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The substance of this paper consists of the analysis of the variant versions of a single hadith: a hadith regarding the Prophet visiting Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqās while the latter was ill. The purpose of the exercise, however, is not to look at the hadith but to look beyond it and behind it. I am arguing for the possibility of a science of rijāl: a science of evaluating the qualities of narrators of hadiths in their transmission of hadiths. Having established this possibility I will argue that:

(1) The significance of the mass of textual material known as ‘hadiths’ is best understood and explained in the light of such a science of rijāl.
(2) Evaluating the factual contents of hadiths with the use of such a science will lead to results which are much more reliable than any of the methods modern scholars have proposed for the study of hadiths.
(3) The methods of the hadith scholars working within the classical Islamic style of hadith study, the muhaddithin, in studying hadith are at least similar to what I have described as hadith study based on a science of rijāl.

Thus, with a hadith which has over a hundred variants, I make no attempt at all to evaluate the soundness of the hadith, or to date it, or to separate ‘fact’ from ‘embellishment’ in the hadith. I do not even wish to suggest that because there are so many versions of this hadith one should think it is a sound hadith. This is because the hadith itself is not the subject of this paper. I am only interested in showing that by gathering together many variant versions of a hadith it is possible to come to conclusions about the qualities of hadith narrators in their narrations of hadith. One could evaluate the skill of a hadith narrator in preserving and transmitting the words and meanings of a hadith—
regardless of whether such a narrator was writing down hadiths, whether he was memorizing them, or whether he was using some entirely different method. Moreover such an evaluation of skills of a narrator is based on material which is public and currently available—it does not rely on some esoteric ‘experience’ of hadiths and it can even be quantified if one’s tastes run in that direction.

We find in it the following statement in Ibn Salāh’s Muqaddima, the most basic presentation of classical Islamic hadith criticism:

To know a narrator’s control over his material (dabt) we compare his narrations with the narrations of sound narrators (thiqāt) who are well known for their control of their material and their thoroughness. If (1) we find his narrations to be in accord with their narrations, even if only in sense [and not in wording], or (2) we find that his narrations are usually in accord with their narrations and that he only rarely opposes them, then we will know that he is in control of his material and is reliable. But if we find that he often opposes [sound narrators] we will know that he is not reliable and we will not use his hadith as a sound basis for argumentation. God only knows best.

The procedure of comparing variant versions of a text is familiar to Western scholars from the analysis of the variant versions of the Gospels. In the case of the hadith I have discussed in this paper, Marston Speight has applied that same kind of procedure to this hadith in an article devoted to the hadith of Sa‘d. But the exercise I am undertaking is crucially different from such exercises: I am not concerned with identifying the reliable texts or the reliable portions of the various texts I will study. Rather, I am interested in determining the possibility of reaching judgements regarding the narrators of these texts through a study in the variations in the texts as they are narrated through different narrators.

This attempt to reconstruct the reliability of narrators through a
study of their texts is, in my opinion, the procedure Ibn Ṣalāḥ is
outlining in the passage quoted. Although the study of the Gospels
seems an appropriate analogy for the study of the hadiths, this is the
point at which the analogy fails. There simply are not enough versions
of each passage in the Gospels to be able to go beyond speculation
about textual emendations to a study of the narrators of the texts
themselves. One finds, for example, forty-five versions of the hadith of
Saʿd narrated through Zuhrī. As we find seven students of Zuhrī
narrating these hadiths, it becomes possible to compare the narration
of these hadiths through Zuhrī to come to some tentative conclusions
on their grasp of the material they were transmitting. It is this possibility
which I would like to establish in this paper: that were this experiment
to be repeated over a number of hadiths narrated through Zuhrī, for
example, we would be able to identify those of Zuhrī’s students whose
narration of material from Zuhrī is most reliable.

Once again it is important to spell out what I would like to avoid
by this method: ‘counting’ narrations is entirely misleading; one has to
‘weigh’ them. In the hadith of Saʿd we find twelve or thirteen versions
being narrated through Mālik from Zuhrī. But the consistency of these
narrations is such that one would not want to leave them for the
narrations of, say, Saʿd b. Ibrāhīm, even if they were twice as many in
number.

In fact, that there are a certain number of narrations which quote
the text in a certain way depends on factors like the popularity of a
text, or the fame of a narrator at a certain time. Such factors have
nothing to do with the reliability of the text. Having many parallel
narrations is useful, but determining the reliability of a narration is not
a simple game of adding up narrations of two kinds and then deciding
in favour of the more numerous.

THE PHENOMENON: THE CORRELATION
BETWEEN CHAINS OF NARRATIONS AND TEXTS
NARRATED

The hadith describing the Prophet’s visiting Saʿd b. Abī Waqqās
during the latter’s illness occurs in thirty-one hadith collections.3 I

3 ‘Hadith collection’ here includes books which contain hadiths but are not necessarily
seen as hadith collections.
have chosen to identify these hadiths as 114 in number. Version 4 is as follows:


Humaydī told us that Sufyān said: Zuhrī related: Āmir b. Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās told me narrating from his father, that his father said: I became very ill in Makka so that I came to the brink of death. So the Prophet came to visit me. So I said, ‘O Messenger of God, I have a lot of wealth, and only my daughter is inheriting from me. May I give away two-thirds of my wealth as charity?’ He said, ‘No.’ I said, ‘How about a half?’ He said, ‘No.’ I said, ‘What about a third?’ He said, ‘A third is a large [amount]. It is better that you leave your offspring wealthy than that you leave them paupers, begging from people. You will be rewarded for whatever you spend, even for the morsel of food you put in your wife’s mouth.’ So I said, ‘O Messenger of God, will I be left behind from my emigration?’ He said, ‘If you are left behind, for every deed you do for the pleasure of God you will increase in rank and stature. Perhaps you will be left behind after me so that some people benefit from you while others are harmed by you. But the unfortunate one is Sa‘d b. Khawla.’ The Prophet expressed sorrow at his death as he died in Makka. Sufyān said: Sa‘d b. Khawla is of the Āmir b. Lu‘ayy tribe.

Analysing the various versions of this hadith, one sees that much of the variation in the text is strongly correlated to the variation in the chains of narration through which the versions are narrated. A comparison of the sixteen versions of the hadith which are reported on the authority of Sufyān—Zuhrī—Āmir—Sa‘d with the thirteen versions narrated on the authority of Mālik—Zuhrī—Āmir—Sa‘d identifies certain definite patterns within the text in each of the two groups. Later, when we add the eleven versions of the hadith narrated through

4 In many cases the decision to assign a number to an occurrence of the hadith is straightforward. Sometimes, however, I have assigned two distinct numbers to versions which are not necessarily distinct (as one example of many, see the discussion of Versions 55 and 57 on p. 14). The only logic to the numbering is that of convenience—where I encounter a phenomenon in which I will need to distinguish between two narrations of a hadith, I have assigned two numbers to the narration.
Thawrī—‘Āmir—Sa‘d, we find that the texts of this group also have
their own distinct features.

Comparing these versions group by group with each other, the anom-
alous will begin to stand out. This is the phenomenon I would like to
identify clearly in the forthcoming section. In this first look, I will speak
broadly of the topics mentioned in the various versions—basically
ignoring variations in the wording of the sentences representing these
topics. In a second look at these versions (page 16) I will study the
correlation of details such as the peculiarities of wording and the
treatment of issues mentioned in the hadiths to the chains of narration.
In this section I will simply identify these two phenomena.

Figure 1 provides an overview of the chains of narration through
which the 114 versions studied in this paper are transmitted.

The hadith is reported from Sa‘d himself along with a few versions
(105–7) which report it on the authority of ‘Ā’ishah bint Abī Bakr and
some (108–14) which report it from ‘Umar b. al-Qārī. The most numer-
ous versions (1–62) are reported by Sa‘d’s son ‘Amr from Sa‘d. Forty-
five (1–45) of these are reported through Zuhrī—‘Āmir—Sa‘d. The
other major group of these reports (46–58) is through Sa‘d b. Ibrāhīm—
‘Āmir—Sa‘d.

There are four major groups of versions narrated from Sa‘d by
narrators other than Sa‘d’s son ‘Amir. Versions 63–71 are narrated by
Humayd b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Himyarī who heard the hadith from
‘three children of Sa‘d’. Another one of Sa‘d’s sons, Mus‘ab, narrates
versions 72–80 from Sa‘d. Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī narrates
versions 81–8 from Sa‘d, while a daughter of Sa‘d, ‘Ā’ishah, narrates ver-
sions 92–7 from Sa‘d.

THE APPEARANCE OF VARIOUS THEMES:
HADITHS OF ‘ĀMIR B. SA‘D—SA‘D

The following outline describes the hadith of ‘Āmir b. Sa‘d—Sa‘d—
the Prophet (versions 1–62):

The Visit
A The circumstances of the visit: time, place, and fact of illness.
B The Prophet’s visit.

5 Two of the narrators from Zuhrī are named Sufyān: Sufyān al-Thawrī and Sufyān
b. ‘Umayna. I will refer to Sufyān al-Thawrī as ‘al-Thawrī’, while I will use ‘Sufyān’ to
refer to Sufyān b. ‘Umayna.
The Question of the Bequest
C That Sa'd had a lot of wealth.
D That he had only one heir, a daughter.
E A conversation on the amount of the bequest.
F Reason for denial of request: Better leave your heirs rich...
G Consolation: Whatever you spend will be considered a good deed.

The Issue of Emigration

The specific question
H Sa'd's concern regarding being 'left behind'.
I Parry and consolation: If you are left behind, your good deeds will increase your rank with God.
J Veiled prediction that Sa'd will survive the illness.

The general problem
K Prophet's prayer for the emigrations of his companions.
L Grief at Sa'd b. Khawla's death.
M Identification of the reason for the Prophet's grief.

In studying the appearance of these sentences in the versions of this hadith, I find it useful to think of full versions and truncated versions. Truncation is sometimes explicit, where a bit of the hadith is narrated and then the author of the hadith collection writes 'and he narrated the remainder of the hadith...' or words to that effect. Sometimes there is an argument for presuming that such a truncation would have occurred. The context of the narration of the hadith can itself suggest this as I will argue in the case of version 5 below. Or, the fact that all the sentences related to a single theme are missing can suggest that perhaps one of the narrators or the hadith collector was interested in only a certain subject discussed in the hadith and so he narrated only the sentences of the hadith dealing with that subject. Thus, there will be full versions, explicitly truncated versions, versions with contextual indication of truncation, and versions in which there is a likelihood of truncation along thematic lines.

Figure 2 is an abbreviated representation of the way in which the thirteen sentences appear or do not appear in the first twenty-three of the hadiths I will discuss. Each letter in the second-last column to the right indicates the presence of the sentence with the corresponding label in the outline above. For the full versions, in the far right column I have also listed letters representing the sentences missing in each version—while a dash in place of a letter indicates the presence of the sentence corresponding to that letter.
Figure 1: An Abbreviated Representation of the 114 Versions of the Hadith of Sa'd.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain of Narration</th>
<th>Sentence Present</th>
<th>Missing Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sa‘id b. Mansūr</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Humaydī</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ibn Sa‘d</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/JKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Humaydī</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yūnus</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB ????? HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Humaydī</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDE/........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ‘Amr b. ‘Uthmān</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ‘Uthmān b. A. Shayba</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ibn A. ‘Umar</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/ IJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hishām, Ḥusayn, Sahīb</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sa‘dān b. Naṣr</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/b JKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Zakariyā b. Yahyā</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/....../G/HIJ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Zakariyā al-Mirwāzī</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>aB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Zakariyā al-Mirwāzī</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>aB/....../........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Abū Khaythama</td>
<td>Sufyān</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Ahmad b. Yūnus</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Sa‘d</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Yahyā b. Qaza‘a</td>
<td>Ibrāhīm b. Sa‘d</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/HJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ta‘ālīsī</td>
<td>Abū b. Sa‘d, Ibn</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/ABHIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Mūsā b. Ismā‘il</td>
<td>Ibn Abī Salāma</td>
<td>AB/CDEFG/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2:** Hadiths of Zuhri—‘Āmir—Sa‘d: Group 1.

I have used a lower-case letter to represent a sentence in a version where the wording of that sentence is significantly different from the usual wording. For example, in version 14 the first sentence has been split up:

\[\text{...} \quad \text{أَنَّهُ مَرْضَ عَامٍ لَغَدَّ مَرْضًا أَضْفَقَ مَنَّهُ عَلَى الْمَوْتُ، فَأَتَاهُ النَّبِيُّ صلى الله عليه وسلم يُؤْهِبُهُ وَهُوَ مَتَّ} \]

[Sa‘d said that:] he became ill in Makka to the point that his illness took him to the brink of death. So the Prophet ṣallā llāhu ‘alayhi wa-sallama came to visit him while he was in Makka.

Normally, the mention of Makka comes along with the mention of Sa‘d’s sickness so that A can properly represent all the ‘circumstances of the visit’ as in the outline. I indicate this, and similar minor variations from the routine, by the lower-case form of the letter representing the sentence.

I represent the simple omission of a sentence by a blank in the place
where one expects the letter which stands for the sentence. Thus, since there is a blank in the space for M in version 2, one knows that the sentence simply does not appear in this version.

I have placed question marks instead of letters representing sentences where there is a contextual indication of truncation. In version 5, there are question marks where one expects C to G. This hadith is taken from Tahawi’s *Sharh Ma’ani l-Athar* from a chapter discussing hadiths dealing with emigration. The sentences dealing with Sa’d’s bequest have been omitted as a unit. This context suggests the possibility that Tahawi might have had the entire hadith but narrated only the portion which was relevant to his immediate discussion.

I have placed dots instead of letters representing sentences where the narration of the hadith itself contains explicit indication that the narrator has truncated the hadith. Version 6, for example, is taken from the *Tambhid* of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr. This version occurs in the middle of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s discussion of Malik’s narration of this hadith in the *Muwatta*. Having already quoted a few other versions of this hadith, and being in the midst of discussing the full version of this hadith in the *Muwatta*, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr narrates sentences A to E of the hadith and then says ‘... and he narrated the [rest of the] hadith’.

Along with version 6, versions 9, 13, and 15 also contain explicit indications that the hadith has been truncated. Abû Dâwûd narrates version 9 in his *Sunan* on the authority of a ‘joint’ chain of narration: ‘Uthmân b. Abî Shayba and Ibn Abî Khalaf both said… Sa’d said that he fell ill (Ibn Abî Khalaf added the words ‘in Makka’, then they both agreed in their narration) in illness during which he came to the brink of death…’ The parenthetical mention of the difference between Ibn Abî Khalaf’s narration and that of ‘Uthmân b. Abî Shayba could justify assuming that we have here two narrations each of which contained all the thirteen sentences which Abû Dâwûd mentions. If he is careful enough to note the missing word ‘in Makka’, he certainly would note the omission of an entire sentence. Nevertheless, because of the speculation here, I have chosen somewhat arbitrarily to assign the version to ‘Uthmân b. Abî Shayba and to attribute only sentence A to Ibn Abî Khalaf. Bayhaqi mentions version 13 after recording version 12 in full. After quoting the portion of the hadith which differs from version 12 he says that the narrator of version 13 related the rest of the hadith as in version 12. Baghawi records version 15 on the authority of Zakariya b. Yahya b. Asad having quoted a fuller version of the hadith of Sa’d, and after narrating the first two sentences he says ‘and he narrated a hadith with the same meaning’. In this case we also have a version of this hadith in *Tarikh Dimashq* which is narrated through Zakariya b. Yahya b. Asad. This is a full version containing all but sentence M.
This too could be taken as evidence that Baghawi might have had the fuller version. Considering the tendentious nature of this field, however, I have dismissed these versions to minimize the speculation involved in reaching my results.

As Figure 2 shows, four versions (6, 9, 13, 15) contain explicit truncation; three versions (7, 11, 23) are abbreviated in a way which suggests that thematic interest was the cause of the truncation. Of the remaining sixteen versions, there are three (3, 10, 13) which are missing one or two sentences. The only other anomaly is that in versions 14 and 15, both narrated by the same student of Sufyân, the initial sentence is divided up as discussed above (page 8).

Malik’s hadiths from Zuhri—‘Amir—Sa’d follow the same general pattern as those of Sufyân from Zuhri—‘Amir—Sa’d, although they are easily distinguished from Sufyân’s hadith in their wording:

Malik told us on the authority of Ibn Shihab [al-Zuhri] from ‘Amir b. Sa’d b. Abi Waqqas from his father that his father said: The Messenger of God “Allahu ‘alayhi wa-sallama” came to visit me while I was ill during the year of the Farewell Pilgrimage because of a severe illness. I said: ‘O Messenger of God, you see the stage my illness has reached and I have some wealth and only my daughter is inheriting from me. May I give away two-thirds of my wealth in charity?’ The Messenger of God “Allahu ‘alayhi wa-sallama” said: ‘No.’ So I said: ‘What about a half?’ He said: ‘No.’ Then the Messenger of God “Allahu ‘alayhi wa-sallama” said: ‘A third, and a third is a lot. It is better that you leave your offspring wealthy than that you leave them paupers, begging from people. You will be rewarded for whatever you spend for the sake of God, even for the morsel of food you put in your wife’s mouth.’ I said, ‘O Messenger of God, will I be left behind from after my companions?’ So the Messenger of God “Allahu ‘alayhi wa-sallama” said, ‘If you are left behind, for every deed you do for the pleasure of God you will increase in rank and stature. Perhaps you will be left behind after me so that some people benefit from you while others are harmed by you. But the unfortunate one is Sa’d b. Khawla.’ The Prophet expressed sorrow at his death because he died in Makka.

6 It is worth noting that in each of versions 7 and 11 the hadith actually ends at sentence F. Another look at the outline on page 6 will indicate that it is possible to view sentence F as part of the succeeding discussion of emigration. Such an amendment in the outline would make the abbreviation in versions 7 and 11 fit my definition of truncation due to thematic interest quite precisely.
RIJĀL AS A METHOD IN THE STUDY OF HADITHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain of Narration</th>
<th>Sentences Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mus'ab al-Zubayrī</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Mus'ab al-Zubayrī</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Mus'ab al-Zubayrī</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Abū Mus‘ab</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Abū Mus‘ab</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Suwayd b. Sa‘īd</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Suwayd b. Sa‘īd</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. al-Shāhī</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 'Abdullah b. Yūsuf</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Ibn Qa‘nab and Ibn Bukayr</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Ibn Qa‘nab and Ibn Bukayr</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Ibn Qa‘nab and Ibn Bukayr</td>
<td>Malik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Ibn Wahb</td>
<td>Malik, Yūnus, and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z-A-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/CDEFG/HIJKLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/E./......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Mālik’s Hadiths of Zuhrī—'Āmir—Sa‘īd (Z-A-S).

The outline used to discuss Ṣufyān’s hadiths from Zuhrī can also be used for Mālik’s hadiths from Zuhrī—'Āmir—Sa‘īd. One notes (Figure 3) that the initial two sentences are inverted in all the hadiths narrated through Mālik. All the versions are complete except for versions 32 and 37. Version 32 is taken from Taḥawwī who, having narrated a few versions of this hadith, records the first two sentences of the hadith of Sa‘īd and then says ‘then he mentioned this hadith’. Version 37 is also better seen as a reference to the hadith than as a ‘version’. Bayhaqī records the hadith through a joint isnād within which Ibn Wahb also figures. At the end of the narration, Bayhaqī says, ‘... and in Ibn Wahb’s narration the words are: “I said: What about a half, O messenger of God?” He said: “No. A third, and a third is a large amount (or: a third is a lot).”’ As we shall see later in the discussion of wording, hadiths narrated through Mālik are outstading in their uniformity.

Versions 38–45 (Figure 4) include a set of four versions from ‘Abd al-Razzāq—Ma‘mar—Zuhrī—’Āmir—Sa‘īd. ‘Version’ 41 is another case which might better be called a ‘reference’ to the hadith: Muslim quotes the chain of narration and simply says that ‘a similar hadith’ was narrated to him through this chain. The texts of the three versions are quite complete and the order of presentation is the same as in the initial outline which I proposed for the Ṣufyān—Zuhrī—’Āmir—Sa‘īd hadiths (page 4).

In version 42 all the sentences related to emigration are missing. Version 43 is complete, the only notable point being the inverted order of the two introductory sentences. The final two versions of the Zuhrī—
| Chain of Narration | Sentences Present |...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Razzāq</td>
<td>Ma'mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Razzāq</td>
<td>Ma'mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Razzāq</td>
<td>Ma'mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abd al-Razzāq</td>
<td>Ma'mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakam b. Nāfī'</td>
<td>Shuʿayb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakam b. Nāfī'</td>
<td>Shuʿayb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Other Hadiths of Zuhri—'Amir—Sa’d (Z-A-S).

'Amir—Sa’d hadiths provide an interesting example of extreme abbreviation. Both hadiths are recorded by Bukhārī from Abū I-Yaman al-Hakam b. Nāfī', from Shuʿayb from the Z-A-S chain. Both are restricted simply to the sentence: ‘You will be rewarded for whatever you spend, even for the morsel of food you put in your wife’s mouth,"

The hadiths of Sa’d b. Ibrāhīm—’Amir—Sa’d differ significantly from the hadiths of Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d. It remains possible to use the same outline as I have proposed for the Sufyān-Z-A-S hadiths, but a new outline is more appropriate.

My decision to treat this as an abbreviation could be disputed. It is possible that this is not a case of abbreviation and that the hadith which Shuʿayb had was entirely limited to this one sentence. I consider this to be an abbreviation from the longer hadith for the following reasons: (1) Version 45 contains the words ‘The Prophet said to Sa’d...’ which can be seen as a reference to the entire incident with Sa’d. (2) In his discussion of this hadith in 'Umdat al-qārī ‘Aynī writes: ‘We have narrated this hadith from Ma’mar, Yūnus b. Yazid, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Abī Salāma, Yahyā b. Sa’īd al-Anṣārī, Ibn Ābī ‘Arūf, and Ibrāhīm b. Sa’d, and all of them have said on the authority of Zuhri: ‘the year of the Farewell Pilgrimage’, as Malik has said. And Shuʿayb too has said this.’ If the hadith of Shuʿayb had any bearing on the question of the time of this incident it must have been longer than the versions Bukhārī has recorded. (3) Bayhaqī too refers to the hadith of Shuʿayb as having a bearing on this issue of the timing of this incident (Ahmad b. Husayn b. ‘Alī al-Bayhaqī (d. 458), al-Sunūn al-kubrā, 10 vols. (Hyderabad: Da’irat al-Maʿarif al-Nizamiyya, 192), vi. 268). (4) Version 56 of Sa’d b. Ibrāhīm—’Amir is also limited to just this sentence. That version, too, belongs to a family of versions all of which relate the hadith in a much fuller form. This suggests that early narrators might have considered it sufficient in its didactic content to stand by itself.
Fadl b. Dukayn and Muhammad b. ‘Abdullāh al-Asadī informed us, they said: Sufyān informed us on the authority of Sa‘d from ‘Āmir b. Sa‘d from Sa‘d that he said: ‘The Prophet sallā lāhu ‘alayhi wa-sallama came to visit me during my illness while I was in Makka, and he disliked it that I die in the land which I had emigrated away from. He said, ‘May God have mercy on Ibn ‘Afra’.” I said “O Messenger of God, may I bequeath all my wealth?” He said, “No.” I said, “How about a half?” He said, “No.” I said, “A third?” He said, “A third, and a third is a lot. It is better that you leave your offspring wealthy than that you leave them paupers, begging people for what they have. You will be rewarded for whatever you spend, even for the morsel of food you put in your wife’s mouth. Perhaps Allah will raise you up [from this sickness] so that some people benefit from you while others are harmed by you.”’ He said: And he had only a daughter at that time.

In this hadith (version 54) the portion dealing with the issue of Sa‘d’s emigration is a somewhat brief preface to the main part of the hadith which is the discussion of the bequest. I suggest the following outline for the hadiths of Sa‘d b. Ibrāhīm from ‘Āmir-Sa‘d:

**The Visit and its Circumstances**
A  The Prophet’s visit.
B  The circumstances of the visit: place [and fact of illness].

**The Issue of the Emigration**
C  Circumstances of the visit: That he disliked that one die in the land from which one had emigrated away.
D  The statement about Ibn ‘Afra’.

**The Question of the Bequest**
E  A conversation on the amount of the bequest.
F  Reason for denial of request: Better leave your heirs rich...
G  Consolation: Whatever you spend will be considered a good deed.
H  Veiled prediction that Sa‘d will survive the illness.
I  That he had only one heir, a daughter.

Comparing this outline with that of Sufyān’s hadith (page 5) one sees immediately that the issue of the bequest holds the centre stage in this outline. The issue of emigration is subsumed into the circumstance of the visit, and as we can see from Figure 5, in four versions the sentences relating to the emigration are simply omitted.

Again in Figure 5, a dash (‘—’) indicates the definite absence of a

---

8 The ‘fact of [Sa‘d’s] illness’ is sometimes explicitly mentioned and sometimes not. However, the word used for the Prophet’s visit is ‘iyāda which can only be used in the case of a visit to a sick person. For this reason I have chosen not to distinguish between versions which make explicit mention of his illness and those which are content with mention of the word ‘iyāda.
sentence, while a dot (‘.’) indicates its possible presence. A lower-case letter indicates that the sentence is there but in a sufficiently different form to warrant notice. An asterisk (‘*’) indicates that the sentence is present but at a different position from where it is expected. In addition there is a space after the D since in two of the versions sentence I comes after sentence D.

The abbreviated version 53 is in Muslim’s Sahih. Muslim relates the chain of narration and then says ‘he reported a hadith similar in meaning to the hadith of Zuhri, but he did not mention the statement about Sa’d b. ‘Afra’ and he did mention the sentence that “he disliked that he die in the land from which he had emigrated away.” Thus, the dash in the position of qD indicates that D is definitely not present, while the dots indicate the possibility that those sentences might well have been in the version referred to.

Versions 55 and 57 are actually a single hadith narrated through a ‘joint chain of narration’ where Wakir says that Mis‘ar and Sufyân [al-Thawri] related the hadith to him. I have chosen to assign the words to Thawri, while they could equally well have been Mis‘ar’s.

The hadiths of Sa’d b. Ibrâhim are far less regular than the groups of hadiths we have looked at. This is reflected in the fact that it is more difficult to depict them in an abbreviated form. Sentence I, regarding Sa’d having had only one daughter at the time of this incident, occurs in three of the versions. In versions 47 and 48 it occurs right before the conversation on the bequest. In version 49 it occurs at the very end of the hadith after the conversation on the bequest. To depict the order of appearance of sentence I properly, I have left a blank space after the position for sentence D in all the versions. The asterisk in versions 47 and 48 is to indicate that sentence I occurs in these sentences. Version 55 is particularly hard to represent. Sentence d occurs, but it occurs as the second to last sentence. Sentence H is also not at its usual place. The lower-case d refers to the fact that in this version the statement of the Prophet regarding Sa’d b. ‘Afra’ occurs as follows:

... فذكر سعد الهجرة فقال: يرحم الله سعد ابن عفرا...

...and Sa’d mentioned emigration so the Prophet said: ‘May God have mercy on Sa’d ibn ‘Afra.’

Of course, this addition to the usual version of statement D is clearly a statement of a narrator and not the words of the Prophet. Similarly, sentence I (‘He said: And he had only a daughter at that time’) is the statement of an unidentified narrator. Nevertheless, the varied place-
I have identified the few differences between the two versions by putting them in parentheses. Perhaps the only significant difference is that the final sentence in version 59 draws the conclusion from Sa‘d’s bequest of a third by saying ‘So people began to bequeath a third, and this became permissible for them.’ In version 60 this sentence is: ‘So Sa‘d bequeathed a third and this was permissible for him.’ Naturally, a jurist
would then draw the conclusion of version 59 as a further step: since it was permissible for Sa‘d, it is permissible for us. Version 61 consists of mention of the visit of the Prophet; then it reports Sa‘d as crying and asking the Prophet if he would die in this land from which he had emigrated away. The Prophet explicitly says that, God willing, he will not. Then follows the conversation on the bequest followed by the sentence that it is better to leave his heirs rich than to leave them as paupers. Version 62 has no introduction and consists simply of the conversation on the bequest followed by the sentence that it is better to leave one’s heirs well-off than to leave them as paupers.

THE WORDING

To compare the wording of up to thirteen sentences as they occur or do not occur in over a hundred versions is a tedious task. Even more important, it becomes difficult to see the larger picture in such a morass of detail. It is important, however, to see the degree to which one can correlate certain chains of narration with regularity in the text of this hadith. With this intention I have chosen to provide three types of differential analyses of the wordings of the various versions.

I begin with an analysis of the first sentence of the hadith of Sa‘d in the versions narrated through his son ‘Āmir b. Sa‘d (versions 1–62). In its occurrence in these versions, this sentence provides a sort of mean example of the regular correlation between chain of narration and text. One finds that a particular wording of the hadith can definitely be associated with each ‘family’ of chains of narration (for example, the family of hadiths related through Zuhrî). On the other hand, even within such families, the wording does fluctuate. The crucial quality here is that the wordings within families are sufficiently similar that, were one to be faced with a text of the hadith of Sa‘d without a chain of narration associated with it, one would be able to provide an intelligent guess regarding its chain of narration. This can be contrasted with the narration of sentences F, G, H, I, J, and K² which are so regularly reported with essentially the same wording that no specific set of words

---

² All according to the outline based on the hadiths of Sufyân, on page 5. From the section on bequest: F-Reason for denial of request: Better leave your heirs rich... G-Consolation: Whatever you spend will be considered a good deed. From the section dealing with emigration: H-Sa‘d’s concern regarding being ‘left behind’. I-Parry and consolation: If you are left behind, your good deeds will increase your rank with God. J-Veiled prediction that Sa‘d will survive the illness. K-Prophet’s prayer for the emigrations of his companions.
can be seen as a particularly strong indication that that version is narrated through a particular family of chains of narration.\textsuperscript{10}

After the analysis of the first sentence, I discuss four specific issues on which the versions do differ:

(1) Did the event occur during the Farewell Pilgrimage or in the year of the Conquest of Makka?
(2) Was Sa‘d’s question regarding bequest (\textit{was\textsuperscript{t}ya}) or was it regarding giving his wealth away as charity (\textit{s\textsuperscript{a}daqa})?
(3) Why did Sa‘d wish to give his wealth away?
(4) In the conversation on the bequest, did the negotiation (which finally settled on a third) actually proceed?

Naturally we will never really know the answer to these questions. The question being asked is: what information should we understand the hadith of Sa‘d to be giving us on these issues?

\textit{The Introductory Sentence in the ‘Āmir b. Sa‘d—Sa‘d hadiths}

To allow the presentation of the first sentence of the hadith in a single line, I will adopt the abbreviations in the left column of Figure 7 for the phrases in the right column.

I have used this abbreviated notation to describe the hadiths narrated

\textsuperscript{10} The versions which do report these sentences with an unusual wording are particularly obvious because of the overall homogeneity in the narration of these sentences. But none of the major families of chains of narrations have any peculiar wording associated only with the texts narrated through them.
from ‘Āmir—Saʿd\(^{11}\) in Figure 8. A look at the figure suffices to show how groups of hadiths cluster together in their wording—so much so that it is quite conceivable that one could recognize the chain of narration of a hadith simply by looking at its words. Again, the versions related through some narrators are far more consistent than those related through others. Versions related through Mālik (24–36) are by far the most consistent, while those related through Sufyān are a little less so.

It is important to bear in mind, once again, that counting hadiths can be misleading: it is far more important to identify the people around whom patterns of consistency emerge. Further, consistency in wording is really an additional thing. Early narrators of hadith are themselves quoted as having taken responsibility only for transmitting the meanings of hadiths—though they may well have striven to maintain the wordings also. The level of consistency in wording and in broader meaning at the level of the students of Zuhārī, and then at the level of Zuhārī and his contemporaries, is worth noting. As I will argue later, if this is a typical hadith, then this level of consistency in narrations will allow us to identify with precision narrators whose narrations are to be relied upon, even where the numbers go against them.

*The Time of the Event*

Those of the hadiths narrated through Sufyān—Zuhārī—‘Āmir—Saʿd which do record a time for the event record it as being the year of the Conquest of Makkah. However, hadiths narrated through Ibrāhīm b. Saʿd, Ibn Abī Salāma, Mālik, Maʿmar, Muhammad b. Ishāq, and Sufyān b. Husayn all narrating from Zuhārī record the event as occurring in the year of the Farewell Pilgrimage. ‘Amar b. al-Qārī’s hadiths are the only other hadiths which place the event in the year of the Conquest and they do so in an unequivocal manner:

ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قدم مكة، وخلق سعد مريضاً حيث خرج إلى حنين. فلما قدم من جعراتة معتمراً دخل عليه...\(^{12}\)

The Messenger of God *sallā llāhu 'alayhi wa sallama* came to Makkah and he left Saʿd behind when he left for Ḥunayn. Then, when he returned from Jīʿirānā to visit the holy places [in Makkah] he came to him [i.e. to Saʿd]...\(^{13}\)

I have already made incidental mention (in note 7 on p. 12) of the comments of ‘Aynī and Bayhaqī on this issue: both argue that Sufyān

\(^{11}\) Of course, only those hadiths which have an introductory sentence have been described.
is in error here. Their argument is simply that, though Sufyân is a reliable narrator, more reliable narrators have it from Zuhrî that the event occurred in the year of the Farewell Pilgrimage. Ibn Hajar\textsuperscript{12} points out that the hadith of ‘Amr b. al-Qârî supports Sufyân’s version:

I have found support for [Sufyân] ibn ‘Uyayna’s version in the hadith of ‘Amr b. al-Qârî which Ahmad, Bazzar, Tabarânî, Bukhârî in his Târîkh, and Ibn Sa’d have narrated: ‘The Prophet sallâ llâhu ‘alayhi wa-sallama came and left Sa’d ill...’ Perhaps Ibn ‘Uyayna confused one hadith with the other...

Thus Ibn Hajar argues that, as far as the hadith of Zuhrî is concerned, Sufyân stands overruled by the reliable narrators opposing his narration. The source of his error might have been his knowledge of the hadith of ‘Amr b. al-Qârî. Nevertheless he is not able to come up with a solution better than to suggest that the event might have happened twice—once in the year of the Conquest, and another time during the Farewell Pilgrimage. ‘Amr b. al-Qârî’s hadith cannot be dismissed easily either, since the narrators in it are all considered reliable.

Bequest or Alms?

Another point on which the hadith of Sa’d seems to vacillate when viewed as a whole, is whether Sa’d was asking permission to bequeath his wealth or whether he wanted to give it all away in charity. A derivative of the word sadaqa would indicate a desire to give it away as charity, while a derivative of waṣîya would indicate bequest. When the hadiths of Sa’d are viewed as a whole, the issue seems rather unclear. But when the textual variation is indexed to its chain of narration we see, as in Figure 9, that the variation is quite discrete.

I have coded the hadiths of ‘Amr b. al-Qârî with a question mark to indicate that in each of the versions the narrator expresses his doubt as to whether the hadith used the wording indicating bequest or that indicating alms. It is only in the narrations of Sufyân from Zuhrî that we see any vacillation on this within a family of texts. This study of the hadith of Sa’d has allowed us a brief amount of exposure to the qualities of hadith narrators. Based on this admittedly small corpus, one might hazard that the narration of those who speak of alms in narrating this hadith from Sufyân—Zuhrî ought to be preferred to the four versions which speak of bequest. These four versions are:

(1) No. 3 which Ibn Sa’d narrates from Sufyân;

Sufyan—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

1. annahu qadima M
   ’amF qala: fa-mrd
   mrdN ashfaqtu ’ala nafsī mwt fa-atRy
2. mrdt bi-M ’amF
   mrdN ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt fa-atRy
3. mrdt
   mrdN ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt fa-atRy
4. mrdt bi-M
   mrdN fa-ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt fa-atNy
5. mrdt ’amF
   mrdN ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt fa-atRy
6. mrdt bi-M ’amF
   mrdN ashfaytu minhu fa-atRy
7. mrdt
   mrdN ashfaytu minhu fa-atRy
8. mrd
   mrdN ashfā fihi fa’-‘adR
9. mrd
   mrdN bi-M ashfā fihi fa-atNy
10. mrdt ’amF
    mrdN ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt fa-atRy
11. mrdt ’amF
    ḥattā ashfaytu ’ala mwt fa’-‘adR
12. mrdt ’amF
    mrdN ashfaytu minhu fa-atRy
13. annahu mrd ’amF wa-huwa bi-M
    mrdN ashfā minhu ’ala mwt fa-atNy wa huwa bi-M
14. mrdt ’amF
    mrdN ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt atRy fihi
15. mrdt ’amF
    mrdN ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt

Ibrahim b. Sa’d—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

17. ‘adN ft hijj min waja’in ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt
18. ‘adN ft hijj min mrdN ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt
19. ‘adR ft hijj min shakwa ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt
20. ‘adR ft hijj min waja’in ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt

Sufyan—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

21. ‘adN ft hijj min waja’in ashfaytu minhu ’ala mwt

Ibrahim b. Sa’d, Ibn Abî Salâma, and others—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

22. mrdt mrdN ashfaytu minhu fa-dakhala ’alayya R ya’uduni
    Ibn Abî Salâma—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

23. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt

Malik—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

24. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
25. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
26. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
27. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
28. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
29. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
30. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
31. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
32. jāRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
33. kRy ’am hijj min waja’in ishtadda bt
34. jāRy ’am hijj, qa’a: wa bt waja’un qad ishtadda
35. jāRy ’am hijj, qa’a: wa bt waja’un qad ishtadda
36. jāRy ’am hijj, qa’a: wa bt waja’un qad ishtadda

Ma’mar—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

38. kuntu ma’a R ft hijj fa mrdt mrdN ashfā ’ala mwt, qâl: fa-‘adR
39. kuntu ma’a R ft hijj fa mrdt mrdN ashfaytu ’ala mwt fa-‘adR
40. kuntu ma’a R ft hijj fa mrdt mrdN ashfā ’alayya minhu mwt fa-‘adR

Muhammad b Ishâq—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

42. Ishrâkaytu ma’a N ft hijj hârât idhâ adnafru fadhakhala ’alayya R ya’uduni
    Sufyan b. Husayn—Zuhri—’Amir—Sa’d

43. Anna R ’adahu ft marâdihi bi-makkata

Figure 8: The Wording of the Introductory Sentence of ‘Amir’s hadiths from Sa’d.
### Versions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain of Narration</th>
<th>Bequest</th>
<th>Alms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–16 Sufyān—Zuhrī—‘Āmir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17–21 Ibrāhīm b. Sa‘d—Zuhrī—‘Āmir</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (joint isnād)—Zuhrī—‘Āmir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ibn Abī Salāma—Zuhrī—‘Āmir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24–36 Mālik—Zuhrī—‘Āmir</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38–41 Ma‘mar—Zuhrī—‘Āmir</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Ibn Ishaq—Zuhrī—‘Āmir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Sufyān b. Husayn—Zuhrī—‘Āmir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46–58 Sa‘d b. Ibrāhīm—‘Āmir</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59–60 Ḥāshim b. Ḥāshim—‘Āmir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 Bukayr b. Mismar—‘Āmir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Jarīr b. Zayd—‘Āmir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63–71 Ḥumayd—3 children of Sa‘d</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72–80 Mus‘ab b. Sa‘d</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81–7 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88–91 Muhammad b. Sa‘d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92–7 ‘A‘isha bint Sa‘d</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Abū Bakr b. Ḥafṣ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 Ibn Jūrayī—‘Ata’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103–7 ‘A‘isha bint Abī Bakr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108–14 ‘Amr b. al-Qārī—father—grandfather</td>
<td>5?</td>
<td>5?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 9: Sa‘d’s Request: Bequest or Alms?

2. No. 10 which Tirmidhī narrates from Ibn Abī ‘Umar—Sufyān;
3. No. 12 which Bayhaqqī narrates through Sa‘dān b. Naṣr—Sufyān;
4. No. 16 which Abū Ya‘lā narrates from Abū Khaythama—Sufyān.

On the other side we have narrations by Sa‘īd b. Mansūr (1), ‘Amr b. ‘Uthmān (7), ‘Uthmān b. Abī Shayba (8), Zakariyā b. Yahyā al-Mirwāzī (14), the narration of Ibn Māja’s Sunan through a joint chain of narration (11), and, most important, three versions from Humaydī (1 in his Musnad, 4 in Bukhārī’s Sahih, and 6 in Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s Tāmīdī). Although this is drawing on material which goes beyond the text of the hadith, Humaydī is known as one of Sufyān’s strongest students. Indeed a look at his Musnad indicates that it is almost a collection of the hadiths of Sufyān. Thus, it would seem that it is not simply that more narrators relate the hadith of Zuhrī—‘Āmir as speaking of alms, but that the more reliable narrators are relating it in this manner.

One would be comfortable with this, were it not for the fact that one finds Sufyān b. Husayn and Ma‘mar also narrating the hadith from Zuhrī—‘Āmir as speaking of bequest. In addition, all the other narrators of this hadith, including others who narrate it from ‘Āmir, speak of bequest. Perhaps we can trace this ambivalence to ‘Āmir himself: he
Chain of Narration | No reason | Own wealth | One heir | Rich heirs
---|---|---|---|---
Zuhri—‘Āmir | | 34 | 34 |
Sa’d b. Ibrāhīm—‘Āmir | 4 | | 5 |
Hāshim b. Hāshim—‘Āmir | | | 2 |
Bukayr b. Masmar—‘Āmir | 1 | | |
Jarir b. Zayd—‘Āmir | | | 1 |
Ḥumayd—3 children of Sa’d | | 7 | |
Mus‘ab b. Sa’d | | 6 | |
Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulami | 1 | | 6 |
Muhammad b. Sa’d | | 3 | |
‘Ā’isha bint Sa’d | | 3 | 3 |
Abū Bakr b. Ḥafṣ | 1 | | 1 |
Ibn Jurayj—‘Atā’ | 1 | | 1 |
‘Ā’isha bint Abī Bakr | 4 | | |
‘Amr b. al-Qārī | 6 | | 6 |

Figure 10: The Circumstances of Sa’d’s Request.

might have narrated it in both ways. Consider, for example, the hadith of Abū Bakr b. Ḥafṣ (version 98) which has Sa’d asking the Prophet:

أفرصي في إخواني (يعني المهاجرين) بالثلث

May I bequeath two-thirds to my brothers [meaning, the Emigrants]?

In this case the bequest itself would be a bequest to charity! Certainly the Prophet’s follow-up (‘... whatever you spend will be considered as charity...’) would suggest that Sa’d was thinking of last-minute good deeds to do: a simple bequest would be relevant to his fear of death, but not to the Prophet’s reply.

The Background to Sa’d’s Request

Sa’d prefaces his request with mention of one or more of three circumstances: (i) that he has a lot of wealth, (ii) that his heirs are rich, and (iii) that he has only one heir. Figure 10 shows the distribution of these three circumstances among the various versions.

Along with the complete unanimity of the Zuhri—‘Āmir hadiths on the circumstances of the request, note that all the other hadiths of ‘Āmir present nothing incompatible with the explicit description of circum-
stances in the Zuhri—ʿĀmir hadiths. Either no reason is put forth, or the statement that Saʿd himself was wealthy is left out. Going further down the figure one finds that Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī is the only narrator whose hadiths present Saʿd’s having had rich heirs as the reason for this request. Again, using the rudimentary knowledge of *rijāl* I have been developing in this paper, perhaps one would want to look at al-Sulami’s general career as hadith narrator—is it just that in this hadith he is narrating differently from other narrators, or is it the case that he often differs from other reliable narrators? If it is the latter, then perhaps we could begin to form a judgement that he cannot be relied upon.

*The Conversation on the Amount of the Bequest*

The progression of the conversation on the bequest is probably the one thing which varies most within the hadiths of ʿĀmir. I have listed the chains of narration from ʿĀmir—Saʿd in the far left column of Figure 11. Then I have constructed four columns for the four common ‘progressions’ I have found in the request to bequeath.

For example, ‘1 → ⅔ → ½’ in the column to the left after the chain of narration represents Saʿd asking permission to bequeath all his wealth, then, being denied that, asking permission to bequeath two-thirds, being denied which he asks permission to bequeath a half, being denied which he asks and finally gets permission to bequeath a third. In this column I have noted the number of versions from each chain of narration which record the conversation on the bequest as progressing in this manner.

I have put a ‘1 + 6’ in the row for the hadiths of al-Sulamī to indicate that one of these hadiths does indeed follow the pattern of requesting permission for bequeathing all his wealth, then two-thirds, then a half, and finally getting permission for a third. The six other versions are actually unique. When the Prophet arrives, Saʿd informs him that he has given away all of his wealth to charity. The Prophet tells him to bequeath only a tenth. Then Saʿd says, ‘... I kept bargaining with him and he kept bargaining with me until he said “Bequeath a third, and a third is a lot.”’

Here, restricting ourselves to looking only at the enumeration of differences, we find most Sufyān—Zuhri—ʿĀmir hadiths describing the event in one way, all the Mālik—Zuhri—ʿĀmir hadiths describing it another way, while all the Saʿd b. ʿIbrāhīm—ʿĀmir hadiths describe it a third way!

I think it important to note that even though this is the element which sustains the most variety in its narration, it too is not entirely random. One could explain away some of the variety by arguing that in narrating the meaning of the text, the thing which was relevant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain of Narration</th>
<th>1 → ½ → ½</th>
<th>1 → ¼</th>
<th>½</th>
<th>¼</th>
<th>½ → ¼</th>
<th>½ → ½</th>
<th>½ → ¼</th>
<th>½</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufyān—Zuhri—‘Āmir</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İbrahim b. Sa’d—Zuhri—‘Āmir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(joint isnād)—Zuhri—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Abī Salāma—Zuhri—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mālik—Zuhri—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma’mar—Zuhri—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Ishaq—Zuhri—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufyān b. Husayn—Zuhri—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa’d b. İbrahim—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḥāshim b. Ḥāshim—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukayr b. Mismar—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarīr b. Zayd—‘Āmir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humayd—3 children of Sa’d</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus‘ab b. Sa’d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī</td>
<td>1 + 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhammad b. Sa’d</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A’isha bint Sa’d</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Bakr b. Ḥafṣ</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Jurayj—‘Aṭā’</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘A’isha bint Abī Bakr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Amr b. al-Qārī—father—grandfather</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: The Progression of Sa’d’s Request in the Conversation on the Bequest.

to the narrators was the final decision of the Prophet. The only relevant point about all the intermediate questions was that bargaining occurred. Nevertheless, it is clear that, if there had been this wide a variety in all the portions of the narration of the hadith of Sa’d, one would be hard put to try to identify any patterns in the narrations of narrators.

THE HADITH OF SA’D B. ABĪ WAQQĀS

I have spoken of the hadith of Sufyān—Zuhri—‘Āmir—Sa’d, of that of Mālik—Zuhri—‘Āmir—Sa’d, and of a few other hadiths; but what
of the hadith of Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās? What does the hadith of Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās have to say? We could say that the hadith of Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās is a story about a man whom the Prophet visited either in the year of the Farewell Pilgrimage or in the year of the Conquest, who either wanted to bequeath all of his wealth, or he wanted to give it all away in charity, or he wanted to combine both bequest and charity, either because he had a lot of wealth, or because his heirs were rich, or because he had only one daughter, and so forth. Or, we could conduct a sort of statistical poll and speak of what most of the versions tell us about all of these issues and construct a sort of ‘mean version’ of the hadith of Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās. A third option is to choose those elements from various versions of Sa‘d’s hadith which make most sense to us from our prior study of the history of early Islam.

Each of these options, and a few which I have not listed, have been explored in the attention this hadith has received at the hands of Western scholars. I hope to have demonstrated, however, that it is simply not possible to discuss any text of this hadith without also looking at its chain of narration. In a sense it is erroneous to speak of the hadith of Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqās’. Consider, for example, version 72 where Sa‘d says:


Four statements of the Qur’ān were revealed about me. [Sa‘d] said: My mother swore that she would not eat or drink anything until I denied [the message of] the Prophet. [Sa‘d] said: So when we wanted to feed her we would take a stick and enter it into her mouth [to keep it open] and then we would pour food and drink into her mouth. So the following statement of the Qur’ān was revealed about me: ‘... and we enjoin man

---

13 It is clear that there are two groups of scholars who work in almost complete mutual independence on the hadith literature. A simple index of this independence is that there are two distinct corpora of bibliographic references which are considered necessary by each group. How one should refer to the two groups is not entirely evident. There are many ‘Muslim scholars’ whose work is clearly in the ‘Western’ style, and there are many ‘Western’ scholars whose work falls squarely within the classical Islamic tradition of hadith study. A more descriptive terminology would be to refer to scholars who work within the classical Islamic tradition of hadith study and those who work within the modern critical historical tradition of hadith study. I simply use the words ‘Western’ and ‘Muslim’ as an abbreviation to refer to these two groups of scholars.
to be good to his parents ... to God’s statement ‘... but if they struggle against you to make you associate [others] with Allah that which you do not know ...’ [Sa’d] said: We were gathered around drink and we began to compete with each other in boasting. I began to outdo a man from amongst the Ansār so he picked up the jaw-bone of a camel and he hit me on the nose with it. ([A narrator] said: So Sa’d’s nose was broken.) [Sa’d] said: The statement of the Qur’ān stating the prohibition of alcohol was revealed about me. [Sa’d] said: On the day of the battle of Badr I found a sword, so I brought it to the Prophet. I said: ‘O Prophet of God, grant it to me.’ He said: ‘Leave it.’ [Sa’d] said: I said, ‘Do not treat a warrior the way you would treat someone who cannot protect himself.’ So the Prophet said: ‘Leave it.’ Then the statement of the Qur’ān ‘... and they ask you about the spoils of war...’ [Sa’d] said: And the statement of the Qur’ān regarding inheritance was revealed about me.

This, too, is a ‘hadith of Sa’d’! Consider also version 92 related by ‘Ā’isha bint Sa’d from her father Sa’d b. Abī Waqqās:

قال سعد: اشتكتني بمكة فدخل علي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يعودني، فسمع وجهي وصدري، وبطني. وقال: اللهم اشف سعدا فما زالت بخيل إلى أني أ جني برده صلى الله عليه وسلم على كبدتي حتى الساعة.

Sa’d said: I became ill in Makka so the Messenger of God came to visit me. He passed his hand over my face and my chest and my stomach and said: ‘O God, heal Sa’d!’ To this moment it seems to me as if I can feel the coolness of the touch of his hand on my heart.

Viewing simply the texts of these hadiths, one is rapidly driven to the desperation exhibited in the ‘composite version’ of the hadith of Sa’d at the beginning of this section. Notice, however, that one could create such a situation of desperation even using the materials provided by the hadiths of ‘Āmir—Sa’d. It is just that, having assigned weights to the various narrators and their narrations, one is able to see one’s way through the undifferentiated mass of texts which would go by the name of ‘the hadith of ‘Āmir from Sa’d’.

Thus, I would suggest that we speak of the ‘Āmir’s hadith from Sa’d, and Mus‘ab’s hadith from Sa’d, and ‘Ā’isha bint Sa’d’s hadith from Sa’d. In particular in this hadith, all the hadiths which come through the students of Sa’d are themselves sufficiently homogeneous and often sufficiently distinguished from each other for us to be able to speak of hadiths of students of Sa’d. To aggregate all the hadiths of Sa’d yields far too much disparity even to allow for comparison. Within the hadiths of Sa’d, the level of Zuhri—‘Āmir and Sa’d b. Ibrāhīm—‘Āmir remains interesting in identifying the sources for the variations within the text. The level of Sufyān—Zuhri—‘Āmir and Malik—Zuhri—‘Āmir takes us to the point of tedium. Of course, even this can become important when studying a particular variation within the text; but we can safely speak of a unity within the hadiths well before we get to this subset of the ‘Āmir—Sa’d hadiths.
CONCLUSION

There is an integral link between texts and the names mentioned in the chains of narration through which texts are related. I have demonstrated this phenomenon in the case of one hadith, but I will claim that this is a very typical case. Any hadith which has made it in to Bukhārī’s Sahīh will have variants on the same scale as I have located for this hadith.14 Any theory about the significance of the words in a text of hadiths remains incomplete without accounting for the manifestation of this link between texts and chains of narration in the case of that specific text.

A further claim which is implicit in much of my argumentation is that this link between names mentioned in chains of narrations of a specific text and texts reported through those chains describes a regular correlation which is sufficiently uniform for us to be able to trace it across different hadiths. In other words, suppose that we first find that the versions being narrated through a specific narrator tend to be associated with peculiarities in the text of a specific hadith. I claim that if we then perform a similar comparative examination of the texts of other hadiths in which the name of this narrator figures in the chain of narration, we will find that on the whole the tendencies we found in the study of the first hadith will be confirmed and strengthened. The hypothesis formed in the first step can be tested and modified in the second stage.

This is indeed what classical Islamic scholars do when they study hadith. This method of basing judgements on the qualities of narrators by gathering variant versions of hadiths narrated by them is implicit in all the work of the rijāl scholars starting from the middle of the second century. I do not demand that their judgement be accepted, or that one even follow their methods. It is not even fair to ask that modern Western scholarship achieve the same level of explanatory rigour which the theories of classical Islamic scholars present. Their command of hadith texts and their single-minded dedication to this one discipline are not compatible with the many demands on the time of a scholar in the modern academic environment. I only ask that the correlation between texts and name mentioned in the chains of narrations of texts be seen as data which should be accounted for.

Even if in dealing with hadith texts we are dealing with something like rumours, these rumours exhibit a certain correlation with the chains

14 A quick look at the discussion at the first occurrence of any hadith in the text of Ibn Hajar’s Fath al-bāri is enough to locate an initial dozen or so versions of any hadith in Bukhārī’s Sahīh.
of narrations attached to these rumours. If we are not willing to credit that these chains of narrations consist of the names of the actual people who narrated the hadith as it reached the compilers of hadith collections, then we must provide an alternative explanation. Theories of Western scholars in this regard would simply dismiss these regularities in correlation between text and chains of narration instead of trying to develop theoretical mechanisms which would explain such correlations.\textsuperscript{15} To reject the methodology of \textit{rijāl} which classical hadith scholars have used in studying hadith before such alternative mechanisms are proposed is to abandon a theory with far more actual and potential explanatory power for the sake of a theory which does not even aspire to address a large part of textual data available to us in the hadith literature.

REFERENCES TO THE VERSIONS OF THE HADITH OF SAʿD

Below is a list of the sources for 114 versions of the hadith of Saʿd. In the left-hand column I have noted the version number or numbers, followed by the reference to the hadith in parentheses. For works in which hadiths are numbered consecutively I have given the hadith number; otherwise I have provided reference to the volume and page on which the hadith occurs. For hadiths in Bukhārī’s \textit{Sāḥīḥ} I have used the numbering provided in \textit{Fath al-bāri}.

\begin{itemize}
\item 38 (16357) ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Saʿnānī (d. 211), \textit{Musannaf},
\item 46 (16358) 11 vols., ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-ʿazmī
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{15} Gautier Juynboll does attempt to provide such a mechanism in his theory of certain names achieving popularity at certain times (‘An Appraisal of Muslim Hadith Criticism’, Chapter 4 in \textit{Muslim Tradition}, Cambridge, 1983). On the other hand, his method in developing this mechanism is fatally flawed by a lack of control groups. He suggests, for example, that the name Hāfṣ b. ‘Umar was such a name—there was one real Hāfṣ b. ‘Umar, and then other people began to borrow his name to pass off their forged material on the basis of his reliability. Later \textit{rijāl} scholars were faced with a mass of varied material all attributed to Hāfṣ b. ‘Umar, so they chose to assume that there were many Hāfṣ’s. The evidence for this is, for example, that of forty-three people named Hāfṣ, b. Hājar reports twenty as having fathers by the name of ‘Umar (Ahmad b. ‘Alī b. Hājar al-ʿAsqālānī (d. 852), \textit{Lisān al-mīzān} (Hyderabad, 1329), 6 vols.). But if Juynboll were to look at a biographical dictionary of poets or of physicians, he would find that people whose name is Hāfṣ often do tend to have fathers by the name of ‘Umar. Similarly, Ismāʿīl will usually be the son of Ibrāhīm, Ḥasan will usually have ‘Alī as a father, and so forth. This seems to be a pattern in naming, perhaps having to do with Arab customs regarding patronymics.
RIJAL AS A METHOD IN THE STUDY OF HADITHS
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68 (781) 81 (779) (d. 307), al-Musnad, 5 vols.


92 (i.74) al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. ʿUthmān (d. 748), Siyār aʿlām al-nubalāʾ, 23 vols., ed. Shuʿayb al Arnaʾut (Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1982).


Ibn Ḥanbal, Ahmad b. Muḥammad (d. 241), al-Musnad,
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3 (iii.144) 54, 64 (iii.145) Ibn Saʿd, Muḥammad (d. 230), al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā, 8 vols. + index vol., ed. ʿIḥsān ʿAbbās (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1958–60).


20 (iii.1250) Muslim b. Hajjāj al-Qushayrī (d. 261), al-Sahīḥ, 4 vols. + index vol., ed. Muḥammad


40 (vi. 242)


10 (2199) 82 (982) al-Tirmidhī, Muḥammad b. ʿIsā Abū ʿIsā (d. 279), *al-Jāmiʿ*, 5 vols., i, ed. ʿAbd al-Wahḥāb ʿAbd al-Latīf (Cairo: Matbaʿat al-Madanī, 1965); ii-v, ed. ʿAbd al-Rahmān Muḥammad ʿUthmān (Medina: Maktaba Salafiyya).