The *Bilderverbot*, a new survey

by Daan van Reenen (Amsterdam)

The Islamic prohibition against images of living creatures is a well dis-
cussed subject of *ḥadīth* literature[1]). Over the past hundred years scholars
like SNOUCK HURGRONJE, LAMMENS, CRESWELL, PARET and CRONE
have occupied themselves with it[2]). PARET especially deserves mention
since he has devoted five articles to this subject, of which "Die Entste-
hungszeit des islamischen Bilderverbots", 1976, is the most important[3]).
His articles are all the more seminal since he was the first to gather and
compare a large number of traditions about the Bilderverbot[4]).

Many questions concerning this subject still have to be answered: what
are the earliest sources where this subject is to be found, what is the rela-
tion between the reports found, what are the theological ideas behind the
prohibition, how and when did this prohibition come into existence, who
was involved: was it entirely a Muslim affair (whatever that may have
meant in that time) or can we manage to track down evidence, demonstrat-
ing an external, Jewish or Byzantine, influence in this still obscure stage of
early Islamic history?

However, I am at present confining myself to the study of the Bilder-
verbot in *ḥadīth* literature, in itself a vast subject, and also one where the
challenge lies in extracting every available scrap of evidence out of these
traditions. Because it is so difficult to use traditions as an historical source
and because of the large number of traditions it appeared necessary to

---

[1]) I am grateful to G. H. A. JUYNBOLL and W. RAVEN for their many stimulat-
ing and valuable suggestions concerning this subject and *ḥadīth* study in general.
This paper was presented at the *ḥadīth*-colloqium held in september 1988 in Oxford.

[2]) Literature on the Islamic *Bilderverbot* until 1942 is found in CRESWELL,
K. A. C., *"The Lawfulness of Painting in Early Islam"*: *Ars Islamica*, 11–12, 1946,
p. 159–166; for the period after 1942 see KING, G. R. D., *"Islam, Iconoclasm, and the
Declaration of Doctrine"*, in: *BSOAS*, vol. XLVIII, part 2, 1985, p. 267–277; (refer-
ences to literature are given in full the first time only).

[3]) In: PARET, R., *Schriften zum Islam*, ed. J. von Ess, Stuttgart, 1981, all these
articles are gathered.

[4]) A synonym for this word in English, I am afraid, could not be found.

develop some sort of method, based on traditions as they are. It seems use-
ful to propose here this schematization of the various aspects of the study
of traditions, thus providing a methodologically clearer way of dealing with
them and of attempting to fix them to particular historical periods.

The study of tradition can be divided into four aspects, i.e. *matn* con-
tents, *matn* form, *isnād* contents and *isnād* form.

Matn contents: the study of the contents of the text: what is it about, is
it historical, what are its legal consequences, can we observe tendencies,
what party is supported by it etc. Neglected questions (also in view of the
prevalent scholastic demand for dates and places of origin) are: what are
the concepts or groups of concepts that are used and where do they come
from, are they Koranic, foreign, do we see topoi, can we discern a develop-
ment in the variant texts of one basic tradition?

Matn form: the study of the forms of traditions and the periods during
which certain forms came into popularity or disappeared. It is strange that
of all the aspects of *ḥadīth* study this one is the most neglected. After all,
ḥadīth is literature and *ḥadīth* texts are made, both knowingly and uncons-
ciously. Traditionists used all kinds of means to increase their credibility
and all kinds of forms to help them, for example, remember the texts. If we
want to know the makers we must look at their tools to uncover the older or
maybe even the original layer of traditions. This last possibility is im-
portant for dating of course, but even if we would not be able to go back to
earlier layers, we can use this knowledge of forms to recognize a form in a
specific story and not to regard it as part of what actually happened. As
NOTH said concerning historical traditions: one should have a general view
over the forms and tendencies of the whole early Islamic tradition to be
able to judge even one tradition properly[5]).

Isnād contents: the study of the "*riǧāl*" and biographical material
available about them in Muslim biographies of transmitters. The reliability
of a transmitter has to be judged and a link has to be made between his life
and the traditions under scrutiny.

Isnād form: the study of *isnāds*, *isnād* bundles, the ways of transmit-
ting traditions and the ways *isnāds* came into existence, were made and
changed. SCHACHT's theories: the common link theory and "*isnāds* have a
tendency to grow backwards", COOK's adjustments to these and the numer-
ous findings of our contemporary JUYNBOLL fall under this heading but

---

[5]) NOTH, A. *Quellenkritische Studien zu Themen, Formen und Tendenzen frühisla-
mischer Geschichtsüberlieferung, Teil I, Themen und Formen,* Bonn, 1973, p. 24 (abbre-
viation: *"Quellenkritische Studien"*).

also material in Muslim biographies of transmitters explaining the tricks of the transmitters which they already recognized.

Of course, every aspect of *ḥadīth* study should be allowed a constant comparison with the other aspects but on the other hand it seems useful to stress that all these aspects of *ḥadīth* study are necessary and, as it were, equal. Sometimes one gets the impression that it is presumed that if the *isnād* is sound, the *matn* will also be sound or that if the *isnād* is formed in a certain time, the *matn* will be so as well.

If, after the study of all these aspects, we come to the conclusion that there are no topoi, no specific forms, no tendencies and that the *isnāds* have not been tampered with, even then it remains to be proven that the tradition material is unique, in other words, that it might in fact be a report of a historical event. But of course, after stripping all the secondary and later elements and forms the remaining material is more likely to be "historical" than the final story we find in the collections.

Perhaps with these four aspects the study of traditions is pressed in an already outdated and rigid scheme, but at least for the large number of *Bilderverbot* traditions it proved its workability, although this is not the same as its methodological soundness of course.[6])

To return to the Bilderverbot: I searched for texts in the *ḥadīth* collections of AL-BUKHĀRĪ, MUSLIM, ABŪ DĀWŪD, AL-TIRMIDHĪ, AL-NASĀ'Ī, IBN MĀǦA, AL-DĀRIMĪ, MĀLIK B. ANAS, AḤMAD B. ḤANBAL, 'ABD AL-RAZZĀQ, AL-BAYHAQĪ, AL-ḤUMAYDĪ, AL-RABĪ' B. ḤABĪB, IBN ABĪ ŠAYBA and AL-ṬAYĀLISĪ. Of the 'historical' literature I used the *Akhbār Makka* of AL-AZRAQĪ, *the Sīrat al-Nabiy* of IBN HIŠĀM, the *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr* of IBN SA'D and the *Kitāb al-Maǧāzī* of AL-WĀQIDĪ (see Appendix II). *Tafsīr* works were not systematically consulted yet, although at first sight it seemed that there are far less traditions about images in the exegesis of Qur'ān verses related to images and idols than expected.

Some 325 texts were traceable and although on a rainy Sunday afternoon I discovered that there are still more texts hidden away especially in collections not yet opened up by a concordance I felt I had taken on a sufficient number to get a good idea about the traditions concerning images. The traditions were then divided into groups and subgroups. In most cases it was quite clear to which group a tradition belonged; sometimes, however, it

---

[6]) Next to the study of these aspects, knowledge gained in the study of other religions and societies should be of great help, because traditions, *isnāds*, the age-trick, the notion *"Sunna"*, all kinds of transmission-related forms and indeed the very important process of changing from to oral to written tradition and the process of canonization are of course not purely Islamic phenomena.

was difficult to decide because the traditions had important material, such as a saying, in common with a number of different groups or because a number of traditions had only one minor aspect in common. In the process of evaluating and comparing traditions it appeared to be crucial to keep in mind that the division into groups, though necessary, was only a secondary one.

In the following pages a general survey will be presented of all the relevant texts. This might seen tedious but it is necessary to get a good idea of the traditions we are dealing with. Topoi, Qur'ān quotations, and legal implications will be mentioned along with general remarks on the development of traditions. After that the rules on images as found in the traditions and the rules found in some works of *fiqh* will be given and topoi, schemes and text development will be discussed. Finally I will attempt to refute PARET's dating and to establish a provisional alternative.

The text given is the average of the texts of the group discussed. However, as many variants as possible will be included. (Variant readings will be separated by a /; in Appendix I + II at the end of this paper a list of the traditions and the places where the traditions were found in ḥadīth collections will be presented.)

1 "Angels do not enter"

This group consists of texts containing, both alone and accompanied by a story, the following saying: "Angels do not enter a house in which there is a dog (*kalb*), an image (*ṣūra/ṣūrat al-tamāthīl/tamāthīl/taṣāwīr*) or, in some texts, a person in a state of major ritual impurity (*ǧunub*[7]))" (the abbreviation for this saying will be "Angels do not enter").

1.1 "Angels do not enter"

31 texts that only contain the saying just mentioned. To one text is added "ṣūrat al-tamāthīl allatī fīhā al-arwāḥ" and this is exactly what we should always think when we read the words with which images are designated. It is not images as such that are prohibited but images of living crea-

---

[7]) PARET, R., *"Die Entstehungszeit des islamischen Bilderverbots"*, translates "something impure", p. 162, by "excrements and urine", p. 170, which is another reason for this ritual impurity than E. W. LANE mentions in his *Arabic-English Lexicon*, London, 1863–93, under *"ǧunub"*, viz. sexual intercourse and/or ejaculation.

tures. The now following list gives an impression of the variants of this tradition but it is likely that even more could easily be found:

1) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi kalb wa lā ṣūra wa lā ǧunub* (*in 4 diff. orders*)
2) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi kalb wa lā ṣūra* (*or vice versa*)
3) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi kalb wa lā ṣūrat al-tamāthīl*
4) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi kalb wa lā taṣāwīr*
5) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi tamāthīl aw taṣāwīr*
6) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi ṣūra wa lā ǧunub*
7) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi kalb*
8) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi ǧaras*
9) *al-malā'ika lā taṣḥabu rufqatan fīhā ǧaras*
10) *al-malā'ika lā taṣḥabu rufqatan fīhā ǧaras wa lā kalb*
11) *al-malā'ika lā taṣḥabu rufqatan/rakban ma'āhum ǧulǧul*
12) *al-malā'ika lā taṣḥabu al-'īr allatī fīhā al-ǧaras*
13) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi ǧaras wa lā taṣḥabu rufqatan fīhā ǧaras*
14) *al-malā'ika lā tadkhulu baytan fīhi ǧulǧul wa lā taṣḥabu rufqatan fīhā ǧaras*

From the number of variants of the saying "Angels do not enter" without the mention of images, we can deduce that "images" are not necessarily the first or oldest element of this saying since it might just as well be only a variant of the same saying with dogs or some of the other impure or foreign matters forbidden in this tradition.

1.2.1 "Angels do not enter", Busr, *raqm*

7 Texts that start with the saying with only "*ṣūra*" as forbidden thing. Then Busr b. Sa'īd tells how he visits the sick Zayd b. Khālid with 'Ubaydallah al-Khawlānī. In his house they see a curtain with images on it. Busr says: Didn't he (Zayd) transmit to us about images? But 'Ubaydallah answers: "Didn't you hear that he said 'except (when you are dealing with) an ornament on a garment ("*illā raqm fī thawb*")"?

The visit, for example of a sick man, is a topos that occurs in many traditions concerning images always with different persons and subjects involved (cf. p. 58). This tradition probably deals with an exception to the prohibition: an ornament on a garment is allowed[8]). One could, by the way, argue that an ornament is not the same as an image, although in this and other traditions they are treated as such (3.2/5.1).

---

[8]) Cf. IBN HAZM, *Mu'ǧam al-Fiqh*, Damascus, 1966, I, p. 673.

1.2.2 "Angels do not enter", Rafiʿ

3 Texts in which Rafiʿ tells how he went to visit Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī on his sickbed (a topos) with ʿAbdallah b. abī Ṭalḥa. Abū Saʿīd said: "Angels do not enter a house in which there are images or pictures (*tamāthīl aw taṣawīr/tamāthīl aw ṣūra*). Isḥāq (the son of ʿAbdallah) was in doubt (about the terms used): he did not know which of the two Abū Saʿīd said.

The visit, again of a sick man, only seems to function here as the scene in which the people concerned can quote (or be made quote) the saying of the Prophet. At least, it was not on account of images found in the house, and if it had been, probably someone other than the owner of the house, Abū Saʿīd, would have uttered the saying. The doubt about which of the two words Abū Saʿīd has used seems rather artificial[9]). The listener is made to believe that the traditionist is really improvising and recollecting the story from memory, by doubting about a detail: two synonymous or nearly synonymous words for images. After this moment of doubt, the listener is supposed to think that the rest is true.

1.3 "Angels do not enter", Ǧabrīl, dogs

This group contains 6 smaller groups of which the following is a sort of basic text: Ǧabrīl has an appointment with Muḥammad but he does not show up. The Prophet is very sad about this, goes out and finds Ǧabrīl there. He complains to him about his staying away but Ǧabrīl explains that it is the dog in the house of the Prophet that prevents him from entering (a topos). In most of the stories he does this by saying "Angels do not enter". Then Muḥammad removes the dog from the house.

1.3.1: 2 Texts with the basic text.

1.3.2: 3 Texts in which ʿĀ'isha *tells* the story; compared to the basic text there is a specification of a detail: not just a dog but a puppy (*ǧarw kalb*) and it is found under ʿĀ'iša's bed. The Prophet has is brought out and he has it killed the next morning.

1.3.3: 2 Texts in which Usāma *tells* how he comes to the Prophet and finds him sad, the Prophet explains why (topos). Again it is a puppy but it appears from between the houses and is killed.

---

[9]) LAMMENS, H., *L'Attitude de l'Islam primitif en face des arts figurés*, in: Études sur le siècle des Omayyades. Beiroet, 1930, p. 353: he calls this one of the *"hésitations artificielles communes aux redacteurs du Hadith"*, who used this cleverly placed hesitation to enlarge their credibility, and cf. STETTER, E., *Topoi und Schemata im Hadith*, Tübingen, 1965, p. 21, 31.

1.3.4: 5 Texts in which *Maymūna tells* how she finds the Prophet waking in the morning quite sad and Muḥammad explains why (topos). Then the puppy comes to his mind and he has it brought out. He washes the place where the dog had been lying and Ǧabrīl appears. The next morning he has the watch-dog for the little garden killed, but the watch-dog for the large garden is spared.

1.3.5: 6 Texts in which *'Alī tells*[10]) how close he is to the Prophet, they even agreed that if 'Alī would pass by while the Prophet was performing the ṣalāt, the latter would cough. One night 'Alī passes by, the Prophet comes out of the house and tells how he heard something rustle outside, earlier that night, and he went out and found Ǧabrīl. The latter explained that he had not entered the house because of the dog. The Prophet tells how he reentered the house and found the dog of Ḥasan under a bed/chair/in the house/playing with Ḥasan. Then Ǧabrīl said: "Angels do not enter a house in which there is one of these three things: a dog, an image (*ṣūra/ṣūrat rūḥ/ timthāl*) or an impure person (*ǧunub*).

1.3.6: 9 Texts in which Ǧabrīl tells the Prophet that he passed by the day before but that he could not enter because (1) there were images (*timthāl raǧul/tamāthīl/sūra*) near the door, (2) there was a curtain with images on it (*tamāthīl/taṣāwīr/timthāl ṣūra*) and (3) there was a dog in the house. Then he orders Muḥammad to (1) cut off the heads of the images, so that they become like trees, (2) to cut the curtain into pieces and to make pillows of it that will be thrown on the ground and trodden upon and (3) to bring the dog out of the house. The Prophet carries it all out. The dog appeared to be Ḥasan's or Ḥusayn's.

As for these last measures, they are exactly the same as the rules found in works of *fiqh*, later to be discussed (p. 54). Images without a head cannot of course be alive and are therefore allowed, "becoming like trees" means becoming inanimate (without a soul, "*rūḥ*"). Images that lie on the ground are trodden upon and this excludes the possibility of venerating them.[11])

Ǧabrīl's not entering the house of the Prophet is a topos and also the visit itself, in fact this whole story seems to be a sort of narrative offspring

---

[10]) See Topoi, p. 57, for the 4 different people who find the Prophet sad and ask him why.

[11]) As for the measures against dogs in these six traditions, the Prophet has them killed or brought out and he sometimes cleans the spot the dog was lying on. Once is added, in what seems a typical legal addition, that the Prophet has the watch-dog for little gardens killed and spares the watch-dogs for large gardens. All this is conforming the rules concerning dogs: useful dogs, hunting- and watch-dogs, are allowed, but they are impure, so the place they have lain on has to be cleaned, *Encyclopedia of Islam, new ed.*, IV, 489–92, "*kalb*".

of the saying, a compilation of answers to such questions as: which angel, whose house, why was he visited, whose dog? The texts in this group vary from being short and simple to being long and filled with detail; especially the traditions found in AḤMAD B. ḤANBAL's *Musnad* are very elaborate and vivid. These six traditions all have their own completely different *isnāds* although the story remains basically the same. Several circles seem to have given this basic story their own colours, a clear example being tradition 1.3.5, with a clearly Kūfan *isnād*, in which the close relationship between ʿAlī and the Prophet is described extensively.

Another example is more vague and seems to reflect popular demands for nice stories about the life of the Prophet: his relation with Ǧabrīl is described like one with an old friend, the Prophet even gets angry because Ǧabrīl does not appear on time for the appointment! This is the only tradition in which Muḥammad is the "owner" of images and then, of course, one needs an angel to reprimand the Prophet, or maybe Muḥammad was just picked out because he was already known to have met Ǧabrīl regularly for the revelations. Ǧabrīl's being late is found also in an entirely different tradition which is presented as a tafsīr of Sūra 93: 3[12]).

Summary and conclusion group 1

We saw the saying "Angels do not enter" in 1.1 without any context, in 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 in the topos of "the visit" and again in 1.3 in six variants of a story which also has a visit and the topos of "not entering a house with something forbidden". The saying occurs in 4 other groups too but then mostly as an addition or in combination with other sayings. The first conclusion we can draw now is that, for determining the origin of the saying, its context is probably not important (although a first one, in which the saying really came into existence, could be genuine, the others probably are not).

Secondly we saw in 1.1 that there are many variants in which images are not even mentioned. This added to the fact that in variants with images, they are usually mentioned after "dogs" must make us wonder whether "images" belonged to the original stock of things forbidden with this saying at all.

When we finally look at the things which according to this saying you cannot be in the same room with: bells (*ǧaras*), bells hung to the necks of

---

[12]) BU 65, S. 93, 2, MU 32: 114, TIR 44, S. 93, ABH I: 243, IV: 313; I happened to find it in G. H. A. JUYNBOLL's *"Analysing isnāds in ḥadīth and akhbār literature"* p. 13, most likely to be published in an anthology of the papers presented at the Historiography Panel of the American Oriental Society meeting of March 1988 in Chicago; in "my" traditions synonyms of "abṭaʾa" are used.

beast of burden (ǧulǧul), dogs and someone not cleaned according to purity laws, then we cannot help but wonder on the extent of Jewish and Christian influences. Whether there has been any such influence still remains to be investigated[13]).

Other sayings "Angels do not enter" in 2.6/3.5/3.6/6.6.

2 Al-bayt (or al-Bayt)/al-Ka'ba

This group of traditions has in common that in it Muḥammad enters the Ka'ba on the day/in the year/at the time of the conquest of Mecca. Here he finds images (ṣuwar, tamāthīl, taṣāwīr), a wooden dove (ḥamāmat 'aydān), the ram's horns (qurnā l-kabš) or statues or idols (anṣāb, aṣnām, tamāthīl) around it and he removes them out of the Ka'ba or strikes the (360) idols down. The last 3 traditions do not actually deal with images like the rest of the traditions of the *Bilderverbot*. The main subjects seem to be idols, a wooden dove or the horns of the ram. It seems appropriate to discuss these traditions here. As "tradition" placed them in the same context as the images, also removed by Muḥammad, and because the struggle against the veneration of idols is probably one of the, Koranic, ideas behind the *Bilderverbot* and since the words for images and idols sometimes seem to be used as synonyms, it seems appropriate to discuss these traditions here. It might be that in a later phase of the study of this subject this decision has to be reconsidered.

2.1 No ṣuwar in al-bayt

3 Texts in which Muḥammad forbids images (ṣuwar) in house or in the House (al-bayt) and he forbids to make images (ṣuwar).

One of these texts has a combined text, after this one comes the text of the following tradition 2.2, in which it is clear that with "al-bayt" the Ka'ba is meant. It is important to notice that in the two other cases, and in several other traditions, it is still not clear what was meant with the word "al-bayt".

2.2 Al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba, 'Umar

8 Texts in which the Prophet, while he is in Baṭḥā', orders 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb to go to al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba to wipe out all the images (ṣuwar) in it.

---

[13]) Cf. LAMMENS, H., *L'Attitude de l'Islam primitif en face des arts figurés*, p. 362, 386f, CRESWELL, K. A. C., "*The Lawfulness of Painting in Early Islam*", p. 165, and PARET, R., "*Die Entstehungszeit des islamischen Bilderverbots*", p. 170.

The Prophet did not enter before all the images were wiped out. In one text 'Umar gets some water and wipes them out.

Muḥammad's not entering the Ka'ba seems to be the same topos we saw previously (Ǧabrīl, group 1). The detail about the water might be important (cf. 2.3 and 2.5).

2.3 *Al-Ka'ba,* 'Usāma, *khalaqa*

2 Texts in which the Prophet enters the Ka'ba with 'Usāma b. Zayd. They find images (*ṣuwar*) in it and the Prophet orders 'Usāma to get him some water and with a piece of coth he wipes out the images and says: "Cursed are those who make images (*yuṣawwirūna*) of what they do not create".

In this tradition Muḥammad does enter the Ka'ba. The saying in the end is like those in group 4.

2.4 *Al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba,* Ibrāhīm, *ṣalāt*

9 Texts in which the Prophet comes to Mecca but refuses to enter "*al-bayt*" (sometimes is added: "*ya'nī al-Ka'ba*"!) before all the images are wiped out. Then he sees the images of Ibrāhīm and Ismā'īl, depicted with arrows (*azlām*) in their hands and curses those who did that, because Ibrāhīm and Ismā'īl would never have used divination arrows[14]). In 4 texts is added that Muḥammad only performed the *takbīr* in "*al-bayt*" and not the *ṣalāt*.

Muḥammad again refuses to enter. In this and other traditions on images in the Ka'ba legendary material already existing about the Ka'ba, like the divination arrows[15]) for example, is probably mixed with the event of his coming to the Ka'ba. In AL-ṬABARĪ's *Tafsīr* on Sūra 5: 3 (the abbreviation for Sūra will be "S") tradition material from IBN ISHĀQ is mentioned in which it is related that there was an idol of Hubal inside the Ka'ba and that Hubal had seven divination arrows. Maybe depicting these in the hands of the respectable fathers and letting them be found by the Prophet who forbids these arrows, is only a story made around the prohibition against using them in S 5: 3,90.

The obvious addition at the end of the tradition is part of the discussion as to whether it is obligatory or just allowed or even forbidden to perform

---

[14]) IBN HIŠĀM adds that "Ibrāhīm was not a Jew, nor a Christian but a *Hanīf Muslim* and he was not an idolater", which is a quotation from the Qur'ān: 3: 67, 95/ 4: 125/6: 79, 161 *et alii*.

[15]) Cf. FAHD, T., *La Divination Arabe*, Leiden, 1966, p. 181 f, 204 f.

the *ṣalāt* or the *takbīr* inside the Ka'ba[16]); one can easily understand why this tradition is used to support one of the parties in this matter.

2.5 *Al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba*, 'Īsā and Maryam, exception

6 Quite different texts, in *matn* and *isnād*, in which Muḥammad, and once 'Umar, enters the Ka'ba and leaves images in the Ka'ba undisturbed. It is remarkable that the images are those of 'Īsā with his mother Maryam or only of Maryam. Some texts mention images of Ibrāhīm, angels, prophets and also trees. When Ibrāhīm is mentioned so are the arrows and the makers of the images are again cursed (cf. 2.4).

The reason for the appearance of Mary and Jesus is not clear; one would expect that of all images especially these images symbolizing Christianity would have had to be removed. In this tradition as well there is someone who is ordered to get some water to wipe out the images (cf. 2.2/2.3). Since there is the variation in the people who have the honour of doing this, we can wonder, with HAWTING, whether we have just as many attempts to associate these families with the "siqāya" of the pilgrims[17]). In 2.2 it is 'Umar, the caliph to be, in 2.3 Usāma b. Zayd, in some other traditions also mentioned entering the Ka'ba with Muḥammad[18]), and here al-Faḍl b. 'Abbās b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib and therewith the Abbasids[19]).

2.6 *Al-Bayt*, Ibrāhīm, Maryam, "Angels do not enter"

2 Texts which seem to be a combination of the two main groups we have seen until now: the Prophet entered al-Bayt and found an image (*ṣūra*) of Ibrāhīm and one of Maryam, and he said: "They have heard that angels do not enter houses in which there are images; this is an image of Ibrāhīm (*muṣawwar*) and why does he cast arrows?".

This tradition shows that those who connected the elements in this tradition saw a relation between the prohibition against making images, the images in the Ka'ba and Muḥammad's removal of them.

---

[16]) Cf. HAWTING, G. R., "'*We were not ordered with entering it, but only with circumambulating it*'. *Hadith and Fiqh on entering the Ka'ba*", BSOAS, vol. XLVII, 1984, part 2, p. 228.

[17]) Cf. *Encyclopedia of Islam*, IV, p. 320, Ka'ba.

[18]) In the traditions in which Muḥammad enters the Ka'ba for the *ṣalāt*, cf. HAWTING, G. R., "'*We were not ordered with entering it, but only with circumambulating it*'. *Hadith and Fiqh on entering the Ka'ba*".

[19]) HAWTING, G. R., op. cit., p. 232, note 27.

(2.7 Al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba ṣanam, nuṣub, 360)

18 Texts which can be divided into two groups, in the first of which Muḥammad comes to al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba on the day/in the year of the conquest and finds 360 idols (ṣanam/nuṣub) standing around it. The Prophet strikes the idols with his staff and says: "The truth has come, and falsehood has vanished away; surely falsehood is ever certain to vanish" (S 17: 81). The texts of the second group also contain this story but it is embellished with all kinds of details bringing it into the sphere of wonder-stories. The Prophet is now seated on his camel (cf. 2.8) and if he points at the faces of the statues, some of which, like Hubal's for example, are fixed on with lead, they fall on their back and if he points from behind, they fall on their faces[20]).

In the Qur'ān both ṣanam and nuṣub are forbidden to use (S 5: 3, 90/70: 43) but there it seems that aṣnām meant idols whereas anṣāb were some sort of offering blocks, maybe with a human shape but formed by nature (cf. AL-ṬABARĪ's Tafsīr on S 5: 3,90). In this tradition the two words are used together and both seem to mean "idol". AL-ṬABARĪ mentions the 360 nuṣub in his commentary on S 5: 3 but strangely he does not mention this tradition nor the Ka'ba[21]).

(2.8 Al-Bayt, wooden dove)

3 Texts in which Muḥammad comes to al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba on the day/in the year of the conquest and performs ṭawāf seven times on his camel and touches the rukn with his crosier. He calls 'Uthmān b. Ṭalḥa for the key, enters the Ka'ba and finds a dove carved out of palm wood (?, "ḥamāmat 'aydān"). He breaks it into pieces and goes out of the Ka'ba again.

The key of the Ka'ba, in/coming into the possession of 'Uthmān b. Ṭalḥa, is a regularly occurring detail of Ka'ba traditions. The meaning and origin of the dove is not clear. To be sure of not overlooking anything concerned with images one could consider this tradition as a prohibition against making an image of living creatures like doves.

---

[20]) Usually in traditions on the Ka'ba the statue of Hubal is found inside the Ka'ba, cf. HAWTING, G. R., op. cit., p. 241.

[21]) The origin of the number of "360" is still not clear, cf. Encyclopedia of Islam, IV, p. 320, Ka'ba; LAMMENS, in his article "L'Attitude de l'Islam primitif en face des arts figurés, p. 357, thinks of this tradition as a fable, made to strengthen Muḥammad's role as thaumaturg and therewith the power of Mekka and the exclusive pretentions of the Qurayšites on the caliphate. The large number would show, however, that they lost idea of the pre-Islamic 'pagan' reality because all these anṣāb would have formed "un étrange musée d'échantillons geologiques".

(2.9 *Al-Ka'ba*, horns)

10 Texts in which it is told that the horns of the ram (*qurnā l-kabš*) are inside the Ka'ba. In most of the texts 'Uthmān b. Ṭalḥa says that the Prophet had called for him after he had left the Ka'ba because he had seen the horns of the ram but had forgotten to order 'Uthmān to cover them, because "it is not appropriate that there should be anything in *"al-bayt"* that distracts the attention of those performing the *ṣalāt*". According to some traditions the horns are those of the ram sacrificed in the place of Ismā'īl[22]). In others it is related that the horns stayed in the Ka'ba until it was destroyed at the time of Ibn Zubayr (64 A.H./683 A.D.).

The reason for removing them, because they distract people making the ṣalāt, is the same as is mentioned in other traditions (3.2 and 3.3). Maybe this reason is borrowed from the *ṣalāt*-in-Ka'ba discussion to explain the tradition (why the horns had to be covered) and to give support to the permissibility of performing the ṣalāt inside the Ka'ba by way of a smart and subtle change of the argument, changing it from "whether or not" to "of course, except if"[23]).

2.10 *Al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba*, miscellaneous

11 Texts of various traditions concerning images or statues in, around or on top of the Ka'ba.

2 Texts, a long and a very short version, in which Muḥammad and 'Alī carry out a Gideon-like[24]) plan to destroy the images/idols (*timthāl/aṣnām*) on top of the Ka'ba. In the middle of the night they try to climb it, first Muḥammad tries standing on 'Alī's shoulders but he is too heavy, the other way around works, however, and 'Alī destroys the images. He says that, if he had wanted too, he could have reached "the horizon of Heaven". But then they run away, afraid to be seen by anyone.

It is a nice tradition, a mixture of tendencies to stress the comradeship of the Prophet and 'Alī (cf. 1.3.5) and tales about the life of the Prophet, struggling against the veneration of idols already before the Hiǧra, maybe even before his revelations. The charming detail about his weight seems only possible in Islamic prophet-traditions.

1 text in which Ǧarīr is sent out to destroy images/idols (*nuṣub*) in "a house" or "the House" (*al-bayt*), also called the Ka'ba, in Ḏhū l-Khalaṣa in

---

[22]) Cf. Fahd, T., *La Divination Arabe*, p. 32, and Wensinck, A. J., *The ideas of the Semites concerning the navel of the earth*", p. 56f.

[23]) Cf. Hawting, G. R., "'*We were not ordered with entering it, . . .*", p. 230.

[24]) I Judges 6: 25–32.

Yaman[25]). Only after the Prophet has slapped him on his chest can he stay on his horse without falling off and carry out his task.

2 Texts in which Ibn Ǧurayǧ, 'Aṭā' b. abī Rabāḥ and others talk about the images (*timthāl*) of 'Īsā b. Maryam and Maryam on the pillars inside the Ka'ba and about when they were destroyed, in the days of the Prophet or in the days of Ibn Zubayr (64 A.H.)[26]).

It would be interesting to compare these traditions and those in which he left only the images of 'Īsā b. Maryam and Maryam undisturbed (2.5) with those that are definite on the fact that the Prophet destroyed the images (2.2/2.3/2.4). It seems that there is still some discussion in traditions only found in historical works, about a subject which can be considered as nearly closed in traditions mostly found in canonical collections.

6 Texts which tell us that the Qurayshites had idols in their houses and that the Prophet sent heralds through Mecca to summon the people, if they believed in Allah and his Prophet, or in Allah and the Last Day, to destroy their idols, and not to sell them. Sometimes volunteers (from then on to be written in the records or respectable people of course) went to every house where they had heard that there were images and destroyed them.

Summary and conclusion group 2

Now it may be interesting to describe the factors that contributed to the development of the traditions about images related to the Ka'ba. We have seen the ingredients of the Ka'ba-stories: images, statues, a wooden dove, horns of a ram, ṣalāt or takbīr and the key and other rights of the Ka'ba. The first questions to be discussed here are those of the identification of "*al-bayt*" with "*al-Ka'ba*" and "*al-fatḥ*" with "the conquest of Mecca" (if indeed there was a conquest). We will start with the last item: time and place of action. Hawting[27]) showed that "the entering of the Ka'ba by Muḥammad" was usually considered to have taken place at the time of the conquest of Mecca, although there first seemed to be some uncertainty about when that happened, and he showed that the identification of *al-fatḥ* with the conquest took place relatively late. In our traditions it is usually made clear that the "*fatḥ*" spoken of is the conquest of Mecca (maybe an indication that these traditions represent a later phase of development). With regard to the place: the identification of "*al-bayt*" with "*al-Ka'ba*" is not yet self evident in our traditions, we still have variation and uncer-

---

[25]) Cf. FAHD, T., *La Divination Arabe*, p. 124, 180f., 185.

[26]) Ibn Ǧurayǧ and 'Aṭā' b. abī Rabāḥ are mentioned often as having a conversation about when something happened, also cf. HAWTING, G. R., op. cit., p. 233.

[27]) HAWTING, G. R., op. cit., p. 229.

tainty. In 2.1 it is not at all clear what is meant by *al-bayt* and it would be illogical to think of *al-Ka'ba* instead of the general "in house", if there was not one text which combines this tradition with another one (2.2) that obviously deals with the Ka'ba. A combination which thereby also is an interpretation, probably made to solve the uncertainty. There is another example which shows this need for interpretation: after *"al-bayt"* in 2.4 is added *"ya'nī al-Ka'ba"*.

Another aspect of these traditions to be discussed is the possible relation between these stories and the Qur'ān. In the Qur'ān Ibrāhīm is the champion of monotheism and the founder or reformer of the Ka'ba. He asks Allāh to "make this land secure, and turn me and my sons away from serving idols" (S 14: 35) and Allah says "Purify My House for those that shall go about it and those that stand, for those that bow and prostrate themselves" (S 22: 26/2: 125); by the context of these verses it seems clear that it meant "cleaning the Ka'ba of idols", which is the same as AL-TABARĪ's explanations of these verses. We can conclude that there is a relationship in the Qur'ān between Ibrāhīm, the Ka'ba, idols and the purification of "His House". Muhammad declares, at least that is how this material is presented in the Qur'ān, that Ibrāhīm is the first Muslim of the pure religion and therefore he is the forerunner of Muhammad while Muhammad restores the *"millat Ibrāhīm"*. Then Muhammad conquers, enters or at least gets authority in Mecca and consequently over the Ka'ba. In the Qur'ān not much is said about the measures Muhammad takes concerning the Ka'ba. He incorporates it as a sanctuary into Islam, modifies a few things, establishes the Islamic *hağğ* and changes the *qibla* from Jerusalem to Mecca[28]).

A connection was then made between the Koranic and legendary material about Ibrāhīm, the Ka'ba, idols and the struggle against idolatry on one side, and traditions about images of living creatures, which the idols also were, on the other side. This is illustrated by the combinations in tradition 2.1 and 2.6, in which general material on images and the saying "Angels do not enter" is combined with Ka'ba-material. And so Muhammad, successor of Ibrāhīm, also purifies "My House" (S 22: 26/2: 125)". Added to these traditions were elements of other traditions about the Ka'ba, containing legendary material: the horns, the dove, or later legal material: on *salāt* and *tawāf*, and historical material, e.g. on the families which obtain the rights of the Ka'ba, and maybe ideas arising from other Qur'ān verses like 48: 27 (in which it is said that Allah has fulfilled his promise to His Messenger that he will enter *"al-Masğid al-Harām"*). The

---

[28]) See, however, HAWTING, G. R., op. cit., p. 240.

time in which this was to take place was set on the year, or even the day, of the conquest, which is not strange since it offers the first possibility for the new ruler of Mecca to change anything at all and it shows the importance that was attached to the subject (or at least it shows the means that were used to make it seem important). It is not clear which was the first story where Muḥammad removed anything forbidden from the Ka'ba but once the story was settled, it seems to have gathered the other material to it: exegitical, prophet-biographical, legal and historical-legendary. Maybe all this is already sufficient to doubt the historical probability of any one of the reports, although it seems reasonable that a person like the prophet/leader who is described in the sources would need to take a position with regards to a Ka'ba.

3 Images on fabrics, 'Ā'iša

The basic text of the following traditions, which are in other respects clearly distinct, is a story about 'Ā'iša. While the Prophet is away she hangs up a piece of cloth or a curtain, or buys a pillow with images on it. When the Prophet comes back he gets angry and/or refuses to enter (topos) and orders 'Ā'iša to take them away or takes them away himself and tears them apart. In the last three traditions of this group 3 'Ā'iša makes pillows of the fabrics.

3.1 *Durnūk*, winged horses

6 Texts with the basic text as described above. 'Ā'iša hangs up a curtain (*durnūk/qirām*) with images (*tamāthīl*) of winged horses on it (see 6.7 and p. 65). The Prophet comes back and orders her to remove the curtain.

3.2 *Sitr, tā'ir, dunyā*

8 Texts in which is related that 'Ā'iša and the Prophet have a curtain (*sitr*) with an image/images (*timthāl/tamāthīl*) of birds on it. The position of the curtain is such that anyone who enters, cannot but see the curtain with the images. Then the Prophet says: "take this thing away: every time I enter it makes me think of this world (*dhakartu l-dunyā*)". 'Ā'iša adds that she had a velvet shawl of which the embroidered edge was made of silk and she and the Prophet wore it regularly.

In the legal discussion about details of the Bilderverbot is important that is said that each time someone enters, he cannot but see the images; images on unobtrusive places are less offensive. Muḥammad refers to his

spiritual attitude towards life in this world, an aspect that rarely occurs in these traditions. 'Ā'iša's addition about their shawl is a good example of a legal addition to a tradition with a different subject (cf. p. 59).

3.3 *Qirām, ṣalāt*

4 Texts in which 'Ā'iša hangs a curtain (*qirām*) on a side of her house, but the Prophet says: "take this thing away, I keep thinking of the images (*taṣāwīr*) on it while I am making the *ṣalāt*".

We already encountered this reasoning, images distract the attention of Muḥammad, i. e. a believer, during the ṣalāt in group 2.9 (horns in *al-Ka'ba*) and it occurs again in the next group. Maybe this issue is important for the question as to whether or not images are allowed in a place of prayer. The reason is related to the one in 3.2: images keep your thoughts in this world.

3.4 *Thawb, ṣalāt*, pillows

6 Texts in which 'Ā'iša tells how she had a piece of cloth with images (*taṣāwīr*) on it which she hung before an alcove. The Prophet, however, always did the *ṣalāt* in that direction and told her to take it away. 'Ā'iša did so and used it to make pillows (*wasā'id*). The legal implication of the last remark is that images on pillows are allowed.

3.5 *Numruqa*, "Angels do not enter", "*Aḥyū mā khalaqtum*"

11 Texts in which 'Ā'iša tells how she bought a pillow (*numruqa*) with images (*taṣāwīr*) on it. The Prophet sees the pillow and does not enter (a topos). 'Ā'iša notices Muḥammad's disapproval (*al-karāhiya fī waǧhihi*, topos, cf. p. 57) and repenting she explains to him that she bought the pillow for him to sit on and to lay down his head on/and he laid his head on it. Then Muḥammad says: 'Angels do not enter a house in which there are images (*ṣuwar*; group 1)' and 'Those who make/posses images will be punished on the Day of Resurrection and it will be said to them "make alive what you have created (*'aḥyū mā khalaqtum*)" (group 4.2)'.

This tradition is an obvious combination of two sayings with the 'Ā'iša-story. Pillows appear to be forbidden here, but there is a comparatively large number of variants of the "to lay down his head on/and he laid his head on it". Six vocalized and unvocalized forms of the verb "wasada" II and V. When vocalized sometimes the perfect tense is read, and this would mean that Muḥammad actually laid his head on the pillow (an addition that is quite common in these traditions), meaning that these pillows are

allowed, after which the two sayings would only follow to stress the fact that images in general are forbidden. Sometimes, however, the imperfect or conjunctive is read which makes the "to lay down his head on" a continuation of the "to sit on" after which the two sayings would serve to stress the fact that images on pillows are forbidden. In the latter case this would be the only tradition with this prohibition.

3.6 Pillows Miscellaneous

13 Texts which comply more or less to the basic text described above. In all the texts 'Ā'iša makes (two) pillows (wisādatayn/numruqatayn/ wasā'id) out of the curtains/pieces of cloth (sitr/namaṭ). In a number of traditions 'Ā'iša adds that she really saw Muḥammad sit on them, in others, however, this addition is again disputed. Two texts are interesting because 'Ā'iša is asked whether she really heard the Prophet utter the saying "Angels do not enter" (group 1). 'Ā'iša answers that she did not, but that she can relate what she saw him do and she tells how Muḥammad was on a raid (topos) and that she hung a curtain . . . (following basic text) . . . and that when she made pillows of it Muḥammad ceased to disapprove.

Summary group 3

In this group we have seen that images on curtains and similar material are forbidden and we have seen two related reasons, i. e. images distract the mind from prayer (3.3/3.4) and make people think too much of this world (3.2). Images on pillows are allowed although it does not seem to be an established rule yet (cf. 3.5 and additions 3.6). It seems that once the basic story was settled it was used repeatedly with Muḥammad forbidding images on all sorts of fabrics and giving reasons for it; all this of course in a home atmosphere with Ā'iša, who was said to be his favourite wife.

There is an 'Ā'iša-story in 4.1 also.

4 Sayings

4.1 "Ašadd 'adhāban"

25 Texts, to be divided into three groups. The saying in each group is the same: On the Day of Resurrection those people who make images (muṣawwirūn)/who try to create like Allah (yušabbihūna/yuḍāhūna bi-khalq Allah) will be punished most severely (ašadd 'adhāban) by Allah.

The first group has the 'Ā'iša-story as related in group 3. 'Ā'iša hangs a curtain (sitr/qirām) with images (ṣuwar/taṣāwīr/tamāthīl) on it before an

alcove (cf. 3.4). The Prophet gets angry and utters the saying. In some of
the texts 'Ā'iša makes pillows out of the curtains.

The second group tells us about a visit (topos). Muslim b. Ṣubayḥ visits
Yasār b. Numayr with Masrūq. In his house they see images (*tamāthīl*) on a
bench. Masrūq says it is an image of Kisrā (Chosrau) but Muslim says it is
an image of Maryam. Masrūq then says to Yasār: Didn't you hear that 'Ab-
dallāh b. Mas'ūd said: . . . (follows saying).

This tradition is used by Paret for dating the Bilderverbot (p. 63).

The third group of texts contains apart from the saying 4 categories
(number-structure, cf. p. 59) to which it applies: an erring imām (*imām
ḍalāla/imām muḍill yuḍillu l-nās bi-ġayri 'ilm*), someone who kills a
prophet, someone who gets killed by a prophet and someone who makes
images (*muṣawwir/mumaththil min al-mumaththilīn*)[29]).

4.2 "Aḥyū mā khalaqtum"

22 Texts that consist of the following saying only: Those who make/
possess images (*al-muṣawwirūn/aṣḥāb al-ṣuwar/alladhīna ya'malūna/yaṣ-
na'ūna l-ṣuwar*) will be punished on the Day of Resurrection and it will be
said to them 'make alive what you have created' (*'aḥyū mā khalaqtum*).

This tradition is also used by Paret for dating (p. 64). Compare group
3.5 where this saying is part of an 'Ā'iša-tradition next to the saying
"Angels do not enter".

4.3.1 Ṣūra, nafakha rūḥ

12 Texts that contain the following saying: Those who make images
will be punished on the Day of Resurrection until they/and they will be
called upon to breathe life into them (*nafakha rūḥ*), but they will not suc-
ceed in this task[30]).

This saying is in some texts placed in the context of a story in which Ibn
'Abbās is giving *fatwas* and near him Qatāda/al-Naḍr b. Anas/Sa'īd b. abī l-
Ḥasan/nobody is seated (cf. p. 60). Ibn 'Abbās does not refer to the
Prophet (*sanada ilā/dhakara fī futyāhu l-Rasūl/qāla qāla rasūl Allāh*). But
then a man/a man from Irāq[31]) comes to him and says: "I make a living of
making images (,so what shall I do?)". Ibn 'Abbās (who now does refer to

---

[29]) It is the only time in image-traditions *mathala* II is used in this meaning; by
the context I suppose it means making images.

[30]) This is the tradition bishop Theodor Abū Qurra cites practically literally, cf.
CRESWELL K. A. C., *Early Muslim Architecture*, Oxford, 1969 p. 411 f.

[31]) The isnāds of these traditions are indeed 'Irāqī.

the Prophet) says: I have heard the Prophet say ". . . (follows saying) . . .".
(In three texts) the man turns yellow and green but Ibn ʿAbbās comforts
him: "My dear man, you can make images of trees and all inanimate things
(without a "*rūḥ*").

This tradition makes clear that making images is forbidden, except in
the case of images of trees and things without spirit. The change in the way
that Ibn ʿAbbās' supports his *fatwas* may be meant to show the importance
of this question of the images and to stress the authenticity of the saying as
being really Muḥammad's. The variation of those who sit near Ibn ʿAbbās is
remarkable: Qatāda, al-Naḍr b. Anas, Saʿīd b. abī l-Ḥasan or nobody.
When we look at the *isnāds* we see that those who sit near Ibn ʿAbbās are
also mentioned as the transmitter after him. Although this may seem
logical it is worth mentioning since such a diversity near the first transmit-
ter is very rare in isnād bundles or traditions on images and it seems to
indicate how people have been tampering with this isnād to gain a favourite
place next to the famous Ibn ʿAbbās.

4.3.2 Taḥallama, istamaʿa, nafakha rūḥ

10 Texts that contain three sayings of which 4.3.1 is one. The three
sayings, occurring in different orders, have the same structure: those who
. . . will be . . . on the Day of Resurrection (cf. schemes, p. 58).

The first saying: those who listen stealthily to the talk of people who
dislike them, shall have lead poured into their ears on the Day of the Resur-
rection.

The second saying: those who tell a dream they did not have will be
punished on the Day of Resurrection until they fix two barley-corns to-
gether, but they will not succeed in this task[32]).

The third saying: those who make images will be punished on the Day
of Resurrection until they/and they will be called upon to breathe life in
them, but they will not succeed in this task.

4.4 *Man aẓlamu, khalaqa ka-khalqī*

9 Texts that contain the following saying: the worst people are (*man
aẓlamu mimman*) those who set out creating like I do (*yakhluqu ka-khalqī*);
let them but create a grain of corn, an ant-egg[33]) or a barley-corn (cf. 4.3.2).

---

[32]) This saying also exists alone: Tɪʀ (32) *ruʾyā*, 8, nr. 2281–3, IM (35) *ruʾyā*, 8,
Dā (10) *ruʾyā*, 9, Dā (20) *riqāq*, 3, and AbH I: 91, 101, 131, the *isnāds* of which are
clearly related to the *isnāds* of these traditions.

[33]) "*Dharra*", with a different vocalisation "*dhura*" could be read which means
"durra", a variety of sorghum, with which we would have three sorts of grain.

In 4 of the 9 texts the saying is uttered during a visit (topos). Abū Zurʿa and Abū Hurayra enter a house in Medina/a house that was built in Medina for Marwān or Saʿīd/the house of Marwān/the house of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam (cf. text development, p. 60). Abū Hurayra sees images/someone making images (*taṣāwir/muṣawwir yuṣawwir*) and says: "I have heard the Prophet say: . . . (follows saying) . . .". In 2 texts is added that Abū Hurayra then performs the ritual ablution, *wuḍū'*, which is described in detail (cf. text development p. 60).

This *hadīth qudsī* is also used by Paret for dating the Bilderverbot (p. 61). Because in 4 texts this saying and images are connected by the same story we can conclude that, at least when the connection was made, making images was interpreted as a form of creating, which corresponds with the ideas expressed in previous sayings.

Summary group 4

In this group we have seen 5 traditions in which a saying plays a crucial role. The basic idea behind these sayings seems to be that it is presumptuous of man to even think that he, like the Creator, could create and make images of living creatures. That is why those who do will be punished most severely on the Day of Resurrection and why they will be summoned to make their images come alive by breathing spirit into them, as Allah did, but that they will not be able to do.

There is a connection between the sayings and the Qur'ān, both in language and ideas: using *ṣawwara* and *khalaqa* as (nearly) synonyms for creating and making images (4.1/4.4) (S 40: 64/59: 24), inflating *"rūḥ"* as part of the creation (4.3) (S 3: 49/5: 110/15: 29 *et alii*), *"man aẓlamu mimman"* (4.4) occurs in the Qur'ān 15 times (S 2: 114, 140/6: 21, 93, 144 *et alii*), the idea of Allah's immense creative power in comparison with the inability of man or, in the Qur'ān, false gods to create even the tiniest things (4.4) (S 22: 73, 35: 13 and cf. 6: 95)[34]).

Other sayings are found in 1/2.3/6.4.

---

[34]) CRONE, P., mentions a remarkable Talmudic parallel in her *"Islam, Judeo-Christianity and Byzantine Iconoclasm"*, in: JSAI, II, 1980, p. 67, note 33: "JOSHUA b. LEVI (ca. A.D. 250) contrasted the painters inability to put souls into their pictures with God's power to animate what he shapes, *Berakhoth*, f. 10 a ". . ." the point of the comparison, however, is God's grandeur rather than the iniquity of painters, and though the dictum occurs elsewhere, it never seems to be used for a sweeping condemnation of art". Other than CRONE, who calls this reason for not representing animate beings, in spite of this quotation and the general teneur in her article in which many direct links between Islam and Judaism are made, of uncertain origin (p. 67, top line), I would say that in spite of the different stress the likeliness is too big not to think of a Jewish origin of this specific idea (and of several other elements, texts and ideas of the image-traditions).

5 Visits

5.1 *Abū Ṭalḥa, taṣāwir, raqm*

5 Texts in which 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh b. 'Utba b. Mas'ūd visits the sick (topos) Abū Ṭalḥa al-Anṣārī, in whose house he finds Sahl b. Ḥunayf. Abū Ṭalḥa has someone draw a cloth (*namaṭ*) from under him and Sahl asks why. Abū Ṭalḥa answers that it is because of the images (*taṣāwir*) on it and "you know what the Prophet said about that subject". Sahl: "Did not the Prophet say 'except when mere ornaments (raqm) are concerned'?". Abū Ṭalḥa: Yes indeed, but it is better for me and wiser than an offence.

This tradition is based on such already existing traditions, like the one described in 1.2.1, that allow ornaments on fabrics, but it seems to state that is better not to have them. There is one variant which reads "people" ('*unās*) instead of 'Ubaydallāh and "*raǧul minhum*" instead of Sahl (cf. text development, p. 60).

5.2 Ibn 'Abbās, *istabraq, kānūn, taṣāwir*

3 Texts in which Ibn 'Abbās is sick and Miswar b. Mikhrama comes to visit him (topos). Ibn 'Abbās has a brocade plaid covering him and before him stands a stove (*kānūn*) with images (*taṣāwir*) on it. Miswar asks about the plaid and Ibn 'Abbās says that, according to him, the Prophet only forbade brocade cloths which are worn out of vanity and pride, adding that, thank God, he is not like that.

(I + III) Then Miswar asks about the images on the stove. Ibn 'Abbās: "do you not see that I destroyed them with fire?" (II + III) After Miswar has left Ibn 'Abbās has the cloth removed and the heads of the images destroyed. (III) Someone says he could get a nice price for it at the market but Ibn 'Abbās says 'no' and orders the heads of the images to be removed.

The second part of the story has three versions, in (I) destroying with fire is enough, in (II) the heads are destroyed, (III) is a combination, destroying with fire and heads off and only here the prohibition on selling the images is added.

Other visits are found in 1.2.1/1.2.2/4.1/4.3.1/4.4.

6 Miscellaneous

6.1 *La'ana al-muṣawwir, thaman al-damm*

6 Texts in which 8 (or 7) things are forbidden or in which people who do something forbidden are cursed. 'Awn b. Ǧuḥayfa tells how his father bought a slave who was a cupper (*ḥaǧǧām*) and then ordered his cupping-

glasses (*maḥāǧim*) to be broken and he said: the Prophet forbade 1) to pay for blood (forbidding the work of the cupper), 2) to pay for a dog and 3) to earn by prostitution, and he cursed 4) those who take usury, 5) those who let someone take usury (by lending money with usurious interest), 6) the woman who makes tattoos, 7) the woman who has herself tattooed and 8) those who make images (*muṣawwir*).

2 Texts only contain 7 elements, once prostitution is not mentioned and once paying for blood and this is also the only text without the story of the cupper-slave. Brief research in the *Concordance* and *Handbook*[35]) shows that this row is built up from elements that also occur alone or in other combinations (cf. schemes, p. 59 for the form).

6.2 *Khinzīr, mayta, khamr, aṣnām*

11 Texts: the Prophet said, when he was in Mecca in the year of the conquest (a topos): Allāh and his Prophet forbade selling pork, carrion, wine and idols (*aṣnām*). Follows a section on the selling of fat of *mayta* by Jews.

Compare Qur'ān S. 5: 3 where amongst others *mayta, damm, laḥm khinzīr*, things sacrificed on *anṣāb* and using divination arrows (*azlām*) are forbidden and 5: 90 where *khamr, anṣāb, maysir* and *azlām* are forbidden (for *anṣāb, maysir* and using divination arrows, cf. group 2).

(6.3 *Taṣlīb*)

8 Texts in which is told that the Prophet tore everything apart on which a cross was depicted (*taṣlīb/muṣallab/ṣulub*).

In these traditions crosses are only depicted on fabrics. Of course crosses do not fall under the rule of a prohibition against making images of living creatures. But, together with images, they were seen as typical Christian objects of reverence and therefore probably forbidden because of what they symbolized, i. e. the dogma of the crucifixion of Jesus, Christianity and maybe also the Byzantine enemy in general[36]).

---

[35]) *Concordance et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane*, ed. A. J. WENSINCK *et al.*, Leiden, 1939–69, and WENSINCK, A. J., *A Handbook of early Muhammadan Tradition alphabetically arranged*, Leiden, 1927.

[36]) Cf. IBN ḤAZM, *Muʿǧam l-Fiqh*, I, p. 673, crosses on clothes are not allowed, you are not allowed to kneel for them, play with them nor sell them, touching a cross does not annihilate a *wuḍū'*, though, and you can destroy a cross unless it belongs to a muslim or a *dhimmī*. And cf. AHMED MUH. ʿISA, *"Muslims and taṣwīr"*, in: The Muslim World, XLV, 1955, p. 252, and KING, G. R. D., *"Islam, Iconoclasm and the Declaration of Doctrine"*, in: BSOAS, vol. XLVIII, 1985, part 2, p. 69.

6.4 *Kanisa, Ḥabaša, taṣāwir*

9 Texts in which is related that the Prophet is ill and near him are seated (topos) some of his women/Umm Salama/Umm Salama and Umm Ḥabība and they tell him about a church, named Māriya, which they have seen in Ḥabaša. They say how beautiful it was and describe the images (*taṣāwir*) in it. The Prophet says: "When with these people a pious man dies, they build a place of prayer on his grave and make images (*ṣuwar*) in it. On the Day of the Resurrection these will be judged as the worst people by Allāh (cf. S. 98: 6)".

In the tradition collections this account is usually headed under "building a place of prayer on a grave" and we can ask ourselves whether the images are a mere addition to an existing tradition only related to graves (cf. S. 18: 21 and *Concordance et Indices*, "*qabr*"). The scene, Muḥammad's sickbed, is well suited for story-telling. The women mentioned by name seem to have evolved out of "some women" (cf. text development p. 60).

6.5 *Qabr, ṣūra*

15 Texts which can be divided into two groups. The first 9 texts are practically the same: ʿAlī gives Abū l-Ḥayyāǧ (or *ṣāḥib šurṭatihi*[37])) the task the Prophet gave him, namely to level all the highly elevated graves and to destroy all the images/idols (*ṣūra/timthāl/ṣanam*). In 6 other texts the Prophet walks in a mourning procession and asks a volunteer to go to Medina[38]) to destroy all the idols (*wathan*) there, to level all the graves and to smear all the images (*ṣūra/ṣanam*) (cf. schemes, p. 58). The sixth text is interesting because ʿAlī is only summoned to level the graves; images are not mentioned at all.

In view of the task of leveling graves, the context, a mourning procession and the last variant (without images) this tradition might also originally be intended for discussing graves.

6.6 Invitation to dinner, *taṣāwir*

6 Texts in which someone is invited to dinner, but when the guest finds images in the house he leaves or refuses to enter in the first place (topos).

---

[37]) Cf. DONNER, F. M., "*The Shurṭa in Early Umayyad Syria*", to appear in the forthcoming 'Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on the History of Bilād al-Shām', Third Session, held in ʿAmmān, Jordan, from 23–29 October, 1987.

[38]) The *isnāds* of the first group of texts are Kūfan, those of the second Kūfan and Baṣran, one could look for a period of rivalry between Kūfa and Medīna therefore.

In 3 texts the Prophet is invited by 'Alī, in one of which the Prophet says after he has seen the images: "Angels do not enter a house in which there are images (*taṣāwīr*) (group 1)", in another, a related saying: "It does not befit me that I enter a house that is decorated"[39]). In 1 text 'Umar is invited in Syria by a Christian but he refuses with the words: "we do not enter churches (!) because of the images (*ṣuwar*) in it, i. e. the images (*tamā thīl*)[40]). In 1 text Ibn Mas'ūd is invited, he sees an image (*ṣūra*) in the house of the host and leaves. In the last text Ibn 'Umar invites Abū Ayyūb who sees a curtain in the latter's house (images are not mentioned again, cf. the decorated house), Ibn 'Umar explains that he gave in to the pressure of his wives and Abū Ayyūb, very disappointed in him, leaves.

6.7 *Banāt* of 'Ā'iša

4 Texts in which the Prophet returns from the raid at Tabūk or Khaybar (topos) and finds 'Ā'iša and her little friends playing with dolls (*banāt li'Ā'iša lu'abin*)[41]). Sometimes the girls go away, sometimes the Prophet lets them stay or sends them back to 'Ā'iša after he has left. In 1 text the Prophet sees a horse with wings made of patchwork and he asks her what that is, a horse with two wings. 'Ā'iša says surely he knows that Sulaymān had horses with two wings, after which the Prophet bursts out laughing heartily (*ḍaḥika ḥattā ra'aytu nawāǧidhahu*: a topos, cf. p. 57).

The meaning of this tradition is clear: dolls are allowed. In *fiqh* texts[42]) dolls are in fact an exception, apparently because playing with dolls was considered to be a good preparation for motherhood. Winged horses were also met in 3.1, as images on fabric and in 6.8.7 a horse is mentioned, also made of patchwork, but without wings[43]).

---

[39]) No images are mentioned in this tradition, but seen these texts there must have been a, quite understandable, close legal connection between images and decoration.

[40]) The same words of 'Umar we find in 6.8.8, without this story. The saying does not really fit: 'Umar is invited for dinner and he answers that he will not enter a church. It seems an example of a wrong connection of two related tradition elements; maybe it is a fresh one, the unevennesses of which still had to be cleared away by the tradition process.

[41]) Cf. NOJA, S., *"Les chevaux ailés d'Ā'iša et les banat"*, in: AJON, 43, 1983, p. 33–42.

[42]) Cf. IBN ḤAZM, *Mu'ǧam l-Fiqh*, Damascus, 1966, I, p. 673.

[43]) Cf. *Burāq*, the horse Muḥammad made his celestial journey on, which is said to have had wings too, *Encyclopedia of Islam*, new ed., I, p. 1310f, *"Burāq"*; horses of Sulaymān are mentioned here; in TIR. *Ṣifat l-Ǧanna* (36), 11, nr. 2543, and AbH, V, 352, nr. 8 horses in paradise are mentioned, with two wings and made of ruby, the believers can fly on.

6.8 Various prohibitions

8 Loose texts that seem to answer the direct questions: what is forbidden and what is not?

1) making images of a date-palm is forbidden

2 and 3) images of "things" with a spirit are not allowed, trees and things without a spirit are allowed (cf. 1.3.6 and 4.3)

4) a lemon of gypsum in a mosque is not allowed

5) drawing a bird on the ground is not allowed

6) images on a bench are not allowed (cf. 4.1)

7) a horse of patchwork is not allowed (cf. 'Ā'iša's winged horses that are allowed, 6.7)

8) 'Umar does not enter a church because of the images therein (cf. 6.6) and Ibn 'Abbās only did the ṣalāt in churches without images (tamā-thīl).

7 Nahā 'an tuḍraba al-ṣuwar

2 Texts of which the longer version starts telling that Ibn 'Umar disapproved of images (ṣūra) being marked/branded (?, "tu'lama") and said (this is the beginning of the shorter version): The Prophet forbade images (ṣūra) to be destroyed, i.e. the face (of the image).

The meaning of "tu'lama" is not clear. Maybe it means something like "being erected as a landmark"[44]) or "being made as a mark on cloth". The second part, however, is clear and very strange on the other hand since it is the only tradition that seems image-friendly: the faces of images do not have to be destroyed (cf. e.g. 1.3.6 and 5.2).

The rules concerning images as found in the traditions

1) making images, not allowed: 2.1/4.1–4.4/6.1/6.4/6.8.5

2) selling images ("aṣnām": maybe only "idols"), not allowed: 2.10/5.2/6.2

3) images of a) things with rūḥ, not allowed: 1.1/6.8.2/6.8.3
                        without rūḥ, allowed: 4.3.1/6.8.2/6.8.3
                        with rūḥ, without a head, allowed: 1.3.6/5.2
                        with a head, allowed: 7
                        bereaved of rūḥ by fire, allowed: 5.2

---

[44]) A suggestion I owe to G. H. A. Juynboll; the heading of the chapter where this tradition is found is "al-wasm wa l-'alam fī l-ṣūra", i.e. "a brand and a mark (?) on images".

      b) animals, not allowed: wooden dove in Ka'ba: 2.9

                                birds: 3.2/6.8.5

                                (winged) horses: 3.1/6.7/6.8.7

                                allowed: bird and wild beast on

                                pillow: 4.3.1

      c) trees and plants, allowed: 1.3.6/4.3.1/6.8.2/6.8.3

                        not allowed: 6.8.1 (*nakhla*)/6.8.4 (lemon)/

                                2.5 (in Ka'ba)

      d) ornaments, allowed: 1.2.1/(5.1)

                   not allowed: 3.2 (not discussed in this article)

                   better not: 5.1

    (e) crosses, not allowed: 6.3)

4) images in a) a house, not allowed: 1.1–1.3.6/2.6/3.5/3.6/6.6

                b) *al-bayt*, not allowed: 2.1

                c) *al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba*, not allowed: 2.2/2.3/2.4/2.6/2.7

                d) *al-Bayt/al-Ka'ba*,   allowed: 2.5 ('Īsā and Maryam)

                e) a *masǧid* on a grave, not allowed: 6.4

                f) a mosque, not allowed: 6.8.4

                g) a church, not allowed: 6.4/6.6/6.8.8

5) images on a) a pillow, allowed: 3.4/3.5?/3.6/4.3.1

                       not allowed: 3.5?

                b) a curtain, cloth, not allowed: 1.2.1/3.1–3.4/3.6/4.1/5.1

                c) a stove, not allowed: 5.2

                d) a bench, not allowed: 4.1/6.8.6

6) dolls, allowed: 6.7

Reasons actually mentioned are:

    1) images distract during the ṣalāt 2.9 (horns)/3.3/3.4

    2) they keep the mind in this world: 3.2

    3) (implied:) making images is (an attempt) to create like Allāh: 2.3/4.1–4.4

    4) pillows are allowed because they are thrown on the ground and trodden upon: 1.3.6, or are used to sit on, c. q. to rest the head on: 3.5

    5) images without a head are allowed because they are like trees, considered to be without "*rūḥ*"): 1.3.6 (implied in 4.3.1/6.8.2/6.8.3).

The rules concerning images in works of fiqh

In the *sunnī* works of *fiqh*[45]) the Bilderverbot is usually treated in the chapter about the "*walīma*", a banquet mostly given on the occasion of a

---

[45]) In the *ḥanafī* and the *šī'ī* works the Bilderverbot is dealt with in the chapters on the ṣalāt, PARET, R., "*Das islamische Bilderverbot und die Schia*", p. 224.

wedding[46]). Acceptance of an invitation is obligatory unless laws concerning these banquets are transgressed, for example when there is music, impure food, wine or other intoxicating drinks, unlawful luxury or images of living creatures, in fact these things even make it objectionable or forbidden to accept the invitation.

The Bilderverbot implies that it is forbidden for a Muslim to create, have, use, buy or sell images of living creatures or to be in a place where such images are to be found.

Exceptions to this prohibition are the following[47]): 1) Trees, plants and other "things" without "rūḥ" are allowed to be portrayed, this is also the case for things that cannot be considered to be alive any more, like pictures of living creatures without a head[48]). The underlying assumption seems to be that making images of living things is an attempt to imitate the creation whereas with inanimate things there is no such danger.

2) Living creatures can be depicted when it is not possible to respect or venerate the pictures, for example when they appear on carpets, pillows, diwans etcetera. Sitting, standing, lying or leaning on them makes it impossible to respect them. The images are also allowed if they are treated carelessly or with obvious disregard, e. g. in a corridor or in a hall of a bath whereas they are forbidden in the reception-room or in the bath itself. The underlying assumption seems to be that making images must lead to idolatry, the imitation of unbelievers who worship their images as gods; the actions described exclude this possibility.

3) Children's toys in the form of living creatures, like dolls, are allowed[49]). The reason for this is said to be that for girls playing with dolls was considered to be a good preparation for later maternal duties.

Secondary subjects

In the traditions concerning images we came across many other subjects and because these subjects were placed in context next to the image

---

[46]) Cf. Snouck Hurgronje, C., *Verspreide Geschriften*, ed. A. J. Wensinck, Bonn, 1923-7, II, p. 88, 454, 456, 543; Juynboll, Th. W., *Handleiding tot de kennis van de Mohammedaansche Wet*, Leiden, 1925, p. 155-9; Abū Isḥāq al-Shīrāzī, *Kitāb al-Tanbīh*, ed. A. W. T. Juynboll, Leiden, 1879, p. 205.

[47]) Considering the uncompromising language in most of the traditions and in contrast to that the exceptions to the prohibition and the fact that it seems to be held mostly in places of worship, I find, other than Crone, P. *"Islam, Judeo-Christianity and Byzantine Iconoclasm"*, p. 64, note 24, that Islamic art was not, by contrast to Christian art, "staunchly refused concessions to practice".

[48]) Paret, R., *"Die Entstehungszeit des islamischen Bilderverbots"*, p. 158.

[49]) Cf. the discussion of the "banāt of 'Ā'iša", group 6.7.

prohibition, it seems relevant to name these secondary subjects. Sometimes, by the way, they take a more prominent place in the tradition than the images themselves.

1) watch-dogs 1.1–1.3.6/6.1
2) impurity 1.1/1.3.5
3) cupping 6.1
4) prostitution 6.1
5) usury 6.1
6) tattooing 6.1
7) selling pork 6.2
8) selling carrion 6.2
9) using, selling grease of *mayta*
10) selling wine 6.2
11) *ṣalāt* 2.9/3.3/3.4
12) *ṣalāt* and *takbīr* in Ka'ba 2.4/2.9
13) *ṣalāt* in a church 6.6/6.8.8
14) *wuḍū'* 4.4
15) *ṭawāf* 2.8/2.9/6.3
16) Safā and Marwā 6.3
17) graves 6.4/6.5
18) place of prayer on a grave 6.4
19) churches 6.4/6.6/6.8.8
20) velvet 3.2
21) silk 3.2/6.3
22) brocade 5.2
23) an erring imam 4.1
24) a prophet killer and a -killed 4.1
25) invitation for dinner 6.6
26) telling false dreams 4.3.2
27) listening secretly to people 4.3.2
28) pillows filled with palm leaves 3.6
29) bells 1.1
30) Ka'ba-legends 2

In future all these subjects should be studied separately, at least superficially, and then together with traditions on images and in that way one could get an idea how, when and why these subjects were combined with images, which, amongst others, could help when dating the Bilderverbot and studying the process whereby different traditions are combined and the forms in which this is done.

Conclusion

When we compare the rules found in traditions and in *fiqh* works it is clear that these rules are practically the same. Exceptions are the images in the Kaʻba being spared (2.5), the trees, palm-date and lemon that are not allowed whereas they do not have a "rūḥ" (2.5/6.8.1/6.8.4), the ornaments that do not always seem to be allowed (3.2/5.1), and the prohibition against destroying the faces of images (7). Characteristic for these traditions is that they are mostly found outside the so-called "canonical" collections and in the "historical" works. One could wonder whether or not it is strange that with so many traditions so few contra-traditons are found and whether this might be due to a tendency with the compilers of the collections to avoid troublesome traditions (cf. dating p. 65). At least it shows the importance of using as many of the lesser known collections as possible.

Topoi, schemes and text development

In order to recognize parts of traditions as topoi and structures as schemes a survey of the traditions was made and E. STETTER's 'Topoi und Schemata im Hadith', A. NOTH's 'Quellenkritische Studien zu Themen, Formen und Tendenzen früh-islamischer Geschichtsüberlieferung, Teil I, Themen und Formen' and the 'Concordance et Indices de la Tradition Musulmane' were used.

1 Topoi as introduction of traditions

In the opening section of different traditions we often find the same description of a situation. Some of these introduction topoi are neutral, like: *dakhala al-rasūl wa* . . . (3.3/4.1), *qadima al-rasūl wa* . . . (3.3/4.1), *qadima min safar wa* . . . (3.1/3.6/4.1), *qadima min ġazwa* . . . (6.7), *kharaġa fī ġazātihi wa lammā qadima* . . (3.6), *kharaġa al-rasūl kharǧatan thumma dakhala wa* . . . (3.6).

The second type of topoi is more precise with regard to time and place. They mostly belong to the group of traditions about Muḥammads entering the Kaʻba. Examples of these are: *zamana l-fatḥ* (2.3), *lamma qadima makka* (2.4), *dakhala makka* (2.8), *dakhala makka yawma fatḥ* (2.8), *dakhala makka yawma l-fatḥ* (2.8), *lammā ṣallā l-ẓuhr yawma l-fatḥ* (2.8), *yawma l-fatḥ* (6.2), *ʻāma l-fatḥ* (6.2), *wa huwa bi-makka* (6.2), *ʻāma l-fatḥ wa huwa bi-makka* (6.2), *qadima min ġazwat Tabūk aw Khaybar* (6.7). A phenomenon that confirms that these elements are not necessarily original is that there are variants of the same traditions where one variant has this introduction and the other does not or with different words or where other times of

action are mentioned, e. g. in 3 variants: "in the day, in the year and at the time of the conquest"; in one case even the topos is given in an addition.

The third kind of topoi we met in the opening sections of traditions is closely related to the tradition itself, like: the Prophet is sad and someone asks him what is wrong after which he explains why (Ǧabrīl's not appearing in time for their appointment). This example is a nice illustration of an introduction used to fill in at will the names of those who were on very close terms with the Prophet, something which of course sheds a positive light on them and their posterity and enhances their credibility as traditionists. The case is all the more clear as we found this topos amongst others in four variants of basically the same tradition (1.3) with four different isnād bundles starting with the Prophet and four different close friends or wifes mentioned.

2 Topoi within traditions

We usually found those when the state of mind of the Prophet was described, like: *talawwana waǧhuhu, ʿalayhi al-kaʿāba, aṣfarra waǧhuhu, ʿaraftu al-karāhiya fī waǧhihi, ḍaḥika ḥattā ra'aytu nawāǧidhahu*[50]). A very subtle way to stress the actual presence of the traditionists is the *"ʿaraftu"* and *"ra'aytu"*. Comparable is a detail of 2.10 which says that the Prophet beats Ǧarīr so hard on his chest that the imprint of his hand could be seen[51]).

3 Inherent topoi

Another type of tradition element which occurs repeatedly is inherent to the basic function, structure and meaning of the stories told. Images are forbidden, so the kind of images that is meant must be specified, and also where they are found and how one is to react to them. Probably as a result of these general demands it appeared that the many stories about images share a feature that occurs too often to be mere coincidence.

One of these so-called inherent topoi is the refusal to enter a room in which there are images. Examples can be found in the saying "Angels do not enter", "Ǧabrīl does not enter the house of Muḥammad", Muḥammad does not enter the Kaʿba, Muḥammad does not enter ʿA'iša's house, and ʿAlīs house after an invitation for dinner, ʿUmar, Abū Ayyūb and Ibn

---

[50]) Cf. STETTER, E., *Topoi und Schemata im Hadith*, Tübingen, 1965, p. 27 that gives a list of these expressions.

[51]) Cf. STETTER, E., op. cit, p. 24.

Mas'ūd react in the same way to an invitation and 'Umar and Ibn 'Abbās do not enter churches because they contain images.

Of course, all this could really have happened but it could also be a way of saying that something is forbidden: you do not enter the place containing it. In the discussion of the variants of the saying "Angels do not enter" it was shown that this same topos is also used for two kinds of bells, impure persons and dogs.

Another example of this kind of topos, closely related to the first one, are the visits of which we found a large number: 8 very clear cases and 3 less clear. The basic structure of all these visits is the same: A, sometimes accompanied by B, visits the (sick) C. They find images in the latter house and react to them. C then reacts to their statements. Usually something is asked about the images or an exception or restriction is given to the prohibition after which it is all the more clearly stated. The visit also seems to be born out of the need for home-surroundings to explain details of the prohibition, since images usually would have been found in a house. Here again names could be filled in at will: for the visitors it was nice to be mentioned because visiting the sick ('iyāda) is regarded as commendable and one can depict someone negatively by making him the owner of a house containing images (cf. p. 63f concerning Marwān b. al-Ḥakam).

4 Schemes

Among our traditions we found several with a number-structure. Of course such a structure could be purely coincidental but when there is parallelism of form and contents, assonance, rhyme and rhythm then it surely must be more than that[52]).

3 parts:
- *lam yamna'nī 'an adkhula illā 'annahu kāna . . . fakāna . . . fakāna . . . fa mur . . . wa mur . . . wa mur . . .* (1.3.6)
- *man . . .*[a] *. . . wa man . . .*[b] *. . . wa man . . .*[c] *. . ., fa 'ammā man . . .*[a] *. . . fa . . .* etc. (4.2)
- *man . . . wa man . . . wa man . . . (2x man . . . kullifa 'an . . . wa laysa bi + ptc.)* (4.3.2)
- (let them but create) *ša'īra aw dharra/dhura aw ḥabba* (4.4)
- *lā . . . illā . . ., lā . . . illā . . ., lā illā . . .* (6.5)
- *lā . . . wa lā . . . wa lā . . .* (6.5)

---

[52]) Stetter, E., op. cit., p. 40, 50.

4 parts

- — *'ashadd al-nās 'adhāban yawma l-qiyāma raǧul qatalahu nabiy aw qatala nabiyyan aw imām ḍalāla aw raǧul muṣawwir* (4.1)
- — *Allāh wa rasūluhu mana'ū khinzīr wa mayta wa khamr wa aṣnām* (6.2)

8 parts

- — . . . *thamana l-kalb, thamana l-damm, 'ākila l-ribā wa mu'kilahu, al-wāšima wa l-mustawšima, kasba l-baghiy wa l-muṣawwir* (6.1)[53])

In this row the parallelism and the antithetic symmetry is quite clear, twice with a participle of the same verb and once with genitive constructions with the same *regens* but a different *rectum*. It also seems clear that the last two elements, which include the makers of images, are added to an already existing and well-structured row, which only contains six elements. This row, in his turn, is only one variant of a large number of rows, varying in length from rows with 3 to 18 elements. This variation in length or number of elements is found in all the schemes discussed here.

5 Text development

In our search for original tradition elements and the date at which certain traditions came into existence it is very important to recognize signs of text development, perceptible within the variants of a single tradition.

The following were found in our texts:

1) rows grow and are built up regularly (1.3.6/3.6./4.1/4.3.2/6.1/6.2/6.5)

2) (introduction) topoi are varied and filled in with details (1.3/2/6.2/6.7)

3) some traditions are combinations of two originally separate traditions (2.1/2.5/2.6/3.5/4.3.2 and cf. the "secondary elements"). Sometimes the meaning of a tradition changes by this combination (cf. 2.1).

3) to some traditions small elements about different, usually legal, subjects are added (1.3.5/2.4/3.2/4.4)[54])

4) there are traditions containing a saying with or without a story (4.3.1/4.4/6.1/6.6 and 6.8.8), sometimes the story explains or changes the (most obvious) meaning.

---

[53]) STETTER, E., op. cit., p. 45, nr. 20 and 22.

[54]) STETTER, E., op. cit., p. 58: he argues that these additions are formed secondarily and fixed to the original tradition and he argues that an investigation into the *"Formgeschichte"* of traditions would enable us to isolate out of the many compound traditions those pieces that form a unity in structure and contents.

5) there are short and long versions of the same tradition

6) in some traditions we see a process of specification and clear symp-
toms of what NOTH calls *"Namenmanie"*[55])

a) the dog that was the reason for Ġabrīl's not entering Muḥammad's
house is called: a dog/a puppy/the dog of Ḥasan or Ḥusayn/the dog of
Ḥasan and it is found under a chair/under a bed/under ʿĀ'iša's bed/in the
house/playing with Ḥasan/between the houses (1.3),

b) the house in which Abū Zurʿa and Abū Hurayra enter for a visit is a
house in Medina/a house that was built in Medina for Marwān or Saʿīd/the
house of Marwān/the house of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam (4.4),

c) next to Ibn ʿAbbās sits nobody/Qatāda/al-Naḍr/Saʿīd (4.3.1),

d) Abū Ṭalḥa is visited by *"'unās"* en *"ragul minhum"* says something
or by ʿUbaydallah b. ʿAbdallah b. ʿUtba b. Masʿūd and Sahl b. Ḥunayf and
the latter says something (5.1),

e) near the Prophet sit "some of the women of the Prophet"/Umm
Salama/Umm Salama and Umm Ḥabība (6.4)[56]).

Only after a thorough investigation of these variants and other aspects
of their traditions and the isnāds, may we be able to say that where there
was first only "someone", names were later filled in and anonymous people
were identified and differentiated[57]).

What we can conclude from these rows of variants for the moment,
however, is that it is not safe to assume that the persons mentioned in these
parts of traditions were really present at the events described.

Dating

Dating is probably the most difficult part of the study of traditions. As
we are here dealing with a very large number of traditions, we cannot dis-
cuss the dating of all the traditions in detail and therefore it is proposed to
only discuss the dating of all the traditions together. First of all though we
will discuss PARET's dating as presented in his article *"Die Entstehungszeit
des islamischen Bilderverbots"*, (1976).

---

[55]) NOTH, A., *Quellenkritische Studien*, p. 115.

[56]) Cf. NOTH, A., op. cit., p. 125: the people asked for advice by the caliph were
designated with *"nās"* and "they" (*-hum*), but also more specifically with *"aṣḥāb"*, a
part of them, or even more often with certain persons, like ʿUthmān, ʿAlī, ʿAbbās etc.

[57]) Cf. BULTMANN, R., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen,
1979, p. 278.

Paret's external dating

In his article Paret discusses the views of CRESWELL[58]) and
O. GRABAR[59]). CRESWELL adopts as *terminus ante quem* the year 787 A.D.,
and as *terminus post quem* the year 750 A.D.[60]). O. Grabar agrees on the
main points with CRESWELL. PARET disagrees with CRESWELL's *terminus
post quem* and therefore then stands at "before 787". After dating three tra-
ditions, to be discussed shortly, he concludes that the essential parts of the
Bilderverbot came into existence between about 675 and 725 A.D. He men-
tions the coins without images which appeared during the monetary reform
of caliph ʿAbd al-Mālik (685–705) and says that it is probably more than a
coincidence that these coins made their entrance exactly in this same
period. According to CRESWELL's and OLEG GRABAR's dating the Islamic
prohibition would only have come into existence when the Byzantine icon-
oclasm was already at his height. ANDRÉ GRABAR, however, considers it
possible that an Islamic prohibition had an influence on the outbreak of the
Byzantine iconoclasm[61]) and this would coincide with PARET's own dating.
PARET argues, however, that one must be careful with making assump-
tions on things like mutual influence (p. 177f.).

Paret's internal dating

After having presented as a general argument that the material in
ḥadīth collections of the 9th century has a *"relativ hohes Alter"* (p. 163),
PARET discusses in his *"Fixpunkte zur zeitlichen Einordnung"* (p. 164–8) the
dating of the beginning and the end of the period in which the discussion
about images was of prime importance.

The first tradition PARET makes use of is tradition 4.4, in 4 of the
9 texts of which Abū Zurʿa en Abū Hurayra enter a house in Medina/a
house that was built in Medina for Marwān or Saʿīd[62])/the house of Mar-
wān/the house of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam. Here Abū Hurayra sees images/

---

[58]) CRESWELL, K. A. C., *Early Muslim Architecture*, Oxford, 1969, p. 411f., and
cf. his *"The Lawfulness of painting in early Islam"*, in: Ars Islamica, 11–12, 1946,
p. 162.

[59]) GRABAR, O., *The Formation of Islamic Art*, Newhaven and London, 1973,
p. 26.

[60]) Idem LAMMENS, H., *L'Attitude de l'Islam primitif en face des arts figurés*,
p. 378.

[61]) GRABAR, A., *L'Iconoclasme Byzantin*, Parijs, 1957, p. 111f, idem CRONE, P..
"Islam, Judeo-Christianity and Byzantine Iconoclasm".

[62]) Probably Saʿīd b. al'Āṣ, died in 678, alternately governor of Medina with
Marwān: Paret, R., "Die Entstehungszeit . . .". p. 165.

someone making images and he says: "I have heard the prophet say: the worst people are those who set out creating like I do, let them but create a grain of corn, an ant-egg or a barley-corn". PARET also mentions the variant readings but finds it improbable that all the details were added just to make this tradition seem more reliable. He knows that this is a well used practice but he says "sie wirken vielmehr echt" (p. 165). Then he determines which historical persons the names refer to and concludes that Abū Hurayra probably came to visit Marwān once, saw the images and cited or invented[63]) the tradition to express his disapproval. The fact that the saying is not genuine: invented, modeled after Qur'ān sayings, does not really alter his conclusion. According to PARET, what is decisive here is that Abū Hurayra referred to this tradition in an actual situation, for which the date can be determined. And therefore he concludes that this tradition originated in the seventh decade of the 7th century.

My first objection against this dating is that PARET uses the material in the *matn* of a tradition of which he declares the saying was invented and, without giving sound reasons, he only believes that the details, which are crucial for his dating, were not added to make the tradition seem reliable. Whereas in fact, in dating another tradition (p. 170), he uses the argument that the fact that a tradition contains a topos, like the visit, is a reason against using it.

Secondly we see that there are only 4 out of 9 texts describing the visit, the other 5 only have the saying and in these traditions it is not absolutely clear that they are concerned with images, because the saying only mentions creating (khalaqa). This leads us to the conclusion that the visit and the saying are not necessarily connected and that, in order to be able to add the story about Sa'īd or Marwān, the "creating" was interpreted as meaning "making images of living creatures", which is quite possible since these two words are sometimes used nearly synonymous, e.g. in the Qur'ān.

Thirdly we saw in the discussion of this tradition that there probably was a process of specification in this tradition: from "a house in Medina" to "the house of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam" which also makes the historicity of both the events and the persons mentioned unsure.

In short: material of different origin was combined, it was modeled as a Qur'ān saying, topoi were added and the names of individuals were filled in. So all the elements PARET uses for dating just emerged some time during the formation process. And this fact excludes by definition the possibility of being sure of the historicity of the situation with the persons de-

---

[63]) In one of the texts it is mentioned in the isnād that Abū Hurayra raised the isnād to the level of the Prophet ("*rafa'a al-Hadīth*", AbḤ II: 391 b).

scribed. Other material could change this, but at present it is impossible to use these names and details for dating a single tradition, let alone for dating the first emergence of the traditions on images in general.

To make it more plausible that the names in this tradition were simply filled in I will attempt to show why they probably took Marwān b. al-Ḥakam to be the owner of the house where images were found. Marwān b. al-Ḥakam was the governor of Medina from 662 to 669 and from 674 to 677. In the year 684 he became caliph and in the following year he died. When we look at the isnād bundle we see a very clear example of a common link, i.e. ʿUmara b. al-Qaʿqāʿ, a Kūfan (it is not clear when he died)[64]), and so is Abū Zurʿa before him in the isnād and most of the transmitters after him.

The next question then is why Kūfan people would like to discredit Marwān b. al-Ḥakam by depicting him as someone who has images in his house, why they used him to act in a tradition as someone who does something forbidden. The answer probably lies in the fact that Kūfa was the centre of the anti-Umayyad opposition and that, for these anti-Umayyads Marwān was the classical scapegoat[65]).

With regard to the way that PARET uses a sceond tradition to determine the starting point of the discussion about images much of the same arguments can be offered. The matn of this tradition, 4.1, again consists of a saying, placed in three different contexts: the ʿĀʾiša-story (which has many characteristics of a topos), the topos of "the visit", again, and a row of people to whom the saying applies. PARET only uses the texts with the visit and he argues that it is improbable that this setting was made up as a frame work. Then he gives the data of the people mentioned in matn and isnād and concludes that also this visit would have taken place towards the end of the seventh century, and probably before 683 A.D., the year of death of Masrūq, one of the visitors.

However, because in this tradition too the topos of 'the visit' is used to "carry" the tradition material we cannot conclude that this visit actually did take place unless we have very solid reasons for doing so. As well as the fact that this topos is merely a setting not pertaining to the original tradition material, there is the added fact that there are also texts with the same saying in the ʿĀʾiša-story and texts with four categories of people to whom

---

[64]) IBN ḤAǦAR, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, Hyderabad, 1325–27 A.H., VII, p. 423/ nr. 690.

[65]) NOTH A., *Quellenkritische Studien*, p. 107, in which he speaks of Marwān b. ʿabd al-Ḥakam as the classical scapegoat of the opponents of the Umayyads, I assume he means our Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, and cf. LAMMENS, H., *"L'Attitude de l'Islam primitif en face des arts figurés"*, p. 374.

this saying applies, of which the makers of images are only one. Now of
course the development of this saying might have started during a real visit
as described and later have taken on different forms, but we cannot be cer-
tain that the whole visit was not fabricated and therefore it is safer to con-
clude that it was. Another weak point of the tradition itself is the "choice"
of the persons making the visit because they differ very much in age, a fact
which PARET by the way mentions himself[66]). Muslim dies in 718, Masrūq
in 683, 35 years before and Yasār b. Numayr must have been a very old
man if even he was still alive at the time of Masrūq's death.

To determine the period when the basic discussion about the images
must have ended, PARET quotes AL-NAWAWĪ (d. 1278) and AL-QĀḌĪ
(1088–1149), both authors of a commentary on traditions of MUSLIM, who
state that making images is forbidden, using tradition 4.2. It is allowed,
however, to depict inanimate things, including fruit-bearing trees, and to
earn money with that. This, they say, is the opinion of all the scholars
except that of Muǧāhid b. Ǧabr (d. 717/722). He is supposed to have been
against it, using tradition 4.4 discussed above. Paret then states that there
is no reason to doubt what AL-NAWAWĪ said about Muǧāhid, although AL-
ṬABARĪ does not mention this opinion of Muǧāhid in his *Tafsīr*. After the
opinion that it is only forbidden to make images of living creatures became
widespread, it would make no sense to depict Muǧāhid as the only repre-
sentative of a deviating opinion had he not been that. The discussion about
the legality of making images of trees Paret calls characteristic for the end
of the general discussion about images, it being a more specific question
and not a general one. Because Muǧāhid is presumed to be the only one
with a deviating opinion, the year of his death, 722 A.D., would be the *ter-
minus ante quem* for the main discussion.

Here also one can have serious doubts about the validity of the argu-
ments used. First of all PARET could only have proven that "images of
trees" is the end of a development if he had shown the whole development.
One cannot assume that every general question must occur at the begin-
ning nor every specific question at the end of discussions, even though it
might seem very logical to make such an assumption.

He then quotes AL-NAWAWĪ and AL-QĀḌĪ, who died ca. 550 and 420
years respectively after Muǧāhid. Therefore this information has travelled
too long to guarantee its intactness without providing earlier witnesses of
Muǧāhid's lonely position.

Paret argues that AL-NAWAWĪ and AL-QĀḌĪ would have had no reason
to call Muǧāhid the only deviator had he not been just that. However, it

---

[66]) PARET, R., *"Die Entstehungszeit des islamischen Bilderverbots"*, p. 166.

could very well be that the scholars only mentioned one of possibly more people in their aim to depict the development of "law" as through an almost constant iǧmā'; AL-ṬABARĪs not mentioning Muǧāhid's opinion, whereas Muǧāhid is an important source for AL-ṬABARĪ, could be cited as another example of this tendency. In fact, the absence of supporters for Muǧāhid's supposed opinion should raise our doubts.

Dating anew

This will be done following the aspects of traditions as discussed in the beginning of this paper. Most of the possibilities for dating mentioned here, however, could not be used yet.

1 Dating with the *matn* form

Traditions develop and so do the ways of transmitting them along with the forms chosen for their transmission. Until now there have been too few results in the study of this field to suggest an outline of the time when certain specific forms came into popularity.

2 Dating with the *matn* contents

The first things to consider are the accidental anachronisms which appear in the *matns* of traditions. In these texts on images none were found.

Secondly there are the names of the people mentioned. As it was not usually certain whether or not the names were mentioned for a particular purpose and whether the events described were historical, amongst others because of the topoi, schemes and text development found in the texts, these names are of no avail in dating the traditions.

Indirectly, however, they can be used if we can find the people, the place or the period, when these particular names could have been used with good reason. An attempt to do this was only made in the case of Marwān b. al-Ḥakam, in the refutation of PARET's dating, which led us to the anti-Umayyad opposition or, at least, to people spreading negative traditions about an Umayyad. This is still too vague for use here though.

Then there is something which might be called, in analogy to Schacht's invention, the text common link. Sometimes entirely different texts have one particular detail in common. If we would then compare the isnād bundles of these texts we could see whether they also have one or several transmitters in common or at least share the place of origin. Now, an example of such a text common link was found in the traditions 3.1 en 6.7. In both cases we find images of horses with wings and in both cases we find

5   Islam LXVII, Heft 1

Hišām b. ʿUrwa, who died in 145/7, as the probable common link. Another, less clear, example is the occurrence of a *"ǧunub"*, someone in a state of major ritual impurity, as one of the things which make it forbidden for a muslim to enter a house, in tradition 1.1 and 1.3.5. Both these variants of the saying "Angels do not enter" originate in Kūfa. The last example concerns picturing trees. This aspect of the *Bilderverbot* is discussed in four traditions (1.3.6/4.3.1/6.8.2/6.8.3). The isnāds of these texts have in common that they probably originated in Baṣra or Kūfa. (In the isnāds of group 1.3.6 and 4.3.1 the same *kunya* Ibn abī Isḥāq, is mentioned but the Yaḥyā of group 4.3.1 is nowhere reported to be related to the Abu Isḥāq and Yūnus b. abī Isḥāq in 1.3.6)

A kind of relative dating following the several stages of the texts' development is also important, but this is still very difficult. Some texts are more crude and short and others polished and longer: the possibility that the shorter one is an abbreviation of the longer prevents us, however, from automatically concluding that the shorter text is the earlier.

The last way, I can think of, for dating with the matn contents is to try to date the traditions of the subjects that are sometimes dealt with in the same traditions as the *Bilderverbot*, the so called secondary subjects (cf. p. 55). After this, one would have a *terminus post quem* for the combining of the different tradition material in the present one.

3 Dating with the *isnād* form

For this aspect of dating I only used Schacht's common link theory, which I consider to be a possible help when dating, if accompanied by a study of all the other aspects of the tradition concerned. Of course there is also Schacht's assertion that *"isnāds* have a tendency to grow backwards" but most of the isnāds were too complete for using it. To state that the *isnāds* must be or relatively late date solely for that reason is still too vague to fix traditions to a certain period. The completeness of *isnāds* does not exclude the possibility, of course, that traditions developed very early, since there may be an old part of the *isnāds* which was later raised to the level of the Prophet[67]).

The following figures represent the number of *isnāds* and common links found: there are 41 groups of texts and in support of that 46 *isnād* bundles and 48 loose *isnāds*. In the *isnād* bundles I found 25 common links who were active in the spreading of 37 (or 40) traditions. In the other 6 bundles there is no or no clear common link. Of the loose *isnāds* 23 support more or less

---

[67]) Cf. G. H. A. JUNYBOLL, *Muslim Tradition*, see Index, under *"rafʿ"*.

loose and separate texts and 25 are extra to groups that also have an *isnād* bundle. It is remarkable that especially AḤMAD B. ḤANBAL often seems to be the "owner" of this type of extra *isnāds*. They furthermore occur especially in some historical works (the *Kitāb al-Maǧāzi* of AL-WĀQIDĪ and the *Akhbār Makka* of AL-AZRAQĪ). The isnāds of the "9" usually form very clear and decent isnād bundles (maybe too decent?).

With regard to the relation between the *isnāds* and the contents of the texts we can conclude by saying that there is usually a close relationship between the form of the *isnād* bundles and the number and degree of variants found in the texts. To put it differently, if the *isnāds* all come together beautifully in one common link, then it is usually a quite homogeneous group without too many major text variants (which might be an argument in favour of the common link theory) and when there are many variants in the text, the bundle usually shows a lot of separate and divergent *isnāds*.

4 Dating with the *isnād* contents

In this aspect of the study of traditions we are concerned with identifying the transmitters, and in particular the common links, finding data about their life and works and finding a clue in their lives or the time they lived in, which would reveal a relation between them and the tradition they are supposed to have transmitted. For the moment, however, this is too big a task, especially since, when a short résumé of someone's life was written in the biographical dictionaries, images appeared not to be the first subject an opinion would be given on.

In spite of these tasks not carried out, the great number of traditions has one big advantage. The fact is, of course, that SCHACHT's common link theory is still subject of heavy debates. But here one can make use of the great number of traditions to reduce the chance of misusing this theory. But putting all the dates of the supposed common links on a time-scale, I thought, these dates would maybe fall within a certain period. If not, either I could have misused the theory or it is not workable or the traditions concerning images came into existence over a very long period.

For establishing the biographical data of the transmitters, over 500, IBN HAǦAR's *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* was used. Then all the common links were put into three categories, common links (c. l.) with 2 or more partial common links (p. c. l.), with 1 p. c. l. and with no p. c. l. at all[68]). In the first

---

[68]) G. H. A. JUYNBOLL, *"Analysing isnāds in ḥadīth and akhbār literature"*, p. 2–7.

category there appeared to be 7 common-links related to 15 traditions, in the second 4, related to 8 traditions, and in the last 14, related to 14 (or 17) traditions. I will now list these (partial-)common links along with the figures which explain in how many traditions they are important or just transmitted. Herewith, I hope, an idea of the value of the list can be given. ("c.l. + 3 p.c.l. + 1 4.1c" means "x is common link with 3 partial common links and 1 single *isnād*, supporting tradition 4.1c" "c.l. + 10" means a "c.l. without p.c.l. but with 10 students").

Common links with 2 or more partial common links:
al-A'maš, Sulaymān b. Miḥrān, 61–147/8, Kūfa

c.l. + 3 p.c.l. + 1	4.1c	trsm. in 1 other trad.	

Ayyūb b. abī Tamīma, d. 125/31, Baṣra

c.l. + 2 p.c.l. + 1	2.4	c.l. + 1 p.c.l. + 8	4.2
c.l. + 1 p.c.l. + 5	4.3.2	trsm. in 4 other traditions	

Bukayr b. 'Abdallāh b. al-'Ašaǧǧ, d. 118/20/22/127, Medina

c.l. + 2 p.c.l.	1.2.1	? c.l.	2.6

trsm. in 2 other traditions

Dāwūd b. abī Hind, d. 139/41, Baṣra

c.l. + 2 p.c.l. + 2	3.2

Hišām b. 'Urwa, d. 145/7, ?

c.l. + 1 p.c.l. + 4	3.1	c.l. + 2 p.c.l. + 2	6.4
c.l. + 3	6.7		

Yaḥyā b. abī Kathīr, d. 129, ?

c.l. + 2 p.c.l. + 1	

al-Zuhrī, Ibn Šihāb, d. 123/4/5/6, Medina,

c.l. + 2 p.c.l.	1.1	c.l. + 1 p.c.l. + 3	1.3.4
c.l. + 4 p.c.l.	4.1a	trsm. in 4 other traditions	

Common links with 1 p.c.l.:
'Abd l-Raḥmān b. l-Qāsim, d. 126, Medina

c.l. + 1 p.c.l. + 1	3.6	c.l. + 1 p.c.l. + 2	4.1b

Abū Mu'āwiya, Muḥ. b. Khāzim, d. 195, Kūfa

c.l. + p.c.l. + 4	3.1	trsm. in 6 other traditions	

Šu'ba b. Ḥaǧǧāǧ, d. 160, Baṣra

c.l. + 10	1.1	c.l. + 1 p.c.l. + 4	3.4
c.l. + 6	6.1	c.l. + 4	6.5

trsm. in 2 other traditions

'Umāra b. l Qa'qā', d. ?, Kūfa

c.l. + p.c.l. + 3	4.4

Common links without p.c.l. and important p.c.l.'s:

'Abdallāh b. Naǧī, d. ?, Kūfa	c.l. + 4	1.3.5
'Abd l-Wārith b. Sa'īd, d. 179	c.l. + 4	3.3
Abū Isḥāq, 'Amr b. 'Abdallāh, d. 126/9, Kūfa	c.l. + 9 ?	1.3.6
Ḥanzala b. abī Sufyān, d. 151, Mecca	? c.l. + 3	7
Ibn Ǧuraǧ, 'Abd al-Mālik, 80–150, Mecca	c.l. + 3	2.1
trsm. in 4 other traditions	p.c.l. + 3	2.2
	c.l. + 2	2.9
Ibn abī Dhi'b, Muḥ. b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, 80–158, Medina		
trsm. in 5 other traditions	c.l. + 3	5.2
Ibn Wahb, 'Abdallāh, 125–197, Egypt	p.c.l.	1.1
	p.c.l.	1.3.4
Al-Layth b. Sa'd, 94–174/5, Egypt	p.c.l.	1.2.1
trsm. in 3 other traditions	c.l. + 9	6.2
Ma'mar b. Rašīd, d. 152/3/8, Baṣra	p.c.l.	1.1
trsm. in 10 other traditions		
Mālik b. Anas, d. 176, Medina	c.l. + 5	3.5
trsm. in 2 other traditions	c.l. + 4	5.1
Muḥammad b. Fuḍayl, d. 195, Kūfa	p.c.l.	4.4
trsm. in 1 other tradition		
Muḥammad b. Ǧa'far, d. 192/3, Baṣra	p.c.l.	3.4
trsm. in 5 other traditions		
Muḥammad b. Isḥāq, d. 150, Medina, Iraq	c.l. + 2	2.8
trsm. in 2 other traditions		
Nu'aym b. Ḥakīm, d. 148, Madā'in	c.l. + 2	2.10
Sa'īd b. abī 'Arūba, d. 156/7, Baṣra	c.l. + 5	4.3
Sa'īd b. Yasār, d. 116/7/20, Medina	c.l. + 2	3.6
trsm. in 1 other tradition		
Sufyān al-Thawrī, d. 161, Baṣra	c.l. + 5	6.5
trsm. in 3 other traditions		
'Ubaydallāh b. 'Umar, d. 144/5/7, Medina	c.l. + 3	4.2
trsm. in 2 other traditions		
Usāma b. Zayd, d. ?, Medina	p.c.l.	3.6
Yūnus b. abī Isḥāq, d. 159, Kūfa	p.c.l.	1.3.6

If the data of these supposed common links, of different value, are put on a time-scale it appears that they all died between about 120 and 180 A.H. (737–796 A.D.) and three even in about 195 A.H. If we then subtract 20 years to come to an average peak period of these transmitters we come to a time when our traditions emerged (i. e. the final stage that our texts represent) of *between about 100 and 160 A.H. c.q. 720 and 775 A.D.*

Now first of all the 20 years subtracted from the date of death of the common links is rather trivial since such information is not always reliable and the 20 years is a guess. We therefore could also take "740 until 800" as a sort of terminus ante quem. And there is also the general objection to be taken into consideration that one cannot date with isnāds and the common link theory. Against this one could bring forward that the figures show that

a) there are a lot of common links (which would not convince those people who are not convinced by this theory),

b) many of them had a considerable number of pupils, relations often attested to in several, different and possibly "independent", image-traditions. This would be an argument in favour of the historicity of their, let us say, active role in the spreading of the traditions because "the more transmission lines come together in one transmitter" . . . "the more this transmitter and his transmission have a claim to historicity"[69]).

c) they transmitted, c. q. are c.l. or p.c.l., in several, different, traditions, which also strengthens their claim to reality.

One could furthermore say that it must be more than mere coincidence that if someone, not very experienced in dating isnāds, gathers and groups 325 isnāds, makes bundles and appoints common links in them, that he finds that 25 more or less clear common links have spread 37 (40) traditions within the same period of 100 to 160 A.H. The value of this argument is strongly diminished, however, by the fact that one would probably have the same findings with so many other subjects, due to the fact that this is the period in which large numbers of traditions came into circulation and isnads became widely used. So in fact there is nothing new to this dating, except that it is different from Parets dating and that different arguments are used.[70]). Something one should not forget, of course, is that we are only talking about dating isnāds here and not texts, but for the moment this is as far and precise as we can go. This dating is much later than Paret's dating (675–725) and is more in line with that of CRESWELL and O. GRABAR (second half of the eight century)[71]).

---

[69]) G. H. Juynboll, "Analysing isnāds in ḥadīth and akhbār literature", p. 2.

[70]) An important argument I owe to Dr. F. Zimmermann, Oxford. Cf. also Schacht, J., The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, Oxford, 1967, p. 176.

[71]) With this dating the decree of Yazīd II (720–724) would mark the beginning of the period in which the traditions about images started to come into existence. It is important to note, however, that Yazīd's actions were so remarkable because they were quite rare compared to those of his colleagues at the throne. If we talk about an offence against the prohibition this depends largely on our views concerning the time of origin and the extent of influence of the scholars of law on society. To start with the latter: did the prohibition reach the people, and the caliph, in their

5 The place of origin

The last aspect to be discussed here is the place of origin of the traditions. This is related to finding the common link but if there is not a clear one, one could make a start by finding out what places the main transmitters mentioned in the isnād came from. Of course several transmitters lived in an number of ḥadīth centres, but with the information in the *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* of IBN ḤAǦAR an average can be deduced that will not be too far from the truth. A short and general survey will be presented here to give an idea on where the traditions originated.

It became clear that most of the great ḥadīth centres, i.e. Mecca, Medina, Baṣra en Kūfa and to a lesser degree Egypt were involved in spreading traditions about images; Syrian traditions were not found.

Mecca: there are only 4 traditions that are unmistakably Meccan and they are, as was to be expected, traditions about the Kaʿba (2.7 *nuṣub/ṣanam*/2.9 horns/2.10 miscellaneous) or the, in 2.1 still, unidentified, *"al-*

---

every day life or only as something the Byzantines or their own scholars were disputing about? And suppose it reached them, was the influence of the scholars such that if we see a palace without images of animate beings, we can say that this must be because of the prohibition? Maybe there was, next to the old christian, non-figurative, decorative tradition in the Near East (KING, G. R. D., *"Islam, Iconoclasm, and the declaration of Doctrine"*, p. 72, 75) also an Arabian one. And with regard to the time of origin: a prohibition issued by Muḥammad makes every image of an animate being at least after 632 a transgression but with my dating maybe even until half-way the eighth century one could have made images without being blamed for it. There might be several, internal and external, reasons for the development of an anti-image feeling. It might, of course, be a reaction to the Byzantine use or destruction of images, but it might just as well have arisen out of fear for idolatry, a very important qurʾānic theme (wherever that came from) and therefore it might just as well be an independent use of that theme as an "old Judaic ground" (CRONE, P., *"Islam, Judeo-Christianity and Byzantine Iconoclasm"*, p. 66); two similar reactions dot not have to be as related as suggested. And also a "straight carry-over from rabbinical to Islamic rules of desecration by mutilation or disrespect" (CRONE, op. cit., p. 66, note 32) or indications to the fact that the "Arabs took the Mosaic prohibition seriously from the start" (p. 66) could not be found, in our texts at least. It appeared that these rules of desecration, which could be Judaic, and the reasons for the prohibition are found in a very small number of traditions and were really elaborated upon probably only in later legal reasoning (cf. e.g. AL-NAWAWĪ (d. 1278) and AL-QĀḌĪ (1088–1149) mentioning fruit-bearing trees being allowed to depict whether they are not as such in our traditions). I agree, however, with Crone that there must be some sort of relation between the iconoclastic tendencies among the Arabs, Jews and Byzantines.

bayt". It is remarkable that the traditions in which it is said that there were images in the Ka'ba and that they were obliterated by Muḥammad or 'Umar stem from Medina or Baṣra and not from Mecca. The Meccan traditions are the more legendary traditions found in historical works.

Medina: the city with the greatest number of traditions, 23. Of all the different groups of traditions a number of them originated in Medina. However, the character of these traditions varies too much to establish some sort of common characteristic.

Baṣra: there are 14 traditions that stem from Baṣra and they also have too little in common to establish some sort of common characteristic.

Kūfa: as was to be expected: all the traditions in which 'Alī, Fāṭima, Ḥasan or Ḥusayn are mentioned stem from Kūfa[72]) (i. e. 6 of the 9 Kūfan traditions). Tradition 4.4, as we have seen in the discussion of Paret's dating, seems to fit in Kūfa because of its anti-Marwān contents, since it was the centre of anti-umayyad opposition. The variants of the well-known saying "Angels do not enter" in which an impure person (ǧunub) is mentioned (1.1 and 1.3.5) also originated in Kūfa.

Egypt: there is only one tradition, about selling aṣnām, khinzīr, mayta and khamr and using and selling fat of mayta, by Jews, that originated in Egypt. The rest of the traditions that end in Egypt originated in Medina.

In future research a dating based on all aspects of the traditions out of all
early Islamic sources could be made. Perhaps parts of traditions can
be traced back to their, eventual non-Muslim, origin, circumstances
and reasons for the development of the prohibition against
making images can be found and maybe the stages in the
development of the traditions can be dated and linked
to certain people. External evidence should also
be studied and maybe then something can be
said about the relation between the Islamic
and the Jewish and Byzantine attitude
towards images.

Daan van Reenen
Amsterdam

---

[72]) Juynboll, G. H. A., Muslim Tradition, p. 48, 59 ea., and EI, new ed., V, p. 349: "Kūfa".

Appendix I: list of the traditions

1 "Angels do not enter"
1.1 "Angels do not enter"
1.2.1 "Angels do not enter", Busr, raqm
1.2.2 "Angels do not enter", Rafiʾ
1.3 "Angels do not enter", Ǧabrīl, dogs
Other sayings "Angels do not enter"
are found in 2.6/3.5/3.6/6.6

2 al-bayt or al-Bayt/al-Kaʿba
2.1 no ṣuwar in al-Bayt
2.2 al-Bayt/al-Kaʿba, ʿUmar
2.3 al-Kaʿba, ʾUsāma, khalaqa
2.4 al-Bayt/al-Kaʿba, Ibrāhīm, ṣalāt
2.5 al-Bayt/al-Kaʿba, ʿĪsā and Maryam
2.6 al-Bayt, Ibrāhīm, Maryam, "Angels"
(2.7 al-Bayt/al-Kaʿba, ṣanam, nuṣub, 360)
(2.8 al-Bayt, wooden dove)
(2.9 al-Kaʿba, horns)
2.10 al-Bayt/al-Kaʿba, miscellaneous

3 Images on fabrics, ʿĀʾiša
3.1 Durnūk, winged horses
3.2 Sitr, ṭāʾir, dunyā
3.3 Qirām, ṣalāt
3.4 Thawb, ṣalāt, pillows
3.5 Numruqa, "Angels do not enter", "Aḥyū mā khalaqtum"

3.6 Pillows miscellaneous
Another ʿĀʾiša-story is found in 4.1

4 Sayings
4.1 "Ašadd ʿadhāban"
4.2 "Aḥyū mā khalaqtum"
4.3.1 Ṣūra, nafakha rūḥ
4.3.2 Taḥallama, istamaʿa, nafakha rūḥ
4.4 Man aẓlamu, khalaqa ka-khalqī
Other sayings are found in 1/2.3/6.4

5 Visits
5.1 Abū Ṭalḥa, taṣāwīr, raqm
5.2 Ibn ʿAbbās, istabraq, kānūn, taṣāwīr 2.6
Other visits: in 1.2.1/1.2.2/4.1/4.3.1/4.4

6 Miscellaneous
6.1 Laʿana al-muṣawwir, thaman al-damm
6.2 Khinzīr, mayta, khamr, aṣnām
(6.3 Taṣlīb)
6.4 Kanīsa, Ḥabaša, taṣāwīr
6.5 Qabr, ṣūra
6.6 Invitation to dinner, taṣāwīr
6.7 Banāt of ʿĀʾiša
6.8 Various prohibitions

7 Nahā ʾan tuḍraba al-ṣuwar

Appendix II: a list of ḥadīth works used, with their abbreviations, and the places of the traditions in these ḥadīth works.

ʿAbd al-Razzāq, al-Ṣanʿānī, al-Muṣannaf, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī, Beiroet, 1970–2, 11 vols., **ARZQ**
Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo, 1935, 4 parts, 2 vols., **AD**
Abū Ḥanīfa, Kitāb musnad ḥibr al-umma wa imām al-aʾimma al-imām al-aʿẓam Abī Ḥanīfa al-Nuʿmān, Cairo, 1327 A.H., **Abū Ḥan**
Azraqī, al-, Akhbār Makka, ed. Rušdī al-Ṣāliḥ Mulḥaṣ, Madrid, 1935, **AZR**
Bayhaqī, al-, Kitāb al-Sunan al-Kubrā, Hyderabad, 1344–55, 10 vols., **BAY**
Bukhārī, al-, Receuil des Traditions Mahometanes, par Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī, ed. M. L. Krehl, Leiden, 1862–1908, 4 vols., **BU**
Dārimī, al-, Sunan, Cawnpore, 1293 A.H., **DA**

Ḥumaydī, ʿAbd Allāh b. al-Zubayr al-, Musnad, ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī, Cairo, 1380–2 A.H., 11 vols., **HUM**

Ibn abī Šayba, al-Muṣannaf, Hyderabad, 1966–71, 5 vols., **IAŠAY**

Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad, Musnad, Cairo, 1313 A.H., 6 vols., **AbH**

Ibn Hišām, Kitāb Sīrat Rasūl Allāh, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen, 1858–60, 3 vols., **IH**

Ibn Māǧa, Sunan, ed. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī, Cairo, 1952, 3, 2 vols., **IM**

Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr, ed. Sachau et alii, Leiden, 1905–17, 9 vols., **IS, Tab**

Mālik b. Anas, al-Muwaṭṭaʾ, ed. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī, Cairo, 1951, 2 vols., **MUW**

Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, ed. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī, Cairo, 1955, 6, 5 vols., **MU**

Nasāʾī, al-, Sunan bi-šarḥ al-Suyūṭī, 1348, 8 vols., **NAS**

Rabīʿb Ḥabīb, al-, Ḥašiyat al-Ǧāmiʿ al-Ṣaḥīḥ Musnad, ed. ʿAbd Allāh b. Ḥumayd al-Sālimī, Cairo, 1348 A.H., 2 vols., **Rabīʿ**

Ṭabarī, al-, Ǧāmiʿ al-Bayān ʿan taʾwīl al-Qurān al-Karīm, Cairo, 1954, 30 vols., **Tab-Taf** and **Tafsīr**

Ṭayālisī, al-, Musnad, Hyderabad, 1321 A.H., **TAY**

Tirmidhī, al-, Ṣaḥīḥ bi-šarḥ Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. al-ʿArabī al-Mālikī, Cairo, 1350–2 A.H., 13 parts, 7 vols., **TIR**

Wāqidī, Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al, Kitāb al-Maġāzī, ed. J. Marsden and B. Jones, London, 1966, 3 vols., **WAQ**

In the case of the "9", except for AbH, the first number refers to the "*kitāb*", the second to the "*bāb*". In AbH and other works the first, roman, number refers to the part and the second number to the page or, in the case of ARZQ, HUM and TAY, to the number of the tradition. The letters after numbers, not consequently given, refer to the number of the tradition on a page or in a "*bāb*". A "P" after traditions means that PARET also used and listed this tradition in his article "*Die Entstehungszeit des islamischen Bilderverbots*" (p. 180f.).

1.1

1) BU 59: 7	P	15) AD 1: 89	P
2) BU 59: 17	P	16) AD 31: 45a	P
3) BU 64: 12	P	17) IM 32: 44a	P
4) BU 77: 88	P	18) IM 32: 44b	P
5) MU 37: 83	P	19) AbH I: 139b	P
6) MU 37: 84	P	20) AbH I: 83	P
7) MU 37: 102	P	21) AbH I: 104	P
8) DA 19: 34	P	22) AbH IV: 28b	P
9) NAS 48: 111a	P	23) AbH IV: 29	P
10) NAS 48: 111b	P	24) AbH IV: 30	P
11) NAS 1: 167	P	25) TAY 110	
12) NAS 42: 11a	P	26) TAY 1228	
13) NAS 42: 11b	P	27) IAŠHAY V: 410d	
14) TIR 41: 44	P	28) IAŠHAY V: 410c	
		29) IAŠHAY V: 410a	

30) ARZQ 19483	
31) HUM I: 431	

1.2.1

1) BU 59:7	P
2) BU 77: 92b	P
3) MU 37: 85	P
4) NAS 48: 111d	P
5) AD 31: 45d	P
6) AbH IV: 28a	P
7) MU 37: 86	P

1.2.2

1) MUW 54: 6	P
2) AbH III: 90	P
3) TIR 41: 44	P

1.3.1
1) BU 77: 94   P
2) BU 59: 7 d   P

1.3.2
1) AbH VI: 142, 3   P
2) IM 32: 44 c   P
3) MU 37: 81   P

1.3.3
1) AbH V: 203   P
2) TAY 627

1.3.4
1) MU 37: 82   P
2) NAS 42: 11 b   P
3) AbH VI: 330
4) AD 31: 45 f   P
5) NAS 42: 9   P

1.3.5
1) AbH I: 150   P
2) AbH I: 148   P
3) AbH I: 146   P
4) AbH I: 107   P
5) AbH I: 85
6) AbH I: 80   P

1.3.6
1) AD 31: 45 g   P
2) AbH II: 305   P
3) AbH II: 390   P
4) AbH II: 478   P
5) ARZQ 19488, 9
6) AbH II: 308   P
7) NAS 48: 114 b   P
8) TIR 41: 44   P
9) Abū Ḥan. 42

2.1
1) TIR 22: 18 a   P
2) AbH III: 384   P
3) AbH III: 335 (= 2.2) P

2.2
1) AD 31: 45 e   P
2) AbH III: 336   P
3) AbH III: 383   P
4) IS, Tab II. I: 102   P
5) AZR 168 e

6) AZR 168 f
7) AbH III: 335 (= 2.1) P
8) AbH III: 396   P

2.3
1) WAQ 834 b
2) TAY 623 g

2.4
1) BU 24: 54   P
2) BU 64: 48 b   P
3) AD 11: 92 a   P
4) AbH I: 334   P
5) AZR 169 d   (= 2.9)
6) IH 821, 2
7) BU 60: 8 b   P
8) AbH I: 365   P
9) ARZQ 19485

2.5
1) AZR 168 c
2) AZR 168 g, 169 a
3) WAQ 833, 4
4) AZR 169 b
5) IH 821 c
6) AZR 165,6

2.6
1) BU 60: 8   P
2) AbH I: 277 b   P

2.7
1) BU 46: 32
2) BU 64: 48 a
3) BU 65: S17, b.12
4) MU 32: 87
5) TIR 44: S17: 81
6) AbH I: 377, 8
7) HUM I: 86
8) TabTaf S17: 81
9) AZR 121 b
10) IH 824, 5
11) AZR 120, 1 a
12) AZR 121 c
13) WAQ 832
14) AZR 121 d
15) WAQ 830-2 a
16) AbH II: 538
17) IS, Tab II. I: 98 f

2.8
1) IH 820, 1
2) IM 25: 28
3) AZR 169

2.9
1) ARZQ 9083
2) AbH V: 380
3) AZR 223
4) HUM I: 565
5) AbH V: 379
6) AbH IV: 68
7) ARZQ 9082
8) AZR 224 a
9) ARZQ 9081
10) AZR 169 d (= 2.4)
11) AD 11: 92

2.10
1) AZR 168 b
2) AZR 167, 8 a
3) BU 64: 62
4) AbH I: 84   P
5) AbH I: 151
6) AZR 119, 120 a
7) AZR 122, 123 a
8) AZR 123 b
9) AZR 123 c
10) AZR 123 d
11) AZR 123 e
12) IS, Tab II. I: 99

3.1
1) BU 77: 91 b   P
2) MU 37: 90   P
3) AbH VI: 281
4) AbH VI: 229
5) NAS 48: 111 f   P
6) AbH VI: 208

3.2
1) MU 37: 88   P
2) MU 37: 89   P
3) NAS 48: 111 g   P
4) AbH VI: 49   P
5) TIR 35: 32
6) AbH VI: 53   P
7) AbH VI: 241
8) AD 31: 43

3.3
1) BU 77: 93 — P
2) AbH III: 283 — P
3) BU 8: 15 — P
4) AbH III: 151

3.4
1) MU 37: 93 — P
2) NAS 9: 12 — P
3) NAS 48: 111h — P
4) DA 19: 33 — P
5) TAY 1423
6) AbH VI: 172 — P

3.5
1) BU 34: 40 — P
2) BU 59: 7a — P
3) BU 67: 76 — P
4) BU 77: 92a — P
5) BU 77: 95 — P
6) MU 37: 96a — P
7) MU 37: 96b — P
8) MUW 54: 8
9) AbH VI: 246 — P
10) TAY 1435
11) Rabiʻ I: 402

3.6
1) AbH VI: 116
2) AbH VI: 112
3) BU 46: 32 — P
4) MU 32: 85 — P
5) AbH I: 247b
6) IS, Tab VIII: 334
7) MU 37: 94 — P
8) AbH VI: 214 — P
9) MU 37: 95 — P
10) NAS 48: 111i — P
11) AbH VI: 103 — P
12) MU 37: 87 — P
13) AD 31: 45b — P

4.1
1) BU 78: 75 — P
2) MU 37: 91 — P
3) NAS 48: 112b — P
4) AbH VI: 86 — P
5) AbH VI: 199 — P
6) HUM I: 251a

7) ARZQ 19484
8) AbH VI: 85
9) BU 77: 91a — P
10) MU 37: 92 — P
11) NAS 48: 112a — P
12) NAS 48: 113 — P
13) AbH VI: 36 — P
14) AbH VI: 83
15) HUM I: 251b
16) AbH VI: 219
17) BU 77: 89a — P
18) MU 37: 98 — P
19) NAS 48: 111a — P
20) AbH I: 375 — P
21) AbH II: 26
22) HUM I: 117
23) AbH I: 426
24) AbH I: 407
25) ARZQ 19487

4.2
1) BU 97: 56c — P
2) BU 97: 56b — P
3) NAS 48: 113e — P
4) IM 4: 215
5) AbH II: 101
6) AbH II: 125, 6
7) AbH II: 380
8) AbH VI: 70
9) AbH VI: 80
10) AbH VI: 223
11) AbH II: 4 — P
12) AbH II: 141
13) ARZQ 19490
14) BU 77: 89b — P
15) MU 37: 97 — P
16) NAS 48: 113 — P
17) AbH II: 20
18) AbH II: 55
19) AbH II: 139
20) ARZQ 19492
21) AbH II: 336
22) TIR 37: 103

4.3.1
1) NAS 48: 113b — P
2) NAS 48: 113c — P
3) BU 77: 97 — P

4) MU 37: 100 — P
5) NAS 48: 113a — P
6) AbH I: 350 — P
7) AbH I: 208
8) AbH I: 241 — P
9) AbH I: 360 — P
10) AbH II: 145
11) BU 34: 104 — P
12) MU 37: 99 — P

4.3.2
1) BU 91: 45 — P
2) BU 91: 45b — P
3) TIR 22: 19 — P
4) AbH I: 216 — P
5) AbH I: 246 — P
6) AbH I: 359 — P
7) ARZQ 19491
8) AD 40: 88 — P
9) AbH II: 504 — P
10) HUM I: 531

4.4
1) BU 77: 90b — P
2) MU 37: 101 — P
3) AbH II: 232 — P
4) AbH II: 391a — P
5) AbH II: 391b — P
6) AbH II: 259 — P
7) AbH II: 400, 1 — P
8) AbH II: 527 — P
9) BU 97: 56 — P

5.1
1) BU 54: 7 — P
2) NAS 48: 111c — P
3) TIR 22: 18b — P
4) Rabiʻ I: 405–7
5) AbH II: 486 — P

5.2
1) TAY 2730
2) AbH I: 319, 20 — P
3) AbH I: 352, 3 — P

6.1
1) BU 77: 96 — P
2) BU 68: 51 — P
3) BU 34: 25 — P

4) BU 34: 113
5) AbH IV: 308   P
6) AbH IV: 309   P
7) AbH I: 150

6.2
1) BU 34: 112
2) NAS 41: 8
3) AbH III: 326
4) AbH III: 324
5) NAS 44: 93
6) AD 22: 64
7) IM 12: 11
8) TIR 14: 61
9) BAY VI: 12
10) BAY VI: 12, 3
11) AbH III: 340

6.3
1) BU 77: 90a   P
2) AD 31: 44
3) AbH VI: 53
4) AbH VI: 140
5) AbH VI: 216
6) AbH VI: 225
7) AbH VI: 237
8) AbH VI: 252

6.4
1) BU 8: 48   P
2) BU 8: 54   (= 6.8) P
3) BU 23: 71   P
4) BU 63: 37   P
5) MU 5: 16   P
6) MU 5: 17   P
7) MU 5: 18   P
8) NAS 8: 13b   P
9) AbH VI: 51   P

6.5
1) MU 11: 93   P
2) NAS 21: 99   P
3) TIR 8: 26   P
4) AbH I: 89
5) AbH I: 96   P
6) AbH 128, 9   P
7) AbH I: 111
8) AbH I: 145
9) AD 20: 68   P
10) AbH I: 87a   P
11) AbH I: 87b   P
12) AbH I: 138, 9   P
13) AbH I: 139c
14) AbH I: 150   P
15) AbH I: 139a

6.6
1) ARZQ 19486
2) NAS 48: 11e   P
3) IM 29: 56a   P
4) IM 29: 56b   P
5) BU 67: 76   (= 3.5) P

6.7
1) AD 40: 54a   P
2) AD 40: 54b   P
3) BU 78: 81
4) IM 9: 50

6.8
1) IM 32: 44d   P
2) ARZQ 19493
3) ARZQ 19494
4) ARZQ 19495
5) AZR 168d
6) ARZQ 19496
7) AbH II: 288, 9
8) BU 8: 54   (= 6.4)

7
1) AbH II: 25
2) BU 72: 35

PARET mentions two places, AbH I: 306, nr. 8 (his group V: 16) and AbH I: 424, nr. 6 (his group VII: 2), in which no traditions about images were found