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David Powers' has provided a response to Agostino Cilardo’s review article “The Adoption of Zayd and the Finality of the Islamic Prophec,” in CIS issue (11.1, 2015, pp. 109–120). He writes:

1. The correct title of my book is Zayd, not Zayd: The Little Known Story of Muḥammad's Adopted Son.

2. On p. 112, the reviewer claims that I mistakenly claimed that Zayd is said to have had a side lock in order to “stress the dependence of Islam on Judaism.” Ibn Asakir, Ta’rikh Madinat Dimashq, vol. 19, p. 3, line 11 reads as follows:

   absara rasul allah – salla allahu alayhi wa-sallam – Zayd b. Haritha ghulaman dha dhu’aba ...

3. On three occasions, the reviewer attributes to me the claim that the idea that true prophecy belongs to a single family is “Biblical” (p. 115, line 7 from bottom, p 117, line 4) or “Jewish” (p. 117, line 16). Nowhere in my book do I make such a claim. The idea is Qur’anic, not biblical. See pp. 109ff:

   a. “The Qur’an teaches that biblical figures…”
   b. “The Qur’an suggests ... that prophecy is the exclusive possession of a single, divinely privileged lineage”
   c. “In the Qur’anic worldview, true prophecy is the exclusive possession of a single family”
   d. “The Qur’anic representation of prophecy as a biblical office”