decrees and were presented under the rubric of *siyāsa*, rather than a hermeneutic interference with legal pluralism. Peters's list of rules that were rejected by the Ottoman Ḥanafī establishment confirms my contention. It includes: (1) capital sentences based on *qasāma*; (2) allowing capital sentences to stand despite a female heir's waiving of her right to demand retribution; (3) sentences based on the testimony of one witness and an oath; and (4) sentences regarding a triple repudiation given in one session (p. 322). The first two examples fall under criminal law (the archetypal case of public order), while the third is a question of legal procedure—one against Ottoman Ḥanafī *ordre public*, according to Peters (p. 324). One can assume that the fourth example about triple divorce was rejected because it was a minority position within the Ḥanbalī school. That would make sense since by the Ottoman period judges were required to adjudicate on the basis of dominant positions within the schools. In his examination of Dakhla, Peters rightly cautions that we must not exaggerate the practical importance of the quadruple system, as it functioned only in a few big cities (p. 323). Despite finding pragmatic choices of forum in his sample, Peters convincingly argues that in some cases the forum-shopping explanation for the choice of a non-Ḥanafī judge does not stand, giving way instead to more mundane explanations, such as the vacancy of the deputyship of a particular school requiring it (pp. 324–25).

For the study of Islamic legal theory, and even for important insights into Islamic legal practice, this tome offers many invaluable contributions—including those of necessity left undescribed here. Providing a thoughtful reflection on Bernard Weiss's scholarship and posing relevant questions that will be grappled with for years to come, it is an indispensable resource for students of Islamic law.

AHMED FEKRY IBRAHIM
MCGILL UNIVERSITY

Zayd. BY DAVID S. POWERS. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS, 2014. Pp x + 175. $55, £36.

Zayd b. Ḥāritha should have been one of the household names of early Islam. The only companion of the Prophet to be mentioned by name in the Quran, the Prophet's adoptive son, and the first adult male to embrace Islam—you would expect him to be up there with Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿAlī, and the other well-known close companions. Yet few non-specialists will have heard of him. Those who do will most likely connect him to the memorable and controversial story of how Muḥammad accidentally came to see the wife of a companion in a state of undress and fell in love with her, upon which said companion divorced her to allow Muḥammad to take her as his wife. That selfless companion was Zayd. However, there are many more and important aspects to the life of this unobtrusive figure, and David Powers has set out to show the importance of why he has not been paid more attention.

The topic is linked to Powers's lifelong interest in historicizing Islamic inheritance law, to which belongs the question of what do adopted children inherit? The short answer is nothing, since there is no adoption in Islam. God abolished it in Q 33:4–6, and Zayd is central to the story behind this abolition. Powers discussed this issue in his monograph *Muḥammad Is Not the Father of Any of Your Men* in 2009 (see the review in *JAOS* 131 [2011]: 171–73). The present book takes up his argument, situating the story of Zayd in a wider literary tradition of father-son relationships in biblical and Jewish sources.

The book begins with the traditional narration of the story as we find it in the *sīra* biographies of Muḥammad: a member of the north Arabian Kinda tribe, the youngster Zayd b. Ḥāritha was captured by raiders and sold as a slave in Mecca, where Muḥammad's wife Khadīja bought him and gave him to her husband as a wedding present. Muḥammad took a liking to Zayd, freed him, and adopted him as his son: "I am his heir and he is mine." As part of the household, Zayd was the first to hear and accept Muḥammad's revelation after Khadīja and his foster brother ʿAlī (then still a child). After the *hijra* to Medina, Zayd took part in many campaigns and became a respected war leader. Then came the well-known episode of Zayd's wife Zaynab, referred to in Q 33:37, where God chides Muḥammad for fearing the people's prattle rather than God's will that Zayd's former wife was meant for him—this is where Zayd is named. Immediately following this event, however, and before Muḥammad married

Zaynab, Muḥammad repudiated Zayd as his son, at which time verses 4–6 of sura 33, abolishing adoption in general, were revealed. Zayd reverted to Zayd b. Ḥāritha instead of Zayd b. Muḥammad. He remained Muḥammad's close and trusted companion, however, until he was killed in a battle against a Roman army at Muťa in Jordan in the year 8*h* (630 C.E.). He thus died two years before Muḥammad. He was succeeded by a son, Usāma, also a close companion of the Prophet.

The Muslim exegetes link the abolition of adoption to the Zaynab story. The prattle of people that held Muḥammad back was the kinship bond: it was considered incestuous to marry your former daughter-in-law. By cutting the legal kinship link between Muḥammad and Zayd, God removed that possible barrier to the marriage. But, says Powers, verse 37 already indicates that God's will for Muḥammad is superior and Muḥammad is not bound by what governs other men. Furthermore, he points out, Q 4:23 specifically says that the ban on marrying daughters-in-law only concerns natural sons, not adoptive or foster relations. So there was no reason for Muḥammad to repudiate Zayd for this reason.

Instead, Powers suggests, the adoption issue is not related to the Zaynab story at all. Rather, the explanation must be found in 33:40: "Muhammad is not the father of any of your [the community's] men, but he is God's Messenger and seal of the prophets." This is the one place the expression *khātam al-nabiyyīn* ("seal of the prophets") occurs in the Quran. Powers argues that these two statements, that Muḥammad had no sons and that he is the "seal," must be read together. Originally, "seal" may have meant simply the "confirmation" of earlier divine revelations. Connected to Muḥammad's sonlessness, however, it gains a new meaning. In both Judaic and Arabic traditions, prophethood is inherited: Isaac is the son of Abraham, Solomon the son of David. But, says the verse (in Powers's reading), as Muḥammad has no son, prophethood must end with him. If Muḥammad *had* had sons (Zayd), then that son would have inherited the position of *nabī*, prophet.

According to Powers, these verses must have therefore been inserted into the Quran later, when the issue of succession to Muḥammad came up, probably toward the end of the seventh century C.E. Together with the composition of sura 33 and the story of Zayd's death at Muťa, they were made to counteract the possibility of Zayd's being a prophet by inheritance. Zayd's potential claim would only arise if he outlived the Prophet, *and* if he at that point was Muḥammad's son and heir. If only the latter were true, then Zayd's son Usāma would be the heir-prophet, so the Muťa story was not enough; Zayd's adoptive link to Muḥammad must also be severed.

We are thus clearly in the area of Quranic revisionism. Powers assumes that the Quran was open to editorial change—after its Prophet was gone, elements were both removed and added. This is clearly unacceptable to most believing Muslims, and it was also met with skepticism by many non-Muslim scholars when he presented these claims in his earlier book, *Muḥammad Is Not the Father*. This hypothesis is also the premise for the present volume, *Zayd*. Here, however, Powers's aim is more limited; he wishes to place the Zayd story into the narrative patterns of biblical tradition.

He does this by dividing the story into four themes: Zayd's origin and adoption; Zaynab; the battle of Muťa; and Usāma. Each of these is then divided into topics, and for each topic he presents "textual encounters" from the biblical tradition. Thus, for instance, Zayd's initial capture by slavers, his rise to prominence in Muḥammad's household, and his relation to his biological father Ḥāritha are compared to the biblical (and Quranic) story of Joseph and the pharaoh, and to Joseph's love for his father Isaac. As for the marriage to Zaynab, besides the evident parallel to David and Bathsheba, there is a story that Abraham went to visit his son Ishmael and only his wife was at home, comparable to Muḥammad's visit to Zayd's house (although nothing other than this happened in Abraham's case). The biblical story of a messenger being sent to find a wife for Isaac (Rachel) compares to when Zayd first proposed to Zaynab, when ʿAlī was sent as his spokesman. For the battle of Muťa, the textual encounter is the story of a Jew warning Muḥammad that Zayd would die in the expedition, yet Muḥammad still sent him. This is connected to the biblical story of Abraham's willingness to sacrifice Isaac on God's command, the link being a father figure willing to see his son die.

For each element of the Zayd story, such a parallel is sought, although there are some cases where none is found, which is also clearly pointed out. Nevertheless, the reader sometimes wonders what the connection is. Zayd is sent on the Muťa raid in order to avenge an earlier Muslim envoy who had been killed. In 2 Samuel 10, messengers sent by King David to the Ammonites are humiliated by having

their beards cut off, which provokes David to go to war (in which Uriah is killed). Thus, in the biblical tradition there is a case where a provocation leads to war, and in the Zayd story there is a case where a provocation leads to war. This is not uncommon in war. Both Uriah and Zayd had wives desired by their commanders—does that make the revenge motive more comparable?

Powers's argument is that the Muslim community constructed its "foundation narrative" on models from the Bible that were well known to the community. Thus, the story of Zayd is a compilation of disparate elements taken from the biblical tradition. They do not convey a historical truth, but are constructed with the prime objective of removing Zayd as a potential competitor for Abū Bakr as caliph or, even worse, as a possible *nabī*. The first was a political threat, the second a theological threat. The stories of Zayd losing his status as Muḥammad's adoptive son and of his death in 8*h*, as well as the Quranic verses all stem from this need. God sent Zayd to Arabia "to facilitate the process whereby Muḥammad became the Last Prophet," Powers concludes.

Quranic revisionism such as this is often seen as a flight of fancy—how can we prove that the established history, documented in so many early texts, is untrue. Powers is not necessarily interested in "how it really was," however, but in how the story was constructed (and why)—intertextuality. Nevertheless, story and history must have some points of contact, and this does raise some queries. If the argument is that Zayd is a complete fiction, why was he invented in the first place? No Zayd, no problem: Muḥammad had no sons and no potential heirs. If a historical Zayd really was Muḥammad's adoptive son, why not simply let Muḥammad un-adopt him, which we learn was a simple enough process? If necessary, by divine decree, given that verses could be added to the Quran at will. Why was it necessary to abolish the institution of adoption completely? If we follow Powers's argument, adoption did actually exist for a while after the Prophet's death. So what happened to all the other adopted children who suddenly became fatherless and disinherited when these new Quranic verses miraculously appeared? Was there no murmur of dissent, or were such protests also successfully erased from the collective memory? And if Zayd was a real challenger to Abū Bakr, why is there no historical memory of that, no *shīʿat Zayd*? This belongs to "actual history," which Powers may claim we can never know, but the issue of how memory is preserved and what elements can and cannot be completely erased is a relevant one.

The biblical precedents were also presented in a chapter of *Muḥammad Is Not the Father of Any of Your Men*. But *Zayd* is not just an abbreviated version of the earlier work. The presentation and focus are different and many of the story elements are elaborated in greater detail. In *Zayd*, there is no mention of the disputed *kalāla* issue that was central to the former book. Both works can thus be read independently of the other. *Zayd* is also an easy read, much of it a straightforward narrative of Zayd's story and those of the biblical-Judaic tradition. Like the longer work, however, it is a thorough, erudite, and thought-provoking exploration of an alternative way to see early Islamic historiography. It may not convince readers who want more definite proof of tampering with the Quranic text, but it does show that there was a large store of themes and motifs that could have influenced the body of "sacred myths" that went into the *sīra* and other later sources. Powers's way of arguing "whom does the story benefit" is certainly stimulating and should force us to question how much of the early history may have been manipulated, how exactly, and to what end.

<div align="right">

Knut S. Vikør
University of Bergen

</div>

The Archetypal Sunnī Scholar: Law, Theology, and Mysticism in the Synthesis of al-Bājūrī. By Aaron Spevack. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2014. Pp. viii + 212. $80.

What does an archetypal Sunni scholar look like? This question is explored in Aaron Spevack's comprehensive biography and intellectual portrait of Ibrāhīm al-Bājūrī (d. 1860), the prolific Shāfiʿī jurist, Ashʿarī theologian, and member of the Naqshbandī mystical order, who may be considered one