G. H. A. Juynboll, "Ḥadīth," in: Dictionary of the Middle Ages, New York 1982-9

(1950); *Hadewijch Brieven,* F. van Bladel and B. Spaapen, eds. (1954), and *Hadewijch: Strofische Gedichten,* N. de Paepe, ed., 2 vols. (1968-1972). Translations may be found in Edmund Colledge, ed., *Mediaeval Netherlands Religious Literature* (1964); Tanis M. Guest, ed., *Some Aspects of Hadewijch's Poetic Form in the "Strofische Gedichten"* (1975); and J.-B. Porion, ed., *Hadewijch d'Anvers: Poèmes des béguines* (1954).

Studies. Reinder Meijer, *Literature of the Low Countries* (1971), 17-20; Theodoor Weevers, *Poetry of the Netherlands in Its European Context, 1170-1930* (1960), 26-39. For the special role of *minne* in Hadewijch's poetry, see Tanis M. Guest, "Hadewijch and Minne," in P. K. King and P. F. Vincent, eds., *European Context* (1971).

ERNST H. SOUDEK

[See also Dutch Literature; Mysticism, European: Women Mystics.]

ḤADĪTH, an Arabic word meaning literally "conversation" or "report," which developed into one of the most important concepts of Islam: tradition. Islamic "tradition" differs from its English counterpart in that it refers solely to the transmitted account of what happened in the past, while the larger notion of established custom or practice is reserved for the term *sunna.* In this article the word "tradition" will be used exclusively in the Islamic sense.

Over the first two and a half centuries of Islam (620's–860's), *ḥadīth* evolved from an orally transmitted report of an event directly involving the prophet Muḥammad and/or one or more of his contemporaries into a highly standardized account of the normative behavior of the Prophet, comprising his sayings and deeds as well as his tacit approval of the practices of others. The chronology proposed by Western scholarship, to be discussed below, differs somewhat from that agreed upon among Islamic scholars, which will be sketched first.

The chronology formulated by Muslim *ḥadīth* scholars in the early Middle Ages and gradually accepted in the entire orthodox Islamic world assumed that the earliest accounts of the Prophet's normative practices arose immediately after his death in 632, if not even earlier on a limited scale. With the mushrooming of social and political unrest and the proliferation of politicodoctrinal schisms as a result of the First Civil War, which broke out in 656, transmitters of *ḥadīth*s could, in the opinion of the pious, no longer automatically be believed on their word and hence were required to name their informant or informants. The sequence of transmitters, from the

eyewitness of a certain event in which the Prophet is reported to have played a role to the last person interrogated, whose account is eventually taken down in writing, forms the *isnād* (chain of authorities), the birth of which was thus fixed in 656, the year that the First Civil War began. At that time, since a large group of the Prophet's first and most important followers were still alive, anyone who desired to be informed about the stance taken by the Prophet in a given situation had only to inquire of someone who remembered having heard (someone reporting on) the Prophet's point of view. After verification of the reliability of the transmitter(s), the account describing the Prophet's words, deeds, or tacit approval was authenticated and allowed to stand on its own as an authoritative bit of religious learning. Thus the nascent Islamic community had at its disposal, apart from the Koran, which had been definitively codified by order of the caliph ʿUthmān, the living memory of the earliest period, when the Prophet was still alive, passed on by oral transmission from one pious generation of Muslims to the next, a transmission soon standardized by the introduction of the *isnād.*

The first scholar to lay the foundations of later *ḥadīth* studies in the West, Ignaz Goldziher, was not particularly concerned with chronology. In his *Muhammedanische Studien* he gives a very detailed and rich description of Muslim *ḥadīth* as it developed in the course of the ninth century, but he omits a precise chronology covering the seventh and eighth centuries. Joseph Schacht, in *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence,* dealing with exclusively legal traditions, is very much concerned with early chronology. He fixes the date of origin of the *isnād* after the Third Civil War, which broke out in 744, some eighty years after the date Muslim scholars had agreed upon. Schacht herewith attempted to refute another date, about 700, first advanced by Josef Horovitz in 1918.

More recently, G. H. A. Juynboll has proposed a chronology coinciding more or less with that of Horovitz but based on evidence gathered from a variety of predominantly Muslim sources hitherto untapped. The significance of the discrepancy between the two chronologies for the establishment of the *isnād* presented here—656 for Muslim scholars and about 700 in Western studies—lies in the fact that in 700 virtually all those who had known the Prophet as well as those who had seen him and spoken with him, the Companions, had died. In other words, the later chronology fixes the birth of the *isnād* during the next generation, that of the Successors.

A related issue, and indeed, the first major question regarding Islamic ḥadīth that invariably arises among Muslim as well as Western scholars, is that of authenticity. In this particular context "authenticity" means the historicity of the ascription of a certain report to the oldest authority in its isnād, regardless of whether that is the Prophet or another ancient authority. The authenticity issue is closely linked to the historical events of the period and will be broached more than once in the historical sketch that follows.

During the century or so after Muhammad's death in 632, there was a major Islamic expansion into hitherto Byzantine- and Sasanian-controlled territories. The seat of government of the nascent Islamic empire was moved from Medina to Al-Kufa in 656, to Damascus in 661, and back to Iraq, to become fixed at Baghdad some one hundred years later. Islam as a religion with a creed, but especially during the first century of its existence as a politicoreligious expansionist ideology, underwent a development that is reflected in the evolution of ḥadīth, the most important phenomenon of Islam after the Koran. No scholar, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, will deny that as Islam progressed, so did ḥadīth, or, conversely, that as ḥadīth developed, so, as a consequence, did Islam. In other words, the first evolution of Islam is mirrored in ḥadīth; to interpret the early history of Islam properly entails the assessing of the first stages of ḥadīth,

Strictly speaking, ḥadīth originally meant "conversation," "story," "narrative," and that is precisely the meaning that might be attached to the earliest "stories" circulating about the Prophet and/or his oldest followers in the years immediately after his death. It was especially the class of the (later professional) storytellers (Arabic: quṣṣāṣ) who appropriated these stories. Posing as preachers, they disseminated the stories to congregations in the mosques, as well as at other public gatherings, from which they made a living and reaped prestige. Early Muslim rulers such as ᶜUthmān (644–656) and ᶜAlī (656–661), and particularly the first Umayyad caliph, Muᶜāwiya (661–680), recognized the propaganda potential of the quṣṣāṣ, who might be—and duly were—recruited to advocate the ruler's policies, alternately spreading "stories" of a generally edifying tenor and singing the ruler's praises while reviling the reputation and false political claims of his adversaries.

The edifying stories ultimately developed into the genre later known as tarhīb wa-targhīb (that which inspires awe as well as awakens desire), while the propaganda material formed the beginnings of the faḍāʾil/mathālib genre, the traditions describing the (de)merits of certain personalities, cities, regions, institutions, and the like, put into the mouth of the Prophet or some other respectable ancient authority. These two genres may be considered to be the two oldest of Muslim tradition. A third genre, soon to overshadow the first two in prestige as well as in "critical authentication" through the increasingly emphasized stipulation that its isnāds be "sound," was that describing what a Muslim should or should not do in daily life. This genre was the ḥalāl wa-ḥarām (literally, what is permissible and what is forbidden); in due course it came to constitute the bulk of the highly prestigious, eventually canonized collections of ḥadīths to be enumerated below. From the Muslim point of view, this last genre has from the beginning formed a major contingent of ḥadīths that began to circulate in the years immediately following the death of Muhammad. Another, somewhat later chronology suggests the first decades after 700 as the time in which the first ḥalāl wa-ḥarām traditions were collected.

The early Muslim community was from the start distinguished from its neighbors by its increasingly elaborate rituals, religious observances, and—later—its religious laws. Since the Koran could not be considered to be a lawbook per se and only sporadically touched on certain matters of social intercourse, while a great many other matters were not dealt with at all, the solutions to problems that arose were sought in the practice of the first Muslims, which were eventually deemed normative. In the course of the second half of the seventh century pious Muslims assumed, or were vested with, the function of public consultants (Arabic: fuqahāʾ). These largely unofficial functionaries relied mostly on their own insight into religious and secular matters for their problem solving.

But while the fuqahāʾ might be considered to have been inspired at times by the example set by their elders, another category of religious people, the ᶜulamāʾ (scholars), purposefully searched for precedents in the sunna (exemplary behavior) of the earliest Muslim community. These precedents were transmitted, at first only orally and later on an increasingly extensive scale in writing, as ḥadīths, after 700 duly provided with isnāds. However, not only these precedents but also the considered opinions of the fuqahāʾ were transmitted to later generations in this way. The earliest surviving, but as yet unstandardized, ḥadīth collections, dating to the

first half of the eighth century, contained three distinct groups of traditions: those having an *isnād* that ended in a Successor, those having *isnād*s that ended in a Companion, and those having *isnād*s that ended with the Prophet. A famous collection arranged according to this method was the *Muwaṭṭaʾ* of the Medinan jurist Mālik ibn Anas (*d.* 795).

When certain traditions supported by certain *isnād*s in the oldest preserved collections are compared with the same material in later collections, the characteristic of *isnād*s "to grow backward," as Schacht put it, or "growing in time with soundness," is observed. This phenomenon reflects the gradually increasing emphasis placed on the *sunna* of the Prophet in preference to the *sunna* formulated somewhat later by *fuqahāʾ* and other pious persons. It was not until the second half of the ninth century that the *sunna* of the Prophet can be considered to have gradually eclipsed the *sunna* of other respected early Muslims. It was al-Shāfiʿī (*d.* 820), the first legal theorist of Islam, who designated as the main roots of Islamic canon law (Arabic: *sharīʿa*) first the Koran and second the *sunna* of the Prophet. With the increase of emphasis on the *sunna,* there was the "raising" of *isnād*s that initially ended in a Successor or a Companion "to the level" of *isnād*s ending in the Prophet by the insertion or addition of one or more links. *Isnād*s in which one or more links were missing were also patched up, and the names of obscure personalities were often replaced with those of better-known transmitters.

Thus Muslim traditions grew from perhaps a few dozen in the 680's to many thousands during the eighth century. But this spectacular growth was not due solely to the phenomenon of Companions' and Successors' *isnād*s being "raised to the level" of *isnād*s ending in the Prophet; rather, there was another phenomenon that gave rise to thousands of traditions: wholesale fabrication. Thus *fadāʾil/ mathālib* traditions were forged to serve religiopolitical and social aims; *tarhīb wa-targhīb* traditions snowballed, being brought into circulation by pious but naive transmitters who were convinced that they served their religion this way; and finally *ḥalāl wa-ḥarām* traditions multiplied in each separate *ḥadīth* center, mirroring the rivalry of the centers concerning legal issues as well as their individual scholars' personal rivalry. Moreover, politicodoctrinal schisms found expression in numerous fabricated reports duly traced to the Prophet in the hope that these prophetic justifications, often taking the form of *vaticinationes post eventum* (prophecies after the

event), might enhance the chances of one doctrine over the other.

The pious soon recognized this large-scale fabrication as endangering the religion in its initially pure essentials and, subsequently, methods were sought to counter it. Thus originated the science of *ḥadīth* authentication, which was almost solely concerned with *isnād* criticism. *Ḥadīth*s were only occasionally rejected because their contents were deemed anomalous or preposterous. *Isnād* criticism, then, boiled down to investigating the transmitters of an *isnād* as to veracity, reliability, and whether each pair of transmitters had been known to have had a master-pupil relationship or had at least been contemporaries. The first major practitioner of this new science was Shuʿba (*d.* 777). Other well-known early *ḥadīth* experts, such as Zuhrī (670–742), reputedly the first *ḥadīth* collector to make consistent use of *isnād*s, did not yet apply this critical method, which, with Shuʿba, gradually became standard practice. "Accepting traditions means knowing the men" was the motto that determined *ḥadīth* collectors' activities.

Another phenomenon resulting in colossal numbers of traditions being brought into circulation was the *ṭalab al-ʿilm*, journeys undertaken, from the middle of the eighth century on, by various *ḥadīth* scholars to *ḥadīth* centers other than their own in order to hear traditions with new masters. Whereas the earliest *ḥadīth* collecting had been largely based on oral transmission, it was soon recognized that preserving the material in writing, no matter how scarce and expensive writing materials were, was a far better and more reliable method. The first standardized written collections, only a very few of which are extant, originated in the middle of the eighth century. The first collection to acquire universal recognition was the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Bukhārī (*d.* 870), soon followed by the collections of Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj (*d.* 875), Abū Dāwūd (*d.* 888), al-Tirmidhī (*d.* 892), and al-Nasāʾī (*d.* 915). These five, later augmented by the collection of Ibn Mājā (*d.* 886), became known as *al-kutub al-sitta* (six books). Of these revered *ḥadīth* collections, especially the first two contain, for the most part, "sound" (*ṣaḥīḥ*) traditions, according to Muslim authentication criteria. As the Sunnis have their "six," the Shiites eventually canonized their "four."

In the first written collections the material was still arranged according to the Companion or the Successor of the *isnād*s. In Bukhārī's collection there is a subdivision into *fiqh* (legal) chapters, an arrange-

ment initiated by Mālik ibn Anas. These chapters covered in minute detail everything "permissible and forbidden" in ritual and civil matters and gave suggestions for "recommended" behavior, interspersed with a great many accounts of purely historical events. The *sunna* of the Prophet, having become the second major legislative source of Islam, had dictated this subdivision. With the "six books" the *ḥadīth* literature of Islam became more or less fixed. Later collections, of which there are many, never attained to the prestige of those six, and the science of *ḥadīth* was, from the tenth century on, no longer exposed to new impulses that might have changed its character.

The science of *ḥadīth* has flourished until the present day, but only in such offshoot disciplines as the rearranging of traditions, numerous commentaries, supercommentaries, glossaries, and transmitter criticism, the ʿ*ilm al-rijāl* (the science of men). But this discipline, seemingly so sophisticated, was already, in the tenth and the eleventh centuries, generally thought of as having accomplished what it was set up for: sifting the spuriously ascribed traditions from those with "sound" *isnād*s. Muslim scholars are still convinced, a conviction fueled by faith, that the *rijāl* experts of the early Middle Ages were on the whole successful.

To return to the issue of chronological hypotheses against this historical background, it appears first of all that the Muslim chronology for the origin of the *isnād*, beginning in 656, is difficult to uphold vis-à-vis the facts that the first user of the *isnād*, Zuhrī, was born in 670, the first critical assessment of *isnād*s originated as late as the 730's, and the first standardized collections appeared after 750. Within the later, Western chronology (*ca.* 700), however, these three dates seem feasible. But once the later chronology of the *isnād* is accepted, the growth explosion of *ḥadīth* must be fixed at a later date as well, and consequently the alleged role played by the Prophet's Companions, who were all dead by then, must be considered minimal.

Muslim *rijāl* experts eventually solved the difficulty posed by the lapse of time between them and the Companions by having the latter collectively declared trustworthy, a doctrine dating from about 900, thus letting the first "culpability" in *isnād* "raising" and "doctoring," as well as in *ḥadīth* fabrication, fall on the shoulders of the next generation, the Successors. But even between the Successors, all of whom may be considered to have been dead virtually by 750, and the *rijāl* experts, whose studies formed the basis of later *isnād* acceptance or rejection, dating to the beginning of the ninth century, too long a time had elapsed to give these experts' fact-finding (with regard to the reliability of transmitters long dead) anything more than the credence bestowed on grapevine rumors.

It may be inferred that although Muslim and Western chronologies of the origins of standardized *ḥadīth* differ by but a few decades, accepting the Muslim chronology with its concomitant corollaries requires an act of faith of which millions of Muslims are perfectly capable. Adhering to the Western one, on the other hand, breeds skepticism regarding the historicity of most ascription of *ḥadīth* to the prophet Muḥammad. But both the Muslim and the Western points of view may subscribe to the essential verity in the statement of the modern Muslim scholar Fazlur Rahman that Muslim tradition literature "breathes the spirit of the prophetic *sunna*"; to what extent this spirit is measurable will probably remain a matter of debate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For general studies by Western scholars, see Nabia Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri*, II (1967); Ignaz Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II (1890), trans. by Samuel M. Stern and C. R. Barber as *Muslim Studies* (1971); William A. Graham, *Divine Word and Prophetic Word in Early Islam* (1977); Jozef Horovitz, "Alter und Ursprung des Isnād," in *Der Islam*, 8 (1918); G. H. A Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition* (1983); Meir J. Kister, "On 'Concessions' and Conduct: A Study in Early Ḥadīth," in G. H. A. Juynboll, ed., *Papers on Islamic History: Studies on the First Century of Islamic Society* (1982); Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (1950); and Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*, I (1967), 53–84.

Major medieval *ḥadīth* studies include Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj, "Introduction to His *Ṣaḥīḥ* etc.," G. H. A. Juynboll, trans., in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 5 (1985); al-Nawawī, *Taqrīb*, French trans. by W. Marçais in *Journal asiatique*, 9th ser. (1900), xvi, xvii, xviii, and *passim*; and al-Ḥakīm an-Nīsābūrī, *An Introduction to the Science of Tradition, Being al-Madkhal ilā maʿrifat al-Iklīl*, James Robson, ed. and trans. (1953).

For the modern Muslim point of view, see Muḥammad M. Az(a)mi, *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature* (1968), which contains detailed criticism of Schacht's *Origins*; G. H. A. Juynboll, *The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature: Discussions in Modern Egypt* (1969), and "Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (1892–1958) and His Edition of Ibn Ḥanbal's *Musnad*," in *Der Islam*, 49 (1972); three articles by Fazlur Rahman in *Islamic Studies*, 1 (1962), and his *Islam* (1966); and Muḥammad Z. Siddiqi, *Ḥadīth Literature* (1961).

Translations of *ḥadīth* collections include Bukhārī, *Les traditions islamiques*, Octave Houdas and William Marçais, trans., 4 vols. (1903–1914), and *The Translation of the Meanings of Sahih al-Bukhari*, Muhammad Muhsin Khan, trans., 9 vols. (1979); Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj, *Sahih Muslim, Being Traditions of the Sayings and Doings of the Prophet Muhammad*, Abdul Hamid Siddiqi, trans. (1971); Mālik ibn Anas, *Muwattaʾ Imam Malik*, Muhammad Rahimuddin, trans. (1980); al-Nawawī, *An-Nawawi's Forty Ḥadīth*, Ezzedin Ibrahim and Denys Johnson-Davies, eds. and trans. (1976), and *Une herméneutique de la tradition islamique: Le commentaire des Arbaʿūn al-Nawawīya de Muḥyī al-Dīn Yaḥyā al-Nawawī (m. 676/1277)*, Louis Pouzet, ed. and trans. (1982); and al-Khaṭīb at-Tibrīzī, *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ*, James Robson, trans., 4 vols. in 5 (1960–1965).

General works of reference are Ahmad Von Denffer, *Hadith: A Selected and Annotated Guide to Materials in the English Language* (1979), and *Literature on Hadith in European Languages: A Bibliography* (1981).

G. H. A. JUYNBOLL

[See also **Bukhāri, al-**; **Historiography, Islamic**; **Law, Islamic**; **Sunna.**]

HADOARDUS, a ninth-century West Frankish presbyter and monastery librarian about whom almost nothing is known. His extant work includes some verse and an immense compilation of excerpts from Cicero that is divided into two sections. The first part, *Sententiae philosophorum*, is a collection of phrases from Macrobius, Cicero, Sallust, and Martianus Capella. The second part contains excerpts from the philosophical works of Cicero.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts are in *Monumenta Germaniae historica: Poetae latini aevi carolini*, Ernst Dümmler, ed., II (1884), 683–685, and *Neues Archiv* (Hannover), 4 (1879), 531; Paul Schwenke, *Des Presbyter Hadoardus Cicero-excerpte* (1889), 389–588. See also Max Manitius, *Geschichte der Lateinische Literatur des Mittelalters*, I (1911), 478–483.

NATHALIE HANLET

[See also **Classical Literary Studies.**]

HADRAMAWT is a part of the Arabian peninsula bounded on the south by the Indian Ocean and on the north by the sand desert of what is called Empty

Quarter; the eastern and western limits cannot be precisely defined but are roughly Qamr Bay on the east and Shuqra on the west. The most conspicuous feature of the region is the Wādī Ḥadramawt, a canyon some sixty miles long, enclosed by precipitous cliffs and containing the towns of Shibām, Ṣayʾūn, and Tarīm, historically the most important in Ḥadramawt and all very ancient. With the exception of the fine harbor (a volcanic crater) of Cane (modern Bīr ʿAlī), which is also of great antiquity, the coastal towns were until recently of less significance.

Ḥadramawt, together with adjacent Dhofar (now in the sultanate of Oman), is notable as one of the only two areas in the world that produce frankincense, which was consumed in staggeringly high quantities in Greco-Roman times. Although the demand declined somewhat in Christian times, Christian liturgical use and nonliturgical use throughout the Arab world continued over the centuries.

Until the end of the third century, Ḥadramawt had been an independent kingdom, but during the fourth to sixth centuries it was part of the realm of the Himyarite dynasty (called the Tabābiʿa by Arab writers), whose native territory lay to the west; by the mid sixth century it was governed on their behalf by a *kabīr* (headman, senior official). From the beginning of the Islamic period there was hardly ever any central authority, and the area was fragmented among numerous rival petty dynasties in isolation from the rest of the Muslim world. Hardly anything is known about these rulers because the works of local historians are still almost entirely in manuscript, and the one or two that have been printed are extremely difficult to obtain.

In its social structure, too, Ḥadramawt had (until quite recently) distinctive features without parallel elsewhere in the Muslim world; particularly the special position of the sayyids (descendants of the Prophet), who constituted a separate social class with very extensive prestige and influence. Some customs, moreover, seem to be survivals of pre-Islamic practices.

Hadramis have always been seafarers and were noted as navigators. They have been prominent in East Africa, and even before Islam there were close connections between Ḥadramawt and the island of Socotra, which in most periods in history has acknowledged at least a nominal suzerainty vested in a mainland Hadrami authority. From the beginning of the fifteenth century the Hadrami were greatly involved in the introduction of Islam into the East Indies, with which they retain close links.