ ʿurwat^a ʿan ʾabī-hi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat...

Thereafter (regardless of whether he had prefaced the hadith with the narrative about dreams and silk), he would usually begin the main (marital-age) hadith as follows:

...tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ...

Thereafter, Ḥammād would often mention ʿĀḍiyah’s death, usually in the following way:

...mutawaffā ʿĀḍiyat^a...

At other times (according to two attestations), he would instead mention it in the following way:

...baʿda wafātⁱ ʿĀḍiyat^a...

At other times (according to two attestations), he would proceed without mentioning it at all. Either way, he would usually (but not always, per three attestations) continue:

...qabla makraji-hi ʾilā al-madīnatⁱ bi-sanataynⁱ [ʾaw talātⁱⁿ]...

Thereafter, he would continue

...wa-ʾanā [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a ʾaw sabʿⁱ sinīn^a...

Or, alternatively:

...wa-ʾanā [bint/ibnat]^u sabʿⁱ sinīn^a ʾaw sittⁱ sinīn^a...

Thereafter, he would usually mention the Hijrah, as follows:

...fa-lammā qadimnā al-madīnat^a...

Alternatively, he would make no mention of the Hijrah and instead move straight to ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital consummation, probably as follows:

...wa-banā bī wa-’anā [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{‘i} sinīn^a...

Thereafter (regardless of whether he mentioned the Hijrah or ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital consummation), he would continue with a mention of ‘Ā’iṣah’s playing on a swing as a girl with shoulder-length hair, probably as follows:

...ā’a-nī niswat^{un} wa-’anā ’al’abu ’alā ’urjūḥatⁱⁿ wa-’anā mujammamat^{un}...

Alternatively, he may have reordered the wording, although this is poorly attested (i.e., by only two reports, with markedly different wordings). Either way, he would then continue with mention of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital preparation, often beginning with the following:

...fa-dahabna bī...

Thereafter, he would continue (or alternatively, begin the element) with the following:

...fa-hayya’na-nī wa-ṣan[n]a’na-nī...

Thereafter, he would usually conclude the hadith with the following:

...tumma ’atayna bī rasūl^a allāhⁱ [fa-banā bī] wa-’anā [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{‘i} sinīn^a.

(Sometimes, he may have omitted *fa-banā bī*, as attested in two instances.) But sometimes (when he had already mentioned ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital consummation near the beginning of the hadith), he would instead conclude with the following shorter ending (attested twice):

...wa-’ahdayna-nī ’ilā rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ.

The ordering these elements was not random: the narrative from the Prophet about ‘Ā’iṣah being presented to him in a dream in silk (when present) always came at the beginning of the hadith; the ‘Ḳadījah’s death’ element (when present) was always made near the beginning of the aforementioned narrative (after the first instance of *ḥarīr*), and/or near the beginning of ‘Ā’iṣah’s autobiographical narrative (after *tazawwaja-nī rasūl allāh*); the ‘Hijrah’ element (when present) always came immediately after the ‘married at six/seven’ element; the ‘swing’ element, the ‘hair’ element, and the ‘marital preparation’ element were always present, and always in that order (although the first two were sometimes a bit intermingled); and the ‘consummated in marriage at nine’ element always came either directly after the ‘married at six/seven’ element (in lieu of the ‘Hijrah’ element), or (when the ‘Hijrah’ element was included) at the very end of the hadith.

The ordering principle behind this pattern is easy to discern: the elements comprising (the various redactions of) Ḥammād’s hadith—whenever they happened to be present—were ordered chronologically. The exception thereto is the ‘consummated in marriage at nine’ element, which was sometimes paired directly with the ‘married at six/seven’ element (and always at the expense of the ‘Hijrah’ element, for some reason), presumably because they were related thematically.

There is less order (which is to say, no real order) when it came to the inclusion or omission of *sub-elements*, i.e., the inclusion or omission of specific wordings *within* some of the elements of the hadith. This was the case principally with the ‘marital preparation’ element: sometimes *ḡahabna bī* was included, and sometimes not; sometimes *hayya’na-nī* was included, and sometimes not; and sometimes *ṣan[n]a’na-nī* was included, and sometimes not. Additionally, the word *sinīn* was sometimes included and sometimes excluded, in both the ‘married at six/seven’ element and the ‘consummated in marriage at nine’ element, and *fa-banā bī* was sometimes omitted from the latter as well.

Less common (or at least, less detectable, absent more corroborating transmissions) are paraphrastic substitutions, of which the main examples are *mutawaffā ḡadījah* versus *ba’da wafāt ḡadījah*, *ibnah* versus *bint* (along with the addition or omission of *sinīn*), and *ṭumma ’atayna bī rasūl allāh* versus *wa-’ahdayna-nī ’ilā rasūl allāh*. For the most part, wordings were variously added or subtracted, but not *substituted*.

In short, the inclusion of many elements was random, and the inclusion therein of specific sub-elements or particular wordings was random; but the *ordering thereof* was not random, and the specific wordings *themselves* were not random. The latter point is of particular interest: for example, the marital-age element may have comprised *ḍahabna bī + hayyaʿna-nī + ṣan[n]aʿna-nī*, or *ḍahabna bī + ṣan[n]aʿna-nī + hayyaʿna-nī*, or just *hayyaʿna-nī + ṣan[n]aʿna-nī*, but seemingly not *paraphrases* or *substitutions* thereof.

All of this is consistent with Ḥammād’s having memorised a set of wordings tied to particular concepts or episodes, which he variously included or excluded—usually in chronological order—in successive retellings. Ḥammād’s version of the marital-age hadith was thus a kind of fluid construct, in which a range of (mostly fixed) wordings functioned as optional or interchangeable building blocks. In this respect, Ḥammād comes across as somewhat of a storyteller, rather than a simple tradent.

Wuhayb b. Kālid (d. 165/781-782)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Basran tradent Wuhayb b. Kālid (situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b. ‘Urwah), recorded by ‘Affān b. Muslim (reconstructed) and al-Buḵārī.

‘Affān b. Muslim (d. 220/835)

Wuhayb—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁸⁶⁶

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

Mu‘allā b. ‘Asad—Wuhayb—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.

Hišām:

Together nine years.⁸⁶⁷

⁸⁶⁶ See the section on ‘Affān b. Muslim, above.

⁸⁶⁷ Buḵārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ* III, pp. 1076-1077.

These two texts are more similar to each other than either is to any other version of the marital-age tradition (with the same set of elements in the same order, with the same distinctive wording), such that they constitute a distinctive sub-tradition and must share a recent common ancestor *vis-à-vis* all the rest. This matches the *ʿisnāds*, which depict Wuhayb as the PCL for this sub-tradition. The attribution of the urtext of this hadith to Wuhayb thus seems probable.

There is a wrinkle here, however: al-Ṭabarānī’s transmission from Wuhayb via ‘Affān is actually identical to al-Buḵārī’s transmission from Wuhayb via Mu‘allā, when it comes to the wording of the constitutive elements of the hadith.⁸⁶⁸ In other words, when it comes to the *wording* of the elements, al-Ṭabarānī’s version is more similar to al-Buḵārī’s version than Ibn Sa‘d’s, despite Ibn Sa‘d likewise transmitting from ‘Affān. This is consistent with Ibn Sa‘d’s being uniquely sloppy within this sub-tradition (as was argued above),⁸⁶⁹ but it is also consistent with al-Ṭabarānī’s version’s having been contaminated by al-Buḵārī’s, or even having been borrowed therefrom and given a false, alternative *ʿisnād* (via ‘Affān rather than Mu‘allā).

Of course, there is still a major difference between al-Buḵārī’s version, on the one hand, and Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī’s, on the other: the former adds an important statement from Wuhayb that is absent in the other two, clarifying that the third element is an editorial comment or addendum. To illustrate this difference, consider the following translation of Ibn Sa‘d’s version:

‘Affān b. Muslim reported to us: “Wuhayb reported to us: “Hišām b. ‘Urwah reported to us, from his father, from ‘Ā’iṣah, that the Messenger of God married her when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years, and she was with him nine years.””

Likewise, consider the following translation of al-Ṭabarānī’s version:

Muḥammad b. al-‘Abbās al-Mu‘addib related to us: “‘Affān b. Muslim al-Ṣaffār related to us—he said: “Wuhayb b. Ḳālīd related to me, from Hišām b. ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Ā’iṣah, that the Prophet married her when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years, and she was with him nine years.””

⁸⁶⁸ Both Ṭab. and Buḵ. have *al-nabiyy*, where Ibn Sa‘d has *rasūl allāh*; and in the two instances where both Ṭab. and Buḵ. have *bint*, Ibn Sa‘d has *ibnah*.

⁸⁶⁹ See the section on ‘Affān, above.

In both of these versions, the final element is presented as if it is part of the same package of information as the rest, deriving together from the same set of sources back to ‘Ā’iṣah. By contrast, consider al-Buḵārī’s version (emphasis mine):

Mu‘allā b. ‘Asad related to us: “Wuhayb related to us, from Hišām b. ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Ā’iṣah, that the Prophet married her when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years.

Then Hišām said: “And I was informed that (*fa-qāla hišām wa-‘unbi’tu ‘anna-hā*) she was with him nine years.””

The difference is striking: in al-Buḵārī’s version, it is recorded that the third element was an unsourced addendum by Hišām. Even if the third element also derived from ‘Urwah, the fact that Hišām presents it as an addendum (rather than simply narrating it along with the rest) suggests that this element was not originally transmitted in the same package of information as the other two, or in other words: at minimum, Hišām is combining information from different reports from his father. That said, there is reason to suspect that Hišām is actually not being depicted as saying that he received the third element from ‘Urwah. For the first two elements, Hišām is explicitly depicted as having claimed to receive them from his father, from ‘Ā’iṣah; but for the final element, he vaguely states that “I was informed”, in the passive. This would be odd if the informant in question was simply ‘Urwah, who was explicitly cited as the source for the preceding two elements: why not simply say, “my father said” (*qāla ‘abī*), or “he said” (*qāla*), or similar?⁸⁷⁰ This suggests that Hišām obtained this element from someone other than his father, i.e., an anonymous source.

There is thus a major difference between Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī’s versions, on the one hand, and al-Buḵārī’s, on the other: the first two make it seem as though the third element in this hadith (*kānat ‘inda-hu tis‘ sinīn*) was part of the same report—from the same line of transmission—as the third element, whereas the latter makes it clear that the third element is an addendum or comment from some other source. Al-Buḵārī’s version is clearly the archaic one, in light of the Criterion of Dissimilarity: it is much

⁸⁷⁰ For comparison, see the redactions of Ḥammād b. Salamah, ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, Muḥammad b. Biṣr, Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá, and ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār (in the relevant sections, above), where the previously-cited source is reintroduced or cited again with a simple *qālat* or *qālat fulān*.

more likely that an addendum from a *majhūl* was smoothed over and incorporated into the rest of the hadith, rather than vice versa. This is similar to the well-known phenomenon of the “incorporation of marginalia” in the copying of manuscripts,⁸⁷¹ which is to say: this sort of thing happened all the time in the transmission of texts.

Since both of the versions that lack Hišām’s clarification claim to derive from ‘Affān, he is the obvious culprit behind the suppression thereof: where Mu‘allā accurately transmitted Wuhayb’s recounting of Hišām’s addendum to al-Buḵārī, ‘Affān made it seem as though the addendum was simply part of the same narration as the rest of the hadith, which he then transmitted to both Ibn Sa‘d and Muḥammad b. al-‘Abbās (which the latter in turn passed on to al-Ṭabarānī).

However, the fact that al-Ṭabarānī’s version is otherwise identical to al-Buḵārī’s in wording is still highly suspect, for it looks as though the former (or his source, Muḥammad) may have borrowed the latter’s *matn* and supplied it with an alternative line of transmission: via ‘Affān (who may have been known as a transmitter of this hadith, thanks to Ibn Sa‘d), rather than Mu‘allā. Alternatively, al-Ṭabarānī or Muḥammad may really have received a version of this hadith from ‘Affān, but updated the wording according to that in the version of the great al-Buḵārī.

If either of those scenarios is correct, then why did al-Ṭabarānī or Muḥammad not also borrow Hišām’s statement? The answer is simple: doing so would have created a weaker or less desirable hadith, i.e., one with an element from a *majhūl*. Thus, even if al-Ṭabarānī or Muḥammad borrowed from al-Buḵārī’s version, or updated the wording of a genuine transmission from ‘Affān to accord to the exact wording of al-Buḵārī’s version, we would still have a reason to expect that they would omit Hišām’s statement.

Since this scenario is at least plausible, we cannot treat al-Ṭabarānī’s version as a corroboration for Ibn Sa‘d’s transmission from ‘Affān: al-Ṭabarānī’s version is suspect, and must be removed from the equation accordingly. This leaves us with only two transmissions from Wuhayb: Ibn Sa‘d, via ‘Affān; and al-Buḵārī, via Mu‘allā. Can we still reconstruct Wuhayb’s urtext therefrom, or could some kind of borrowing underly the remaining two versions as well? Since al-Buḵārī retains Hišām’s statement, he cannot have borrowed his version from Ibn Sa‘d, who lacks it—otherwise, we would have to

⁸⁷¹ E.g., John P. Postgate, ‘Textual Criticism’, in *The Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature and General Information: Eleventh Edition*, vol. XXVI (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 712, col. 2.

posit that al-Buḳārī inserted Hišām’s statement into the hadith, which seems unlikely. (Likewise, if al-Buḳārī indeed received his version from Mu‘allá, it does not seem likely that Mu‘allá borrowed it from Ibn Sa’d, for the same reasons.) Again, al-Buḳārī’s version likely represents the original outline (though not necessarily the exact wording) of this sub-tradition, per the Criterion of Dissimilarity. In light of that fact, and in light of the fact that an interpolated version of the sub-tradition is recorded by Ibn Sa’d (d. 230/845), the original must be earlier still.

The attribution of this sub-tradition back to Wuhayb is thus at least plausible, even if the match between the *’isnāds* and the *matns* is not as precise as it first appeared.⁸⁷² The texts are still consistent with descending from a recent common ancestor (who must have been operating prior to Ibn Sa’d), which matches the depiction of Wuhayb as the PCL thereof in the *’isnāds*.

There is of course variation between Ibn Sa’d and al-Buḳārī’s ascriptions to Wuhayb, but these are mostly few and minor (i.e., four instances of substituted words),⁸⁷³ with the exception of the omission of Hišām’s statement in Ibn Sa’d’s version. The minor variants could be chalked up to occasional mild paraphrasing or simple scribal errors, but the major variant is consistent with interpolation on the part of either Ibn Sa’d or his source ‘Affān.

Accordingly (and by taking the Criterion of Dissimilarity into account), the following redaction can be plausibly reconstructed back to Wuhayb:

...hišāmⁱ bnⁱ ‘urwat^a ‘an ‘abī-hi ‘an ‘ā’išat^a ‘anna [[**rasūl^a allāhⁱ]/[al-nabiyy^a]] tazawwaja-hā wa-hiya [**ibnat/bint**]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-banā bi-hā wa-hiya [**ibnat/bint**]^u tisⁱ sinīn^a fa-qāla hišām^{un} wa-’unbi’tu ‘anna-hā **kānat** ‘inda-hu tis^a sinīn^a.**

The sequence of elements and most of the wordings therein have been accurately preserved, which is consistent with the hadith’s having been transmitted (at least in part) in writing, from Wuhayb to his students. Al-Buḳārī, Mu‘allá, and Wuhayb come across as particularly reliable, given their accurate preservation of Hišām’s

⁸⁷² I.e., when it appeared that the *’isnāds* accurately tracked the sub-tradition of ‘Affān within the broader sub-tradition of Wuhayb; see the section on ‘Affān, above.

⁸⁷³ Where Ibn Sa’d claims to record Wuhayb saying *’aḳbara-nā*, Buḳ. simply has *‘an*; where Ibn Sa’d has *rasūl allāh*, Buḳ. has *al-nabiyy*; and in the two places where Ibn Sa’d has *ibnah*, Buḳ. has *bint*.

clarificatory statement concerning the third element (*vis-à-vis* Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī’s versions).

al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy (d. 169/785-786)

I was only able to find one transmission of the tradition of the Kufan Zaydī theologian and traditionist al-Ḥasan b. Ṣāliḥ b. Ḥayy within the extant Hadith corpus: the report recorded by Ibn Rāhwayh (reconstructed).

ʿIshāq b. Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

Yaḥyá b. ʿĀdam—al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy:

He saw a twenty-one-year-old grandmother; the minimum age of pregnancy is nine; ʿĀʾiṣah’s marriage was consummated at nine.⁸⁷⁴

Given that the attribution of this hadith to al-Ḥasan relies upon a SS, said attribution cannot be confirmed, which is to say: the evidence does not allow us to affirm that al-Ḥasan was a genuine CL. Moreover, even if it were the case that this hadith ultimately originates as the saying of al-Ḥasan (which is certainly plausible),⁸⁷⁵ we would have no way of knowing exactly which extant wordings belong to the original, and which are the product of later error, contamination, or interpolation.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Zinād (d. 164/780-781 or 174/790-791)

I have collated five reports ascribed to the Madino-Baghdadian tradent ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Zinād (mostly situated within the broader tradition of Hišām b.

⁸⁷⁴ See the section on ʿIshāq b. Rāhwayh, above.

⁸⁷⁵ After all, why would Ibn Rāhwayh or Yaḥyá, both of whom were traditionists operating in the era when Companion or Prophetical hadiths were prized above all else, have bothered to invent the saying of an 8th-Century traditionist?

‘Urwah), recorded by Ibn Sa‘d, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad (in his recension of the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal), al-ʿAṣamm (in his recension of the *Jāmiʿ* of Ibn Wahb), and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. ‘Umar [al-Wāqidī]—Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:
Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁸⁷⁶

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad (d. 290/903)

Ibn Ḥanbal—‘Abd al-Raḥmān [b. ‘abī al-Zinād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:
Marriage at six; Kadijah’s death; consummation at nine.⁸⁷⁷

al-ʿAṣamm (d. 346/957-958)

Muḥammad [b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam]—Ibn Wahb—Sa‘īd b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān & Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:
Marriage at six; Kadijah’s death; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁸⁷⁸

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Marwazī—Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-‘Abdī—Bakr b. Yūnus—Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād—‘Abū al-Zinād—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:
Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁸⁷⁹

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Yaḥyá b. ‘Ayyūb al-‘Allāf & ‘Abū Yazīd al-Qarāṭisī—Sa‘īd b. ‘abī Maryam—Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:
Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁸⁸⁰

⁸⁷⁶ Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 40.

⁸⁷⁷ Ibn Ḥanbal (ed. Ḡamrāwī), *Musnad*, VI, p. 118.

⁸⁷⁸ Ibn Wahb (ed. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib & Mazyad), *Jāmiʿ*, pp. 154-155, # 260.

⁸⁷⁹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Ṭāriq & Ḥusaynī), *al-Muʿjam al-ʿAwsaṭ*, VII, p. 94, # 6957.

⁸⁸⁰ *Id.* (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 21, # 46.

Al-Ṭabarānī's first version (recorded in his *al-Muʿjam al-ʿAwsaṭ*) should be discarded immediately, on several grounds: firstly, it comprises a combination of elements (in particular, about the Prophet's death) that is uncorroborated by any other transmission from Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād; secondly, the *ʿisnād* has Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād transmitting from his father, where all the rest have him transmitting from Hišām; and thirdly, the combination of elements therein is more similar to the sub-tradition of Sufyān al-Ṭawrī (i.e., a different PCL) than to the other transmissions from Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād, and the key wordings therein (*ʿudkiltu ʿalay-hi* and *wa-makaṭṭu ʿinda-hu tisʿan*) are identical to those in the redaction by Sufyān's PCL-student al-ʿAḥwaṣ b. Jawwāb in particular, a version of which was recorded by none other than al-Ṭabarānī himself.⁸⁸¹ For all of these reasons, al-Ṭabarānī's first version is likely the product of contamination and/or interpolation.

Al-Ṭabarānī's second version (recorded in his *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*) suffers from a similar problem, but on a much smaller scale: the ascription to Hišām and the combination of elements therein are corroborated by other transmissions from Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād, but the wording of the second element (*wa-ʿudkiltu ʿalay-hi wa-ʿanā bint tisʿ sinīn*) happens to be identical with al-Ṭabarānī's first version (in *al-Muʿjam al-ʿAwsaṭ*) and, by extension, the redaction of al-ʿAḥwaṣ. This is consistent with minor contamination, wherein the wording of one particular element has been replaced by the analogous wording from a different transmission. Since this happened twice in the works of the very same collector (and the *ʿisnāds* claim independent paths, via different regions, back to Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād), the collector himself is likely responsible for the contamination: whether through error, mendacity, or some other motive, al-Ṭabarānī altered the wording in at least one of his transmissions from Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād. Perhaps he did so under the influence of the first contaminated or interpolated version (in *al-Muʿjam al-ʿAwsaṭ*), for which he was not himself responsible—or perhaps he was responsible for contamination or interpolation of both versions (in *al-Muʿjam al-ʿAwsaṭ* and *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr* alike).

There is also a problem in al-ʿAṣamm's version, *viz.*, the dual ascription: his transmission claims to derive via both Saʿīd b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān *and* ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Zinād, with both receiving the hadith in turn from Hišām. In addition to the

⁸⁸¹ *Id.* (ed. Ṭāriq & Ḥusaynī), *al-Muʿjam al-ʿAwsaṭ*, II, p. 301, # 2042.

ascription to Sa'īd being completely uncorroborated (both in the other ascriptions to Ibn 'abī al-Zinād, and in other transmissions from Hišām more broadly), Sa'īd was reportedly born in 157/773-774 (as recorded in the *'Akbār al-Quḍāh* of Wakī'),⁸⁸² a decade after the death of Hišām. If so, he cannot have transmitted this hadith directly from Hišām, which means that the *'isnād* in question is *munqaṭi'* in that respect.

Despite all of that (and with al-Ṭabarānī's first version removed from the equation), these reports are more similar to each other than to other versions of the marital-age in certain key ways: two of them share the unusual element *mutawaffā kadījah*, and three of them share the element about 'Ā'īshah's dolls and her shy friends. More importantly, all three of these 'dolls' elements begin with the *d-k-l* root, then 'Ā'īshah's saying that she would *'al'abu*, then a statement about her friends, which is unique out of all versions of the marital-age hadith that incorporate the 'dolls' element.⁸⁸³

That said, al-'Aṣamm's version of the 'dolls' element is in another respect more similar to the 'dolls' element that appears in one of versions of the marital-age hadith recorded in al-Rabī' al-Murādī's recension of al-Šāfi'ī's works: both have the line *fa-'idā ra'ayna rasūl allāh*, to the exclusion of all other related versions of the marital-age hadith.⁸⁸⁴ Since al-'Aṣamm received his version from Egyptians, and since al-Šāfi'ī and al-Rabī' both operated in Egypt, this cannot be a coincidence: some kind of contamination evidently took place between Egyptian tradents of different versions of the marital-age hadith around the turn of the 9th Century CE. Still, in most other respects, al-'Aṣamm's version is more similar to other transmissions from Ibn 'abī al-Zinād: in addition to the aforementioned, his version also shares both *istahyayna* and *rubba-mā* with al-Ṭabarānī's second version, to the exclusion of all other relevant versions.

Thus, it is still plausible that the relevant reports preserve a distinctive redaction from Ibn 'abī al-Zinād, even if the preservation in question was highly imperfect: the variation between these reports is substantial, including the addition or omission of

⁸⁸² Wakī' Muḥammad b. Kālaf b. Ḥayyān, *'Akbār al-Quḍāh*, vol. 3 (Beirut, Lebanon: 'Ālam al-Kutub, n. d.), p. 264.

⁸⁸³ Cf. Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41; Šāfi'ī (ed. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib), *'Umm*, X, p. 141, # 147; Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā (ed. Kālaf), *'Iyāl*, p. 756, # 559; 'Abū 'Awānah (ed. 'Aṭā' Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Šaḥīḥ*, XI, p. 382, # 4703; *ibid.*, pp. 384-385, # 4708; Ibn 'abī Dāwūd (ed. Ḥusayn), *Musnad 'Ā'īshah*, p. 74, # 56; 'Abū Nu'aym (ed. Šāfi'ī), *al-Musnad al-Mustaḥraj*, IV, p. 87, # 3311.

⁸⁸⁴ Compare Šāfi'ī (ed. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib), *'Umm*, X, p. 141, with all of the other references above.

whole elements.⁸⁸⁵ Even where the same elements are retained, there are numerous variants, including additions,⁸⁸⁶ omissions,⁸⁸⁷ and, above all, substitutions and paraphrases.⁸⁸⁸ All of this suggests that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād's redaction was transmitted to his students not just orally, but rather freely or sloppily. Despite this, the outline and at least some of the wording of Ibn 'abī al-Zinād's redaction can be recovered from the available transmissions, although much of it is poorly attested (by only two of the four reports), and some parts are largely reconstructable altogether:

...hišāmⁱ bni 'urwat^a 'an 'abī-hi 'an 'ā'īṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-'anā bint^u sittⁱ sinīn^a [mutawaffā kadījat^a] wa-daḡala bī wa-'anā [bint/ibnat]^u tisⁱ sinīn^a fa-daḡaltu [[alā rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ]/[alay-hi]] wa-'anā 'al'abu bi-al-banātⁱ wa-kāna lī ṣawāhibu yal'abna ma'ī [[fa-yadḡulu fa-yanqami'na min-hu ṣawāhibī fa-yakrujna fa-yakruju rasūl^u allāhⁱ]/[fa-'idā ra'aynā rasūl^a allāhⁱ istahyayna wa-taḡamma'na fa-rubba-mā ḡaraja rasūl^u allāhⁱ]/[fa-rubba-mā istahyayna min rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ]] fa-yusarribu-hunna 'ilayya.

The muddled penultimate section of the 'dolls' element probably contained the verb *istahyayna*, the *q-m-* root, the preposition *min*, the wording *fa-rubba-mā*, and the *k-r-j* root, since each is attested twice. The ordering and specifics differ in each version, however, rendering the original impossible to reconstruct.

⁸⁸⁵ Namely, *mutawaffā kadījah* and the 'dolls' element; see the summaries at the beginning of this section.

⁸⁸⁶ 'Aṣamm has *zawj al-nabiyy 'anna-hā*, absent in the other three; and 'Abd Allāh has *bi-makkah*, absent in the other three, and *bi-al-madīnah*, also absent in the other three. As it happens, the source of 'Abd Allāh's hadith is 'Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī, who also happens to be the source of Yūnus b. Ḥabīb's transmission from Ḥammād b. Salamah (see the relevant section, above), in which *bi-makkah* and *bi-al-madīnah* are also added. In other words, it looks like 'Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī interpolated or elaborated two different transmissions of the marital-age hadith emanating from Hišām in exactly the same way.

⁸⁸⁷ Ṭabarānī lacks *sinīn*, present in the other three; Ibn Sa'd lacks *yal'abna ma'ī*, present in 'Aṣamm and Ṭabarānī; and Ṭabarānī lacks *fa-*, present in both Ibn Sa'd and 'Aṣamm.

⁸⁸⁸ 'Abd Allāh has *'an 'abī-hi qāla qālat 'ā'īṣah*, where Ibn Sa'd and Ṭabarānī both have *'an 'abī-hi 'an 'ā'īṣah qālat* (and 'Aṣamm has *'an 'abī-hi 'an 'ā'īṣah zawj al-nabiyy 'anna-hā qālat*); 'Abd Allāh has *ibnah*, where the other three have *bint*; Ṭabarānī has *sab'*, where the other three have *sitt*; Ṭabarānī has *udḡiltu 'alay-hi* (borrowed from another hadith, as discussed above), where Ibn Sa'd has *daḡala 'alayya*, 'Abd Allāh has *daḡala bī*, and 'Aṣamm has *banā bī*; Ibn Sa'd and Ṭabarānī both have *bint*, where 'Abd Allāh and 'Aṣamm both have *bint*; Ibn Sa'd has *wa-la-qad daḡaltu 'alay-hi*, where 'Aṣamm has *fa-daḡaltu 'alā rasūl allāh*, and Ṭabarānī has *fa-daḡala 'alayya*; Ibn Sa'd has *wa-'innī la-'al'abu*, where 'Aṣamm and Ṭabarānī both have *wa-'anā 'al'abu*; Ṭabarānī has *lu'ab*, where Ibn Sa'd and 'Aṣamm have *banāt*; Ibn Sa'd has *ma'a al-jawārī*, where 'Aṣamm and Ṭabarānī both have *wa-kāna lī ṣawāhibu*; Ibn Sa'd has *fa-yadḡulu fa-yanqami'na min-hu ṣawāhibī fa-yakrujna fa-yakruju rasūl allāh*, where 'Aṣamm has *fa-'idā ra'aynā rasūl allāh istahyayna wa-taḡamma'na fa-rubba-mā ḡaraja rasūl allāh*, and Ṭabarānī has *fa-rubba-mā istahyayna min rasūl allāh*; and finally, Ibn Sa'd has *yusirru bi-hinna 'alayya*, where 'Aṣamm and Ṭabarānī both have *yusarribu-hunna 'ilayya*.

Sufyān al-Ṭawrī (d. 161-162/777-779)

The reports ascribed to Sufyān al-Ṭawrī are somewhat messy, so some disentanglement is in order. Firstly, there are three that reside within the broader tradition of Hišām b. ‘Urwah, recorded by al-Firyābī (reconstructed), ‘Abū al-Jawwāb al-‘Aḥwaṣ (reconstructed), and al-Bukārī.

al-‘Aḥwaṣ (d. turn of 9th C. CE)

Sufyān—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁸⁸⁹

al-Firyābī (d. 212/827)

Sufyān—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁸⁹⁰

al-Bukārī (d. 256/870)

Qabīṣah—Sufyān—Hišām—‘Urwah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁸⁹¹

All three reports are more similar to each other than they are to all other versions of the marital-age hadith,⁸⁹² such that they definitely constitute a distinctive sub-tradition: this is consistent with all three reflecting Sufyān al-Ṭawrī’s particular redaction of the marital-age hadith. There is still considerable variation between these three ascriptions, however, including a difference in their *’isnāds*,⁸⁹³ a difference in narrative perspective,⁸⁹⁴ and several substituted words.⁸⁹⁵ Based on the Criterion of

⁸⁸⁹ See the section on al-‘Aḥwaṣ, above.

⁸⁹⁰ See the section on al-Firyābī, above.

⁸⁹¹ Bukārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, III, p. 1081.

⁸⁹² In addition to all three sharing the same three elements and agreeing in particular on *sitt* (without *sinīn*) and *tis* (without *sinīn*), they also share the rare *m-k-ṭ* root in the third element.

⁸⁹³ B. is *munqaṭi* and reaches only back to ‘Urwah, whereas the other two are *muttaṣil* and reach all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah.

⁸⁹⁴ Both B. and F. have ‘Ā’iṣah being described in the third person (*hiya*, etc.), whereas A. has her speaking in the first person (*’anā*, etc.).

⁸⁹⁵ F. has *’anna* and the corresponding syntax, absent in the other two; A. has *rasūl allāh*, where the other two have *al-nabiyy*; B. has *’ā’iṣah* (as a direct object), where the other two only have attached

Dissimilarity, al-Buḵārī's *munqaṭi'* version of the hadith from Qabīṣah is more likely to represent Sufyān's original than the *muttaṣil* ascriptions of the other two, which would imply that both al-'Aḥwaṣ and al-Firyābī raised their respective versions. Given that their *muttaṣil* ascriptions are worded differently,⁸⁹⁶ they may have done so independently, in response to the common pressure against broken or imperfect *'isnāds*.⁸⁹⁷ Additionally, the first-person point-of-view in al-'Aḥwaṣ's version is definitely secondary, compared to the third-person narrations about 'Ā'iṣah in the versions of al-Firyābī and al-Buḵārī—Qabīṣah: this is again consistent with interpolation, although it could be the product of very liberal paraphrasing. The remaining variants are also consistent with paraphrasing, which in turn suggests that the hadith was transmitted orally from Sufyān to his students: the gist was retained fairly accurately, even if some of the wordings (along with the ascriptions in two cases, and the narrator's perspective in one case) changed along the way. Some of the wording is thus tentative, but the following redaction can be attributed to the PCL Sufyān al-Ṭawrī:

...hiṣāmī bnī 'urwatā 'an 'urwatā tazawwaja al-nabiyyū 'ā'iṣatā wa-hiya
 [ibnat/bint]^u sittⁱⁿ wa-'udkilat 'alay-hi wa-hiya [ibnat/bint]^u tisⁱⁿ wa-
 makātat 'inda-hu tis^{an}.

In addition to all of the above, I was also able to find three reports ascribed to Sufyān al-Ṭawrī that ostensibly reside within the broader tradition of 'Abū 'Ishāq, recorded by Ibn Sa'd and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Wakī'—Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah:

'Ā'iṣah was married at seven; consummation at nine; the Prophet died when she was
 eighteen.⁸⁹⁸

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

pronouns; in two places, B. and Ṭabarānī—A. have *ibnah*, where F. and 'Abū Nu'aym—A. have *bint*; F. and A. have *'udkilat 'alay-hi* and *'udkiltu 'alay-hi*, respectively, where B. has *banā bi-hā*; and A. has *makaṭtu*, where the other two have *makaṭat*.

⁸⁹⁶ F. has *'an 'abī-hi 'an 'ā'iṣah 'anna*, whereas A. has *'an 'abī-hi 'an 'ā'iṣah qālat*.

⁸⁹⁷ Similarly, Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 58.

⁸⁹⁸ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

al-Ḥaḍramī—ʿAbū Kurayb—Muʿāwiyah b. Hišām—Sufyān—ʿAbū ʿIshāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Consummation at nine; together nine years.⁸⁹⁹

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Ḥaḥ b. ʿUmar—Qabīṣah—Sufyān—ʿAbū ʿIshāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah:

ʿĀʾiṣah was married at nine; together nine years.⁹⁰⁰

These three ascriptions do not constitute a distinctive sub-tradition *vis-à-vis* other versions of the marital-age hadith: Ibn Saʿd's version is more similar to ʿIsrāʾīl's redaction (in terms of elemental outline)⁹⁰¹ and a certain transmission from ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah (in terms of specific wording)⁹⁰²; al-Ṭabarānī's first version comprises a combination of elements that jars with all other transmissions from Sufyān, but which also closely matches the distinctive wording of the second half of al-ʿAḥwaṣ's redaction (from Sufyān, from Hišām) in particular⁹⁰³; and al-Ṭabarānī's second version likewise comprises a combination of elements that jars with all other transmissions from Sufyān and Qabīṣah alike, but which likewise closely matches some of the distinctive wording of both Qabīṣah and al-Firyābī (from Sufyān, from Hišām).⁹⁰⁴ In other words, there is no distinctive redaction from Sufyān *from ʿAbū ʿIshāq* discernible here: in addition to being extremely disparate *vis-à-vis* each other (in terms of elements), each of these three ascriptions is more similar to other transmissions, including other transmissions from Sufyān *from Hišām b. ʿUrwah*. This is consistent with all three of these ascriptions being the product of some kind of borrowing or contamination, through error (e.g., accidentally mixing Sufyān's ascription to Hišām with ʿIsrāʾīl's ascription to ʿAbū ʿIshāq) and/or some kind of deliberate reattribution and diving (e.g., to provide ʿIsrāʾīl's ascription to ʿAbū ʿIshāq with some kind corroboration). Either

⁸⁹⁹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 23, # 55.

⁹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, # 56.

⁹⁰¹ See the section on ʿIsrāʾīl, below.

⁹⁰² Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 22, # 51, sharing *sabʿ*, *baná*, and *wa-māta ʿan-hā*.

⁹⁰³ In particular, *ʿudkiltu* and *makaṭtu*; see the section on al-ʿAḥwaṣ, above.

⁹⁰⁴ In particular, *wa-makaṭat ʿinda-hu tisʿan*; see above in the present section, and also see the sections on Qabīṣah and al-Firyābī.

way, it does not seem like Sufyān transmitted a version of the marital-age hadith from ʿAbū ʿIshāq.

Finally, there are two additional reports ascribed to Sufyān al-Ṭawrī that appear to be versions of the marital-age hadith, recorded by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAsadī (reconstructed) and al-ʿIjlī.

Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (d. turn of 9th C. CE)

Sufyān—Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she was consummated in Ṣawwāl; [she was the preferred wife; she preferred women to be consummated in Ṣawwāl].⁹⁰⁵

al-ʿIjlī (d. 261/874-875)

ʿAbū Dāwūd al-Ḥafarī—Sufyān—ʿIsmāʿīl b. ʿUmayyah—ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she was consummated in Ṣawwāl; she was the preferred wife; she preferred women to be consummated in Ṣawwāl.⁹⁰⁶

Both of these hadiths are the product of substantial contamination or interpolation, and cannot be attributed to Sufyān. The first version (from Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan) has an *ʿisnād* (Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad) that is completely uncorroborated by any other ascription of the marital-age hadith to Sufyān, and a set of elements that is only corroborated by a version (al-ʿIjlī’s) that has a different *ʿisnād* (ʿIsmāʿīl b. ʿUmayyah—ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUrwah). In turn, the second version (from al-ʿIjlī—ʿAbū Dāwūd al-Ḥafarī) is an obvious corruption of an extremely widely transmitted hadith from Sufyān about Ṣawwāl that otherwise—in every other version, of which there are dozens and dozens—lacks the marital-age elements.⁹⁰⁷ In other words, al-ʿIjlī’s version is a pre-existing and well-known hadith from Sufyān that has been contaminated (at the hands of al-ʿIjlī himself or, more likely, his immediate source, ʿAbū Dāwūd) by the marital-age hadith,⁹⁰⁸ whilst Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan’s version is a similar contamination (or borrowing) compounded by a *further* error or

⁹⁰⁵ See the section on Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, above.

⁹⁰⁶ ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿIjlī (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Qalʿajī), *Taʾrīkh al-Ṭiqāt* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Bāz, 1984), p. 521, # 2103.

⁹⁰⁷ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 642, col. 2.

⁹⁰⁸ Specifically, the sub-tradition of ʿAbdah, which shares extremely similar wordings therewith.

interpolation in the *ʿisnād*, whereby the original ascription (via ʿIsmāʿīl—ʿAbd Allāh) has been replaced by a false ascription (via Saʿd—al-Qāsim). To top this all off, the *ʿisnād* in al-ʿIjlī’s version is *munqaṭiʿ*, since it is missing ʿUrwah between ʿAbd Allāh and ʿĀʾiṣah—but this is plausibly the product of scribal error, whereby a scribe skipped *ʿan ʿurwah* by mistaking it for the preceding *bn ʿurwah* (similar to *homeoteleuton*).

In short, Sufyān al-Ṭawrī was a genuine PCL who transmitted his own distinctive redaction of the marital-age hadith, on the authority of Hišām b. ʿUrwah, to at least three students: Qabīṣah, al-Firyābī, and al-ʿAḥwaṣ. Thereafter, in two instances, Sufyān’s hadith was contaminated or interpolated and reattributed from Hišām to ʿAbū ʾIshāq, whilst in a third instance, Sufyān’s name was recruited into an existing ascription to ʿAbū ʾIshāq. Finally, in two instances, a completely different hadith about Ṣawwāl—transmitted by Sufyān to numerous students, on the authority of ʿIsmāʿīl b. ʿUmayyah—was contaminated or interpolated in two instances with elements from the marital-age hadith, one of which was also reattributed from ʿIsmāʿīl to Saʿd b. ʾIbrāhīm.

ʾIsrāʾīl b. Yūnus (d. 160-162/776-779)

I have collated eight reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent ʾIsrāʾīl b. Yūnus (situated within the broader tradition associated with ʿAbū ʾIshāq), recorded by ʿAbū Nuʿaym al-Faḍl (reconstructed), Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Mājah, al-Tirmidī, al-ʿUqaylī, and al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī. A ninth report, recorded by al-Nasāʾī, has already been shown to be dubious, and can be discounted accordingly.⁹⁰⁹

ʾAbū Nuʿaym al-Faḍl (d. 218-219/833-834)

ʾIsrāʾīl—ʾAbū ʾIshāq—ʾAbū ʿUbaydah:

ʿĀʾiṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹¹⁰

Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845)

ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAṭāʾ—ʾIsrāʾīl—ʾAbū ʾIshāq—Muṣʿab b. Saʿd:

⁹⁰⁹ See the section on Yaḥyá b. ʾĀdam, above.

⁹¹⁰ See the section on ʾAbū Nuʿaym al-Faḍl, above.

[‘Ā’iṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.]⁹¹¹

Ibn Sa’d (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. ‘Umar [al-Wāqidī]—’Isrā’īl—al-’A‘maš—’Ibrāhīm—al-’Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah:
Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹¹²

Ibn Mājah (d. 273/887)

’Aḥmad b. Sinān—’Abū ’Aḥmad—’Isrā’īl—’Abū ’Ishāq—’Abū ’Ubaydah—‘Abd Allāh:
Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹¹³

al-Tirmidī (d. 279/892)

Yaḥyá b. ’Aḫṭam—Yaḥyá b. ’Ādam—’Isrā’īl—’Abū ’Ishāq—’Abū ’Ubaydah—‘Abd Allāh:
Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹¹⁴

al-’Uqaylī (d. 322/933-934)

Muḥammad b. Mūsá al-Balkī—Mālik b. Sulaymān al-Harawī—’Isrā’īl—’Abū ’Ishāq—
’Abū ’Ubaydah—Ibn Mas’ūd:
Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹¹⁵

al-’Uqaylī (d. 322/933-934)

[‘Alī b.] ‘Abd al-’Azīz—‘Abd Allāh b. Rajā’—’Isrā’īl—’Abū ’Ishāq—’Abū ’Ubaydah:
Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹¹⁶

al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baġdādī (d. 463/1071)

’Umar b. ’abī Ṭālib—Yūsuf b. ’Umar al-Qawwās—Muḥammad b. Maṣṣūr al-Šī’ī—Naṣr
b. ‘Alī al-Jahḍamī—’Abū ’Aḥmad—’Isrā’īl—’Abū ’Ishāq—’Abū ’Ubaydah—‘Abd Allāh:
Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹¹⁷

⁹¹¹ Ibn Sa’d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁹¹³ Ibn Mājah (ed. ‘Abd al-Bāqī), *Sunan*, I, p. 604, # 1877.

⁹¹⁴ Tirmidī (ed. Sāmarrā’ī *et al.*), *’Ilal*, p. 169, # 296.

⁹¹⁵ ‘Uqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍu‘afā’*, V, p. 473, # 1/5735.

⁹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 473-474, # 2/5736.

⁹¹⁷ Ḳaṭīb (ed. Ma’rūf), *Ta’rīḵ Madīnat al-Salām*, XIII, pp. 148-149.

Most of these reports are more similar to each other than all other versions of the marital-age hadith (bar one or two related SSs),⁹¹⁸ such that they constitute a distinctive sub-tradition: this is consistent with said reports reflecting an underlying redaction from 'Isrā'il, and with 'Isrā'il being a genuine PCL. A notable exception is the first report recorded by al-'Uqaylī, the *matn* of which contradicts every other ascription to 'Isrā'il and looks like it instead belongs to the distinctive sub-tradition of the PCL 'Abū Mu'āwiyah.⁹¹⁹ Given that al-'Uqaylī includes the hadith in his *Kitāb al-Ḍu'afā'*, he evidently recognises a problem therewith, which exempts him from any responsibility therefor. Thus, the culprit for the contamination or borrowing behind this particular hadith must be Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Balkī, Mālik b. Sulaymān al-Harawī, or some other (now-suppressed) tradent. Al-'Uqaylī seems to have regarded Mālik as the culprit, since he prefaced his citation of this hadith with the statement, "[There is] some doubt regarding his Hadith (*fī ḥadīthi-hi naẓar*),"⁹²⁰ and ended the relevant statement with statement, "The hadith of 'Abd Allāh b. Rajā' is better (*'awlā*)." ⁹²¹

Another highly problematic report amongst the ascriptions to 'Isrā'il is Ibn Sa'd's transmission from al-Wāqidī: the *matn* clearly belongs to the same sub-tradition as the rest, but the *'isnād* contradicts them all by depicting 'Isrā'il's immediate source as al-'A'maš, rather than 'Abū 'Ishāq. To compound matters, this version has 'Ā'īshah narrating in the first person, rather than being described in the third person (as in every other transmission from 'Isrā'il). This is clearly a grave error or falsification on the part of Ibn Sa'd, al-Wāqidī, or some now-suppressed tradent.

Putting aside al-'Uqaylī's contaminated or borrowed transmission from Mālik b. Sulaymān, and the false *'isnād* and altered point of view in Ibn Sa'd's transmission from

⁹¹⁸ Most of the other versions that comprise the same broad set of elements are as follows: Ibn Sa'd—Kaṭīr b. Hišām—*et al.* (*malaka*, six, *jama'a*, *tuwuffiya*); al-Ṭabarānī—*et al.*—Ibn 'abī al-Zinād—*et al.* (*tazawwaja-nī*, six, *'udkiltu*, *makaṭtu*, *halaka*); the Sufyān sub-tradition (*tazawwaja-hā*, six, *'udkilat*, *makaṭat*); the Wuhayb sub-tradition (*tazawwaja-hā*, six, *banā*, *wa-kānat 'inda-hu tis' sinīn*); al-Ṭabarānī—*et al.*—'Abd al-Razzāq—*et al.* (*tazawwaja-nī*, seven, *zuffitu*, nine, *māta*); and Ibn Mandah—*et al.*—'Abd al-Razzāq—*et al.* (*tazawwaja-nī*, six, *dufi'tu*, *māta*). By contrast, most of the ascriptions to 'Isrā'il = *tazawwaja*, six, *daḳala/banā*, *qubiḍa/tuwuffiya*. The closest thereto are two SSs that likewise claim to derive from 'Abū 'Ishāq, namely: Ibn Sa'd—Wakī'—Sufyān—'Abū 'Ishāq—*et al.* (*tazawwaja*, seven, *banā*, *māta*); al-Ṭabarānī—*et al.*—Šarīk—*et al.* (*tazawwaja*, six, *daḳala*, *qubiḍa*). (That said, the first of these SS ascriptions has "seven" where almost all of the 'Isrā'il ascriptions have "six").

⁹¹⁹ See the section on 'Abū Mu'āwiyah, above.

⁹²⁰ 'Uqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍu'afā'*, V, p. 473.

⁹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 474.

al-Wāqidī, there are still numerous variants across the 'Isrā'īl sub-tradition, including added,⁹²² omitted,⁹²³ and especially substituted words,⁹²⁴ and even differences in the earliest segment of the *'isnād*.⁹²⁵ Most of this variation is consistent with frequent paraphrasing (giving rise to *banā* and *daḳala*, for example, and *māta*, *tuwuffiya*, and *qubiḍa*), which in turn suggests that the transmission of this hadith from 'Isrā'īl to his students was primarily oral. The gist of 'Isrā'īl's redaction was still accurately preserved (save in one instance),⁹²⁶ but the exact wording thereof is extremely difficult to pinpoint, along with the original *'isnād*. The versions preserved by al-Tirmidī, Ibn Mājah, and al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baḡdādī (the latter two both on the authority of 'Abū 'Aḥmad) all have 'Isrā'īl transmitting from 'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—Ibn Mas'ūd, whereas the redaction of al-Faḍl and one of the versions recorded by al-'Uqaylī (# 5736) only have 'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah, and yet another version recorded by Ibn Sa'd has 'Abū 'Ishāq—Muṣ'ab b. Sa'd. Based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity, an original ascription to 'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah was probably raised or interpolated into 'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—Ibn Mas'ūd, arising in two or three transmissions either synchronously (as an obvious move in response to the rising demand for *muttaṣil* hadiths, since Ibn Mas'ūd was the famous father of 'Abū 'Ubaydah⁹²⁷) or through contamination (as some tradents borrowed the superior ascription from others).⁹²⁸ In

⁹²² Ḳaṭīb has *'anna* (and the corresponding syntax), absent in all the rest; Ibn Sa'd—Faḍl, Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad, and Ḳaṭīb—'Abū 'Aḥmad have *sanah*, absent in all the rest.

⁹²³ In two places each, Balāḍurī—Faḍl and Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad lack *sinīn*, present in all the rest.

⁹²⁴ Faḍl, Ibn Sa'd (p. 42), and Tirmidī have *rasūl allāh*, where 'Uqaylī (# 5735), Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad, and Ḳaṭīb—'Abū 'Aḥmad have *al-nabiyy*; in two places each, Balāḍurī—Faḍl, Ibn Sa'd (p. 42), Tirmidī, and Ḳaṭīb—'Abū 'Aḥmad have *ibnah*, where Ibn Sa'd—Faḍl, Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad, and 'Uqaylī (# 5735) have *bint*; Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad has *sab*, where all the rest have *sitt*; Faḍl, Tirmidī, and 'Uqaylī (# 5735) have *daḳala*, where Ibn Sa'd (p. 42), Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad, and Ḳaṭīb—'Abū 'Aḥmad have *banā*; 'Uqaylī (# 5735) has *'alay-hā*, where all the rest have *bi-hā* (and in one case, *bī*); Faḍl has *māta* *'an-hā*, Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad has *tuwuffiya* *'an-hā*, Ibn Sa'd (p. 42) has *tuwuffiya rasūl allāh*, 'Uqaylī (# 5735) and Ḳaṭīb—'Abū 'Aḥmad both have *qubiḍa al-nabiyy*, and Tirmidī has *qubiḍa*; Faḍl, Ibn Sa'd (p. 42), Ḳaṭīb—'Abū 'Aḥmad, and Tirmidī have *ibnah*, where Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad and 'Uqaylī (# 5735) both have *bint*; Faḍl and Ibn Sa'd (p. 42) both have *ṭamāniy*, where all the rest have *ṭamān*.

⁹²⁵ Faḍl and 'Uqaylī (# 5736) both have 'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah, where Ibn Sa'd (p. 41) has 'Abū 'Ishāq—Muṣ'ab b. Sa'd, and Tirmidī, Ibn Mājah—'Abū 'Aḥmad, and Ḳaṭīb—'Abū 'Aḥmad all have 'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—Ibn Mas'ūd.

⁹²⁶ Namely, where Ibn Mājah has *sab*, for which he himself, or his immediate source 'Aḥmad b. Sinān, is probably responsible.

⁹²⁷ Similarly, Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 58.

⁹²⁸ This means that either Yahyā b. 'Aḳṭam or Yahyā b. 'Ādam was a *raffā'* (in al-Tirmidī's transmission), along with 'Abū 'Aḥmad (the common tradent in the transmissions of Ibn Mājah and al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baḡdādī—although the *matns* thereof are clearly contaminated, as discussed already), if the relevant *'isnāds* are anything to go by.

this respect, I cannot disagree with al-Buḵārī's conclusion about the ascription to Ibn Mas'ūd, as reported by al-Tirmidī:

I asked Muḥammad [al-Buḵārī] about this hadith, and he said: "This [version] is erroneous (*kaṭa'*); on the contrary, it [should be] (*'inna-mā huwa*): "Abū 'Ishāq, from 'Abū 'Ubaydah, that the Prophet married 'Ā'īshah...." Thusly they related, from 'Isrā'īl, from 'Abū 'Ishāq."⁹²⁹

Al-'Uqaylī's aforementioned criticism of Mālik b. Sulaymān may also have covered Mālik's raised *'isnād*, in contrast to 'Abd Allāh b. Rajā's unraised version; if so, then again, I would concur with his judgement that the latter's hadith is *'awlā* in that regard.⁹³⁰ Likewise, al-Dāraquṭnī (regarding transmissions from 'Abū 'Ishāq more broadly) described the 'Abū 'Ubaydah—Ibn Mas'ūd ascription as *marfū'* and the 'Abū 'Ubaydah ascription as *mursal*, before concluding: "The *mursal* [version] is more likely (*'ašbah*)."⁹³¹ Once again, I cannot disagree.

This leaves 'Abū 'Ishāq—Muṣ'ab b. Sa'd, which at first glance seems dubious: it is only attested in one source (Ibn Sa'd), which would suggest that the ascription was the product an error or interpolation after 'Isrā'īl (for which Ibn Sa'd or his immediate source, 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. 'Aṭā, must be responsible). On the other hand, Muṣ'ab was valued as a source by Kufans in particular (since his father was the founder of Kufah), which makes it more likely that 'Isrā'īl (a Kufan) would have created an ascription to him (to provide the hadith with a further Kufan pedigree), rather than Ibn Sa'd or 'Abd al-Wahhāb (both of whom were Basro-Baghdadians).

That aside, an approximate wording of 'Isrā'īl's redaction can still be discerned across the surviving sub-tradition, as follows:

...ʿabī ʿishāq^a ʿan ʿabī ʿubaydat^a qāla tazawwaja [[rasūl^u allāhⁱ]/[al-nabiyy^u]] ʿāʾiṣat^a wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-[daḡala/banā] bi-hā wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u tisⁱ sinīn^a wa-[[qubiḡa al-nabiyy^u]/[tuwuffiya ʿan-hā/rasūl^u allāhⁱ]] wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u tamānī ʿaṣrat^a [sanat^{an}].

⁹²⁹ Tirmidī (ed. Sāmarrāʾī *et al.*), *ʿIlal*, p. 169.

⁹³⁰ 'Uqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍuʿafāʾ*, V, p. 474.

⁹³¹ 'Alī b. 'Umar al-Dāraquṭnī (ed. Maḥfūz al-Raḥmān Zayd Allāh al-Salafī), *al-ʿIlal al-Wāridah fī al-ʾAḥādīṭ al-Nabawiyyah*, vol. 5 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ṭaybah, 1989), p. 305, # 901.

Again, the gist has been preserved, but the exact wording has not. This is consistent with 'Isrā'il's having reworded the hadith in successive retellings (such that there is no single, underlying redaction per se), and/or his students' having paraphrased from him. Either way, the *ma'ná* can be reconstructed, but not the *lafz*.

Ma'mar b. Rāšid (d. 152-154/769-771)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Basro-Yemenite tradent Ma'mar b. Rāšid (ostensibly situated within the broader traditions of both Hišām and al-Zuhrī), recorded by 'Abd al-Razzāq (reconstructed) and Ibn Sa'd.

'Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211/827)

Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī [& Hišām]—'Urwah:

'Ā'īṣah married at six or seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹³²

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd al-'Abdī—Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī & Hišām:

'Ā'īṣah married at nine or seven.⁹³³

These two reports are complicated. On the one hand, they exhibit some striking similarities: both of them cite both Hišām and al-Zuhrī; they share the wording *nakaḥa al-nabiyy 'ā'īṣah wa-hiya*, including the rare verb *nakaḥa*; and they share the wording *sanawāt 'aw sab'*, including the rare word *sanawāt*. As such, there must be some kind of common ancestry or mutual dependency here, which is to say: both of these reports, at least in these respects, clearly constitute a distinctive sub-tradition, which matches their common ascription to Ma'mar, and is thus consistent with both reflecting his particular redaction.

On the other hand, there are huge discrepancies between these two reports: 'Abd al-Razzāq's version is ascribed via Hišām and al-Zuhrī to 'Urwah, where Ibn Sa'd's is

⁹³² See the section on 'Abd al-Razzāq, above.

⁹³³ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42.

ascribed only to Hišām and al-Zuhrī; ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version has ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage occurring at six or seven, where Ibn Sa’d’s version has it at nine or seven; and ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version has three whole elements that are absent from Ibn Sa’d’s. More importantly, the presence of these additional elements in ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s ascription to Ma‘mar makes it more similar in that respect to various other transmissions from Hišām, than to Ibn Sa’d’s parallel transmission from Ma‘mar. Conversely, the inclusion of “nine” in the ‘marriage’ element in Ibn Sa’d’s version makes it more similar in that respect to the various transmissions from al-ʿAʿmaš, than to ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version. At minimum, therefore, these ascriptions to Ma‘mar appear to be heavily interpolated or contaminated.

Thus, if we accept that these two reports in some way reflect Ma‘mar’s distinctive redaction (given the unique or rare elements they have in common), only a fragment of ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version, in conjunction with Ibn Sa’d’s (and in light of the Criterion of Dissimilarity⁹³⁴), can be attributed to Ma‘mar, as follows:

...al-zuhriyyi wa-hiṣāmī bnī ʿurwat^a qālā **nakaha al-nabiyyu ʿāʾiṣat^a wa-hiya**
[bint/ibnat]^u [tis^ʿ/sitt]ⁱ sanawātⁱⁿ ʿaw sab^{ʿin}....

Based on the textual-critical principle of *lectio difficilior potior*, the highly unusual *tis^ʿ* is more likely to be the original wording than the conventional *sitt*.

Needless to say, if this hadith indeed derives from Ma‘mar (which is certainly plausible), it was transmitted from him to students in an incredibly sloppy fashion (which would be consistent with paraphrastic oral transmission), if not involving outright interpolation. In particular, ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version ended up comprising a sequence of elements (marriage, consummation, dolls, death) that is completely uncorroborated by any other version of the marital-age hadith, but which individually appear in various transmissions from Hišām, al-ʿAʿmaš, and ʿAbū ʾIṣḥāq.⁹³⁵ This is consistent with ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s having combined a short statement inherited from Ma‘mar with elements taken from other, miscellaneous transmissions from Hišām.⁹³⁶

⁹³⁴ I.e., applied to the discrepant *ʾisnāds*.

⁹³⁵ The ‘death’ element appears in Ibn Bukayr’s transmission from Hišām, ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah’s transmission from al-ʿAʿmaš, and ʾIsrāʾīl’s transmission from ʿAbū ʾIṣḥāq; and the ‘dolls’ element appears in numerous transmissions from Hišām.

⁹³⁶ E.g., from Hišām’s hadith about ʿĀʾiṣah’s playing with dolls. Indeed, ‘Abd al-Razzāq elsewhere transmitted a version thereof from Ma‘mar: ‘Abd al-Razzāq (ed. ʿAʿzamī), *Muṣannaf*, X, pp. 465-466, # 19722; Ibn Rāḥwayh (ed. Balūṣī), *Musnad*, II, p. 276, # 242/785; Ibn Ḥanbal (ed. ʾArnaʾūṭ *et al.*), *Musnad*,

Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-ʿAʿmaš (d. 147-148/764-766)

I have collated five relevant reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent and putative CL Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-ʿAʿmaš, variously recorded by ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah (reconstructed), Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Qutaybah, and ʿAbū ʿAwānah (twice):

ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah (d. 194-195/809-811)

al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹³⁷

Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. ʿUmar—ʿIsrāʾīl—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹³⁸

Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276/889)

ʿAbū al-Ḳaṭṭāb—Mālik b. Suʿayr—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; i.e., consummated; together nine years.⁹³⁹

ʿAbū ʿAwānah (d. 316/929)

ʿAbū ʿUmayyah—Manṣūr b. Ṣuqayr—ʿAbū ʿAwānah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; together nine years.⁹⁴⁰

ʿAbū ʿAwānah (d. 316/929)

Ibn ʿabī al-Dunyā—ʿAbū Ḳayṭamah—Jarīr—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʿIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

XLII, p. 204, # 25334; ʿAṣamm (ed. Jarrār), *Majmūʿ*, p. 339, # 633; al-Ḥusayn b. Masʿūd al-Baḡawī (ed. Ṣuʿayb al-ʿArnaʾūṭ), *Ṣarḥ al-Sunnah*, vol. 9 (Beirut, Lebanon: al-Maktab al-ʿIslāmiyy, 1983), p. 165, # 2336.

⁹³⁷ See the section on ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah, above.

⁹³⁸ Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42.

⁹³⁹ ʿAbd Allāh b. Muslim b. Qutaybah al-Dīnawarī (ed. Ṭarwat ʿUkkāšah), *al-Maʿārif* (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Maʿāraf, n. d.), p. 134.

⁹⁴⁰ ʿAbū ʿAwānah (ed. ʿAṭāʾ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XI, pp. 383-384, # 4706.

Marriage at six or seven; consummated at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.⁹⁴¹

The version recorded by Ibn Saʿd and the second version recorded by ʿAbū ʿAwānah can both be dismissed at the outset: both are false ascriptions, as has been shown already.⁹⁴² This leaves us with only three ascriptions: the reconstructed version of ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah, the version recorded by Ibn Qutaybah, and the first version recorded by ʿAbū ʿAwānah. As it happens, all three are more similar to each other than to most other versions of the marital-age tradition, sharing the distinctive elemental sequence of (1) ʿĀʾiṣah being married (i.e., engaged for marriage) at nine and (2) a mention (directly or indirectly) of the Prophet’s death. They are not the only versions within the broader marital-age tradition that share this distinctive sequence, however. There are three other versions with different ascriptions that exhibit similar elements: one recorded by al-Ṭabarānī (with an *ʾisnād* that ends with Sufyān—ʿAbū ʾIṣḥāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah),⁹⁴³ one recorded by al-ʿUqaylī (with an *ʾisnād* that ends with ʾIsrāʾīl—ʿAbū ʾIṣḥāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah—Ibn Masʿūd),⁹⁴⁴ and one that can be reconstructed back to ʿAbṭar (with the *ʾisnād* Muṭarrif—ʿAbū ʾIṣḥāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah—ʿĀʾiṣah).⁹⁴⁵ In other words, the distinctive textual sub-tradition in question does not neatly line up with a common ascription.

The first two reports (from al-ʿUqaylī and al-Ṭabarānī) are both false ascriptions (as has again been shown already), and can be dismissed accordingly: al-ʿUqaylī’s version contradicts every other ascription to ʾIsrāʾīl, and the *matn* looks like it was borrowed directly from ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah’s version; meanwhile, al-Ṭabarānī’s version contradicts every other ascription to Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, but matches some of the particular wordings therein (*vis-à-vis* all other versions of the marital-age tradition more broadly), such that it looks like a corruption thereof.⁹⁴⁶

This leaves only ʿAbṭar’s redaction as a point of comparison with the three remaining ascriptions to al-ʿAʿmaš (ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah, Ibn Qutaybah, and ʿAbū ʿAwānah), and here a curious pattern arises: the versions of Ibn Qutaybah and ʿAbū ʿAwānah are

⁹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 384-385, # 4708.

⁹⁴² See the sections on Jarīr and ʾIsrāʾīl, above.

⁹⁴³ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 23, # 56.

⁹⁴⁴ ʿUqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍuʿafāʾ*, V, p. 473, # 1/5735.

⁹⁴⁵ See the section on ʿAbṭar, above.

⁹⁴⁶ See the sections on Qabīṣah b. ʿUqbah and Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, above, and ʿAbū ʾIṣḥāq al-Sabīʿī, below.

much more similar to each other than to all the rest, but are also more similar—at least in terms of the *matn*—to ‘Abṭar’s version than to ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah’s. In the first case, the versions recorded by Ibn Qutaybah and ‘Abū ‘Awānah both quote ‘Ā’iṣah in the first person, share a similar wording in the first element (despite a corruption in one and an editorial comment inserted into the other),⁹⁴⁷ and share exactly the same wording in the second element.⁹⁴⁸ In the second case, the versions of Ibn Qutaybah, ‘Abū ‘Awānah, and ‘Abṭar all quote ‘Ā’iṣah in the first person and share a similarly-worded final element, in contrast to the corresponding element in ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah’s version.⁹⁴⁹ Clearly, the versions of Ibn Qutaybah, ‘Abū ‘Awānah, and ‘Abṭar are more closely related to each other than they are to ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah’s version, which means that there is a problem in their ascriptions: where ‘Abṭar cited the *’isnād* Muṭarrif—‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Ā’iṣah, all the rest cite the *’isnād* al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah. In other words, ‘Abṭar’s *matn* entails a close relationship with the versions of Ibn Qutaybah and ‘Abū ‘Awānah *vis-à-vis* ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah’s, but his *’isnād* depicts a much more distant relationship *vis-à-vis* all three. Clearly, ‘Abṭar received his *matn* from an ultimate source in common with Ibn Qutaybah or ‘Abū ‘Awānah and then replaced the original *’isnād* (al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah) with the *’isnād* associated with the hadith of his senior Kufan contemporary ‘Isrā’īl,⁹⁵⁰ whilst incorporating his own Kufan master Muṭarrif therein (Muṭarrif—‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Ā’iṣah). This explains why ‘Abṭar’s *matn* is extremely close to the versions of Ibn Qutaybah and ‘Abū ‘Awānah, whilst at the same time, his *’isnād* is the same as that cited by ‘Isrā’īl in his version.

With all of that out of the way, we can now focus on the remaining ascriptions to al-‘A‘maš:

‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah (d. 194-195/809-811)

al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah:

⁹⁴⁷ Both of them have *tazawwaja-nī rasūl allāh wa-’anā bint*, but the *tis’* in Ibn Qutaybah has been corrupted into a *sab’* in ‘Abū ‘Awānah, and the former also adds a *sinīn* that is absent in the latter. Finally, a tradent or scribe (obviously bothered or confused by the unusual *tis’*) has inserted *turīdu daḡala bī* into Ibn Qutaybah’s version.

⁹⁴⁸ Both of them have *wa-kuntu ‘inda-hu tis’an*.

⁹⁴⁹ Ibn Qutaybah and ‘Abū ‘Awānah both have *wa-kuntu ‘inda-hu tis’an*, and ‘Abṭar has *wa-ṣaḥibtu-hu tis’an*, where ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah has *wa-māta ‘an-hā wa-hiya bint ṭamān[iy] ‘ašrah*.

⁹⁵⁰ See the section on ‘Isrā’īl, above.

Marriage at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹⁵¹

Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276/889)

ʿAbū al-Ḳaṭṭāb—Mālik b. Suʿayr—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʾIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at nine; i.e., consummated; together nine years.⁹⁵²

ʿAbū ʿAwānah (d. 316/929)

ʿAbū ʿUmayyah—Manṣūr b. Ṣuqayr—ʿAbū ʿAwānah—al-ʿAʿmaš—ʾIbrāhīm—al-ʿAswad—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; together nine years.⁹⁵³

All three—when scribal errors and editorial comments are accounted for—clearly embody a common, distinctive tradition, which matches their common ascription to al-ʿAʿmaš. However, a problem remains: the versions of Ibn Qutaybah and ʿAbū ʿAwānah are much more similar to each other than they are to ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah’s version, as has been noted already. How is this to be explained? It might be posited that ʿAbū ʿAwānah and Ibn Qutaybah’s versions are so similar because both have (broadly) accurately preserved the words of al-ʿAʿmaš, where ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah has strayed therefrom. However, this explanation is contradicted by the fact that the wording in ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah’s version (in which ʿĀʾiṣah is referred to in the third person) seems more archaic—and thus more likely to reflect the original—than the versions of ʿAbū ʿAwānah and Ibn Qutaybah (in which ʿĀʾiṣah speaks in the first person).

Alternatively, it might be posited that al-ʿAʿmaš narrated his hadith in two different ways: once with ʿĀʾiṣah as the object of the narration (recorded by ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah), and once with ʿĀʾiṣah herself as the narrator (recorded by both Ibn Qutaybah and ʿAbū ʿAwānah). This is certainly plausible: Hišām did the same thing with his hadith, as will be seen below.⁹⁵⁴

Alternatively, this could be explained by positing that the versions of Ibn Qutaybah and ʿAbū ʿAwānah share a more recent common ancestry or dependency *vis-à-vis* ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah’s version, despite the fact that all three claim independent lines of

⁹⁵¹ See the section on ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah, above.

⁹⁵² Ibn Qutaybah (ed. ʿUkkāšah), *Maʿārif*, p. 134.

⁹⁵³ ʿAbū ʿAwānah (ed. ʿAṭāʾ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XI, pp. 383-384, # 4706.

⁹⁵⁴ See the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah, below.

transmission back to a common source (i.e., al-ʿAʿmaš). This would mean that someone in the *ʿisnād* of either Ibn Qutaybah or ʿAbū ʿAwānah’s version borrowed from someone in the other *ʿisnād* and then suppressed this dependence. Even if this scenario is preferred, however, we would still be left with two distinct ascriptions to al-ʿAʿmaš: the version of ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah, and whichever of the other two is the original therebetween. As always, there is the possibility that even the original in question was a *diver*—for example, one designed to update ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah’s version. Indeed, the fact that both Ibn Qutaybah and ʿAbū ʿAwānah’s versions are supported by lengthy SSs back to al-ʿAʿmaš is suspect: given the immense stature of al-ʿAʿmaš (a *madār* of Kufah, no less), it is odd that only a single PCL of his survived, and that the other transmission(s) from him occurred in isolation for several generations. Despite this, it remains at least *plausible* that al-ʿAʿmaš was a genuine CL, whose distinctive redaction of the marital-age hadith is reflected in the tradition embodied by the redactions of ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah and at least one other.

Even if the tradition embodied in the reports of ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah, Ibn Qutaybah, and ʿAbū ʿAwānah derives from the distinctive redaction of al-ʿAʿmaš, the wording thereof—in light of the meagre and somewhat questionable evidence available—remains highly uncertain:

...ʿibrāhīm^a ʿanī al-ʿaswadi ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-[hā/nī] rasūl^u allāhⁱ
 wa-[hiya/ʿanā] bint^u tis^{i[n]} [sinīn^a] wa-[[kuntu ʿinda-hu tis^{ʿan}]/[māta
 ʿan-hā wa-hiya bint tamān[iy] ʿašrah]].

Needless to say, if al-ʿAʿmaš was a genuine CL, then his hadith appears to have been transmitted via oral paraphrase, with notable changes in wording (e.g., from “he died when she was eighteen years old” to “I was with him for nine years”) and a major change in narratorial point of view.

Hišām b. ʿUrwah (d. 146-147/763-765)

I have collated twenty-three reports ascribed to the Madinan tradent and putative CL Hišām b. ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr, recorded by Maʿmar b. Rāšid (reconstructed), Sufyān al-Tawrī (reconstructed), ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Zinād (reconstructed), Wuhayb b.

Ḳālīd (reconstructed), Ḥammād b. Salamah (reconstructed), Jaʿfar b. Sulaymān (reconstructed), Ḥammād b. Zayd (reconstructed), ʿAbdah b. Sulaymān (reconstructed), Jarīr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (reconstructed), ʿAlī b. Mushir (reconstructed), Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah (reconstructed), ʾAbū ʾUsāmah Ḥammād (reconstructed), Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Rāḥwayh, ʾAḥmad al-ʿUṭāridī, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Ṣāʾiḡ, al-Ṭabarī, ʾAbū ʿAwānah, al-Baḡawī (reconstructed), al-Ṭabarānī, al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, and ʾAbū Nuʿaym.

Maʿmar b. Rāšid (d. 152-154/769-771)

Hišām & al-Zuhrī:

ʿĀʾiṣah was married at nine or seven.⁹⁵⁵

Sufyān al-Ṭawrī (d. 161-162/777-779)

Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.⁹⁵⁶

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʾabī al-Zinād (d. 164/780-781 or 174/790-791)

Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; Ḳadījah’s death; consummation at nine; playing with dolls.⁹⁵⁷

Wuhayb b. Ḳālīd (d. 165/781-782)

Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.

Hišām:

Together nine years.⁹⁵⁸

Ḥammād b. Salamah (d. 167/784)

Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah—Prophet:

Dream-vision, after Ḳadījah’s death, of ʿĀʾiṣah.

ʿĀʾiṣah:

⁹⁵⁵ See the section on Maʿmar, above.

⁹⁵⁶ See the section on Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, above.

⁹⁵⁷ See the section on b. ʾabī al-Zinād, above.

⁹⁵⁸ See the section on Wuhayb, above.

Marriage, after Ẹadījah's death, before the Hijrah, at six or seven; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁹⁵⁹

Ja'far b. Sulaymān (d. 178/794-795)

Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁶⁰

Ḥammād b. Zayd (d. 179/795)

Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁶¹

'Abdah b. Sulaymān (d. 187-188/803-804)

Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she still played dolls.⁹⁶²

Jarīr b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd (d. 188/804)

Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at [six or] seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁶³

'Alī b. Mushir (d. 189/804-805)

Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Married at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.⁹⁶⁴

Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah (d. 198/814)

Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁶⁵

⁹⁵⁹ See the section on Ḥammād b. Salamah, above.

⁹⁶⁰ See the section on Ja'far b. Sulaymān, above.

⁹⁶¹ See the section on Ḥammād b. Zayd, above.

⁹⁶² See the section on 'Abdah, above.

⁹⁶³ See the section on Jarīr, above.

⁹⁶⁴ See the section on 'Alī b. Mushir, above.

⁹⁶⁵ See the section on Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah, above.

ʿAbū ʿUsāmah Ḥammād (d. 201/817)

Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Ḳadījah's death; marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁹⁶⁶

ʿAbū ʿUsāmah Ḥammād (d. 201/817)

Hišām—ʿUrwah—Ā'īshah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hījah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.⁹⁶⁷

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Wakī'—Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁶⁸

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

ʿAbū Mu'āwiyah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—Ā'īshah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁹⁶⁹

ʿAḥmad al-ʿUṭāridī (d. 272/886)

Yūnus b. Bukayr—Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Marriage, after Ḳadījah's death, at six; consummation at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.⁹⁷⁰

Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Šā'iġ (d. 287/900 or 291/904)

Sa'īd b. Maṣṣūr—ʿIsmā'īl b. Zakariyyā—Hišām—ʿUrwah—Ā'īshah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁹⁷¹

al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)

⁹⁶⁶ See the section on ʿAbū ʿUsāmah, above.

⁹⁶⁷ See the section on ʿAbū ʿUsāmah, above.

⁹⁶⁸ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁹⁶⁹ Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūšī), *Musnad*, II, p. 214, # 722/178.

⁹⁷⁰ Yūnus b. Bukayr b. Wāṣil (ed. Suhayl Zakkār), *Kitāb al-Siyar wa-al-Maġāzī* (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Fikr, 1978), p. 255.

⁹⁷¹ Sa'īd b. Maṣṣūr (ed. ʿA'zamī), *Sunan*, I, p. 170, # 515.

‘Alī b. Naṣr & ‘Abd al-Wārith b. ‘Abd al-Ṣamad—‘Abd al-Ṣamad b. ‘Abd al-Wārith—‘Abān al-‘Aṭṭār—Hišām—‘Urwah:

‘Urwah wrote to ‘Abd al-Malik; Kadijah’s death; marriage, after Kadijah’s death; dream-vision of ‘Ā’iṣah; marriage at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine.⁹⁷²

‘Abū ‘Awānah (d. 316/929)

Al-Ḥusayn b. Bahān—Sahl b. ‘Uṭmān—Yaḥyá b. Zakariyyā’ b. ‘abī Zā’idah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

“[Something] close to the hadith of ‘Alī b. Mushir.”⁹⁷³

al-Baḡawī (d. 317/929-930)

al-‘Alā’ b. Mūsá—al-Hayṭam b. ‘Adī—Hišām—‘Urwah:

Discussion with Hišām b. ‘Urwah about Kadijah’s children; Kadijah’s death; Kawlah arranges the Prophet’s marriages to Sawdah and ‘Ā’iṣah; marriage at six; consummation; Hijrah.⁹⁷⁴

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ishāq al-Tustarī—Ya‘qūb b. Ḥumayd b. Kāsib—‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá b. ‘Urwah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, three or so years before the Hijrah, at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine.⁹⁷⁵

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

‘Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Aḥmad b. Bālawayh—‘Ibrāhīm b. ‘Ishāq al-Ḥarbī—Muṣ‘ab b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayrī—‘Abd Allāh b. Mu‘āwiyah—Hišām:

‘Urwah wrote to al-Walīd; marriage, after Kadijah’s death; dream-vision of ‘Ā’iṣah; marriage at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine; ‘Ā’iṣah’s death.⁹⁷⁶

‘Abū Nu‘aym (d. 430/1038)

⁹⁷² Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV, p. 1770.

⁹⁷³ ‘Abū ‘Awānah (ed. ‘Aṭā’ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XI, pp. 381-382, # 4702.

⁹⁷⁴ See the section on al-Baḡawī, above.

⁹⁷⁵ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salāfi), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 22, # 50.

⁹⁷⁶ Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, p. 19, # 6880.

Muḥammad b. 'Aḥmad b. Maḳlad—al-Ḥārīt b. 'abī 'Usāmah—Yaḥyá b. Hāšim—
Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'išah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁹⁷⁷

Before proceeding, some caveats are in order. Firstly, the redaction of the PCL Ḥammād b. Salamah is highly tentative, given the great variation in his transmissions to his students. In other words, it is questionable whether he ever transmitted the hadith in the exact form given here—although he likely did transmit each of the constituent parts thereof, at different times and in various combinations. Secondly, the reports underpinning my reconstruction of the redaction of the PCL Jarīr b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd do not constitute a *distinctive* sub-tradition, which weakens said reconstruction. Thirdly, the reports underpinning my reconstruction of the redaction of the PCL Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah are in some respect more similar to other reports than to each other, which undermines the identification of Sufyān as a PCL in the first place and renders my reconstruction of his redaction speculative at best. Fourthly, Ibn Sa'd's ascription to Wakī' is just one out of four disparate ascriptions thereto, although it still has the best claim thereof to being genuine. Fifthly, Ibn Rāḥwayh's ascription to 'Abū Mu'āwiyah (to Hišām) is uncorroborated, and indeed, does not match the numerous other ascriptions thereto (to al-'A'maš). Sixthly, it should be acknowledged that there is mention (by Ibn Wahb) of a parallel transmission from Hišām by Sa'īd b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, alongside that of 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Zinād; however, as has been noted already, this is (1) uncorroborated by any other transmissions from Ibn 'abī al-Zinād, (2) uncorroborated by any other transmissions full stop, and (3) contradicts the report that Sa'īd was born after Hišām died. Seventhly (and finally), 'Abū 'Awānah's ascription (via an Eastern SS) back to Yaḥyá b. Zakariyyā' is (1) completely uncorroborated and (2) lacks a *matn*, rendering it completely unusable in this analysis.

Even a cursory examination of this collection of reports and PCL redactions immediately reveals striking disunity there-between: the variation at the elemental level is often extreme, with some reports or redactions sharing little in common. Moreover, there is noticeable instability even in the wording of the common element of 'Ā'išah's marital engagement (i.e., her *nikāḥ/tazawwuj*): Hišām is variously said to

⁹⁷⁷ 'Abū Nu'aym (ed. 'Azzāzī), *Ma'rifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, I, p. 3208, # 7375.

have reported that ‘Ā’iṣah was married at age ‘six’, ‘six or seven’, ‘seven’, or ‘seven or nine’. Who is responsible for this textual chaos: Hišām, his students, or later tradents?

The answer seems to be: all of the above. In the first case, most of these reports constitute several distinct sub-traditions, i.e., clusters of corroborating ascriptions to Hišām that share a similar set of elements. This is consistent with Hišām himself having told and retold the hadith in different ways at different times, with each distinctive iteration’s having been preserved by a different set of students.

In the second case, several of Hišām’s direct students were alone in their transmission of a particular element or addition: Ma‘mar alone transmitted the uncertain ‘nine or seven’ version of the ‘marriage’ element, and plausibly omitted (or even conflated therewith) a discrete ‘consummation’ element; ‘Abū ‘Usāmah alone added an elaborate element about Ẓadījah’s death (which appears in various forms in other hadiths from Hišām⁹⁷⁸) to the common, simple version of Hišām’s marital-age hadith; Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād alone interspersed the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements with an element about Ẓadījah’s death, and further added a lengthy ‘dolls’ element at the end (evidently taken from another well-known hadith of Hišām’s); Ḥammād b. Salamah alone added an elaborate narrative about a dream-vision about ‘Ā’iṣah (which appears elsewhere in various forms as a separate hadith from Hišām⁹⁷⁹), and frequently rearranged other elements and alternated their wordings; and finally, ‘Alī b. Mushir alone transmitted various details in the ‘Hijrah’ and ‘marital preparation’ elements. All of this is consistent with contamination, elaboration, interpolation, and/or major errors or sloppiness on the part of these students of Hišām, resulting in elemental divergences in their respective redactions. Moreover, even where elements are shared, many students of Hišām transmit particular wordings or formulations thereof,⁹⁸⁰ which is consistent with their having paraphrased what they received from Hišām. In light of all this, it is hard to take seriously Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj’s assertion that the students of Hišām were “precise memorisers of his Hadith” (*al-ḥuffāẓ al-mutqinīn li-ḥadīṭi-hi*), who transmitted his Hadith “with agreement amongst them regarding

⁹⁷⁸ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 193, col. 2; also see ‘Abd al-Razzāq (ed. ‘A‘ẓamī), *Muṣannaf*, VII, p. 492, # 14003.

⁹⁷⁹ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 195, col. 1; e.g., Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 44, 46; ‘Abū ‘Awānah (ed. ‘Atā’ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, XVIII, pp. 587-589, # 10742-17246; Bayhaqī (ed. Qal‘ajī), *Dalā’il*, II, pp. 410-411. Cf. ‘Ājurri (ed. Sayf al-Nāṣir), *Ṣarī‘ah*, III, pp. 470-471, # 1936/1239, and ‘Abū Ya‘lā (ed. ‘Asad), *Musnad*, VIII, pp. 243-244, # 4822/466.

⁹⁸⁰ See below.

most of it” (*‘alá al-ittifāq min-hum fī ‘akṭari-hi*).⁹⁸¹ On the contrary, many of his students—most of whom were later regarded as *ṭiqāt*—appear to have distorted their respective transmissions.

In the third case, in reports that only reach back to Hišām via SSs, there are notable instances of isolated elements and aberrations: al-Baḡawī’s SS alone transmitted a certain elaborate combination of elements (including material on Ẹadījah, Ẹawlah, and Sawdah); al-Ṭabarī’s SS alone transmitted Hišām’s letter from ‘Urwah with a preface about Ẹadījah’s death; al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī’s SS alone transmitted Hišām’s letter from ‘Urwah with an addendum about ‘Ā’iṣah’s death; and al-Ṭabarānī’s SS alone transmitted certain chronological elaborations in both the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements. These variants could be the fault of the direct students of Hišām cited in the relevant SSs, or could instead be the fault of later tradents.

In light of all of the above, which wordings, elements, or gists can be traced back to Hišām himself? The best way to proceed in analysing all of this material is to deal with each of the distinctive sub-traditions associated with Hišām individually and successively, from the simplest to the more complex.

Version 1: marriage, consummation.

The following reports comprise an elemental sequence that is almost always associated with Hišām, such that they constitute a distinctive sub-tradition with a common source.

Ja‘far b. Sulaymān (d. 178/794-795)

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁸²

Ḥammād b. Zayd (d. 179/795)

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁸³

⁹⁸¹ Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, pp. 3-4. For an alternative translation, see Juynboll, ‘Muslim’s introduction’, 269-270.

⁹⁸² See the section on Ja‘far, above.

⁹⁸³ See the section on Ḥammād b. Zayd, above.

‘Abdah b. Sulaymān (d. 187-188/803-804)

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she still played dolls.⁹⁸⁴

Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (d. 188/804)

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at [six or] seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁸⁵

Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah (d. 198/814)

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁸⁶

Ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845)

Wakī‘—Hišām—‘Urwah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine.⁹⁸⁷

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁹⁸⁸

Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Ṣā’ig (d. 287/900 or 291/904)

Sa‘īd b. Manṣūr—‘Ismā‘īl b. Zakariyyā—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁹⁸⁹

‘Abū Nu‘aym (d. 430/1038)

Muḥammad b. ‘Aḥmad b. Maḳlad—al-Ḥarīṭ b. ‘abī ‘Usāmah—Yaḥyá b. Hāšim—

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

⁹⁸⁴ See the section on ‘Abdah, above.

⁹⁸⁵ See the section on Jarīr, above.

⁹⁸⁶ See the section on Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah, above.

⁹⁸⁷ Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

⁹⁸⁸ Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūšī), *Musnad*, II, p. 214, # 722/178.

⁹⁸⁹ Sa‘īd b. Manṣūr (ed. ‘A‘zamī), *Sunan*, I, p. 170, # 515.

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁹⁹⁰

The following two reports can also be included in this set, since they are most likely variations thereof.⁹⁹¹

‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād (d. 164/780-781 or 174/790-791)

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; Kadijah’s death; consummation at nine; playing with dolls.⁹⁹²

‘Abū ‘Usāmah Ḥammād (d. 201/817)

Hišām—‘Urwah:

Kadijah’s death; marriage at six; consummation at nine.⁹⁹³

Even aside from the elemental additions in Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah’s redactions, there are numerous differences in wording between all of these reports, most of which are minor additions, omissions, and substitutions,⁹⁹⁴ but some of which affect the ascription (i.e., *munqaṭi‘* vs. *muttaṣil*),⁹⁹⁵ the narrative point of view (i.e.,

⁹⁹⁰ ‘Abū Nu‘aym (ed. ‘Azzāzī), *Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, I, p. 3208, # 7375.

⁹⁹¹ The reason for this is simple: of all the sub-traditions from Hišām under consideration, it would have been easiest for Version 1 to be transformed into both ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād’s redactions, through the addition of one (in the case of ‘Abū ‘Usāmah) or two (Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād) elements. By contrast, the transformation of Versions 2, 3, or 3 into either would have required not just the *addition* of elements, but the *omission* of elements.

⁹⁹² See the section on Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, above.

⁹⁹³ See the section on ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, above.

⁹⁹⁴ Ibn Sa‘d—Wakī‘ and Ibn Rāhwayh—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah both begin with *‘anna* and rearrange the first noun and verb accordingly, unlike all the rest; ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *nakaḥa*, where all the rest have *tazawwaja*; Ibn Sa‘d—Wakī‘ and possibly Ja‘far have *al-nabiyy*, where all the rest have *rasūl allāh*; Ja‘far and ‘Abū Nu‘aym—Yaḥyá both have *li-*, where all the rest have the usual *ḥāl* clause (*wa-‘anā/hiya ibnah/bint...*); Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, Jarīr, ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, and Ibn Rāhwayh—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah all have *bint*, Ibn Sa‘d—Wakī‘ and Muḥammad al-Ṣā’ig—‘Ismā‘il both have *ibnah*, and Ḥammād b. Zayd, ‘Abdah, and Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah could have had either; Ibn Rāhwayh—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah omits *sinīn*; ‘Abū ‘Usāmah may have had *ṭumma*, where all the rest have *wa-*; Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, Ja‘far, and possibly ‘Abdah have *daḳala*, where all the rest have *baná*; Ja‘far possibly has *‘alayya*, where all the rest have *bī* or *bi-hā*; Ja‘far has *li-*, where all the rest have the usual *ḥāl* clause (*wa-‘anā/hiya ibnah/bint...*); Ḥammād b. Zayd, Jarīr, ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, Ibn Rāhwayh—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, and ‘Abū Nu‘aym—Yaḥyá all have *bint*, Ibn Sa‘d—Wakī‘ and Muḥammad al-Ṣā’ig—‘Ismā‘il both have *ibnah*, and Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, ‘Abdah, and Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah could have had either; and finally, Ḥammād b. Zayd, Ibn Sa‘d—Wakī‘, and Ibn Rāhwayh—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah all omit *sinīn*.

⁹⁹⁵ Ibn Sa‘d—Wakī‘ and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah both have Hišām—‘Urwah, where all the rest have Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah.

biography vs. autobiography),⁹⁹⁶ and even the basic meaning thereof (i.e., ‘six’ vs. ‘six or seven’ vs. ‘seven’).⁹⁹⁷ As such, a single urtext cannot be reconstructed, and probably never existed: as noted already, Hišām seems to have modified his hadith (including Version 1) in successive retellings. Still, the multiple attestation of particular wordings allows us to reconstruct *sub-versions* of Version 1, which is to say, at least some of Hišām’s formulations thereof.

To begin with, this hadith likely began as *munqaṭi*‘ (as attested by ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and Ibn Sa’d—Wakī‘, and in conjunction with the Criterion of Dissimilarity), meaning that it probably originated as a story *about* ‘Ā’iṣah rather than *from* ‘Ā’iṣah. However, since none of the Version 1 reports record Hišām’s direct wording in the *’isnād* (i.e., none of them quote him as saying, “my father said”, or similar), the exact form of this original ascription remains speculative (e.g., *qāla ‘abī*): we can infer *that* he narrated the hadith as a saying of his father’s, but not *how* he narrated it as such.

Thereafter, Hišām himself seems to have raised the hadith explicitly back to ‘Ā’iṣah,⁹⁹⁸ and further rephrased the *matn* into her direct, autobiographical speech: this is by far the most common form of Version 1. Although some iterations of this raised version are doubtless the product of interpolations by Hišām’s students (contaminated by the raised versions of others, or simply as the obvious means of lending more legitimacy to the report, in response to the general, increasing demand for *muttaṣil* ascriptions), it is simpler to suppose that most of these are accounted for by Hišām himself having transmitted it as such. As above, the relevant reports do not record Hišām’s direct wording in the *’isnād*, again leaving us to speculate on the exact form (e.g., *‘aḵbara-nī ‘abī ‘an ‘ā’iṣah qālat*).

Things are generally clearer in regards to the *matn*: in the first element of Version 1, Hišām almost always used the verb *tazawwaja* and the noun *rasūl allāh*; this was almost always followed by a *ḥāl* clause specifying ‘Ā’iṣah’s age, in which Hišām

⁹⁹⁶ ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, Ibn Sa’d—Wakī‘, and Ibn Rāhwayh—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah all have ‘Ā’iṣah being described in the third person (i.e., *-hā/‘ā’iṣah* and *hiya*), where all the rest have her narrating the hadith herself, in the first person (i.e., *-nī* and *‘anā*).

⁹⁹⁷ Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, ‘Abdah, ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, Ibn Rāhwayh—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, Muḥammad al-Šā’ig—‘Ismā’īl, and ‘Abū Nu‘aym—Yaḥyá all have *sitt*; Jarīr, Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah, and Ibn Sa’d—Wakī‘ all have both *sitt* and *sab*‘; and Ja‘far and Ḥammād b. Zayd both have *sab*‘.

⁹⁹⁸ In contrast to the usual pattern found in Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 16, 59, 66-67; *id.*, ‘Méthodes et Débats’, 362-363; *id.*, ‘Foundations’, in Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory*, 25-26; Görke, Motzki, & Schoeler, ‘First Century Sources’, 27-28; Görke, ‘Remnants of an old *tafsīr* tradition?’, in Daneshgar & Saleh (eds.), *Islamic Studies Today*, 24, 37, 41.

alternated between *ibnah* and *bint*, and between *sitt*, *sitt* 'aw *sab*^ʿ, and *sab*^ʿ; and Hišām almost always concluded this clause (and thereby the first element) with *sinīn*.

The second element of Version 1 is even more straightforward: Hišām almost always introduced it with a *wa*-, followed by the verb *baná*, followed by a *bi*- with an attached pronoun; this was almost always followed by a *ḥāl* clause specifying ‘Ā’iṣah’s age, in which Hišām alternated between *ibnah* and *bint*, always included *tis*^ʿ, and alternated in adding or omitting *sinīn* at the end.

Thus, whilst a single urtext cannot be reconstructed, several of Hišām’s redactions—several distinct formulations of Version 1—can still be identified, the most archaic of which probably looked something like the following:

[qāla ‘abī]⁹⁹⁹ tazawwaja rasūl^u allāhⁱ ‘ā’iṣat^a wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a ‘aw sab^{ʿin} wa-baná bi-hā wa-hiya [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{ʿi[n]} [sinīn^a].

Given that Version 2 evolved out of Version 1 (see below), and given that Version 2 combined a *munqaṭi*^ʿ ascription with a ‘marriage’ element containing only *sitt*, there must once have also been a version of Version 1 that combined a *munqaṭi*^ʿ ascription with a ‘marriage’ element containing only *sitt*, like the following:

[qāla ‘abī]¹⁰⁰⁰ tazawwaja al-nabiyy^u ‘ā’iṣat^a wa-hiya [ibnat/bint]^u sitt^{i[n]} [sinīn^a] wa-[[baná bi-hā]/[‘udkilat ‘alay-hi]] wa-hiya [ibnat/bint]^u tis^{ʿi[n]} [sinīn^a].

There may also have been a *munqaṭi*^ʿ version with a ‘marriage’ element containing only *sab*^ʿ, but no iteration of such has survived.

At a later phase, Hišām formulated a raised version of this hadith, as follows:

[‘aḵbara-nī ‘abī]¹⁰⁰¹ ‘an ‘ā’iṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-‘anā [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a ‘aw sab^{ʿin} wa-baná bī wa-‘anā [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{ʿi[n]} [sinīn^a].

At times, Hišām specified ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age to have been seven:

⁹⁹⁹ Speculative.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Speculative.

¹⁰⁰¹ Speculative.

[ʾaḵbara-nī ʾabī]¹⁰⁰² ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-ʾanā [bint/ibnat]^u sab^{ʿi} sinīn^a wa-banā bī wa-ʾanā [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{ʿi[n]} [sinīn^a].

Most of the time, however, Hišām specified ʿĀʾiṣah’s marital age to have been six:

[ʾaḵbara-nī ʾabī]¹⁰⁰³ ʿan ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-ʾanā [bint/ibnat]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a wa-banā bī wa-ʾanā [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{ʿi[n]} [sinīn^a].

Version 2: marriage, consummation, together nine years.

The second set of reports ascribed to Hišām comprise the following elements: ʿĀʾiṣah was married at six, consummated in marriage at nine, and was married to the Prophet for nine years.

Sufyān al-Ṭawrī (d. 161-162/777-779)

Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.¹⁰⁰⁴

Wuhayb b. Ḳālīd (d. 165/781-782)

Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.

Hišām:

Together nine years.¹⁰⁰⁵

ʾAḥmad al-ʿUṭarīdī (d. 272/886)

Yūnus b. Bukayr—Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Marriage, after Ḳadījah’s death, at six; consummation at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹⁰⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰² Speculative.

¹⁰⁰³ Speculative.

¹⁰⁰⁴ See the section on Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, above.

¹⁰⁰⁵ See the section on Wuhayb, above.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Ibn Bukayr (ed. Zakkār), *al-Siyar wa-al-Maḡāzī*, p. 255.

There is the problem with al-‘Uṭāridī’s transmission, however: his version states that the Prophet died when ‘Ā’iṣah was eighteen years old (*wa-māta rasūl allāh wa-‘ā’iṣah ibnat ṭamānī ‘ašrah sanah*), whereas the other two state that ‘Ā’iṣah lived with the Prophet for nine years (*makaṭat/kānat ‘inda-hu tis’ [sinīn]*). Although representing basically the same proposition (such that we can count all three exemplifying the same element), al-‘Uṭāridī’s wording diverges noticeably from the other two. More importantly, al-‘Uṭāridī’s wording is much more similar to the corresponding element in numerous other reports (for example, the redaction of ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, from al-‘A‘maš)¹⁰⁰⁷ than it is to that found in the two other attributions of this element to Hišām. Even when the combination of this ‘death’ element with the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements is taken into account, al-‘Uṭāridī’s version is noticeably more similar to Muslim’s transmission from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah¹⁰⁰⁸ and, to a lesser extent, al-Faḍl b. Nu‘aym’s redaction (from ‘Isrā’īl, from ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq) and certain sub-versions descended from ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s redaction (from Ma‘mar, from both Hišām and al-Zuhrī).¹⁰⁰⁹ It is thus extremely likely that al-‘Uṭāridī’s version is at the very least contaminated, whether at his hands or by his source Ibn Bukayr.

Additionally, al-‘Uṭāridī’s version contains a sub-clause about Ẓadījah’s death in the middle of the ‘marriage’ element, which is uncorroborated most other transmissions from Hišām, and differs in wording from those few transmissions from Hišām that do mention Ẓadījah’s death. This is consistent with the sub-clause in al-‘Uṭāridī’s version being contaminated (probably by another hadith from Hišām¹⁰¹⁰), either by al-‘Uṭāridī or his source Ibn Bukayr.

Despite all of this, the archaic *munqaṭi‘* ascription in al-‘Uṭāridī’s transmission suggests that the original version of the report—a hypothetical, pre-interpolated or pre-contaminated version—indeed derives from the 8th Century CE, which is consistent with an ultimate origin with Hišām. Even if that is the case, however, there is no way to know whether the original version belonged to Version 1 or Version 2 of Hišām’s hadith, rendering it useless in the present analysis.

This leaves us with the redactions of Sufyān al-Ṭawrī and Wuhayb, but here we are on more solid ground: in addition to sharing the same elements, with similar wordings,

¹⁰⁰⁷ See the section on ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, above.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Muslim (ed. Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 642, # 72/1422.

¹⁰⁰⁹ See the section on ‘Abd al-Razzāq, above.

¹⁰¹⁰ See the comment above, concerning ‘Abū ‘Usāmah.

in the same order, these two reports are more similar to each other than to all other versions of the marital-age hadith. We thus have a distinctive sub-tradition that matches a common ascription, which is consistent with both reports in question reflecting a distinctive redaction from Hišām. The variation between them is noticeable, but usually not at the expense of meaning, and is consistent with controlled paraphrasing (i.e., the sort of thing usually envisaged by *al-riwāyah bi-al-ma‘nā*).¹⁰¹¹

There are two notable differences, however. Firstly, Sufyān’s version has a *munqaṭi‘* ascription where Wuhayb’s is *muttaṣil*, which is consistent with the latter’s having been raised (by either Wuhayb or Hišām). Secondly, Wuhayb’s version includes a comment from Hišām indicating that the third element is actually an addendum from an unspecified source (i.e., other than ‘Urwah); the absence of this comment from Sufyān’s version is consistent either with Sufyān omitting it, or with Hišām’s having simply fully absorbed the element into his ascription to ‘Urwah in subsequent retellings. Either way, Hišām’s comment (as recorded by Wuhayb) reveals how Version 2 *evolved* out of Version 1, through the incorporation of a new element taken from some other source.

In light of all this, the following ur-redaction of Version 2—an approximation distilled from the extant redactions of Sufyān and Wuhayb, in conjunction with the Criterion of Dissimilarity—can be attributed to Hišām:

[qāla ‘abī]¹⁰¹² tazawwaja al-nabiyyu ‘ā’iṣat^a wa-hiya [ibnat/bint]^u sitt^{i[n]}
[sinīn^a] wa-[[baná bi-hā]/[‘udkīlat ‘alay-hi]] wa-hiya [ibnat/bint]^u tis^{i[n]}
[sinīn^a] wa-‘unbi’tu ‘anna-hā [kānat/makatāt] ‘inda-hu tis^{a[n]} [sinīn^a].

As should be clear, the exactly wording of Hišām’s redaction remains unclear, but the gist at least—along with some of the wording—is recoverable.

Version 3: ‘Urwah’s letter

¹⁰¹¹ Wuhayb begins the *matn* with ‘anna and orders the first sentence accordingly; Sufyān has ‘ā’iṣah as the direct object of the verb *tazawwaja*, where Wuhayb has an attached pronoun (i.e., *tazawwaja-hā*); both Sufyān and Wuhayb may have had either *bint* or *ibnah*; Wuhayb added *sinīn*; Sufyān has ‘udkīlat ‘alay-hi, where Wuhayb has *baná bi-hā*; both Sufyān and Wuhayb again may have had either *bint* or *ibnah*; Wuhayb again added *sinīn*; Sufyān has *makatāt* where Wuhayb has *kānat*; and finally, Wuhayb adds *sinīn*.

¹⁰¹² Speculative.

The third set of reports ascribed to Hišām take the form of a letter composed by ‘Urwah and addressed to a Marwanid caliph, in which the marriage and consummation of ‘Ā’iṣah are mentioned.

al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)

‘Alī b. Naṣr & ‘Abd al-Wārith b. ‘Abd al-Ṣamad—‘Abd al-Ṣamad b. ‘Abd al-Wārith—‘Abān al-‘Aṭṭār—Hišām—‘Urwah:

‘Urwah wrote to ‘Abd al-Malik; Kadijah’s death; marriage, after Kadijah’s death; dream-vision of ‘Ā’iṣah; marriage at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine.¹⁰¹³

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

‘Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Aḥmad b. Bālawayh—‘Ibrāhīm b. ‘Ishāq al-Ḥarbī—Muṣ‘ab b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayrī—‘Abd Allāh b. Mu‘āwiyah—Hišām:

‘Urwah wrote to al-Walid; marriage, after Kadijah’s death; dream-vision of ‘Ā’iṣah; marriage at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine; ‘Ā’iṣah’s death.¹⁰¹⁴

Despite only reaching back to Hišām via lengthy SSs, these two reports are far more similar to each other (sharing not just a letter form, but the same core sequence and many specific wordings) than they are to all other versions of the marital-age hadith, which—in conjunction with their common ascription to Hišām—is consistent with both reflecting a common redaction from Hišām. Again, a distinctive sub-tradition correlates with a particular source.

However, the level of variation between these two extant redactions of this letter is far greater than any we have encountered in the transmissions of Versions 1 and 2 of Hišām’s hadith: al-Ṭabarī’s version is addressed to Caliph ‘Abd al-Malik, where al-Ḥākim’s version is addressed to Caliph al-Walid b. ‘Abd al-Malik; al-Ṭabarī’s version begins with a comment to the recipient and information about Kadijah’s death, all absent in al-Ḥākim’s version; and al-Ḥākim’s version ends with information about ‘Ā’iṣah’s death, absent in al-Ṭabarī’s version. Moreover, even where the two versions share the same elemental sequence (‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage; Kadijah’s death; the Prophet’s

¹⁰¹³ Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV, p. 1770.

¹⁰¹⁴ Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, p. 19, # 6880.

dream-vision of ‘Ā’iṣah; ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage at age six; ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital consummation, after the Hijrah, at age nine), their wordings are plagued by additions, omissions, and substitutions,¹⁰¹⁵ all of which is consistent with fairly sloppy or loose paraphrasing.¹⁰¹⁶ This is extremely ironic: of all the reports under consideration, an alleged *letter* surely had the best chance of being transmitted reliably, either directly in writing, or through reading out the letter—either way, not purely orally or from memory. And yet, this alleged letter is one of the worst-preserved reports in the set under consideration: the only question is whether Hiṣām or his students were responsible for the lion’s share of this distortion.

Still, an outline or approximation of the original letter—which is to say, Hiṣām’s redaction—can be reconstructed, even if much of the wording is uncertain and some elements are dubious:

kataba [‘abī]¹⁰¹⁷ ilā [al-walīdī bnī] ‘abdi al-malikī bnī marwān^a [‘inna-ka katabta ‘ilayya fī ḡadījat^a bintī kuwaylidīⁱⁿ tas’alu-nī matá tuwuffīyat wa-‘inna-hā tuwuffīyat qabla maḡrajī rasūlī allāhī min makkat^a bi-ṭalāṭī sinīn^a ‘aw qarīb^{an} min ḡalīka] wa-nakaḡa [‘ā’iṣat^a/rasūl^u allāhī] [‘inda] mutawaffā ḡadījat^a [‘ā’iṣat^a] [wa-]kāna rasūl^u allāhī [‘uriya-hā]/[ra’ā ‘ā’iṣat^a] [fī al-manāmī] [[ṭalāṭ^a mirārⁱⁿ]/[marrataynī]] yuḡālu [la-hu] ḡadīhi imra’atu-ka [‘ā’iṣat^u] wa-[kānat] ‘ā’iṣat^u yawma[-‘idīn] [nakaḡa-hā rasūl^u allāhī] [bint^a/ibnat^u] sittī sinīn^a ṭumma [‘inna rasūl^a allāhī] baná bi-[hā/‘ā’iṣat^a] [yawma/ba’da mā] ḡadīma al-madīnatⁱ wa-ḡiya [yawma baná bi-hā] [bint/ibnat^u] tis^ī sinīn^a [wa-mātat ‘ā’iṣat^u ‘umm^u al-mu’minīn^a laylat^a al-ṭulāṭ^a ba’da ṣalātī al-witrī wa-dufinat min laylati-hā bi-al-baqī^ī li-ḡamsī ‘aṣrat^a laylat^{an} ḡalat min ramadān^a wa-ṣallá ‘alay-hā ‘abū hurayrat^a wa-kāna marwān^u ḡā’ib^{an} wa-kāna ‘abū hurayrat^a yaḡlufu-hu].

Sean Anthony has recently argued for a general acceptance of such letters all the way back to ‘Urwah, based on two main sets of “internal features”.¹⁰¹⁸ Firstly (following the

¹⁰¹⁵ Ṭ. has ‘ā’iṣah directly after nakaḡa, where Ḥ. has it after mutawaffā ḡadījah; Ḥ. adds rasūl allāh; Ḥ. adds ‘inda; Ḥ. adds wa-; Ṭ. has ra’ā ‘ā’iṣah, where Ḥ. has ‘uriya-hā; Ḥ. adds fī al-manām; Ṭ. has marratayn, where Ḥ. has ṭalāṭ mirār; Ṭ. adds la-hu; Ḥ. adds ‘ā’iṣah; Ḥ. adds kānat; Ṭ. has yawma-‘idīn, where Ḥ. has yawma; Ḥ. adds nakaḡa-hā rasūl allāh; Ṭ. has ibnah, where Ḥ. has bint; Ṭ. adds ‘inna rasūl allāh; Ṭ. has bi-‘ā’iṣah, where Ḥ. has bi-hā; Ṭ. has ba’da mā, where Ḥ. has yawma; Ṭ. adds yawma baná bi-hā; and finally, Ṭ. has ibnah, where Ḥ. has bint.

¹⁰¹⁶ In light of this, the comment in Anthony, *Muhammad*, 103, that the “exact wording” of such letters “likely” does “not survive” due to “the vagaries of their transmission”, seems like an understatement: whole elements have been added or omitted.

¹⁰¹⁷ Speculative.

¹⁰¹⁸ Anthony, *Muhammad*, 103.

research of Görke), the letters are unmiraculous and unembellished,¹⁰¹⁹ which is consistent with their reflecting “an early, even relatively primitive, sampling of the historical memory of Medinan elites”, which is in turn consistent with ‘Urwah’s authorship.¹⁰²⁰ Secondly, “much of the letters’ contents evoke themes and stories potentially conducive to a Zubayrid-Umayyad reconciliation, or at least reflecting their shared interests” (in contrast to later Abbasid interests), which is again consistent with ‘Urwah’s authorship.¹⁰²¹ Thus, the best explanation for the evidence—for the existence of these letters ascribed to ‘Urwah, in light of the particularities of their content—is that most of them are (broadly) accurately preserved letters composed by ‘Urwah himself.

There are several problems with this argumentation. Firstly, Anthony faces a contradiction: he cites Görke’s analysis on the unmiraculous and unembellished content of these letters to show that they reflect an “early” or “primitive” layer (i.e., relative to later layers of tradition, which are full of miracles and embellishments), yet it was none other than Görke who observed, in an ICMA of ‘Urwah’s hadith about al-Ḥudaybiyyah, that ‘Urwah’s original formulation thereof was already diffused with miracles and embellishments.¹⁰²² In other words, the letters and the hadith belong to the same layer of tradition (i.e., ‘Urwah’s era and material); the letters are unmiraculous and unembellished, and the hadith is miraculous and embellished; but the lack of miracles and embellishments in the letters is supposed to indicate that they belong to an early layer *vis-à-vis* later, miraculous, embellished layers—in which case, they should belong to a different layer from the miraculous, embellished hadith. How is this contradiction be resolved? Anthony might conclude (*contra* Görke) that the hadith cannot be traced back to ‘Urwah, since it is miraculous and embellished, and thus must belong to a later layer than the letters—but Anthony in fact seems to accept Görke’s conclusions thereon.¹⁰²³ Consequently, Anthony is committed either to

¹⁰¹⁹ Also see Görke, ‘Prospects and Limits’, in Boekhoff-van der Voort *et al.* (eds.), *Transmission and Dynamics*, 146; *id. et al.*, ‘First Century Sources’, 20-21.

¹⁰²⁰ Anthony, *Muhammad*, 103-104.

¹⁰²¹ *Ibid.*, 104-105.

¹⁰²² Görke, ‘The historical tradition about al-Ḥudaybiya’, in Motzki (ed.), *Biography*, 260-262.

¹⁰²³ Anthony, *Muhammad*, 104, n. 6. When Anthony very generously sent a draft of this chapter to me in January of 2019, this footnote was absent—its subsequent appearance, in the published version of his book, is thus possibly a response to my having pointed out to him all of these issues, including the specific Görke reference. However, Anthony’s caveat in this footnote seems insufficient to me: *acknowledging* the contradiction (i.e., that ‘Urwah’s other material already contained embellishments and miracles) is not the same thing as *resolving* the contradiction.

rejecting ‘Urwah’s authorship of the letters (since the letters clearly do not belong to ‘Urwah’s layer of tradition, being as it was full of miracles and elaborations), or to conceding that an absence of miracles and embellishments is not indicative of belonging to an early layer—in which case, Anthony’s first argument for the general authenticity of these letters’ collapses.¹⁰²⁴

Moreover, alternative explanations for the absence of miracles and elaborations in these letters can be speculated, further revealing Anthony’s explanation therefor to be *ad hoc*. For example, it could simply be a matter of *genre*: these letters are *prosopographical* and *exegetical*, clarifying specific historical questions; by contrast, miracles and embellishments are more expected in the *narrative* and *edifying* context of Hadith, which, in this early period, were only just becoming distinguished from popular, oral storytelling and preaching. In fact, we might actually *invert* Anthony’s schema: surely the era of the greatest miraculous embellishment was the 1st Islamic Century, when early, victorious Muslims were riding on an apocalyptic high, and their whole world seemed God-infused? Moreover, surely the oral storytellers and preachers of the early period, who so profoundly shaped early Islamic historical memory,¹⁰²⁵ were the most prolific in embellishing stories with miracles? In other words, why could we not see the lack of miracles and embellishments in the letters ascribed to ‘Urwah as being indicative of a later layer of the tradition (i.e., as the product of more sober, professional traditionists, in contrast to early storytellers)? This is of course quite speculative, but the point is: Anthony’s interpretation seems *ad hoc*, and would need to be justified against such a counter-view.

As for Anthony’s second argument, this too is problematic. Firstly, it would not follow, even if “much of the letters’ contents evoke themes and stories potentially conducive to a Zubayrid-Umayyad reconciliation, or at least reflecting their shared interests”, that the letters can be traced all the way back to ‘Urwah: such themes and interests would fit equally well with the Marwanid period more broadly, and with the milieux and interests of al-Zuhrī and Hišām in particular.

Of course, this is to say that, historically, ‘Urwah did not write letters to the Marwanids. The fact that three of ‘Urwah’s students (including his son) ascribed letters

¹⁰²⁴ See also Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 7.

¹⁰²⁵ Cook, *Muhammad*, 66-67; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 11-15, 74; Crone, *Meccan Trade*, ch. 9; *ead.*, ‘Two legal problems’, 13-21.

to him is most easily explained by the fact that ‘Urwah was broadly remembered as having sent some letters in the first place—otherwise, why would such ascriptions be plausible? However, it does not follow therefrom that any of those original letters have survived, i.e., that any of the surviving letter-ascriptions to ‘Urwah are the actual letters he composed.¹⁰²⁶

Finally, even if a compelling case can be made for the *general* authenticity of the letters, which specific wordings and elements therein can be identified as actually going back to ‘Urwah, versus later additions and alterations by (for example) Hišām and even later tradents? As we have already seen, this is not a hypothetical problem: the extant redactions of Version 3 of Hišām’s marital-age hadith exhibit substantial discrepancies, and if such variation could occur merely between Hišām and his students, it is reasonable to expect that the level of variation that occurred between ‘Urwah and Hišām must have been quite serious indeed.¹⁰²⁷

Version 4: ‘Ā’iṣah’s elaborate anecdote

The fourth set of reports ascribed to Hišām comprise of an elaborate, autobiographical narration by ‘Ā’iṣah, in which she mentions her marriage, the Hijrah, her shoulder-length hair, her playing on a swing, her being prepared for marriage, and her marital consummation.

Ḥammād b. Salamah (d. 167/784)

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah—Prophet:

Dream-vision, after Ẹadījah’s death, of ‘Ā’iṣah.

‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, after Ẹadījah’s death, before the Hijrah, at six or seven; Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation at nine.¹⁰²⁸

‘Alī b. Mushir (d. 189/804-805)

¹⁰²⁶ Also see Shoemaker, ‘In Search of ‘Urwah’s *Sīra*’, 282.

¹⁰²⁷ Also see Görke *et al.*, ‘First Century Sources’, 21, who acknowledge that the letters were transmitted orally and paraphrastically.

¹⁰²⁸ See the section on Ḥammād b. Salamah, above.

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation;
consummation at nine.¹⁰²⁹

‘Abū ‘Usāmah Ḥammād (d. 201/817)

Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing;
marital preparation.¹⁰³⁰

In general, these three reports are much more similar to each other than to all other versions of the marital-age hadith,¹⁰³¹ with one exception: the redaction of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr (which supposedly derives from an independent source) is specifically more similar to ‘Alī’s transmission from Hišām, which is a sure sign of borrowing or major contamination. However, given that ‘Alī’s version is in certain respects more similar to these other two transmissions from Hišām (i.e., in only comprising the ‘Ā’iṣah story; in lacking the *‘adqayn* detail in the ‘swing’ element; and in lacking the element of Sa’d b. ‘Ubādah altogether), the simplest stemma thereof places Muḥammad b. ‘Amr as an outgrowth from ‘Alī’s version or a close common ancestor with ‘Alī’s version, with both in turn descending from a more distant common ancestor alongside the versions of ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and Ḥammād. (For more on this, see below.) Since this inferable common source matches the common ascription to Hišām given by ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, ‘Alī, and Ḥammād, it is reasonable to conclude that this distinctive sub-tradition—Version 4—also derives from Hišām.

An obvious problem still remains, however: Ḥammād’s redaction differs markedly from those of ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah. Even when the narrative about the Prophet’s dream-vision of ‘Ā’iṣah is removed (since Ḥammād obviously joined together two discrete hadiths, as even the *fa-qālat ‘ā’iṣah* separating the two indicates),¹⁰³² the elemental sequence of the remaining hadith differs in a key respect (i.e., in the location of the ‘hair’ element. Even when this is set aside, the specific wordings of Ḥammād’s

¹⁰²⁹ See the section on ‘Alī b. Mushir, above.

¹⁰³⁰ See the section on ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, above.

¹⁰³¹ Even the closest report (aside from the redaction of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr), which is an interpolated transmission from Ḥammād b. Zayd (see above), differs noticeably from these three in its inclusion of the ‘dolls’ element and in its omission of the *j-m-m* root from the ‘hair/illness’ element.

¹⁰³² For more on this, see the section on Ḥammād b. Salamah, above.

elements differ noticeably from those of ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah.¹⁰³³ Clearly, the versions of ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah are more closely related to each other than to Ḥammād—but why? This could be explained by positing that either ‘Alī or ‘Abū ‘Usāmah borrowed from the other, but given the great variety in Ḥammād’s transmissions to his students (discussed already), it is plausible that Ḥammād himself was responsible for much of the divergences in his version(s). Additionally, Hišām may simply have told this hadith in different ways at different times, with ‘Abū ‘Usāmah and ‘Alī hearing it together in one instance, and Ḥammād hearing it a different way in another instance. As it happens, the biographical data concerning these tradents corroborates such a supposition: ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah were both Kufan, whereas Ḥammād was Basran, which is consistent with Hišām’s having related this hadith in different ways in different places.

As such, there is likely not a single, underlying redaction of Version 4 that can be traced back to Hišām: at the very least, there were probably two—one disseminated in Kufah, and one disseminated in Basrah. Of these, the Kufan version is the best represented, thanks to the redactions of ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah; but even this version is difficult to reconstruct, due to numerous divergences in wording and even—in one case—elemental sequence between these two.¹⁰³⁴ Still, in those places where at least two of these three (‘Alī, ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, and Ḥammād) agree on an elemental sequence or wording, it is reasonable to infer that we have thereby an echo of something that Hišām related to his students. Thus, whilst no single, coherent (say, Kufan or Basran)

¹⁰³³ Ḥammād: adds a sub-clause about Qadījah’s death, and a further chronological sub-clause, in the ‘marriage’ element; adds *‘aw sab‘ sinīn*; adds a *lammā* in the ‘Hijrah’ element; has *jā‘a-nī*, where the other two have *fa-‘atat-nī*; has *niswah*, where the other two have *‘umm rūmān*; adds *‘al‘abu*; omits *wa-ma‘ī ṣawāhib...*; omits the sub-clauses about illness and hair-loss; has *wa-‘anā mujammamah*, where the other two have *[fa-‘awfā] jumaymah*; and finally, has a completely different, simplified wording of the ‘marital preparation’ element (*fa-ḍahabna bī fa-hayya‘na-nī wa-ṣan[n]a‘na-nī ṭumma ‘atayna bī rasūl allāh*).

¹⁰³⁴ In terms of elemental differences, ‘Alī has the ‘consummation’ element at the very end of the hadith, whereas ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has it near the beginning, directly after the ‘marriage’ element. In terms of differences in wording: ‘Alī has *wa-‘anā bint*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *li-*; ‘Abū ‘Usāmah adds *wa-banā bī*; ‘Abū ‘Usāmah adds *qālat* (reintroducing the narrator); ‘Alī adds *fa-nazalnā fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-ḥazraj*; ‘Abū ‘Usāmah adds *ṣahr^{an}*; ‘Alī has *fa-tamazzaqa ṣa‘arī fa-‘awfā jumaymat^{an}*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *fa-wafā ṣa‘arī jumaymat^{an}*; ‘Alī adds *‘ummī*; ‘Alī has *‘innī la-fī*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *‘anā ‘alā*; ‘Alī has *ṣawāhibāt lī*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *ṣawāhibī*; ‘Alī has *mā*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah may have had *mādā*; ‘Alī has *turīdu*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *yurādu*; ‘Alī has *ḥattā*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *fa-*; ‘Alī has *bāb al-dār*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *al-bāb*; ‘Alī has *wa-‘innī la-‘anhaju*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *fa-qultu hah hah*; ‘Alī has *sakana ba‘ḍu nafasī*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *ḍahaba*; ‘Alī adds *ṭumma ‘aḳaḍat ṣay^{an} min mā fa-masaḥat bi-hi wajhī wa-ra‘sī*; ‘Alī has *ṭumma*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *fa-*; ‘Alī has *al-dār*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *bayt^{an}*; ‘Alī adds *fī bayt*; ‘Abū ‘Usāmah adds *fa-ḡasalna ra‘sī*; ‘Alī has *fa-*, where ‘Abū ‘Usāmah has *wa-*; ‘Alī adds *min ṣa‘nī*; and finally, ‘Alī adds *yawma-‘id*.

sub-redaction of Version 4 from Hišām can be reconstructed, the following *wordings* and *sequence* can at least be traced back to him:

[ʔakbara-nī ʔabī]¹⁰³⁵ ʔan ʔāʔiṣat^a qālat tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ wa-ʔanā
[ibnat/bint]^u sittⁱ sinīn^a [ʔaw sab^{ci} sinīn^a] fa-qadimnā al-madīnat^a fa-
wuʔiktu fa-[tamazzaqa/wafá] šaʔ[a]rī [fa-ʔawfá] jumaymat^{an} fa-ʔatat-nī
ʔumm^u rūmān^a wa-ʔanā ʔalá ʔurjūhatⁱⁿ wa-maʔī šawāhib[ī/āt^{un} lī] fa-šarakat
bī fa-ʔataytu-hā wa-mā ʔadrī mā [turīdu/yurādu] bī fa-ʔaḡadāt bi-yadī fa-
ʔawqafat-nī ʔalá [al-]bābⁱ [al-dārⁱ] [[wa-ʔinnī la-ʔanhaju]/[fa-qultu hah
hah]] ḡattá [ḡahaba/sakana] [baʔḡ^u] nafasī [ṭumma/fa-]ʔadḡalat-nī [al-
dār^a/bayt^{an}] fa-ʔiḡdā niswat^{un} min^a al-ʔanṣārⁱ fa-qulna ʔalá al-ḡayrⁱ wa-al-
barakatⁱ wa-ʔalá ḡayrⁱ ṭāʔirⁱⁿ fa-ʔaslamat-nī ʔilay-hinna [f/w]a-ʔaṣlahna-nī fa-
lam yaruʔ^c-nī ʔillā rasūl^u allāhⁱ ḡuḡ^{an} fa-ʔaslamna-nī ʔilay-hī [f/w]a-banā bī
wa-ʔanā [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{ci} sinīn^a.

Again, Hišām may never have articulated Version 4 in exactly this way—but he likely articulated most of the constitutive elements and wordings that way, at different times and in different places.

The version of Maʕmar

There are three other versions of the marital-age hadith ascribed to Hišām, all of which are isolated and problematic. The first is the redaction of the PCL Maʕmar, as previously reconstructed from the redaction of ʕAbd al-Razzāq and a report from Ibn Saʕd:

Maʕmar b. Rāšid (d. 152-154/769-771)

Hišām & al-Zuhrī:

ʕĀʔiṣah was married at nine or seven.¹⁰³⁶

There are three issues here. Firstly, the report is ascribed to both Hišām and al-Zuhrī, and it is not clear which was intended to be the actual source, and which is just being invoked for having allegedly said something vaguely similar. Secondly, this report comprises a mere statement ascribed to Hišām and al-Zuhrī, rather than a report from

¹⁰³⁵ Speculative.

¹⁰³⁶ See the section on Maʕmar, above.

‘Urwah, unlike every other transmission from Hišām and al-Zuhrī. Thirdly, the *matn* of the report is extremely divergent from all of the other transmissions from Hišām (not to mention al-Zuhrī), since it only comprises the ‘marriage’ element. Of course, this could simply be a limitation of my ICMA and the available evidence: since Ma‘mar’s redaction was reconstructed from only two reports (from ‘Abd al-Razzāq and Ibn Sa‘d), and one of them (the version recorded by Ibn Sa‘d) is quite short, only a short *matn* can be traced back to Ma‘mar. In other words, it is possible that Ibn Sa‘d’s version is actually an abridgement, and that the original was longer and, thereby, more similar to other transmissions from Hišām. However, the aberrant wording of that which can be traced back to Ma‘mar—in conjunction with the Criterion of Dissimilarity and principle of *lectio difficilior potior*—remains: where every other transmission from Hišām has him report that ‘Ā’iṣah was married (*tazawwaja*, *nakaḥa*) at age six or seven and consummated in marriage (*baná*, *daḵala*) at nine, this version has him state that ‘Ā’iṣah was married (*nakaḥa*) at nine or seven, thereby conflating or confusing the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements.

For all of these reasons, Ma‘mar’s version cannot be attributed to Hišām: if Hišām did transmit a version of his hadith to Ma‘mar, the latter seems to have corrupted it quite badly. This is actually not unexpected: according to the later Hadith critic Yaḥyá b. Ma‘īn, Ma‘mar’s transmissions from Hišām were “inconsistent” (*muḍṭarib*) and “full of errors” (*kaṭīr al-’awhām*).¹⁰³⁷

That said, it is questionable whether Ma‘mar even received this hadith directly from Hišām: the poor state thereof is consistent with its having passed through considerable mutation (such that even the core element has been altered), meaning that it may have passed through several hands before reaching Ma‘mar. Thus, where every other PCL transmission from Hišām has only suffered from his reformulations and the alterations of the PCL (whose distinctive redaction was henceforth preserved fairly accurately, in most cases), Ma‘mar’s version may have undergone a more protracted process of alteration via some intermediary tradent(s). Of course, this would mean that Ma‘mar has obscured his true source by suppressing an intermediary—or several—between him and Hišām, but again, this is not unexpected: according to the later Hadith scholar

¹⁰³⁷ Cited in Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VII, p. 11.

Ibn al-ʿAṭṭār, “he used to deceive” (*ʿinna-hu yudallisu*) in his *ʿisnāds* (i.e., suppress sources).¹⁰³⁸

Finally, it is worth noting that the Arabic words for ‘seven’ (سبع) and ‘nine’ (تسع) share a similar-looking consonantal skeleton or *rasm* (namely, سسع), which could be confused with each other in the reading or copying of unvowelled and undotted writing. In other words, we might have a scenario in which Maʿmar (or a now-suppressed intermediary) acquired his version of the tradition from an ambiguous transcription (rather than a direct transmission from Hišām or an intermediary), or else forgot what he had once memorised and had to resort to personal notebooks written in rudimentary Arabic.¹⁰³⁹ However, this does not explain the absence of a distinct ‘consummation’ element in Maʿmar’s version of the hadith, in light of which, some kind of more intensive confusion or conflation—of the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements—seems more likely.

The version of al-Baḡawī from al-Hayṭam

The second isolated and problematic version of the marital-age hadith ascribed to Hišām is the discussion that reportedly occurred between him and al-Hayṭam, in which Hišām related information about the Prophet’s wives and children from his father:

al-Baḡawī (d. 317/929-930)

al-ʿAlāʾ b. Mūsā—al-Hayṭam b. ʿAdī—Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Discussion with Hišām b. ʿUrwah about Ḳadījah’s children; Ḳadījah’s death; Ḳawlah arranges the Prophet’s marriages to Sawdah and ʿĀʾiṣah; marriage at six; consummation; Hijrah.¹⁰⁴⁰

The *munqaṭiʿ* ascription of this report makes it seem archaic, which means that, at the very least, it probably does originate as early as al-Hayṭam. There is a problem with the content thereof, however: most of Hišām’s statements therein are near-identical to the following report recorded by Ibn Saʿd:

¹⁰³⁸ Cited in Suyūṭī (ed. Naṣṣār), *ʿAsmāʾ al-Mudallisīn*, p. 94, # 56.

¹⁰³⁹ I owe thanks to Christopher Melchert for pointing out this possibility.

¹⁰⁴⁰ See the section on al-Baḡawī, above.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd al-Ṭanāfisī—Muḥammad b. 'Amr—'Abū Salamah & Yaḥyá:

Kawlah arranges the Prophet's marriages to Sawdah and 'Ā'ishah; marriage at six; consummation; Hijrah.¹⁰⁴¹

Since this report is similarly archaic-looking (again, with a *munqaṭi'* ascription), it cannot be ruled out that al-Baḡawī's hadith was straightforwardly ripped therefrom, either by al-Baḡawī himself, or by his source al-'Alā' b. Mūsá, or even by al-Hayṭam. As it happens, al-Baḡawī was reportedly "weak" (*ḍa'īf*),¹⁰⁴² whilst al-Hayṭam was reportedly "abandoned in Hadith" (*matrūk al-ḥadīth*), "a liar" (*kaḍḍāb*), and "passed over" (*sakatū 'an-hu*) by other traditionists.¹⁰⁴³

The version of al-Ṭabarānī from 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad

The third isolated and problematic version of the marital-age hadith ascribed to Hišām is recorded by al-Ṭabarānī, as follows:

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

al-Ḥusayn b. 'Ishāq al-Tustarī—Ya'qūb b. Ḥumayd b. Kāsib—'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá b. 'Urwah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'ishah:

Marriage, three or so years before the Hijrah, at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine.¹⁰⁴⁴

There are two problems here. Firstly, this report only reaches back to 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad via a SS, such that he cannot be considered a confirmed PCL. Secondly, the *matn* thereof is markedly divergent from most other transmissions from Hišām, with uncorroborated chronological elaborations in both the 'marriage' and 'consummation'

¹⁰⁴¹ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 39.

¹⁰⁴² 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī b. al-Jawzī (ed. 'Abd Allāh al-Qāḍī), *Kitāb al-Ḍu'afā' wa-al-Matrūkīn*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1986), p. 139, # 2109.

¹⁰⁴³ Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūt *et al.*), *Siyar*, X, pp. 103-104.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 22, # 50.

elements. Ḥammād b. Salamah's transmission from Hišām does have a similar elaboration in the 'marriage' element, but his redaction belongs to Version 4; and al-Ṭabarī and al-Ḥākim do have a similar elaboration in the 'consummation' element, but their redactions belong to Version 3. In other words, the only transmissions from Hišām with similar elaborations belong to different versions, and none share *both* elaborations simultaneously. Al-Ṭabarānī's report thus stands out as interpolated or fabricated: it looks as though someone took an iteration of Version 1 and updated it—based on a chronology of ʿĀʾiṣah's life that had been synthesised from various different hadiths—to be more chronologically precise.

Who then was responsible for fabricating or interpolating this hadith? As it happens, various Hadith critics identified two of the tradents cited in the *ʾisnād* thereof as unreliable: firstly, Yaʿqūb b. Ḥumayd was “nothing” (*laysa bi-ṣayʾ*), according to Ibn Maʿīn and al-Nasāʾī¹⁰⁴⁵; “unreliable” (*laysa bi-ṭiqah*), according to Ibn Maʿīn¹⁰⁴⁶; and “weak in Hadith” (*ḍaʿīf al-ḥadīth*), according to ʿAbū Ḥātim al-Rāzī¹⁰⁴⁷; and secondly, ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad was “abandoned in Hadith” (*matrūk al-ḥadīth*), according to ʿAbū Ḥātim¹⁰⁴⁸; “rejected in Hadith” (*munkar al-ḥadīth*), according to al-Dāraquṭnī¹⁰⁴⁹; “a possessor of rejected and false hadiths” (*ṣāhib manākīr wa-bawāṭil*), according to ʿAbū Nuʿaym¹⁰⁵⁰; and “one of those who transmitted fabricated hadiths from reliable tradents (*yarwī al-mawḍūʿāt ʿan al-ʾaṭbāt*); indeed, “he brought forth (*yaʿtī*) from Hišām b. ʿUrwah hadiths that Hišām never, ever transmitted (*mā lam yuḥaddīṭ bi-hi hišām qaṭṭ*),” according to Ibn Ḥibbān.¹⁰⁵¹ Given the chronological interest of the Hadith, and given that an interest in precise dating is generally a feature of later rather than earlier scholarship, it seems to me that the culprit is more likely Yaʿqūb than ʿAbd Allāh. That said, there is no reason for us to be constrained by the judgements and sensibilities of the Hadith critics: the true culprit could well have been al-Tustarī, or perhaps even al-Ṭabarānī.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Cited in Ibn ʿabī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, IX, p. 206; Ibn ʿAdī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, X, p. 423, # 2067.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Cited in Ibn ʿabī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, IX, p. 206.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Cited in *ibid.*

¹⁰⁴⁸ Cited in Ibn al-Jawzī (ed. ʿAbd Allāh), *Ḍuʿafāʾ*, II, p. 141, # 2116.

¹⁰⁴⁹ ʿAlī b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī (ed. Ḳalīl b. Muḥammad ʿArabī), *Taʿlīqāt al-Dāraquṭniyy ʿalā al-Majrūḥīn li-Ibn Ḥibbān* (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Maktab al-ʾIslāmiyy, 1994), p. 143, # 172.

¹⁰⁵⁰ ʿAbū Nuʿaym (ed. Ḥamādah), *Ḍuʿafāʾ*, p. 94, # 107.

¹⁰⁵¹ Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (ed. Maḥmūd ʾIbrāhīm Zāyid), *Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Maʿrifah, 1992), p. 11.

Addendum: The Dolls Hadith

Hišām is also the CL for a widely-transmitted hadith concerning ‘Ā’iṣah’s playing with dolls with her friends,¹⁰⁵² and it is possible that he sometimes combined this hadith with the marital-age hadith in some instances. Most transmissions of the marital-age hadith from Hišām that contain a ‘dolls’ element have been exposed as having been interpolated or contaminated in that regard *subsequent* to Hišām,¹⁰⁵³ however, leaving only the redactions of the PCLs Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād and ‘Abdah b. Sulaymān—which differ considerably from each other—as evidence for Hišām’s combination of these two reports.

’Ismā’īl b. ’abī Kālīd (d. 146/763-764)

I have collated nine reports constituting the *faḍā’il* tradition ascribed to the Kufan tradent and putative CL ’Ismā’īl b. ’abī Kālīd: five unabridged versions in the *Muṣannaf* of Ibn ‘abī Šaybah, the *Ta’rīk* of al-Ṭabarī, al-Ṭabarānī’s *al-Mu’jam al-Kabīr*, the *Mustadrak* of al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, and the *Ḥujjah* of ’Ismā’īl al-’Aṣbahānī; and four abridgements or references in the *Ta’rīk* of al-Buḵārī.

Ibn ‘abī Šaybah (d. 235/849)

‘Abd al-Raḥīm b. Sulaymān—’Ismā’īl—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ’abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud‘ān—unnamed source:

‘Abd Allāh b. Šafwān and someone else came to ‘Ā’iṣah, who mentioned her nine special attributes; angel brought image; marriage at seven; consummation at nine; virgin; revelation in blanket; most-beloved; Quranic revelation and communal destruction; seeing Gabriel; the Prophet’s death and the angel.¹⁰⁵⁴

¹⁰⁵² Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 196.

¹⁰⁵³ See the sections on ‘Abū Kayṭamah Zuhayr, Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah, Jarīr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, Ḥammād b. Zayd, and Ma‘mar b. Rāšid, above.

¹⁰⁵⁴ Ibn ‘abī Šaybah (ed. ‘Usāmah), *Muṣannaf*, X, pp. 527-528, # 32877.

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

Mu'ammal b. Faḍl—Marwān b. Mu'āwiyah—'Ismā'īl—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad [sic] b. 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud'ān:

'Abd Allāh b. Ṣafwān came to 'Ā'iṣah....¹⁰⁵⁵

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

Sa'īd b. Sulaymān—Abbād b. 'Awwām—'Ismā'īl—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī Ḍaḥḥāk [sic]—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Jubayr b. Muṭ'im:

Ṣafwān came....¹⁰⁵⁶

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

Muḥammad b. Biṣr—'Ismā'īl—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud'ān:

'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ṣafwān... [seven attributes...].¹⁰⁵⁷

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

'Aḥmad b. Yūnus—'Abū Ṣihāb—'Ismā'īl—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud'ān:

'Abd Allāh and someone else came to 'Ā'iṣah....¹⁰⁵⁸

al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)

'Abd al-Ḥumayd b. Bayān al-Sukkarī—Muḥammad b. Yazīd—'Ismā'īl—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk—a man from Qurayṣ—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad [b. Zayd b. Jud'ān]:

'Abd Allāh b. Ṣafwān and someone else came to 'Ā'iṣah, who mentioned her nine special attributes; angel brought image; marriage at seven; consummation at nine; virgin;

¹⁰⁵⁵ Muḥammad b. 'Ismā'īl al-Buḵārī (ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Mu'īd Ḳān), *al-Ta'riḳ al-Kabīr*, vol. 3 (Hyderabad, India: Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uṭmāniyyah, n. d.), p. 345, # 1096; also see Yūsuf b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mizzī (ed. Baṣṣār 'Awwād Ma'rūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl fī 'Asmā' al-Rijāl*, vol. 17 (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1992), p. 394, # 3951.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Buḵārī (ed. Ḳān), *al-Ta'riḳ al-Kabīr*, III, p. 345, # 1096; also see Mizzī (ed. Ma'rūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl*, XVII, p. 394, # 3951.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Buḵārī (ed. Ḳān), *al-Ta'riḳ al-Kabīr*, III, pp. 345-346, # 1096; also see Mizzī (ed. Ma'rūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl*, XVII, pp. 394-395, # 3951.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Muḥammad b. 'Ismā'īl al-Buḵārī (ed. Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ b. Muḥammad al-Dabbāsī), *al-Ta'riḳ al-Kabīr*, vol. 6 (Riyadh, KSA: al-Nāṣir al-Mutamayyiz, 2019), p. 442; also see Mizzī (ed. Ma'rūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl*, XVII, p. 394, # 3951.

revelation in blanket; most-beloved; Quranic revelation and communal destruction; seeing Gabriel; the Prophet's death and the angel.¹⁰⁵⁹

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

ʿUbayd b. Ḡannām—ʿAbū Bakr b. ʿabī Šaybah—ʿAbd al-Raḥīm b. Sulaymān—ʿIsmāʿīl b. ʿabī Ḳālīd—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Ḍaḥḥāk—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Judʿān—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Mūsā b. Hārūn—Ḳalaf b. Hišām al-Bazzār—ʿAbū Šihāb—ʿIsmāʿīl—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Ḍaḥḥāk—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Judʿān—ʿĀʾiṣah:

nine special attributes; angel brought image; marriage at seven; consummation at nine; virgin; revelation in blanket; most-beloved; Quranic revelation and communal destruction; seeing Gabriel; the Prophet's death and the angel.¹⁰⁶⁰

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

ʿAbū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad b. Bālawayh—Mūsā b. Hārūn—ʿAbū al-Ḳaṭṭāb Ziyād b. Yaḥyā al-Ḥassānī—Mālik b. Suʿayr—ʿIsmāʿīl—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḍaḥḥāk:

ʿAbd Allāh b. Šafwān and someone else came to ʿĀʾiṣah, who mentioned her nine special attributes; angel brought image; marriage at seven; consummation at nine; virgin; revelation in blanket; most-beloved; Quranic revelation and communal destruction; seeing Gabriel; the Prophet's death and the angel.¹⁰⁶¹

ʿIsmāʿīl al-ʿAṣbahānī (d. 535/1141)

ʿAbū al-Muẓaffar—ʿAbū al-Ḥusayn ʿAḥmad b. Muḥammad—ʿĪsā b. ʿAlī—al-Baḡawī—Dāwūd b. ʿAmr—Marwān b. Muʿāwiyah—ʿIsmāʿīl—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Ḍaḥḥāk—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Judʿān:

ʿAbd Allāh b. Šafwān and someone else came to ʿĀʾiṣah, who mentioned her nine special attributes; angel brought image; marriage at seven; consummation at nine; virgin; most-beloved; Quranic revelation and communal destruction; seeing Gabriel; the Prophet's death and the angel.¹⁰⁶²

¹⁰⁵⁹ Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, III, pp. 1261-1262.

¹⁰⁶⁰ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 31, # 77.

¹⁰⁶¹ Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, pp. 29-30, # 6899.

¹⁰⁶² ʿIsmāʿīl b. Muḥammad al-ʿAṣbahānī (ed. ʿAbū Raḥīm Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd), *al-Hujjah fī Bayān al-Maḥajjah wa-Šarḥ ʿAqīdat ʿAhl al-Sunnah*, vol. 2 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Rāyah, 1990), pp. 371-372, # 368.

All of these versions are ascribed unto 'Ismā'īl via SSs, making him a potential spider. Moreover, the texts (of the unabridged versions) are extremely similar, despite the hadith's being rather long—this is unexpected given the usual rates of mutation exhibited by CLs and PCLs in transmission from the middle of the 8th Century CE to the beginning of the 9th Century CE.¹⁰⁶³ In other words, this tradition as a whole looks suspiciously homogenous, in addition to being suspiciously transmitted via SSs alone. The situation worsens considerably when *matns* are taken into account: al-Buḡārī and 'Ismā'īl al-'Aṣbahānī both claim to transmit a variant of this hadith from the putative PCL Marwān b. Mu'āwiyah (via SSs), but their *matns* (or at least, what is available thereof) are more different from each other than either is to allegedly more distant versions. Where al-Buḡārī has *daḡala* 'abd allāh, 'Ismā'īl al-'Aṣbahānī has the more standard 'abd allāh bn ṣafwān wa-'âḡkar ma'a-hu 'atayā: the use of *daḡala* in the former is more similar to two other versions (also recorded by al-Buḡārī) ascribed to two other transmitters from 'Ismā'īl b. 'abī Ḳālid,¹⁰⁶⁴ whereas the use of 'atayā, the syntax, and the inclusion of wa-'âḡkar ma'a-hu in the latter are all more similar to several other versions ascribed to other transmitters from 'Ismā'īl b. 'abī Ḳālid. The same goes for the putative PCL 'Abū Ṣihāb: al-Buḡārī has *daḡala* (which is more similar to al-Buḡārī's other variants), where al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī has 'atā (which is more similar to the usual 'atayā in most other versions). In other words, the attribution of this hadith to 'Ismā'īl b. 'abī Ḳālid is based entirely on SSs, and even the convergence of some of some of these (in two instances) on putative PCLs display major textual inconsistencies (where the abridgement allows for such comparisons): particular wordings do not correlate with particular tradents. We thus probably have some borrowing and suppression occurring in the 'isnāds: some of the extant versions were probably obtained from late transmitters of the others and supplied with false, alternative 'isnāds back to 'Ismā'īl b. 'abī Ḳālid. Otherwise, some major contamination has occurred between the relevant tradents.

And yet, for all that, the tradition as a whole at least plausibly derives from 'Ismā'īl, even if the precise wording is in question: the hadith is at least as old as Ibn 'abī Ṣaybah

¹⁰⁶³ For a similar point (albeit concerning ascriptions to Followers and Companions), see Mitter, cited at the outset.

¹⁰⁶⁴ I.e., the versions transmitted from Sa'īd b. Sulaymān and 'Aḥmad b. Yūnus; see above.

(d. 235/849), and since the era of the creation or formulation of most hadiths (on the Revisionist view) coincides with the lifetime of 'Ismā'īl (i.e., the middle of the 8th Century CE), it makes sense to suppose that this particular hadith originates with him. This hypothesis becomes even more plausible given that the hadith fits the polemical context of 8th-Century Kufah (as a proto-Sunnī defence against proto-Šī'ī criticisms of 'Ā'īshah) and, as it happens, 'Ismā'īl was both Kufan and a proto-Sunnī: "He was not attributed with Shi'ism (*lam yunbaz bi-taṣayyu'*), nor any other innovation (*wa-lā bid'ah*)," as al-Ḍahabī put it.¹⁰⁶⁵ Thus, on historical-critical grounds, the underlying redaction of the hadith can still be plausibly attributed to 'Ismā'īl. This is strengthened by the originally-*munqaṭi'* ascription of this hadith (see below), which again points to an 8th-Century provenance.

Moreover, *in general or overall*, the ascriptions to 'Ismā'īl are much more alike than all other relevant hadiths: this gives us a reason to think that the hadith as a whole embodies his distinctive redaction, even if some contamination, borrowing, interpolation, and/or occurred amongst his students and later transmitters. Still, the situation is not as neat or clear as with other CLs, where the PCLs constitute distinctive bundles, etc.

The *'isnāds* of this hadith are problematic in other respects, however. Everyone agrees that 'Ismā'īl claimed to have received his *'isnād* from a certain 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk, but who was he? Even after a search of the Islamweb and Shamela electronic databases, all mentions of him—and all information about him—appear to derive entirely from this very hadith and its *'isnād*. He appears in no other *'isnāds*, and no prosopographer has any further information about him—only what is inferable from this *'isnād*.¹⁰⁶⁶ In other words, 'Ismā'īl's immediate source for this hadith is a *majhūl*, which is consistent with 'Ismā'īl's inventing a source on the spot for a *faḍā'il* hadith that he himself had cobbled together from elements obtained from his contemporaries in early Abbasid Iraq.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, p. 177.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Buḵārī (ed. Kān), *al-Ta'rik al-Kabīr*, V, p. 345, # 1096 (s.v. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud'ān); Ibn 'abī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, V, pp. 246-247, # 1176; Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Kān), *Tiqāt*, V, p. 102 (s.v. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud'ān); *ibid.*, VIII, p. 371; 'Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baḡdādī (ed. Yaḥyá b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bakrī al-Šahrī), *Ġunyaṭ al-Multamis 'Idāḥ al-Multabis* (Riyadh, KSA: Maktabat al-Ruṣd, 2001), pp. 264-265, # 327; Mizzī (ed. Ma'rūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl*, XVII, pp. 394-395, # 3951; 'Aḥmad b. 'Alī b. Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Tahḍīb al-Tahḍīb*, vol. 6 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Šādir, 1968), pp. 267-268.

The problems with the *ʿisnāds* of this hadith only worsen thereafter. Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī seemingly depicts “‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḍaḥḥāk” (sic) as the source or narrator of the hadith, but this is probably a scribal error: an earlier source (as in every other version) was probably dropped from the text in the same way as the “‘abī” in “‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk”, by some sloppy copyist or editor of the manuscript. That aside, then, who then did (the plausibly fictitious) ‘Abd al-Raḥmān transmit from, according to ‘Ismā‘īl? Most versions depict him transmitting directly from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud‘ān, with one exception: in al-Ṭabarī’s *Ta’rīk*, Ibn ‘abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk transmits from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad via *rajul min qurayš* (i.e., another *majhūl*). Since this is absent from most other versions, and even from another manuscript of al-Ṭabarī,¹⁰⁶⁷ this may be another error. Probably, *rajul min qurayš* was meant to refer to ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad,¹⁰⁶⁸ whom a confused scribe (aware of alternative transmissions of this hadith that explicitly name ‘Abd al-Raḥmān) readded into the *ʿisnād*.

Who then was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud‘ān? Once again, we have a tradent about whom the prosopographical sources possess no data other than that found in the handful of *ʿisnāds* in which he appears.¹⁰⁶⁹ According to al-Bukārī, he transmitted one hadith (about ‘Ā’īshah’s nine *kilāl*) to Ibn ‘abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk, and another hadith (about Ibn ‘Umar saying *udkul bi-salām*) to ‘Abū Ja‘far al-Farrā’.¹⁰⁷⁰ According to Ibn Ḥibbān, he also transmitted one hadith (about how the *mustašār* is a *mu’taman*) to Dāwūd b. ‘abī ‘Abd Allāh,¹⁰⁷¹ and my own search of Hadith databases has yielded a second hadith (about a *waṣīfah* who *‘abṭa’at*) likewise transmitted to Dāwūd.¹⁰⁷² Finally, according to al-Mizzī (on the authority of al-Nasā’ī), he also transmitted something to al-Zuhrī under the name ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad,¹⁰⁷³ although no indication of the hadith is given, and I have thus far failed to find any earlier source

¹⁰⁶⁷ Cf. Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, III, p. 1262, n. a.

¹⁰⁶⁸ See the clue in Bukārī, cited below.

¹⁰⁶⁹ The one exception is telling: Bukārī (ed. Kān), *al-Ta’rīk al-Kabīr*, V, p. 345, # 1096, seemingly has to surmise that he was from the Qurayš (*‘arā-hu al-qurašīyy*).

¹⁰⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 345-346, # 1096.

¹⁰⁷¹ Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Kān), *Tiqāt*, VI, p. 283 (s.v. Dāwūd b. ‘abī ‘Abd Allāh).

¹⁰⁷² Cited in the *Musnad* of ‘Abū Ya‘lā, al-Ṭabarānī’s *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, and the *Ḥilyah* of ‘Abū Nu‘aym, with all three converging in their *ʿisnāds* upon Wakī‘—Dāwūd—Ibn Jud‘ān—his grandmother (or in one version, some other unnamed tradent)—‘Umm Salamah—the Prophet.

¹⁰⁷³ Mizzī (ed. Ma‘rūf), *Tahdīb al-Kamāl*, XVII, p. 395, # 3951.

where al-Nasā'ī mentions this, nor any hadith in which someone called al-Zuhrī¹⁰⁷⁴ transmits from anyone called 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad other than 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. 'abī Salamah.¹⁰⁷⁵ That aside, then, Ibn Jud'ān seemingly only transmitted to three people, in the entire Hadith corpus: Ibn 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk (a *majhūl* cited by 'Ismā'īl, a Kufan),¹⁰⁷⁶ 'Abū Ja'far al-Farrā' (a Kufan),¹⁰⁷⁷ and Dāwūd b. 'abī 'Abd Allāh (yet another Kufan).¹⁰⁷⁸ Ibn Jud'ān is thus also on the verge of being *majhūl*, being cited by only two known Kufans and a *majhūl*.¹⁰⁷⁹ It is thus conceivable that he is someone who was invented by a Kufan (most likely 'Ismā'īl), only to be borrowed in two or three other Kufan *'isnāds*.¹⁰⁸⁰ Of course, he may simply have been an extremely obscure figure.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Probably Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad al-Zuhrī, rather than Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī; see the following reference.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Ibn 'abī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, V, p. 281, # 1340; Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Kān), *Tiqāt*, VII, p. 88; *ibid.*, VIII, p. 377.

¹⁰⁷⁶ See above.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Barr (ed. 'Abd Allāh Marḥūl al-Sawāmah), *al-Istiḡnā' fī Ma'rifat al-Mašhūrīn min Ḥamalat al-'Ilm bi-al-Kunā*, vol. 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ibn Taymiyyah, 1985), pp. 502-503, # 514: *kūfiyy tiqah*.

¹⁰⁷⁸ This is implied in Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Kān), *Tiqāt*, VI, p. 283 (where it is mentioned that Dāwūd transmitted to Wakī' and *al-kūfiyyūn*), and made explicit in Kaṭīb (ed. Šahrī), *Ḡunyah*, p. 183.

¹⁰⁷⁹ He is called *majhūl* in Faḍl Allāh al-Jilānī, *Faḍl Allāh al-Šamad fī Tawḍīḥ al-'Adab al-Mufrad*, vol. 1 (Cairo, Egypt: al-Maṭba'ah al-Salafiyyah wa-Maktabatu-hā, 1958), p. 276.

¹⁰⁸⁰ The Kufan tradent 'Ismā'īl is the plausible creator of the hadith about 'Ā'īšah's nine *kilāl*, as noted above.

All of the versions of the *waṣīfah* hadith converge on Wakī'—Dāwūd—Ibn Jud'ān—his grandmother—'Umm Salamah—the Prophet, as noted above. Since the Kufan tradent Wakī' is the putative CL, he plausibly originated the hadith.

Dāwūd himself is the putative CL of twelve versions of the *al-mustašār mu'taman* hadith, with two putative PCLs: those recorded in the *Jāmi'* of al-Tirmidī, al-Ṭabarānī's *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, the *'Amtāl* of 'Abū al-Šayḫ al-'Aṣbahānī, and the *Musnad* of 'Abū Ya'lā (twice) all share the *'isnād* Wakī'—Dāwūd—Ibn Jud'ān—his grandmother—'Umm Salamah—the Prophet, thus converging on Wakī'; and those recorded in the *Kunā* of al-Dawlābī, the *Mu'jam* of Ibn al-'A'rāb, al-Ṭabarānī's *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr* (again), the *'Amtāl* of 'Abū al-Šayḫ al-'Aṣbahānī (again), and the *Ma'rifat* of 'Abū Nu'aym all share the *'isnād* Šihāb b. 'Abbād—Muḥammad b. Bišr—Dāwūd—Ibn Jud'ān—his grandmother—'Abū al-Hayṭam b. al-Tayhān—the Prophet, thus converging on the Kufan tradent Šihāb. This is consistent either with Dāwūd's formulating the hadith and changing the penultimate source (from 'Umm Salamah to 'Abū al-Hayṭam) in successive retellings (first to Wakī', then to Muḥammad b. Bišr), or with Wakī's creating his version and Šihāb's borrowing from him, suppressing him from the *'isnād* by citing an alternative intermediary (Muḥammad b. Bišr), and tweaking the earliest part of the *'isnād* (from 'Umm Salamah to 'Abū al-Hayṭam).

The *udkul bi-salām* hadith exists in three versions, each with a different *'isnād*, but each from Kufans: 'Abd al-Razzāq (*Muṣannaf*)—Ma'mar—al-'A'maš—Ibn 'Umar; Ibn 'abī Šaybah (*Muṣannaf*)—Wakī'—'Imrān—'Abū Mijlāz—Ibn 'Umar; and al-Buḳārī (*'Adab*)—Mālik b. 'Ismā'īl—'Isrā'īl—'Abū Ja'far al-Farrā'—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Jud'ān—Ibn 'Umar. It is plausible that al-'A'maš formulated the original (*munqaṭi'*) version, only for Wakī' and 'Isrā'īl to each create their own *'isnāds* therefor, with the latter incorporating Ibn Jud'ān.

It is thus plausible that Ibn Jud'ān was made up by one Kufan and borrowed by two or three others. If so, the originator of his name was probably 'Ismā'īl (d. 146/763-764), as he is the earliest plausible CL in any of these hadiths and plausibly invented *another* tradent (Ibn 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk); from him, the fictitious Ibn Jud'ān would thus have been borrowed by Dāwūd (fl. 8th C. CE?), 'Isrā'īl (d. 160-162/776-

Be that as it may, Ibn Jud‘ān is depicted as the source of this hadith in most versions, relating *about* rather than *from* ‘Ā’iṣah and her two interlocutors.¹⁰⁸¹ The original version of the hadith was thus *munqaṭi‘* (since Ibn Jud‘ān is not presented as a witness, nor as citing a witness), in addition to containing one definite *majhūl* (Ibn ‘abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk) and another conceivable *majhūl* (Ibn Jud‘ān).

And yet, there are still more problems with the *’isnāds*: in the earliest extant version of this hadith, recorded by Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah, the source of the story is *not* Ibn Jud‘ān, but rather, some unnamed earlier source: “It was related to us that (*ḥudditnā ’anna*) ‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣafwān and another with him came to ‘Ā’iṣah,” as Ibn Jud‘ān is made to say. Incredibly, this means that Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah’s version derives from a definite *majhūl* (Ibn ‘abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk), from a conceivable *majhūl* (Ibn Jud‘ān), from yet another *majhūl*! This could be an error by Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah or some later scribe, or it could reflect the very earliest version of the hadith; either way, those who transmitted this hadith from Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah emended their versions to remove this particular ambiguity: al-Buḳārī simply has Ibn Jud‘ān as the source of the hadith,¹⁰⁸² whereas al-Ṭabarānī (or an intermediary between him and Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah) turned the unnamed *majhūl* into ‘Ā’iṣah herself (see below). Interestingly, in al-Mizzī’s quotation of al-Buḳārī, the *’isnād* has likewise been raised unto ‘Ā’iṣah: “‘Ā’iṣah reported this to us (*’aḳbarat-nā ’ā’iṣah bi-hāḍā*),” as Ibn Jud‘ān is made to say.¹⁰⁸³ Thus, where al-Buḳārī seemingly emended Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah to remove an unnamed *majhūl* from behind Ibn Jud‘ān, al-Mizzī (or some intermediary in the many centuries between him and al-Buḳārī) then re-extended the *’isnād* back behind Ibn Jud‘ān, this time explicitly back to ‘Ā’iṣah.

In one version recorded by al-Buḳārī, however, the source of the hadith has been transformed into a completely different person: ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud‘ān has become ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im, presumably at the hands of one of the intermediaries between al-Buḳārī and ‘Ismā‘īl (i.e., Sa‘īd b. Sulaymān or ‘Abbād b. ‘Awwām).¹⁰⁸⁴ As it happens, Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im was remembered

779), Wakī‘ (d. 196-197/812), and/or Ṣihāb (d. 224/839). But of course, plausible ≠ probable, so this explanation for the data is speculative.

¹⁰⁸¹ In al-Buḳārī (from both al-Mu‘ammal and ‘Aḥmad), al-Ṭabarī, and ‘Ismā‘īl al-‘Aṣbahānī. Probably also in al-Buḳārī—Muḥammad b. Biṣr, as recorded in al-Mizzī. For all of these, see above.

¹⁰⁸² Buḳārī (ed. Kān), *al-Ta’rīk al-Kabīr*, III, p. 345, # 1096.

¹⁰⁸³ Mizzī (ed. Ma‘rūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl*, XVII, pp. 394, # 3951.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Buḳārī (ed. Kān), *al-Ta’rīk al-Kabīr*, III, p. 345, # 1096; also see Mizzī (ed. Ma‘rūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl*, XVII, p. 394, # 3951.

as someone to whom ‘Ā’iṣah was initially engaged (as in the tradition of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—see below), so this change is probably not a coincidence: what we have here is the grandson of ‘Ā’iṣah’s ex-fiancé attesting to her virtues.¹⁰⁸⁵ It is easy to imagine a storyteller or tradent delighting in such a connection, or thinking that such a connection adds weight to the story: even the family of ‘Ā’iṣah’s *ex* related her virtues, after all. Despite such an appeal, this version never caught on. Moreover, this grandson was probably invented by whoever was responsible for the alteration of the relevant *’isnād*: he appears in no other source that I have been able to find.¹⁰⁸⁶ Thus, in this version of the hadith, we have yet another *majhūl* in the *’isnād*.

Finally, in the version recorded by al-Ṭabarānī, the *’isnād* has been raised: where most versions of this hadith depict Ibn Jud‘ān as the source of the story, al-Ṭabarānī has him relate from (‘*an*) ‘Ā’iṣah.¹⁰⁸⁷ Given that al-Ṭabarānī’s version purports to derive ultimately via either Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah or ‘Abū Ṣihāb, and given also that Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah’s extant version of this hadith is unraised,¹⁰⁸⁸ and an alternative transmission from ‘Abū Ṣihāb is likewise unraised,¹⁰⁸⁹ the raising of al-Ṭabarānī’s version presumably occurred between them and him.

In sum, we have a series of SSs that attribute the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s nine *kilāl* to the putative Kufan CL ‘Ismā‘īl b. ‘abī Kālid (d. 146/763-764), although an ICMA thereof suggests that some of them are probably false or misleading, disguising later borrowings or contaminations. It is plausible that the hadith does originate with ‘Ismā‘īl, but this cannot be rigorously confirmed. The original version of the hadith (whether originating with ‘Ismā‘īl, or a later tradent from whom others borrowed) claimed that ‘Ismā‘īl received the hadith from Ibn ‘abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk (a *majhūl* who left no other trace within the extant Hadith corpus), who in turn allegedly received it from Ibn Jud‘ān (a conceivable *majhūl*, cited by only two non-*majhūl* tradents within the extant Hadith corpus), who in turn related the story about ‘Ā’iṣah from no specified source

¹⁰⁸⁵ Buḳārī (ed. Kān), *al-Ta’rīk al-Kabīr*, III, p. 345, # 1096; also see Mizzī (ed. Ma’rūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl*, XVII, p. 394, # 3951.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Thus, a Shamela search yielded only al-Buḳārī, and al-Mizzī citing al-Buḳārī. An editor’s footnote in one edition of the *Dalā’il* of al-Bayhaqī mentions a certain “Ḥuṣayn b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im” cited by Ibn Ḥanbal, but this is a typographical error on the part of said editor: the original *’isnād* in the *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal has Ḥuṣayn b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān *from* (‘*an*) Muḥammad b. Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im, not *the son of* (bn) Muḥammad b. Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 31, # 77.

¹⁰⁸⁸ Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah (ed. ‘Usāmah), *Muṣannaf*, X, pp. 527-528, # 32877.

¹⁰⁸⁹ Buḳārī (ed. Dabbāsī), *al-Ta’rīk al-Kabīr*, VI, p. 442.

(making the hadith *munqaṭiʿ* to boot). Subsequent tradents then corrupted or interpolated the *ʿisnād*, variously adding, subtracting, or substituting early tradents in the earliest segment.

When the extant transmissions of this hadith are collated and compared, the following urtext (albeit with some uncertain wordings) obtains:

...ʿabdi al-raḥmānⁱ bnⁱ ʿabī al-ḍaḥḥākⁱⁿ ʿan ʿabdi al-raḥmānⁱ bnⁱ muḥammadⁱ bnⁱ zaydi bnⁱ judʿān^a [[qāla **daḡala**]/[ʿanna]] ʿabd^[u/a] allāhⁱ [**bn^a ṣafwān^a**] wa-ʾāḡar^[u/a] maʿa-hu [**ʿalā/ʾatayā**] ʿāʾiṣat^a fa-qālat ʿāʾiṣat^u yā fulān^u [**hal/hallā/ʾa-**]samiʿta ḥadīṭ^a ḥafṣat^a [**fa-**]qāla [**la-hā**] naʿam yā ʾumm^a al-muʾminīn^a fa-qāla la-hā ʿabd^u allāhⁱ bn^u ṣafwān^a wa-mā ḍāka yā ʾumm^a al-muʾminīn^a qālat **kilāl^{un}** fiyya tisʿ^{un} lam [**t/y**]akun fī ʾaḥadⁱⁿ min^a al-nisāʾⁱ ʾilla mā ʾatā allāh^u maryam^a bint^a ʿimrān^a wa-allāhⁱ mā ʾaqūlu ḥadā [**fakr^{an}/ʾannī ʾaftakiru**] ʿalā ʾaḥadⁱⁿ min [**ṣawāḥibī/ṣawāḥibātī**] fa-qāla la-hā ʿabd^u allāhⁱ bn^u ṣafwān^a wa-mā hunna yā ʾumm^a al-muʾminīn^a qālat **nazala al-malak^u bi-ṣūratī** **wa-tazawwaja-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ li-sabʿⁱ sinīn^a** **wa-ʾuhdītu ʾilay-hi li-tisʿⁱ sinīn^a** **wa-tazawwaja-nī bikr^{an} lam [yaṣrak/yuṣrik]-hu** fiyya ʾaḥad^{un} min^a **al-nāsⁱ** wa-kāna yaʿtī-hi al-waḥy^u wa-ʾanā wa-huwa fī liḥāfⁱⁿ wāḥidⁱⁿ wa-kuntu min ʾaḥabbⁱ al-nāsⁱ ʾilay-hi wa-nazala fiyya ʾāyāt^{un} min^a al-qurʾānⁱ kādatⁱ al-ʾummat^u [**ʾan**] tahlik^[u/a] fī-hinna wa-raʾaytu jibrīl^a wa-lam yarah^u ʾaḥad^{un} min nisāʾⁱ-hi ḡayrⁱ wa-qubīḍa fī baytī lam yalī-hi ʾaḥad^{un} ḡayr^u al-malakⁱ wa-ʾanā.

Again, however, some of the corroborated wordings underpinning this reconstructed urtext may be the result of contamination or borrowing, given the problems mentioned above.

There is no question about pushing this hadith back into the Umayyad period; in the best-case scenario, it can be reconstructed as far back as ʾIsmāʿīl, operating in the first decade or so of Abbasid Kufah. Since ʾIsmāʿīl's sources are a string of definite and conceivable *majhūlūn*, it is plausible (if indeed he was the hadith's creator) that he invented Ibn ʿabī al-Ḍaḥḥāk (and possibly even Ibn Judʿān) on the fly when he first formulated the narrative. Moreover, the fact that this narrative contains the distinctive elemental sequence usually associated with ʾIsmāʿīl's contemporary Hišām b. ʿUrwah (ʿĀʾiṣah's being married at seven and consummated in marriage at nine), along with the fact that Hišām just so happened to be in Kufah at exactly the same time, is consistent with ʾIsmāʿīl's having borrowed these elements from Hišām when he cobbled together his *faḍāʾil* hadith.

In short, I cannot disagree with al-Dāraquṭnī's judgement on the matter: "Ismā'īl b. 'abī Kālid transmitted this hadith, from 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk, from 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud'ān, from 'Ā'iṣah, but there is nothing sound about it (*wa-laysa fī-hā šay' ṣaḥīḥ*)."¹⁰⁹⁰

Addendum: Related *Faḍā'il* Hadiths

'Ismā'īl's list of special attributes bestowed upon 'Ā'iṣah was not the only one circulating in Kufah in the early Abbasid period: al-Ṭabarānī also recorded a list of seven special attributes, supported by a distinctively Kufan SS ('Abū Ḥanīfah—al-Šaybānī—al-Ša'bī—Masrūq) unto 'Ā'iṣah,¹⁰⁹¹ and al-Dāraquṭnī recorded an additional, similar Kufan SS ('Abū Ḥanīfah—'Awn—al-Ša'bī) for the same hadith.¹⁰⁹² This hadith shares five elements with 'Ismā'īl's, often with very similar wordings: 'Ā'iṣah was the only virgin wife; revelations came whilst 'Ā'iṣah was alone with the Prophet in a blanket; 'Ā'iṣah was the most-beloved; a revelation exonerated 'Ā'iṣah, at a time of communal strife; and 'Ā'iṣah was present when the Prophet died.

Meanwhile, another list of nine special attributes—which also compares 'Ā'iṣah to Mary—is ascribed via two Baghdadian-Kufan SSs (Bišr b. al-Walīd—'Abū Ḥaḥṣ 'Umar—al-Šaybānī, on the one hand; and 'Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Sūsī—'Abū Badr Šujā'—Ḥaḥṣ al-Ḥalabī, on the other) unto a putative Basran CL named 'Alī b. Zayd b. Jud'ān, who allegedly received this list from 'Ā'iṣah via a relative.¹⁰⁹³ The similarities are striking: with 'Alī's hadith and 'Ismā'īl's, we have two lists of 'Ā'iṣah's special attributes, both transmitted from Kufans, both comprising nine attributes, both comparing her to Mary, and both claiming to derive via someone called Ibn Zayd b. Jud'ān. They even share five out of nine elements, often with very similar wordings: the angel brought 'Ā'iṣah's

¹⁰⁹⁰ 'Alī b. 'Umar al-Dāraquṭnī (annotated by Muḥammad b. Šāliḥ b. Muḥammad), *al-'Ilal*, vol. 15 (Dammam, KSA: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1427 AH), p. 166.

¹⁰⁹¹ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 30, # 75.

¹⁰⁹² Dāraquṭnī, *Ilal*, XV, p. 166.

¹⁰⁹³ 'Abū Ya'lā (ed. 'Asad), *Musnad*, VIII, pp. 90-91, # 4626/270; 'Ājurri (ed. Ibn Muḥammad), *Šarī'ah*, III, pp. 448-449, # 1907/672; *ibid.*, p. 484, # 1961/1256; 'Ismā'īl al-'Aṣbahānī (ed. Ibn Maḥmūd), *Hujjah*, II, pp. 372-373, # 369-370; 'Abd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Rāfi'ī (ed. 'Azīz Allāh al-'Utāridī), *al-Tadwīn fī 'Akbār Qazwīn*, vol. 3 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1987), pp. 468-469; 'Umar b. 'Aḥmad b. al-'Adīm (ed. Suhayl Zakkār), *Buḡyat al-Ṭalab fī Ta'rīk Ḥalab*, vol. 6 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 1988), p. 2856. Cf. Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, pp. 30-31, # 76, in which *tis'* has been changed to *sitt*.

image; ‘Ā’iṣah was the only virgin wife; ‘Ā’iṣah was present when the Prophet died; revelations came whilst ‘Ā’iṣah was alone with the Prophet in a blanket; and a revelation exonerated her.

Meanwhile, yet another list of *ten* special attributes is recorded by Ibn Sa’d and ascribed via a Basro-Madinan SS (Ḥajjāj b. Nuṣayr—‘Īsā b. Maymūn—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad) unto ‘Ā’iṣah,¹⁰⁹⁴ which shares with ‘Ismā‘īl’s hadith an introduction in which someone is prompted by ‘Ā’iṣah to ask her about her special attributes, along with five other elements: ‘Ā’iṣah was the only virgin wife; a revelation exonerated ‘Ā’iṣah; Gabriel brought ‘Ā’iṣah’s image; revelations came whilst ‘Ā’iṣah was alone with the Prophet; and ‘Ā’iṣah was present when the Prophet died, and he was buried in her house.

Finally, as we have already seen, yet another list of special attributes was transmitted by the Kufan CL ‘Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ (d. 176/792), on the authority of his Kufan predecessor ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Umayr, from ‘Ā’iṣah.¹⁰⁹⁵ All six of the attributes in ‘Abū ‘Awānah’s hadith are shared by ‘Ismā‘īl’s hadith: ‘Ā’iṣah was married at age six; the angel brought ‘Ā’iṣah’s image; ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage was consummated at age nine; ‘Ā’iṣah alone saw Gabriel; ‘Ā’iṣah was the most-beloved; and ‘Ā’iṣah was present when the Prophet died.

‘Abū Ḥanīfah	‘Alī b. Zayd	‘Abū ‘Awānah	Ibn Sa’d	‘Ismā‘īl
			Conversation	Conversation with two others
Seven attributes	Nine attributes	Attributes [no specified number]	Ten attributes	Nine attributes
	Comparison to Mary			Comparison to Mary
[1] She was the most-beloved	[1] The angel Gabriel brought her image to the Prophet	[1] She was married at seven	[1] She was the Prophet’s only virgin wife	[1] An angel brought her image to the Prophet
[2] Her father was the most-beloved	[2] She was the Prophet’s only virgin wife	[2] An angel brought her image to the Prophet	[2] She was the only daughter of emigrants	[2] She was married at seven

¹⁰⁹⁴ Ibn Sa’d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 43-44.

¹⁰⁹⁵ See the section on ‘Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ, above.

			whom the Prophet married	
[3] She was the Prophet's only virgin wife	[3] She was with the Prophet when he died	[3] The marriage was consummated at nine	[3] God exonerated her	[3] The marriage was consummated at nine
[4] The revelation came whilst she was with the Prophet in a blanket	[4] The Prophet was buried in her house	[4] She alone saw Gabriel	[4] Gabriel brought her image to the Prophet from Heaven, in silk, and he was informed that she would be his wife	[4] She was the Prophet's only virgin wife
[5] She stayed with the Prophet for two days and nights per week	[5] The angels surrounded her house	[5] She was the most-beloved, and her father was the most-beloved	[5] She used to wash whilst sharing a single vessel with the Prophet	[5] The revelation came whilst she was with the Prophet in a blanket
[6] A revelation exonerated her, when a group almost destroyed her	[6] The revelation came whilst she was with the Prophet in a blanket	[6] She was with the Prophet when he died, with the angels	[6] The Prophet used to pray whilst she was lying in front of him	[6] She was the most-beloved
[7] She was with the Prophet when he died	[7] She was the daughter of the Prophet's successor and friend		[7] The revelation came whilst she was alone with the Prophet	[7] A revelation exonerated her, when the community was almost destroyed
	[8] A revelation exonerated her		[8] The Prophet was resting against her when he died	[8] She saw Gabriel
	[9] She was created good, and blessed		[9] The Prophet died on the night that would have been her round	[9] She was with the Prophet when he died, with the angels
			[10] He was buried in her house	

The hadith recorded by Ibn Sa‘d cannot be subjected to an ICMA, since I was able to find no parallel transmissions thereof. Additionally, the alleged Basran provenance of the hadith is less expected than a Kufan origin (see below), which raises the possibility that the hadith is a Basran dive.

The hadith transmitted via ‘Abū Ḥanīfah likewise cannot be subjected to an ICMA, since I was only able to find a single *matn* and two differing *’isnāds* therefor. Based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity, however, we can infer which of these *’isnāds* is earlier than the other: where one version has al-Ša‘bī—Masrūq—‘Ā’iṣah, the other has omitted the superfluous tradent Masrūq (since al-Ša‘bī was remembered as having transmitted from ‘Ā’iṣah directly). In other words, the latter has a shorter *’isnād*, whilst retaining connectedness therein—and, given that traditionists came to prize the shortest possible *’isnāds*, it more likely that the longer *’isnād* was shortened by a tradent in the course of transmission, rather than *vice versa*. In short, the less elegant or economical *’isnād*—the *’isnād* that accords less to later ideals and preferences—is more likely to be the original.

Something can also be said about the probable provenance of this hadith. The fact that it reduces in both *’isnāds* to a string of early Kufans is consistent with the hadith’s having originated in Umayyad-era or early Abbasid-era Kufah, as indeed is the content: Kufah was the centre of Shi’ism in the 8th Century CE, which would make Kufah the place where proto-Sunnīs had the greatest need for *faḍā’il* of ‘Ā’iṣah at that time. In other words, the hadith is exactly the sort of thing that we would expect to be created by proto-Sunnī Kufans in the 8th Century CE—and, given other evidence concerning the mass-creation of Hadith in this period,¹⁰⁹⁶ we have all the more reason to suspect the falsity of the hadith’s ascription all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah. Again, I must concur with al-Dāraqūṭnī’s judgement on the matter:

‘Abū Ḥanīfah transmitted this hadith, but it varied from him (*wa-iḳtalafa ‘an-hu*): ‘Abd Allāh b. Buzay‘ transmitted it, from ‘Abū Ḥanīfah, from al-Šaybānī, from al-Ša‘bī, from Masrūq, from ‘Ā’iṣah; but ‘Iṣḥāq al-‘Azraq contradicted him (*wa-kālaḳa-hu*); he transmitted it from ‘Abū Ḥanīfah, from ‘Awn b. ‘Abd Allāh, from al-Ša‘bī, from ‘Ā’iṣah. There is nothing sound about it (*wa-laysa fī-hā šay’ yaṣiḥḥu*).¹⁰⁹⁷

¹⁰⁹⁶ See the previous chapter of the present work.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Dāraqūṭnī, *Ilal*, XV, p. 166.

More can be said about the hadith transmitted via ‘Alī b. Zayd, of which there are seven versions (discounting duplicates), with SSs that converge upon two putative PCLs: the Baghdadian tradent Bišr b. al-Walīd (d. 238/853),¹⁰⁹⁸ and the Baghdadian tradent ‘Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Sūsī (d. 263/876).¹⁰⁹⁹ As it happens, the versions attributed via each PCL are more similar to each other than they are to those attributed via the other PCL: where all the Bišr versions have ‘Alī b. Zayd relating the hadith from his grandmother (*jaddah*), all the ‘Aḥmad versions have him relating it from either his mother (‘*umm*) or his father (‘*ab*); where all the Bišr versions have *mā ‘u‘ṭiyat-hā*, all the ‘Aḥmad versions have *lam tu‘ṭi-hi/yu‘ṭi-hi/yu‘ṭi-hinna*; where all the Bišr versions have *imrā‘ah*, all the ‘Aḥmad versions have *al-nisā’*; where all the Bišr versions have *rāḥati-hi*, all the ‘Aḥmad versions have *kaffi-hi*; where most the Bišr versions have *mā tazawwaja*, all the ‘Aḥmad versions have *lam yatazawwaj*; where all the Bišr versions have *‘in kāna al-waḥy la-yanzilu*, all the ‘Aḥmad versions have *kāna yanzilu al-waḥy*; where all the Bišr versions have *‘innī*, all the ‘Aḥmad versions have *‘anā*; all the Bišr versions lack *fī al-qur’ān*, which is present in all the ‘Aḥmad versions; where all the Bišr versions have *ḥuliqtu*, all the ‘Aḥmad versions have *ju‘iltu*; and so on.

In other words, an analysis of the *matns* of these hadiths yields two clusters of reports that each derive from a recent common ancestor, both of which in turn share an ultimate common ancestor; and as it happens, this is exactly what the *‘isnād* bundle depicts, with two PCLs (Bišr and ‘Aḥmad) and a CL (‘Alī b. Zayd). We thus have a reason to accept that the original version derives from ‘Alī b. Zayd b. Jud‘ān, a Basran traditionist (or possibly, a Meccan who moved to Basrah), who died 131/748-749.¹¹⁰⁰ Thus, (the underlying redaction of) the hadith can seemingly be traced at least as far back as someone operating in Basrah during the late Umayyad period.

This has significance for ‘Ismā‘īl’s hadith: ‘Alī was operating in Iraq before Hišām settled in the region and, as it happens, ‘Alī’s version of the *faḍā’il* hadith lacks the

¹⁰⁹⁸ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, X, pp. 673-676.

¹⁰⁹⁹ Kaṭīb (ed. Ma‘rūf), *Ta’rīk Madīnat al-Salām*, VI, pp. 444-445, # 2946.

¹¹⁰⁰ Ibn ‘Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VIII, p. 137, # 1354, states that he was *makkiyy*, *nazala al-baṣrah*, but ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Alī b. Manjuwayh al-‘Aṣbahānī (ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Layṭī), *Rijāl Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1987), p. 56, # 1138, states that he was *al-baṣriyy*, *wa-yuqālu al-makkiyy nazala al-baṣrah*, seemingly regarding his Meccan origin with some doubt. Most of the time (e.g., in the various reports cited by Ibn ‘Adī), he is simply called Basran. Likewise, Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, V, pp. 206-208, only calls him *al-baṣriyy*.

marital-age elements associated with Hišām; by contrast, ʾIsmāʿīl was operating in Iraq for a decade or more longer than ʿAlī, conterminously with Hišām, and, as it happens, ʾIsmāʿīl's version of the *faḍā'il* hadith incorporates the marital-age elements associated with Hišām. In other words, ʿAlī's hadith can be understood to reflect an earlier phase of the *faḍā'il* material about ʿĀ'ishah in Iraq, before the arrival of Hišām and his dissemination of the marital-age elements. Meanwhile, ʾIsmāʿīl's hadith can be understood as an updated version of ʿAlī's hadith (or the material embodied therein), retaining most of the elements and the attribution of the hadith via a certain Ibn Zayd b. Judʿān, but incorporating some other elements, including two from Hišām.

There are several problems with the attribution of ʿAlī b. Zayd's hadith all the way back to him, however. Firstly, ʿAlī was operating in Basrah, yet the hadith (with its defence of ʿĀ'ishah, evidently against proto-Šīʿī criticisms) better fits a Kufan context—and, as it happens, all versions of this hadith (not to mention related hadiths, like those of ʾIsmāʿīl and ʾAbū Ḥanīfah) derive via Kufans. This is consistent with the hadith's originating in Kufah, not Basrah.

Secondly, ʿAlī b. Zayd was reportedly a Šīʿī,¹¹⁰¹ which is extremely suspicious: this is the sort of hadith that we would expect a Šīʿī to reject, not disseminate. This makes it look like someone ascribed the hadith via ʿAlī b. Zayd *post facto*, to give the hadith more legitimacy or polemical utility against Šīʿīs (i.e., as a kind of Trojan horse).

Finally, the two PCL sub-traditions comprising the broader tradition are extremely similar (indeed, mostly identical) in wording, which would suggest a very *recent* ultimate common ancestor for both sub-traditions—yet the *ʾisnāds* depict a century or more of transmission between the CL and his two PCLs, i.e., a very *distant* ultimate common ancestor.¹¹⁰² To put things into perspective, there are far more differences and paraphrases between Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853) and Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855)'s respective transmissions of the Ḳawlah hadith directly from Muḥammad b. Bišr (d. 203/818-819)¹¹⁰³ than there are between Bišr (d. 238/853) and ʾAḥmad (d.

¹¹⁰¹ Ibn ʿAdī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VIII, p. 139, citing Yazīd b. Zurayʿ: *kāna rāfiḍiyyan*. *Ibid.*, p. 153: *kāna yuḡālī fī al-taṣayyūʿ*. Ḍahabī (ed. ʾArnaʾūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, V, p. 206: *taṣayyūʿ qalīl fī-hi*. *Ibid.*, p. 207, citing al-ʿIjlī: *kāna yataṣayyāʿu*.

¹¹⁰² Thus, we have Bišr b. al-Walīd (d. 238/853) the Baghdadian, from ʾAbū Ḥaṣṣ ʿUmar (fl. late 8th C. CE) the Kufan, from Sulaymān al-Šaybānī (d. 129-142/746-760) the Kufan, from ʿAlī b. Zayd b. Judʿān (d. 131/748-749) the Basran; and ʾAḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Sūsī (d. 263/876) the Baghdadian, from ʾAbū Badr Šujāʿ b. al-Walīd (d. 204-205/819-821) the Kufo-Baghdadian, from Ḥaṣṣ al-Ḥalabī, a *mawla* of the Sakūn (and a *majhūl*), from ʿAlī b. Zayd b. Judʿān (d. 131/748-749) the Basran.

¹¹⁰³ See the section on Muḥammad b. Bišr, above.

263/876)'s respective transmissions of this *faḍā'il* hadith all the way back from 'Alī b. Zayd (d. 131/748-749). Not only did the former transmission (from Ibn Bišr to both Ibn Rāhwayh and Ibn Ḥanbal) take place for only half a century, it also occurred from the turn of the 9th Century CE onwards, when the transmission and preservation of Hadith in writing was becoming normalised. By contrast, the latter transmission (from 'Alī to both Bišr and 'Aḥmad) occurred for a century or more, beginning in an era of heavy paraphrastic transmission (i.e., the middle of the 8th Century CE). The implication is clear: if Bišr and 'Aḥmad's *'isnāds* were genuine, such that their respective versions truly derived via a century of transmission (from the end of the Umayyad period to the middle of the 9th Century CE), then it would be reasonable to expect far greater divergences between their respective versions.¹¹⁰⁴

We thus have multiple reasons to reject the ascription of this hadith back to 'Alī b. Zayd, which also robs us of the neat chronology outlined above (*vis-à-vis* 'Ismā'il's version). The attribution of the two versions of the hadith to Bišr and 'Aḥmad respectively still seems secure, but from thereon backwards, the *matns* imply a much more recent common ancestor than 'Alī, and non-Šī'i Kufan one at that. From Bišr and 'Aḥmad backwards, the relevant *'isnāds* cannot be trusted.

The aforementioned chronology is salvageable, however, provided we assume that Bišr's transmission from 'Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān (fl. late 8th C. CE) is genuine, and that the latter's transmission from 'Abū 'Ishāq Sulaymān b. 'abī Sulaymān al-Šaybānī (d. 129-142/746-760) is genuine. If some earlier version of this hadith does indeed derive from al-Šaybānī, as Bišr claimed, then we would still have a version of the *faḍā'il* hadith slightly earlier than 'Ismā'il's, and plausibly from the late Umayyad period as well: al-Šaybānī was reportedly born when Companions such as Ibn 'Umar and Jābir were still alive (i.e., the 690s CE at the latest), and died in 129/746-747, or 138/755-756, or 139/756-757, or 142/759-760,¹¹⁰⁵ all of which places him at least slightly earlier than 'Ismā'il (d. 146/763-764). Thus, if some version of the hadith goes back to al-Šaybānī, it can still be understood as an earlier version than 'Ismā'il's, which may also explain the absence of Hišām's distinctive elements therefrom. (Unlike in the

¹¹⁰⁴ For a similar point (albeit concerning ascriptions to Followers and Companions), again see Mitter, cited at the outset.

¹¹⁰⁵ Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (ed. Majdī b. Maṣṣūr b. Sayyid al-Šūrā), *Mašāhīr 'Ulamā' al-'Amsār* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1995), p. 137, # 844; 'Ijlī (ed. Qal'ajī), *Tīqāt*, pp. 202-203, # 612; Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, pp. 193-195.

case of ‘Alī b. Zayd, however, al-Šaybānī may have lived long enough to meet Hišām in Iraq, so the chronology is not as neat as before.)

Why should we believe that some version of the hadith does indeed go back to al-Šaybānī? There are several reasons, all of which are admittedly weak. Firstly, al-Šaybānī is cited in Bišr’s *’isnād* therefor. Secondly, al-Šaybānī was Kufan, which matches the probable context of the hadith’s creation. Thirdly, al-Šaybānī is also cited in the *’isnād* for the earlier version of the two *faḍā’il* hadiths ascribed via ‘Abū Ḥanīfah (see above), which is consistent with his being the disseminator of several different versions of the hadith: one via al-Ša‘bī and Masrūq unto ‘Ā’iṣah, and another via ‘Alī b. Zayd and his relative unto ‘Ā’iṣah.

But all of that is *ad hoc*: the attribution of Bišr’s version of the hadith to al-Šaybānī may simply be the product of a Kufan retrojection to a suitable local authority, and the appearance of al-Šaybānī in the *’isnād* of a similar hadith may simply be the product of later borrowing and suppression or error amongst the transmitters and redactors of these hadiths. All we can say for sure is that the *faḍā’il* hadith probably originated in Kufah, somewhere between middle and the end of the 8th Century CE.

There is however a final consideration that strengthens the idea that ‘Ismā‘īl’s version of the hadith is later than the other two attributed to ‘Abū Ḥanīfah and ‘Alī b. Zayd: ‘Ismā‘īl’s is noticeably more elaborate, framing the exposition of ‘Ā’iṣah’s nine special attributes in a discussion that arose when ‘Abd Allāh b. Šafwān and someone else visited ‘Ā’iṣah. In other words, we have a clear instance of what Schacht described as the insertion of “spurious circumstantial details”, intended “to provide an authentic touch” to a fabricated hadith.¹¹⁰⁶ (Incidentally, the employment of such techniques by ‘Ismā‘īl makes him come across as more of a storyteller than a simple tradent.) Since elaboration (rather than abbreviation) is the norm in the transmission of traditions, such that details in reports accumulate over time, the more detailed version of any set of reports is more likely to reflect a later formulation, whereas a simpler version is more likely to reflect an earlier formulation, generally speaking—this is the textual-critical principle of *lectio brevior potior*.¹¹⁰⁷ We thus have another reason to think that ‘Ismā‘īl’s version of the *faḍā’il* hadith about ‘Ā’iṣah is later than those ascribed to both ‘Abū Ḥanīfah and ‘Alī b. Zayd. And, if this version attributed to ‘Ismā‘īl was indeed

¹¹⁰⁶ Schacht, *Origins*, 97, 153, 156, 157, 160, 266-267.

¹¹⁰⁷ See Pavlovitch, *Formation*, 37-39.

formulated later than the other two, and this version attributed to ʿIsmāʿīl truly derives from ʿIsmāʿīl (d. 146/763-764), then it follows that the other two versions must be earlier still—plausibly earlier than Hišām’s settlement in Iraq (c. 754 CE). Provided all of that stands, we again have a chronology that explains the absence of the distinctive marital-age elements in the two hadiths ascribed via ʿAbū Ḥanīfah and ʿAlī b. Zayd, and the presence of said elements in the hadith of ʿIsmāʿīl: the former two were formulated before the spread of Hišām’s distinctive marital-age elements in Kufah, whereas the latter was formulated thereafter, incorporating these newly-available elements.

Finally, a form-critical analysis of all of these *faḍāʾil* hadiths together can yield some deeper conclusions about their pre-history (i.e., beyond their *ʿisnāds*). As we have seen, their *matns* exhibit a huge amount of overlap in terms of elements and even wordings, which cannot be a coincidence: all of these hadiths must share some kind of common origin. If it is ruled out that ʿĀʾiṣah herself went around constantly declaring contradictory and ever-changing lists of her own (six, or seven, or nine, or ten) virtues, the heavy overlap between these hadiths has to be explained by widespread borrowing and contamination on the part of those involved in their formulation or dissemination, and/or by the fact that these hadiths represent various combinations of a common pool of *faḍāʾil* material that was circulating at least as early as the middle of the 8th Century CE. This kind of creation and remixing of material immediately suggests the agency of popular, oral storytellers and preachers in the dissemination of these hadiths.¹¹⁰⁸

Since the material is attested most densely for Kufah and perfectly fits a Kufan context, it seems probable that it originated in Kufah in particular. Consequently, the claims of two of the hadiths in question—that ascribed to Ibn Judʿān, and that recorded by Ibn Saʿd—to derive via independent Basran and Basro-Madinan lines of transmission back to ʿĀʾiṣah must be discarded: the shared elements and wordings cannot have arisen independently and must share a single source, and if that source was the storytellers and preachers of Kufah, such *ʿisnāds*—which ultimately or completely bypass Kufan sources—must be false.

¹¹⁰⁸ For more on the early storytellers, see the previous chapter of the present work.

'Abū Ḥujayyah al-'Ajlaḥ (d. 145/762-763 or later)

I have collated four reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent and putative CL 'Abū Ḥujayyah al-'Ajlaḥ b. 'Abd Allāh al-Kindī, recorded by Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Rāhwayh (twice), and al-Ṭabarānī.

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

'Abd Allāh b. Numayr—al-'Ajlaḥ—Ibn 'abī Mulaykah:

The arranging of 'Ā'īshah's marriage to the Prophet, and the cancellation of her engagement to Jubayr b. Muṭ'im; marriage.¹¹⁰⁹

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

Yahyá b. 'Ādam—'Abū Bakr b. 'Ayyāš—al-'Ajlaḥ—Ibn 'abī Mulaykah—'Ā'īshah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.¹¹¹⁰

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

Yahyá b. 'Ādam—'Abū Bakr b. 'Ayyāš—al-'Ajlaḥ—Ibn 'abī Mulaykah—'Ā'īshah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.¹¹¹¹

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar b. 'Abān—'Abū 'Usāmah—al-'Ajlaḥ—Ibn 'abī Mulaykah:

The arranging of 'Ā'īshah's marriage to the Prophet, and the cancellation of her engagement to Jubayr b. Muṭ'im; marriage at six; she was left alone until she was eight; consummation at nine.¹¹¹²

These reports (all of which derive from Kufan SSs) are extremely divergent: Ibn Sa'd's version lacks the full 'marriage' element, and the 'consummation' element altogether; the 'marriage' and 'consummation' elements in Ibn Rāhwayh's version (especially the

¹¹⁰⁹ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, 40.

¹¹¹⁰ Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūšī), *Musnad*, II, p. 650, # 1238/694.

¹¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1033, # 1784/1242.

¹¹¹² Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 26, # 62.

relatively uncommon *daḳala bi-hā* in the latter) are more similar to those in various transmissions from the Kufan tradents 'Isrā'īl¹¹¹³ and Šarīk,¹¹¹⁴ both on the authority of 'Abū 'Ishāq, than they are to al-Ṭabarānī's version; and both Ibn Sa'd and al-Ṭabarānī's versions are together more similar, *at a very general level*, to the tradition of the Kufan CL Muḥammad b. 'Amr (in particular, concerning 'Ā'īshah's engagement to Jubayr),¹¹¹⁵ than they are to Ibn Rāhwayh's version. Still, the short account of 'Ā'īshah's engagement to Jubayr shared by Ibn Sa'd and al-Ṭabarānī's reports is distinctive, which is consistent with their common ascription to al-'Ajlaḥ: this part of the hadith at least plausibly derives therefrom, despite considerable variation in the wording of the extant versions. The genesis of the original form of this hadith as early as al-'Ajlaḥ is also consistent with the *munqaṭi'* ascription shared by Ibn Sa'd and al-Ṭabarānī's versions, against which Ibn Rāhwayh's version stands out as secondary.

What then was the original form of this hadith? Did al-'Ajlaḥ include therein a mention of 'Ā'īshah's marital age, or are these later accretions, contaminations, or interpolations? At first glance, it might seem as though the first scenario is beyond dispute—after all, two of the three transmissions from al-'Ajlaḥ manifest such. And yet, as noted already, Ibn Rāhwayh's version (1) is *muttaṣil* (which already makes it seem secondary), (2) lacks the distinctive account of 'Ā'īshah's engagement to Jubayr (which is the only component that makes an origin with al-'Ajlaḥ seem likely in the first place), and (3) is much more similar to other transmissions than to either Ibn Sa'd and al-Ṭabarānī's versions, all of which makes it seem all the world like Ibn Rāhwayh or (more likely) one of his Kufan sources (Yaḥyá b. 'Ādam or 'Abū Bakr b. 'Ayyāš) completely replaced al-'Ajlaḥ's original *matn* with one borrowed from another Kufan source, and improved the ascription (from *munqaṭi'* to *muttaṣil*) along the way. As it happens, even traditional Islamic Hadith scholarship was suspicious of Ibn Rāhwayh's version, with none other than al-Ṭabarānī commenting thereon: "No one transmitted this hadith from al-'Ajlaḥ except for 'Abū Bakr b. al-'Ajlaḥ, nor from 'Abū Bakr except for Yaḥyá b. 'Ādam. 'Ishāq b. Rāhwayh transmitted it in isolation (*tafarrada bi-hi*)."¹¹¹⁶ As Melchert

¹¹¹³ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41; Tirmidī (ed. Sāmarrā'ī et al.), *Ilal*, p. 169, # 296; Balāḍurī (ed. Zakkār & Ziriklī), *'Ansāb al-'Ašraf*, II, pp. 40-41.

¹¹¹⁴ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, X, p. 184, # 10279.

¹¹¹⁵ See below, in the section on Muḥammad b. 'Amr.

¹¹¹⁶ Ṭabarānī (ed. Ṭāriq & Ḥusaynī), *al-Mu'jam al-'Awsaṭ*, VIII, p. 108, # 8116.

notes, for the Hadith critics, such *tafarrud* “is usually a sign that something is wrong.”¹¹¹⁷

This leaves us with Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī’s reports, and the following question: is the former (in which any mention of ‘Ā’iṣah’s age is absent) abridged, or is the latter (which includes full versions of the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements, along with a comment on the period there-between) interpolated? Based on the principle of *lectio brevior potior*, the latter scenario is more likely: al-ʿAjlāḥ’s original formulation probably did not mention ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age, which means that al-Ṭabarānī’s version represents yet another instance of the marital-age hadith contaminating an initially-unrelated hadith.

Consequently, only the following approximate wording can be traced back to the Kufan CL al-ʿAjlāḥ:

...[‘**abdi allāh**’] [i]bni ʿabī mulaykata qāla **kaṭaba [al-nabiyyu/rasūlu allāhi]**
 ʿā’iṣata ʾilā ʿabī bakrⁱⁿ [al-ṣiddīqⁱ] [[wa-kāna ʿabū bakrⁱⁿ qad zawwaja-hā
 jubayr^a bn^a muṭʿimⁱⁿ fa-kalaʿa-hā min-hu]/[fa-qāla yā rasūlu allāhi ʾinnī
 kuntu ʿaṭaytu-hā muṭʿim^{an} li-ibni-hi jubayrⁱⁿ fa-daʿ-nī ḥattā ʾasullu-hā
 min-hum fa-istasalla-hā min-hum fa-ṭallaqa-hā]] **fa-[ta]zawwaja-hā**
rasūlu allāhi.

Given the major variation in wording between the extant derivations from al-ʿAjlāḥ (recorded by Ibn Sa‘d and al-Ṭabarānī), most of his original formulation remains unclear, leaving us with little more than a gist. This is consistent with the loose or sloppy paraphrastic transmission of this hadith from al-ʿAjlāḥ to his students, which fits well with the relevant time-period (i.e., the mid-to-late 8th Century CE, before the predomination of written transmission).

Muḥammad b. ʿAmr (d. 144-145/761-763)

I have collated eight reports ascribed to the Madinan tradent and putative CL Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. ʿAlqamah al-Layṭī (usually on the authority of ʿAbū Salamah b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and/or Yaḥyá b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān), recorded by Muḥammad b. Bišr

¹¹¹⁷ Melchert, *Ahmad*, 54.

(reconstructed), Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Rāhwayh, Sa'īd b. Yaḥyá (reconstructed), 'Aḥmad b. 'Abd al-Jabbār (reconstructed), 'Abū Dāwūd, al-Balāḡurī, and 'Abū Ya'lá.

Muḥammad b. Bišr (d. 203/818-819)

Muḥammad b. 'Amr—'Abū Salamah & Yaḥyá:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to 'Ā'īṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to 'Umm Rūmān and waits for 'Abū Bakr; 'Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; 'Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ'im's son; 'Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ'im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to 'Abū Bakr's relief; 'Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages 'Ā'īṣah to him; 'Ā'īṣah is six; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah and talks to her; Ḳawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah's father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah's brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.

—'Ā'īṣah:

Hijrah; men and women gather in the house; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; marital consummation in the house; Sa'd brings food; 'Ā'īṣah is nine.¹¹¹⁸

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. 'Umar—Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd al-Ṭanāfisī—Muḥammad b. 'Amr—'Abū Salamah & Yaḥyá:

The Prophet mourns Ḳadījah; Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to remarry; Ḳawlah arranges the Prophet's marriage to Sawdah; Ḳawlah arranges the Prophet's marriage to 'Ā'īṣah; Sawdah's marriage was consummated in Makkah; 'Ā'īṣah is six; 'Ā'īṣah's marriage was consummated later, after the Hijrah.¹¹¹⁹

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

'Abdah b. Sulaymān—Muḥammad b. 'Amr—Yaḥyá—'Ā'īṣah—Sawdah:

Consummation; Sa'd brings food.¹¹²⁰

¹¹¹⁸ See the section on Muḥammad b. Bišr, above.

¹¹¹⁹ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 39.

¹¹²⁰ Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūšī), *Musnad*, II, p. 561, # 1335/592.

Saʿīd b. Yaḥyá (d. 249/863)

Yaḥyá b. Saʿīd—Muḥammad b. ʿAmr—Yaḥyá—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ʿĀʾiṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ʾUmm Rūmān and waits for ʾAbū Bakr; ʾAbū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ʾAbū Bakr departs; ʾUmm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭʿim's son; ʾAbū Bakr visits al-Muṭʿim and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ʾAbū Bakr's relief; ʾAbū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ʿĀʾiṣah to him; ʿĀʾiṣah is six; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah and talks to her; then Ḳawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah's father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah's brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.

—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Hijrah; men and women gather in the house; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; marital consummation in the house; no camel or sheep; ʿĀʾiṣah is nine; Saʿd brings food.¹¹²¹

ʾAḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Jabbār (d. 272/886)

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʾIdrīs—Muḥammad b. ʿAmr—Yaḥyá—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ʿĀʾiṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ʾUmm Rūmān and waits for ʾAbū Bakr; ʾAbū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ʾUmm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭʿim's son; ʾAbū Bakr visits al-Muṭʿim and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ʾAbū Bakr's relief; ʾAbū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ʿĀʾiṣah to him; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah, and passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah's father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah's brother disapproves, but later regrets having done so.

—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Married at six; Hijrah; swing; age nine; her mother comes; marital preparation; shoulder-length hair; taken to the Prophet; marital consummation; Saʿd brings food.¹¹²²

¹¹²¹ See the section on Saʿīd b. Yaḥyá, above.

¹¹²² See the section on ʾAḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Jabbār, above.

ʿAbū Dāwūd (d. 275/889)

ʿUbayd Allāh b. Muʿāḍ—Muʿāḍ—Muḥammad b. ʿAmr—Yaḥyá—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair.¹¹²³

al-Balāḍurī (d. post-270/883-884)

Ḥafṣ b. ʿUmar—Hišām b. al-Kalbī—ʿAbd Allāh b. al-ʿAjlaḥ—Muḥammad b. ʿAmr:

ʿĀʾiṣah's marital consummation; playing; taken to Prophet; Šawwāl; Hijrah; nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen; the Prophet proposed to ʿĀʾiṣah and Sawdah simultaneously.¹¹²⁴

ʿAbū Yaʿlá (d. 307/919-920)

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿĀmir b. Zurārah al-Ḥaḍramī—Yaḥyá b. Zakariyyā b. ʿabī Zāʾidah—Muḥammad b. ʿAmr—Yaḥyá—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Abū Bakr married her off.¹¹²⁵

The level of variation between some of these reports is astonishing, although this is to some degree misleading: the reports of Ibn Rāhwayh and ʿAbū Dāwūd are clearly just abridged versions of the long tradition shared by Muḥammad b. Bišr, Saʿīd b. Yaḥyá, and ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Jabbār, since what little content there is in the former lines up closely to the corresponding content in the latter. As such, we have five reports from Muḥammad b. ʿAmr that line up fairly well and clearly embody a distinctive tradition, being more similar to each other than to all other versions of the marital-age hadith; and three other reports, recorded by Ibn Saʿd, al-Balāḍurī, and ʿAbū Yaʿlá, that diverge sharply therefrom and from each other.

The version recorded by Ibn Saʿd is the most similar to the common tradition shared by most of the other transmissions from Muḥammad b. ʿAmr, sharing therewith multiple elements: Ḳawlah arranges the Prophet's marriages to Sawdah and ʿĀʾiṣah; ʿĀʾiṣah is married at age six; and her marriage is consummated after the Hijrah. Still, most of the elements in the common tradition are absent from Ibn Saʿd's version, and

¹¹²³ ʿAbū Dāwūd (ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd), *Sunan*, IV, p. 285, # 4937.

¹¹²⁴ Balāḍurī (ed. Zakkār & Ziriklī), *ʿAnsāb al-ʿAšraf*, II, p. 39.

¹¹²⁵ ʿAbū Yaʿlá (ed. ʿAsad), *Musnad*, VIII, pp. 132-133, # 4683/317.

even the corresponding elements are mostly worded very differently. Moreover, Ibn Sa'd's version is actually more similar to a section of al-Baḡawī's transmission from Hišām b. 'Urwah than it is to the common tradition from Muḥammad b. 'Amr, as was noted previously. However, both Ibn Sa'd's version and the relevant section in al-Baḡawī's report are broadly more similar to other transmissions from Muḥammad b. 'Amr than to other transmissions from Hišām, and Ibn Sa'd's version is attested earlier in any case, all of which makes it more likely that Ibn Sa'd's version is (1) the original and (2) ultimately originated with something that Muḥammad b. 'Amr actually said. Moreover, the ascription in Ibn Sa'd's version is *munqaṭi'*, which is consistent with an early origin. Still, the wording in Ibn Sa'd's version is far removed from the common tradition, which is consistent with its having undergone extreme mutation in the course of transmission. It is perhaps not a coincidence that Ibn Sa'd's version derives via al-Wāqidī, an infamous *kaddāb*.¹¹²⁶

The version recorded by al-Balāḍurī also shares several elements with the common tradition of Muḥammad b. 'Amr (namely, in mentioning 'Ā'īshah's marital consummation, her playing with her friends, the post-Hijrah context, and the Prophet's parallel marriage to Sawdah). However, there are two additional elements in this report; the order of even the shared elements is different; and the wording of even the shared elements is extremely divergent. At the very least, this is consistent with extreme mutation. Moreover, the ascription is unusually *munqaṭi'*, being the unsourced statement not of a Follower about 'Ā'īshah, but of Muḥammad b. 'Amr himself about 'Ā'īshah. We could take this to mean that this report reflects not a hadith per se, but simply a biographical summary by Muḥammad b. 'Amr. However, one of the additional elements in this report is identical to one of the elements comprising the distinctive sub-tradition emanating from the redaction of 'Abū Mu'āwiyah,¹¹²⁷ which is consistent with contamination or interpolation. In other words, given the lack of corroboration for al-Balāḍurī's report, we have no way of knowing which parts thereof are the product of contamination, interpolation, and/or mutation, and which parts ultimately derive from Muḥammad b. 'Amr.

The version recorded by 'Abū Ya'lā is perhaps the most divergent of all, since it only comprises three elements, the first two of which (i.e., 'marriage' and 'consummation')

¹¹²⁶ For more on al-Wāqidī and his reputation, see Chapter 3 of the present work.

¹¹²⁷ See the section on 'Abū Mu'āwiyah, above.

are more similar to the common version of Hišām b. ‘Urwah—in fact, they are nearly identical to the relevant elements in the sub-tradition of Wuhayb,¹¹²⁸ and even more so to an Egypto-Madinan SS reaching back to ‘Abū Salamah.¹¹²⁹ Meanwhile, the third element in ‘Abū Ya‘lā’s version (*zawwaja-hā ‘iyyā-hu ‘abū bakr*) is very similar to a wording (*zawwaja-hā ‘iyyā-hu*) that appears only in Ibn Ḥanbal’s redaction of Muḥammad b. Bišr’s redaction of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s tradition.¹¹³⁰ Moreover, the ascription in ‘Abū Ya‘lā’s version is explicitly *muttaṣil* (explicitly reaching all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah herself), where several of the other versions (Muḥammad b. Bišr and Ibn Sa‘d, and perhaps al-Balāḍurī) are *munqaṭi‘* or at least only implicitly *muttaṣil*, evidently reflecting the original form of the hadith. All of this makes ‘Abū Ya‘lā’s version seem not just abridged, but interpolated, contaminated, or simple cobbled together. Certainly, it cannot be traced back to Muḥammad b. ‘Amr.

This leaves us with the following five reports, all reflecting (albeit in abridged form, in two cases) the common tradition of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr:

Muḥammad b. Bišr (d. 203/818-819)

Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—‘Abū Salamah & Yaḥyá:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ‘Umm Rūmān and waits for ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ‘Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ‘im’s son; ‘Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ‘im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ‘Abū Bakr’s relief; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; ‘Ā’iṣah is six; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah and talks to her; Ḳawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Hijrah; men and women gather in the house; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation in the house; Sa‘d brings food; ‘Ā’iṣah is nine.¹¹³¹

¹¹²⁸ See the section on Wuhayb, above.

¹¹²⁹ Namely, Nasā’ī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, p. 794, # 3379.

¹¹³⁰ Ibn Ḥanbal (ed. Ġamrāwī), *Musnad*, VI, pp. 210-211.

¹¹³¹ See the section on Muḥammad b. Bišr, above.

Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853)

‘Abdah b. Sulaymān—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah—Sawdah:

Consummation; Sa‘d brings food.¹¹³²

Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá (d. 249/863)

Yaḥyá b. Sa‘īd—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ‘Umm Rūmān and waits for ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ‘Abū Bakr departs; ‘Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ‘im’s son; ‘Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ‘im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ‘Abū Bakr’s relief; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; ‘Ā’iṣah is six; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah and talks to her; then Ḳawlah passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother returns from the Ḥajj and disapproves.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Hijrah; men and women gather in the house; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; consummation in the house; no camel or sheep; ‘Ā’iṣah is nine; Sa‘d brings food.¹¹³³

‘Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār (d. 272/886)

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Idrīs—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ‘Umm Rūmān and waits for ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ‘Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ‘im’s son; ‘Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ‘im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ‘Abū Bakr’s relief; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah, and passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother disapproves, but later regrets having done so.

¹¹³² Ibn Rāhwayh (ed. Balūṣī), *Musnad*, II, p. 561, # 1335/592.

¹¹³³ See the section on Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá, above.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; swing; age nine; her mother comes; marital preparation; shoulder-length hair; taken to the Prophet; consummation; Sa’d brings food.¹¹³⁴

’Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/889)

’Ubayd Allāh b. Mu‘āḍ—Mu‘āḍ—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Hijrah; swing; shoulder-length hair.¹¹³⁵

There can be no doubt that the gist of this hadith derives from Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, as alluded to already: the distinctive tradition embodied in these reports matches their common ascription thereto, which is consistent with their reflecting his particular redaction(s) of the marital-age hadith. However, there are some notable divergences between the redactions of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s students, in terms of the elemental sequence: where the extant (reconstructed) redactions of Muḥammad b. Biṣr and Sa’īd b. Yaḥyá place the ‘marriage’ element at the end of the narrative about ’Abū Bakr’s cancellation of ‘Ā’iṣah’s engagement to Jubayr, that of ’Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār places it at the beginning of ‘Ā’iṣah’s discrete, elaborate, autobiographical narrative about the circumstances of her marital consummation. Moreover, Sa’īd’s redaction intermingles the ‘consummation’ element with the ending about Sa’d bringing food; Muḥammad b. Biṣr’s redaction sandwiches the Sa’d ending completely within the ‘consummation’ element; and ’Aḥmad’s redaction and (ostensibly) Ibn Rāḥwayh’s version break up the ‘consummation’ element, placing half in the middle of the ‘swing’ element, and half in-between the ‘preparation’ element and the Sa’d ending. Additionally, the redactions of Muḥammad b. Biṣr and Sa’īd place the first half of the ‘preparation’ element before the ‘swing’ element, whereas ’Aḥmad’s redaction places it after.

Even aside from elemental sequence (and when abridgements are accounted for), there are numerous divergences in wording between the extant redactions of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, including omissions, additions, and substitutions. (Since the footnote cataloguing these variants would have taken up an entire page *even as a footnote*, I instead opted to outline the relevant information in the main text with a diminished font size, as follows. The normal main text resumes thereafter.)

¹¹³⁴ See the section on ’Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār, above.

¹¹³⁵ ’Abū Dāwūd (ed. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd), *Sunan*, IV, p. 285, # 4937.

'Aḥmad has *mātat*, Ibn Bišr has *halakat*, and Sa'īd has *tuwuffiya*; 'Aḥmad adds *bint kulaḡlid*; Sa'īd adds *qālat*; Sa'īd adds *bn 'umayyah bn al-'awqaš*; 'Aḥmad omits *imra'at 'uṡmān bn maz'ūn*; 'Aḥmad adds *fa-*; Ibn Bišr omits *'ilā rasūl allāh [fa-]qālat*; Sa'īd adds *wa-ḡālika bi-makkah*; Sa'īd has *'ay*, where the other two have *yā*; 'Aḥmad relocates *wa-man al-ṡayyib* and adds *'ammā al-bikr fa-* and *wa-'ammā al-ṡayyib fa-*; Sa'īd has *bn qays*; 'Aḥmad omits *'alā mā 'anta 'alay-hi*; Ibn Bišr adds *taqūlu* or *allaḡī*; 'Aḥmad omits *fa-iḡhabī*; 'Aḥmad adds *qālat*; 'Aḥmad has *fa-'ataytu*, Sa'īd has *fa-jā'at*, and Ibn Bišr has nothing; 'Aḥmad adds *'umm rūmān*; 'Aḥmad omits *fa-daḡalat bayt 'abī bakr*; Sa'īd adds *fa-wajadat 'umm rūmān 'umm 'ā'iṡah*; 'Aḥmad has *qultu*, where the other two have *qālat*; 'Aḥmad has *wa-ḡāka māḡā*, where the other two have *wa-mā ḡāka*; 'Aḥmad omits *'arsala-nī*; 'Aḥmad has *yaḡkuru*, where the other two have *'aḡṡubu 'alay-hi*; Sa'īd adds *wadiḡtu*; 'Aḥmad has *fa-'inna 'abā bakr 'ātⁱⁿ*, Ibn Bišr has *'abā bakr ḡattā ya'tiya*, and Sa'īd has *'abā bakr fa-'inna-hu 'ātⁱⁿ*; Sa'īd adds *qālat*; 'Aḥmad adds *fa-ḡakartu ḡālika*; 'Aḥmad omits *fa-qālat yā 'abā bakr māḡā 'adḡala allāh 'alay-kum min al-ḡayr wa-al-barakah [qāla wa-mā ḡāka qālat]* *'arsala-nī rasūl allāh 'aḡṡubu 'alay-hi 'ā'iṡah*; 'Aḥmad adds *fa-*; 'Aḥmad has *'a-wa-ṡaṡluḡu*, where the other two have *wa-hal ṡaṡluḡu*; 'Aḥmad has *wa-hiya*, where the other two have *'inna-mā hiya*; 'Aḥmad omits *fa-raja'at 'ilā rasūl allāh fa-ḡakarāt ḡālika la-hu*; 'Aḥmad has *fa-qāla rasūl allāh*, Ibn Bišr has *qāla irja'ī 'ilay-hi*, and Sa'īd has *fa-qāla irja'ī 'ilay-hi*; 'Aḥmad omits *fa-qūli la-hu*; 'Aḥmad has *'anā 'aḡū-hu wa-huwa 'aḡī*, Ibn Bišr has *'anā 'aḡū-ka wa-'anta 'aḡī fī al-'islām*, and Sa'īd has *'anta 'aḡī fī al-'islām wa-'anā 'aḡū-ka*; 'Aḥmad has *wa-ibnatu-hu*, where the other two have *wa-ibnatu-ka*; 'Aḥmad adds *qālat*; Ibn Bišr has *fa-raja'at [ilay-hi]*, Sa'īd has *fa-'atat 'abā bakr*, and 'Aḥmad has nothing; 'Aḥmad omits *fa-ḡakarāt ḡālika la-hu qāla intaḡirī*; 'Aḥmad has *wa-qāma 'abū bakr*, Ibn Bišr may have had *wa-ḡaraja*, and Sa'īd has *ḡattā 'arji'a*; 'Aḥmad adds *lī*; Ibn Bišr omits *al-*; Sa'īd omits *qad*; Ibn Bišr may have added *fa-*; Sa'īd adds *wa-lā*; 'Aḥmad has relocated *'aḡlafa* and put it in the place of *wa'ada*; Sa'īd has *ṡay^{an}*, where the other two have *wa'd^{an}*; 'Aḥmad adds *ta'nī 'abā bakr*; Ibn Bišr had either *'abū bakr fa-'aḡlafa-hu* or *fa-'aḡlafa-hu li-'abī bakr*, Sa'īd has *fa-'aḡlafa*, and 'Aḥmad has relocated this wording (see above); 'Aḥmad adds *qālat*; 'Aḥmad has *'atā*, where the other two have *daḡala* and *'alā*; 'Aḥmad adds *al-*; Ibn Bišr adds *bn 'adiyy*; Ibn Bišr has *al-fatā* where Sa'īd has *ibni-hi*; Sa'īd adds *allaḡī kāna ḡakara-hā 'alay-hi*; 'Aḥmad adds *fa-qāla mā taqūlu fī 'amr hāḡihi al-jāriyah qāla fa-'aqbala 'alā imra'ati-hi fa-qāla la-hā mā taqūliṡa yā hāḡihi qāla fa-'aqbalat 'alā 'abī bakr*; Sa'īd adds *al-'ajūz*; 'Aḥmad omits *yā ibn 'abī quḡḡāfah*; 'Aḥmad has *'in 'ankaḡnā hāḡā al-fatā 'ilay-ka tuṡību-hu wa-tudḡilu-hu fī dīni-ka allaḡī 'anta 'alay-hi*, Ibn Bišr has *[muṡbⁱⁿ/muṡbi'] hāḡā al-fatā wa-mudḡilu-hu fī dīni-ka allaḡī 'anta 'alay-hi 'in [[anta zawwajta-hu/tazawwaja 'ilay-ka]]*, and Sa'īd has *'in zawwajnā ibna-nā ibnata-ka 'an tuṡbi'a-hu wa-tudḡila-hu fī dīni-ka allaḡī 'anta 'alay-hi*; 'Aḥmad has *'alay-hi 'abū bakr*, Ibn Bišr has *'abū bakrin 'alā al-muṡ'im bn 'adiyy*, and Sa'īd has *'alā zawji-hā al-muṡ'im*; Ibn Bišr has *fa-qāla [a-taqūlu mā taqūlu]*, where the other two have *fa-qāla mā taqūlu*; 'Aḥmad has *'anta*, where the other two have *hāḡihi*; 'Aḥmad has *la-taqūlu*, Ibn Bišr has *[la-]taqūlu*, and Sa'īd has *taqūlu*; 'Aḥmad has *mā tasma'u*, Ibn Bišr has *ḡālika*, and Sa'īd has *ḡāka*; Sa'īd adds *qāla*; 'Aḥmad has *qāma*, where the other two have *ḡaraja*; 'Aḥmad has *wa-laysa*, where the other two have *wa-qad 'aḡhaba allāh*; Ibn Bišr has *mā kāna*, Sa'īd has *al-'idah allatī kānat*, and 'Aḥmad has nothing; 'Aḥmad has *al-maw'id ṡay'*, where Ibn Bišr has *'idati-hi allatī wa'ada-hu* and Sa'īd has *'idati-hi allatī wa'ada-hā 'iyyā-*

hu; Ibn Bišr adds *fa-raja'a*; 'Aḥmad has *la-hā 'abū bakr*, where the other two have *li-kawlah*; 'Aḥmad has *qūlī li-rasūl allāh fa-l-ya'ti*, where the other two have *id'ī lī rasūl allāh fa-da'at-hu*; 'Aḥmad adds *qāla*; Ibn Bišr omits *fa-jā'a*; 'Aḥmad adds *rasūl allāh*; 'Aḥmad has *fa-malaka-hā*, Ibn Bišr has *fa-zawwaja-hā*, and Sa'īd has *fa-'ankaḥa-hu*; Ibn Bišr added either *min rasūl allāh* or *'iyyā-hu*; 'Aḥmad added *qālat kawlah*; Sa'īd has *fa-*, where the other two have *ṭumma*; 'Aḥmad replaces the rest of this element with just *inṭalaqtu 'ilā sawdah*; Ibn Bišr has *karajat* and Sa'īd has *karajtu*; Ibn Bišr has *daḡalat* and Sa'īd has *daḡaltu*; Ibn Bišr adds *[ibnat/bint] zam'ah*; Ibn Bišr has *fa-qālat [la-hā]* and Sa'īd has *fa-qultu yā sawdah*; Ibn Bišr has *dālika* and Sa'īd has *dāka*; Sa'īd adds *qālat*; 'Aḥmad has *wa-'abū-hā šayk kabīr*, Ibn Bišr has *wa-kāna šayk^{an} kabīr^{an}*, and Sa'īd has *wa-huwa šayk kabīr*; Ibn Bišr adds *qad 'adraka[t]-hu al-sinn*; 'Aḥmad has *jalasa*, where the other two have *taḡallafa*; 'Aḥmad has *al-mawāsim*, where the other two have *al-ḥajj*; Ibn Bišr has *fa-daḡalat 'alay-hi*, Sa'īd has *fa-daḡaltu 'alay-hi*, and 'Aḥmad has nothing; Ibn Bišr has *ḥayyat*, where the other two have *ḥayyaytu*; 'Aḥmad omits *'ahl*; 'Aḥmad adds *[f/w]a-qultu 'an'im ṣabāḥ^{an}*; Sa'īd omits *fa-qāla man 'anti*; 'Aḥmad has *qultu kawlah bint ḥakīm*, Ibn Bišr has *fa-qālat kawlah bint ḥakīm*, and Sa'īd has nothing; 'Aḥmad adds *qālat fa-raḥḥaba bī wa-*; Sa'īd omits *qāla*; 'Aḥmad has *mā šā'a allāh 'an yaqūla*, Ibn Bišr has *[w/f]a-mā ša'nu-ki*, and Sa'īd has nothing; 'Aḥmad has *qālat qultu*, Ibn Bišr has *[fa-]qālat*, and Sa'īd has *ṭumma qultu*; 'Aḥmad has *muḥammad bn 'abd allāh bn 'abd al-muṭṭalib yaḡkuru*, Ibn Bišr has *'arsala-nī muḥammad bn 'abd allāh [ilay-ka] 'aḡtubu 'alay-ka*, and Sa'īd has *'inna muḥammad bn 'abd allāh bn 'abd al-muṭṭalib 'arsala-nī 'aḡtubu 'alay-hi*; 'Aḥmad adds *bint zam'ah*; 'Aḥmad adds *fa-*; 'Aḥmad has *-ka*, where the other two have *-ki*; Ibn Bišr adds *fa-*; 'Aḥmad has *qultu tuḥibbu dāka*, where the other two have *qālat tuḥibbu dālika*; 'Aḥmad omits the rest of the element; Ibn Bišr has *fa-qāla id'ī-hā [lī]*, where Sa'īd has *qāla fa-id'ī-hā 'ilayya*; Ibn Bišr adds *fa-jā'at*; Ibn Bišr has *bunayyah*, where Sa'īd has *sawdah*; Ibn Bišr has *'inna ḥāḍihi taz'umu*, where Sa'īd has *za'amat ḥāḍihi*; Ibn Bišr has *'a-tuḥibbīna*, where Sa'īd has *'a-fa-tuḥibbīna*; 'Aḥmad has *[fa-]qūlī la-hu fa-l-ya'ti*, where the other two have *id'ī-hi lī*; 'Aḥmad omits *fa-da'at-hu*; 'Aḥmad has *rasūl allāh*, Ibn Bišr may have had *rasūl allāh*, and Sa'īd omitted it; 'Aḥmad has *fa-malaka-hā*, Ibn Bišr has *fa-zawwaja-hā [iyyā/min]-hu*, and Sa'īd has *fa-zawwaja-hu*; 'Aḥmad adds *qālat*; 'Aḥmad has *wa-qadima*, Ibn Bišr has either *fa-jā'a-hā 'aḡū-hā* or *lammā qadima*, and 'Aḥmad has *fa-jā'a 'aḡū-hā*; 'Aḥmad has *'abd bn zam'ah*, Ibn Bišr has *'abd bn zam'ah min al-ḥajj*, and Sa'īd has *min al-ḥajj 'abd bn zam'ah*; Ibn Bišr has *yaḡtī*, Sa'īd has *yaḡtū*, and 'Aḥmad may have had either; 'Aḥmad has *'alá*, where the other two have *fī*; Sa'īd omits *la-'amru-ka*; Ibn Bišr has *'aḡtī*, Sa'īd has *'aḡtū*, and 'Aḥmad may have had either; 'Aḥmad has *'alá*, where the other two have *fī*; 'Aḥmad omits *bint zam'ah*; Sa'īd adds *qāla*; 'Aḥmad has *fa-lammā qadimnā*, Ibn Bišr had either *fa-qadimnā* or *fa-lammā qadimnā*, and both Sa'īd and 'Abū Dāwūd have *fa-qadimnā*; Sa'īd and 'Abū Dāwūd has *fa-*, Ibn Bišr may have had *fa-*, and 'Aḥmad omitted it; 'Aḥmad has *al-sunḥ* before *fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-ḡazraj*, Ibn Bišr has *fī al-sunḥ* after *fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-ḡazraj*, Sa'īd may have had either, and 'Abū Dāwūd has neither; Ibn Bišr and Sa'īd have *fa-jā'a rasūl allāh fa-daḡala bayta-nā fa-ijtama'a 'ilay-hi rijāl min al-'anṣār wa-nisā'*, absent in both 'Aḥmad and Sa'īd; 'Aḥmad has *fa-'innī la-'urajjaḥu bayna 'aḡqayn wa-'anā ibnat tis' id'jā'at 'ummī fa-'anzalat-nī*, Ibn Bišr has *fa-jā'at-nī 'ummī wa-[innī/'anā] [la-]fī 'urjūḥah bayna 'aḡqayn tarjaḥu bī fa-'anzalat-nī [min al-'urjūḥati]*, Sa'īd has *fa-jā'at-nī 'ummī wa-'anā [fī/'alá] 'urjūḥah bayna 'aḡqayn yurjaḥu bī fa-'anzalat-nī*, and 'Abū Dāwūd has *fa-wa-allāh 'innī la-'alá 'urjūḥah bayna 'aḡqayn fa-jā'at-nī 'ummī fa-'anzalat-nī*; 'Aḥmad has *wa-faraqat jumaymat^{an} kānat lī* (in

a different location), Ibn Bišr has *wa-lī jumaymah fa-faraqat-hā*, Saʿīd has *ṭumma faraqat jumaymat^{an} kānat lī*, and ʿAbū Dāwūd has *wa-lī jumaymah*; ʿAḥmad has *ṭumma maṣat bī ḥattá intahat bī ʿilá al-bāb wa-ʿanā ʿanhaju fa-masaḥat wajhī bi-šayʿ min māʿ*, Ibn Bišr has *wa-masaḥat wajhī bi-šayʿ min māʿ ṭumma ʿaqbalat taqūdu-nī ḥattá waqafat bī ʿinda al-bāb wa-ʿinnī la-ʿanhaju*, and Saʿīd has *wa-masaḥat wajhī bi-šayʿ min māʿ ṭumma ʿaqbalat taqūdu-nī ḥattá [ʿidā] kuntu ʿinda al-bāb waqafat bī*; Ibn Bišr has *ḥattá sakana [bī]/[min] nafasī*, Saʿīd has *ḥattá dahaba baʿḍ nafasī*, and ʿAḥmad has nothing; Ibn Bišr has *ʿalay-hi*, where the other two have *ʿalá rasūl allāh*; Ibn Bišr has *fa-ʿidā rasūl allāh jālis ʿalá sarīr*, Saʿīd has *wa-huwa jālis ʿalá sarīr*, and ʿAḥmad has nothing; ʿAḥmad has *wa-fī al-bayt*, where the other two have *fī bayti-nā*; Ibn Bišr adds *wa-ʿinda-hu*; Saʿīd omits *rijāl wa-nisāʿ*; Ibn Bišr adds *min al-ʿanṣār*; ʿAḥmad adds *fa-ʿajlasat-nī fī hijri-hi*; Saʿīd has *fī-hinna*, where the other two have *fī-him*; Saʿīd has *la-hunna*, where the other two have *la-hum*; ʿAḥmad adds *qālat*; Saʿīd has *wa-*, where the other two have *fa-*; ʿAḥmad has *qāma*, where the other two have *waṭaba*; Saʿīd has *al-qawm*, where the other two have *al-rijāl*; Ibn Bišr and Saʿīd both have *fī bayti-nā*, absent in both Ibn Rāhwayh and ʿAḥmad; Ibn Bišr and Saʿīd both have *fa-*, where ʿAḥmad has *wa-*, and Ibn Rāhwayh has nothing; Ibn Rāhwayh and ʿAḥmad both have *wa-*, absent in both Ibn Bišr and Saʿīd; ʿAḥmad adds *lā wa-allāh*; ʿAḥmad has *ḍabaḥa*, where the other three have *nuḥirat*; ʿAḥmad switches the order of *šāt^{an}* and *jazūr^{an}*; Ibn Rāhwayh omits *ḍubihat ʿalayya*; ʿAḥmad adds *min*; Ibn Bišr and Saʿīd both have *ḥattá ʿarsala ʿilay-nā*, where Ibn Rāhwayh has *ḥattá baʿaṭa ʿilay-nā*, and ʿAḥmad has *kāna[t] yabʿaṭu bi-hā*; Ibn Rāhwayh has *bi-ḥafnah* (an obvious scribal error), where Ibn Bišr and Saʿīd both have *bi-jafnah* and ʿAḥmad has *wa-lākin jafnah* (which has been relocated earlier in the element); Ibn Bišr and Saʿīd both have *kāna yursilu bi-hā*, where Ibn Rāhwayh has *wa-kāna yabʿaṭu bi-hā*, and ʿAḥmad has nothing; Ibn Rāhwayh has *ʿilay-nā*, where the other three have *ʿilá rasūl allāh*; ʿAḥmad has *ʿidā dāra bayna nisāʿi-hi* and Ibn Bišr has *ʿidā dāra fī nisāʿi-hi*, where the other two have nothing; and finally, ʿAḥmad added *fa-qad ʿalimtu ʿanna-hu baʿaṭa bi-hā*.

There are also some notable discrepancies in the *ʿisnād* of this hadith. Firstly, who did Muḥammad b. ʿAmr cite as his source? Muḥammad b. Bišr has him cite both ʿAbū Salamah and Yaḥyá, where Ibn Rāhwayh, Saʿīd, ʿAḥmad, and ʿAbū Dāwūd have only Yaḥyá. The ascription to ʿAbū Salamah could thus simply be an addition by Muḥammad b. Bišr, although the fact that it is shared by Ibn Saʿd (whose version is otherwise hopelessly mutated) could indicate that, at certain times, Muḥammad b. ʿAmr himself gave his tradition a dual ascription. In fact, Ibn Saʿd and Muḥammad b. Bišr corroborate each other on a second key point in the *ʿisnād*, which has been alluded to previously: both of them have Muḥammad b. ʿAmr citing both ʿAbū Salamah and Yaḥyá as the ultimate sources for his tradition (i.e., a *munqaṭiʿ* ascription)—based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity, this must surely be the original version of the tradition. However, Ibn Rāhwayh, Saʿīd, ʿAḥmad, and ʿAbū Dāwūd all corroborate each other not just in citing only Yaḥyá, but in having Yaḥyá transmit from ʿĀʾišah (i.e., a *muttaṣil* ascription). (Ibn

Rāhwayh's addition thereto of Sawdah can immediately be dismissed as an error, since in every other version, the relevant element is part of 'Ā'īshah's narration.) All of this is consistent with Muḥammad b. 'Amr himself having transmitted his tradition with two different ascriptions: first he transmitted it as simply the statement of 'Abū Salamah and Yaḥyá, and then he omitted 'Abū Salamah and also raised it all the way back to 'Ā'īshah herself. Even this raised version is still partially *munqaṭi'*, however: in the first half at least, the narrative speaks about 'Ā'īshah in the third person and covers events where she was not present. Both versions could be considered *muttaṣil* in their second halves, however, since 'Ā'īshah (who was remembered as having transmitted to both 'Abū Salamah and Yaḥyá) is there introduced as a source and narrator.

Despite all of this, much of Muḥammad b. 'Amr's original wordings survive, thanks to the survival of three full redactions and two abridged redactions of his students and the students of his students. Of course, many wordings remain uncertain, and it seems likely that Muḥammad b. 'Amr himself paraphrased his hadith in the course of successive retellings,¹¹³⁶ such that that there is no single original redaction that can be reconstructed. Still, the following *wordings* and *sequence* can at least be traced back to Muḥammad b. 'Amr, even if he never articulated his hadith in exactly this way in a single instance:

...ʿabū salamat^a wa-yaḥyá bn^u ʿabdī al-raḥmānī bnī ḥāṭibⁱⁿ qālā lammā [mātat/halakāt/tuwuffiyat] kaḍijāt^u jāʿat kawlat^u bint^u ḥakīmⁱⁿ imraʿat^u ʿuṭmān^a bnī mazʿūnⁱⁿ ʿilā rasūlī allāhī [fa-]qālat yā rasūl^a allāhī ʿa-lā tuzawwija qāla wa-man qālat ʿin šīʿta bikr^{an} wa-ʿin šīʿta ṭayyib^{an} qāla wa-manī al-bikr^u qālat ibnat^u ʿaḥabbī kaḷqī allāhī ʿilay-ka ʿāʾiṣat^u bint^u ʿabī bakrⁱⁿ qāla wa-manī al-ṭayyib^u qālat sawdat^u bint^u zamʿat^a qad ʾāmanat bi-ka wa-ittabaʿat-ka ʿalā mā [taqūlu/alladī] ʾanta ʿalay-hi qāla fa-idḥabī fa-udkurī-himā ʿalayya [fa-jāʿat] fa-daḳalat bayt^a ʿabī bakrⁱⁿ fa-qālat yā ʾumma rūmān^a māḍā ʾadḳala allāh^u ʿalay-kum min^a al-ḳayrī wa-al-barakatī qālat wa-mā ḍāka qālat ʾarsala-nī rasūl^u allāhī ʾaḳṭubu ʿalay-hi ʿāʾiṣat^a qālat intaḻirī ʾabā bakrⁱⁿ fa-ʾinna[-hu] ʾātⁱⁿ fa-jāʿa ʾabū bakrⁱⁿ fa-qālat yā ʾabā bakrⁱⁿ māḍā

¹¹³⁶ E.g., sometimes he transmitted it with *al-sunḥ* before *fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-ḳazraj* (ʿAḥmad; Saʿīd), and sometimes he transmitted it with *fī al-sunḥ* after *fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-ḳazraj* (Ibn Bišr; Saʿīd); sometimes he transmitted it with *fa-jāʿa rasūl allāh fa-daḳala bayta-nā fa-ijtamaʿa ʿilay-hi rijāl min al-ʾanṣār wa-nisāʾ* (Ibn Bišr; Saʿīd), and sometimes without (ʿAḥmad; ʾAbū Dāwūd); sometimes he placed *fa-jāʿat-nī ʾummī* at the beginning of the 'swing' element (ʿAḥmad; ʾAbū Dāwūd), and sometimes he placed it near the end (Ibn Bišr; Saʿīd); sometimes he transmitted *wa-lī jumaymah* (Ibn Bišr; ʾAbū Dāwūd), and sometimes he transmitted *wa-faraḳat jumaymat^{an} kānat lī* (ʿAḥmad; Saʿīd); sometimes he transmitted it with *fī bayti-nā* (Ibn Bišr; Saʿīd), and sometimes without (Ibn Rāhwayh; ʿAḥmad); sometimes he transmitted it with *ʾidā dāra bayna/fī nisāʾi-hi* (ʿAḥmad; Ibn Bišr), and sometimes without (Ibn Rāhwayh; Saʿīd); etc.

'adk̄ala allāh^u 'alay-kum min^a al-ḳayrⁱ wa-al-barakatⁱ [qāla wa-mā dāka qālat] 'arsala-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ 'aḳṭubu 'alay-hi 'ā'īṣat^a qāla wa-hal taṣluḥu la-hu 'inna-mā hiya ibnat^u 'aḳī-hi fa-raja'at 'ilā rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ fa-ḍakarat ḍālika la-hu fa-qāla irja'ī 'ilay-hi fa-qūlⁱ la-hu 'anā 'aḳū-ka wa-'anta 'aḳī fī al-'islāmⁱ wa-ibnatu-ka taṣluḥu lī fa-[[raja'at 'ilay-hi]/[atat 'abā bakrⁱⁿ]] fa-ḍakarat ḍālika la-hu qāla intaḏirī [[ḥattā 'arjī'a]/[wa-ḳaraja]] fa-qālat 'umm^u rūmān^a 'inna al-muṭ'im^a bn^a 'adiyyⁱⁿ kāna ḍakara-hā 'alā ibni-hi wa-allāhⁱ mā wa'ada wa'd^{an} qaṭṭ^u fa-'aḳlafa[-hu] fa-daḳala 'abū bakrⁱⁿ 'alā muṭ'imⁱⁿ wa-'inda-hu imra'atu-hu 'umm^u [al-fatā/ibni-hi] fa-qālat yā ibn^a 'abī quḥāfat^a la'alla-ka 'in [ankaḥnā/zawwajnā] hādā al-fatā [ibnata-ka/'ilay-ka] [tuṣību-hu/'an tuṣbī'a-hu] wa-tudḳila-hu fī dīni-ka alladī 'anta 'alay-hi fa-'aqbala [[alay-hi 'abū bakrⁱⁿ]/[abū bakrⁱⁿ 'alā al-muṭ'imⁱ bnⁱ 'adiyyⁱⁿ]/[alā zawji-hā al-muṭ'imⁱ]] fa-qāla mā taqūlu hādihī fa-qāla 'inna-hā [la-]taqūlu ḍā[li]ka fa-ḳaraja 'abū bakrⁱⁿ wa-qad 'aḍhaba allāh^u [[mā kāna]/[al-'idat^a allatī kānat]] fī nafsi-hi min 'idati-hi allatī wa'ada-[[hu]/[hā 'iyyā-hu]] fa-qāla li-ḳawlat^a idⁱ lī rasūl^a allāhⁱ fa-da'at-hu fa-jā'a fa-[zawwaja/'ankaḥa/malaka]-hā wa-hiya yawma-'idⁱⁿ ibnat^u sittⁱ sinⁱⁿ^a tumma ḳarajat fa-daḳalat 'alā sawdat^a fa-qālat [la-hā] mādā 'adk̄ala allāh^u 'alay-ki min^a al-ḳayrⁱ wa-al-barakatⁱ qālat wa-mā dāka qālat 'arsala-nī rasūl^u allāhⁱ 'aḳṭubu-ki 'alay-hi fa-qālat wadidtu udḳulī 'alā 'abī fa-udḳurī ḍā[li]ka la-hu [qālat] wa-[huwa/'abū-hā/kāna] ṣayḳ^{un} kabīr^{un} qad taḳallafa 'anⁱ al-ḥajjⁱ fa-[daḳalat/daḳaltu] 'alay-hi fa-[ḥayyat/ḥayyaytu]-hu bi-taḥiyyatⁱ 'ahlⁱ al-jāhiliyyatⁱ fa-qāla man 'anti fa-qālat ḳawlat^u bint^u ḥakīmⁱⁿ [wa-]qāla [w/f]a-mā [[ša'nu-ki]/[šā'a allāhu 'an yaqūla]] [fa-]qālat [qultu] [arsala-nī/] muḥammad^u bn^u 'abdi allāhⁱ bnⁱ 'abdi al-muṭṭalibⁱ [/arsala-nī] 'aḳṭubu 'alay-[ka/hi] sawdat^a [fa-]qāla kuḥ^{un} karīm^{un} mādā taqūlu ṣāhibatu-ki qālat tuḥibbu ḍālika [fa-]qāla [fa-]idⁱ-hā [lī/'ilayya] fa-da'at-hā [fa-jā'at] fa-qāla 'ay [bunayyat^u/sawdat^u] [[za'amat hādihī]/[inna hādihī taz'umu]] 'anna muḥammad^a bn^a 'abdi allāhⁱ bnⁱ 'abdi al-muṭṭalibⁱ 'arsala yaḳṭubu-ki wa-huwa kuḥ^{un} karīm^{un} 'a-[fa-]tuḥibbīna 'an 'uzawwija-ki-hi qālat na'am qāla idⁱ-hi lī fa-da'at-hu fa-jā'a [rasūl^u allāhⁱ] fa-zawwaja-hā fa-[[jā'a-hā 'aḳū-hā]/[qadima] 'abd^u bn^u zam'at^a min^a al-ḥajjⁱ fa-ja'ala yaḥt[ū/i] fī ra'si-hi al-turāb^a fa-qāla ba'da 'an 'aslama la-'amru-ka 'innī la-safih^{un} yawma 'aḥt[ū/i] fī ra'sī al-turāb^a 'an tazawwaja rasūl^u allāhⁱ sawdat^a bint^a zam'at^a qālat 'ā'īṣat^u fa-[lammā] qadimnā al-madīnat^a [fa-]nazalnā [al-sunḥa/] fī banī al-ḥārītⁱ bnⁱ al-ḳazrajⁱ [/fī al-sunḥi] qālat fa-jā'a rasūl^u allāhⁱ fa-daḳala bayta-nā fa-ijtima'a 'ilay-hi rijāl^{un} min^a al-'anṣārⁱ wa-nisā^{un} [fa-jā'at-nī 'ummī/] wa-[innī/'anā] [la-][fī/'alā] 'urjūḥatⁱⁿ bayna 'adqaynⁱ [yurjahu/tarjahu] bī [/fa-jā'at-nī 'ummī] fa-'anzalat-nī [[wa-lī jumaymat^{un}]/[wa-faraqat jumaymat^{an} kānat lī]] wa-masaḥat wajhī bi-ṣayⁱⁿ min māⁱⁿ tumma 'aqbalat taqūdu-nī ḥattā waqafat bī 'inda al-bābⁱ wa-'innī la-'anhaju ḥattā [[sakana bī min]/[dahaba ba'd^u]] nafasī tumma daḳalat bī 'alā rasūl^u allāhⁱ [[wa-huwa]/[fa-'idā rasūl^u allāhⁱ]] jālis^{un} 'alā sarīrⁱⁿ fī bayti-nā [wa-'inda-hu] rijāl^{un} wa-nisā^{un} [min^a al-'anṣārⁱ] fa-'ajlasat-nī fī ḥijri-hi fa-qālat hā'ulāⁱ 'ahlu-ki fa-bāraka allāh^u la-ki fī-him wa-bāraka la-hum fī-ki fa-waṭaba al-rijāl^u wa-al-nisā^u fa-ḳarajū fa-banā bī rasūl^u allāhⁱ [fī bayti-nā] [wa-]mā nuḥirat 'alayya jazūr^{un} wa-lā ḍubihāt 'alayya ṣāt^{an} ḥattā 'arsala 'ilay-nā sa'd^u

bn^u ‘ubādat^a bi-jafnatⁱⁿ kāna yursilu bi-hā ‘ilā rasūlⁱ allāhⁱ ‘idā dāra
[fi/bayna] nisā’i-hi wa-‘anā yawma-‘idⁱⁿ [bint/ibnat]^u tis^{‘i} sinīn^a.

The students of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr preserved the gist of this lengthy hadith quite accurately (abridgements aside), and many wordings as well—this would suggest a written transmission. However, the extensive divergences in wording between the redactions of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s students, not to mention divergences in the order of elements, suggest paraphrastic oral transmission. In other words, in the course of transmission from Muḥammad to his students, his tradition evidently underwent substantial but constrained paraphrasing. All of this is consistent with some kind of combined oral and written transmission, as if paraphrasing occurred alongside a basic written outline of the hadith.

A Digression into Form Criticism

The structure of this hadith’s narrative and content has important implications for its prehistory and provenance. The hadith begins with an omniscient narrator describing the death of Ẓadījah, and Ẓawlah’s suggestion to the Prophet that he should remarry; Ẓawlah then visits ‘Abū Bakr to bring him the Prophet’s proposal of marriage to ‘Ā’iṣah, and at this point, the omniscient narrator leaves Ẓawlah and follows ‘Abū Bakr as he visits and speaks to the pagan family of Jubayr about cancelling ‘Ā’iṣah’s prior engagement thereto; thereafter, the omniscient narrator follows ‘Abū Bakr back to Ẓawlah, who is instructed to relay the news to the Prophet—at which point, the Prophet comes and marries her.¹¹³⁷ (In some versions, the omniscient narrator then specifies that ‘Ā’iṣah was six years old at the time.) Thereafter, the omniscient narrator follows Ẓawlah as she visits Sawdah to bring her the Prophet’s proposal of marriage, and after a discussion with Sawdah’s venerable father, the match is approved and the news is relayed to the Prophet—at which point, the Prophet comes and marries her.¹¹³⁸ Finally, the omniscient narrator recounts how Sawdah’s brother was still at that time

¹¹³⁷ ...fa-jā’a fa-[zawwaja/’ankaḥa/malaka]-hā....

¹¹³⁸ ...fa-jā’a [rasūl allāh] fa-zawwaja-hā....

an intransigent pagan, who later converted to Islam and regretted not celebrating this wedding at the time.

At this point, there is a definite shift in the hadith: ‘Ā’iṣah is explicitly introduced as the narrator (*qālat ‘ā’iṣah*), and henceforth recounts in great detail the events leading up to her marital consummation: how her family emigrated to Madinah and settled in al-Sunḥ, amongst the Banū al-Ḥārith b. al-Ḳazraj; how men and women from the ‘Anṣār were present when the Prophet came to marry her; how she was playing on a swing between two palm trees when her mother came for her; how she had shoulder-length hair at the time; how her face was washed; how she was out of breath; how she was led into a house, where the Prophet was waiting, and some men and women congratulated her; how the men and women departed, and the Prophet consummated his marriage to her; how Sa’d b. ‘Ubādah brought her food; and, finally, how she was nine years old at the time.

It is clear that Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith is actually two distinct narratives that have been stitched together: one from an omniscient narrator (who is perhaps meant to be Yaḥyá), who follows Ḳawlah around as she arranges the Prophet’s marriages to both ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah, and who also switches to following ‘Abū Bakr at one point; and one from ‘Ā’iṣah, who narrates her own marital consummation in excruciating detail. There is no way that ‘Ā’iṣah could be the narrator in the first section: the events mostly occur in her absence, and she is described therein in the third person. Thus, at minimum, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith comprises *two distinct narrations*. Indeed, the presence of *qālat ‘ā’iṣah* between the two sections even remains as a kind of stitch line, showing where the two initially-discrete narratives were joined together.

The initial discreteness of the two narratives can also be discerned in a subtle tension therebetween: in the first narrative, the Prophet comes and marries ‘Ā’iṣah immediately after ‘Abū Bakr’s successful cancellation of her prior engagement to Jubayr (i.e., in Makkah, before the Hijrah); but in the second narrative, ‘Ā’iṣah is married in Madinah, after the Hijrah. Of course, this discrepancy is explained away in light of the second narrative: ‘Ā’iṣah was merely *engaged* to the Prophet in Makkah, and it was only in Madinah that their marriage was *consummated*. And yet, there is no hint in the first narrative of a prolonged engagement, no hint that ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital consummation was delayed for years: only the second narrative would lead us to read such into the first. Moreover, ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage to the Prophet is described *in identical*

terms to his marriage to Sawdah, which is usually understood to have been consummated soon afterwards (i.e., in Makkah, before the Hijrah).¹¹³⁹ Given the parallel language used for ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah (not to mention the fact that ‘Ā’iṣah is depicted here as being married *before* Sawdah), we would naturally assume that both ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah were fully married to the Prophet (i.e., consummated) in Makkah, before the Hijrah. At the very least, the first narrative seems ignorant of the second, which is consistent with both reflecting independent—or originally-independent—streams of marriage tradition pertaining to ‘Ā’iṣah.

If Muḥammad b. ‘Amr indeed combined two separate narratives into a single hadith, whence came said narratives? Did he simply take two reports from the same source (e.g., Yaḥyá) and combine them into one, or did he instead combine two different reports from two different sources? As it happens, several of the elements comprising the first narrative can be found in other hadiths—for example, in the following hadith disseminated by the Egyptian CL al-Layṭ b. Sa’d (d. 175/791), citing an Egypto-Madinan SS back to ‘Urwah:

...Yazīd b. ‘abī Ḥabīb, from ‘Irāk, that ‘Urwah reported to him, that the Messenger of God proposed a marriage between himself and ‘Ā’iṣah to ‘Abū Bakr, whereupon ‘Abū Bakr said: “But I am your brother!” Then he said: “Verily you are my brother in the religion of God and his scripture [only]: she is permissible for me [to marry].”¹¹⁴⁰

Something similar appears in another hadith recorded by Ibn Sa’d, citing an Iraqi SS back to Kufan Follower ‘Aṭīyyah al-‘Awfī:

Yazīd b. Hārūn reported to us—he said: “Fuḍayl b. Marzūq related to us, from ‘Aṭīyyah, who said: “The Messenger of God proposed to marry ‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr when she was a young girl, so ‘Abū Bakr said: “O Messenger of God, can a man marry the daughter of his brother?” Then he [i.e., the Prophet] said: “Verily you are my brother in my religion [only].””

He [i.e., ‘Aṭīyyah] said: “So he married her off to him for some household goods, the amount of which was fifty, or close to fifty. Her nursemaid came

¹¹³⁹ E.g., Barbara F. Stowasser, *Women in the Qur'an, Traditions, and Interpretation* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1994), 170, n. 60 (citing various reports from Ibn Sa’d); ‘Ismā‘īl b. ‘Umar b. Kaṭīr (ed. Muṣṭafá ‘Abd al-Wāḥid), *al-Sīrah al-Nabawīyyah*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1976), p. 144.

¹¹⁴⁰ Synthesised from Buḳārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, III, p. 1065; Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, XIV, p. 256, # 14031; ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Baṭṭah al-‘Ukbarī (ed. Riḍā Mu‘ṭī *et al.*), *al-‘Ibānah al-Kubrā*, vol. 9 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Rāyah, n. d.), p. 675, # 184.

to her whilst she was playing with some children, then she took her by the hand and hurried her along to the house. She made her look suitable, then took a *ḥijāb* with her, then led her to the Messenger of God.”¹¹⁴¹

Ibn Sa‘d also recorded a report containing another element that appears in Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s tradition, citing a Kufan SS back to Ibn ‘Abbās:

Hišām b. Muḥammad b. al-Sā’ib al-Kalbī reported to us, from his father, from ‘Abū Ṣāliḥ, from Ibn ‘Abbās, who said: “The Messenger of God proposed marriage between ‘Ā’iṣah and himself to ‘Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, then ‘Abū Bakr said: “O Messenger of God, I have [already] promised her, or mentioned her, to Muṭ‘im b. ‘Adī b. Nawfal b. ‘Abd Manāf, for his son Jubayr, so bear with me until I withdraw her from them.” Then he did that, whereupon the Messenger of God married her—and at that time, she was a virgin.”¹¹⁴²

It is thus possible that Muḥammad b. ‘Amr constructed the first narrative in his hadith out of a set of existing elements, some of which survive independently in hadiths such as those just cited. However, since all of these reports—at least in their extant forms—postdate Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, the direction of causation could be reversed: it is possible that the spread of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith spawned spinoff traditions, such as those just cited. Alternatively, it may be the case that all of these hadiths, including Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith, reflect common tradition that was circulating even earlier than Muḥammad b. ‘Amr. At this stage, little more can be said thereon.

By contrast, the origin of the second narrative comprising Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith can be pinpointed fairly precisely: there is little doubt that it was borrowed from Version 4 of Hišām b. ‘Urwah’s marital-age hadith, either directly from Hišām, or from one of Hišām’s students, such as ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, Ḥammād b. Salamah, or ‘Alī b. Mushir. There are several reasons to think this. Firstly, the redactions of ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, Ḥammād, ‘Alī, and Muḥammad b. ‘Amr (i.e., his second narrative) are all markedly more similar to each other than to all other versions of the marital-age hadith: in all of them, ‘Ā’iṣah recounts how, after her emigration to Madinah, a woman came to her whilst she was playing on a swing, when she had shoulder-length hair; she was cleaned and beautified; and she was consummated in marriage at age nine. This immediately

¹¹⁴¹ Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 40.

¹¹⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 39.

implies that all four redactions constitute a common tradition and share a more recent common ancestor *vis-à-vis* all other versions of the marital-age hadith—a recent common ancestor comprising all of these inherited elements. This already fits awkwardly with the claim of the relevant *ʿisnāds* that ʿĀʾiṣah, operating in the distant depths of the 7th Century CE, is the source for (i.e., the formulator of) this textual recent common ancestor: given the rates of mutation established for the 1st Islamic Century already, a much more recent source therefor would be expected.¹¹⁴³ This problem is immediately solved if Muḥammad b. ʿAmr’s claim to an alternative path back to ʿĀʾiṣah is disregarded: the other three *ʿisnāds* all cite Hišām as their common source, who—chronologically—fits perfectly as the formulator of the textual recent common ancestor of this distinctive tradition.

However, an even stronger case can be made. In terms of elemental sequence and specific wording, the redactions of ʾAbū ʾUsāmah and ʿAlī are much closer to each other than they are to either Ḥammād’s or Muḥammad b. ʿAmr’s.¹¹⁴⁴ At the same time, the redactions of ʾAbū ʾUsāmah, ʿAlī b. Mushir, *and* Muḥammad b. ʿAmr are much closer to each other than they are to Ḥammād’s.¹¹⁴⁵ This implies that the redactions of ʾAbū ʾUsāmah, ʿAlī, and Muḥammad b. ʿAmr all share an even more recent common ancestor *vis-à-vis* Ḥammād’s, despite the fact that Muḥammad b. ʿAmr claimed a more distant common source *vis-à-vis* ʾAbū ʾUsāmah, ʿAlī, and Ḥammād. Since the differences between ʾAbū ʾUsāmah, ʿAlī, and Ḥammād’s redactions are partially explained by their common source, Hišām, having transmitted the hadith in different ways in different places (see above), this means that Muḥammad b. ʿAmr’s redaction is not just broadly similar to a tradition emanating from Hišām, but is most similar to *a specific sub-tradition* emanating from Hišām. The simplest explanation for this pattern is that Muḥammad b. ʿAmr borrowed a specific iteration of Hišām’s Version 4 hadith, out of a range of iterations thereof.

¹¹⁴³ Similarly, see Mitter, cited at the outset.

¹¹⁴⁴ E.g., both have *wuʾiktu* and *šaʾ[a]rī*, absent in the others; both have *ʾatat-nī ʾummī ʾumm rūmān*, where Muḥammad has *jāʾat-nī ʾummī* and Ḥammād has *jāʾa-nī niswah*; both have *wa-maʾī ṣawāhib[ī/āt]*, absent in the others; both have *fa-ṣaraḡat bī*, etc., absent in the others; both have *fa-ʾiqā niswah min al-ʾanṣār*, where Muḥammad has *fa-ijtamaʾa ʾilay-hi rijāl min al-ʾanṣār wa-nisāʾ*, and Ḥammād has nothing; both have the *ʾanṣār* bestowing a *barakah*, where Muḥammad has ʿĀʾiṣah’s mother invoke *bāraka allāh*, and Ḥammād has nothing; both have *duḥʾan*, absent in the others; etc.

¹¹⁴⁵ E.g., all three have *jumaymah*, where Ḥammād has *mujammamah*; all three have ʿĀʾiṣah’s mother (ʾummī or ʾumm rūmān), where Ḥammād has plural, anonymous women (*niswah*); all three mention a *bāb*, absent in Ḥammād; all three have *nafasī*, absent in Ḥammād; all three mention the *ʾanṣār*, absent from Ḥammād; all three mention blessings (i.e., variants of the *b-r-k* root), absent in Ḥammād.

That said, in three instances, the redactions of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr and ‘Alī are more similar to each other than either is to the other two,¹¹⁴⁶ even though ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah’s redactions are still generally more similar to each other. This is easily explained by ‘Alī’s redaction’s having been contaminated by the spreading hadith of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr (following Muḥammad’s initial borrowing from Hišām); after all, most of the relevant tradents (i.e., ‘Alī b. Mushir and Muḥammad’s students—Muḥammad b. Bišr, Yaḥyá b. Sa‘īd, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Idrīs, *et al.*) were operating in Kufah at the same time. That said, if ‘Alī’s version was indeed influenced by Muḥammad’s version, it seems odd that the elaborations and details in the latter are absent from the former. However, there is actually no need to posit a secondary contamination, since the pattern of evidence is consistent with only a single instance of borrowing by Muḥammad b. ‘Amr. If Hišām alternated his hadith in successive retellings (as has been argued already), then the pattern of similarities and differences can be explained as follows:

- **Firstly**, Hišām formulated Version 4, which was originally more similar to Ḥammād’s redaction, and which Ḥammād received (and paraphrased to some degree). Given that Ḥammād’s redaction is much simpler than the rest,¹¹⁴⁷ it makes sense that his would reflect an earlier phase (i.e., a less elaborated version) of Version 4.
- **Secondly**, Hišām transmitted a more elaborate iteration of Version 4 containing the wordings shared by the redactions of both Muḥammad b. ‘Amr and ‘Alī, which Muḥammad b. ‘Amr borrowed and subsequently paraphrased in his own retellings—thus, the appearance of certain novel features in his redactions.¹¹⁴⁸ The greater degree of paraphrase in Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s version (compared to those of ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah) is only to be expected, given that he belonged to an earlier generation.

¹¹⁴⁶ Both Muḥammad and ‘Alī have the line *nazalnā fī banī al-ḥāriṭ bn al-kazraj*; Muḥammad has *masaḥat wajhī bi-ṣay’ min mā’* and ‘Alī has *ṣay’^{an} min mā’ fa-masaḥat bi-hi wajhī*; and both have *’anhaju*.

¹¹⁴⁷ Not just in terms of elements, but also in terms of some details within elements—notably, the vague *niswah*.

¹¹⁴⁸ E.g., *al-ṣunḥ* in the ‘Hijrah’ element; *’adqayn* in the ‘swing’ element; the entire element of Sa‘d’s bringing food; etc.

- **Thirdly**, Hišām transmitted another—still elaborate—iteration of Version 4 containing *both* the wordings shared by the redactions of both Muḥammad b. ‘Amr and ‘Alī *and* the wordings shared by the redactions of ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, which ‘Alī inherited and transmitted to his students.
- **Fourthly**, Hišām transmitted a slightly different—but still elaborate—iteration of Version 4 (i.e., one that was still very close to that which he transmitted to ‘Alī) to ‘Abū ‘Usāmah. **Alternatively** (and this is probably the simpler explanation), Hišām transmitted the same iteration to both ‘Alī and ‘Abū ‘Usāmah, and the latter simply omitted the three wordings shared by both Muḥammad b. ‘Amr and ‘Alī in the course of his own paraphrasing.

Regardless of which specific scenario we opt for, the bottom line is this: Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s redaction is most similar to *specific sub-versions* of Version 4 of Hišām’s marital-age hadith, which is most easily explained in general by his redaction being a derivation therefrom. If Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s redaction and Hišām’s Version 4 coequally descended (via Yaḥyá and ‘Urwah, respectively) from ‘Ā’iṣah, without the occurrence of any contamination, then Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s redaction should be the outlier *vis-à-vis* the various transmissions from Hišām, since the latter transmissions would all share a more recent common source. Instead, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s redaction seems to reflect one out of a range of sub-versions emanating from Hišām.

Muḥammad b. ‘Amr did not simply copy and paste a version of Version 4 of Hišām’s hadith, however: in addition to paraphrasing what he received, he sometimes relocated the ‘marriage’ element therefrom into the first narrative in his composite hadith, at the end of the section dealing with ‘Ā’iṣah’s engagement to the Prophet.¹¹⁴⁹ This makes chronological sense: since Hišām’s hadith focuses upon the marital consummation, and the first narrative in Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith focuses on marital engagement, it makes sense that Muḥammad b. ‘Amr would relocate the one element in Hišām’s hadith pertaining to the marital engagement to the section in the first narrative dealing with that issue. Still, in some instances (perhaps reflecting the earliest phase of his transmission of this composite hadith), Muḥammad b. ‘Amr

¹¹⁴⁹ Attested by Muḥammad b. Bišr and Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá; see the relevant sections thereon, above.

retained the ‘marriage’ element in its original position, in the second narrative within his composite hadith.¹¹⁵⁰

Finally, the last element in Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith, concerning Sa’d b. ‘Ubādah’s bringing of some food to ‘Ā’iṣah after her marital consummation, can be found in various forms in several reports recorded by Ibn Sa’d, citing numerous Madinan SSs back to early Madinan authorities. Thus, the Madinan Followers ‘Abū Bakr b. Ḥazm,¹¹⁵¹ ‘Āṣim b. ‘Umar b. Qatādah,¹¹⁵² and Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zurārah¹¹⁵³ each reportedly narrated about the bowl (*jafnah*) of Sa’d b. ‘Ubādah; the Madinan Follower ‘Umārah b. Ġaziyyah and a certain ‘Amr b. Yaḥyá¹¹⁵⁴ both reportedly narrated about the content of Sa’d’s bowl, and how he would dispatch it (*yab‘aṭu bi-hā*) to the Prophet whenever he made his rounds (*dāra*)¹¹⁵⁵; and the early Madinot-Syrian traditionist Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī reportedly also mentioned how the bowl of Sa’d used to make the rounds with him,¹¹⁵⁶ as did the Madinan Companion (and wife of the Prophet) ‘Umm Salamah.¹¹⁵⁷ All of this is consistent with the element of Sa’d’s bowl’s being in circulation in Madinah in the 8th Century CE, and with Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s having incorporated this element into his composite hadith. However, absent a dedicated ICMA of these hadiths, this conclusion remains speculative.

‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Uqayl (d. post-140/757-758)

¹¹⁵⁰ Attested by ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār; see the relevant section thereon, above.

¹¹⁵¹ Ibn Sa’d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 116: Muḥammad b. ‘Umar [Madinan]—‘Abd Allāh b. Ja‘far b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Miswar [Madinan]—‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. ‘abī ‘Awn [Madinan]—‘Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. Ḥazm [Madinan].

¹¹⁵² *Ibid.*: Muḥammad b. ‘Umar [Madinan]—Muḥammad b. Šāliḥ b. Dīnār [Madinan]—‘Āṣim b. ‘Umar b. Qatādah [Madinan]—Prophet.

¹¹⁵³ *Ibid.*: Muḥammad b. ‘Umar [Madinan]—Qudāmah b. Mūsá [Madinan]—Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zurārah [Madinan].

¹¹⁵⁴ In contrast to the others, I was not able to identify ‘Amr b. Yaḥyá.

¹¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*: Muḥammad b. ‘Umar [Madinan]—Sa‘īd b. Muḥammad b. ‘abī Zayd [Madinan]—‘Umārah b. Ġaziyyah [Madinan] & ‘Amr b. Yaḥyá [Meccan].

¹¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*: Muḥammad b. ‘Umar [Madinan]—[‘Abd Allāh b.] ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Layṭī [Madinan]—Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī [Madinan].

¹¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*: pp. 116-117: Muḥammad b. ‘Umar [Madinan]—Mūsá b. Ya‘qūb [Madinan]—‘Umm Salamah [Madinan].

The prominent Andalusian Mālikī jurist and Hadith scholar Yūsuf b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Barr (d. 463/1071) recorded the following in his *al-Tamhīd li-mā fī al-Muwaṭṭa’ min al-Ma‘ānī wa-al-’Asānīd*:

‘Abd al-Wārīṭ related to us: “Qāsim related to us: “‘Aḥmad b. Zuhayr related to us—he said: “Mūsá b. ‘Ismā‘īl related to us—he said: “Ḥammād b. Salamah related to us....” [And] ‘Aḥmad b. Zuhayr [also] said: “My father related to us—he said: “Jarīr related to us....” They [i.e., Ḥammād and Jarīr] said: “Hišām b. ‘Urwah reported to us, from his father, from ‘Ā’iṣah, who said: “The Messenger of God married me when I was a girl of six or seven years, and consummated the marriage with me when I was a girl of nine years.”””””””””””

And [it is reported] in the transmission of al-’Aswad, from ‘Ā’iṣah, that the Messenger of God married her when she was a girl of nine years, whilst ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Uqayl said: “The Messenger of God married her when she was a girl of ten years (*tazawwaja-hā rasūl allāh wa-hiya ibnat ‘aṣr sinīn*).”¹¹⁵⁸

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s summary of hadiths features some familiar transmissions, but to these he adds the statement of a certain ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Uqayl, who would seem to be the Madinan Follower ‘Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Uqayl/‘Aqīl b. ‘abī Ṭālib al-Hāšimī (d. post-140/757-758), who was remembered as having transmitted Hadith to Ḥammād b. Salamah, Sufyān al-Tawrī, and Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah, amongst others.¹¹⁵⁹ ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad’s statement is striking, since he places ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital engagement (*tazawwuj*) at age ten, rather than the usual six or seven, or even the unusual nine. This could be the product of simple error, or it could reflect a lingering, alternative tradition of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age. Unfortunately, there is no way to tell: even the attribution of this statement to ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad cannot be confirmed, since I was unable to find a single other reference thereto, besides Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s. Moreover, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr does not even provide an *’isnād* for this statement back to ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad, which only compounds the matter. Suffice to say, ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad cannot be considered a credible tradent or source within the broader marital-age tradition.

¹¹⁵⁸ Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (ed. ‘A’rāb), *Tamhīd*, XIX, p. 108.

¹¹⁵⁹ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, pp. 204-205.

ʿIsmāʿīl b. Jaʿfar (d. pre-148/765)

I was able to find a single report ascribed to the ʿIsmāʿīlī imam ʿIsmāʿīl b. Jaʿfar (who lived in Madinah), recorded as follows by the eminent Twelver traditionist Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī/al-Kulīnī (d. 328/939-940) in his *al-Furūʿ min al-Kāfī*:

ʿAlī b. ʿIbrāhīm [related] from Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā, from Yūnus, from ʿAbū ʿAyyūb al-Ḳazzāz, who said: “I asked ʿIsmāʿīl b. Jaʿfar: “When is the testimony of a boy permissible?” He said: “When he attains ten years.””

He [i.e., ʿAbū ʿAyyūb] said: “I said: “And is his authority [over himself] permissible?””

He [i.e., ʿAbū ʿAyyūb] said: “Then he said: “Verily the Messenger of God consummated his marriage with ʿĀʾiṣḥāh when she was a girl of ten years (*ʿinna rasūl allāh daḳala bi-ʿāʾiṣḥāh wa-hiya bint ʿaṣr sinīn*), and a girl’s marriage cannot be consummated until she is a woman, so when a boy attains ten years, his authority [over himself] is accepted and his testimony is accepted.””¹¹⁶⁰

The same hadith is recorded by the eminent Twelver traditionist Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067) in his *Tahḏīb al-ʾAḥkām*.¹¹⁶¹

ʿIsmāʿīl’s statement is striking, since he places ʿĀʾiṣḥāh’s marital consummation (*duḳūl*) at age ten, rather than the usual nine. The only other reference to such a late marital-consummation age that I have found is the following biographical summary by the Basro-Egyptian scholar ʿAbd al-Malik b. Hišām (d. 213/828-829 or 218/833), which he appended to his recension of the famous *Kitāb al-Maḡāzī* of Muḥammad b. ʾIshāq:

The Messenger of God married (*tazawwaja*) ʿĀʾiṣḥāh bt. ʾabī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq in Makkah, when she was a girl of seven years (*wa-hiya ibnat sabʿ sinīn*), and consummated the marriage with her (*wa-banā bi-hā*) in Madinah, when she was a girl of nine years or ten (*wa-hiya bint tisʿ sinīn ʾaw ʿaṣr*). The Messenger of God did not marry any virgin except her (*wa-lam yatazawwaj rasūl allāh bikra^{an} ḡayra-hā*). Her father ʾAbū Bakr gave her in marriage to him, and the Messenger of God fixed a 400-dirham dowry for her.¹¹⁶²

¹¹⁶⁰ Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī (ed. ʿAlī ʾAkbar al-Ġaffārī), *al-Furūʿ min al-Kāfī*, vol. 3 (Qom, Iran: Muʾassasat ʾAnṣāriyyān, 2005), p. 1903, # 14442/1.

¹¹⁶¹ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (ed. Ḥasan al-Ḳarsān), *Tahḏīb al-ʾAḥkām*, vol. 2 (Qom, Iran: Muʾassasat ʾAnṣāriyyān, 2005), p. 856, # 7649/49.

¹¹⁶² ʿAbd al-Malik b. Hišām (ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld), *Kitāb Sīrat Rasūl Allāh / Das Leben Muhammed’s*, 2 Volumes in 1 (Göttingen, Germany: Dieterichsche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1858-1860), p. 1001.

This could be the product of simple error, or it could reflect a lingering, alternative tradition of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age. Unfortunately, there is no way to tell: even the attribution of this statement to ‘Ismā‘īl cannot be confirmed, since I was unable to find a single other reference thereto, besides al-Kulaynī’s and al-Ṭūsī’s. Moreover, there is a positive reason to doubt the authenticity of this ascription, given its broader context in early Shi’ism: the report plausibly reflects later intra-Šī‘ī polemics. Some light thereon is shed by the eminent Persian Twelver Šī‘ī Hadith-scholar ‘Allāmah Majlisī (d. 1110/1698) in his *Mir’ât al-‘Uqūl fī ‘Aḡbār ‘Āl al-Rasūl*, who commented regarding this report:

Sound (*ṣaḥīḥ*). Perhaps their recounting of this saying—founded upon invalid analogy—from ‘Ismā‘īl was for proof of the nullity of his fitness for the Imamate.¹¹⁶³

In other words, this hadith was understood to have theological or sectarian implications: ‘Allāmah Majlisī, al-Ṭūsī, and al-Kulaynī were all Imamite or Twelver Šī‘īs, whose sect or tradition diverged from the ‘Ismā‘īlīs over whether the Imamate had passed from Ja‘far al-Šādiq to his older son ‘Ismā‘īl (as the ‘Ismā‘īlīs believed) or his younger son Mūsā (as the Imamites and Twelvers believed). Given that Šī‘ī Imams were supposed to be infallible, and given that ‘Ismā‘īl had supposedly engaged in invalid legal reasoning (according to ‘Allāmah Majlisī), this hadith constituted evidence for the Twelver view against the ‘Ismā‘īlī view. This would explain why Twelver Hadith collections recorded such a dictum from ‘Ismā‘īl in the first place, as ‘Allāmah Majlisī suggested, but it also raises the possibility that the report is a polemical fabrication.

Given all of the above (especially the lack of corroboration), this report cannot be attributed to ‘Ismā‘īl b. Ja‘far: he is not a credible tradent or source within the broader marital-age tradition.

‘Abū ‘Ishāq al-Sabī‘ī (d. 127-128/744-746)

¹¹⁶³ Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī (ed. Hāšim al-Rasūlī), *Mir’ât al-‘Uqūl fī ‘Aḡbār ‘Āl al-Rasūl*, vol. 24 (Tehran, Iran: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Islāmiyyah, 1983), p. 235.

I have collated seven reports ascribed to the Kufan tradent and putative CL 'Abū 'Ishāq 'Amr b. 'Abd Allāh al-Sabī'ī, variously recorded by 'Isrā'īl b. Yūnus (reconstructed), 'Abṭar b. al-Qāsim (reconstructed), Ibn Sa'd, and al-Ṭabarānī.

'Isrā'īl b. Yūnus (d. 160-162/776-779)

'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah:

'Ā'iṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹¹⁶⁴

'Abṭar b. al-Qāsim (d. 178/794-795)

Muṭarrif—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; together nine years.¹¹⁶⁵

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Wakī—Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹¹⁶⁶

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. Mūsā b. Ḥammād al-Barbarī—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ṣāliḥ al-'Azdī—Yaḥyá b. 'Ādam—Šarīk—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—'Abd Allāh:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹¹⁶⁷

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—Yaḥyá al-Ḥimmānī—Šarīk—'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.¹¹⁶⁸

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

¹¹⁶⁴ See the section on 'Isrā'īl, above.

¹¹⁶⁵ See the section on 'Abṭar, above.

¹¹⁶⁶ Ibn Sa'd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41.

¹¹⁶⁷ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, X, p. 184, # 10279. This edition should be emended (to include the missing line *wa-qubīḍa wa-hiya bint*) in light of the 1984 *Wizārat al-'Awqāf wa-al-Shu'ūn al-Dīniyyah*, al-Jumhūriyyah al-'Irāqiyyah edition (also at # 10279).

¹¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, XXIII, p. 23, # 54.

al-Ḥaḍramī—ʿAbū Kurayb—Muʿāwiyah b. Hišām—Sufyān—ʿAbū ʿIshāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Consummation at nine; together nine years.¹¹⁶⁹

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Ḥaḥṣ b. ʿUmar—Qabīṣah—Sufyān—ʿAbū ʿIshāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah:

ʿĀʾiṣah was married at nine; together nine years.¹¹⁷⁰

As we have already seen, there are serious problems in these ascriptions to ʿAbū ʿIshāq. Firstly, the three ascribed via the seeming PCL Sufyān al-Ṭawrī are not more similar to each other than they are to transmissions from other sources: Ibn Saʿd's transmission from Sufyān looks like it was contaminated by a transmission from ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah and/or borrowed from ʿIsrāʾīl's redaction; the elemental composition of al-Ṭabarānī's first transmission from Sufyān contradicts every other transmission therefrom, and some of the specific wording therein looks like it was borrowed from—or contaminated by—the redactions of Qabīṣah and al-Firyābī (both from Sufyān, *from Hišām b. ʿUrwah*); and the elemental composition of al-Ṭabarānī's second transmission from Sufyān similarly contradicts most other transmissions therefrom, and some of the specific wording therein likewise looks like it was borrowed from—or contaminated by—the redactions of Qabīṣah and al-Firyābī (both from Sufyān, *from Hišām b. ʿUrwah*). There is thus no redaction of the tradition of ʿAbū ʿIshāq that can be attributed to Sufyān, which is to say, he is not a credible PCL therefor (i.e., he looks like a spider).¹¹⁷¹

Secondly, the two reports ascribed via the seeming PCL Šarīk b. ʿAbd Allāh are not more similar to each other than they are to transmissions from other sources: they differ in terms of ascription (Ibn Masʿūd vs. ʿĀʾiṣah), the core detail of the first element (*sitt* vs. *sab*), and the verb in the second element (*daḡala* vs. *baná*); they even differ in terms of elemental composition, with the second report lacking the 'death' element altogether. Moreover, the second report is more similar to various transmissions from Hišām b. ʿUrwah, and the first is more similar to certain, specific transmissions from ʿIsrāʾīl—and, as it happens, one of its transmitters (Yaḥyá b. ʿĀdam) also ostensibly

¹¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, # 55.

¹¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, # 56.

¹¹⁷¹ For all of this, see the section on Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, above.

transmitted the hadith of 'Isrā'īl, with a nearly-identical *matn*. There is thus no redaction of the tradition of 'Abū 'Ishāq that can be attributed to Šarīk, which is to say, he is not a credible PCL therefor (i.e., he looks like a spider).¹¹⁷²

Thirdly, the redaction of 'Abṭar is much more similar to the tradition of al-'A'maš than it is to the other transmissions from 'Abū 'Ishāq,¹¹⁷³ bar one—and even this one, recorded by al-Ṭabarānī, from Ḥafṣ, from Qabīṣah, from Sufyān, is more similar in wording to transmissions from Qabīṣah and al-Firyābī, from Sufyān, *from Hišām b. 'Urwah* (as noted already). Thus, 'Abṭar's redaction was likely borrowed from or contaminated by tradition of al-'A'maš, whilst the only other ascription to 'Abū 'Ishāq that is similar is clearly a corruption of Qabīṣah's transmission from Hišām b. 'Urwah.

All of this leaves only 'Isrā'īl's ascription to 'Abū 'Ishāq, which we have no reason to accept: it is possible that 'Isrā'īl genuinely received his hadith from 'Abū 'Ishāq, but it is equally possible that he simply paraphrased and reattributed Version 2 of Hišām b. 'Urwah's hadith—or Version 1, in combination with the 'death' element taken from the hadith of 'Abū Mu'āwiyah—thereto. Certainly, we have no distinctive redaction that correlates with 'Abū 'Ishāq: the ascriptions to him are extremely disparate and mostly similar to transmissions from other sources, which makes 'Abū 'Ishāq look like a Juynbollian spider.

Only one of these parallel transmissions from 'Abū 'Ishāq—one of the conflicting ascriptions via Šarīk, recorded by al-Ṭabarānī—even matches the elemental sequence and details of *some* of the transmissions from 'Isrā'īl, such that they could conceivably embody a common tradition from 'Abū 'Ishāq together. However, this parallel transmission derives via a lengthy SS and—as noted already—derives via a transmitter of 'Isrā'īl's version, Yaḥyá b. 'Ādam, who is credited in an earlier source with a nearly-identical *matn*. This is exactly what it would look like if Yaḥyá or a later tradent reattributed his transmission from 'Isrā'īl to Šarīk, which is to say: this ascription to Šarīk looks like a Juynbollian dive. Given such suspicious circumstances, 'Isrā'īl's ascription to 'Abū 'Ishāq cannot be corroborated thereby.

¹¹⁷² For all of this, see the section on Šarīk, above.

¹¹⁷³ See the section on al-'A'maš, above.

Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741-742)

I have collated five reports ascribed to the Madino-Syrian tradent and putative CL Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Šihāb al-Zuhrī, variously recorded by Ma‘mar (reconstructed), al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘abī Manī‘ (reconstructed), and Ibn Sa‘d. Given the potential match between ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s redaction of Ma‘mar’s redaction, on the one hand, and one of Ibn Sa‘d’s reports, on the other, I have opted to cite the pre-reconstructed ascriptions via Ma‘mar as well, recorded by ‘Abd al-Razzāq (reconstructed) and Ibn Sa‘d.

Ma‘mar b. Rāšid (d. 152-154/769-771)

Hišām & al-Zuhrī:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at nine or seven.¹¹⁷⁴

‘Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211/827)

Ma‘mar—Hišām & al-Zuhrī—‘Urwah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine; dolls; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹¹⁷⁵

al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘abī Manī‘ (d. post-216/831)

‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘abī Ziyād—al-Zuhrī:

‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage; after Kaḍījah; shown in a dream; married in Makkah at six; consummation; Hijrah; nine; ‘Ā’iṣah’s genealogy; virgin; ‘Abū Bakr’s name.¹¹⁷⁶

Ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd al-‘Abdī—Ma‘mar—Hišām b. ‘Urwah & al-Zuhrī:

Marriage at nine or seven.¹¹⁷⁷

Ibn Sa‘d (d. 230/845)

¹¹⁷⁴ See the section on Ma‘mar, above.

¹¹⁷⁵ See the section on ‘Abd al-Razzāq, above.

¹¹⁷⁶ See the section on al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘abī Manī‘, above.

¹¹⁷⁷ Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42.

Kaṭīr b. Hišām—Jaʿfar b. Burqān—al-Zuhrī:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹¹⁷⁸

Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. ʿUmar—Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh—al-Zuhrī:

Muḥammad b. ʿUmar—Kaṭīr b. Zayd—al-Muṭṭalib b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥanṭab:

Marriage, in Makkah, at six, during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood; consummated, in Madinah, at nine, during Šawwāl; eight months after the Hijrah; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹¹⁷⁹

At first glance, there seems to be some promise in this cluster of reports: three of them share the elemental combination of ‘marriage’, ‘consummation’, and ‘death’, giving the impression of a distinctive sub-tradition. Upon closer examination, however, there are serious problems therewith. Firstly, there are major differences in the ascriptions of these reports: both transmissions from Maʿmar have him cite both Hišām and al-Zuhrī, but only ʿAbd al-Razzāq has them cite ʿUrwah in turn; Ibn Saʿd has Muḥammad b. ʿUmar cite both Kaṭīr b. Zayd, from al-Muṭṭalib b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥanṭab, and Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh, from al-Zuhrī; and both Ibn Saʿd and al-Ḥajjāj cite just al-Zuhrī. In other words, all of these reports are *munqaṭiʿ*, but in different ways: one has an ascription to ʿUrwah; two have dual ascriptions, to both al-Zuhrī and someone else; and two have ascriptions just to al-Zuhrī. It is thus unclear whether the transmissions from Maʿmar are even meant to convey a *matn* from al-Zuhrī rather than Hišām, or whether Ibn Saʿd—Muḥammad b. ʿUmar is meant to convey a *matn* from al-Zuhrī rather than al-Muṭṭalib.

Moreover, the core elements of these reports are unusually divergent—for example:

ʿAbd al-Razzāq, from Maʿmar	Ibn Saʿd, from Ibn Ḥumayd, from Maʿmar	Ibn Saʿd, from Kaṭīr, from Jaʿfar	al-Ḥajjāj, from ʿUbayd Allāh	Ibn Saʿd, from Muḥammad b. ʿUmar, from Muḥammad & Kaṭīr
nakaḥa al-nabiyy ʿāʾiṣah	nakaḥa al-nabiyy ʿāʾiṣah	malaka rasūl allāh ʿuqdah ʿāʾiṣah	ṭumma tazawwaja rasūl allāh	ṭumma tazawwaja ʿalā ʾaṭari-hā

¹¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 156-157.

			‘ā’iṣah [ba‘da ḵadījah] wa- kāna qad [ra‘á/’uriya] fī al-nawm marratayn yuqālu [la-hu] hiya imra’atu- ka wa-‘ā’iṣah yawma-’id [ibnat/bint] sitt sinīn fa- nakaha-hā rasūl allāh	‘ā’iṣah bint ‘abī bakr al-ṣiddīq
			bi-makkah	bi-makkah
wa-hiya bint sitt sanawāt ’aw sab’	wa-hiya ibnat tis’ sanawāt ’aw sab’	wa-hiya ibnat sitt sinīn	wa-hiya [bint/ibnat] sitt sinīn	wa-hiya ibnat sitt sinīn
				fī ṣawwāl
				sanat ‘aṣr min al-nubuwwah

Likewise:

‘Abd al- Razzāq, from Ma‘mar	Ibn Sa‘d, from Ibn Ḥumayd, from Ma‘mar	Ibn Sa‘d, from Kaṭīr, from Ja‘far	al-Ḥajjāj, from ‘Ubayd Allāh	Ibn Sa‘d, from Muḥammad b. ‘Umar, from Muḥammad & Kaṭīr
wa-zuffat ’ilay-hi		wa-jama‘a-hā	ṭumma ’inna rasūl allāh baná bi- ‘ā’iṣah	wa-baná bi-hā
			ba‘da-mā qadima al- madīnah	bi-al-madīnah
wa-hiya bint tis’ [sinīn]		wa-hiya ibnat tis’ sinīn	wa-‘ā’iṣah yawma baná bi-hā [rasūl allāh] bint tis’ sinīn	wa-hiya ibnat tis’ sinīn
				fī ṣawwāl
				‘alá ra’s ṭamāniyat ’aṣhur min al- muhājar

Of course, this level of variation could just be chalked up to the extremely loose or sloppy paraphrastic transmission that predominated in the early-to-mid 8th Century CE, when al-Zuhrī would have transmitted to his students.

However, there is a deeper problem: in addition to being extremely divergent in their core elements, some of these reports are more similar to transmissions from other authorities, in terms of specific wording and elemental composition, than they are to each other. Thus, the wording of the ‘death’ element in ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s transmission from Ma‘mar—which is uncorroborated by Ibn Sa‘d’s transmissions from Ma‘mar—is much more similar to (in fact, nearly identical to) the corresponding element in ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah’s hadith¹¹⁸⁰ and several false transmissions from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Abū ‘Ishāq.¹¹⁸¹ Meanwhile, the ‘death’ elements in Ibn Sa‘d’s transmissions from both Kaṭīr and Muḥammad b. ‘Umar are more similar to certain transmissions from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah¹¹⁸² and especially ‘Isrā’īl.¹¹⁸³ Finally, Ibn Sa‘d’s dual transmission (via Muḥammad b. ‘Umar) from both al-Zuhrī and al-Muṭṭalib is strikingly similar, in terms of broad outline and sequence, to the following parallel transmission from al-Zuhrī, which can be reconstructed back to al-Zubayr b. Bakkār (d. 256/870):

tnā al-zubayr^u [bn^u bakkārⁱⁿ] ḥaddaṭa-nī muḥammad^u bn^u [al-]ḥasanī^[n] ‘an [ḡayrⁱ wāḥidⁱⁿ min ‘ahlī al-‘ilmī min-hum] ‘usāmat^[u/a] bn^[u/i] ḥafṣⁱⁿ ‘an [yūnus^a/mūsá] ‘an ibnī šihābⁱⁿ ‘anna rasūl^a allāhī tazawwaja ‘ā’iṣat^a bint^a ‘abī bakrⁱⁿ fī šawwālⁱⁿ [sanat^a ‘ašrⁱⁿ min^a al-nubuwwatⁱ qabla al-hijratⁱ bi-talātⁱ sinīn^a] wa-‘a’rasa bi-hā bi-al-madīnatⁱ fī šawwālⁱⁿ ‘alā ra’sⁱ [sittat^a/tamāniyat^a] ‘ašar^a šahr^{an} min muḥājari-hi ‘ilā al-madīnatⁱ wa-tuwuffiyat ‘ā’iṣat^u laylat^a al-ṭulāt^a li-sab‘^a ‘ašrat^a maḍat min ramadān^a ba‘da al-witrⁱ sanat^a tamānⁱⁿ wa-ḡamsīn^a wa-dufinat min laylati-hā.¹¹⁸⁴

¹¹⁸⁰ See the section on ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, above.

¹¹⁸¹ Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41 (Wakī‘—Sufyān—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah); Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá’s redaction of ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah’s redaction (‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah); Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 22, # 51 (Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī—Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Numayr & Yaḥyá al-Ḥimmānī & Hannād b. al-Sarī & ‘Ibrāhīm b. ‘abī Mu‘āwiyah—‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah).

¹¹⁸² Ibn Rāḥwayh (ed. Balūšī), *Musnad*, II, p. 870, # 1537/995 (‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah—al-‘A‘maš—‘Ibrāhīm—al-‘Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah).

¹¹⁸³ Ibn Mājah (ed. ‘Abd al-Bāqī), *Sunan*, I, p. 604, # 1877 (‘Aḥmad b. Sinān—‘Abū ‘Aḥmad—‘Isrā’īl—‘Abū ‘Ishāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Abd Allāh).

¹¹⁸⁴ Synthesised from [Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Zabālah &] al-Zubayr b. Bakkār b. ‘Abd Allāh (ed. ‘Akram Ḍiyā’ al-‘Umarī) *al-Muntaḡab min Kitāb ‘Azwāj al-Nabiyy* (Madinah, KSA: Maṭba‘at al-Jāmi‘ah al-‘Islāmiyyah, 1981), p. 39, and Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 28, # 71.

Ibn Sa‘d and al-Zubayr’s reports share the same distinctive skeleton in their *matns*, and although this skeleton is not unique,¹¹⁸⁵ it is at least plausible that it derives from al-Zuhrī—certainly, Ibn Sa‘d’s secondary ascription to al-Muṭṭalib can be discarded. However, the skeleton shared by al-Zubayr and Ibn Sa‘d’s reports—that which can be plausibly ascribed all the way back to al-Zuhrī—is the following:

...[rasūl^a allāhⁱ] tazawwaja ‘ā’iṣat^a bint^a ‘abī bakrⁱⁿ fī šawwālⁱⁿ sanat^a ‘ašrⁱⁿ min^a al-nubuwwatⁱ [qabla al-hijratⁱ bi-ṭalātⁱ sinīn^a] [wa-‘a‘rasa bi-hā bi-al-madīnatⁱ] fī šawwālⁱⁿ ‘alā ra’sⁱ ṭamāniyatⁱ [‘ašhurⁱⁿ/‘ašar^a šahr^{an}] min^[a] [al-]muhājari[-hi ‘ilā al-madīnatⁱ]...

In other words, Ibn Sa‘d’s version lacks the element about ‘Ā’iṣah’s death, and al-Zubayr lacks any mention of ‘Ā’iṣah’s age at marital engagement, marital consummation, and the Prophet’s death: this is consistent with al-Zuhrī’s simple, original formulation’s having been contaminated, updated, or elaborated in the century of transmission between him and the extant recorders thereof (i.e., Ibn Sa‘d and al-Zubayr). At the very least, all of this is consistent with Ibn Sa‘d’s report’s being interpolated, such that it cannot be used to reconstruct a version of the marital-age hadith back to al-Zuhrī.¹¹⁸⁶

This leaves us with only four reports, which together exhibit an unusual level of divergence in both elemental composition and specific wording, and some of which are more similar in wording to other hadiths. Certainly, they do not constitute a distinctive sub-tradition within the broader marital-age hadith-tradition, which means that there is no particular redaction that can be correlated with and attributed to al-Zuhrī. All of this is consistent with al-Zuhrī’s being a Juynbollian spider, but this comes as no surprise. After all, in light of the kind of oral transmission that predominated in the 8th Century CE, it is only to be expected that any genuine traditions about ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage (but not her age) deriving from al-Zuhrī would be subject to updating by tradents with access to more detailed or specific information thereon (as seems to have happened with the skeleton shared by Ibn Sa‘d and al-Zubayr, and may have occurred also in the case of al-Ḥajjāj’s report). Likewise, given al-Zuhrī’s towering status in both

¹¹⁸⁵ See the section on ‘Amrah, below.

¹¹⁸⁶ For more on this, see also the section on ‘Amrah, below.

legal and biographical Hadith, it is not surprising that he would be the target of at least a few dives, as some transmitters of Hišām's hadith and others sought alternative or parallel paths of transmission therefor. Either way, al-Zuhrī is not a credible CL in the marital-age tradition—instead, he looks like a spider.

Qatādah b. Di'āmah (d. 177-178/735-736)

I was able to find a single report ascribed to the Basran traditionist Qatādah b. Di'āmah, recorded by al-Ṭabarānī.

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. Ja'far b. 'A'yan al-Baḡdādī—'Abū al-'Aš'aṭ 'Aḥmad b. al-Miqdām—Zuhayr b. al-'Alā' al-Qaysī—Sa'īd b. 'abī 'Arūbah—Qatādah:

'Ā'īṣah's marriage; virgin; age six; Gabriel's message; marriage in Makkah, before the Hijrah and after the death of Ḳadījah; consummation, in Madinah, at age nine; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹¹⁸⁷

This transmission is completely isolated, with only a SS stretching all the way back from al-Ṭabarānī to Qatādah. There can thus be no correlation between a putative CL and a distinctive sub-tradition in such a situation—Qatādah is not even a Juynbollian spider. In other words, even the transmission of this hadith from Muḥammad b. Ja'far to al-Ṭabarānī cannot be confirmed, let alone from 'Aḥmad to Muḥammad b. Ja'far, let alone from Zuhayr to 'Aḥmad, let alone from Sa'īd to Zuhayr, let alone from Qatādah to Sa'īd. Even if the hadith has some kind of transmission-history before al-Ṭabarānī, we have no way of knowing how far back any given part of the wording goes, absent corroborating transmissions.

That said, a fragment of this hadith is also cited by the Baghdadian Hadith critic Ibn 'abī Ḳayṭamah (d. 279/892-893) in his *al-Ta'rīk al-Kabīr*, independently of al-Ṭabarānī and Muḥammad b. Ja'far:

¹¹⁸⁷ Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 19, # 40.

And Qatādah said: “Ḳadījah died three years before the Hijrah.” ‘Aḥmad b. al-Miqdām related that to us, from Zuhayr b. al-‘Alā’, from Sa‘īd, from Qatādah: “Then the Messenger of God married ‘Ā’iṣah around the time of the death of Ḳadījah (*tumma tazawwaja rasūl allāh ‘ā’iṣah mutawaffā kadījah*).”¹¹⁸⁸

Although at first glance this suggests that the hadith can be traced at least as far back as the Basran tradent ‘Aḥmad b. al-Miqdām (d. 251/865 or 253/867), the fragment in question contains no reference to ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age, which could indicate that the relevant elements were absent from the original ascription to Qatādah. Absent parallel transmissions (or at least a full citation of Ibn ‘abī Ḳayṭamah’s version), we are again left with uncertainty—all that we can say for sure is that *some version* of this hadith can be traced as far back as ‘Aḥmad, even if most of the features of his original redaction cannot be identified.

In terms of elemental composition, this hadith does not match any other single version of the marital-age hadith. In terms of specific elements, however, there are plenty of matches (beyond the generic ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements):

- al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘abī Manī’¹¹⁸⁹’s hadith shares therewith (1) mention of Ḳadījah’s death in the ‘marriage’ element, (2) *hiya imra’atu-ka* in the ‘angelic message’ element, (3) “six” in the ‘marriage’ element, (4) *bi-makkah* in the ‘marriage’ element, and (5) the ‘virgin’ element (albeit differently worded).¹¹⁸⁹
- Ibn Hišām’s own biographical summary shares therewith (1) “‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq” (i.e., a fuller version of her name), (2) *bi-makkah* in the ‘marriage’ element, (3) *bi-al-madīnah* in the ‘consummation’ element, and (4) the *lam* + imperfect verb version of the ‘virgin’ element.¹¹⁹⁰
- Ibn Sa‘d’s transmission from al-Zuhri and al-Muṭṭalib shares therewith (1) “‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq” (i.e., a fuller version of her name), (2) *bi-makkah* in the ‘marriage’ element, (3) “six” in the ‘marriage’ element, (4) *bi-al-madīnah* in the ‘consummation’ element, and (5) the *tuwuffīya* version of the ‘death’ element.¹¹⁹¹

¹¹⁸⁸ Ibn ‘abī Ḳayṭamah (ed. Halal), *al-Ta’rīk al-Kabīr*, I, p. 170.

¹¹⁸⁹ See the section on al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘abī Manī’, above.

¹¹⁹⁰ Ibn Hišām (ed. Wüstenfeld), *Das Leben Muhammed’s*, p. 1001.

¹¹⁹¹ Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 156-157.

- Ibn Ḥanbal’s transmission (via ‘Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī) from Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād shares therewith (1) “six” in the ‘marriage’ element, (2) *bi-makkah* in the ‘marriage’ element, (3) mention of Ḳadījah’s death at the end of the ‘marriage’ element, and (4) *bi-al-madīnah* in the ‘consummation’ element.¹¹⁹²
- al-Ṭabarī’s transmission (via Ibn Sa’d) from Ibn ‘Abbās shares therewith (1) “‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr” (i.e., a fuller version of her name), (2) *qabla al-hijrah* in the ‘marriage’ element, (3) the *tuwuffīya* version of the ‘death’ element, and (4) the *lam* + imperfect verb version of the ‘virgin’ element.¹¹⁹³
- al-Warjlānī’s transmission from Jābir shares therewith (1) “six” in the ‘marriage’ element, (2) the rare verbal form *ibtanā* in the ‘consummation’ element, (3) the ‘virgin’ element (albeit differently worded), and (4) the *tuwuffīya* version of the ‘death’ element.¹¹⁹⁴

Thus, in addition to relying upon a mere SS, al-Ṭabarānī’s ascription to Qatādah curiously exhibits recurring overlaps in content with several other hadiths—and, as it happens, most of them are connected to Basrah: Ibn Hišām and Ibn Sa’d both originated in Basrah; ‘Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī was a prominent Basran traditionist; al-Warjlānī claimed a Basran SS back to Jābir; and, of course, al-Ṭabarānī claimed a Basran SS back to Qatādah. Moreover, the ‘angelic message’ element (including the similar wording *hādīhi imra’atu-ka*) constitutes a well-known hadith that was disseminated by Hišām b. ‘Urwah and transmitted by the notable Basran traditionist Ḥammād b. Salamah, among others.¹¹⁹⁵ In light of all of this, it is at the very least plausible that the ascription to Qatādah was cobbled together out of various biographical elements about ‘Ā’iṣah that were circulating in Basrah—and Iraq more broadly—at the beginning of the 9th Century CE. Certainly, there are no grounds for identifying Qatādah as a credible source for any version of the marital-age hadith.

¹¹⁹² Ibn Ḥanbal (ed. Ḡamrāwī), *Musnad*, VI, p. 118.

¹¹⁹³ Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV, pp. 1770-1771.

¹¹⁹⁴ Yūsuf b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-Warjlānī (ed. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥumayd al-Sālimī), *Kitāb al-Tartīb fī al-Ṣaḥīḥ min Ḥadīṯ al-Rasūl* (Muscat, Oman: Maktabat Musqat, 2003), p. 326, # 750. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 238, # 528, which has *māta* instead of *tuwuffīya*.

¹¹⁹⁵ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 195, col. 1; Baššār ‘Awwād Ma’rūf *et al.*, *al-Musnad al-Jāmi‘*, vol. 20 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Jil, 1993), pp. 348-349, # 17236.

‘Amrah bt. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 98/716-717 or 106/724-725)

I was able to find a single report ascribed via the Madinan Follower ‘Amrah bt. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān to ‘Ā’iṣah, recorded by Ibn Sa’d.

Ibn Sa’d (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. ‘Umar—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Rijāl—‘Abū al-Rijāl—‘Amrah bt. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage, during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood, three years before the Hijrah, at age six; Hijrah; wedding feast, during Šawwāl, eight months after the Hijrah, at age nine.¹¹⁹⁶

This transmission is completely isolated, with only a SS stretching all the way back from Ibn Sa’d to ‘Amrah. There can thus be no correlation between a putative CL and a distinctive sub-tradition in such a situation—‘Amrah is not even a Juynbollian spider. Moreover, this report shares the same distinctive structure and content as the statements of various biographical authorities—namely:

Ibn Sa’d (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. ‘Umar—Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh—al-Zuhrī:

Muḥammad b. ‘Umar—Kaṭīr b. Zayd—al-Muṭṭalib b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥanṭab:

Marriage, in Makkah, at six, during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood; consummated, in Madinah, at nine, during Šawwāl; eight months after the Hijrah; the Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹¹⁹⁷

al-Zubayr b. Bakkār (d. 256/870)

Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan—‘Usāmah b. Ḥafṣ *et al.*—Mūsá/Yūnus—Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī:

Marriage, during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood, three years before the Hijrah; wedding feast, in Madinah, during Šawwāl, eighteen/sixteen months after the

¹¹⁹⁶ Ibn Sa’d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 39-40.

¹¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 156-157.

Hijrah; ‘Ā’iṣah died on Tuesday, in Ramaḍān, post-Witr, in the year 58, and was buried that night.¹¹⁹⁸

al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)

‘Ā’iṣah’s genealogy; marriage, during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood, three years before the Hijrah; wedding, during Šawwāl, eight months after the Hijrah; consummation at age nine.¹¹⁹⁹

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

Ibn Baṭṭah—al-Ḥasan b. al-Jahm—al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faraj—Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidī:

‘Ā’iṣah’s genealogy; marriage, during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood, three years before the Hijrah; wedding, during Šawwāl, eight months after the Hijrah; consummation at age nine.¹²⁰⁰

Since the *matn* of al-Ṭabarī’s biographical summary and that of al-Ḥākim’s transmission from al-Wāqidī are nearly identical,¹²⁰¹ they must be closely related via written transmission: either al-Ḥākim’s transmission was copied from al-Ṭabarī’s biographical summary, or both were copied from a common suppressed source, or al-Ṭabarī copied al-Wāqidī’s biographical summary. Given the accurate written preservation of al-Ḥākim’s transmission of al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faraj’s recension of al-Wāqidī’s *al-Mubtada’ wa-al-Maḡāzī* elsewhere,¹²⁰² and given that al-Wāqidī was also a major source for al-Ṭabarī (including in the relevant section of al-Ṭabarī’s work),¹²⁰³ the last scenario seems most likely. Consequently, we can provisionally treat the urtext behind al-Ṭabarī’s biographical summary and al-Ḥākim’s transmission as al-Wāqidī’s composition (i.e., al-Wāqidī’s own biographical summary).

In light of this, we are left with the following reports and statements: Ibn Sa’d’s transmission, from al-Wāqidī, from al-Zuhrī and al-Muṭṭalib; al-Zubayr’s transmission

¹¹⁹⁸ See the section on Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī, above.

¹¹⁹⁹ Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV (series III), p. 2439.

¹²⁰⁰ Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, p. 20, # 6881.

¹²⁰¹ Ṭ. adds *wa-*; Ḥ. adds *rasūl allāh*; and Ṭ. has *ibnah* where Ḥ. has *bint*.

¹²⁰² See the section on Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidī, above.

¹²⁰³ In fact, al-Wāqidī is cited in the very next sentence of al-Ṭabarī’s biographical dictionary (*loc. cit.*), following the information on ‘Ā’iṣah: “Ibn ‘Umar said....”

from al-Zuhrī; Ibn Sa‘d’s transmission, via al-Wāqidī, from ‘Amrah; and (provisionally) al-Wāqidī’s own biographical summary. For a clearer comparison, consider the following breakdown of the elements and wordings of the statements and reports in question:

Ibn Sa‘d, from al-Wāqidī, from al-Zuhrī & al-Muṭṭalib	al-Zubayr, from al-Zuhrī	Ibn Sa‘d, from al-Wāqidī, from ‘Amrah	al-Wāqidī
			[wa-]‘ā’iṣah bint ‘abī bakr ‘ummu- hā ‘umm rūmān bint ‘umayr bn ‘āmir min banī duhmān bn al- ḥārīt bn ḡanm bn mālik bn kinānah
tumma tazawwaja ‘alā ‘aṭari-hā ‘ā’iṣah bint ‘abī bakr al-ṣiddīq bi- makkah	‘anna rasūl allāh tazawwaja ‘ā’iṣah bint ‘abī bakr	tazawwaja-nī rasūl allāh	tazawwaja-hā rasūl allāh
wa-hiya ibnat sitt sinīn			
fī ṣawwāl	fī ṣawwāl	fī ṣawwāl	fī ṣawwāl
sanah ‘aṣr min al- nubuwwah	[sanah ‘aṣr min al- nubuwwah	sanah ‘aṣr min al- nubuwwah	sanah ‘aṣr min al- nubuwwah
	qabla al-hijrah bi- ṭalāt sinīn]	qabla al-hijrah li- ṭalāt sinīn	qabla al-hijrah bi- ṭalāt sinīn
		wa-‘anā ibnat sitt sinīn	
		wa-hājara rasūl allāh fa-qadima al-madīnah yawma al-‘iṭnayn li-‘iṭnatay ‘aṣrah laylah kalat min ṣahr rabī‘ al- ‘awwal	
wa- banā bi-hā	wa-‘a‘rasa bi-hā	wa-‘a‘rasa bī	wa-‘arrasa bi-hā [rasūl allāh]
bi-al-madīnah	bi-al-madīnah		
wa-hiya ibnat tis‘ sinīn			
fī ṣawwāl	fī ṣawwāl	fī ṣawwāl	fī ṣawwāl

‘alá ra’s ṭamāniyah ’ašhur min al-muhājar	‘alá ra’s ṭamāniyah ‘ašar šahr ^{an} min muhājari-hi ’ilá al-madīnah	‘alá ra’s ṭamāniyah ’ašhur min al-muhājar	‘alá ra’s ṭamāniyah ’ašhur min al-hijrah
		wa-kuntu yawma daḡala bī ibnat tis‘ sinīn	wa-kānat yawma ibtaná bi-hā [bint/ibnah] tis‘ sinīn
wa-tuwuffiya ‘an- hā wa-hiya ibnat ṭamāniy ‘ašrah sanah			
	wa-tuwuffiyat ‘ā’iśah laylat al- ṭulāṭā’ li-sab‘ ‘ašrah maḡat min ramaḡān ba‘da al-witr sanat ṭamān wa- ḡamsīn wa- dufinat min laylati-hā		

All four reports and statements share the same structure or elemental sequence, and much of the same wording: (1) The Messenger of God married ‘Ā’iśah bt. ’abī Bakr, (2) during Šawwāl, (3) in the tenth year of the Prophethood, (4) three years before the Hijrah; and (5) he arranged her wedding feast, (6) during Šawwāl, (7) at the beginning of eight months since his emigration. Two of them add: (5.5) in Madinah. Additionally, two of them add: (8) and she was, on the day that he consummated the marriage with her, a girl of nine years. Clearly, these four reports are closely related—in fact, they much more similar to each other than they are to any other version of the marital-age hadith.

There are two common denominators in the *’isnāds* for these *matns*: al-Zuhrī, who is the source cited for two of them; and al-Wāqidī, who is a transmitter in two of them, and the source in another (i.e., his own biographical summary). There are two ways to explain this correlation (within the framework of an ICMA): either the common skeleton of these reports derives from a formulation by al-Zuhrī, which was inherited by al-Wāqidī and then variously elaborated and reattributed (including via ‘Amrah); or the common skeleton derives from al-Wāqidī himself and was variously

reformulated and retrojected back to al-Zuhrī and others. Given al-Zubayr b. Bakkār's independent transmission from al-Zuhrī, I am inclined to accept the first scenario—but the possibility that al-Zubayr borrowed (directly or indirectly) from al-Wāqidī cannot be discounted. That said, al-Zubayr's report lacks some key elaborations (i.e., specific biographical details) present in all of al-Wāqidī's versions, which we would not expect al-Zubayr to have omitted (given his interests as a biographer); consequently, it seems reasonable to infer that al-Zubayr's report represents an independent transmission from al-Zuhrī, free from al-Wāqidī's alterations (including references to 'Ā'īshah's marital age).¹²⁰⁴ Consequently, the ascription to 'Amrah—which contains these additions associated with al-Wāqidī—represents a *secondary* stage of the distinctive tradition originating with al-Zuhrī (i.e., his own words), thus precluding its authenticity.

In short, Ibn Sa'd's transmission via 'Amrah probably originated as a biographical summary by al-Zuhrī, which lacked any reference to 'Ā'īshah's marital age; this summary was inherited and variously updated by al-Wāqidī, who inserted references to 'Ā'īshah's marital age therein; then an iteration of al-Wāqidī's updated version was ascribed via 'Amrah back to 'Ā'īshah.

'Abū Salamah (d. 94/712-713 or 104/722-723)

I have collated two reports ascribed to the Madinan Follower 'Abū Salamah b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, recorded by Muḥammad b. 'Amr (reconstructed) and al-Nasā'ī.

Muḥammad b. 'Amr (d. 144-145/761-763)

Yahyá & 'Abū Salamah:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to 'Ā'īshah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to 'Umm Rūmān and waits for 'Abū Bakr; 'Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; 'Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ'im's son; 'Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ'im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to 'Abū Bakr's relief; 'Abū Bakr sends for the

¹²⁰⁴ For more on this, see also the section on al-Zuhrī, above.

Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; she is six; Kāwlah then goes to Sawdah, and passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother disapproves, but later regrets having done so.

—‘Ā’iṣah:

Hijrah; women; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; marital consummation; Sa’d brings food; nine.¹²⁰⁵

al-Nasā’ī (d. 303/915-916)

’Aḥmad b. Sa’d b. al-Ḥakam b. ’abī Maryam—Sa’īd b. ’abī Maryam—Yaḥyá b. ’Ayyūb—’Umārah b. Ġaziyyah—Muḥammad b. ’Ibrāhīm—’Abū Salamah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.¹²⁰⁶

There are numerous problems with these two reports. Firstly, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr cites both ’Abū Salamah and Yaḥyá b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān as his source, which makes it unclear which of the two was supposed to be the actual source for the *matn*. Secondly, there is a discrepancy in the ascriptions, since al-Nasā’ī’s report reaches all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah, whereas Muḥammad b. ‘Amr only reaches back to ’Abū Salamah (and Yaḥyá); even if we prefer the raised version of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith in this regard, the problem only gets worse, since the raised version only cites Yaḥyá, from ‘Ā’iṣah, without any mention of ’Abū Salamah. Thirdly, the *matns* of these two reports are amongst the most dissimilar in the relevant corpus: al-Nasā’ī’s is extremely short, comprising only the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements, whereas Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s is a lengthy, disjointed narrative, comprising a multitude of elements. Moreover, where al-Nasā’ī has the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements directly coupled, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr usually has them dispersed across his vast narrative. In fact, in terms of elemental composition and sequence, al-Nasā’ī’s report is much more similar to Version 1 of Hišām’s hadith. In terms of specific wording, however, it is most similar to the corresponding elements in Wuhayb’s redaction of Version 2,¹²⁰⁷ and to those in ’Abū Ya’lá’s dubious transmission from Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, from Yaḥyá, from

¹²⁰⁵ See the section on Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, above.

¹²⁰⁶ Nasā’ī (ed. Ṭayyār *et al.*), *Sunan*, p. 794, # 3379.

¹²⁰⁷ See the section on Wuhayb, above.

‘Ā’iṣah.¹²⁰⁸ Regardless, these two reports are amongst the most disparate in the marital-age tradition, and certainly do not embody a distinctive sub-tradition that can be correlated with a common ascription to ‘Abū Salamah. Consequently, ‘Abū Salamah looks like another example of a Juynbollian spider, and certainly cannot be counted as a genuine CL for this hadith-tradition.

Jābir b. Zayd (d. 93/711-712 or 103/721-722)

I was able to collate two reports ascribed to the Basran Follower ‘Abū al-Ša‘tā’ Jābir b. Zayd al-‘Azdi: one recorded by al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, and another recorded twice, in two slightly different versions, by al-Warjlānī.

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

‘Aḥmad b. ‘Ubayd b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-‘Asadī—‘Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥusayn b. Dīzīl—‘Abū Mushir ‘Abd al-‘Alā b. Mushir—‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd b. Jābir—Yazīd b. Jābir—Jābir b. Zayd:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at seven; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen; she died under Mu‘āwiyah, in the year 57.¹²⁰⁹

al-Warjlānī (d. 570/1174-1175)

al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb al-Farāhīdī—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah Muslim—Jābir b. Zayd:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; virgin; Prophet died when she was eighteen; she lived for a further forty-eight years; she died under Mu‘āwiyah, during Ramaḍān, in the year 58; ‘Abū Hurayrah prayed over her; she was buried in al-Baqī‘.¹²¹⁰

al-Warjlānī (d. 570/1174-1175)

al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb al-Farāhīdī—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah Muslim—Jābir b. Zayd:

¹²⁰⁸ ‘Abū Ya‘lā (ed. ‘Asad), *Musnad*, VIII, pp. 132-133, # 4683/317. Also see the section on Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, above.

¹²⁰⁹ Ḥākim, *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Šaḥīḥayn*, VII, p. 19, # 6879.

¹²¹⁰ Warjlānī (ed. Sālimī), *al-Tartīb fī al-Šaḥīḥ*, p. 238, # 528.

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; virgin; Prophet died when she was eighteen; she lived for a further forty-eight years; she died under Mu‘āwiyah, during Ramaḍān, in the year 58; ‘Abū Hurayrah prayed over her; she was buried in al-Baqī‘; she was sixty-eight.¹²¹¹

At first glance, these two/three reports appear to embody a common, distinctive tradition: both/all of them contain the elements of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital engagement and consummation, the Prophet’s death, and ‘Ā’iṣah’s death during the reign of Mu‘āwiyah. In this respect, these reports are more similar to each other than they are to all the rest, which is consistent with their embodying the distinctive, underlying redaction of their common source, Jābir b. Zayd.

However, there are several problems with these reports. Firstly, they contradict each other on a basic detail: al-Ḥākim’s report has ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage occurring at age seven, where al-Warjlānī’s reports have it at age six. However, this could be chalked up to the early, sloppy transmission that these reports had to have undergone in the time between Jābir and the extant sources preserving them, if indeed they originated with Jābir.

Secondly, in certain key respects, al-Warjlānī’s reports are more similar to other reports. For example, as we have seen already, al-Warjlānī’s reports share a lot of material with the hadith ascribed to Qatādah: “six” in the ‘marriage’ element; the rare verbal form *ibtanā* in the ‘consummation’ element; the ‘virgin’ element (albeit differently worded); and—in the case of one of al-Warjlānī’s reports—the *tuwuffiya* version of the ‘death’ element.¹²¹² This makes it seem like al-Warjlānī’s reports are contaminated or interpolated, if not outright cobbled together from disparate sources.

Thirdly, it is well-known that al-Warjlānī borrowed extensively from Sunnī Hadith sources in his creation of his *Musnad*, systematically (falsely) ascribing such material via the early imams of his Ibadite sect: al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah Muslim, from Jābir b. Zayd.¹²¹³ In other words, there are immediate source-critical grounds for

¹²¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 326, # 750.

¹²¹² See the section on Qatādah, above.

¹²¹³ E.g., Ersilia Francesca, ‘The Concept of *sunna* in the Ibādī School’, in Adis Duderija (ed.), *The Sunna and Its Status in Islamic Law: The Search for a Sound Hadith* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 109: “The material is almost the same as that reported by Sunnis: most of the traditions transmitted by al-Rabī‘ are reported in Sunnī collections by other Sunnī authorities with the same wording, or with slight differences; the *isnād* of the two first parts is as follows: al-Rabī‘ b. Ḥabīb—Abū ‘Ubaydah—Jābir b.

suspecting that al-Warjlānī's versions are the product of some kind of borrowing and retrojection (i.e., Ibadite dives), rather than genuine transmission all the way back to the Ibadite leaders of 8th-Century Basrah. Indeed, it is possible that al-Warjlānī directly borrowed from the work of al-Ḥākim (or from one of al-Ḥākim's sources for his version of the hadith in question), along with sources, in his creation of the two relevant hadiths in his collection.

If al-Warjlānī's report was borrowed from al-Ḥākim's report (or a source of the latter's), however, then suspicion falls upon the latter in turn: the core of al-Ḥākim's report is an elemental sequence matches the distinctive sub-tradition of 'Isrā'īl b. Yūnus above all others (in particular, those transmissions from him that include the *qubīḍa* wording),¹²¹⁴ which immediately suggests that the *matn* of al-Ḥākim's report derives therefrom. This is only compounded by the fact that al-Ḥākim's *matn* includes a chronological addendum—the specification that 'Ā'īshah died in the year 57 AH, during the reign of Mu'āwiyah—that again makes it look like a secondary construction *vis-à-vis* the transmissions of 'Isrā'īl. To this can be added the fact that most versions of the marital-age hadith that include the 'death' element (especially, the traditions of 'Isrā'īl and al-'A'maš) derive from Kufans citing Kufan sources, which strongly suggests that the elemental combination in question ("Ā'īshah was married when she was a girl of X years' and 'the Prophet died when she was a girl of eighteen') derives from Kufah. This would imply that al-Ḥākim's version, which claims a lengthy Hamadhanian and Levantine SS (in fact, a Levantine family *'isnād*) back to a Basran source, is a false ascription, or in other words: al-Ḥākim's version looks exactly like a Levantine dive.

In short, we lack credible, independent transmissions unto Jābir b. Zayd, which precludes the attribution of any version of the marital-age hadith to him: he cannot be established as a CL. Moreover, there is reason to suspect that the core of both transmissions derives from the distinctive sub-tradition of 'Isrā'īl.

Addendum: The Identity of Jābir

Zayd—a companion—Prophet. The companions are mainly: Ibn 'Abbās, Abū Hurayra, Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī, Anas b. Mālik, 'Ā'isha."

¹²¹⁴ See the section on 'Isrā'īl, above.

A close revaluation of the version of this hadith cited by al-Ḥākim reveals another problem with all of this: the ultimate authority cited therein is not actually Jābir at all, but rather, his son Yazīd. To understand this, let us reconsider the *ʿisnād*, beginning with ʿAbū ʿIsmāʿīl ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd b. Jābir al-ʿAzdī al-Šāmī (fl. turn of 9th C. CE),¹²¹⁵ who was the son of the notable Damascene jurist ʿAbū ʿUtbah ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd b. Jābir al-ʿAzdī (d. 153-154/770-771)¹²¹⁶ and the grandson of the lesser known Yazīd b. Jābir al-ʿAzdī al-Šāmī (fl. turn of 8th C. CE), the latter of whom was “the father of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd and Yazīd b. Yazīd” according to Ibn Ḥibbān.¹²¹⁷ According to the *ʿisnād* under consideration, ʿAbd Allāh transmitted “from his paternal uncle Yazīd b. Jābir, from his father,” which immediately reveals the problem: the father of ʿAbd Allāh’s paternal uncle Yazīd cannot be Jābir, because Yazīd is the brother of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd b. Jābir, whose father was Yazīd b. Jābir. The father of ʿAbd Allāh’s uncle Yazīd would thus have to be Yazīd b. Jābir, which is confirmed by what we just cited concerning Yazīd b. Jābir, “the father of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd and **Yazīd b. Yazīd.**” This is further confirmed by Ibn ʿabī Ḥātim, who states that ʿAbd Allāh transmitted from “his father and his paternal uncle Yazīd b. Yazīd b. Jābir.”¹²¹⁸ In short, the “Yazīd b. Jābir” cited in the *ʿisnād* under consideration is actually Yazīd b. Yazīd b. Jābir, which means that “his father” is actually Yazīd b. Jābir, not Jābir.

To compound matters, my initial assumption that Yazīd b. Jābir al-ʿAzdī al-Šāmī’s father was ʿAbū al-Šuʿaṭā Jābir b. Zayd al-ʿAzdī al-Baṣrī appears to be false: none of the biographical sources that I consulted regarding all of the figures under consideration make any connection between these two figures. If ʿAbū al-Šuʿaṭā Jābir had a son named Yazīd and a famous jurist amongst his grandsons, we might expect that to be mentioned in his biographical entries; if Yazīd b. Jābir was indeed the son of the famous ʿAbū al-Šuʿaṭā, we would reasonably expect that to be specified in his biographical entries; and if the notable jurist ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Yazīd b. Jābir was indeed the grandson of the famous ʿAbū al-Šuʿaṭā, we would certainly expect that to be mentioned in his biographical entries. We thus have strong reasons to doubt that ʿAbd Allāh is a direct descendent of ʿAbū al-Šuʿaṭā Jābir’s, which means that the Jābir al-ʿAzdī referred

¹²¹⁵ Ibn ʿabī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, V, pp. 98-99.

¹²¹⁶ Ḍahabī (ed. ʿArnaʿūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VII, pp. 176-177.

¹²¹⁷ Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Kān), *Tiqāt*, V, p. 535.

¹²¹⁸ Ibn ʿabī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, V, p. 98.

to in the *ʿisnād* via the patronyms of his descendants is likely a completely different person from ʿAbū al-Šuʿatā Jābir al-ʿAzdī.

Thus, if indeed al-Warjlānī (or some now-suppressed source of his) ultimately borrowed from al-Ḥākim’s hadith in the creation of the ʿIbādī version ascribed to ʿAbū al-Šuʿatā Jābir (as suggested above), he appears to have made the same mistake that I initially made—mistaking the ambiguous formulation in the relevant *ʿisnād* (“from his paternal uncle Yazīd b. Jābir, from his father”) as an ascription to ʿAbū al-Šuʿatā Jābir. This would explain the similarities between al-Ḥākim and al-Warjlānī’s versions of the hadith and the coincidence of their both mentioning the name Jābir.

In short, it transpires that ʿAbū al-Šuʿatā Jābir b. Zayd does not even rise to the level of a Juynbollian spider, let alone a CL.

ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 93-95/711-714 or 101/719-720)

I was able to collate six reports ascribed to the Madinan Follower ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām, four of which were recorded by his son Hišām (reconstructed), one of which was recorded by ʿAbd al-Razzāq (reconstructed), and one of which was recorded by al-Ṭabarānī.

Hišām b. ʿUrwah (d. 146-147/763-765)

ʿUrwah:

ʿĀʾiṣah was married at six or seven; consummation at nine.¹²¹⁹

Hišām b. ʿUrwah (d. 146-147/763-765)

ʿUrwah:

ʿĀʾiṣah was married at six or seven; consummation at nine.

Hišām:

Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹²²⁰

Hišām b. ʿUrwah (d. 146-147/763-765)

¹²¹⁹ See the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah, above.

¹²²⁰ See the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah, above.

‘Urwah:

‘Urwah wrote to [al-Walīd b.] ‘Abd al-Malik; [Kadījah’s death;] ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage, after Kadījah’s death; dream-vision of ‘Ā’iṣah; marriage at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine; [‘Ā’iṣah’s death].¹²²¹

Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah (d. 146-147/763-765)

‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; illness, hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.¹²²²

‘Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211/827)

Ma‘mar—Hiṣām & al-Zuhrī—‘Urwah:

Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine; dolls; Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹²²³

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Marwazī—Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-‘Abdī—Bakr b. Yūnus—Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād—‘Abū al-Zinād—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six; she was consummated at nine; together nine years; Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹²²⁴

Two of these reports need to be discarded immediately, since they have already been shown to be the product of contamination, interpolation, error, or fabrication. Firstly, ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version is plausibly contaminated or interpolated, and there is reason to think—based on a parallel transmission from Ma‘mar—that Ma‘mar’s original formulation lacked any reference to ‘Urwah at all.¹²²⁵ Secondly, al-Ṭabarānī’s hadith comprises a *matn* that was likely borrowed from Sufyān al-Ṭawrī’s redaction of Hiṣām’s Version 2 hadith (or al-‘Aḥwaṣ b. Jawwāb’s redaction thereof in particular),

¹²²¹ See the section on Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah, above.

¹²²² See the section on Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah, above.

¹²²³ See the section on ‘Abd al-Razzāq, above.

¹²²⁴ Ṭabarānī (ed. Ṭāriq & Ḥusaynī), *al-Mu‘jam al-‘Awsaṭ*, VII, p. 94, # 6957.

¹²²⁵ See the section on Ma‘mar, above.

and an altered version of the usual Ibn 'abī al-Zinād *'isnād* (in which Hišām has been replaced by 'Abū al-Zinād).¹²²⁶

This leaves us with only four different ascriptions by Hišām back to his father 'Urwah, which amounts to four isolated transmissions of four different versions of the marital-age hadith. There is thus no question of 'Urwah being established as a CL: absent independent corroboration, he cannot even rise to the level of a Juynbollian spider. Moreover, the fact that Hišām claimed the same source ('Urwah or 'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah) for four (and possibly more) markedly different versions of the same hadith is highly suspect: whilst it is certainly possible that he simply received and passed on each of them from his father, such evidence is also consistent with Hišām's having created and/or reworked the hadiths himself in successive retellings, incorporating different elements from a broader pool of material at various points. There is even direct evidence for this in the case of Version 2 of Hišām's hadith, which demonstrably arose through the addition of the 'death' element—taken from some other source—to Version 1.¹²²⁷

In short, the hadith of 'Ā'īṣah's marital age cannot be traced back to 'Urwah, at least on the basis of an ICMA.

Ḥabīb al-'A'war (d. early 8th C. CE)

I was able to find a single report ascribed to the early Madinan traditionist Ḥabīb al-'A'war, recorded by al-Wāqidī (reconstructed).

al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823)

'Abd al-Wāḥid b. Maymūn—Ḥabīb:

Ḳadījah's death; 'Ā'īṣah shown by angel; Prophet's interactions with 'Ā'īṣah's family; 'Ā'īṣah's birth; marriage at six; marriage to Sawdah.¹²²⁸

¹²²⁶ See the section on Ibn 'abī al-Zinād, above.

¹²²⁷ See the section on Hišām, above.

¹²²⁸ See the section on Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Wāqidī, above.

This transmission is completely isolated, with only a SS stretching back from al-Wāqidī to Ḥabīb. There can thus be no correlation between a putative CL and a distinctive sub-tradition in such a situation—Ḥabīb is not even a Juynbollian spider. In other words, even the transmission of this hadith from ‘Abd al-Wāḥid to al-Wāqidī cannot be confirmed, let alone from Ḥabīb to ‘Abd al-Wāḥid. Even if the hadith has some kind of transmission-history before al-Wāqidī, we have no way of knowing how far back any given part of the wording goes, absent corroborating transmissions. Moreover, the ending of the hadith—the short series of statements about the year of ‘Ā’iṣah’s birth, the year of her marriage, her age at marriage, and the relative chronology of ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah’s marriages—seems oddly chronologically-detailed for an early figure like Ḥabīb, but fits perfectly with the interests al-Wāqidī, a leading biographer and antiquarian. It is thus plausible that the ending of the hadith is an addendum or interpolation by al-Wāqidī, assuming that the rest of the narrative—which is precisely *narrative*, rather than *chronology*—derives from some earlier source (presumably a Madinan storyteller, who may or may not have been ‘Abd al-Wāḥid, or even Ḥabīb).

al-’Aswad b. Yazīd (d. 75/694-695)

I was able to collate two reports ascribed to the Kufan Follower al-’Aswad b. Yazīd al-Naḵa’ī (both on the authority of ‘Ā’iṣah), recorded by al-’A‘maš (reconstructed) and al-Ṭabarānī.

Sulaymān al-’A‘maš (d. 147-148/764-766)

’Ibrāhīm—al-’Aswad—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at nine; [[together nine years]/[Prophet died when she was eighteen]].¹²²⁹

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

‘Abdān b. ’Aḥmad—Zayd b. al-Ḥarīš—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Muḥāribī—’Abū Sa’d al-Baqqāl—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-’Aswad—al-’Aswad:

¹²²⁹ See the section on al-’A‘maš, above.

‘Ā’iṣah asked about the *’ifk*; marriage, when ‘Ā’iṣah was young and not yet desirable, in Makkah, at six; ‘Ā’iṣah’s attitude changed; Hijrah; she was brought to the Prophet; nine; the rest of the *’ifk* narrative.¹²³⁰

These two reports embody completely disparate traditions—in fact, they have almost nothing in common, beyond the verb *tazawwaja*: al-ʿAʿmaš’s report has ‘Ā’iṣah being engaged in marriage at nine, where al-Ṭabarānī’s report has it at six; al-ʿAʿmaš’s report is a short set of statements about ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age and the length of her marriage, whereas al-Ṭabarānī’s report is an elaborate narrative about the *’ifk*; and al-Ṭabarānī’s report includes elements and details pertaining to ‘Ā’iṣah’s physical maturation, her self-image, the Hijrah, and her being brought to the Prophet at age nine, all of which are absent from al-ʿAʿmaš’s report. In other words, these two reports are amongst the most dissimilar in the entire relevant corpus—they certainly do not embody a common tradition that could be identified as reflecting the distinctive redaction of their putative common source, al-ʿAswad.

Additionally, al-Ṭabarānī’s version is suspect on other grounds: no other version of the famous *’ifk* narrative contains any mention of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age, which immediately suggests that al-Ṭabarānī’s version has been interpolated or contaminated in that regard.¹²³¹ As it happens, one of the transmitters thereof, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad, was accused of transmitting objectionable hadiths (*’aḥādīṭ manākīr* or *’aḥādīṭ munkarah*) from unknown sources (*al-majhūlīn*), and of having been an interpolator of some sort (*kāna yudallisu*)¹²³²; and another, ‘Abū Sa’d al-Baqqāl, was outright weak (*ḍaʿīf*) or rejected (*matrūk* or *munkar*) in Hadith, according to some authorities.¹²³³ However, absent a comparison with parallel transmissions, little more can be said thereon.

In short, al-ʿAswad is not a credible CL for the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age; instead, he looks like a spider.

¹²³⁰ Ṭabarānī (ed. Ṭāriq & Ḥusaynī), *al-Muʿjam al-ʿAwsaṭ*, XXIII, pp. 118-120, # 153.

¹²³¹ Likewise, Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 107, who argues that this version was fashioned out of an *’ifk* tradition from al-Zuhri (i.e., one that lacked any reference to ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age).

¹²³² Ḍahabī (ed. ʿArnaʿūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, IX, pp. 136-138.

¹²³³ Ibn ʿAdī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, V, pp. 569-576.

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās (d. 67-68/687-688)

I was able to find a single report ascribed to the Meccan Companion ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās, recorded by al-Ṭabarī.

al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923)

al-Ḥārith b. Muḥammad b. ‘abī ‘Usāmah—Ibn Sa‘d—Hišām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbī—Muḥammad al-Kalbī—‘Abū Ṣāliḥ—Ibn ‘Abbās:

Marriage to ‘Ā’iṣah; ‘Ā’iṣah’s genealogy; marriage, three years before the Hijrah, at age seven; consummation, after the Hijrah, at age nine, during Šawwāl; Prophet died when she was eighteen; virgin.¹²³⁴

This transmission is completely isolated, with only a SS stretching back from al-Ṭabarī to Ibn ‘Abbās. There can thus be no correlation between a putative CL and a distinctive sub-tradition in such a situation—Ibn ‘Abbās is not even a Juynbollian spider. In other words, even the transmission of this hadith from al-Ḥārith to al-Ṭabarī cannot be confirmed, let alone from Ibn Sa‘d to al-Ḥārith, let alone from Hišām to Ibn Sa‘d, let alone from Muḥammad to his son Hišām, let alone from ‘Abū Ṣāliḥ to Muḥammad, let alone from Ibn ‘Abbās to ‘Abū Ṣāliḥ. Even if the hadith has some kind of transmission-history before al-Ṭabarī, we have no way of knowing how far back any given part of the wording goes, absent corroborating transmissions.

In addition to being uncorroborated, the *matn* of this hadith is also suspiciously detailed—and, as it happens, the hadith’s *’isnād* depicts it as having been ‘transmitted’ by a sequence of leading biographers and genealogists, including Muḥammad al-Kalbī and his son Hišām. It could simply be the case that those with such interests were drawn to—and thus transmitted—detailed biographical reports, but it may also be the case that such reports are the *product* of the biographers and genealogists. In other words, it is plausible that this report is actually a summary or synthesis of biographical information about ‘Ā’iṣah derived from various other reports (or the biographical or

¹²³⁴ Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV, pp. 1770-1771. For the *’isnād*, see *ibid.*, p. 1799. For the further, implied *’isnād*, see Ismail K. Poonawala, in Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (trans. Ismail K. Poonawala), *The History of al-Tabarī, Volume 9: The Last Years of the Prophet: The Formation of the State A.D. 630-632/A.H. 8-11* (Albany, USA: State University of New York Press, 1990), 126, n. 870.

prosopographical literature more broadly), which was then retrojected back to Ibn ‘Abbās. In particular, the constitutive elements of (and often the exact wordings in) this report are often found in other reports and statements associated with the biographers Ibn Sa‘d and al-Wāqidī.¹²³⁵

Either way, Ibn ‘Abbās is not a credible CL for the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age.

‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr (d. 57-58/677-678)

At first glance, the marital-age hadith appears to have innumerable *’isnāds* reaching all the way back to its subject: ‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr, who was a famous Companion, an emigrant (*muhājirah*) to Madinah, and one of the Mothers of the Believers (*’ummahāt al-mu’minīn*). However, this veritable forest of *’isnāds* is illusory: through an ICMA and the systematic application of the Criterion of Dissimilarity, most of these ascriptions to ‘Ā’iṣah have proved to be the product of raising (*raf’*). Time and again, the original redactions of numerous PCLs and CLs within the broader tradition have been exposed as *munqaṭi’*, including the following:

- ‘Abd al-Razzāq (d. 211/827), who originally only cited Hiṣām and al-Zuhrī, from ‘Urwah, as his source for his redaction of the marital-age hadith.¹²³⁶
- ‘Isrā’īl b. Yūnus (d. 160-162/776-779), who originally only cited ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah (and possibly Muṣ‘ab), as his source for his redaction of the marital-age hadith.¹²³⁷

¹²³⁵ The genealogy is present in al-Ḥajjāj b. ‘abī Manī’^{’s} redaction (see the relevant section, above), and in numerous other biographical, prosopographical, and genealogical sources; the phrase *qabla al-hijrah bi-ṭalāt* is present in the reports associated with Ibn Ṣihāb al-Zuhrī (see the relevant section, above), and in al-Wāqidī’s biographical summary (see the section on ‘Amrah, above); the exact phrase *wa-hiya ibnat sab’ sinīn* is present in Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 41, and Ibn Hiṣām (ed. Wüstenfeld), *Das Leben Muhammed’s*, p. 1001, amongst other sources; the distinctive verb *jama’a* (as used in the ‘consummation’ element) is present in Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42; the ‘Hijrah’ element can be found in numerous sources; the inclusion of *fī ṣawwāl* in the ‘consummation’ element is present in Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 156-157 (i.e., al-Wāqidī’s redaction of al-Zuhrī’s biographical summary); the *tuwuffiya* version of the ‘Prophet’s death’ element is present in Ibn Sa‘d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 42, 156-157, and Balāḍurī (ed. Zakkār & Ziriklī), *Jumal min ‘Ansāb al-‘Aṣrāf*, II, p. 39, and various other sources; and, finally, the exact phrase *wa-lam yatazawwaj rasūl allāh bikra^{an} ḡayra-hā* is present in Ibn Hiṣām (ed. Wüstenfeld), *Das Leben Muhammed’s*, p. 1001.

¹²³⁶ See the section on ‘Abd al-Razzāq, above.

¹²³⁷ See the section on ‘Isrā’īl, above.

- **Hišām b. ‘Urwah** (d. 146-147/763-765), who originally only cited his father as his source for Versions 1-3 of his marital-age hadith.¹²³⁸
- **’Ismā’īl b. ’abī Kālīd** (d. 146/763-764), who originally only cited ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ’abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk, from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud‘ān, as his source for his *faḍā’il* hadith.¹²³⁹
- **’Abū Ḥujayyah al-’Ajlaḥ** (d. 145/762-763 or later), who originally only cited Ibn ’abī Mulaykah as his source (and whose original formulation lacked the marital-age elements in any case).¹²⁴⁰

There are nevertheless some hadiths that claim to reach all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah (i.e., hadiths for which no direct evidence of raising survives), but these are beset by other problems. Firstly, there are several that have been exposed as contaminated or interpolated versions of hadiths *that originally lacked the marital-age elements altogether*, such as the following:

- **Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-’Asadī** (d. turn of the 9th C. CE)’s hadith, with the *’isnād* Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—Sa’d b. ’Ibrāhīm—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad—‘Ā’iṣah, is an obvious corruption of well-known hadith about Ṣawwāl that is traceable back to the CL Sufyān, whose original formulation thereof lacked any mention of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age, and was ascribed to ’Ismā’īl b. ’Umayyah—‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Urwah—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah.¹²⁴¹
- **al-’Ijlī** (d. 261/874-875)’s hadith, with the *’isnād* ’Abū Dāwūd al-Ḥafarī—Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—’Ismā’īl b. ’Umayyah—‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah, is another obvious corruption of Sufyān’s Ṣawwāl hadith, but only of the *matn*.¹²⁴²
- **al-Ṭabarānī** (d. 360/971)’s hadith, with the *’isnād* ‘Abdān b. ’Aḥmad—Zayd b. al-Ḥarīš—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Muḥāribī—’Abū Sa’d al-Baqqāl—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-’Aswad—al-’Aswad, which purports to record ‘Ā’iṣah’s retelling of the *’ifk* narrative to al-’Aswad, is obviously contaminated or

¹²³⁸ See the section on Hišām, above.

¹²³⁹ See the section on ’Ismā’īl, above.

¹²⁴⁰ See the section on al-’Ajlaḥ, above.

¹²⁴¹ See the section on Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, above.

¹²⁴² See the section on Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, above.

interpolated, since every other version of the *ʿifk* hadith lacks any mention of her marital age.¹²⁴³

Moreover, there are several *ʿĀʾiṣah*-ascribed versions of the marital-age hadith that seem to have been constructed out of *other versions of the same hadith*, such as the following:

- **Muḥammad b. ʿAmr** (d. 144-145/761-763)’s hadith, on the authority of ʿAbū Salamah and Yaḥyá, and in which *ʿĀʾiṣah* is introduced halfway through as a source and narrator, probably borrowed its elaborate marriage narrative from Hišām’s Version 4 hadith.¹²⁴⁴
- **ʿAbṭar b. al-Qāsim** (d. 178/794-795)’s hadith, with the *ʿisnād* Muṭarrif—ʿAbū ʾIshāq—ʿAbū ʾUbaydah—*ʿĀʾiṣah*, has a *matn* likely borrowed from the tradition of al-ʾAʿmaš.¹²⁴⁵
- **al-Nasāʾī** (d. 303/915-916), with the *ʿisnād* ʾAḥmad b. Saʿd—Saʿīd b. ʾabī Maryam—Yaḥyá b. ʾAyyūb—ʾUmārah b. Ġaziyyah—Muḥammad b. ʾIbrāhīm—ʾAbū Salamah—*ʿĀʾiṣah*, has a *matn* plausibly borrowed from an iteration of Hišām’s Version 1 hadith (especially Wuhayb’s redaction), or possibly ʾAbū Yaʿlá’s dubious transmission from Muḥammad b. ʿAmr.¹²⁴⁶
- **al-Ṭabarānī** (d. 360/971)’s hadith, with the *ʿisnād* al-Ḥaḍramī—ʾAbū Kurayb—Muʿāwiyah b. Hišām—Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—ʾAbū ʾIshāq—ʾAbū ʾUbaydah—*ʿĀʾiṣah*, is probably a corruption of either Qabīṣah or al-Firyābī’s redactions of Sufyān’s redaction of Hišām’s Version 2 hadith, in which the early segment of the original *ʿisnād* (Hišām—ʾUrwah) has been replaced by (a raised version of) that of ʾIsrāʾīl’s hadith (ʾAbū ʾIshāq—ʾAbū ʾUbaydah—*ʿĀʾiṣah*).¹²⁴⁷
- **al-Ṭabarānī** (d. 360/971)’s hadith, with the *ʿisnād* al-Ḥaḍramī—Yaḥyá al-Ḥimmānī—Šarīk—ʾAbū ʾIshāq—ʾAbū ʾUbaydah—*ʿĀʾiṣah*, has a *matn* likely

¹²⁴³ See the section on al-ʾAswad, above.

¹²⁴⁴ See the sections on both Muḥammad b. ʿAmr and Hišām, above.

¹²⁴⁵ See the sections on al-ʾAʿmaš and ʾAbū ʾIshāq, above.

¹²⁴⁶ See the section on ʾAbū Salamah, above.

¹²⁴⁷ See the sections on Sufyān al-Ṭawrī and ʾAbū ʾIshāq, above.

borrowed from either Jarīr or Ḥammād b. Zayd's redactions of Hišām's Version 1 hadith.¹²⁴⁸

- **al-Ṭabarānī** (d. 360/971)'s hadith, with the *'isnād* Muḥammad al-Marwazī—Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Karīm—Bakr b. Yūnus—Ibn 'abī al-Zinād—'Abū al-Zinād—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah, has a *matn* likely borrowed from Sufyān al-Ṭawrī's redaction of Hišām's Version 2 hadith (or al-'Aḥwaṣ b. Jawwāb's redaction thereof in particular), and an altered version of the usual Ibn 'abī al-Zinād *'isnād* (in which Hišām has been replaced by 'Abū al-Zinād).¹²⁴⁹

All of this leaves only the following hadiths ascribed to 'Ā'iṣah:

Hišām b. 'Urwah (d. 146-147/763-765)

Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; illness, hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.¹²⁵⁰

Sulaymān al-'A'maš (d. 147-148/764-766)

'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at nine; [[together nine years]/[Prophet died when she was eighteen]].¹²⁵¹

'Abū 'Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ (d. 176/792)

'Abd al-Malik b. 'Umayr—'Ā'iṣah

Special attributes; marriage at six/seven; angel brought image; consummation at nine; seeing Gabriel; most-beloved; illness; angels.¹²⁵²

Ibn Sa'd (d. 230/845)

Muḥammad b. 'Umar reported—'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Rijāl—'Abū al-Rijāl—'Amrah bt. 'Abd al-Raḥmān—'Ā'iṣah:

¹²⁴⁸ See the sections on Šarīk and 'Abū 'Ishāq, above.

¹²⁴⁹ See the section on Ibn 'abī al-Zinād, above.

¹²⁵⁰ See the section on Hišām, above.

¹²⁵¹ See the section on al-'A'maš, above.

¹²⁵² See the section on 'Abū 'Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ, above.

Marriage, during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood, three years before the Hijrah, at age six; Hijrah; wedding feast, during Šawwāl, eight months after the Hijrah, at age nine.¹²⁵³

ʿAbū Nuʿaym (d. 430/1038)

ʿAḥmad b. ʿIṣḥāq—ʿIbrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Fābzānī—Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd—Zayd b. al-Ḥubāb—Ḥusayn b. Wāqid—Ibn Buraydah—Buraydah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; Prophet seeks consummation; ʿĀʾiṣah is fattened up by her parents.¹²⁵⁴

There are numerous problems with this set of reports. Firstly, Hišām’s hadith is suspect: his original formulations of Versions 1-3 of his hadith were all *munqaṭiʿ*, so why would Version 4 be any different? Moreover, Hišām’s hadiths are consistent with being the product of Hišām’s own elaborations in successive retellings—indeed, there is direct evidence for the creation of Version 2 out of Version 1.¹²⁵⁵ If Version 4 is likewise merely an extremely elaborated version of Version 1 (as indeed seems plausible), it cannot be treated as an independent transmission back to ʿĀʾiṣah.

Secondly, al-ʿAʿmaš’s hadith (the authenticity of which is questionable) is extremely divergent in its core element from all the rest, depicting ʿĀʾiṣah as being married (i.e., engaged) at *nine* rather than six or seven.

Thirdly, ʿAbū ʿAwānah’s hadith is much more similar overall to other *faḍāʾil* hadiths about ʿĀʾiṣah (most of which lack the marital-age elements) than it is to other versions of the marital-age hadiths ascribed to ʿĀʾiṣah: this is consistent with his hadith’s being yet another iteration of the common stock of *faḍāʾil* material that was circulating in Iraq in the 8th Century CE, or with its being a remix or updated version of earlier *faḍāʾil* reports that lacked any mention of ʿĀʾiṣah’s marital age.¹²⁵⁶

Fourthly, Ibn Saʿd’s hadith is much more similar in structure and content to the statements of various biographical authorities—including statements that lack the marital-age elements altogether—than it is to other versions of the marital-age hadith, which is consistent with the hadith’s having been fashioned therefrom.¹²⁵⁷

¹²⁵³ Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 39-40.

¹²⁵⁴ ʿAbū Nuʿaym (ed. Ḥasan), *Taʾrīḫ ʿAṣḥābān*, I, p. 233.

¹²⁵⁵ See the section on Hišām, above.

¹²⁵⁶ See the section on ʿIsmāʿīl b. ʿabī Kālid, above.

¹²⁵⁷ See the section on ʿAmrah, above.

Fifthly, 'Abū Nu'aym's hadith appears to be completely isolated: I have been unable to find a single other transmission thereof in the entire extant Hadith corpus, which means that it reaches from 'Abū Nu'aym (fl. c. 1000 CE) all the way back to 'Ā'īṣah (d. 57-58/677-678) via a SS. Moreover, the content differs markedly from every other version of the marital-age hadith: the only thing they have in common is the 'marriage at six' element, which could easily be the product of an interpolation or contamination that occurred at any point in the three centuries separating hadith's alleged point of origin with its extant preservation. As it happens, one of this hadith's tradents, Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd al-Rāzī (d. 248/862-863), was widely regarded not just as unreliable, but as specifically someone who transmitted unusual hadiths (*ṣāḥib 'ajā'ib*).¹²⁵⁸ As always, however, the judgements of the early Muslim Hadith critics are not necessarily to be relied upon in these matters.

In short, these five ascriptions to 'Ā'īṣah are not just extremely disparate (which we would actually expect in the case of genuine early provenance), but are in fact respectively more similar to transmissions from other sources and authorities than they are to each other, which is consistent with their being a product of contamination thereby, or borrowing therefrom. As such, these five reports do not constitute a distinctive tradition *vis-à-vis* other iterations of the same material, such that they cannot be said to reflect an underlying redaction attributable to 'Ā'īṣah herself. In other words, *pace* Juynboll and Brown, the marital-age hadith cannot be traced back to 'Ā'īṣah: she is not a credible CL, or in other words, she looks like a spider. Whilst it is certainly *possible* that the marital-age hadith originated with 'Ā'īṣah, this cannot be demonstrated with an ICMA, at least on the basis of the available evidence.

Conclusion

Through the application of a critical, rigorous, and systematic version of the ICMA, the basic principles of textual criticism more broadly, and the Criterion of Dissimilarity (along with occasional instances of source-, form-, and historical-critical analysis,

¹²⁵⁸ Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, XI, p. 503.

whenever an ICMA proved inapplicable), the following results obtained in regards to the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age:

- The majority of the relevant reports form mutually-similar clusters *vis-à-vis* other reports and thus constitute distinctive traditions and sub-traditions (i.e., possessing particular elemental sequences and wordings in common, *vis-à-vis* most other versions).
- The majority of these clusters/traditions correlate with particular tradents (i.e., commonly-cited sources).
- In such cases, *as a general tendency*, the rate of variation between parallel ascriptions to common sources increases in proportion to the antiquity of the source. In other words, there is a correlation, in such cases, between the dates of common sources (i.e., the time-periods in which transmission apparently occurred) and the rate of variation.
- The absolute dating of this apparent transition from a high rate of variation to a low rate of variation (i.e., the relevant time-periods of transmission, based on dates of the relevant tradents) correlates, *broadly speaking*, with our established background knowledge on the general transition from the oral to the written transmission of Hadith.

The best general explanation for these data is that the particular wordings of earlier tradents—the CLs and their PCLs—were (at least broadly) accurately recorded by subsequent tradents, with each successive generation becoming more precise in its transmission (due above all to the ongoing rise of written transmission). Thus, the distinctive redactions of CLs were (to at least some degree) accurately recorded by their PCLs, whilst the distinctive redactions of these PCLs were (to a much greater degree) accurately recorded by their students in turn. Consequently, earlier redactions the marital-age hadith—the distinctive formulations of PCLs and CLs—can be identified and, to varying degrees, reconstructed.

In practice, this reveals that it was the norm for tradents operating in the middle of the 8th Century CE (visible to us as CLs) to substantially reword their reports in successive retellings, and for tradents operating at the turn of the 9th Century CE (visible to us as PCLs, or senior PCLs in particular) to noticeably modify what they

received; it was only during the 9th and especially the 10th Century CE that precise transmission obtained. (Conversely, if this pattern is extrapolated backwards, transmission in the 7th Century CE must have been extremely mutagenic and volatile.)

The changes that occurred in the course of transmission often go far beyond mere paraphrasing: tradents will transmit different versions of their hadiths (with differences in details and even elements) at different times; tradents will add details and even elements into what they received from their sources, absent from the transmissions of co-tradents; the distinctive wordings of some tradents will randomly appear in ascriptions to others; the entire redactions of some tradents will reappear with alternative *ʿisnāds*; the *ʿisnāds* cited by some tradents from certain sources will differ—in part or even in whole—from the *ʿisnāds* cited by their co-tradents for the same redactions from the same sources; and of course, sometimes simple spelling errors occurred in the written transmission of hadiths.

In short, whilst an ICMA of the marital-age hadith reveals a general tendency for successive tradents to accurately record *some data* (at least from the CLs and the PCLs unto the extant sources), it simultaneously reveals a vast amount of accretion, error, contamination, interpolation, borrowing, and false ascription. Moreover, whilst the full-blown creation of new *ʿisnāds* for *matns* turned out to be relatively uncommon (at least amongst PCLs and later tradents), the alteration of existing *ʿisnāds* turned out to be fairly common: time and again, we encountered raisings and other such *ʿisnād*-related improvements.

Still, the overwhelming majority of the putative PCLs and CLs within the marital-age hadith turned out to be genuine sources whose distinctive redactions were identifiable and (to some degree) reconstructable. Such positive results only held as far back as the middle of the 8th Century CE, however: from thereon backwards, the evidence was either insufficient or outright inconsistent with genuine, early transmission. Thus, whilst an ICMA allowed us to attribute various different versions of this hadith to figures as early as Sulaymān al-ʿAʿmaš (d. 147-148/764-766) (debatably), Hišām b. ʿUrwah (d. 146-147/763-765), and Muḥammad b. ʿAmr (d. 144-145/761-763), nothing could be attributed to anyone earlier, including ʿAbū ʿIshāq al-Sabīʿī (d. 127-128/744-746), Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741-742), ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 93-95/711-714 or 101/719-720), and ʿĀʾiṣah bt. ʿabī Bakr (d. 57-58/677-678).

Chapter 3: A Critical Analysis of the Origins of the Hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s Marital Age

When and where did the idea of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage to the Prophet at a young age originate? Is there any reason to think that the extant reports conveying this idea can be traced all the way back to an actual statement by ‘Ā’iṣah herself; or are there instead indications that such reports reflect a later phase of Islamic history; or can nothing be said thereon, one way or the other?

When I first began to seriously analyse this hadith, it appeared to me to be a product of Zubayrid Madinah: the overwhelming majority of the *’isnāds* therefor converge on the Madinan and Zubayrid traditionist Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 146-147/763-765), citing the authority of his eminent Follower father (d. 93-101/711-720); three *’isnāds* also converge on the Madinan traditionist Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Šihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/741-742), likewise citing the authority of ‘Urwah; one *’isnād* also reaches back to the Madinan traditionist ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād (d. 164/780-781 or 174/790-791), from his Madinan father (d. 130/748), likewise citing the authority of ‘Urwah; eight *’isnāds* also converge on the Madinan traditionist Muḥammad b. ‘Amr (d. 144-145/761-763), on the authority of the Madinan Followers ‘Abū Salamah b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 94/712-713, or 104/722-723) and Yaḥyá b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥāṭib (d. 104/722-723); an Egypto-Madinan SS (cited by al-Nasā’ī) similarly reaches back to ‘Abū Salamah, on the authority of ‘Ā’iṣah herself; two *’isnāds* also converge on the Madinan traditionist Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823), citing the authority of the Madinan tradent ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Maymūn, who in turn cited the authority of the Madinan tradent Ḥabīb al-‘A‘war; and finally, a Madinan SS (cited by Ibn Sa‘d) reaches back to the Madinan Follower ‘Amrah bt. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (d. 98/716-717, or 106/724-725), citing the authority of ‘Ā’iṣah herself.

I was not so hasty as Juynboll and Brown to identify ‘Ā’iṣah as the ultimate source for all of these Madinan transmissions,¹²⁵⁹ for two reasons. Firstly, the original formulations of most of the aforementioned traditionists were *munqaṭi‘* or *mursal* (despite the subsequent raisings and improvements of some of their students), being

¹²⁵⁹ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 75, col. 1; Brown, in Rea, ‘Hadith’.

ascribed to the Followers of Madinah (‘Urwah, ‘Abū Salamah, Yaḥyá, and Ḥabīb); only two SSs (via ‘Abū Salamah and ‘Amrah) explicitly claimed to reach all the way back to ‘Ā’ishah herself. This is consistent with the ‘Ā’ishah story’s vaguely circulating in Madinah in the second half of the 1st Islamic Century (i.e., after her death in 57-58/677-678), the origin of which could be any one of the aforementioned Followers.

Secondly, the hadith was suspiciously useful for the Zubayrid political cause: early Muslim political claimants in the first and second *fitnahs* seem to have derived legitimacy from their female familial connections to Muḥammad, and ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr, nephew of ‘Ā’ishah and leader of the Hijaz-based Zubayrid faction in the second *fitnah* (c. 60-73/680-692), was no exception.¹²⁶⁰ As such, the Zubayrids must have been under pressure to emphasise the importance of ‘Ā’ishah in order to bolster the Zubayrid cause—and, given that they were wont to fabricate or interpolate reports in their favour,¹²⁶¹ it is only to be expected that they did so in this regard. This would explain the initial appearance of reports about the uniqueness of ‘Ā’ishah and her status as the favourite wife of the Prophet, for example.¹²⁶² Following this, one of the ways that these propagandists could have emphasised the specialness of ‘Ā’ishah was by trumpeting her distinctive status as Muḥammad’s only virgin wife—an emphasis that would have been accentuated by the circulation of reports concerning her young marital age.¹²⁶³ It is thus unsurprising that the marital-age hadith is associated overwhelmingly with a locus of Zubayrid-connected Madinan notables: ‘Urwah was himself a Zubayrid, being the brother ‘Abd Allāh; ‘Abū Salamah and ‘Urwah were remembered as having transmitted from each other¹²⁶⁴; Yaḥyá was remembered as having transmitted from ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr and to ‘Urwah¹²⁶⁵; Ḥabīb was

¹²⁶⁰ Peter Webb, *Imagining the Arabs: Arab Identity and the Rise of Islam* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), 197-201. It is also worth noting that ‘Ā’ishah was reportedly known as ‘*Umm ‘Abd Allāh*’ on account of her nephew, whom she reportedly loved more than any other, save the Prophet and her parents. See Spellberg, *Politics, gender, and the Islamic past*, 40-41; Abbott, *Aishah*, 64-65.

¹²⁶¹ E.g., William M. Watt, *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Oxford, UK: Oneworld Publications, 1998), 69-70; Gerald R. Hawting, “‘A plaything for kings’: ‘Ā’ishah’s *Ḥadīth*, Ibn al-Zubayr, and the Rebuilding of the Ka‘ba’, in Majid Daneshgar & Walid A. Saleh (eds.), *Islamic Studies Today: Essays in Honor of Andrew Rippin* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2017), 20-21; Shaddel, “‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and the Mahdī’. For general notes about pro-Zubayrid propaganda, see *ibid.*, 18-19, in particular.

¹²⁶² See the references in Wensinck, *Handbook*, 13-14.

¹²⁶³ For an elaboration on this function, see below.

¹²⁶⁴ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, IV, pp. 287-288.

¹²⁶⁵ Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdīb*, XI, p. 249.

reportedly the *mawlá* of ‘Urwah,¹²⁶⁶ as was ‘Abd al-Wāḥid¹²⁶⁷; al-Zuhrī was one of the most prolific students of ‘Urwah; Muḥammad b. ‘Amr transmitted from both ‘Abū Salamah and Yaḥyá¹²⁶⁸; and Hišām was the son of ‘Urwah. Thus, if ‘Urwah (for example) had created the marital-age hadith in order to bolster the Zubayrid cause, it would have been easy for it to spread (at a time when citing sources was not yet a norm) amongst his Madinan contemporaries and students, before ultimately being raised (at least by some later students) all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah.

In short, the political utility of this hadith for the Zubayrids, in conjunction with its common ascription to a coterie of Zubayrid-connected Madinan Followers and their students, in conjunction with the known tendency of propagandistic fabrication and interpolation amongst supporters of the Zubayrids, along with the fact that the earliest versions of the hadith were evidently not ascribed all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah herself, all provide grounds for concluding that the marital-age hadith originated in Zubayrid Madinah, rather than with a genuine statement or anecdote from ‘Ā’iṣah herself. Of course, it is possible that the Zubayrids merely exploited an expedient genuine memory for their cause—but such a supposition cannot be justified *vis-à-vis* a fabrication scenario.

And yet, even this scenario proved to be overly optimistic. After a year of preliminary analysis, I was decisively converted to Yasmin Amin’s position on this matter: the marital-age hadith probably originated even later—with Hišām and his contemporaries, in early Abbasid Iraq.¹²⁶⁹

Recapitulation of the *’Isnād-Cum-Matn* Analysis

In the preceding chapter, an ICMA revealed that most versions of the marital-age hadith can be traced back—in one form or another—to the following CLs, whose

¹²⁶⁶ Buḵārī (ed. Kān), *al-Ta’rīḳ al-Kabīr*, II, p. 312, # 2588.

¹²⁶⁷ [‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqānī &] ‘Alī b. ‘Umar al-Dāraqūṭnī (ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Muḥammad ‘Aḥmad al-Qaṣṣarī), *Su’ālāt al-Barqānīyy li-l-Dāraqūṭnīyy: Riwayāt al-Karajīyy ‘an-hu* (Lahore, Pakistan: Kutub Kānah Jamīliyy, 1404 AH), p. 45, # 308.

¹²⁶⁸ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, pp. 136-137.

¹²⁶⁹ I owe thanks to Belal Abu-Alabbas for alerting me to Amin’s position; and Amin herself, for generously taking the time to impart to me her insights on the significance of Hišām’s Iraqi students and the silence of Mālik and Ibn ‘Ishāq, along with her own hunches regarding Hišām’s motives.

redactions could be reconstructed at least in terms of gist, and often in terms of specific wording:

ʿIshāq b. Rāhwayh (d. 238/853) [Khurasanian]

Yahyá b. ʿĀdam [Kufan]—al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy [Kufan]:

He saw a twenty-one-year-old grandmother; the minimum age of pregnancy is nine; ʿĀʾiṣah's marriage was consummated at nine.¹²⁷⁰

al-Ḥajjāj b. ʿabī Manīʿ (d. post-216/831) [Levantine]

ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿabī Ziyād [Levantine]—Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī [Madīno-Levantine]:

Married ʿĀʾiṣah; after Kaḍījah; shown in a dream; married in Makkah at six; consummation; Hīrah; nine; ʿĀʾiṣah's genealogy; virgin; ʿAbū Bakr's name.¹²⁷¹

al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823) [Madinan]

ʿAbd al-Wāḥid b. Maymūn [Madinan]—Ḥabīb [Madinan]:

Kaḍījah's death; ʿĀʾiṣah shown by angel; Prophet's interactions with ʿĀʾiṣah's family; ʿĀʾiṣah's birth; ʿĀʾiṣah's marriage at six; marriage to Sawdah.¹²⁷²

Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (d. turn of 9th C. CE) [Kufan]

Sufyān al-Ṭawrī [Kufan]—Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm [Madinan]—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad [Madinan]—ʿĀʾiṣah [Madinan]:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; consummation in Šawwāl; [she was the preferred wife; she preferred women to be consummated in Šawwāl].¹²⁷³

ʿAbṭar b. al-Qāsim (d. 178/794-795) [Kufan]

Muṭarrif [Kufan]—ʿAbū ʿIshāq [Kufan]—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah [Kufan]—ʿĀʾiṣah [Madinan]:

Marriage at nine; together nine years.¹²⁷⁴

ʿAbū ʿAwānah al-Waḍḍāḥ (d. 176/792) [Wasitian-Basran]

¹²⁷⁰ See the section on ʿIshāq b. Rāhwayh in ch. 2.

¹²⁷¹ See the section on al-Ḥajjāj b. ʿabī Manīʿ in ch. 2.

¹²⁷² See the section on Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Wāqidī in ch. 2.

¹²⁷³ See the section on Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan in ch. 2.

¹²⁷⁴ See the section on ʿAbṭar in ch. 2.

‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Umayr [Kufan]—‘Ā’iṣah [Madinan]:

Special attributes; marriage at six/seven; angel brought image; consummation at nine; seeing Gabriel; most-beloved; illness; angels.¹²⁷⁵

‘Isrā’īl b. Yūnus (d. 160-162/776-779) [Kufan]

‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq [Kufan]—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah [Kufan]:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹²⁷⁶

Sulaymān al-‘A‘maš (d. 147-148/764-766) [Kufan]

‘Ibrāhīm [Kufan]—al-‘Aswad [Kufan]—‘Ā’iṣah [Madinan]:

Marriage at nine; [[together nine years]/[Prophet died when she was eighteen]].¹²⁷⁷

Hišām b. ‘Urwah (d. 146-147/763-765) [Madinan]

‘Urwah [Madinan]:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six or seven; consummation at nine.¹²⁷⁸

Hišām b. ‘Urwah (d. 146-147/763-765) [Madinan]

‘Urwah [Madinan]:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at six or seven; consummation at nine.

Anonymous:

The Prophet died when she was eighteen.¹²⁷⁹

Hišām b. ‘Urwah (d. 146-147/763-765) [Madinan]

‘Urwah [Madinan]:

‘Urwah wrote to [al-Walīd b.] ‘Abd al-Malik; [Kadījah’s death;] ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage, after Kadījah’s death; dream-vision of ‘Ā’iṣah; marriage at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine; [‘Ā’iṣah’s death].¹²⁸⁰

¹²⁷⁵ See the section on ‘Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍḍāh in ch. 2.

¹²⁷⁶ See the section on ‘Isrā’īl in ch. 2.

¹²⁷⁷ See the section on al-‘A‘maš in ch. 2.

¹²⁷⁸ See the section on Hišām b. ‘Urwah in ch. 2.

¹²⁷⁹ See the section on Hišām b. ‘Urwah in ch. 2.

¹²⁸⁰ See the section on Hišām b. ‘Urwah in ch. 2.

Hišām b. ‘Urwah (d. 146-147/763-765) [Madinan]

‘Urwah [Madinan]—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; illness, hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.¹²⁸¹

’Ismā’il b. ’abī Ḳālīd (d. 146/763-764) [Kufan]

‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ’abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk [unknown]—‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad [unknown]:

‘Abd Allāh b. Ṣafwān and someone else came to ‘Ā’iṣah, who mentioned her nine special attributes; angel brought image; marriage at seven; consummation at nine; virgin; revelation in blanket; most-beloved; Quranic revelation and communal destruction; seeing Gabriel; the Prophet’s death and the angel.¹²⁸²

Muḥammad b. ‘Amr (d. 144-145/761-763) [Madinan]

Yahyá [Madinan] & ’Abū Salamah [Madinan]:

Ḳawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Ḳawlah brings word to ’Umm Rūmān and waits for ’Abū Bakr; ’Abū Bakr questions the validity of the proposal, but the Prophet assuages him; ’Umm Rūmān informs Ḳawlah of a prior engagement with al-Muṭ‘im’s son; ’Abū Bakr visits al-Muṭ‘im and his wife, who call off the engagement on religious grounds, to ’Abū Bakr’s relief; ’Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; she is age six; Ḳawlah then goes to Sawdah, and passes on the proposal to her venerable father, who approves the match; Sawdah’s father sends for the Prophet and engages her to him; Sawdah’s brother disapproves, but later regrets having done so.

—‘Ā’iṣah [Madinan]:

Hijrah; women; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation; marital consummation; Sa’d brings food; nine.¹²⁸³

Numerous versions—whether SS ascriptions to isolated figures or transmissions from putative CLs—were also exposed as the clear product of error, contamination,

¹²⁸¹ See the section on Hišām b. ‘Urwah in ch. 2.

¹²⁸² See the section on ’Ismā’il b. ’abī Ḳālīd in ch. 2.

¹²⁸³ See the section on Muḥammad b. ‘Amr in ch. 2.

interpolation, and false ascription, including the CL redactions of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, ‘Abṭar b. al-Qāsim, Hišām b. ‘Urwah (in the case of his Version 2 hadith, at least), and Muḥammad b. ‘Amr. Many other versions—especially SS ascriptions to isolated figures—were not as definitive, but still exhibited suspicious signs of secondary construction; thus, out of the SS ascriptions to isolated figures, only the following one was not positively cast into doubt on specific textual or contextual grounds (whilst still being uncorroborated):

‘Abū Nu‘aym (d. 430/1038) [Isfahanian]

‘Aḥmad b. ‘Ishāq [Eastern?]-‘Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad [Eastern?]-Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd [Razian]-Zayd b. al-Ḥubāb [Mervian/Kufan]-Ḥusayn b. Wāqid [Mervian]-Ibn Buraydah [Mervian]-Buraydah [Madinan]-‘Ā’iṣah [Madinan]:

Marriage at six; Prophet seeks consummation; ‘Ā’iṣah is fattened up by her parents.¹²⁸⁴

As we concluded in the previous chapter, no version of the marital-age—including the CL redactions and SS ascriptions just cited—can be traced back to anyone operating before the middle of the 8th Century CE, at least on the basis of an ICMA. However, this raises an important question: is it possible to move beyond an ICMA and evaluate the hadith on other grounds? In other words, can we take the results of our ICMA and subject them to further analysis, in order to gain deeper insights into the transmission and origins of the hadith in question?

Dating by Ascription Type

One consideration is the different levels of ascription exhibited by these various reports: where some of them claim to reach all the way back to a Companion (‘Ā’iṣah), others only claim to reach back to a Follower (Jābir, ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, and ‘Urwah), or even convey the statements of later figures (Ḥabīb, Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī, and al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy). Based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity, we would generally expect those ascribed to later figures to reflect an earlier stage than those ascribed to earlier figures.

¹²⁸⁴ ‘Abū Nu‘aym (ed. Ḥasan), *Ta’rīk ‘Aṣbahān*, I, p. 233.

However, this does not get us very far, at least in this context: even hadiths that have preserved archaic ascriptions could still be interpolated or contaminated in terms of *content*. Moreover, a relative chronology does not help us establish an absolute dating: even if we now have reason to believe that Hišām's (Follower-ascribed) version predates al-'A'māš's (Companion-ascribed) version, for example, we are still left without any specific notion of the time-span and time-periods involved.

Form Criticism

Another potential avenue of analysis is form criticism: the identification and comparison of the narrative components of *matns* (i.e., regardless of their *'isnāds*), with the aim of identifying earlier forms thereof. Such an analysis immediately suggests that all versions of the marital-age hadith—all hadiths containing the 'marriage' and/or 'consummation' elements—must in that respect share a common origin, either as parallel recollections of an actual event, or various offshoots of an *ur-story*. The traditional explanation would of course be that 'Ā'īshah was actually engaged and consummated in marriage at a young age, and that this event was described and transmitted as a hadith accordingly—thus, a genuine historical memory undergirds the common form of the hadith. However, even putting aside the failure of the preceding ICMA to correlate any particular redaction with 'Ā'īshah, and putting aside also the fact that most versions of the hadith did not originally claim 'Ā'īshah as their source in the first place, this is not a satisfactory explanation: the age range given for 'Ā'īshah's marital engagement (*tazawwuj, nikāḥ*) is six, six or seven, seven, nine and (in the case of one extreme outlier) ten, so it cannot simply be the case that an actual event was accurately remembered and reported. Moreover, both the 'marriage' and 'consummation' elements are usually worded in a fairly specific way (i.e., sharing common verbs and *ḥāl* structures), which is suspect: there are many ways that the relevant information could have been expressed in Arabic,¹²⁸⁵ yet a common formula prevails in the relevant reports:

¹²⁸⁵ There are numerous alternative ways of expressing this information, including alternative verbs, alternative verbal forms, and alternative syntax. Rather than creating a list of hypothetical examples, it

suffices to catalogue the actual examples that exist within the variants of the broader marital-age tradition.

Firstly, in terms of alternative verbs for the ‘marriage’ element: Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 26, # 62 (cf. the section on al-ʿAjlāh in ch. 2) has *fa-zawwaja-hā rasūl allāh*; al-Baḡawī’s redaction (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *wa-kaṭabat ʿalay-hi ʿāʾiṣah* (with Ḳawlah as the subject); Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42 (cf. the section on al-Zuhrī in ch. 2) has *malaka rasūl allāh ʿuqdat ʿāʾiṣah*; Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42 (cf. the sections on Hišām b. ʿUrwah and al-Zuhrī in ch. 2) has *nakaḥa al-nabiyy ʿāʾiṣah*; ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s redaction (cf. the sections on Maʿmar, Hišām b. ʿUrwah, and al-Zuhrī in ch. 2) has *nakaḥa al-nabiyy ʿāʾiṣah*; Šāfiʿī (ed. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib), *ʿUmm*, VI, pp. 45-46, # 2210 (cf. the section on Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah in ch. 2) has *nakaḥa-nī al-nabiyy*; Muḥammad b. Bišr’s redaction (cf. the sections on Muḥammad b. ʿAmr and Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *fa-zawwaja-hā [[min rasūl allāh]/[ʿiyyā-hu]]*; ʿAbū ʿUsāmah’s first redaction (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *[tumma/wa-] nakaḥa ʿāʾiṣah*; ʿAbū ʿAwānah’s redaction (cf. the preceding discussion, and the section on ʾIsmāʿīl b. ʾabī Ḳālid in ch. 2) has *malaka-nī rasūl allāh*; and Hišām’s Version 3 hadith (cf. his section in ch. 2) has *wa-nakaḥa ʿāʾiṣah* and possibly *nakaḥa-hā rasūl allāh*.

Secondly, in terms of alternative verbs for the ‘consummation’ element: Warjlānī (ed. Sālimī), *al-Tartīb fī al-Šaḥīḥ*, p. 238, # 528; *ibid.*, p. 326, # 750 (cf. the section on Jābir b. Zayd in ch. 2) has *wa-ibtanā bi-hā*; Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, p. 20, # 6881 (cf. the sections on al-Zuhrī and ʿAmrah in ch. 2) has *wa-ʿarrasa bi-hā* and *ibtanā bi-hā*; Ṭabarānī (ed. Salafī), *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*, XXIII, p. 19, # 40 (cf. the section on Qatādah in ch. 2) has *tumma ibtanā bi-hā*; Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV, pp. 1770-1771 (cf. the section on Ibn ʿAbbās in ch. 2) has *wa-jamaʿa ʿilay-hā*; Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV (series III), p. 2439 (cf. the sections on al-Zuhrī and ʿAmrah in ch. 2) has both *wa-ʿarrasa bi-hā* and *ibtanā bi-hā*; ʿAbd al-Razzāq (ed. ʿAʿzamī), *Muṣannaf*, VI, p. 162, # 10349 (cf. the section on ʿAbd al-Razzāq) has *wa-ʾuhdiyat ʿilay-hi*; Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 39-40 (cf. the section on ʿAmrah) has *wa-ʾaʿrasa bī*; Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42 (cf. the section on al-Zuhrī in ch. 2) has *wa-jamaʿa-hā*; ʿAbd al-Razzāq’s redaction (cf. the sections on Maʿmar, Hišām b. ʿUrwah, and al-Zuhrī in ch. 2) has *wa-zuffat ʿilay-hi*; Sufyān al-Ṭawrī’s redaction (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *wa-ʾudkilat ʿalay-hi*; and ʾIsmāʿīl b. ʾabī Ḳālid’s redaction (cf. his section in ch. 2) has *wa-ʾuhdītu ʿilay-hi*.

Thirdly, in terms of alternative syntax for either element: ʿAbū Nuʿaym (ed. ʿAzzāzī), *Maʿrifat al-Šaḥābah*, I, p. 3208, # 7375 (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *li-sitt sinīn*; Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, p. 19, # 6879 (cf. the section on Jābir b. Zayd in ch. 2) has *wa-la-hā sabʿ sinīn* and *wa-la-hā tisʿ sinīn*; Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, p. 19, # 6880 (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *wa-kānat ʿāʾiṣah yawma nakaḥa-hā rasūl allāh bint sitt sinīn*; Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, VII, p. 20, # 6881 (cf. the sections on al-Zuhrī and ʿAmrah in ch. 2) has *wa-ʿarrasa bi-hā rasūl allāh fī šawwāl ʿalā raʾs ʿāmāniyat ʾašhur min al-hijrah wa-kānat yawma ibtanā bi-hā bint tisʿ sinīn*; al-Baḡawī’s redaction (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *wa-kaṭabat ʿalay-hi ʿāʾiṣah bint/ibnah ʾabī bakr fa-banā bi-sawdah wa-ʿāʾiṣah yawma-ʾid bint sitt sinīn*; Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV, p. 1770 (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *wa-ʿāʾiṣah yawma-ʾid ibnat sitt sinīn*; Ṭabarī (ed. de Goeje), *Annales*, IV (series III), p. 2439 (cf. the sections on al-Zuhrī and ʿAmrah in ch. 2) has *wa-ʿarrasa bi-hā fī šawwāl ʿalā raʾs ʿāmāniyat ʾašhur min al-hijrah wa-kānat yawma ibtanā bi-hā ibnat tisʿ sinīn*; Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 39 (cf. the sections on Muḥammad b. ʿAmr and Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *wa-kaṭabat ʿalay-hi ʿāʾiṣah bint ʾabī bakr fa-tazawwaja-humā fa-banā bi-sawdah bi-makkah wa-ʿāʾiṣah yawma-ʾid bint sitt sinīn*; Ibn Saʿd (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, pp. 39-40 (cf. the section on ʿAmrah) has *wa-ʾaʿrasa bī fī šawwāl ʿalā raʾs ʿāmāniyat ʾašhur min al-muhājar wa-kuntu yawma daḳala bī ibnat tisʿ sinīn*; ʿAbū ʿUsāmah’s second redaction (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *li-sitt sinīn*; Ibn Bukayr (ed. Zakkār), *al-Siyar wa-al-Maḡāzī*, p. 255 (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *wa-ʿāʾiṣah yawma-ʾid ibnat sitt sinīn*; Jaʿfar b. Sulaymān’s redaction (cf. the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2) has *li-sabʿ [sinīn]* and *li-tisʿ sinīn*; ʾAbṭar’s redaction (cf. the sections on al-ʿAʿmaš and ʿAbū ʾIshāq in ch. 2) has *li-tisʿ sinīn*; and ʾIsmāʿīl b. ʾabī Ḳālid’s redaction (cf. his section in ch. 2) has *li-sabʿ sinīn* and *li-tisʿ sinīn*.

However, as is indicated in each case (by the “cf.” reference to an ICMA in the preceding chapter), these actual variants are almost always *secondary* rewordings (i.e., the wordings of *offshoots* or *outgrowths* of traditions, such as PCL redactions, or obvious dives with elemental combinations taken from other sources). By contrast, most of the earliest CL redactions (namely, Ibn Rāḥwayh’s ascription to al-Ḥasan; ʾIsrāʾīl’s redaction; al-ʿAʿmaš’s redaction; and Versions 1, 2, and 4 of Hišām’s hadith) adhere to the usual *tazawwaja* verbal sentence and consequent *ḥāl* clause for the ‘marriage’ element, and the usual *banā* or *daḳala* verbal sentence and consequent *ḥāl* clause for the ‘consummation’ element, whenever they have either element. The notable exceptions are the redactions of ʿAbū ʿAwānah al-

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr—‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad:

tazawwaja-hā rasūl allāh wa-hiya ibnat ‘ašr sinīn.

al-Kulaynī—‘Alī—Muḥammad—Yūnus—‘Abū ‘Ayyūb—‘Ismā‘īl:

’inna rasūl allāh daḡala bi-‘ā’iṣah wa-hiya bint ‘ašr sinīn.

Ibn Rāhwayh—Yaḥyá—al-Ḥasan:

daḡala rasūl allāh bi-‘ā’iṣah wa-hiya bint tis‘ sinīn.

al-Ḥajjāj—‘Ubayd Allāh—al-Zuhrī:

nakaḡa-hā rasūl allāh bi-makkah wa-hiya bint/ibnat sitt sinīn tumma ’inna rasūl allāh baná bi-‘ā’iṣah ba‘da-mā qadima al-madīnah wa-‘ā’iṣah yawma baná bi-hā [rasūl allāh] bint tis‘ sunan.

Ibn Hišām:

tazawwaja rasūl allāh ‘ā’iṣah bint ’abī bakr al-ṣiddīq bi-makkah wa-hiya ibnat sab‘ sinīn wa-baná bi-hā bi-al-madīnah wa-hiya bint tis‘ sinīn ’aw ‘ašr.

al-Wāqidī—‘Abd al-Wāḥid—Ḥabīb:

tazawwaja-hā rasūl allāh fī al-sanah al-‘āširah fī šawwāl wa-hiya yawma-’id bint/ibnat sitt sinīn.

Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan—Sufyān—Sa‘d—al-Qāsim—‘Ā’iṣah:

tazawwaja-nī/bī rasūl allāh wa-’anā ibnat sitt sinīn wa-baná bī wa-’anā bint tis‘ sinīn.

‘Abṭar—Muṭarrif—‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq—‘Abū ‘Ubaydah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Waḡḡah and ‘Ismā‘īl b. ‘abī Kālid, along with Hišām’s Version 3 hadith, all of which exhibit some non-standard wordings; but as we saw previously, there are reasons to think that ‘Abū ‘Awānah and ‘Ismā‘īl’s redactions are secondary constructions that incorporate the distinctive sequence of Hišām’s Version 1 hadith. This leaves Hišām’s Version 3 hadith, which cites exactly the same source as his other three versions (‘Urwah), and is thus consistent with being secondary as well (*vis-à-vis* the three other formulations ascribed to the same source).

In short, the tendency of the marital-age tradition as a whole—from earlier redactions to later redactions—is from unity to diversity, implying a common ur-story.

tazawwaja-nī rasūl allāh li-tis' sinīn.

'Abū 'Awānah—'Abd al-Malik—'Ā'iṣah:

malaka-nī [rasūl allāh] wa-'anā bint sitt/sab' sinīn [...] wa-banā bī [[wa-'anā bint]/[li-]]tis' sinīn.

'Isrā'il—'Abū 'Iṣḥāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah:

tazawwaja rasūl allāh/al-nabiyy 'ā'iṣah wa-hiya bint/ibnat sitt sinīn wa-daḡala/banā bi-hā wa-hiya bint/ibnat tis' sinīn.

Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī & Hišām:

nakaha al-nabiyy 'ā'iṣah wa-hiya bint/ibnat tis' sanawāt 'aw sab'.

al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

tazawwaja-hā rasūl allāh wa-hiya bint tis' [sinīn].

Hišām—'Urwah:

tazawwaja rasūl allāh 'ā'iṣah wa-hiya bint/ibnat sitt sinīn 'aw sab' wa-banā bi-hā wa-hiya bint/ibnat tis' [sinīn].

'Ismā'il b. 'abī Kālid—'Abd al-Raḥmān—'Abd al-Raḥmān:

tazawwaja-nī rasūl allāh li-sab' sinīn wa-'uhdītu 'ilay-hi li-tis' sinīn.

Muḥammad b. 'Amr—Yaḥyá & 'Abū Salamah:

[zawwaja/'ankaha/malaka]-hā wa-hiya yawma-'id ibnat sitt sinīn [...] fa-banā bī rasūl allāh [fī bayti-nā] [...] wa-'anā yawma-'id bint/ibnat tis' sinīn.

Most of these variants share the same elemental sequence, and even those that only comprise one or the other of the two elements share the distinctive wordings of those that do constitute the usual sequence. Even the rare 'ten' variants otherwise conform to the structure and wordings of the more common variants, as do the unusual 'nine' variants. This suggests not merely that they share a common origin, but that they share a common *narrative* origin: all of them likely stem from some kind of ur-story.

What did this ur-story look like, and who formulated it? It could be none other than an authentic statement of ‘Ā’iṣah’s (despite the limitations of the extant *’isnāds*), but given that the original clearly described her in the third-person (with all first-person versions being secondary rewordings),¹²⁸⁶ this seems improbable. Instead, the original speaker in this ur-story must be some later figure, even if they were using information that genuinely derived from ‘Ā’iṣah—for example, her nephew ‘Urwah, or his son Hiṣām. Either way, this inferable ur-story or ur-hadith would need to be something with which we could account for the rise of the aforementioned fundamental variants within the marital-age hadith-tradition. As it happens, two viable candidates for such an ur-story (or at least, for being a close reflection thereof) exist amongst the available reports, one of which is an extant report, and the other of which is a reconstructed CL redaction (though also still represented by extant transmissions). The first is the following ascription to both al-Zuhrī and Hiṣām, recorded by Ibn Sa’d:

Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd al-‘Abdī reported to us: “Ma‘mar related to us, from al-Zuhrī and Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah, who [both] said: “The Prophet married ‘Ā’iṣah when she was a girl of nine years or seven (*nakaḥa al-nabiyy ‘ā’iṣah wa-hiya ibnat tis‘ sanawāt ’aw sab*).””¹²⁸⁷

Although this report diverges substantially from the only other parallel transmission from Ma‘mar, from al-Zuhrī and Hiṣām (*viz.*, the redaction of ‘Abd al-Razzāq), it has the best claim out of the two to accurately reflecting Ma‘mar’s original redaction (based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity).¹²⁸⁸ In addition to being the putative statement of two virtual Followers-of-the-Followers (thus making it seem extremely archaic), this report is striking due to its vague equivocation over ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age: nine or seven. If indeed this reflects the ur-story (i.e., if the ur-story happens to survive via this version), it would explain the rise of the most fundamental variants within the marital-age hadith-tradition: the proposition that ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage (*tazawwuj, nikāḥ*) occurred at age seven and that her marital consummation (*binā’, dukūl*) occurred at age nine; and the proposition that ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage (*tazawwuj, nikāḥ*) occurred at age nine. In other words, this is consistent with the two rival ages (seven versus nine) for the same event (the marriage) given in the ur-story’s having been split into discrete

¹²⁸⁶ See the previous chapter of the present work.

¹²⁸⁷ Ibn Sa’d (ed. Brockelmann), *Biographien*, VIII, p. 42.

¹²⁸⁸ See the section on Ma‘mar in ch. 2.

ages for two separate events in most subsequent iterations of the hadith-tradition (e.g., the redaction of Hišām): seven at the time of the marital engagement, and nine at the time of the consummation of the marriage. Not all subsequent versions adhered to this common division, however: in some cases (e.g., the redaction of al-ʿAʿmaš), the marital age of ʿĀʾiṣah continued to be identified as nine.

The main weakness of this report as (an accurate reflection of) the ur-story is that it fails to explain the rise of the most common variant of all: the proposition that ʿĀʾiṣah was married at *six* and consummated at nine. By contrast, the second candidate for the ur-story can explain *all* of the relevant variants (six, seven, and nine)—namely, the Version 1 hadith of Hišām b. ʿUrwah, on the authority of his father:

The Messenger of God married (*tazawwaja*) ʿĀʾiṣah when she was a girl of six or seven years, and consummated the marriage with her (*baná bi-hā*) when she was a girl of nine years.¹²⁸⁹

This reconstructed redaction is the putative statement of a Follower, which is again consistent with its being archaic. Moreover, its being the ur-story (or a close reflection thereof) would explain all of the major variants of the marital-age hadith: ‘marriage at six’ and ‘consummation at nine’; ‘marriage at six or seven’ and ‘consummation at nine’; and ‘marriage at seven’ and ‘consummation at nine’.¹²⁹⁰ In other words, it is easy to envisage some tradents improving or updating the vague, initial version of the hadith (‘six or seven’) into more specific versions, choosing specifically either ‘six’ or ‘seven’. Alternatively, it is easy to envisage simple error or poor memory resulting in the loss of either ‘six’ or ‘seven’, leaving only the other (specifically ‘six’ or specifically ‘seven’) in the transmissions in question. Either way, Hišām’s Version 1 hadith easily accounts for most of the fundamental variation in question.

Hišām’s Version 1 hadith can also account for the rise of the ‘marriage at nine’ variant, in at least three ways. Firstly, poor memory or some other form of garbled transmission could easily result in the conflation or merging of the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements, resulting in a version of the hadith with ‘marriage at nine’ rather than ‘marriage at six/seven’ and ‘consummation at nine’ (as in the redaction of

¹²⁸⁹ See the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2.

¹²⁹⁰ Only the super-rare and typically late ‘marriage at ten’ (Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr), ‘consummation at ten’ (al-Kulaynī) and ‘consummation at nine or ten’ (Ibn Hišām) variants would remain unexplained.

al-ʿAʿmaš). Secondly, poor memory or some other form of garbled transmission could easily result in the conflation or merging of the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements but the retention of the ages ‘seven’ and ‘nine’, resulting in the ‘marriage at nine or seven’ (as in the aforementioned ascription to Maʿmar). Thirdly, as has been noted already,¹²⁹¹ the Arabic words for ‘seven’ (سبع) and ‘nine’ (تسع) share a similar-looking consonantal skeleton or *rasm* (namely, سسع), which could be confused with each other in the reading or copying of unvowelled and undotted writing. It is thus plausible that a version of Hišām’s Version 1 hadith with ‘seven’ was misread as ‘nine’, and that the ‘marriage’ and ‘consummation’ elements (both being read as occurring at ‘nine’) were again conflated or merged into a single ‘marriage at nine’ element (as in the redaction of al-ʿAʿmaš). Additionally, an uncertain *rasm*, in conjunction with some other garbled form of transmission (of the sort outlined above), could produce an uncertain ‘marriage at nine or seven’ variant (as in the aforementioned ascription to Maʿmar).

In short, Hišām’s Version 1 hadith, out of all extant versions of the marital-age hadith, best answers the classic textual-critical question of *utrum in alterum abiturum erat* (“Which would have been more likely to give rise to the other?”).¹²⁹² It is of course still possible that the fundamental variation in question—marital engagement at six and marital consummation at nine; marital engagement six or seven and marital consummation at nine; marital engagement seven and marital consummation at nine; marital engagement at nine; and marital engagement at nine or seven—arose through deliberate alterations or rewordings, either by the original formulator of the ur-story, or by subsequent tradents. For example, we could imagine a scenario in which someone—even ʿĀʾiṣah herself—repeated the same formula (in terms of verbs and syntax) but changed the details in successive retellings. Thus, whilst there would be an ur-story in terms of general outline (i.e., the formula reused in the successive retellings), there would not be an ur-story in terms of an ultimate, direct ancestor of all extant variants.

However, there is no reason to posit hypothetical successive redactions (i.e., *new entities*) to explain the extant variation: the *existing material*—or at least, a redaction

¹²⁹¹ Again, see the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2.

¹²⁹² Peter K. McCarter, *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (Philadelphia, USA: Fortress Press, 1986), 21.

that *survives within the extant material*—already suffices. Moreover, in the case of the scenario of a later tradent’s rewording the hadith (e.g., al-ʿAʿmaš and his ‘married at nine’ version), there is no reason to suppose a deliberate alteration (absent a discernible motive), which leaves only accidental or incidental alteration. In such a case, however, we would still need to explain *how* such an accident could occur, which is precisely what the posited ur-story provides: the confusion of ‘seven’ with ‘nine’, or the conflation of two elements, are exactly how such an error would occur.

In short, on form- and textual-critical grounds, Hišām’s Version 1 hadith is uniquely consistent with being the ur-story behind the marital-age hadith-tradition more broadly, since it could have plausibly—in light of the common pressures and problems of transmission—given rise to nearly all other versions, in a way that is not true for any other extant version. Only the ‘ten’ variants of the hadith are not readily explained thereby, but these are ultra-rare, attested relatively late,¹²⁹³ and are either statements without isnads (e.g., Ibn Hišām’s biographical statement about ʿĀʾiṣah, which looks like his own summary based on various different hadiths) and/or influenced by Šīʿī legal traditions about the ideal age of marital consummation (especially in the case of the ascription to ʾIsmāʿīl b. Jaʿfar).¹²⁹⁴ In other words, the only seeming exceptions to the broad tradition organically springing forth from the ur-story embodied by Hišām’s hadith—three late ‘ten’ variants—are easily explained as contaminations and/or the product of inferences by later historians. All of the material is thus accounted for.

Form Criticism and ʾIsnāds

Form criticism can also be combined with the evidence of ʾisnāds (i.e., beyond the scope of an ICMA, which narrowly focuses on correlating particular redactions with putative PCLs and CLs): as we already saw in the preceding chapter, a form-critical analysis in combination with a geographical analysis of the relevant ʾisnāds revealed that the *faḍāʾil* hadiths of ʾAbū ʿAwānah al-Waḍḍāḥ and ʾIsmāʿīl b. ʾabī Ḳālid are likely just different iterations of a common pool of storyteller and preacher material circulating

¹²⁹³ I.e., with Ibn Hišām (d. 213/828-829 or 218/833), al-Kulaynī (d. 328/939-940), and Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071).

¹²⁹⁴ See below in the present chapter.

in 8th-Century Kufah. Moreover, the fact that both share the two elements associated with Hišām's distinctive Version 1 hadith, in conjunction with the survival of closely-related *faḍā'il* reports that lack said elements altogether, suggests that 'Abū 'Awānah and 'Ismā'īl's redactions represent *secondary* iterations of the relevant *faḍā'il* material, under the influence of Hišām's hadith.

Form criticism can also be used to expose the unreliability of specific *'isnāds* at a certain level, as in the case of the redactions of 'Isrā'īl and al-'A'maš: both share the distinctive elemental combination of 'Ā'īshah was married when she was a girl of X years' and 'the Prophet died when she was a girl of eighteen', even if they differ on some details (for example, her specific marital age, and whether her marriage was distinct from her marital consummation). As such, both must share a common origin, yet each claims an independent *'isnād* back to (i.e., purports to be the words of) a different early figure: 'Abū 'Ubaydah and 'Ā'īshah, respectively. This immediately suggests that at least one of the two *'isnāds* in question are false, or at least misleading: they do not disclose their common source, which is consistent with their being dives.

Similar form-critical considerations apply to Hišām's Version 1 hadith, 'Isrā'īl's hadith, and most other versions of the marital-age hadith more broadly: their common form—the distinctive combination of the 'marriage at six/seven' and 'consummation at nine' elements—implies a common origin (as noted above), yet many of their *'isnāds* claim independent SSs—sometimes in different regions—back to different early figures, such as Qatādah b. Di'āmah (d. 117-118/735-736) in Basrah, Jābir b. Zayd (d. 93/711-712 or 103/721-722) in Basrah, 'Urwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 93-95/711-714 or 101/719-720) in Madinah, 'Abū 'Ubaydah (d. 81/700-701) in Kufah, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās (d. 67-68/687-688) in Makkah, and 'Ā'īshah bt. 'abī Bakr (d. 57-58/677-678) in Madinah. This again immediately suggests—even putting aside all of the specific textual and historical problems outlined in the preceding chapter—that most of the relevant *'isnāds* are false or misleading, which is consistent with their being dives or retrojections of various kinds. Of course, at least one of these surviving ascriptions could be the original—but if so, which one? As noted already, Hišām's Version 1 hadith has the strongest claim out of any iteration of the marital-age hadith to being the progenitor of the tradition as a whole.

Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the *ʿIsnāds*

Of course, just because Hišām’s Version 1 hadith looks exactly like the ur-story behind the marital-age hadith-tradition as a whole, that does not mean that Hišām himself was responsible for it: it is conceivable that Hišām simply passed on the report from ʿUrwah, and even that ʿUrwah in turn merely passed on what he had heard from ʿĀʾiṣah. There are strong reasons to doubt this, however. In particular, there are clear indications that this hadith arose in Iraq in the early Abbasid period, rather than earlier in Madinah.

The earliest figures to whom versions of the marital-age hadith can be attributed—the CLs operating between 750 and 800 CE—were all tradents operating in Iraq:

- **Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan** (d. turn of 9th C. CE), who added marital-age elements into the Ṣawwāl hadith of Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, was Kufan.¹²⁹⁵
- **ʿAbṭar b. al-Qāsim** (d. 178/794-795), who combined a sub-tradition from al-ʿAʿmaš with a Kufan SS back to ʿĀʾiṣah, was Kufan.¹²⁹⁶
- **ʿAbū ʿAwānah al-Waḍḍāḥ** (d. 176/792), who incorporated marital-age elements into his redaction of the *faḍāʾil* of ʿĀʾiṣah and cited a Kufan source (ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿUmayr) therefor, spent time in Wasit and ended up in Basrah.¹²⁹⁷
- **ʾIsrāʾīl b. Yūnus** (d. 160-162/776-779) was Kufan,¹²⁹⁸ and cited a Kufan SS.
- **Sulaymān al-ʿAʿmaš** (d. 147-148/764-766) was Kufan,¹²⁹⁹ and also cited a Kufan SS back to ʿĀʾiṣah.
- **ʾIsmāʾīl b. ʿabī Kālīd** (d. 146/763-764), who incorporated marital-age elements into his redaction of the *faḍāʾil* of ʿĀʾiṣah, was Kufan.¹³⁰⁰

¹²⁹⁵ Buḵārī (ed. Kān), *al-Taʾrīḫ al-Kabīr*, I, p. 67, # 152.

¹²⁹⁶ Ḍahabī (ed. ʾArnaʾūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, pp. 227-228.

¹²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 217-222.

¹²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, VII, pp. 355-360.

¹²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, VI, pp. 226-249

¹³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 176-178.

Even the Madinan CLs **Hišām b. ‘Urwah** (d. 146-147/763-765) and **Muḥammad b. ‘Amr** (d. 144-145/761-763), who at first glance appear to defy this tendency, actually conform thereto. Firstly, every single tradent who (allegedly or actually) directly received a version of the marital-age hadith from Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—including doubtful tradents, alleged tradents, and PCLs whose transmission therefrom can be confirmed—was Iraqi:

- **Yahyá b. Zakariyyā’** (d. 183-184/799-800), who allegedly (but improbably) transmitted a short marital-age hadith from Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, was Kufan.¹³⁰¹
- **‘Abd Allāh b. al-’Ajlaḥ** (fl. turn of 9th C. CE), who allegedly transmitted a biographical summary about ‘Ā’iṣah from Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, was Kufan.¹³⁰²
- **‘Abdah b. Sulaymān** (d. 187-188/803-804), who transmitted a highly abridged version of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith, was Kufan.¹³⁰³
- **‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Idrīs** (d. 192/808), who transmitted a version of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith to ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār (a Kufan PCL whose distinctive redaction can be reconstructed), was Kufan.¹³⁰⁴
- **Yahyá b. Sa‘īd** (d. 194/809-810), who transmitted a version of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith to his son Sa‘īd b. Yahyá (a Baghdadian PCL whose distinctive redaction can be reconstructed), was a Kufan who moved to Baghdad.¹³⁰⁵
- **Mu‘āḍ b. Mu‘āḍ b. Naṣr** (d. 196/811), who transmitted a highly abridged version of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith, was Basran.¹³⁰⁶
- **Muḥammad b. Bišr** (d. 203/818-819), a PCL whose distinctive redaction can be reconstructed, was Kufan.¹³⁰⁷
- **Muḥammad b. ‘Ubayd al-Ṭanāfisī** (d. 203-205/818-821), who ostensibly transmitted an unusual version of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s hadith to al-Wāqidī, was a Kufan who spent time in Baghdad.¹³⁰⁸

¹³⁰¹ *Ibid.*, VIII, pp. 337-341.

¹³⁰² Buḵārī (ed. Kān), *al-Ta’rīḳ al-Kabīr*, V, p. 45, # 88.

¹³⁰³ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, p. 511.

¹³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 42-48.

¹³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140.

¹³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 54-56.

¹³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 265-266.

¹³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 436-438.

This may at first seem puzzling: why was every single (alleged and actual) student who transmitted a version of the marital-age hadith from Muḥammad b. ‘Amr Iraqian, when Muḥammad himself was Madinan? The answer is provided by al-Ḍahabī: “Muḥammad b. ‘Amr died in the year 145 [i.e., 762-763 CE] or 144 [i.e., 761-762 CE]. He transmitted Hadith (*wa-qad ḥaddaṭa*) in Iraq.”¹³⁰⁹ In other words, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr was known to have spent time in Iraq and transmitted Hadith there—and, given that this datum is given by al-Ḍahabī directly after his specification of Muḥammad’s death-date, it seems implied that this occurred towards the end of his life. Indeed, such is explicitly recorded by al-Kalābādī, citing the statement of a certain Sa’d b. ‘Āmir: “Muḥammad b. ‘Amr came to us—meaning, to Basrah—two times: he came in the year 137 [i.e., 754-755 CE], and he came a second time in the year 144 [i.e., 761-762 CE].”¹³¹⁰ (That said, nearly all of the transmitters of the marital-age hadith from Muḥammad b. ‘Amr were Kufan, not Basran.) All of this is consistent with Muḥammad b. ‘Amr’s having only transmitted the hadith in Iraq at the end of life, not his hometown of Madinah—otherwise, we would reasonably expect it to be transmitted by at least one early Madinan source or PCL.

However, there are textual-critical grounds for inferring that Muḥammad b. ‘Amr borrowed the marital-age elements in his hadith from a version of Hišām b. ‘Urwah’s Version 4 hadith,¹³¹¹ and Hišām was also Madinan—surely this would suggest that Muḥammad obtained the hadith in Madinah, despite the odd absence of any Madinan transmissions thereof from him? In fact, even Hišām b. ‘Urwah appears to have overwhelmingly transmitted (all four versions of) his hadith in Iraq, as can be seen from the regional provenance of the overwhelmingly majority of his (alleged and actual) relevant students:

- **Sufyān al-Ṭawrī** (d. 161-162/777-779), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive redaction of the Version 2 hadith from Hišām, was a Kufan who died in Basrah.¹³¹²

¹³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, VI, p. 137.

¹³¹⁰ ‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Kalābādī (ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Layṭī), *Rijāl Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḵārīyy al-Musammā al-Hidāyah wa-al-’Iršād fī Ma’rifat ‘Ahl al-Ṭīqah wa-al-Sadād*, vol. 2 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma’rifah, 1987), p. 882, # 151.

¹³¹¹ See the sections on Muḥammad b. ‘Amr and Hišām b. ‘Urwah in ch. 2.

¹³¹² Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VII, pp. 229-279; Hans-Peter Raddatz, ‘Sufyān al-Thawrī’, in Clifford E. Bosworth, Emeri J. van Donzel, Wolfhart P. Heinrichs, & Gerard Lecomte (eds.), *The*

- **Wuhayb b. Kālid al-Karābīsī** (d. 165/781-782), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive redaction of the Version 2 hadith from Hišām, was Basran.¹³¹³
- **Ḥammād b. Salamah** (d. 167/784), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive redaction of the Version 4 hadith from Hišām, was Basran.¹³¹⁴
- **ʿIsmāʿīl b. Zakariyyāʾ al-Ḳulqānī** (d. 173-174/789-791), who ostensibly transmitted a redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was a Kufan who moved to Baghdad.¹³¹⁵
- **Jaʿfar b. Sulaymān al-Ḍubāʿī** (d. 178/794-795), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was Basran.¹³¹⁶
- **Ḥammād b. Zayd** (d. 179/795), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was Basran.¹³¹⁷
- **Yahyā b. Zakariyyāʾ** (d. 183-184/799-800), who reportedly transmitted an unspecified version of the marital-age from Hišām, was Kufan.¹³¹⁸
- **ʿAbān b. Yazīd al-ʿAṭṭār** (fl. turn of 9th C. CE), who transmitted a redaction of the Version 3 hadith from Hišām, was Basran.¹³¹⁹
- **ʿAbd Allāh b. Muʿāwiyah** (fl. turn of 9th C. CE), who transmitted a redaction of the Version 3 hadith from Hišām, was Basran.¹³²⁰
- **ʿAbdah b. Sulaymān al-Kilābī** (d. 187-188/803-804), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was Kufan.¹³²¹
- **Jarīr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḍabbī** (d. 188/804), a PCL who ostensibly transmitted a redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was a Kufan of Eastern origin.¹³²²

Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 9: San-Sze (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 1997), 770-772.

¹³¹³ Ḍahabī (ed. ʿArnaʿūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, pp. 223-226.

¹³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, VII, pp. 444-456.

¹³¹⁵ *Ibid.*, VIII, pp. 475-476.

¹³¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 197-200.

¹³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, VII, pp. 456-466.

¹³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, VIII, pp. 337-341.

¹³¹⁹ *Ibid.*, VII, pp. 431-433.

¹³²⁰ Buḳārī (ed. Kan), *al-Taʾrīḳ al-Kabīr*, V, p. 209, # 663.

¹³²¹ Ḍahabī (ed. ʿArnaʿūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, p. 511.

¹³²² *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 9-18.

- **‘Alī b. Mushir** (d. 189/804-805), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive redaction of the Version 4 hadith from Hišām, was a Kufan who became the *qāḍī* of Mosul.¹³²³
- **‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah Muḥammad b. Kāzīm al-Ḍarīr** (d. 194-195/809-811), who ostensibly transmitted a redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was Kufan.¹³²⁴
- **Wakī‘ b. al-Jarrāḥ** (d. 196-197/812), who ostensibly transmitted a redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was Kufan.¹³²⁵
- **Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah** (d. 198/814), a PCL who ostensibly transmitted a redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was a Kufan who spent time in Makkah (from 122/739-740 to 126/743-744), then returned to his hometown of Kufah, then travelled to Yemen twice (in 150/767 and 152/769), and finally settled in Makkah (from 163/779-780 until his death).¹³²⁶
- **Yūnus b. Bukayr b. Wāṣil** (d. 199/814-815), who ostensibly transmitted an altered version of Hišām’s (Version 1 or 2) hadith, was Kufan.¹³²⁷
- **‘Abū ‘Usāmah Ḥammād b. ‘Usāmah** (d. 201/817), a PCL who transmitted two distinctive redactions—of Version 1 and Version 4, respectively—of the marital-age hadith from Hišām, was Kufan.¹³²⁸
- **al-Hayṭam b. ‘Adī al-Ṭā’ī** (d. 207/822-823), who ostensibly transmitted a discussion between himself and Hišām in which the latter related information about ‘Ā’ishah’s marriage on the authority of ‘Urwah, was Kufan.¹³²⁹
- **Yaḥyá b. Hāšim al-Ġassānī** (d. 225/839-840), who ostensibly transmitted a redaction of the Version 1 hadith from Hišām, was Kufan.¹³³⁰

¹³²³ *Ibid.*, VIII, pp. 484-487.

¹³²⁴ *Ibid.*, IX, pp. 73-78.

¹³²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 140-168; Raif G. Khoury, ‘Wakī‘, in Peri J. Bearman, Thierry Bianquis, Clifford E. Bosworth, Emiri J. van Donzel, & Wolfhart P. Heinrichs (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 11: V-Z* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002), 101.

¹³²⁶ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, pp. 454-474; Susan A. Spector, ‘Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah’, in Clifford E. Bosworth, Emiri J. van Donzel, Wolfhart P. Heinrichs, & Gerard Lecomte (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 9: San-Sze* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 1997), 772; Feryal Salem, *The Emergence of Early Sufi Piety and Sunnī Scholasticism: ‘Abdallāh b. al-Mubārak and the Formation of Sunnī Identity in the Second Islamic Century* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2016), 57-58.

¹³²⁷ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, IX, pp. 245-246.

¹³²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 277-279.

¹³²⁹ *Ibid.*, X, pp. 103-104.

¹³³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 160-162.

Time and again, the relevant *ʿisnāds* give the impression that Hišām transmitted the marital-age hadith in Iraq (above all, in Kufah), not his hometown of Madinah. Once again, the Islamic biographical sources provide an answer for this oddity: Hišām reportedly moved from Madinah to Iraq towards the end of his life, where he joined the court of the Abbasid caliph al-Manṣūr (r. 754-775 CE). It is reported that he first moved to Kufah (perhaps meaning the temporary Abbasid capital of al-Hāšimiyyah, which was close to Kufah), before moving with the Abbasids into their new capital of Baghdad, where he died in 146/763-764 or 147/764-765.¹³³¹ Thus, in the last few years of his life (perhaps for a whole decade), Hišām appears to have mass-disseminated four different versions of the marital-age hadith to a plethora of Iraqi students, especially Kufans.

There are only four putative instances of Madinan students—or students in Madinah—having transmitted the marital-age hadith from Hišām, or in other words, four apparent exceptions to the overwhelming Iraqi tendency observed above:

- **Maʿmar b. Rāšid** (d. 152-154/769-771), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive and strange redaction of the marital-age hadith from Hišām, was a Basran who moved to the Levant to study with Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī during the Marwanid period (during the early-to-mid 8th Century CE), then to the Hijaz for a time (during the middle of the 8th Century CE), before finally settling in Yemen for the last twenty years of his life (c. 750-771 CE).¹³³²
- **ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Zinād** (d. 164/780-781 or 174/790-791), a PCL who transmitted a distinctive redaction—in fact, an interpolated or contaminated version—of (Version 1 of) the marital-age hadith from Hišām, was a Madinan who still resided in his hometown around 762-764 CE (when he was punished

¹³³¹ Amikam Elad, *The Rebellion of Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya in 145/762: Ṭālibīs and Early ʿAbbāsīs in Conflict* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015), 369.

¹³³² Harald Motzki, “Abd al-Razzāq al-Šanʿānī”, in Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, & Everett Rowson (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2018), online edition.

by the local *qāḍī*) and soon afterwards (when he was appointed the head of the local tax bureau), and eventually moved to Baghdad (where he died).¹³³³

- **Saʿīd b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān** (d. 172/788-789 or 194-196/809-812), who allegedly transmitted a version of the marital-age hadith from Hišām, was a Madinan who moved to Baghdad, where he was appointed as a local *qāḍī* by an Abbasid caliph.¹³³⁴
- **ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá b. ʿUrwah** (fl. turn of 9th C. CE), who allegedly transmitted an unusual version of (Version 1 of) the marital-age hadith from Hišām, was Madinan.¹³³⁵

The last two cases can be dismissed without much consideration. In the first case, Saʿīd is cited alongside Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād in only a single report, rendering his alleged transmission of the marital-age hadith from Hišām completely uncorroborated; and in any case, he was reportedly born (157/773-774) after Hišām died (146-147/763-765).¹³³⁶ In the second case, ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad is cited as a transmitter from Hišām only via a SS, and the version ascribed to him diverges markedly from every other transmission of the marital-age hadith from Hišām, such that the *ʾisnād* and *matn* alike are completely uncorroborated and suspect; this is consistent with the ascription to ʿAbd Allāh’s being a *dive* (in particular, an instance of an updated or improved version of the *matn*’s being retrojected back to a common source via a new path).¹³³⁷

The case of Maʿmar is a bit more complicated. On the one hand, the relevant chronological and geographical entailments are clear: if Maʿmar heard his version of the marital-age hadith directly from Hišām, then this transmission must have occurred during the former’s stint in Madinah during the middle of the 8th Century CE (i.e., around 750 CE), when the latter still resided there. In other words, by the time that Hišām moved to Iraq, Maʿmar was long gone, having passed through both Syria and Madinah enroute to Yemen; thus, Maʿmar can only have obtained his hadith directly

¹³³³ Christopher Melchert, ‘Ibn Abī l-Zinād’, in Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, & Everett Rowson (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2018), online edition.

¹³³⁴ Wakīʿ, *ʿAkbār al-Quḍāh*, III, pp. 264-265; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahḍīb*, IV, pp. 55-56.

¹³³⁵ Ibn al-Jawzī (ed. ʿAbd Allāh), *Ḍuʿafāʾ*, II, p. 141, # 2116.

¹³³⁶ For all of this, see the section on Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād in ch. 2.

¹³³⁷ For all of this, see the section on Hišām b. ʿUrwah in ch. 2; for varieties of *dive*s in particular, see Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, xxii ff., esp. xxvii.

from Hišām in Madinah.¹³³⁸ On the other hand, the version of the marital-age hadith that can be positively attributed to Ma‘mar is extremely divergent on a fundamental level from every other transmission from Hišām,¹³³⁹ which is consistent with his having obtained it *indirectly* from Hišām. In other words, the *unusually* garbled state of Ma‘mar’s version precisely gives us a reason to doubt that he obtained it directly from Hišām, in contrast to every other PCL and confirmed student thereof (who are all corroborated in at least the core elements of their versions). This is not to say that alternative explanations cannot be proposed for Ma‘mar’s garbled version (e.g., simple poor memory in his part), but the point is this: the evidence is *consistent* with some kind of sloppy, *indirect* transmission (e.g., from distant Iraq), which casts doubt over Ma‘mar’s transmission. (That said, if Ma‘mar periodically returned to his hometown of Basrah, as some have suggested,¹³⁴⁰ then it is plausible that he picked up his version of the hadith directly therefrom, at some point after Hišām’s death.) Consequently, the chronological and geographical limitations of Ma‘mar and Hišām’s relationship are not binding in regards to this hadith: if it cannot be established that Ma‘mar directly received his hadith from Hišām, then the fact that Ma‘mar only ever directly received Hadith from Hišām during his stint in Madinah (enroute to Yemen) is irrelevant.¹³⁴¹

The strongest counter-example to the Iraqi tendency of the evidence is the case of Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, a PCL to whom a distinctive redaction of Hišām’s hadith can be attributed. Although Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād certainly appears to have altered (i.e., interpolated or contaminated) his version with a ‘dolls’ element and perhaps also a clause referencing Ḳadījah’s death, the core elements therein are corroborated by many other transmissions from Hišām,¹³⁴² in a way that is not true for Ma‘mar’s version. The evidence is thus less equivocal: if all else were equal, we might simply assume that Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād received this hadith from Hišām in Madinah.

¹³³⁸ Such is the view of Sean Anthony, expressed via personal correspondence. I owe thanks to Anthony for pointing out this chronological problem to me.

¹³³⁹ See the section on Hišām b. ‘Urwah in ch. 2.

¹³⁴⁰ Motzki (trans. Paoli & Reid), ‘The Jurisprudence of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 10; Gregor Schoeler, ‘The relationship of literacy and memory in the second/eighth century’, *Archaeopress: Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies*, Volume 40 (2010), 124.

¹³⁴¹ Of course, all of this assumes that a redaction can be attributed to Ma‘mar in the first place, which is actually not beyond question: cf. the highly divergent character of the only two ascriptions to him, in his section in ch. 2.

¹³⁴² See the sections on both Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād and Hišām in ch. 2.

That said, Ibn 'abī al-Zinād was a Madinan who moved to Baghdad, so at first glance, there would seem to be no problem: the evidence would still be consistent with Hišām's mass-dissemination of his hadith in Iraq (and specifically, with Ibn 'abī al-Zinād's having received it in Baghdad), not Madinah. However, there are chronological considerations that militate against such an interpretation: the relevant *'isnāds* depict Ibn 'abī al-Zinād transmitting to the Madinan tradent al-Wāqidī,¹³⁴³ which immediately suggests that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād transmitted his version of the marital-age hadith in Madinah (i.e., before he moved to Baghdad), which would in turn imply that Hišām transmitted his hadith in Madinah (i.e., before he moved to Iraq). As it happens, al-Wāqidī—like both Ibn 'abī al-Zinād and Hišām—was a Madinan who moved to Baghdad, which would again render the evidence equivocal: it would seem to be plausible that Hišām transmitted his hadith to Ibn 'abī al-Zinād after both of them had moved to Baghdad, and that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād in turn transmitted his version of the hadith to al-Wāqidī when he too moved to Baghdad. However, Ibn 'abī al-Zinād reportedly died in Baghdad in either 164/780-781 (according to al-Dāraquṭnī)¹³⁴⁴ or 174/790-791 (according to every other authority),¹³⁴⁵ whilst al-Wāqidī only moved there in 180/796-797.¹³⁴⁶ Thus, if al-Wāqidī received his version of the hadith directly from Ibn 'abī al-Zinād, then this must have occurred when Ibn 'abī al-Zinād was still in Madinah; and if Ibn 'abī al-Zinād in turn received his version of the hadith directly from Hišām, and Ibn 'abī al-Zinād already possessed the hadith before he moved from Madinah to Baghdad, then it would follow that Hišām in turn must have transmitted it to Ibn 'abī al-Zinād before he moved from Madinah to Baghdad. In short, the fact that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād was a genuine PCL of Hišām's, in conjunction with the fact that al-Wāqidī genuinely transmitted a version of Ibn 'abī al-Zinād's hadith, in conjunction with the chronology of al-Wāqidī's life reported in the Islamic biographical sources,

¹³⁴³ Ibn 'abī al-Zinād is also depicted as having transmitted versions of his hadith to Sa'īd b. 'abī Maryam and Ibn Wahb, both of whom were Egyptian—but this evidence is equivocal, since both could have obtained their versions from Ibn 'abī al-Zinād in either Madinah or Baghdad. E.g., Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, 44: "When we scrutinize, for example, Ibn Wahb's *Jāmi'*, it appears that a large percentage of the *'isnāds* is Iraqi judging by the provenance of the transmitters at the Successors' level or the one following that."

¹³⁴⁴ Dāraquṭnī (ed. 'Arabī), *Ta'liqāt*, p. 158, # 191.

¹³⁴⁵ Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, p. 170. The same date is also recorded in the *Ṭabaqāt* of Ibn Sa'd, the *Ṭabaqāt* of Ḳalīfah b. Ḳayyāt, the *Majrūhīn* of Ibn Ḥibbān, and the *Ta'rīk Baḡdād* of al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baḡdādī.

¹³⁴⁶ Stefan Leder, 'al-Wāqidī', in Peri J. Bearman, Thierry Bianquis, Clifford E. Bosworth, Emeri J. van Donzel, & Wolfhart P. Heinrichs (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 11: V-Z* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002), 102-103.

reasonably leads to the conclusion that Hišām was already disseminating the marital-age hadith before he moved from Madinah to Iraq.

However, matters are not as straightforward as they might seem. To begin with, the ICMA technically does not guarantee *direct* transmission, only *ultimate* transmission: it can establish that several tradents all accurately preserved (at least in part) the distinctive redaction of a common source, without necessarily ruling out the occurrence of borrowing, interpolation, error, and so forth in the course of the transmission of said redaction from said common source to said tradents.¹³⁴⁷ Thus, whilst al-Wāqidī certainly transmitted a version of the marital-age hadith to his secretary Ibn Saʿd, and whilst this hadith certainly originated—in one form or another—with Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād, it is not at all assured that al-Wāqidī received this hadith directly from his cited source. Of course, ordinarily, we would have no grounds to suspect any problems like this, such that it would not be unreasonable to presume—in the case of a student transmitting the distinctive redaction of a PCL who was known to be one of their masters—direct transmission. In the case of al-Wāqidī in particular, however, there are reasons to doubt. Firstly, al-Wāqidī was infamous even amongst traditionists for being an interpolator, a fabricator, or otherwise extremely unreliable: al-Nasāʾī declared that “he was unreliable” (*laysa bi-ṭiqah*); Ibn Maʿīn declared that “al-Wāqidī is nothing” (*laysa al-wāqidiyy bi-ṣayʾ*); Ibn al-Madīnī reported that “al-Wāqidī had twenty-thousand hadiths that I never heard [from anyone else]”, leading him to declare that “he is not to be transmitted from” (*lā yurwā ʿan-hu*); al-Bukārī reported that both Ibn Ḥanbal and Ibn Numayr “rejected him” (*taraka-hu*) in Hadith; ʿAbū Zurʿah reported that the bulk of the traditionists “rejected” his Hadith (*taraka al-nās ḥadīṭ al-wāqidiyy*); Muslim declared that he was “rejected in Hadith” (*matrūk al-ḥadīṭ*); al-Šāfiʿī declared that “the writings of al-Wāqidī are fabrications” (*kutub al-wāqidiyy kaḍib*); Ibn Ḥanbal declared that he was a “liar” (*kaḍḍāb*); ʿIshāq declared that “he was amongst those who would fabricate Hadith (*mimman yaḍaʿu al-ḥadīṭ*); and finally, al-Nasāʾī listed al-Wāqidī amongst “those famous for the fabrication of Hadith” (*al-maʿrūfūn bi-waḍʿ al-ḥadīṭ*).¹³⁴⁸

¹³⁴⁷ For example, consider all the instances of raisings documented in ch. 2: sources would often accurately record the CL and much of their distinctive *matn*, whilst also interpolating the *ʿisnād*.

¹³⁴⁸ For all of these judgements (as well as a smattering of positive appraisals), see Ḍahabī (ed. ʿArnaʿūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, X, pp. 457-469.

Of course, the judgements of Mediaeval Hadith critics should not be accepted uncritically,¹³⁴⁹ but in this particular instance, their judgements can be corroborated. In the preceding ICMA, we discovered that none other than al-Wāqidī seems to have contaminated, interpolated, or falsely-ascribed *every single other version the marital-age hadith that he transmitted*.¹³⁵⁰ In other words, the conclusion that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād disseminated the marital-age hadith in Madinah, and therefore that Hišām likewise disseminated the hadith in Madinah, rests upon the testimony of a tradent who not only was known amongst his contemporaries and successors to be a liar in Hadith, but whom we have repeatedly implicated in the interpolation and false ascription of versions of the marital-age hadith specifically. The basis for Ibn 'abī al-Zinād and thus Hišām's Madinan transmission of the marital-age hadith would thus appear to be extremely tenuous indeed.

Even putting al-Wāqidī aside, however, there is still a chronological factor in favour of Ibn 'abī al-Zinād's having received the hadith from Hišām in Madinah: Ibn 'abī al-Zinād was reportedly punished by a certain *qāḍī*, and the *qāḍī* in question was appointed in 760-761 CE and reappointed in 761-762 CE. This entails that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād was still in Madinah in 760-762 CE—and, given that he was subsequently appointed as the head of the local tax bureau,¹³⁵¹ he must have remained in Madinah for at least another year. In the best-case scenario, this leaves an extremely small window of time for Ibn 'abī al-Zinād to have moved to Baghdad and heard from Hišām before the latter's death (763-765 CE); ordinarily, we would simply assume that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād received hadiths from Hišām in Madinah, before latter's departure therefrom.

Still, the fact that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād is the *only* credible Madinan transmitter of Hišām's hadith (amidst a sea of Iraqian transmitters), despite Hišām's lifetime of teaching and transmission in Madinah, is extremely suspect. This suspicion is compounded by the fact that Ibn 'abī al-Zinād moved to Iraq, or in other words: the only credible Madinan transmitter of Hišām's hadith *just so happens to have moved to*

¹³⁴⁹ Cf. Goldziher (trans. Barber & Stern), *Muslim Studies*, II, *passim*; Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, *passim*; *id.*, *Encyclopedia*, xxiii-xxiv; Melchert, 'The Life and Works of al-Nasā'ī'; etc.

¹³⁵⁰ See the sections on 'Isrā'īl, al-Zuhrī, Habib, and 'Amrah in ch. 2. Other modern studies have also repeatedly exposed al-Wāqidī as a fabricator, interpolator, and borrower of hadiths; see Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, 12-13, 18; *id.*, 'Méthodes et Débats', 365-366; Görke, 'The relationship between *maghāzī* and *ḥadīth*', 179-180; Motzki, *Reconstruction*, 14.

¹³⁵¹ Melchert, 'Ibn Abī l-Zinād', in Fleet *et al.* (eds.), *ET*³.

the very region where every single other credible transmitter of the same hadith was operating. All of this seems extremely improbable on the view that Hišām was already disseminating his hadith in Madinah, and highly probable on the view that Hišām only began to disseminate his hadith in Iraq. We thus have strong grounds for suspecting that Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād did not hear the marital-age hadith directly from Hišām (i.e., in Madinah), but instead, obtained it when he moved to Iraq (i.e., soon after Hišām’s death), just like every single other credible transmitter and PCL thereof. In other words, it is plausible—in light of the specific historical and geographical context of this hadith and its transmission—that we have here an instance of the spread of *‘isnāds* (in this case, *tadlīs*): since Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād heard other hadiths from Hišām, and since it went “against the grain to transmit from a mere contemporary”,¹³⁵² it is plausible that Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād heard the hadith from an Iraqi student of Hišām’s when he moved to Baghdad and simply passed it off—whether explicitly or implicitly—as a direct transmission from Hišām. In other words, just as suspicion surrounds al-Wāqidī’s claim to have received the hadith directly from Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, so too does suspicion surround Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād’s claim to have received the hadith directly from Hišām: in both cases, we have Madinans who moved to Iraq purportedly receiving an overwhelmingly Iraq-associated hadith in Madinah.

The parallel with al-Wāqidī holds in another regard: Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād was likewise remembered as being unreliable by fellow traditionists, though certainly not to the same degree as al-Wāqidī. Thus, on the one hand: al-‘Ijlī declared that Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād was “reliable” (*ṭiqah*)¹³⁵³; Ibn al-Jawzī reported that Mālik “declared him to be reliable” (*waṭṭaqa-hu*)¹³⁵⁴; Ibn al-Madīnī declared that the hadiths “that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād transmitted in Madinah are authentic (*ṣaḥīḥ*),” even if “that which he transmitted in Baghdad was corrupted (*‘afsada-hu*) by the Baghdadians”¹³⁵⁵; and Ibn Ma‘īn declared that “‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād was the most reliable person (*‘aṭbat al-nās*) regarding Hišām b. ‘Urwah”.¹³⁵⁶ On the other hand: Ibn Ḥanbal declared that “‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād was such and such (*kaḍā wa-kaḍā*)”¹³⁵⁷ (i.e., mediocre), and that he was “muddled [in his transmission] of Hadith” (*muḍṭarib al-*

¹³⁵² Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma*, 109.

¹³⁵³ ‘Ijlī (ed. Qal‘ajī), *Ṭiqāt*, p. 292, # 952.

¹³⁵⁴ Ibn al-Jawzī (ed. ‘Abd Allāh), *Ḍu‘afā’*, II, p. 94, # 1869.

¹³⁵⁵ Kaṭīb (ed. Ma‘rūf), *Ta’rīk Madīnat al-Salām*, XI, p. 496, # 5312.

¹³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 495, # 5312.

¹³⁵⁷ Ibn ‘Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VII, p. 139, # 10532.

ḥadīṭ)¹³⁵⁸; Šāliḥ Jazarah declared that “he transmitted things from his father that were transmitted by no one else”¹³⁵⁹ (i.e., suspiciously); Ibn ‘Adī declared (regarding a specific *ḥadīṭ*), “I am not aware of [anyone who] transmitted this *ḥadīṭ* from Hišām, other than Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād”¹³⁶⁰ (again, suspiciously); and Ibn Ḥibbān declared:

He was amongst those who would transmit mixed-up *ḥadīṭ*s in isolation from reliable tradents (*kāna mimman yanfaridu bi-al-maqlūbāt ‘an al-’aṭbāt*), due to the poor state of his memorisation (*wa-kāna ḍālika min sū’ ḥifẓi-hi*) and the frequency of his erring (*wa-kaṭrat kaṭa’i-hi*). Argumentation cannot rest upon a report of his (*fa-lā yajūzu al-iḥtijāj bi-kabari-hi*), when he transmits a *ḥadīṭ* in isolation (*’idā infarada*); but as for that which is corroborated by [other] reliable tradents (*fa-’ammā fī-mā wāfaqa al-ṭiqāt*), he is [in such cases] trustworthy in transmission [and can be] relied upon in argumentation (*fa-huwa ṣādiq fī al-riwāyāt yuḥtajju bi-hi*).¹³⁶¹

Others went further: Ibn Ma‘īn declared that “he is nothing” (*laysa bi-šay’*)¹³⁶²; Ibn Maḥdī,¹³⁶³ Ibn Ma‘īn,¹³⁶⁴ and al-Nasā’ī¹³⁶⁵ all declared that he was “weak” (*ḍa‘īf*); ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī reported that “our companions deem him to be weak” (*kāna ‘inda ‘aṣḥābi-nā ḍa‘īfan*)¹³⁶⁶; al-Rāzī declared that “he cannot be relied upon in argumentation” (*lā yuḥtajju bi-hi*)¹³⁶⁷; Ibn Ma‘īn similarly declared that “his *ḥadīṭ*s are not to be relied upon in argumentation” (*lā yuḥtajju bi-ḥadīṭi-hi*)¹³⁶⁸; al-Fallās reported that “‘Abd al-Raḥmān [b. Maḥdī] would not transmit *Ḥadīṭ* from (*lā yuḥaddītu ‘an*) ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād”¹³⁶⁹; and Ibn Maḥdī declared, “I am astounded (*’innī la-’a’jabu*) by those who count Fulayḥ and Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād amongst the traditionists (*fī al-muḥaddiṭīn*)”.¹³⁷⁰ Finally, and perhaps most importantly of all, Ibn al-Madīnī declared that “his *Ḥadīṭ* in Madinah were close [to being reliable] (*muqārib*), whereas those

¹³⁵⁸ Ibn al-Jawzī (ed. ‘Abd Allāh), *Ḍu‘afā’*, II, p. 94, # 1869.

¹³⁵⁹ Kaṭīb (ed. Ma‘rūf), *Ta’rīk Madīnat al-Salām*, XI, pp. 497, # 5312.

¹³⁶⁰ Ibn ‘Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VII, p. 140, # 10538.

¹³⁶¹ Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Zāyid), *Majrūḥīn*, II, p. 56, # 595.

¹³⁶² Ibn ‘Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VII, p. 138, ## 10528-10529.

¹³⁶³ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, p. 168.

¹³⁶⁴ Ibn ‘Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VII, p. 138, ## 10526-10527.

¹³⁶⁵ Kaṭīb (ed. Ma‘rūf), *Ta’rīk Madīnat al-Salām*, XI, pp. 497-498, # 5312.

¹³⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 496, # 5312.

¹³⁶⁷ Ibn al-Jawzī (ed. ‘Abd Allāh), *Ḍu‘afā’*, II, p. 94, # 1869.

¹³⁶⁸ Ibn ‘Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VII, p. 138, # 10530.

¹³⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, # 10531.

¹³⁷⁰ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, p. 169.

that he transmitted in Iraq were muddled (*muḍṭarib*).¹³⁷¹ Similarly, both al-Fallās and al-Sājī declared that “there is weakness in him” (*fī-hi ḍaʿf*): that which he transmitted in Madinah is more authentic (*ʿaṣaḥḥ*) than that which he transmitted in Baghdad”.¹³⁷²

Once again, the judgements of Mediaeval Hadith critics should not be accepted uncritically—but once again, the suspicious historical and geographical patterns of the evidence happen to be congruent with the observations of some Hadith critics: that Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād was sometimes unreliable, or even generally unreliable. More importantly, he is said to have become unreliable *specifically when he moved to Baghdad*, so if indeed he obtained his version of the marital-age hadith when he moved thereto (as the overwhelming Iraqi tendency of the evidence would suggest, along with the suspicious absence of any other credible Madinan sources, not to mention the amazing coincidence that Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād just so happens to have moved to Iraq), his suppression or omission of an Iraqi intermediary source would be congruent with such reports.

That said, none of the transmissions from Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād actually claim that he explicitly or directly received the hadith from Hišām in the first place—in every instance, a student is reported as saying something to the effect of, “Abd al-Raḥmān b. ʿabī al-Zinād reported to us, from (ʿan) Hišām...”¹³⁷³ The generic “from” is famously ambiguous in Hadith transmission, being consistent with either direct or indirect transmission. Thus, even the *prima facie* evidence of the *ʿisnāds* turns out to be equivocal on the issue of Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād’s transmission from Hišām.

In sum, Hišām—in some cases plausibly, in most cases probably—variously transmitted four different versions of the marital-age hadith to thirteen Kufan tradents and six Basran tradents. This evidently occurred when he moved to Kufah (or close to Kufah) and then to Baghdad, in the last decade of his life, between 754 and 765 CE. By contrast, the evidence that Hišām already possessed and was disseminating this hadith in Madinah is extremely dubious: (1) a single attestation of the Madino-Baghdadian tradent Saʿīd b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (appearing in an isolated variant within the transmissions of another tradent), who was reportedly born after Hišām died; (2) a SS ascription of a markedly divergent—unusually-detailed and secondary-looking—

¹³⁷¹ Kaṭīb (ed. Maʿrūf), *Taʾrīk Madīnat al-Salām*, XI, p. 496, # 5312.

¹³⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 497-498, # 5312.

¹³⁷³ See the citations given in the section on Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād in ch. 2.

matn to the Madinan tradent ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad; (3) a fundamentally divergent and uncorroborated transmission from the itinerant Basran tradent Ma‘mar b. Rāšid (who met Hišām in Madinah but may have returned home several times), which is consistent with being a garbled, indirect transmission from Hišām; and (4) the transmission of the Madino-Baghdadian PCL ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād, who just so happens to have moved to Baghdad. This is exactly what it would look like if Hišām only disseminated the marital-age hadith in Iraq, and if the—inevitable or predictable—secondary process of *tadlīs* and spreading *’isnāds* generated a few stray instances of pseudo-Madinan ascription (i.e., the superficial appearance of Madinan transmission). Put differently, what are the odds that the only two remotely-plausible instances of Madinan transmission (i.e., Ma‘mar and Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād) would just so happen to be (1) the uncorroborated, highly-garbled transmission of an itinerant tradent (which is consistent with indirect transmission) and (2) the transmission of a Madinan who moved to Iraq (which is consistent with his having obtained the hadith there)? The paucity of credible Madinan transmitters from Hišām, and the complete absence of any credible *unambiguously-Madinan* transmitters from Hišām, is simply unexpected on the view that Hišām already possessed and was disseminating this hadith in Madinah, but completely in line with the view that he only disseminated this hadith in Iraq. In short, the evidence of the *’isnāds*—when viewed altogether—is best explained by positing that Hišām only began to transmit the marital-age hadith in Kufah (or in al-Hāšimiyah, close to Kufah).

Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the Earliest Madinan Collections

Perhaps the strongest corroborating evidence for the Iraqi provenance of the marital-age hadith is its absence from the earliest Madinan legal collections and biographies of the Prophet, despite the prominence and abundance of Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, Hišām, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī, ‘Urwah, ‘Abū Salamah, ‘Ā’iṣah, and others as alleged Madinan authorities therein. Crone famously warned against arguments from silence regarding Hadith before the time of al-Šāfi‘ī, given that “the

literature is too scanty and above all too local in character for silences to count.”¹³⁷⁴ However, this is a warning against early inter-regional comparisons, whereas our given example is *intra*-regional: we would reasonably expect the local collections to contain local hadiths from local authorities. Thus, as Crone herself put it: “Mālik’s work can perhaps be used to show that certain Medinese traditions still did not exist in Medina.”¹³⁷⁵

To begin with, it is striking that the early Mālikī school of Islamic jurisprudence—an outgrowth of the 8th-Century Madinan legal tradition—never cited the marital-age hadith, even when it would have been expedient in the justification of their doctrines on child marriage. As Baugh observes:

Early Mālikī jurisprudential writings do not reference the story of ‘Ā’isha’s marriage to the Prophet during discussions of prepubescent marriage. Rather, there is consistent reliance on both Medinan practice and the *ayyim/bikr* report related from Mālik.¹³⁷⁶

Consider for example the absence of any version of this hadith in the premiere extant collection(s) of early Madinan legal material: the extant recensions of the *Kitāb al-Muwaṭṭa’* of Mālik b. ‘Anas (d. 179/795).¹³⁷⁷ Although Mālik did not necessarily reflect the totality of the Madinan milieu,¹³⁷⁸ (1) he devoted an entire chapter of his *Muwaṭṭa’* to marriage and at least two entire sections therein to the (contested and debated issue of) the marriage of virgins and young girls, (2) was perfectly happy to adduce Prophetical reports that he himself rejected (in the context of the marriage of virgins, no less),¹³⁷⁹ and (3) was also a prolific student of Hišām, al-Zuhrī, and other notable

¹³⁷⁴ Crone, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law*, 30.

¹³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷⁶ Baugh, *Minor Marriage*, 104. By contrast, “all of the future schools of law” from al-Šāfi‘ī onward utilised this hadith (*ibid.*, 168).

¹³⁷⁷ Thus, a search of the chapters on marriage (especially the sections pertaining virgins) in the recensions of al-Šaybānī, Yahyá, ‘Abū Muṣ‘ab, Suwayd, Ibn al-Qāsim, and Ibn Bukayr yielded nothing.

¹³⁷⁸ Cf. Patricia Crone, ‘Jāhilī and Jewish law: the *qasāma*’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 4 (1984), 196-197, and Najam I. Haider, ‘The Geography of the *Isnād*: Possibilities for the Reconstruction of Local Ritual Practice in the 2nd/8th Century’, *Der Islam*, Volume 90, Issue 2 (2013), 310.

¹³⁷⁹ E.g., Ali, *Marriage and Slavery*, 34. This is at least the case in the following recensions: Yahyá b. Yahyá al-Layṭī (ed. Aisha A. Bewley), *Al-Muwaṭṭa’ of Imām Mālik ibn Anas: Arabic & English*, revised ed. (Norwich, UK: Diwan Press, 2014), 527-528; ‘Abū Muṣ‘ab b. ‘abī Bakr al-Zuhrī (ed. Baššār ‘Awwād Ma‘rūf & Maḥmūd Muḥammad Ḳalīl), *al-Muwaṭṭa’*, vol. 1 (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah, 1991), pp. 569-570; Suwayd b. Sa‘īd al-Ḥadaṭānī (ed. ‘Abd al-Majīd Turkī), *al-Muwaṭṭa’* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ġarb al-‘Islāmiyy, 1994), pp. 255-256; and Yahyá b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Bukayr, redacted by Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Tūmart (ed. Ignáz Goldziher), *Muwaṭṭa’ al-‘Imām al-Mahdī* (Algiers, Algeria: Gouvernement

Madinan transmitters of ‘Ā’iṣṣah’s reports.¹³⁸⁰ As such, the failure of Mālik to cite this hadith suggests not merely that Mālik rejected it, but that it was not circulating in Madinah at that time.¹³⁸¹ This is especially so given that the marital-age hadith has important *and expedient* legal ramifications, and thus would surely have demanded inclusion into a dedicated Madinan collection of Madinan legal Hadith.

Mālik’s non-citation of the marital-age hadith, on the view that the hadith arose in Iraq, is consistent with the following report from the Baghdadian Hadith critic ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Kīrāš (d. 283/896):

It reached me that Mālik was angry (*naqama*) at Hišām b. ‘Urwah [due to] the Hadith [that he transmitted] to the people of Iraq, which he would not accept (*wa-kāna lā yarḍā-hu*).¹³⁸²

In another report, Mālik’s alleged hostility towards Hišām—due to his departure from Madinah to Iraq—is framed in an anecdote about a dream:

‘Alī b. al-Madīnī said: “Yaḥyá b. Sa‘īd [al-Qaṭṭān] said: “I saw Mālik b. ‘Anas during [my] sleep, so I asked him about Hišām b. ‘Urwah, whereupon he said: “As for that which he related when he was in our proximity [i.e., Madinah], he—i.e., it was as though he—declared it to be sound (*yuṣaḥḥihū-hu*), and that which he related after he departed from our proximity [i.e., to Iraq], it was as though he declared it to be weak (*yuwahhinu-hu*).””¹³⁸³

All of this is consistent with Mālik’s having only transmitted from Hišām hadiths that Hišām transmitted in Madinah, as opposed to hadiths that he only began to disseminate after he moved to Iraq—including the marital-age hadith. In other words, if Mālik only transmitted Hišām’s Madinan hadiths, and Mālik did not transmit Hišām’s marital-age hadith, this is evidence that Hišām’s marital-age hadith was not one of his

Général de l’Algérie, 1905), pp. 424-425. In the recension of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Šaybānī (ed. Yahya Batha, Zubair Ismail Bayat, Uthman Ibrahim-Morisson, Sulaiman Gani, Muhammad Ansa, Abdassamad Clarke, & Safira Batha), *The Muwatta of Imam Muhammad* (London, UK: Turath Publishing, 2010), p. 235, however, the citation of the opposing Madinan ‘amr and Mālik’s commitment thereto is absent, although the relevant conflicting Prophetic report (Mālik—‘Abd Allāh b. al-Faḍl—Nāfi’ b. Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im—‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās) remains, along with an approving comment by al-Šaybānī.

¹³⁸⁰ By my count (using the Sunnah.com digital database), Hišām is cited 108 times in Yaḥyá’s recension of Mālik’s *Muwatta’*, whilst Motzki (trans. Paoli & Reid), ‘The Jurisprudence of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Tradition*, 18, estimated that al-Zuhrī constitutes 21% of Mālik’s citations (which is more than any other source).

¹³⁸¹ Shanavas, ‘The Myth of a Proverbial Age’, 21, makes a similar point.

¹³⁸² Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, p. 35.

¹³⁸³ Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahḍīb al-Tahḍīb*, XI, p. 50.

Madinan hadiths. As Baugh again observes: “The report of ‘Ā’isha, like other reports of Hishām ibn ‘Urwa from the Kufan period of his old age, was not included by Mālik in the *Muwatta’*.”¹³⁸⁴

The marital-age hadith is also absent from the *Mudawwanah* of the proto-Mālikī Qayrawanian jurist Saḥnūn b. Sa’īd al-Tanūkī (d. 240/854), a compilation of Madinan legal transmissions and opinions not just from Mālik (e.g., from Hišām, from ‘Urwah, from ‘Ā’ishah), but also from early Madinan authorities more broadly, including Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād, Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī, ‘Urwah, and others. Even in the sections pertaining to marriage and especially child marriage, no version of the marital-age hadith—whether from Hišām or from any of the other Madinan authorities to which it is ascribed—can be found.¹³⁸⁵

To my knowledge,¹³⁸⁶ the earliest Mālikī legal work¹³⁸⁷ to cite any version of the marital-age hadith is *al-Ma’ūnah ‘alā Maḍhab ‘Ālim al-Madīnah*, which was composed by the Baghdadian Mālikī jurist ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. ‘Alī al-Qāḍī (d. 422/1031), nearly three centuries after the hadith’s initial mass-dissemination in Iraq. Thus, in his chapter on marriage (*kitāb al-nikāḥ wa-’abwābi-hi wa-al-ṭalāq wa-mā yata’allaqu bi-hi*), in the section pertaining to child marriage (*fī tazwīj al-’ab ibnata-hu al-bikr al-ṣaḡīrah*), ‘Abd al-Wahhāb wrote the following:

And [it is permissible] for the father to marry off his prepubescent virgin daughter (*wa-li-l-’ab ’inkāḥ ibnata-hu al-bikr al-ṣaḡīrah*), without [there being any scholarly] disagreement [on the matter] (*min ḡayr kilāf*). And the

¹³⁸⁴ Baugh, *Minor Marriage*, 122.

¹³⁸⁵ E.g., cf. Saḥnūn b. Sa’īd al-Tanūkī, *al-Mudawwanah al-Kubrā*, vol. 4 (Riyad, KSA: Wizārat al-Šu’ūn al-’Islāmiyy wa-al-’Awqāf wa-al-Da’wah wa-al-’Iršād, n. d.), pp. 5-9, comprising the following sections within the *kitāb al-nikāḥ al-’awwal*: § *fī ’inkāḥ al-’ab ibnata-hu bi-ḡayr riḍā-hā*; § *fī ’inkāḥ al-’ab ibnata-hu al-bikr wa-al-ṭayyib*; § *bāb fī iḥtilām al-ḡulām*; and § *fī riḍā al-bikr wa-al-ṭayyib*.

¹³⁸⁶ Based upon my search of the Shamela database.

¹³⁸⁷ By contrast, a version of the hadith is cited in the surviving fragments of the *Kitāb al-Jāmi’*, a general Hadith collection ascribed—via ‘Abū al-‘Abbās al-’Ašamm and his Egyptian teacher Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Ḥakam—to the Egyptian proto-Mālikī traditionist ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb. As will be discussed below, however, Ibn Wahb cited this version not from an unambiguously-Madinan line of transmission (let alone Mālik, for example), but rather, from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘abī al-Zinād and Sa’īd b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān (both of whom were Madinans who moved to Iraq), from Hišām b. ‘Urwah (another Madinan who moved to Iraq). At minimum, Ibn Wahb or a later tradent seems to have interpolated this ascription, since Sa’īd was reportedly born after Hišām died, and there is literally no other attestation of his having transmitted this hadith from Hišām beyond this single citation attributed to Ibn Wahb. The only early Mālikī citation of this hadith is thus a single citation in an Egyptian general collection that (1) contains a probable false ascription, (2) fails to cite the hadith in any actual legal context (e.g., as part of the established proto-Mālikī legal tradition emanating from Madinah), and (3) is consistent with having been obtained in Iraq rather than Madinah (let alone the proto-Mālikī legal tradition emanating from Madinah). For more on all of this, see below.

basis thereof (*wa-al-ʿaṣl fī-hi*) is His (the Sublime’s) statement, “and marry the unmarried females amongst you” [Q. 24:32], and His (the Sublime’s) statement, “verily, I want to marry you to one of my two daughters, [one of] these two” [Q. 28:27], and His statement, “and [as for] those amongst your women who have despaired of menstruation: if you doubt, then their [post-marital] waiting period is three months; and [likewise for] those who have not [i.e., never] menstruated” [Q. 65:4]. Thus, He established for the female who has not attained puberty (*allatī lam tabluġ*) a [post-marital] waiting period, and the [post-marital] waiting period is not necessary except [in the instance of] the separation of a valid [i.e., consummated] marriage (*nikāḥ ṣaḥīḥ*). And [it is also permissible] because the Messenger of God married (*tazawwaja*) ʿĀʾiṣah when she was a girl of six and consummated the marriage with her (*wa-banā bi-hā*) when she was a girl of nine, and [also because] it was transmitted that he married off (*zawwaja*) his two daughters to ʿUṭmān without consulting them (*wa-lam yastaṣīr-humā*). There is no disagreement on this matter (*wa-lā kīlāfū fī-hi*).¹³⁸⁸

It is fitting that the first Mālikī jurist to use the marital-age hadith happens to have been an Iraqi, but regardless, the key point is this: the absence of this hadith from the early Mālikī legal tradition—exemplified by its belated entry therein, around the turn of the 11th Century CE—is straightforwardly inconsistent with the notion that the hadith was being transmitted in Madinah already during the 8th Century CE. If leading legal authorities and transmitters of legal hadiths in Madinah—including Hiṣām, Muḥammad b. ʿAmr, Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhri, ʿAbū Salamah, Yaḥyá b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, ʿUrwah, and ʿĀʾiṣah—were truly disseminating versions of the marital-age hadith during the 7th and 8th Centuries CE (as most of the relevant *ʾisnāds* would have us believe), we would reasonably expect at least some versions thereof to appear in the Madinan legal collections—and Mālikī collections of Madinan legal material—of the 8th, 9th, and 10th Centuries CE. This is especially so given the legal utility of the marital-age hadith for specific, early Madinan and Mālikī doctrines regarding child marriage—yet the Madinans and the Mālikīs failed to cite the hadith for centuries. The absence of any version of the marital-age hadith in the earliest compendia of Madinan legal Hadith is thus strong evidence against the notion that the hadith in question was circulating in Madinah already in the 7th and 8th Centuries CE, which corroborates the hypothesis of Iraqi origin. If the Madinans and early Mālikīs knew of the marital-age hadith at all (as they surely must have by at least the middle of the 9th Century CE,

¹³⁸⁸ ʿAbd al-Waḥḥāb b. ʿAlī al-Baġdādī (ed. Ḥamīš ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq), *al-Maʿūnah ʿalā Maḍhab ʿĀlim al-Madīnah* (Makkah, KSA: al-Maktabah al-Tijāriyyah, n. d.), p. 718.

when it was spreading all across the Abbasid Caliphate), they presumably experienced it as a foreign import (from Iraq or elsewhere), not a local resource that they had possessed all along—thus, its continued absence from the Madīnī-Mālikī legal tradition until the turn of the 11th Century CE, when a Mālikī from Iraq finally recruited it to support the Madīnī position that a father can arrange the marriage of his virgin daughter without her permission or consent. Thereafter, the marital-age hadith became a standard proof for this doctrine within the classical Mālikī tradition.¹³⁸⁹

The silence of the earliest collections of Madīnī legal Hadith is matched by the silence of the earliest Madīnī collection of biographical Hadith—namely, the famous *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* of the influential Madīnī traditionist and biographer Muḥammad b. ʿIshāq b. Yasār (d. 150-153/767-770). The original version of this biography lacked any mention of ʿĀʾiṣah's young marital age, despite the fact that Ibn ʿIshāq otherwise transmitted from Hišām b. ʿUrwah, various other sons of ʿUrwah, other Zubayrids, Zubayrid clients, students of ʿUrwah, and ultimately ʿĀʾiṣah herself.¹³⁹⁰ Ibn ʿIshāq's failure to acquire this hadith from Hišām after they had both migrated to Baghdad is

¹³⁸⁹ E.g., Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Yūnus al-Ṣiqillī (prepared by ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ʿAḥmad al-ʿAnṣārī), *al-Jāmiʿ li-Masāʾil al-Mudawwanah*, vol. 9 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 2013), pp. 21-22; Yūsuf b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Barr (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī ʿAmin Qalʿajī), *al-Istiḍkār*, vol. 16 (Damascus & Beirut: Dār Qutaybah; and Aleppo & Cairo: Dār al-Waʿy; 1993), pp. 49-54. There is however a slight difference in use here: whereas ʿAbd al-Wahhāb cited the marital-age hadith to justify forced *prepubescent* virgin marriage in particular, al-Ṣiqillī and Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr cited it to justify forced virgin marriage in general, without qualification.

¹³⁹⁰ E.g., ʿAbd al-Malik b. Hišām & Muḥammad b. ʿIshāq (ed. & trans. Alfred Guillaume), *The Life of Muḥammad: A Translation of Ishāq's Sīrat Rasūl Allāh* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1998 [originally published in 1955]), 99 (Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿAsmāʾ), 105 (al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 111 (Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar), 112 (Ṣāliḥ b. Kaysān—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 130 (Yahyā b. ʿUrwah—ʿUrwah—ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr), 144 (Hišām—ʿUrwah), 153 (al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 154 (Yazīd b. Rūmān—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 171 (al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 187 (Yazīd b. Rūmān—ʿUrwah), 191 (ʿUmar b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUrwah—ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUrwah), 191 (Hišām—ʿUrwah), 212 (ʿUrwah), 223 (*fulān*—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 227 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Uwaymir), 236 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah—*fulānah*), 279 (al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—ʿUsāmah b. Zayd), 289 (al-Zuhrī & ʿĀṣim b. ʿUmar b. Qatādah & ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿabī Bakr & Yazīd b. Rūmān—ʿUrwah & others—Ibn ʿAbbās), 290 (Yazīd b. Rūmān—ʿUrwah), 292 (Yazīd b. Rūmān—ʿUrwah), 305 (Yazīd b. Rūmān—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 318 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah), 435 (Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀmir b. al-Ṭufayl), 445 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr & Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān—ʿUrwah—ʿAbū Hurayrah), 464 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 493 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 493 (*fulān*—al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 494 (al-Zuhrī—ʿAlqamah b. Waqqāṣ & Saʿīd b. Jubayr & ʿUrwah & ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUtbah), 500 (al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—Miswar & Marwān), 509 (al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah), 513-514 (Hišām), 527 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah), 532 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah), 536 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah), 540 (al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—Miswar & Marwān), 545 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah & others), 555 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah), 670 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—Ziyād b. Ḍumayrah b. Saʿd al-Sulamī—ʿUrwah—al-Zubayr—al-ʿAswad), 679 (al-Zuhrī—ʿAyyūb b. Baṣīr), 680 (Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 682 (Yaʿqūb b. ʿUtbah—al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah), 686 (al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah); etc.

understandable (given the enmity that arose between the two in Madinah, prior to their respective departures),¹³⁹¹ but his failure to acquire it beforehand from Hišām and a multitude of other Madinan and Zubayrid authorities is hard to explain if the hadith was actually circulating in Madinah. This is especially so given that the hadith is of great biographical importance (being the marriage of the Prophet to his favourite wife, no less), and thus would surely have demanded inclusion into a dedicated Madinan collection of Prophetical biography. Ibn ʿIshāq’s *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* is thus another early Madinan collection that *should* have cited this hadith but did not, and the later editors and transmitters had to add this hadith therein themselves as a supplement in their recensions of his work: the Basro-Egyptian redactor ʿAbd al-Malik b. Hišām (d. 213/828-829 or 218/833)—who received a version of the *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* from Ibn ʿIshāq’s Kufan student Ziyād al-Bakkāʾī (d. 183/799-800)—referred to the hadith in his own biographical summary of ʿĀʾiṣah’s marriage (i.e., amongst his explicit addenda),¹³⁹² whilst Ibn ʿIshāq’s Kufan student and redactor Yūnus b. Bukayr (d. 199/814-815) cited the hadith on the authority of Hišām b. ʿUrwah (again, as an explicit addendum).¹³⁹³ In other words: not only was the marital-age hadith absent from the original *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* of Ibn ʿIshāq, it was explicitly added to this collection of Madinan material by Iraqians.¹³⁹⁴

The marital-age hadith is also absent from the *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* of al-Wāqidī (another collection of Madinan material), which may at first seem odd: we have already established that al-Wāqidī transmitted several different versions of the marital-age hadith to his secretary Ibn Saʿd in Baghdad, so it would not have been surprising if he had inserted at least one such version into his own *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* as well. It could be posited that the material constituting the *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* was already relatively fixed or closed by the time that al-Wāqidī moved to Baghdad, in which case, its silence would be meaningful: if the *Kitāb al-Mağāzī* is a dedicated Madinan collection of material, and the marital-age hadith is absent therefrom, then this would be further evidence that

¹³⁹¹ John M. B. Jones, ‘Ibn Ishāq’, in Bernard Lewis, Victor L. Ménage, Charles Pellat, & Joseph F. Schacht (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 3: H-Iram* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 1971), 810-811; Guillaume, *The Life of Muḥammad*, xiii-xiv.

¹³⁹² Ibn Hišām (ed. & trans. Guillaume), *The Life of Muḥammad*, 792. He even cites Ibn ʿIshāq (i.e., Ibn Hišām—al-Bakkāʾī—Ibn ʿIshāq—Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. al-Zubayr—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah) for his data on other wives (e.g., *ibid.*, 793), but not for ʿĀʾiṣah.

¹³⁹³ Ibn Bukayr (ed. Zakkār), *Siyar*, p. 255.

¹³⁹⁴ I owe thanks to Yasmin Amin for pointing out the example of Ibn Bukayr.

the hadith was not circulating in Madinah during the 8th Century CE, not to mention that al-Wāqidī in particular only obtained the hadith after he moved to Baghdad. That said, the silence of this work may not be meaningful: unlike Ibn 'Ishāq's work, al-Wāqidī's (or at least the extant redaction thereof) truly lives up to its name, being much more focused on the raids and battles of the Prophet. It is thus less surprising—and less interesting—that al-Wāqidī (in contrast to Ibn 'Ishāq) failed to cite the marital-age hadith: it was less germane to his interests, at least as far as his extant *Kitāb al-Maḡāzī* was concerned.¹³⁹⁵

Finally, it is worth noting that another Madinan collection of biographical Hadith has just been rediscovered and published (as of October, 2021): the *Kitāb al-Maḡāzī* of the influential Madinan biographer and traditionist Mūsá b. 'Uqbah (d. 141-142/758-760), a client of the Zubayrids' who was remembered as having transmitted from such Madinan notables as Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī, 'Abū Salamah, and 'Urwah.¹³⁹⁶ Given the biographical importance of the marital-age hadith and given Mūsá's teachers, it is reasonable to expect that he should have cited the hadith, if indeed it was circulating in Madinah during the 7th and 8th Centuries CE: as above with Ibn 'Ishāq, so too with Mūsá.

Unfortunately, I do not yet have access this work, but its importance cannot be overstated: it is rare indeed that a historian is presented with an opportunity to test the novel predictions (or in the case of past occurrences, retrodictions) generated by their hypotheses. If Mūsá's biography cites the marital-age hadith but exhibits no further signs of tampering or later redaction, then the hypothesis outlined thus far will be seriously weakened: if Mūsá possessed a version of the marital-age hadith on a Madinan authority, spent most of his life in Madinah, and died before Hišām, then it would reasonably follow that he obtained his version in Madinah, and that the hadith was already circulating in Madinah in the middle of the 8th Century CE (i.e., independently of Hišām's activities in Iraq). The silence of all other Madinan sources and the absence of unambiguously-Madinan CLs and PCLs would still need to be explained, but at that point, the hypothesis of Madinan origins and the hypothesis of

¹³⁹⁵ The marital-age hadith is likewise absent from Sulaymān b. Ṭarkān al-Taymī (ed. Riḍwān al-Ḥaṣrī), *Sīrat Rasūl Allāh* (Riyadh, KSA: Markaz al-Malik Fayṣal li-al-Buḥūṭ wa-al-Dirāsāt al-'Islāmiyyah, 1443 AH), a Basran work that is exclusively focused on the Prophet's raids. I owe thanks to Pavel Pavlovitch for this reference.

¹³⁹⁶ Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, pp. 114-118.

Iraqian origins would be on a much more equal footing: both would be supported by strong pieces of evidence, whilst simultaneously conflicting with other strong points of evidence. Both hypotheses would thus have to explain away some of the evidence, for which purpose *ad hoc* auxiliary hypotheses would need to be devised: this would leave both hypotheses in the awkward position of having to make additional, unevidenced assumptions (unless or until independent confirmation could be furnished for a given auxiliary hypothesis).

Conversely, if Mūsá's biography follows every other early Madinan source in failing to cite the marital-age hadith, this would make their collective silence all the more deafening—strengthening the evidence that the marital-age hadith was not circulating in Madinah during the 7th and 8th Centuries CE. In short, my hypothesis predicts (all else being equal) that the marital-age hadith should be absent from Mūsá's *Kitāb al-Maḡāzī*—a prediction that should be verifiable by the time that you read this.

In sum, the absence of the marital-age hadith from *all early Madinan sources and early dedicated collections of Madinan material*—despite (1) its claiming to derive from the great masters of Madinah, whose transmissions were copiously recorded in these sources; (2) its specifically embodying their legal stances on topics they explicitly addressed (in the case of the legal sources) and biographical details of the sort they liked to adduce (in the case of the biographical sources); and (3) its ubiquitous citation in these same contexts and for these same interests in later sources—is extremely unexpected, which is to say, highly unlikely on the hypothesis of a genuine Madinan origin. This collective silence is thus strong evidence for the absence of the marital-age hadith in Madinah during the 8th Century CE.

Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the Earliest Kufan Collections

Although most versions of the marital-age hadith—including those from Iraqi CLs—claim to derive via Madinan SSs and/or from Madinan sources, three of the earliest CLs cited Kufan SSs:

- The Kufan CL **‘Abṭar b. al-Qāsim** (d. 178/794-795) also cited the Kufan traditionist Muṭarrif b. Ṭarīf (d. 133/750-751 or 141-143/758-761), from ‘Abū ‘Ishāq, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, from ‘Ā’iṣah.
- The Wasitian-Basran CL **‘Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ** (d. 176/792) cited the Kufan Follower and *qāḍī* ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Umayr (d. 136/754), from ‘Ā’iṣah.
- The Kufan CL **‘Isrā’īl b. Yūnus** (d. 160-162/776-779) cited the Kufan traditionist ‘Abū ‘Ishāq ‘Amr b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Sabī’ī (d. 127-128/744-746), from the Kufan Follower ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah ‘Āmir b. ‘Abd Allāh (d. 81/700-701).
- The Kufan CL **Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-‘A’maš** (d. 147-148/764-766) cited the Kufan Follower ‘Ibrāhīm b. Yazīd al-Naḵa’ī (d. 96/714), from the Kufan Follower al-‘Aswad b. Yazīd (d. 75/694-695), from ‘Ā’iṣah.

Thus, even if the Madinan origin of the marital-age hadith is in doubt, the possibility remains that it can be traced back to the early 8th Century CE in Kufah, if not earlier.

There are several reasons to doubt that the marital-age hadith goes back any earlier than the middle of the 8th Century CE even in Kufah, however. Firstly, as we have already seen, ‘Abṭar’s hadith was likely borrowed from the tradition of al-‘A’maš, and can be set aside accordingly. Secondly, as we have already seen, ‘Abū ‘Awānah’s *faḍā’il* hadith plausibly reflects a secondary reworking of the relevant *faḍā’il* material, from which the marital-age elements were initially absent. Thirdly, in terms of ascription, al-‘A’maš’s hadith (which explicitly and continuously reaches all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah) is superior to Hišām’s (which originally only reached back to ‘Urwah), making it seem secondary. Fourthly, all of these Kufan ascriptions—like every other version of the hadith more broadly—are consistent with being outgrowths of Hišām’s version (via the ordinary mechanisms of erroneous or sloppy transmission, in conjunction with the common occurrence of secondary false ascription).

To all of the above can be added the following consideration: as with the Mālikīs, the Kufan versions of the marital-age hadith are never cited by the early Ḥanafī school of Islamic jurisprudence, despite its being an outgrowth of the 8th-Century Kufan legal tradition, and despite the hadith’s potential utility as a justification for Ḥanafī doctrines relating to child marriage. Thus, the hadith is absent from all of the extant writings of and transmissions from the leading Kufan jurists ‘Abū Ḥanīfah al-Nu‘mān b. Ṭābit (d. 150/767), ‘Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb b. ‘Ibrāhīm (d. 182/798), and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-

Šaybānī (d. 189/804-805), not to mention all of their early followers. Thus, as Baugh again observes: “It cannot be overlooked that al-Ṭaḥāwī does not mention the hadith of ‘Ā’isha here or in the *Ikhtilāf*.”¹³⁹⁷ Likewise: “Much of al-Jaṣṣāṣ’s argument is built on the arguments of al-Ṭaḥāwī, and al-Shaybānī before him; none of these relies on the hadith of ‘Ā’isha.”¹³⁹⁸ In short, “the Ḥanafī position definitely allowed prepubescent marriage but it was never justified by this hadith.”¹³⁹⁹

An alleged exception to this overwhelming Kufan legal silence is the extant *Kitāb al-’Aṣl* ascribed to al-Šaybānī, who allegedly cited the marital-age hadith therein—in the chapter on marriage (*kitāb al-nikāḥ*), in the section pertaining to child marriage (*bāb nikāḥ al-ṣaḡīr wa-al-ṣaḡīrah*)—as follows:

It reached us (*balaḡa-nā*) from the Messenger of God that he married (*tazawwaja*) ‘Ā’iṣah when she was a prepubescent girl (*ṣaḡīrah*), a girl of six years, and consummated the marriage with her (*wa-banā bi-hā*) when she was a girl of nine years; she was with him nine [years].¹⁴⁰⁰

If indeed al-Šaybānī—one of the founders of the Ḥanafī school—had cited the marital-age hadith in his jurisprudence, it would be reasonable to expect that the subsequent Ḥanafī tradition, in which earlier works were continuously cannibalised and elaborated in later works, would have mentioned this fact. Instead, the Ḥanafī tradition failed to cite this hadith for centuries, which immediately suggests that the citation in the extant *’Aṣl* is a later interpolation, or that the extant *’Aṣl* as a whole is actually a text that was reworked centuries after al-Šaybānī. This hypothesis has been corroborated by Hocine Benkheira, who argues that the *’Aṣl* was reworked and revised (“remanié et révisé”) long after (“longtemps après”) the time of al-Šaybānī, on the basis of the appearance therein of a hadith that is otherwise mysteriously absent in the works of Mālik and especially al-Šāfi‘ī—a hadith that otherwise only appeared late (“tardive”) in the Ḥanafī tradition.¹⁴⁰¹

¹³⁹⁷ Baugh, *Minor Marriage*, 189.

¹³⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 192.

¹³⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 179, n. 56.

¹⁴⁰⁰ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Šaybānī (ed. Mehmet Boynukalın), *al-’Aṣl*, vol. 10 (Doha, Qatar: Wizārat al-’Awqāf, 2012), p. 186.

¹⁴⁰¹ Hocine Benkheira, ‘Un acte manqué peut-il invalider le jeûne? À propos de l’oubli et de cas semblables’, *Mélanges de l’Institut dominicain d’études orientales*, Number 34 (2019), 30. More generally, see also Melchert, *Aḥmad*, 67-68.

The Transoxanian Ḥanafī jurist Muḥammad b. 'Aḥmad al-Saraḡsī (d. 483/1090) also attributed the use of the marital-age hadith to the earlier Ḥanafī jurist Muḥammad b. Muqātil al-Rāzī (d. 248/862-863), in the following passage of his famous *al-Mabṣūt*:

Our masters (*mašāyiku-nā*) disagreed regarding the minimum age (*'adnā al-muddah*) by which the determining of the puberty of the prepubescent girl is permissible (*yajūzu al-ḥukm fī-hā bi-bulūḡ al-ṣaḡīrah*). Thus, Muḥammad b. Muqātil al-Rāzī used to set it at nine years, because the Prophet consummated his marriage (*banā*) with 'Ā'īṣah when she was a girl of nine years, and [it is] obvious (*al-zāhir*) that he consummated the marriage with her after [she had attained] puberty (*ba'da al-bulūḡ*). Moreover, 'Abū Muṭī' al-Balḡī had a daughter who became a grandmother when she was a girl of nineteen years, such that he said: "This girl has put us to shame!" And amongst our masters are those who set it at seven years because of his [i.e., the Prophet's] saying: "Command them to [uphold] the prayer, when they reach [the age of] seven."¹⁴⁰²

Given that Ibn Muqātil's use is unattested in the Ḥanafī tradition prior to al-Saraḡsī (i.e., in the approximately two centuries separating the two), the ascription is dubious; moreover, al-Saraḡsī does not actually quote Ibn Muqātil's own words in this regard, which is consistent with his description of Ibn Muqātil's use of the marital-age hadith's being the product of al-Saraḡsī's own inferences or speculation.

As far as I am aware,¹⁴⁰³ the earliest definite use of the marital-age hadith within the Ḥanafī tradition occurred in *al-Nutaf fī al-Fatāwá*, which was composed by the Transoxanian Ḥanafī jurist 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Suḡdī (d. 461/1068-1069), nearly three centuries after the hadith's initial mass-dissemination in Iraq. Thus, in a discussion on the age at which Islamic rituals become obligatory, al-Suḡdī wrote the following:

And as for prayer, [children] are commanded to [uphold] it at seven years, and they are beaten [into doing] it at ten.

And as for fasting, [children] are commanded to [uphold] it at ten, and they are beaten [into doing] it at twelve.

And as for [being] alone in sleep, [children] are separated into boys and girls [on the one hand], and fathers and mothers [are separated] from them [as well], at six; and that is because the Messenger of God married

¹⁴⁰² Muḥammad b. 'Aḥmad al-Saraḡsī, *al-Mabṣūt*, vol. 3 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma'rifah, 1989), p. 149.

¹⁴⁰³ Again, based upon my search of the Shamela database.

(*tazawwaja*) ‘Ā’iṣah when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her (*banā bi-hā*) at nine.

And, at fifteen, pens are upon them [i.e., they are subject to the rulings of jurists].¹⁴⁰⁴

Following al-Suḡdī (in fact, beginning with his student al-Saraḡsī), the marital-age hadith became a standard proof within the classical Ḥanafī tradition for various marriage-related doctrines—in particular, that fathers can arrange the marriages of their prepubescent children; that girls can be consummated in marriage when they attain physical maturity; and that nine is the minimum age at which puberty can occur in girls.¹⁴⁰⁵

Of course, the Ḥanafīs must have been aware of the marital-age hadith for centuries before they finally started to use it—indeed, their early Kufan forebears could not have failed to notice its proliferation amongst the traditionists and Hadith-oriented jurists of their hometown at the end of the 8th Century CE. Thus, as with the Mālikīs, a distinction can be made between the initial non-use of the hadith on the one hand, and its prolonged non-use on the other. The latter can be easily explained by the former, as a consequence of inertia or a kind of legal traditionalism or conservatism: the founders of the legal school did not use the hadith in their authoritative works, so their early followers simply followed suit. By contrast, the former is much harder to explain on the view that the Kufan versions of the marital-age hadith genuinely derive from their alleged sources—in particular, ‘Ibrāhīm al-Naḡa‘ī (d. 96/714), ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah ‘Āmir (d. 81/700-701), and al-‘Aswad b. Yazīd (d. 75/694-695). The early Kufan legal tradition venerated the local Companion ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd and his students (‘*aṣḥāb*) above all others as sources of legal doctrine¹⁴⁰⁶ and, as it happens, al-‘Aswad was the student of Ibn Mas‘ūd and ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah was the son of Ibn Mas‘ūd. Moreover, amongst the Followers, the early Kufan legal tradition venerated none other than ‘Ibrāhīm al-Naḡa‘ī above all others as a source of legal doctrine,¹⁴⁰⁷ such that his

¹⁴⁰⁴ ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Suḡdī (ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Nāḥī), *al-Nutafī al-Fatāwā* (Amman, Jordan: Dār al-Furqān, 1984), p. 113.

¹⁴⁰⁵ E.g., Saraḡsī, *Mabṣūt*, III, p. 149; *ibid.*, IV, pp. 212-213; Burhān al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. ‘Aḥmad al-Buḡārī (ed. Na‘īm ‘Aḥmad), *al-Muḥīṭ al-Burhāniyy fī al-Fiqh al-Nu‘māniyy*, vol. 1 (Riyad, KSA: Maktabat al-Ruṣd, 2004), p. 395, # 833; ‘Abū Bakr b. Mas‘ūd al-Kāsānī (ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad Mu‘awwaḍ & ‘Ādil ‘Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Mawjūd), *Badā’i‘ al-Ṣanā’i‘ fī Tartīb al-Ṣarā’i‘*, vol. 3 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 2003), p. 355; Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Aḥmad al-‘Aynī (ed. ‘Ayman Ṣāliḥ Ṣa‘bān), *al-Bināyah Ṣarḥ al-Hidāyah*, vol. 5 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 2000), p. 90; *ibid.*, XI, p. 111.

¹⁴⁰⁶ Schacht, *Origins*, 31, 231 ff.

¹⁴⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 32-33, 86-87, 105, 233 ff.

opinions and transmissions comprise the bulk of the reports cited in both the *Kitāb al-ʿĀṭār* of ʿAbū Yūsuf and the *Kitāb al-ʿĀṭār* of al-Šaybānī.¹⁴⁰⁸ Thus, if these leading authorities amongst the Followers of Kufah had truly transmitted versions of the marital-age hadith to their local students, such that the marital-age hadith was already circulating in Kufah during the early 8th Century CE, we would reasonably expect that the Kufan jurists and jurist-collectors of the mid-to-late 8th Century CE would have cited or mentioned it from their own authorities in their various legal writings and compendia, especially given the utility of the hadith for some of their marriage-related legal doctrines. Consequently, the absence of the marital-age hadith (which had utility as a justification for certain Kufan legal doctrines) from the early Kufan legal tradition (which venerated the Kufan Followers who allegedly transmitted the hadith) is unexpected on the view that the ascriptions of the Kufan CLs ʿIsrāʿīl and al-ʿAʿmaš to the Followers of Kufah are genuine. The absence of any version of the marital-age hadith from the early Kufan legal tradition is consistent with the hadith’s being a mid-8th-Century innovation amongst the *traditionists* of Iraq in particular, such that it only took off amongst subsequent Hadith-oriented jurists (such as al-Šāfiʿī), rather than the indigenous, mainstream, rationalist-inclined jurists of Kufah (such as ʿAbū Ḥanīfah, ʿAbū Yusuf, and al-Šaybānī), who never possessed the hadith to begin with (i.e., did not inherit it from their own authorities).¹⁴⁰⁹

The only hint at an early Kufan legal use of the marital-age hadith (i.e., beyond the Hadith-oriented jurists) is the following ascription of the Khurasanian CL Ibn Rāhwayh (d. 238/853), via the Kufan tradent Yaḥyá b. ʿĀdam (d. 203/818), to the Zaydī Kufan theologian and traditionist al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy (d. 169/785-786):

Yaḥyá b. ʿĀdam reported to us, from al-Ḥasan [b. Ḥayy], who said: “I saw a grandmother [who was] a girl of twenty-one years.”

He said: “And the minimum of the ages [at which] the pregnancy of a woman [can occur] is nine years (*wa-ʿaqaḷ ʿawqāt [al-]ḥaml [al-marʿah] tisʿ sinīn*), which is the earliest time [at which there can be] sexual intercourse

¹⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 86.

¹⁴⁰⁹ That Hišām, al-ʿAʿmaš, and ʿIsrāʿīl were not part of the regional Kufan legal tradition is evident from their general absence from the works of ʿAbū Ḥanīfah, ʿAbū Yusuf, and al-Šaybānī. They are collectively cited therein little more than 100 times (in contrast to the 1000+ citations of Ḥammād b. ʿabī Sulaymān, for example), and even then, almost entirely in a single, polemical work directed against outsiders (namely, al-Šaybānī’s *Hujjah*). Hišām *et al.* clearly belonged to a Hadith-oriented tendency that would culminate in the Partisans of Hadith (*ahl al-ḥadīth*), the rivals of the proto-Ḥanafī rationalists (*ahl al-raʾy*) of Kufah, and were only cited sporadically by the latter.

(*wa-huwa 'awwal waqt/'awqāt al-waṭ'*). The Messenger of God consummated his marriage (*daḳala*) with 'Ā'iṣah when she was a girl of nine."¹⁴¹⁰

Ibn Rāhwayh's ascription to al-Ḥasan is uncorroborated, but even if it is authentic, it does not change the unexpected silence of the dominant proto-Ḥanafī faction of Kufah, which was obsessed with 'Ibrāhīm and the students of Ibn Mas'ūd: if 'Ibrāhīm and the students of Ibn Mas'ūd had truly disseminated versions of the marital-age hadith in Kufah, it would be reasonable to expect that these specific versions would have been cited by proto-Ḥanafī jurists and collectors.

With all of that said, even if the ascription to al-Šaybānī cited at the outset (i.e., the relevant passage in the extant *Kitāb al-'Aṣl*) was somehow genuine, there would still be a major problem. The version of the marital-age hadith that was putatively cited by al-Šaybānī (*'an rasūl allāh 'anna-hu tazawwaja 'ā'iṣah wa-hiya ṣaḡīrah ibnat sitt sinīn wa-banā bi-hā wa-hiya ibnat tis' sinīn wa-kānat 'inda-hu tis'^{an}*) was demonstrably not the version ascribed to 'Ibrāhīm al-Naḳā'ī and al-'Aswad b. Yazīd (which contained the rare 'married at nine' element), nor the version ascribed to 'Abū 'Ubaydah and Ibn Mas'ūd (which contained a different, distinctive final element about how the Prophet died when 'Ā'iṣah was eighteen).¹⁴¹¹ Instead, the version putatively cited by al-Šaybānī is most similar to Hišām's Version 2 hadith, which not only shares therewith the 'married at six' and 'consummated at nine' elements, but also the specific *kānat 'inda-hu tis'^{an}* wording of the third element.¹⁴¹² Thus, even if al-Šaybānī's alleged citation of the marital-age hadith is genuine, he specifically failed to cite the Kufan versions of the hadith, which is unexpected on the hypothesis that 'Ibrāhīm and the 'aṣḥāb of Ibn Mas'ūd disseminated versions of the hadith in Kufah. Once again, if they had actually done so, we would reasonably expect such material to have been inherited by the proto-Ḥanafī legal tradition.

In short, (1) the absence of the marital-age elements from most versions of the 8th-Century Kufan *faḍā'il* material on 'Ā'iṣah, (2) the perfect 'isnād cited by al-'A'maš, (3) the consistency of all Kufan versions with being outgrowths of Hišām's version, and above all (4) the absence of (especially the Kufan versions of) the marital-age hadith

¹⁴¹⁰ See the section on Ibn Rāhwayh in ch. 2.

¹⁴¹¹ See variously above.

¹⁴¹² See the section on Hišām b. 'Urwah in ch. 2.

from the early Kufan—or specifically, the proto-Ḥanafī—legal tradition all cast serious doubt on the Kufan versions of the marital-age hadith, which claim derive from or via the Followers of Kufah. On the contrary, this evidence is consistent with the marital-age hadith’s being a recent (mid-8th-Century) innovation amongst the traditionists of Kufah, or in other words: even in Kufah, the marital-age hadith cannot be traced back to—indeed, is positively unlikely to derive from—the early 8th Century CE.

Interim Summary and Entailments: Hišām as the Originator of the Marital-Age Hadith

All of the evidence surveyed thus far points to mid-8th-Century Kufah as the starting point of the marital-age hadith: several versions can be traced back to a series of Kufan CLs operating in the mid-to-late 8th Century CE, but there are strong reasons to doubt the ascriptions of these CLs back to their respective sources, including Kufan sources (in the case of ‘Abū ‘Awānah, ‘Isrā’īl, and al-’A‘maš), Madinan sources (in the case of Hišām and Muḥammad b. ‘Amr), and others (in the case of ‘Ismā’īl b. ‘abī Ḳālid). (This also applies to every SS ascription and spider within the hadith-tradition, all of which are either probably or at least plausibly dives.) Where then did the marital-age hadith come from, and why did it suddenly explode in Kufah in the mid-to-late 8th Century CE?

We have already seen that Muḥammad b. ‘Amr probably borrowed his version from Hišām’s Version 4 hadith, that al-’A‘maš’s ascription looks secondary compared with Hišām’s, and that Hišām’s Version 1 hadith is consistent with being the ur-story behind virtually all other versions of the marital-age hadith more broadly—and, as it happens, Hišām’s versions of the hadith far and away the most widely-disseminated and influential out of all the CL redactions. All of this is consistent with (i.e., is actually explained by) the hadith’s having originated with Hišām when he moved to Kufah, or in other words: Hišām falsely ascribed a report about ‘Ā’iṣah to his father, and elaborated the report in successive retellings; Hišām’s hadith rapidly proliferated amongst the traditionists of Iraq; and some of his Kufan contemporaries borrowed—and in some cases altered or garbled—his hadith and reattributed it to other early

authorities. In practice, this would mean that every extant CL, including al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī' (d. post-216/831), al-Wāqidī (d. 207/823), Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (d. turn of 9th C. CE), 'Abṭar (d. 178/794-795), 'Abū 'Awānah (d. 176/792), 'Isrā'īl (d. 160-162/776-779), al-'A'maš (d. 147-148/764-766), 'Ismā'īl (d. 146/763-764), and Muḥammad b. 'Amr (d. 144-145/761-763), directly or indirectly acquired their hadiths—or the marital-age elements therein—from Hišām (d. 146-147/763-765). In addition to variously explaining or being consistent with all of the evidence surveyed thus far, this is completely feasible in terms of chronology and geography: all of the earliest CLs (i.e., al-'A'maš, 'Ismā'īl, and Muḥammad b. 'Amr) were operating at the same time (c. 754-765 CE) and in the same place (i.e., Iraq) as Hišām; and every later CL (e.g., al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī') operated at times (e.g., the early 9th Century CE) and in places (e.g., the Levant) where transmissions from the earlier CLs were spreading.

If indeed Hišām (after his move to Kufah) was the ultimate source of all extant versions of the marital-age hadith, an obvious question arises: did Hišām create the ur-story (i.e., the Version 1 hadith) out of thin air (*ex nihilo*), or did he obtain the key information therein (without acknowledgement) from some other source (*ex materia*)? If the latter scenario occurred, Hišām must have picked up the material from an obscure source in Kufah, based on similar *e silentio* considerations to those outlined above: if Hišām's (hypothetical) suppressed informant had been influential, then it seems reasonable to expect that they would constitute a CL in their own right, whose redaction could fulfill the textual-critical criterion of *utrum in alterum abiturum erat*. Since no other extant CL redaction fulfills this requirement, we are left with two plausible options: either Hišām was the first *influential* traditionist to pick up, formulate, and disseminate some obscure information that already existed in Kufah at the beginning of the Abbasid period, or he himself was the creator of that information. Given that the latter scenario is simpler (since it does not require the supposition of additional tradents), it seems preferable to the former, which is to say: the more probable scenario is that Hišām created the hadith whole-cloth when he moved to Kufah.

A Historical-Critical Analysis of the Marital-Age Hadith's Context

If indeed Hišām created the marital-age hadith when he moved to Kufah, an obvious follow-up question arises: why? Was this the result of some kind of error, or was it an instance of deliberate false creation—and if the latter be the case, what was Hišām’s motive? Of course, our ability to answer this secondary question of Hišām’s psychology has no bearing at all upon the preceding argumentation regarding the hadith’s origin—even if no explanation for Hišām’s act or motive was forthcoming, the evidence for the hadith’s belated creation would remain. That said, several factors can be—and have been—adduced explain Hišām’s creation of this hadith.

To begin with, even Mediaeval Hadith critics recognised that Hišām became unreliable—or at least *much less reliable*—when he moved to Iraq. In addition to the ascriptions to Mālik cited already (from Ibn Ẹirāš and Yaḥyá b. Sa‘íd), the following is reported from Ibn Ẹirāš:

He [i.e., Hišām] came to Kufah three times.

During [the first] visit, he would say therein, “My father related to me, saying: “I heard ‘Ā’iṣah...””

[He came] a second time, then he would say, “My father reported to me, from ‘Ā’iṣah...”

He came a third time, then he would say, “[from] my father, from ‘Ā’iṣah...”, meaning that he had omitted intermediary tradents in his transmission (*yursilu*) from his father.¹⁴¹³

Similarly, the following is reported from the Basran Hadith critic Ya‘qūb b. Šaybah (d. 262/875):

Hišām was reliable (*ṭabt*). There was nothing objectionable about him (*lam yunkar ‘alay-hi*) until after he went to Iraq, whereupon he transmitted widely (*inbaṣaṭa fī al-riwāyah*) and [in the process] omitted intermediary tradents in his transmission (*‘arsala*) of things from his father. [He did this with Hadith] that he had heard from [people] other than his father (*mimmā kāna sami‘a-hu min ḡayr ‘abī-hi*) [and ascribed them directly] to his father (*‘an ‘abī-hi*).¹⁴¹⁴

The later Hadith scholar and prosopographer al-Ḍahabī tried to downplay the problems that arose in Hišām’s transmission towards the end of his life, chalking them up to mere bad memory:

¹⁴¹³ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, p. 35.

¹⁴¹⁴ *Ibid.* Also see *ibid.*, p. 46.

Hišām b. ‘Urwah: one of the luminaries (*‘aḥad al-‘a‘lām*); a proof (*ḥujjah*); a leading scholar (*‘imām*). However, in old age (*lākin fī al-kibar*), his memory diminished (*tanāqasha ḥifzu-hu*), although he was never confused (*lam yaḡtaliṭ ‘abad^{an}*), and it deserves no attention that ‘Abū al-Ḥasan b. al-Qaṭṭān said of him that he and Suhayl b. ‘abī Ṣāliḥ became confused (*iktalaṭā*) and changed (*taḡayyarā*). Yes, the man changed a little (*taḡayyara qalīl^{an}*), and his memory was not the same as it was during [his] youth (*lam yabqa ḥifzu-hu ka-huwa fī ḥāl al-ṣabībah*), so he forgot some of that which he had memorised (*nasiya ba‘ḍ maḥfūzi-hi*), or erred (*wahima*)—so what? Is he immune from forgetfulness (*‘a-huwa ma‘šūm min al-nisyān*)?!¹⁴¹⁵

Al-Ḍahabī may even have blamed Hišām’s Iraqi students for the problems in the Hadith that he transmitted in Iraq, as in the following:

In the Hadith of the Iraqians from Hišām b. ‘Urwah, there are errors (*‘awḥām*) that have been transmitted, just as there are errors (*‘awḥām*) in their Hadith from Ma‘mar.¹⁴¹⁶

Other Hadith scholars were less apologetical, however—thus, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, one of the greatest Hadith scholars within the Sunnī tradition, candidly described Hišām’s omission of tradents in transmission (*‘irsāl*) as a lesser form of Hadith-related deception (*tadlīs*):

Hišām b. ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr b. al-‘Awwām; a famous junior Follower. ‘Abū al-Ḥasan b. al-Qaṭṭān mentioned him in that regard [i.e., in the context of inaccurate transmission], which al-Ḍahabī denounced. Verily, the famous account about him [i.e., Hišām] is that he came to Iraq three times. During the first [visit], he related from his father then clarified [that it was] heard directly from him. During the second [visit], he related numerous [hadiths from his father], yet never clarified the transmission (*lam yuṣarriḥ al-qīṣṣah*), which necessitates that he related from him with that which he had not heard from him (*wa-hiya taqṭaḍī ‘anna-hu ḥaddaṭa ‘an-hu bi-mā lam yasma‘-hu min-hu*). This is [a form of] deception (*al-tadlīs*).¹⁴¹⁷

Regardless of whether it was intentional or the product of declining memory in old age, the relevant reports all agree: Hišām began to falsely ascribe reports directly to his

¹⁴¹⁵ Ḍahabī (ed. Bijāwī), *Mizān*, IV, p. 301.

¹⁴¹⁶ *Id.* (ed. ‘Arna‘ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VI, p. 46.

¹⁴¹⁷ ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Alī b. Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-Mudallisīn* (Cairo, Egypt: al-Maṭba‘ah al-Ḥusayniyyah al-Miṣriyyah, 1904), p. 7.

father when he moved to Iraq. Thus, the Islamic biographical sources are at least broadly consistent with all the evidence that Hišām created the marital-age hadith—and falsely ascribed it to his father—when he moved to Kufah: this was not an isolated incident.¹⁴¹⁸ Indeed, there is even a specific indication that the marital-age was regarded by some traditionists as belonging to Hišām’s dubious (i.e., Iraqi) transmissions, in the form of a defensive comment that appears in the version of the marital-age hadith recorded in (Bišr b. Mūsá’s recension of) the *Musnad* of al-Ḥumaydī:

Al-Ḥumaydī related to us—he said: “Sufyān [b. ‘Uyaynah] related to us—he said: “Hišām b. ‘Urwah related to us—and [this] was from among the reliable of [those hadiths] that he transmits (*wa-kāna min jayyid mā yarwī*)—from his father, from ‘Ā’iṣah, who said: “The Messenger of God married me when I was a girl of six years or seven years and consummated the marriage with me when I was a girl of nine.”””¹⁴¹⁹

Whether the comment was made by Bišr, al-Ḥumaydī, or Sufyān, it is quite revealing: the marital-age hadith was clearly in question (presumably given the notoriety of Hišām’s Iraqi Hadith), prompting a transmitter thereof to defensively assert that this particular hadith was actually one of the good ones. In light of all of the evidence surveyed thus far, however, we can see that the transmitter in question was wrong: Hišām likely created the marital-age hadith when he moved to Kufah, which is consistent with the doubts cast upon his Iraqi transmissions more broadly. If al-Ḍahabī in particular is to be trusted, then we might simply conclude that this occurred by accident: Hišām began to falsely ascribe hadiths to his father when he moved to Iraq simply because he was old.¹⁴²⁰

There is reason to doubt all of these reports, however: “conditional appraisals” by Hadith critics (‘X was reliable until Y occurred’) were often retrospective attempts to rationalise perceived disparities in the quality of a given tradent’s transmissions,

¹⁴¹⁸ Of course, *’irsāl* and *tadlīs* are neither *waḍ’* nor *kaḍīb*, and it is the former that Hišām is accused of in the relevant reports, whereas I am effectively accusing him of something closer to the latter. Thus, I am not saying that the Islamic biographical sources explicitly recall that Hišām *fabricated* hadiths when he moved to Iraq—I would not expect someone of his venerated and pivotal status to be accused of such in the first place, regardless of his *actual* reliability. Rather, I am saying that the Islamic biographical sources convey the impression that Hišām’s transmissions became *dubious* or *suspect* when he moved to Iraq, and that this general impression of *dubiousness* or *suspiciousness* is consistent with Hišām’s having created and falsely ascribed some hadiths.

¹⁴¹⁹ Ḥumaydī (ed. Ḍārānī), *Musnad*, I, p. 273, # 233.

¹⁴²⁰ This point is also made in Shanavas, ‘The Myth of a Proverbial Age’, 21-22.

rather than accurate historical memories of changes in life circumstance.¹⁴²¹ Mālik's hostility to Hišām's emigration seems plausible enough (given the common regional rivalries of the day, and Mālik's Madinan chauvinism in particular), but Hišām's poor memory in old age, and even the distinction between his Madinan and Iraqi transmissions, is in doubt.

That said, conditional appraisals were attempts to rationalise obvious disparities in the material transmitted by a given tradent, so even if the specific rationalisation is suspect (e.g., poor memory in old age, or a change that occurred in Iraq), the underlying observation that prompted such a rationalisation in the first place remains valid: Hišām noticeably falsely ascribed some hadiths to his father. Moreover, even if Hišām had falsely ascribed Hadith to his father all of his life (i.e., in Madinah), it is plausible that such activities only became salient when he moved to Iraq and began to transmit Hadith that he had never transmitted before (i.e., that his Madinan students had never heard of).

Still, even if Hišām's creation of the marital-age hadith in Kufah is corroborated by a general memory of his dissemination of false ascriptions in Iraq, we are still left without a specific reason or motive therefor. In order to answer this deeper question, it is helpful to first answer a secondary question: what was the marital-age hadith *used for*? If the marital-age hadith had utility for a specific cause or interest soon after Hišām, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Hišām himself would have recognised the same utility—which could explain why he created the hadith in the first place.

One of the earliest uses of the marital-age hadith was in Islamic jurisprudence, in a way that we have encountered already: the hadith was widely understood to justify the right of a father to arrange the marriage of his (in some cases prepubescent, in other cases virgin) daughter without her consent. Other than possibly al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy (who reportedly cited the marital-age hadith to justify nine as the minimum age of marital consummation), the earliest legal use of the hadith occurred with the early Hijazo-Egyptian jurist—and supporter of the Hadith partisans (*ʿaṣḥāb al-ḥadīth*)—Muḥammad b. ʿIdrīs al-Šāfiʿī (d. 204/820), whose famous *Kitāb al-ʿUmm* survives via the recension of his Egyptian student al-Rabīʿ b. Sulaymān al-Murādī (d. 270/884). (In conformity with the thesis outlined already, al-Šāfiʿī received his version of the marital-

¹⁴²¹ Dickinson, *Development*, 99.

age hadith from Sufyan b. ‘Uyaynah in Makkah, who received it in turn from Hišām in Kufah.) Al-Šāfi‘ī cited this hadith to justify two similar legal doctrines: the right of a father to marry off his prepubescent daughter without her consent, and the right of a father to marry off his virgin daughter (i.e., including pubescent or post-pubescent girls) without her consent.¹⁴²² In the first case, al-Šāfi‘ī wrote the following:

If someone says, “Why do you claim that fathers can marry off minors (*al-‘ābā’ yuzawwijūna al-ṣiġār*),” it is said [in response to them]: ‘Abū Bakr married off (*zawwaja*) ‘Ā’iṣah to the Messenger of God when she was a girl of six or seven, and the Prophet consummated the marriage with her (*banā bi-hā*) when she was a girl of nine. Thus, the two conditions (*al-ḥālān*), which are that there was marital engagement (*al-nikāḥ*) and marital consummation (*al-duḳūl*) with the two of them, were [in effect] when ‘Ā’iṣah was [still] a minor (*ṣaġīrah*) from amongst those who have no authority over themselves (*mimman lā ‘amrā la-hā fī nafsi-hā*). More than one Companion of the Messenger of God married off (*zawwaja*) his daughter as a minor (*ṣaġīrah*).¹⁴²³

For al-Šāfi‘ī, the marital-age hadith justified the right of fathers to arrange marriages for their prepubescent daughters (i.e., without their consent); in this respect, al-Šāfi‘ī’s position was uncontroversial within early Islamic jurisprudence, since even the jurists of Kufah and their Ḥanafī descendants agreed thereon (even though they initially did so on different bases than the marital-age hadith).¹⁴²⁴ However, al-Šāfi‘ī (in contrast to the Kufans and Ḥanafīs) also extended this paternal right to *pubescent* or *post-pubescent* daughters, as long as they are still virgins:

Al-Šāfi‘ī said: “Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah reported to us, from Hišām b. ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Ā’iṣah, who said: “The Prophet married me when I was a girl of six or seven and consummated the marriage with me when I was a girl of nine.””

[There is] doubt from aṣ-Šāfi‘ī [on ‘Ā’iṣah’s exact age of marital engagement].

Al-Šāfi‘ī said: “Although it was part of the *sunnah* of the Messenger of God that *jihād* is [incumbent] upon the boy of fifteen years; and Muslims adopted that in the *ḥudūd*; and God judged that concerning orphans and said, “...until they reach marriage, then if you observe in them mental maturity...”; and [a child] does not have authority over himself (*lam yakun*

¹⁴²² For a more detailed analysis of al-Šāfi‘ī’s use of this hadith, see Ali, *Marriage and Slavery*, 35-36, and Baugh, *Minor Marriage*, ch. 5.

¹⁴²³ Šāfi‘ī (ed. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib), *‘Umm*, VIII, p. 365, # 3224.

¹⁴²⁴ Baugh, *Minor Marriage*, 79, 96-97, 100, 102, 163-164, 184, 190-191.

la-hu al-'amr fī nafsi-hi), except for the boy of fifteen years and the girl of fifteen years, unless he attains puberty (*'an yabluḡa al-ḥulum*) or [she becomes a] menstruating girl (*al-jāriyah al-maḥīḍ*) before that, [at which point] they have authority over themselves (*yakūnu la-humā 'amr fī 'anfusi-himā*); [nevertheless, despite all of this,] 'Abū Bakr's marrying off (*'inkāḥ*) of 'Ā'īṣah to the Messenger of God as a girl of six years and his [i.e., Muḥammad's] consummation of the marriage (*banā'u-hu*) with her as a girl of nine proved (*dalla*) that the father has more right over the virgin than herself (*al-'ab 'aḥaqq bi-al-bikr min nafsi-hā*). And, were [it the case that] when she attains puberty as a virgin (*'idā balaḡat bikr^{an}*) she has more right over herself than he (*kānat 'aḥaqq bi-nafsi-hā min-hu*), then it would be [the case] that it is not permissible (*'allā yajūza*) for him [to force such decisions] upon her until she reaches puberty (*ḥattā tabluḡa*) and it would [also be the case] that [such decisions can occur] with her permission (*bi-'idni-hā*)."¹⁴²⁵

In other words, al-Šāfi'ī acknowledged that there is evidence from the *sunnah* that boys and girls gain authority over themselves or attain legal majority at age fifteen or puberty (if puberty occurs earlier than age fifteen), but nevertheless insisted that a father has legal power over his virgin daughter and can marry her off regardless (i.e., without her consent), on the basis of the marital-age hadith. Al-Šāfi'ī then incredulously pointed out that, if being a pubescent virgin conferred full legal majority, that would entail that her father would not be able to marry her off without her permission—a conclusion that al-Šāfi'ī evidently rejected. Thus, in a later passage, al-Šāfi'ī reiterated:

Her father [i.e., 'Abū Bakr] married her off to him (*zawwaja-hu 'iyyā-hā*), so that proved (*dalla*) that the father of the virgin has more right to her marriage than herself (*'abā al-bikr 'aḥaqq bi-'inkāḥi-hā min nafsi-hā*), because a girl of seven years and [likewise one of] nine has no authority over herself (*lā 'amr la-hā fī nafsi-hā*). No one other than fathers can marry off a virgin until she attains puberty (*laysa li-'aḥad ḡayr al-'ābā' 'an yuzawwijū bikr^{an} ḥattā tabluḡa*) and attains authority over herself (*yakūnu la-hā 'amr fī nafsi-hā*).¹⁴²⁶

Once again, al-Šāfi'ī interpreted the marital-age hadith as proof that a father can marry off his virgin daughter without her permission, affirming that the rights of the father trump those of his virgin daughter in this regard.

¹⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*, VI, p. 46, # 2210.

¹⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 429, # 2462.

Al-Šāfi‘ī’s use of the marital-age hadith (to justify the right of fathers to arrange marriages for their daughters under certain conditions) was widely adopted by other Hadith-partisan jurists (such as Ibn Ḥanbal), and was thereafter inherited by the legal traditions that evolved out of the Hadith partisans—namely, the Šāfi‘ī and Ḥanbalī schools. Eventually, even the Mālikīs (who evolved out of the early Madinan legal tradition) and the Ḥanafīs (who evolved out of the early Kufan legal tradition) adopted the marital-age hadith to justify the same or similar legal doctrines.¹⁴²⁷ All of this provides a potential clue as to Hišām’s motive for the creation of this hadith: if jurists from al-Šāfi‘ī onward commonly saw a justification for the rights of fathers to arrange marriages for their daughters in the marital-age hadith, then it is conceivable that Hišām himself saw the same potential therein and created the hadith for that exact purpose in the first place.

However, an even earlier use of the marital-age hadith can be identified: ‘Ā’iṣah’s being married at a young age was cited in propagandistic lists of her distinguishing qualities or virtues (*faḍā’il*). We have encountered this use of the marital-age elements already—for example, in the *faḍā’il* hadith of the Wasitian-Basran CL ‘Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ (d. 176/792) (who spent a lot of time in Kufah and mostly transmitted from Kufan authorities¹⁴²⁸), on the authority of the Kufan *qāḍī* ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Umayr (d. 136/754):

...from ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Umayr, from ‘Ā’iṣah [that] she said: “I was given characteristics that no other woman was given: [the Messenger of God] married me when I was a girl of six/seven years; the angel brought him my image in his hand, then he gazed upon it; he consummated the marriage with me at/when I was a girl of at nine years; I saw Gabriel, and no woman saw him except for me; I was the most-beloved of his wives to him; my father was the most-beloved of his companions to him; the Messenger of

¹⁴²⁷ See Baugh, *Minor Marriage*, *passim*.

¹⁴²⁸ E.g., ‘Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-‘Aṣ‘aṭ al-Sijistānī (ed. Ṭāriq b. ‘Iwāḍ Allāh b. Muḥammad), *Masā’il al-‘Imām ‘Aḥmad Riwayāt ‘Abī Dāwūd Sulaymān bn al-‘Aṣ‘aṭ al-Sijistāniyy* (Cairo, Egypt: Maktabat Ibn Taymiyyah, 1999), p. 383, # 1850: “‘Abū ‘Awānah heard from him—meaning, from ‘Aṭā’ [b. al-Sā’ib]—in both Kufah and Basrah.” Meanwhile, in Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VIII, p. 217, the majority (seventeen) of ‘Abū ‘Awānah’s cited masters and sources are Kufan, namely: al-Ḥakam b. ‘Uṭaybah, Ziyād b. ‘Ilāqah, Simāk b. Ḥarb, al-‘Aswad b. Qays, ‘Ismā‘īl al-Suddī, ‘Āṣim b. Kulayb, Ḥuṣayn b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Maṣṣūr b. al-Mu‘tamir, ‘Abū ‘Ishāq al-Sabī‘ī, Muḡīrah b. Miqsam, ‘Abū Mālik al-‘Aṣja‘ī, ‘Ibrāhīm b. Muḥājir, Sa‘īd b. Masrūq al-Ṭawrī, Yazīd b. ‘abī Ziyād, ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Umayr, and Dāwūd al-‘Awdī. By contrast, only three Wasitians—or people who settled in Wasit—are cited (Ya‘lā b. ‘Aṭā’, Maṣṣūr b. Zāḍān, and ‘Umar b. ‘abī Salamah b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān); two Basrans (Qatādah and Ja‘far b. ‘Iyās); two Meccans (‘Amr b. Dīnār and ‘Abū al-Zubayr); and one Madinan (Sa‘d b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-Zuhrī).

God fell ill [in my house and I nursed him; then he died] when no one was present except for me and the angels.”¹⁴²⁹

Likewise, consider the *faḍā'il* hadith of the Kufan CL 'Ismā'īl b. 'abī Kālid (d. 146/763-764), on the authority of a sequence of two unknown or ambiguous tradents named 'Abd al-Raḥmān:

...from 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk, from 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud'ān, [who said] [that] 'Abd Allāh b. Ṣafwān and another with him came to 'Ā'īṣah, and 'Ā'īṣah said: “O so-and-so, have you heard the talk of Ḥaṣṣah?” He said [to her]: “Yes, O Mother of the Believers.” 'Abd Allāh b. Ṣafwān said to her: “And what is that?” She said: “There are nine attributes in me that are not in any other woman, except for that which God bestowed upon Maryam bt. 'Imrān. But by God, I am not saying this [pridefully] [to exalt myself] over any of my companions!” He said to her: “And what are they?” She said: “[1] The angel descended with my image; [2] the Messenger of God married me at seven years; [3] I was led to him as a bride at nine years; [4] he married me as a virgin, without any other man sharing me with him; [5] the revelation used to come to him when he and I were in a single blanket; [6] I was amongst the most-beloved of people to him; [7] a passage from the Quran concerning me was sent down when the community almost perished; [8] I saw Gabriel, and none of his wives saw him except me; and [9] he died in my house when no one was with him except the angel and I.”

The very fact that the marital-age hadith was incorporated into such *faḍā'il* reports as early as the middle of the 8th Century CE automatically proves that 'Ā'īṣah's marriage at a young age was regarded as some kind of *faḍīlah* at that time, even if this early use was rapidly eclipsed by the hadith's subsequent legal use.¹⁴³⁰ The likely reason therefor has already been identified by Denise Spellberg: 'Ā'īṣah's marriage at a young age reinforced her status as a virgin at marriage, which in turn constituted one of her major distinctive attributes (in early Islamic society) *vis-à-vis* her fellow wives, which in turn served as a justification for the claim that 'Ā'īṣah was the Prophet's favourite wife. As Spellberg notes, 'Ā'īṣah became—certainly, by the middle of the 8th Century CE—a popular exemplar and symbol for proto-Sunnīs (as both the daughter of 'Abū

¹⁴²⁹ See the section 'Abū 'Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ in ch. 2.

¹⁴³⁰ Indeed, so rapidly was this proto-Sunnī association eclipsed that the hadith was transmitted even by some proto-Šī'ī or “soft Šī'ī” (*mutaṣayyi'*) tradents early on, such as Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-'A'maš (d. 147-148/764-766) [although his transmission is not beyond question], Ja'far b. Sulaymān (d. 178/794-795), 'Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām (d. 211/827), and al-Faḍl b. Dukayn (d. 218-219/833-834). Still, its initial proto-Sunnī use is clearly evidenced and cannot be denied.

Bakr and a wife of the Prophet's),¹⁴³¹ and conversely, a popular villain among proto-Ši'īs (due to her political opposition towards 'Alī during the first *fitnah*).¹⁴³² Consequently, retrospective depictions of 'Ā'ishah reflected "emerging Sunni and Shi'i concerns about political succession and communal identity,"¹⁴³³ and thus served as a vehicle for sectarian polemics: proto-Sunnīs asserted that 'Ā'ishah was the Prophet's favourite woman and 'Abū Bakr his favourite man, whilst proto-Ši'īs made analogous assertions about Fāṭimah and 'Alī.¹⁴³⁴ In this context, 'Ā'ishah's alleged virginity was polemically useful as a "special attribute" distinguishing her from the Prophet's other wives and, to that end, the emphasis on her young marital age served to "reinforce 'A'isha's pre-menarcheal status and, implicitly, her virginity."¹⁴³⁵ This explains the incorporation of the marital-age hadith into proto-Sunnī *faḍā'il* reports about 'Ā'ishah, the promulgation of which "reflect a posthumous attempt to present the Prophet's wife as more than just another wife".¹⁴³⁶ Moreover, the fact that the relevant pool of *faḍā'il* material is associated above all with Kufah is surely no coincidence: Kufah was the centre of Shi'ism during 7th and 8th Centuries CE,¹⁴³⁷ and thus the region in which proto-Sunnīs had the greatest need to defend 'Ā'ishah.¹⁴³⁸

All of this yields a much more plausible motive for Hišām's creation of the marital-age hadith: to bolster the proto-Sunnī defence of 'Ā'ishah. This coheres well with Hišām's specific background: as the grand-nephew of 'Ā'ishah, Hišām was strongly incentivised—not to mention well-placed, as an established tradent of 'Urwah's stories about 'Ā'ishah in general—to create expedient hadiths to augment the proto-

¹⁴³¹ Spellberg, *Politics, gender, and the Islamic past*, 4-5, 8, 28, 32 ff.

¹⁴³² *Ibid.*, 5-6.

¹⁴³³ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹⁴³⁴ *Ibid.*, 32-37. Also see Abbott, *Aishah*, 48-49.

¹⁴³⁵ Spellberg, *Politics, gender, and the Islamic past*, 39-40. Also see Ali, *Sexual Ethics*, rev. ed., 191: "When the early biographical sources talk about Aishah, they do so in the context of her role in early Muslim history. She was a contentious figure in factional struggles for power, prestige, and legitimacy; stories told about her might denigrate or, as in the hadith sources Sunnis rely on, celebrate her merits, including her purity. The sources link youth, virginity, and purity; it is certainly possible that her youth was exaggerated to strengthen her claims to purity and, therefore, to merit."

¹⁴³⁶ *Ibid.*, 47.

¹⁴³⁷ Shi'ism emerged in Kufah, which was the location of 'Alī's *de facto* capital during the first *fitnah*, al-Muḳtār's rebellion during the second *fitnah*, Zayd b. 'Alī's rebellion during the Marwanid period, 'Abd Allāh b. Mu'āwiyah's rebellion during the third *fitnah*, etc. E.g., see Crone, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought*, 20, 24, 70-71, 99.

¹⁴³⁸ 8th-Century Kufah was also home to a group who accepted only the first two caliphs as legitimate, described in Christopher Melchert, 'The Rightly Guided Caliphs: The Range of Views Preserved in Ḥadīth', in Saud al-Sarhan (ed.), *Political Quietism in Islam: Sunni and Shi'i Practice and Thought* (London, UK: I.B. Tauris, 2019), 64-65. As Melchert pointed out to me, it is plausible that such a group would also have been receptive to upgrading 'Ā'ishah's status.

Sunnī effort and defend a kinswoman. It also explains why he only created the hadith when he moved to Kufah: Hišām was reacting to the polemical pressures of his new environment, the centre of early Shi'ism.

Interestingly, the marital-age hadith is not the only one of Hišām's hadiths that could bolster 'Ā'īshah's status as a virgin at marriage, or that could serve as ammunition for her status as the Prophet's favourite wife more broadly: Hišām is also the ostensible CL for a hadith about 'Ā'īshah's playing with dolls after her marriage (thus reinforcing her youthfulness),¹⁴³⁹ and another hadith in which 'Ā'īshah's virginity is directly implied to be a positive distinguishing quality *vis-à-vis* the Prophet's other wives.¹⁴⁴⁰ The hadith about dolls could also be one of Hišām's Kufan creations,¹⁴⁴¹ but the more overt hadith about 'Ā'īshah's virginity was only transmitted from Hišām by Syrians and Madinans,¹⁴⁴² which suggests that Hišām was already disseminating this hadith in Madinah. Consequently, Hišām's creation of the marital-age hadith should be understood as an attempt to *bolster* or *reinforce* a claim already expressed in one of his hadiths—this other perhaps ultimately reflecting Zubayrid-era polemics.¹⁴⁴³

In short, a historical-critical analysis of the emergence of the marital-age hadith—an appraisal of the historical and polemical context and early use thereof—reveals that the most plausible reason for its creation is the following: Hišām created the hadith in Kufah in response to proto-Šī'ī polemics against his great-aunt. The hadith served to augment 'Ā'īshah's status as a virgin at marriage, which in turn constituted one of her unique attributes (from the point of view of early Islamic society), which in turn served as a basis for her status as the Prophet's favourite wife. Consequently, as early as Hišām's Kufan contemporary 'Ismā'īl b. 'abī Kālid, the marital-age hadith was incorporated into proto-Sunnī *faḍā'il* hadiths about 'Ā'īshah, evidently serving as ammunition in the sectarian disputes of 8th-Century Kufah.¹⁴⁴⁴ This early polemical

¹⁴³⁹ Juynboll, *Encyclopedia*, 196.

¹⁴⁴⁰ Bukārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, II, p. 1064, # 5132; Ibn 'Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VII, p. 576, # 11616; 'Abū Nu'aym (ed. 'Azāzī), *Ma'rafat al-Ṣaḥābah*, part 6, p. 3210, # 7383; Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, XIV, pp. 8-9, # 13601.

¹⁴⁴¹ The overwhelming majority of the transmitters from Hišām are Kufan or (to a lesser extent) Basran, but there are one or two transmitters who appear to be unambiguously-Madinan—namely: 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd Allāh; 'Abd al-'Azīz b. Muḥammad; and 'Anas b. 'Iyād. The precise way in which this hadith fits into the picture with the marital-age hadith will have to await future research.

¹⁴⁴² Namely, by Sulaymān b. Bilāl and a string of Madinan tradents, on the one hand, and 'Imrān b. 'abī al-Faḍl and a string of Syrian tradents, on the other.

¹⁴⁴³ See the discussion and references given at the beginning of the present chapter.

¹⁴⁴⁴ Interestingly, according to Henri Lammens, 'Fāṭima', in Martijn T. Houtsma, Arent J. Wensinck, Thomas W. Arnold, Willi Heffening, & Évariste Lévi-Provençal (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islām: A*

use of the marital-age hadith was rapidly overshadowed by its legal use, however, and from the turn of the 9th Century CE onward, it became a standard proof in Islamic jurisprudence—at first just in the Šāfi‘ī and Ḥanbalī schools, and later in the Mālikī and Ḥanafī schools as well—for the right of fathers to arrange marriages for their virgin and/or prepubescent daughters.

A Historical-Critical Analysis of the Origins of the Marital-Age Hadith’s Specific Content

All of this leaves us with a final question: why did Hišām choose the ages of “six or seven” for ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital engagement and “nine” for her marital consummation? After all, any early age would have sufficed for his purposes (to highlight her virginal status at marriage): why those ages in particular; why a distinction between the marital engagement and consummation; and why the vagueness over the former in particular? Part of the answer seems to lie in an aspect of the chronology of the Prophet’s life that was already established as early as al-Zuhrī, to whom the following report can be plausibly traced:

[The Messenger of God] married ‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood, [three years before the Hijrah]; and he arranged her wedding feast [in Madinah], during Šawwāl, at the beginning/end of eight/eighteen months after [his] emigration [to Madinah].¹⁴⁴⁵

The exact wording of al-Zuhrī’s original formulation—and the exact chronology intended thereby—is highly uncertain, and I am not suggesting that Hišām was directly influenced by al-Zuhrī on this point in any case. Still, such a report at least suggests that, in the biographical material that was circulating in Madinah during the early-to-mid 8th Century CE, there was already some kind of notion of an approximately three-

Dictionary of the Geography, Ethnography and Biography of the Muhammadan Peoples, Volume II: E—K (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill Ltd., 1927), 85, col. 1, the spread of the marital-age hadith prompted some Šī‘īs to assert that Fāṭimah had been married at age nine as well, although this could be an independent development; see below.

¹⁴⁴⁵ See the sections on al-Zuhrī and ‘Amrah in Chapter 2 of the present work.

year delay between ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital engagement and consummation. Thus, if any given age was stipulated or inputted for either event, this pre-established *relative chronology* would automatically generate a corresponding age—an *absolute chronology*—for the other event as well. However, given the slight vagueness in this relative chronology (i.e., the lack of certainty regarding the precise dates or the exact number of months overall), the automatically-generated age would necessarily be approximate. We thus have a straightforward explanation for both the distinction between ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital engagement and consummation and the vagueness of the age given for the former within Hiṣām’s original hadith: the hadith’s starting point was the stipulation that ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital consummation occurred at age nine, which automatically entailed the vague “six or seven” for her marital engagement. In short, by stipulating that ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital consummation occurred at nine and by taking into account a relative chronology that was already established amongst the biographical authorities of his Madinan hometown, Hiṣām created the marital-age hadith.

This leaves a final question: why did Hiṣām choose “nine” for ‘Ā’iṣah’s age at her marital consummation? We will probably never know for sure, and to a certain extent, it was arbitrary: twelve-to-fourteen was the usual minimum age of marriage in ancient societies,¹⁴⁴⁶ so any age up to that point would have sufficed to assure a listener or reader that ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage was indeed consummated when she was still a virgin (i.e., that she had never been consummated in any marriage previously). That said, there are several interesting potential sources of inspiration that can be adduced for Hiṣām’s choosing of “nine” in particular. To begin with, there is some evidence that girls in the Hijaz would reach menarche at the age of nine during the first few Islamic centuries, and thus, that they could—and would—be married at that age. Thus, al-Bayhaqī recorded the following from al-Šāfi‘ī, who grew up in the Hijaz during the mid-to-late 8th Century CE:

Amongst that which ‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥāfiẓ [al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī] authorised me to transmit from him [is the following]: from him, from ‘Abū al-‘Abbās al-‘Aṣamm, from al-Rabī‘, from al-Šāfi‘ī, who said: “The earliest women to menstruate of whom I have heard (*‘a’jal man sami‘tu bi-hi min al-nisā’ yaḥidna*) are the women of Tihāmah [i.e., coastal Hijaz]. They menstruate at nine years.”¹⁴⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴⁶ See Chapter 6 of the present work.

¹⁴⁴⁷ Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, II, p. 432, # 1547.

To this can be added the following legal maxim disseminated by the Syrian CL Sulaymān b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dimašqī (fl. 9th C. CE), citing a Syro-Basran SS back to the Prophet:

‘Abd al-Malik b. Mihrān [al-Dimašqī] related to us: “Sahl b. ‘Aslam al-‘Adawī [al-Baṣrī] related to us: “Mu‘āwiyah b. Qurrah [al-Baṣrī] related to us—he said: “I heard Ibn ‘Umar say: “The Messenger of God said: “When a girl reaches nine years of age (*‘idā ‘atā ‘alā al-jāriyah tis‘ sinīn*), she is a woman (*fa-hiya imra’ah*).”””””¹⁴⁴⁸

This very same maxim is also attributed to none other than ‘Ā’iṣah, usually without an *‘isnād*,¹⁴⁴⁹ but with an *‘isnād*—a Kufo-Mesopotamian SS—in at least one instance, recorded in the *Masā’il* of Ḥarb b. ‘Ismā‘īl al-Kirmānī:

‘Iṣḥāq [b. Rāhwayh] related to us—he said: “Zakariyyā’ b. ‘Adī [al-Kūfī] informed us, from ‘Abū al-Maliḥ [al-Raqqī], from Ḥabīb b. ‘abī Marzūq [al-Raqqī], from ‘Ā’iṣah, who said: “When a girl reaches nine (*‘idā balaġat al-jāriyah tis‘an*), she is a woman (*fa-hiya imra’ah*).””””¹⁴⁵⁰

Although this legal maxim is less direct than the statement from al-Šāfi‘ī, the plausible intended meaning is spelled out by al-Bayhaqī: “She means (and God knows best): She has menstruated (*fa-ḥāḍat*), so she is a woman (*fa-hiya imra’ah*).”¹⁴⁵¹ Taken together, all of this could be interpreted as evidence—directly and indirectly—that Hijazian girls would usually reach menarche at age nine during the 7th and 8th Centuries CE, which could have served in turn as the inspiration for the marital-age hadith. In other words, it is possible that Hišām simply drew upon the traditional minimum age of marital consummation in his native Hijaz in the construction of his hadith.

There are several problems with such a historical reconstruction, however. Firstly, the ascriptions unto the Prophet and ‘Ā’iṣah are isolated SS transmissions, which

¹⁴⁴⁸ Synthesised from ‘Abū Nu‘aym (ed. Ḥasan), *Ta’rīk ‘Aṣbahān*, II, p. 243, and Ibn ‘Asākir (ed. ‘Amrawī), *Ta’rīk Madīnat Dimašq*, XXXVII, p. 174.

¹⁴⁴⁹ E.g., Muḥammad b. ‘Īsā al-Tirmidī (ed. ‘Ibrāhīm ‘Aṭwah ‘Iwaḍ), *al-Jāmi‘ al-Šaḥīḥ*, vol. 3 (Cairo, Egypt: Maṭba‘at Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1975), p. 409, # 1109, and Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, II, p. 433.

¹⁴⁵⁰ Ḥarb b. ‘Ismā‘īl al-Kirmānī (ed. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Surayyī), *Masā’il* (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu‘assasat al-Rayyān, 2013), p. 587, # 1289.

¹⁴⁵¹ Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, II, p. 433.

cannot be positively traced back to their alleged sources, which means that they cannot be established as early. Secondly, the Prophetical version of the legal maxim is plausibly a secondary raising thereof, in comparison to the version ascribed to ‘Ā’iṣah. Thirdly, the direction of causation could easily be reversed here, with the legal maxim and al-Šāfi’ī’s statement about Hijazian girls both actually deriving from (i.e., having been extrapolated from) the marital-age hadith (of which al-Šāfi’ī was a transmitter). Fourthly, nine as the average age of menarche in the early Hijaz seems rather low in comparison to the global historical average (twelve-to-fourteen) and is thus questionable,¹⁴⁵² raising the possibility that these particular reports reflect later *legal ideals* rather than historical realities. Fifthly, these reports are somewhat in tension with another series of reports from various early sources that seem to embody surprise at the occurrence of menarche and marital consummation at age nine:

- According to a transmission from al-Šāfi’ī (d. 204/820), he reported: “In Ṣan‘ā’, I saw a grandmother [who was] a girl of twenty-one years: she menstruated as a girl of nine and gave birth as a girl of ten, and [her] daughter [likewise] menstruated as a girl of nine and gave birth as a girl of ten.”¹⁴⁵³
- According to a transmission from the Kufan jurist al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy (d. 169/785-786), he reported: “I know of a neighbour of ours who became a grandmother as a girl of twenty-one years.”¹⁴⁵⁴
- According to al-Sarakṣī, the Khurasanian proto-Ḥanafī jurist ‘Abū Muṭī‘ al-Ḥakam b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Balkī (d. 199/815) “had a daughter who became a grandmother when she was a girl of nineteen years, such that he said: “This girl has put us to shame!”¹⁴⁵⁵
- According to a transmission from the Basran traditionist ‘Abbād b. ‘Abbād al-Muhallabī (d. 181/797), he reported: “I encountered amongst us—meaning, the Mahālibah—a woman who became a grandmother when she was a girl of eighteen years: she gave birth to a girl at nine years, and then her daughter [in

¹⁴⁵² This lower age is especially suspect given the relatively harsher conditions of pre-Islamic Hijaz, which would predictably *delay* the onset of menarche and puberty more broadly. See Chapter 6 of the present work.

¹⁴⁵³ Bayhaqī (ed. Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, II, pp. 432-433, # 1548.

¹⁴⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 433.

¹⁴⁵⁵ Sarakṣī, *Mabṣūt*, III, p. 149.

turn] gave birth at nine years. Thus, she became a grandmother when she was a girl of eighteen years.”¹⁴⁵⁶

Of course, the veracity of these various ascriptions could also be questioned (especially given that most are isolated transmissions), but the key point is this: the very fact that various figures—whether those cited in the reports or later tradents—deemed such occurrences worth remarking upon indicates that they were remarkable in the first place, which is in turn consistent with their being rare occurrences. In other words, these reports read as expressions of surprise or amazement, which undermines the notion that such occurrences were common in the early Hijaz. If girls in the Islamic heartland of Hijaz ordinarily reached menarche—and thus frequently consummated marriage—at age nine, why would there be so many reports expressing surprise or amazement at instances—even successive instances—of marital consummations and consequent births at or around age nine? If the previously-cited reports (from al-Šāfi‘ī, ‘Ā’iṣah, and Prophet) were accurate, this sort of thing should have been a familiar occurrence to early Muslims.¹⁴⁵⁷ All of this undermines the notion that girls in the early Hijaz would usually reach menarche at age nine, which militates against its having inspired the marital-age hadith.

A second potential source of inspiration for the specific content of the marital-age hadith is the legal and religious traditions of the Sasanid Persian Empire, in which “nine” appears as an ideal age for marriage.¹⁴⁵⁸ Thus, according to Touraj Daryaee (summarising marriage-related material in “Zoroastrian Middle Persian texts”):

Once a girl reached the age of nine it was believed that she had to be married, and a boy when he was fifteen. This was the ideal age for humans, and at the end of the world they would dwell in heaven at the same age.¹⁴⁵⁹

Meanwhile, according to Baugh:

¹⁴⁵⁶ ‘Alī b. ‘Umar al-Dāraqūṭnī (ed. ‘Ādil ‘Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Mawjūd & ‘Alī Muḥammad Mu‘awwad) *Sunan*, vol. 3 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 2001), p. 252, # 382/286.

¹⁴⁵⁷ I owe thanks to Jonathan A. C. Brown for this interpretation of such reports.

¹⁴⁵⁸ This connection has already been made by Amin, as noted in the Introduction to the present work.

¹⁴⁵⁹ Daryaee, *Sasanian Persia*, 60. Emphasis mine.

Although investigation into Sasanian-era (224–651 CE) child marriage practices unearths scant information, the age of twelve is again important for girls. According to the Avesta, the age of majority was clearly set at fifteen for boys as well as girls; **Middle Persian civil law allowed marriage at age nine**, provided that consummation wait until age twelve. In the case of physical maturity, **one juristic opinion suggests the marriage can be consummated at the age of nine years for the girl**. Under this system, if she reached the age of fifteen and refused marriage, “she had committed a capital sin,” while if her father or guardian failed to arrange a marriage for her at that age, he too had sinned.¹⁴⁶⁰

Moreover, as it happens, the Sasanid Empire encompassed Iraq, even locating its capital at Ctesiphon, extremely close to Kufah. Thus, in the very region where Hišām seems to have created and disseminated a hadith depicting ‘Ā’iṣḥah as having been consummated in marriage at age nine, there recently predominated an empire in which the dominant religious and legal traditions contained ideals or prescriptions for marriage or marital consummation at age nine (even if this was a minority position therein). It is thus entirely possible that Hišām was influenced by some kind of lingering Zoroastrian or Persian tradition in Iraq in his choice of nine for the marital-age hadith. However, the *means* or *mechanism* of cultural transmission that would be required here are not ideal for this hypothesis: Hišām did not have recent Persian heritage and did not grow up in a directly post-Sasanid environment, so the most obvious transmission channels would appear to be absent. Still, it is easy enough to imagine Hišām encountering this marital ideal amongst the Muslims of Iraq (many of whom married Persians or were themselves *mawālī*) and incorporating it in a hadith that he sought to disseminate amongst them.

A third potential source of inspiration was none other than the community to whom Hišām was responding: the proto-Šī‘īs of Kufah. The extant Twelver Hadith collections and legal works are replete with transmissions—almost always via Kufan tradents—from their imams on the subject of marriage or sex with girls at age nine, and although these sources are certainly much later, a preliminary ICMA would suggest that at least some redactions of this material can be traced back to figures operating in the middle of the 8th Century CE. Thus, the following can be tentatively traced all the way back—via a network of Kufan tradents—to the proto-Šī‘ī imam Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Bāqir (d. 114/732-733 or 117/735):

¹⁴⁶⁰ Baugh, *Minor Marriage*, 28-29. Emphasis mine.

[A man should] not cohabit with a girl until she has reached nine years or ten years [of age] (*lā yadkulu bi-al-jāriyah ḥattā ya'tiya la-hā tis' sinīn 'aw 'ašr sinīn*).¹⁴⁶¹

One version (again, transmitted by Kufans) even ascribes this position—albeit narrowing the age range down to ten—all the way back to 'Alī b. 'abī Ṭālib (d. 40/661), although this is certainly secondary (i.e., interpolated, elaborated, and raised) vis-à-vis the other versions:

[It was transmitted] from him [i.e., Muḥammad b. 'abī Kālid], from Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá [a Kufan], from Ġiyāṭ b. 'Ibrāhīm [a Kufan], from Ja'far [al-Šādiq], from his father [al-Bāqir], from 'Alī [b. 'abī Ṭālib], who said: "A girl [should] not be sexually penetrated [by a man] at less than ten years [of age] (*lā tūṭa'u jāriyah li-'aqall min 'ašr sinīn*). If he does that and she is damaged [thereby], he will be liable [therefor] (*fa-'in fa'ala fa-ibat fa-qad ḍamina*)."¹⁴⁶²

By contrast, in a similarly-raised version (again, unto 'Alī), the age range has instead been narrowed down to nine:

[It was transmitted] from him [i.e., Muḥammad b. 'abī Kālid], from Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá [a Kufan], from Ṭalḥah b. Zayd, from Ja'far [al-Šādiq], from his father [al-Bāqir], from 'Alī [b. 'abī Ṭālib], who said: "Whoever marries a virgin and then consummates the marriage with her [when her age is] less than nine years (*man tazawwaja bikran fa-daḡala bi-hā fi 'aqall min tis' sinīn*), [in such a way that] she is damaged [thereby] (*fa-ibat*), is liable [therefor] (*ḍamina*)."¹⁴⁶³

Likewise, a series of (again, mostly Kufan) transmissions from the proto-Šī'i imam Ja'far b. Muḥammad al-Šādiq (Madinan, d. 148/765) narrow this age range down to nine, as in the following:

¹⁴⁶¹ Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī, *Furū' al-Kāfi*, vol. 5 (Beirut, Lebanon: Manšūrāt al-Fajr, 2007), p. 240; *ibid.*, VII, p. 45; Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (ed. 'Alī 'Akbar al-Ġaffārī), *Tahdīb al-Aḥkām fi Šarḥ al-Muqni'ah*, vol. 7 (Tehran, Iran: Dār al-Kutub al-'Islāmiyyah, 1386 Š.), p. 473; Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Bābawayh al-Šadūq (ed. 'Alī 'Akbar al-Ġaffārī), *Kitāb al-Kiṣāl*, vol. 2 (1983), p. 420; Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-'Anwār*, vol. 100 (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat al-Wafā', 1983), p. 328.

¹⁴⁶² Ṭūsī (ed. Ġaffārī), *Tahdīb al-Aḥkām*, VII, p. 473.

¹⁴⁶³ *Ibid.*

- “Whoever has sex with his wife before [she has reached the age of] nine years (*man waṭi’a imra’ata-hu qabla tis’ sinīn*) [in such a way that] she is damaged [thereby] (*fa-’aṣāba-hā ‘ayb*) is liable [therefor] (*fa-huwa dāmin*).”¹⁴⁶⁴
- “If a man marries a girl when she is prepubescent (*’idā tazawwaja al-rajul al-jāriyah wa-hiya ṣaḡīrah*), he [should] not consummate the marriage with her until she reaches nine years [of age] (*fa-lā yadkulu bi-hā ḥattā ya’tiya la-hā tis’ sinīn*).”¹⁴⁶⁵
- “If a man proposes marriage to a girl (*’idā kaṭaba al-rajul al-mar’ah*) and then consummates the marriage with her before she has reached nine years [of age] (*fa-daḡala bi-hā qabla ’an tabluḡa tis’ sinīn*), they are to be separated (*furriqa bayna-humā*), and she will never be lawful for him ever again (*wa-lam taḥilla la-hu ’abad^{an}*).”¹⁴⁶⁶

Finally, in another clear instance of secondary reworking, a version of one of these reports was even raised all the way back to the Prophet:

[It was transmitted] from him [i.e., Ḥumayd b. Ziyād, a Kufan], from Zakariyyā’ al-Mu’min—or, possibly, there was a tradent between him [i.e., Ḥumayd] and between him [i.e., Zakariyyā’]; I only know what he [i.e., Ḥumayd] related to me—from ‘Ammār al-Sijistānī, who said: “I heard ‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh [Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq] say to a *mawlā* of his: “Go and tell the *qāḍī*: “The Messenger of God said: “The [earliest] point [at which] a woman [can be] consummated in marriage by her husband is as a girl of nine years (*ḥadd al-mar’ah ’an yadkula bi-hā ’alā zawji-hā ibnat tis’ sinīn*).”””¹⁴⁶⁷

Of course, all of this is traced back to figures—the proto-Šī‘ī imams—who primarily lived in Madinah; but, as has been noted already, practically all of these reports and ideas were disseminated and transmitted amongst the proto-Šī‘īs of Kufah during the 8th Century CE. In other words, the very community to whom Hišām was plausibly responding with his hadith about ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital consummation at age nine appear to have already been adhering to or promulgating legal traditions and ideals about “nine” (or in some cases, “nine or ten”) as the minimum age of marital consummation

¹⁴⁶⁴ *Ibid.*; Ṣadūq (ed. Ġaffārī), *Kiṣāl*, II, pp. 420-421.

¹⁴⁶⁵ Kulaynī, *Furū‘ al-Kāfī*, V, p. 240.

¹⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 258

¹⁴⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

for girls, seemingly independently of any ‘Ā’iṣah precedent. Once again, we have a clear potential source of inspiration for Hiṣām’s hadith: he was simply using the doctrines or ideals of the proto-Šī’īs of Kufah against them.¹⁴⁶⁸

A fourth potential source of inspiration comes from the biography of Hiṣām himself. According to a report recorded by al-‘Uqaylī, Hiṣām married his wife, Fāṭimah bt. al-Munḍir, when she was a girl of nine years:

Al-Faḍl b. Ja‘far related to me: “‘Abd al-Malik b. Muḥammad related to us: “Sulaymān b. Dāwūd related to me: “Yaḥyá b. Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān said to me: “I testify that Muḥammad b. ‘Ishāq is a liar.”” He [i.e., Sulaymān] said: “I said: “And how do you know that?” He said: “Wuhayb b. Ḳālid said [it] to me.” So, I said to Wuhayb: “How do you know that?” He said: “Mālik b. ‘Anas said [it] to me.” So, I said to Mālik b. ‘Anas: “How do you know that?” He said: “Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah said [it] to me.”” He [i.e., Sulaymān] said: “I said to Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah: “And how do you know that?” He said: “He [purportedly] related [hadiths] from my wife, Fāṭimah bt. al-Munḍir. [However,] we consummated our marriage when she was a girl of nine years (*daḳalat ‘alayya wa-hiya bint tis‘ sinīn*), and he has never seen her [since that time, nor will he ever see her] until she meets God.”””¹⁴⁶⁹

If this report is true, it is entirely plausible that Hiṣām modelled the marital-age hadith upon his own direct experience: since his own marriage was consummated with a bride who was nine, he simply drew upon this when creating a statement emphasising ‘Ā’iṣah’s young age at the time of her marriage to the Prophet.¹⁴⁷⁰ That said, the veracity of this report—including the specific claim of Fāṭimah’s age at the time of her marital consummation—has been contested, as in the following from al-Ḳaṭīb al-Baḡdādī:

This is a false story (*ḥikāyah bāṭilah*). Sulaymān al-Šāḍakūnī was not reliable (*laysa bi-ṭiqah*). Fāṭimah was only taken to Hiṣām [as a bride] when she was a girl of twenty and some years. Indeed, she was older than him by about nine years.¹⁴⁷¹

¹⁴⁶⁸ Of course, if the marital-age hadith were genuine, it would be reasonable to suppose that this proto-Šī’ī doctrine ultimately originated with the historical precedent it records; on such a view, it would further be plausible to suppose that the imams omitted mention of this precedent simply due to their animosity towards ‘Ā’iṣah. However, since we have strong reasons to doubt the historicity and even early provenance of the marital-age hadith, the direction of influence can actually be reversed.

¹⁴⁶⁹ ‘Uqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍu‘afā’*, V, pp. 193-194.

¹⁴⁷⁰ Again, if the marital-age hadith were genuine, it would be reasonable to suppose that Hiṣām’s marriage to his own wife was influenced thereby; but again, given all that we have covered, the direction of influence can be reversed.

¹⁴⁷¹ Ḳaṭīb (ed. Ma‘rūf), *Ta’rīḳ Madīnat al-Salām*, IV, p. 193.

Still, the possibility remains that the first report—about Hišām’s consummating his marriage with Fāṭimah when she was nine—is genuine, and further, that Hišām drew upon this personal experience in his creation of the marital-age hadith. That said, it is equally possible that the direction of influence is the reverse, and that this story of Hišām’s marriage was instead modelled upon the hadith in question.

In short, there are at least four possible sources of inspiration for Hišām’s choice of nine as ‘Ā’iṣah’s age of marital consummation: he may have drawn upon the traditional minimum age of marriage in his native Hijaz (although this is highly questionable); he may have drawn upon an old Sasanid tradition or ideal about marital consummation at age nine, lingering amongst his interlocutors or audience in Iraq; he may have polemically drawn upon the common doctrine of his proto-Šī‘ī foes in Kufah concerning nine as the minimum age of marital consummation, using it against them in his depiction of ‘Ā’iṣah’s young age at marriage; and he may simply have drawn upon his own experience of marrying a girl nine years of age (although this biographical datum is heavily contested). And, of course, these four possibilities are not mutually exclusive—several or even all could have been at play simultaneously. We thus have ample explanations for Hišām’s choice of nine as ‘Ā’iṣah’s age of marital consummation, which, in conjunction with an established relative chronology of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage, can further explain the origins of all of the specific content of Hišām’s hadith.

Conclusion

The preceding chapter’s ICMA allowed us to narrow down the marital-age hadith-tradition to a series of CLs ranging from the middle of the 8th Century CE to the middle of the 9th Century CE, whilst eliminating virtually every other version as a probable or definite dive. The present chapter took these results as its starting point and applied thereto a number of further analyses:

- **Dating by Ascription Type:** a comparison of the levels of ascription of the reconstructed CL redactions revealed that some only claim to derive from

Followers, whilst others claim to reach all the way back to Companions. Based on the Criterion of Dissimilarity (in conjunction with established background knowledge on early Hadith culture), the Follower ascriptions are likely more archaic than the Companion ascriptions, which makes the latter versions of the marital-age hadith seem like secondary developments in general.

- **Form Criticism:** a comparison of the CL redactions and other versions of the marital-age hadith revealed a common form, which implies that the tradition as a whole derives from a single ur-story. The most viable candidate for (an accurate reflection of) such an ur-story turned out to be the redaction of Hišām b. ‘Urwah, since his particular wording can explain the rise the variants in the cores of virtually all extant versions of the marital-age hadith.
- **Form Criticism and *’Isnāds*:** the common form’s entailment of a common source also contradicts many of the relevant *’Isnāds*, which depict said common form as the utterance of various different early figures, even in completely different regions. This contradiction holds true not just for particular elemental combinations within the marital-age hadith-tradition, but for the fundamental elemental combination as well. This implies that most of the relevant *’Isnāds* are false or at least misleading, since they fail to disclose their common sources. This is consistent with most of the relevant versions of the marital-age hadith’s being dives.
- **Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the *’Isnāds*:** a geographical analysis of the relevant tradents reveals that all of the earliest CLs were Iraqi (especially Kufan), except for two Madinans who just so happened to have moved to Iraq. Moreover, all of the credible transmitters from these two Madinans were Iraqi (especially Kufan), except for a Madinan who just so happens to have moved to Iraq, who in turn transmitted to another Madinan who just so happens to have moved to Iraq. All of this is consistent with the marital-age hadith’s having originated in Iraq (in particular, in Kufah), and unexpected on the view that it derives from early, major figures in Madinah.
- **Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the Earliest Madinan Collections:** the marital-age hadith is completely absent from all of the earliest Madinan legal collections and biographies of the Prophet, despite the prominence and abundance of the alleged Madinan sources of the hadith in

such works, and despite the hadith's utility for the composers thereof. This is consistent with the marital-age hadith's having originated in Iraq, and unexpected on the view that it derives from early, major figures in Madinah.

- **Geography and Arguments from Silence: The Evidence of the Earliest Kufan Collections:** certain versions of the marital-age hadith are absent from the earliest Kufan legal collections, despite the prominence and abundance of the alleged Kufan sources of the relevant hadiths in such works, and despite the hadith's utility for the composers thereof. This is consistent with the marital-age hadith's having originated amongst the traditionists and Hadith-oriented jurists of mid-8th-Century Iraq in particular (as distinct from the mainstream, rationalist-inclined jurists of Kufah), and unexpected on the view that it derives from early, major figures in Kufah.
- **Interim Summary and Entailments: Hišām as the Originator of the Marital-Age Hadith:** most of the evidence points to Kufah in the middle of the 8th Century CE, and Hišām in particular, as the starting point of the marital-age hadith. Although it is possible that Hišām borrowed the content of the hadith from an obscure Iraqi contemporary, it is simpler to suppose that he formulated it *ex nihilo*.
- **A Historical-Critical Analysis of the Marital-Age Hadith's Context:** Hišām was remembered as having falsely or misleadingly ascribed reports to his father when he moved to Iraq, which is at least broadly consistent with his having created the marital-age hadith in Kufah. Based on the relevant historical and polemical context and the earliest discernible use of the marital-age hadith, it was most likely created by Hišām to bolster 'Ā'īshah's unique status as a virgin at marriage (which in turn bolstered her claim to being the Prophet's favourite wife), in response to the hostile, Šī'ī-dominated environment of Kufah in the middle of the 8th Century CE.
- **A Historical-Critical Analysis of the Origins of the Marital-Age Hadith's Specific Content:** in creating his hadith, Hišām was likely influenced by an established relative chronology of the Prophet's marriage to 'Ā'īshah, and may also have drawn upon the traditional minimum age of marriage in his native Hijaz, a lingering Sasanid tradition or ideal in Iraq, the legal doctrine of the proto-Šī'īs of Kufah, and/or his own personal marital experience.

In short, the best explanation for the evidence overall—the hypothesis that explains or is consistent with *all of the evidence together*—is that Hišām b. ‘Urwah created the marital-age hadith when he moved to Kufah in the early Abbasid period (specifically, between 754 and 765 CE), as a response to his new polemical environment. The hadith rapidly spread and diversified amongst Hišām’s contemporaries and students in Iraq and thereby acquired several independent *’isnāds*, whilst also gaining currency amongst both proto-Sunnī propagandists and Hadith-oriented jurists. In time, the hadith even gained local dives in other provinces, although the original source thereof remained clearly visible: even within the extant forest of *’isnāds* supporting the marital-age hadith as a whole, Hišām—the most frequently or densely cited source thereof—towers over the rest as a veritable super-CL.

Chapter 4: The Spread and Diversification of the Hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s Marital Age

Having thus argued that the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age originated with Hišām b. ‘Urwah in Kufah at the beginning of the Abbasid period, we are now in a position to provide an overarching summary of its spread and diversification therefrom. This is in effect a restatement of the conclusions reached in the preceding two chapters of the present work, but presented in a more straightforward chronological and geographical order, with some implications spelled out more clearly, in such a way as to account, directly or indirectly, for all of the extant manifestations of the marital-age hadith.

Origin and Growth in Iraq

When the prominent Madinan traditionist Hišām b. ‘Urwah (d. 146-147/763-765) moved to Kufah (or to al-Hāšimiyyah, the nearby provisional capital of the Abbasids) during the reign of the Abbasid caliph al-Manṣūr (754-775 CE), he became known for certain forms of false ascription or omission in citing sources (*’irsāl* and *tadlīs*). Thereafter, probably in response to proto-Šī‘ī polemics against ‘Ā’iṣah in particular, he began to disseminate a short report about ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage to the Prophet at a young age: the marriage was contracted when she was six or seven and consummated when she was nine. He initially only ascribed this report to his father, but over the course of successive retellings, he also explicitly ascribed it all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah herself. He also updated the content of the report, at times adding a statement about how long ‘Ā’iṣah and the Prophet lived together, and at other times developing an elaborate narrative, from ‘Ā’iṣah’s own perspective, about her circumstances on the day of her marital consummation. Much of this content also made its way into a letter he transmitted from—or ascribed to—his father. Hišām disseminated all of these different iterations of his hadith to numerous Kufan and Basran students, many of whom went on to become the leading traditionists of Iraq in the late 8th Century CE. Most of these traditionists at least reworded what they had received, and some—such

as 'Abū 'Usāmah, Ibn 'abī al-Zinād, Ḥammād b. Salamah, and 'Alī b. Mushir—incorporated additional elements into their versions, often derived from Hišām's other hadiths. Such insertions or additions also sometimes occurred amongst the students of Hišām's students, many of whom also raised their versions (transforming an ascription to 'Urwah into an ascription via 'Urwah to 'Ā'iṣah).

Three of Hišām's Iraqi contemporaries borrowed or incorporated his hadith into their own formulations. To begin with, the Kufan proto-Sunnī propagandist 'Ismā'īl b. 'abī Kālid (d. 146/763-764) incorporated the simple version of Hišām's hadith into his iteration of a common pool of *faḍā'il* material about 'Ā'iṣah that was circulating in Kufah in the 8th Century CE, which he ascribed via 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk (a definite *majhūl*) to 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud'ān (a near-*majhūl*). 'Ismā'īl disseminated this hadith to multiple Kufan and Wasitian students and, in the process, his original ascription was variously altered and improved, usually being raised back to 'Ā'iṣah herself in one way or another.

At the same time, Muḥammad b. 'Amr (d. 144-145/761-763), a fellow Madinan emigrant to Iraq, incorporated the elaborate version of Hišām's hadith practically wholesale into a longer, synthetic narrative about 'Ā'iṣah and Sawdah's marriages to the Prophet, combining it with several other relevant narratives that seem to have been circulating in Madinah already. Muḥammad ascribed this synthetic narrative to his Madinan masters Yaḥyá and 'Abū Salamah and disseminated it to various Iraqi students, mostly Kufans.

Meanwhile, Sulaymān al-'A'maš (d. 147-148/764-766), one of the leading traditionists of Kufah in the middle of the 8th Century CE, but also a "deceiver" (*mudallis*) who was accused of corrupting (*'afsada*) the Hadith of Kufah,¹⁴⁷² borrowed a version of the hadith, which he (or some now-suppressed intermediary) altered in a fundamental way: instead of 'Ā'iṣah's marriage being contracted at six or seven and consummated at nine, 'Ā'iṣah's marriage is simply stated as occurring at age nine, thereby conflating or compressing Hišām's original. To this, al-'A'maš added a statement about how long 'Ā'iṣah and the Prophet lived together, or her age at the time of his death. Al-'A'maš ascribed this hadith via the leading Kufan Followers 'Ibrāhīm al-Naḳa'ī and al-'Aswad b. Yazīd back to 'Ā'iṣah and transmitted it to several Kufan

¹⁴⁷² Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Šākir), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, I, p. 116; 'Abū al-Qāsim (ed. Ḥusaynī), *Qabūl al-'Akbār*, I, pp. 275-276, 249-250; *ibid.*, II, p. 402.

students, the most prolific of whom was 'Abū Mu'āwiyah al-Ḍarīr (d. 194-195/809-811).

A generation later, 'Isrā'īl b. Yūnus (d. 160-162/776-779), a notable Kufan traditionist who was nevertheless regarded by some as “not strong” (*laysa bi-al-qawīyy*) and even “weak” (*ḍa'īf*),¹⁴⁷³ seems to have combined the simple version of Hišām's hadith and half of al-'A'maš's version. 'Isrā'īl ascribed this synthetic hadith via his grandfather, the eminent Kufan traditionist 'Abū 'Ishāq al-Sabī'ī, to the notable Kufan Follower 'Abū 'Ubaydah, and possibly also the Madino-Kufan Follower Muṣ'ab b. Sa'd. 'Isrā'īl transmitted this hadith to multiple Iraqi students, some of whom variously raised it back to 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd (i.e., 'Abū 'Ubaydah's father) and 'Ā'iṣah, and one of whom (probably al-Wāqidī, an infamous “fabricator” or *kaḍḍāb*) replaced the original 'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah *isnād* with al-'A'maš—Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah.

The marital-age hadith may also have been cited in a legal opinion by the Kufan Zaydī theologian and traditionist al-Ḥasan b. Ḥayy (d. 169/785-786), although this cannot be confirmed.

Meanwhile, the Basran traditionist 'Abū 'Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ (d. 176/792) ascribed another iteration of the aforementioned Kufan *faḍā'il* material via the Kufan *qāḍī* 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Umayr back to 'Ā'iṣah, which he transmitted to his students in Basrah.

At around the same time, the Kufan traditionist 'Abṭar b. al-Qāsim (d. 178/794-795) borrowed al-'A'maš's distinctive version of the marital-age hadith and ascribed it, via his Kufan master Muṭarrif b. Ṭarīf, to the same sources cited by 'Isrā'īl and his students: 'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—'Ā'iṣah. 'Abṭar may thus have combined al-'A'maš's *matn* with 'Isrā'īl's *isnād*, although it is equally possible that 'Isrā'īl and 'Abṭar simply created their ascriptions independently, given that the “'Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah—'Ā'iṣah” relationship was already established and respected in Kufan circles.

It was plausibly also in Kufah that the marital-age hadith was incorporated into a version of the famous *ifk* narrative and falsely ascribed via a Kufan SS back to 'Ā'iṣah, possibly at the hands of 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-Muḥāribī (d. 195/810-811), who was remembered as a “deceiver” (*mudallis*) and a transmitter of dubious hadiths (*'aḥādīṭ manākīr* or *'aḥādīṭ munkarah*).¹⁴⁷⁴

¹⁴⁷³ Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VII, pp. 357-358.

¹⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, IX, p. 137.

Meanwhile, the Kufan traditionist 'Abū Dāwūd al-Ḥafarī (d. 203/818 or 206/821-822) interpolated a well-known hadith disseminated by Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, from 'Ismā'īl b. 'Umayyah, from 'Abd Allāh b. 'Urwah, from 'Ā'īṣah, about her preferred day for marriages, merging it with the *matn* of the simple version of Hišām's hadith. At the same time, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (d. turn of 9th C. CE), a Kufan traditionist regarded by some as "nothing" (*laysa bi-ṣay*) and "excessive in error" (*fāḥiṣ al-ḡaṭa*),¹⁴⁷⁵ went further by not just merging Sufyān's hadith with Hišām's, but also replacing Sufyān's original *'isnād* ('Ismā'īl b. 'Umayyah—'Abd Allāh b. 'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah) with another (Sa'd b. 'Ibrāhīm—al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad—'Ā'īṣah). Meanwhile, two other Kufan traditionists (plausibly including Wakī' b. al-Jarrāḥ) also altered Sufyān's actual marital-age hadith by replacing the original *'isnād* (Hišām—'Urwah) with another ('Abū 'Ishāq—'Abū 'Ubaydah), in one case also involving some kind of borrowing or contamination (from al-'Aḥwaṣ's particular transmission of Sufyān's original marital-age hadith).

Meanwhile, some Kufans—plausibly Yaḥyá b. 'Ādam (d. 203/818) and Yaḥyá al-Ḥimmānī (d. 225/839-840 or 228/842-843), the latter of whom was regarded by some as "unreliable" (*laysa bi-ṭiqah*) and "weak" (*ḍa'īf*)¹⁴⁷⁶—ascribed two different versions of the marital-age hadith (one derived from 'Isrā'īl's version and the other from either Jarīr or Ḥammād b. Zayd's redactions of Hišām's version) back to the notable Kufan traditionist Šarīk, from 'Abū 'Ishāq, from 'Abū 'Ubaydah—one all the way back to 'Ā'īṣah, and the other all the way back to Ibn Mas'ūd.

At the same time, an Iraqi—plausibly the Kufan biographer, genealogist, and antiquarian Hišām b. Muḥammad al-Kalbī (d. 204-206/819-822), who was condemned as "unreliable" (*laysa bi-ṭiqah*) and "abandoned in Hadith" (*matrūk al-ḥadīth*)¹⁴⁷⁷—ascribed a biographical summary of 'Ā'īṣah via his Kufan father and a Basran Follower back to Ibn 'Abbās, seemingly assembled from the miscellaneous reports and statements of biographical and prosopographical authorities like Ibn Sa'd and al-Wāqidī. Meanwhile, al-Wāqidī himself (d. 207/823), a notorious "fabricator" (*kaḍḍāb*), interpolated or fabricated several different versions of the marital-age hadith: he likely replaced the *'isnād* of 'Isrā'īl's hadith with that of al-'A'maš's (noted already); he

¹⁴⁷⁵ Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Zāyid), *Majrūḥīn*, II, p. 277.

¹⁴⁷⁶ Ḍahabī (ed. 'Arna'ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, X, p. 534.

¹⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 101-102.

probably interpolated a narrative from the Madinans ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Maymūn and Ḥabīb; he likely interpolated a biographical summary from Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī in two different ways, one of which he reattributed—via a Madinan SS—to ‘Ā’iṣah; and he plausibly omitted an intermediary source between himself and Ibn ‘abī al-Zinād.

A generation later, someone in Basrah—possibly ‘Aḥmad b. al-Miqdām (d. 251-253/865-867) or his master Zuhayr b. al-‘Alā’ (fl. turn of the 9th C. CE)—assembled a relatively detailed biographical summary of ‘Ā’iṣah from various iterations of the marital-age hadith and related reports that were circulating in Basrah—and Iraq more broadly—at the beginning of the 9th Century CE, which they ascribed via Sa‘īd b. ‘abī ‘Arūbah to Qatādah (both of whom were leading Basran traditionists and authorities of the early-to-mid 8th Century CE).

Finally, around the turn of the 9th Century CE, two Kufan transmitters of a hadith about ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital engagement—disseminated by the Kufan traditionist ‘Abū Ḥujayyah al-‘Ajlaḥ (d. 145/762-763 or later), on the authority of the Meccan Follower Ibn ‘abī Mulaykah—interpolated their respective versions thereof with elements taken from Hišām’s marital-age hadith. However, given that this occurred independently, each Kufan interpolator drew upon a different version of Hišām’s hadith (resulting in differences in wording), and one of them went further by explicitly raising his version all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah.

Spread to Yemen

The marital-age hadith ostensibly spread to Yemen via the peripatetic Basran traditionist Ma‘mar b. Rāšid (d. 152-154/769-771), who claimed to have received it from both Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī (implausibly) and Hišām (plausibly). This could have occurred in the Hijaz, when Ma‘mar (who would eventually end up in Yemen) and Hišām (who would eventually end up in Iraq) seemingly coincided in time and place. However, given that the only version of the hadith that can be positively assigned to Ma‘mar via the ICMA differs markedly from every other transmission from Hišām, it is plausible that Ma‘mar did not receive it directly from Hišām, but instead via indirect means (e.g., from someone else’s notes or summary)—thus, its garbled state. Consequently, the exact place and time of Ma‘mar’s acquisition of his version of the

hadith remains uncertain. In fact, Ma‘mar’s version of this hadith was seemingly not even a ‘hadith’ at all, being instead a statement ascribed to Hišām. To compound matters, Ma‘mar falsely ascribed this statement to al-Zuhrī as well. As it happens, Ma‘mar was deemed by some to have “erred” (*ḡaliṭa*) in some of his transmissions from al-Zuhrī; to be “muddled” (*muḍṭarib*) and “full of errors” (*kaṭīr al-’awhām*) in his transmissions from Hišām; and to be a *mudallis* in general.¹⁴⁷⁸

Thereafter, the Yemenite traditionist ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām (d. 211/827), who was accused by some of being “not strong” (*laysa bi-al-qawīyy*) and even a “fabricator” (*kaddāb*),¹⁴⁷⁹ interpolated the version of this hadith that he received from Ma‘mar, adding therein elements taken from other transmissions from Hišām, ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, and/or Wakī‘ b. al-Jarrāḥ. ‘Abd al-Razzāq also raised this composite hadith in successive retellings, changing it from an ascription to ‘Urwah to an ascription via ‘Urwah to ‘Ā’iṣah.

Spread to Makkah

A version of the Kufan traditionist ‘Ismā‘īl b. ‘abī Ḳālid’s *faḍā’il* hadith may have been brought to Makkah by his student Marwān b. Mu‘āwiyah (d. 193/808-809), a Kufan who died in Makkah. More definitely, Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah, a Kufan who received a version of the marital-age hadith from Hišām in Kufah, brought it with him when he settled in Makkah in 163/779-780, where he disseminated it to several Meccan students (including Ibn ‘abī ‘Umar, al-Ḥumaydī, and al-Šāfi‘ī). Other transmissions from Hišām also came to Makkah from Iraq: with the Khurasanian traditionist Sa‘īd b. Manṣūr (d. 226-229/840-844), from the Kufo-Baghdadian traditionist ‘Ismā‘īl b. Zakariyyā’ (d. 173-174/789-791); with the Baghdadian traditionist Muḥammad b. ‘Ismā‘īl al-Šā’iḡ (d. 276/889); and with the Khurasanian traditionist ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (d. 286-287/899-900), from his Basran teachers al-Ḥajjāj b. al-Minhāl (d. 216-217/831-832) and ‘Ārim b. al-Faḍl (d. 224/838-839). ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz also brought

¹⁴⁷⁸ Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, VII, p. 11; Ibn ‘Asākir (ed. ‘Amrawī), *Ta’rīk Dimašq*, LIX, p. 392; Suyūṭī (ed. Naṣṣār), *‘Asmā’ al-Mudallisīn*, p. 94.

¹⁴⁷⁹ Ibn ‘Adī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Kāmil*, VIII, p. 448, # 12967; Ḍahabī (ed. ‘Arna’ūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, IX, pp. 571, 574.

a version of 'Isrā'īl's hadith with him to Makkah, from the Basran traditionist 'Abd Allāh b. Rajā' (d. 219-220/834-835). A version of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan's hadith also presumably spread to Makkah with his Kufan student al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī (d. 242/857). Likewise, a version of 'Abd al-Razzāq's hadith presumably spread to Makkah with the Basran traditionist 'Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād (d. 340/952).

It was plausibly also in Makkah that the Madinan traditionist Ya'qūb b. Ḥumayd b. Kāsib (d. 240-241/854-856), who was variously condemned as "nothing" (*laysa bi-ṣay*), "unreliable" (*laysa bi-ṭiqah*), and "weak in Hadith" (*ḍa'īf al-ḥadīth*),¹⁴⁸⁰ created a noticeably more detailed version of Hišām's simple hadith, which he projected back to Hišām via their Madinan intermediary 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Yaḥyá b. 'Urwah.

Spread to Northern Mesopotamia

The marital-age hadith spread to Northern Mesopotamia—here meaning the region of al-Jazīrah and the cities of Anbar, Mosul, Raqqah, and Harran, along with the Anatolian city of Mopsuestia—numerous times, virtually always from nearby Iraq. To begin with, Hišām's Kufan student 'Alī b. Mushir (d. 189/804-805) was appointed the *qāḍī* of Mosul, where he transmitted his redaction of Hišām's elaborate version of the hadith to Suwayd b. Sa'īd al-'Anbārī (d. 240/855). Over the subsequent decades, other versions of the hadith also travelled north from Iraq: Mu'ammal b. al-Faḍl al-Ḥarrānī (d. 229/843-844) seemingly transmitted a version of 'Ismā'īl's hadith; Muḥammad b. 'Ādam al-Maṣṣīṣī (d. 250/864-865) received a version of Hišām's hadith from the latter's Kufan student 'Abdah b. Sulaymān; both 'Aḥmad b. Ḥarb al-Mawṣilī (d. 263/876-877) and 'Alī b. Ḥarb al-Mawṣilī (d. 265/879) transmitted versions of 'Abū Mu'āwiyah's redaction of al-'A'maš's hadith (in the second case, plausibly involving interpolations in the *matn*); al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Ḥarrānī (d. 318/930) transmitted versions of 'Abū 'Usāmah and Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firyābī's redactions of Hišām's hadith; and 'Abū Ya'lá 'Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Mawṣilī (d. 307/919-920) collected several Iraqi transmissions from Muḥammad b. 'Amr and Hišām in his *Musnad*.

¹⁴⁸⁰ See the section on Hišām b. 'Urwah in ch. 2.

The spread of the marital-age hadith from Iraq to Northern Mesopotamia thus mostly occurred in a fairly straightforward and transparent fashion, without major interpolations or fabrications, except for two instances. In the first instance, Kaṭīr b. Hišām al-Raqqī (d. 207-208/822-824), or possibly his cited source Jaʿfar b. Burqān al-Raqqī (d. 154/770-771), seems to have falsely reattributed the hadith of ʿIsrāʾīl—plausibly also incorporating an element from ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah’s version—back to Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī. (As it happens, Jaʿfar was widely regarded as unreliable *specifically in his transmissions from al-Zuhrī*,¹⁴⁸¹ and even Kaṭīr was reportedly error-prone.¹⁴⁸²) In the second instance, Ḥaṣṣ b. ʿUmar al-Raqqī (d. 280/893-894) seems to have combined a hadith he received from Qabiṣah (from Sufyān, from Hišām, from ʿUrwah) with the *matn* of ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah’s version and the *ʿisnād* associated with ʿIsrāʾīl’s version and certain other false ascriptions to Sufyān (i.e., Sufyān—ʿAbū ʿIshāq—ʿAbū ʿUbaydah). (As it happens, Ḥaṣṣ was deemed by al-Ḍahabī to be “imprecise” (*laysa bi-mutqin*).¹⁴⁸³)

Spread to Egypt

The marital-age hadith came to Egypt with the students of the Madino-Baghdadian traditionist Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād (d. 174/790-791), who disseminated his version thereof in Baghdad¹⁴⁸⁴ after he acquired it from Hišām (probably in Baghdad, and probably indirectly, which is consistent with the reports that he became unreliable *specifically when he moved to Iraq*). Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād transmitted his redaction of the hadith to two Egyptian students, ʿAbd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 197/813) and Saʿīd b. ʿabī Maryam (d. 224/838-389), each of whom passed it on to his own Egyptian students in turn. In the process, however, Ibn Wahb (a known *mudallis*¹⁴⁸⁵) or possibly his student Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (d. 268/882) added the Madino-Baghdadian traditionist Saʿīd b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān into the *ʿisnād* as a co-transmitter with Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād from Hišām.

¹⁴⁸¹ Ibn ʿabī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, II, pp. 474-475.

¹⁴⁸² Ibn Ḥibbān (ed. Kān), *Tiqāt*, IX, p. 26: “he errs and contradicts [the transmissions of others] (*yukṭiʿu wa-yukālifu*).”

¹⁴⁸³ Ḍahabī (ed. ʿArnaʿūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, XIII, p. 406. However, al-Ḍahabī (*ibid.*) preceded this with the claim that “he was in essence sincere (*huwa ṣadūq fī nafsi-hi*).”

¹⁴⁸⁴ For example, to the Basran traditionist Sulaymān b. Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī.

¹⁴⁸⁵ Ibn Saʿd (ed. Sachau), *Biographien*, VII, part 2, p. 205.

At around the same time, the prominent Hadith-partisan jurist Muḥammad b. ʿIdrīs al-Šāfiʿī (d. 204/820) also brought Hišām’s hadith with him when he came to Egypt from Makkah, where he had received it from Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah. Al-Šāfiʿī transmitted his version to his Egyptian student al-Rabīʿ b. Sulaymān al-Murādī (d. 270/884), but in the process, some core details were altered: al-Rabīʿ recorded it from al-Šāfiʿī once with “six or seven” and twice with “seven”. Moreover, al-Rabīʿ recorded one version from al-Šāfiʿī with an additional ‘dolls’ element, with wordings suspiciously similar to Ibn Wahb’s transmission from Ibn ʿabī al-Zinād: evidently, some contamination occurred between these Egyptian contemporaries.

An unusual version of the marital-age hadith (“nine or ten”)—in the form of a biographical summary about ʿĀʾiṣah without an *ʾisnād*—was also recorded by the Basran biographer ʿAbd al-Malik b. Hišām (d. 213/828-829 or 218/833) in his *Kitāb al-Sīrah al-Nabawiyyah*, which he brought with him when he settled in Egypt. Ibn Hišām’s *Sīrah* was a recension of the *Kitāb al-Maḡāzī* of Muḥammad b. ʾIshāq (d. 150-153/767-770), but Ibn Hišām did not cite Ibn ʾIshāq as his source for this biographical summary, nor any other source; presumably, it was Ibn Hišām’s own assemblage of information—perhaps from multiple sources—that he acquired in Basrah.

The obscure Egyptian traditionist ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Saʿīd b. ʿabī Maryam (fl. 9th C. CE) also received a version of the marital-age hadith from the Khurasanian and Levantine traditionist Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firyābī, from his Kufan master Sufyān al-Ṭawrī, from Hišām.

An unusual version of the hadith (ascribed to Qatādah—see above) was also transmitted by the obscure Baghdadian traditionist Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. ʾAʿyan (d. 293/905-906), who received it from Basran sources and presumably took it with him when he settled in Egypt.

Finally, there was a single, notable fabrication in Egypt: ʾAḥmad b. Saʿd b. al-Ḥakam b. ʿabī Maryam (d. 253/867), or possibly his uncle and cited source Ibn ʿabī Maryam, borrowed the *matn* of the simple version of Hišām’s hadith (probably Wuhayb’s redaction) and falsely ascribed it via an Egypto-Madinan SS back to ʿĀʾiṣah.

Spread to the Levant

The marital-age hadith came to the Levant with the Khurasanian traditionist Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Firyābī (d. 212/827), who received a version of Hišām's hadith from the latter's Kufan student Sufyān al-Ṭawrī and settled thereafter in the Palestinian city of Caesarea, where he disseminated it to some local traditionists. Not long afterwards, the notable Damascene traditionist Hišām b. 'Ammār (d. 245/859) recorded a version of Muḥammad b. 'Amr's hadith in his own collection, which he obtained from the Baghdadian Sa'īd b. Yaḥyá al-'Umaywī (who in turn received it from his Kufan father, one of Muḥammad's students). Sometime after that, the Baghdadian traditionist 'Abū 'Umayyah Muḥammad b. 'Ibrāhīm (d. 273/886) may also have brought 'Alī b. Mushir's redaction of Hišām's elaborate version of the marital-age hadith—which he received from 'Alī's Kufan student 'Ismā'īl b. al-Ḳalīl—with him when he settled in Tarsus. At around the same time, 'Abū Mu'āwiyah's hadith also spread to the Levant via his Kufan student Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Numayr, who in turn transmitted it to the prominent Damascene chronicler 'Abū Zur'ah 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Amr (d. 280-281/893-895), who recorded it in his *Ta'rik*. Finally, several centuries later, an unusual version of Hišām's hadith (framed as a conversation between him and his Kufan student al-Hayṭam b. 'Adī al-Ṭā'ī) spread via a succession of Baghdadian and Eastern tradents to the famous Damascene chronicler 'Alī b. al-Ḥasan b. 'Asākir (d. 519/1125), who recorded it in his *Ta'rik Madīnat Dimašq*.

Meanwhile, at some point in the early-to-mid 9th Century CE, the Aleppine traditionist al-Ḥajjāj b. 'abī Manī' (d. post-216/831) updated or elaborated a relatively detailed biographical summary of 'Ā'ishah that he may have received from his local uncle 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'abī Ziyād al-Ruṣāfī, perhaps ultimately deriving from Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī—adding therein the elements of the simple version of Hišām's hadith. (Of course, it is also possible that al-Ḥajjāj assembled the summary himself from the biographical material that was flowing into the Levant from Iraq and completely falsely ascribed it via his uncle to al-Zuhrī.)

Finally, it was plausibly also in the Levant, possibly with the Damascene traditionist 'Abū Mushir 'Abd al-'A'lā b. Mushir (d. 218/833), that a version of 'Isrā'īl's hadith was elaborated and reattributed via a local familial *'isnād* back to the Levantine Follower Yazīd b. Jābir al-'Azdī.

Spread to Persia

Easterners came to dominate Hadith scholarship in the 9th Century CE to such an extent that, alongside Baghdadians, they predominate in the later segments of most *ʿisnāds* of the marital-age hadith, or else as the compilers of the collections in which versions of the hadith are extant. As part of this process of domination, the marital-age hadith spread to Persia—meaning above all the regions of al-Jibāl and Fārs—by many routes. One of the earliest instances thereof occurred with Ḥasan b. Mūsá (d. 209/824-825), who received a redaction of the elaborate version of Hišām’s hadith from Ḥammād b. Salamah in Basrah and presumably took it with him to Rayy, where he died. Likewise, the Baghdadian traditionist al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faraj (fl. 9th C. CE) brought al-Wāqidī’s ascription to Ḥabīb (along with his *al-Mubtada’ wa-al-Maḡāzī* more broadly) with him from Baghdad when he settled in Isfahan, where he transmitted it to a local student. Soon afterward, several Persians (and a Basran who settled in Persia) recorded multiple versions of the marital-age hadith in their extant Hadith collections: Muḥammad b. Mājah al-Qazwīnī (d. 273/887), who received one version from a Mesopotamian and another from a Wasitian, both recorded in his *Sunan*; Yūnus b. Ḥabīb al-ʿAṣbahānī (d. 267/880-881), who transmitted a version as part of his recension of the *Musnad* of his Basran master ʿAbū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī; Yaʿqūb b. Sufyān al-Fasawī (d. 277/890-891 or 280-281/893-895), who received several versions from Kufan, Basran, and Aleppine sources, all of which he recorded in his *Taʾrīk*; and ʿAḥmad b. ʿabī ʿĀṣim (d. 287/900), a Basran traditionist who was appointed the *qāḍī* of Isfahan and who received several versions from Iraqi sources, all of which he recorded in his *al-ʾĀḥād wa-al-Maṭānī*. Many versions of the hadith, including from some of these earlier collectors, were also recorded by later mega-compilers like ʿAbū Nuʿaym ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʾIṣfahānī (d. 430/1038).

Finally, it was plausibly in Rayy that Muḥammad b. Ḥumayd (d. 248/862-863), a local traditionist who was variously condemned as “unreliable” (*laysa bi-ṭiqah* and *ḡayr ṭiqah*), “rejected in Hadith” (*munkar al-ḥadīth*), and “possessing strange hadiths” (*ṣāḥib ʿajāʾib*),¹⁴⁸⁶ created a strange version of the marital-age hadith (recounting how

¹⁴⁸⁶ Ḍahabī (ed. ʿArnaʾūṭ *et al.*), *Siyar*, XI, p. 503-506.

‘Ā’iṣah was fattened up by her parents for her marital consummation), which was projected back to ‘Ā’iṣah via a Mervian familial *’isnād*.

Spread to Khurasan

The Eastern domination of Hadith scholarship also brought the marital-age hadith into Khurasan, via numerous routes. One of the earliest instances thereof seems to have occurred with Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá al-Naysābūrī (d. 226/840-841), who travelled from Naysabur to Kufah and obtained a version from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah, which he brought with him when he returned home and disseminated to his local students. In the process, however, Yaḥyá altered or contaminated ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah’s hadith, combining it with elements taken from the simple version of Hišām’s hadith. The latter also arrived in Khurasan around the same time with Muḥammad b. al-Naḍr al-Marwazī (d. 239/853-854), who obtained it from Ja‘far b. Sulaymān when he visited Basrah. ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version of the hadith also came to Khurasan over the ensuing decades, as various Khurasanian traditionists travelled to Yemen, obtained the hadith from ‘Abd al-Razzāq, and took it back home with them: Muḥammad b. Rāfi‘ al-Naysābūrī (d. 245/860), Muḥammad b. ‘Iṣḥāq al-Ṣāḡānī (d. 270/883), and Fayyāḍ b. Zuhayr al-Nasā’ī (d. post-250/864-865). A version of ‘Ismā‘īl’s hadith also made its way there via ‘Aḥmad b. Yūnus al-Naysābūrī (d. 263-264/876-878), who seems to have received it in Kufah (or possibly al-Madā’in) from ‘Abū Ṣihāb ‘Abd Rabbi-hi and brought it home with him.

Numerous versions of the marital-age hadith were also preserved in the extant Hadith collections of various leading Khurasanian traditionists: the *Musnad* of ‘Iṣḥāq b. Rāhwayh al-Marwazī (d. 238/853), from various Kufan sources; the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī (d. 261/875), from various Eastern and Iraqi sources (involving some notable instances of contamination or interpolation); the *Ta’rīk* of ‘Aḥmad b. ‘abī Kayṭamah Zuhayr al-Naysābūrī (d. 279/892), from a Basran source; the *Musnad* of ‘Abū ‘Awānah Ya‘qūb b. ‘Iṣḥāq al-‘Isfarāyīnī (d. 316/929), from various Egyptian, Levantine, Iraqi, and Eastern sources; and the *Mustadrak* of Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014), from various Eastern sources. Many

versions of the hadith, including from some of these earlier collectors, were also recorded by later mega-compilers like 'Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī (d. 458/1066).

Spread to Transoxania

The marital-age hadith also spread to Transoxania, in at least four notable instances: firstly, with 'Abd b. Ḥumayd al-Kaššī (d. 249/863-864), who obtained a version from 'Abd al-Razzāq when he visited Yemen; secondly, with 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī al-Samarqandī (d. 250/864-865 or 255/869), who obtained 'Alī b. Mushir's redaction of Hišām's elaborate version of the marital-age hadith from 'Ismā'īl b. Ḳalīl when he visited Kufah, which he recorded in his *Musnad* or *Sunan*; thirdly, with Muḥammad b. 'Ismā'īl al-Buḳārī (d. 256/870), who obtained several different redactions of Hišām's hadiths from various Kufan, Basran, and Perso-Palestinian sources (all recorded in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*), and several different versions of 'Ismā'īl's hadith from various Iraqi sources (all recorded in his *al-Ta'rīk al-Kabīr*); and fourthly, with Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (d. 354/965), a Sijistanian traditionist who was appointed the *qāḍī* of Samarqand and who obtained two versions of Hišām's hadith from a Khurasanian source and a Mesopotamian source respectively, both tracing back to Hišām's Kufan students, which Ibn Ḥibbān recorded in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*.

Spread to the West

Eventually, several versions of the marital-age hadith also made it to West, here meaning North Africa (including 'Ifriqiyyah and al-Maḡrib) and the Iberian Peninsula (i.e., al-'Andalus). It is striking that, despite the heavy dependence of West—the stronghold of Mālikism—upon the legal tradition and Hadith of Madinah, Westerners seem to have virtually always obtained their versions of the marital-age hadith, directly or indirectly, from Iraqi sources. For example, the Hadith critic 'Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-'Ijlī (d. 261/874-875), who settled in Tripoli and preserved a version of the hadith in his *Ta'rīk al-Ṭiqāt*, came from Kufah and received his version from a Kufan

source: 'Abū Dāwūd al-Ḥafarī, whose interpolation of a well-known hadith from Sufyān al-Tawrī has been discussed already. Likewise, the Andalusian jurist and Hadith scholar Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī (d. 463/1071) recorded several versions of the hadith in his *Kitāb al-Istī'āb* and his *Tamhīd*, all ultimately tracing back to Hišām's Basran and Kufan students and to the Kufan 'Abū Mu'āwiyah.¹⁴⁸⁷ That said, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr also ascribed an unusual statement ("The Messenger of God married her when she was a girl of ten years") to the junior Madinan Follower 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. 'Uqayl/'Aqīl (d. post-140/757-758), but did so without citing any sources (Madinan or otherwise)—in fact, this statement appears to be uncorroborated in all other Islamic literature, including legal works and Hadith collections.

A century later, the Ibadite Hadith scholar Yūsuf b. 'Ibrāhīm al-Warjlānī (d. 570/1174-1175), as part of his general project of systematically creating an Ibadite Hadith corpus, cobbled together a relatively detailed biographical summary of 'Ā'īshah from earlier prosopographical sources and/or hadiths, which he ascribed via a suitable sequence of Ibadite imams back to the Basran Follower Jābir b. Zayd. (In this respect, al-Warjlānī may have drawn upon the previous Levantine ascription to Yazīd b. Jābir, discussed above.)

Conclusion

The hadith of 'Ā'īshah's marital age rapidly proliferated after its genesis in early Abbasid Iraq, spreading north to the rest of Mesopotamia, west to the Levant, Egypt, and beyond, south to Makkah and Yemen, and east to Persia, Khurasan, and Transoxania, all within the space of a century and a half. The hadith underwent considerable mutations and reworkings during the first few decades of its existence in Iraq, receiving multiple (usually local or familial) 'isnāds in the process. This might be taken to imply a considerable amount of mendacity on the part of Iraqi traditionists, but it should be reiterated that most of this occurred during the mid-to-late 8th Century CE, before the predomination of the Hadith critics (*nuqqād al-ḥadīth*) and their literalist,

¹⁴⁸⁷ Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Barr (ed. 'Alī Muḥammad Bijāwī), *Kitāb al-Istī'āb fī Ma'rifat al-'Aṣḥāb*, part 4 (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Jīl, 1992), pp. 1881-1882, # 4029; *id.* (ed. 'A'rāb), *Tamhīd*, vol. 19, p. 108.

historicist attitude towards Hadith. Thereafter (above all, in the 9th and 10th Centuries CE), it mostly spread transparently, with only minor rewordings and interpolations—but not always: in several regions and cities (specifically, the Levant, Raqqah, Rayy, and Ouargla), local traditionists (often with bad reputations already) combined the marital-age hadith with their own local reports or created their own versions of the hadith with local and familial *ʾisnāds*.

Once again, the general absence of Madinah from this picture is striking: in the 9th and 10th Centuries CE (i.e., the era of stable and transparent Hadith transmission), Madinans are completely absent. Madinans only appear in the earliest segments of various retrojections and dives, which is to say, as tradents and authorities in the segments of *ʾisnāds* covering the 7th and 8th Centuries CE (i.e., the era of false ascription, legendary transmission, mutation, and instability). Certainly, no early Madinan legal work or Hadith collection recorded any version of the marital-age hadith, from Madinan sources or otherwise. Once again, it seems clear that the true birthplace of the hadith was Iraq, not Madinah.

Chapter 5: The Canonisation and Criticism of the Hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s Marital Age in Sunnism

The hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age was put into circulation by several of the leading traditionists of Iraq in the mid-to-late 8th Century CE and transmitted by many of their illustrious students, making the acceptance of this hadith by the proto-Sunnī Hadith critics (*nuqqād al-ḥadīth*) of the 9th Century CE practically inevitable. In fact, it is probably more accurate to say that the Hadith critics simply *inherited* the hadith, being the main students (e.g., al-Bukārī) of the main students (e.g., al-Firyābī) of the main students (e.g., Sufyān al-Ṭawrī) of the creators thereof (e.g., Hišām). The Hadith critics explicitly saw themselves as the scholarly successors to the likes of Hišām, so unless they were confronted by flagrant contradictions between his hadiths and those of their other great forebears, or else by a recurring lack of corroboration for his ascriptions, they would accept Hišām’s material by default. Of course, even when Hišām’s transmissions were contradicted or suspiciously uncorroborated, this was downplayed or rationalised as a relatively minor foible—*tadlīs* and *’irsāl*, or even mere *wahm*, as opposed to *waḍ’* and *kaḍīb*. He always remained *al-’imām al-ṭīqah šayk al-’islām* in the Sunnī Hadith tradition.¹⁴⁸⁸

As it happens, there are some notable contradictions both within and between Hišām’s version of the marital-age hadith and those ascribed to his equally-venerated contemporaries Ibn Šihāb al-Zuhrī, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr, ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq, and al-’A‘maš, in which ‘Ā’iṣah’s age at her marital engagement (*nikāḥ*, *tazwīj*, *tazawwuj*) is variously given as six, six or seven, seven, and nine. However, these contradictions were almost never addressed by the Hadith critics, who seem to have accepted most of these versions—above all, those of Hišām, al-’A‘maš, ‘Isrā’īl (from ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq), and ‘Abd al-Razzāq (from al-Zuhrī)—as ‘sound’ (*ṣaḥīḥ*). Evidently, these contradictions were usually not regarded as flagrant, and rarely warranted comment or explanation.

Still, some contradictions and discrepancies (especially in the *’isnāds*) were felt to require explanation and adjudication, and not all versions of the hadith derived from

¹⁴⁸⁸ For more on the methods of the Hadith critics, see the section on Motzki’s criticisms of Cook in ch. 1, and the references given therein. For more on the excuses and rationalisations surrounding Hišām, see the historical-critical analysis in ch. 3 of the present work and the references given therein.

predecessors as esteemed as Hišām—thus, there were some instances in which the Hadith critics criticised or rejected specific transmissions of the marital-age hadith.

What follows is a summary of notable instances of proto-Sunnī and classical Sunnī scholars authenticating and/or criticising various versions of the marital-age hadith.

al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870)

The leading Transoxanian Hadith critic Muḥammad b. ʿIsmāʿīl al-Buḵārī (d. 256/870) recorded the following versions of the hadith in his *al-Jāmiʿ al-Ṣaḥīḥ*:

Farwah—ʿAlī b. Mushir—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.

ʿUbayd—ʿAbū ʿUsāmah—Hišām—ʿUrwah:

Kadijah's death; ʿĀʾiṣah married at six; consummation at nine.

al-Firyābī—Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.

Muʿallā—Wuhayb—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.

Farwah—ʿAlī b. Mushir—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage; marital preparation.

Qabīṣah—Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—Hišām—ʿUrwah:

ʿĀʾiṣah was married at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.

Farwah—ʿAlī b. Mushir—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage; marital preparation.

Although al-Bukārī never explicitly expressed a judgement on any of these hadiths, their inclusion in his *al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaḥīḥ* strongly implies that he regarded them to be *ṣaḥīḥ*, even though two of them are technically *mursal* or *munqaṭi‘*.

By contrast, an explicit judgement has been recorded from al-Bukārī regarding a defect (*‘illah*) in some versions of the hadith, as recorded by his student—and fellow Hadith critic—Muḥammad b. ‘Īsā al-Tirmidī (d. 279/892):

Yahyá b. ‘Aḡtam related to us: “Yahyá b. ‘Ādam related to us: “‘Isrā’īl related to us: “‘Abū ‘Ishāq related to us, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, from ‘Abd Allāh [b. Mas‘ūd], who said: “The Messenger of God married ‘Ā’iṣah when she was a girl of six years, consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years, and died when she was a girl of eighteen.””””

I asked Muḥammad [al-Bukārī] about this hadith, and he said: “This [version] is erroneous (*kaṭa‘*); on the contrary, it [should be] (*inna-mā huwa*): “‘Abū ‘Ishāq, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, that the Prophet married ‘Ā’iṣah....” Thusly they related, from ‘Isrā’īl, from ‘Abū ‘Ishāq. And they said, “...from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, from ‘Ā’iṣah...” also.”¹⁴⁸⁹

In other words, al-Bukārī deemed to be erroneous those versions of ‘Isrā’īl’s hadith that had been raised all the way back to ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd, rejecting them in favour of the unraised versions ascribed only to ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah and also those that were raised all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah.

Muslim (d. 261/875)

The leading Khurasanian Hadith critic Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī (d. 261/875) recorded the following versions of the hadith in his *al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaḥīḥ*:

‘Abū Kurayb—‘Abū ‘Usāmah—Hiṣām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Ibn ‘abī Ṣaybah—‘Abū ‘Usāmah—Hiṣām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.

¹⁴⁸⁹ Tirmidī (ed. Sāmarrā’ī *et al.*), *Ilal*, pp. 169-170.

Yahyá b. Yahyá—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'ishah:

Ibn Numayr—'Abdah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'ishah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine.

'Abd b. Ḥumayd—'Abd al-Razzāq—Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī—'Urwah—'Ā'ishah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; Prophet died when she was eighteen.

Yahyá b. Yahyá & Ibn Rāhwayh & Ibn 'abī Šaybah & 'Abū Kurayb—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'ishah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen.

Although Muslim never explicitly expressed a judgement on any of these hadiths, their inclusion in his *al-Jāmi' al-Šaḥīḥ* strongly implies that he regarded them to be *ṣaḥīḥ*, even though one of them ("seven") contradicts the others ("six"). That said, it is plausible that Muslim regarded some of these hadiths to be sounder than others, and that he arranged them in descending order of soundness.¹⁴⁹⁰

Ibn 'abī Kayṭamah (d. 279/892-893)

In his *al-Ta'rīk al-Kabīr*, the Baghdadian Hadith critic 'Aḥmad b. 'abī Kayṭamah Zuhayr (d. 279/892-893) adjudicated between a version of the hadith and another, in a broader discussion on the chronology of Ẓadījah's death, 'Ā'ishah's marriage, and the Hijrah:

Someone other than Ibn 'Ishāq said: "Ẓadījah died five years before the emigration of the Messenger of God."

And it is [also] said: "four [years] before the marital engagement (*tazwīj*) of 'Ā'ishah." Al-'Atram reported that to us, from 'Abū 'Ubaydah.

And Qatādah said: "Ẓadījah died three years before the Hijrah." 'Aḥmad b. al-Miqdām related that to us, from Zuhayr b. al-'Alā', from Sa'īd, from Qatādah: "Then the Messenger of God married (*tazawwaja*) 'Ā'ishah around the time of the death of Ẓadījah."

¹⁴⁹⁰ Juynboll, '(Re)Appraisal', 316.

Mūsá b. 'Ismā'il related to us—he said: “Ḥammād b. Salamah related to us—he said: “Hišām related to us, from 'Urwah, from 'Ā'iṣah—she said: “The Messenger of God married me after the death of Ḳadījah, two or three years before his escape to Madinah, when I was a girl of six years or seven.”””

That which was said by 'Abū 'Ubaydah is the correct [version] (*al-ṣawāb*), because she [i.e., 'Ā'iṣah] said: “he consummated the marriage with me when I was a girl of nine.”¹⁴⁹¹

In regards to the chronology around Ḳadījah's death, Ibn 'abī Ḳayṭamah seemed to prefer a hadith ascribed to 'Abū 'Ubaydah over the relevant versions of Hišām's marital-age hadith.

al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916)

In his *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, the Khurasanian Hadith critic 'Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Nasā'ī (d. 303/915-916) recorded and adjudicated between conflicting ascriptions to 'Abū 'Ishāq, as follows:

Qutaybah b. Sa'īd reported to us—he said: “'Abṭar related to us, from Muṭarrif (who is Ibn Ṭarīf al-Kūfī), from 'Abū 'Ishāq, from 'Abū 'Ubaydah, who said: “'Ā'iṣah said: “The Messenger of God married me at nine years and I was in his company for nine.”””

'Isrā'īl differed with him (*kālaḥu*) regarding his *'isnād* and his *matn*:

'Ishāq b. 'Ibrāhīm b. Rāhwayh reported to us—he said: “Yahyá b. 'Ādam reported to us—he said: “'Isrā'īl related to us, from 'Abū 'Ishāq, from 'Abū 'Ubaydah, from his father, who said: “The Messenger of God married 'Ā'iṣah when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine.”””

'Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān [al-Nasā'ī] said to us: “Muṭarrif b. Ṭarīf al-Kūfī is more reliable (*'aṭbat*) than 'Isrā'īl, and his hadith is more likely to be correct (*'aṣbah bi-al-ṣawāb*). God knows best.”¹⁴⁹²

In short, al-Nasā'ī judged the *mursal* or *munqaṭi'* version ascribed via Muṭarrif to 'Abū 'Ishāq to be more reliable than the *muttaṣil* version ascribed via 'Isrā'īl to 'Abū 'Ishāq.

¹⁴⁹¹ Ibn 'abī Ḳayṭamah (ed. Halal), *al-Ta'rīk al-Kabīr*, I, p. 170.

¹⁴⁹² Nasā'ī (ed. Šalabī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, V, pp. 170-171, ## 5349-5350.

'Abū 'Awānah (d. 316/929)

The Khurasanian Hadith critic 'Abū 'Awānah Ya'qūb b. 'Ishāq al-'Isfarāyīnī (d. 316/929) recorded the following versions of the hadith in his *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Mukarrar* 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim:

al-Rabī'—al-Šāfi'—Sufyān b. 'Uyaynah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

'Abū 'Umayyah—'Ismā'īl—'Alī b. Mushir—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation; consummation at nine.

al-Ḥusayn b. Bahān—Sahl b. 'Uṭmān—Yaḥyá b. Zakariyyā—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:
"[Something] close to the hadith of 'Alī b. Mushir."

Ibn 'abī al-Ḥunayn—Šihāb b. 'Abbād—Ḥammād b. Zayd—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; women came to her; she was on a swing; fever and hair; prepared for marriage by women; hair; she still played dolls with her shy friends.

'Abū al-'Abbās al-Ġazzī—al-Firyābī—Sufyān al-Ṭawrī—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.

al-Šāḡānī—Muslim b. 'Ibrāhīm—Ja'far b. Sulaymān—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine.

'Abū 'Umayyah—Manṣūr b. Ṣuqayr—'Abū 'Awānah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; together nine years.

'Alī b. Ḥarb—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

al-Šāḡānī—Sa'īd b. Sulaymān—'Abū Mu'āwiyah—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'iṣah:

Marriage at seven; Prophet died when she was eighteen.

Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā—'Abū Ḳayṭamah—Jarīr—al-'A'maš—'Ibrāhīm—al-'Aswad—'Ā'īṣah:
Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.

al-Ṣāḡānī—'Abd al-Razzāq—Ma'mar—al-Zuhrī—'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah:
Marriage at six or seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; Prophet died when she was eighteen.

Muḥammad b. 'Ismā'īl al-Ṣā'iḡ—'Affān b. Muslim—Ḥammād b. Salamah—Hišām—'Urwah—'Ā'īṣah—Prophet:
Girl in silk, Ḳadījah's death, the girl was 'Ā'īṣah; marriage, Ḳadījah's death, six or seven; consummation at nine; swing; shoulder-length hair; marital preparation.

Although 'Abū 'Awānah never explicitly expressed a judgement on any of these hadiths, their inclusion in his *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ*—intended as a collection of independent transmissions of the hadiths recorded in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim—strongly implies that he regarded them to be *ṣaḥīḥ*, even though they conflict on certain details (e.g., “six” vs. “seven” vs. “nine”).

Ibn al-Mundir (d. 318/930)

The Khurasanian jurist Muḥammad b. 'Ibrāhīm b. al-Mundir (d. 318/930), an early follower of al-Šāfi'ī, recorded the following in his *al-'Iṣrāf 'alā Maḍāhib al-'Ulamā'*:

It is established (*tabata*) that the Messenger of God married 'Ā'īṣah when she was a girl of seven years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years.¹⁴⁹³

¹⁴⁹³ Muḥammad b. 'Ibrāhīm b. al-Mundir (ed. Ṣaḡīr 'Aḥmad al-'Anṣārī), *al-'Iṣrāf 'alā Maḍāhib al-'Ulamā'*, vol. 5 (Ra's al-Ḳaymah, UAE: Maktabat Makkah al-Ṭaqāfiyyah, 2005), p. 177.

In other words, Ibn al-Mundir implies that the marital-age hadith (evidently here referring to a version from Hišām) was widely accepted as sound by his contemporaries.

al-‘Uqaylī (d. 322/933-934)

The Meccan Hadith critic Muḥammad b. ‘Amr al-‘Uqaylī (d. 322/933-934) recorded the following in an entry in his *Kitāb al-Ḍu‘afā’*:

Mālik b. Sulaymān al-Harawī.

[There is] some doubt regarding his Hadith (*fī ḥadīṭi-hi naẓar*).

Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Balkī related to us—he said: “Mālik b. Sulaymān al-Harawī related to us—he said: “‘Isrā’īl related to us, from ‘Abū ‘Ishāq, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, from Ibn Mas‘ūd, who said: “The Prophet married ‘Ā’ishah when she was a girl of nine and died when she was a girl of eighteen.”””

[‘Alī b.] ‘Abd al-‘Azīz related this to us—he said: “‘Abd Allāh b. Rajā’ related to us—he said: “‘Isrā’īl related to us, from ‘Abū ‘Ishāq, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, who said: “The Prophet married ‘Ā’ishah when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years. The Prophet died when she was a girl of eighteen.”””

And the hadith of ‘Abd Allāh b. Rajā’ is better (*‘awlā*).¹⁴⁹⁴

In other words, according to al-‘Uqaylī, ‘Abd Allāh b. Rajā’*s* (*mursal* or *munqaṭi’*) ascription via ‘Isrā’īl is more reliable than Mālik b. Sulaymān’s (*muttaṣil*) ascription thereby.

Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965)

The Sijistanian Hadith critic Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī (d. 354/965) recorded the following versions of the hadith in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*:

al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān—‘Ibrāhīm b. Sa‘īd—‘Abū ‘Usāmah—Hišām—‘Urwah—‘Ā’ishah:

¹⁴⁹⁴ ‘Uqaylī (ed. Sarsāwī), *Ḍu‘afā’*, V, pp. 473-474, # 1755.

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.

ʿAbū ʿArūbah al-Ḥarrānī—Zakariyyāʾ—al-Firyābī—Sufyān—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; together nine years.

Although Ibn Ḥibbān never explicitly expressed a judgement on any of these hadiths, their inclusion in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* strongly implies that he regarded them to be *ṣaḥīḥ*.

al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971)

The Palestinian Hadith critic Sulaymān b. ʿAḥmad al-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971) commented on two versions of the marital-age hadith, the first of which was the following:

ʿAḥmad b. Zuhayr related to us—he said: “ʿUbayd Allāh b. Saʿd al-Zuhri related to us—he said: “ʿAbū al-Jawwāb related to us—he said: “Sufyān al-Ṭawrī related to us, from Hišām b. ʿUrwah, from his father, from ʿĀʾiṣah, who said: “The Messenger of God married me when I was a girl of six and I was taken to him when I was a girl of nine, and I lived with him nine [years].””””

No one transmitted (*lam yarwī*) this hadith from Sufyān except for ʿAbū al-Jawwāb.¹⁴⁹⁵

In other words, ʿAbū al-Jawwāb was isolated or uncorroborated in his transmission of this hadith from an eminent authority, making him suspect. However, given the survival of parallel transmissions of this hadith—with the same elements and often very similar wordings—from Sufyān’s other students (Qabīṣah and al-Firyābī), recorded in several notable collections already before the time of al-Ṭabarānī (including the works of al-Buḵārī, ʿAbū ʿAwānah, and Ibn Ḥibbān), it is unclear what al-Ṭabarānī meant in this instance.

Al-Ṭabarānī also recorded the following:

¹⁴⁹⁵ Ṭabarānī (ed. Ṭāriq & Ḥusaynī), *al-Muʿjam al-ʿAwsaṭ*, II, p. 301, # 2042.

Mūsá b. Hārūn related to us: “‘Ishāq b. Rāhwayh related to us: “Yaḥyá b. ‘Ādam reported to us: “‘Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāš related to us, from al-‘Ajlaḥ, from ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘abī Mulaykah, from ‘Ā’iṣah, that the Prophet married her when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years.”””

No one transmitted (*lam yarwī*) this hadith from al-‘Ajlaḥ except for ‘Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāš, nor [did anyone transmit it] from ‘Abū Bakr except for Yaḥyá b. ‘Ādam. ‘Ishāq b. Rāhwayh transmitted it in isolation (*tafarrada bi-hi*).¹⁴⁹⁶

Unlike al-Ṭabarānī’s previous comment, this one makes perfect sense: the transmission of *this version* of this hadith from al-‘Ajlaḥ to Ibn Rāhwayh is uncorroborated; both of the other two extant transmissions from al-‘Ajlaḥ mention that ‘Ā’iṣah was initially engaged to Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im, and both are also unraised (i.e., do not explicitly reach all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah herself). Thus, it would seem that al-Ṭabarānī regarded Ibn Rāhwayh’s transmission from al-‘Ajlaḥ with suspicion (and rightly so).¹⁴⁹⁷

al-Dāraqūṭnī (d. 385/995)

In the *‘Ilal* of ‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqānī (d. 425/1033-1034), a collection of questions posed to and answers given by his master, the Baghdadian Hadith critic ‘Alī b. ‘Umar al-Dāraqūṭnī (d. 385/995), the following is recorded:

He [i.e., al-Dāraqūṭnī] was asked about the hadith of ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, from ‘Abd Allāh [b. Mas‘ūd]: “The Prophet married ‘Ā’iṣah when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years.” Then he [i.e., al-Dāraqūṭnī] said: “‘Isrā’īl and Yūnus b. ‘abī ‘Ishāq [both] transmit it, from ‘Abū ‘Ishāq, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, from ‘Abd Allāh [b. Mas‘ūd], as a *marfū‘*. Others transmitted it, from ‘Abū ‘Ishāq, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, as a *mursal*. The *mursal* [version] is more likely (*‘aṣḥab*).”¹⁴⁹⁸

In other words, al-Dāraqūṭnī declared the unraised version of the hadith ascribed to ‘Abū ‘Ishāq, from ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah, to be more reliable—or, more specifically, better

¹⁴⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, VIII, p. 108, # 8116.

¹⁴⁹⁷ See the section on al-‘Ajlaḥ in ch. 2.

¹⁴⁹⁸ Dāraqūṭnī (ed. Salafī), *al-‘Ilal al-Wāridah*, V, p. 305, # 901.

preserved or more likely to reflect the original—than the raised version, which reaches all the way back to Ibn Mas‘ūd.

Al-Barqānī also recorded the following judgement from al-Dāraquṭnī, after a discussion of various *faḍā’il* hadiths about ‘Ā’iṣah:

’Ismā‘īl b. ’abī Kālid transmitted this hadith, from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ’abī al-Ḍaḥḥāk, from ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Zayd b. Jud‘ān, from ‘Ā’iṣah, but there is nothing sound about it (*wa-laysa fī-hā šay’ ṣaḥīḥ*).¹⁴⁹⁹

Clearly, al-Dāraquṭnī rejected ’Ismā‘īl’s version of the marital-age hadith as weak or fabricated.

al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014)

The Khurasanian Hadith critic Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014) recorded the following versions of the hadith in his *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*:

Maḳlad b. Ja‘far—Muḥammad b. Ḥarb—Sa‘īd b. Yaḥyá—Yaḥyá b. Sa‘īd—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah; Kawlah goes to ‘Abū Bakr; ‘Abū Bakr sends for the Prophet and engages ‘Ā’iṣah to him; ‘Ā’iṣah is seven.

Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb—’Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Jabbār—‘Abd Allāh b. ’Idrīs—Muḥammad b. ‘Amr—Yaḥyá—‘Ā’iṣah:

Kawlah convinces the Prophet to propose to ‘Ā’iṣah and Sawdah.

’Aḥmad b. ‘Ubayd—Ibn Dīzīl—’Abū Mushir—‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān—Yazīd b. Yazīd b. Jābir—Yazīd b. Jābir:

‘Ā’iṣah was married at seven; consummation at nine; Prophet died when she was eighteen; she died under Mu‘āwiyah, in the year 57.

¹⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, XV, p. 166.

Ibn Bālawayh—ʾIbrāhīm b. ʾIshāq—Muṣʿab b. ʿAbd Allāh—ʿAbd Allāh b. Muʿāwiyah—Hišām:

ʿUrwah wrote to al-Walīd; marriage, after ʿAdījah’s death; dream-vision of ʿĀʾiṣah; marriage at six; consummation, after the Hijrah, at nine; ʿĀʾiṣah’s death.

Ibn Baṭṭah—al-Ḥasan b. al-Jahm—al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faraj—al-Wāqidī:

ʿĀʾiṣah’s genealogy; marriage, during Šawwāl, in the tenth year of the Prophethood, three years before the Hijrah; wedding, during Šawwāl, eight months after the Hijrah; consummation at age nine.

Ibn Baṭṭah—al-Ḥasan b. al-Jahm—al-Ḥusayn b. al-Faraj—al-Wāqidī—ʿAbd al-Wāḥid b. Maymūn—Ḥabīb:

ʿAdījah’s death; ʿĀʾiṣah shown by angel; Prophet’s interactions with ʿĀʾiṣah’s family; ʿĀʾiṣah’s birth; ʿĀʾiṣah’s marriage at six; marriage to Sawdah.

Ibn Bālawayh—Mūsá b. Hārūn—Ziyād b. Yaḥyá—Mālik b. Suʿayr—ʾIsmāʿīl—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḍaḥḥāk:

ʿAbd Allāh b. Šafwān and someone else came to ʿĀʾiṣah, who mentioned her nine special attributes; angel brought image; marriage at seven; consummation at nine; virgin; revelation in blanket; most-beloved; Quranic revelation and communal destruction; seeing Gabriel; the Prophet’s death and the angel.

Although al-Ḥākim did not explicitly express judgements on most of these hadiths, their inclusion in his *Mustadrak*, which was supposed to supplement the *Šaḥīḥayn* of al-Buḳārī and Muslim, strongly implies that he regarded them to be *šaḥīḥ*, despite the fact that some versions contradict each other (e.g., “six” vs. “seven”).

In some instances, however, al-Ḥākim explicitly offered judgements on the hadiths that he cited. For example, regarding the version of Muḥammad b. ʿAmr’s hadith that he received from Maḳlad b. Jaʿfar, al-Ḥākim commented: “This is a sound (*šaḥīḥ*) hadith according to the criterion (*šarṭ*) of Muslim, although neither of them [i.e., al-Buḳārī and

Muslim] cited it (*lam yukrijā-hu*).¹⁵⁰⁰ In other words, even though neither al-Buḡārī or Muslim included this particular version in their collections, it was still deemed by al-Ḥākim to fulfil the soundness-criteria of Muslim.

Similarly, after citing a version of ʿIsmāʿīl’s *faḍā’il* hadith about ʿĀ’iṣah that he received from Ibn Bālawayh, al-Ḥākim commented: “This is a hadith [that is] sound (*ṣaḥīḥ*) [in terms of] the *ʿisnād*, although neither of them [i.e., al-Buḡārī and Muslim] cited it (*lam yukrijā-hu*).”¹⁵⁰¹ In contrast to al-Dāraquṭnī, it seems like al-Ḥākim accepted ʿIsmāʿīl’s hadith.

ʿAbū Nuʿaym (d. 430/1038)

The Persian Hadith critic ʿAbū Nuʿaym ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿIṣfahānī (d. 430/1038) recorded the following versions of the hadith in his *al-Musnad al-Mustakraj ʿalā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*:

Muḥammad b. ʿIbrāhīm—al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad—Muḥammad b. ʿUṭmān—ʿAbū ʿUsāmah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀ’iṣah:

ʿAbū Bakr al-Ṭalḥī—ʿUbayd b. Ġannām—Ibn ʿabī Ṣaybah—ʿAbū ʿUsāmah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀ’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; Hijrah; illness, shoulder-length hair; swing; marital preparation.

ʿAbū al-ʿAbbās al-Ṣarṣarī—Yūsuf al-Qāḍī—Muḥammad b. ʿUbayd—Ḥammād b. Zayd—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀ’iṣah:

ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad—ʿAbū Yaḥyá al-Rāzī—Hannād—ʿAbū Muʿāwiyah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀ’iṣah:

Ibn Ḥayyān—ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḥasan—Hārūn b. ʿIṣḥāq—ʿAbdah—Hišām—ʿUrwah—ʿĀ’iṣah:

Marriage at six; consummation at nine; she still played dolls with her shy friends.

¹⁵⁰⁰ Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, III, p. 443.

¹⁵⁰¹ *Ibid.*, VII, p. 30.

ʿAbū ʿAmr b. Ḥamdān—al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān—Fayyād b. Zuhayr—ʿAbd al-Razzāq—Maʿmar—al-Zuhrī—ʿUrwah—ʿĀʾiṣah:

Marriage at seven; consummation at nine; her dolls were with her; Prophet died when she was eighteen.

Although ʿAbū Nuʿaym never explicitly expressed a judgement on any of these hadiths, their inclusion in his *al-Musnad al-Mustakraj*—intended as a collection of independent transmissions of the hadiths recorded in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim—implies that he regarded them to be *ṣaḥīḥ*, even though they conflict on a core detail (i.e., “six” vs. “seven”).

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071)

The Andalusian jurist and leading Mālikī Hadith scholar Yūsuf b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī (d. 463/1071) recorded the following in his *Kitāb al-Istīʿāb*:

She [i.e., ʿĀʾiṣah] was a girl of six years, [although] it is [also] said: “...girl of seven...” And he consummated the marriage with her in Madinah, when she was a girl of nine: I do not know of them [i.e., the scholars] having disagreed thereon (*lā ʿaʿlamu-hum iḵtalafū fī dālika*).¹⁵⁰²

In other words, whilst the scholars—presumably meaning Sunnī scholars—disagree on whether ʿĀʾiṣah’s marital engagement occurred at six or seven, the part about her marital consummation at nine is universally accepted. This implies that the marital-age hadith in general—above all, the version of Hišām—was widely regarded as sound.

al-Baḡawī (d. 516/1122)

The Khurasanian Hadith scholar al-Ḥusayn b. Masʿūd al-Baḡawī (d. 516/1122) recorded many versions of the marital-age hadith in his *Šarḥ al-Sunnah*, some of which

¹⁵⁰² Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (ed. Bijāwī), *Istīʿāb*, part 4, p. 1881, # 4029.

he commented upon. For example, after citing a version deriving from al-Šāfi‘ī, from Sufyān b. ‘Uyaynah, from Hišām, from ‘Urwah, from ‘Ā’iṣah, which included the ‘dolls’ element, al-Baḡawī commented:

This is a hadith whose soundness is agreed-upon (*muttafaq ‘alā ṣiḥḥati-hi*). Muḥammad [al-Buḵārī] cited it (*‘aḵraja-hu*) from Muḥammad b. Yūsuf [al-Firyābī], from Sufyān [al-Ṭawrī], and both of them [i.e., al-Buḵārī and Muslim] cited it (*‘aḵrajā-hu*) via [other] paths of transmission (*ṭuruq*) from Hišām.¹⁵⁰³

Already with al-Baḡawī, the phrase “agreed-upon” (*muttafaq ‘alay-hi*) had clearly acquired its classical Hadith-scholarly technical meaning: that the hadith in question had been cited by both al-Buḵārī and Muslim in their *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.

After citing ‘Abd al-Razzāq’s version of the marital-age hadith, al-Baḡawī also commented: “This is a sound (*ṣaḥīḥ*) hadith, and with this *’isnād*.”¹⁵⁰⁴

Finally, after citing ‘Alī b. Mushir’s redaction of Hišām’s hadith, al-Baḡawī also commented: “This is a sound (*ṣaḥīḥ*) hadith.”¹⁵⁰⁵

Ibn Qudāmah (d. 620/1223)

The Levantine jurist and leading Ḥanbalī scholar ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Qudāmah (d. 620/1223) recorded the following in his *al-Muḡnī*:

‘Ā’iṣah said: “The Prophet married me when I was a girl of six and consummated the marriage with me when I was a girl of nine.” [This hadith is] agreed upon (*muttafaq ‘alay-hi*).¹⁵⁰⁶

Once again, the authority of the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* was appealed to in order to establish the soundness of the marital-age hadith (in this case, evidently Hišām’s simple version).

¹⁵⁰³ Baḡawī (ed. ‘Arna’ūt), *Šarḥ al-Sunnah*, IX, p. 35.

¹⁵⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹⁵⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, XII, p. 136.

¹⁵⁰⁶ ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Qudāmah (ed. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī & ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥulw), *al-Muḡnī*, vol. 9, 3rd ed. (Cairo, Egypt: Dār ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1997), p. 398, # 1118.

Ibn Kaṭīr (d. 774/1373)

The famous Levantine Hadith scholar, exegete, and biographer ʿIsmāʿīl b. ʿUmar b. Kaṭīr (d. 774/1373) recorded the following in his *al-Sīrah al-Nabawīyyah*, after citing a transmission from Hišām, from his father ʿUrwah:

This which was said by ʿUrwah is [a hadith with an *ʿisnād* that is] discontinuous (*mursal*) in appearance [in this] context, as we established earlier, but it is as good as [a hadith with an *ʿisnād* that is] continuous (*muttaṣil*) in reality. His statement [that] “he married her when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine” is that concerning which there is no difference of opinion between the people [of knowledge] (*lā kilāf fī-hi bayna al-nās*); it has been firmly established (*qad ṭabata*) in the sound [sources] (*al-ṣiḥāḥ*) and others.¹⁵⁰⁷

Clearly, Ibn Kaṭīr regarded even the *mursal* or *munqaṭiʿ* versions of Hišām’s hadith to be *ṣaḥīḥ*. More broadly, the soundness of Hišām’s hadith was clearly seen as a matter of consensus between Sunnī scholars.

Badr al-Dīn al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451)

The Syro-Egyptian jurist Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451), a leading Ḥanafī scholar, recorded the following in his *al-Bināyah Ṣarḥ al-Hidāyah*:

The hadith of ʿĀʾiṣah is famous (*maṣhūr*) and close to being universally-transmitted (*qarīb ʾilā al-tawātur*); verily he [i.e., the Prophet] married her [i.e., ʿĀʾiṣah] when she was a girl of six years and consummated the marriage with her when she was a girl of nine years, and she was with him nine years.¹⁵⁰⁸

In this instance, *maṣhūr* may be meant in the technical sense of classical Hadith scholarship: that the given hadith is widely-transmitted, but not to the level of

¹⁵⁰⁷ Ibn Kaṭīr (ed. ʿAbd al-Wāḥid), *al-Sīrah al-Nabawīyyah*, II, p. 141.

¹⁵⁰⁸ Badr al-Dīn al-ʿAynī (ed. Šaʿbān), *Bināyah*, V, p. 90.

mutawātir. That this is so is indicated by al-‘Aynī’s subsequent, explicit statement that the marital-age hadith (here clearly meaning the versions of Hišām and/or ‘Isrā’īl) is nearly *mutawātir*. Either way, al-‘Aynī clearly regarded the hadith to be *ṣaḥīḥ*.

Conclusion

After its origins and proliferation in Iraq and consequent spread across the Abbasid Caliphate, the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age was subjected to the evaluations of the emerging Hadith critics (*nuqqād al-ḥadīth*) within the broader proto-Sunnī Hadith-partisan movement (*‘aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth*). Given that most of the leading Hadith critics were the students of—or in scholarly and identitarian continuity with—the early major transmitters (and creators) of the marital-age hadith, it is not surprising that the hadith in general ended up being unanimously accepted as ‘sound’ (*ṣaḥīḥ*). Not all versions of the hadith were rubberstamped as such, however: the proto-Sunnī Hadith critics and later Sunnī Hadith scholars alike were confronted with a profusion of different—sometimes conflicting—transmissions and iterations thereof, forcing them to adjudicate therebetween. Thus, whilst the hadiths of Hišām, al-‘A‘maš, ‘Isrā’īl (from ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq), and ‘Abd al-Razzāq (from al-Zuhrī) were generally accepted as *ṣaḥīḥ*, some specific transmissions from ‘Isrā’īl and ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq more broadly—specifically, those ascribed all the way back to Ibn Mas‘ūd—were identified as ‘raised’ (i.e., having been subject to *raf‘*), and there was disagreement as to whether or not ‘Ismā‘īl’s *faḍā’il* hadith was *ṣaḥīḥ*. Overall, there seems to be little consistency or systematicity in the evaluations of the Hadith critics: instances of *raf‘*, *idrāj*, *sariqah*, and *kaḍīb* in numerous other versions of the hadith either went unnoticed or were positively accepted, even when they should have been obvious (i.e., by simply comparing the versions).¹⁵⁰⁹ All of this is consistent with Melchert’s observation that early Hadith critics relied upon “intuition” and “a case-by-case, seat-of-the-pants approach to determining what was

¹⁵⁰⁹ In particular, the various raisings of Hišām, his students, and their students, including ‘Abd al-Razzāq, unto ‘Ā’iṣah; the raisings of ‘Isrā’īl’s version, and other ascriptions via ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq, unto ‘Ā’iṣah; the insertion of extraneous elements into various transmissions from Hišām; the interpolations of ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah’s hadith, including the “seven” versions and Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá’s false ascription; ‘Abtar’s borrowing from ‘Abū Mu‘āwiyah and false ascription via ‘Abū ‘Iṣḥāq; etc. For all of these, see Chapter 2 of the present work.

sound and what was not.”¹⁵¹⁰ Alternatively (or perhaps additionally), the Hadith critics were deeply committed to the general reliability of their traditionist forebears, resulting in widespread—though probably *synchronous* or *independent*—motivated reasoning in their evaluations. To put it simply, the Hadith critics were collectively motivated to accept the dubious transmissions of the likes of Hišām, resulting in an uneven or inconsistent application of their method.¹⁵¹¹ Either way, most of the fabrication, interpolation, and distortion in the marital-age hadith went unregistered or was simply ignored.

¹⁵¹⁰ Melchert, *Ahmad*, 56.

¹⁵¹¹ For some similar ideas (i.e., a general tendency to downplay the problems with tradents), see Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, ch. 5.

Chapter 6: Broader Implications for Hadith and Hadith Studies

Having thus intervened in the methodological debates of Hadith Studies, pinpointed the probable origins of the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marital age, reconstructed its growth and spread across the Abbasid Caliphate in minute detail, and tracked its reception by the early Hadith critics, we are now in a position to reflect on the broader implications of all of this for Hadith and Hadith Studies. In other words: what is the significance of this research? Why should we care?

Implications for Modern Methods and Debates

To begin with, I have shown that some iterations of the ICMA are vacuous, arbitrary, or otherwise unsound, especially when it comes to establishing the independence of texts. To solve this problem, I proposed or identified a more rigorous and defensible version of the method, appealing to the distinctiveness of PCL and CL traditions and our established background knowledge on the rise of writing and rigour in the transmission of Hadith. The present study has thus contributed to refining a key methodology within the field of Hadith Studies, in addition to a large set of relevant, corroborating data: time and again, my analysis of PCL and CL traditions within the marital-age material or corpus revealed recurring correlations, with particular wordings usually lining up with particular tradents. (I found this to be the case even with hadiths with short *matns*, thereby confirming Motzki’s suggestion that the ICMA can also be applied to such material, not just hadiths with lengthy *matns*.¹⁵¹²) I have also shown that the results of ICMA should always be subjected to further form-critical and geographical analyses, lest the ultimate character and provenance of hadiths be overlooked: false *’isnāds* may be exposed thereby, and insights about the common origins or ur-forms of hadiths can be revealed even in the absence of *’isnāds*.

¹⁵¹² Motzki, ‘The Origins of Muslim Exegesis’, in Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions*, 237.

My findings are also relevant to the general theories and models of specific scholars. For example, the results of my ICMA—in particular, the tendency for variation to decrease over time in Hadith transmission—are broadly consistent with the theses of both Schoeler and Yanagihashi regarding the general development of Hadith culture and transmission: in the first case, that major reworkings (in the middle of the 8th Century CE) gave way to lesser reworkings (at the turn of the 9th Century CE), which gave way to mere paraphrasing (in the 9th Century CE) and finally verbatim transmission (above all in the 10th Century CE)¹⁵¹³; and, in the second case, that the alteration even of fundamental aspects of hadiths was common and therefore probably accepted amongst earlier traditionists (during the 8th Century CE), but not later traditionists (during the 9th and 10th Centuries CE).¹⁵¹⁴

The results of my form-critical, geographical, and historical-critical analyses also have a bearing on debates about the role of CLs: in the case of the marital-age hadith at least, the earliest CLs (operating from the mid-to-late 8th Century CE) appear to have mostly created their respective versions from their own minds and/or by borrowing and reworking the material of their contemporaries, rather than accurately—or even inaccurately—transmitting material from their cited sources or predecessors. In this respect, my findings corroborate Schacht and Juynboll more than Motzki *et al.*¹⁵¹⁵

The results of all of these analyses also have a bearing on debates about the general authenticity of Hadith and the presumption of skepticism. For example, according to Najam Haider, the last few decades of ICMA have shown that “most traditions are reliably dateable to the early 2nd/8th century”¹⁵¹⁶ and that “traditions were being recorded without wholesale fabrication in the early 2nd/8th century Muslim world”,¹⁵¹⁷ such that “the burden of proof with respect to these texts falls on those who claim fabrication.”¹⁵¹⁸ On the basis of my findings at least, and even on a careful reading of past ICMA, this assessment needs to be seriously modified: whilst it is true that most hadiths can be presumed to derive from sources operating in the middle of the 8th Century CE (i.e., the early 2nd Century AH), many can be shown to be later borrowings or dives, and almost all can be shown to have undergone reworking or

¹⁵¹³ Schoeler (trans. Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad*, *passim*.

¹⁵¹⁴ Yanagihashi, *Studies*, *passim*.

¹⁵¹⁵ For this debate, see Chapter 1 of the present work.

¹⁵¹⁶ Haider, ‘The Geography of the *Isnād*’, 313.

¹⁵¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 315.

¹⁵¹⁸ *Ibid.*, n. 31.

alteration in the course of transmission, at least from the middle of the 8th Century CE to the middle the 9th. In other words, whilst there is a general tendency for post-CL tradents to accurately record *some data* from their cited sources, and whilst the full-blown creation of new *ʿisnāds* for *matns* is relatively uncommon after the middle of the 8th Century CE, accretions, errors, contaminations, interpolations, raisings, and other alterations were all extremely common until at least the 9th Century CE, which means that the *extant form* of any given hadith cannot be assumed to accurately represent the original formulation of a CL or 8th-Century source in any given instance. Thus, whilst most hadiths can be presumed to derive from sources operating in the middle of the 8th Century CE, their extant forms should also be presumed to be *reworked* or *altered*.

My survey of the reception of the marital-age hadith by the proto-Sunnī Hadith critics also exposes a general lack of systematicity or consistency in their evaluations of variants and transmissions, which is in turn consistent with Melchert’s suggestion that they approached Hadith in an *ad hoc* and intuitive fashion.

My general findings are also relevant to the more specific conclusions of some scholars—most notably, past assessments regarding the authenticity of the marital-age hadith: not only can the hadith not be attributed all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah, there are strong reasons to suspect that it was created later, *contra* al-ʿAlbānī, Juynboll, al-Munajjid, and Brown. Conversely, my findings—above all, the indications of an Iraqi provenance—corroborate the conclusions of a string of researchers and scholars from the last few decades, including Shanavas, Abdul-Raof, and Amin.¹⁵¹⁹ My findings also confirm Schoeler’s specific conclusion that a certain version of the *ʿifk* hadith is interpolated, and conflict with Anthony’s specific conclusion that the ‘letter’ version of Hiṣām’s marital-age can traced back to ‘Urwah, not to mention that such letters can be trusted in general.¹⁵²⁰

Implications for Hadith and History

My general findings also have at least three consequences for the history of Hadith and early Islam more broadly. Firstly, if my critical analysis of the origins of the marital-age

¹⁵¹⁹ For the views of all of these figures, see the Intro. of the present work.

¹⁵²⁰ For both of these, see Chapter 2 of the present work.

hadith and reconstruction of its development are correct, I have shown, in fairly minute detail, how a false hadith could arise, spread, diversify, and attain universal acceptance within early Sunnī Hadith scholarship. In other words, even a near-*mutawātir* hadith can be, and can be shown to be, inauthentic, in very concrete and specific ways, accounting for all extant versions, variants, and transmissions.¹⁵²¹

Secondly, in the course of my ICMA, as I concurrently consulted Sunnī biographical dictionaries and other tradent-related prosopographies every step of the way,¹⁵²² I found very little correlation between traditional Sunnī gradings of specific tradents, on the one hand, and the observable or demonstrable quality or state of their transmissions, on the other: alleged *ṭiqāt* sometimes transmitted accurately and sometimes not; alleged *ṣāliḥūn* sometimes transmitted accurately and sometimes not; alleged *ḍuʿafāʾ* sometimes transmitted accurately and sometimes not; and so forth. Of course, this is not to say that there was *no* correlation at all: for example, al-Wāqidī was generally regarded as a *kaḍḍāb* by later Hadith critics and, as it happens, all of his versions of the marital-age hadith are fabricated, interpolated, or otherwise highly suspect. In general, however, a tradent's being judged *ṭiqah* or *ṭabt* did not actually predict that their transmissions would be accurate—more often than not, their transmissions were interpolated, contaminated, or otherwise distorted, ranging from changes to the *ʾisnād* to changes to the details and even the constitutive elements of the *matn*.

Thirdly and finally, my general findings have an obvious implication for the historical Muḥammad: there is no longer any reason to think that Muḥammad married ʿĀʾiṣah—and consummated the marriage with her—when she was a young girl. In this respect, my research is actually superfluous: even if the marital-age hadith can be traced back to ʿĀʾiṣah (i.e., actually reflects her own words), there are strong reasons to doubt its authenticity (i.e., that ʿĀʾiṣah was accurately self-reporting on the matter). This is not because of conflicting chronologies or any of the other considerations commonly adduced in this regard, but much more simply, because it is extremely unlikely that ʿĀʾiṣah would have known—or even *could have known*—her own age. This

¹⁵²¹ For some notable earlier attempts of this kind, see Juynboll, *Muslim tradition*, ch. 3; *id.*, '(Re)Appraisal', 322 ff.

¹⁵²² This data was originally included in ch. 2 of the present work, but had to be omitted due to limitations of space. However, my findings can be easily reproduced, by comparing the results of my ICMA regarding any specific tradent to the Hadith-critical judgements thereof in the *rijāl* works.

is because ‘Ā’iṣah, in her formative years, grew up in a society that was still stateless (or only just beginning to acquire a state, through the efforts of Muḥammad)¹⁵²³ and certainly lacked a bureaucracy and bureaucratic culture,¹⁵²⁴ not to mention a scholarly or literary tradition.¹⁵²⁵ Such societies usually pay little heed to dates of birth and age (since they serve no real function) and lack the means to record such data in any case (i.e., birth certificates, government records, personal diaries, etc.). This has been found time and again in rural, tribal, and nomadic societies around the world, including: certain Native American societies in the United States at the beginning of the 19th Century¹⁵²⁶; the Ababda of Egypt at the beginning of the 19th Century¹⁵²⁷; the Samoyeds of Siberia at the beginning of the 20th Century¹⁵²⁸; the bedouins of the Negev in the early 20th Century¹⁵²⁹; the Amhara of Ethiopia as of 1995¹⁵³⁰; the rural population of Papua New Guinea as of 2002¹⁵³¹; the Tarahumara of Mexico as of 2015¹⁵³²; the general population of the Solomon Islands as of 2016¹⁵³³; the Khasi of

¹⁵²³ For the stateless condition of the Hijaz at the time, see, for example, Crone, *Meccan Trade*, 145-147, 236.

¹⁵²⁴ For the belated rise of the Islamic state and its bureaucracy, see Chase F. Robinson, *‘Abd al-Malik* (Oxford, UK: Oneworld Publications, 2005), ch. 4, and Robert G. Hoyland, ‘New documentary texts and the early Islamic state’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 69, Issue 3 (2006), 395-416.

¹⁵²⁵ For the belated rise of such a tradition (i.e., over the subsequent two centuries), see Jonathan E. Brockopp, *Muhammad’s Heirs: The Rise of Muslim Scholarly Communities, 622–950* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

¹⁵²⁶ Henry R. Schoolcraft, *Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States: Collected and prepared under the direction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Part III* (Philadelphia, USA: Lippincott, Grambo & Company, 1853), 238: “As the Indians do not know their age, we cannot tell the exact time or age of bearing children”.

¹⁵²⁷ Frédéric Cailliaud, ‘Travels in the Oasis of Thebes and El Dakel’, in *New Voyages and Travels*, Volume 7 (London, UK: Richard Phillips & Co.), 47: “They never know their own age: when questioned, their answer is, “I was born some years before or after such a pacha, such a catastrophe,” &c.”

¹⁵²⁸ Elena A. Volzhanina, ‘The Interpretation of Nenets Demography in the First Third of the Twentieth Century’, in David G. Anderson (ed.), *The 1926/27 Soviet Polar Census Expeditions* (New York, USA: Berghahn Books, 2011), 83-84, citing a 1926-1927 report: Nenets “cannot tell the age of a child” and “do not know their age”, and Samoyeds “do not know their age”.

¹⁵²⁹ Helmut V. Muhsam, *Beduin of the Negev: Eight Demographic Studies* (Jerusalem, Israel: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1966), 37: “the beduin themselves do not know their age.”

¹⁵³⁰ Reidulf K. Molvaer, *Socialization and social control in Ethiopia* (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995), 89: “Few Amhara children know their date of birth.”

¹⁵³¹ Deborah Carlyon, *Mama Kuma: One Woman, Two Cultures* (St. Lucia, Australia: University of Queensland Press, 2002), 160, n. 2: “Most village-born New Guineans do not know their date of birth.”

¹⁵³² Alfonso Paredes & Fructuoso Irigoyen Rascón, *Tarahumara Medicine: Ethnobotany and Healing Among the Rarámuri of Mexico* (Norman, USA: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015), 96: “few persons know their date of birth unless they were born during a holiday. After a couple of years have passed, parents seem to have forgotten the birth dates of their offspring.”

¹⁵³³ Jennifer Corrin, ‘The Rights of the Child in Solomon Islands’ Plural Legal System’, in Olga C. Jančić (ed.), *The Rights of the Child in a Changing World: 25 Years After the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2016), 269: “some people do not know their date of birth. It is not

Bangladesh as of 2018¹⁵³⁴; the general population of northern Benin as of 2018¹⁵³⁵; the rural population of Somalia as of 2018¹⁵³⁶; and many others.¹⁵³⁷ If even modern pre-bureaucratic and pre-literary societies do not—or indeed cannot—keep track of dates of birth and ages, this is all the more reason to think that ‘Ā’īshah and her contemporaries in early 7th-Century Hijaz did not or could not as well. That this was so is strengthened by the belated rise of dating—and any interest in dating—in early Muslim society, which can be demonstrated in at least three ways. Firstly, it was only after the Great Conquests that a consistent (Hijrah-based) calendar and chronology was adopted amongst the Arabs and Muslims—and even then, it was adopted gradually and sporadically.¹⁵³⁸ Secondly, early authorities on the life of Muḥammad and Islamic history more broadly made little-to-no effort to date their reports or arrange them in chronological order—it was only from middle of the 8th Century CE onward that such efforts were made, at least with any kind of consistency.¹⁵³⁹ Thirdly, the birth-dates and even death-dates of early traditionists (operating in the 7th and even the 8th Century CE) had to be inferred by later Hadith-oriented prosopographers based on positions in *’isnāds*, given that such data was simply often not known or not recorded in earlier times.¹⁵⁴⁰ Once again, an *a fortiori* argument applies: if the post-Conquest Arabs and Muslims, the early authorities on Islamic history, and even early traditionists generally had no interest in dates, dating, and chronology, this is all the more reason to think that the earliest Muslims likewise lacked such interests. It is thus

unusual for people to assess their approximate age, and that of family members, by reference to an important event”.

¹⁵³⁴ Rekha Pande & Theo van der Weide, *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Perspectives on Gender and Aging* (Hershey, USA: IGI Global, 2018), 144: “Most of the participants did not know their date of birth and therefore did not know their age.”

¹⁵³⁵ Erdmute Alber, *Transfers of Belonging: Child Fostering in West Africa in the 20th Century* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2018), 213, n. 34: “Many older people in northern Benin do not know their date of birth and therefore cannot say exactly how old they are.”

¹⁵³⁶ Carol Bohmer & Amy Shuman, *Political Asylum Deceptions: The Culture of Suspicion* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 43: “In Somalia and other African countries, people born or married in rural areas are unlikely to have birth certificates; many of them do not even know their date of birth.”

¹⁵³⁷ Carl Haub, ‘World Population History’, in George Modelski & Robert A. Denemark (eds.), *World System History: Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems* (Oxford, UK: Eolss Publishers Co. Ltd., 2009), 97: “Many in developing countries do not know their age”.

¹⁵³⁸ Noth & Conrad (trans. Bonner), *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition*, 40-42; Pourshariati, *Decline and Fall*, 167-168.

¹⁵³⁹ Donner, *Narratives*, ch. 10; Görke, ‘Prospects and Limits’, in Boekhoff-van der Voort *et al.* (eds.), *Transmission and Dynamics*, 149.

¹⁵⁴⁰ Dickinson, *Development*, 116; Melchert, *Ahmad*, 52-53; *id.*, ‘Bukhārī and Early Hadith Criticism’, 12; *id.*, ‘*Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth*’, 409; *id.*, ‘Theory and Practice of Hadith Criticism’, in Sijpesteijn & Adang (eds.), *Islam at 250*, 75-76.

extremely unlikely that ʿĀʾiṣḥāh and her contemporaries would have known her age: it was not the sort of thing that people in such conditions usually cared about, nor was it something that they had any realistic means of recording. Even if ʿĀʾiṣḥāh in general possessed an extraordinary memory (as is sometimes claimed), this would be of no avail for data that she likely never memorised in the first place. The hadith of ʿĀʾiṣḥāh’s marital age—including the assertion that her marriage was consummated when she was nine—is thus necessarily the product of speculation or guesswork, whether by ʿĀʾiṣḥāh or someone later.¹⁵⁴¹

If indeed ʿĀʾiṣḥāh was married to Muḥammad as a virgin, it is more likely that she was twelve-to-fourteen years old at the time of her marital consummation, at least on the basis of general historical prior probability.¹⁵⁴² This was reportedly the average age-range for menarche and, consequently, the average and/or minimum age of marriage for girls in Ancient and Mediaeval societies around the world, including Egypt,¹⁵⁴³ the Near East,¹⁵⁴⁴ Crete,¹⁵⁴⁵ Greece,¹⁵⁴⁶ the Roman Empire,¹⁵⁴⁷ Roman-era Jewish

¹⁵⁴¹ The notion that the hadith authentically goes back to ʿĀʾiṣḥāh but is still erroneous was also expressed by al-ʿIdlibī, albeit on different grounds; see the Intro. of the present work.

¹⁵⁴² By contrast, we have no reliable data on early 7th-Century Arabian marital trends, given all of the source problems outlined in Chapter 1 of the present work. See also the discussion in Chapter 3 of the present work concerning a relevant report. Cf. Anthony, *Muhammad*, 115: “Based on the available data, it appears that ʿĀʾiṣḥāh’s age at her first marriage was not an extreme outlier in the seventh-century Ḥijāz.” Anthony’s “data” (*ibid.*, n. 39) in fact comprises a single questionable datum: an unsubstantiated report about Ḥaṣṣah bt. ʿUmar’s first marriage.

¹⁵⁴³ Charles Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome: Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2004), 88: “Marriage took place for women at the onset of puberty, between 12 and 14”.

¹⁵⁴⁴ Milton Eng, *The Days of Our Years: A Lexical Semantic Study of the Life Cycle in Biblical Israel* (New York, USA: T & T Clark International, 2011), 55: “Puberty is marked by the onset of menstruation, usually in the girl’s twelfth year. At age 16 or even less, the typical woman is married and begins bearing children.”

¹⁵⁴⁵ Ronald F. Willetts, *The Law Code of Gortyn* (Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1967), 10: “The age of puberty in females may have generally been considered to be twelve in the light of that passage of the Code which gives the marriageable age of an heiress as twelve.”

¹⁵⁴⁶ Aristotle (trans. D’Arcy W. Thompson), *The Works of Aristotle: Works translated into English under the editorship of W. D. Ross, Volume 4: Historia Animalium* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1910), vii-viii: “When twice seven years old, in the most of cases, the male begins to engender seed; and at the same time hair appears upon the pubes, in like manner, so Alcmaeon of Croton remarks, as plants first blossom and then seed. [...] At the same age in the female, the breasts swell and the so-called catamenia commence to flow; and this fluid resembles fresh blood.” Don P. M. Weerakkody, ‘Demography’, in Nigel Wilson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece* (New York, USA: Taylor & Francis, 2006), 214, col. 1: “early marriage for women” occurred in their “mid- to late teens”.

¹⁵⁴⁷ Heather M. Prescott, ‘VI.8 ~ Adolescent Nutrition and Fertility’, in Kenneth F. Kiple & Kriemhild C. Ornelas (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Food, Volume 2* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1454, col. 1: “Reviews of Greek and Roman textbooks, for example, indicate that the average age of menarche in the ancient world was about 13.5 years”. *Ibid.*, 1454, col. 2: “Roman law linked the age of marriage with the age of puberty, which was believed to be 14 for boys and 12 for girls”. Christopher Kelly, *The Roman Empire: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2006), 107: in Roman Egypt, “women married early; on average at just under 20 years”. *Ibid.*: in the

communities,¹⁵⁴⁸ the Byzantine Empire,¹⁵⁴⁹ Sasanid Persia,¹⁵⁵⁰ Tang China,¹⁵⁵¹ Mediaeval Europe,¹⁵⁵² and Ancient and Mediaeval India (albeit with notable fluctuations and exceptions).¹⁵⁵³ (Even now, the global average age of menarche ranges from 12.5 to 13.5.¹⁵⁵⁴) In fact, given that “the onset of menstruation is highly dependent on biological living standards and physiological stress”, and given that historical records are almost always “biased towards an elite public and reference group” (i.e., girls with easy lifestyles and access to better diets), “the average age at which the majority of the female population entered their fertile phase could have been

Western provinces, there was “an average age at first marriage in the late teens or early 20s”. Saskia Hin, *The Demography of Roman Italy: Population Dynamics in an Ancient Conquest Society 201 BCE–14 CE* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 151: “Ancient [Greek and Roman] authors suggest that average age at menarche was around 14.” *Ibid.*, 175: the average age of marriage for women was “mid-teens”.

¹⁵⁴⁸ Gordon P. Hugenberger, *Marriage as a Covenant: Biblical Law and Ethics as Developed from Malachi* (Eugene, USA: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1994), 315: “the Talmud recommends that girls marry at puberty, that is, at twelve or twelve and a half (*b. Yebam. 62d*)”. James S. Jeffers, ‘Jewish and Christian Families in First-Century Rome’, in Karl P. Donfried & Peter Richardson (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome* (Grand Rapids, USA: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 134-135: “The age of first marriage for Jewish girls probably was also between twelve and eighteen. Epigraphical and papyrological evidence suggests an average age of fifteen, while rabbinical sources generally assume an age of twelve, with betrothals earlier.”

¹⁵⁴⁹ Baugh, *Minor Marriage*, 28: “Byzantine law required that a girl attain the age of thirteen before contracting a marriage.”

¹⁵⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 28-29: “Although investigation into Sasanian-era (224–651 CE) child marriage practices unearths scant information, the age of twelve is again important for girls. According to the Avesta, the age of majority was clearly set at fifteen for boys as well as girls; Middle Persian civil law allowed marriage at age nine, provided that consummation wait until age twelve.” For a notable minority or alternative Sasanid tradition about marital consummation at age nine, see Chapter 3 of the present work.

¹⁵⁵¹ Ps.-Huang Ti (trans. Ilza Veith), *Huang Ti Nei Ching Su Wên: The Yellow Emperor’s Classic of Internal Medicine* (Berkeley, USA: University of California Press, 2002), 98-99: “When she reaches her fourteenth year she begins to menstruate”. Given that this lines up with data from around the world, it should not be rejected as a mere trope of “numerical concordances” and “parallelism” (*pace* Veith, in *ibid.*, 20).

¹⁵⁵² Prescott, ‘VI.8 ~ Adolescent Nutrition and Fertility’, in Kiple & Ornelas (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Food*, II, 1454, col. 1: “evidence from medieval [European] textbooks indicates that the age of menarche varied from 13 to 15 years”. Hin, *The Demography of Roman Italy*, 178: “Most women married between age 16.6 and 22.8” in Mediaeval Tuscany.

¹⁵⁵³ B. Datta & D. Gupta, ‘The age at menarche in ancient India as compared to the data from classical Greece and Rome’, *Pediatric Research*, Volume 15, Number 1 (1981), 83: “Almost all of the legislators in their writings pointed out that the age of menarche was at 12 although full completion of puberty took place at age 16.” Krishna C. Sagar, *Foreign Influence on Ancient India* (New Delhi, India: Northern Book Centre, 1992), 290: “during the Mauryan period... girls were being married at the age of 14 or 15.” Abraham Eraly, *The First Spring: The Golden Age of India* (New Delhi, India: Penguin Books India Pvt. Ltd., 2011), 335: “The Arab scholar Al-Biruni in the tenth century noted that the normal age of a brahmin bride was around twelve. In South India, boys were considered marriageable at age sixteen, and girls at twelve”. For the recurrence of female child marriage (i.e., *prepubescent* marriage) at various points in Indian history, see Sagar, *Foreign Influence on Ancient India*, 289-290, and Eraly, *The First Spring*, 334-335.

¹⁵⁵⁴ David F. Bjorklund & Carlos H. Blasi, *Child and Adolescent Development: An Integrated Approach* (Belmont, USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2011), 154.

substantially higher.”¹⁵⁵⁵ *Mutatis mutandis*, ‘Ā’iṣah, a girl growing up under the stresses of the Hijrah, the conflict with Makkah, and the general impoverished conditions and resources of early 7th-Century Hijaz, probably also reached menarche at or after age fourteen. Thus, if the Arab society of the Hijaz followed the general global pattern of marrying off girls following menarche, it is probable that that ‘Ā’iṣah was at least fourteen years old—and plausibly even older—at the time of her marital consummation with Muḥammad.

Of course, all of this is extremely probabilistic and tentative, but as is so often the case with modern attempts to reconstruct the earliest phase of Islamic history, such uncertainty cannot be avoided. In other words, there is nothing exceptional about this particular case: in light of the profound problems of the Islamic literary sources and the limitations of the available methods of analysis, our understanding of the life and times of Muḥammad and his followers necessarily remains extremely provisional.

¹⁵⁵⁵ Hin, *The Demography of Roman Italy*, 151. Hin focuses on the Roman and Greek world, but her points apply in every other case as well. For the factors that delay menarche and puberty more generally, see also Prescott, ‘VI.8 ~ Adolescent Nutrition and Fertility’, in Kiple & Ornelas (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Food*, II, 1453, col. 2, and Marloes Schoonheim, ‘Demography: Comparative History’, in Bonnie G. Smith (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Women in World History, Volume 2: Dance–Judith* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008), 37, col. 1.

Conclusion

The hadith-tradition of ‘Ā’iṣah bt. ‘abī Bakr’s marital age is a widely-transmitted family of some 200+ reports that can be found all across the Islamic—in particular, the Sunnī—literary corpus, above all in Hadith, historical, and legal collections. Most versions of the hadith state that ‘Ā’iṣah (d. 57-58/677-678) was betrothed to the Prophet Muḥammad (d. 11/632) at the age of six or seven and that her marriage was consummated at the age of nine, although some versions instead state that she was betrothed at nine. The majority have *’isnāds* that reach all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah herself, almost always via a string of Madinan or Kufan intermediaries; a few reach instead back to her Hijazo-Kufan contemporary, ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd (d. 32-33/652-654), always via a string of Kufan intermediaries; quite a few only reach as far back as ‘Ā’iṣah’s students amongst the Followers (*tābi‘ūn*), above all, her Madinan nephew ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 93-101/711-720) and her Kufan student ‘Abū ‘Ubaydah ‘Āmir b. ‘Abd Allāh (d. 81/700-701), respectively via Madinan and Kufan intermediaries; and a small handful claim different regional genealogies or sources altogether.

On the basis of a critical, consistent, and falsifiable version of the *’isnād-cum-matn* analysis (ICMA), applied to all of these extant versions, several underlying redactions of the hadith can be reconstructed and traced back to a series of common links (CLs) operating from the middle of the 8th Century CE to the middle of the 9th, one of the earliest—and certainly the most prolific—being the Madino-Iraqian traditionist Hiṣām b. ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 146-147/763-765). By contrast, the hadith cannot be credibly traced all the way back to ‘Ā’iṣah herself, nor even to her students and immediate successors—at least not on the basis of an ICMA.

In fact, the notion that the hadith derives from any major figure in 7th- or 8th-Century Madinah, or that it predates the middle of the 8th Century CE even in Iraq, is flatly contradicted by the available evidence, on several points. Firstly, all of the earliest Madinan legal and biographical works—which are generally overflowing with transmissions from ‘Ā’iṣah, ‘Urwah, Hiṣām, and all of the other early alleged Madinan sources for the marital-age hadith, and for which the marital-age hadith would have been expedient—uniformly fail to cite it, which is straightforwardly inconsistent with its early circulation in Madinah at the hands of ‘Ā’iṣah *et al.* Secondly, all of the earliest

CLs for this hadith are Iraqi or moved to Iraq (including Hišām), and in general, Iraqians overwhelmingly predominate in its early transmission and dissemination. Thirdly, the earliest Kufan legal collections—which are generally overflowing with transmissions from the alleged early Kufan transmitters of the marital-age hadith, and for which the marital-age hadith would have been expedient—likewise uniformly omit all mention of the hadith, which is straightforwardly inconsistent with its earlier circulation amongst the Companions and Followers of Kufah. All of this strongly suggests that the hadith originated amongst the traditionists of Iraq during the middle of the 8th Century CE, lacking earlier roots in Iraq and Madinah alike, or in other words: Hišām and the other early CLs in Iraq falsely ascribed their respective redactions of the hadith back to their Madinan and Kufan predecessors. In Hišām’s case, this occurred after he moved from Madinah (where he left no credible trace of the hadith) to Kufah and then Baghdad (where he transmitted the hadith to a vast array of students), during the early Abbasid period.

Hišām’s status as a veritable super-CL in the transmission of the hadith—far overshadowing even his fellow CLs—immediately marks him out as a plausible candidate for the hadith’s ultimate originator, which is consistent with the more archaic-seeming character of his original, simple redaction (being an ascription to a Follower rather than a Companion). This is corroborated by the striking way in which Hišām’s simple version is the strongest candidate for reflecting or being the ur-hadith that inferably lies behind all extant iterations of the hadith-tradition as a whole: his version alone can explain the rise of (i.e., *could plausibly give rise to*) virtually every other variant. To all of this can be added the fact that Hišām had the strongest motive of all of the CLs to create such a hadith, since it served as ammunition not just for the proto-Sunnī cause, but for the defence of his family in particular, against proto-Šī‘ī attacks on ‘Ā’iṣah: her young age at marriage served to highlight or emphasise her virginity, which in turn served as her most striking unique characteristic *vis-à-vis* the Prophet’s other wives, which in turn justified the proto-Sunnī claim that she was the Prophet’s favourite wife. All of this perfectly matches the abovementioned circumstances of Hišām’s creation of the hadith: it occurred after he moved from Madinah to Kufah, which was then the centre of Shi’ism. In short, on the basis of a combined form-critical, geographical, and historical-critical analysis, it seems likely

that the marital-age hadith emerged in the polemical and sectarian milieu of early Abbasid Iraq.

As the hadith diversified in Iraq and spread to the other provinces of the Abbasid Caliphate, it acquired a number of false, secondary, diving *'isnāds*, as some traditionists across the empire concocted, inferred, or perhaps even accidentally created alternative—usually *local* and/or *familial*—paths of transmission for their own versions. Despite this, most regions of the empire openly received their versions of the hadith from Iraqians or those who explicitly received it from Iraqians, or in other words: Iraqians were the chief agents of the hadith's transmission in the *historical* or *verifiable* era of the late 8th and early 9th Centuries CE, whilst Madinans are only present in the *legendary* or *ascribed-to* era of the 7th and early 8th Centuries CE, in terms of where they appear in the relevant *'isnāds*.

Because the marital-age hadith was disseminated by the leading Iraqi traditionists of the mid-to-late 8th Century CE, its acceptance by the subsequent proto-Sunnī Hadith critics of the 9th Century CE was practically inevitable: the latter venerated the former and saw themselves as a continuation of the same scholarly and communal tradition, and simply inherited their transmissions. Thus, although some versions of the marital-age hadith—above all, those with conflicting contents and/or those transmitted by less famous or less respected sources—were subject to scrutiny and criticism, many versions were judged to be 'sound' (*ṣaḥīḥ*), usually without any explanation and always without any kind of real argumentation.

Some of these findings have broader implications for both the modern methods and debates of Hadith Studies, on the one hand, and the history of Hadith and early Islam, on the other. In the first case, the present work has variously: refined and defended the ICMA; demonstrated the necessity of subjecting the results of any ICMA to a further geographical and form-critical analysis; contributed a large body of evidence for the hypothesis that Hadith transmission evolved from earlier imprecision to later precision; contributed a large body of evidence for the hypothesis that the alteration and interpolation of hadiths was common until at least the early 9th Century CE; and contributed further evidence for the hypothesis that the proto-Sunnī Hadith critics were unsystematic or inconsistent in their evaluations of Hadith, plausibly relying on intuition and/or a general veneration for their hallowed forebears. In the second case, the present work has variously: demonstrated how even a near-*mutawātir* hadith

could have arisen and spread during the 8th Century CE; demonstrated—albeit implicitly—that the reliable reputations of at least 8th- and 9th-Century tradents do not reliably predict actual reliability in transmission; and finally (and most obviously), demonstrated that the hadith of ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage to Muḥammad as a child is likely an 8th-Century polemical creation. Even if the hadith truly derived from ‘Ā’iṣah herself, however, it would probably still be false: given the conditions of Hijazian society at the time, it is highly unlikely that ‘Ā’iṣah or anyone else would have—or even could have—known her age at the time of her marriage, especially decades after the event. On the basis of general historical probability, it is more likely that ‘Ā’iṣah’s marriage was consummated when she was twelve-to-fourteen years old, if not older, although, as with so many other aspects of early Islamic history, there is currently no way to know for sure.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

ʿĀbanūsī, Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad b. al- (ed. Ḳalīl Ḥasan Ḥammādah), *al-Mašyakah*, 2 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: King Saud University, 1421 A.H.).

ʿAbd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Rāfiʿī (ed. ʿAzīz Allāh al-ʿUṭaridī), *al-Tadwīn fī ʿAḵbār Qazwīn*, 4 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1987).

ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAḥmad b. Ḥanbal (ed. Waṣī Allāh b. Muḥammad ʿAbbās), *Kitāb al-ʿIlal wa-Maʿrifat al-Rijāl*, 4 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Ḳāniyy, 2001).

ʿAbū al-Qāsim ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAḥmad al-Kaʿbī al-Balkī (ed. al-Ḥusaynī b. ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-Raḥīm), *Qabūl al-ʿAḵbār wa-Maʿrifat al-Rijāl*, 2 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 2000).

ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī (ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-ʿAḏamī), *al-Muṣannaf*, 12 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmiyy, 1970).

ʿAbū al-Ṣayḵ ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad (ed. ʿAbd al-Ġafūr b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Balūṣī), *Ṭabaqāt al-Muḥaddithīn bi-ʿAṣbahān wa-al-Wāridīn ʿalay-hā*, 4 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Muʿassasat al-Risālah, n. d.).

ʿAbd al-Waḥhāb b. ʿAlī al-Baġdādī (ed. Ḥamīš ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq), *al-Maʿūnah ʿalā Maḍhab ʿĀlim al-Madīnah* (Makkah, KSA: al-Maktabah al-Tijāriyyah, n. d.).

ʿAbū ʿAwānah Yaʿqūb b. ʿIshāq al-ʿIsfarāyīnī (ed. Muḥammad Makkī ʿAṭāʾ Allāh), *al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muḵarraj ʿalā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 20 vols. (Madinah, KSA: al-Jāmiʿah al-ʿIslāmiyyah, 2014).

ʿAbū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-ʿAṣʿaṭ al-Sijistānī (ed. Ṭāriq b. ʿIwaḍ Allāh b. Muḥammad), *Masāʾil al-ʿImām ʿAḥmad Riwāyat ʿAbī Dāwūd Sulaymān bn al-ʿAṣʿaṭ al-Sijistāniyy* (Cairo, Egypt: Maktabat Ibn Taymiyyah, 1999).

— (ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd), *Sunan*, 4 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: al-Maktabah al-ʿAṣriyyah, n. d.).

ʿAbū Nuʿaym ʿAḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿIṣfahānī (ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan ʿIsmāʿīl al-Ṣāfiʿī), *al-Musnad al-Mustakraj ʿalā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 4 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, n. d.).

—, *Ḥilyat al-ʿAwliyāʾ wa-Ṭabaqāt al-ʿAṣfiyāʾ*, 11 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Fikr, 1996).

— (ed. Fārūq Ḥammādah), *Kitāb al-Ḍuʿafāʾ* (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Qalam, 2010).

— (ed. ʿĀdil ibn Yūsuf al-ʿAzzāzī), *Maʿrifat al-Ṣaḥābah*, 6 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Waṭan, 1998).

— (ed. Sayyid Kasrawī Ḥasan), *Taʾrīḵ ʿAṣbahān / ʿAḵbār ʿAṣbahān*, 2 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1990).

ʿAbū Yaʿlā ʿAḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Mawṣilī (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm ʿAsad), *Musnad*, 16 vols. (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Maʾmūn li-l-Turāt, 1989).

ʿAbū Zurʿah ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAmr al-Dimašqī (ed. Šakr Allāh Niʿmat Allāh al-Qawjānī), *Taʾrīḵ ʿAbī Zurʿah al-Dimašqiyy* (Damascus, Syria: Majmaʿ al-Luġah al-ʿArabiyyah, 1980).

— (ed. Ḳalīl al-Manšūr), *Taʾrīḵ ʿAbī Zurʿah al-Dimašqiyy* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1996).

'Abū Zur'ah 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Rāzī & Sa'īd b. 'Amr al-Barḍa'ī (ed. Sa'dī al-Hāsimī), *'Abū Zur'ah al-Rāziyy wa-Juhūdu-hu fī al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah ma'a Tahqīq Kitābi-hi al-Ḍu'afā' wa-'Ajjwibati-hi 'alā 'As'ilat al-Barḍa'iyy*, 3 vols. in 1 (Mansurah, Egypt: Dār al-Wafā', 1989).

'Ājurri, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al- (ed. al-Walīd b. Muḥammad Nabīh Sayf al-Nāṣir), *al-Šarī'ah*, 3 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Mu'assasat Qurṭubah, 1996).

Aristotle (trans. D'Arcy W. Thompson), *The Works of Aristotle: Works translated into English under the editorship of W. D. Ross, Volume 4: Historia Animalium* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1910).

Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Aḥmad al-'Aynī (ed. 'Ayman Šāliḥ Ša'bān), *al-Bināyah Šarḥ al-Hidāyah*, 13 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 2000).

Baḡawī, al-Ḥusayn b. Mas'ūd al- (ed. Šu'ayb al-'Arna'ūt), *Šarḥ al-Sunnah*, 16 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: al-Maktab al-'Islāmiyy, 1983).

Balāḍurī, 'Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al- (ed. Suhayl Zakkār & Riyāḍ Ziriklī), *Kitāb Jumal min 'Ansāb al-'Ašraf*, 13 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 1997).

Bayhaqī, 'Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al- (ed. 'Āmir 'Aḥmad Ḥaydar), *al-Ba't wa-al-Nuṣūr* (Beirut, Lebanon: Markaz al-Ḳadamāt wa-al-'Abḥāt al-Ṭaqāfiyyah, 1986).

— (ed. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī), *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, 24 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Hajar, 2011).

— (ed. 'Abd al-Mu'tī Qal'ajī), *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah wa-Ma'rifat 'Aḥwāl Šāḥib al-Šarī'ah*, 7 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1988).

Bukārī, Muḥammad b. 'Ismā'il al- (ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Mu'īd Kān), *al-Ta'rīk al-Kabīr*, 10 vols. (Hyderabad, India: Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uṭmāniyyah, n. d.).

— (ed. Muḥammad b. Šāliḥ b. Muḥammad al-Dabbāsī), *al-Ta'rīk al-Kabīr*, 12 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: al-Nāṣir al-Mutamayyiz, 2019).

—, *Šaḥīḥ*, 3 vols. in 1 (Vaduz, Liechtenstein: Thesaurus Islamicus Foundation, 2000).

Burhān al-Dīn Maḥmūd b. 'Aḥmad al-Bukārī (ed. Na'im 'Aḥmad), *al-Muḥīṭ al-Burhāniyy fī al-Fiqh al-Nu'māniyy*, 25 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Maktabat al-Ruṣd, 2004).

Ḍahabī, Muḥammad b. 'Aḥmad al- (ed. 'Alī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī), *Mizān al-I'tidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl*, 4 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma'rifah, n. d.).

— (ed. Šu'ayb al-'Arna'ūt et al.), *Siyar 'A'lām al-Nubalā'*, 25 vols., 2nd ed. (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1982).

Dāraquṭnī, 'Alī b. 'Umar al- (ed. Maḥfūz al-Raḥmān Zayd Allāh al-Salafī), *al-'Ilal al-Wāridah fī al-'Aḥādīṭ al-Nabawiyyah*, 11 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ṭaybah, 1989).

— (ed. 'Abd al-Raḥīm Muḥammad 'Aḥmad al-Qašqarī), *Su'ālāt al-Barqāniyy li-l-Dāraquṭniyy: Riwayāt al-Karajiyy 'an-hu* (Lahore, Pakistan: Kutub Kānah Jamīliyy, 1404 AH).

— (ed. 'Ādil 'Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawjūd & 'Alī Muḥammad Mu'awwad) *Sunan*, 3 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma'rifah, 2001).

— (ed. Ḳalīl b. Muḥammad 'Arabī), *Ta'liqāt al-Dāraquṭniyy 'alā al-Majrūḥīn li-Ibn Hibbān* (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Maktab al-'Islāmiyy, 1994).

Dārimī, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al- (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm 'Asad al-Dārānī), *Musnad*, 4 vols. in 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Muḡnī, 2000).

Dīnawarī, 'Aḥmad b. Marwān al- (ed. Mašḥūr b. Ḥasan 'Āl Salmān), *al-Mujālasah wa-Jawāhir al-'Ilm*, 10 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 1998).

Fasawī, Ya'qūb b. Sufyān al- (ed. 'Akram Ḍiyā' al-'Umarī), *Kitāb al-Ma'rifah wa-al-Ta'rīk*, 4 vols. (Madinah, KSA: Maktabat al-Dār, 1989).

Fīryābī, Ja'far b. Muḥammad al- (ed. 'Abd al-Wakīl al-Nadawī), *Fawā'id al-Fīryābiyy* (Bombay, India: al-Dār al-Salafiyyah, 1992).

Hākim al-Naysābūrī, Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al- (ed. Fu'ād 'Abd al-Mun'im 'Aḥmad), *al-Madḳal 'ilā Kitāb al-'Iklīl* (Alexandria, Egypt: Dār al-Da'wah, 1983).

—, *al-Mustadrak 'alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, 9 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ta'ṣīl, 2014).

— (ed. 'Aḥmad b. Fāris al-Sulūm), *Ma'rifat 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīṭ wa-Kammiyyat 'Ajnāsihi* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2003).

Ḥarb b. 'Ismā'īl al-Kirmānī (ed. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Surayyī), *Masā'il* (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat al-Rayyān, 2013).

Hannād b. al-Sarī b. Muṣ'ab (ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Farīwā'ī), *Kitāb al-Zuhd* (Kuwait: Dār al-Ḳulafā' li-l-Kitāb al-'Islāmiyy, 1985).

Hišām b. 'Ammār al-Dimašqī (ed. 'Abd Allāh b. Wakīl), *Ḥadīṭ Hišām bn 'Ammār* (Riyadh, KSA: Dār 'Iṣbiyyā, 1999).

Ḥumaydī, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr al- (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm 'Asad al-Dārānī), *Musnad*, 2 vols. (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Saqā, 1996).

Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, Yūsuf b. 'Abd Allāh (ed. 'Abd al-Mu'tī 'Amīn Qal'ajī), *al-Istidkār*, 30 vols. (Damascus & Beirut: Dār Qutaybah; and Aleppo & Cairo: Dār al-Wa'y; 1993).

— (ed. 'Abd Allāh Marḥūl al-Sawāmah), *al-Istiḡnā' fī Ma'rifat al-Maṣḥūrīn min Ḥamalāt al-'Ilm bi-al-Kuná*, 3 vols. in 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ibn Taymiyyah, 1985).

— (ed. Sa'īd 'Aḥmad 'A'rāb), *al-Tamhīd li-mā fī al-Muwaṭṭa' min al-Ma'ānī wa-al-'Asānīd*, 26 vols. (Rabat, Morocco: Wizārat 'Umūm al-'Awqāf wa-al-Šu'un al-'Islāmiyyah, 1988).

— (ed. 'Alī Muḥammad Bijāwī), *Kitāb al-Istī'āb fī Ma'rifat al-'Aṣḥāb*, 4 parts (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Jīl, 1992).

Ibn 'abī al-Dunyā, 'Abd Allāh (ed. Najm 'Abd al-Raḥmān Ḳalaf), *Kitāb al-'Iyāl* (Dammam, KSA: Dār Ibn al-Qayyim, 1990).

Ibn 'abī 'Āsim, 'Aḥmad (ed. Bāsil Fayṣal 'Aḥmad al-Jawābirah), *al-'Āḥād wa-al-Maṭānī li-Ibn 'abī 'Āsim*, 6 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Rāyah, 1991).

Ibn 'abī Dāwūd Sulaymān al-Sijistānī, 'Abd Allāh (ed. 'Abd al-Ġafūr 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Ḥusayn), *Musnad 'Ā'īṣah* (Kuwait: Maktabat Dār al-'Aqṣá, 1985).

Ibn 'abī Ḥatīm, 'Abd al-Raḥmān (ed. Sa'd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥumayyid, Ḳalid b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Juraysī, et al.), *Kitāb al-'Ilal*, 7 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Maṭābi' al-Ḥumaydiyy, 2006).

—, *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa-al-Ta'dīl*, 9 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār 'Iḥyā' al-Turāṭ al-'Arabiyy, 1952-1953).

Ibn 'abī Ḳayṭamah Zuhayr b. Ḥarb, 'Aḥmad (ed. Ṣalāḥ ibn Fathī Halal), *al-Ta'rīk al-Kabīr al-Ma'rūf bi-Ta'rīk Ibn 'abī Ḳayṭamah*, 4 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: al-Fārūq al-Ḥadīṭiyyah, 2004).

Ibn 'abī Ṣaybah, 'Abd Allāh (ed. 'Usāmah b. 'Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad), *al-Muṣannaf*, 15 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: al-Fārūq al-Ḥadīṭah, 2008).

Ibn 'Adī al-Qaṭṭān, 'Abd Allāh (ed. Māzin b. Muḥammad al-Sarsāwī), *al-Kāmil fī Du'afā' al-Rijāl*, 10 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Maktabat al-Ruṣd, n. d.).

Ibn al-Ja'd al-Jawharī, 'Alī (ed. 'Āmir 'Aḥmad Ḥaydar), *Musnad* (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu'assasat Nādir, 1990).

Ibn al-Jārūd al-Naysābūrī, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Alī (ed. 'Abū 'Ishāq al-Ḥawaynī al-'Atarī), *Kitāb Ḡawṭ al-Makdūd bi-Takrīj Muntaqá Ibn al-Jārūd*, 3 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabiyy, 1988).

Ibn al-Jawzī, 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Alī (ed. 'Abd Allāh al-Qāḍī), *al-Du'afā' wa-al-Matrūkīn*, 3 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1986).

- (ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ‘Uṭmān), *Kitāb al-Mawḍū‘āt*, 3 vols. (Madinah, KSA: al-Maktabah al-Salafiyyah, 1966-1968).
- Ibn al-Munḍir, Muḥammad b. ‘Ibrāhīm (ed. Ṣaḡīr ‘Aḥmad al-‘Anṣārī), *al-‘Iṣrāf ‘alā Maḍāhib al-‘Ulamā’*, 10 vols. (Ra’s al-Ḳaymah, UAE: Maktabat Makkah al-Ṭaqāfiyyah, 2004-2005).
- Ibn al-Sammāk, ‘Uṭmān b. ‘Aḥmad al-Daqqāq, in Nabīl Sa‘d al-Dīn Jarrār (ed.), *Majmū‘ fī-hi ‘Aṣrat ‘Ajzā’ Ḥadīṭiyyah* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Baṣā’ir al-‘Islāmiyyah, n. d.).
- Ibn ‘Asākir, ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan (ed. ‘Umar b. Ġaramah al-‘Amrawī), *Ta’rīk Madīnat Dimašq*, 80 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 1995-2000).
- Ibn Baṭṭah, ‘Ubayd Allāh al-‘Ukbarī (ed. Riḍā Mu‘ṭī *et al.*), *al-‘Ibānah al-Kubrā*, 9 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Rāyah, n. d.).
- Ibn Bukayr b. Wāṣil, Yūnus (ed. Suhayl Zakkār), *Kitāb al-Siyar wa-al-Maḡāzī* (Damascus, Syria: Dār al-Fikr, 1978).
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, *Kitāb Ṭabaqāt al-Mudallisīn* (Cairo, Egypt: al-Maṭba‘ah al-Ḥusayniyyah al-Miṣriyyah, 1904).
- *Tahḍīb al-Tahḍīb*, 12 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār Ṣādir, 1968).
- Ibn Ḥanbal, ‘Aḥmad (ed. Muḥammad al-Zahrī al-Ġamrāwī), *al-Musnad*, 6 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: al-Maṭba‘ah al-Maymaniyyah, 1895).
- Ibn Ḥibbān, Muḥammad al-Bustī (ed. Šu‘ayb al-‘Arna‘ūt), *al-‘Iḥsān fī Tartīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, 18 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah, 1991).
- (ed. Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī), *al-Majrūḥīn min al-Muḥaddiṭīn*, 2 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Šamī‘iyy, 2000).
- (ed. Maḥmūd ‘Ibrāhīm Zāyid), *Kitāb al-Majrūḥīn*, 3 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1992).
- (ed. Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Mu‘īd Kān) *Kitāb al-Ṭiqāt*, 10 vols. (Hyderabad, India: Osmania Oriental Publications Bureau, 1980).
- (ed. Majdī b. Maṣṣūr b. Sayyid al-Šūrā), *Mašāhīr ‘Ulamā’ al-‘Amṣār* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 1995).
- (ed. ‘Aḥmad Muḥammad Šākir), *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān bi-Tartīb al-‘Amīr ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Fārisiyy* (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ma‘ārif, 1952).
- Ibn Hišām, ‘Abd al-Malik (ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld), *Kitāb Sīrat Rasūl Allāh / Das Leben Muhammed’s*, 2 vols. in 1 (Göttingen, Germany: Dieterichsche Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1858-1860).
- (ed. & trans. Alfred Guillaume), *The Life of Muḥammad: A Translation of Ishāq’s Sīrat Rasūl Allāh* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1998 [originally published in 1955]).
- Ibn Kaṭīr, ‘Ismā‘īl b. ‘Umar (ed. Muṣṭafā ‘Abd al-Wāḥid), *al-Sīrah al-Nabawiyyah*, 4 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1976).
- Ibn Mājah, Muḥammad b. Yazīd (ed. Muḥammad Fu‘ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī), *Sunan*, 2 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Dār ‘Iḥyā’ al-Kutub al-‘Arabiyyah, 1952-1954).
- Ibn Mandah, Muḥammad b. ‘Ishāq (ed. ‘Āmir Ḥasan Ṣabrī), *Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥābah* (UAE: Jāmi‘at al-‘Imārāt al-‘Arabiyyah al-Muttaḥidah, 2005).
- Ibn Manjuwayh al-‘Aṣbahānī, ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Alī (ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Layṭī), *Rijāl Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 2 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1987).
- Ibn Qudāmah, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (ed. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī & ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥulw), *al-Muḡnī*, 15 vols., 3rd ed. (Cairo, Egypt: Dār ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1997).

- Ibn Qutaybah al-Dīnawarī, ‘Abd Allāh b. Muslim (ed. Tarwat ‘Ukkāshah), *al-Ma‘ārif* (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ma‘āraf, n. d.).
- , *Kitāb ‘Uyūn al-‘Akbār* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kitāb al-‘Arabiyy, n. d.).
- Ibn Rāhwayh, ‘Ishāq (ed. ‘Abd al-Ġafūr b. ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Balūshī), *Musnad*, 5 vols. (Madinah, KSA: Maktabat al-‘Imān, 1990).
- Ibn Sa‘d, Muḥammad (ed. Eduard Sachau, Eugen Mittwoch, Horowitz, Friedrich Schwally, Julius Lippert, Bruno Meissner, & Carl Brockelmann), *Biographien Muhammads, seiner Gefährten und der späteren Träger des Islams bis zum Jahre 230 der Flucht*, 9 vols. (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1904-1940).
- Ibn Šāhīn, ‘Umar b. ‘Aḥmad (ed. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Muḥammad ‘Aḥmad al-Qašqarī), *Kitāb Ta’rīk ‘Asmā’ al-Ḍu‘afā’ wa-al-Kaḍḍābīn* (1989).
- Ibn Wahb, ‘Abd Allāh (ed. Rif‘at Fawzī ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib & ‘Alī ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ Mazyad), *al-Jāmi‘* (Mansurah, Egypt: Dār al-Wafā’, 2005).
- Ibn Ziyād al-Naysābūrī, ‘Abd Allāh (ed. Kālid b. Hāyif b. ‘Urayj al-Muṭayrī), *al-Ziyādāt ‘alā Kitāb al-Muzaniyy* (Kuwait: Dār al-Kawṭar, n. d.).
- ‘Ijlī, ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh al- (ed. ‘Abd al-Muṭī Qal‘ajī), *Ta’rīk al-Ṭiqāt* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Bāz, 1984).
- ‘Irāqī, Walī al-Dīn ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm b. al- (ed. Rif‘at Fawzī ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib & Nāfiḍ Ḥusayn Ḥammām), *al-Mudallisīn* (Mansurah, Egypt: Dār al-Wafā’, 1995).
- ‘Ismā‘īl b. Muḥammad al-‘Aṣbahānī (ed. ‘Abū Raḥīm Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd), *al-Hujjah fī Bayān al-Maḥajjah wa-Šarḥ ‘Aqīdat ‘Ahl al-Sunnah*, 2 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Dār al-Rāyah, 1990).
- Jūzajānī, ‘Ibrāhīm b. Ya‘qūb al- (ed. Šubḥī al-Badrī al-Samarrā’ī), *‘Aḥwāl al-Rijāl*, 3 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah, n. d.).
- Kalābādī, ‘Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al- (ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Layṭī), *Rijāl Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḵārīyy al-Musammā al-Hidāyah wa-al-‘Iršād fī Ma‘rifat ‘Ahl al-Ṭiqah wa-al-Sadād*, 2 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ma‘rifah, 1987).
- Kāsānī, ‘Abū Bakr b. Mas‘ūd al- (ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad Mu‘awwad & ‘Ādil ‘Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Mawjūd), *Badā’i‘ al-Šanā’i‘ fī Tartīb al-Šarā’i‘*, 10 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyyah, 2003).
- Kaṭīb al-Baġdādī, ‘Aḥmad b. ‘Alī al- (ed. Maḥmūd al-Ṭaḥḥān), *al-Jāmi‘ li-‘Aklāq al-Rāwī wa-‘Ādāb al-Sāmi‘*, 3 vols. (Riyadh, KSA: Maktabat al-Ma‘ārif, 1983).
- (ed. Yaḥyā b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Bakrī al-Šahrī), *Ġunyat al-Multamis ‘Idāḥ al-Multabis* (Riyadh, KSA: Maktabat al-Ruṣd, 2001).
- (ed. ‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Sawraqī & ‘Ibrāhīm Ḥamdī al-Madanī), *Kitāb al-Kifāyah fī ‘Ilm al-Riwāyah* (Madinah, KSA: al-Maktabah al-‘Ilmiyyah, n. d.).
- (ed. Baššār ‘Awwad Ma‘rūf), *Ta’rīk Madīnat al-Salām*, 17 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ġarb al-‘Islāmiyy, 2001).
- Kulaynī, Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb al- (ed. ‘Alī ‘Akbar al-Ġaffārī), *al-Furū‘ min al-Kāfī*, 8 vols. (Qom, Iran: Mu‘assasat ‘Anṣāriyyān, 2005).
- , *Furū‘ al-Kāfī*, 8 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Manšūrāt al-Fajr, 2007).
- Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir al-, *Biḥār al-‘Anwār*, 110 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu‘assasat al-Wafā’, 1983).
- (ed. Hāšim al-Rasūlī), *Mir‘āt al-‘Uqūl fī ‘Akbār ‘Āl al-Rasūl*, 26 vols. (Tehran, Iran: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Islāmiyyah, 1983).
- Mālik b. ‘Anas & ‘Abū Muṣ‘ab b. ‘abī Bakr al-Zuhrī (ed. Baššār ‘Awwād Ma‘rūf & Maḥmūd Muḥammad Kālīl), *al-Muwaṭṭa’*, 2 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah, 1991).

— & Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Šaybānī (ed. Yahya Batha, Zubair Ismail Bayat, Uthman Ibrahim-Morisson, Sulaiman Gani, Muhammad Ansa, Abdassamad Clarke, & Safira Batha), *The Muwatta of Imam Muhammad* (London, UK: Turath Publishing, 2010).

— & Suwayd b. Saʿīd al-Ḥadaṭānī (ed. ʿAbd al-Majīd Turkī), *al-Muwattaʿa* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Ġarb al-ʿIslāmiyy, 1994).

— & Yaḥyá b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Bukayr, redacted by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Tūmart (ed. Ignáz Goldziher), *Muwattaʿa al-ʿImām al-Mahdī* (Algiers, Algeria: Gouvernement Général de l'Algérie, 1905).

— & Yaḥyá b. Yaḥyá al-Layṭī (ed. Aisha A. Bewley), *Al-Muwattaʿa of Imām Mālik ibn Anas: Arabic & English*, revised ed. (Norwich, UK: Diwan Press, 2014).

Maymūn b. ʿIshāq al-Šawwāf, *al-Juzʿ fī-hi min Ḥadīṭ ʿAbī ʿUmar al-ʿUṭāridiyy wa-Ġayri-hi*, Hadith, available online at the Mawsūʿat al-Ḥadīṭ website: <https://hadith.maktaba.co.in/single-book/1304/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D8%B2%D8%A1-%D9%81%D9%8A%D9%87-%D9%85%D9%86-%D8%AD%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%AB-%D8%A3%D8%A8%D9%8A-%D8%B9%D9%85%D8%B1-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%B7%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%AF%D9%8A-%D9%88%D8%BA%D9%8A%D8%B1%D9%87/878041/42>

book/1304/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AC%D8%B2%D8%A1-

%D9%81%D9%8A%D9%87-%D9%85%D9%86-

%D8%AD%D8%AF%D9%8A%D8%AB-%D8%A3%D8%A8%D9%8A-

%D8%B9%D9%85%D8%B1-

%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B9%D8%B7%D8%A7%D8%B1%D8%AF%D9%8A-

%D9%88%D8%BA%D9%8A%D8%B1%D9%87/878041/42

Mizzī, Yūsuf b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al- (ed. Baššār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf), *Tahḍīb al-Kamāl fī ʿAsmāʾ al-Rijāl*, 35 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Muʿassasat al-Risālah, 1992).

Muḥalliṣ, Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al- (ed. Nabīl Saʿd al-Dīn Jarrār), *al-Muḥalliṣiyyāt wa-ʿAjzāʾ ʿUkrá*, 4 vols. (Qatar: Wizārat al-ʿAwqāt wa-al-Šuʿūn al-ʿIslāmiyyah, 2008).

Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysābūrī (ed. Naẓar b. Muḥammad al-Fāryābī), *Ṣaḥīḥ*, 2 vols. in 1 (Riyadh, KSA: Dār Ṭaybah, 2006).

Nasāʾī, ʿAḥmad b. Šuʿayb al- (ed. Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Munʿim Šalabī), *Kitāb al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, 12 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Muʿassasat al-Risālah, 2001).

— (ed. ʿImād al-Ṭayyār, Yāsir Ḥasan, & ʿIzz al-Dīn Ḍillī), *Sunan al-Nasāʾī wa-huwa al-Mujtabā*, (Beirut, Lebanon: Muʿassasat al-Risālah, 2014).

Ps.-Huang Ti (trans. Ilza Veith), *Huang Ti Nei Čing Su Wên: The Yellow Emperor's Classic of Internal Medicine* (Berkeley, USA: University of California Press, 2002).

Rāmahurmuzī, al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al- (ed. Muḥammad ʿAjjāj al-Ḳaṭīb), *al-Muḥaddiṭ al-Fāṣil bayn al-Rāwī wa-al-Wāʿī*, 3rd ed. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 1984).

Šadūq, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Bābawayh al- (ed. ʿAlī ʿAkbar al-Ġaffārī), *Kitāb al-Ḳiṣāl*, 2 vols. (1983).

Šāfiʿī, Muḥammad b. ʿIdrīs al- (ed. Rifʿat Fawzī ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib), *Kitāb al-ʿUmm*, 11 vols. (Mansurah, Egypt: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 2001).

Šaḥnūn b. Saʿīd al-Tanūḳī, *al-Mudawwanah al-Kubrā*, 16 vols. (Riyad, KSA: Wizārat al-Šuʿūn al-ʿIslāmiyy wa-al-ʿAwqāf wa-al-Daʿwah wa-al-ʿIršād, n. d.).

Saʿīd b. Manšūr al-Ḳurāsānī (ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-ʿAḏamī), *Kitāb al-Sunan*, 2 vols. (Bombay, India: al-Dār al-Salafiyyah, 1982).

Saraḳṣī, Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad al-, *al-Mabṣūt*, 31 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Maʿrifah, 1989).

Šaybānī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al- (ed. Mehmet Boynukalın), *al-ʿAṣl*, 13 vols. (Doha, Qatar: Wizārat al-ʿAwqāf, 2012).

Şiqillî, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Yūnus al- (prepared by ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ‘Aḥmad al-‘Anṣārî), *al-Jāmi‘ li-Masā’il al-Mudawwanah*, 24 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 2013).

Suġdî, ‘Alî b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al- (ed. Şalāḥ al-Dîn al-Nāhî), *al-Nutaf fî al-Fatāwā* (Amman, Jordan: Dār al-Furqān, 1984).

Sulaymān b. Ṭarḳān al-Taymî (ed. Riḍwān al-Ḥaşrî), *Sīrat Rasūl Allāh* (Riyadh, KSA: Markaz al-Malik Fayṣal li-al-Buḥūt wa-al-Dirāsāt al-‘Islāmiyyah, 1443 AH).

Suyūṭî, Jalāl al-Dîn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al- (ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad Maḥmūd Ḥasan Naṣṣār), *‘Asmā’ al-Mudallisîn* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Jīl, 1992).

Ṭabarānî, Sulaymān b. ‘Aḥmad al- (ed. Ṭarîq b. ‘Iwaḍ Allāh b. Muḥammad & ‘Abd al-Muḥsin b. ‘Ibrāhīm al-Ḥusaynî), *al-Mu‘jam al-‘Awsaṭ*, 10 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Dār al-Ḥaramayn, 1995).

— (ed. Ḥamdî ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Salafî), *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*, 25 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Maktabat Ibn Taymiyyah, n. d.).

Ṭabarî, Muḥammad b. Jarîr al- (ed. Michael J. de Goeje *et al.*), *Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari*, 15 vols. (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1879-1901).

— (trans. Franz Rosenthal, William M. Brinner, Moshe Perlmann, Clifford E. Bosworth, William M. Watt, Michael V. McDonald, Michael Fishbein, Ismail K. Poonawala, Fred M. Donner, Khalid Y. Blankinship, Yohanan Friedmann, Gautier H. A. Juynboll, Gerald R. Smith, R. Stephen Humphreys, Adrian Brockett, Gerald R. Hawting, Michael G. Morony, Ian K. A. Howard, Everett K. Rowson, Martin Hinds, David S. Powers, Carole Hillenbrand, John A. Williams, Jane D. McAuliffe, Hugh Kennedy, Joel L. Kraemer, George Saliba, David Waines, Philip M. Fields, & Ella Landau-Tasseron, and indexed by Alex V. Popovkin), *The History of al-Ṭabarî*, 39 vols., 1 index (Albany, USA: State University of New York Press, 1989-2007).

Ṭayālīsî, Sulaymān b. Dāwūd al-, *Musnad* (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Tawfīq, n. d.).

Tirmidî, Muḥammad b. ‘Īsā al- (ed. ‘Ibrāhīm ‘Aṭwah ‘Iwaḍ), *al-Jāmi‘ al-Şaḥīḥ*, 5 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Maṭba‘at Muṣṭafā al-Bābî al-Ḥalabî, 1975).

— (ed. Şubḥî al-Sāmarrā’î, ‘Abū al-Ma‘āṭî al-Nawwarî, & Maḥmūd Muḥammad Ḳalîl al-Şa‘idî), *Ilal al-Tirmidîyy al-Kabīr* (Beirut, Lebanon: ‘Ālam al-Kutub, 1989).

Ṭūsî, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al- (ed. ‘Alî ‘Akbar al-Ġaffārî), *Tahḍīb al-‘Aḥkām fî Şarḥ al-Muqni‘ah*, 10 vols. (Tehran, Iran: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Islāmiyyah, 1386 Ş.).

— (ed. Ḥasan al-Ḳarsān), *Tahḍīb al-‘Aḥkām*, 10 vols. (Qom, Iran: Mu‘assasat ‘Anṣāriyyān, 2005).

‘Umar b. ‘Aḥmad b. al-‘Adīm (ed. Suhayl Zakkār), *Buġyat al-Ṭalab fî Ta’rīḳ Ḥalab*, 12 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Fikr, 1988).

‘Uqaylî, Muḥammad b. ‘Amr al- (ed. Māzin b. Muḥammad al-Sarsāwî), *Kitāb al-Du‘afā’*, 7 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: Dār Majd al-‘Islām, 2008).

Wakî‘ Muḥammad b. Ḳalaf b. Ḥayyān, *‘Aḳbār al-Quḍāḥ*, 3 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: ‘Ālam al-Kutub, n. d.).

Warjlānî, Yūsuf b. ‘Ibrāhīm al- (ed. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥumayd al-Sālimî), *Kitāb al-Tartīb fî al-Şaḥīḥ min Ḥadīṭ al-Rasūl* (Muscat, Oman: Maktabat Musqaṭ, 2003).

Zubayr b. Bakkār b. ‘Abd Allāh, al- (ed. ‘Akram Ḍiyā’ al-‘Umarî) *al-Muntaḳab min Kitāb ‘Azwāj al-Nabiyy* (Madinah, KSA: Maṭba‘at al-Jāmi‘ah al-‘Islāmiyyah, 1981).

Secondary Sources

Abbott, Nabia, *Aishah, the Beloved of Mohammed* (Chicago, USA: Chicago University Press, 1942).

—, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri, Volume 2: Qur'anic Commentary and Tradition* (Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press, 1967).

Abdul-Raof, Hussein, *Theological Approaches to Qur'anic Exegesis: A Practical Comparative-Contrastive Analysis* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2012).

Abu-Alabbas, Belal, 'The Principles of Hadith Criticism in the Writings of al-Shāfi'ī and Muslim', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 24 (2017), 311-335.

Aerts, Stijn, 'Isnād', in Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, & Everett Rowson (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2018), online edition.

—, "'Pray with Your Leader": A Proto-Sunni Quietist Tradition', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 136, Issue 1 (2016), 29-45.

—, 'The Prayers of Abū Muslim and al-Ma'mūn. An Exercise in Dating Ḥadīth', *Journal of Abbasid Studies*, Volume 1 (2014), 66-83.

Afsaruddin, Asma, 'Ā'isha bt. Abī Bakr', in Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Everett Rowson, et al. (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2007-present), online.

'Albānī, Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-, *'Irwā' al-Ġalīl fī Taḥrīj 'Aḥādīṭ Manār al-Sabīl*, 9 vols., 2nd ed. (Beirut, Lebanon: al-Maktab al-'Islāmiyy, 1985).

Alber, Erdmute, *Transfers of Belonging: Child Fostering in West Africa in the 20th Century* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2018).

Ali, Kecia, *Marriage and Slavery in Early Islam* (Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

Amin, Yasmin, 'Age is just a number or is it? 'A'isha's age between Ḥadīth and History' – paper presented at the Third Annual Conference of the British Association for Islamic Studies, *Panel 3: Historical and Literary Approaches to Ḥadīth*, the British Association for Islamic Studies, London (11th/April/2016), 1-9.

Ansari, Zafar I., 'The Authenticity of Traditions: A Critique of Joseph Schacht's Argument *E Silentio*', *Hamdard Islamicus*, Volume 7, Number 2 (1984), 51-61.

Anthony, Sean W., 'Crime and Punishment in Early Medina: The Origins of a *Maghāzī*-Tradition', in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 385-465.

—, *Muhammad the Empires of Faith: The Making of the Prophet of Islam* (Oakland, USA: University of California Press, 2020).

Armstrong, Lyall R., *The Quṣṣās of Early Islam* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2017).

Azami, Muhammad Mustafa, *On Schacht's Origins of Muhammad Jurisprudence* (Lahore, Pakistan: Suhail Academy, 2004).

—, *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature* (Indianapolis, USA: American Trust Publications, 1978).

Bannister, Andrew G., *An Oral-Formulaic Study of the Qur'an* (Lanham, USA: Lexington Books, 2014).

Baugh, Carolyn G., *Minor Marriage in Early Islamic Law* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2017).

Bednarkiewicz, Maroussia, 'The History of the *Adhān*: A View from the Hadith Literature', in Belal Abu-Alabbas, Michael Dann, & Christopher Melchert (eds.), *Modern Hadith Studies: Continuing Debates and New Approaches* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2020), 27-48.

Benkheira, Hocine, 'Un acte manqué peut-il invalider le jeûne? À propos de l'oubli et de cas semblables', *Mélanges de l'Institut dominicain d'études orientales*, Number 34 (2019), 3-34.

Berg, Herbert, 'Ibn 'Abbās in 'Abbāsīd-Era *Tafsīr*', in James E. Montgomery (ed.), *'Abbasid Studies: Occasional Papers of the School of 'Abbasid Studies* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters Publishers & Department of Oriental Studies, 2004), 129-146.

—, *The Development of Exegesis in Early Islam: The Authenticity of Muslim Literature from the Formative Period* (Richmond, UK: Curzon Press, 2000).

—, 'The Needle in the Haystack: Islamic Origins and the Nature of the Early Sources', in Carlos A. Segovia & Basil Lourié (eds.), *The Coming of the Comforter: When, Where, and to Whom? Studies on the Rise of Islam and Various Other Topics in Memory of John Wansbrough* (Piscataway, USA: Gorgias Press, 2012), 271-302.

—, 'Weaknesses in the Arguments for the Early Dating of Qur'ānic Commentary', in Jane D. McAuliffe, Barry D. Walfish, & Joseph W. Goering (eds.), *With Reverence for the Word: Medieval Scriptural Exegesis in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2010), 329-345.

Birkeland, Harris, *Old Muslim Opposition against Interpretation of the Koran* (Oslo, Norway: I Komrnisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1955).

Bjorklund, David F., & Carlos H. Blasi, *Child and Adolescent Development: An Integrated Approach* (Belmont, USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, 2011).

Boekhoff-van der Voort, Nicolet, 'The Raid of the Hudhayl: Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī's Version of the Event', in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 305-383.

Bohmer, Carol, & Amy Shuman, *Political Asylum Deceptions: The Culture of Suspicion* (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

Brockopp, Jonathan E., *Muhammad's Heirs: The Rise of Muslim Scholarly Communities, 622-950* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

Brown, Daniel, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Brown, Jonathan A. C., 'Critical Rigor vs. Juridical Pragmatism: How Legal Theorists and Ḥadīth Scholars Approached the Backgrowth of *Isnāds* in the Genre of *ʿIlal al-Ḥadīth*', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 14, Number 1 (2007), 1-41.

—, 'Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth, by G. H. A. Juynboll', *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Volume 19, Number 3 (2008), 391-397.

—, *Hadith: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, UK: Oneworld Academic, 2018 [1st ed. published in 2009]).

—, interview with Ernie Rea 'Hadith', *Beyond Belief*, on BBC Radio 4 (29th/June/2015): <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b06084kv>.

Burton, John, *An Introduction to the Ḥadīth* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 1994).

Cailliaud, Frédéric, 'Travels in the Oasis of Thebes and El Dakel', in *New Voyages and Travels*, Volume 7 (London, UK: Richard Phillips & Co.).

Carrier, Richard C., *On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason to Doubt* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014).

Carlyon, Deborah, *Mama Kuma: One Woman, Two Cultures* (St. Lucia, Australia: University of Queensland Press, 2002).

Calder, Norman, *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1993).

Cook, Michael A., 'Anan and Islam: The Origins of Karaite Scripturalism', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 9 (1987), 161-182.

—, *Early Muslim Dogma: A Source-critical Study* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

—, 'Eschatology and the Dating of Traditions', *Princeton Papers in Near Eastern Studies*, Volume 1 (1992), 23-47.

—, 'Magian Cheese: An Archaic Problem in Islamic Law', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 47, Number 3 (1984), 449-467.

—, *Muhammad* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1983).

—, 'The Opponents of the Writing of Tradition in early Islam', *Arabica*, Tome 44, Issue 4 (1997), 437-530.

Corrin, Jennifer, 'The Rights of the Child in Solomon Islands' Plural Legal System', in Olga C. Jančić (ed.), *The Rights of the Child in a Changing World: 25 Years After the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child* (Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2016), 263-292.

Crone, Patricia, 'Jāhili and Jewish law: the *qasāma*', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 4 (1984), 153-201.

—, *Meccan Trade and the Rise of Islam* (Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press, 1987).

—, *Medieval Islamic Political Thought* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2004).

—, 'Muhammad and the origins of Islam. By F. E. Peters', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Volume 5, Issue 2 (1995), 269-272.

—, *Roman, provincial and Islamic law: The origins of the Islamic patronate* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

—, *Slaves on Horses: The Evolution of the Islamic Polity* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

—, 'The First-Century Concept of *Hiğra*', *Arabica*, Tome 41 (1994), 352-387.

—, 'Two legal problems bearing on the early history of the Qur'ān', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 18, Number 1 (1994), 1-37.

— & Martin Hinds, *God's Caliph: Religious authority in the first centuries of Islam* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

— & Michael A. Cook, *Hagarism: The making of the Islamic world* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

Daryaee, Touraj, *Sasanian Persia: The Rise and Fall of an Empire* (London, UK: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2009).

Datta, B., & D. Gupta, 'The age at menarche in ancient India as compared to the data from classical Greece and Rome', *Pediatric Research*, Volume 15, Number 1 (1981), 83.

Dickinson, Eerik, *The Development of Early Sunnite Ḥadīth Criticism: The Taqdimā of Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (240/854-327/938)* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2001).

Ehrman, Bart D., *How Jesus Became God: The Exaltation of a Jewish Preacher from Galilee* (San Francisco, USA: HarperOne, 2014).

—, *Jesus Before the Gospels: How the Earliest Christians Remembered, Changed, and Invented Their Stories of the Savior* (San Francisco, USA: HarperOne, 2016).

—, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Elad, Amikam, *The Rebellion of Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya in 145/762: Ṭalibīs and Early ‘Abbāsīs in Conflict* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015).

El Shamsy, Ahmed, *The Canonization of Islamic Law: A Social and Intellectual History* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Eng, Milton, *The Days of Our Years: A Lexical Semantic Study of the Life Cycle in Biblical Israel* (New York, USA: T & T Clark International, 2011).

Eraly, Abraham, *The First Spring: The Golden Age of India* (New Delhi, India: Penguin Books India Pvt. Ltd., 2011).

Faḍl Allāh al-Jilānī, *Faḍl Allāh al-Ṣamad fī Tawḍīḥ al-‘Adab al-Mufrad*, 2 vols. (Cairo, Egypt: al-Maṭba‘ah al-Salafiyyah wa-Maktabatu-hā, 1958).

Francesca, Ersilia, ‘The Concept of *sunna* in the Ibādī School’, in Adis Duderija (ed.), *The Sunna and Its Status in Islamic Law: The Search for a Sound Hadith* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 97-115.

Freeman, Charles, *Egypt, Greece and Rome: Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Gilliot, Claude, ‘Reconsidering the authorship of the Qur’ān: is the Qur’ān partly the fruit of a progressive and collective work?’, in Gabriel S. Reynolds (ed.), *The Qur’ān in Its Historical Context* (London, UK: Routledge, 2008), 88-108.

Gledhill, Paul J., ‘Motzki’s Forger: The Corpus of the Follower ‘Aṭā’ in Two Early 3rd/9th-Century Ḥadīth Compendia’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 19, Number 1/2 (2012), 160-193.

Goldziher, Ignáz (trans. Andras Hamori & Ruth Hamori), *Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law* (Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press, 1981).

— (ed. Samuel M. Stern and trans. Christa R. Barber & Samuel M. Stern), *Muslim Studies*, 2 vols. (Albany, USA: State University Press of New York, 1966-1971).

Görke, Andreas, ‘Authorship in the Sīra literature’, in Lale Behzadi & Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila (eds.), *Concepts of Authorship in Pre-Modern Arabic Texts* (Bamberg, Germany: University of Bamberg Press, 2015), 63-92.

—, ‘Between History and Exegesis: The Origins and Transformation of the Story of Muḥammad and Zaynab bt Ḡaḥṣ’, *Arabica*, Volume 65, Issue 1-2 (2018), 31-63.

—, ‘Criteria for dating early *Tafsīr* traditions: The exegetical traditions and variant readings of Abū Mijlaz Lāḥiq b. Humayd’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 49 (2021), 275-338.

—, ‘Eschatology, History, and the Common Link: A Study in Methodology’, in Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2003), 179-208.

—, ‘*Ḥadīth* between Traditional Muslim Scholarship and Academic Approaches’, in Majid Daneshgar & Aaron W. Hughes (eds.), *Deconstructing Islamic Studies* (Boston, USA: Ilex Foundation, 2020), 33-52.

—, ‘Prospects and Limits in the Study of the Historical Muḥammad’, in Nicolet Boekhoff-van der Voort, Kees H. M. Versteegh, & Joas Wagemakers (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam: Essays in Honour of Harald Motzki* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2011), 137-151.

—, ‘Remnants of an old *tafsīr* tradition? The exegetical accounts of ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr’, in Majid Daneshgar & Walid A. Saleh (eds.), *Islamic Studies Today: Essays in Honor of Andrew Rippin* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2017), 22-42.

—, 'The Historical Tradition about al-Ḥudaybiya: A Study of 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr's Account', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad: The Issue of the Sources* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2000), 140-271.

—, 'The relationship between *maghāzī* and *ḥadīth* in early Islamic scholarship', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 74, Issue 2 (2011), 171-185.

— & Gregor Schoeler, 'Reconstructing the Earliest *sīra* Texts: the *Hiġra* in the Corpus of 'Urwa b. al-Zubayr', *Der Islam*, Volume 82 (2005), 209-220.

—, Harald Motzki, & Gregor Schoeler, 'First Century Sources for the Life of Muḥammad? A Debate', *Der Islam*, Volume 89, Issue 1-2 (2012), 2-59.

Haider, Najam I., 'The Geography of the *Isnād*: Possibilities for the Reconstruction of Local Ritual Practice in the 2nd/8th Century', *Der Islam*, Volume 90, Issue 2 (2013), 306-346.

Hallaq, Wael B., *The Origins and Evolution of Islamic Law* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Haub, Carl, 'World Population History', in George Modelski & Robert A. Denemark (eds.), *World System History: Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems* (Oxford, UK: Eolss Publishers Co. Ltd., 2009), 90-104.

Hawting, Gerald R., "'A plaything for kings': 'Ā'isha's *Ḥadīth*, Ibn al-Zubayr, and the Rebuilding of the Ka'ba', in Majid Daneshgar & Walid A. Saleh (eds.), *Islamic Studies Today: Essays in Honor of Andrew Rippin* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2017), 3-21.

—, 'Harald Motzki: *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz: ihre Entwicklung in Mekka bis zur Mitte des 2./8. Jahrhunderts*', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 59, Issue 1 (1996), 141-143.

—, 'The role of the Qur'ān and *ḥadīth* in the legal controversy about the rights of a divorced woman during her 'waiting period' (*'idda*)', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 52, Issue 3 (1989), 430-445.

Hennigan, Peter C., *The Birth of a Legal Institution: The Formation of the Waqf in Third-Century A.H. Ḥanafī Legal Discourse* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2004).

Hin, Saskia, *The Demography of Roman Italy: Population Dynamics in an Ancient Conquest Society 201 BCE–14 CE* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Horowitz, Josef, 'The Antiquity and Origin of the *Isnād*', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Variorum, 2004), 1-8/151-158.

— (ed. Lawrence I. Conrad), *The Earliest Biographies of the Prophet and their authors* (Princeton, USA: The Darwin Press, Inc., 2002).

Hosain, Mohammad Hidayet, 'Tadlīs', in Martijn T. Houtsma, Arent J. Wensinck, Hamilton A. R. Gibb, Willi Heffening, & Évariste Lévi-Provençal (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islām: A Dictionary of the Geography, Ethnography and Biography of the Muhammadan Peoples: Supplement* (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1938), 222.

Hoyland, Robert G., 'History, fiction and authorship in the first centuries of Islam', in Julia Bray (ed.), *Writing and Representation in Medieval Islam: Muslim horizons* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2006), 16-46.

—, *In God's Path: The Arab Conquests and the Creation of an Islamic Empire* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2015).

—, 'New documentary texts and the early Islamic state', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 69, Issue 3 (2006), 395-416.

—, 'Writing the Biography of the Prophet Muhammad: Problems and Solutions', *History Compass*, Volume 5, Number 2 (2007), 581-602.

Hugenberger, Gordon P., *Marriage as a Covenant: Biblical Law and Ethics as Developed from Malachi* (Eugene, USA: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1994).

'Idlibī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn b. 'Aḥmad al-, 'Umr al-Sayyidah 'Ā'īshah Yawm al-'Aqd wa-Yawm al-Zawāj (first published online in 2013, then updated in 2014, then again in 2015), available online: <http://shanfaraa.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Hadith-on-age-of-Aisha.pdf>.

Jarrar, Maher, *Doctrinal Instruction in Early Islam: The Book of the Explanation of the Sunna by Ghulām Khalīl (d. 275/888)* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2020).

Jeffery, Arthur, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ān* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2007).

Jeffers, James S., 'Jewish and Christian Families in First-Century Rome', in Karl P. Donfried & Peter Richardson (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome* (Grand Rapids, USA: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 128-150.

Jokisch, Benjamin, *Islamic Imperial Law: Harun-al-Rashid's Codification Project* (Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. K.G, 2007).

Jones, Alan, 'The Maghāzī Literature', in Alfred F. L. Beeston, Thomas M. Johnstone, John D. Latham, Robert B. Serjeant, & Gerald R. Smith (eds.), *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 344-351.

Jones, John M. B., 'Ibn Ishāq', in Bernard Lewis, Victor L. Ménage, Charles Pellat, & Joseph F. Schacht (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 3: H-Iram* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 1971), 810-811.

Juynboll, Gautier H. A., 'Early Islamic society as reflected in its use of *isnāds*', *Le Muséon*, Volume 107 (1994), 151-194.

—, *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2007).

—, 'Muslim's Introduction to his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, translated and annotated with an excursus on the chronology of *fitna* and *bid'a'*', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 5 (1984), 263-311.

—, *Muslim tradition: Studies in chronology, provenance and authorship of early ḥadīth* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

—, 'Nāfi', the *mawlā* of Ibn 'Umar, and his position in Muslim *Ḥadīth* Literature', *Der Islam*, Volume 70 (1993), 207-244.

—, 'On the Origins of Arabic Prose: Reflections on Authenticity', in Gautier H. A. Juynboll (ed.), *Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society* (Carbondale & Edwardsville, USA: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982), 161-175.

—, 'On the origins of poetry in Muslim tradition literature', in Wolfhart Heinrichs & Gregor Schoeler (eds.), *Festschrift Ewald Wagner zum 65. Geburtstag. Vol. 2: Studien zur arabischen Dichtung* (Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag; Beirut, Lebanon: Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft; 1994), 182-207.

—, '(Re)Appraisal of Some Technical Terms in *Ḥadīth* Science', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 8, Number 3 (2001), 303-349.

—, 'Some *isnād*-analytical methods illustrated on the basis of several woman-demeaning sayings from *ḥadīth* literature', *al-Qanṭara*, Volume 10, Issue 2 (1989), 343-384.

- , 'Some new ideas on the development of *sunna* as a technical term in early Islam', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 10 (1987), 97-118.
- , 'Some notes on Islam's first *fuqahā*' distilled from early *ḥadīth* literature', *Arabica*, Volume 39 (1992), 288-314.
- , *Studies on the Origins and Uses of Islamic Ḥadīth* (Aldershot, UK: Variorum, 1996).
- , 'The date of the great *fitna*', *Arabica*, Volume 20, Fascicule 2 (1973), 142-159.
- , 'The Role of *Mu'ammārūn* in the Early Development of the *Isnād*', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Volume 81 (1991), 155-175.
- Kelly, Christopher, *The Roman Empire: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- Khoury, Raif G., 'Wakī', in Peri J. Bearman, Thierry Bianquis, Clifford E. Bosworth, Emeri J. van Donzel, & Wolfhart P. Heinrichs (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 11: V-Z* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002), 101.
- Kister, Meir J., 'The *Sīrah* Literature', in Alfred F. L. Beeston, Thomas M. Johnstone, John D. Latham, Robert B. Serjeant, & Gerald R. Smith (eds.), *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 352-367.
- Kramers, Jan H. (trans. Matthew Gordon), 'A Tradition of Manichaeism Tendency ("The She-Eater of Grass")', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Variorum, 2004), 245-257/1-13.
- Lammens, Henri, 'Fāṭima', in Martijn T. Houtsma, Arent J. Wensinck, Thomas W. Arnold, Willi Heffening, & Évariste Lévi-Provençal (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islām: A Dictionary of the Geography, Ethnography and Biography of the Muhammadan Peoples, Volume II: E—K* (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill Ltd., 1927), 84-88.
- Leder, Stefan, 'al-Wāḳidī', in Peri J. Bearman, Thierry Bianquis, Clifford E. Bosworth, Emeri J. van Donzel, & Wolfhart P. Heinrichs (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 11: V-Z* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002), 102-103.
- Lucas, Scott C., *Constructive Critics, Ḥadīth Literature, and the Articulation of Sunnī Islam: The Legacy of the Generation of Ibn Sa'd, Ibn Ma'in, and Ibn Ḥanbal* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2004).
- Ma'rūf, Baššār 'Awwād, et al., *al-Musnad al-Jāmi'*, 22 vols. (Beirut, Lebanon: Dār al-Jīl, 1993-1996).
- McCarter, Peter K., *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (Philadelphia, USA: Fortress Press, 1986).
- Melchert, Christopher, *Ahmad ibn Hanbal* (Oxford, UK: Oneworld Publications, 2006).
- , 'Basra and Kufa as the Earliest Centers of Islamic Legal Controversy', in Behnam Sadeghi, Asad Q. Ahmed, Adam Silverstein, & Robert G. Hoyland (eds.), *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts: Essays in Honor of Professor Patricia Crone* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015), 173-194.
- , 'Bukhārī and Early Hadith Criticism', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 121, Number 1 (2001), 7-19.
- , 'Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth. By G.H.A. Juynboll', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 15 (2008), 408-411.
- , 'Harald Motzki with Nicolet Boeckhoff-van der Voort and Sean Anthony, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth*', *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Volume 57, Issue 2 (2012), 436-438.

—, 'Ibn Abī l-Zinād', in Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, & Everett Rowson (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2018), online edition.

—, 'Lucas, Scott C. *Constructive Critics, Ḥadīth Literature, and the Articulation of Sunnī Islam: The Legacy of the Generation of Ibn Saʿd, Ibn Maʿīn, and Ibn Ḥanbal*', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 13, Number 3 (2006), 410-413.

—, 'Motzki, Harald. *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools*', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 11, Number 3 (2004), 404-408.

—, 'Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī and Traditional Hadith Criticism', in Elisabeth Kendall & Ahmad Khan (eds.), *Reclaiming Islamic Tradition: Modern Interpretations of the Classical Heritage* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), 33-51.

—, 'Narrative Social Structure: Anatomy of the Ḥadīth Transmission Network, 610–1505. By Recep Şentürk', *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Volume 19, Number 1 (2008), 115-117.

—, 'On Schacht's "Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence" by M. Mustafa al-Azami; *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* by Norman Calder', *Journal of Law and Religion*, Volume 15, Number 1/2 (2000-2001), 363-367.

—, 'The Life and Works of al-Nasāʾī', *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Volume 59, Issue 2 (2014), 377-407.

—, 'P. Crone and F. W. Zimmermann, *The Epistle of Sālim ibn Dhakwān*', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 65, Number 3 (2002), 578-579.

—, 'Traditionist-Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 8, Number 3 (2001), 383-406.

—, 'The Destruction of Books by Traditionists', *al-Qanṭara*, Volume 35, Number 1 (2014), 213-231.

—, 'The *Musnad* of Aḥmad ibn Hanbal: How It Was Composed and What Distinguishes It from the Six Books', *Der Islam*, Volume 82 (2005), 32-51.

—, 'The Rightly Guided Caliphs: The Range of Views Preserved in Ḥadīth', in Saud al-Sarhan (ed.), *Political Quietism in Islam: Sunni and Shi'i Practice and Thought* (London, UK: I.B. Tauris, 2019), 63-79.

—, 'The Theory and Practice of Hadith Criticism in the Mid-Ninth Century', in Petra M. Sijpesteijn & Camilla Adang (eds.), *Islam at 250: Studies in Memory of G.H.A. Juynboll* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2020), 74-102.

Mitter, Ulrike, 'Origin and Development of the Islamic Patronate', in Monique Bernards & John Nawas (eds.), *Patronate and Patronage in Early and Classical Islam* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2005), 70-133.

—, '"The Majority of the dwellers of Hell-fire are women": A short analysis of a much-discussed *ḥadīth*', in Nicolet Boekhoff-van der Voort, Kees H. M. Versteegh, & Joas Wagemakers (eds.), *The Transmission and Dynamics of the Textual Sources of Islam: Essays in Honour of Harald Motzki* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2011), 443-473.

Moin, Mumtaz, *Umm al-Mu'minīn ʿĀʾishah Ṣiddiqah: Life and Work* (Karachi, Pakistan: Royal Book Company, 1979).

Mol, Arnold Yasin, 'Aisha (ra): The Case for an Older Age in Sunni Hadith Scholarship', *Yaqeen* (3rd/October/2018): <https://app.yaqeen.io/arnold-yasin-mol/aisha-ra-the-case-for-an-older-age-in-sunni-hadith-scholarship>.

Molvaer, Reidulf K., *Socialization and social control in Ethiopia* (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995).

Motzki, Harald, ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī’, in Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, & Everett Rowson (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2018), online edition.

—, ‘Abraham, Hagar and Ishmael at Mecca: A Contribution to the Problem of Dating Muslim Traditions’, in Andrew L. Rippin & Roberto Tottoli (eds.), *Books and Written Culture of the Islamic World: Studies Presented to Claude Gilliot on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015), 361-348.

— (trans. Sonja Adrianovska & Vivien Reid), ‘Al-Radd ‘Alā l-Radd: Concerning the Method of Ḥadīth Analysis’, in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 209-229.

—, ‘Dating Muslim Traditions: A Survey’, *Arabica*, Volume 52, Issue 2 (2005), 204-253.

—, ‘Der Fiqh des -Zuhrī: die Quellenproblematik’, *Der Islam*, Volume 68, Issue (1991), 1-44.

—, *Die Anfänge der islamischen Jurisprudenz: ihre Entwicklung in Mekka bis zur Mitte des 2./8. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner, 1991).

—, ‘G.H.A. Juynboll. *Encyclopedia of canonical ḥadīth*’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 36 (2009), 539-549.

—, ‘Historical-Critical Research of the *Sīra* of the Prophet Muhammad: What Do We Stand to Gain?’, in Josephine van den Bent, Floris van den Eijnde, & Johan Weststeijn (ed.), *Late Antique Responses to the Arab Conquests* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2022), 74-88.

—, ‘Islamic Law: Transmission and Authenticity of the Reports from the Prophet’, in Stanley N. Katz (ed.), *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Legal History, Volume 3: Evidence—Labor and Employment Law* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2009), 330-333.

—, ‘Motzki’s Reliable Transmitter: A Short Answer to P. Gledhill’, *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 19 (2012), 194-199.

—, *Reconstruction of a Source of Ibn Ishāq’s Life of the Prophet and Early Qur’ān Exegesis: A Study of Early Ibn ‘Abbās Traditions* (Piscataway, USA: Gorgias Press, 2017).

—, ‘The Collection of the Qur’ān: A Reconsideration of Western Views in Light of Recent Methodological Developments’, *Der Islam*, Volume 78 (2001), 1-34.

— (trans. Barbara Paoli & Vivien Reid), ‘The Jurisprudence of Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī: A Source-Critical Study’, in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 1-46.

—, ‘The Murder of Ibn Abī l-Ḥuqayq: On the Origin and Reliability of Some Maghāzī-Reports’, in Harald Motzki (ed.), *The Biography of Muhammad: The Issue of the Sources* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2000), 170-239.

—, ‘The *Muṣannaḥ* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī as a Source of Authentic *Aḥādīth* of the First Century A. H.’, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Volume 50, Number 1 (1991), 1-21.

— (trans. Marion H. Katz), *The Origins of Islamic Jurisprudence: Meccan Fiqh before the Classical Schools* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2002).

—, ‘The Origins of Muslim Exegesis. A Debate’, in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 231-303.

—, 'The Prophet and the Cat: on dating Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* and legal traditions', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 22 (1998), 18-83.

— (trans. Sonja Adrianovska & Vivien Reid), 'The Prophet and the Debtors. A *Ḥadīth* Analysis under Scrutiny', in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 125-208.

—, 'The Question of the Authenticity of Muslim Traditions Reconsidered: A review article', in Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2003), 211-257.

— (trans. Frank Griffel & Paul Hardy), 'Whither *Ḥadīth* Studies?', in Harald Motzki, *Analysing Muslim Traditions: Studies in Legal, Exegetical and Maghāzī Ḥadīth* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2010), 47-124.

Muhsam, Helmut V., *Beduin of the Negev: Eight Demographic Studies* (Jerusalem, Israel: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1966).

Munajjid, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-, et al., Q&A # 124483 (*Taḥqīq fī 'Umr 'Umm al-Mu'minīn 'Ā'īshah 'inda-mā tazawwaja-hā al-Nabiyy*), *IslamQA* (31st/January/2009): <https://islamqa.info/ar/124483>.

Mourad, Suleiman Ali, *Early Islam Between Myth and History: Al-Ḥasan Al-Baṣrī (d. 110H/728CE) and the Formation of His Legacy in Classical Islamic Scholarship* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2006).

Noth, Albrecht (trans. Gwendolyn Goldbloom), 'Common Features of Muslim and Western *Ḥadīth* Criticism: Ibn al-Jawzī's Categories of *Ḥadīth* Forgers', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Variorum, 2004), 1-8/309-316.

— & Lawrence I. Conrad, *The Early Arabic Historical Tradition: A Source-critical Study*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, USA: The Darwin Press, Inc., 1994).

Pande, Rekha, & Theo van der Weide, *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Perspectives on Gender and Aging* (Hershey, USA: IGI Global, 2018).

Paredes, Alfonso, & Fructuoso Irigoyen Rascón, *Tarahumara Medicine: Ethnobotany and Healing Among the Rarámuri of Mexico* (Norman, USA: University of Oklahoma Press, 2015).

Pavlovitch, Pavel, 'Dating', in Daniel W. Brown (ed.), *The Wiley Blackwell Concise Companion to the Hadith* (Hoboken, USA: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 2020), 113-133.

—, *The Formation of the Islamic Understanding of Kalāla in the Second Century AH (718–816 CE): Between Scripture and Canon* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015).

—, 'The Origin of the *Isnād* and al-Mukhtār b. Abī 'Ubayd's Revolt in Kūfa (66-7/685-7)', *al-Qanṭara*, Volume 39, Number 1 (2018), 17-48.

— & David S. Powers, "'A Bequest May Not Exceed One-Third": An *Isnād-cum-Matn* Analysis and Beyond', in Behnam Sadeghi, Asad Q. Ahmed, Adam Silverstein, & Robert G. Hoyland (eds.), *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts: Essays in Honor of Professor Patricia Crone* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2015), 133-172.

Peters, Francis E., *Muhammad and the Origins of Islam* (Albany, USA: State University of New York University Press, 1994).

Peters, Rudolph, 'Murder at Khaybar: Some Thoughts on the Origins of the *Qasāma* Procedure in Islamic Law', *Islamic Law and Society*, Volume 9, Issue 2 (2002), 132-167.

Postgate, John P., 'Textual Criticism', in *The Encyclopædia Britannica: A Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, Literature and General Information: Eleventh Edition*, vol. XXVI (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1911), 708-715.

Pourshariati, Parvaneh, *Decline and Fall of the Sasanian Empire: The Sasanian-Parthian Confederacy and the Arab Conquest of Iran* (London, UK: I. B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2008).

Powers, David S., 'On Bequests in Early Islam', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Volume 48, Number 3 (1989), 185-200.

Prescott, Heather M., 'VI.8 ~ Adolescent Nutrition and Fertility', in Kenneth F. Kiple & Kriemhild C. Ornelas (eds.), *The Cambridge World History of Food, Volume 2* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1453-1457.

Raddatz, Hans-Peter, 'Sufyān al-Thawrī', in Clifford E. Bosworth, Emeri J. van Donzel, Wolfhart P. Heinrichs, & Gerard Lecomte (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 9: San-Sze* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 1997), 770-772.

Reinhart, A. Kevin, 'Juynbolliana, Gradualism, the Big Bang, and Ḥadīth Study in the Twenty-First Century', *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Volume 130, Number 3 (2010), 413-444.

Reynolds, Gabriel S., *The Qur'ān and Its Biblical Subtext* (London, UK: Routledge, 2010).

Rippin, Andrew L., 'Literary analysis of Qur'ān, *tafsīr*, and *sīra*', in Richard C. Martin (ed.), *Approaches to Islam in Religious Studies* (Tucson, USA: University of Arizona Press, 1985), 151-163.

—, 'Tafsīr Ibn 'Abbās and criteria for dating early *tafsīr* texts', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 18, Number 2 (1994), 38-83.

—, 'The Function of *Asbāb al-Nuzūl* in Qur'ānic Exegesis', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 51, Issue 1 (1988), 1-20.

—, 'The Search for Ṭuwā: Exegetical Method, Past and Present', in Carlos A. Segovia & Basil Lourié (eds.), *The Coming of the Comforter: When, Where, and to Whom? Studies on the Rise of Islam and Various Other Topics in Memory of John Wansbrough* (Piscataway, USA: Gorgias Press, 2012), 399-421.

Robinson, Chase F., *Abd al-Malik* (Oxford, UK: Oneworld Publications, 2005).

—, *Islamic Historiography* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Robinson, Neal, 'Muhammad, "The Prophet like Moses", and the editing of the Qur'an', lecture presented at the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford (23rd/October/2018).

Robson, James, 'Ibn Ishāq's use of the *Isnād*', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Volume 38, Issue 2 (1956), 449-465.

—, 'The *Isnād* in Muslim Tradition', in Harald Motzki (ed.), *Ḥadīth: Origins and Development* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Variorum, 2004), 15-26/163-174.

Roohi, Ehsan, 'A Form-Critical Analysis of the al-Rajī' and Bi'r Ma'ūna Stories: Tribal, Ideological, and Legal Incentives behind the Transmission of the Prophet's Biography', *al-'Uṣūr al-Wuṣṭā*, Volume 30 (2022), 267-338.

—, 'Between History and Ancestral Lore: A Literary Approach to the *Sīra*'s Narratives of Political Assassinations', *Der Islam*, Volume 98, Issue 2 (2021), 425-472.

Rubin, Uri, *The Eye of the Beholder: The life of Muḥammad as viewed by the early Muslims: A Textual Analysis* (Princeton, USA: The Darwin Press, Inc., 1995).

Sagar, Krishna C., *Foreign Influence on Ancient India* (New Delhi, India: Northern Book Centre, 1992).

Salem, Feryal, *The Emergence of Early Sufi Piety and Sunnī Scholasticism: ‘Abdallāh b. al-Mubārak and the Formation of Sunnī Identity in the Second Islamic Century* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2016).

Schacht, Joseph F., ‘A Revaluation of Islamic Traditions’, *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, Number 2 (1949), 143-154.

—, ‘On Mūsā b. ‘Uqba’s *Kitāb al-Maghāzī*’, *Acta Orientalia*, Volume 21 (1953), 288-300.

—, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1950).

Schneider, Jens, ‘Single *Isnāds* or *Riwāyas*? Quoted Books in Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Tarjama* of Tamīm al-Dārī’, Maurice A. Pomerantz & Aram A. Shahin (eds.), *The Heritage of Arabo-Islamic Learning: Studies Presented to Wadad Kadi* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2016), 42-72.

Schoeler, Gregor, ‘Foundations for a New Biography of Muḥammad: The Production and Evaluation of the Corpus of Traditions according to ‘Urwah b. al-Zubayr’, in Herbert Berg (ed.), *Method and Theory in the Study of Islamic Origins* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2003), 21-28.

—, ‘Méthodes et Débats: Character and Authenticity of the Muslim Tradition on the Life of Muḥammad’, *Arabica*, Volume 49, Issue 3 (2002), 360-366.

— (ed. James E. Montgomery & trans. Uwe Vagelpohl), *The Biography of Muḥammad: Nature and Authenticity* (New York, USA: Routledge, 2011 [originally published in 1996]).

— (ed. James E. Montgomery and trans. Uwe Vagelpohl), *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2006).

—, ‘The relationship of literacy and memory in the second/eighth century’, *Archaeopress: Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies*, Volume 40 (2010), 121-129.

Schoolcraft, Henry R., *Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States: Collected and prepared under the direction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Part III* (Philadelphia, USA: Lippincott, Grambo & Company, 1853).

Schoonheim, Marloes, ‘Demography: Comparative History’, in Bonnie G. Smith (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Women in World History, Volume 2: Dance–Judith* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008), 36-40.

Şentürk, Recep, *Narrative Social Structure: Anatomy of the Ḥadīth Transmission Network, 610–1505* (Stanford, USA: Stanford University Press, 2005).

Shaddel, Mehdy, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr and the Mahdī: Between propaganda and historical memory in the Second Civil War’, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Volume 80, Number 1 (2017), 1-19.

Shanavas, T. O., ‘The Myth of a Proverbial Wedding’, *The Minaret: The Islamic Magazine*, Volume 21, Number 3 (1999), 21-25.

Sharon, Moshe, ‘The Development of the Debate around the Legitimacy of Authority in early Islam’, *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, Volume 5 (1984), 121-142.

Shoemaker, Stephen J., ‘Andreas Görke and Gregor Schoeler, *Die ältesten Berichte über das Leben Muhammads: Das Korpus ‘Urwa ibn az-Zubair*’, *Der Islam*, Volume 89, Issue 2 (2012), 207-210.

—, ‘In Search of ‘Urwa’s *Sīra*: Some Methodological Issues in the Quest for “Authenticity” in the Life of Muḥammad’, *Der Islam*, Volume 85 (2011), 257-344.

—, *The Death of a Prophet: The End of Muhammad's Life and the Beginnings of Islam* (Philadelphia, USA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012).

Spectorsky, Susan A., 'Sufyān b. 'Uyayna', in Clifford E. Bosworth, Emeri J. van Donzel, Wolfhart P. Heinrichs, & Gerard Lecomte (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition, Volume 9: San-Sze* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 1997), 772.

Speight, R. Marston, 'A Look at Variant Readings in the ḥadīth', *Der Islam*, Volume 77 (2000), 169-179.

Spellberg, Denise A., *Politics, gender, and the Islamic past: the legacy of 'Ā'isha bint Abi Bakr* (New York, USA: Columbia University Press, 1994).

Stowasser, Barbara F., *Women in the Qur'an, Traditions, and Interpretation* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Volzhanina, Elena A., 'The Interpretation of Nenets Demography in the First Third of the Twentieth Century', in David G. Anderson (ed.), *The 1926/27 Soviet Polar Census Expeditions* (New York, USA: Berghahn Books, 2011), 67-96.

Wansbrough, John E., *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Amherst, USA: Prometheus Books, 2004).

Watt, William M., *The Formative Period of Islamic Thought* (Oxford, UK: Oneworld Publications, 1998).

Webb, Peter, *Imagining the Arabs: Arab Identity and the Rise of Islam* (Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2016).

Weerakkody, Don P. M., 'Demography', in Nigel Wilson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece* (New York, USA: Taylor & Francis, 2006), 213-216.

Wensinck, Arent J., *A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition* (Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1927).

Willetts, Ronald F., *The Law Code of Gortyn* (Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1967).

Yanagihashi, Hiroyuki, *Studies in Legal Hadith* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2019).