JIQSA 1 (2016): 93–125

DID ḤAFṢAH EDIT THE QUR'ĀN? A RESPONSE WITH NOTES ON THE CODICES OF THE PROPHET'S WIVES

SEAN W. ANTHONY AND CATHERINE L. BRONSON

Abstract

This article revisits, assesses, and critiques the recent claim made by Ruqayya Khan that Ḥafṣa bint ʿUmar, a wife of the Prophet Muḥammad, played a significant editorial role in the early establishment of the text of the Qur'ān but that her prominent editorial role in this enterprise has been suppressed by androcentric scholarship. In the course of our critique, we also attempt to offer insight into what role the Qur'ān codices owned by the Prophet's wives played in early Muslim narratives of the ʿUthmānic codex, as well as how modern historical-critical and feminist readings of the early source material can, and must, mutually inform one another.

In a recent issue of the *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Ruqayya Khan published a promising and somewhat provocative article entitled "Did a Woman Edit the Qur'ān? Hafṣa [sic] and Her Famed 'Codex.'"[1] Khan's article puts forward bold historical claims and a trenchant critique of the androcentrism endemic to scholarship on the Qur'ān and its codification. Khan's article, however, is not merely a critique. She also aims to ameliorate the ailing state of Qur'ānic Studies by exploring how feminist criticism might shed light on an important historical case study: the role of Ḥafṣah bint ʿUmar's *muṣḥaf* (or written copy of the Qur'ān) in the codification of the Qur'ān under the caliph ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān (r. 644–656). Most, if not all, of Khan's general criticisms about the neglect of women's history and agency in scholarship

1. Ruqayya Khan, "Did a Woman Edit the Qur'ān? Hafṣa [sic] and Her Famed 'Codex,'" *JAAR* 84 (2014): 174–216. Page citations will appear in parentheses in references to Khan's article below. Note that another article has appeared since the publication of Khan's that presents a virtually identical thesis and makes many of the same methodological missteps: see Sharon Silzell, "Ḥafṣa and al-Muṣḥaf: Women and the Written Qur'ān in the Early Centuries of Islam," *Hawwa* 13 (2015): 25–50. The relationship of Silzell's work to Khan's is unclear.

on the Qur'ān and early Islam is fully justified. Yet, however profoundly sympathetic we may be with Khan's criticism of the androcentricism rife in the study of early Islam and with her advocacy for feminist critique, we have rather strong objections to her historical methodology.

Our objections to Khan's essay are not against the general project but rather its execution. Although Khan's targets merit critique, she assumes a posture of moral superiority in order to indict the field of Qur'ānic Studies in the name of feminist criticism. However, she then proceeds with her critique while neglecting not only some of the most seminal Western scholarship on the Qur'ān but also some of the most germane and important discussions of the putative object of her analysis: Ḥafṣah's role in the codification of the Qur'ān. Most alarmingly, Khan limits her analysis to scholarship written in English, as though any analysis of Western scholarship could possibly neglect the contributions of francophone and germanophone scholars (175). Unintentionally perhaps, Khan thus blithely dismisses the most seminal and recent discussions of Ḥafṣah's codex. These include not only the epoch-making *Geschichte des Qorâns* of Theodor Nöldeke and his successors,[2] but also the recent research of francophone scholars such as the late Alfred-Louis de Prémare and especially Viviane Comerro.[3] Khan's neglect of these last two scholars comes across as ~~a particularly~~ egregious case of selection bias given that their research in particular has added important new insights into the formation and dissemination of the traditions about Ḥafṣah's codex.

Moreover, Khan's discussion of the English secondary literature is often skewed. While she criticizes Jeffery's and Burton's discussions of Ḥafṣah's codex as hopelessly blind to gender—hardly surprising for scholars of their era—she extols Asma Afsaruddin as a paragon of feminist scholarship merely for a passing mention of the existence of Ḥafṣah's codex. One gets the distinct sense here, as elsewhere in her essay, that Khan is playing favorites.

Beyond the charge that Western Qur'ān scholarship has been remiss in its discussion of gender, Khan takes aim at the depictions of Ḥafṣah's role in the traditional Muslim narrative of the Qur'ān's collection. In this narrative—most likely first promulgated by the Medinan scholar Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124/742) in the late Umayyad period—Ḥafṣah inherits an early copy of the Qur'ān from her father, the caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (r. 634–644), which he

2. Theodor Nöldeke, Friedrich Schwally, Gotthelf Bergsträßer, and Otto Pretzl, *Geschichte des Qorâns* (3 vols.; Leipzig: Dieterich, 1909–1938), 2.47 ff. *et passim* [English: *History of the Qur'ān*, ed. and trans. W. H. Behn (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 251 ff. *et passim*]; hereafter abbreviated as: *GdQ*.

3. Alfred-Louis de Prémare, *Les fondations de l'Islam: Entre écriture et histoire* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2002), 290–292, 452–456; Viviane Comerro, *Les traditions sur la constitution du muṣḥaf de ʿUthmān* (Beiruter Texte und Studien 134; Beirut: Ergon, 2012), 56–59 *et passim*.

ordered compiled in consultation with the first caliph Abū Bakr (r. 632–634).[4] When the third caliph, ʿUthmān, sets about to establish a definitive copy of the Qur'ān, the committee appointed by ʿUthmān and led by the Medinan Companion Zayd ibn Thābit relies on the codex Ḥafṣah had inherited from her father as the template for their project. This account came to be the consensus account in traditional Sunnī scholarship, even if its historicity has been seriously challenged since at least the early twentieth century.[5]

Like the early pioneers of Western scholarship on the Qur'ān, Khan also aims to challenge the Sunni consensus narrative first articulated by Zuhrī; however, she undertakes her distinctive project to demonstrate what a 'feminist reading' of the story might contribute to our current understanding of the tradition. She writes:

> A feminist reading would counter with the following question: Could the historicity of "the first 'collection' under Abū-Bakr" be challenged on the basis of an obscuring of Hafṣa's [sic] possible role in the preparation of a written Qur'ān? In other words, the Hadīth [sic] account of "the first 'collection' under Abū-Bakr" may have been fabricated for many reasons, among them not only to suppress Hafṣa's role in establishing an 'official' text given that she was a woman, but also because she, too, came to be shrouded in some controversy due to the stigma of divorce (206).

Albeit couched in guarded language, Khan's argument pushes the reader to an easily discernable conclusion: the narratives of Abū Bakr's collection of the Qur'ān into a written codex (*muṣḥaf*)—as well as how he bequeathed the codex to ʿUmar, and how ʿUmar subsequently bequeathed the same codex to his daughter Ḥafṣah—purposefully obscure Ḥafṣah's editorial role in the establishment of the standard qur'ānic text. The animus behind the narrators' conspiracy to obscure Ḥafṣah's importance, Khan argues, arise from their attitudes toward gender more generally and their anxieties about the stigma Ḥafṣah incurred by her divorce from the Prophet more specifically—attitudes ripe to be exposed by feminist readings of the accounts.

4. Harald Motzki, "The Collection of the Qur'ān: A Reconsideration of Western Views in Light of Recent Methodological Developments," *Der Islam* 78 (2001): 1–34. See also G. H. A. Juynboll, *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) , 695–697.

5. Cf. the helpful summary in Motzki, "Collection of the Qur'ān," 6–15 and the recent defense of the historicity of the traditional account in Gregor Schoeler, "The Codification of the Qur'an: A Comment on the Hypotheses of Burton and Wansbrough," in Angelika Neuwirth, Nicolai Sinai, and Michael Marx (eds.), *The Qur'ān in Context: Historical and Literary Investigations into the Qur'ānic Milieu* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 779–794.

Alas, although the study sets out with salutary aims, Khan's execution falls short of its avowed goals. As a work of feminist criticism, Khan's 'feminist reading' of Ḥafṣah's marriage to the Prophet and the stigma she claims tarnished Ḥafṣah's reputation suffers from interpretations of the source material that are either poorly substantiated or too credulous; surprisingly, these poorly substantiated and often overly credulous readings also undermine her avowed aim to offer a feminist critique of the traditional narrative. Khan's essay wavers, on the one hand, between uncritically accepting accounts deeply entrenched in androcentric currents in the Islamic tradition and, on the other, reading into early accounts conspiracies that are mostly the product of her own guesswork. Lastly, as a work of historical analysis, her methods for adducing new evidence for Ḥafṣah's editorial activities are insufficient and often unsound; her arguments too often rely on readings of the early Arabic source material that are tendentious and ahistorical.

In what follows, we revisit two issues raised by Khan's essay by way of three specific lines of inquiry. The first asks what a 'feminist reading' of Ḥafṣah's life, and particularly her marriage to Muḥammad, might look like—especially if informed by historical-critical methods and decoupled from a straightforward, credulous reading of the *sīrah* and *ḥadīth* literature. The second asks what evidence actually exists for Ḥafṣah's knowledge of the Qur'ān and for her alleged editorial involvement in establishing the definitive text of the Qur'ān. To these two questions, we intervene with a third question of our own which Khan does not address: what light might the narratives of the codices of the Prophet's wives cast upon the early codification of the Qur'ān?

Ḥafṣah's Marriage to Muḥammad: A Feminist Reading?

Traditional scholarship dates Muḥammad's marriage to Ḥafṣah to the month of Shaʿbān in year 3 after the *hijrah* (January–February 625 CE), when she was eighteen years of age.[6] According to one account, her marriage ceremony to Muḥammad was quite the affair, occasioned by such a generous dower and bountiful banquet that Ḥafṣah would boast that her wedding's grandeur even outstripped her co-wife ʿĀ'ishah's.[7] Ḥafṣah's marriage to Muḥammad was not

6. Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845), *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1957), 8.81; ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Allāh Samhūdī (d. 911/1506), *Wafā' al-wafā bi-akhbār dār al-Muṣṭafā*, ed. Qasim al-Samarrai (London: Mu'assasat al-Furqān, 2001), 1.497. For an early tradition that places Ḥafṣah's marriage to the Prophet in 2 AH, see Ibn Abī Khuthaymah (d. 279/892), *Al-Tārīkh*, ed. Ṣalāḥ b. Fatḥī Halal (Cairo: al-Fārūq al-Ḥadīthah, 2003), 2.5.

7. Ibn Zabālah (d. after 199/814), *Al-Muntakhab min kitāb azwāj al-Nabī bi-riwāyat al-Zubayr ibn Bakkar*, ed. Akram Ḍiyā' al-ʿUmarī (Medina: Maṭbaʿat al-Jāmiʿah al-Islamiyyah, 1981), 45.

her first. Most accounts claim that the young Ḥafṣah was already a widow at the time of her marriage to the Prophet. Her previous husband was Khunays b. Ḥudhāfah al-Sahmī, one of the earliest Meccan converts to Islam. Fleeing persecution in Mecca, Ḥafṣah emigrated to Abyssinia with Khunays in *ca.* 617, when she was ten years of age, and they returned to the Hijaz after Muḥammad's *hijrah* to Medina in 622.[8]

On other matters relating to Ḥafṣah's marriage, our sources offer less of a consensus. Most authorities assert that Ḥafṣah's first husband, Khunays, joined Muḥammad in Medina just prior to the Battle of Badr in March 624 but quickly fell ill. Too ill to fight at Badr, Khunays died before the battle's end and was buried in Medina soon thereafter.[9] Three additional stories of Khunays' death circulated as well. According to one, Khunays died in Mecca during his return journey from Abyssinia and never reached Medina.[10] Another claims that Khunays lived long enough to fight at Uḥud in Shawwāl 3/March–April 625 but that he perished soon thereafter from a fatal wound received during the battle.[11] Yet another places his death in Sassanid Ctesiphon after the Prophet sent him as an emissary to Khusro's court.[12]

Khan playfully calls Ḥafṣah "the least favorite" wife of the Prophet, citing a famous story in which the Prophet purportedly divorced her (188). However, Khan's comments potentially undermine her aim of providing a feminist reading of Ḥafṣah's biography, likely because of her overestimation of the historicity of the accounts of Ḥafṣah's divorce. This is an unfortunate misstep, as her argument depends on demonstrating that the Prophet's divorce of Ḥafṣah stigmatized her and thus led to the suppression of her

8. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 4.392; Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī (d. 279/872), *Ansāb al-ashrāf*, vol. 1.2, ed. Yūsuf al-Marʿashlī (Wiesbaden: Klaus Schwarz, 2008), 1053f.; idem, *Ansāb al-ashrāf: sā'ir furūʿ Quraysh*, vol. 5, ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1996), 334.

9. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 4.392; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, vol. 1.2, 1054 and vol. 5, 334.

10. Muṣʿab al-Zubayrī (d. 236/851), *Nasab Quraysh*, ed. E. Levi-Provençal (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, n.d.), 352.

11. Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī (d. 852/1449), *Al-Iṣābah fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥābah*, ed. Khalīl Maʾmūn Shayḥā (Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifah, 2004), 1.519.

12. Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣfahānī (d. 430/1038), *Maʿrifat al-ṣaḥābah*, ed. ʿĀdil b. Yūsuf al-ʿAzāzī (Riyadh: Dār al-Waṭan, 1998), 6.3205 and Ibn ʿAsākir (d. 571/1176), *Tārīkh madīnat Dimashq*, ed. ʿUmar b. Gharāmah al-ʿAmrawī (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995–2000), 3.173. These two accounts likely conflate Khunays' story with that of his brother, ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥudhāfah, whom the Prophet purportedly sent to Khusro II Parvēz with his famous letter; cf. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 5.334f. Scholars who placed Khunays' death *after* Uḥud and, therefore, also after Ḥafṣah's marriage to the Prophet speculated that perhaps Khunays had divorced Ḥafṣah prior to Uḥud. See Samhūdī, *Wafā'*, 3.279f.

extensive editorial involvement in the Qur'ān's codification (206, 209). Khan also overlooks how embedded the Ḥafṣah divorce story (as well as its many variants) is in early exegesis of the Qur'ān, leading her to poorly measure her standing among the Prophet's wives during the divorce episode.

Few stories of Ḥafṣah's allegedly rocky marital relationship with Muḥammad survive that do not derive from qur'ānic exegesis. Ḥafṣah's purported divorce appears as a centerpiece narrative in the exegetes' treatment of the marital dispute between the Prophet and his wives recounted in Q Taḥrīm 66:1–5. According to the most seminal exegetical readings of Q 66:1–5, the marital strife arising between Ḥafṣah and Muḥammad is set in motion when Ḥafṣah witnesses her husband in her quarters having sexual relations with his slave-girl (*jāriyah*)—sometimes identified with Māriyah the Copt[13] and other times with a young, Ethiopian slave-girl (*juwayriyah ḥabashiyyah*) named Ḥusn.[14] Ḥafṣah upbraids the Prophet for having so humiliated her, and to show his contrition, Muḥammad foreswears any future sexual relations with the slave-girl. Having thus appeased Ḥafṣah, Muḥammad stipulates to Ḥafṣah that she must not inform anyone else of the incident—especially her co-wife ʿĀ'ishah. When Ḥafṣah fails to uphold her side of the agreement by informing ʿĀ'ishah about what had transpired, a marital dispute ensues that ultimately is resolved by divine revelation—namely, Q 66:1–5.

Q 66:1–5 provides the exegetes with ~~essentially~~ narrative elements which they then expand, albeit in manifold ways, into the longer narratives preserved in the *tafsīr* and *ḥadīth* literature. Because of the importance of the qur'ānic pericope to these narratives, and arguably because the exegesis of these verses may even account for the existence of these narratives in the first place, the relevant verses are worth quoting in full:

13. Muqātil b. Sulaymān (d. 150/767), *Al-Tafsīr*, ed. ʿAbd Allāh Maḥmūd al-Shiḥātah (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-Miṣriyyah al-ʿĀmmah li'l-Kitāb, 1989), 4.375; Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/864), *Jāmiʿ al-bayān ʿan taʾwīl āy al-Qurʾān*, ed. ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAbd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī (Cairo: Dār Hajar, 2001), 23.83; Hūd b. Muḥakkam al-Hawwārī (d. *ca.* 280/893) *Tafsīr kitāb Allāh al-ʿazīz*, ed. Bālḥāj b. Saʿīd Sharīfī (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1990), 4.378; ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (d. 307/919), *Al-Tafsīr* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Aʿlamī, 2007), 710–711. On the figure of Māriyah and the sexual scandals surrounding her, see now Uri Rubin, "The Seal of the Prophets and the Finality of Prophecy: On the Interpretation of the Qur'ānic Sūrat al-Aḥzāb (33)," *ZDMG* 164 (2014): 65–96, 76–79. For a recent study that calls the very historicity of Māriyah into question, see Christian Cannuyer, "Māriya, la concubine copte de Muḥammad, réalité ou mythe," *Acta Orientalia Belgica* 21 (2008): 251–264.

14. Abū Isḥāq al-Thaʿlabī (d. 427/1025), *Al-Kashf waʾl-bayān*, ed. Abū Muḥammad Ibn ʿĀshūr and Naẓīr al-Sāʿidī (Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2002), 9.343.

66:1 O Prophet, why do you forbid that which God has declared lawful for you while seeking to please your wives? God is forgiving, merciful.

66:2 God has already ordained a means for you believers to release yourselves from your oaths.[15] God is your protector, knowing and wise.

66:3 Recall how the Prophet confided in one of his wives and how she divulged what he said—God exposed it to him. He made it known in part and concealed it in part. When he told it to her, she said, "Who told you this?" "He who knows and sees all informed me," he said.

66:4 If only you two were to repent before God, for your two hearts are twisted.[16] Were you two to seek to overcome him, God would surely protect him, as would Gabriel, the righteous of the believers, and the angels after that.

66:5 If he divorces you women, perhaps his Lord will give him better wives than you in exchange—women who are submissive, pious, obedient, worshipful, and fasting[17]—whether previously married or virgins.

The events behind these verses are tantalizingly elusive when reading the qur'ānic pericope on its own. What did the Prophet forbid himself, and why would his doing so please his wives? What oath must be broken, and why did this oath displease God? What secret did the Prophet confide to his wife, and to which wife? To whom did she divulge the secret of 'what he said' (*ḥadīth*) in verse 3? Who are 'the two' with twisted hearts called upon to repent in verse 4? How did these two seek to overcome the Prophet? What is the rationale behind the warning that God will replace the Prophet's wives with better women in verse 5?

Equally as curious as modern readers, the early exegetes filled in the gaps. Each did so in their own way, of course, but a reasonably stable consensus position—probably emerging in Medina and itself accommodating internal diversity—came to dominate the interpretation of these verses from at least as early as the mid-eighth century. At the risk of oversimplification, this consensus position may be summarized as follows:

Verse 1 (*why do you forbid that which God has declared lawful for you…*) admonishes the Prophet against a previous action: he had declared forbidden to himself what God declared permissible in order to placate his wives. In the

15. *taḥillat aymānikum*; *v.l.* "expiation for your oaths" (*kaffārat aymānikum*). The means to release oneself from an oath referenced here appears in Q Mā'idah 5:89.

16. *ṣaghat qulūbukumā*; *v.l.* "both your hearts have gone astray" (*zāghat qulūbukumā*).

17. *sāʾiḥāt*; perhaps "traveling" and thus having abandoned their homes for the sake of God. Cf. Q Tawbah 9:112. All of these qualities reference the hypothetical wives' attitudes toward God and not necessarily toward their spouse.

mainstream interpretation of the exegetes, the Prophet declared his slave-girl forbidden to himself once Ḥafṣah caught him having relations with her, saying, "She is now forbidden to me (*hiya ʿalayya ḥarām*)!"[18]

Verse 2 (*God has already ordained a means for you believers to release yourselves from your oaths…*) expands upon the content of what precedes it: an oath must now be broken in accord with the ordinances prescribed in Q Mā'idah 5:89. The exegetical literature specifies that the verse refers to Muḥammad's oath not to sleep with his slave-girl, for his concession contravened God's decree. The revelation thus dictates that the Prophet's oath must be rescinded in the manner ordained in a previous revelation.[19]

Verse 3 (*Recall how the Prophet confided in one of his wives and how she divulged what he said…*) mentions a conversation (*ḥadīth*) that the Prophet requested one of his wives not to divulge, but when she acts contrary to his wishes, God reveals her misdeed to the Prophet, who confronts her. The exegetical literature specifies this 'conversation' to have been the Prophet's command to Ḥafṣah not to spread word of the incident involving the slave-girl—either commanding her, "Keep quiet and mention this to no one" (*uskutī lā tadhkurī hādhā li-aḥad*)[20] or "Hide this matter for me, and do not tell ʿĀ'ishah what you saw" (*uktumī ʿalayya wa-lā tadhkurī li-ʿĀ'ishah mā raʾayti*)![21] Acting contrary to his wishes, Ḥafṣah informs ʿĀ'ishah of the matter in secret, but God exposes Ḥafṣah's misdeed to the Prophet.

Verse 4 (*If only you two were to repent before God…*) singles out two individuals and calls them to repent of their misdeeds. The exegetical tradition unanimously identifies the two persons as Ḥafṣah and ʿĀ'ishah, who together conspire to sow discord between the Prophet and the rest of his wives because of the incident involving the slave-girl.[22] The verse affirms God's support of his Prophet against their designs.

Verse 5 (*If he divorces you women…*) contains the divine rebuke and a threat against the Prophet's wives as a collective: if they oppose the Prophet any further, God will replace them with better wives who are more pious and tractable than they. The exegetical tradition thus expands these verses by emphasizing the seriousness of the Prophet's divinely sanctioned threat to

18. ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 211/827), *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*, ed. Muṣṭafā Muslim Muḥammad (Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 1983), 2.301; Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 23.85.

19. Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 23.90.

20. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1055; Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 23.85.

21. Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 23.85.

22. Tradition often portrays the two as being of one mind. Ḥafṣah and ʿĀ'ishah purportedly lived in neighboring quarters during the Prophet's lifetime and continued to live in neighboring homes after their husband's death. Samhūdī, *Wafā'*, 2.299 and 3.46.

divorce them, as well as to divorce Ḥafṣah in particular. Ḥafṣah's divorce sometimes appears as an actualization of this threat, although Gabriel prevents the divorce by divine fiat. What must be emphasized, however, is that the tradition frequently asserts that the Prophet not only divorced Ḥafṣah but rather divorced *all* his wives, arousing angelic, and thus divine, intervention to affect reconciliation in the Prophet's household.[23] This last point is key, because Khan would have her readers believe that these events uniquely stigmatized Ḥafṣah to the exclusion of the Prophet's other wives.

Certainly *this* is the story that needs feminist intervention. As the exegetes would have it, Q Taḥrīm 66:1–5 admonishes the Prophet against placing self-imposed limits on his sexual access to the women of household, wedded or enslaved, and rebukes any of his wives who object and assert their own agency and desires. This interpretive stream, dominant as it may be, is a clear example of an androcentric scriptural reading.

Yet the Muslim exegetical tradition is nothing if not multivocal, and Muslim exegetes offer alternative interpretations for this passage. The alternatives differ over what exactly the Prophet had declared to be forbidden to himself in order to placate his wives and seem to have proliferated among the *ḥadīth* folk more broadly that it did among the Qur'ān exegetes. Among the *ḥadīth* scholars—such as al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870) and Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj (d. 261/875)—the issues discussed in the opening passages of Q 66 relate to a scandal over the Prophet's love of enjoying honey with Zaynab bt. Jaḥsh, a wife whose beauty inspired jealousy among his other wives. Bukhārī's version of the story is narrated by ʿĀ'ishah:[24]

> The Messenger of God used to sip honey in Zaynab bt. Jaḥsh's chambers and would spend a long time there, so I made an agreement with Ḥafṣah, "Whichever one of us he comes to next, she will say, 'Did you eat *maghāfīr*?[25] I swear I can smell the stench of *maghāfīr* on your breath!'" The Prophet replied, "No, but I was supping honey in the chambers of Zaynab bt. Jaḥsh. I shan't do it again!"

23. Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), *Al-Musnad*, ed. Shuʿayb al-Arnaʾūṭ et al. (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risālah, 1993–), 1.348–349 (from Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī); cf. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1059–1062 and Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 23.94–96.

24. Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī, *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, *kitāb al-tafsīr*, (Stuttgart: TraDigital, 2000), 2.1023, no. 3961. Cf. ibid., *kitāb al-ṭalāq*, 3.1102–1103; Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj, *Al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, *kitāb al-ṭalāq* (Stuttgart: TraDigital, 2000), 1.613–616; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1057–1059; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, 43.41. The exegetes know the story as well, of course, and some favor it; e.g., see ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Tafsīr*, 2.301–302 (from Ibn al-Zubayr) and Abū'l-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Aḥmad al-Wāḥidī (d. 468/1076), *Al-Tafsīr al-basīṭ*, ed. Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ b. ʿAbdallāh al-Fawzān (25 vols.; Riyadh: Jāmiʿat al-Imām Muḥammad b. Saʿūd al-Islāmiyyah, 2010), 22.5–6.

25. Gum from the Urfuṭ tree known is for its pungent smell.

And I made Ḥafṣah swear not to tell anyone of this.

Hence, this tradition and its kindred variants replace the scandal of the slave-girl story with a minor plot among the Prophet's wives to put an end to his lengthy visits to sup honey with one wife to the neglect of the others.

Modern scholars have been inclined to regard the more scandalous story involving the slave-girl as the earlier one given that it appears in the earliest sources, and despite the fact that the honey story has a superior pedigree in the eyes of the *ḥadīth* scholars. These modern scholars reason that, if the story of Ḥafṣah's jealousy after seeing the Prophet with his slave-girl predates the honey story, then exegetes likely contrived the honey narrative at a later date in order to provide an alternative to the unflattering portrayal of the Prophet and his wives in the former story.[26] Furthermore, while the honey story may provide a somewhat plausible explanation for Q 66:1–2, its explanatory force greatly diminishes when applied to the remainder of the pericope. The gravity of Q 66:5–6, which threatens divorce as a penalty for plotting against the Prophet, makes a poor match for the trifles of the honey story.[27]

In addition to the above alternative, there is the sectarian Shi'ite reading of the passage. In this reading, Ḥafṣah and ʿĀ'ishah walk in together on Muḥammad and both find him with Māriyah the Copt. To placate Ḥafṣah, the Prophet reveals a secret to her that she subsequently divulged to ʿĀ'ishah—namely, that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar will succeed him as the community's leaders. Inasmuch as this story aims to abnegate the merits of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar as well as their daughters, the divulgence of this secret stirs up the political ambitions of the four and inspires them to plot against the Prophet in order to poison him and hasten his death and, thus their rise to power.[28]

26. See *GdQ*, 1.217 (trans. Behn, 175f.) where it is argued that the story was invented to mitigate the scandal of the story of Ḥafṣah and the slave-girl. Cf. G.H.A. Juynboll, *Encyclopedia of Canonical Ḥadīth* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 155, 675–676. Such arguments do run the risk of using anachronistic assessments of what early Muslims did, or did not, find scandalous to determine the historicity of the tradition. In at least this case, however, it is clear that early Muslims did indeed find such intrigues by the Prophet's wives scandalous—a fact that is attested, for example, by comments on the Zaynab-Zayd scandal in the late-seventh century *Kītāb al-Irjāʾ* of Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyyah. See J. van Ess, "Das *Kītāb al-Irǧāʾ* des Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya," *Arabica* 21 (1974): 20–52, 37–38. Cf. ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Tafsīr*, 2.117; Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 19.115–117.

27. Muslim scholars put forward a juridical rationale for rejecting the honey story, too. According to the exegete Wāḥidī (*Basīṭ*, 22.11), for example, al-Shāfiʿī argued that if the Prophet had merely forbade himself honey, or any other food or drink, then the prescribed expiation (*kaffārah*) would have been entirely unnecessary.

28. Qummī, *Tafsīr*, 710–711; cf. Me'ir Bar-Asher, *Scripture and Exegesis in Early Imāmī Shiism* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 44–45. The claim that the secret told to Ḥafṣah that she conveyed to ʿĀ'ishah was that Abū Bakr and then ʿUmar would become the community's leaders appears in non-Shi'ite sources, too (see Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1056 and n. 4 thereto); however, the murder plot is absent.

Regardless of the plurality of these stories, one important point deserves to be emphasized: outside of the divorce anecdotes, there is little reason to suppose that Ḥafṣah was particularly disliked among the Prophet's wives. Even if, for example, her father purportedly once admonished her to never contradict the Prophet's wishes since she lacked Zaynab's beauty and ʿĀ'ishah's favored position, such fatherly admonitions hardly indicate actual antipathy towards Ḥafṣah.[29] Furthermore, although Khan is keen to play up the stigma attached to Ḥafṣah after her divorce, she adduces no evidence that Ḥafṣah had been stigmatized by the nascent community in the years following. The story of Gabriel convincing the Prophet to remain married to Ḥafṣah is less likely to be a source of stigma against Ḥafṣah than it is an explanation of how God intervened on her behalf to restore her to the Prophet. Hence, many accounts claim that the Prophet declared divorce against her merely one of the three times required for the divorce to be binding (*ṭallaqa ḥafṣah taṭlīqatan*); others flatly deny that the Prophet divorced Ḥafṣah at all, claiming he had merely resolved to do so (*hamma bi-ṭalāq ḥafṣah*).[30]

The stigma touted by Khan is hard to find anywhere outside these stories. This is especially true when one compares her to her co-wives. For instance, in the course of her life, Ḥafṣah clearly experiences nothing tantamount to ʿĀ'ishah's humiliation from rumors spread about her alleged adulterous tryst with Ṣafwān b. al-Muʿaṭṭal,[31] or her estrangement after leading the opposition to ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib alongside her co-conspirators, Ṭalhah and al-Zubayr, into catastrophe at the Battle of Camel.[32]

Hence, even a straightforward, credulous reading of the *sīrah* literature does not lead one to conclude that Ḥafṣah was any more disliked than any of the other wives—and certainly no more than any of the wives whom the

29. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1063, *laysa laki jamāl zaynab wa-lā ḥuzwat ʿā'ishah*. The *ḥadīth* folk record a long account of the disagreement between the Prophet and his wives narrated by ʿUmar in which he says to his daughter Ḥafṣah, "By God, I know that God's Messenger does not love you—were it not for me, the Messenger of God would divorce you" (*law lā anā la-ṭallaqaki*). Yet even in this story the rumor that prods ʿUmar to confront his daughter (as well as ʿĀ'ishah) is that the Prophet had divorced *all* of his wives, not merely Ḥafṣah. E.g., Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *kitāb al-ṭalāq*, 1.616–621; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, 1.346–350; Abū Yaʿlā al-Mawṣilī (d. 307/919), *Al-Musnad*, ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad (Beirut: Dār al-Maʾmūn, 1989), 1.149–153.

30. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 8.84–85; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1061.

31. Maʿmar b. Rāshid (d. 153/770), *The Expeditions (Kītāb al-Maghāzī)*, ed. and trans. Sean W. Anthony (New York: NYU Press, 2014), 148–159.

32. Cf. Denise A. Spellberg, *Politics, Gender, and the Islamic Past: The Legacy of ʿA'ishah bint Abi Bakr* (New York: Columbia, 1994), 107–149.

ḥadīth scholars report Muḥammad actually divorced. These wives include Ghuzayyah bt. Dūdān (divorced for old age),[33] Rayḥānah bt. Shamʿūn al-Quraẓiyyah (divorced temporarily),[34] al-ʿĀliyah bt. Ẓabyān (divorced for freely going about outside the house, *al-taṭallu*ʿ),[35] ʿAmrah bt. Yazīd al-Kilābiyyah (divorced because the Prophet found a disconcerting flaw on her skin, a white mark at her waist),[36] Asmāʾ bt. Qays al-Kindiyyah (divorced allegedly because she refused to come at the Prophet's beckoning),[37] or the wife whom Muḥammad divorced after she cruelly mocked the death of his infant son Ibrāhīm.[38] On the other hand, one need not adopt a credulous reading of any of the above stories nor even of the story of Ḥafṣah's divorce. If one reads, in particular, the narratives of Ḥafṣah's scandal as evolving out of efforts to interpret Q 66:1–5, then Ḥafṣah's divorce and the stories of her contentious relationship with the Prophet might conceivably be regarded as a concoction of the exegetes.

Ḥafṣah and the Commitment of the Qurʾān to Writing

Central to Khan's thesis as well is that Ḥafṣah "memorized, recited, and *edited* the Qurʾānic materials" (190, emphasis ours). That Ḥafṣah would have memorized and recited the Qurʾān (at least in part) is a given, since the quotidian practice of Islamic ritual necessitates the memorization and

33. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1052f. (citing al-Kalbī), *raʾā … bi-ghuzayyah kibratan fa-ṭallaqahā*; cf. Ibn Ḥabīb (d. 245/860), *Al-Muḥabbir* , ed. Ilse Lichtenstädter (Hyderabad: Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyyah, 1942), 81 and Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh al-rusul waʾl-mulūk* , ed. M.J. de Goeje et al. (Leiden: Brill, 1879–1901), 1.1776.

34. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 8.129f.; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1120f.

35. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1123f.; cf. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 8.142: Ibn Abī Zayd al-Qayrawānī, *Al-Jāmiʿ*, ed. ʿAbd al-Majīd Turkī (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 1990), 163; and Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī, *Dalāʾil al-nubuwwah wa-maʿrifat aḥwāl ṣāḥib al-sharīʿah*, ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn Qalʿajī (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyyah, 1985), 7.286.

36. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1124, *raʾā bi-kashḥihā bayāḍan fa-ṭallaqahā*; cf. Ibn Ḥabīb, *Muḥabbar*, 96; Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 8.143; and Ibn ʿAsākir, *Dimashq*, 3.164. The likely implication here is that she showed signs of leprosy; see M. W. Dols, *EI2*, s.v. "Djudhām."

37. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1125

38. Bayhaqī, *Dalāʾil*, 8.289. After Ibrāhīm's death, the wife purportedly commented, "Were he truly a prophet, then the one dearest to him would not have died (*law kāna nabiyyan mā māta aḥabb al-nās ilayhi*)." Though the story is relatively widespread in the tradition, there is no consensus regarding the name of the wife who uttered these words. See, e.g., Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, 1.1774 (where the name is given as Shanbāʾ bt. ʿAmr al-Ghifāriyyah); Ibn ʿAsākir, *Dimashq*, 3.164 (Shanbāʾ bt. ʿAmr al-Ghifāriyyah); and al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī*, ed. ʿAlī Akbar al-Ghaffārī (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyyah, 1968–1971), 5.421 (Bint Abīʾl-Jawn al-Kindiyyah).

recitation of at least part of the Qurʾān. Since the first two feats are banalities, it suffices to focus on Khan's third assertion: that Ḥafṣah edited the Qurʾān. What evidence does Khan adduce for her readers?

The first evidence Khan puts forward is a tradition attributed to the Medinan scholar ʿUrwah Ibn al-Zubayr (d. *c* . 94/713) preserved in the *Jāmiʿ* of the Egyptian scholar ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Wahb al-Miṣrī (d. 197/812). Citing the tradition on the authority of Abūʾl-Aswad (d. 131/748 or later), ʿUrwah's orphan ward, Ibn Wahb's account reads as follows:

ʿUrwah ibn al-Zubayr said:

> People disagreed over how to read, "Those of the People of Book and the Pagans who disbelieved…" (Q Bayyinah 98:1), so ʿUmar went with a strip of leather (*adīm*) to see [his daughter] Ḥafṣah. He said, "When the Messenger of God comes to see you, ask him to teach you "Those of the People of Book and the Pagans who disbelieved…," then tell him to write the verses down for you on this strip of leather. She did so, and the Prophet wrote them down for her and that became the generally accepted reading (*al-qirāʾah al-ʿāmmah*).[39]

Commenting on this tradition, Khan avers that, "'Umar is shown as asking Hafṣah [sic] to edit the Qurʾān on the basis of Muḥammad 'teaching' her the correct recitation and writing of the said verse" (191–192). But Khan's reading is tendentious. Ḥafṣah does not even transcribe, let alone *edit*, the Qurʾān in this anecdote; rather, she asks the *Prophet* to write it down *for her*.

The tradition is certainly a curious one, not so much because it casts Ḥafṣah in the role of an editor (which it does not) but rather because it portrays the Prophet as capable of writing the Qurʾān down himself. That the Prophet was illiterate and could neither read nor write is, of course, a staple of Sunni prophetology, but the dogmatic insistence on his illiteracy is a later development. The earliest strata of the tradition speak without hesitation of the Prophet as capable of reading and writing.[40] "Hafṣa's [sic] edited version of the verse is then presumably orally disseminated," Khan further argues, but her presumption of editing goes too far. It rests too precariously on the idea that Ḥafṣah actually *edited* anything, an assertion for which this tradition provides zero evidence. The Prophet's personal record of the ninety-eighth *sūrah* establishes the consensus reading (*al-qirāʾah al-ʿāmmah*), and Ḥafṣah is certainly, to use Khan's words, "a significant 'go-between'" on her father's

39. Ibn Wahb al-Miṣrī, *Al-Jāmiʿ*, ed. Miklos Muranyi (Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2003), 3.62. On the disputed reading referenced here, see *GdQ*, 1.241–242 (trans. Behn, 194–195).

40. Alan Jones, "The Word Made Visible: Arabic Script and the Committing of the Qurʾān to Writing," in Chase F. Robinson (ed.), *Texts, Documents and Artefacts: Islamic Studies in Honour of D.S. Richards* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1–16, 6ff.

behalf, but she is not an editor (192). To assert that Ḥafṣah acts as an editor of the Qur'ān in this tradition, or plays any editorial role whatsoever here, is, alas, ultimately untenable.

Khan's second, and surprisingly last, piece of evidence for her claims regarding Ḥafṣah's editorial activity hearkens back to a tradition of the Medinan scholar Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī that is preserved in the *Jāmiʿ* of Zuhrī's student, the Basran scholar Maʿmar b. Rāshid (d. 153/770), as well as the *Muṣannaf* of Maʿmar's student ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī (d. 211/827). This account reads:

> Zuhrī said:
>
> Ḥafṣah brought the Prophet a piece of writing from the stories of Joseph on a shoulder blade (*kitāb min qiṣaṣ yūsuf fī katfin*), and she began reading it to him. The Prophet's countenance suddenly changed, and he said, "By Him in whose hand my soul resides! Were Joseph to come to you while I remained in your midst and were you then to follow him and abandon me, you would surely go astray (*law atākum yūsuf wa-anā baynakum fa-ttabaʿtumūhu wa-taraktumūnī la-ḍalaltum*)![41]

Noting that the text displays, "Hafṣa's [sic] literacy, intellectual curiosity, and recitation skills," Khan cites this tradition as further proof that Ḥafṣah "read, recited, collected, and/or wrote scriptural writings" (192).

Khan's insight into Ḥafṣah's literacy and intellectual curiosity is certainly correct and deserves commendation—indeed, the Islamic tradition notes with striking regularity the prevalence of literacy among ʿUmar's female kin. In accounts of ʿUmar's conversion to Islam, what leads him to embrace the faith is, at least in part, his remorse for having brutally beaten his sister Umm Jamīl Fāṭimah bt. al-Khaṭṭāb with the very shoulder blade from which she had been reading verses of the Qur'ān.[42] Ḥafṣah herself learned writing and incantations to mend wounds (*ruqyat al-namlah*) from another woman of her clan, the Qurashī Companion al-Shifāʾ bt. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAdawī.[43] However,

41. ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī, *Al-Muṣannaf*, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī (Beirut: al-Majlis al-ʿIlmī, 1972), 6.113f. and 11.110.

42. Maʿmar, *Expeditions*, 18–21; Ibn Hishām, *Al-Sīrah al-nabawiyyah*, eds. Muṣṭafā al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Ibyārī, and ʿAbd al-Ḥafīẓ Shalabī (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.), 1.344.

43. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 8.84; Ibn Abī Khaythamah, *Tārīkh*, 2.82; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, 44.43–45. Iṣfahānī (*Maʿrifat*, 6.3371–3372) records the text of this incantation and notes that she would utter over a stick of turmeric (*ʿūd kurkum*) seven times and, after placing the stick on a clean spot, rubbed it with acidic vinegar (*khall khamr thaqīf*) and then applied it to the wounds. On the use of incantations and enchantments in the medicinal practices by the Prophet and his circle, see T. Fahd, *EI2*, s.v. "Ruḳya," and U. Rubin, "Muḥammad the Exorcist: Aspects of Islamic-Jewish Polemics," *JSAI* 30 (2005): 104–107. Tradition also lists ʿUmar among the seventeen men of Quraysh who knew how to read and write. See al-Balādhurī, *Liber expugnationis regionum (Futūḥ al-buldān)*, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 470f. and Claude Gilliot, "Oralité et écriture dans la genèse, la transmission et la fixation du Coran," in Philippe Cassuto and Pierre Larcher (eds.), *Oralité et écriture dans la Bible et le Coran* (Aix-en-Provence: Presse Universitaires de Provence, 2014), 99–142,106–112. However, a common trope in the stories of ʿUmar's conversion to Islam portrays him as hopelessly illiterate; e.g., see Rāshid, *Expeditions*, 20–21. On ʿUmar's literacy, see also Maged A. Badahdah, *Sināʿat al-kitāb wa'l-kitābah fī 'l-Ḥijāz: ʿaṣr al-nubuwwah wa'l-khilāfah al-rāshidah* (London: Furqan, 2006), 2.611–613.

Khan goes further by asserting that this tradition also displays Ḥafṣah's fluency in several scriptural traditions and, hence, underscores Ḥafṣah as an editor of the text of the Qur'ān.

A careful reading of the tradition hardly vindicates Khan's interpretation. What, for example, are 'the stories of Joseph (*qiṣaṣ yūsuf*)' written on the shoulder blade? And why would Ḥafṣah's reading of these stories so perturb Muḥammad? The 'stories of Joseph' are certainly not identical with Yūsuf, the twelfth *sūrah* of the Qur'ān. Ḥafṣah's reading of this *sūrah* of the Qur'ān would hardly have provoked such marked displeasure in Muḥammad—"[the Prophet's] face changed color (*yatalawwin wajhuh*)," as the tradition words it. Although somewhat obscure if read in isolation, the meaning of the tradition, within the context of both Maʿmar's *Jāmiʿ* and ʿAbd al-Razzāq's *Muṣannaf*, elucidates the significance of the Prophet's anger considerably. The tradition of Ḥafṣah's reading the 'stories of Joseph' appears alongside a litany of others addressing the study and reading of *non*-qur'ānic scripture. The tradition trails a discussion of the famous and controversial, *ḥaddithū ʿan banī isrāʾīl wa-lā ḥaraja* tradition, in which the Prophet enjoins his followers to transmit biblical traditions from Jews without fear of sinning.[44] Hence, Muḥammad's reaction expresses his displeasure at hearing Ḥafṣah read non-qur'ānic traditions about Joseph—her knowledge of the Qur'ān is neither contested here nor even the topic of the tradition.

Another tradition mirrors the Ḥafṣah-exchange and clarifies this point further. In this tradition, the Prophet's interlocutor is not Ḥafṣah but rather her father, ʿUmar. According to this tradition, ʿUmar asks a Jew from Medina's Qurayẓah clan to copy for him sections of (*jawāmiʿ min*) the Torah, and when ʿUmar then offers to present these writings to Muḥammad, "the Messenger of God's countenance changed (*fa-taghayyara wajh rasūl allāh*)." Muḥammad then likewise declares to ʿUmar, "Were Moses to appear in your midst and

44. ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, 6.109–110. Discussed in meticulous detail by M. J. Kister, "*Ḥaddithū ʿan banī isrāʾīla wa-lā ḥaraja*: A Study of an Early Tradition," *IOS* 2 (1972): 215–239. See also de Prémare, *Les fondations*, 452–454.

were you then to follow him and abandon me, you would go astray. Of all peoples, you are my lot; just as of all the prophets I am your lot."[45]

As seen above, the evidence that Khan offers readers for deducing that Ḥafṣah actively edited the codex is remarkably not only slim but virtually non-existent. However, much Ḥafṣah and her persona in these early traditions may fascinate us, one cannot simply conjure evidence where none exists. In this case, the evidence for the editorial activities of Ḥafṣah as imagined by Khan is sorely wanting.

Marwān b. al-Ḥakam's (or ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān's?) Destruction of Ḥafṣah's Codex

The last central point in Khan's discussion of Ḥafṣah's codex focuses on Zuhrī's account of the destruction of Ḥafṣah's codex during the caliphate of Muʿāwiyah b. Abī Sufyān (r. 660–680). Khan highlights Ḥafṣah's resolve when facing the request of Medina's governor, Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, that she hand over her copy of the Qur'ān inherited from her father in order to have it destroyed. Khan writes:

> From a feminist perspective, Hafṣa's [sic] refusal here is a powerful example of female agency that stands out in these androcentric classical narratives. This act of refusal to comply with Marwān's demand was no small matter ... What palpably comes across is the special and intense nature of the relationship between her and the *ṣuḥuf*. Western scholars of Qur'ānic studies need to ponder the not-so-obvious: of what significance, if any, is the vigilance and tenacity with which Hafṣa guarded the *ṣuḥuf*? What could Qur'ānic studies' [sic] scholars glean from the way in which Hafṣa "owned" or possessed the *ṣuḥuf* (especially since the intensity of this relation is evident in nearly all the classical narratives associated with the codification of the Qur'ān)? Is the special and intense nature of the relationship between Hafṣa and the *ṣuḥuf* simply due to them being ultimately *her* editorial product? Is this intensity a marker of her intellectual labor *vis-à-vis* the *ṣuḥuf*—that is, the Qur'ānic writings that she collected, recorded, and edited? There are other scenarios. Perhaps, the intensity is simply a function of the daughter–father bond because the *ṣuḥuf* were bequeathed to her by her father ʿUmar. Or perhaps the intensity of Hafṣa's relation to the *ṣuḥuf* is a function of the father–daughter joint effort as regards the collecting, copying, and editing the Qur'ān. It is plausible that if

45. ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf*, 6.113, *wa-law aṣbaḥa fīkum Mūsā thumma ittabaʿtumūhu la-ḍalaltum antum ḥazzī min al-umam wa-anā ḥazzukum min al-nabiyyīn*; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, 25.198 and ibid., 30.280; Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām al-Harawī (d. *ca.* 224/834), *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, eds., Ḥusayn M. M. Sharaf et al. (Cairo: al-Hay'ah al-ʿĀmmah li-Shu'ūn al-Maṭābiʿ al-Amīriyyah, 1984–1999), 2.322–325 and ibid., 5.55–60. Cf. Kister, "*Ḥaddithū*," 234.

> ʿUmar possessed a copy, he would have his daughter Hafṣa help him make this copy, especially given the reports concerning her literacy. After all, according to the first Hadīth [sic] tradition (from Bukhārī's collection), it was ʿUmar who was very invested in the project of assembling the Qur'ān (208–209).

Zuhrī—the earliest known scholar to emphasize the importance of Ḥafṣah's codex for the collection of the caliph ʿUthmān's recension—also serves as the authority for the accounts of the destruction of Ḥafṣah's scrolls (*ṣuḥuf*). Hence, we are likely dealing with two intimately intertwined narratives that originated with Zuhrī and his students. The extant iterations of Zuhrī's story of, on the one hand, the codification of the ʿUthmānic recension of the Qur'ān and, on the other, the destruction of the Ḥafṣah codex ought to be read as complimentary accounts, inasmuch as they posit Ḥafṣah's codex as simultaneously indispensable to the establishment of the ʿUthmānic recension carried out by Zayd ibn Thābit and definitively surpassed by this recension.

Khan's reading of the Marwān-Ḥafṣah episode relies heavily on her previous readings of Ḥafṣah's alleged editorial activities, and suffers as a result. For Khan, Marwān's "obsession" with destroying Ḥafṣah's codex was not only because it was a pre-canonical *muṣḥaf*:

> Marwān's obsession with destroying these codical materials possibly was a function of not just what was in them, but also of who "owned" them—namely, a woman and a "once-divorced" widow of the prophet at that (209).

Given that the evidence she adduces for Ḥafṣah's role as an editor of the Qur'ān and her lifelong stigmatization lacks any textual foundation or evidentiary support, it is unsurprising that Khan's reading of this episode collapses under scrutiny. Khan reads the episode as revealing Ḥafṣah's deeply personal attachment to the codex as indicative of her role in its redaction, but as framed by Zuhrī's account of the events, what Marwān destroys is not Ḥafṣah's *personally edited* codex but, rather, the codex compiled during Abū Bakr's caliphate at ʿUmar's prompting—a codex she *inherited* (and perhaps curated) rather than edited.[46]

Khan cites Ḥafṣah's stipulation to the caliph ʿUthmān that her codex be returned to her after his recension is completed as further evidence for Ḥafṣah's investment in the codex as the product of *her* editorial work. But lacking an evidentiary basis in the source material, this interpretation is superfluous at best and even misleading. Ḥafṣah's demands that ʿUthmān return the codex to her reflects rather her belief in the inviolability of her ownership rights

46. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1063; Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, *Kītāb al-maṣāḥif*, ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Sabhān (Beirut: Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyyah, 2002), 1.169, 202.

over the codex—ownership that she fears will be annulled if she hands over the codex to the caliph. Indeed, one tradition portrays Ḥafṣah stating as much during her exchange with ʿUthmān. She explains her reluctance to hand over her codex as follows: "I fear that you will withhold [the *muṣḥaf*] from me (*innī akhāfu an taḥbisahu ʿannī*)!"[47] In other words, she fears that the codex will not be returned to her.[48] ʿUthmān cedes to her demands and agrees to return the codex to her. Since Ḥafṣah dies childless and without a husband—as do all the Prophet's wives—her property rights fall to her brother, ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar, from whom Marwān demands the codex once again at a later date. Unlike his sister Ḥafṣah, Ibn ʿUmar consents to Marwān's demands, and Marwān has the codex either erased by washing the parchment (*ghasalahā ghaslan*),[49] torn to shreds (*shaqqaqahā wa-mazzaqahā*),[50] or burned to ashes (*fashāhā wa-ḥarraqahā*).[51]

47. Arthur Jeffery (ed. and trans.), *Two Muqaddimas to the Qur'anic Sciences: The Muqaddima to the 'Kitāb al-Mabānī' and the Muqaddima of Ibn ʿAṭiyya to His Tafsīr* (Cairo: al-Khaniji Booksellers, 1943), 22. Once regarded as anonymous, Claude Gilliot has recently deduced the identity of the author of the *Kitāb al-mabānī* as being a scholar and belletrist of late-tenth century Khorasan, Abū Muḥammad Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-ʿĀṣimī. See Gilliot, "La théologie musulmane en Asie Centrale et au Khorasan," *Arabica* 49 (2002): 135–203, 182f.

48. One may also speculate that she feared that the *ṣuḥuf* might be damaged. When the governor of Iraq, al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf al-Thaqafī (d. 95/713), undertook the 'second canonization' of the Qur'ān between 703 and 705 on behalf of the Umayyad caliph ʿAbd al-Malik, Ḥajjāj sent the new vulgate to Medina, as well as other population centers, to serve as the official copy for public readings. ʿUthmān's kin in Medina soon protested the idea that ʿUthmān's copy would be surpassed. In response to their objections, Ḥajjāj demanded that they hand over ʿUthmān's codex for official use; however, much like Ḥafṣah, they refused to hand over the codex, claiming that it had been damaged during the caliph's assassination. Cf. ~~ʿUmar~~ b. Shabbah al-Numayrī (d. 264/877), *Tārīkh al-madīnah al-munawwarah*, ed. Fuhaym Shaltūt (Jeddah: Dār al-Iṣfahānī, 1979), 1.7f., "*uṣība 'l-muṣḥaf yawma qutila ʿuthmān*"; Samhūdī, *Wafāʾ*, 2: 457.

49. Ibn Zabālah, *Muntakhab*, 37; Ibn Shabbah, 3.1003; Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1064. Erasing the parchment of the *muṣḥaf*s rather burning or shredding them is attested elsewhere, too. Cf. the account in *Ikhtilāf al-maṣāḥif* by the Zaydī scholar Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Manṣūr al-Murādī (d. *ca.* 290/903) cited in Raḍī al-Dīn Ibn Ṭāwūs (d. 664/1266), *Saʿd al-suʿūd* (Qum: n.p. 1944), 278, where ʿUthmān seizes the *muṣḥaf*s of Ubayy b. Kaʿb, ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd, and Sālim, Abū Ḥudhayfah's *mawlā*, and has them erased (*ghasalahā ghaslan*) rather than burning them. On the Zaydī scholar Murādī, see Etan Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work: Ibn Ṭāwūs and his Library* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 100, 188.

50. Ibn Shabbah, 3.1004; Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām, *Kitāb Faḍāʾil al-Qurʾān*, ed. Marwān al-ʿAṭiyyah, Muḥsin Kharābah, and Wafāʾ Taqī al-Dīn (Damascus: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1995), 284.

51. Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *Maṣāḥif*, 1.203.

But why this insistence on the destruction of Ḥafṣah's *ṣuḥuf*? Is this a plot, as Khan implicates, to conceal the spurned Ḥafṣah's role in editing the Qur'ān because she was a despised, stigmatized wife of the Prophet? Again, a close reading fundamentally contradicts this hypothesis. The Zuhrī-traditions about the destruction of the Ḥafṣah codex explicitly state the rationale behind Marwān's pursuit of Ḥafṣah's codex to have it destroyed. Marwān himself cites "the fear that there might be a cause to dispute that which ʿUthmān copied down because of something therein"—i.e., Ḥafṣah's codex must ultimately be subjected to the same fate all other codices of the Prophet's Companions faced.[52] If copies of ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd's and Ubayy b. Kaʿb's codices must be destroyed, so must Ḥafṣah's, for otherwise the unassailable authority of ʿUthmān's recension would be open to question. Admittedly, this contention is in tension with a key premise of Zuhrī's account of the ʿUthmānic recension—namely, that the codex Ḥafṣah inherited served as the basis of, or merely confirmed the accuracy of, the project Zayd ibn Thābit oversaw during ʿUthmān's caliphate.[53] Yet, it is also not entirely incompatible with fears that the mere existence of the codex Ḥafṣah inherited from ʿUmar, being both earlier and an important precursor, would mitigate and even undermine the authority of the ʿUthmānic recension.[54]

Also neglected in Khan's credulous treatment of the Marwān story are several important authorities who place Ḥafṣah's death not during Muʿāwiyah's caliphate but, rather, during ʿUthmān's.[55] The testimony of these authorities, which include such heavyweights as the Medinan scholar Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795),[56] renders the entire Marwān story impossible. Indeed, at

52. Ibn Shabbah, 3.1004, *makhāfata an yakūna fī shayʾin min dhālika khilāfun li-mā nasakha ʿUthmān*; Abū ʿUbayd, *Faḍāʾil*, 284.

53. Hence, according to at least one version of the Zuhrī account, it was only after ʿUthmān had himself seen the codex Ḥafṣah inherited and had confirmed that his copy matched it word for word that "[ʿUthmān's] soul was content, and he ordered the people to write down the codices" (*ṭābat nafsuhu wa-amara al-nās an yaktubū al-maṣāḥif*), (Ibn Shabbah, 3.1002).

54. Aziz al-Azmeh's recent monograph offers an important insight that further elaborates the need to destroy her codex from the perspective of the early Umayyads: "The rapidly centralizing state needed a 'master-copy', the need for which was not purely technical … the state needed to additionally keep an Umayyad guarantee of the integrity of the Vulgate, and for the integrity to be in the custody of an emergent class of specialists," *The Emergence of Islam in Late Antiquity: Allāh and His People* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 487.

55. Cf. Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1063, who lists two authorities who place her death during ʿUthmān's caliphate, albeit while rejecting the date himself.

56. Ibn Abī Zayd, *Jāmiʿ*, 321. The Egyptian scholar Ibn Wahb also asserted that his teacher Mālik b. Anas of Medina dated Ḥafṣah's death to the year of the conquest of North Africa—i.e., in 27/647–648. See Abū Zurʿah al-Dimashqī (d. 281/894), *Al-*

least four versions of the Zuhrī account assert that the caliph ʿUthmān (and *not* Marwān) requested ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar to hand over Ḥafṣah's *muṣḥaf* after his sister's death, whereupon the codex was either burned[57] or erased.[58] As is well known, ʿUthmān's destruction of all previous codices created a scandal, leading dissenters to excoriate him as "the codex-incinerator" (*ḥarrāq al-maṣāḥif*)[59]—indeed, some traditions even deny that ʿUthmān burned the codices at all, claiming rather that he buried them in a chest (*ṣundūq*) beneath the Prophet's pulpit (*minbar*), or that he merely ripped them to shreds because the idea of burning the codices grieved him.[60] Was the Marwān narrative invented, therefore, to exculpate ʿUthmān from the responsibility for the destruction of Ḥafṣah's codex?

Not likely. The incongruities between these accounts suggest that they are, to a large degree, literary constructions shaped by theological interests rather than simply straightforward records of the Qur'ān's compilation. For this reason, modern scholars must be wary of inferring that one can derive empirical data about the earliest copies of the Qur'ān from the minutiae of these accounts, which can exhibit a high degree of variance. In other words, the historicity of every detail of Zuhrī's account of the fate of Ḥafṣah's copy after her passing is elusive and, in all likelihood, ultimately unknowable.[61]

Tārīkh, ed. Luṭfī Maḥmūd Manṣūr (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 2007), 1.324–325. Abū Zurʿah attempts to harmonize Mālik's assertion with those accounts that place her death during the caliphate of Muʿāwiyah by positing that Mālik must have referred to a later campaign during the governorship of Marwān given the anachronism this creates for the story of Marwān's destruction of Ḥafṣah's codex (see ibid., 1.6); however, if ʿUthmān rather than Marwān destroyed the codex, the anachronism disappears.

57. Jeffery, *Two Muqaddimas, kitāb al-mabānī*, 22 (citing Zuhrī): *lammā halakat ḥafṣah arsala ʿuthmān ilā ʿabd allāh ibn ʿumar bi-ʿazīmatin lammā arsala ilayhi bi'l-ruqʿah fa-akhadhahā wa-aḥraqahā*; cf. Abu Nuʿaym al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-awliyāʾ wa-ṭabaqāt al-asfiyāʾ* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1996), 2.51.

58. Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ*, 1.56: *fa-lammā mātat ḥafṣah arsala* [*ʿUthmān*] *ilā ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar fī'l-ṣaḥīfah bi-ʿazīmatin fa-aʿṭāhum iyāhā fa-ghusilat ghaslan*. Cf. Ibn Shabbah, 3.1003 and n. 3 thereto, where the editor has amended the text of the manuscript from "Uthmān' to 'Marwān,' erroneously assuming a copyist's error.

59. Ibn Shabbah, 3.996; Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Shahrastānī, *Mafātīḥ al-asrār wa-maṣābiḥ al-abrār*, ed. Muḥammad ʿAlī Ādharshab (Tehran: Mirāth-i Maktūb, 2008), 1.10, 12; cf. Sayf b. ʿUmar al-Tamīmī, *Kitāb al-Riddah wa'l-futūḥ*, ed. Qasim al-Samarrai (Leiden: Smtiskamp Oriental Antiquarium, 1995), 51f.

60. Ibn Shabbah, 3.1003–1005.

61. Hence, while Motzki's conclusions regarding the transmission of Zuhrī's tradition are cogently argued and convincing (see n. 5 above), whether or not the accounts are in fact historical is another matter altogether. The distinction here, and one often missed by Motzki's readers, is between dating the origin of the reports and their historical authenticity. Cf. Nicolai Sinai, "When Did the Consonantal Skeleton of the Quran Reach Closure? Part II," *BSOAS* 77 (2014): 512–513: "For all we know, the full narrative about the promulgation of the ʿUthmānic text could be teeming with later expansions, accretions, and embellishments. This possibility is augmented by the fact that al-Zuhrī … may legitimately be suspected of having been susceptible to the exigencies of Umayyad 'state expediency.'" Also, see now Viviane Comerro, "Pourquoi et comment le Coran a-t-il été mis par écrite?" in François Déroche, Christian J. Robin, and Michel Zink (eds.), *Les origines du Coran, le Coran des origines* (Paris: De Boccard, 2015), 191–206.

What modern scholars can deduce with greater certainty is that, whether historical or not, the diverse accounts of Ḥafṣah's codex serve as a literary means to add testimonies to the veracity and success of ʿUthmān's project.

As recently argued by Viviane Comerro, the theological function of the accounts of Ḥafṣah's codex can be seen more clearly when read against parallel accounts that reproduce a similar scenario, but swap out Ḥafṣah's codex for that of ʿĀ'ishah. According to a tradition recorded by Ibn Shabbah (d. 262/876), during his codification project, the caliph ʿUthmān sent Ibn al-Zubayr not to Ḥafsah, to obtain the codex she inherited from ʿUmar, but rather to ʿĀ'ishah, asking her to bring "the sheets upon which the Messenger of God wrote the Qur'ān, which we compared with the sheets [in ʿUthmān's *muṣḥaf*] and rectified [ʿUthmān's *muṣḥaf*]. Later he ordered the rest of the sheets to be ripped to shreds."[62] According to another account, ʿUthmān asked ʿĀ'ishah to send him "the scraps of leather upon which the Qur'ān was written straight from the mouth of the Messenger of God, at the moment when God revealed it to Gabriel, and Gabriel revealed it to Muḥammad and brought it down to him—when the Qur'ān was still fresh (*wa-idh al-qur'ān ghaḍḍ*)."[63] The intent of the tradition, as Comerro notes, is to assert that

> ʿĀ'ishah possessed, in effect, a parchment that contained the original Qur'ān, exactly contemporary with the recitation of the Prophet, exactly contemporary with the moment of its revelation, and identical with that which God revealed to Gabriel—the exemplar most faithful to the heavenly original.[64]

That is, ʿĀ'ishah's copy ensures that the authenticity and accuracy of ʿUthmān's recension is vouchsafed and unimpeachable.

Comerro's cogent arguments are a far cry from Khan's speculation that Ḥafṣah's divorce stigmatized her and thus inspired the traditionists to suppress

62. Ibn Shabbah, 3.991, *baʿathanī ilā ʿā'ishah fa-jiʾtu bi'l-ṣuḥuf allatī kataba fīhā rasūl allāh al-qurʾān fa-ʿaraḍnāhā ʿalayhā ḥattā qawwamnāhā thumma amara bi-sāʾirihā fa-shuqqiqah.* Cf. *GdQ*, 2.53 (trans. Behn, 256).

63. Ibn Shabbah, 3.997–998.

64. Comerro, *Les traditions*, 164, "'Ā'isha possède, en effet, un parchemin qui contient le Coran originel, exactement contemporain de la récitation du Prophète, exactement contemporain du moment de sa révélation, identique à celui que Dieu a révélé à Gabriel, l'exemplaire le plus fidèle à l'original céleste."

her decisive role in establishment of the ʿUthmānic codex. What Comerro's reading demonstrates is precisely the opposite: the Prophet's wives, whether one reads the version featuring ʿĀ'ishah or the version featuring Ḥafṣah, confirm and vouchsafe the authority and accuracy of ʿUthmān's recension by virtue of the intimacy they enjoyed with the Prophet as members of his household.

In truth, readings of these traditions that deploy the historical-critical method bear rather bad news for any project burdened with the task of excavating feminine subjectivity in the scattered stories *about* (rather than *by*) women in the *ḥadīth* and *tafsīr* literature. The tradition only rarely presents us with independent female voices, and in the absence of substantial evidence unmediated by the androcentric frame of the early Islamic tradition, it is truly difficult to imagine how modern historians might create a reliable methodology for reconstructing a history of feminine subjectivity from these sources. These stories are men's stories about women, and what vestiges of women's independent voices did exist at some point in time are muffled by the anecdotal recollections of men. The women we encounter are often "anecdotal women"[65]—images of women and their lives devised to serve men's narratives. These difficulties should never dissuade us from writing the histories of women lives, but as we do so, we must be wary of the perils of historical error awaiting us along the path to this goal. Worded in another way, the parameters of the tradition and its historicization of the Qur'ān are by default androcentric and, therefore, stifle feminist readings of the past and scripture. Feminist readings can only flourish when they can reveal, disrupt, and transcend said parameters: a process that the tools of the historical-critical method can facilitate considerably.

The Codices (Maṣāḥif) of the Prophet's Wives and Their Scribes

Another line of inquiry worth pursuing is what these anecdotes about the Prophet's wives tell us about the codicological history of the Qur'ān and its preservation. The literature on the variant readings (*qirā'āt*) of the Qur'ān also features the codices of the Prophet's wives—in particular the codices of Ḥafṣah, ʿĀ'ishah, and Umm Salamah—but in this literature, the codices play an altogether different role than the one seen above. In the *qirā'āt* literature, the role of the wives' codices is that of repositories for readings that depart from the ʿUthmānic recension. This contrasts with the role the

65. An idea developed, albeit for a different literary context, by Fedwa Malti-Douglas in *Women's Body, Women's Word: Gender Discourse in Arabo-Islamic Writing* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 29ff. It has fallen into disuse but perhaps the time is ripe for its revival.

wives' codices play in the narratives discussed above—i.e., to vouch for the accuracy and authenticity of the ʿUthmānic recension. Ostensibly, the codices of the Prophet's wives represent different collections undertaken by the Prophet's wives independently, but in actuality, the variant readings this literature attributes to the codices of the Prophet's wives are striking for their uniformity and homogeneity rather than their diversity.

Accounts of these codices' origins conspicuously follow the same narrative template, amounting to three iterations of the same story. Hence, ʿĀ'ishah's codex purportedly came to be when she commissioned her own copy of the Qur'ān from her slave-client (*mawlā*), Abū Yūnus. While Abū Yūnus copied the codex, ʿĀ'ishah intervened: she specified that he take care to write *āyat al-ṣalāt* (Q Baqarah 2:238) in the precise manner she heard the Prophet recite it to her, adding the words "and the afternoon prayer" (*wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*) to the ʿUthmānic text.[66] A nearly identical story about this same verse is told regarding Ḥafṣah's personal copy, too; however, in the Ḥafṣah story the scribe is named ʿAmr b. Rāfiʿ (*v. l.* Nāfiʿ), and he is the slave-client of her father ʿUmar.[67] Likewise is yet another, virtually identical story recounted about the codex of Umm Salamah where, again, *āyat al-ṣalāt* features foremost. In the Umm Salamah version, her personal scribe, the slave-client ʿAbd Allāh b. Rāfiʿ, undertakes the copy and receives instruction to copy *āyat al-ṣalāt* according to Umm Salamah's instructions.[68]

The codices of the Prophet's wives are all purported to have been copied down by scribes after the Prophet's death, presumably for each wife's personal use rather than public dissemination.[69] Owning a Qur'ān codex required a considerable expenditure of wealth during this time—a level of wealth that only the post-conquest affluence of Medinans rendered feasible.[70] All of this

66. Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *Maṣāḥif*, 366–369, where Abū Yūnus' daughter Ḥamīdah claimed ʿĀ'ishah bequeathed this *muṣḥaf* to her family.

67. Ibid., 374–376. The same story is repeated as well, in which the scribe is rather Ḥafṣah's *mawlā* Abū Rāfiʿ in ibid., 376–377.

68. Ibid., 377–379.

69. Jeffery claims that the wives' codices were completed *during* the lifetime of the Prophet, but this assertion is not supported by his sources (*Materials*, 212, citing Ibn al-Jazarī's [d. 833/1429] *Al-Nashr fī qirā'āt al-ʿashar*). The cost of owning of personal copy of the Qur'ān would be too prohibitive prior to the influx of wealth that flooded Medina after the conquests. While reports of scribes recording parts of the Qur'ān during the Prophet's lifetime abound, such reports never mention Ḥafṣah among the so-called "scribes of the revelation" (*kuttāb al-waḥy*). See Balādhurī, *Ansāb*, 1.2, 1280–1281 and Claude Gilliot, "Collecte ou mémorisation du Coran: Essai d'analyse d'un vocabulaire ambigu," in Rüdiger Lohlker (ed.), *Ḥadīṯstudien – Die Überlieferungen des Propheten im Gespräch: Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Tilman Nagel* (Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač, 2009), 77–132.

70. On the high cost of producing our earliest extant *muṣḥaf*s, see François

would lead one to infer that the codex Ḥafṣah commissioned from the scribe ʿAmr b. Rāfiʿ must be different, therefore, from the codex she inherited from her father. But in truth, the relationship between the two codices—one serving as the template for ʿUthmān's collection (according to Zuhrī) and the other as a source for variant readings—is unclear in historical terms. Inasmuch as these traditions are the best evidence we have for the Prophet's wives acting in anything resembling an editorial role in the commitment of the Qurʾān to writing, we have included a translation of Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī's (d. 230–316/844–929) compilation thereof in an appendix to this essay.

As was the case with roles attributed to the codices owned by the Ḥafṣah and ʿĀʾishah during the establishment of the ʿUthmānic recension, the replication of the same story about the same verse with different names in this second case does little to inspire confidence in the probative value of the accounts. The codices that ʿĀʾishah, Ḥafṣah, and Umm Salamah commissioned from their scribes are theoretically different artifacts, but they are functionally identical in *qirāʾāt* literature. All three codices serve as a repository for possible Qurʾān variants—and usually the same variants at that. Although it is certainly plausible that the wives of the Prophet owned their own copies of the Qurʾān, this *a priori* plausibility quickly becomes a rather trifling matter once the accounts are read horizontally as varying stories that hit upon either a single theme or a multitude of salient ones.[71] What such a reading reveals is that, regardless of the antiquity of these reports or how widely they circulated, they are impossible to read as simple, matter-of-fact accounts.

Yet, the cause of gleaning historical insight into the Qurʾān's codicological history from such literary accounts is not entirely hopeless, nor is the application of the modern methods of historical criticism entirely a destructive enterprise. With the aid of a little philological spadework and a dash of paleographic insight, one can discern that the aforementioned accounts do reflect, however obliquely, a modicum of historical reality, even if the details the accounts offer are merely factitious. One can see this in the striking verisimilitude found in the account of Ḥafṣah's commissioning ʿAmr b. Rāfiʿ to copy a *muṣḥaf* for her. As first noted by Alfred-Louis de Prémare, Ibn Saʿd identifies Ḥafṣah's scribe (*kātib*) as a member of the Banū Lakhm, a tribe famous for converting to Christianity prior to the advent of Islam.[72] The origins of Ḥafṣah's scribe accords very much with the recent findings

Déroche, *Qurʾāns of the Umayyads* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 112.

71. Jeffery already noted this, albeit somewhat reluctantly, in *Materials*, 213 n. 1.

72. Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, 5.299; de Prémare, *Les fondations*, 455. On the Christianization of the Lakhmids, especially in Ḥīrah, see now Adam Talib, "Topoi and Topography in the Histories of al-Ḥīra," in Philip Wood (ed.), *History and Identity in the Late Antique*

of Alain George that, "The manuscript evidence … shows that some of the earliest scribes [of the Qurʾān] had become acquainted with Christian scribal techniques … either by personal contact, or because some of them were (or had been) Christian."[73] Indeed, the importance of Christianized Arabs and their role as scribes is a trope present in Arabic historiography and even Syriac historical accounts of early Islamic society.[74]

In other words, while theses accounts may be laced with *topoi* and theological tropes, the verisimilitude in which they are clothed is, in many cases, 'historical,' broadly speaking. Historians would be well-advised not to dismiss these stories as mere concoctions even if the historical truth of the event in all its details may not find vindication in the methods of modern historical and literary criticism. The picture such stories paint is not merely plausible in a general sense; these stories are historically informed by, and deeply ensconced in, the world the accounts depict.

The caveat is, of course, that these sorts of observations can only take modern historians so far, *pace* Khan's inadvisable speculations that Ḥafṣah might be the former editor of one of our earliest extant Qurʾān manuscripts (let alone its editor). Khan cites Behnam Sadeghi and Uwe Bergmann's radiocarbon dating of a single folio from the Sanʿāʾ 1 palimpsest to before 669 CE with a 95% probability, and then she upbraids them for failing to

Near East (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 123–148 and Isabel Toral-Niehoff, *Al-Ḥīra: Eine arabische Kulturmetropole im spätantiken Kontext* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 151–211.

73. Alain George, *The Rise of Islamic Calligraphy* (London: Saqi, 2010), 52–53 where he also cites traditions from *ḥadīth* literature in which several early Muslims—both *ṣaḥābīs* (Companions) and *tābiʿīs* (Followers)—commission copies of the Qurʾān to be transcribed by Christian scribes from Ḥīra (cf. Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *Maṣāḥif*, 2.501–502). Strikingly, some of the earliest extant qurʾānic palimpsests were repurposed by Christians rather than Muslims. See idem, "Le palimpseste Lewis-Mingana de Cambridge, témoin ancien de l'histoire du Coran," *Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Année* 1 (2011): 377–429. Early jurists like Muḥammad b. Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (d. 189/805), to cite one example, regarded the purchase and sale of a Qurʾān codex by Christians as permissible but problematic. See Shaybānī, *Al-Aṣl*, ed. Mehmet Boynukalın (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2012), 2.514, "Were a Christian to purchase a *muṣḥaf*, I'd force him to sell it, for his purchase was valid; likewise, were he to sell it, his sale of the *muṣḥaf* would be valid (*idhā ishtarā al-naṣrānī muṣḥafan ajbartuhu ʿalā bayʿihi wa-kāna shirāʾuhu jāʾizan ʿalayhi wa-kadhālika law bāʿahu kāna bayʿuhu jāʾizan*).

74. Jones, "The Word Made Visible"; Barbara Roggema, "The Debate between Patriarch John and an Emir of the Mhaggrāyē: a reconsideration of the earliest Christian-Muslim debate," in Martin Tamcke (ed.), *Christen und Muslime im Dialog: Christlich-muslimische Gespräche im muslimischen Orient des Mittelalters* (BTS 117; Beirut: Ergon, 2007), 21–39, 23–26; Michael P. Penn, "John and the Emir: A New Introduction, Edition and Translation," *Le Muséon* 121 (2008): 65–91, 78–80; Luke Yarbrough, "Upholding God's Rule: Early Muslim Juristic Opposition to the State Employment of non-Muslims," *ILS* 19 (2012): 11–85.

hypothesize that Ḥafṣah's copy of the Qur'ān could be behind the text (210–211).[75] However, it is Sadeghi and Bergmann's circumspection against equating the lower text of the palimpsest with a specific Companion codex that is warranted, not Khan's groundless speculation about the survival of Ḥafṣah's codex.[76] Moreover, while indubitably an extraordinary and exciting find, Sadeghi and Bergmann's dating of this parchment does not ~~resolve~~ the historiographical problems associated with resolving the tensions between *literary* traditions about the Qur'ān's compilation and transmission and the current analysis of its material remains. Even the discovery of a complete Qur'ān manuscript from ʿUthmān's caliphate—regardless of the revolutionary importance such a find would be in other respects—would not instantly dispel the intrinsic historiographical problems embedded in the multifarious, and oftentimes contradictory, accounts of the rationale and methods underlying the Qur'ān's compilation during his caliphate.

Appendix: Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī's Account of the Codices of the Prophet's Wives

Among the many merits of the *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* (*Book of Qur'ānic Codices*) of Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (230-316/844-929) is that he arranges his lists of variant qur'ānic readings (*qirā'āt*) according the codices in which they appear. Ibn Abī Dāwūd's compilation serves our purposes particularly well in that it not only lists all the variant readings attributed to the codices of the Prophet's wives, but that it also assigns each wife's codex its own section. As noted above, Ibn Abī Dāwūd includes three codices in his treatise: the *muṣḥaf* of ʿĀ'ishah, the *muṣḥaf* of Ḥafṣah, and the *muṣḥaf* of Umm Salamah. However, the distinction between the codices is actually rather superficial. The variant readings attributed to the wives' codices are quite homogenous. The traditions Ibn Abī Dāwūd compiled almost entirely focus on the codices' expanded reading of Q Baqarah 2:238—each codex of the Prophet's wives inserts mention of the afternoon prayer (*ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*) to the verse. The wives' expanded reading of this verse is, notably, also the Qur'ān reading favored by the Shi'ah.[77]

Scholars working in the Western academy predominately know the *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* via the edition included in Arthur Jeffery's *Materials for the History of*

75. Behnam Sadeghi and Uwe Bergmann, "The Codex of a Companion of the Prophet and the Qur'ān of the Prophet," *Arabica* 57 (2010): 348–53 *et passim*.

76. Sadeghi and Bergmann, 360.

77. See Etan Kohlberg and Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, *Revelation and Falsification: The* Kitāb al-qirā'āt *of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyārī* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 81–82.

the Text of the Qur'ān published by Brill in 1937. However, we have based our translation below not just on Jeffery's edition (marked AJ) but also the second printing of Muḥibb al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Sabḥān's edition of the *Maṣāḥif* published in two volumes by Dār al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyyah in 2002 (marked AS), as the Arabic text of this edition surpasses Jeffery's edition in his *Materials* in many respects.

[AJ 83/AS 1.365]
The Codex of ʿĀ'ishah, the Wife of the Prophet

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from ʿAbd Allāh b. Isḥāq al-Nāqid[78] and Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Adhramī,[79] who said: Zayd[80] related to us: Ḥammād[81] reported to us on the authority of Hishām[82] on the authority of his father [ʿUrwah],[83] who said:

> Written in ʿĀ'ishah's copy of the Qur'ān (*muṣḥaf*) was: "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).[84]

[AS 366]

ʿAbd Allāḥ related to us from Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Aḥmasī, from Jaʿfar b. ʿAwn [AJ 84], who said: Hishām[85] reported to us on the authority of Yazīd,[86] on the authority of Abū Yūnus, ʿĀ'ishah's slave-client (*mawlā*), who said:

> I wrote down (*katabtu*) a copy of the Qur'ān for ʿĀ'ishah, and she said, "When you come to *āyat al-ṣalāt* (Q Baqarah 2:238), do not write it down until I dictate it to you" (*ḥattā umliyahā ʿalayka*). She later dictated it to me as: "Take care to

78. ʿAbd Allāh b. Isḥāq al-Nāqid al-Wāsiṭī al-Baghdādī (d. after 200/815).

79. ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Isḥāq al-Jazarī al-Adhramī, a scholar of Mosul who flourished during the reign of al-Wāthiq (r. 227–32/842–47).

80. Yazīd b. Hārūn b. Zādhān al-Sulamī al-Wāsiṭī (d. 206/821).

81. Uncertain: either Ḥammād b. Zayd al-Baṣrī (d. 179/795) or Ḥammād b. Salamah al-Baṣrī (d. 167/783–783).

82. Hishām b. ʿUrwah b. al-Zubayr (d. 146/763).

83. ʿUrwah Ibn al-Zubayr (d. *ca.* 94/713), ʿĀ'ishah's nephew.

84. Cf. Q 2:283 where the standard reading omits "the afternoon prayer" (*ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).

85. Hishām b. Saʿd al-Madanī (d. 160/776–777).

86. Probably Yazīd b. Nuʿaym b. Hazzāl al-Ḥijāzī, but perhaps "Yazīd" is a corruption of "Zayd [ibn Aslam]"; cf. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmā' al-rijāl*, ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah, 1983–1992), 3.205.

> observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Abū'l-Ṭāhir,[87] who said: Ibn Wahb[88] reported to us and said: Mālik[89] reported to us on the authority of Zayd b. Aslam,[90] on the authority of al-Qaʿqāʿ b. Ḥakīm, on the authority of Abū Yūnus, the slave-client of ʿĀ'ishah the Mother of the Faithful, who said:

ʿĀ'ishah ordered me to write down a copy of the Qur'ān for her. Later she said, "When you reach this *āyah*—'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt* [AS 367] *al-wusṭā*)—consult me (*fa-ādhinnī*)." So when I reached the *āyah*, I consulted her, and she dictated to me: "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).

Then she said, "I heard this from the Messenger of God."

[AS 368]

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Muḥammad ibn Maʿmar, from Abū ʿĀṣim,[91] on the authority of Ibn Jurayj,[92] who said: Ibn Abī Ḥamīd[93] reported to me and said: Ḥamīdah[94] reported to me and she said:

> ʿĀ'ishah bequeathed to us her possessions (*awṣat lanā … bi-matāʿihā*), and in her copy of the Qur'ān it read, "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).

ʿAbd Allāh related to us, from Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm b. Zayd, from Abū ʿĀṣim, who said: Ibn Jurayj reported to us and said: ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān reported to us from his mother, Umm Ḥamīd bt. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, that she asked ʿĀ'ishah the Mother [AS 369] of the Faithful about the middle prayer (*al-ṣalāh al-wusṭā*), and she said:

We used to read in the original (*fī'l-ḥarf al-awwal*): "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer and stand in devotion before God" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr wa-qūmū li-llāh qānitīn*).

87. Aḥmad b. ʿAmr b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAmr b. al-Sarḥ al-Miṣrī (d. 255/869).
88. ʿAbd Allāh Ibn Wahb al-Miṣrī (d. 197/812).
89. Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795).
90. Zayd b. Aslam al-ʿAdawī al-Madanī (d. 136/754).
91. Al-Ḍaḥḥāk b. Mukhlad b. al-Ḍaḥḥāk al-Shaybānī al-Baṣrī (d. *ca.* 112/731).
92. ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Jurayj al-Makkī (d. 150/767–768).
93. Muḥammad b. Abī Ḥamīd al-Anṣārī, a Medinese tradent of ill repute.
94. Ḥamīdah bt. Abī Yūnus, the daughter of ʿĀ'ishah's *mawlā* Abū Yūnus.

ʿAbd Allāh related to us, from Ismāʿīl b. Asad: Ḥajjāj[95] told us that Ibn Jurayj said: ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān reported to me on the authority of is his mother, Umm Ḥamīd bt. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, that she asked ʿĀ'ishah what God Most High decreed concerning "the middle prayer" (*al-ṣalāh al-wusṭā*). She said:

> We use to read in the original during the era (*ʿahd*) of the Prophet: "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer and stand in devotion before God" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr wa-qūmū li-llāh qānitīn*).

[AS 370]

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Aḥmad b. al-Ḥabbāb, from Makkī,[96] from ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīʿah,[97] on the authority of Ibn Hubayrah,[98] on the authority of Qabīsah [AJ 85] b. Dhu'ayb,[99] who said:

> In ʿĀ'ishah's copy of the Qur'ān was: "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).

So said Ibn Abī Dāwūd.

ʿAbd Allāh related to us: Muḥammad b. Maʿmar told us: Abū ʿĀṣim related to us on the authority of Ibn Jurayj, who said: Ibn Abī Ḥamīd reported to me and said: Ḥamīdah reported to me and she said:

> ʿĀ'ishah bequeathed to us her possessions, and in her copy of the Qur'ān read "God and his angels continually bless the Prophet and those attain the highest ranks" (*inna allāha wa-malāʾikatahu yuṣallūna ʿalā al-nabiyyi wa-'lladhīna yaṣilūna al-ṣufūf al-uwal*).[100]

[AS 371]
The Codex of Ḥafṣah, the Wife of the Prophet

95. Ḥajjāj b. Muḥammad al-Maṣīṣī al-Aʿwar (d. 206/821).
96. Makkī b. Ibrāhīm b. Bashīr al-Tamīmī al-Balkhī (d. 215/830).
97. ʿAbd Allāh b. Lahīʿah al-Miṣrī (d. 174/790–791).
98. ʿAbd Allāh b. Hubayrah b. Asʿad al-Sabaʾī al-Miṣrī (d. 126/743–744).
99. Qabīsah b. Dhu'ayb b. Ḥalḥalah al-Khuzāʿī al-Madanī (d. *ca.* 86–87/705–706).
100. Q Aḥzāb 33:56 in the *textus receptus* has only *inna allāha wa-malāʾikatahu yuṣallūna ʿalā al-nabī*.

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Muḥammad b. Bashshār,[101] from Muḥammad,[102] from Shuʿbah,[103] from Abū Bishr,[104] from ʿAbd Allāh b. Yazīd al-Azdī (one of them said 'al-Awdī' according to Ibn Abī Dāwūd), from Sālim b. ʿAbd Allāh:

> Ḥafṣah ordered someone to write down a copy of the Qur'ān for her (*amarat insānan an yaktuba lahā muṣḥafan*), and she said, "When you read this *āyah*—"Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā*)—consult me (*fa-ādhinnī*). When he reached it, he consulted her, and she said, "Write: 'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*)."

ʿAbd Allāh related to us, from Muḥammad b. Bashshār—and we wrote it down from no one else—from Ḥajjāj b. Minhāl, from Ḥammād b. Salamah, from ʿUbayd Allāh,[105] from Nāfiʿ,[106] from Ibn ʿUmar, from Ḥafṣah that:

> Ḥafṣah told the scribe for her copy of the Qur'ān, "If you reach the appointed times (*mawāqīt*) for the prayer, let me know so that I can let you know what I heard the Messenger of God say." When he told her, she said, [AS 372] "Write: 'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*)."

ʿAbd Allāh related to us: My uncle[107] and Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm said: Ḥajjāj related to us: ʿUbayd Allāh b. ʿUmar reported to us on the authority of Nāfiʿ, from Ḥafṣah a similar report, but he did not mention Ibn ʿUmar in it.

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Muḥammad b. Bashshār, from ʿAbd al-Wahhāb,[108] from ʿUbayd Allāh, from Nāfiʿ:

> Ḥafṣah ordered a slave-client of hers to write down a copy of the Qur'ān for her. She said, "When you reach 'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer, and stand in devotion before God' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-qūmū li-llāh qānitīn*), do not write it down until I dictate it to you the way I heard the Messenger of God read it (*yaqraʾuhā*)." When he reached it, she commanded him, and he wrote the verse as, "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer and stand in devotion before God" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā al-ṣalāt wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr wa-qūmū li-llāh qānitīn*).

Nāfiʿ added, "I read this myself in the codex and found the two *wāw*s."

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Ismāʿīl b. Isḥāq, from Ismāʿīl,[109] who said: [AS 373] My brother[110] related to me on the authority of Sulaymān,[111] from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd Allāh, from Nāfiʿ:

> ʿAmr ibn Rāfiʿ (or Ibn Nāfiʿ), the slave-client of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, informed him that he wrote down a copy of the Qur'ān for Ḥafṣah bt. ʿUmar and she said, "When you reach *āyat al-ṣalāt*, consult me and I'll dictate to you the way I heard from the Messenger of God." When I reached "Take care to observe the prayers" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~*), she said: "especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer" (*wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Naysabūrī, from Khālid, from Muḥammad b. Isḥāq on the authority of Abū Jaʿfar and Nāfiʿ the slave-client of Ibn ʿUmar, from ʿAmr b. Nāfiʿ [sic], the slave-client of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, who said:

> While the wives of the Prophet were alive I used to write down copies of the Qur'ān (*kuntu aktubu 'l-maṣāḥif fī ʿahd azwāj al-nabī*), and Ḥafṣah bt. ʿUmar sought me out to write down a copy of the Qur'ān for her (*fa-istaktabatnī ḥafṣah bt. ʿumar muṣḥafan lahā*). She told me, "Listen boy, when you reach this *āyah*—'Take care to observe the prayers' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~*)—do not write it down until you come to me so I can dictate it to you the way I memorized it from God's Messenger."
>
> When I reached the verse, I carried my sheet and writing utensils (*al-waraqah wa'l-dawāh*) to go see her, and she said: "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer and stand in devotion before God" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr wa-qūmū li-llāh qānitīn*).

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Abū'l-Ṭāhir who said: Ibn Wahb reported to us and said: Mālik reported to me on the authority of Zayd b. [AJ 87] Aslam, from ʿAmr b. Nāfiʿ [sic], that he said:

101. Muḥammad b. Bashshār al-Baṣrī (d. 252/866).
102. Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar al-Hudhalī al-Baṣrī (d. 193/809).
103. Shuʿbah b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Baṣrī (d. 160/776).
104. Jaʿfar b. Iyās al-Wāsiṭī (d. *ca.* 123–126/740–744).
105. ʿUbaydallāh b. ʿUmar b. Ḥafṣ b. ʿĀṣim b. ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb al-Madanī (d. *ca.* 144–145/761–763).
106. Nāfiʿ, the slave-client of ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿUmar (d. 117/735).
107. Muḥammad b. al-Ashʿath al-Kindī al-Kūfī (d. *ca.* 66–67/685–687).
108. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb b. ʿAbd al-Majīd b. al-Ṣalt al-Thaqafī al-Baṣrī (d. 194/809–810).
109. Ismāʿīl b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Uways al-Madanī (d. 227/842).
110. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd b. ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Uways al-Madanī (d. 202/817–818).
111. Sulaymān b. Bilāl al-Taymī al-Madanī (d. 172/788–789 or 177/793–794).

> I used to write down a copy of the Qur'ān (*kuntu aktubu muṣḥafan*) [AS 374] for Ḥafṣah, the Mother of the Faithful, and she said, "When you reach this *āyah*, consult me: 'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā*)." When I reached the *āyah*, I consulted her, and she dictated: "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer and stand in devotion before God" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr wa-qūmū li-llāh qānitīn*).

[AS 376]

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik,[112] from Yazīd,[113] from Muḥammad b. ʿAmr,[114] on the authority of Abū Salamah[115] who said: ʿAmr b. Nāfiʿ [sic] the slave-client of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb said:

> Written in the codex of Ḥafṣah, the Prophet's wife, is "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Hārūn b. Sulaymān, from ʿUthmān b. ʿUmar, from Abū ʿĀmir al-Khazzāz,[116] from Ibn Abī Rāfiʿ, on the authority of his father, Ḥafṣah's slave-client, who said:

> Ḥafṣah sought me out to write down a copy of the Qur'ān, and she said, "When [AS 377] you come to this *āyah*, come here so I can dictate to you the way it was recited to me (*kamā uqrītūhā*)." So when I came to the *āyah*—"Take care to observe the prayers" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāh~~*)—she said, "Write: 'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā al-ṣalāt wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*)."
>
> Then I met Ubayy b. Kaʿb, or perhaps Zayd b. Thābit, and I said, "O Abū'l-Mundhir![117] Ḥafṣah said the *āyah* went such-and-such way (*qālat kadhā wa-kadhā*). Ubayy replied, "It's just as she said. For is it not the case that at the time the noon prayer (*ṣalāt al-ẓuhr*) we are most busy with our work and our camels (*fī ʿamalinā wa-nawāḍiḥinā*)?"

The Codex of Umm Salamah

112. Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān al-Wāsiṭī (d. 266/879–880).
113. Yazīd b. Hārūn b. Zādhān al-Sulamī al-Wāsiṭī (d. 198/813 or later).
114. Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. ʿAlqama al-Laythī al-Madanī (d. *ca.* 144–145/761–763).
115. Abū Salamah b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAwf al-Zuhrī al-Madanī (d. 94/712–713 or 104/722–723).
116. Ṣāliḥ b. Rustam al-Mazanī al-Baṣrī al-Khazzāz.
117. Abū'l-Mundhir Ubayy b. Kaʿb (d. 19/640 or later).

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Abū'l-Ṭāhir,[118] from Ibn Nāfiʿ,[119] from Dāwūd b. Qays on the authority of ʿAbd Allāh b. Rāfiʿ, the slave-client of Umm Salamah, that she said to him:

> Write down for me [AS 378] a copy of the Qur'ān. When you reach this *āyah*, let me know: "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā*." When I reached "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā*), she said, "Write down: 'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*)."

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Hārūn b. Isḥāq and ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Abī al-Khaṣīb, who said: Wakīʿ related to us on the authority of Dāwūd b. Qays, from ʿAbd Allāh b. Rāfiʿ, from Umm Salama:

> She [?] wrote a copy of the Qur'ān (*annahā k-t-b-t muṣḥafan*), and when she [?] reached (*fa-lammā b-l-gh-t*)[120] "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā*), she said, "Write down: 'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer' (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*)."

ʿAbd Allāh related to us [AJ 89] from Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Aḥmasī, from ʿUbayd Allāh,[121] from Sufyān,[122] on the authority of Dāwūd b. Qays, from ʿAbd Allāh b. Rāfiʿ, who said:

> I wrote down a copy of the Qur'ān for Umm Salamah, and she dictated to me "Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer and the afternoon prayer" (*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā wa-ṣalāt al-ʿaṣr*).

[AS 379]

ʿAbd Allāh related to us from Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm, from Saʿd b. al-Ṣalt, from ʿAmr b. Maymūn b. Mihrān al-Jazarī on the authority of his father, who said:

> Umm Salamah told a scribe writing down a copy of the Qur'ān for her, "When you write 'Take care to observe the prayers, especially the middle prayer'(*ḥāfiẓū ʿalā ~~al-ṣalāt~~ wa-ṣalāt al-wusṭā*), write down: 'the afternoon prayer' (*al-ʿaṣr*)."

118. Aḥmad b. ʿAmr b. al-Sarḥ al-Umawī al-Miṣrī (d. 250/864).
119. ʿAbd Allāh b. Nāfiʿ al-Ṣāʾigh al-Madanī (d. 206/822).
120. *Sic.* The text seems to be corrupt here, as the second half of the report has the scribe, rather than Umm Salamah, writing the *muṣḥaf* as in the above report.
121. ʿUbaydallāh b. Mūsā b. Bādhām al-ʿAbsī al-Kūfī (d. 213/828–829).
122. Either Sufyān al-Thawrī or Sufyān b. ʿUyaynah.