

# SHĪ'Ī NARRATOR CRITICISM

A Critical Study of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī  
and Abū l-Qāsim al-Khūī

By:

Sa'd Rāshid 'Awaḍ al-Shanfā

[WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM](http://WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM)

## Transliteration key

أ- 'ā	ض - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ṣ
ت - t	ع - 'c
ث - th	غ - gh
ج - j	ف - f
ح - ḥ	ق - q
خ - kh	ك - k
د - d	ل - l
ذ - dh	م - m
ر - r	ن - n
ز - z	و - w, ū
س - s	ه - h
ش - sh	ي - y, ī
ص - ṣ	

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>1</b>
The Difficulty, Significance and Objectives of this Study	1
Significance of the Study	2
Core Areas of Research	3
Previous Research	4
1. The Early Period	4
2. The Pre-modern Period	5
3. The Modern Period	6
<b>Introductory Chapter</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Historical Development of Literature on the Sciences of Narrator</b>	
<b>Evaluation According to the Imāmī Shī'ah</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>1.0 Reviewing the claim that attributes the science of ḥadīth narrator</b>	
<b>criticism to the Ahl al-Bayt</b>	<b>14</b>
The first proof	14
Objections to the first proof	16
The second proof	18
Objections to the second proof	19
The third proof	21
Objections to the third proof	21
<b>2.0 A historical overview and appraisal of the biographical works authored</b>	
<b>by the Shī'ah</b>	<b>24</b>
The Shī'ah conceding to their books being lost	26
Presentation and critique of the Shī'ah's primary works in narrator evaluation	32
1. <i>Rijāl al-Barqī</i> by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khālīd al-Barqī (d. 264/74/80 A.H)	32
2. <i>Rijāl al-Kashshī</i> by Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Kashshī Abū 'Amr	34
3. <i>Al-Fihrist</i> by Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H)	43
4. <i>Rijāl al-Ṭūsī</i> (Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī)	44
5. <i>Fihrist Asmā' Muṣannifi al-Shī'ah/Rijāl al-Najjāshī</i> by Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn al-'Abbās al-Najjāshī (d. 540 A.H)	46

6. <i>Al-Rijāl li Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī</i> (also called <i>al-Ḍu'afā'</i> ) by Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn	49
What can we determine from these overall numbers?	50
1. <i>Risālah</i> of Abū Ghālīb al-Zurārī	54
2. <i>Mashyakhat al-Ṭūsī fī Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām</i>	57
3. <i>Mashyakhat al-Faqīh</i> (Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī)	59
The phase of the latter-day scholars' works (sixth century)	60
1. <i>Al-Fihrist</i> by Muntakhab al-Dīn 'Alī ibn Muwaffaq al-Dīn 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 548 A.H)	61
2. <i>Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā'</i> by Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī, known as Ibn Shahr Āshūb (d. 588 A.H)	61
The phase of the seventh century	62
1. <i>Ḥall al-Ishkāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl</i> (Ibn Ṭāwūs)	63
2. <i>Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd</i> by Taqīyy al-Dīn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī (d. 707 A.H)	64
3. <i>Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl</i> by Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī	67
The phase after the seventh century	67
<b>3.0 The lack of sciences by the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah in the field of 'ilm al-rijāl</b>	<b>71</b>
3.1 The disregard for death dates	71
3.2 The disregard for tadlīs and mudallisīn	72
<b>4.0 The Imāmī Shī'ah's lacking in the sciences of taṣḥīḥ, taḍ'īf, and ta'līl</b>	<b>77</b>
4.1 The lack of effort expended by the Imāmiyyah in making taṣḥīḥ and taḍ'īf of aḥādīth	77
4.2 The disregard for collecting the various chains of ḥadīth and explaining its hidden defects ('ilal)	91
4.2.1 Hidden defects and anomalies ( <i>al-'ilal wa al-shudhūdh</i> )	91
4.2.2 The issue of collecting narrations ( <i>jam' al-turuq</i> )	95
<b>5.0 The absence of writing in the sciences of Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth except in later times</b>	<b>99</b>
When did the Imāmiyyah write about the science of Muṣṭalaḥ?	106
The first opinion	107
The second opinion	120
The third opinion	121

The fourth opinion	123
The fifth opinion	124
<b>6.0 A biography of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī and an exposition of their creed and respective methodologies in their works</b>	<b>133</b>
6.1 Biography of al-Ḥillī and his methodology in <i>Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl</i>	133
His name	133
His birth	133
His status among the Imāmiyyah	133
His teachers	135
His students	135
His writings	136
His death	138
A description of the work <i>Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl fī Maʿrifat al-Rijāl</i>	139
Two points of caution regarding the work al-Khulāṣah	140
6.2 Biography of al-Khūṭī and an exposition of his methodology in <i>Muʿjam al-Rijāl</i>	142
His Name	142
His Birth	142
His Emigration	142
His Teachers	143
His Authorizations to Transmit ( <i>Ijāzāt</i> )	144
His Teaching	144
His Writings	144
His Students	145
His Death	146
Some Statements Regarding Him	146
An Introduction to al-Khūṭī's Work <i>Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth</i> and a Detailed Explanation of the Ṭabaqāt of Narrators	147
The Number of Volumes	147
The Number of Biographies	148
Al-Khūṭī's Methodology	148
<b>Chapter One - Mujmal (general) Tawthiq between al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī</b>	<b>150</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>151</b>

<b>1.1 Tawthīq of a narrator on account of him being one of the teachers of al-Najjāshī in his work Rijāl al-Najjāshī (d. 450 AH)</b>	<b>152</b>
A critique of this principle	156
<b>1.2 Tawthīq of a narrator on account of him being in the asānīd of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī’s Tafsīr</b>	<b>165</b>
A critique of this principle	169
<b>1.3 Tawthīq of a narrator on account of him being in the asānīd of the book Kāmil al-Ziyārāt</b>	<b>178</b>
A critique of this principle	181
A critique against those who say that the tawthīq refers to all narrators of <i>Kāmil al-Ziyārāt</i> (the second phase)	182
A critique against the opinion that the tawthīq refers to all of the author’s teachers (the third phase)	185
<b>1.4 Tawthīq of a narrator on account of Ibn al-Walīd including him from the book Nawādir al-Ḥikmah and him deeming weak those who he excluded</b>	<b>191</b>
Critiquing those who make tawthīq of the narrators who included in <i>Nawādir al-Ḥikmah</i>	195
The first objection	195
The second objection	195
The third objection	196
The fourth objection	197
The fifth objection	198
The sixth objection	199
<b>Chapter Two - Between al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī: The Critics Whose Statements in al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl Are Relied Upon</b>	<b>204</b>
<b>2.1 The critics of the Shī‘ah Imāmiyyah whose statements are relied upon in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl</b>	<b>205</b>
2.1.1 Al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ	205
The position of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī regarding the statements of tawthīq of al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ	206
The position of al-Khūṭī regarding the statements of tawthīq of al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ	207
2.1.2 Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Najjāshī (d. 450 AH)	208

2.1.3 Al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān	210
2.1.4 The Qūmmīs	213
2.1.5 Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī	218
The Imāmī scholars' position regarding Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's work	221
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī	224
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī	226
2.1.6 Al-'Aqīqī	230
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl from al-'Aqīqī	231
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding the statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl from al-'Aqīqī	234
2.1.7 Al-Barqī (d. 274 AH)	236
What is the opinion of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūṭ regarding the statements of his tawthīq?	237
The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the jarḥ and ta'dīl of narrators of al-Barqī	237
The opinion of al-Khūṭ regarding the jarḥ and ta'dīl of narrators of al-Barqī	238
2.1.8 Al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 AH)	239
<b>2.2 The non-Imāmī critics whose statements are relied upon in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl according to the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah</b>	<b>241</b>
2.2.1 Ibn 'Uqdah (d. 332 AH)	241
1. The opinion of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding Ibn 'Uqdah	241
2. The opinion of the Imāmiyyah regarding Ibn 'Uqdah	243
The attempt of some Imāmī researchers to exploit Ibn 'Uqdah in order to propagate their views	244
The person of Ibn 'Uqdah	246
3. The opinions of both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding Ibn 'Uqdah	248
3.1 The opinion of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī regarding Ibn 'Uqdah	248
Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī relying on what is mentioned by Ibn 'Uqdah	248
Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī not relying on the statements of Ibn 'Uqdah, or regarding them as merely lending weight to others' opinions	250
3.2 Al-Khūṭ's opinion regarding the statements of Ibn 'Uqdah related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl	251

2.2.2 Ibn Faḍḍāl (al-Taymalī)	256
1. The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the statements of tawthīq and narrations of Ibn Faḍḍāl	260
2. The opinion of al-Khūī regarding the statements of tawthīq of Ibn Faḍḍāl	262
2.2.3 Ibn Numayr	264
1. Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī's position on the statements of tawthīq of Ibn Numayr	266
2. Abū al-Qasim al-Khūī's position on the statements of tawthīq of Ibn Numayr	267
<b>2.3 The Methodology of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī when the scholars' statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl contradict</b>	<b>269</b>
The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī on the differences of al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl	275
1. Al-Ḥillī	275
2. The position of al-Khūī	278
<b>2.4 The position of al-Khūī in light of the scholars' statements of tawthīq before him</b>	<b>289</b>
2.4.1 The position of al-Khūī on the statements of the early generation of scholars	289
2.4.2 The position of al-Khūī on the statements of the latter-day scholars	291
2.4.3 The position of al-Khūī on the statements of al-Ḥillī regarding narrators	296
<b>Chapter Three - The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding the narrations of their adversaries in creed (the people of heresy—in their view) and those who are wanting in integrity ('adālah)</b>	<b>298</b>
<b>3.0 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding the narrations of their adversaries in creed (the people of heresy, in their view), and those who are wanting in 'adālah</b>	<b>299</b>
<b>3.1 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding their intra-creedal adversaries from the Imāmiyyah Shī'ah</b>	<b>303</b>
3.1.1 The Mukhammisah and the 'Alīyyā'īyyah	303
3.1.2 The Mushabbihah and the Muḥassimah	307



The position of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī regarding narrations from the Mushabbihah/Mujassimah	310
Al-Khūṭ's position on the Mushabbihah	311
3.1.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the <i>Ghulāt</i> (Extremists): the Ahl al-Ṭayyārah, the Ahl al-Irtifā', and the Mufawwiḍah	313
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the extremists	317
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding the extremists	319
3.1.4 The position of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the claimants of the Bābiyyah	325
<b>3.2 Intra-creedal adversaries from the non-Imāmī Shī'ah</b>	<b>330</b>
3.2.1 The Wāqifah and the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding them	330
The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ on the narrations of the Wāqifah	337
1. The position of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī on the Wāqifah	337
2. The position of al-Khūṭ on the Wāqifah	339
3.2.2 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the Faṭḥiyyah	341
1. The position of al-Ḥillī on the Faṭḥiyyah	346
ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukayr	346
Abān ibn ʿUthmān al-Aḥmar	347
2. The methodology of al-Khūṭ in dealing with narrators of the Faṭḥiyyah	354
3.2.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the Kaysāniyyah	355
1. The position of al-Ḥillī on narrators of the Kaysāniyyah	358
2. The position of al-Khūṭ on narrators of the Kaysāniyyah	359
3.2.4 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the Zaydiyyah	359
1. The position of al-Ḥillī on narrators of the Zaydiyyah	362
Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd ibn Hilāl	362
Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sulaymān	363
2. The position of al-Khūṭ on narrators of the Zaydiyyah	365
<b>3.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding non-Shī'ī narrators</b>	<b>367</b>
1. The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the Nawāṣib	371
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the Nawāṣib	372
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding the Nawāṣib	372
2. The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah	376

The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah	376
The position of al-Khūṭī regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah (al-‘Āmmah)	380
3. The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the Khawārij	385
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the Khawārij	386
The position of al-Khūṭī regarding the Khawārij	389
<b>3.4 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding non-Muslim narrators</b>	<b>390</b>
<b>3.5 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding narrators wanting in ‘adālah</b>	<b>394</b>
1. The lying narrator ( <i>al-rāwī al-kadhḥāb</i> )	396
2. The narrator who consumes intoxicants	398
3. The narrator who defies a command of the infallible	402
4. The narrator that denies or usurps the wealth of the infallible	407
1. Maṣṣūr ibn Yūnus ibn Barzaj	407
2. Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bilāl Abū Ṭāhir	410
3. Ziyād ibn Marwān, or Ziyād al-Qindī	412
<b>Chapter Four - The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī and the scholars of the Imāmiyyah on the Ṣaḥābah</b>	<b>414</b>
<b>4.1 Statements of the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars on the Ṣaḥābah</b>	<b>415</b>
Al-Amīr al-Ṣan‘ānī	415
Al-Zarkashī	416
Al-Imām al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 AH)	416
Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Jamā‘ah (d. 733 AH)	416
Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Fihrī	417
Ibrāhīm al-Abnāsī	417
Al-Imām Zayd al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī	417
Al-Sakhāwī (d. 902 AH)	417
Ibn al-Mulaqqin	417
Al-Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī (d. 324 AH)	418
Al-Qāḍī Iyāḍ	418
Al-Imām al-Lālikāṭī	419
Ibn Taymiyyah	419
Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī	420

Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 505 AH)	420
Al-Imām al-Ṭaḥāwī	420
Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597 AH)	421
<b>4.2 The position of the Imāmiyyah regarding the Ṣaḥābah</b>	<b>424</b>
4.2.1 The opinion of the Imāmiyyah on the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah	427
4.2.2 Companionship with the Prophet does not indicate to virtue, according to the Imāmiyyah	442
<b>4.3. The position of the Imāmiyyah on the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah and the impact of that on their narrations</b>	<b>444</b>
4.3.1 Examples of the Imāmiyyah denying established virtues of the Ṣaḥābah	444
4.3.2 The Imāmiyyah belying the Ṣaḥābah and describing them as liars	453
4.3.3 The Imāmiyyah altering the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah into vices	457
<b>4.4. A comparative analysis between the position of the Imāmiyyah on the Ṣaḥābah and their own reliable narrators from the Imāmiyyah</b>	<b>466</b>
4.4.1 Al-Khūṭ and the Imāmī scholars justifying mistakes committed by their reliable narrators	466
‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah	467
Zurārah ibn A‘yan	469
Al-Faḍl ibn ‘Abd al-Malik	474
‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr	474
Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād al-Marwazī	475
‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm (famously known as ‘Allān)	476
Abū Baṣīr	478
Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān	483
Abū Ḥamzah al-Thimālī Thābit ibn Dīnār	488
Ḥarīz ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Sijistānī	490
Muḥammad ibn al-Khalīl al-Sakkāk	491
Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Awn al-Asadī	493
Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭsā al-Ash‘arī	494
4.4.2 Practical application of the criticisms that al-Khūṭ and other Imāmiyyah raised against the Ṣaḥābah and that which they regarded as being from the reasons of criticism against reliable narrators according to the Imāmiyyah	498

Abū Hurayrah <small>رضي الله عنه</small>	499
Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim	502
Jābir al-Ju‘fī	505
‘Ā’ishah bint Abī Bakr al-Şiddīq <small>رضي الله عنها</small>	510
4.4.3 An example of al-Khūṭ’s approach with the Şahābah	518

## **Chapter Five - The Principles of al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl Between al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ** **520**

<b>5.1 The principles of al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl according to al-Khūṭ and al-Ḥillī related to the tenants of Shī‘ah faith</b>	<b>521</b>
5.1.1 The narrator’s unyielding commitment to Shī‘ism	521
5.1.2 The narrator’s open proclamation of Raj‘ah	521
5.1.3 The narrator’s recognition of the truth (Shī‘ism) and belief therein	523
5.1.4 The narrator’s disproportionate defense of the Prophet’s Family and disputing and quarrelling with his opposition	524
<b>5.2 The positions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ concerning the statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl that come from the infallible Imāms—according to the Imāmī Shī‘ah</b>	<b>528</b>
5.2.1 The Imām or one of the notables asking Allah to have mercy on the narrator	528
5.2.2 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the negative statements that come from the infallible about a narrator	535
<b>5.3 The relationship that connects the Imām with the narrator</b>	<b>537</b>
5.3.1 The meaning of “khāṣṣ” and its implications	537
5.3.2 The Imām making <i>tawkīl</i> (delegating) of the narrator	540
Al-Ḥillī on the Imām making <i>tawkīl</i> of the narrator	543
Al-Khūṭ on the Imām making <i>tawkīl</i> of the narrator	544
5.3.3 The Imām’s writing and correspondence with the narrator	549
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the Imām’s writing and correspondence with the narrator	550
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding the Imām’s writing and correspondence with the narrator	551
5.3.4 An individual serving the Imām as a doorkeeper or attendant	553
Does taking the narrator as a doorkeeper necessitate ta’dīl?	553

Does the Imām taking the narrator as an attendant necessitate ta‘dīl?	554
5.3.5 The Imām taking the narrator as a <i>ḥawārī</i> (disciple)	556
The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the disciples ( <i>ḥawāriyyūn</i> ) of the infallible Imām	558
5.3.6 The narrator keeping the company ( <i>ṣuḥbah</i> ) of the Imām	561
The opinion of al-Ḥillī on companionship	565
‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṭāwūs	566
‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Aṭā’	566
The opinion of al-Khūṭ on companionship	567
1. Al-Khūṭ’s refutation against those who say that companionship with the infallible is evidence for the narrator’s tawthīq	567
2. Al-Khūṭ’s refutation against those who say that the companions of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq are reliable	568
<b>5.4. The positions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ concerning riwāyah and its sciences</b>	<b>570</b>
5.4.1 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the narrator who has an <i>aṣl</i> or a <i>kitāb</i>	570
The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the narrator who has an <i>aṣl</i> or a <i>kitāb</i>	573
The opinion of al-Khūṭ regarding the narrator who has an <i>aṣl</i> or a <i>kitāb</i>	575
Ibrāhīm ibn Yaḥyā	577
Al-Ḥasan ibn Ribāt	577
Al-Ḥusayn ibn Abī Ghundar	577
Ibrāhīm ibn Khālīd al-‘Aṭṭār	577
Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan – al-Ḥusayn – Ibn Sa‘īd ibn ‘Uthmān al-Qurashī	578
Aḥmad ibn Sulaymān al-Ḥajjāl	578
5.4.2 Abundantly narrating from the infallible	578
The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the narrator who narrates abundantly	579
The opinion of al-Khūṭ regarding the narrator who narrates abundantly	581
5.4.3 The fact that the narrator narrates from eminent people and they narrate from him	584
The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ on the narrator who narrates from the greats and they narrating from him	586
5.4.4 Scholars who grant <i>ijāzah</i> (authorization to narrate) and its implication on tawthīq	588

What is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the tawthīq of scholars of authorization?	593
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the tawthīq of scholars of authorization	593
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding the tawthīq of scholars of authorization	595
5.4.5 The narrator about whom it is said, “asnada ‘anhu”	596
The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding their statement “asnada ‘anhu”	600
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding their statement “asnada ‘anhu”	600
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding their statement “asnada ‘anhu”	601
5.4.6 The confused narrator (al-rāwī al-mukhallat)	602
The meaning of takhlīṭ	603
The implication, or lack thereof, of takhlīṭ on jarḥ	604
The opinion of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ on takhlīṭ	604
The opinion of al-Ḥillī on takhlīṭ	604
‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd	605
‘Aṭā’ ibn Abī Rabāḥ	605
Salamah ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Aḥmar	606
Ishāq ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Abān ibn Mirār	607
The opinion of al-Khūṭ on takhlīṭ	607

## **5.5 Miscellaneous principles in al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl between al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ** **614**

5.5.1 Describing the narrator as a “ <i>wajh</i> (prominent),” or “from the prominent (associates) of the companions	614
The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the narrator who was a ‘ <i>wajh</i> ’	614
The opinion of Al-Khūṭ regarding the narrator who was a ‘ <i>wajh</i> ’	616
5.5.2 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding those martyred in the path of Allah	617
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding those martyred in the path of Allah	617
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding those martyred in the path of Allah	618
5.5.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the person who was a <i>wāli</i> (governor) or <i>wazīr</i> (minister) for the oppressors	619
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the person who was a <i>wāli</i> (governor) or <i>wazīr</i> (minister) for the oppressors	619
The position of al-Khūṭ regarding the person who was a <i>wāli</i> (governor)	

or <i>wazīr</i> (minister) for the oppressors	620
5.5.4. The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding a person who transmitted a narration praising himself	621
The position of al-Ḥillī regarding a person who transmitted a narration praising himself	621
The position of al-Khūṭī regarding a person who transmitted a narration praising himself	623
<b>5.6 Principles of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl established by al-Khūṭī</b>	<b>625</b>
5.6.1 Beneficial points related to al-Ṣadūq (d. 381 AH)	625
1. Does al-Ṣadūq's authentication of the narrator's report imply his tawthīq?	625
2. Does al-Khūṭī make tawthīq of the narrator whom al-Ṣadūq has a chain for in <i>Mashyakat al-Faqīh</i> ?	626
5.6.2 What is the position of al-Khūṭī regarding the statement of al-Mufīd about the narrator that he has "virtue and well-known traits?"	627
5.6.3 Beneficial points related to the position of al-Khūṭī on the earlier generation of scholars	627
1. When the scholars of the earlier generation authenticate the isnād of a narration, does this necessitate the tawthīq of its narrators?	627
2. Does the reliance of the earlier generation of scholars on a narrator imply his tawthīq?	629
3. Al-Najjāshī and al-Ṭūsī narrating from a person; does this prove his tawthīq?	629
<b>5.7 Miscellaneous beneficial points related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl touched on by al-Khūṭī</b>	<b>629</b>
1. Does the narration used in the pronouncement of a legal ruling imply the tawthīq of its narrators?	629
2. Is the narrator's expertise in (the art of) debating and argumentation advantageous to him such that his tawthīq and uprightness is established because of it?	630
3. Is the fact that a notable scholar narrated from a person indicative of his tawthīq?	630
4. When an infallible says to a narrator, "Your opinion is in conformity with the Sunnah," does it imply his tawthīq?	630

5. The position of al-Khūṭī regarding a narrator described with possessing a great deal of etiquette, virtue, knowledge, and an elevated standing 631
6. The position of al-Khūṭī regarding a reliable scholar transmitting words of criticism of a narrator without mentioning the critic’s name. For example, it is said of him that he is “accused of being weak,” and we do not know who accused him. 632
7. Is the Imām’s making the narrator a messenger and his requesting the infallible for counsel indicative of his tawthīq? 633
8. The significance of the scholars’ statement “*maskūn al-riwāyah*” in the view of al-Khūṭī 634
9. Al-Khūṭī’s position on describing the narrator as “*mustaqīm*” 634





## Preface

### The Difficulty, Significance and Objectives of this Study

This study comprises the science of ḥadīth transmitter criticism (*‘ilm al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*) according to the Imāmī Shī‘ah. It is based on the works of two of their leading authorities, namely al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Asadī al-Ḥillī’s *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl Fī Ma’rifat al-Rijāl* and Abū al-Qāsim al-Mūsawī al-Khūṭī’s *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*. Furthermore, a comparative analysis between their respective methodological approaches will also be included, as well as a discussion underscoring their respective areas of agreement and disagreement.

The reason for restricting this study to the above-mentioned works only is because their views signify the vast majority of issues concomitant to the science of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl* as understood by the Imāmiyyah. Additionally, I have restricted myself to both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī for the following reasons:

1. According to several scholars of the Imāmī Shī‘ah, Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī is regarded as the first person to categorize ḥadīth into *ṣahīḥ* (authentic), *muwaththaq* (trustable), *ḥasan* (fair), and *da‘īf* (weak). According to them, this is referred to as *taqṣīm al-ḥadīth*, or ḥadīth classification.

This study will be restricted to his work *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* because it clearly demonstrates al-Ḥillī’s approach to the science, as well as an elucidation of the normative principles he sets himself out upon—even though he violates them on numerous occasions. Additionally, his work is among the first exclusively dedicated dictionaries of transmitter evaluation (*kutub al-rijāl*) after the phase of ḥadīth classification in the seventh century.

2. As for al-Khūṭī, he is considered one of the last to write a dictionary of transmitter evaluation in the present-day. His work consists of twenty-four volumes; and not only is he a leading authority of the Uṣūlī school, but he is also one of the latter-day proponents of ḥadīth classification.

Al-Khūṭ stands out because he boldly challenges the status quo of his predecessors—including al-Ḥillī in several places. Furthermore, al-Khūṭ is seen as a prominent figure for many modern-day ḥadīth scholars of the Imāmī tradition. His methodological approach has had a great impact within several academic circles of the Shīʿah in the present-day. This fact can be evidenced by the statements of his students who have themselves critically edited several authoritative works of the Imāmī legal school.

(As mentioned previously), this study will (also) include a comparative analysis between their respective methodologies and a discussion underscoring the areas upon which they agree and disagree.

### Significance of the Study

The research presented in this work comes at a time in which the unmitigated attacks against Islam’s leading figures have intensified, with the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ at the forefront. Through the media, dilettantes and self-proclaimed Muslims continue to needle doubts and raise suspicions about them. They incessantly launch attacks and cast aspersions against this generation; doing so in the name of academic inquiry, as characterized by the principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*. While attacks against the Companions ﷺ precipitate, many individuals, who according to classical scholars are considered heterodoxical and unreliable, are sold as trustworthy and upright. Such individuals appear (again) under the banner of academic inquiry, as characterized by the principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*.

Therefore, this study comes to investigate the reality of these principles and whether the Imāmiyyah have objectively applied them to their transmitters of ḥadīth. The critical and empirical analysis will come to show a rather immethodical approach in the Imāmiyyah scholars’ criticism of reports and transmitters. At the same time, the astute methodical approach of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā’ah—irrespective of whether they form part of the early or later generation of scholars—will reveal itself when comparatively analyzed with the statements of

the Imāmī scholars, at the head being Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūī. “Things are known by their opposites,” as the saying goes.

## Core Areas of Research

The following areas will be covered in the study:

- The extent to which al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī adhere to their principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*; and the respective application thereof to the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ and their reliable transmitters who transmit from the infallible Imāms, according to the Imāmī Shī’ah. Also, the extent of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī’s impartiality in the principles’ application to their transmitters.
- The motives behind the origins of these principles and the reason as to why they are so many in number.
- The effect that results from the different methodologies of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī on issues related to ḥadīth transmitters.
- A study of the reasons which lead to the findings upon which the scholar of transmitters’ (*al-‘ālim al-rijālī*) bases his rulings; without simply focusing on the linguistics of the terms associated with *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*. Rather, a study of the reason and principles which lead to either a transmitter being deemed reliable, or a rejection of his narration; without delving into the linguistic meanings of (words such as) *thiqah* and *ḍa’īf*.

For example, the transmitter (in question) happens to be an agent (*wakīl*) of an infallible Imām. The question then arises, does the act of agency (*wakālah*) signify the agent’s reliability (as a ḥadīth transmitter)?

Or, the fact that an infallible Imām supplicated for a particular individual. Does this supplication by the infallible Imām denote his reliability (as a ḥadīth transmitter)?

- Do these principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* which they formulated have any practical value, or are they merely applied theoretically with no real consequences therefrom?
- The extent to which al-Khūṭī relies on his predecessors *tawthīqāt*, or positive gradings (of transmitters), and the impact it has had on his overall methodological approach of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl*.

Part of the objectives of this work is an overall critical analysis of the science of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* according to the Imāmiyyah Shī'ah. Also, to ask the question: do the Shī'ah actually possess their own dedicated sciences to *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl*?

With the divine strength of Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى**, this study will attempt to answer these—and several other—questions in view of these two authoritative figures.

The methodological framework in this study will be (as previously mentioned) entirely empirical and will comprise a comparative analysis between Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī's *al-Khulāsah* and al-Khūṭī's *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, as well as a critical analysis of their respective methodologies.

## Previous Research

Vis-à-vis their many writings, scholars from both the early and later generations have continued providing responses to the people of *bid'ah* (innovation), in particular, the Imāmī Shī'ah. However, these works—which I have chronologically divided into three periods—can effectively be described as follows:

### 1. The Early Period

The writings of the early generation of scholars are largely characterized in non-specifics. Scholars during this period did not write specific treatises concerning the Twelvers. However, this was not due to their negligence thereof. Rather, mention of the Shī'ah (during this time) would merely be *incidental*, similar to

how biographical works would mention when discussing certain transmitters. For example, when such a transmitter is described as a ‘liar’, or with the term ‘*rafḍ*’.

Similarly, when transmitters are described as having ascribed to the creed of the Imāmiyyah and the belief of infallibility—which they incessantly dispute with the entire Ummah. Or, when they excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, curse the pious predecessors, believe in the interpolation (*Tahrīf*) of the Qur’ān, or even believe in the concepts of *Raj’ah*<sup>1</sup> and *Badā’*<sup>2</sup>.

One of the first people to categorically write on the Twelvers was al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Nu’aym al-Aṣbahānī (d. 430 A.H) in his work *al-Imāmah wa al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah*. The central theme of the book is precisely as its name suggests: Imāmah and the differences related therein. Again, this period was not characterized with having produced much details. Perhaps this was on account of the sheer lack of works by the Shī’ah themselves at that time. Or, because of the early generation’s indifferences with them, and the fact that they were undeserving of having their time wasted with the likes of such people. Not a single scholar from the early generation described in detail their principles of ḥadīth for the simple reason that they were only developed (much) later on.

## 2. The Pre-modern Period

Writings following the early generation and prior to the latter-day period, such as in the time of Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Dhahabī, and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī. Here, the writings began detailing the issues of disagreement more than before. The early generation of scholars wrote in general terms. Thereafter, scholars came and gained benefit from whatever they stated, and at the same time, also began

---

1 *Raj’ah*: The Shī’ī belief that the Imāms and others will be brought back to life and return to this world before the Day of Qiyāmah. [Translator’s note]

2 *Badā’*: The Shī’ah doctrine that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى عَمَلُهُ only learns of things after they occur, thus forcing Him to change His Will, Allah forbid. [Translator’s note]

incorporating the writings of the Imāmī Shī'ah scholars. For example, it reads under the biography of 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm Abū al-Ḥasan al-Muḥammadī: “(He was a staunch Rāfiḍī. He has a Tafsīr that contains calamitous information.”<sup>1</sup>

The likes of this prove the scholars were aware of their works after their dissemination. The scholars in this time did not mention any of the ḥadīth sciences of the Imāmiyyah for the simple fact that they were not (considered) of the people of ḥadīth and isnād. Ibn Taymiyyah specifically alludes to this fact in his confutation of Ibn al-Muṭahhīr al-Ḥillī (as will be explained later in this study). He writes:

If one of them were asked to produce an authentic, sound report regarding 'Alī عليه السلام or someone else, they would be unable to do so. They do not possess the expertise of isnād nor the transmitters (of ḥadīth) as the Ahl al-Sunnah do.<sup>2</sup>

He also states:

With regards to the transmitters of (general) knowledge and narrators of ḥadīths and reports, they are unable to distinguish between the transmitter who is a known liar, or commits serious mistakes, or is unaware of what he transmits, and the transmitter who is precise, an expert, and upright, known to possess knowledge of prophetic reports.<sup>3</sup>

### 3. The Modern Period

Writings of the modern period that are characterized as having reaped (the benefits of) everything the earlier scholars sowed. They benefited greatly from their scholarly predecessors in relation to the numerous sects—among them the Imāmī Shī'ah. However, they did not deviate much from the set course of their

---

1 Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī: *Lisān al-Mīzān*.

2 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah*, 3/505.

3 *Ibid*, 1: 8.

predecessors in the nature of the subject matter—the areas that are considered areas of disagreement between the Sunnīs and Shī'ah (as mentioned previously).

Most of the issues revolve around Imāmah and what results therefrom, including the issue of Qur'ānic interpolation, excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, infallibility (of the Imāms), and other such issues which are stated in the creedal works of the of Imāmiyyah. I have personally come across approximately one hundred and fifty refutational works authored by the Ahl al-Sunnah against the Imāmiyyah.

Unfortunately, I have rarely found Sunnī works dedicated to the ḥadīth sciences according to the Imāmī Shī'ah. Mention of this subject-matter is merely incidental, as will be explained in detail shortly. What is important to note is the fact that whatever has been written regarding the sciences of ḥadīth has been in a very broad sense. The term 'Sunnah' is defined according to the Shī'ah, and their works of ḥadīth, popular dictionaries of transmitter evaluation, and famous transmitters who have been subject to criticism have been enlisted. However, I have not come across—to the best of my knowledge—someone who has discussed the principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* in such a detailed manner as these pages will soon explain.

Among the Ahl al-Sunnah, the following scholars have written on the subject of ḥadīth. At times, the author alludes to some of the principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl*.

1. *Ma'a al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah fī al-Uṣūl wa al-Furū'* (Dār al-Faḍīlah, Riyadh; Dār al-Thaqāfah, Qatar – 2003), written by 'Alī al-Sālūs. This is a very beneficial work. The author provides an overview of the Imāmī Shī'ah school in terms of both their roots and branches (*uṣūl* and *furū'*), as well as a comparative analysis between the Sunnīs and Shī'ah in every chapter. The section of concern to us is related to the sciences of Ḥadīth. In terms of the Imāmī Shī'ah's general definition of the ḥadīth sciences, it is one of the most excellent works written. However, when it comes to the chapter of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* according to the Shī'ah, he records their account of criticisms leveled at the (famous) Imāms of the Muslims and their books

written on the subject. This is done without any reference to the *reasoning* behind such criticisms and the principles upon which they formulated ḥadīth transmitter criticism, or *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl*. At the end of the book the author cites a number of accusations leveled at the noble Companions رضي الله عنهم by al-Khūṭī. However, he does not refer to any of their principles related to *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl*.

2. *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* (published by Ḥusayn Ḥilmī Sa'īd Iṣṭānbūlī – 1979), by Maḥmūd Shukrī al-Ālūsī. This work is primarily centered on defining the Imāmī Shī'ah, their denominations, and their creedal beliefs regarding Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the prophets. He also gets into several issues of disagreement between the Sunnīs and Shī'ah and provides an excellent refutation in favour of the Ahl al-Sunnah. There are a number of reservations against the book; however, it does not discredit the academic value found therein. Despite its brevity, it contains a number of unique benefits. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى reward the (original) author and its abridger with the best of reward.

In chapter two, the author discusses the classification of reports according to the Shī'ah, the credibility of their transmitters, and the *ṭabaqāt* (classes) of their predecessors. He also briefly mentions the sciences of ḥadīth according to them. To the best of my knowledge, he is the first to speak in detail about some of their principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl*. He states:

They have authenticated the narrations of individuals who the infallible Imām supplicated against, with the statements such as, “May Allah disgrace him,” and, “May Allah kill him,” or, “May Allah curse him.” Or, he (i.e. the infallible Imām) judged a person's beliefs to be false, or by dissociating himself from him.

They also authenticated the reports of the *Mushabbihah*, the *Mujassimah*, and (the reports) of those who permit the concept of *Badā'* in relation to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. This, even though such acts are akin to disbelief. Furthermore,



the *riwāyah* (transmission) of a disbeliever is unacceptable, let alone it being considered authentic. Their *‘adālah* (uprightness) is of no value by them, even though they mention it in the definition of an authentic ḥadīth. This is because the disbeliever, from inception, is not considered upright (*‘adl*).<sup>1</sup>

These finer points from the author highlight his cognizance of their dictionaries of transmitter evaluation (*kutub al-rijāl*) and their usages of these principles.

3. *Al-Shī‘ah wa al-Sunnah* (Dār al-Imām al-Mujaddid (first edition) – 2005), written by Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāhīr. The author is one of the most knowledgeable people about the specifics of this school. He quotes extensively from both their primary and secondary sources, in all the languages they were written in. He was proficient in several languages, including Arabic, Urdu, Persian, and English, thereby making his books invaluable. However, in most of his works—including this one—he only addresses the contradictions in their transmitter criticism and their incompetence thereof in general terms, without mentioning any of the principles upon which they rely. Instead, he only cites examples of a few transmitters. This is contrary to his customary, more thorough approach in the other issues, all of which remain controversial among the two groups.
4. *Uṣūl Madhhab al-Shī‘ah* (Dār al-Riḍā Publications – 1998), written by Nāṣir al-Qafārī. This is the most well-known and widely available work to date. The amount of effort the author expended in scrutinizing the opinions—both in terms of their *furū‘* (branches) and *uṣūl* (roots)—of the Shī‘ah is self-evident. However, when he addresses the sciences of ḥadīth, he does so pursuant to the subject-matter of his work—the general framework (*uṣūl*) of the Twelvers. Therefore, he speaks in non-specifics about their beliefs regarding the Sunnah, as well as their opinion of prophetic reports

---

1 Maḥmūd Shukrī al-Ālūsī: *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*, p. 48.

transmitted by Sunnī transmitters, their seminal works, and their method of reconciliation in dealing with contradictory reports. He also mentions their approach to dealing with transmitters—the theme of this present work—in a general manner. However, he only discussed the excuse of *Taqiyyah* as proffered by the Shī'ah scholars. This despite his encyclopedic knowledge, and the fact that Allah ﷻ assisted him in both traversing uncharted territories (*terra incognita*) and quoting from (their) primary sources, he did not, however, explain the principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* according to them.

Another important discussion he deals with in this work, and his other work entitled *Mas'alat al-Taqrīb bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Shī'ah*, is that of rapprochement between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah. Although the issue is important, he very much echoes sentiments similar to people of the past; and, in doing so, he abridges much of the discussion.

5. *Rijāl al-Shī'ah fī al-Mizān*, written by 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Zarī. This is an excellent work in the field. Though small in size, the author mentions the most reliable narrators according to the Imāmī Shī'ah. He also explains their status as transmitters, in addition to their criticisms of the Ahl al-Bayt and vice-versa. He also refutes the Shī'ī scholar 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Mūsawī in his work *al-Murāja'āt* (which is being circulated as gospel!); who lauds a number of transmitters of the Shī'ah despite him knowing full well they have been subject to serious criticism.

The author of *Ruwāt al-Akhbār* heavily relies on this work; however, he does not discuss any issues of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* according to the Imāmiyyah since it falls outside of the subject matter. The work is mostly an exposition of the transmitters who have been subjected to criticism, as I alluded to. He did a wonderful job—Allah ﷻ grant him success!

6. *Ruwāt al-Akhbār 'an al-A'imma al-Aṭḥār*, written by Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq (first edition – 2006). This work is dedicated to the science of ḥadīth

according to the Imāmī Shī'ah. The author offers an overview of several issues, including: the sciences of ḥadīth, the classification of ḥadīth and the status of both their transmitters and works—which transmit from the infallibles (according to them), its development, and their methodology pertaining to transmitters. However, he does not explain the principles of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* according to them in a detailed manner. It is important to note that the author, despite mentioning numerous beneficial points which have not been mentioned before, unduly quotes from his predecessors. For example, he quotes from *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*. At times, he references it, and other times, he does not. Similarly, he quotes a clip from 'Uthmān al-Khamīs entitled “*Zawaj al-Mu'ah* (Temporary Marriage)” without referencing it. He does this with others as well without referencing the original sources. This is an objectionable act from the author.

7. *Akḥbār al-Shī'ah wa Aḥwāl Ruwāṭihā*, written by Muḥammad Shukrī al-Ālūsī. The author relied heavily upon *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*. Why wouldn't he? He summarized it. In this work, the author discusses the division of ḥadīth according to the Imāmī Shī'ah. Thereafter, he expounds on the sources of the Sharī'ah, which are four, namely: 1. *Kitāb* (i.e. the Qur'ān), 2. *Khabar* (i.e. prophetic report(s)), 3. *Ijmā'* (consensus), and 4. *'Aql* (rational faculty).

Next, he addresses the *ṭabaqāt* (classes) of Shī'ī transmitters. According to him, the first class includes 'Abd Allāh ibn Sabā; he is enlisted among the *mustafīdīn* (a high-ranking transmitter) in their school of thought. The second class includes several people of the hypocrites weak in faith. These include the killers of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه. The followers of al-Ḥasan رضي الله عنه form part of the fourth class of transmitters. He continues mentioning these classes until he reaches the seventh: those who claim to have enjoyed the company of the Imāms and received knowledge from them. This, even though the Imāms declared them disbelievers and considered them liars.

The author then explains their respective statuses. However, he does not deal with any of their issues related to *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl*.

Most of these studies are similar in nature and reference one another. Also, all of them are late developments since the early generation of scholars did not write on the subject. I have already explained the reason for this.

These works usually contain the *riwāyāt* (transmissions) wherein senior-ranking transmitters from the Imāmiyyah are criticized, such as Zurārah, Jābir al-Ju'fī, Abū Baṣīr, and other senior transmitters. Furthermore, their opinions regarding the Sunnah are scrutinized along with their works on ḥadīth and dictionaries of transmitter evaluation.

These are the works I have come across by the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah regarding this subject.

I ask Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى to rectify any insufficiencies.

## Introductory Chapter

### Historical Development of Literature on the Sciences of Narrator Evaluation According to the Imāmi Shī'ah

- 1.0 Reviewing the claim that attributes the science of ḥadīth narrator criticism to the Ahl al-Bayt
- 2.0 A historical overview and appraisal of the biographical works authored by the Shī'ah
- 3.0 The lack of sciences by the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah in the field of 'ilm al-rijāl
- 4.0 Historical overview of the Imāmiyyah's literature on Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth
- 5.0 The absence of writing in the sciences of Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth except in later times
- 6.0 Biographies of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī and an exposition of their methodologies in their respective works



## 1.0 Reviewing the claim that attributes the science of ḥadīth narrator criticism to the Ahl al-Bayt

Before exploring the details provided in this work, it is important to understand the origins of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* (ḥadīth narrator criticism) as stated by the Twelver Shī'ah. It is not possible to understand the findings of both Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khū'ī except by knowing the intellectual foundations which they relied upon, as well as the legacy they inherited from their predecessors and how they navigated through it.

Many scholars of the Shī'ah have devoted a lot of their efforts in trying to prove that they were, in fact, the first to write about *'ulūm al-rijāl* (sciences of narrator evaluation) *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. In doing so, it bolsters the image of the Imāmī school and establishes their antecedence therein. They substantiate this claim by attributing the science of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* to the Ahl al-Bayt with the following proof:

### The first proof

Dr. 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī and Ḥusayn al-Ṣadr<sup>1</sup>—both Twelver Shī'ah—attempted to link the origins of this science to 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Al-Faḍlī states:

كانت وثيقة الإمام أمير المؤمنين (ع) ... والتي تضمنت تقسيم الرواة إلى أربعة أقسام البذرة الأولى لنشأة مادة أسماء الرجال والفكرة الأولى التي انطلق منها التفكير في جمع أسماء الرواة وتبيان هوياتهم وتقييم أحوالهم

The *wathīqah* (document) of Amīr al-Mu'mīnīn al-Imām عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام ... It included the classification of narrators into four categories, laying the first stone for the (eventual) development of narrator evaluation as a subject-matter. And the intellectual foundations through which the concept of collecting the names of narrators, their different identities, and appraising their conditions originated.<sup>2</sup>

1 Ḥusayn al-Ṣadr: *Nihāyat al-Dirāyah*, p. 15.

2 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 27; Ḥusayn al-Sā'idī: *Kitāb al-Du'afā' min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/42.

Al-Faḍlī was unable to (successfully) attribute this science to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه by ascribing its origins to him. Similarly, he was also unable to prove that ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه was, in fact, responsible for categorizing ḥadīth narrators into the following four categories:

1. The hypocrite narrator; the liar (*al-rāwī al-munāfiq; al-kadhḥāb*)
2. The narrator who commits mistakes (*al-rāwī al-wāḥim*)
3. The narrator who is inaccurate (*al-rāwī ḡhayr al-ḍābiṭ*)
4. The reliable narrator (*al-rāwī al-thiqah*)

The narration which al-Faḍlī relied upon is included in al-Kulaynī’s (d. 329 AH) work *al-Kāfī*:

عن علي بن إبراهيم بن هاشم بن أبيه عن حماد بن عيسى عن إبراهيم بن عمر اليماني عن أبان بن أبي عياش عن سليمان بن قيس الهلالي قال قلت لأُمير المؤمنين عليه السلام إني سمعت من سلمان والمقداد وأبي ذر شيئاً من تفسير القرآن وأحاديث عن نبي الله صلى الله عليه وآله غير ما في أيدي الناس ثم سمعت منك تصديق ما سمعت منهم ورأيت في أيدي الناس أشياء كثيرة من تفسير القرآن ومن الأحاديث عن نبي الله صلى الله عليه وآله أتتم تخالفونهم فيها وتزعمون أن ذلك كله باطل أفترى الناس يكذبون على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله متعمدين ويفسرون القرآن بأرائهم؟ قال فأقبل علي فقال قد سألت فافهم الجواب...

On the authority of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim — from his father — from Ḥammād ibn ‘Tsā — from Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Umar al-Yamānī — from **Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh** — from **Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī**, who said:

“I said to *Amīr al-Mu’minīn*: ‘Indeed, I heard from Salmān, al-Miqdād, and Abū Dharr a certain amount of *tafsīr* of the Qur’ān and aḥādīth from the Prophet of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم different to what the people have in their hands. Then I heard (from you) confirmation of what I heard from them. (And) I saw many things from the *tafsīr* of the Qur’ān and from the aḥādīth of the Prophet of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم in the peoples’ hands and you are opposing them. You claim it is all false. Do you consider the people as having intentionally lied against the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, and interpreting the Qur’ān with their own opinions?’

‘Alī approached and said, ‘You have asked. Now understand the answer...’”<sup>1</sup>

## Objections to the first proof

The *isnād* (chain of narration) which al-Faḍlī and al-Ṣadr relied upon is *sāqīṭah* (wholly unreliable), even according to the ḥadīth principles of the Shī‘ah. Al-Majlisī (d. 1111 AH) says regarding this ḥadīth:

ضعيف على المشهور معتبر عندي

Weak according to the most widespread (opinion); duly considered, according to me.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, the ḥadīth is famously known to be *ḍa‘īf* (weak).

As for al-Majlisī’s statement, “duly considered, according to me,” the response is: How can it be ‘duly considered’ according to al-Majlisī when the *isnād* contains Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh? Al-Majlisī symbolizes him (in his work) with (the letter) ‘ḍād,’ suggesting he is a weak narrator.<sup>3</sup> This is a clear contradiction. There is no other version by which this one can be bolstered.

The Shī‘ī scholar Ḥusayn al-Sā‘idī judged the ḥadīth *ḍa‘īf* and he referred to the view of al-Majlisī regarding Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh when he said:

ضعفه المجلسي في رجاله وحكم على رواياته بالضعف عند دراسته لأسانيد الكافي وتهذيب الأحكام

Al-Majlisī judged him to be weak in his work *Rijāl al-Majlisī*. He also judged his narrations as weak in his review of al-Kāfī’s *asānīd* (pl. of *isnād*) and *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfī*, 1/62 (ḥadīth no. 1 under the chapter ‘*Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth*’).

2 Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī: *Mir‘āt al-Uqūl*, 1/210.

3 Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī: *Rijāl al-Majlisī*, p. 141.

4 Ḥusayn al-Sā‘idī: *al-Ḍu‘afā’ min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/136.



The statements criticizing Abān from the scholars of the Shī'ah are many, including:

- Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī says, “Weak. No consideration of him.”<sup>1</sup>
- Al-Ṭūsī says, “Tābi'ī. Weak.”<sup>2</sup>
- Al-Ḥillī says, “Tābi'ī. Very weak.”<sup>3</sup>
- Al-Bahbūdī says something similar.<sup>4</sup>

The *isnād* (also) contains Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī. He is *muttahaḡ* (accused of lying) according to many scholars of the Shī'ah. Al-Māzindarānī (d. 1081 AH) says he is “*Majhūl al-Ḥāl* (unknown condition).”<sup>5</sup>

The Shī'ī scholar Hāshim Ma'rūf al-Ḥasanī's statement criticizing one of the narrations is sufficient proof (against him). Al-Ḥasanī states:

ويكفي هذه الرواية عيباً أنها من مرويات سليم بن قيس وهو من المشبهين والمتهمين بالكذب

The fact that this *riwāyah* (narration) is among Sulaym ibn Qays's is enough to render it problematic. He is of the doubtful narrators and of those who have been accused of lying.<sup>6</sup>

How then is it possible to use a narration which is inapt as evidence to establish the origin of the sciences of *al-Jarḡ wa al-Ta'dīl*—the science which explains to

---

1 Aḡmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghaḍā'irī: *Ḍu'afā' Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī*, p. 36 (biography no. 1).

2 'Alī ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī: *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 126.

3 Ibn al-Muṭaḡhar al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 325, # 1280 (section two on weak narrators); al-Tiffarishī: *Naqd al-Rijāl*, 1/39; Abū al-Qāsim al-Khū'ī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/120. Abān is suspected of having forged the work of Sulaym ibn Qays. Refer to above sources.

4 Muḡammad al-Bahbūdī: *Ma'rifat al-Ḥadīth wa Tārīkh Nashrihi wa Tadwīnihi wa Thaḡāfatihī 'inda al-Shī'ah al-Imāmiyyah*, p. 159.

5 Muḡammad Ṣālīḡ al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḡ Uṣūl al-Kāfi* (*Bāb Isti'māl al-'Ilm*), 2/139 (under ḡadīth no. 1). He contradicts himself. See p. 307 of the previous reference.

6 Hāshim Ma'rūf al-Ḥasanī: *al-Mawḡū'āt fi al-Āthār wa al-Aḡhbār*, p. 184 (in the marginalia).

us the authenticity and weakness of narrations? In fact, al-Bahbūdī judged this actual narration *da'if* when he excluded it from his work *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī*<sup>1</sup>

Based on the above, it becomes clear that the link between the origins of this science with 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is incorrect, as the narrations of the Imāmiyyah assert. As explained earlier, they have been proven false.

## The second proof

Al-Faḍlī, and similarly, al-Kajūrī al-Shīrāzī (d. 1293 A.H) attempted it differently when they attributed this science to Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. They based this on a narration that is considered, according to al-Faḍlī's description, "the introduction into the evolution of this subject."<sup>2</sup> Using this as textual proof for what he believed, al-Faḍlī says:

مقبولة عمر بن حنظلة فقد جاء فيها ما يرتبط بموضوعنا قلت أي قول عمر بن حنظلة وهو يسأل الأمام المعصوم فإن كان كل رجل اختار رجلا من أصحابنا فرضيا أن يكونا الناظرين في حقهما واختلفا فيما حكما وكلاهما اختلفا في حديثكم؟ قال الحكم ما حكم به أعدلهما وأفقهما وأصدقهما في الحديث وأورعهما ولا يلتفت إلى ما يحكم به الآخر قال قلت فإنهما عدلان مرضيان عند أصحابنا لا يفضل واحد منهما على الآخر؟

The *maqḅūlah*<sup>3</sup> of 'Umar ibn Ḥanḏalah. It contains (information) related to our subject-matter: (In asking Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, 'Umar ibn Ḥanḏalah says) If both (Shī'ī) parties (in their dispute) selected one person (each) from our associates (i.e. the Shī'ah) to assume arbitrating in respect to each individual's best interests, and they both (eventually) differ in their

---

1 Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bahbūdī: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī* (i.e. the ḥadīths which he excluded because they contain narrators who are abandoned (*matrūk*), or the *matn* (text) is not free from any *wahm* (mistake), *iḍṭirāb* (irreconcilable problem), or *takhlīṭ* (confusion), p. 1 (from the introduction, and under the chapter 'Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth' wherein he makes no mention of this ḥadīth in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (collection), 1/10).

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 30.

3 *Maqḅūlah* (lit. 'accepted') is a term referring to a *riwāyah* that has been consistently accepted by the scholars of the Imāmiyyah. Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī has an entire chapter dedicated to the meaning of this term, as mentioned in Samā' al-Maqāl.

judgement and in (understanding) your ḥadīth? Ja'far al-Ṣādiq replied: “The judgement will be in favour of the one who is more just, possesses more understanding and truthfulness in relation to ḥadīth, and more Allah-conscious. The other individual’s opinion will not be considered.”

I said: “(And what if) They are equally just, and enjoy the same level of approval from our companions (i.e. the Shī'ah) such that one cannot be proven better than the other? ...”<sup>1</sup>

## Objections to the second proof

Firstly, in terms of the *isnād*, it is *ḍa'īf* and inauthentic. It appears as follows:

قال الكليني (٣٢٩هـ) محمد بن يحيى عن محمد بن الحسين عن محمد بن عيسى عن صفوان بن يحيى عن داود بن الحصين عن عمر بن حنظلة قال ...

Al-Kulaynī (d. 329 A.H) states — Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā – from Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn – from Muḥammad ibn Ṭsā – from Ṣafwān ibn Yaḥyā – from Dāwūd ibn al-Ḥuṣayn – from **Umar ibn Ḥanzalah** who said...

The *isnād* includes the narrator 'Umar ibn Ḥanzalah. Al-Khūṭī cites six reasons why people regard him as a *thiqah* (reliable) and he disproves all of them.<sup>2</sup> The abridged version of al-Khūṭī's work regards him as “*majhūl* (unknown).”<sup>3</sup> In fact, al-Khūṭī himself considered this specific narration *ḍa'īf* when he said:

إن الرواية ضعيفة السند بعمر بن حنظلة إذ لم يرد في حقه توثيق ولا مدح وإن سميت روايته هذه بالمقبولة وكأنها مما تلقته الأصحاب بالقبول وإن لم يثبت هذا أيضا

The *isnād* of this *riwāyah* is *ḍa'īf* because of 'Umar ibn Ḥanzalah; there is not mention of *tawḥīq* (attestation of reliability) in his right nor praise,

1 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfī (Bāb Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth)*, 1/67-68.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 14/31.

3 Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 425. This work is an abridgement of al-Khūṭī's rulings on narrators.

even though this *riwāyah* of his is named the ‘*maqḅūlah* (accepted).’ It is as if it forms part of those issues that have been acknowledged by the companions (i.e. the Shī‘ah) as acceptable (*tallaqathu al-aṣḥāb bi al-qabūl*), even though it is unproven.<sup>1</sup>

The author of *Majma‘ al-Fā‘idah*, al-Ardabīlī (d. 993 A.H), judged that ‘Umar ibn Ḥaṇṣalah is *majhūl*.<sup>2</sup> Similarly, al-Bahbūdī considered it *ḍa‘īf* when he excluded it from his work *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi*. In fact, this very ‘Umar has no *tawthīq* of him (mentioned) in the primary sources of narrator evaluation (*al-uṣūl al-rijāliyyah*).

Secondly, in terms of the narration’s actual meaning, it has to do with a legal and judicial ordinance (*al-qaḍā’ wa al-ḥukm*); it has no correlation to the narration of ḥadīth. The actual wording is as follows:

عن عمر بن حنظلة قال سألت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام عن رجلين من أصحابنا بينهما منازعة في دين أو ميراث فتحاكما إلى السلطان وإلى القضاة أيحل ذلك؟

On the authority of ‘Umar ibn Ḥaṇṣalah: “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام whether it was permissible for two of our companions who had a debt or inheritance-related dispute to seek a verdict from the ruler or judges.”

Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 A.H) said:

وأما رواية عمر بن حنظلة فواردة في القاضي دون الراوي إلا أن يلتزم أن كل راو قاض وحاكم شرع

Regarding the narration of ‘Umar ibn Ḥaṇṣalah, it is concerning a judge, not a narrator. Unless it means that every narrator is a judge and an Islamic ruler.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ijtihād wa al-Taqlīd* (under the commentary), p. 143.

2 Aḥmad al-Ardabīlī: *Majma‘ al-Fā‘idah*, 12:10 (under the commentary). The text reads: “And because of ‘Umar ibn Ḥaṇṣalah being unknown (*bijahli ‘Umar ibn Ḥaṇṣalah*) in the dictionaries of narrator evaluation (*kutub al-rijāl*). This author is different to the al-Ardabīlī who authored *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt*.”

3 Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī: *al-Fawā‘id al-Ḥāiriyyah*, p. 219.

Therefore, the proof they rely upon to claim the historical roots connecting them to the sciences of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* is wholly unreliable, both in terms of the isnād and meaning.

### The third proof

Al-Faḍlī<sup>1</sup> and al-Kajūrī<sup>2</sup> also use as a proof what is referred to as the “*Marfū‘ah* of Zurārah.” He says:

سألت الباقر (عليه السلام) فقلت جعلت فداك يأتي عنكم الخبران أو الحديثان المتعارضان فبأيهما آخذ؟ فقال يا زرارة خذ بما اشتهر بين أصحابك ودع الشاذ النادر فقلت يا سيدي إنهما معا مشهوران مرويان مأثوران عنكم؟ فقال (عليه السلام) خذ بقول أعدلهما عندك وأوثقهما في نفسك

I (i.e. Zurārah) asked al-Bāqir عليه السلام: “May I be ransomed for your sake! If two conflicting reports or ḥadīths come regarding you (i.e. the Imāms), which one should I use?”

He said, “O Zurārah, take the one that is (more) well-known amongst your associates. And discard the rare (and) anomalous one.”

I said, “O my master, (what if) they are equally narrated (and) well-known from you (i.e. the Imāms)?”

He said: “Take the statement of the one you think is more just and trustworthy.”<sup>3</sup>

### Objections to the third proof

When returning to the source that mentions the narration, the work ‘*Awālī al-Lāālī* by al-Aḥsā‘ī, I found it saying:

وروى العلامة قدس نفسه مرفوعا إلى زرارة بن أعين قال سألت الباقر (عليه السلام)

1 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 30.

2 Al-Kajūrī: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 46.

3 Ibn Abī Jūmhūr al-Aḥsā‘ī: *‘Awālī al-Lāālī*, 4/133.

Al-'Allāmah (may his being be sanctified) narrated *marfū'an*<sup>1</sup> from Zurārah ibn A'yan who said, 'I asked al-Bāqir...'"

It is mentioned like this without an *isnād*?<sup>2</sup>

After going through great pains searching for the *isnād* of this report, I did not find anything reliable, not to mention the fact that it does not even have an *isnād* to begin with! So how then can it be used to infer the foundations of a science that is meant to understand and distinguish between authentic and faulty (reports)?

The most that can be said of this narration—assuming it is authentic—is that it falls within the parameters of taking precaution and being self-conscious (when accepting reports). This is self-evident from the Imam's statement, "Take the statement of the **one you think is more just and trustworthy.**" Similarly, it falls within the parameters of conflicting authentic reports and how to deal with them because, according to many scholars of the Shī'ah, the *ḍa'īf ḥadīth* does not take into account narrations that are *shādh* (anomalous) and *nādir* (rare).<sup>3</sup>

---

1 The term '*marfū'an*' (lit. 'raised') here refers to a *ḥadīth* that is directly attributed to one of the imams, i.e. it is 'raised' up to him. [Translator's note]

2 Ibn Abī Jumhūr al-Aḥsā'ī: *Awālī al-Lā'ālī*, 4/133.

3 The latter-day scholars of the Shī'ah (predominantly the *Uṣūlīs*) infer from the early generation of scholars that they were, in fact, the forerunners to the science of authenticating and disparaging *aḥādīth*. They achieve this by arguing that the early generation of scholars, at times, ruled several *aḥādīth* to be *shādh* and *nādir*. However, I say this is a form of *tadlīs* (obfuscation). The term *shādh*, according to many scholars of the Shī'ah, does not imply the *ḥadīth* in question is weak. Rather, as al-Ḥusayn al-Āmilī says, the term *shādh* refers to a *ḥadīth* which "contradicts the majority, even if its narrator is a *thiqah*." He also says: "*Shādh*, according to us (the Shī'ah) can also refer to a *ḥadīth* whose contents is not acted upon by the scholars, **even though its *isnād* is authentic and (a report) other than it does not oppose it.**" See: al-Ḥusayn al-Āmilī: *Wuṣūl al-Akhyār ilā Uṣūl al-Akḥbār* (printed under *Majmū'ah Rasā'il fī al-Ḥadīth wa al-Dirāyah*), 1/410; 'Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Miqbās al-Hidāyah*, 1/252, He says: "The *shādh* and *nādir* are synonymous terms. *Shādh* is more frequently used; whereas *nādir*, although it exists, it is rarely used."; al-Shahīd al-Thānī: *al-Bidāyah fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah*, p. 31. In defining an authentic *ḥadīth*, he states: "It is a contiguous chain up to the infallible (imam) that is narrated by an upright *imāmī* (i.e. believes in Imāmah), from someone similar on all levels (of the chain), **even if it is befallen by *shudhūdh* (anomalies).**"

It is important to note the Shī'ah that substantiate this view with these textual proofs—which are proven inauthentic—are from their leading ḥadīth scholars, individuals who work in the field of understanding how to recognize and distinguish between ṣaḥīḥ and ḍa'īf. They are research specialists and people of isnād and narrator biographies (tarājim). What, then, to say of their remaining scholars?

## 2.0 A historical overview and appraisal of the biographical works authored by the Shī'ah

The attempts of Shī'ah scholars have continued unabated in establishing their (claimed) antecedence in the history of *'ulūm al-rijāl* and *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. This can be clearly seen in their listing of works dedicated to narrator evaluation and *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. For this reason, we find Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī in his work *Tārīkh 'ilm al-Rijāl* make the same attempts as al-Faḍlī and al-Kajūrī; although, he was somewhat less thoughtful than them and other scholars of the Shī'ah and adopted a much more literal approach. However, he was unsuccessful in his findings. Under the section "*Lamḥah 'an Tārīkh 'ilm al-Rijāl* (A Glimpse into the History of *'ilm al-Rijāl*)," he writes:

إذا أخذنا علم الرجال بمعناه الأعم الباحث عن أحوال الرواة وقبولهم وعدم قبولهم فإن نظرة سريعة على تاريخ علم الرجال يعود بنا العهد إلى النصف الأول من القرن الأول حيث أنه في سنة ٤٠ هـ كتب عبيد الله بن أبي رافع مولى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كتابا في الصحابة الذين شهدوا مع أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام حروبه مثل صفين والجمل والنهروان وتعيين من كان منهم من البدرين

When we understand the science of narrator evaluation in its broader sense, i.e. studying the conditions of narrators and whether they are acceptable or not, then a quick glance through its history takes us back to the first-half of the first century. In the year 40 A.H, 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Abī Rāfi', the *mawlā* (client) of Allah's Messenger ﷺ, wrote a letter regarding the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم who were present with Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام in his battles, such as *Ṣiffīn*, *Jamal*, and *Nahrawān*. He also specified who amongst them were *Badrīs* (i.e. the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم who took part in the Battle of Badr).<sup>1</sup>

Al-Rāḍī regarded the letter of 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Rāfi' in which he mentioned the individuals who took part in Ṣiffīn with 'Alī رضي الله عنه and were *Badrīs* as a work in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*! If we were to ask Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī: Is there, in the work you claim "studies of the conditions of narrators and whether they are acceptable or

---

1 Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī: *Tārīkh 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 9.



not” *jarḥ* (statement of impugment) or *ta’dīl* (attesting statement of reliability)? Did he (i.e. ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Rāfi‘) describe any of the narrators as being a *thiqah* (reliable)? Did he describe any of the narrators as being ḍa’īf? Did he discuss the concept of their accepting and rejecting of narrators? Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī will certainly be unable to answer. He will never find a way. How could he? The book simply mentions the names of participants in Ṣiffīn!

Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī also attempted to establish a link between the Shī’ah and the letter of ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Rāfi‘ in his statement:

ذكره الطوسي في الفهرست وذكر سنده إليه

Al-Ṭūsī mentions it in *al-Fihrist* along with his isnād for it.<sup>1</sup>

Regarding this claimed link, al-Khūṭī says:

وفي طريق الشيخ [يقصد الطوسي] إليه عدة مجاهيل

And in the sanad of *al-Shaykh* (i.e. al-Ṭūsī) up to the ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Rāfi‘, there are a number of *majhūl* (unknown) narrators.<sup>2</sup>

Counting ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Rāfi‘ among the authors of the Shī’ah is extremely implausible. Who has ever said he is an Imāmī Shī’ī that believes in Twelve Imāms? After studying his biography, I could not find a single person who said he is a Shī’ī that believes in Twelve infallible Imāms. The most that can be said is that he was a *kātib* (scribe) for ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه.<sup>3</sup>

We can summarize everything up to now as follows:

---

1 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 13.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 12:70 (at the end of ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Rāfi‘’s biography).

3 Al-Bukhārī writes: “‘Ubayd Allah ibn Abī Rāfi‘, the mawlā of Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم. He heard (from) ‘Alī and Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه. Busr ibn Sa‘īd, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī, al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad, and al-A‘raj heard his ḥadīth regarding the people of Madīnah from him. See: *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, 5:381.

1. There is no correlation with this work and the sciences of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. In fact, Ja'far al-Subḥānī described it as “a work of history and events.”<sup>1</sup>
2. The Shī'ah do not possess one authentic chain of narration for this book, as mentioned in al-Khūṭ's statement.
3. This claim of Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī is contradictory to other statements by Shī' scholars. In fact, Ḥasan al-Ṣadr states that the first person to write in this regard was Abū Muḥammad ibn Jabalah al-Kinānī.<sup>2</sup>

For the most part, these are the attempts made by the Shī'ah to claim their antecedence in the unique accomplishments of the Islamic sciences in general, not just the sciences of ḥadīth. It has become clear to us from this academic review thus far that the Shī'ah still need to prove this claim, despite their scholars' attempts at finding a historical basis that corroborates their viewpoint.

### The Shī'ah conceding to their books being lost

Many scholars of the Imāmiyyah have attempted to prove the existence of several works in narrator evaluation for themselves. However, a number of them have conceded to the fact that whatever was written in the earlier periods was, as they say, lost to history! When mentioning the written works of the third century, al-Ḥasan al-Rāḍī states:

في هذا القرن صدر عدد كبير من الكتب في علم الرجال وإن كان لم يصلنا منها ومن أسمائها إلا القليل  
جدًا ومع ذلك فقد حفظ لنا التاريخ عددًا من أسماء المؤلفين في هذا المجال

In this century, a large number of works in the science of narrator evaluation (*ilm al-rijāl*) appeared, despite only a very small number of them, along with their names, reaching us. Nevertheless, history has preserved for us a number of writers' names in this field.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fi 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 57.

2 Ḥasan al-Ṣadr: *Nihāyat al-Dirāyah*, p. 25.

3 Ḥasan al-Rāḍī: *Tārīkh 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 29.

Al-Rāḍī only mentions the names, nothing else. Regarding the fourth century, he states:

فقد أكثر تلك الكتب في حوادث أَلَمَّتْ بالعالم الإسلامي من حروب وفتن مذهبية قضت على الكتب  
والمكتبات والعلماء

Most of the works were lost to history on account of the events that befell the Islamic world. Wars and sectarian discord led to the loss of books, libraries, and scholars alike.<sup>1</sup>

‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī says:

ولم يصل إلينا منها شيء من هذه الكتب إلا ما ذكره شيخنا الطهراني في الذريعة من وجود كتاب الطبقات  
للبرقي حتى عصرنا هذا

None of these works reached us until now, except for what our Shaykh, al-Ṭahrānī, mentioned in *al-Dharī‘ah* concerning the existence of the book *al-Ṭabaqāt*, written by al-Barqī.<sup>2</sup>

Ja‘far al-Subḥānī recognized this fact when he said:

ومن المأسوف عليه أنه لم تصل هذه الكتب إلينا وإنما الموجود عندنا وهو الذي يعد اليوم أصول الكتب  
الرجالية ما دون في القرنين الرابع والخامس

Regrettably, these works did not reach us. Whatever we have available—which are considered the primary works on narrator evaluation today—excludes (everything from) the fourth and fifth centuries.<sup>3</sup>

A similar conclusion was reached by their teacher, Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī when he stated:

---

1 Ibid, p. 61.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 32.

3 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fi ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 57.

وأما سائر الكتب القديمة فقد ضاعت أعيانها الشخصية من جهة قلة الاهتمام بها بعد وجود عين ألفاظها مدرجة في الأصول الأربعة المتداولة عندنا

As for all of the early works, they all individually perished on account of the lack of importance shown to them after their exact wordings were inserted into the Four Primary works (*al-Uṣūl al-Arbaʿah*), now common to us.<sup>1</sup>

In discussing the works of al-Kashshī and Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī, al-Khūʾī states:

هذا حال كتاب الكشي وكتاب ابن الغضائري المعدودين من الأصول وأما باقي الكتب الرجالية المعروفة في عصر الشيخ والنجاشي فلم يبق منها عين ولا أثر في عصر المتأخرين

This is the condition of al-Kashshī's and al-Ghaḍāʾirī's work; they are counted among the primary works. As for the remaining famous works in narrator evaluation during the time of al-Shaykh (i.e. al-Ṭūsī) and al-Najjāshī, no sign or trace remains of them in latter-day times.<sup>2</sup>

I will conclude with the statement of Muḥammad al-Bahbūdī who, regarding the scholars of the Shīʿah, said:

ومع ذلك ألفوا في معرفة الرواة وعقائدهم وأخلاقهم وسيرتهم معاجم كبيرة مسندة وفي معرفة الأصول والمؤلفات وصحيحها وسقيمها وطرقها وإسنادها فهارس قيمة ممتعة إلا أنه لم يبق إلى الآن من هذه المعاجم الرجالية إلا معجمين أحدهما يعرف برجال شيخنا الكشي والآخر برجال شيخنا الطوسي ولم يبق من تلك الفهارس القيمة إلا اثنان أحدهما فهرس شيخنا أبي الحسين ابن النجاشي والآخر فهرس شيخنا أبي جعفر الطوسي

Nevertheless, they authored a number of works (*maʿājim*) in identifying narrators, their beliefs, character traits, and biographies. They also authored several invaluable indices in understanding both the primary and the compiled works—both authentic and inauthentic, their many

1 Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī: *al-Dharīʿah ilā Taṣānīf al-Shīʿah*, 1/81.

2 Al-Khūʾī: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/45.

versions and isnāds. However, until today, none of these works of narrator evaluation survived, save two: 1) the *Rijāl* of our Shaykh, al-Kashshī, and 2) the *Rijāl* of our Shaykh, al-Ṭūsī. And from the invaluable indices, only the following two survived: 1) the *Fihrist* of our Shaykh, Abī al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Najjāshī, and 2) the *Fihrist* of our Shaykh, Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Faḍlī mentioned that some of the works on narrator evaluation of their predecessors, such as *Rijāl al-Barqī*, *Rijāl al-‘Aqīqī*, *Rijāl Ibn Faḍḍāl*, and *Rijāl al-Faḍl Ibn Shādhān* existed until the era of al-‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī.<sup>2</sup>

In short, there remains no trace of books in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta‘dīl* written by the Shī‘ah in the first three centuries, according to their many claims; except for the work of al-Barqī, as documented in the text of al-Subḥānī. Also, the earlier works simply dissipated into the Four Primary works of narrator evaluation (*al-Uṣūl al-Rijāliyyah al-Arba‘ah*) after their texts were inserted therein.<sup>3</sup>

Based on this, the fifth century is regarded as the *actual beginning* for consolidating the science of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta‘dīl*, according to them. Al-Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī states:

وبعد أن انتهى القرن الرابع الهجري ودخل القرن الخامس وفيه كثر التأليف في علم الرجال وفي النصف الأول منه صدرت الأصول الأربعة لعلم الرجال

1 Al-Bahbūdī: *Ma‘rifat al-Ḥadīth wa Tārīkh Nashrihi wa Tadwīnihi wa Thaqāfatihi ‘inda al-Shī‘ah al-Imāmiyyah*, p. 82-83.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 33.

3 In describing these lost works—which represents the first phase of writing in narrator evaluation, as the Shī‘ah claim—Ḥusayn al-Sā‘idī states: “During this phase of writing, it is observed that the scholars only attached importance in mentioning the names and *ṭabaqāt* (classes). Rarely would they operate in the field of authenticating and inauthenticating (reports).” See: *al-Ḍu‘afā’*, 1/50. In fact, this is applicable to everything the Shī‘ah refer to as “*Uṣūl al-Tarājim*,” or the foundations of narrator biographies. Their writings, which they refer to as “the works of the early (scholars)” are names that are applied to (works of) *ṭabaqāt*, or to simply enumerating their works; without any recourse to mention the status of the person in question in terms of his reliability or weakness. This is the case in most instances.

- ١ . اختيار الرجال للشيخ الطوسي [الكشي]
- ٢ . الرجال المعروف برجال الشيخ الطوسي
- ٣ . فهرست كتب الشيعة وأصولهم وأسماء المصنفين وأصحاب الأصول للشيخ الطوسي [أيضا] المشتهر بالفهرست
- ٤ . فهرست أسماء مصنفي الشيعة المعروف بـ (رجال النجاشي - ٤٥٠ هـ)

والكتب الثلاثة الأولى كلها للشيخ أبي جعفر محمد بن الحسن الطوسي المتوفى ٤٦٠ هـ ومن مراجعتنا لأسماء ما تقدمت من كتب علم الرجال في القرون الأربعة المتقدمة وأن أكثرها قد بادت وذهبت ولم يبق منها إلا الاسم وأن مجرد صدور هذه الكتب المتأخرة للشيخ الطوسي أصبحت محط البحث والتنقيب والتدقيق

Only after the fourth hijrī century came to an end and the fifth century began, did the writings in al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl proliferate. In the first half of this century, the Four Primary works in the science of narrator evaluation emerged, namely:

1. *Ikhtiyār al-Rijāl*, written by al-Ṭūsī (originally *Rijāl al-Kashshī*),
2. *al-Rijāl* (famously known as *Rijāl al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī*), written by al-Ṭūsī,
3. *Fihrist Kutub al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluhum wa Asmā' al-Muṣannifīn wa Aṣḥāb al-Uṣūl* (famously known as *al-Fihrist*), written by al-Ṭūsī, and
4. *Fihrist Asmā' Muṣannifī al-Shī'ah* (famously known as *Rijāl al-Najjāshī* (d. 450 A.H)), written by Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Najjāshī.

The first three works are all written by Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H). In our revision of the names of works in the science of narration evaluation from the first four centuries, most of them have perished and disappeared, only the names appear. The emergence of these latter-day books of al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī have become the object of study, research, and investigation.<sup>1</sup>

1 Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī: *Tārīkh 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 110.

It is important to note the words of Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī and other writers of the Shī'ah since they did not mention the work of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī among the primary works of the science of narrator evaluation. Notwithstanding, the work of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī printed and in circulation nowadays is considered one of the works in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* that are *specific to weak narrators*. It is therefore, in reality, *Ḍu'afā' Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī* (The Weak Narrators of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī). Nevertheless, many scholars of the Shī'ah exacerbated things with their statement “*al-Uṣūl al-Rijāliyyah al-Khamsah* (the Five Primary works of narrator evaluation);” they would (contradictorily) refer to it as “*al-Uṣūl al-Arba'ah* (the Four Primary works).” Ja'far al-Subhānī refers to it as such. On the other hand, 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī disagreed with him and regarded Ibn Ghaḍā'irī's work, *Rijāl al-Ghaḍā'irī*, as the fifth of their primary works.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps this issue stems from the difference of opinion regarding the provability of the work. This is an issue that will be investigated further when dealing specifically with Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī.

Therefore, the works that the Shī'ah scholars eventually settled on were these four, or five (according to the other opinion). These are the primary works that are regarded as the real wealth for understanding *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. Whoever of the Shī'ī scholars that writes on narrator evaluation does so within the parameters of these works; they are like the *qiblah* for their scholars. It is from here they transmit the opinions of their predecessors. In investigating these works, we find that there are no actual written biographies for thousands of Shī'ī narrators; only their names exist, let alone any statements of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*! There are no statements of *jarḥ* or *tawthīq* for hundreds, in fact thousands of narrators!

Let us now consider these works, one by one, in order to understand the principle(s) and intellectual heritage upon which both Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khū'ī stood. Also, (to offer) an overall evaluation of the Shī'ī legacy of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. The work of al-Barqī will also be included since it is printed and in common use.

---

1 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 72.

## Presentation and critique of the Shī'ah's primary works in narrator evaluation

### 1. Rijāl al-Barqī by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khālīd al-Barqī (d. 264/74/80<sup>1</sup> A.H)

Although this work was written before *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, the existence of it is practically insignificant. It “**does not fatten (one), nor avail against hunger.**”<sup>2</sup> Therefore, we see that most people who speak to the subject of narrator evaluation prefer *Rijāl al-Kashshī* over it, and they do not regard it as part of the primary works. The total amount of narrator biographies mentioned by al-Barqī are 1707. The author rarely speaks *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* of the narrators. For instance, he describes Zayd ibn Arqam رضي الله عنه as having “revealed the hypocrisy of the hypocrites from Banī al-Khazraj.”<sup>3</sup>

In describing Hisham ibn al-Ḥakam, he did not criticize him in clear terms, he simply said: “(He is) from the students of Abū Shākir al-Zindīq, and he is an anthropomorphist,”<sup>4</sup> despite the fact that Hishām is one of the most reliable narrators of the Shī'ah!

Similarly, he described 'Abd Allāh ibn Ḥabīb saying: “And some narrators have leveled accusations against him.”<sup>5</sup>

---

1 There is a difference of opinion regarding the exact year he passed away.

2 The author is referring to Sūrah al-Ṭāriq, 7. [Translator's note]

3 Aḥmad al-Barqī: *Rijāl al-Barqī*, biography no. 14.

4 Ibid, biography no. 884. The scholar Jawwād al-Qayyūmī has replaced the words “*jismī ru'īyy*” (which appears in the version of *Mu'assasat al-Nashr* in the University of Tehran – 1383 AH) with “*ḥasbamā ruwiya* (as narrated)”. In *Qāmūs al-Rijāl* of al-Tustarī, the words “*jismī radī* (evil anthropomorphist)” appear (10:552). With this accusation, the scholars of the Shī'ah have attempted to make the personal pronoun (*ḍamīr*) (in the statement) refer to Abū Shākir al-Zindīq. However, the context rejects such a claim.

5 Ibid, biography no. 73.



Additionally, he only regarded four narrators as reliable, namely: Ibrāhīm ibn Ishāq ibn Azwar<sup>1</sup>, ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Alī al-Ḥalabī<sup>2</sup>, al-Faḍl al-Baqbāq<sup>3</sup>, and Dāwūd ibn Abī Zayd<sup>4</sup>—who he simply described as ‘truthful (*ṣādiq al-lahjah*).’ Aside from them, he did not make tawthīq of anyone else!

Part of al-Barqī’s methodology is that he writes (for example) “The Companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ” and assigns them to (different) *ṭabaqāt* (classes). He does this because his book is dedicated to *ṭabaqāt*, and not to *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl*. In fact, Āqā Buzurg mentions it under the title *Ṭabaqāt al-Rijāl* (Classes of Narrators).<sup>5</sup>

The creed of the Imāmiyyah clearly had an impact on the author; he does not even mention Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, or ‘Uthmān among the Companions! In fact, he only mentions a small number among the Companions, enough to be counted on ones’ fingers. Thereafter, he mentions the companions of ‘Alī, followed by the companions of the infallible Imāms, with no reference to *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl*. He simply introduces them as “So and so. A Kufan,” or “So and so. A food merchant.” In short, the author did not make tawthīq nor criticize anyone except the four aforementioned cases. If he added anything, it was negligible.

The scholars of the Shī‘ah disagree as to whether *Rijāl al-Barqī* is the author’s work or his father’s.<sup>6</sup>

If this is the state of *Rijāl al-Barqī*, how then can it form part of the relied upon primary works, as some scholars of the Shī‘ah hold?

---

1 Ibid, biography no. 1594.

2 Ibid, biography no. 572.

3 Ibid, biography no. 880.

4 Ibid, biography no. 1613.

5 Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī: *al-Dharī‘ah*, 15/147 (see p. 145 under the title which al-Ṭahrānī refers to as *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt*).

6 The editor of the work prefers the opinion that the author is Aḥmad al-Barqī, not his father. See p. 19. Similarly, Baḥr al-‘Ulūm, al-Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī prefers the opinion that it is the work of Aḥmad al-Barqī, and not his father. See: *al-Fawā’id al-Rijāliyyah*, 4:156.

## 2. Rijāl al-Kashshī by Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Kashshī Abū ‘Amr<sup>1</sup>

Despite the author being from the fourth century, we find al-Faḍlī saying about al-Kashshī’s book:

من الكتب التي لم يقدر لها أن تكون في أيدي الباحثين الرجاليين وبخاصة مصنفي القرن السادس الهجري وما بعده!

It is from the works that researchers in the field of narrator evaluation were unable to get their hands on, especially the writers in the sixth century A.H and beyond.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Faḍlī does not mention the reason why the book was unavailable; even though it was the central point for those that wrote on the subject. Regarding this, Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Kalbāsī (d. 1315 AH) states:

وضع كتاب الكشي لنقل الروايات المادحة والقاذحة والتعرض لحال الرجل فيه نادر

Al-Kashshī’s work was written in order to transmit both praiseworthy and problematic reports. It rarely addresses the condition of the narrator.<sup>3</sup>

Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī states:

وكثيرا ما يروي أخبارا متعددة في حق شخص واحد في مواضع شتى فلا بد لمن أراد تحقيق الحال التصفح الأكيد والتفحص الشديد فيه ليحصل الاطلاع على تمام المرام

---

1 Muḥammad al-Jalālī mentions that the works of history do not mention his date of birth nor death; however, they mention him in the category of scholars of the fourth century A.H. See: *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 404.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 34.

3 Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Kalbāsī: *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah*, 3/180. The al-Kalbāsī referred to here is Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Kalbāsī Abū al-Ma‘ālī (d. 1315 AH). He is different to Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī (d. 1356 A.H), the author of the work *Samā’ al-Maqāl*.

Many times, he narrates several reports of one narrator in different places. Whoever is interested in knowing the condition (of a particular narrator) is therefore required to thoroughly examine and carefully scrutinize in order that he may be completely aware (of his condition).<sup>1</sup>

Al-Shahīd al-Thānī (d. 965 A.H) states:

كيف بمثل الكشي الذي يشتمل كتابه على أغاليط من جرح لغير مجروح بروايات ضعيفة ومدح لغيره كذلك كما نبه عليه جماعة من علماء أهل هذا الفن والغرض من وضعه ليس هو معرفة التوثيق وضده كعادة غيره من الكتب بل غرضه ذكر الرجل وما ورد فيه من مدح وجرح وعلى الناظر طلب الحكم [من غيره]

What then, with the likes of al-Kashshī, whose work contains errors involving narrators who are wrongfully criticized with weak narrations, and (others) wrongfully praised. Just as a number of scholars in this field have indicated, the intention of the author was not to identify reliable and unreliable narrators—like other works (in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*); rather, his intention was merely to mention the name of the narrator and everything (positive and negative) said about him. It is up to the reader to investigate the (actual) ruling of the narrator in question (from somewhere else).<sup>2</sup>

Al-Tustarī offers the following evaluation of al-Kashshī's work:

وأما رجال الكشي فلم تصل نسخته صحيحة إلى أحد حتى الشيخ [الطوسي] والنجاشي

As for *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, an authentic copy of it did not reach anyone until al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) and al-Najjāshī.

A few lines after this, he says:

---

1 Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī: *Samā' al-Maqāl fi 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, 1/90.

2 Al-Shahīd al-Thānī: *Rasā'il al-Shahīd al-Thānī (ṭab'ah ḥajariyyah)*, p. 67. I did not find the words “from somewhere else” in *Rasā'il al-Shahīd al-Thānī*. Rather, I found it as an addition in the work *al-Rasā'il al-Rijāliyyah* of Abū al-Ma'ālī al-Kalbāsī (2/303). I also found it in *Samā' al-Maqāl fi 'Ilm al-Rijāl* of Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī (1/91).

قلما تسلم رواية من رواياته عن التصحيف بل وقع في كثير من عناوينه بل وقع فيه خلط أخبار ترجمة بترجمة أخرى وخلط طبقة بأخرى

Rarely will one of his narrations be free of any distortions. In fact, this has (also) occurred in a number of his titles. The reports of one (narrator's) biography are mixed up with another's, as are the *ṭabaqāt*.

Then he says:

إن الشيخ [الطوسي] اختار مقدارا مع ما فيه من الخلط والتصحيف وأسقط منه أبوابا وإن بقي ترتيبه

Indeed, al-Shaykh al-Tūsī chose selections (from this work), despite the distortions and confusion therein. He removed certain chapters, despite the order remaining.

Then he said:

وبعدما قلنا من وقوع التحريفات في أصل الكشي بتلك المرتبة لا يمكن الاعتماد على ما فيه إذا لم تقم قرينة على صحة ما فيه

After what we have stated regarding the extent of distortions in al-Kashshī's original work, it is not possible to rely on its contents unless there is other contextual evidence in support of what it contains.

Until the section wherein he says:

إنه حدث في الاختيار من الكشي أيضا تحريفات غير ما كان في أصله – فإنه شأن كل كتاب – إلا أنها لم تكن بمقدار الأصل

Similarly, distortions which were not in the original work occurred in al-Ikhtiyār of al-Kashshī—this is the nature of every book. However, they were not as many as in the original.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/58 (in the twenty-first section of the introduction, under *al-Muṣaḥḥaf wa al-Muḥarraf min Nusakh tilka al-Kutub*).

There are numerous contradictions related to *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* in al-Kashshī's work. Consequently, a narrator will be elevated to the highest ranks of trustworthiness (*amānah*) and precision (*dabt*), and then (in other places) reduced to the lowest of ranks. As for the contradictory reports in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*, they are abundant (*mutawatirah*). In fact, there does not exist a work of theirs in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* that is free from contradictions, as is the case of *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, especially relating to the leading narrators of the Shī'ah. In order to review (the work of) al-Kashshī, let us, for example, look at Zurārah ibn A'yan al-Shaybānī, one of the most prolific narrators of the Shī'ah. In the first narration under his biography, it states:

قال جعفر الصادق يا زرارۃ إن اسمك في أسماء أهل الجنة!

Ja'far al-Ṣādiq said, "O Zurārah, verily your name is among the names of the people of Jannah!"<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kashshī did not wait long—after 'admitting' Zurārah into Jannah, before saying something very different. A few narrations later, he says—on the tongue of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq:

لعن الله زرارۃ

May Allah curse Zurārah.<sup>2</sup>

This is a clear contradiction! The personal views of al-Kashshī related to *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* in this work are minimal, as alluded to by Abū al-Ma'ālī al-Kalbāsī previously.<sup>3</sup> Al-Kashshī frequently presents narrations after mentioning the name of the biographee; he makes no mention in many of these biographies of statements of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. He simply informs about an incident that

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 133, narration number 208.

2 Ibid, p. 148-49, narration number 237. Regarding this narration, Muḥsin al-Amīn says: "The sanad is authentic." See: *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 7/50.

3 As in biography numbers 1087 and 1080.

occurred with the narrator, or his function/work.<sup>1</sup> How then, is the researcher to find out his (i.e. al-Kashshī's) intended meanings in the likes of this primary work?

In addition to the many contradictions in the work, the scholars of the Shī'ah have conceded to another problem: the numerous errors in al-Kashshī's work. Al-Najjāshī states:

فيه أغلط كثيرة

It contains numerous errors.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ḥillī followed in his footsteps saying:

له كتاب الرجال إلا أن فيه أغلطا كثيرة

He has a work on narrators; however, it contains numerous errors.<sup>3</sup>

Neither al-Najjāshī nor al-Ḥillī have alluded to the details of these errors! A number of scholars of the Shī'ah have attempted to answer what is meant by these mistakes. Consequently, al-Taqī al-Majlisī states:

إن المراد الروايات المتعارضة ظاهرا

What is intended thereby are the apparent contradictory narrations.<sup>4</sup>

Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī refutes this opinion saying:

---

1 See biography numbers 973, 1034, 1067, 1069, 1124, and many others.

2 Aḥmad al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 372, biography no. 1018.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāsat al-Aqwāl*, p. 247, biography no. 838.

4 Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī: *Samā' al-Maqāl fī 'Ulūm al-Rijāl*, 1:80. The editor of the work (Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī al-Qazwīnī) alluded to the statement of al-Taqī al-Majlisī in *Rawḍat al-Muttaqīn*, 14/445.

ولا يخفى ما فيه من المخالفة لظاهر السياق بل الظاهر ما هو الظاهر من العبارة فإنه قد وقع فيه أغلاط كثيرة كما يظهر بعد التتبع والتأمل فيه

This is clearly contrary to the apparent context. In fact, the apparent context is precisely what is apparent from the actual text. There are numerous errors therein, as becomes clear after scrutinizing and examining it.<sup>1</sup>

‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī took a neutral course on this issue. He states:

هذه الأغالط قد تكون علمية وقد تكون فنية كما أننا لا نعرف عن مستواها شيئاً لأن الكتاب لم يصل إلينا وذلك لأن الشيخ الطوسي عمد لهذا الكتاب واختصره فيما عنوانه بـ (اختيار معرفة الرجال) فحل محل الأصل

These mistakes can either be technical or academic in nature. Likewise, we know nothing of their extent because the work did not reach us. That is because al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī took up the work and abridged it under the title *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl*, thereby occupying the place of the original.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the reason for these errors was as Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā‘irī (d. 1216 AH) alluded to:

عمد إليه شيخ الطائفة...فلخصه وأسقط منه الفضلات...والموجود الآن في هذه الأزمان بل وزمان العلامة وما قاربه إنما هو اختيار الشيخ لا الكشي الأصل

Shaykh al-Ṭā‘ifāh went about and abridged it and removed the ‘residue’ therefrom. The work in existence these days and, in fact, during and after the time of al-‘Allāmah (al-Ṭūsī) is the *Ikhtiyār* of al-Shaykh, not al-Kashshī’s original.<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps al-Ṭūsī’s doings in his abridgement of al-Kashshī’s work is the primary reason for the existence of the numerous mistakes and all the confusion.<sup>4</sup>

1 Ibid, 1/80.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 35.

3 Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā‘irī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl*, 6/144. Al-Ḥā‘irī transmits what he says from his teachers.

4 Al-Kalbāsī has a long discussion concerning the errors of al-Kashshī. See his work: *al-Rasā‘il al-Rijāliyyah*, 2/299.

There is another issue which presents itself in the work, as Muḥammad al-Jalālī has documented:

ولم يعين الشيخ الطوسي كيفية الاختيار من رجال الكشي لا في هذا الاختيار ولا في غيره من كتبه

Al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī did not stipulate the method of selecting from the narrators of al-Kashshī, not in *al-Ikhtiyār* nor in his other works.<sup>1</sup>

In short, the defect in this work is clear and obvious: the birth and death of the author are unknown. Furthermore, it was misplaced for a long time. A difference of opinion transpired: Is the existing work the original or is it the abridgment of the original? There is (also) a difference of opinion about the actual name of the work. Furthermore, it contains numerous errors. There is (also) a difference in determining these mistakes. The entire contents of the work is all but discrepancies and contradictions, all of which the viewer suffers from.

The erudite scholar, al-Muṣṭafawī says:

وأما الخلط في ترتيب الكتاب فهو خطأ فاحش لأنه يوجب التقص من غرض التأليف

Regarding the confusion in the sequence of the book, it is an appalling error because it brings about a lack in (understanding) the purpose and intention behind the work.<sup>2</sup>

Who can guarantee for us there was no distortion in the text of the work? In fact, al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 AH) clearly stated that the work was manipulated in his statement:

واعلم أنه قد ظهر لنا من بعض القرائن أنه قد وقع في اختيار الشيخ - أيضا - تصرف من بعض العلماء أو النساخ بإسقاط بعض ما فيه وأن الدائر في هذه الأعصار غير حاو لتتمام ما في الاختيار ولم أر من تنبه لذلك ولا وحشة من هذه الدعوى بعد وجود القرائن

---

1 Muḥammad al-Jalālī: *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 406.

2 Al-Muṣṭafawī: *al-Muqaddimah*, p. 15.



And know well that it has become evident to us through several pieces of evidence that tampering occurred from some scholars or transcribers by omitting some of the contents therein. And the current version in circulation in these times does not include everything of *al-Ikhtiyār*. I have not seen anyone take note of this. There is no irregularity in this claim after the existence of such evidence.<sup>1</sup>

Regarding the previously mentioned statement of al-Faḍlī in which he alluded to the book being misplaced for some time and (the fact that) there existed numerous mistakes in the many copies, al-Tiffarishī states:

يخطر ببالي أن النسخة التي [كانت] عند العلامة [الحلي] من الكشي كان غلطا فاشتبه عليه

It seems to me that the copy al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) possessed of al-Kashshī’s work was incorrect, and therefore it confused him.<sup>2</sup>

If the copy of al-Kashshī’s work that al-‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī possessed was incorrect, what then in this time?

The number of narrators in al-Kashshī’s work that have dedicated biographies is 560, according to the highest estimate.<sup>3</sup> When a researcher wants to know the ruling of one of these particular narrators in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, he is required to exert a lot of energy and effort in reviewing the narrations in order to know the condition of the narrator. For example, al-Kashshī cites sixty-two narrations under the biography of Zurārah, the asānīd of which all need to be reviewed. Can

---

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrasī: *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 3/287.

2 Muṣṭafa al-Tafrashī: *Naqd al-Rijāl*, 1/351.

3 I did not find anyone mention the number of biographies in al-Kashshī’s work; even in the best print (of the book) I came across, al-Muṣṭafī’s print. Therefore, I was forced to count the number of narrators with biographies from the beginning of the work. The number reached 534, including many repeated names. This quick count further emphasises that the amount of biographies does not exceed 560. If it is more, it is not much more. And if it is less, it surely will not exceed this amount by much. In short, this count gives (us) an overall impression of the existing number.

there be more obstinance than this? Even al-Bahbūdī acceded to the difficulty in studying this work. He states:

أنه ذكر الأسانيد المعلقة على ما وجدها من دون إصلاحها فصعب على الناظرين تمييز صحيحها من سقيمها ولم يصح لنا من ألف ومائة وخمسين نصا إلا أقل القليل منها لا يبلغ رقمها إلى ثلاثمائة!

He mentions *mu'allaq* (suspended) chains of narrations as he found them without any rectification thereof. Therefore, it is difficult for those looking at the work to distinguish between the authentic and faulty chains. From 1150 texts, only a trivial amount is authentic. The number does not even amount to 300!<sup>1</sup>

Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī (d. 1356 AH) said:

وهو غير مبوب على خلاف الطريقة المعروفة في الكتب الرجالية ولذا يصعب منه الظفر على المرام

It is not arranged in chapters, contrary to the known method in works of narrator biographies. Therefore, it is difficult to gain benefit as desired.<sup>2</sup>

It is also important to point out the statement of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 AH):

إن الكشي كثيرا ما يعول في الجرح والتعديل على غير الإمامية فلا حظ

Indeed al-Kashshī many a times relies on non-imāmīs in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. Take note (of this fact).<sup>3</sup>

This clearly proves that the Imāmiyyah—at the head of them al-Kashshī—rely upon others, from other groups, in the sciences of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. They have no choice but to rely on others. Contrary to what they propagate, that others rely on them. A work such as this, how is it possible to be primary source in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*?

---

1 Al-Bahbūdī: *Ma'rifat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 103.

2 Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī: *Samā' al-Maqāl fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, 1/88.

3 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 5/78.

In short, when the scholars of the Imāmiyyah want to show admiration to the state of their works, they mention, enumerate, and praise their primary works. And when they want to vindicate themselves from the actual contents therein, they echo the sentiments of Murtaḍā al-‘Askarī:

تصريح العلماء مدى القرون بعدم اعتمادهم على رجال الكشي وتضعيفهم لهذا الكتاب

The explicit statement(s) of the scholars over the centuries has been one of non-reliance on *Rijāl al-Kashshī* and their deeming this work as weak/unreliable.<sup>1</sup>

### 3. Al-Fihrist by Shaykh al-Ṭā‘ifah Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H)

This is a small work and contains 909 biographies. It is an index specific to the authors of (general) books and the primary sources, not for every narrator. Al-Ṭūsī alludes to his methodology in the introduction saying:

فإذا ذكرت كل واحد من المصنفين وأصحاب الأصول فلا بد أن أشير إلى ما قيل فيه من التعديل والتجريح وهل يعول على روايته أو لا؟

When I mention every one of the writers and authors of the primary works, I need to (also) mention what has been said regarding the individual’s *jarḥ* and *ta‘dīl*, and whether his narrations are to be relied upon or not.<sup>2</sup>

However, did al-Ṭūsī actually abide by what he said? The answer is as follows. I embarked on an empirical study of al-Ṭūsī’s work, which contains 909 biographies (of narrators), and I only found 107 cases from them in which he made *tawthīq* and twelve cases in which he made *jarḥ*! Therefore, the total number of narrators he offered statements of *jarḥ* and *ta‘dīl* is 119. Some of them are Shī‘ah, others are not. With so little rulings, is it then possible for this work to form part of the primary sources?

1 Murtaḍā al-‘Askarī: *‘Abd Allāh Ibn Sabā*, 2/178. He said this when he wanted to vindicate himself from the narrations in which Ibn Sabā is mentioned.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 28.

In describing al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī's works, al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) states:

أنهما كثيرا يستكتان عن تضعيف الإمامي الضعيف حيث إن كتابيهما ليسا إلا مجرد فهرست لمن صنف من الشيعة أو صنف لهم دون الممدوحين والمذمومين

Very often, both remain quiet about the (statement of) weakness of a ḍaʿīf Imāmī narrator. This is because both of their works are nothing but an index of Shīʿī authors or those who wrote for them, without mentioning the praiseworthy and objectionable narrators.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, we can safely say the work is nothing but an index of authors, and not from the works of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl*.

#### 4. Rijāl al-Ṭūsī (Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī)

I acquired the first edition of this work with the editorial notes of Ṣādiq Baḥr al-ʿUlūm (d. 1212 A.H). On the first page, he writes:

يحتوي على زهاء (٨٩٠٠) اسم وهو أحد الكتب الأربعة المعول عليها في رجال الحديث

It contains some 8900 names. It is one of the four relied-upon works in ḥadīth narrators.

However, the version edited by Jawwād al-Qayyūmī includes 6429 biographies. Perhaps al-Qayyūmī did not count the repeated names. In reviewing the copy of Baḥr al-ʿUlūm, I found that from this large number, al-Ṭūsī only made tawthīq of 173 narrators and jarḥ of another 100. This is according to the amount I calculated—they can possibly add or subtract from this number. Although, 33 narrators whom al-Ṭūsī regarded as reliable in *al-Fihrist*, he also regarded them as reliable in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1:27 (chapter 16 of the introduction).

2 The editor of *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, Jawwād al-Qayyūmī alludes to an enumeration of narrators at the end of the work, such that he concluded al-Ṭūsī ruled 157 narrators as reliable and 43 as weak or problematic (*majrūḥ*). This number from the editor is close to the number I reached. Perhaps my (number) is larger than his because of the repetition of many names in the copy of *Baḥr al-ʿUlūm*. However, it gives (us) an overall impression of the work's contents.

I noticed Āṣif Muḥsinī claim that both the reliable and praiseworthy narrators in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* amount to 215 and the number of weak and extreme (*ghulāt*) narrators amount to 73, without omitting the repetitions.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, these figures are similar in relation to the total number of narrators, which is approximately 6429; especially considering the difference of opinion among the Rāfiḍah regarding the praiseworthy narrators. A narrator can be considered praiseworthy according to one scholar, and not another. This applies to the calculation of Āṣif Muḥsinī since he included the praiseworthy narrators with the reliable ones in his calculation, a calculation in which he included and did not omit the repeated (names).

Perhaps the reason for so few rulings in terms of *jarḥ* and *tawthīq* of narrators in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* goes back to what al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) said:

إنه أراد استقصاء أصحابهم عليهم السلام ومن روى عنهم مؤمناً كان أو منافقاً إمامياً كان أو عامياً فعدّ أبا بكر وعمر وعثمان ومعاوية وعمرو بن العاص ونظراءهم في أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وعد زياد بن أبيه وابنه عبید الله بن زياد في أصحاب أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام وعد منصور الدوانيقي في أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام بدون ذكر شيء فالاستناد إليه ما لم يحرز إمامية رجل غير جائز حتى في أصحاب غير النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وأمير المؤمنين عليه السلام فكيف في أصحابهم؟

He intended (with his work) an investigation of the companions of the Imāms عليهم السلام and those who narrated from them, be he a believer, hypocrite, Imāmī, or ‘āmmī (i.e. sunnī). He regarded Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, Mu‘āwiyah, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, and their equals to be among the Companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. He regarded Ziyād ibn Abīhi and his son, ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Ziyād among the companions of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn عليه السلام. He regarded Manṣūr al-Dawānīqī among the companions of al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام without mentioning anything further about them. Therefore, it is not permissible to rely upon it as long as the Imāmiyyah [status] of a person has not been preserved, even if they be companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and Amīr al-Mu‘minīn عليه السلام. What then about their companions?<sup>2</sup>

1 Mahdī al-Kajūrī al-Shīrāzī: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 129.

2 Al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/29 (chapter 6 of the introduction).

In short, the work is nothing but a writing on *ṭabaqāt*; it was not written for *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*.

## 5. *Fihrist Asmā' Muṣannifī al-Shī'ah/Rijāl al-Najjāshī* by Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn al-'Abbās al-Najjāshī (d. 540 A.H)

Al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) states:

سمينا كتاب النجاشي فهرستا لتصريحه بذلك في أول الجزء الثاني منه فتسمية العلامة [الحلي] وابن داود له بالرجال في ترجمته غلط فإن الرجال ما كان مبينا على الطبقات دون مجرد ذكر الأصول والمصنفات فإنه يسمى بالفهرست ولذا ترى النجاشي يقول في بعضهم ذكره أصحاب الفهرستات وفي بعضهم ذكره أصحاب الرجال

We termed the work of al-Najjāshī a “*fihrist* (index)” because he himself expressly refers to it as such in the beginning of the second chapter. Therefore, for al-'Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) and Ibn Dāwūd to refer to it as a dictionary of narrator evaluation is incorrect. Dictionaries of narration evaluation are based on *ṭabaqāt*, not simply mentioning the primary and (related) works—this is termed a *fihrist*. Therefore, you will see al-Najjāshī saying about some of them (i.e. narrators), “The people of the *fihristāt* (indices) mentioned him,” and about some (other narrators), “The people of narrator evaluation mentioned him.”<sup>1</sup>

The *Fihrist* of al-Najjāshī is much more accurate and better than the previous works. It is the last work of the primary works to be authored. It only mentions the writers of the Shī'ah and those who wrote for them. Ja'far al-Subḥānī says:

إن كتابه ليس إلا مجرد فهرس لمن صنف من الشيعة أو صنف لهم دون الممدوحين والمذمومين

His work is nothing but an index for writers of the Shī'ah, or for those who wrote for them without (mentioning) the praiseworthy and discreditable (narrators).<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Ibid.

2 Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 62.

What is clearly discernible is the fact that al-Najjāshī did not write this except to fend off the Ahl al-Sunnah’s condemnation of them. He states:

فإني وقفت على ما ذكر السيد الشريف من تعبير قوم من مخالفينا أنه لا سلف لكم ولا مصنف

I came across what al-Sayyid al-Sharīf mentioned regarding the criticism of a people from among our opposition (stating) that ‘you (i.e. the Shī‘ah) have no antecedence nor anything written (i.e. in the field of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl*):’<sup>1</sup>

This proves the existence of an ‘old knot (i.e. feud)’ of theirs in establishing their existence (in the field). The observer will notice that the total number of (narrator) biographies in al-Najjāshī’s work comes to 1269, of which approximately 45— or slightly more—are *majrūḥ* (criticized) and approximately 550 are *thiqah*. He concurred with al-Ṭūsī in deeming approximately 70 narrators *thiqah*. Most of the Shī‘ah scholars rely on this work; however, it is possible that some hands got a hold of it and distorted the contents therein. It contains things which give this impression. (For example), in the biography of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ḥamzah, al-Najjāshī states:

مات رحمه الله في يوم السبت سادس عشر من شهر رمضان سنة ثلاث وستين وأربع مائة ودفن في داره

He (i.e. the narrator) died رحمته الله on Saturday, the sixteenth of Ramaḍān, in the year 463. He was buried in his house.<sup>2</sup>

This proves that the biography was inserted into the book after the death of Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Najjāshī. The question here is: How did al-Najjāshī say that his death was in the year 463 when al-Najjāshī himself died in the year 450? This affirms that the book contains distortions. It cannot be said that this is merely a slip of the pen (*taṣḥīf*) because the date of death is an *entire sentence*, not just one word. In investigating biographical works, we find that many scholars of the

---

1 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 3 of the introduction.

2 Ibid, p. 404, biography number 1070.

Shī'ah allude to the flaws in the copies of al-Najjāshī's work. Al-Tiffarishī (d. 1021 AH) states:

ونقل العلامة [الحلي] وابن داود توثيقه من النجاشي ولم أجد توثيقه فيه وهو أربع نسخ عندي

Al-'Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) and Ibn Dāwūd transmit the (same) narrator's *tawthīq* from al-Najjāshī. I did not find his *tawthīq* (transmitted) in it, and I have four copies!<sup>1</sup>

In exonerating al-Najjāshī for not making *tawthīq* of al-Ḥasan ibn Maḥbūb, Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī states:

لم تصل نسخة من النجاشي صحيحة ولا كاملة إلينا

Neither a complete nor reliable copy of al-Najjāshī's work reached us.<sup>2</sup>

The errors are so numerous that perhaps the work is not to be relied upon. At times, there is a drop (*saqṭ*) in the names (mentioned). As al-Khūṭī states:

إن ما في عندنا من نسخة النجاشي والشيخ سقطا ظاهرا أما الساقط من نسخة النجاشي فهو كلمة (عن) فيما بين كلمة (أبيه) وكلمة (أيوب) ولكنها غير ساقطة عن نسخة القهبائي المطبوعة

There is in the copy we possess of<sup>3</sup> al-Najjāshī and al-Shaykh a clear drop. As for what is dropped in the copy of al-Najjāshī, it is the word “*an* (from)” in-between the word “*abīhi* (his father)” and the word “*Ayyūb*.” However, it is not dropped in the printed version of al-Quhbāṭī.<sup>4</sup>

Whoever pursues this further will find many more similar examples. At times, the drop is in relation to the *tawthīq*. Al-Khūṭī states:

---

1 Al-Tiffarishī: *Naqd al-Rijāl*, 2/211. He mentioned this under the biography of Dāwūd ibn Zarbī.

2 Al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 3/349. Under the biography of Sa'd ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Qummī, he says something similar. See: 2/58.

3 The author mentions that al-Khūṭī wrote this sentence with the word '*fi* (in)' and that it is more correct to have omitted this preposition. [Translator's note]

4 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/164 under the biography of Ayyūb ibn al-Ḥurr.



وظاهر الميرزا الاسترآبادي اشتغال نسخة النجاشي التي كانت عنده على التوثيق أيضا حيث إنه بعد نقله كلام العلامة المشتمل على التوثيق قال وزاد النجاشي له كتاب ونقل الحائري عن حاشية كبيرة للميرزا التصريح بسقوط التوثيق عن كثير من نسخ النجاشي

Al-Mirzā al-Istarābādī proclaimed that the copy of al-Najjāshī in his possession included the (author’s) *tawthīq* as well. After transmitting the words of al-‘Allāmah—which include the *tawthīq*—he says, “And al-Najjāshī added, ‘He has (written) a book.’” Al-Ḥā’irī transmits from a large commentary (*ḥāshiyah kabīrah*) of al-Mirzā an explicit statement stating the drop of (al-Najjāshī’s) *tawthīq* from numerous copies of al-Najjāshī’s (work).<sup>1</sup>

Whoever desires to scrutinize the work will soon come to find numerous mistakes. The work of al-Najjāshī is like the *Fihrist* of al-Ṭūsī; it is not devoted to *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl*.

## 6. Al-Rijāl li Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī (also called al-Ḍu‘afā) by Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn<sup>2</sup>

This work is an area of dispute among the Shī‘ah scholars. Differences of opinion therein are numerous. They include those that assert this work is his, and there are others who belie this ascription to Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī (this will be discussed in the upcoming section of al-Khūṭb’s comments). In fact, in an effort to distort the image of the Shī‘ah, they even went as far as attributing the work to the Ahl al-Sunnah. In short, the total number of narrators with biographies in the book is 159. The editor of the book, Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī, amended the total number of narrators and made it 225. This work is specific to weak narrators. In fact, Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī criticized a number of reliable narrators of the Shī‘ah in this work. This caused al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 AH) to call him extremely critical (*ta‘ān*).<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ibid, 5/331 under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn al-Sarī.

2 The death of the author has not been determined. However, the book’s editor states, “The death of the author has not been determined; however, it was in the fifth century. It has been said in the year 450 A.H.”

3 Al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā’il*, 5/334.

## What can we determine from these overall numbers?

The total number of narrators who have dedicated rulings of *jarḥ* or *ta'dīl* mentioned in the primary works of narrator evaluation of the Shī'ah are more or less as follows:

- 600 from al-Najjāshī
- 273 from al-Ṭūsī in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* (including the repetitions)
- 119 from al-Ṭūsī in his *al-Fihrist*
- 7 from *Rijāl al-Barqī*

If we exclude the repetitions then the total number comes to approximately 999. In short, the narrators do not even reach a thousand. And if we were to omit the 70 which al-Najjāshī and al-Ṭūsī in his *al-Fihrist* agree upon, the total would be 926 narrators. This is an approximate calculation, without omitting the repeated narrators. And without mentioning the narrators about whom there is a difference of opinion, an explanation that I do not want to explain here. At best, they do not even reach 900, within which both reliable and impugned narrators are included. Where then, is the claimed legacy of the Shī'ah in these primary works? Is it possible to establish the religion and recognize what is and is not authentic from the Ahl al-Bayt with this number of biographies? A number that does not even exceed a thousand, and that too with some compromise and indulgence!

In describing the condition of the early works, Muḥammad Riḍā al-Jalālī states:

قلة التوثيق الصريحة في التراث الرجالي والمصادر الرجالية الأولى وضآلة عدد الموجود منها بالنسبة إلى زرافات الرواة التي تعج بأسمائهم المعاجم الرجالية المتأخرة وكذلك تزخر بأسمائهم أسانيد الروايات المجموعة في الأصول الحديثية حيث لم يختص بالتصريح بحالته الرجالية أعم من التوثيق والتضعيف سوى ربع المجموع منهم

The lack of explicit *tawthīq* in the legacy of narrator evaluation and the primary references of narrator evaluation. (Also,) the small number of

these statements that exist in relation to the clusters of narrators that are teeming with their names in the latter-day works (*ma'ājim*) of narrator evaluation. Similarly, combined with their names, there are an abundance of *asānīd* of narrations that are collected in the primary works of ḥadīth (*al-uṣūl al-ḥadīthiyyah*) such that no mention is even made therein of the status of narrators—which is broader (as a category) than (the terms of) *tawthīq* and *taḍ'īf*, except for one-fourth of them.<sup>1</sup>

I think one-fourth is much. Al-Ḥasan al-Burūjirdī states:

رأيت أن في الطائفة الأولى من هذه الكتب نقائص لإهمالها ذكر كثير ممن تضمنته الأسانيد من [أسماء] الرواة وعدم تعرضها في تراجم من ذكر فيها لبيان طبقتهم وشيوخه الذين روى عنهم وتلامذته الذين تحملوا عنه مع أن هذه [الأمر] من أهم ما له دخل في الغرض من ذلك الفن

I have noticed that the first group of these works contain defects because they fail to mention the names of many narrators as included in the *asānīd*. Also, for the names that are mentioned, there is no attention given to explaining the *ṭabaqah* they belong to, their teachers from whom they narrate, and their students who received (knowledge) from them. Even though these (matters) are of the most significant objectives in this science.<sup>2</sup>

Setting aside the serious contradictory statements of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* found in one scholar to the next (in fact, even within one scholar's own statements), one of the senior scholars of the Imāmiyyah discredited al-Ṭūsī's judgements regarding narrators in both his works of narrator evaluation and *fiqh*, since they contain severe contradictions. As al-Kalbāsī transmitted for us al-Khawājūṭī's opinion regarding the confusion of al-Ṭūsī:

أنه يقول في موضع إن الرجل ثقة وفي آخر يقول إنه ضعيف كما في سالم بن مكرم الجمال وسهل بن زياد وأنه قال في الرجال محمد بن علي بن بلال ثقة وفي كتاب الغيبة إنه من المذمومين وأنه قال في العدة

1 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī: *Manhaj al-Rijālī wa al-'Amal al-Rā'id fi Mawsū'ah al-Rijāliyyah li Sayyid al-Ṭā'ifah al-Burūjirdī*, p. 112.

2 Ibid, p. 134.

إن عبد الله بن بكير ممن عملت الطائفة بخيره بلا خلاف وفي الاستبصار في آخر الباب الأول من أبواب الطلاق صرح بما يدل على فسقه وكذبه وأنه يقول برأيه وأنه قال في الاستبصار إن عمار الساباطي ضعيف لا يعمل بروايته وفي العدة لم تزل الطائفة تعمل بما يرويه وأنه قد ادعى عمل الطائفة بأخبار الفطحية مثل عبد الله بن بكير وغيره وأخبار الواقفية مثل سماعه بن مهران وعلي بن أبي حمزة وعثمان بن عيسى وبني فضال والطاطريين مع أننا لم نجد أحدا من الأصحاب وثق علي بن أبي حمزة البطائني أو عمل بروايته إذا انفرد بها لأنه خبيث واقفي كذاب مذموم

In one place, he says: ‘The narrator is *thiqah*.’ And in another place, he says (about the same narrator): ‘He is *ḍaʿīf*.’ As is the case of Sālīm ibn Mukram al-Jamāl and Sahl ibn Ziyād. In *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, he states that Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bilāl is *thiqah*, and in *al-Ghunya* he says he is of the reprehensible narrators. In *al-ʿIddah fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, he states: “‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr is of such narrators whom the *Ṭāʾifah* (i.e. the Shīʿah) have acted upon his reports without any difference of opinion.” In *al-Istibṣār*, under the final chapter of divorce, he clearly states that which indicates to his (i.e. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr’s) transgression, lies, and to the fact that he exercises his own opinion. In *al-Istibṣār*, he says that ‘Ammār al-Sābāṭī is *ḍaʿīf* and his narrations are not to be acted upon. In *al-ʿIddah*, he states that the *Ṭāʾifah* (i.e. the Shīʿah) have always acted on what he narrates. And he claimed the *Ṭāʾifah* acted on the reports of the *Faṭḥiyyah*<sup>1</sup> such as ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr and others. And the reports of the *Wāqifiyyah*<sup>2</sup> such as his *samāʿ* (audition)

1 Al-Shahrestānī states in *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* (1/195): “The *Aftaḥiyyah* say that the *Imāmah* (i.e. the role of being the Imām) transferred from al-ṣādiq to his (other) son, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Aftaḥ. He is the true brother of Ismāʿīl, their mother is Faṭimah bint al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī. He was the eldest of the children. They claim that he said: ‘Imāmah is in (i.e. belongs to) the oldest children of the Imām.’” Al-Kashshī states: “They say that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad is the Imām. They are referred to as such because it was said he (i.e. ‘Abd Allāh) was broad headed. Some say that it was because he had broad feet.” (*Rijāl al-Kashshī*, 254, no. 472). Al-Kashshī has more on this and can be referred to there. Ibn Manẓūr states in *Lisān al-Mīzān* (5/13): “(*Faṭḥ*) *al-faṭaḥ*: a wide space in the middle of the head...a man who is *afṭaḥ* is someone with a broad head.” For more, see: al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 5/13. More about the *Aftaḥiyyah* will come later.

2 The *Wāqifah*, or the *Wāqifiyyah*, is a sect of the Shīʿah who deny the death of the Imām al-Kāẓim Mūsā ibn Jāʿfar. With that, they (also) deny the Imāmah of his son, al-Riḍā. This sect is also called the *Mamṭūrah*, or *al-Kilāb al-Mamṭūrah*. See: Ḥusayn al-Shākiri: *Musūʾah al-Muṣṭafā wa al-ʿItrah*, 13/287 (in the marginalia). More about them will come later.

from Ibn Mihrān, ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah, ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Īsā, Banī Faḍḍāl, and the Ṭāṭāriyyīn. This, despite the fact that we have not found anyone that considered ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah al-Baṭā’inī reliable or having acted on his narrations when he transmits them in isolation. This is because he is an evil, reprehensible, lying *wāqifī*.<sup>1</sup>

It suffices to say that these contradictions appear in the most important works of narrator evaluation, the works of *Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifah!*

When we revert back to the total number of narrators in the four primary works of the fourth and fifth centuries—a number that does not exceed a thousand—how then is it possible for the contemporary al-Shāhrūdī to deal with just about 18189 narrators in his work *Mustadrakāt ‘ilm al-Rijāl!* Similarly, al-Khūṭī; he collected 15706 narrators in his *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth!* Likewise, ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī (d. 1351 A.H); he collected 13360 narrators in *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl!*

This proves to us that the remaining scholars of the Shī’ah who came after this time met with an enormous void such that they encountered thousands of narrators’ names about whom nothing was known in all the works; until the four works, upon which the entire school (of the Shī’ah) is based. And whoever was mentioned in the books of narrator evaluation, as I stated previously, he is usually not void of any contradictions related to *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl*. If he is void of such, only his name is mentioned! Or he is of the thousand (narrators) that have a *jarḥ* or *tawthīq* (mentioned about them).

As such, this void led to confusion and contradiction among the latter-day scholars, those wanting to know the relevant rulings on the asānīd and what is and is not authentic. This resulted in every scholar having their own particular methodology in evaluating narrators as thought up by his *ijtihād* (independent reasoning). Therefore, in most instances, others would not agree to what that particular scholar concluded. And this is the reason for the numerous principles of

---

1 Abū al-Ma’ālī al-Kalbāsī: *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah*, 4/177-78.

the Imāmiyyah scholars in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*; principles that were reproduced so as to repair the deficiency and reduce the number of *majhūl* (unknown) narrators.

These are the six that are mentioned as the primary works. However, Ja'far al-Subḥānī attempted to forcibly introduce several (other) works into the primary works of narrator evaluation. In all likelihood, this attempt by al-Subḥānī is nothing but an act of promoting the school of the Shī'ah; by increasing (the amount of) what they consider the primary works upon which the school stands. Al-Subḥānī mentions that the primary works of narrator evaluation are eight, namely: 1) *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, 2) *Fihrist al-Najjāshī*, 3) *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, 4) *Fihrist al-Ṭūsī*, 5) *Rijāl al-Barqī*, 6) *Risālat Abī Ghālib al-Zurārī*, 7) *Mashyakhat al-Faqīh* of al-Ṣadūq, and 8) *Mashyakhat al-Ṭūsī*.<sup>1</sup> We notice that he did not mention the work of *al-Ghaḍā'irī*; instead, he replaced it with the *Risālah* of al-Zurārī, the *Mashyakhat* of al-Ṣadūq, and the *Mashyakhat* of al-Ṭūsī. However, we would ask al-Subḥānī: Are these works suitable for being regarded as the primary works of narrator evaluation by means of which *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* can be established? Let us have a look at and evaluate the extra works that he included.

## 1. *Risālah* of Abū Ghālib al-Zurārī<sup>2</sup>

Al-Subḥānī states:

هذه الرسالة على صغر حجمها تعد من الأصول الرجالية وهي بعينها مندرجة في (كشكول) المحدث  
البحراني

This work, despite its small size, forms part of the primary works of narrator evaluation and is the very same work inserted in the (*Kashkūl*) of al-Muḥaddith al-Baḥrānī.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fi 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 55.

2 Al-Najjāshī has a biography about him (no. 201) saying: "Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Jahm ibn Bukayr ibn A'yan ibn Sunsun Abū Ghālib al-Zurārī." I say (i.e. the author) that al-Zurārī died in the year 368 A.H as mentioned by al-Shāhrūdī in *Mustadrakāt 'ilm al-Rijāl* (1/473).

3 Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fi 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 73.

I checked the *Kashkūl* of al-Baḥrānī (d. 1186 AH) and found that the work itself does not exceed seventeen pages. It represents a letter that Abū Ghālib al-Zurārī sent to a grandson informing him about his native family, *Āl A'yan*. He speaks about their ancestry, children, womenfolk, heritage, residences, plantations/estates, and something of their affairs (*akhbār*). He concludes the work advising his grandson to memorize several books that he left behind for him with his mother for safekeeping. Al-Zurārī mentions the various modes through which he receives these books. For example, he says:

كتاب غياث بن إبراهيم حدثني به جدي (ره) عن محمد بن الحسين عن محمد بن يحيى الخزاز عن غياث  
مجلس لابن هلال حدثني جدي (ره) عن أحمد بن هلال

The book of Ghiyāth ibn Ibrāhīm was narrated to me by my grandfather ﷺ – from Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn – from Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Khazzāz – from Ghiyāth. The Majlis of Ibn Hilāl was narrated to be by my grandfather ﷺ – from Aḥmad ibn Hilāl.<sup>1</sup>

In a similar fashion, he presents the remaining books. Thus, the book simply ends by mentioning the names of the grandfather's teachers, nothing more. Although, he does praise a handful of narrators such as Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Mīhzaẓayār, Ḥumayd ibn Ziyād, Abū 'Abd Allāh ibn Thābit, Aḥmad ibn Rabāḥ and his uncle, Ḥumrān, 'Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr and 'Alī ibn 'Āṣim. If this is the condition of the *Risālah*, how can it be counted among the primary works of the (Shī'ī) school in *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*? In fact, a number of chains that he mentioned for the works are problematic. The previous chain of narration is sufficient proof; it contains Aḥmad ibn Hilāl. Regarding him, al-Ṭūsī states:

كان غاليا متهما في دينه

He was a radical (and) suspected in his religion.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Baḥrānī: *Kashkūl* (Dār wa Maktabat al-Hilāl: Beirut, 1st edition, 1998).

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, no. 107.

Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī said he was *ḍaʿīf*.<sup>1</sup> In fact, al-Najjāshī—a contemporary of Abū Ghālib—disapproved of his narration from those that are not eligible to narrate. For example, al-Najjāshī states under the biography of Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad ibn Mālik ibn ʿĪsā ibn Sābūr:

كان ضعيفا في الحديث قال أحمد بن الحسين كان يضع الحديث وضعاً ويروي عن المجاهيل وسمعت من قال كان أيضاً فاسد المذهب والرواية ولا أدري كيف روى عنه شيخنا النبيل الثقة أبو علي بن همام وشيخنا الجليل الثقة أبو غالب الزراري رحمهما الله

He was *ḍaʿīf* in ḥadīth. Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn said that he used to grossly forge ḥadīth and narrate from unknown persons. I heard someone say that he believed in corrupt doctrines and was misguided in his narration of ḥadīth. I do not know how our teachers, Abū ʿAlī ibn Humām and Abū Ghālib al-Zurārī narrated from him.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, the man does not actually care—based on the apparent text of al-Najjāshī—who he narrates from. So how then can he rely on the likes of him, considering the fact that al-Baḥrānī (d. 1186 A.H) does not mention for us in his *Kashkūl* the source for this *Risālah* that is attributed to al-Zurārī. Neither does he mention its *isnād* and how he acquired it. If he found an *isnād* for it in another source, can it form part of the primary works if this is its condition?

Therefore, I do not know how al-Subḥānī accepted this work—which does not exceed twenty pages in the *Kashkūl* of al-Baḥrānī—to be one of the primary sources to recognize the condition of a narrator, whether a *jarḥ* or *tawthīq*!

Before concluding my remarks on this work, I will mention the statement of Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī speaking about the *Kashkūl* of Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī:

فيه فوائد كثيرة منها أنه أدرج فيه رسالة أبي غالب الزراري إلى ابن ابنه التي مر بعنوان الإجازة

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāsāt al-Aqwāl*, p. 214 (under the biography of ʿĪsā ibn Jaʿfar ibn ʿĀṣim).

2 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 122, no 313.



There are numerous benefits in this work. Among them, he included the entire *Letter of Abū Ghālib al-Zurārī* (*Risālat Abī Ghālib al-Zūrārī*) to his son—which is included under the section ‘*ijāzah*.<sup>1</sup>

The *Risālah* is precisely what Āqā Buzurg called it, an *ijazah* (i.e. a license to transmit). In it, the author mentions his teachers and some aspects of the life of family. It is not a work of ḥadīth transmitter criticism. In fact, more than this is the fact that Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī—the editor and the individual responsible for converting it into a separate work—admitted:

بأن النسخة المحققة تخلو عن أية إجازة أو إنهاء سماع أو بلاغ أو ما يشبهها

The edited copy is void of any sort of *ijazah*, or transmission via *samāʿ*, or *balāgh* (i.e. using the words *balagha* (it reached us) as a form of transmission), or whatever resembles these.”<sup>2</sup>

This, despite the fact that he attempted to establish its transmission via a number of chains that are unacceptable in (the realm of) academic research.

## 2. *Mashyakhat*<sup>3</sup> al-Ṭūsī fi Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām

Al-Ṭūsī mentions the *mashyakhah* at the end of his work *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*. The reason he mentioned them (there) is because he omitted the *asānīd* that connect him to the authors of the works that he quotes from. He begins (i.e. in *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*) by mentioning (the name of) the work’s author and the isnād that connects him to the infallible (imam). He did this in order to make the work

---

1 Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī: *Al-Dharīʿah*, 2/465.

2 Abū Ghālib al-Zurārī: *Risālat Abī Ghālib al-Zurārī ilā Ibnihī fi Dhikr Āl Aʿyan wa Takmilatihā*, p. 79 of the editor’s introduction.

3 A *mashyakhah* is a ḥadīth work wherein the author mentions the names of his teachers, those via whom he narrated aḥādīth. In *Muʿjam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah* (p. 161): “A place where teachers and chains of transmission are mentioned. Therefore, a *mashyakhah* is a place where teachers (*mashyakhah*) are mentioned.”

easier (for the reader) and for the sake of brevity<sup>1</sup>. Then, he mentions at the end of the work his various chains of transmission for each of the author's works in such a manner where, before mentioning them, he states in his *Mashyakhah*:

والآن فحيث وفق الله تعالى للفراغ من هذا الكتاب نحن نذكر الطرق التي يتوصل بها إلى رواية هذه الأصول والمصنفات ونذكرها على غاية ما يمكن من الاختصار لتخرج الأخبار بذلك عن حد المراسيل وتلحق بباب المسندات

And now, in so far as Allah ﷻ gave *tawfiq* (divine ability to achieve success) to complete this work, we will mention the chains through which we reach the transmission of these primary and (other) authored works. We are mentioning them as concisely as possible, so the reports come out of the realm of *marāsīl* (halted reports) and be included among the *musnadāt* (connected reports).<sup>2</sup>

He then begins mentioning the *asānīd*, one by one. For example, he says:

وما ذكرته عن علي بن الحسن الطاطري فقد أخبرني به أحمد بن عبدون عن علي بن محمد بن الزبير عن أبي الملك أحمد بن عمر بن كيسة عن علي بن الحسن الطاطري

And whatever I have mentioned on the authority of 'Alī ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭāṭārī, I was informed of it by Aḥmad ibn 'Abdūn – from 'Alī ibn Muḥammad

---

1 The reader of *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* may be misled in that he will see al-Ṭūsī saying "from so-and-so" and then mention the entire chain of narration. He will get the impression that this is the entire chain. However, in reality, what he is seeing is only half of it; al-Ṭūsī begins (the chain of narration) with the author of the primary work from which he is quoting the ḥadīth until the infallible (imām). He omits the isnād from him to the author of the work. He arranges this (i.e. the isnād from him to the author) in the *mashyakhah* of his work (*Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*). At times, the isnād that is apparent in front of the reader is *rubā'iy* (i.e. the isnād only contains four narrators); however, in reality, it is *subā'iy* (i.e. it contains seven narrators). The reader should be aware of this because whoever desires to know the ruling of a particular isnād, he not only needs to consider the isnād in the actual work, but he also needs to add to it what al-Ṭūsī mentioned in the *Mashyakhah* so that the *isnād* is complete. This has also been observed in *al-Faqīh* of al-Qummī.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*, 10:281.

ibn al-Zubayr – from Abū al-Malik Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar ibn Kaysabah – from ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭāṭārī.<sup>1</sup>

And like this, there is nothing but the mentioning of chains of transmission in this *Mashyakhah*. What is the difference between this and him mentioning the complete *asānīd* in the work (as opposed to the end) other than for the sake of brevity? There is no difference. Al-Subḥānī’s inclusion of this among the primary works on narrator evaluation is nothing but an attempt at snowballing their number of primary works. And after examining this *Mashyakhah*, it becomes evident that al-Ṭūsī did not make *tawthīq* of any of the narrators! It is simply his recording of the chains of transmission, nothing else. Does it make sense for us to regard this as part of the primary works?

### 3. *Mashyakhah al-Faqīh*<sup>2</sup> (Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī)

This is an entirely similar concept to the *Mashyakhah* of al-Ṭūsī, except that Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī discussed eight narrators in this small work (which includes all the variant chains of narration of his work), no more. Of these eight, he only made *tawthīq* of two.<sup>3</sup> For the remaining six, he only mentions narrations that praise them, without mentioning the authenticity, or lack thereof of these narrations. Also, he does so without mentioning his personal opinion about them. In assuming what al-Subḥānī transmitted from al-Ṭūsī—i.e. the fact that al-Ṭūsī made *tawthīq* of these eight and left out mentioning the status of tens of narrators—is it still possible after this for *Mashyakhah al-Faqīh* to be one of the primary works for knowing the *jarḥ* and *ta’dīl* of narrators? This is the reality of the primary works of narrator evaluation which they draw from, some of which are presumed to be of the primary works.

---

1 Ibid, 10:338.

2 Printed in a small brochure with the explanation and commentary of Muhammad Ja’far Shams al-Dīn. It is also printed as an attachment at the end to the complete work.

3 The two are: 1) Abū Ḥamzah al-Thumālī Thābit ibn Dīnār (p. 39), and 2) Ḥumayd ibn al-Muthanna (p. 67).

## The phase of the latter-day scholars' works (sixth century)

After the scholars of the Shī'ah reached the phase of the fifth century in which they collected the primary sources of narrator evaluation, a new period of writing began. It is the period of works of the latter-day scholars which are based on the primary sources of their predecessors. This period, which stretches from the sixth century until our current time, is generally characterized by an effort to conclude the status of narrators (i.e. whether they are acceptable or not) and decide what the preponderant views are between those that appear in the primary works. Al-Ḥusayn al-Burūjirdī accurately described the works of this phase and the subsequent ones up until our time. He states:

لا تفي بغرضها شيئا إذ لم يبحثوا فيها عما هو موضوعها وهو أسانيد الروايات بأشخاصها بل [قاموا] باستقراءها استقراءً ناقصاً كل حسب وسعه واستنبطوا منها قضايا كلية ذكروها في تلك الكتب على وجه الفتوى أو استشهدوا عليها بشواهد قليلة من جزئياتها مما لا يوجب للمحصل علماً ولا ظناً ولا يخرجهم عن حد التقليد باعاً ولا وشيراً ولأجل ذلك صارت تلك الكتب متروكة عند أهل العلم رأساً

They did not fulfill anything of their purpose since they (i.e. the authors of these works) did not examine in these works what the subject-matter actually entails: the asānīd of the narrations according to the individuals (who narrate them). In fact, they undertook an empirical study which was incomplete. Everyone, according to his (own) ability. They derived therefrom general propositions which they mentioned in those works in the form of *fatwā* (legal opinion). Or they attested to it with few evidences from its parts. All of which does not engender conclusive nor speculative knowledge for the acquirer, and it does not remove him neither a hand nor arm span from the boundary of sheer imitation. For this reason, these works were considered discarded by the people of knowledge.<sup>1</sup>

The following works of this phase are:

---

1 Cited from Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī in *Manhaj al-Rijālī wa al-'Amal al-Rā'id fī al-Mawsū'ah al-Rijāliyyah* by Sayyid al-Tā'ifāh al-Burūjirdī, p. 134.

## 1. Al-Fihrist by Muntakhab al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Muwaffaq al-Dīn ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 548 A.H)

This al-Qummī is different to Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī.

Al-Subḥānī<sup>1</sup> and al-Faḍlī<sup>2</sup> mention that this work is specific to biographies of Shī‘ī writers. According to al-Faḍlī, it contains 533 biographies. And according to the opinion of al-Subḥānī, it contains 540 biographies. In my copy of the book, with the editorial notes of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Ṭabṭabā‘ī, it contains 553 biographies.<sup>3</sup> There is no difference of opinion among the scholars of the Shī‘ah that this work is not regarded as a primary source of narrator evaluation, despite the fact that it was the first work authored after the previous primary works.<sup>4</sup> It is a work that mentions the scholars of the Imāmiyyah and their works, nothing else. It is not much relied upon for research purposes.

## 2. Ma‘ālim al-‘Ulamā’ by Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī, known as Ibn Shahr Āshūb (d. 588 A.H)

Ibn Shahr Āshūb states in the introduction of his work:

هذا كتاب معالم العلماء في فهرست كتب الشيعة وأسماء المصنفين قديما وحديثا وإن كان جمع شيخنا أبو جعفر الطوسي رضي الله عنه في ذلك العصر ما لا نظير له إلا أن هذا المختصر فيه زوائد وفوائد فيكون إذن تنمة له وقد زدت فيه نحوًا من ستمائة مصنف وأشرت إلى المحذوف من كتابه

This work, *Ma‘ālim al-‘Ulamā’ fī Fihrist Kutub al-Shī‘ah wa Asmā’ al-Muḥannifīn Qadīman wa Ḥadīthan*—despite the fact that our shaykh, Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī, gathered what he did in an unparalleled fashion—is an abridgement that contains numerous additional beneficial information. It is, therefore, a supplement to it. I have added approximately 600 (other) works and (also) alluded to what has been omitted from his work.<sup>5</sup>

1 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 110.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 40.

3 ‘Alī ibn ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Bābawayh al-Rāzī: *Fihrist Asmā’ ‘Ulamā’ al-Shī‘ah wa Muḥannifīhim*, p. 206.

4 Being considered the first work written after the phase of the primary works is based on the order of books as set-out by al-Subḥānī and al-Faḍlī.

5 Ibn Shahr Āshūb: *Ma‘ālim al-‘Ulamā’*, p. 38.

It becomes apparent from the words of the author that his work is nothing but an index of names for the authors of books. In perusing the work, I found that it contained 1012 biographies. Additionally, the author added the names of those whom he calls ‘the poets of the Ahl al-Bayt.’ He adds tens of biographies with no reference to their *jarḥ* or *ta’dil* and simply mentions their names. When he does give a ruling of *jarḥ* or *ta’dil*, he does not mention a basis for it. It is simply words that are incompletely transmitted; he does not mention the source for what he is saying. I was amazed at Ja’far al-Subḥānī’s statement:

وقد أصبح معالم العلماء من المدارك المهمة لعلماء الرجال كالعلامة الحلبي في الخلاصة ومن بعده

*Ma’ālim al-‘Ulamā* has become an important tool of understanding for the scholars of narrator evaluation such as ‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī in *al-Khulāṣah* and those after him.<sup>1</sup>

In coming to know and studying the *Khulāṣah* of al-Ḥillī, I did not find him quoting from this work except in only two instances! Therefore, the words of al-Subḥānī are nothing but a means of propaganda for the work, nothing more. If this is not the case, how can it be an “important tool” when he only referred to it twice—according to what I found? Unless this type of exaggeration forms part of the methodology used by Ja’far al-Subḥānī.

### The phase of the seventh century

The writings in narrator evaluation during this century followed another trajectory. The scholars of the Shī’ah differed about the reality of this period. At times, we see ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī mentioning Ibn al-Biṭrīq (d. 600 A.H) in his work *Rijāl al-Shī’ah* as being responsible for the beginning (of scholarship) in this century. Then, in his (other) work *Ḥall al-Ishkāl fī Ma’rifat al-Rijāl*, he attaches Ibn Ṭāwūs (d. 664 A.H) to it (i.e. the beginning of scholarship).<sup>2</sup> We see that al-Subḥānī neglected both of these works and did not even touch on them! However,

1 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 113.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 41.

what al-Faḍlī concluded was more accurate than what al-Subḥānī left out. As for Ibn al-Biṭrīq's work, I was unable to find it. What is apparent from the words of al-Faḍlī is that the actual work does not even exist, only its name. As for what al-Faḍlī mentioned about the fact that Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī رحمه الله and Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī رحمه الله (d. 911 A.H) relied on it in their respective works *Lisān al-Mizān*<sup>1</sup> and *Bughyat al-Wu'āt fī Ṭabaqāt al-Lughawīyyīn wa al-Nuḥāt*<sup>2</sup>, this is incorrect. Therefore, it is not possible to provide a ruling on the work since we know nothing of it except for its name.

As for the work of Ibn Ṭāwūs *Ḥall al-Ishkāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl*, even though it is also missing (this is habitually the case for the works of the Shī'ah), it has had an impact present in our time. Hereunder is an account of this work and the others of this period.

## 1. Ḥall al-Ishkāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (Ibn Ṭāwūs)

Ibn Ṭāwūs authored this book in an attempt to fix the mistakes and dispel the contradictions that he saw in the works of narrator evaluation, especially the work of al-Kashshī. In this work the author collected all the previously mentioned primary works except for, as he states:

واختص كتاب الاختيار من كتاب الكشي بنوعي عناء لم يحصل في غيره لأنه غير منسوق على حروف المعجم فنسقته وغير ذلك من تحرير دبرته ثم القصد إلى تحقيق الأسانيد المتعلقة بالقدح في الرجال والمدح حسبما اتفق لي وما أعرف أن أحدا سبقني إلى هذا على مر الدهر وسالف العصر وقد يكون عذر من ترك أوضح من عذر من فعل ووجه عذري ما نهت عليه أن الكتاب المذكور ملتبس جدا

The work *al-Ikhtiyār* of al-Kashshī, in particular, has two problems which others do not have. It is not arranged in alphabetical order, and so I arranged it accordingly. This is in addition to other things I expounded upon and organized. Thereafter, the objective was to scrutinize the

1 Ibn Ḥajar رحمه الله cites as proof this work in a number of places in *Lisān al-Mizān*. For example, under the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad al-Mīmadhī (no. 49), he states: "Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Bābawayh mentioned him in *Rijāl al-Shī'ah*." See: *Lisān al-Mizān*, 1:29.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 41.

asānīd that are connected to narrators that have been both criticized and praised, according to what concurs with me. I am unaware of anyone that has preceded me in this regard, throughout the ages. The excuse for the person leaving this work out (and doing nothing with it) is perhaps more obvious than actually doing something (with it). My excuse (for doing something with it) is what I have already mentioned: the aforementioned work is very confusing.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, the work is considered an attempt at salvaging whatever was possible from the inconsistencies found in the work of al-Kashshī and others. However, as I mentioned previously, the work is lost. I found a significantly damaged copy that was transferred, by way of inheritance, to Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn (al-Shahīd al-Thānī) (d. 965 A.H). When he brought out the work, al-Shahīd al-Thānī said:

إني لم أظفر لكتاب السيد رحمه الله بنسخة غير نسخة الأصل التي أغلبها بخط المصنف وقد أصابها تلف في أكثر المواضع بحيث صار نسخ الكتاب بكماله متعذرا

I was unable to find a copy of al-Sayyid's work except for the original copy of which most of it is the author's (own) writing. It was damaged in most places such that copying the entire book turned out to be impossible.<sup>2</sup>

In short, he restricted himself to what Ibn Ṭāwūs mentioned regarding the work of al-Kashshī, without (mentioning) the other works. Therefore, the reality of *al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī* of al-Shahīd al-Thānī, which is printed today, is a selection and abridgement of the work *Ḥall al-Ishkāḷ*.

## 2. Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd by Taqīyy al-Dīn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī (d. 707 A.H)

Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī is a contemporary of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. Both him and Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī studied under Ibn Ṭāwūs, the author of *Ḥall al-Ishkāḷ*.

1 Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Shahīd al-Thānī: *al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī*, p. 25.

2 Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Shahīd al-Thānī: *al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī*, p. 3.



He is the first person to divide the work into two sections: the first section is dedicated to mentioning the *muwaththaqīn* and *muhmalīn* (reliable and neglected narrators)<sup>1</sup>, and the second to the *majrūhīn* and *majhūlīn* (impugned and unknown narrators).<sup>2</sup>

The work is a matter of great dispute among the scholars of the Shī'ah on account of numerous errors and mistakes. Quoting from al-Fāḍil al-Tustarī<sup>3</sup>, al-Majlisī states in *Malādh al-Akhyār*:

كتاب ابن داود مما لم أجده صالحا للاعتماد لما ظفرنا عليه من الخلل الكثير في النقل عن المتقدمين وفي تفقيد الرجال والتمييز بينهم ويظهر ذلك بأدنى تتبع للموارد التي نقل ما في كتابه منهم

The work of Ibn Dāwūd is of those that I did not find suitable to be relied upon because of the numerous defects we discovered in (his) narrating from the earlier generation, and in examining/criticizing narrators and distinguishing between them. This becomes clear with the least amount of scrutiny applied to the places where he narrates from them in his work.<sup>4</sup>

Al-Kalbāsī transmitted from the author of *al-Ḥāwī* the statement:

واعلم أي لم أعتمد على كتاب ابن داود وإن كان حسن الترتيب واضح المسلك لأنني وجدت فيه أغلاطا كثيرة تنبئ عن قلة الضبط نعم ربما أذكر كلامه في بعض المواضع شاهدا أو لأمر ما

And know well that I did not rely upon the work of Ibn Dāwūd, even though it is well organized and clearly laid out. This is because I found numerous

---

1 There is a difference of opinion regarding the (term) *muhmalīn* (neglected). Al-Kalbāsī alluded to this in *al-Rasā'il al-Rijāliyyah*, 4/100.

2 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 114.

3 He is 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Tustarī (d. 1021 AH), a student of al-Irdabīlī and the teacher of al-Majlisī, al-Tiffarishī, and al-Qahbā'ī. He is different to Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, the author of *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*.

4 Al-Majlisī: *Malādh al-Akhyār*, 1/37-38 (in his commentary of the first ḥadīth under *Bāb al-Aḥdāth al-Mūjibah li al-Ṭahārah*).

errors which stem from the lack of precision (*dabt*). Yes, I do mention his statements in certain instances as testimonial evidence, or for whatever (appropriate) reason.<sup>1</sup>

After mentioning some of his errors, ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī states:

كانت هذه الملاحظة مثار خلاف في تقييم الكتاب ومدى صحة الاعتماد عليه عند الرجاليين المتأخرين

This observation is a matter of dispute in the work’s evaluation, and the extent of its validity for the latter-day narrator scholars.<sup>2</sup>

The book is no more than a compilation of the previous primary works and a means of giving preponderance between the views of its authors. The method of the latter-day scholars is mostly characteristic of this form of writing.<sup>3</sup> Ḥusayn al-Sā’idī states:

أهمية الكتاب وفائدته فيما نقله عن كتب القدماء المفقودة التي لم نجد لها نصوصا

The importance and benefit of the work is in his transmitting from the lost works of the earlier scholars, the texts of which we cannot find.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Quoting from *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah* of Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-Kalbāsī, 2/402. The complete name of the work *al-Ḥāwī* is *Ḥāwī al-Aqwāl fī Ma’rifat al-Rijāl* of ‘Abd al-Nabī ibn al-Shaykh Sa’d al-Jazā’irī al-Gharawī al-Ḥā’irī (d. 1021 A.H) (as mentioned under his biography by al-Ṭahrānī in *al-Dharī’ah*, 6/237).

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 46.

3 For more information on the status of *Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd*, see: *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah* of Muḥammad al-Kalbāsī, 2/100.

4 Ḥusayn al-Sā’idī: *al-Ḍu‘afā’ min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/58. Al-Tustarī says something similar about the book *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* of al-Ḥillī. He states: “It is merely beneficial in that which we could not come across a basis for.” In other words, in his transmitting from the lost works. See: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/24 (chapter 16).

### 3. *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* by Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī<sup>1</sup>

In general, this work is similar to Ibn Dāwūd's work. As such, the references are practically one and the same, as are the statements and rulings pertaining to the narrators. Ja'far al-Subḥānī detailed a comparative analysis between the works of al-Ḥillī and Ibn Dāwūd.<sup>2</sup>

#### The phase after the seventh century

ʿAbd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī states:

وفي القرنين التاسع والعاشر ضمير التأليف في أسماء الرجال ثم عاد إلى نشاطه في القرن الحادي عشر  
بشكل تشكل فيه كثرة ظاهرة فارقة

In the two centuries, the ninth and tenth, writings in dictionaries of narrator evaluation subsided. Then it returned to its activity in the eleventh century in a manner in which a great number of distinct phenomena were formed.<sup>3</sup>

After listing several of these works, Ja'far al-Subḥānī states:

هذه الأصول الأولية الثمانية والثمانية لعلم الرجال

These are the eight primary and secondary works in the science of narrator evaluation.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī has an extensive work on narrator evaluation entitled *Kashf al-Maqāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl*. It is larger than *al-Khulāṣah*; however, it is lost and there remains no trace of it. Al-Ḥillī himself alluded to it in the introduction of *al-Khulāṣah* (p. 44). He references it in many places throughout *al-Khulāṣah*. Al-Ḥillī has another work which is printed under the title *Īdāh al-Ishṭibāh*. This work is specific to the correct pronouncement of narrators' names (*ḍabt asmā' al-ruwāt*) and distinguishing them from one another. He did not write it for the sake of knowing the rulings of narrators.

2 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 120.

3 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 48.

4 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 123. The 'eight' (works) al-Subḥānī was referring to are: 1) *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, 2) *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, 3) *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, 4) *Fihrist al-Ṭūsī*, 5) *Rijāl al-Barqī*, 6) *Risālat Abī Ghālib*, 7) *Mashyakhat al-Ṣadūq*, and 8) *Mashyakhat al-Faqīh fī Kitāb al-Faqīh wa al-Istibṣār*.

Some pages later, he says:

وقد وقفت على الأصول الرجالية وهناك جوامع رجالية مطبوعة ومنتشرة يجب على القارئ الكريم التعرف عليها وهذه الجوامع ألفت في أواخر القرن العاشر إلى أواخر القرن الثاني عشر

I came across the primary sources of narrator evaluation; there are (other) printed collections on narrator evaluation that are widespread which the honorable reader need be aware of. These collections were authored in the late tenth to late twelfth centuries.<sup>1</sup>

Like this, we find al-Faḍlī and al-Subḥānī recording the history of the sciences of narrator evaluation; by skipping the eighth century. Both of their statements agree in the omission of this century. Therefore, it would have been more suitable for al-Faḍlī to mention the eighth century as well in his previous statement, “In the two centuries, the ninth and tenth, writings in dictionaries of narrator evaluation subsided.” Al-Subḥānī should have (also) mentioned the decline in the ninth century since he said that the collections (*jawāmiʿ*) were “authored in end of the tenth century.”

In short, the remaining works detailing narrator evaluation that emerged in the tenth century right up to our time, as well as everything that was authored during this period, and the time of Ibn Ṭāwūs and his student are, as I mentioned, nothing but recollections of the Four Primary works as well as an offering of the preponderant opinion (*tarjīḥ*) among them (i.e. the various opinions). In fact, you will only find nothing in these works except for what the Shīʿī scholar, Muḥammad Riḍā al-Jalālī stated:

لا يشاهد في أكثر المؤلفات المتأخرة غير التكرار الممل لما سبق والإعادة من غير جديد إفادة مع تكثير التصحيقات المشينة أو ذكر الاحتمالات البعيدة مما يزيد الطالب مشقة وعناء ويورطه في التزام الفرضيات العقلية المتناهية البعد عن الواقع فيعرقل مسيرة عمله ودراسته وبحثه ويكدر صفاء ذهنه

In most of the latter-day works, nothing but tedious repetition of what has been previously mentioned is seen. Repetition with nothing

---

1 Al-Subḥānī: *Kullīyāt fī ʿilm al-Rijāl*, p. 127.

new of benefit. In addition to the many scandalous distortions, or the mentioning of farfetched possibilities; all of which makes it more difficult and troublesome for the student (of knowledge). It implicates him in committing to the mental hypotheses that are extremely far from reality, thereby hindering the course of his work, study, and research, all the while muddying the clarity of his mind.<sup>1</sup>

In another place he says:

المشاهد في بعض المؤلفات المتأخرة المتسمة بكبر الحجم وتكديس المنتقولات

What is clearly discernable in some of the latter-day literature is their large size(s) and the mere amassment of (earlier) transmitted statements!<sup>2</sup>

This is what the student goes through when he studies these latter-day works. Until it eventually led to one of the senior scholars of the Imāmiyyah writing an encyclopedia under the title *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*. He is none other than ‘Alī al-Namāzī al-Shāhrūdī (d. 1405 A.H). The author gathered thousands of narrators who have had nothing written about them for over a thousand years! Here is his exact wording:

جمعت - بحمد الله تعالى - فيه أسامي آلاف من رواة أحاديث الشيعة من رجال المشايخ الثلاثة في الكتب الأربعة المشهورة وغيرهم في غيرها فذكروا ٢٠٠ رجل يسمى بإبراهيم وذكرت ٥٢٧ منهم ٢٨٦ لم يذكروهم وذكروا ٣١٩ رجلا مسمى بأحمد وذكرت ١٢٧١ منهم ٨٤٠ لم يذكروهم وذكروا ١٣٥٠ محمدا وذكرت ٢٥٦٥ منهم ١٣٧٠ لم يذكروهم وذكروا ٣٥٦ حسنا وذكرت ٨١٧ منهم ٤٢٦ لم يذكروهم وذكروا ٣٠٨ حسينا وذكرت ٦٧٣ منهم ٣٣٤ لم يذكروهم وهكذا في سائر الأسماء ولا أذكر ممن ذكره إلا من لنا مزيد بيان في حقه من رفع الجهالة أو الضعف عنه أو جعله ممن روى عنهم (عليهم السلام) أو إدراكه وصحبته لإمام أزيد مما تعرضوا له أو باعتبار الراوي والمروي عنه كل ذلك مع تعيين المدرك والدليل

I have collected—praise be to Allah ﷻ—in it the names of thousands of narrators of Shī‘ah aḥādīth from the three *mashāyikh* of the four

1 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī: *al-Manhaj al-Rijālī wa al-‘Amal al-Rā‘id fī al-Mawsū‘ah al-Rijāliyyah li Sayyid al-Ṭā‘ifah al-Burūjirdī*, p. 58.

2 Ibid, p. 136.

famous works, and others. They mentioned 200 men named Ibrāhīm and I mentioned 527, 286 of which they did not mention. They mentioned 319 men named Aḥmad and I mentioned 1271, 840 of which they did not mention. They mentioned 1350 men named Muḥammad and I mentioned 2565, 1370 of which they did not mention. They mentioned 356 men named Ḥasan and I mentioned 817, of which 426 they did not mention. They mentioned 3081 men named Ḥusayn and I mentioned 673, of which 334 they did not mention. And in a similar fashion, all the remaining names. I did not mention those whom they mentioned unless we had more information about him in terms of removing his unknownness (*jahālah*) or weakness from him. Or making the narrator from those who narrate from them عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. Or (the fact that) he (i.e. the narrator) met and had companionship with an imam—I have mentioned more than what they did. Or in consideration of the narrator and what has been narrated from him. All of this stipulated with reason and proof.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Shāhrūdī mentioned 18189 biographies in his *Mustadrakāt*!

This is the general state of biographical works. If we reflect on the thousands (of narrators) about whom nothing has been said, as al-Shāhrūdī states, how many *asānīd* can they be dispensed into?

This means that prior to the writing of this work, the researcher would find it difficult and practically impossible to know the status of a narrator which was not mentioned before in the biographical works. This results in a standstill for thousands of *asānīd*. Or the ruling of a narrator's condition would be pure conjecture. In fact, even al-Shāhrūdī who named his work *al-Mustadrakāt* (The Amendments) did not provide rulings on many narrators!

This is the intellectual legacy that both Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khū'i built all the principles upon which they relied on for their rulings on narrators!

---

1 'Alī al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt 'Ilm Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1:6.

### 3.0 The lack of sciences by the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah in the field of 'ilm al-rijāl

#### 3.1 The disregard for death dates

Knowing the death date of a narrator is regarded as a helpful tool for ascertaining whether the isnād is *muttaṣil* (contiguous). The early generation of scholars from the Ahl al-Sunnah used this tool to ascertain such information. As such, Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 327 AH) mentions:

عن (عفیر بن معدان) قال قدم علينا (عمر بن موسى الوجیهی المیشی) فاجتمعنا في مسجد حمص فجعل يقول حدثنا شیخکم الصالح خالد بن معدان فقلت في أي سنة سمعت منه؟ فقال سمعت منه في ثمان ومائة فقلت وأین سمعت منه؟ قال في غزاة أرمينية فقلت له اتق الله ولا تكذب! مات خالد بن معدان في سنة أربع ومائة فأنت سمعت منه بعد موته بأربع سنين ولم یغز أرمينية قط ما كان یغزو إلا الروم

Regarding 'Ufayr ibn Ma'dān who said: "Umar ibn Mūsā al-Wajīhī al-Maythamī came to us. We gathered in a masjid in Ḥimṣ. He began saying, 'Your teacher, al-Ṣālīh Khālīd ibn Ma'dān narrated to us.' I said: 'In what year did you hear from him?' He said, 'I heard from him in the year 108.' I said: 'And where did you hear from him?' He said, 'In the Battle of Armenia.' I said to him: 'Fear Allah, and do not lie! Khālīd ibn Ma'dān died in the year 104 and you heard from him four years after his death! He never fought against the Armenians ever; he only ever fought against the Romans!'"<sup>1</sup>

This has been the status-quo of the scholars of this Ummah to such an extent that most of the biographical works of the Ahl al-Sunnah mention the death dates of the narrators. This is simply not found in the school of the Twelvers. Most of the primary works which mention biographies of narrators do not mention the death date of a narrator. It is rarely mentioned.

Hereunder is general calculation of narrators whose death dates have been mentioned in the works of narrator evaluation according to them:

---

1 Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī: *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*, 6/133.

1. Al-Barqī: 0 from a total of 1707
2. Al-Najjāshī: 24 from a total of 1269
3. Fihrist al-Ṭūsī: 2 from a total of 909
4. *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*: 225 from a total of 6429
5. *Rijāl al-Kashshī*: 8 from a total 560

Based on this, we have:

$$24 + 2 + 225 + 8 = 259$$

This is more or less the sum total of narrators whose death dates have been mentioned in the agreed-upon primary works of narrator evaluation.

After we have concluded that the number of narrators does not exceed 259, did the scholars of the Shī'ah notice this inadequacy and begin to author works dedicated to mentioning the death dates (of narrators)? The answer is no, they did not.

This shortcoming has had a great impact on rulings related to narrators since it is not possible to conclusively determine whether the asānīd are *muttaṣil*. Rulings on many of these asānīd are therefore pure conjecture!

### 3.2 The disregard for *tadlīs* and *mudallisīn*

The scholars of Islam from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah have always shown interest in the science of ḥadīth. As such, they wrote in all of its respective categories. Regarding the issue of *tadlīs* (obfuscation), the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have a detailed discussion because of its practical implications. When they wrote about it, it was not merely hypothetical; rather, they dealt with it as a living reality. The Ahl al-Sunnah detailed the conditions of narrators and identified those who confused things from those that did not. They distinguished between a *thiqah* and a *ḍa'īf* narrator. This is contrary to the workings of the



Shī'ah Imāmiyyah scholars, among them, Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūī.

A person that investigates the biographical works of the Shī'ah, especially the latter-day collections which collected thousands of narrators, will not find them addressing the *tadlīs* of any narrators! This differs to the works of *muṣṭalah*; many scholars of the Shī'ah have written on *Muṣṭalah al-Ḥadīth* and mentioned a chapter on the *mudallis* (the one who commits *tadlīs*)!

So, what is the reason why it is neglected in biographical works and mentioned in the works of *muṣṭalah*? The answer: The biographical works of the Shī'ah, especially the Four Primary works, do not address the *tadlīs* of even a single narrator. That is because there is a disregard for the *ḍabt* (precision) of narrators. Similarly, there are no details about their conditions and knowledge regarding how they would transmit narrations. This is because these works are nothing but indices and *ṭabaqāt*. Since its inception and until our time, the sciences of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* have been regarded as being from the preliminary sciences which did not develop among this sect. Whatever the latter-day scholars brought forth was merely facsimiled from whatever the early scholars mentioned. There is no renewal or further analysis; their orbit is one, they do not depart from it. If this is not the case, does it make sense that some biographical works contain more than fifteen thousand narrators and there is not even one narrator described with *tadlīs*, the same technical term that appears in the works of *muṣṭalah*?

As for the works of *muṣṭalah* which mention *tadlīs*, they do not even bring forth one example of a Shī'ah narrator. In fact, all of the examples mentioned are purloined from the *muṣṭalah* works of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah. Whoever of the Shī'ah wrote on the subject of *muṣṭalah* did not consider the reality of ḥadīth sciences according to them and establish their principles accordingly; they simply followed and took whatever was in the works of *muṣṭalah* of the Sunnis, lock, stock, and barrel. More details will follow.

Hereunder I provide a number of examples.

1. In the book *al-Bidāyah fī ‘ilm al-Dirāyah* of al-Shahīd al-Thaṇī, he speaks about the *mudallis* and does not mention any example thereof from the biographical works of the Shī‘ah.<sup>1</sup>
2. In the book *Wuṣūl al-Akhyār ilā Uṣūl al-Akḥbār* of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-‘Āmilī (d. 984 AH), he mentions the *mudallis* and does not mention any example throughout his findings in the biographical works of the Shī‘ah.<sup>2</sup>
3. In the book *al-Fanna al-Thānī min al-Qawāmīs* of Mullā Āqā Fāḍil Darbandī, he mentions the *mudallis* in detail and does not mention any example throughout his findings in the biographical works of the Shī‘ah.<sup>3</sup>
4. In the book *al-Wajīz fī ‘ilm Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of Mullā ‘Abd al-Razzāq ibn ‘Alī Riḍā al-Ḥā‘irī, he alludes to the *mudallis* and does not mention any example throughout his findings in the biographical works of the Shī‘ah.<sup>4</sup>
5. In the book *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Jalālī, he alludes to the *mudallis* and does not mention any example therein throughout his findings in the biographical works of the Shī‘ah.<sup>5</sup>
6. In the book *al-Fawā‘id al-Rijāliyyah* of al-Kajūrī, he spoke in detail (about the *mudallis*); however, he too cited what appears in the works of the Ahl al-Sunnah, without any example from the works of the Shī‘ah.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 Printed among the treatises in *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, 1/130.

2 Ibid, 1/414.

3 Ibid, 2/125.

4 Ibid, 2/545.

5 Ibid, p. 112.

6 Ibid, p. 205

7. The book *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl* of Mullā 'Alī Kanī, he alluded to the *mudallis* and did not mention any example therein throughout his findings in the works of the Shī'ah.<sup>1</sup>
8. The book *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Aḥkāmuhu fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah* of Ja'far al-Subḥānī, al-Subḥānī was unable to find any examples in the biographical works of the Shī'ah to mention. As a result, he was forced to cite examples from the works of the *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah*.<sup>2</sup>
9. In the book *Miqbās al-Hidāyah fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah* of 'Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī, he blackened (i.e. scribbled over) a number of pages and did not bring one example of *tadlīs* for us from the works of the Shī'ah.<sup>3</sup>
10. In the book *Dirāsāt fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah* of 'Alī Akbar Ghifārī he does not mention any example.<sup>4</sup>
11. In the book *Rasā'il fī 'Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfizyān al-Bābilī he does not mention any example.<sup>5</sup>
12. In the book *Ṭarā'if al-Maqāl* of 'Alī al-Burūjirdī (d. 1313 AH) he does mention any example.<sup>6</sup>

The rest of the scholars of the Shī'ah set out on similar grounds; we do not find this technical term (of *tadlīs*) except in the works of *muṣṭalah* of the latter-day scholars. This proves that the matter of *tadlīs* was 'saturated' with what they do not possess and is propaganda work for the school (of the Shī'ah) in order

---

1 Ibid, p. 285.

2 Ibid, p. 114.

3 Ibid, 1:376.

4 Ibid, p. 69.

5 Ibid, 3:130.

6 Ibid, 2:255.

for them to increase their sciences. When the neutral researcher looks to find the truth of the matter, he will find nothing but conjectural anecdotes with no practicality. After this, how is a scholar among them to know how to distinguish between a *mudallils* or know the degree of his *tadlīs*. It is simply impossible. And it is, quite frankly, sheer obstinance for someone to say that a narrator described with *tadlīs* is simply not to be found among the Shī'ah, even though there exist thousands of biographies!

## 4.0 The Imāmī Shī'ah's lacking in the sciences of *taṣḥīḥ*, *taḍīf*, and *ta'līl*

### 4.1 The lack of effort expended by the Imāmiyyah in making *taṣḥīḥ* and *taḍīf* of *aḥādīth*

The issue of scrutinizing and sieving through *asānīd* and distinguishing between *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḍa'īf* is one of the greatest academic conflicts in the intellectual legacy of the Shī'ah. Regarding this matter, there are two groups that emerge.

The first group does not regard everything that exists in the works of the Imāmī school as authentic. The *asānīd* for all the works they have are subject to criticism. The person with this type of orientation is referred to as the *Uṣūlī*.

The second group regards whatever is contained in the works of the Shī'ah as authentic, at the forefront of which are the Four (Primary) works.<sup>1</sup> This group warns, in fact, threatens whosoever (from the other group) analyzes and works on sifting through the intellectual legacy. This group claims it is on the same path of the first and early Shī'ah. The person with this type of orientation is referred to as the *Akḥbārī*.

Each of these orientations has its supporters and observers. I would not dare venture into the issue of writings of the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah on *ṣaḥīḥ* *aḥādīth*. As I have mentioned, it is already an enormous conflict. There are those who do not even consider the science of narrator evaluation from the outset. These are the *Akḥbārīyyah* who consider that the “origin of differences in *aḥādīth* is *Taqīyyah* (dissimulation), not the foisting of reports.” Mahdī al-Kajūrī entered into an academic discussion with the proponents of this view in his book *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Al-Kāfi*, *al-Tahdhīb*, *al-Istibṣār*, and *Man La Yaḥḍuruḥu al-Faqīh*.

2 Al-Kajūrī: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 50 (under the chapter *Radd al-Akḥbārīyyah fī 'Adam al-Ḥājah ilā 'ilm al-Rijāl*).

These individuals regard the works of their predecessors as authentic that take the place of authorship in authentic aḥādīth. The brassiest example of these individuals is what the contemporary, ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn Abū al-Ḥasan, said regarding his support of al-Nā‘īnī’s opinion that states the work of *al-Kāfi* is authentic!<sup>1</sup>

The neutral observer of both schools will see that the difference of opinion is superficial and has no practical reality, even though tens of books have been written on it. The people (i.e. the Shī‘ah), whether *Uṣūlī* or *Akhbārī*, do not distinguish between ṣāḥīḥ and *da‘īf* ḥadīth, even if they claim to have accurately and precisely researched the matter. My remarks are not mere ramble; in fact, I will mention what supports what I say, *in shā’ Allah*.

When we come to the school that claims accurate and detailed investigation, the *Uṣūliyyah*, and we question its observers: Did any of them author a work in which *da‘īf* aḥādīth were collected and their reasons explained? The answer is no. This is true despite the fact that this school existed from the time of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and his teacher, Ibn Ṭāwūs! As for the *Akhbārī* school, they consider this to be evil, as will be seen in the statement of al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī.

The reality of the matter is that the scholars of the Shī‘ah, whether *Uṣūlī* or *Akhbārī*, know very well that subjecting the aḥādīth of their works to the scale of academic inquiry will inevitably mean the invalidity of the entire *Imāmī* school. Here we have al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī (d. 1104 AH) warning the *Uṣūlīs* of the consequences of this approach saying:

أنه يستلزم ضعف أكثر الأحاديث التي قد علم نقلها من الأصول المجمع عليها لأجل ضعف بعض رواياتها أو جهالتهم أو عدم توثيقهم فيكون تدوينها عبثا بل محرّما وشهادتهم بصحتها زورا وكذبا ويلزم بطلان الإجماع الذي علم دخول المعصوم فيه أيضا كما تقدم واللوازم باطلة وكذا الملزوم بل يستلزم ضعف الأحاديث كلها عند التحقيق لأن الصحيح عندهم ما رواه العدل الإمامي الضابط في جميع الطبقات“ ولم ينصوا على عدالة أحد من الرواة إلا نادرا وإنما نصوا على التوثيق وهو لا يستلزم العدالة قطعا بل

---

1 The work is from the first volume. However, it is a section from the first two sections of *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah* that starts from p. 1 to 230. Thereafter, the second section (*al-Intiṣār li Siḥḥat al-Kāfi*) restarts the numbering from p. 1 to 188.

بينهما عموم من وجه كما صرح به الشهيد الثاني وغيره ودعوى بعض المتأخرين أن (الثقة) بمعنى (العدل الضابط) ممنوعة وهو مطالب بدليلها وكيف؟ وهم مصرحون بخلافها حيث يوثقون من يعتقدون فسقه وكفره وفساد مذهبه؟! ..... فيلزم من ذلك ضعف جميع أحاديثنا لعدم العلم بعدالة أحد منهم إلا نادرا ففي إحداث هذا الاصطلاح غفلة من جهات متعددة كما ترى

This necessitates rendering *ḍaʿīf* most of the *aḥādīth* which are known to have been transmitted from the agreed-upon primary works. This is on account of the weakness of a few of their narrators, or their unknownness (*jahālah*), or the fact that no one has made *tawthīq* of them, thereby rendering their documentation futile. This would mean their documentation was done in vein. In fact, ḥarām. Their testimony in favour of their authenticity would be false, a lie, and necessitate the invalidity of the *ijmāʿ* (consensus) which, as mentioned, is also known to include the infallible—as mentioned above. The antecedents (*al-lawāzīm*) and the consequent (*malzūm*) are (also) invalid. In fact, a critical examination would necessitate that all the *aḥādīth* are *ḍaʿīf* since a *ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth* is, according to them “that which is narrated by an upright (*ʿadal*) and precise (*dābiṭ*) imāmī on all levels (of the *sanad*).” Very rarely do they document the uprightness (*ʿadālah*) of any of the narrators; they merely document the *tawthīq*, and this (alone) does not definitively necessitate uprightness. In fact, between the two (terms), there is (only) commonality in one regard, as clarified by al-Shahīd al-Thānī and others. The claim by some latter-day scholars that the term *thiqah* means “*al-ʿadl al-dābiṭ* (upright precise)” is prohibited and requires proof. They explicitly state its opposite in that they make *tawthīq* of those they consider to be a *fāsiq*, *kāfir*, and even believing in an invalid school!... This means rendering all of our *aḥādīth ḍaʿīf* on account of not knowing, in most instances, the uprightness of any of them. From many angles, there is a measure of heedlessness in the creation of this term, as you can see.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, al-ʿĀmilī is not speaking in a vacuum; rather, he is warning of the seriousness of the approach that necessitates the revision and investigation of a legacy because of his knowledge of the (abysmal) condition of this school’s works and what this type of orientation will lead to.

1 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah*, 30:249.

With this new (and) old conflict between Shī'ah scholars, the researcher sees, as I stated earlier, that there is no real difference of opinion because both schools did not collect *ḍa'īf* or *mawḍū'* (forged) aḥādīth. In fact, one of the scholars of the Shī'ah regarded the editing of *al-Kāfi* by one of the contemporary scholars, Muḥammad al-Bahbūdī<sup>1</sup>, wherein he removed the *ḍa'īf* (aḥādīth) and (re)named it *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi* (The Authentic *al-Kāfi*) as a crime against the school! 'Abd al-Rasūl al-Ghaffār stated:

هذا محمد باقر البهبودي قد صير (الكافي) في ثلاثة أجزاء صغيرة وسماه بـ (صحيح الكافي) ثم أعاد طبعه تحت عنوان (زبدة الكافي) ظنا منه أنه يحسن صنعا وما يدري أن ذلك إساءة كبيرة إلى التراث الشيعي بل إساءة إلى أهل البيت عليهم السلام

This Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bahbūdī made *al-Kāfi* into three small volumes and named it *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi*. Then he reprinted it under the title *Zubdat al-Kāfi* thinking that he is 'doing something good.'<sup>2</sup> He does not know that it was a great insult to the legacy of the Shī'ah. In fact, an insult to the Ahl al-Bayt عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام.<sup>3</sup>

1 Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bahbūdī is an erudite shī'ī scholar whose has given much effort into reviewing the intellectual legacy of the Shī'ah. He has reviewed *Kitāb al-Mabsūt* of al-Ṭūsī, *al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* of 'Alī ibn Yūnus al-'Āmilī, *Zubdat al-Bayān* of al-Ardabīlī, and the work of Ibn al-Maghāzilī. He also participated with the committee responsible for overseeing the printing of *Biḥār al-Anwār* of al-Majlisī for Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah. In the introduction to his revised work of *al-Kāfi*, the great shī'ī scholar 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī says about him: "Our respected, brilliant, and favorite colleague, Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bahbūdī." 'Alī 'Āshūr, the editor of *Ghāyat al-Marām* of al-Baḥrānī referred to him as "the eminent scholar Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bahbūdī." Therefore, al-Bahbūdī is a noteworthy scholar who holds weight among the scholarly circles of the Shī'ah. He has a number of works, including: *Ma'rifat al-Ḥadīth wa Tārīkh Nashrihi wa Tadwīnihi wa Taḥāfatihi* 'inda al-Shī'ah, *Īlal al-Ḥadīth*. This is a response to those who claim that he is incompetent to verify aḥādīth. To find out everything that al-Bahbūdī has done, review the work *Nazariyyat al-Sunnah fī al-Fikr al-Imāmī al-Shī'ī* of Ḥaydar Ḥubb Allāh. He has an entire chapter dedicated to the efforts of al-Bahbūdī and the ruthless campaigns he was subjected to—to such an extent that Khomeini's successor actually summoned him. There is a story about this which can be referred to in Ḥubb Allāh's work, p. 564.

2 In reference to the eighteenth verse of Sūrat al-Kahf "while they think that they are doing well in work." [Translator's Note]

3 'Abd al-Rasūl al-Ghaffār: *al-Kulaynī wa al-Kāfi*, p. 432.



He also stated:

نهج فيه طريقا غير مرضي أسقط ما يقارب نصف أحاديث الكتاب واختار الصحيح حسب مذاقه الخاص ولا أحسبه يجيد هذا الفن أو يحسن اختياره بل إن ذلك موكل إلى علماء الطائفة ومراجعها لأنهم منزهون عن الأهواء والميول

He approached the work in an unsatisfactory matter; he dropped nearly half of the aḥādīth of the work and chose the ṣaḥīḥ ones' according to his own particular taste. I do not think he did well for this science or selecting it. In fact, this is entrusted to the scholars and leaders (*marāji*)<sup>1</sup> of the sect since they are free from desires and inclinations.<sup>2</sup>

He also stated:

بل إن البعض منهم قد أساء إلى الشيخ [الكليني] بصورة مزرية بل أنه أساء إلى الفكر الإمامي وإلى تراث أهل البيت كالبهبودي محمد باقر الذي اختزل كتاب الشيخ من غير أن يستند في عمله ذلك على منهج علمي صحيح أو مبني واضح سليم حتى يعذر فيما صنّفه في كتابه (صحيح الكافي) الذي يعد من أحد مساوئه التي لا تغتفر وسبيله إنما ينطوي تحت شعار "خالف تعرف"

In fact, some of them, such as Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bahbūdī, insulted al-Shaykh (al-Kulaynī) in a disgraceful manner, as well as the entire Imāmī thought and the legacy of the Ahl al-Bayt. He abridged the book of al-Shaykh (al-Kulaynī) without relying on—in this work of his—a true, academic methodology, or a clear, sound edifice such that he may be excused in his writing of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī*; a work which is considered one of his shortcomings that is unforgiveable. The path (he undertook in this work) falls under the saying "Be different. Become known."<sup>3</sup>

---

1 If we were to ask the person who stated this a question: Have your great leaders undertook this task from the very advent of Islam until our time today? The answer is no! This is because they know the consequences of this act, which will expose what is referred to as the sciences of ḥadīth according to the Imāmiyyah.

2 *Al-Kulaynī wa al-Kāfī*, p. 453-454.

3 *Ibid*, p. 556-557.

This scholar was not satisfied with what he said. In fact, he also stated:

غير عنوان هذا المختصر في الطبعة الثانية فأسماه (زبدة الكافي) وهذا خير دليل على سوء فعلته السابقة ولا أدري ما هو المبنى الذي يسير عليه فلا هو يطابق مسلك القدماء كما أنه نأى عن مذاق المتأخرين ومن مثله يصدق عليه القول حاطب ليل

He changed the title of this summary in the second edition and he called it *Zubdat al-Kāfī*. This is the best evidence of his previous misdoing. I do not know what edifice he set himself upon. As such, he does not conform to the path of the early scholars. Likewise, he distanced himself from the ‘flavour’ of the latter-day scholars. The statement *hātīb layl* (a woodcutter at night) truly applies to his likes.<sup>1</sup>

And this is how the issue of independent reasoning (*ijtihād*) and inquiry is regarded; a crime against the school (of the Shī‘ah) and the *Āl al-Bayt*, even if it is from an adept scholar such as the al-Bahbūdī. Perhaps this attack is the one that called for changing the work’s name from *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī* to *Zubdat al-Kāfī*, due to the attack of some Shī‘ah extremists on the printing press. Based on this, they changed the name of the book, as mentioned by Ḥaydar Ḥubb Allāh.

Hāshim Ma‘rūf al-Ḥusaynī, one of the erudite scholars and the author of the work *al-Mawḍū‘āt fī al-Āthār wa al-Akhbār* states in the introduction of his work:

وأنا واثق بأنني سأتعرض لحملات قاسية من بعض حشوية الشيعة والمتاجرين بالدين ولكني بحول الله وقوته سوف أتجاهل كل ما يقال معتمدا على الله

I am sure that I will be subject to harsh attacks from some of the viciousness of the Shī‘ah and the “traffickers of religion,” but I will, with the strength and power of Allah, ignore everything that is said with complete dependence on Him.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Ibid, p. 454.

2 Hāshim Ma‘rūf al-Ḥusaynī: *al-Mawḍū‘āt fī al-Āthār wa al-Akhbār*, p. 10.

The man knows the reality of the situation, and the reality his predecessors went through. However, this group that claims to investigate matters commonly does not have a specific work authored that gathers *ḍaʿīf* and *mawḍūʿ* aḥādīth. Rather, they merely allude to what they see as inconsistent, and considered—by other senior scholars of the school—as red lines that cannot be crossed. The strange thing about this section is that some fanatics of the Shīʿah regarded the authorship wherein *ḍaʿīf* and *mawḍūʿ* aḥādīth are explained as a shortcoming! In criticizing the methodology of the Ahl al-Sunnah, Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī al-Qazwīnī states:

وقد ألف القوم كتباً عديدة في هذا الموضوع منها الضعفاء الصغير للبخاري الضعفاء والمتروكون للنسائي الضعفاء الكبير للعقيلي الجرح والتعديل للرازي المجروحين لابن حبان الكامل في ضعفاء الرجال لأبي أحمد عبد الله الضعفاء والمتروكون للدارقطني معرفة التذكرة في الأحاديث الموضوعة لابن القيسراني الأباطيل والمنكير والصحاح والمشاهير للجوزقاني الضعفاء والمتروكون لابن الجوزي الموضوعات للصاغاني المغني في الضعفاء للذهبي اللآلئ المصنوعة في الأحاديث الموضوعة للسيوطي الأسرار المرفوعة في الأخبار الموضوعة لملا علي القاري الفوائد المجموعة في الأحاديث الموضوعة للشوكاني

The people (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah) authored a number of works on this subject, among them: *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Ṣaghīr* of al-Bukhārī, *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ wa al-Matrūkūn* of al-Nasāʾī, *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Kabīr* of al-ʿUqaylī, *al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl* of al-Rāzī, *al-Majrūḥīn* of Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Kāmil fī Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Rijāl* of Abū Aḥmad ʿAbd Allāh, *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ wa al-Matrūkūn* of al-Dāraquṭnī, *Maʿrifat al-Tadhkirah fī al-Aḥādīth al-Mawḍūʿah* of Ibn al-Qaysarānī, *al-Abāṭīl wa al-Manākīr wa al-Ṣiḥāḥ wa al-Mashāḥīr* of al-Jūzaqānī, *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ wa al-Matrūkūn* of Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Mawḍūʿāt* of al-Ṣāghānī, *al-Mughnī fī al-Ḍuʿafāʾ* of al-Dhahabī, *al-Lāʾlī al-Maṣnūʿah fī al-Aḥādīth al-Mawḍūʿah* of al-Suyūṭī, *al-Asrār al-Marfūʿah fī al-Akhbār al-Mawḍūʿah* of Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī, *al-Fawāʿid al-Majmūʿah fī al-Aḥādīth al-Mawḍūʿah* of al-Shawkānī.<sup>1</sup>

1 Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī: *Samʿ al-Maqāl*, 1/11 (introduction to the edited version). I slightly adjusted the wording—without changing the contents—and summarized by omitting the full names of scholars and their death dates

After citing all of these blessed efforts, he follows it saying:

هذا كله يدل على وجود أحاديث موضوعة كثيرة اصطنعتها الأيدي الصنيعة وبثتها بين أحاديثهم

All of this indicates the existence of many mawdū' aḥādīth that were created by willing hands and spread among their (other) aḥādīth.

And like this, he turns truth into falsehood, good into evil. My Lord spoke the truth when he said: “Or do they envy people for what Allah has given them of His bounty?”<sup>1</sup> He regarded all this giving, effort, inquiry, and purging of the Sunnah from what was wrongly attached to it among the reasons for criticism! This is only but envy. The poet rightfully said with his statement:

لو قطعت البلاد طولاً إليه  
ثم من بعد طولها سرت عرضاً  
لرأى ما فعلت غير كثير  
واشتهى أن يزيد في الأرض أرضاً

*If I traversed the length of the country,*

*Then, after that, I set out traveling its breadth,*

*Only but a few will see what I have done,*

*And desire that the ground expand.*

Every illness has a cure, except for rancor and envy. In fact, this individual did not suffice himself with just that; he explained what the satisfactory method is according to him saying:

إلا أن للشبيعة الإمامية ميزات في هذا الصعيد إذ لم يقعوا في الشراك الذي وقع فيها علماء المذاهب الإسلامية الأخرى حيث إن الأئمة الأطهار عليهم السلام قد تصدوا لهذه الظاهرة من أول يوم انتشر فيه الحديث وأعطوا كل ذي حق حقه فلما رأوا أن عدة من أصحاب الأهواء الباطلة والآراء الفاسدة أخذوا يتلاعبون في الأحاديث الشريفة ويحرفون الشريعة النبوية ويدسون في آثار العترة الطاهرة أعلنوا التبيري منهم ووصفوهم بالكذابين والوضاعين ولعنوههم أشد اللعن ليسقط صدقهم ويذهب بهاؤهم عند الناس وأمروا الشيعة بعدم الأخذ عنهم لكي تمحص الأحاديث من الدساتس والحقاتق من المنكرات

1 Sūrat al-Nisā', v. 54.

However, the Imāmī Shī'ah have advantages in this regard as they did not fall into the traps in which scholars from the other Islamic schools of thought fell; such that the Pure Imāms, peace be upon them, responded to this phenomenon from the first day when ḥadīth spread and they gave every person his due. When they saw that several people of false desires and corrupt opinions began to manipulate the noble aḥādīth, distorted the prophetic Sharī'ah, and interpolated the reports of the Pure Family, they openly recanted from them and described them as liars and forgers, and cursed them in no uncertain terms so their trustworthiness would fall and their standing with people would go away. They commanded the Shī'ah not to accept from them so that the aḥādīth could be purified from machinations, and truths from falsities.

We have the right to ask this individual: Where can I find the aḥādīth which you described their people as “people of false desires and corrupt opinions... and distorted the prophetic Sharī'ah...and interpolated...as liars and forgers, and cursed them in no uncertain terms?” The answer: We find them widespread in the most authentic and best ḥadīth works of the Shī'ah. The observer does not know what is *ṣaḥīḥ* from what is a lie. With what and how did this man make this distinction, and what is the trap in which scholars of the other Islamic schools fell into and he got away from!

In contrast to this extremism, we find someone from the adept scholars of the Shī'ah who is more rational. He is Muḥammad Ṣādiq *Baḥr al-'Ulūm*. In describing the efforts to defend the Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ, he says:

أفرد جماعة من العلماء المتأخرين كتباً في الأحاديث الموضوعية وحدها جمعت من كتب المتقدمين في التواريخ والعلل وكتب الرجال في الضعفاء وكتب الجرح والتعديل واشتهرت هذه المؤلفات وعم نفعها وازدادت مادتها بازدياد ما حدث من الأباطيل في كل جيل فتعقبها أهل الاستقراء التام من الحفاظ ودونها في كتبهم وفندوا علة كل حديث منها ثبت عندهم وضعه فرووه بسنده وأبانوا عن عواره وزيفوا نسبه إلى الرسول الكريم صلى الله عليه وسلم

A group of latter-day scholars devoted works dedicated to *mawḍū'* aḥādīth that were collected from earlier scholars' works in history, *'ilal* (hidden

defects), *da'if* narrators, and *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. These works became well known, and their utility widespread. Their material increased with the increase of what occurred of falsehoods in every generation. Thereafter, ḥadīth masters (*ḥuffāz*) conducted inductive studies and recorded them in their works. They specified the *'illah* (hidden defect) of every ḥadīth which was proven to them to be *mawḍū'*. They narrated it with its sanad, and revealed their flaws, and falsified its attribution to the noble Messenger

صلى الله عليه وسلم<sup>1</sup>

However, when he wanted to mention these efforts, he cited the works authored by the Ahl al-Sunnah, and did not mention the literature of the Shī'ah! This is because he does not know them to have any literature in this regard.

This is what 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī admitted to when he said:

ويسجل لعلماء الحديث من أهل السنة مآثرة علمية جليلة هي تأليفهم في الموضوعات

A great academic feat was recorded for the ḥadīth scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. It is their writings on ḥadīth forgeries.<sup>2</sup>

Then al-Faḍlī cited a number of works of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah and did not mention any works of the Shī'ah except for what the contemporary scholar, Hāshim Ma'rūf al-Ḥasanī, authored in *al-Mawḍū'āt fī al-Āthār wa al-Akhbār*. More on this will come later.

A researcher will be amazed at the opinion of the Shī'ī Muḥammad al-Sanad who asserted that there are no interpolated aḥādīth in the works of the Shī'ah. Despite this, he does not prohibit studying the *asānīd* and *mutūn* (texts) as he claims, and that the authentication, revision, and discarding of interpolated aḥādīth have been completed and finished. In fact, Muhammad al-Sanad regarded the claim of

1 He stated this in the introduction of his edited version of *Takmilat al-Rijāl* of 'Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 166.

authenticating the Shīʿah legacy as having defects in it, and that he responded to it in detail. He also admitted that many scholars of the Shīʿah view the Four Primary works to be authentic, and that some of them regard the *Tafsīr* of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī as authentic.<sup>1</sup>

And thus, we find many scholars of the Shīʿah claiming entire books are authentic, such as the *Akhbārīyyah*, and some *Uṣūliyyah*, such as al-Khūʿī’s opinion of *Tawthīq* of all the narrators of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī’s *Tafsīr*. We do not find anyone who wrote on the topic of collecting false and daʿīf aḥādīth, and explained their defects.

This is Jaʿfar al-Subḥānī, who is not free from his many exaggerations, saying:

More than one of our scholars undertook the task of thoroughly examining what has been narrated of aḥādīth from the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt. By way of example, I will mention: 1) *al-Akhbār al-Dakhīlah* (printed) of Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī (d. 1401 A.H), and 2) *al-Mawḍūʿāt fī al-Āthār wa al-Akhbār* of Hāshim Maʿrūf al-Ḥasanī.”<sup>2</sup>

Al-Subḥānī’s words can be contested in two ways. Firstly, we find the work *al-Akhbār al-Dakhīlah* of al-Tustarī—which al-Subḥānī claims is a work that thoroughly examines the legacy of the Ahl al-Bayt—as a mere imitation of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and following of a path different to what the scholars of the Shīʿah were on. Regarding this, Yāsīn al-Mūsawī states in his annotation of al-Ṭabarsī’s work, *al-Najm al-Thāqib*:

---

1 Muḥammad al-Sanad: *Buḥūth fī Mabānī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 253.

2 *Al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī Bayna al-Riwāyah*, p. 72. The purpose of this book is to disparage the literary works of the Ahl al-Sunnah; however, he does so in a twisted manner. He conceals his poison within honey; disparaging the Ṣaḥābah, al-Bukhārī and Muslim along with them as well, in the name of academic research. If only al-Subḥānī had dedicated his time to scrutinising the books of his own people and scholars, then he would have truly understood the difference in value between the literary works of the two groups.

والغريب موقفه في ذلك الكتاب من الأخبار فكأنه تأثر ببعض علماء السنة الذين كتبوا في الأخبار الدخيلة والموضوعة فأراد أن يجاريهم بأحاديثنا وهو مسلك غير صحيح في دراسة الأخبار والأحاديث وخرقا للسنة المتبعة بين علماء السلف الصالح في فهم الأحاديث ومعرفة السقيم من المستقيم والصحيح من الضعيف والمعتبر من الموضوع

He has a strange position in that work on the topic of reports (*al-akhbār*). It is as if he was affected by some Sunnī scholars who wrote on the subject of extraneous and forged reports. As a result, he wanted our aḥādīth to conform to them (and their standards). This is an incorrect path in the study of reports and aḥādīth and a violation of method followed by the righteous scholarly predecessors (i.e. of the Shī'ah) in understanding aḥādīth, knowing the 'sick (reports)' from the 'straight,' and the ṣaḥīḥ from the ḍa'īf, and the considered (mu'tabar) from the mawḍū'.<sup>1</sup>

Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī penned a refutation of *al-Akhbār al-Dakhīlah* in his work *Ma'rifat Allāh*.<sup>2</sup> This Shī' scholar named Luṭf Allāh Ṣāfī (Golpayga) did not leave the work *al-Akhbār al-Dakhīlah* and merely brush past it; in fact, he authored a specific work (against it) entitled *al-Nuqūd al-Laṭīfah 'alā al-Kitāb al-Musammā bi al-Akhbār al-Dakhīlah*. I will leave Luṭf Allāh Ṣāfī to accurately evaluate al-Tustarī's work for us so that the proof (against them) will come from the words of the Imāmiyyah themselves, even though, as mentioned, he himself does not deny the existence of false aḥādīth in their collections. Still, the work of al-Tustarī did not appeal to him much. And despite his respect for al-Tustarī, we find him saying:

رأيتُ أنه قد عد من الموضوعات طائفة مما رواه شيخنا الصدوق.. كمال الدين وشيخنا الطوسي .....  
ووجدتُ أنه مع إصراره على إثبات وضعها اعتمد على أدلة ضعيفة وشواهد واهية ..... وهذا الباب  
أي باب التشكيك في الأحاديث سندا أو متنا سيما متونها البعيدة عن الأذهان المتعارفة باب افتتن به كثير  
..... إلا أنه لا ريب أن التسرع في الحكم القطعي بالوضع والجعل على الأحاديث سيما بشواهد عليله  
لا يتوقع صدوره عن العلماء الحاذقين والعارفين بموازين في الرد والحكم بالوضع والتحريف والجرح  
وغيرها ..... فلذلك رأيتُ أن الواجب أبدا ما في تشكيكات هذا المؤلف .... حول هذه الأحاديث حتى  
توجب سوء ظن بعض المعتزين وبالتشكيكات بالمحدثين الأقدمين ..... وخلاصة كلامنا معه دام بقاؤه  
أن هذه الأحاديث التي ذكرت في كتابه لو كان فيها بعض العلل على اصطلاحات بعض الرجاليين فإنه

1 al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Najm al-Thāqib*, 2/178.

2 Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī: *Ma'rifat Allāh*, 2/11.



يجبر بما يجبر مثله أيضا على ما بنوا عليه من الاعتماد على الأحاديث مضافا إلى أن كثيرا مما ذكره من العليل واضح الفساد لا يعتنى به العارف بأحوال الأحاديث ..... إن التهجم على مثل كتاب كمال الدين وغيبة الطوسي مع أن مؤلفيها من حذاق فن الحديث وأكابر العارفين بالأحاديث وعللها والإكثار من ذكر العليل في رواياتها والقول بأن هذه الكتب خلط مؤلفوها الصحيح بالسقيم والغث بالسمين لا فائدة فيه غير زرع سوء ظن في نفوس بعض الجهال

I saw that he regarded as *mawḏūʿ* a number of reports that were narrated by our Shaykh, al-Ṣadūq ... *Kamāl al-Dīn*, and our Shaykh, al-Ṭūsī ... I found that, despite his insistence in proving they are *mawḏūʿ*, he relied on weak and flimsy evidences ... Many were infatuated by this door, i.e. the door of opening doubts of aḥādīth in terms of their sanad and matn, especially the texts that are far from the common minds (i.e. from their understanding) ... However, there is no doubt that (the act of) hastening to judge a conclusive rule as *mawḏūʿ*, and deeming aḥādīth as false evidences, is not expected to come from expert scholars; those who understand the (different) dimensions related to refutation, judging reports as forgeries, interpolation, *jarḥ*, and other (sciences) ... Therefore, I saw that the duty is not in the what is necessary is never to be in the doubts raised by this author ... surrounding the aḥādīth such that they bring about a negative opinion of the early ḥadīth scholars by some of those deceived by the doubts ... The summary of our words with him (may Allah prolong his duration) is that the aḥādīth that are mentioned in his work, even if they contained a few defects according to the terms of some scholars of narrator evaluation, they can also repair one another according to what they established in terms of their (overall) reliance on aḥādīth. Additionally, many of what he mentioned as defects are clearly false; the person acquainted with the variant conditions of aḥādīth will pay no regards to it ... Attacking the likes of the work of *Kamāl al-Dīn* and *al-Ghaybah* of al-Ṭūsī (despite the fact that their authors are experts and in the science of ḥadīth and senior specialists of aḥādīth and their hidden defects (ʿilal), excessively mentioning defects in their narrations, and saying that the authors of these works combined authentic (aḥādīth) with unsound ones' and "fat" ones' with "lean" ones' is of no benefit, except that it sows a negative opinion in the hearts of some ignorant people.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Luṭf Allāh al-Ṣāfi: *Majmūʿat al-Rasāʾil*, 2:138-140.

In short, the work that al-Subḥānī venerates so much is actually unsatisfactory to other scholars of the Shī'ah. What is important is the fact that this work, *al-Akhhbār al-Dakhīlah*, is from a contemporary. Where then is what the early scholars of the Shī'ah wrote in this regard? Did they only come to discover the mistakes in this era? However, as I have repeatedly stated: this is but the way of the people (i.e. the Shī'ah)—at the head of which is Ja'far al-Subḥānī—in presenting their 'goods' to others.

Secondly, a person who scrutinizes the work *al-Mawḍū'āt fī al-Āthār wa al-Akhhbār* of Hāshim Ma'rūf will only find him comparing and explaining some of the reasons behind ḥadīth forgery. He spoke about al-Bukhārī (d. 256 A.H)—as is the Shī'ah's habit—and frequently attacked him. Then he spoke about *al-Kāfī*, a few narrators, and criticized some narrations. In short, *mawḍū'* and *ḍa'īf aḥādīth* were not collected in this work; rather, it set down frameworks and general principles on how to recognize false aḥādīth. This is what I wanted to explain and intended in this section. Hāshim Ma'rūf's book is a contemporary book; he himself admitted that it would not appeal to many of the Shī'ah, as mentioned. And if one of them authored a work they would attack him and say as 'Abd al-Rasūl said about al-Bahbūdī:

بل إن ذلك موكول إلى علماء الطائفة ومراجعها

Rather, this is entrusted to the scholars of the group (i.e. the Shī'ah) and their *marāji'* (religious authorities).

The question is: Where are your senior *marāji'* when it comes to authorship in this important field? Why did they not author any works during these centuries?

Finally, a person could say: What about the works *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl*, *Malādh al-Akhyār* of al-Majlisī, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī*, and *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Faqīh* of al-Bahbūdī? All of them mention the aḥādīth with an explanation of their respective levels (of authenticity)?

Firstly, all the authors of these works are from the latter-day scholars. Where are the earlier scholars of this science? This is the most important factor. Was this discovered only after twelve centuries?

Secondly, when the authors of these works give a ruling on a particular ḥadīth, they do not mention the reason of weakness or authenticity. This is what amazed the Shīʿī scholar Ḥusayn al-Sāʿidī when he said about a ḥadīth: “Al-Majlisī (d. 1111 A.H) states in *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl*: “The ḥadīth is *ḍaʿīf*.” I do not know the reason for its weakness, and I did not find a single weak narrator in the links of the sanad.”<sup>1</sup>

At times, al-Majlisī would rule a narrator to be weak and, despite this, his narration would still be acceptable by him?! This, even though the narration in question does not have another chain (i.e. to support it). An example of this, as previously mentioned, is the narration of Abān ibn ʿAyyāsh. Al-Majlisī states: “Yūnus ibn Ḍabyān: (*dād*). In other words, he symbolizes him with weakness (*ḍaʿīf*). Despite this, he states regarding a narration of his in *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl*: “Weak according to the most widespread (opinion), duly considered, according to me.”<sup>2</sup>

Thirdly, these works are not included in what we are in; the purpose here is “what the Shīʿah authored of weak and false aḥādīth.” Therefore, *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl* and *Malādh al-Akhyār* are nothing but ḥadīth commentaries. As for al-Bahbūdī, he has already been discussed.

## 4.2 The disregard for collecting the various chains of ḥadīth and explaining its hidden defects (ʿilal)

### 4.2.1 Hidden defects and anomalies (al-ʿilal wa al-shudhūd)

From early on already, the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamāʿah authored works in the categories of ḥadīth sciences. They wrote on *ʿilal* (hidden defects) in aḥādīth and

---

1 Ḥusayn al-Sāʿidī: *al-Muʿallā ibn Khunays*, p. 160. The ḥadīth which al-Majlisī says is weak is in *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl*, 8/428.

2 Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī: *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl*, 10/126.

excelled in this category. As for the Imāmī Shī'ah, they, as Ibn Taymiyyah said: "If one of them were asked to produce an authentic, established report from 'Alī رضي الله عنه or someone else, they would be unable to do so. They do not possess the expertise of isnād nor the (knowledge of) narrators as the Ahl al-Sunnah."<sup>1</sup> He spoke the truth. May Allah have mercy on him.

Anyone who reflects on the reality of ḥadīth sciences will find truth to what Ibn Taymiyyah said; they are in need of many foundational components of this science, as mentioned previously. Mentioning the death date of a person, tadlīs, and writings explaining false aḥadīth is of no concern to them. How then do they fare with the science of 'ilal, which is considered the "camel's hump" (i.e. the pinnacle) of ḥadīth sciences? Regarding this (science), al-Kajūrī al-Shīrāzī stated:

ومعرفته أجل علوم الحديث وأدقها

Knowledge of it (i.e. the science of 'ilal) is the most sublime and intricate of ḥadīth sciences.<sup>2</sup>

The Shī'ah have absolutely no knowledge of this science and they have not authored anything therein. This is because their ḥadīth sciences are undeveloped to say the least. In contrast to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah who are leading in this category.

Those who read the books of Shī' authors will find that they mention many (different) works of their authors. I have come across works that are dubbed as 'ilal; however, they do not mention for us what type of 'ilal they are speaking about. An example of this is cited by al-Najjāshī.

- Under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Dūl al-Qummī, al-Najjāshī lists the works he authored and mentions *Kitāb al-'Ilal* among them.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah*, 3/505.

2 Al-Kajūrī: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 205.

3 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 89 (no. 223).

- Under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ammār he mentions *Kitāb al-‘Ilal*.<sup>1</sup>
- Under the biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl he mentions *Kitāb al-‘Ilal*.<sup>2</sup>
- Under the biography of ‘Alī ibn Abī Sahl (he mentions) *Kitāb al-‘Ilal*.<sup>3</sup>
- Under the biography of Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān he mentions *Kitāb al-‘Ilal*.<sup>4</sup>

Similarly, al-Ṭūsī mentions under the biography of Ismā‘īl ibn Mihrān ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr al-Sukūnī *Kitāb al-‘Ilal*.<sup>5</sup>

Whoever contemplates over these works cannot definitively confirm the type of these ‘*ilal*. And since we do not possess but the names of these works, they may be the ‘*ilal* of legal rulings, the ‘*ilal* of the Sharī‘ah, the ‘*ilal* of *Taqīyyah*, or the ‘*ilal* ḥadīth. Is it possible to confirm the type of these ‘*ilal*? If not, inferring from these works is not possible.

Whoever examines the books of *muṣṭalah* of the Shī‘ah, we find them documenting what is called ‘*al-mu‘allal* (defected)’ without reference to what was written in this field from the scholars of the Shī‘ah. The situation here resembles the previously mentioned section of *tadlīs*; there is no reference to specific works in the field.

Note, for example, the following works:

- *Al-Fawā‘id al-Rijāliyyah* of Maḥdī al-Kajūrī<sup>6</sup>

---

1 Ibid, p. 95 (no. 236).

2 Ibid, p. 257 (no. 676).

3 Ibid, p. 263 (no. 688).

4 Ibid, p. 466 (no. 1208).

5 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 38 (no. 32).

6 P. 205.

- *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Jalālī<sup>1</sup>
- *Al-Bidāyah fī ‘ilm al-Dirāyah* of Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Āmilī al-Shahīd al-Thānī (d. 965 A.H)<sup>2</sup>
- *Wuṣūl al-Akhyār ilā Uṣūl al-Akhhbār* of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-‘Āmilī (d. 984 A.H)<sup>3</sup>
- *Al-Wajīzah fī ‘ilm al-Dirāyah* of al-Bahā’ī<sup>4</sup>
- *Al-Fann al-Thānī min al-Qawāmīs* of Mullā Fāḍil Āghādarbandī<sup>5</sup>
- *Miqbās al-Hidāyah fī ‘ilm al-Dirāyah* of ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī<sup>6</sup>
- *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Aḥkāmuhu of Ja‘far al-Subḥānī*<sup>7</sup>, and other works of theirs in this field.

I did not find a single reference to a work in the conventional field of hidden defects in ḥadīth. This has a profound impact on everyone who spoke on the sciences of narrator evaluation from the early and latter-day scholars, among them al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī. How will they deal with thousands of *asānīd*, *mutūn* (pl. of *matn*), and narrators without having any trace from their predecessors in the chapter concerning the science of *‘ilal*? All the while remembering the previous words of al-Kajūrī in which he described the science of *‘ilal* as “the most sublime and intricate of ḥadīth sciences.”

What I have mentioned of *‘ilal* is the same for what can be said of *shudhūdh* (anomalies). If there is a work of the Imāmiyyah in *‘ilal*, then it is the work *al-Akhhbār al-Dakhīlah* of their Shaykh, al-Tustarī. I came across it and found him speaking

---

1 P. 110

2 Printed among *Rasā’il fī Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, 1:130.

3 Ibid, 1/412

4 Ibid, 1/543

5 Ibid, 2/114.

6 1/153.

7 P. 113.

about reports which history has testified to their being distorted. Or (he speaks about) distorted reports as attested to by their context. He (also) mentioned a number of forged reports, according to his claim, distorted supplications, and so on. It is a work from a contemporary scholar. Many scholars of the Shī'ah objected to it and, in fact, did not even reprint the work a second time, as far as I know. To such an extent that it has become of the rare books that are difficult to obtain. Therefore, is it possible for us to say that the Shī'ah have works in *'ilal* knowing that they only authored but one work, from a contemporary who they themselves have refuted and denounced his work?

#### 4.2.2 The issue of collecting narrations (*jam' al-ṭuruq*)

The isnād is of great importance in knowing the truth of a report, and the extent to which it reliably reached us. Multiple asānīd enable the researcher to compare between them. With this, the narrator's error from his correctness becomes clear to us. Additionally, the *ziyādah* (addition)—or lack thereof—in the isnād or matn becomes clear to us. This is what distinguished the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah; most of the aḥādīth have varying narrations. At times, al-Bukhārī (d. 256 A.H) will mention a ḥadīth from one Ṣaḥābī with a number of (different) chains that connect with him. Compare this to (other examples) in the works of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

However, the matter is very different to that of the Shī'ah. This is because most of their asānīd are only via one chain, it has no second. This is the basis for them. If Zurārah ibn A'yan narrated a ḥadīth from an Imam, you will not find from the companions of that Imam another person sharing (this ḥadīth) with him. And you will not find this ḥadīth narrated from Zurārah except from one student. And like this, the ḥadīth reaches the book (of ḥadīth). This is the case for most of the aḥādīth narrated in the primary works of the Shī'ah; most of their aḥādīth are *āḥād* (singular) on all levels.

I am not claiming that there is no narration that does not have one, or two, or more chains by the Shī'ah; however, I am merely emphasizing that this is extremely

rare. In fact, it is something that is not even mentioned in relation to their total number of aḥādīth, even in creedal matters. The Shī'ah did not author works specific to collecting (different) chains in order to be compared to the different asānīd of one matn. This is due to the scarcity of the material found in this field by them, contrary to what the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have authored. *Al-'Ilal* of al-Dāraquṭnī and other works of the Ahl al-Sunnah is sufficient for us in this regard.

The Shī'ah (also) do not know the issue of *mutāba'āt* (parallels narrations) in asānīd. This stems from the non-existence of multiple chains of aḥādīth. Therefore, there is no significant mention of them in their works, except rarely. This is because the weakness in a chain of ḥadīth they have *closes* the door in front of them of authenticating through the asānīd.

*Mutāba'āt* in their works are nothing but what they have written on paper; there does not exist any examples worthy of mentioning. If they are found, as I mentioned, they are of consideration because of their rarity. It is not possible for us to build (principles and rulings) on rarities. It is for this reason we find that the scholars of the Shī'ah have replaced (the term) *mutāba'āt* with what they refer to as “circumstantial evidences indicative of the truth of the report.”<sup>1</sup> We do not find them relying much on *mutāba'āt*. Therefore, we find them frequently ‘repairing’ aḥādīth with what is known as “*shuhrat al-fatwā*,” or “popularity of the *fatwā*,”<sup>2</sup> which lead to the satisfaction in the issuance of ḥadīth.

This is ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī, the Shī'ī scholar mentioning how a *ḍa'if* ḥadīth is ‘repaired’ according to some of their scholars:

---

1 Al-Subḥānī mentioned this and divided them into circumstantial evidence which is internal and external in nature. The difference of opinion between the earlier and latter-day scholars of the Shi'ah is in his work *Durūs Mūjazah fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 68.

2 The Shī'ī scholar Muḥyiy al-Dīn al-Musawī al-Gharīfī alluded to accepting a ḥadīth based on its popularity and the difference therein in his work *Qawā'id al-Ḥadīth*, p. 109.



1. Popularity of the narration (*al-shuhrah fi al-riwāyah*),
2. the popularity of fatwā (*al-shuhrah fi al-fatwā*).<sup>1</sup>

Al-Faḍlī did not even touch on the issue of *mutāba'āt*.

Similarly, Ja'far al-Subḥānī states, quoting from the early generation of scholars, that the circumstantial evidence which they rely on in authenticating reports can be summarized as follows:

1. The existence of a *khābar* (report) in many of the four-hundred primary sources (*al-uṣūl al-arba'umī'ah*).
2. The *khābar* being repeatedly mentioned in one, two, or more of the primary works with different chains.<sup>2</sup>
3. The existence of the narration in a primary work that is known to be attributed to one of the group members about whom their truthfulness has been agreed upon by them.
4. Its inclusion in the works that were presented to the Imāms, who accordingly praised their authors.
5. It being taken from one of the works that was popular, dependable, and relied-upon among their predecessors.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 168.

2 From his words here it appears that the mere presence of *mutāba'āt* to ḥadīth is nothing but circumstantial evidence, nothing more than that. This circumstantial evidence reassures the trust in the issuance of ḥadīth, and it is not one of the foundations by which authenticity of a hadith is judged. Is relying on the different chains for it common in their works or is it rare such that it is not considered? The second (opinion) is the correct one. In fact, they may strengthen the ḥadīth because of the existence of another chain, even if it is more unsound and contains more *'ilal* than the first. In fact, they accept stories and authenticate them even if there is isnād for it, as is the case with the work *Nahj al-Balaghah*; it is falsely attributed to 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام.

3 Al-Subḥānī: *Durūs Mūjazah fī 'Ilmay al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 167.

Therefore, al-Subḥānī did not consider *mutāba‘āt* except as one form of a number of circumstantial evidences, not a standalone principle to be relied upon as in paragraph number two.

It is this intellectual legacy that both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī appeared. As such, they did not find a very fertile legacy in this chapter. They have no previous academic principle left behind for them by their scholars. This led to the existence of a major flaw in the judging of narrations. How then is it possible for the researcher to strengthen/bolster a ḥadīth which is not known to have another chain? And how is the researcher to judge a ḥadīth when he does not possess any critical works that explain the *‘ilal* in aḥādīth?

## 5.0 The absence of writing in the sciences of Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth except in later times

The question of authorship in the science of *Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth* is one of the issues of anguish in the school of the Imāmī Shī'ah. This is, as will be seen later, on account of their differences regarding its permissibility, origins, and its practical application.

*Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*, or *'ilm al-Dirāyah* (the in-depth science of ḥadīth knowledge) is from, in reality, the direct sciences of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah. They are its rightful and outstanding heirs. As for the Shī'ah, they are nothing but imitators of the Ahl al-Sunnah in this regard. The Shī'ī scholar, Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī states:

يمتاز علم الدراية لدى السنة بالقدم والوضوح عما عليه عند الشيعة وكان متداولاً بين علمائهم منذ عهد  
مديد وقد ألفوا في هذا المضمون كتباً عديدة جداً أما بالنسبة إلى الشيعة الإثني عشرية فلم يشعروا بالحاجة  
إلى علم الدراية وذلك بسبب وجود الأئمة المعصومين عليهم السلام بين ظهرانيهم إذ كانوا ينهلون عنهم  
الأحكام والأحاديث وهم في مأمن من خطر تسرب الوضع أو التحريف أو الكذب إليها

The Sunnīs in-depth knowledge of *'ilm al-Dirāyah* is distinguished in terms of its antecedence and clarity than that of the Shī'ah. It was in circulation among their scholars for a long time. They authored a great number of works in this regard. In relation to the Twelver Shī'ah, they did not feel a need for *'ilm al-Dirāyah* because of the existence of the infallible Imāms عليهم السلام in their ranks. They would draw legal rulings and aḥādīth from them as they were safe from the risk of forgery, distortion, and lies slipping in.<sup>1</sup>

There are a few observations on the words of al-Bābilī:

1. His recognition of the precedence, and in fact, clarity of the Ahl al-Sunnah in this regard. This is the evidence.

---

1 Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī: *Rasā'il fī Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, 1:13-14.

2. His recognition of the Shī'ah's delay in this science, which he attributed to the existence of infallible Imāms that freed them from the need of authorship in *muṣṭalah*. This is the other evidence.

Ghulām Ḥusayn Qayṣariyyah agreed with him when he stated:

لما كانت الشيعة في زمن الأئمة عليهم السلام غير محتاجة إلى علم الدراية – لأنهم مرتبطون بالأئمة عليهم السلام ومعتمدون على الأصول المصنفة وعندهم قرائن كانوا يعولون عليها وكانت القرائن لا تزال موجودة عند المتقدمين من الأصحاب – لم يهتموا بهذا العلم ولم يدونوا أصوله ولم يؤلفوا فيه تأليفًا

When the Shī'ah were in the time of the Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ they did not require 'ilm al-Dirāyah since they were linked to the Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ and use to rely on the authored Uṣūl works. They had (knowledge of) circumstantial evidences which they relied on. These evidences continued to exist with the early scholars of the Shī'ah; they too did not show much importance to this science and did not document its uṣūl. They did not author any works therein.<sup>1</sup>

In refutation of al-Bābīlī and Qayṣariyyah, I say: Did you both not claim the existence of an Imam in every age until our present; that is, the awaited Mahdī? Therefore, why do you not draw your legal rulings and aḥādīth from him such that you are safe from the dangers of forgeries, distortions, and lies in your aḥādīth? If they say that he is absent (*ghā'ib*), I ask: Did al-Ṭūsī not produce a chapter in his work *al-Ghaybah* with the chapter heading “What has been narrated of reports regarding those who saw him عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ while not knowing him, or coming to know him after – (these reports are) more than can be counted; however I will mention a selection from them?”<sup>2</sup> Al-Ṭūsī goes on to cite a number of narrations of those that met him!

1 He states this in the introduction of *al-Bidāyah fi 'ilm al-Dirāyah*, 1/108 (printed among *Rasā'il fi Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*).

2 Chapter Three, p. 253.

The infallible, who is the Mahdī, the last of the Imāms in their belief, is not absent from sight. In fact, he is present in every time and place. The Shīʿī scholar, Fāḍil al-Mālikī states:

هذا الشخص المقدس صلوات الله وسلامه عليه يمكن أن يلتقي به بعض الأبدال وبعض الأوحدين وبعض الأفاضل من الناس ممن يليق أن يفوز بلقاء الإمام صلوات الله وسلامه عليه ورؤية طلعتهم المباركة وهذا باب واسع عقد له الميرزا النوري أعلى الله مقامه كتابا في هذا المعنى فيمن رأى الإمام المهدي سلام الله عليه في الغيبة الكبرى وكذلك عقد له السيد البحراني كتابا سماه تبصرة الولي فيمن رأى القائم المهدي سلام الله عليه وهناك ملح في بحار العلامة المجلسي رحمه الله فيمن التقى بالإمام سلام الله عليه في عهد الغيبة الكبرى

It is possible for some of the *abdāl* (saints of Allah), ultra-monotheists (*al-awḥadiyyīn*), and noble peoples of whom are deserving of obtaining a meeting with the Imam ﷺ to meet him and see his blessed outward appearance. This is an extensive chapter; al-Mirzā al-Nūrī ﷺ composed an entire book on this; those who saw al-Imam al-Mahdī ﷺ in the Major Occultation. Similarly, al-Sayyid al-Baḥrānī composed a book called *Tabṣīrat al-Walī fī man Rāa al-Qā'im al-Mahdī* ﷺ. There is (also) an appendix to al-ʿAllāmah al-Majlisī's ﷺ *Bihār al-Anwār* concerning those that met with the Imam ﷺ during the Major Occultation<sup>1</sup>

The issue of the Mahdī meeting with his fellow Shīʿah is *mutawātir*; there is no dispute between them, even in the time of the Major Occultation! So why did they not draw their rulings and aḥādīth from him when they were safe from the risk of forgery and distortion? Is the meeting of the absent (Imam) with his believers and disciples just a greeting, or is to communicate beneficial things to them and teach them their religion?

Therefore, what the scholars of the Shīʿah claim when they are late in every (religious) science is untrue. May Allah have mercy on Ibn Taymiyyah when he said: “Neither a believer of this awaited (Imām) nor his rejector benefitted from him.”<sup>2</sup>

1 Fāḍil al-Mālikī: *al-Ghaybah al-Sughrā wa al-Sufarā' al-Arba'ah*, p. 14-15.

2 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, p. 133.

This is the truth that no one, who promotes this self-admitted excuse, wants to admit. Based on this, it becomes known that there is no credibility to this excuse. This is because their claim of total and complete occultation is unconfirmed. If what they claim of these meetings is confirmed, then it is actually one of the greatest criticisms against the infallible and absent (Imam); he does not even take advantage of his meeting with his loved ones to do (or say) what is beneficial for their *Dīn*, even before their *dunyā*. In reality, they are claims, the truth of which its claimants can never verify. These peoples' clinging to illusions, secretive meetings, or dreams is one of the greatest ways to deviate from the straight path. Ibn Taymiyyah states:

The person of the time (i.e. the awaited Imām) whom they call toward, it is impossible for people to know who he actually is, what he commands and prohibits people to do, and what he informs them of. If a person's felicity and success (i.e. in the Hereafter) depends on obeying this Imam, whose commands and prohibitions is unknown, it becomes impossible for anyone to attain success, felicity, and obedience to Allah. This is one of the greatest forms of burdening someone with that which they cannot bear (*taklīf mā lā uṭāq*). (At the same time,) they are one of the greatest/most frequent of people (i.e. the Shī'ah) to refer to him.<sup>1</sup>

Among those who have admitted to the antecedence of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the late-coming of the Shī'ah in this particular chapter is the introduction submitted by the University of al-Imam al-Ṣādiq to the work *Dirāsāt fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah* of 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī. It states therein:

إن الدقة والعمق والعراقة التي تبرز في تصانيف الشيعة في هذا المجال قد ميزت هذا العلم بكثير على الرغم من سبق الآخرين لهم

The accuracy, depth, and deep-rootedness that stand out in the writings of the Shī'ah in this field have characterized this science much, despite the antecedence of others.”<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Ibid, 1:88.

2 Introduction to *Dirāsāt fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah* of 'Alī Akbar Ghaffārī, p. 4. This work is a summary of *Miqbās al-Hidāyah* of 'Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī.

Another person to point out the late-coming of the Shī'ah in this field is al-Karakī (d. 1076 A.H). He states:

وأن تقسيم الأحاديث إلى الأقسام الأربعة المذكورة في الدراية من مخترعات العامة لأن معظم أحاديثهم أخبار خالية عما يوجب القطع بورودها عن النبي (ص) فلذلك اضطروا إلى التقسيم المذكور وما يتعلق به واشتهر العمل به عندهم لذلك أو لغيره من الأغراض

And the division of aḥādīth into the four distinct aforementioned divisions in *al-Dirāyah* is from the inventions of the 'Āmmah (i.e. the Sunnīs). This is because most of their aḥādīth are reports mentioned from the Prophet ﷺ that are bereft of what necessitates certain knowledge. Therefore, they were forced into the aforementioned division and whatever is related to it. According to them, it became common practice for this purpose and others.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Karakī states:

لم يكن للإمامية تأليف في الدراية لعدم احتياجهم إليها ومخالفة عمدة مقاصدها لطريق القدماء وكون العمل بها يوجب سوء الظن بالسلف الصالح وعدم الاعتماد عليهم وتخطئتهم فيما شهدوا بصحته وما أشبه ذلك بالماء الصافي يلقي فيه التراب فيكدره وأول من ألف في الدراية من أصحابنا الشهيد الثاني اختصر (دراية ابن الصلاح الشافعي في رسالته) ثم شرحها

The Imāmiyyah did not have a work in *'Ilm al-Dirāyah* because they did not have a need for it, and because the major objectives behind it were contrary to the path of the early scholars. Acting on them would bring about a negative opinion of the pious predecessors, non-reliance on them, and their being considered mistaken in what they viewed as authentic. This is similar to dirt thrown into clean water, causing it to become muddy. The first person to write in *al-Dirāyah* from our companions was al-Shahīd al-Thānī. He summarized, and thereafter commented on *Dirāyat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shāfi'ī fī Risālatihi*.<sup>2</sup>

1 Ḥusayn ibn Shihāb al-Dīn al-Karkī al-'Āmilī: *Hidāyat al-Abrār*, p. 178.

2 Ibid, p. 104.

This work is nothing but a summary of Ibn al-Ṣalāh's (d. 643 A.H) work. It is not a separate treatise specific to the school (of the Shī'ah)! The opinion of al-Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn is important in this regard. In his discussion on concept of *iḍṭirāb* (irreconcilably discrepant ḥadīth), he states:

فإنها من مستخرجاتهم [يقصد السنة] بعد وقوع معانيها في حديثهم فذكروها بصورة ما وقع واقتنى جماعة من أصحابنا [الشيعة] في ذلك أثرهم واستخرجوا من أخبارنا في بعض الأنواع ما يناسب مصطلحهم وبقي منها كثير على محض الفرض ولا يخفى أن إثبات الاصطلاح للمعنى بعد وقوعه وتحققه أبعد عن التكلف واحتمال الخطأ من إثبات المعنى للاصطلاح بعد وقوعه وتحققه وأن البحث عما ليس بواقع واتباعهم في إثبات الاصطلاح له قليل الجدوى بعيد عن الاعتبار ومظنة للإيهام

It is from their inferences (i.e. the Sunnīs), the meanings of which occurred in their ḥadīth. And so they mentioned it in the manner it occurred. A group of our companions (i.e. the Shī'ah) followed in their tracks and extracted from our reports a number of technical terms that resembled their technical terms. Many of the terms remained purely hypothetical. It is obvious that establishing a technical term for a meaning after its occurrence and verification is less susceptible to error and strain than establishing a meaning for a technical term after its occurrence and verification. And the fact that analyzing that which is unreal and following them (i.e. the Sunnīs) in establishing a technical term for it is useless, far from consideration, and a cause for ambiguity.<sup>1</sup>

So, the Shī'ah have admitted to following the Ahl al-Sunnah in this science, and that they took sciences for themselves which were not theirs. In fact, as al-Ḥasan Zayn al-Dīn described them: "A group of our companions (the Shī'ah) followed in their tracks and extracted from our reports a number of technical terms that resembled their technical terms. Many of the terms remained purely hypothetical." For this reason, we find that many technical terms in *al-Dirāyah* of the Shī'ah have no existence in reality. The best example of this is what has already been mentioned, and what I have mentioned in the chapter of *Tadlīs*.

---

1 Ḥasan Ṣāhib al-Ma'ālim: *Muntaqā al-Jammān*, 1/10.



Of those that admitted to this fact is al-Istarābādī (d. 1033 A.H). In commenting on the words of al-Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn, he states:

الحق أن تقسيم الخبر الواحد الخالي عن القرائن إلى الأقسام الأربعة من هذا القبيل ومن باب الغفلة عن أن معاني تلك الاصطلاحات مفقودة في أحاديث كتبنا عند النظر الدقيق

The truth is that dividing the solitary report which is free from circumstantial evidences into four categories is of this kind and, upon careful consideration, it is heedless to the fact that the meanings of those technical terms are not to be found in the aḥādīth of our works.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Baḥrānī (1186 AH) considered that the division of reports has no existence in the works of the Shī'ah, and that accepting such a division and applying it to their works stems from obstinacy and deviance. In criticizing the previously mentioned text of al-Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn, he states:

وأنت إذا تأملت بعين الحق واليقين وجدت التقسيم المذكور من هذا القبيل إلى غير ذلك من الوجوه التي أنهيناها في كتاب المسائل إلى إثني عشر وجها وطالب الحق المنصف تكفيه الإشارة والمكابر المتعسف لا ينتفع ولو بألف عبارة

And if you ponder with the eyes of truth and conviction, you will find the aforementioned division is of this type, and the likes of it which we have completed in twelve parts in *Kitāb al-Masā'il*. A mere indication is enough (to understand) for the fair-minded student who seeks the truth and, even if expressed in a thousand (different) ways, the despotic, obstinate individual will not benefit.<sup>2</sup>

And like this, their scholars acknowledge that they drew these sciences from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah, and that they took from them a science that does not conform to their aḥādīth, all of which put them in difficulty and hardship in their application thereof. In fact, it went further than that when some of the

---

1 Nūr al-Dīn al-ʿAmilī: *al-Fawā'id al-Makkiyyah wa bi Hāmishihi al-Shawāhid al-Madaniyyah*, p. 126.

2 Al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāẓirah*, 1:24.

proponents of the *Akhbārī* methodology prohibited this field for the Imāmiyyah since it was taken from the Ahl al-Sunnah, and that the truth and salvation is to be considered in opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah. Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī (d. 1104 A.H) states:

إن طريقة المتقدمين [يقصد متقدمي الإمامية] مبانة لطريقة العامة [أهل السنة] والاصطلاح الجديد موافق لاعتقاد العامة واصطلاحهم بل هو مأخوذ من كتبهم كما هو ظاهر بالتتبع وكما يفهم من كلام الشيخ حسن وغيره وقد أمرنا الأئمة عليهم السلام باجتناوب طريقة العامة وقد تقدم بعض ما يدل على ذلك في القضاء في أحاديث ترجيح الحديثين المختلفين وغيرها

The method of the early scholars is different to the method of the ‘*Āmmah*’ (the Ahl al-Sunnah). The new convention is in accordance to the belief and technical terms of the ‘*Āmmah*. In fact, they are taken from their works, as is clear after studying, and as understood from the words of Ḥasan and others. The Imāms عليهم السلام have ordered us to stay away from the method of the ‘*Āmmah*.’<sup>1</sup> Some evidence for this and other issues has been provided in the issue of giving preference between two conflicting aḥādīth.<sup>2</sup>

## When did the Imāmiyyah write about the science of Muṣṭalah?

Imāmī scholars differed in answering this question; some of them were realistic and fair, and some of them were controlled by the propaganda complex of the

1 Do not be surprised by the reasoning of al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī that one of the evidences of the division of ḥadīth into *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḍa‘īf* is that it is from the division Ahl al-Sunnah scholars’. The issue of opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah, whom they call the ‘*Āmmah*’ is one of the greatest doctrines of *al-Walā’ wa al-Barā’* (loyalty and disavowal) according to the Twelver Shī‘ah. Just as the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم commanded us to oppose the polytheists in many aḥādīth, such as, when he صلى الله عليه وسلم, as reported by al-Bukhārī, said: “Oppose the polytheists” (*Bāb Taqlīm al-Azāfir*). Similar, the Shī‘ah; among their universal objective in both their *uṣūl* and *furu’* is their opposition to the Ahl al-Sunnah. The words of their scholars have been massively transmitted (i.e. it is mutawātir) in this regard. After recounting several narrations commanding opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah, Khomeini states: “In any case, there is no problem that opposing the ‘*Āmmah*’ is one of the ways of giving preference (to an opinion) in the chapter of (how to deal with) contradictions” (p. 83). Therefore, the words of al-‘Āmilī do not go beyond the legal theory of the school—which is supported by narrations.

2 Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah*, 30/249.

Shī' school—in that they were at forefront in everything—to such an extent that people were included among the Imāmī Shī'ah who were not even from them. All so that he (i.e. the proponent of this view) can tell people that we (i.e. the Shī'ah) have a head start in everything. This inferiority complex has continued to control the minds and opinions of many of their scholars.

I will answer this question by first mentioning their views in chronological order and commenting on each of them accordingly.

### The first opinion

The first to write on this subject from the scholars of the Shī'ah is al-Imam Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī (d. 405 AH), the author of *al-Mustadrak* رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. Of those who held this view is Ḥasan al-Ṣadr when he stated:

تقدم الشيعة في تأسيس علم دراية الحديث وتنويعه إلى الأنواع المعروفة فأول من تصدى له أبو عبد الله الحاكم النيسابوري .... صنف فيه كتابا سماه معرفة علوم الحديث

The Shī'ah came first in establishing *'Ilm al-Dirāyah* and its division into its well-known divisions. The first to undertake this was Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī ... He authored a work therein and called it *Ma'rifaṭ 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*.<sup>1</sup>

The reason for Ḥasan al-Ṣadr's claims goes back to what was said in the biography of al-Imam al-Ḥākim رَحِمَهُ اللهُ when some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah attributed him to the Shī'ah; in fact, to the Rawāfiḍ. Commenting (on the biography), al-Ṣadr states:

الحاكم من الشيعة باتفاق الفريقين فقد نص السمعاني في الأنساب والشيخ أحمد بن تيمية والحافظ الذهبي في تذكرة الحفاظ على تشييعه بل حكى الذهبي في تذكرة الحفاظ عن ابن طاهر أنه قال سألت أبا إسماعيل الأنصاري عن الحاكم فقال ثقة في الحديث رافضي خبيث قال الذهبي ثم قال ابن طاهر كان الحاكم شديد التعصب للشيعة في الباطن وكان يظهر التسنن في التقديم والخلافة وكان منحرفا عن معاوية

---

1 Ḥasan al-Ṣadr: *al-Shī'ah wa Funūn al-Islam*, p. 55 (abbreviated).

وآله متظاهرا بذلك ولا يعتذر منه قلت وقد نص أصحابنا على تشييعه كالشيخ محمد بن الحسن الحر في آخر الوسائل وحكى عن ابن شهر آشوب في معالم العلماء في باب الكنى أنه عدّه في مصنفى الشيعة وأن له الأماي وكتابا في مناقب الرضا

Al-Ḥākīm is from the Shī'ah, as agreed upon by both sects. Al-Sam'ānī in *al-Ansāb*, as well as Aḥmad ibn Taymiyyah and al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī in *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ* have documented his Shī'ism. In fact, al-Dhahabī in *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ* (narrates) from Ibn Ṭāhir that he said: "I asked Abū Ismā'īl al-Anṣārī about al-Ḥākīm and he said: 'Reliable in ḥadīth. A repulsive *Rāfiḍī*.' Al-Dhahabī said: 'Then Ibn Ṭāhir said: 'Inside, al-Ḥākīm was a fanatical Shī'i. He used to outwardly express Sunnism regarding issues of *taqdim* (i.e. preferring 'Alī over the other Khulafā') and the khilāfah. He openly and unapologetically held distorted views about Mu'āwiyah and his family.'

I (i.e. Ḥasan al-Ṣadr) say: Our companions (i.e. the Shī'ah) have documented the fact that he is a Shī'i. For example, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr at the end of *al-Wasā'il*. He reported from Ibn Shahr Āshūb in *Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā'* under the chapter of agnomens (*bāb al-kunā*) that he regarded him among the authors of the Shī'ah, and that he has *al-Amālī* and a work on the virtues of al-Riḍā.<sup>1</sup>

There are a number of observations to the words of Ḥasan al-Ṣadr. Firstly, his statement "al-Ḥākīm is from the Shī'ah, as agreed upon by both sect" requires some explanation. First of all, if, by this statement, he meant that al-Ḥākīm was an Imāmī that believed in Twelve "infallible" Imāms, then he is mistaken. In fact, none of the scholars have said that al-Ḥākīm was a Twelver. Secondly, if he meant that al-Ḥākīm sided with 'Alī, then yes. Many scholars have said this. However, his claim that this is agreed-upon by both the Sunnīs and Shī'ah requires proof. The correct and appraised answer to this issue is that he was not a Shī'i, let alone a Rāfiḍī, as will come later.

The second observation to al-Ṣadr statements is his (attempted) inference from al-Dhahabī's statement:

---

1 Ibid.

In fact, al-Dhahabī in *Tadhikirat al-Ḥuffāz* (narrates) from Ibn Ṭāhir that he said: “I asked Abū Ismā‘īl al-Anṣārī about al-Ḥākīm and he said: ‘Reliable in ḥadīth. A repulsive Rāfiḍī.’ Al-Dhahabī said: ‘Then Ibn Ṭāhir said: ‘Inside, al-Ḥākīm was a fanatical Shī‘ī. He used to outwardly express Sunnism regarding issues of *taqḍīm* (i.e. not preferring ‘Alī over the other caliphs) and *khilāfah*. He openly and unapologetically held distorted views about Mu‘āwiyah and his family.’

Firstly, Ḥasan al-Ṣadr did not assume a true academic and trustworthy role when he omitted al-Dhahabī’s commentary on Ibn Ṭāhir. After quoting Ibn Ṭāhir, al-Dhahabī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ immediately states:

كلا ليس هو رافضيا بل يتشيع

Never. He was not a Rāfiḍī; rather, he was a Shī‘ī.<sup>1</sup>

In *Mīzān al-I’tidāl*, he states:

الله يحب الإنصاف ما الرجل برافضي بل شيعي فقط

Allah loves fairness; the man was not a Rāfiḍī. Rather, he was only a Shī‘ī.<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, adding al-Ḥākīm among the authors of the Shī‘ah merely based on Ibn Ṭāhir’s statement that al-Ḥākīm was a ‘Rāfiḍī’ is far from accurate academic research. This is because it has not been established that al-Ḥākīm ever said anything disparaging about Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān. Where is the proof that he is a Rāfiḍī?

Thirdly, adding al-Ḥākīm among the authors of the Shī‘ah on account of some Sunnīs saying that he has Shī‘ī tendencies is incorrect. As it appears, the reason for describing al-Ḥākīm as a Shī‘ī is on account of him authenticating a number of weak aḥādīth on the virtues of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

1 Al-Dhahabī: *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’*, 17/174.

2 Al-Dhahabī: *Mīzān al-I’tidāl*, 3/608.

Describing a scholar as a Shīṭ simply on account of his authenticating ḥadīth on virtues of ‘Alī is an incorrect description. Al-Ḥākīm reached his conclusions based on his independent reasoning. It is irrational to say that someone who authenticates a ḍa‘īf ḥadīth on (the subject of) virtues is a Shīṭ. As is irrational to say that someone who grades the same ḥadīth ḍa‘īf a Nāṣibī.

Fourthly, Ḥasan al-Ṣadr’s clinging to the word ‘Shīṭ’ in order to drag al-Ḥākīm into the group of Shīṭ authors is also rejected. The Shīṭ scholar, al-Tustarī (d. 1401 A.H) explains a reality—often hidden by the scholars of the Shī‘ah from the ordinary non-scholar Shī‘ah. That is, if they wanted to include someone who has been attributed to the Shī‘ah among the group of the Imāmiyyah in order to increase their numbers, many of their scholars would infer to the term “Shīṭ” that is given to one of the scholars or one of the narrators. In his discussion about one of the narrators, al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī states:

جاء أن يكون رجوع من العامة إلى التشيع الذي هو أعم من الإمامية – أي الإثنا عشرية – الذي هو المراد الآن من الشيعة فلا يكون هذا دالا على حسنه وإماميته

It is possible that he reverted from the ‘Āmmiyyah (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah) to Shī‘ism—which is a more general term than the Imāmiyyah (i.e. Twelver Shī‘ism)—and which is implied nowadays from the term Shī‘ah. Therefore, this is not indicative of his goodness and his status as an Imāmī.<sup>1</sup>

Muḥammad al-Tustarī explains the meaning of “Shīṭ” according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah saying:

إن قول العامة [أهل السنة] فلان شيعي أو يتشيع أعم من الإمامية وإنما المرادف له الرافضي أو الشيعي الغالي

قال الذهبي في ابن البيع الحاكم النيسابوري أما انحرافه عن خصوم علي فظاهر وأما أمر الشيخين فمعظم لهما بكل حال فهو شيعي لا رافضي وعتون ابن قتيبة في معارفه الشيعة و عد فيهم طاووسا والحكم بن عتيبة و إبراهيم النخعي والحسن بن صالح بن حي و سفيان الثوري وجمعا آخر مع وضوح عدم كونهم إماميين ..... بل الشيعي الغالي أيضا عندهم أعم

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 1/119.

قال الذهبي في ميزانه (في عنوان أبان بن تغلب) إن الشيعي الغالي في زمان السلف وعرفهم هو من تكلم في عثمان والزبير وطلحة ومعاوية وطائفة ممن حارب عليا وتعرض لسبهم والغالي في زماننا وعرفنا هو الذي يكفر هؤلاء السادة ويتبرأ من الشيخين أيضا وللشيعي أيضا عندهم معنى آخر وهو أنه عباسي

The statement of the ‘*Āmmah* (Ahl al-Sunnah): “So and so is a Shīṭī, or practices Shī’ism” is more general than the (term) Imāmiyyah and this is but synonymous to the *Rāfiḍī* or the extreme Shīṭī (*al-Shīṭī al-ghālī*).

Al-Dhahabī states about Ibn al-Bayyī‘ al-Ḥākīm al-Naysabūrī: “As for his deviation from the opponents of ‘Alī, it is apparent. And as for the matter of the Shaykhayn, either way, he respects them. Therefore, he is a Shīṭī, not a Rāfiḍī. Ibn Qutaybah in *al-Ma‘ārif* has a title “The Shī‘ah” and counts among them Ṭāwūs, al-Ḥakam ibn ‘Utaybah, Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaṭī, al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy, Sufyān al-Thawrī, and a number of others. He clarifies that they are not Imāmīs...

In fact, the extreme Shīṭī is also, according to them, more general...

Al-Dhahabī states in *al-Mizān* under the section of Abān ibn Taghlib: “The extreme Shīṭī in the time of the predecessors and their ‘*urf* (i.e. customary usage of the term) referred to anyone who spoke (negatively) and cursed ‘Uthmān, al-Zubayr, Ṭalḥah, Mu‘āwiyah, and a group of those who fought with ‘Alī. The extreme (Shīṭī) in our time and customary usage is he who makes *takfīr* (excommunicates) these noble personalities and also disavows the Shaykhayn.”

According to them, they also have another meaning for (the word) Shīṭī; and that is he is an ‘*Abbāsī*.<sup>1</sup>

It is clear now that the scholars’ statements about al-Imam al-Ḥākīm do not include him among the Imāmiyyah, as Ḥasan al-Ṣadr attempted to do.

Fifthly, we will now challenge Ḥasan al-Ṣadr regarding the Shī’ism of al-Ḥākīm and whether he was a Shīṭī.

---

1 Al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/22 (introduction of chapter five).

Ḥasan al-Ṣadr confirmed that the first work of the Shī'ah in *Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth* is the work of al-Imam al-Ḥakim *Ma'rifat 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*. A question arises here: How can al-Ḥākīm be a Shī'ī when he himself stated in this work: “Mentioning the seventh type of knowing the types of ḥadīth. The seventh type of this science is knowing the Ṣaḥābah according to their ranks. The first of them are the people who became Muslim in Makkah, like Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, 'Alī, and others رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ?”<sup>1</sup> This is clear documentation from him in the work itself which Ḥasan al-Ṣadr infers. He arranged the Ṣaḥābah according to their respective ranks as follows: Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, and 'Alī. Can the person who arranged them in this manner be regarded as a Shī'ī, let alone an Imāmī?

The person who prefers 'Uthmān over 'Alī is not regarded as a Shī'ī. In fact, after mentioning them, he says *Raḍi Allāh 'anhum* (may Allah be pleased with them). Neither the Shī'ah nor Ḥasan al-Ṣadr will be pleased with this. In fact, more than that. After establishing al-Imam al-Ḥākīm's arrangement of the Ṣaḥābah according to that of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and his being pleased with 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, I will mention this text so that we can understand the reality of al-Ḥākīm's Shī'ism. Imam al-Dhahabī states:

وروى ابن شؤدب عن ليث قال أدركت الشيعة الأول بالكوفة وما يفضلون على أبي بكر وعمر أحدا يعني  
إنما كانوا يتكلمون في عثمان وفيمن قاتل عليا

Ibn Shawdab narrated from Layth: “I met the first Shī'ah in Kūfah; they would not prefer anyone over Abū Bakr and 'Umar. They would simply speak about 'Uthmān and those that fought 'Alī.”<sup>2</sup>

Let us apply this text to al-Imam al-Ḥākīm. We find him arranging the Ṣaḥābah as the Sunnīs do. As mentioned, he (also) documented his pleasure with 'Uthmān. Therefore, there remains nothing for us from the description of Shī'ism except Layth's statement “and those that fought 'Alī.” Thus, whoever falls into (the category of) fighting 'Alī is considered to be of the Shī'ah. Did this happen to al-

1 Al-Ḥākīm: *Ma'rifat 'Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*, 1/43.

2 Al-Dhahabī: *Tārīkh al-Islām*, 3/:88.



Imam al-Ḥākim such that we regard him as a Shīʿī? The answer: The most famous of those who fought ‘Alī are al-Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām and Ṭalḥāh ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh رضي الله عنه. And of the most famous enemies of the Imāmī Shīʿah is al-Mughīrah ibn Shuʿbah as well. Let us see how al-Imam al-Ḥākim dealt with them. He states: “Mentioning the virtues of the Messenger’s disciples and his cousin al-Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām ibn Khuwaylid ibn Asad ibn ‘Abd al-‘Uzzā ibn Quṣayy.”<sup>1</sup>

And he states: “Mentioning the virtues of Ṭalḥāh ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Taymī—may Allah be pleased with him.”<sup>2</sup>

And he states: “Mentioning the virtues of al-Mughīrah ibn Shuʿbah—may Allah be pleased with him.”<sup>3</sup>

What kind of Shīʿī is this who dedicates chapters to the virtues of these people? He was pleased with many of the Ṣaḥābah whom the Shīʿah are not pleased with such as ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها. When mentioning the female Companions, he describes her as: “The first of them (i.e. female Companions) we will begin with is al-Ṣiddīqah bint al-Ṣiddīq, ‘Ā’ishah bint Abī Bakr, may Allah be pleased with both of them.”<sup>4</sup>

Regarding Abu Hurayrah, he states: “I am confused with commencing on the virtues of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه because of his memorizing the ḥadīth of al-Muṣṭafā صلى الله عليه وسلم, and the testimony of the Ṣaḥābah and Tābiʿīn in his favour in that regard. Every person who seeks to memorize ḥadīth from the advent of Islam until our time are among his followers and supporters. He is but their first and most deserving of the word *ḥifẓ* (i.e. to memorize the ḥadīth of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم).”<sup>5</sup>

His praise for the great Sunnī Imāms, like Ibn Khuzaymah, appear a lot in his book. In fact, the sources of al-Ḥākim’s work are all the (same) sources of the

---

1 Al-Ḥākim: *al-Mustadrak*, 5/39.

2 Ibid, 5:51.

3 Ibid, 5:156.

4 Ibid, 5:428.

5 Ibid, 5/245.

Sunnīs, whether they are the asānīd or actual wordings (of the ḥadīth), they are different to the Shī'ah's wordings. Similarly, the authoritativeness of the work is contrary to what Ḥasan al-Ṣadr wanted it to pass as; al-Ḥākim رَحِمَهُ اللهُ did not adhere to the statements of the infallible Imāms, as Ḥasan al-Ṣadr believes. Therefore, he is from the honourable and greats of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

There remains nothing for us of the Shī'ism of al-Imam al-Ḥākim except for his stance regarding Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. Here, it is necessary to pose a question: Has it been proven that al-Imam al-Ḥākim criticized Mu'āwiyah? The answer is no. In fact, al-Ḥākim mentioned a number of asānīd that include Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, as it comes in the *Mustadrak*:

حدثني علي بن حمشاد العدل ثنا بشر بن موسى ثنا الحميدي ثنا سفيان ثنا عمرو بن دينار قال سمعت وهب بن منبه في داره بصنعاء وأطعمني خزيرة في داره يحدث عن أخيه عن معاوية بن أبي سفيان رضي الله عنه أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لا تلحفوا في المسألة فوالله لا يسألني أحد منكم شيئا فتخرجه له مني المسألة فأعطيه إياه وأنا كاره فيبارك له في الذي أعطيه

قال الحاكم هذا حديث صحيح على شرط الشيخين ولم يخرجاه بهذه السياقة

تعليق الذهبي في التلخيص على شرط البخاري ومسلم

‘Alī ibn Ḥamshād narrated to me – Bishr ibn Mūsā narrated to us – al-Ḥumaydī narrated to us – Sufyān narrated to us – ‘Amr ibn Dīnār narrated to us (and) said: “I heard Wahb ibn Munabbih in his house in Ṣan‘ā’—and he fed me *khazīrah*’ in his house—narrating from his brother, from Mu’āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَحِمَهُ اللهُ that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: ‘Do not be importunate<sup>2</sup> in asking. By Allah, if one of you asks me for something and I give it to him unwillingly, there is no blessing in what I give him.’

1 Ibn al-Athīr (d. 606 A.H) states in *al-Nihāyah fī Gharīb al-Ḥadīth*: “(Khazar) ... *al-khazīrah*: Meat that is cut into small pieces and a lot of water is poured over it. When it gets well done, flour is sprinkled over it. If there is no meat in it, it is *‘aṣīdah*. It is said that it is mixed with flour and cream. It is also said that when it is from flour then it is *ḥarīrah*, and when it is from bran then it is *khazīrah*.” (2/72)

2 Ibn al-Athīr states in *al-Nihāyah fī Gharīb al-Ḥadīth*: “(Lahf) ... *alḥafa fī al-mas’alah ulḥifu ilḥāfan* – when a person persists therein and perseveres.” (4/455) Ibn Manẓūr states in *Lisān al-‘Arab*: “(Lahf) ... *Wa alḥafa al-mas’al alahḥa*.” (9/314)

Al-Ḥākim says: This ḥadīth is ṣaḥīḥ according to the condition of the *Shaykhayn* (i.e. al-Bukhārī and Muslim) and they did not include it (in their collections) with this thread of the conversation.

Al-Dhahabī's commentary in *al-Talkhīs*: On the condition of al-Bukhārī and Muslim.<sup>1</sup>

If al al-Ḥākim had a negative opinion or criticism against Mu'āwiyah he would not have included his aḥādīth that he regarded as ṣaḥīḥ.

The judgement of al-Ḥākim on any of the Ṣaḥābah is to be in the positive and not in the negative. Accordingly, if his tongue and pen abstained from Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, then the original and actual presumption is soundness (of opinion regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه). If, on the other hand, a positive statement appeared from him such that he spoke or wrote something about Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, then we are to judge him accordingly (i.e. based on his statement).

How so, when he included the aḥādīth of Mu'āwiyah and judged their asānīd to be authentic and sound. If there was something in his heart, he would have said or implied it.

Also, if Ḥasan al-Ṣadr regards al-Imam al-Ḥākim رحمته الله as a Shī'ī, why did the scholars of the Imāmiyyah not mention him in their difference of opinion regarding the division of ḥadīth into *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, *muwaththaq*, and *ḍa'īf*?

The Shī'ī dispute is confined to Ibn Ṭāwūs and his student Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. Al-Ḥākim was not mentioned, despite the fact that he classified ḥadīth in sections before Allah created Ibn Ṭāwūs and his student.

Sixthly, the definitions and divisions mentioned by al-Imam al-Ḥākim do not correspond with the doctrine of the Imāmī Shī'ah; the Shī'ah do not infer the

---

1 Al-Ḥākim: *al-Mustadrak*, 2/325.

statements of al-Imam al-Ḥākim in any chapters of ḥadīth because he contradicts them altogether.

Seventhly, the most important thing we respond with to the claim of Ḥasan al-Ṣadr are the statements of the Shī'ah scholars themselves about al-Imam al-Ḥākim. Not one of the scholars of the Shī'ah stated, according to my findings, that al-Imam al-Ḥākim is a Twelver Shī'ī. In fact, commenting on Ḥasan al-Ṣadr's view, the Shī'ī scholar Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī states:

تجدد الإشارة إلى أن انتماء الحاكم النيسابوري إلى المذهب الشيعي غير متفق عليها وثمة شكوك حولها

It should be noted that al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī's affiliation to the Shī'ī school of thought is not agreed upon and there are doubts about it.<sup>1</sup>

And what confirms the invalidity of what Ḥasan al-Ṣadr believed is the statement of 'Alī al-Mīlānī about al-Ḥākim:

هو من كبار أهل السنة بل أساطينهم ومن صدور علمائهم بل سلاطينهم

He is from the seniors of the Ahl al-Sunnah, in fact, their masters. And (he is) from their foremost scholars, in fact, their sultans.<sup>2</sup>

Ja'far al-Subḥānī states:

لا يصح لنا عده ممن ألف من الشيعة في هذا المضممار فضلا عن كونه أول المؤلفين فيه

It is incorrect for us to regard him from those of the Shī'ah who authored works in this category, let alone him being the first one.<sup>3</sup>

Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī states:

---

1 Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī: *Rasā'il fī Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, 1?14.

2 'Alī al-Mīlānī: *Nafahāt al-Azhār*, 14/160.

3 Al-Subḥānī: *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Aḥkāmuhu*, p. 11.

ويحكى الجزم بتشييعه عن ابن تيمية أيضا لكنه احتتمل جمع من الأعلام أن رمي هؤلاء إياه بالتشيع لإرادة إبطال احتجاج الشيعة بما أورده في مستدركه وغيره مما يضر بعقائدهم وهو غير بعيد فراجعه

A definitive opinion of his Shī'ism has been reported from Ibn Taymiyyah as well. However, a number of notable scholars conceived the fact that these individuals' accusations of Shī'ism against him was merely intended to invalidate the Shī'ahs ability to use as proof whatever he mentioned in his *Mustadrak*, and other works regarding such things that would harm their doctrines. This is not farfetched, so consider it.<sup>1</sup>

The contemporary Shī' scholar Ḥusayn al-Ma'tūq states:

وتهمته بالتشيع وكذا الرفض على حد تعبيرهم لا شك في بطلانها وعدم صحتها وذلك أولا لأن المعروف من حال الحاكم أنه من أهل السنة وأعلامهم بل ومن كبار أئمتهم

There is no doubt about the invalidity and inauthenticity of the accusation of his Shī'ism, and similarly, being a Rāfiḍī—according to their interpretation. Firstly, because it is known from al-Ḥākim's condition that he was from the Ahl al-Sunnah and their notable scholars. In fact, he is of their senior Imāms.<sup>2</sup>

Thāmir Hāshim Ḥabīb al-'Amīdī:

إنَّ الحاكم نفسه متنازع فيه بين الشيعة والعامّة؛ إذ لم يثبت بنحو القطع على كثرة ما قيل حوله انتمائه إلى أحد الفريقين وإن كان ظاهر مستدركه عدم الاعتقاد بالتشيع

Al-Ḥākim himself is in conflict between the Shī'ah and the 'Āmmah (i.e. the Sunnīs). This is because his affiliation to one of the two groups has not been definitively established, despite much of what has been said concerning him.<sup>3</sup>

1 Āqā Buzurg al-Tahrānī: *al-Dharī'ah*, 2/199.

2 Ḥusayn al-Ma'tūq: *al-Inṣāf fi al-Masā'il al-Khilāf*, 1/44.

3 In his published research entitled "Tārīkh al-Ḥadīth wa 'Ulūmuhu" in *Majallat Turāthinā*, 47/248.

Did Thāmir Hāshim not bother to look at the remaining works of al-Ḥākim so that he could know the truth that he does not want to speak out about? It may be difficult for him seeing that al-Ḥākim is from the most notable and greatest scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. These are the statements of the Shī'ah scholars about al-Ḥākim, our Imām. It is worth noting that the Shī'ī scholar 'Alī al-Namāzī al-Shāhrūdī stated in his biography of al-Ḥākim: "They (i.e. the Shī'ah) did not mention him."<sup>1</sup> In other words, there is no mention of him in the encyclopedias of Shī'ī narrator evaluation, such as *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* of al-Māmaqānī, *Mu'jam al-Khū'ī*, and *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* of al-Ardabīlī, all of which are considered the most comprehensive encyclopedias in Shī'ah narrator evaluation. All of this further proves that al-Ḥākim رحمته الله is free from Shī'ism.

The third observation to Ḥasan al-Ṣadr's statements has to do with the error he committed in his biography of al-Imam al-Ḥākim. He stated:

Our companions (i.e. the Shī'ah) have documented the fact that he is a Shī'ī. For example, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥurr at the end of *al-Wasā'il*. He reported from Ibn Shahr Āshūb in *Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā'* under the chapter of agnomens (*bāb al-kunā*) that he regarded him among the authors of the Shī'ah, and that he has *al-Amālī* and a work on the virtues of ('Alī) al-Riḍā.<sup>2</sup>

The first reference which documents the Shī'ism of al-Ḥākim from the ones mentioned by Ḥasan al-Ṣadr is *Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā'*. When I referred to *Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā'* by Ibn Shahr Āshūb, I found him<sup>3</sup> saying: "Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Naysābūrī, *al-Shaykh al-Mufīd* (d. 413 AH). He has (written) *al-Amālī* and *Manāqib al-Riḍā 'alayhi al-salām*."<sup>4</sup>

---

1 7/170.

2 Ḥasan al-Ṣadr: *al-Shī'ah wa Funūn al-Islam*, p. 55.

3 After writing this chapter—which took about five months, I came across the words of Dr. 'Umar al-Farmāwī in his work *al-Khilāf bayn al-Shī'ah wa al-Sunnah* (p. 105). He preceded me in several of the refutations I reached, among them is regarding the error of al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī. Therefore, it is necessary to point this out since I found him refuting the opinion that al-Ḥākim was a Shī'ī. He refuted Ḥasan al-Ṣadr excellently. May Allah reward him.

4 P. 167.

Ibn Shahr's statement "Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Naysābūrī, *al-Shaykh al-Mufīd*;" the identification of (the epithet) *al-Mufīd* proves the delusion and confusion of Ḥasan al-Ṣadr, especially when the text states "*al-Shaykh al-Mufīd*." This further proves to me the existence of a mistake in the understanding of Ḥasan al-Ṣadr. What further proves this is what I found in the work *A'yān al-Shī'ah* of Muḥsin al-Amīn. Under the biography of al-Imam al-Ḥākim, he states: "And what is apparent from what he mentioned in *Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā'* is that it is somebody else. In in, it states "Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Naysābūrī al-Shaykh al-Mufīd. From his works is *al-Amālī* and *Manāqib al-Riḍā* عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام." His famous nickname is '*al-Ḥākim*;' no other nickname is mentioned."<sup>1</sup>

Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī mentions the following among the works of the Shī'ah: "*Al-Riḍawīyyāt* of al-Shaykh al-Mufīd Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Naysābūrī al-Khuzā'ī al-Rāzī al-Ḥāfiz al-Thiqah, the student of the two *sayyids* al-Riḍā and al-Murtaḍā, *Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah*, al-Karāchī, Sallār, Ibn al-Barrāj. Muntakhab al-Dīn mentions him; perhaps it (i.e. *Manāqib al-Riḍā*) too is attributed to him."<sup>2</sup>

What is meant by 'al-Mufīd' here is not Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Nu'mān, the teacher of the Shī'ah, which al-Ḥillī has a biography about saying: "From the most honourable *mashāyikh*, leaders, and teachers of the Shī'ah. Everyone that succeeded him benefited from him. His virtue is more famous than can be described in *fiqh*, *kalām* (scholastic theology) and *riwāyah*. The most reliable and knowledgeable of his time. The Imāmiyyah's rule in his time ended with him."<sup>3</sup>

---

1 5/328. From the contradictions of Muḥsin al-Amīn is that he stated in another place in *A'yan al-Shī'ah*: "(2421) Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Naysābūrī al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, famously known as Ibn al-Bayyī'. His name is Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥamawayh ibn Na'im al-Ḍabbī al-Ṭahmānī al-Naysābūrī" (2/380). Muḥsin al-Amīn also stated: "(391) Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ḥamawayh ibn Na'im al-Ḍabbī al-Ṭahmānī al-Naysābūrī, famously known as al-Ḥākim and Ibn al-Bayyī'." This proves the error of Muḥsin al-Amīn; at times, he shows that al-Ḥākim is different to al-Mufīd. Other times, he makes them one person.

2 Āqā Buzurg: *al-Dharī'ah*, 11/240. Refer to: *al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb* of 'Abbās al-Qummī, 2/666 (no. 702).

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl fī Ma'rifat al-Rijāl*, p. 248.

In fact, this is another useful point since whatever has been attributed to al-Ḥākīm of being a Shī'ī is not true, even a slight form of Shī'ism is not proven رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ.

## The second opinion

The first person to write on the in-depth sciences of ḥadīth or *'ulūm al-Dirāyah* is Sa'īd ibn Hibat Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan al-Rāwandī (d. 573 AH). His work is entitled *Risālah fī Ṣiḥḥat Aḥādīth Aṣḥābinā*. From those who held this view is the Shī'ī scholar 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Ḥakīm. After mentioning this work, he states:

يعد القطب الراوندي أول من ألف من أصحابنا في علم الدراية

Al-Quṭb al-Rāwandī is regarded as the first of our companions to write in the in-depth science of ḥadīth.<sup>1</sup>

Where did the Shī'ah come to know that this is a work on *'ilm al-Dirāyah* and *muṣṭalah*?

It appears from the title that it does not depart from the *Akḥbārī* methodology which considers all (ḥadīth) reports as *ṣaḥīḥ*. If this is not the case, who of the Shī'ah scholars actually transmits the technical terms of *al-Dirāyah* from this work?

What confirms that this work does not depart from the *Akḥbārī* methodology (which rejects the division of ḥadīth) is the fact that it was relied upon by the head of the *Akḥbārīs* in his time, the erudite scholar al-Istarābādī. He used to reference it in his work *al-Fawā'id al-Madaniyyah*. In describing the work, he states: "The work which he authored in explaining the conditions of the aḥādīth of our companions and proving their authenticity."<sup>2</sup>

---

1 He mentioned this in *Majallat Turāthinā*, 39/273. Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī also quoted this from him, as mentioned in *Rasā'il fī Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, 1/14.

2 Al-Istarābādī: *al-Fawā'id al-Madaniyyah*, p. 381.



Therefore, the work is, as documented by al-Istarābādī, an explanation on the authenticity of aḥādīth. It is the methodology of the *Akhbārī* school which opposes the division of aḥādīth. With this, it becomes clear that what ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Ṭabṭabāī believed is far from the truth; there is no correlation with this work and the in-depth sciences of ḥadīth and its definitions.

### The third opinion

What Ḥasan al-Ṣadr mentioned in his statement:

وصنف بعد أبي عبد الله الحاكم في علم دراية الحديث جماعة من شيوخ علم الحديث من الشيعة كالسيد جمال الدين أحمد بن طاووس أبي الفضائل وهو واضع الاصطلاح الجديد للإمامية في تقسيم أصل الحديث إلى الأقسام الأربعة الصحيح والحسن والموثق والضعيف كانت وفاته سنة ٦٧٣هـ

A number of scholars of the Shī‘ah in the science of ḥadīth authored works after Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim in *‘Ilm al-Dirāyah*, such as al-Sayyid Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Ṭāwūs Abī al-Faḍāyil. He is the originator of the new technical terms of the Imāmiyyah in their division of ḥadīth into four categories: *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, *muwaththaq*, and *ḍa‘īf*. He died in the year<sup>1</sup> 673 A.H.<sup>2</sup>

Based on this statement, chronologically, Ibn Ṭāwūs is third. If we asked those who held this opinion: What the name of Ibn Ṭāwūs’s work is that you claim is about *‘Ilm al-Dirāyah*? Their answer would be: *Ḥall al-Ishkāl fī Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl*.

The book is missing. Nothing of it reached us except for what Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Shahīd al-Thānī found; he summarized it in what is known as *al-Ṭaḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī*. The editor of *al-Ṭaḥrīr* writes in his introduction to the work:

---

1 What is strange is the fact that the editor of the work mentioned on the cover that the death date of Ibn Ṭāwūs is 664 A/H. And in the introduction to the work he mentions that he died in the year 673 AH.

2 Ḥasan al-Ṣadr: *al-Shī‘ah wa Funūn al-Islam*, p. 56. Muḥsin al-Amīn also held this view in *A’yān al-Shī‘ah*, 1/149.

وصل هذا الكتاب إلى الشيخ حسن صاحب المعالم ووجده مشرفاً على التلف فانتزع منه ما حرره السيد من كتاب اختيار الكشي وزاد عليه بعض الزوائد في المتن مع حواشي لطيفة وسماه بـ (التحرير الطاوسي)

This work reached al-Shaykh Ḥasan, the author of *al-Maʿālim* and he found it completely damaged. He removed from it what al-Sayyid edited from the book *Ikhtiyār al-Kashshī* and added additional information to the text alongside a brilliant supercommentary that he named *al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī*.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, this book is nothing but explanatory remarks on al-Kashshī's work on narrator evaluation. Where is *Rijāl al-Kashshī* in terms of the sciences of *muṣṭalaḥ*?

I perused this work and found Ibn Ṭāwūs saying in it: “I have decided to collect in this work of mine the names of authors and others about whom praiseworthy or negative things have been said and has been harmed by other (statements in other works).” And he states: “After completing the names, I began, in a similar manner, verifying the agnomens (*kunā*) and other titles (of narrators).” And he stated: “Thereafter, the intention is to scrutinize the *asānīd* that are related to narrators who have been praised and criticized, according to what has been concluded by me. I do not know anyone that has preceded me in this regard throughout the ages.”

Ibn Ṭāwūs mentions these texts in the beginning of his work.<sup>2</sup> In reality, the subject-matter of this work is to be regarded as part of the works of narrator evaluation—works that examine the conditions of narrators. This is clear from its title: *Ḥall al-Ishkāl fī Maʿrifat al-Rijāl*. The attempt by some researchers to add this work among the (other) works of *Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth* is nothing but an attempt to gain, as much as possible, antecedence in writing (in this field) to the Ahl al-Sunnah. As we have mentioned this work has no correlation to *Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth*.

---

1 The editor of the work, Muḥammad Ḥasan Tarḥīnī said this in the introduction, p. 7.

2 Al-Shahīd al-Thānī: *al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī*, p. 24-25 (a summary of a Ibn Ṭāwūs's lengthy statements).

Based on this, the Shī'ah do not have anyone that wrote on the sciences of *muṣṭalah* until the time of al-Ḥillī (648-726 A.H). This is what I wanted to explain; that is, Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī does not have a legacy of writing and authorship (to rely on) from his predecessors in the sciences of *muṣṭalah*. This led him to invent rules that were completely unprecedented, such as the division of ḥadīth into separate categories. He was the first to divide ḥadīth, according to many scholars of the Shī'ah. There is a difference between al-Ḥillī—who could not find a foundational basis from the statements of his scholars—and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūṭī—who was aware of the statements of al-Ḥillī and those after him until our time. This lends support to the opinions of al-Khūṭī, relatively speaking, in those areas wherein he disagrees with Ibn al-Muṭahhar.

### The fourth opinion

ʿAbd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī states: “The earliest imāmī work in this science which reference is made to is *Sharḥ Uṣūl Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of al-Sayyid ʿAlī ibn ʿAbd al-Karīm ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Najafī al-Nīlī, the student of al-ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī who is from the scholars of the eighth century A.H.”<sup>1</sup>

I searched long and hard so I could find a person who transmitted even one letter from this work, but I was unable to. It appears from the title that the work speaks about *ʿIlm al-Dirāyah*; however, it does not exist in the first place such that we can verify its subject matter. We are only able to ascertain a name like *Sharḥ Uṣūl Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*; we cannot build a historical basis for it. The words of Muḥsin al-Amīn drew my attention: “Among the authors therein is al-Sayyid ʿAlī ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥasanī. He has (i.e. authored) *Sharḥ Uṣūl Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, as has been said from the eighth century.”<sup>2</sup>

If we turn our attention to his statement “as has been said,” it is as if al-Amīn was uncertain about the reality of the work. However, this is a statement that

---

1 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 26.

2 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *Aʿyān al-Shīʿah*, 1/149.

is not possible to be certain about, especially since, under his biography in the *Ṭabaqāt* of eminent Shīʿī personalities, Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī mentioned some of his works but did not mention this work. However, he alludes to him having a work on narrator evaluation (*Kitāb al-Rijāl*)<sup>1</sup> without mentioning an actual name for. In *Kitāb al-Dharīʿah* of Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī stated:

شرح أصول دراية الحديث للسيد علي بن عبد الكريم بن عبد الحميد النجفي النيلي تلميذ العلامة الحلبي  
المتوفى سنة ٧٢٦هـ وشيخ أبي العباس أحمد بن فهد الحلبي ذكر في ترجمته في عداد مصنفاته

*Sharḥ Uṣūl Dirāyat Ḥadīth* of al-Sayyid ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Najafī al-Nīlī, a student of al-‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī (d. 726 A.H) and the shaykh of Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn Fahd al-Ḥillī. This work is mentioned in his biography among his works.<sup>2</sup>

The question is: Is the work *Kitāb al-Rijāl* the same as *Sharḥ Uṣūl Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*? Especially since the scholars of the Imāmiyyah mentioned *al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī* among the works of the in-depth science of ḥadīth, and it is a work on narrator evaluation!

This is possible. In short, this work is doubtful, at most. It is not possible to say with certainty that this work falls within the parameters of our subject-matter. Perhaps this is closer (to the truth). If the opposite is proven true in that *Kitāb al-Rijāl* is different to *Sharḥ Uṣūl Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, and we can see the contents, it is possible to say that this is the first work of the Shīʿah in this regard. Therefore, authorship in this science commenced in the eighth century, notwithstanding the uncertainty that hovers around this work.

### The fifth opinion

The first work written by the Imāmiyyah in *Muṣṭalah al-Ḥadīth* is *al-Bidāyah fī ‘Ilm al-Riwāyah* of Zayn al-Dīn ibn ‘Alī al-‘Āmilī, famously known as al-Shahīd al-Thānī

1 3/142-143.

2 13/94.

(d. 965 A.H). This opinion is the most famous and closest to the truth. A number of scholars of the Shī'ah held this view. Riḍā al-Mukhtārī states:

من المشهور أن الشهيد الثاني أول عالم من الشيعة كتب كتابا في علم الدراية ولم يكتب قبله أحد من علماء الشيعة كتابا في هذا العلم وقالوا وهذا العلم لم يسبقه أحد من علمائنا إلى التصنيف فيه جاء هذا الكلام من جملة ما جاء فيه في الكتب التالية الدر المنثور وأمل الأمل ورياض العلماء وروضات الجنات وريحانة الأدب ومعجم رجال الحديث ومقدمة شرح اللمعة وإن المرجع الأول لكل هذه المصادر مباشرة أو بالواسطة هو كلام ابن العودي المنقول في الدر المنثور

It is famously known that al-Shahīd al-Thānī was the first scholar of the Shī'ah to write a book on *ʿilm al-Dirāyah*. None of the scholars before him wrote a book in this science and they said: “There was no one to write before him in this science from our scholars.” This statement came from among what was mentioned in the following books: *al-Durr al-Manthūr*<sup>1</sup>, *Amal al-Āmil*, *Riyāḍ al-ʿUlamāʾ*, *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt*, *Rayḥānat al-Adab*, *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, *Muqaddimah Sharḥ al-Lumʿah*. The first reference for all of these sources—directly or indirectly—is the words of Ibn al-ʿAwdī which is transmitted in *al-Durr al-Manthūr*.<sup>2</sup>

This is the preference of a number of notable scholars of the Imāmī school. I add the following:

1. What was mentioned by Ghulām Ḥusayn Qayṣarāhy and Niʿmat Allah al-Jalīlī. They stated: “It has been said that the first person to independently study the (different) subjects of *ʿilm al-Dirāyah* and write a separate treatise on it was al-Shahīd al-Thānī Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿĀmilī. He authored the work

---

1 This work is not the same as the famous one of al-Imam al-Suyūṭī. In fact, it is another work. Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī states: “*Al-Durr al-Manthūr min al-Khabar al-Māthūr wa Ghayr al-Māthūr* is a large work that consists of three volumes. It was written by al-Shaykh ʿAlī ibn al-Shaykh Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Shahīd al-Thānī al-Jubāʾī al-ʿĀmilī—born 1014 (*al-Dharīʿah*, 8/76).

2 He stated this in his editorial introduction to *Munyat al-Murīd* of al-Shahīd al-Thānī, p. 43-44 (with slight variation).

*al-Bidāyah fi 'ilm al-Dirāyah*. Thereafter, he went on to offer a commentary on it.”<sup>1</sup>

2. In describing the work of al-Shahīd al-Thānī, Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī states: “It is a short and very famous work and is considered by many researchers as the first Shīrī work in *'ilm al-Dirāyah*. It had a great influence on what was written later on (*'ilm al-Dirāyah*.”<sup>2</sup>
3. I'jāz Ḥusayn al-Naysābūrī states: “He is the first to author a work *'ilm al-Dirāyah*. The beginning of it starts with ‘We praise you at the beginning and the end and ask You for good care until the end...’”<sup>3</sup>
4. Muḥsin al-Amīn states: “Al-Shahīd al-Thānī Zayn al-Dīn ibn 'Alī al-'Āmilī al-Jubāī was the first of our companions to author a work therein in a fashionable manner.”<sup>4</sup>

When looking at and contemplating these sayings, we find that they revolve around two tendencies. Firstly, al-Shahīd al-Thānī did not convey anything new. In fact, he gathered (the opinions) of a number of Shīrī authors among his predecessors. This is apparent from several texts, as Riḍā al-Mukhtārī mentioned when he spoke about the origins of writing in this field. He states:

وعلى فروض ورود الإشكال والتشكيك في بعض الموارد المذكورة آنفاً – والظاهر أنه كذلك – فمع ذلك  
يثبت من مجموعها أن الشهيد لم يكن أول من ألف في ذا الفن من علماء الشيعة

Assuming there exist problems and doubts in several of the aforementioned resources (and it seems that is the case), nevertheless, all of the resources collectively prove that al-Shahīd was not the first person to write in this field from the scholars of the Shīrīah.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 They mentioned this in the introduction to the edited version of *al-Rawāshih al-Samāwiyyah*, p. 5.

2 Al-Bābilī: *Rasā'il fi Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, 1/22.

3 I'jāz Ḥusayn al-Naysābūrī: *Kashf al-Ḥajb wa al-Astār 'an Asmā' al-Kutub wa al-Asfār*, p. 82.

4 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shīrīah*, 1/149.

5 Al-Shahīd al-Thānī: *Munyat al-Murīd*, p. 45 (editor's introduction).

Therefore, his admitting that all the sources mentioned before this work are questionable sources is the correct opinion and what I believe, except that he (also) believed that al-Shahīd did not convey anything new.

Of those who specifically expressed this point is Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī. He states:

فهو أول من جمع ما كان متناثرا في الكتب والرسائل من آراء سلفه من علماء الشيعة

Therefore, he is the first to collect what was scattered in the works and treatises from the opinions of his predecessor, Shī'ah scholars.<sup>1</sup>

The second tendency is the fact that this work is the first of its kind in its field; the Imāmiyyah have no knowledge of this field *before* this work. Also, what al-Shahīd did is merely transmit what the Ahl al-Sunnah have. The clearest example of this is what al-Karkī (d. 1076 AH) stated:

The Imāmiyyah did not have a work in *‘Ilm al-Dirāyah* because they did not have a need for it, and because the major objectives behind it were contrary to the path of the early scholars. Acting on them would bring about a negative opinion of the pious predecessors, non-reliance on them, and their being mistaken in what they viewed as authentic. This is similar to dirt thrown into clean water, causing it to become muddy. The first person to write on the in-depth science of ḥadīth from our companions was al-Shahīd al-Thānī. He summarized, and thereafter commented on *Dirāyat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shāfi‘ī fi Risālatihi*.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭ states: “He is the first of the Imāmiyyah to write on *‘Ilm al-Dirāyah*. However, he transmitted the technical terms from the works of the *‘Āmmah* (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah), as mentioned by his son and others.”<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Bābilī: *Rasā'il Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, 1/15.

2 Ḥusayn ibn Shihāb al-Dīn al-Karkī al-‘Āmilī: *Hidāyat al-Abrār*, p. 104.

3 Al-Khūṭ: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 8/385.

The erudite scholar Ghulām Ḥusayn Qayṣariyyah admitted to this when he stated:

نظرا إلى أن أكثر الأقوال والآراء التي نقلها المصنف من أهل السنة والجماعة وبلغها (قيل) بذلنا وسعنا لتخريج الأقوال من مصادرها الأصلية والإرجاع إليها وتفحصنا على قائلها ولهذا كان أكثر مصادر التحقيق من كتب العامة

Given that most of the sayings and opinions conveyed by the author are from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah. And with the word “*qīla* (it was said),” we have made every effort to resort back to and extract the sayings from their original sources and examined them accordingly. Therefore, most of the sources of inquiry were from the works of the ‘*Āmmah* (i.e. Ahl al-Sunnah).

After a few lines, he states:

We found that al-Shahīd was influenced by *Muqaddimah Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ* ... This becomes apparent to those who have reviewed *Sharḥ al-Bidāyah* and *Muqaddimah Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*.<sup>1</sup>

This second tendency is in accordance with the truth and the evidence. This is clear to anyone who reads the work *al-Bidāyah fī ‘Ilm Dirāyah*. It does not go beyond the work of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. More than one scholar of the Shī'ah themselves alluded to this. Al-Shahīd al-Thānī even mentioned the (same) examples as mentioned by Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. For example, the ḥadīth “Whoever misrepresents me intentionally, let him prepare for himself a seat in the Hellfire.” Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ

---

1 Introduction to the reviewed work *al-Bidāyah fī ‘Ilm al-Riwāyah* (p. 19). This work has been printed more than once, of which I have two prints. The first one is by *Markaz al-Abḥāth wa al-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyyah* (Qum). I have transmitted this text from this print. The second one printed in *Rasā'il fī Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābīlī. However, the introduction of the same editor, Ghulām Qayṣariyyah, mentioned the same introduction in full and in the exact same order, except that he altered most of the words. I mentioned this so that a mistake does not occur, and that if the reader comes across the same words in one of the prints that he thinks that I transmitted it by way of meaning (i.e. not by its exact wording).



mentioned this in the section on *mutawātir* (massively transmitted) reports and al-Shahīd al-Thānī followed him and mentioned the same example.

Another example is the ḥadīth “Indeed deeds are (judged) by intentions.” Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ mentioned this when speaking about the *mashhūr* (wide-spread) ḥadīth. Al-Shahīd al-Thānī quoted the same example in the same discussion. Likewise, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ mentioned the same ḥadīth in the section on *gharābah* (rare reports) and al-Shahīd followed suit. This is in addition to the many words quoted from the work of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.

If someone said that al-Shahīd took from his predecessors and did not take from the Ahl al-Sunnah, I say that consideration is to be given to the majority and greater portions. Al-Shahīd al-Thānī could have taken from some scholars of the Shī‘ah, such as al-Ḥillī<sup>1</sup> or al-Shahīd al-Awwal<sup>2</sup> (d. 786 A.H) some words or terms such as the definition of *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, *muwaththaq*, *ḍa‘īf*, and *mutawātir*. However, those are general and relatively easy words and terms. Definitions of the sciences of *muṣṭalaḥ* were not brought forth. Therefore, they do not represent anything in relation to what al-Shahīd al-Thānī mentioned. Also, it is not possible to judge a methodology of a group like the Imāmiyyah and establish opinions and knowledge of the sciences of *muṣṭalaḥ* through a word that has not been mentioned in the actual subject-matter unless the science is rooted and properly arranged. Only al-Shahīd al-Thānī undertook such a task in this work. Therefore, the correct opinion is that he was the first to author a work in this regard, without forgetting that most of the work is a summary of the Sunnī scholar Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s work.

There is an important issue that deserves attention here. That is, al-Shahīd al-Thānī stated at the end of his work *al-Bidāyah fī ‘Ilm al-Dirāyah*:

ومن أراد الاستقصاء فيها مع ذكر الأمثلة فعليه بكتابنا غنية القاصدين في معرفة اصطلاحات المحدثين

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Muntahā al-Maṭlab*, 1:15 (in the eighth introduction).

2 Al-Shahīd al-Awwal: *Dhikrā al-Shī‘ah fī Ahkām al-Sharī‘ah*, 1:48 (under the chapter “*Ta‘rīf al-Sunnah wa Taqṣīmuḥā*”).

And whoever wants to investigate it with the citation of examples should read our work *Ghunyat al-Qāṣidīn fī Maʿrifat Iṣṭilāḥāt al-Muḥaddithīn*.<sup>1</sup>

This statement from al-Shahīd al-Thānī proves that he has another extensive work in this chapter. However, most scholars of the Shīʿah did not mention this work. In fact, they believed that *al-Bidāyah fī ʿilm al-Dirāyah* is where this science actually commenced. In any event, whether *al-Bidāyah* or *Ghunyat al-Qāṣidīn*, there is no difference since both of them are from one author. It is beneficial to know that the work *Ghunyat al-Qāṣidīn* is missing. Abu al-Ḥaḍl Ḥāfiẓyān documented the fact that it was missing when he stated:

لم يُعثر على نسخة من هذا الكتاب

No copy of this work was found.<sup>2</sup>

There is another important note here. Riḍā al-Mukhtārī, in his biography of al-Shahīd al-Thānī in the introduction to this work *Munyat al-Murīd* states:

وقد كتب بعض علماء الشيعة قبل الشهيد الثاني كتابا في هذا العلم مثل ابن أبي جمهور الأحسائي (توفي بعد ٩٠١ هـ) والذي ألف كتابه (تحفة القاصدين في معرفة اصطلاح المحدثين) قبل الشهيد بعدة أعوام

A number of scholars of the Shīʿah have written a work on this science before al-Shahīd al-Thānī. For example, Ibn Abī Jamhūr al-Aḥṣāʾī (d. 901 AH). Also, the person who authored the work *Tuḥfat al-Qāṣidīn fī Maʿrifat Iṣṭilāḥ al-Muḥaddithīn* several years before al-Shahīd.<sup>3</sup>

Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī wrote in this regard saying:

---

1 P. 47.

2 Al-Bābilī: In a work entitled *Muṣannafāt al-Shīʿah fī ʿilm al-Dirāyah*, 1/67, printed among *Rasāʾil fī Dirāyah al-Ḥadīth* of the same author.

3 Introduction to *Munyat al-Murīd*, p. 44 where he mentioned a detailed biography of al-Shahīd al-Thānī.

تحفة القاصدين في معرفة اصطلاح المحدثين للشيخ محمد بن علي بن إبراهيم ابن أبي جمهور الاحسائي قال في آخر كتابه (كاشفة الحال) المؤلف سنة ٨٨٨ هـ عند ذكره لأنواع الحديث وأقسامه ومن أراد الاستقصاء مع ذكر الأمثلة فعليه بكتابنا (تحفة القاصدين في معرفة اصطلاح المحدثين)

*Tuḥfat al-Qāṣidīn fī Maʿrifat Iṣṭilāḥ al-Muḥaddithīn* of Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Abī Jamhūr al-Aḥsāʾī. He stated in the end of his work *Kāshifat al-Ḥāl*—authored in the year 888 A.H—when mentioning the types and divisions of ḥadīth: “And whoever wants to investigate (it) with the citation of examples should read our work *Tuḥfat al-Qāṣidīn fī Maʿrifat Iṣṭilāḥ al-Muḥaddithīn*.”<sup>1</sup>

We conclude from this that the Shīʿī scholar Riḍā al-Mukhtārī emulated Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī in proving that al-Aḥsāʾī has a work, the subject-matter of which concerns the sciences of *muṣṭalaḥ*, and that it was before al-Shahīd al-Thānī.

A response to this can be given based on what Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfizyān stated: “Whoever refers back to *Kāshifat al-Ḥāl*, he will not be able to find what al-Ṭahrānī attributed to al-Aḥsāʾī; though there exists a similar statement at the end of *al-Bidāyah* of al-Shahīd al-Thānī. However, instead of “*Tuḥfat al-Qāṣidīn*,” it comes as “*Ghunyat al-Qāṣidīn*.” What was mentioned as a mistake in the work that was edited by al-Ṭabṭabāʾī under the title *Risālah fī al-Dirāyah* of Ibn Abī Jamhūr was *Bidāyat al-Dirāyah* of al-Shahīd al-Thānī.<sup>2</sup> We can therefore conclude that his opinion—which he replicated from Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī—is incorrect. And that it was a mistake from al-Ṭahrānī.

More than this is the fact that the Shīʿī scholar al-Khuwānasārī mentioned in his work *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* that Ibn Abī Jamhūr al-Aḥsāʾī is on the methodology of the *Akhbārīyyah*, and that he heavily criticized him and deemed acting on all reports as something admissible. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 AH) alluded to and contested

---

1 Al-Ṭahrānī: *al-Dharīʿah*, 18/299.

2 Al-Bābilī: *Muṣannafāt al-Shīʿah fī ʿilm al-Dirāyah*, 1/34 (printed among *Rasāʾil fī Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*).

this in his work *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*.<sup>1</sup> Based on this, it is highly unlikely that the likes of this *Akhhbārī* authored a work in this field, especially considering the fact that he bases his methodology on the principle that all books of ḥadīth are sound and authentic, as well as attacking the methodology espoused by the Uṣūliyyah—who consider the classification of ḥadīth as something valid.

---

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 1:334-335.

## 6.0 A biography of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī and an exposition of their creed and respective methodologies in their works

Before delving into the biographies, it is appropriate that I mention what Twelver Shī'ism actually is. That is, the beliefs of both Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūī.

### 6.1 Biography of al-Ḥillī and his methodology in *Khulāsat al-Aqwāl*

#### His name

Al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn 'Alī Ibn al-Muṭahhar Abū Manṣūr al-Ḥillī—born and raised in Hillah, Iraq.<sup>1</sup>

#### His birth

Al-Ḥillī said: “The nineteenth of Ramaḍān in the year 648.”<sup>2</sup>

#### His status among the Imāmiyyah

There is a consensus among the scholars of the Imāmiyyah regarding the virtue and greatness of al-Ḥillī. Whoever studies and reads his biography will perceive this reality. To such an extent that the appellation ‘al-‘Allāmah,’<sup>3</sup> whenever it is

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāsat al-Aqwāl*, p. 109, no. 274. This is what al-Ḥillī said about himself in *Khulāsat al-Aqwāl* when he wrote his autobiography in the first section that is dedicated to reliable narrators!

2 Ibid, p. 113. He mentioned one hundred in *Khulāsat al-Aqwāl* instead of six hundred. The correct (number) is what I affirmed here from the other biographical works. The editor of the *Khulāsat al-Aqwāl*, Jawwād al-Qayyūmī missed this. However, he did mention in the introduction the difference of opinion regarding his birthday: it has been said the twenty-ninth and the twenty-seventh of Ramaḍān. However, the correct date is what al-Ḥillī himself mentioned. See: p. 5 of *al-Khulāsat*. Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī in his work *Ṭabaqāt A'lām al-Shī'ah* (al-Qarn al-Thāmin: *al-Ḥaqā'iq al-Rāhīnah fī al-Mī'at al-Thāminah*, p. 52) is of those who felt he was born on the twenty-seventh of Ramaḍān.

3 The term ‘al-‘Allāmah’ is the superlative form (*ism al-mubālaghah*) of ‘‘ālim (learned),’ meaning ‘very learned.’ [Translator’s Note]

mentioned in unrestricted terms (i.e. without someone's name attached to it), it refers to him, no one else.<sup>1</sup> His contemporary, Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī says:

شيخ الطائفة وعلامة وقته وصاحب التحقيق والتدقيق كثير التصانيف انتهت رياسة الإمامية إليه في المعقول والمنقول مولده سنة ثمان وأربعين وستمائة وكان والده قدس الله روحه فقيها محققا مدرسا عظيم الشأن

Master of the sect and the most learned scholar of his time, an individual of accurate and critical scholarship, and a prolific author. The leadership of the Imāmiyyah ended with him in the rational and transmitted (sciences). He was born in 648 A.H and his father (may Allah sanctify his soul) was a jurist, specialist, and teacher of great rapport.<sup>2</sup>

After mentioning the words of Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, Muṣṭafā al-Tiffarishī (d. 1021 A.H) stated:

ويخطر ببالي ألا أصفه إذ لا يسع كتابي هذا ذكر علومه وتصانيفه وفضائله ومحامده وإن كل ما يوصف به الناس من جميل وفضل فهو فوقه له أزيد من سبعين كتابا في الأصول والفروع والطبيعي والإلهي وغيرها

It has occurred to me that I should rather not describe him because this work of mine cannot fully encompass mentioning his knowledge, works, virtues, and praise-worthy traits. He is beyond everything that people have described about his beauty and virtue. He has more than seventy works in *uṣūl* (legal theory), *furū'* (branches of jurisprudence), science, theology, and others.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 For the Imāmiyyah, al-Ḥillī exclusively enjoys the appellation '*al-'Allāmah*.' Of those who have written a biography of him with this appellation and greatly praised him is 'Abbās al-Qummī in his work *al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb* (2/468, no. 492). See *Mu'jam al-Rumūz wa al-Ishārāt* of Muḥammad Riḍā al-Māmaqānī (p. 285) and *Rijāl Baḥr al-'Ulūm* (2/257). When al-Khūṭī and others mention the appellation '*al-'Allāmah*,' it only refers to al-Ḥillī, as will be seen later.

2 Al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Dāwūd: *Kitāb al-Rijāl (Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd)*, p. 2, no. 466.

3 Muṣṭafā al-Ḥusaynī al-Tiffarishī: *Naqd al-Rijāl*, 2/69.

There is no difference of opinion regarding his greatness and that he is one of the pillars of knowledge in the Imāmī school.<sup>1</sup>

### His teachers

Al-Ḥillī was a student of numerous teachers, among them:

1. His father, Sadīd al-Dīn Yūsuf – he narrates from him *ijāzatan* (i.e. he received a license to transmit from him).
2. His uncle, Najm al-Dīn Ja'far ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥillī, the author of *Sharā'ī' al-Islām*.
3. The philosopher al-Khawājah Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī, the minister of Halagu Khan.
4. Maytham al-Baḥrānī, the commentator of *Nahj al-Balāghah*.
5. Aḥmad ibn Ṭāwūs al-Ḥasanī.
6. 'Umar al-Katbī al-Qazwīnī al-Shāfi' (Dabīrān).

And many others.<sup>2</sup>

### His students

Many scholars were students of al-Ḥillī, among them:

1. Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn Aḥmad al-Shaybānī (famously known as Ibn al-Fuwaṭī).

---

1 Thāmir Kāzīm: *Muqaddimat Iḍāḥ al-Ishtibāh*, p. 33; Abū 'Alī al-Ḥā'irī (d. 1216 AH): *Muntahā al-Maqāl*, 2/475 (no. 831); al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī: *Amal al-Āmāl*, 2/81 (no. 224); al-Khūṭ: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 6/171 (no. 3213). The best biography I found of him was by Baḥr al-'Ulūm in his *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, 2/257, and Muḥsin al-Amīn in *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 5/396 (no. 865).

2 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 5/396 (no. 865); al-Ḥillī: *Muqaddimat Iḍāḥ al-Ishtibāh* (ed. Thāmir Kāzīm), 35; and the references mentioned above.

2. His son, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, the author of *Īdāḥ al-Fawā'id fī Sharḥ Ishkālāt al-Qawā'id*.
3. Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Jurjānī.
4. Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Ma'iyah al-Ḥillī, the author of *'Umdat al-Ṭālib*.

And many others.<sup>1</sup>

### His writings

There has been much talk regarding the number of al-Ḥillī's works, to such an extent that Baḥr al-'Ulūm (d. 1212 A.H) transmitted for us the statement of al-Khuwānasārī (d. 1313 A.H), the author of *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt*, who transmitted from several commentators of *al-Tajrīd*:

أن للعلامة نحواً من ألف مصنف كتب وتحقيق

Al-'Allāmah has written and edited approximately one thousand works.

And in *Lu'lu'at al-Baḥrayn* of Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī:

لقد قيل إنه لو وزع تصنيف العلامة على أيام عمره من ولادته إلى موته فكان قسط كل يوم كراساً

It has been said that if the works of al-'Allāmah were apportioned over the days of his life from the time he was born until his death, it would be (equal to) a book every day.<sup>2</sup>

Listing the number of works will be unnecessary lengthy and so I will restrict them to the following:

---

1 Ibid.

2 Baḥr al-'Ulūm: *Rijāl Baḥr al-'Ulūm (al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah)*, 2/260.



1. *Muntahā al-Maṭlab fī Taḥqīq al-Maṭlab*
2. *Talkhīṣ al-Marām fī Maʿrifat al-Aḥkām*
3. *Mukhtalif al-Shīʿah fī Aḥkām al-Sharīʿah*
4. *Al-Durr wa al-Marjān fī al-Aḥādīth al-Ṣiḥāḥ wa al-Ḥisān*
5. *Al-Sirr al-Wajīz fī Tafsīr al-Kitāb al-ʿAzīz*
6. *Al-Alfayn al-Fāriq bayna al-Ṣidq wa al-Mayn*
7. *Minhāj al-Karāmah fī al-Imāmah*

Al-Ḥillī has three works in narrator evaluation:

1. *Khulāsat al-Aqwāl fī Maʿrifat al-Rijāl* (one of the subjects of this study)
2. *Īdāḥ al-Ishtibāḥ fī Asmāʾ al-Ruwāt*, the objective of this work is to distinguish between narrators by accurately identifying their names. Like *Khulāsat al-Aqwāl*, this work is not for ḥadīth narrator criticism. In this work, he collected 756 names and added 29 *kunyas* (agnomens).<sup>1</sup>
3. *Kashf al-Maqāl fī Maʿrifat al-Rijāl*, in describing this work, al-Ḥillī states:

ذكرنا فيه كل ما نقل عن الرواة والمصنفين مما وصل إلينا عن المتقدمين وذكرنا أحوال المتأخرين  
والمعاصرين ومن أراد الاستقصاء فعليه به فإنه كاف في بابه

We have mentioned in it everything that has been transmitted of the narrators and writers from that which has reached us of the early-day scholars. We have mentioned the conditions of the latter-day and contemporary (writers and narrators). Whoever wants a thorough understanding should use this work; it alone is sufficient in this category.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 This number is according to the version (of the book) edited by Thāmir Kāzīm ʿAbd al-Khafājī.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Muqaddimat Khulāsat al-Aqwāl*.

Therefore, as described by al-Ḥillī, it is a detailed and comprehensive work on narrators' biographies. Many times, al-Ḥillī refers (some 57 times) to it in *al-Khulāsah* for more (information).<sup>1</sup>

*Kashf al-Maqāl* is among the works that have been lost.<sup>2</sup> Baḥr al-'Ulūm (d. 1212 A.H) states:

ولم يظفر به أحد فيما أعلم

To the extent of my knowledge, no one has successfully obtained a copy of it.<sup>3</sup>

Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī (d. 1356 AH) states:

وهو غير موجود في هذه الأعصار بل الظاهر أنه لم يقف عليه أحد من علمائنا الأخير

It is not to be found in these times. In fact, it seems that none of our outstanding scholars have come across it.<sup>4</sup>

## His death

Al-'Abbās al-Qummī (d. 1359 A.H) states: "He died on Saturday, the twenty-first of Muḥarram in the year 726 A.H. He was buried near Amīr al-Mu'minīn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. The author of *Nukhbat al-Maqāl* said:

---

1 Refer to biography numbers 71, 91, 118, 131, 174, and many others.

2 It is necessary to note the following: Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, the contemporary of Ibn al-Muṭahhar has a work entitled *Kashf al-Maqāl bi Ma'rifat Aḥwāl al-Rijāl*. In his work *al-Dharī'ah*, Āqā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī rejected the notion that Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī has a work with a similar name to al-Ḥillī—whom al-Ṭahrānī regards as a teacher of Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī. Al-Ṭahrānī also alludes to the fact that the work of al-Ḥillī exists in what he titled *al-Khazānah al-Riḍawiyyah*. Thereafter, he also regards as farfetched that this work is actually al-Ḥillī's. As he says, maybe it is Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī's! He mentions that the work of al-Ḥillī, *Kashf al-Maqāl*, consists of four volumes. Refer to: *al-Dharī'ah*, 18/63 (nos. 688 and 689).

3 Baḥr al-'Ulūm: *Rijāl Baḥr al-'Ulūm (al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah)*, 2/278.

4 Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī: *Samā' al-Maqāl fī 'ilm al-Rijāl*, 1/219.

سبط مطهر فريدة الزمن  
ولد رحمة ٦٨٤ وعز ٧٧ عمره

وآية الله يوسف الحسن  
علامة الدهر جليل قدره

*The sign of Allah Yūsuf al-Ḥasan -*

*The grandson of Muṭahhar, the unrivaled of his time -*

*The erudite scholar of the time, exalted is his rank -*

*Born as a mercy in 684 and lived his life for 77 cherished years.<sup>1</sup>*

## A description of the work *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl fī Maʿrifat al-Rijāl*

In describing his work, al-Ḥillī said:

تصنيف مختصر في بيان حال رواة ومن يعتمد عليه ومن ترك روايته ..... ولم نطل الكتاب بذكر جميع الرواة بل اقتصرنا على قسمين منهم وهم الذين اعتمد على روايتهم والذين أتوقف عن العمل بنقلهم أما لضعفه أو لاختلاف الجماعة في توثيقه وضعفه أو لكونه مجهولا عندي ولم نذكر كل مصنفات الرواة ولا طولنا في نقل سيرتهم ..... ورتبته على قسمين وخاتمة الأول فيمن اعتمد على روايته أو ترجح عندي قبول قوله

الثاني فيمن تركت روايته أو توقفت فيه ورتبت كل قسم على حروف المعجم للتقريب والتسهيل

The authoring of an abridged work in explaining the conditions of narrators<sup>2</sup>, who can be relied upon, and whose narrations should be abandoned... We will not prolong the work by mentioning all the narrators. In fact, we will restrict ourselves to only two types: those whose narrations are relied upon, and those whom I desisted from acting upon their narrations, either because of a narrator's weakness; or because there is a difference of opinion from the group (i.e. scholars) regarding his reliability or weakness; or because he is *majhūl* (unknown) according

1 'Abbās al-Qummī: *al-Kunā wa al-Aqāb*, 2/470. Refer to the biography of al-Ḥillī in the introduction to *Īdāh al-Ishtibāh* of Thāmir Kāẓim. He mentions a minor difference of opinion about his death date.

2 The reference mentions 'narrators' (i.e. without the definite article 'al'). Perhaps it should be 'the narrators.'

to me. We did not mention all of the writings of the narrators and neither did we elaborate in narrating their biographies... I organized it into two sections and a conclusion:

1. Regarding those whose narrations are relied upon, or, according to me, his statement is acceptable.
2. Regarding those whose narrations are abandoned, or I came to a standstill.

I organized every section in alphabetical order to facilitate its understanding and make easy (i.e. for the reader).<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī mentioned 1779 biographies in his *al-Khulāṣah*, divided over two sections. He concludes his work with ten beneficial points related to the sciences of narrator evaluation.

### **Two points of caution regarding the work *al-Khulāṣah***

1. The scholars of the Imāmiyyah differ and have two views regarding the authoritative value (*ḥujjiyyah*) of the latter-day scholars' rulings of *tawthīq*, at the head of them is al-Ḥillī.<sup>2</sup> There are those who accept their rulings of *tawthīq* and there are those who reject them, such as al-Khūī. This issue will be dealt with later. Based on this, the benefit of al-Ḥillī's *al-Khulāṣah* in relation to those that do not consider his rulings of *tawthīq* is only in his transmission of the previous scholars' statements, as well as his transmission from books that were lost and hence inaccessible to the latter-day scholars. This is what al-Tustarī alluded to in his statement:

---

1 Muqaddimat *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*.

2 Abū al-Ma'ālī al-Kalbāsī mentions in his *al-Rasā'il al-Rijāliyyah* a number of issues in accepting the statements of al-Ḥillī and the difference (of opinion) therein. See: *Radd Tawthīqāt al-'Allāmah*, 1/219, pp. 222, 223, 456; 2/347, 348, 360, 367; 3/362; *Taṣḥīḥāt al-'Allāmah*, p. 516; *Tawthīqāt al-'Allāmah*, 4/374; Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī: *Samā' al-Maqāl*, 1/225. See: al-Gharīfī: *Qawā'id al-Ḥadīth*, p.191.

It is only good for that which we could not find a basis for.<sup>1</sup>

The statement of al-Tustarī is not general. In fact, the authenticity of the narration of al-Ḥillī is required for the statements he transmits, as mentioned by al-Khūṭ—as is still to come.

2. Many scholars of the Imāmiyyah have raised concerns regarding the action of al-Ḥillī in his work *al-Khulāṣah*. For example, after dividing the work into two sections, we find him mentioning, at times, those who are at an impasse regarding his statement in the first section. It would have been more appropriate for him to have included it in the second section specific to weak narrators and those whose statements are rejected or there is a standstill about them. Whatever has been said in the first chapter can be said in the second chapter. This is considered to be of the faults against al-Ḥillī.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/24 (chapter 16). Refer to p. 29-30 for (other) important issues. Al-Tustarī mentions on p. 35 and subsequent pages the differences between the methodology of al-Ḥillī in *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* and *Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī*. He also examined the meaning of majhūl between the two. This is what Ja'far al-Ṣubḥānī quoted without explicit reference to the fact that it is from the words of al-Tustarī, as mentioned in *Kulliyāt fī 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 120.

2 Al-Kalbāsī: *al-Rasā'il al-Rijāliyyah*, 4/96; *Rijāl Baḥr al-'Ulūm*, 2/277

## 6.2 Biography of al-Khūṭī<sup>1</sup> and an exposition of his methodology in Muʿjam al-Rijāl

### His Name

Abū al-Qāsim ibn ʿAlī Akbar ibn Hāshim al-Mūsawī al-Khūṭī

### His Birth

Al-Khūṭī states: “I was born in the city of Khoy, one of the cities of Azerbaijan, on the fifteenth night of Rajab, in the year 1317 A.H. I grew up there with my parents and brothers. I mastered *qirāʾah* (Qurʾān recital), calligraphy, and other foundational sciences.

### His Emigration

He states: “A major difference of opinion occurred between the Ummah on account of the incident of *al-Mashrūṭah*<sup>2</sup> and so my late father emigrated because

---

1 I took this biography from al-Khūṭī's *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* wherein he has an autobiography (3/23). Before it, he states: “Following the tradition of narrator evaluation scholars' (*rijāliyyīn*) wherein they set forth their own biographies when their name reaches its turn, I have briefly explained my autobiography when the print of this work (*muʿjam*) reaches that point.” I adjusted and altered some of sections of the biography.

2 It is written as “*Mashrūṭah*” *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*. And it is also called “*al-Mashrūṭah*,” if the wording in *al-Muʿjam* is not a mistake. Sālim al-Ḥasanī said about it in an article: “The *Mashrūṭah* movement began in 1905 CE and was led by two of the most senior religious scholars in Iran, namely, al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Ṭabṭabāʾī and al-Sayyid ʿAbd Allāh al-Bahbahānī. The movement tried to rely on the religious authority in Najaf to take a stance against the Qajar dynasty, which was opposed to the movement's goals in establishing a Shūrā Council. However, a schism occurred between supporters and opponents in the *Ḥawzah ʿIlmiyyah*. Al-Shaykh Kāẓim al-Khurāsānī, al-Nāʾinī, and others were at the head of *al-Mashrūṭah*'s supporters. Kāẓim al-Yazdī led the opposition and with him was Kāshif al-Ghiṭāʾ. The conflict between the two parties was intense and painful, and its effects were reflected on the *Ḥawzah ʿIlmiyyah* in Iran. This could be seen when Faql Allah al-Nūrī emerged as a strong opponent because he identified the existence of deviations that crept into the reality of the movement. Al-Shahrestānī, who is one of the advocates of *al-Mashrūṭah*, says: “The rivalry between al-Yazdī and al-Shaykh al-Khurāsānī reached its apex in the year 1907 AH as did the height of its brutality.....

of it to al-Najaf al-Ashraf in the year 1328 A.H. I joined up with him in the year 1330 A.H accompanied by my older brother, ‘Abd Allāh al-Khūṭī, and the remaining members of my family.

## His Teachers

He states: “When I arrived in al-Najaf al-Ashraf, at the Islamic University of the Imāmī Shī‘ah, I commenced with reading the literacy sciences and logic. Thereafter, I read the instructional works in *uṣūl* and *fiqh* by several of the institute’s leading scholars, among them was my late father. Then I attended graduate studies “research abroad (*baḥth al-khārīj*)” under senior lecturers in the year 1338 A.H. I will specifically mention five of my teachers among them, namely Āyat Allah Faḥ Allah (famously known as Shaykh al-Sharī‘ah al-Aṣfahānī), Maḥdī al-Māzindarānī, Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī, Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Aṣfahānī, and Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Nāṭinī. I mostly studied *fiqh* and *uṣūl* under the last two. In fact, I attended their complete courses in *uṣūl*, as well as a number of *fiqh* works for a number of years. I used to relate back both of their research to a number of those present. There were a number of great personalities therein. Al-Nāṭinī (may Allah have mercy on him) was the last teacher I accompanied.

---

*continued from page 142*

The scope of division expanded, and its effects included the circles of the Ummah. To such an extent that students of the religious sciences from the supporters of the *Mashrūṭah* were subjected to many harassments that reached the point whereby they did not go for an entire year to visit Karbalā, Kūfah, or the Masjid al-Sahlah, fearing for their lives. This dispute developed when the tribes entered to support the position of the conflicting parties. It is narrated that al-Yazdī asked the Iraqi tribes to attend al-Najaf al-Ashraf, and so they came armed and surrounded him whilst denouncing the *Mashrūṭah*. There would be thousands of people marching with him when he attended ṣalāh, while only a small amount would read ṣalāh behind al-Khurāsānī. The most dangerous thing that the events of the *Mashrūṭah* bore were the contradictory *fatāwā* (plural of *fatwā*) between the two parties. The split almost led to killing (one another), since each group considered the other to be outside of Islam.” From an article of his entitled “*al-Marja’iyyah al-Dīniyyah Dirāyatan fī Taḥawwulāt mā Qabl al-Sittīnāt*” (the eighth article from al-Ṣadr’s website. See *Muḥsin al-Amīn’s A’yān al-Shī‘ah* wherein he mentioned that al-Shaykh (Faḍl Allah al-Nūrī) was executed in Tehran because of this incident (2/604)! Also see Muḥammad al-Ṭarīḥī’s work *Dalīl Mu‘jam al-Rijāl wa al-Ḥadīth*, p. 12.

### **His Authorizations to Transmit (Ijāzāt)**

He states: “In (ḥadīth) narration, I have teachers who have granted me authorization to narrate from them the works of our Imāmī scholars, and others. Therefore, I narrate via a number of chains our Four (Primary) works (*al-Kāfī*, *al-Faqīh*, *al-Tahdhīb*, *al-Istibṣār*), the other *jawāmi‘* (*al-Wasā’il*, *al-Biḥār*, *al-Wāfi*), and other works of our scholars (*aṣḥāb*) (may Allah sanctify their secret). Among these chains is what I narrate from my teacher, al-Nā’īnī, from his teacher, al-Nūrī, via the chains that have been explained in the epilogue of his work *Mustadrak al-Wasā’il* (famously known as *Mawāqī‘ al-Nujūm*); all of which end with the infallible and pure Ahl al-Bayt.

### **His Teaching**

He says: “I taught much, and gave many lectures on jurisprudence, legal theory, and exegesis. And trained a large number of prominent students in the *Ḥawzah* of al-Najaf al-Ashraf. Accordingly, I gave two complete fiqhi lectures (research abroad) on *al-Makāsib* of al-Shaykh al-A’zam al-Anṣārī. I also taught a number of other works, and two complete sessions on *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*. On twenty-seventh of Rabī’ al-Awwal, 1377 AH, I began teaching the *furū‘* of *al-‘Urwah al-Wuthqā* of Faqīh al-Ṭā’ifah, Muḥammad Kāzīm al-Ṭabṭabā’ī al-Yazdī, beginning with *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* such that I taught *al-Ijtihād wa al-Taqlīd* until I reached *Kitāb al-Ijārah*. I started this on the twenty-sixth of *Rabī’ al-Awwal*, 1400 A.H ... During the previous years, I began teaching the *Tafsīr* of the Noble Qur’ān for a while until several harsh conditions prevented me from completing what I wanted to. How I desired to develop and further spread this lesson!

### **His Writings**

He says: “I have authored a number of works in *tafsīr*, *fiqh*, *uṣūl*, and *rijāl* (narrator evaluation); some of which have been printed and others remain in manuscript form. Herewith are the works that have been printed (title/no. of volumes/subject):



1. *Al-Bayān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān/1/tafsīr*
2. *Ajwad al-Taqrīrāt/2/uṣūl*
3. *Takmilat Minhāj al-Ṣāliḥīn/1/fiqh*
4. *Mabānī Takmilat Minhāj al-Ṣāliḥīn/2/fiqh*
5. *Tahdhīb wa Tatmīm Minhāj al-Ṣāliḥīn/2/fiqh*
6. *Al-Masā'il al-Muntakhabah/1/fiqh*
7. *Mustahdathāt al-Masā'il/1/fiqh*
8. *Ta'liqah 'alā al-'Urwat al-Wuthqā/1/fiqh*
9. *Risālah fī al-Libās al-Mashkūk/1/fiqh*
10. *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth/21* volumes have been printed and the remaining are under print. I completed writing it in the blessed month of Ramādān in the year 1389.<sup>1</sup>

And many others.

### **His Students**

Considering the fact that al-Khūī remained the head of the Islamic seminary in al-Najaf for a long time, many students graduated at his hands who (eventually) became famous in this time. Among them: 'Alī al-Sīstānī (Iraq), Muammad Ishāq al-Fayaḍ (Iraq), Jawwād Tabrizī (Iran), Muḥammad Riḍa al-Khalkhālī (Iraq), Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī (Afghanistan), Ḥusayn Waḥīd al-Khurāsānī (Iran), 'Alā' al-Dīn Baḥr al-'Ulūm (Iraq), Muḥammad al-Rūḥānī (Iran), Yūsuf al-Īrawānī (Iran), Muḥyiy al-Dīn al-Gharīfī (Bahrain), Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr (Iraq), and others.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūī mentions until here about himself.

2 This was stated on the official website of the al-Khūī Foundation.

## His Death

Murtaḍā al-Riḍawī states while mentioning the time of this death: “At half past two after ḡuhr on Saturday 8 Ṣafar, 1413 A.H. He was buried in his last place of residency next to al-Imam Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام in one of the rooms of *al-Ṣaḥn al-‘Alawī al-Sharīf*, which was the entrance to *Masjid al-Khaḍrā’* adjacent to *al-Ṣaḥn al-Sharīf* at four o’clock after midnight on Sunday, the ninth of Ṣafar.”<sup>1</sup>

## Some Statements Regarding Him

In describing al-Khūī, Ḥusayn al-Shākirī states: “The final *marja’* (religious authority to follow) that al-Najaf al-Ashraf lived through was led by the Supreme Authority (*al-Marja’ al-A’lā*) al-Sayyid Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūī. With his death, al-Najaf lost its relative leadership. This was in the year 1413 AH/1992 CE.”<sup>2</sup>

Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī, the individual responsible for abridging *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, states: “He is *al-Marja’ al-‘Ām* (the General Religious Authority) of the Shī’ah” (of the Twelvers) “and a teacher at the *al-Ḥawzah al-‘Ilmiyyah* in al-Najaf al-Ashraf. All of the students from the Shīī academic seminaries studied at his hands, and the hands of his students. His opinions regarding *fiqh*, *Tafsīr*, *uṣūl*, and (ḥadīth) narrators are the area of academic focus among the academic circles of the ḥawzāt (plural of *hawzah*); our teacher and leader in *al-Intifāḍah al-Sha’bāniyyah* against the Baathist Party in Iraq in 1991. He died after the *Intifāḍah* in extremely mysterious conditions in the year 1992/1413. The Baathist authorities prevented his funeral and imposed martial law, fearing another revolution, and so he was buried at night.”<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Murtaḍā al-Riḍawī: *Ma’a Rijāl al-Fikr*, 1:146 (footnote).

2 Ḥusayn al-Shākirī: *Tadwīn al-Ḥadīth wa Tārīkh al-Fiqh*, p. 110.

3 Muḥammad al-Jawharī: *al-Mufīd min Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 719 (with some alternation in some of the words). See: *Majjalat Turāthīnā* (affiliated with *Mu’assasat Āl al-Bayt ‘Alayhim al-Salām* of *Iḥyā al-Turāth* in Qum), volume 28 (where they mentioned something of his condition in an obituary statement in the journal’s editorial).

From among all the teachers of the Najaf school of thought, he alone held the title *Za'im al-Hawzah al-'Ilmiyyah* (the Leader of the Islamic Seminar).<sup>1</sup>

### **An Introduction to al-Khūī's Work *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* and a Detailed Explanation of the Ṭabaqāt of Narrators**

*Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* is regarded as the most important work in the intellectual legacy left behind by al-Khūī considering the sheer amount of effort that went into it, its size, and the fact that so many people after him rely so heavily on it.

#### **The Number of Volumes**

The *Mu'jam* of al-Khūī is twenty-four volumes. This is the edition of the work I relied upon.<sup>2</sup>

Ḥusayn 'Abd Allāh Marī states that the *Mu'jam* is twenty volumes. He does not mention the source of its print.<sup>3</sup>

'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī mentions that the *Mu'jam* is twenty-three volumes. It was printed in al-Najaf, Beirut, and Iran. Muḥammad al-Ṭarīḥī and Ja'far al-Subḥānī agreed with him.<sup>4</sup>

The reason for the difference of opinion in the number of volumes goes back to what Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī states in his abridgement of al-Khūī's *Mu'jam* about

---

1 Muḥammad Sa'īd al-Ṭarīḥī: *Dalīl Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 11.

2 'Abd al-Ṣāhib al-Khūī said this in his introduction to the book when describing the changes in the form and publication of the book: "Organizing the parts of the book into 24 parts instead of 23 parts because of the many additions that followed the first four parts." The book was printed in *Maṭābi' Markaz Nashr al-Thaqāfah al-Islāmiyyah* and bound at *Mu'assasat Mahr 'Ā'im* (fifth edition—1413 A.H/1992 AD).

3 Ḥusayn 'Abd Allāh Marī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī al-Dirāyah wa al-Rijāl*, p. 187.

4 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 61; Muḥammad Sa'īd al-Ṭarīḥī: *Dalīl Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 32; Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 146.

the twenty-third and twenty-fourth volumes. He states: “Before I commence with my work (in this abridgment), I have incorporated the twenty-fourth volume of the *Mu’jam*” (which is printed separately in al-Najaf al-Ashraf and only contains amendments) “into the one before it, the twenty-third volume. Other than the amendments, it contains additional information from a number of individuals... The volume specific to amendments has not been incorporated into the volumes before it in the Beirut edition, and neither has it been printed separately. The number of volumes for this edition is twenty-four” (before the Iranian edition was released) “is twenty-three volumes.”<sup>1</sup>

### **The Number of Biographies**

The edition I relied on contains 15706 biographies. Al-Faqlī mentions the number of biographies for them in the work is 15676. With this, the difference in the number of narrators between the two editions is only thirty.

### **Al-Khūṭ’s Methodology**

Al-Khūṭ employed the following methodology in his work *Mu’jam al-Rijāl*:

1. He identified the narrator’s *ṭabaqah* by mentioning who he narrated from (i.e. his teachers) and who narrated from him (i.e. his students). However, al-Khūṭ restricted himself in this regard to (only) four works, namely *al-Kāfī*, *al-Tahdhīb*, *al-Istibṣār*, and *al-Faqīh*. This led many to negate the *samā’* of individuals if the narration is not found in these four works. This is because they did not realize that al-Khūṭ only relied on these and no other works that are transmitted with *asānīd*, such as most of al-Ṣadūq, al-Ṣaffār, and others’ works.
2. He evaluated the *asānīd* of praiseworthy and objectionable narrations so as to know the most authentic narration of a (particular) narrator. However, what al-Khūṭ can be criticized for is the fact that he generally

---

1 Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī: Introduction to *al-Muḥīd min Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*.

did this only when objecting to narrators of the Imāmiyyah. This will be explained in detail later.

3. Similarly, he mentioned the number of narrations of a narrator in the four works and, at times, their places (of residence).
4. He endeavored to distinguish between homonymous names (*al-asmā' al-mushtarakah*).
5. Al-Khūṭī's work generally obviates the need to refer to the (other) works that are considered primary in the science of narrator evaluation by the Imāmiyyah, such as *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, *Fihrist al-Ṭūsī*, *Rijāl al-Najjāshī* (*al-Fihrist*), *al-Kashshī*, *al-Barqī*, and others. This is because he mentions the views of his predecessors regarding the narrator (in question), discussed them, and (eventually) offers his preponderant view.
6. Al-Khūṭī mentions his judgment similar to the ways al-Ṭūsī offers in his *Mashyakhah*. In other words, the ruling of al-Ṭūsī on a narrator when he is of those mentioned in *Mashyakhah al-Ṭūsī* or in *al-Fihrist*. This is also true for the narrations of al-Ṣadūq.
7. The biographies included in the *Mu'jam* are different with respect to the amount spoken about some of the narrators. Some biographies are merely one or two lines. Others are tens of pages.
8. In the introduction to his work, al-Khūṭī objects to a number of principles that the scholars before him used. He repeats these objections in different places as well. Accordingly, he would fill it up in one place and mention what he did not mention in another place as needed. All of which produced a response, explanation, or an inference for us for many of the principles related to narrator evaluation according to the Imāmiyyah. I produced all of this into research, most of which will come throughout this study.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 For more, see: *Mu'jam al-Khūṭī*, 1/11; *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl* of 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī, p. 61; *Muntahā al-Maqāl* of Ḥusayn Marṭī, p. 187; *Dalīl Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* of al-Ṭarīḥī, p. 23.

## Chapter One

### Mujmal (general) Tawthiq between al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī

(Tawthiq of Narrators on Account of Appearing in Specific Works)

- 1.1 Tawthiq of a narrator on account of him being one of the teachers of al-Najjāshī in his work *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*
- 1.2 Tawthiq of a narrator on account of him being a part of the asānīd of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī’s *Tafsīr*
- 1.3 Tawthiq of a narrator on account of him being a part of the asānīd of the book *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*
- 1.4 Tawthiq of a narrator on account of Ibn al-Walīd not excluding him from the book *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*



## Introduction

I mentioned in section two of the introductory chapter that for many narrators of the Imāmiyyah, no mention is made of them in what is known as the “primary sources” of narrator evaluation. Consequently, the latter-day scholars of the Imāmiyyah set out to create a number of general principles of tawthīq in order that a varying number of narrators be included thereunder. In doing so, it makes it possible for them to judge every narrator that falls under these principles as reliable, thereby drastically decreasing the number of *majhūl* narrators that teem the asānīd of their relied-upon works.

If one hundred narrators were inserted into every one of these principles, there would be one thousand narrators for every ten principles. This would be the easiest way for the scholars of the Imāmiyyah to make tawthīq of the greatest number of *majhūl* (unknown) narrators. And every time the (number of) principles increase, so too do the reliable narrators. Draw an analogy based on this! Every single scholar has his own principles which others will differ with.

In defining the general principles of tawthīq, Muslim al-Dāwarī states:

إحدى الطرق المهمة لإثبات وثاقة كثير من الرواة من خلال اندراجهم تحت عنوان عام شامل ينطبق على الأفراد من دون تعيين لأشخاصهم وذلك ما يُعرف بالتوثيق العام

One of the important ways to establish the reliability of many narrators is through their inclusion under a comprehensive general heading that applies to individuals without specifying their actual (individual) character. This is known as general (forms of) tawthīq.<sup>1</sup>

Ja'far al-Subhānī states:

توثيق جماعة تحت ضابطة خاصة وعنوان معين

The *tawthīq* of a group (of narrators) under a specific yardstick and title.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Muslim al-Dāwarī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl Bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbiq*, 2/13.

2 Al-Subhānī: *Durūs Mūjazah fī 'Ilmay al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, 2/13.

Shortly, I will refer to the most important general principles of tawthīq and critique them in the following manner:

- The tawthīq of works. In other words, narrators regarded as *thiqah* (reliable) because they appear in specific works.
- The tawthīq of a group of narrators because they form part of the *asānīd* of a particular work such that we say that ever narrator who appears in the *isnād* of this work is a *thiqah*.

The scholars of the Shī'ah have made tawthīq of individuals of several works. The following is an explanation.<sup>1</sup>

### 1.1 Tawthīq of a narrator on account of him being one of the teachers of al-Najjāshī in his work *Rijāl al-Najjāshī* (d. 450 AH)

A number of scholars of the Imāmiyyah have considered that the mere fact of a person being the teacher of al-Najjāshī constitutes a reason for tawthīq. In fact, it (i.e. being one of al-Najjāshī's teachers) also constitutes a sublime and high-ranking status, as is the opinion of Ja'far al-Subḥānī.<sup>2</sup> They have made it a general principle for everyone that is proven to be a teacher of al-Najjāshī. 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī states:

تعرف غير واحد من علمائنا منهلج النجاشي في الرواية الرجالية من خلال قراءاتهم ومراجعاتهم المتكررة لكتابه الرجالي ومن تصريحاته وما يظهر من كلامه في تراجم بعض من ضمنهم فهرسه الرجالي في أنه لا يروي عن الضعفاء فاستنتجوا من هذا وثيقة جميع شيوخه في الإجازة حتى من لم يصرح بوثاقته ويمكننا أن نضوغ هذا بشكل قاعدة فنقول (كل من يروي عنه النجاشي مباشرة فهو ثقة) أو (كل شيخ من شيوخ النجاشي في الرواية هو ثقة) اهـ

---

1 I would like to point out that a number of these principles resemble those of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl*. I will mention the remainder of them in the (sixth) chapter, which is dedicated to the principles that al-Khūī and al-Ḥillī based their rulings of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* upon. The reason for this is because they are not usually mentioned among the general tawthīq.

2 Al-Subḥānī: *Kullīyyāt fī 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 281.



Several of our scholars have come to know the methodology of al-Najjāshī regarding reports with narrators through their reading and frequent reviewing of his work on narrators.<sup>1</sup> What he clearly expresses and what is apparent from his words regarding several biographies which his index on narrators includes is that he does not narrate from *du‘afā’* (i.e., weak narrators). From this, they deduce that *all* of his teachers in/via *ijazah* are reliable, including those who he did not explicitly make *tawthīq* of.

We can formulate this into a general principle and say that “everyone who al-Najjāshī directly narrates from is reliable,” or “every teacher, from the teachers of al-Najjāshī in *riwāyah* (narrating) is reliable.”<sup>2</sup>

Based on this, they deduce the following:

Al-Najjāshī states under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Jawharī:

ورأيت هذا الشيخ وكان صديقا لوالدي وسمعت منه شيئا كثيرا ورأيت شيوخنا يضعفونه فلم أرو عنه شيئا وتجنبته

I saw this shaykh, he was a friend of my father. I heard much from him. I saw our *shuyūkh* (teachers) declaring him to be a weak narrator. I did not narrate anything from him and I avoided him.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Khūṭī comes along and clarifies this principle. In commenting on the words of al-Najjāshī, he states:

يريد النجاشي بما ذكره من توقفه عن الرواية عنه إلا بواسطة بينه وبينه أنه لا يروي عنه طريقه إلى كتاب بمثل حدثني أو أخبرني وأما النقل عنه بمثل قال فقد وقع منه ... ومما يؤكد ما ذكرناه تفكيك النجاشي

---

1 After describing his review of narration and his abstention from narrating from weak narrators (according to his claim), Baḥr al-‘Ulūm states, “Therefore, it is necessary that his teachers whom he narrates from are all reliable.” He has further details which can be reviewed in its related discussion. See: *Rijāl Baḥr al-‘Ulūm*, 2/99.

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 126.

3 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 86, biography number 207.

بالتعبير حيث قال أخبرنا أبو العباس أحمد بن علي ثم قال وقال محمد بن عبد الله بن مفضل وقال في المورد الثاني قال أبو المفضل الشيباني حدثنا أبو بكر بن أبي الثلج وأخبرنا ابن نوح وعند الاختلاف في التعبير في الموردين دلالة واضحة على ما ذكرنا

Al-Najjāshī intends with what he mentioned regarding his *tawaqquf* (non-commitment) in narrating from him except through an intermediary between him and that narrator is that he does not narrate a book via him with the words *ḥaddathanī* (he narrated to me), or *akhbaranī* (he informed me). As for actually narrating from him with, for example, *qāla* (he said), this has taken place... What further emphasizes what we have mentioned is al-Najjāshī's disjointed manner of expression (narrations). He says (for example): Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī informed us. Then he says: and Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mufaḍḍal. And in the second instance, he says: Abū al-Mufaḍḍal al-Shaybānī said: Abū Bakr ibn Abī al-Thalj narrated to us, and Ibn Nūḥ informed us.

The differences in expression in the two instances is a clear indication of what we have mentioned.<sup>1</sup>

With this, it becomes clear to us those who are included among the teachers of al-Najjāshī and those excluded.<sup>2</sup>

After this, the scholars of the Imāmiyyah differ about the number of al-Najjāshī's teachers on account of their difference in considering the aforementioned words of al-Khūṭī. Al-Māmaqānī states:

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 17/260-261.

2 Maḥmūd Duryāb states, “The most that can be gained from these proofs is the *tawthīq* of his teachers from whom he narrates with the words ‘*Akhbaranā* (He informed us),’ or ‘*Ḥaddathanā* (He narrated to us),’ nobody else. This is because the common feature of these proofs are reports and chains. This is the amount that is definitive; everything beyond this is doubtful. Because the claim of general *tawthīq* of all al-Najjāshī's teachers, including those he learnt the sciences of *fiqh* or *ansāb* (genealogy), for example, or those from whom did not explicitly narrate from using ‘*Akhbaranā* (He informed us),’ or ‘*Ḥaddathanā* (He narrated to us),’ is a claim broader than these proofs (he means the proofs for the *tawthīq* of al-Najjāshī's teachers). Therefore, their *tawthīq* is not established via such a claim.” *Mashyakhat al-Najjāshī*, p. 95.

إن العلامة الطباطبائي قد بذل جهده في جمع مشايخ النجاشي من كتابه وأنهاهم إلى ثلاثين

Indeed, al-‘Allāmah al-Ṭabāṭabāī expended his energy in collecting the teachers of al-Najjāshī in his work and he concluded (they were) thirty.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī held the view that they were thirty-one, as al-Faḍlī narrated from him.<sup>2</sup>

Ja‘far al-Subḥānī narrated from him that they were thirty-two.<sup>3</sup> Al-Khūī came and said that “they are more than forty men,”<sup>4</sup> based on his independent judgement. Baḥr al-‘Ulūm has a lengthy discussion in his description of al-Najjāshī’s teachers.<sup>5</sup> Duryāb put them at twenty-eight.<sup>6</sup>

The issue of tawthīq of al-Najjāshī’s teachers is regarded by al-Khūī as an accepted principle. However, we do not find any trace of it in the words of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī! This is proof of the fact that this principle is from the principles of the latter-day scholars and it was unmentioned in al-Ḥillī’s time. However, Maḥmūd Duryāb al-Najafī believed that the idea of tawthīq regarding al-Najjāshī’s teachers existed in the time of al-Ḥillī. He states, “I think the discussion of the tawthīq of al-Najjāshī’s teachers occurred in the time of al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) because he

---

1 ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 3:90 (under *al-fā'idah al-sādisah*).

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 126.

3 Al-Subḥānī: *Kullīyyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 288.

4 Al-Khūī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 2/167.

5 Baḥr al-‘Ulūm: *Rijāl Baḥr al-‘Ulūm* (famously known as *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*), 2/50. He mentions that they are thirty teachers. Baḥr al-‘Ulūm states, “They are thirty teachers, nine of whom have biographies in the book... He explicitly declared the first five reliable and praised and venerated the others. He did not mention for his other teachers an independent biography.” He mentioned this after listing them on p. 83. It is possible that Baḥr al-‘Ulūm elaborated the most on the teachers of al-Najjāshī.

6 Maḥmūd Duryāb al-Najafī: *Mashyakhat al-Najjāshī Tawthīquhum wa Ṭuruquhum ilā al-Uṣūl*, p. 98. He mentions seventeen teachers whom al-Najjāshī did not mention with the words “Ḥaddathanā (He narrated to us),” or “Akhbaranā (He informed us),” p. 188.

narrated the words of al-Najjāshī about his teacher, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Jundī (biography number 207), when he said, ‘Our teacher (may Allah have mercy on him) connected us to the (other) teachers in his time.’ He commented on this saying: ‘This is not textual proof (*naṣṣ*) of his *ta’dīl*.’ It is as though he is refuting, in this statement of his, whoever concluded the tawthīq of (Ibn Abī Jayyid) this from the sentence, ‘Our teacher (may Allah have mercy on him) connected us to the (other) teachers in his time.’”<sup>1</sup>

What he mentioned is possible; however, what is closer (i.e., to the truth) is to delay this after the time of al-Ḥillī. The words of al-Ḥillī are not indicative of any type of general principle. Perhaps he refuted the actual text of al-Najjāshī and the intent was not that he refuted a general principle. Duryāb believed that the person who mentioned the general principle after al-Ḥillī was Niẓām al-Dīn al-Qurashī (1038 AH).<sup>2</sup> Therefore, Niẓām al-Dīn is the first to allude to this general principle, according to my findings.

### **A critique of this principle**

A number of contemporary Imāmī scholars attempted to let this principle pass as if it were to be taken for granted, even though there is an element of theatrics in actually deducing this principle (i.e., from al-Najjāshī’s statement). And in examining the issue we find that it is not based on a sound foundation. In fact, for the following reasons, the preponderant (opinion) is that it is not authentic:

---

1 Maḥmūd Duryāb al-Najafī: *Mashyakhat al-Najjāshī*, p. 92. (The author says) Whatever Maḥmūd Duryāb has mentioned is erroneous. He confused Abū al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Imrān—famously known as Ibn al-Jundī (he is the one whose apparent tawthīq of al-Najjāshī and was rejected by al-Ḥillī) and Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Abī Jayyid al-Qummī. His confusion between the two narrators appeared to me in his discussion.

2 Ibid. Duryāb suggested that the source of Niẓām al-Dīn is narrated from the book *Riyāḍ al-‘Ulamā*, 3/351. (The author says) *Riyāḍ al-‘Ulamā* is authored by ‘Isā ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Jīrānī al-Tabrīzī, the student of al-Majlisī. In this work, he mentions the conditions of the scholars from the time of *Ghaybah* (Occultation) to his time (1119 AH). This is as mentioned by al-Ṭīhrānī in *al-Dhar‘ah*, 11/331 (no. 1981).

1. Al-Ḥillī's criticism of one of those whom al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, al-Faḍlī, and al-Subḥānī regard as al-Najjāshī's teacher. Under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥāmmad ibn 'Imrān al-Jundī, he states: "Al-Najjāshī says, 'Indeed he is our teacher (may Allah have mercy on him); he connected us with (other teachers) in his time.'" Al-Ḥillī follows up saying: "This is not textual proof of his ta'dīl."<sup>1</sup> Commenting on the statement of al-Ḥillī, 'Abd al-Nabī al-Jazā'irī (d. 1021 AH) said, "And neither is it apparent (from the text)."<sup>2</sup> This proves contradictory to al-Ḥillī, al-Jazā'irī, and others who propagate this principle.
2. Al-Kāzim al-Ḥā'irī also states, "Ibn Abī Jayyid is a thiqaḥ according to al-Sayyid al-Khūṭ on account of him being of al-Najjāshī's teachers. However, we do not accept this premise. Therefore, his reliability is, according to us, unestablished."<sup>3</sup>
3. Regarding 'Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Abī Jayyid, Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī al-Burūjirdī states, "A biography was not written for this shaykh by (al-Tūsī and) al-Najjāshī, despite their numerous narrations from him... I did not find anything for this *shaykh* (i.e., Ibn Abī Jayyid) from the early generation (of scholars) except for what I have mentioned. Whatever claims were made by some of the latter-day scholars regarding his conditions, reliability, and other aspects, I have found nothing that can prove it."<sup>4</sup>

This is a clear indication from him refuting the statement of whoever makes tawthīq of Ibn Abī Jayyid on the mere fact that he is of al-Najjāshī's teachers.

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 70 (biography number 108).

2 'Abd al-Nabī al-Jazā'irī: *Ḥāwī al-Aqwāl*, 3:297 (biography number 1277).

3 Kāzim al-Ḥā'irī: *al-Qaḍā' fī al-Fiqh al-Islāmī*, p. 51.

4 Cited by Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī: *Manhaj al-Rijālī wa al-'Amal al-Rā'id fī al-Mawsū'ah al-Rijāliyyah* of Sayyid al-Ṭā'ifah al-Barūjardī, p. 185.

4. Al-Māzandarānī states, “The extent of what we have arrived at and noticed regarding the words of al-Najjāshī is that he does not narrate from weak narrators whose weakness has been established by the *jarḥ* of experts and (the fact that) the people do not narrate from him. However, it has not been established that he does not narrate from an imāmī about whom neither a *jarḥ* has been mentioned about him nor has his reliability established. Therefore, the ruling that states all of al-Najjāshī’s teachers are reliable is problematic and has no proof for it.”<sup>1</sup>

This is a review of the issue; it is great insight on this subject-matter, and it is the correct opinion. Therefore, whatever al-Ḥillī differs with the latter of the latter-day scholars—at the head of it al-Khū’ī—is correct. This is because the view that all the teachers of al-Najjāshī are reliable is speculative and falls flat when studying the opinions of the Imāmī scholars. The statement of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī—who is one of the leading proponents of adopting this rule—is sufficient in this regard. He states about the teachers of al-Najjāshī:

حسن هؤلاء المشايخ وجمالة قدرهم وعلو مرتبتهم فضلا عن دخولهم في زمرة الثقات بالقرينة العامة التي تعمهم مع قطع النظر عن ملاحظة حال آحادهم

The goodness of these teachers, their greatness of rank, and high position—aside from their entry among the reliable narrators—is established by general terms (*bi al-qarīnah al-āmmah*), with no due consideration to their individual states.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, al-Nūrī knows that by investigating the condition of their individual states, it will lead to the invalidation of this principle. This is because most of them are *majhūl* and no mention of them is made in the works of narrator evaluation and ḥadīth encyclopedias. The following are a few examples of this.

1 Al-Māzandarānī: *Miqyās al-Ruwāt*, p. 158.

2 Al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 3/158.

- i. Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Hārūn, famously known as Ibn al-Ṣalt: He man was counted as reliable among the proponents of the tawthīq-theory, on account of him being from the teachers of al-Najjāshī. After examining his biography, I did not find a reason for his tawthīq except for the fact that he is from the teachers of al-Najjāshī. And this is the statement of the latter-day scholars, otherwise, there is not statement regarding him from the early scholars. Al-Shāharūdī said, “They did not mention him.” Therefore, there is no mention of jarḥ or tawthīq in the encyclopedias of narrator evaluation. Al-Shāharūdī goes on to justify his tawthīq, on the premise that he is from the teachers of al-Najjāshī.<sup>1</sup>
- ii. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Imrān ibn al-Jundī: al-Ḥillī followed up al-Najjāshī’s statement that he (i.e., Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Imrān ibn al-Jundī) is from the teachers of al-Najjāshī saying, “This is not textual evidence for his ta’dīl.”<sup>2</sup> Commenting on al-Ḥillī’s words, ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Jazā’irī said, “And neither is it apparent as well.”<sup>3</sup>
- iii. ‘Uthmān ibn Ḥātim al-Muntāb: al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, al-Faḍlī, and Ja‘far al-Subḥānī deemed him a thiqah because he is of the teachers of al-Najjāshī. Al-Najjāshī gave him the title “our teacher.”<sup>4</sup> Al-Khūṭī remained silent and offered no opinion on his biography.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps he built upon the principle that he does not narrate with the words “ḥaddathanā (he narrated to us)” or “akhbaranā (he informed us)”. However, Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī, the author of *al-Mufīd*, in which he summarised the statements of al-Khūṭī, regarded him as majhūl.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 Al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, 1/480.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 70 (biography number 108).

3 ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Jazā’irī: *Ḥāwī al-Aqwāl*, 3/297 (biography number 1277).

4 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 193 (biography 515).

5 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 12/116 (biography 7585).

6 Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 368.

- iv. Al-Ḥusayn ibn Ja‘far al-Makhzūmī: Al-Shāharūdī said about him, “He is a thiqaḥ because he is from the teachers of al-Najjāshī.” This proves the fact that it is the primary reason for his tawthīq.<sup>1</sup> Had there been (a statement of) tawthīq from any of the earlier Imāmī scholars, they would have mentioned it.
- v. ‘Abd al-Salām ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad al-Baṣrī ibn al-Adīb: Al-Jawāhirī in *al-Mufīd* said about him, “He is a thiqaḥ because he is from the teachers of al-Najjāshī.”<sup>2</sup> He did not find a reason for his tawthīq other than this.
- vi. Al-Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā ibn Hadiyyah: Al-Shāharūdī said, “He is a thiqaḥ because he is from the teachers of al-Najjāshī.”<sup>3</sup> He did not find a reason for his tawthīq other than this.
- vii. Ibrāhīm ibn Makhḻad ibn Ja‘far: Al-Shāharūdī said, “They did not mention him except for al-Khūṭī, who said, ‘(He is) from the teachers of al-Najjāshī. He mentions him under the biography of Di‘bil.’”<sup>4</sup> And so, whoever adopts this principle, is making tawthīq of a narrator who is not mentioned in the books of narrator criticism.
- viii. Muḥammad ibn Hārūn ibn Mūsā al-Talla‘ukburī: al-Nūrī, al-Subḥānī, and al-Faḍlī mention him to be from the teachers of al-Najjāshī. However, al-Khūṭī omitted al-Talla‘ukburī because he did not fall under his principle of introducing the teachers of al-Najjāshī whom he restricted to those who narrated from him with the words “*ḥaddathanā* (he narrated to us)” or “*akhbaranā* (he

---

1 Al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, 3/108 (biography number 4259).

2 P. 316.

3 Al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, 3/95

4 Ibid., 1/208 (biography number 499).



informed us).” Even al-Jawāhirī<sup>1</sup> and Bisām Murtaḍā<sup>2</sup> (who both summarized al-Khūṭī’s book) described him as “majhūl.”

Like this, they differ regarding who is part of, or excluded from this *Mashyakhah*. Using this principle, they make tawthīq of several narrators who are regarded as majhūl in the science of narrator criticism. Furthermore, most of these narrators have no narrations except in the book of al-Najjāshī!

5. Of the most important objections which contradict this principle comes from al-Khūṭī’s critique against al-Najjāshī. He states, “We found his narration from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā in his book. This is indicative of his reliability, like his other teachers. However, it appears after investigation) that al-Najjāshī did not live to reach Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā’s era. According to what we came across, he narrates from him via an intermediary in 150 places. In most instances, this intermediary is either Ibn Shādhān (i.e., Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Shādhān) or Aḥmad ibn Shādhān. It is clear from this that the copy (of the book) is definitively filled with errors and that he is not from the teachers of al-Najjāshī. Therefore, he is *ḍa’if* on account of the lack of tawthīq.”<sup>3</sup>

I checked the places that al-Khūṭī reviewed and found 136-137 of them with the words “*Ḥaddathanī* (He narrated to me),” and 496 with the words “*Akhbaranā* (He informed us).”

The conclusion reached by al-Khūṭī is possible, but it is merely a probability that cannot be relied upon unless the copies (of the books) are verified. It is also possible that al-Najjāshī is among those who narrate from those he never met; this is a possibility as well. All of this calls for

---

1 Al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 568.

2 Bisām Murtaḍā: *Zubdat al-Maqāl min Mu’jam al-Rijāl*, 2/409.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 10/45 (under *ma yaṣiḥḥu al-tayammum bihi*).

further rectifications of this principle, if only we investigated each of the narrators, one by one.

6. It can be said to the proponents of this theory that al-Najjāshī never explicitly stated that he does not narrate except from a *thiqah*; rather, it is a deduction that you understood from his words. Despite this, it has become, according to you, a foundational basis upon which narrators are judged. Therefore, you have to commit to making *taṣḥīḥ* of *aḥādīth* and *tawthīq* of the narrators of every book in which the author explicitly stated that his book is narrated via chains with reliable narrators—which constitute the majority of Imāmī books. Hereunder are a few examples.

A. Ibn Ṭāwūs mentioned the following in the introduction to his book *Falāḥ al-Sā'il*, “Know well that the narrations I mention in this book are narrated from among the most select of our reliable companions. In some of these narrations, there may be between the reliable narrators who have been alluded to and between the Prophet ﷺ or one of the Imāms, an individual who has been criticized via solitary reports. Or, the criticism levelled against him is based on a narration that has been itself criticized by the scholars, thereby a possible valid excuse for the criticized narrator.<sup>1</sup> That reason would be known, or at least be admissible according to the critics... (Then he cited a number of justifications for the *tawthīq* of narrators that have been criticized. Then he stated) ... For there is amongst the *kuffār* (disbelievers) those who are reliable in what they narrate of reports, just as the scholars of Islam have relied on doctors of the *Ahl al-Dhimmah* in their reports concerning that which is suitable for curing the sick.”<sup>2</sup>

Thus, Ibn Ṭāwūs considers everyone who narrates from him to have “crossed the bridge (i.e., acceptable).” And after these words,

---

1 In other words, the original narrator in question would remain free of any criticism since the narration used to establish the criticism against him is itself questionable [translator’s note].

2 Introduction to the book, p. 9.

he goes on to cite some six justifications for the sake of making tawthīq of narrators. Even more than that, he sought justification for those who had no excuse since it was narrated by their senior companions. Thus, he made tawthīq of the narrators and refuted all of the criticisms.

After the explicit statement that he makes tawthīq of the narrators of his book, the proponents of this theory did not adhere to this by making tawthīq of all the narrators! This is a contradiction whereby they seek to distinguish between various obscure matters.

- B. Al-Ṣadūq (d. 381 AH) mentioned in his work *al-Muqni'*: "I omitted the chains of transmission from him so that it (i.e., the book) does not become too burdensome, and does not become too difficult to memorize, and so the reader does not get disinterested. (I omitted the chains of transmission) because whatever I explained in this book is to be found in the primary works and evident to the trustworthy scholars and *fuqahā'* (jurists), may Allah have mercy on them."<sup>1</sup>

Muslim al-Dāwarī stated, "We gather from this that all of the narrations of the book are authentic, and that all of their narrators are reliable."<sup>2</sup>

Do the proponents of this theory make tawthīq of the narrators of *al-Muqni'*, with al-Ṣadūq's (statement of) tawthīq of its narrators?

- C. The book *Bishārat li Shī'at al-Murtaḍā*. The author states, "I do not mention reports in this book except those that are *musnad* (with an unbroken chain and reliable) from the great teachers and choicest

---

1 Introduction to *al-Muqni'*, p. 3.

2 Muslim al-Dāwarī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl Bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 1/330.

(and) reliable narrators.”<sup>1</sup> This is another explicit statement. Despite this, the proponents of this theory do not adhere to his statements!

D. The book *al-Mizār* by Muḥammad ibn al-Mashhadī (d. 610 AH). Describing the litanies (*adhkār*) of his work, he states in the introduction, “Whatever prayers have been resorted to for when performing the various tasks, I have received them in a contiguous manner (*muttaṣil*) from reliable narrators until the descendants of the Prophet (*sādāt*).”<sup>2</sup>

This is also an explicitly clear statement. Despite this, they say, morning and evening, that we do not have an authentic book! This is without mentioning their Four books. Muslim al-Dāwarī gathered thirteen such books the authors of which claim their authenticity and tawthīq of their narrators.

7. Baḥr al-‘Ulūm (d. 1212 AH) states, “The statement of al-Najjāshī is repeated, ‘A number of our companions,’ or ‘a group of our companions.’ These, and other such statements exist in several places without any explicit explanation as to how much or how many are actually in this group. This issue is relatively easy to understand based on what we have determined on the reliability of all narrators. Perhaps that is the secret in not explaining it.”<sup>3</sup>

If al-Najjāshī himself did not explicitly state the names of this group (of narrators), and neither did he attempt to mention them, then how do we judge the authenticity of chains of narration that are contain majhūl narrators? This is nothing more than exercising a good opinion of al-

---

1 Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Ṭabarī (d. 525 AH). He stated this in the introduction to the book, p. 18.

2 P. 27.

3 Baḥr al-‘Ulūm: *Rijāl Baḥr al-‘Ulūm*, 2/100.

Najjāshī. Good opinions about a person, guesswork, and sheer conjecture can never be considered an accepted principle for gauging the reliability of a narration.

Finally, if someone was to say that we (i.e., the Shī'ah) only make tawthīq of the teachers of al-Najjāshī when they do not have a contradictory statement of *taḍ'īf* (against them). We would respond to them by saying: Why do you not say this for the authors of the other books that were previously mentioned? This is but a clear contradiction.

## 1.2 Tawthīq of a narrator on account of him being in the asānīd of 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī's Tafsīr

Regarding *Tafsīr al-Qummī* of 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim al-Qummī, al-Najjāshī states:

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Qummī: *Thiqah* in ḥadīth; *thabt* (reliable); *mu'tamad* (relied-upon); *ṣaḥīḥ al-madhhab* ((belonging to the sound school of law)... He has a work on tafsīr<sup>1,2</sup>

Al-Qummī states in the introduction to his *Tafsīr*:

ونحن ذاكرون ومخبرون بما ينتهي إلينا ورواه مشايخنا وثقاتنا عن الذين فرض الله طاعتهم

---

1 This tafsīr is printed under the title *Tafsīr al-Qummī*. It is loaded with statements regarding the interpolation of the Noble Qur'ān (*Tahṛīf al-Qur'ān*) and rather strange esoteric interpretations. See: *Ma'a al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah fī al-Uṣūl wa al-Furū'* of Dr. 'Alī al-Sālūs, p. 489; *Qaḍīyyat al-Tāwīl Bayna al-Shī'ah wa Ahl al-Sunnah 'Arḍ wa Taqdīm* of Dr. 'Abd al-Mun'im Fu'ād, pp. 212-292 (and other places); *al-Shī'ah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah wa Tahṛīf al-Qur'ān* of Muḥammad al-Sayf, p. 62 (and other places); *Mawqif al-Rāfiqah min al-Qur'ān* of Māmādū Kārāmbīrī, p. 208 (and other places). The best work in this regard is Muḥammad Muḥammad Ibrāhīm al-'Assāl's PhD dissertation under the title *al-Shī'ah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah wa Manhajuhum fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-Karīm*, p. 832.

2 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 260 (biography no. 680).

And we mention and inform (i.e., in this book) of that which has reached us and narrated by our teachers and reliable ones from those upon whom Allah has obligated their obedience.<sup>1</sup>

A number of latter-day scholars of the Imāmiyyah regarded these words of al-Qummī to imply that he made *tawthīq* (approved) of every narrator that comes in the *asānīd* of his work. I tried my utmost best to find the first person to express this principle and (eventually) came to the conclusion that al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī was, in fact, the first to mention this. And although he did not state it as an independent principle, it can be argued that, despite the above, he is the first to allude to it and mention it in the course of his words. In his attempt to make *tawthīq* of Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim, the father of al-Qummī, he states:

وفهم توثيقه من تصحيح العلامة طرق الصدوق ومن أول تفسير ولده علي بن إبراهيم حيث قال ونحن  
ذاكرون ومخبرون ما انتهى إلينا ورواه مشايخنا وثقاتنا عن الذين فرض الله طاعتهم

His *tawthīq* is to be understood from al-ʿAllāmah's authenticating al-Ṣadūq's chains of narrations, as well as from the beginning of his son's, ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī's *Tafsīr* wherein he states, "And we mention and inform (i.e., in this book) of that which has reached us and narrated by our teachers and reliable others from those upon whom Allah has obligated their obedience."<sup>2</sup>

This is what was also understood by Baḥr al-ʿUlūm in his attempt to make *tawthīq* of ʿAlī al-Qummī's father, Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim, using this principle.<sup>3</sup>

The most famous person to employ this principle was al-Khūṭī who, based on it, made *tawthīq* of many narrators whom the works of narrator biographies' do not even identify. With this, he significantly reduced the number of *majhūl* (unknown) narrators in the biographical works of narrators and picked out a number of them and placed them in the ranks of reliable narrators!

---

1 *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, p. 16.

2 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*, 30/302, #12 (under *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl*).

3 Baḥr al-ʿUlūm: *Rijāl Baḥr al-ʿUlūm*, 1/462.

Commenting on ‘Alī al-Qummī’s previous words, al-Khūṭī stated:

في هذا الكلام دلالة ظاهرة على أنه لا يروي في كتابه هذا إلا عن ثقة

In these words, there is a clear indication that he only narrates from a *thiqah* in his book.

Commenting on the words of al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī, al-Khūṭī stated:

إن ما استفادته في محله فإن علي بن إبراهيم يريد بما ذكره إثبات صحة تفسيره وأن رواياته ثابتة وصادرة من المعصومين عليهم السلام وأنها أتت إليه بواسطة المشايخ والثقات من الشيعة وعلى ذلك فلا موجب لتخصيص التوثيق بمشايخه الذين يروي عنهم علي بن إبراهيم بلا واسطة كما زعمه بعضهم

What al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī inferred is correct. This is because ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm intended to establish the authenticity of his *Tafsīr* with what he mentioned. Additionally, his narrations are well-established and come from the Infallibles عليهم السلام, and came to him via teachers and other reliable narrators of the Shī‘ah. Based on this, it is not necessary to restrict the *tawthīq* of only those teachers from whom ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm narrates without an intermediary, as some of them have claimed.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī’s claim can be extracted in the following manner: Everyone that is in the *muttaṣil* (contiguous) chains of *Tafsīr al-Qummī*—thereby excluding the *marāsīl*<sup>2</sup>, or the narrations that are broken (contain *inqiṭā’*)—he is a *thiqah* as long as he is not faced with contradictory evidence, even if we do not find his name being mentioned in the works of narrator evaluation.

As for the fact that “he is not faced with contradictory evidence,” I found it in al-Khūṭī’s statement, “A narrator will be deemed a *thiqah* by virtue of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm (al-Qummī, the author of the *Tafsīr*), or Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh’s testifying to their reliability, **except if he is faced with evidence to the contrary.**”<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/49.

2 See glossary for the definition of *marāsīl* [translator’s note].

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/50.

And he said, “All of the narrators of the *Tafsīr* are reliable as long as someone else’s taḍīf (of them) does not oppose it.”<sup>1</sup>

Of al-Khūṭī’s conditions is that the chain of narration in which the narrator (in question) is that it should end with the infallible (imām), as he stated under the biography of Saʿīd ibn Muḥammad, who is of the narrators’ of *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, “In any case, there is no benefit in mentioning him at all since this chain of narration does not end with one of the infallibles عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ. Therefore, the general tawthīq which ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm mentioned in the beginning of his *Tafsīr* does not include him.”<sup>2</sup>

In short, this principle is the undertaking of the latter, latter-day scholars. Even the latter-day scholars did not know of it, chief among them Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥillī, since he never mentioned it. And he (also) did not make tawthīq of anybody using this principle in his book, *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*. In fact, I found the opposite. Regarding the most famous narrator of *Tafsīr ‘Alī al-Qummī*, his (i.e., ‘Alī al-Qummī’s father, Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām) father, he states:

لم أقف لأحد من أصحابنا على القول بالقدح فيه ولا على تعديله بالتنصيص والروايات عنه كثيرة والأرجح قبول قوله

I did not find a recorded statement of criticism against him nor a statement of taḍīl in his favour from any of our companions. And there are many narrations from him. The preponderant opinion is to accept his statement(s).<sup>3</sup>

Had al-Ḥillī known of this principle, he would have alluded to ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm’s tawthīq of his father, or he would have mentioned the person who explicitly made tawthīq of him using this principle. However, he did not mention this, which proves it was not known in his time.

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, 2/364, in the commentary under the chapter “*Mīqāt al-Ṣibyān*.”

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 9/139.

3 *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 49 (biography no. 9).



What further proves that al-Ḥillī had no knowledge of this principle is his statement under the biography of al-Ḥusayn ibn Yazīd al-Nawfalī:

عندي في روايته توقف لمجرد ما نقله عن القميين وعدم الظفر بتعديل الأصحاب له

According to me, judgement regarding his narration should be suspended simply for what he transmitted from the Qummīs, and since there is no ta'dīl of his from our companions.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥusayn ibn Yazīd is from the narrators of *Tafsīr al-Qummī*. Despite this, al-Ḥillī states that the companions (i.e., the scholars of the Shī'ah) do not have a statement of ta'dīl in his favour. Had he known this principle, he would have suggested the tawthīq of al-Qummī for al-Ḥusayn ibn Yazīd. However, he did not do so.

### A critique of this principle

1. This principle results in an opinion at variance with the more well-known opinion in the Imāmī school. Admitting that his opinion is at variance with the more well-known one, al-Khū'ī states:

الرواية على مسلك المشهور ضعيفة السند لأن في السند محمد بن أسلم وهو لم يوثق في الرجال ولكن الرواية على مسلكنا معتبرة لأن محمد بن أسلم من رجال كامل الزيارة ومن رجال تفسير علي بن إبراهيم القمي وهم ثقات

The narration, according to the more well-known practice (*Maslak*) has a weak chain because it contains Muḥammad ibn Aslam. His tawthīq (i.e., in the works of narrator criticism) was not made. However, the narration according to our practice (*maslak*) is valid because Muḥammad ibn Aslam is among the narrators of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* and *Tafsīr 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī*. And they are (all) reliable.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 339.

2 Al-Khū'ī: *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, 5:253 (in the commentary under the chapter *Aḥkām al-Ṣawm Badl al-Hady*).

2. Kāẓim al-Ḥā'irī thoroughly refuted what al-Khū'ī inferred from 'Alī al-Qummī's words. He states:

As for him attempting to make *tawthīq* of all its narrators—by claiming that his purpose for mentioning what he did was to establish the authenticity of his *Tafsīr*, and (the fact) that his narrations are established and come from the infallibles, and that they reached him via teachers and reliable ones of the Shī'ah (as al-Sayyid al-Khū'ī mentioned)—this is incorrect. I do not know how he came to know this was his intention (in mentioning these words). Is it based on the generality of his words? Or, is it based on the explanation that if it is not the authentication of *aḥādīth* (i.e., that is implied), then deeming the immediate teachers reliable would be of no value? If he intended the latter, we would say, first of all, that there is no doubt that deeming the immediate teachers reliable does strengthen and bolster the narrations. And, secondly, the earlier scholars' authentication of narrations is not always premised upon the *tawthīq* of narrators, as attested to by al-Sayyid al-Khū'ī in his *Mu'jam*. Perhaps, in his *Tafsīr*, he adhered to narrating from his reliable teachers who only narrate authentic narrations. As for knowing definitively the fact that they authenticated the narrations on account of the reliability of their narrators, this is unknown.

If he intended the former, we say that the form of address “reaching us, and narrated by our teachers and reliable (others),” is only true in relation to the reliability of the immediate narrator. It does not unrestrictedly prove the reliability of every narrator.<sup>1</sup>

Muḥammad al-Sanad stated:

إن مقصودهما منها نفي الروايات الموضوعية و المدسوسة عما أخرجاه من روايات كتابيهما لا أنها في  
صدد التوثيق لكل السند

Both<sup>2</sup> of their intentions from their statements is to exclude (the existence of) fabricated and fictitious narrations from what they include of

---

1 Kāẓim al-Ḥā'irī: *Al-Qaḍā' fi al-Fiqh al-Islāmī*, p. 446.

2 I.e., 'Alī al-Qummī in his *Tafsīr* and Ibn Qūlawayh in *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*.

narrations in their respective works, not with respect to the *tawthīq* of every single chain of narration.<sup>1</sup>

3. The intention of ‘Alī al-Qummī in his introduction is to give credit to his book, nothing more. Al-Fānī al-Aṣḫahānī states:

إن قوله [من مشايخنا وثقاتنا] ظاهر في إرادة إعطاء قيمة عليا لكتابه وأن رواياته صادرة عن الثقات الذين  
يركن إليهم ويعتمد عليهم

His statement, ‘from our teachers and reliable ones’ clearly indicates his intention to give his book credit, and to show that his narrations come from such reliable narrators that are relied and depended upon.

Then he states:

إن دعوى إرادة علي بن إبراهيم إعطاء قيمة لكتابه لا تعني وثاقة كل رواية كتابه إذ إنه يوجد مراتب عدة  
للقيمة... ودعوى استظهار توثيق كل الرواة من لفظ [ مشايخنا وثقاتنا ] بتقريب أنه يصدد إعطاء قيمة  
للكتاب غير متعينة لكفاية وثاقة المباشرين في ذلك بل الممدوحين لولا النص على وجود الثقات في  
الجملة

The claim that ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm intended to give his book credit does not necessarily mean that all of the narrators of his book are reliable. This is because there are different levels of (determining) value... And the claim that he desired to express the reliability of all narrators with the words “our teachers and reliable ones” is an approximate judgement (that was said) in the context of him attempting to give overall value to the book. It is a generic statement that need only indicate towards the reliability of his direct teachers and the (already) praised narrators (*al-mamdūhīn*), had it not been for the text including (the word) ‘*thiqāt* (reliable)’ in the sentence.

Thereafter, al-Fānī cited his evidence for this claim. Below is a synopsis of this evidence:

---

1 *Buḥūth fī Mabānī ‘ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 146.

- a. A number of narrators whose weakness has been documented appear in the folds of his book. And it is highly inconceivable that there exist such a significant number of narrators that are well-known for being weak which he was unaware of, especially considering he mentioned these words in his attempt to give credence to his book, such credence that is dependant upon investigating such reliable narrators whose reliability is agreed-upon... (He goes on to mention five of them).
- b. A number of *majhūl*, *muhmalīn* (disregarded), and narrators about whom there is clearly a difference of opinion appear (in this book). It is also highly inconceivable that he came to know about their reliability in the books of narrator criticism, especially considering the fact that others, such as al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī—who were closer to them in time—did not know. Also, despite the fact that their general practice is to investigate narrators like the aforementioned... (He then goes on to mention eight of them).
- c. The fact that *mursal*, *maqṭūʿ*, and other such narrations appear (in the book) that have no justification in being narrated in such high numbers proves that he himself was unaware of such omitted and *majhūl* narrators... Unless of course he claims that he knows of the *Ghayb* (unknown) about them and that he did not mention them so as to preserve the trust of transmitting (this information)... (He then goes on to cite seven examples).

Then al-Fānī states:

These three issues become all the more important by noting the large number of weak narrators and how clearly their conditions are in this regard such that when inductive reasoning of this type increases, so too does the probabilistic value of such a baseless claim increase.

Al-Fānī ends his discussion with the following:

On my life, this matter is clearer than yesterday and clearer than the sun. With this, it is clear that the text of Ibn Ibrāhīm only indicates to the

reliability of his direct teachers—assuming we do not also investigate this matter further, as you know of its explanation.<sup>1</sup>

4. I pursued the number of narrators that have been criticized in *Tafsīr ‘Alī al-Qummī* and found that they reached thirty-eight. These narrators range from being majhūl, or cursed, or maṭ‘ūn (criticized), or weak, or *muhmal* (disregarded).

It is possible to invalidate this principle from its very foundation, rather, the entire *Tafsīr* can be invalidated when considering its narrator. In the beginning of this *Tafsīr* we find the statement:

حدثني أبو الفضل العباس بن محمد بن القاسم بن حمزة بن موسى بن جعفر عليه السلام قال حدثنا أبو الحسن علي بن إبراهيم القمي

Abū al-Faḍl al-‘Abbās ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Ḥamzah ibn Mūsā ibn Ja‘far عليه السلام narrated to me — Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī narrated to us...

Now, who exactly is this al-‘Abbās ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim? Ja‘far al-Subḥānī stated:

مع الأسف إنه لم يوجد لراوي التفسير (العباس بن محمد) ذكر في الأصول الرجالية

Unfortunately, there is no mention of the *Tafsīr*’s narrator, al-‘Abbās ibn Muḥammad, in the primary sources of narrator criticism!”<sup>2</sup>

Kāzīm al-Ḥā’irī stated, “There is no mention of him in the books of narrator criticism.”<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Fānī al-Aṣḥāhānī: *Buḥūth fī Fiqh al-Rijāl*, pp. 107-113.

2 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 312.

3 Kāzīm al-Ḥā’irī: *Al-Qaḍā’ fī al-Fiqh al-Islāmī*, p. 492.

After disputing the method in which several books—including *Tafsīr al-Qummī*—reached the latter-day scholars, Muḥammad Āṣif Muḥsinī stated:

على أن مثل التفسير الموجود المنسوب إلى القمي إشكال آخر وهو جهالة مدوّنه الذي جمع بين روايات تفسير القمي وروايات أبي الجارود الزيدي

However, the likes of the existing *Tafsīr* attributed to al-Qummī is another issue. That is the recorder’s unawareness of the fact that he collected the narrations of both *Tafsīr al-Qummī* and Abū al-Jārūd al-Zaydī.<sup>1</sup>

How great is Ṣā’ib ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd’s statement:

كيف يغيب عن كتب الرجال رجال يروي مثل هذا التفسير الكبير الذي ضم عدة مئات من الأحاديث المنسوبة إلى أهل البيت عليهم السلام؟! ومثل هذا المأخذ السندي لا يمكن إغفاله والإعراض عنه كليا

How can a person who narrates the likes of this great *Tafsīr*—which includes hundreds of aḥādīth attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt عليهم السلام—be absent from the books of narrator evaluation? It is not possible to ignore nor totally disregard this type of egregious defect in the chain of narration.<sup>2</sup>

Bāqir al-Ayrawānī states:

إن القمي وإن كان له كتاب باسم التفسير ولا يمكن التشكيك بذلك باعتبار أن النجاشي والطوسي قد نصا على وجود التفسير المذكور وذكرنا إليه طريقا صحيحا ولكننا نشكك في كون التفسير المتداول اليوم هو نفس تفسير القمي ونحتمل عدم كونه للقمي رأسا أو لا أقل بعضه للقمي والبعض الآخر قد دس فيه

Al-Qummī, even though he has a book in the name of a *Tafsīr*—this cannot be doubted considering the fact that both al-Najjāshī and al-Ṭūsī have documented its existence and mentioned an authentic chain to it—however, we doubt whether the *Tafsīr* that is available today is the same *Tafsīr al-Qummī*. It is possible that it is not entirely al-Qummī’s, or, at the very least, it is partially al-Qummī’s and partially somebody else’s (work) inserted into it.<sup>3</sup>

1 Muḥammad Āṣif Muḥsinī: *Mashra’at Bihār al-Anwār*, 1/15.

2 Ṣā’ib ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd: *Ḥiwār fi al-Umq min Ajl al-Taqrīb al-Ḥaqīqī*, p. 33.

3 Bāqir al-Ayrawānī: *Durūs Tamhidīyyah fi al-Qawā’id al-Rijālīyyah*, p. 174.

Muḥammad Āṣif Muḥsinī states an important principle that applies to many books, including *Tafsīr al-Qummī*:

إن صحة الطريق إلى كتاب مؤلف أمر وصحة أنتساب النسخة الموجودة إليه أمر آخر فإن الأول إختيار مجرد عن فلان عن فلان بأن فلانا ألف كتاب كذا كما يظهر ذلك من جميع الإجازات و الإسناد في آخر بحار الأنوار وكذا من فهرستي الشيخ و النجاشي في معظم منقولاتهما و الثاني بحث صغروي مصداقي و أن هذه النسخة الموجودة تأليف فلان من غير زيادة و نقيصة و بينهما بون بعيد

Authentically establishing the chain to the work of an author is one thing and authentically attributing the existent copy to him is another. The former merely involves relaying information from person to person such that so-and-so a person wrote such-and-such a book, as is evident in all *ijāzāt* (formal documented permissions to transmit), and the *isnād* at the end of *Biḥār al-Anwār*, and the two *Fihrist*s of al-Shaykh and al-Najjāshī in most of their transmissions.

The latter is a minor, corroborative study that proves that the existent copy (of the book) is the authorship of so-and-so without any additions or omissions. There is a significant difference between the two.<sup>1</sup>

It can be said to the claimant of this principle: “Establish the throne (first) and then chisel away at it (i.e., establish the proof first then deconstruct it).”

5. The printed *Tafsīr* represents a concoction between *Tafsīr al-Qummī* and *Tafsīr Ziyād ibn al-Mundhir Abī al-Jārūd al-A‘mā al-Sarḥūb*, the leader of the *Jārūdiyyah*.<sup>2</sup> Al-Kashshī states, “(He is) reprehensible. And there is no

---

1 Muḥammad Āṣif Muḥsinī: *Mashra‘at Biḥār al-Anwār*, 1/23.

2 The *Jārūdiyyah* are the companions of Abū al-Jārūd Ziyād ibn Abī Ziyād. They claim that the Prophet ﷺ explicitly determined through description, not by name, the appointment of ‘Alī عليه السلام. He (according to them) is the imām after him and the people neither knew of this description nor ask about the one being described. Rather, they appointed Abū Bakr by their choice and became disbelievers on account thereof. Abū al-Jārūd differed with his imām, Zayd ibn ‘Alī, in this doctrine of his because he (i.e., Zayd ibn ‘Alī) did not hold this belief.” Al-Shahrestānī: *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, 1/183.

doubt in his reprehensibility. He was named Sarḥūb after a blind shayṭān that lives in the ocean.”<sup>1</sup>

Ja‘far al-Subḥānī stated:

إن الاعتماد على هذا التفسير بعد هذا الاختلاف مشكل جدا خصوصا مع ما فيه من الشذوذ في المتن وقد ذهب بعض أهل التحقيق إلى أن النسخة المطبوعة تختلف عما نقل عن ذلك التفسير في بعض الكتب وعند ذلك لا يبقى اعتماد على هذا التوثيق الضمني أيضا فلا يبقى اعتماد لا على السند ولا على المتن

Relying on this *Tafsīr* after this difference of opinion is very problematic, especially considering the anomalies that exist in the text. Some expert scholars have the view that the printed copy is different to what was transmitted of this *Tafsīr* in some (other) books. In such an instance, the implicit tawthīq also ceases to remain and, accordingly, relying on the sanad and matn is no longer tenable.<sup>2</sup>

Muslim al-Dāwarī undertook to count the number of narrators specific to *Tafsīr Abī al-Jārūd* and he found them to be 438. As al-Dāwarī held, these narrators do not fall under the tawthīq of al-Qummī.

6. ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī is one of the leaders of the *Akhbāriyyah*, as documented by al-Astarābādī (d. 1033 A.H):

The leader of the *Akhbārī* scholars and doyen of the venerable, ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim. He is *Thiqat al-Islam* and *Shaykh al-Islam*. He mentions Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī—may Allah sanctify their souls—in the beginning of his *Tafsīr*. It is an authentic *Tafsīr* that can be relied-upon in the Sharī‘ah since all of it is taken from the infallibles عليهم السلام.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 229. Narrations 413 to 417 all disparage him. Al-Ḥillī made taḍ‘īf of him in *al-Khulāṣah*, p. 348 (no. 1378). Al-Māmaqānī (1/58) stated that he was, “ḍa‘īf.”

2 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fi ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 316.

3 He mentioned this in *al-Shawāhid al-Madaniyyah wa al-Ṭubū‘ ma‘a al-Shawāhid al-Makkiyyah* of Nūr al-Dīn al-‘Āmilī, p. 516.



It is clear to us that ‘Alī al-Qummī is a leader from the leaders of the *Akhbārīyyah*, those who consider their books to be (completely) authentic and taken from an authentic primary works. Therefore, his words in the introduction—if reliable—represent the *Akhbārī* methodology. This methodology (broadly) states that their books are accompanied by internal and external evidence through which their authenticity can be established, irrespective of the individual conditions of each isnād’s narrators.

The strange thing is that al-Khūī—an opponent of this methodology—accepted the tawthīq of the narrators of al-Qummī and shunned the remaining books of the *Akhbārīyyah* that mention similar words to al-Qummī’s, as attested to in the listing of books in which the respective authors documented their authenticity in the section that speaks about the tawthīq of al-Najjāshī’s teachers!

Therefore, there is a clear contradiction in making a distinction between the work of al-Qummī and the remaining works of the *Akhbārī* methodology. It is an attempt to separate something which is (normally) associated with one another.

7. Finally (and how strange and farfetched of a deduction it is!), what Ja‘far al-Subḥānī has stated:

In al-Qummī’s chain of narration, there are those among the *Ummuhāt al-Mu‘minīn* (Mothers of the Believers) that are unreliable. So, take note!<sup>1</sup>

It is quite strange that al-Subḥānī writes the words “*Umm al-Mu‘minīn* (Mother of the Believers)” with his pen and then he goes on to count them among those who are not to be relied upon!

---

1 Al-Subḥānī: *Kullīyyāt fī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 320.

### 1.3 Tawthīq of a narrator on account of him being in the asānīd of the book *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*

The author of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* is Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh al-Qummī (d. 368 A.H). Al-Ṭūsī states, “His *kunya*h (teknonym) is Abū al-Qāsim. He is a thiqaḥ. He is the author of several books ... He has a book *Jāmi‘ al-Ziyārāt*.”<sup>1</sup>

He authored this book in order to explain the virtues of visiting the graves of the *Āl al-Bayt*, and to narrate the virtue of every visit with the isnād. He explains the book saying:

وأنا مبين لك أطلال الله بقاءك ما أتاب الله به الزائر لنبيه وأهل بيته صلوات الله عليهم أجمعين بالآثار  
الواردة عنهم عليهم السلام على رغم من أنكر فضلهم ذلك وجحده وأباه وعادى عليه

And I will explain to you (may Allah prolong your existence) what Allah will reward the one who visits His Prophet and his family, with reports received from them, despite those that reject, deny, dismiss, and act in opposition to their virtue.<sup>2</sup>

Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh states in the introduction to his work:

إننا لا نحيط بجميع ما روي عنهم في هذا المعنى ولا في غيره ولكن ما وقع لنا من جهة الثقات من أصحابنا  
رحمهم الله برحمته ولا خرجت حديثا روي عن الشذاذ من الرجال يؤثر ذلك عنهم عن المذكورين غير  
المعروفين بالرواية المشهورين بالحديث والعلم

We acknowledge that we cannot encompass everything which has been narrated from them about this topic (of ziyārāt) or about any other topic for that matter. Furthermore, I have only narrated that which was reported to me by the reliable ones from among our companions (may Allah's mercy be upon them) and I did not include anything which has been reported by unknown or unreliable sources who are not well-known for their knowledge and narrations.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 71 (biography number 141).

2 Ibn Qūlawayh: *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, p. 36.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 37.

Some of the latter-day scholars Imāmī scholars have deduced from this statement that every narrator that exists in this book is undoubtedly considered a *thiqah* by virtue of the author’s words. There is neither any mention nor the slightest suggestion of this principle in the books of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī—who is among latter-day scholars—and any of his contemporaries. All of this proves that this principle is from the invented principles of the latter-day scholars, who were compelled in this regard in order to, as I have mentioned, reduce the number of (existing) *majhūl* narrators.

The first person to invent this principle was al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī (d. 1104 A.H) in *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* with his statement:

شهد علي بن إبراهيم أيضا بثبوت أحاديث تفسيره وأنها مروية عن الثقات عن الأئمة عليهم السلام وكذلك  
جعفر بن محمد بن قولويه فإنه صرح بما هو أبلغ من ذلك في أول مزاره

‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm also attested to the certainty of the *aḥādīth* of his *Tafsīr* and that they are transmitted from reliable narrators who, in turn, transmitted from the Imāms عليهم السلام. Similarly, Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh (also) testified that the narrators of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* are reliable. His explicit statement in the beginning of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* is more expressive and franker than ‘Alī bin Ibrāhīm’s.<sup>1</sup>

The apparent meaning of al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī’s words suggest the *tawthīq* of every narrator. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī believed this statement implied the *tawthīq* of only his immediate teachers, not the other narrators.<sup>2</sup> For this reason, al-Khūī came along and had (varying) states, stages, and contradictions around (understanding) this principle.

In this first phase, al-Khūī did not adopt any of the previous two opinions in the beginning. Bāqir al-Ayrawānī states, “We turn our attention to al-Sayyid al-Khūī.

1 Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah*, 20/68. He stated this under the sixth point.

2 Al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā’il*, 3/252.

In the beginning, he did not believe that all the narrators of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, including the immediate narrators (i.e., the author’s teachers) among them are reliable.”<sup>1</sup>

Regarding the second phase, and after mentioning the first phase, Bāqir al-Ayrawānī states, “In the time we were in his company, he believed that all of the narrators were reliable, including his immediate teachers.”<sup>2</sup> Thus, al-Khūṭī stated:

يحكم بوثاقة من شهد علي بن إبراهيم [ القمي صاحب التفسير ] أو جعفر بن محمد بن قولويه بوثاقته  
اللهم إلا أن يبتلى بمعارض

A narrator will be deemed a *thiqah* by virtue of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm (al-Qummī, the author of the *Tafsīr*), or Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh’s testifying to their reliability, except if he is faced with evidence to the contrary.<sup>3</sup>

The third phase was near the end of his life. Again, al-Ayrawānī states, “At the end of his life, he offered a more detailed view that included the *tawthīq* of only his immediate teachers.”<sup>4</sup> It is for this reason that al-Khūṭī’s student, Muslim al-Dāwarī, suggested the following, “Therefore, the attempt to demonstrate that the testimony (in their favour) includes all of the narrators of the book is misplaced. We have debated this with *al-Sayyid al-Ustādh* (i.e., his teacher, al-Khūṭī) and vacillated until he (eventually) changed his opinion.”<sup>5</sup>

We understand from this that it was the third opinion al-Khūṭī (eventually) settled upon—after the insistence of his students. Al-Ayrawānī suggested the reason for al-Khūṭī’s retraction from accepting (the opinion of) all the narrators of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* (as reliable) and not (retracting from his opinion from) *Tafsīr al-Qummī*:

---

1 Al-Ayrawānī: *Durūs Tamhidiyyah fi al-Qawā‘id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 176 in the marginal notes.

2 Ibid.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/50.

4 Ibid.

5 Al-Mu‘allim: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 1/323.

This is considering the fact that al-Qummī (the author of the *Tafsīr*), in his previous statement mentioned, ‘And we mention and inform (i.e., in this book) of that which has reached us and narrated by our teachers and reliable others from those upon whom Allah has obligated their obedience...’ The fact that he mentioned “our reliable (others)” after “from those upon whom Allah has obligated their obedience” proves that all the narrators that reach up to the Imāms عليهم السلام are reliable—those upon whom Allah has obligated their obedience. Whereas this type of expression is not to be found in the text of Ibn Qūlawayh.<sup>1</sup>

### A critique of this principle

It is important for me to point out at this stage that al-Khūṭ’s changing of opinion from the second phase to the third occurred in the latter part of his life, as mentioned. In other words, after he authored most of his jurisprudential and non-jurisprudential works. The greatest and most important work, according to the Imāmiyyah, is *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*. In this work, al-Khūṭ made tawthīq of tens of narrators who are (normally) enlisted among the *majāhīl* (pl. *majhūl*) purely on account of them being of the narrators of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*!

Similarly, many jurisprudential matters in such books were given *tarjīḥ* (preference) on account of him authenticating a ḥadīth, the isnād of which contains the narrators that appear in *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*!

Most of the students of knowledge today of the Imāmiyyah are devoted to *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, the book authored by al-Khūṭ. How many gatherings have I observed in which people debate (a particular issue) based on a statement of al-Khūṭ that he actually retracted! The reason for this is disastrous; it would necessitate invalidating the tawthīq of hundreds, all of whom fall under the rubric of this principle. The principle that al-Khūṭ disseminated among his students to such an extent that it, as the saying goes, spread like wildfire.

---

1 Al-Ayrawānī: *Durūs Tamhīdiyyah fī al-Qawāʿid al-Rijālīyyah*, p. 178.

Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī, the Imāmī author of *al-Mufīd min Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* (a summary of al-Khūṭī's statements), was amazed at the prevalence of this view, even in the books that were printed after the death of al-Khūṭī—*Mu'jam al-Rijāl* being at the top (of the list). Under the biography of 'Uqbah ibn Khālid al-Asadī, he states:

منحصر توثيقه بوقوعه في إسناد كامل الزيارات وقد رجع الأستاذ عن مبنى اعتبار كل من وقع في إسناد كامل الزيارات إلا مشايخ ابن قولويه و من الغريب عدم تصحيح هذا المورد في طبعة طهران المصححة بعد رجوع الأستاذ عن المبنى المذكور

His tawthīq is restricted to the fact that he exists in the isnād of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*. Al-Ustādh retracted his view of considering everyone (reliable) in the isnād of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, except for the (immediate) teachers of Ibn Qūlawayh. It is strange that this issue has not been corrected in the edited Tehrani print after *al-Ustādh's* retraction from the aforementioned principle.<sup>1</sup>

### **A critique against those who say that the tawthīq refers to all narrators of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* (the second phase)**

This is one of the weakest views; it is not very far from the view that states the tawthīq of all *Tafsīr al-Qummī's* narrators. The general refutations I mentioned against this principle in relation to the *Tafsīr* can also be said to apply here.

The number of narrators in *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, as mentioned by Muḥammad Riḍā 'Irfāniyyān<sup>2</sup>, al-Ayrawānī<sup>3</sup>, and Abū Ṭālib al-Tabrīzī are 388.

1 P. 375 (in the footnote). He stated something similar in more than just a footnote. See, for example, p. 78.

2 Ja'far al-Subḥānī transmits this from him in *Kullīyyāt fī 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 300. In spite of this, al-Subḥānī documented in his other work, *Durūs Mūjazah fī 'Ilmay al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, that they total 380! See: p. 92 of *Durūs Mūjazah fī 'Ilmay al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*.

3 Al-Ayrawānī: *Durūs Tahhidīyyah fī al-Qawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 176.

Let us examine some of the narrators of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, so we can know the reality of their condition.

### 1. ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Ḥaḍramī

Al-Najjāshī states about him, “Liar. Extremist (Shī‘ī). He narrates from extreme Shī‘ah. There is no good in him and his narrations are not to be relied upon.”<sup>1</sup>

### 2. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Kathīr al-Hāshimī

Al-Najjāshī states about him, “He is weak. Our companions remarked that he fabricates ḥadīth.”<sup>2</sup>

### 3. ‘Alī ibn Ḥamza al-Baṭā‘inī

Ḥusayn al-Sā‘idī states in his encyclopedia, *al-Ḍu‘afā’ min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, “He is the founder of the *waqf* (movement) and is one of the leaders of the *Wāqifiyyah*. He is a liar suspected of forgery. A number of narrations appear criticizing him and the fact that he did not admit to the Imāmah of al-Riḍā عليه السلام, as well as him appropriating the wealth of the Imām. A Tafsīr attributed to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn عليه السلام is ascribed to him.”<sup>3</sup>

### 4. Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah al-Baṭā‘inī

He is the son of the previous ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah. I will quote some of what al-Ḥillī mentioned in relation to this person so that we can come to know the absurdity of this principle. Al-Ḥillī states:

Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah... Abū Muḥammad Wāqif. Al-Kashshī states, “Muḥammad ibn Mas‘ūd narrated to me, ‘I asked ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl, from al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah al-Baṭā‘inī. He said, “He is a liar. Cursed. I narrated many aḥādīth from him. I wrote the entire

---

1 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 226 (biography no. 594).

2 Ibid., p. 235 (biography no. 621).

3 2:360.

*Tafsīr* of the Qur’ān from him, from the beginning to the end. However, I do not consider it permissible to narrate even one ḥadīth from him.” Abū al-Ḥasan Ḥamdawayh ibn Naṣīr narrated to me from some of his teachers that he said, ‘al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah is an evil person.’”<sup>1</sup>

After all of this, I say: How is it possible for al-Khūī in the second phase to say that he believes in the tawthīq of all the narrators “as long as there is no evidence to the contrary” when Ja‘far ibn Qūlawayh, the author of the book, narrates from the most famous of those accused of lying and holding extreme (Shī‘ī) views in his book?

These are but a few examples and there are many such more. If this is the condition of him narrating from such people, how then can we say that that a person is reliable when we neither know of his condition nor is there any mention of him in the books of narrator criticism? Because of not knowing his condition, it is very well possible that he is more of a liar than someone whose name has already been mentioned. This fact alone demands that his tawthīq cannot be made, or, at best judgement should be suspended (regarding him)—if we do not assume he is completely majhūl. This is very clear.

Therefore, Muslim al-Dāwarī states:

Strictly speaking, after reflecting on the book and understanding the asānīd of his narrations, we found that many of the narrators that are in his isnād do not possess the required characteristics with which the author mentioned in his previous statement. Some of them are neither known for being among the learned nor famous for (narrating) ḥadīth. In fact, some of them are not even mentioned outside of this book. Just as some others’ narrations are very little. This is in addition to the fact that he has some narrations from women.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 334 (biography no. 1320), under the section of weak narrators. Some of the words mentioned about him also mention the same in relation to his father.

2 Al-Dāwarī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 1/323.



Al-Fānī al-Aṣḥānī states:

Ibn Qūlawayh himself narrated much from both weak and majhūl narrators. In fact, he mentions such a number of marfū‘ and mursal narrations that gives assurance to the fact that he did not mean (by his statement) tawthīq of all the narrators that appear in his book, nor did he mean giving more value to it. The intent becomes all the clearer through the presence of both weak narrators, and those famously known to be weak and to lie, according to the companions and the master critics (of narrators). It is very unlikely that he did not know of them with the plethora of clearly disparaging remarks (against them). Just as the aforementioned claim, despite the omission of a number of narrators that appear in the chain of narration, is similar to claiming that Ibn Qūlawayh had knowledge of the unseen.

### **A critique against the opinion that the tawthīq refers to all of the author’s teachers (the third phase)**

This is the opinion al-Khūṭ settled on before his death. Ja‘far al-Subḥānī states, “Al-Khūṭ used to rely on his opinion for years; however, he changed whatever it was. He built upon it and explicitly mentioned his opinion in a special paper that was (eventually) published.”<sup>1</sup>

This paper, or booklet, is what ‘Alī Ṣafar ‘Alī al-Mūsawāī al-Kharsānī alluded to when he stated, “Al-Sayyid’s view changed in relation to Ibn Qūlawayh’s tawthīq (of the narrators) of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*. Our teacher, al-‘Allāmah al-Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Jalālī sent us a booklet that contained an amendment in this regard. He informed us of it and what it contains on the 20 April 1992.”<sup>2</sup> He went on and cited the text of the booklet.

I have found a response to a recent *fatwā* given by al-Khūṭ. In it, he states:

---

1 Al-Subḥānī: *Durūs Mūjazah fi ‘Ilmay al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 94.

2 He mentioned this in the introduction of his edited version (*muqaadimat al-tahqīq*) of *Rijāl al-Majlisī*, p. 45. This is an excellent and valuable introduction.

بالنسبة إلى من ورد في أسانيد كامل الزيارات فقد رأينا أخيرا اختصاص التوثيق بخصوص المشايخ المروي عنهم بلا واسطة

In relation to what is mentioned in the chains of narration of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, our considered opinion, in the end, is that it (i.e., the *tawthīq*) is specific to the direct teachers only, without any intermediaries.<sup>1</sup>

Based on this opinion, the difference is stark. After the number was 388 narrators, because it is now restricted to his direct teachers only, they are no more than 32, according to al-Subḥānī<sup>2</sup> and Muslim al-Dāwarī's<sup>3</sup> calculation, and, before them, al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 A.H.).<sup>4</sup>

Based on this, the sum total will be  $388 - 32 = 356$  (i.e., removing 356 narrators). Any narrator from this amount about whom there is no *tawthīq* documented is regarded as *majhūl* and, therefore, his narration is *sāqiṭah* (wholly unreliable). They are as al-Khūṭ stated in his paper: the total amount is more than half!

The difference that comes about between all the narrators and specifically his teachers is incorrect. Perhaps this does not go beyond the scope of exercising a good opinion of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*'s author. After exposing the gaps in the chains (like the existence of *muhmal* (neglected), weak, and other such narrators), al-Khūṭ himself alluded to this. He states in the previously mentioned work:

فصونا لكلامه عن الإخبار بما لا واقع له لم يكن بد من حمل العبارة على خلاف ظاهرها بإرادة مشايخه الخاصة

In preserving his words<sup>5</sup> related to the reports—that have no reality, it is necessary to interpret his statement contrary to its apparent meaning.

---

1 Al-Tabrīzī: *Ṣirāṭ al-Najāt*, 2:457. The book is made up of a number of inquires (*istiftā'āt*) directed to al-Khūṭ in relation to all of the chapters of the religion. Al-Tabrīzī collected all of them.

2 Al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 304.

3 Al-Dāwarī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Naẓariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 1/324.

4 Al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 3/255

5 Meaning, "In protecting the words of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh, the author of the book."

This is to say that he intended his teachers alone.<sup>1</sup>

His student, Muslim al-Dāwarī expressed the same thing when he said:

غير أن مقتضى صون كلام ابن قولويه عن الإخبار على خلاف الواقع أن تحمل شهادته على إرادة مشايخه فقط

However, preserving the statement of Ibn Qūlawayh regarding the reports is contrary to reality and requires that his testimony refer to his teachers alone.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, al-Khūī and his student assumed Ibn Qūlawayh's statement to mean something it does not, and they took it off its apparent meaning and twisted his words out of fear that he should make a mistake. As if his words are sacred and necessary to follow!

For arguments sake, we will also twist his words and exercise a good opinion of Ibn Qūlawayh. So, who are the 32 teachers he narrates from?

(I say) They are a group of narrators. Among them are those who are famous, such as Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī (d. 329 A.H), the author of the book *al-Kāfī*. There are (also) a number of majhūl narrators who are unmentioned in the works of narrator criticism. Among them:

1. The author's father, Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh; there is no mention of his tawthīq in the primary works of narrator evaluation. Al-Najjāshī's statement that he is "among the best companions of Sa'd" is not a tawthīq for him. Even if we assume and accept the statement of al-Najjāshī, he is to be merely regarded as 'mamdūh (praised),' and this is lower than the level of tawthīq.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 *Muqaddimat Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 46.

2 Al-Dāwarī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 1/323.

3 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 123 (biography number 318). He stated this under the biography of his son, Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh.

2. Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Za‘farānī; there is absolutely no tawthīq of him.
3. Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Mahziyār; “They did not mention him,” as stated by al-Shāharūdī.<sup>1</sup> There is no previous tawthīq of him.
4. Abū al-‘Abbās Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far al-Qurashī al-Razzāz; his condition in the works of narrator criticism is not known.
5. Al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā; “They did not mention him,” as stated by al-Shāharūdī.<sup>2</sup>
6. His brother, ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh; “They did not mention him,” as stated by al-Shāharūdī.<sup>3</sup>
7. Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mūsā ibn Ja‘far al-Mūsawī al-‘Alawī; I did not find any mention of jarḥ nor ta‘dīl in the primary works of narrator evaluation.
8. Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Mahdī ibn Ṣadaqah al-Raqiyy; I did not find tawthīq of him in the primary works of narrator evaluation.
9. ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb ibn Iṣḥāq ibn ‘Ammār al-Ṣayrafī; I did not find tawthīq for him.
10. Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Sa‘dābādī; I did not find tawthīq for him.
11. Al-Ḥasan ibn al-Zabarqān; “They did not mention him,” as stated by al-Shāharūdī.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt ‘ilm al-Rijāl*, 7/37 (biography number 13065).

2 Ibid., 2/425.

3 Ibid., 5/466.

4 Ibid., 2/388.

12. Abū ʿĪsā ʿUbayd Allah (ʿAbd Allāh) ibn Faḍl (al-Faḍl) ibn Muḥammad ibn Hilāl; “They did not mention him,” as stated by al-Shāharūdī.<sup>1</sup>
13. Ḥakīm ibn Dāwūd Ḥakīm; “They did not mention him,” as stated by al-Shāharūdī.<sup>2</sup>
14. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Yaʿqūb; “They did not mention him,” as stated by al-Shāharūdī.<sup>3</sup>

In conclusion, they feigned tawthīq of majhūl narrators in order to protect the words of Ibn Qūlawayh from being incorrect. This in itself is an error. It is the scourge of fanaticism and (the result of) deifying the statements of mere individuals. This is the outcome: It makes us take the religion of Allah from people about whom we know nothing of their condition, for fear of the shaykh’s mistake!

It should be noted that the first person to initiate this claim was the head of the *Akhbāriyyah* in his time, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1104 A.H). He mentioned it in the context of proving the validity and integrity of the school’s books. This is one of the deficiencies according to the *Uṣūliyyah* who oppose this methodology.

I previously alluded to the contradiction of al-Khūṭ and others in the lack of consideration for other books which stated the tawthīq of its narrators, as is the case of the book *Man La Yaḥduruhu al-Faqīh* of al-Ṣadūq. If a person were to say that there is a difference between the expressions in terms of their inferences, I mention the statement of al-Shāharūdī when he discusses the tawthīq of the narrators of *Man La Yaḥduruhu al-Faqīh*, “It is clear that that his words<sup>4</sup> are clearer and more indicative than the words of al-Qummī in his *Tafsīr*, Ibn Qūlawayh in the beginning of the work *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, and others.”<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 5/191.

2 Ibid., 3/247.

3 *Mustadrakāt ʿIlm al-Rijāl*, 6/432.

4 He means the authentication of al-Ṣadūq’s book and the tawthīq of his narrators, which total 393.

5 *Mustadrakāt ʿIlm al-Rijāl*, 1/63.

Therefore, based on this, the opinion of differentiating (between these works) is clearly contradictory.

Finally, a number of Imāmī scholars have criticized this principle. By way of example, I will mention the following:

1. ‘Alī al-Abṭaḥī states, “We have determined in its (appropriate) place the inability of establishing (all of the narrators’) reliability with that (statement).”<sup>1</sup>
2. Al-Sayyid Kāzim al-Ḥā’irī states, “And in the chain of narration is Yazīd ibn Ishāq. There is no proof of his reliability aside from the fact that he is mentioned in the sanad of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*. Such things are of no consideration to us.”<sup>2</sup>
3. Muḥammad Ishāq al-Fayāḍ states, “His mere mention in its isnād<sup>3</sup> is not sufficient for tawthīq.”<sup>4</sup>
4. ‘Alī al-Sīstānī states, “‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Sa’dābādī. He is from those who tawthīq has not been made of, even though several (people) have established his reliability based on several weak arguments. From them is the fact that he is from the teachers of Ibn Qūlawayh in the book *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt ...* His intent is not (to consider) the reliability of all those who are in the asānīd of his narrations since among them are those about whom there is no doubt regarding their weakness. His intent is not (also) the (to consider) reliability of most of his teachers since some of them do not fit the characteristic(s) that he described them with, which is that they are famous for ḥadīth and knowledge.”<sup>5</sup>

---

1 ‘Alī al-Abṭaḥī: *Risālah fī Thubūt al-Hilāl*, p.104.

2 Kāzim al-Ḥā’irī: *al-Qaḍā’ fī al-Fiqh al-Islāmī*, p. 488.

3 He means *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*.

4 Al-Fayyāḍ: *Ta’ālīq Mabsūṭah*, 5/61 (under the commentary).

5 Al-Sīstānī: *Qā’idat Lā Ḍarar wa la Ḍirār – Taqrīr Baḥth al-Sīstānī*, p. 21-22.

## 1.4 Tawthīq of a narrator on account of Ibn al-Walīd including him from the book *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* and him deeming weak those who he excluded

Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn ‘Imrān al-Ash‘arī al-Qummī authored his work *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*. Al-Najjāshī states:

كان ثقة في الحديث إلا أن أصحابنا قالوا كان يروي عن الضعفاء ويعتمد المراسيل ولا يبالي بمن أخذ  
وما عليه في نفسه مطعن في شيء

He was a *thiqah* in ḥadīth; however, our companions have stated, “He used to narrate from weak narrators and rely on *marāsīl* (pl. *mursal*). He did not care much from whom he received (knowledge). He himself has no criticism levelled against him.”

And he (i.e., al-Najjāshī) said:

نوادير الحكمة هو كتاب حسن كبير

*Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* is an extensive, great work.<sup>1</sup>

Thereafter, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Walīd—the shaykh and jurist of the people of Qum<sup>2</sup>—excluded several narrators from this book and rejected their narrations, thus implying thereby that they are unacceptable for the purpose of narrating. A number of Imāmī scholars concurred with him in his exclusion of narrators, with an unmentioned dispute about one or some of the narrators.<sup>3</sup> The number of excluded narrators from this book is twenty-four. Al-Ṭūsī added an additional two narrators in *al-Fihrist*.<sup>4</sup>

1 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 349 (biography no. 939).

2 Ibid., p. 383, biography no. 1042.

3 He is Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā ibn ‘Ubayd ibn Yaḥyā. He narrated from him with a *munqaṭi‘* (broken) isnād. There is a lengthy discussion in this regard that al-Khūṭī mentions under his biography, as mentioned in *al-Mu‘jam*, 18/122, biography no. 11536.

4 See Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Mu‘allim: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbiq*, 1/202; *Kulliyāt fī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 292; al-Subḥānī: *Durūs Mūjazzah fī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 86; Aḥmad al-Baṣrī: *Fā‘iq al-Maqāl*, p. 47.

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Walīd also rejected the statement that the author puts forward “from a person (*an rajulin*),” or “from some of our companions (*an ba‘ḍ aṣḥābinā*)” on account of them being clearly and ostensibly unknown.

Based on this, it is safe for us to say that:

1. Every narrator that Ibn al-Walīd excluded from *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* is regarded as *ḍa‘īf*. This principle was picked up thereafter by several Imāmī scholars, including some of their earlier ones.<sup>1</sup>
2. Regarding the second matter, the opinion that assumes *tawthīq*, *tahsīn* (i.e., deeming a narrator as good), or the praiseworthiness of every narrator that Ibn al-Walīd included in his book, al-Khūṭī states, “Some of them have gone the way of considering every person from whom Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā narrates from; and he was not among those narrators whom Ibn al-Walīd excluded from the narrations who Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā narrated from. That is because in Ibn al-Walīd restricting himself to those places of exclusion, it reveals that he is (implicitly) relying on all the narrations of Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā in other than the aforementioned places.”<sup>2</sup> Here, al-Khūṭī mentions the opinion without any (further) information.

Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī narrated for us several opinions of the Imāmī scholars regarding the consequences of the opinion that makes *tawthīq* of the narrators who are included. I summarize it as follows:

أنها شهادة العدالة أنها أمانة الاعتماد بل ربما يكون أمانة الوثيقة أقل مراتب المدح بل ربما جعل طريقا  
إلى التوثيق

---

1 Such as al-Ṭūsī, for example, as in the biography of Muḥammad ibn Ṭsā al-Yaqṭīn, biography no. 612, p. 171. He states, “He is weak (*ḍa‘īf*). Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bābawayh excluded him from the narrators of *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*.” This is because Ibn Bābawayh would follow his teacher, Ibn al-Walīd, in relation to this principle. The evidence shows that accepting the criticism of Ibn al-Walīd is an old opinion and is nothing new.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 16/52.



It is a testimony of ‘adālah—it is an indication of him being dependable. In fact, it can even be a sign of tawthīq—the lowest level of praise (for a narrator); it can even pave the way to tawthīq.<sup>1</sup>

However, what is interesting is the fact that the Imāmī scholars mentioned their acceptance of Ibn al-Walīd’s exclusions and the fact that it is considered a form of rebuke of the narrator since the time of al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 AH). In fact, even before al-Ṭūsī, Ibn Bābawayh (d. 381 AH) held this opinion. The apparent meaning of Ibn al-Muṭahhir al-Ḥillī’s words also indicate that he too relied on the principle that those who are excluded are to be considered ḍa‘īf, as it appears in several places in his book *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*. In this regard, he criticizes those narrators whom Ibn al-Walīd excluded, as is the case in the biography of Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā ibn ‘Ubayd, Muḥammad ibn Mūsā ibn ‘Īsā, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Jāmūrānī, Yūsuf ibn al-Sakht.

Ostensibly, al-Khūṭī’s words indicate acceptance of the claim of *taḍ‘īf* (deeming a narrator to be weak) and not necessarily the claim of *tawthīq* (i.e., for those narrators that were included), as is apparent in many places. This will be discussed later along with the difference of opinion regarding some narrators, such as Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā ibn ‘Ubayd. However, I did not find any mention from those mentioned on the issue of considering, or making tawthīq of the narrators whom Ibn al-Walīd did include. This view only came about with the last of the latter-day scholars. It seems as though it only came about as an attempt to save a number of their narrators from being considered majhūl and to rather make tawthīq of them—as has been their practice in distorting the principles of tawthīq.

In applying this principle, there is a difference of opinion among the Imāmī scholars who consider every narrator whom Ibn al-Walīd did include as either a *thiqah* (reliable) or *maqbul* (accepted): Does this include all of the narrators of the book? Or, is it only specific to the direct teachers of the author?

---

1 Jadīdī: *Mu‘jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 130.

Ja'far al-Subhānī is of the opinion that this principle is only applicable to the direct teachers. He states:

التصحيح والاستثناء راجعان إلى مشايخه بلا واسطة لا كل من جاء اسمه في إسناده ذلك الكتاب متبها إلى الإمام

The act of authenticating and exclusion (from Ibn al-Walīd's book), both, apply to his direct teaches only, not every single person whose name is mentioned in the isnād of that book ending with the Imām.<sup>1</sup>

Muslim al-Dāwūrī disagreed with al-Subhānī. He elaborated on the matter saying:

قد يحتمل أن المستثنى خصوص المشايخ المباشرين حتى تكون نتيجة ذلك توثيق المشايخ المباشرين الذين لم يستثنوا لأنه شامل لجميع أفراد السند ولكن هذا الاحتمال أيضا في غير محله وذلك لعدة قرائن منها أن بعض أفراد المستثنى ليس من المشايخ المباشرين لمحمد بن أحمد كوهب بن منبه فإنه يروي عن الصادق عليه السلام فكيف يمكن أن يروي عنه مباشرة ومنها ما تقدم من أن الصدوق عد نوادر الحكمة من الكتب المشهورة المعول عليها والمراد بذلك طبعاً بعد الاستثناء كما هو واضح فإذا كان مورداً للعمل فلا بد وأن يكون النظر في الاستثناء إلى اعتبار سائر الرواة وبقية الأسانيد (مع أنه مع مشايخه يعتبرون الوثيقة في العمل بالرواية) لا خصوص المشايخ المباشرين

It is possible that the excluded (narrators) are specific to the direct teachers (of the author) with the end result leading to the tawthīq of all the direct teachers who were included—and not that it involves all individuals of the sanad. However, this possibility is also out-of-place. This is because of a number of factors.

One such factor is based on the fact that some of the individuals that were excluded were not of the direct teachers of Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, such as Wahb ibn Munabbih. He narrates from al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, so how is it possible that he directly narrates from him?

Another factor is that, as mentioned, al-Ṣadūq regarded *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* to be of the celebrated, relied-upon books. What is meant by this, of course,

---

1 Al-Subhānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 293.

is that it is relied-upon *after* the narrators were excluded. Therefore, if the book is in a position to be acted upon (i.e., acceptable), then due consideration should be given to all of the narrators and the rest of the *asānīd* (although, with his teachers, they considered reliability based on acting upon the narration), not specifically the direct teachers.<sup>1</sup>

### **Critiquing those who make *tawthīq* of the narrators who included in *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah***

This principle is, generally speaking, similar to the previous principles in relation to how weak the inference made from it is based on its intended usage—on account of the many objections raised against it.

#### **The first objection**

The author of *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* did not mention that his work is authentic—as is the case with the previous books—such that whoever was excluded is *ḍaʿīf* and the remaining (narrators) are considered to be apparently sound.

#### **The second objection**

The narrators were merely excluded as a precautionary measure and not necessarily based on the science of *al-jarḥ wa al-taʿdīl*. Therefore, it cannot be said that whoever was included is necessarily a *thiqah*. Muḥammad al-Sanad importantly states, “The correct view is that inclusion (i.e., of the narrators) does not indicate *tawthīq*. This is because the practice of the *Qummīs* in this and other such instances is (usually) based on the method of sifting through *aḥādīth* and separating them from foisted, fabricated, and obfuscated narrations. They would resort to this method since it is quite evident that they neither restricted themselves to only narrating from reliable narrators nor appraised reports. How many narrations of a *Qummī*, such as Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā ... and other such notable *Qummī* narrators—jurists and *ḥadīth* experts alike—can a

---

1 Al-Dāwūrī: *Uṣūl ʿIlm al-Rijāl Bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Ṭaṭbīq*, 1/251.

person find wherein such individuals narrate from both weak, good, and other such narrators? This is a proof that what is meant by them from the excluded (narrators) is merely to not narrate from them in order to avoid narrating a fabricated ḥadīth, or a ḥadīth that has been clearly foisted, or a ḥadīth that has clear signs of obfuscation.”<sup>1</sup>

### The third objection

Al-Khūṭī rejected the issue of Ibn al-Walīd’s reliance on the narrator (i.e., that was included) and that it does not imply *tawthīq* or *taḥsīn* (goodness). He refutes this issue in his words that also include the issue of *Kitāb al-Nawādir*. He states:

إن اعتماد ابن الوليد أو غيره من الاعلام المتقدمين فضلا عن المتأخرين على رواية شخص والحكم بصحتها لا يكشف عن وثاقة الراوي أو حسنه وذلك لاحتمال أن الحاكم بالصحة يعتمد على أصالة العدالة ويرى حجية كل رواية يرويها مؤمن لم يظهر منه فسق وهذا لا يفيد من يعتبر وثاقة الراوي أو حسنه في حجية خبره هذا بالإضافة إلى تصحيح ابن الوليد وأضرابه من القدماء الذين قد يصرحون بصحة رواية ما أو يعتمدون عليها من دون تعرض لوثاقة روايتها وأما الصدوق فهو يتبع شيخه في التصحيح وعدمه كما صرح هو نفسه بذلك

The reliance of Ibn al-Walīd and other earlier notables—let alone other latter-day scholars—on the narration of an individual and judging it to be authentic does not necessarily reveal the said narrator’s goodness or reliability. This is because it is possible that the person judging it to be authentic is relying on the presumption that the narrator already possesses *‘adālah* (integrity) from the beginning (*aṣālat al-‘adālah*). And that he considers as binding proof the narration of a believer who has no apparent *fiṣq*. This does not necessarily imply such a narrator’s report is also binding proof. This is in addition to the authentication of Ibn al-Walīd and his likes from the earlier scholars, those who used to explicitly authenticate a ḥadīth and rely on it without getting into (investigating) the reliability of its narrators. As for al-Ṣadūq, he followed his teacher in authenticating and not authenticating (*aḥādīth*), as he himself stated.<sup>2</sup>

1 Muḥammad al-Sanad: *Buḥūth fī Mabānī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 145.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1:70.

He stated something similar when he mentioned those who regard Ibn al-Walīd's inclusion as a proof of their tawthīq. He states, "Ibn al-Walīd's inclusion in his narrators reveals Ibn Walīd's reliance on them and, therefore, he will judge them to be reliable. The answer to that has already been given under the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥammawayh."<sup>1</sup> When I went back to the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥammawayh, I found him referring us back to his previous words that he mentioned on page seventy in volume one. This proves that his previous words are not only specific to the tawthīq of the earlier scholars; rather, it also includes *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*.

### The fourth objection

In three points, Muḥammad Āṣif Muḥsinī refutes this opinion:

أولاً أن الاستثناء يرجع إلى الروايات ومتونها دون أسانيدها فلا يستفاد منه ضعف الذين استثنى روايتهم ولا وثاقة من لم يستثن روايتهم وهذا ظاهر

ثانياً يمكن أن يكون السر في الاستثناء هو العلم ببطان المتون في المذهب فلا يدل على صحّة بقية الروايات فإن المستثنى منها هي الروايات الصحيحة و المجهولة معاً دون خصوص الأولى

ثالثاً لو فرضنا دلالة الاستثناء على صحّة سائر الروايات التي لم تستثن فلا نقبله لأن تصحيح المتون و إبطالها أمر اجتهادي لا يجب أو لا يجوز تقليد مجتهد لمجتهد آخر

فلا يستفاد من الاستثناء المذكور شيع فسيحان من جعل الأفكار متفاوتة و مسائل علم الرجال متزلزلة

**Firstly**, he states that the exclusion goes back to the narrations and their texts, not their asānīd. Therefore, it can neither be understood therefrom that the narrations of those whom he excluded are weak, nor that the narrations of those whom he did not exclude are reliable. This is self-evident.

**Secondly**, it is possible that the secret in this exclusion is because of knowing that the texts, according to the school, are false. Therefore, it

1 Ibid., 13/54.

does not prove the authenticity of the other narrations, since whatever was excluded from comprise both authentic and unknown narrations, and not specifically the former.

**Thirdly**, if we assume that the exclusion suggests the authenticity of all the narrations in which narrators were not excluded, we still cannot accept this. This is because authenticating texts and rendering them *bāṭil* (false) is an *ijtihādī* (discretionary) matter. It is neither compulsory nor permitted for a mujtahid to follow another mujtahid in such a matter. Therefore, nothing can be gained from the aforementioned exclusion. Glory be to Him who made ideas divergent and the issues of narrator criticism wavering and open.<sup>1</sup>

### The fifth objection

‘Alī Akbar al-Sayfī al-Māzandarānī states:

وَأَشْكَلَ الْمُحَقِّقِ الْخَوْفِيُّ عَلَى ذَلِكَ بَأْنَ اعْتِمَادِ ابْنِ الْوَلِيدِ لَا يَكْشِفُ عَنْ حَسَنِ هَؤُلَاءِ فَضْلًا عَنْ وَثَاقَتِهِمْ إِذْ لَعَلَّهُ كَانَ يَبْنِي عَلَى أَصَالَةِ الْعَدَالَةِ وَالْعَمَلِ بِرَوَايَةِ كُلِّ شَيْعِي لَمْ يَظْهَرِ مِنْهُ فَسَقٌ وَالظَّاهِرُ أَنَّ كَلَامَهُ مَتِينٌ وَإِشْكَالُهُ فِي مَحَلِّهِ فَإِنْ اسْتِثْنَاءُ ابْنِ الْوَلِيدِ بَعْضَ رِجَالِ النُّوَادِرِ لَمَّا ثَبَتَ لَهُ مِنْ جِرْحِهِمْ أَوْ لِقْرَانِ مَوْجِبَةٍ لَسَقُوطِ رَوَايَتِهِمْ عَنِ الْإِعْتِبَارِ عِنْدَهُ لَيْسَ بِمَعْنَى شَهَادَتِهِ عَلَى وَثَاقَةِ سَائِرِ رِجَالِهِ كَمَا هُوَ وَاضِحٌ إِذْ لَعَلَّ عَدَمَ اسْتِثْنَائِهِ سَائِرَ الرِّجَالِ كَانَ لِبِنَائِهِ عَلَى أَصَالَةِ عَدَالَتِهِ مِنْ لَمْ يَرِدْ فِيهِ قَدْحٌ أَوْ لِبِنَائِهِ عَلَى عَدَالَتِهِ كُلِّ شَيْعِي لَمْ يَظْهَرِ فِيهِ فَسَقٌ كَمَا قَالَ الْمُحَقِّقُ الْمَذْكُورُ مَعَ مَا عَلِمَ مِنْ دِيْدِنِ الْقَدَمَاءِ مِنْ عَدَمِ انْحِصَارِ مَلَكَاتِ صِحَّةِ الْحَدِيثِ فِي وَثَاقَةِ رَوَاتِهِ كَمَا قَلْنَا مَرَارًا

Al-Khūī found a problem with that since Ibn al-Walīd’s doing does not necessarily reveal the goodness of these (other) narrators, let alone their reliability. This is because he may have built upon the premise that all Shīī narrators have *‘adālah* (integrity) and that their narrations should be acted upon when there is no apparent sign of *fiṣq* (sin). The ostensible meaning of his words is sound and his objection is in its place. This is the case, since Ibn al-Walīd excluded several narrators from *al-Nawādir*—when it is proven to him that their *jarḥ* was made, or, because of (other) factors necessitating

---

1 Āṣif Muḥsinī: *Buḥūth fī ‘ilm*

their narrations be discarded from being considered—this does not mean it is his testimony to the reliability of all the other narrators, as is clear. Perhaps his inclusion of all the narrators is premised upon the fact that he considers all narrators to already possess ‘adālah as long as there is nothing disparaging (said) of him. Or, it is based on the fact that he maybe considers every SHĪT narrator to possess ‘adālah as long as there is no apparent *fiṣq* (sin), as mentioned by the above-mentioned scholar. Despite what is known from the practice of the earlier scholars in not restricting the characteristics of the authenticity of ḥadīth in the mere reliability of its narrators, as we have mentioned on multiple occasions.<sup>1</sup>

### The sixth objection

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Walīd is from the extreme school of the Qummīs, those who have become famous for their extreme and radical views. In debating with the Qummīs, Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn al-Maḥmūdī refutes some of what is referred to as *al-uṣūl al-riwā’iyyah* (narration principles) and states:

هو من جملة تشدد القميين المعروف الذي هو في غير محله و الصدوق تابع لشيخه هذا في الجرح والتعديل وجمود الأتقياء قد يكون أضر في الدين من تساهل الفسقة

It is from the overall well-known extreme nature of the Qummīs, which is misplaced. Al-Ṣadūq is a follower of his teacher in matters of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*. The rigidity of the pious can sometimes be more harmful in the religion than the carelessness of the transgressors.<sup>2</sup>

The school of the Qummīs holds specific beliefs contrary to the rest of the Imāmiyyah. Thus, they differ with them on issues of creed which eventually negatively influenced their statements of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*. To such an extent that they began accusing people for the smallest of things, as the contemporary

1 ‘Alī Akbar al-Māzandarānī: *Miqyās al-Ruwāt fi Kulliyāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 165.

2 *Al-Uṣūl al-Sittah ‘Ashara min al-Uṣūl al-Awwaliyyah*, p. 28. Al-Ṣadūq also followed ibn al-Walīd on the issue of Ibn al-Walīd’s exclusions; he is a mere follower of his in most of his opinions.

Imāmīs maintain. This matter reached such a point with them that they even attempted to kill those who opposed them, as Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī mentioned under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Awramah when he was accused of holding extreme views. The Ashā'irah<sup>1</sup> agreed to kill him at night!<sup>2</sup>

They rejected certain narrators from Qum, as stated by al-Kashshī under the biography of al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Muḥarrar; he was expelled from Qum at a time when they would expel anyone who they accused of holding extreme views.<sup>3</sup>

Therefore, the methodology of the Qummīs in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl—at the head of which is Ibn al-Walīd and Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī—is unsatisfactory to many scholars of the Imāmiyyah because of the extreme nature of their positions. Al-Wahīd al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 AH) states:

أن كثيرا من القدماء سيما القميين منهم و الغضائري كانوا يعتقدون للأئمة (ع) منزلة خاصة من الرفعة والجلالة ومرتبة معينة من العصمة والكمال بحسب اجتهادهم ورأيهم وما كانوا يجوزون التعدي عنها وكانوا يعدون التعدي ارتفاعا وغلوا على حسب معتقدهم حتى أنهم جعلوا مثل السهو عنهم غلوا .... وبالجملة الظاهر أن القدماء كانوا مختلفين في المسائل الأصولية أيضا فربما كان شيء عند بعضهم فاسدا أو كفرا غلوا أو تفويضا أو جبرا أو تشبيها أو غير ذلك وكان عند آخر مما يجب اعتقاده

Many of the earlier scholars, especially the Qummīs among them and al-Ghaḍā'irī, used to believe, according to their opinion and independent judgement, that the Imāms held both a high and exalted rank high, and a designated rank of perfection and infallibility. They would not permit going beyond this. For them, going beyond this would be considered a form of extremism, according to their varying beliefs. To such an extent that they considered a mistake on their part as (a form of) extremism... In general, it seems as though the latter-day scholars would differ in

---

1 He is not referring to the famous scholastic theological school; rather, he means here the Ashā'irah from Qum in terms of their lineage, not creed.

2 Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī: *al-Rijāl*, p. 94.

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl*, p. 512, biography no. 990.



regards to the primary issues as well; it is possible for some to consider something completely *fāsid* (false) or to be a form of extreme kufr, or for a theological issue to imply *tafwīd* (relegation), *jabar* (coercion), *tashbīh* (anthropomorphism), or something similar and, for others, necessary to believe.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, the statements of narrator criticism by the Qummīs are not relied-upon.

We also say to those who consider as reliable the narrators who have been included: Is it possible for you to mention to us the names of those you claim are reliable in the book *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*? How can their names be known when the book is lost and there is no trace of it? It is for this reason that Muslim al-Dāwarī counted the number of narrators that Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Ash‘arī, the author of the book, narrated from. He gathered them from books other than *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*, such as the two *Tahdhīb*s of al-Ṭūsī and *al-Faqīh* of al-Ṣadūq. He did this because the book *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* is lost and does not exist. The number of narrators reached 646.<sup>2</sup>

The act of al-Dāwarī gathering (the names of) those who Muḥammad al-Ash‘arī narrated from does not actually bring about the desired result. This is because al-Ash‘arī’s narration from a teacher in any given book does not necessarily mean that he narrated from him in another book. Therefore, al-Ash‘arī narrating from so-and-so, as transmitted from al-Ṭūsī in *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* does not mean this, and it is (also) not necessary that his narration from that particular narrator be in the lost book, *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*.

In providing the foundational basis for an important principle, Āṣif Muḥsinī states:

---

1 Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī: *Ta’līqatun ‘alā Manhaj al-Maqāl li al-Astrābādī*, 1/128 (under the second point entitled “Qawluhum Kāna min Ahl al-Ṭayyārah”).

2 Al-Dāwarī: *Uṣūl ‘ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 1:211.

لم يدلل على أن الشيخ [ الطوسي ] لم يرو في التهذيبين عن غير كتاب نواذر الحكمة لمحمد بن أحمد بن يحيى إذ مع احتمال روايته عنه في غيره لا مجال لتوثيق كل من روى عنه محمد بن أحمد بن يحيى حتى على نظره

It cannot be corroborated that al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) did not narrate in the two *Tahdhīb*s from other than the book *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* of Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā. Because with the possibility of narrating from him somewhere else, it is not the place of tawthīq of every narrator from whom Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā narrated from, even in his own eyes.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, it is not possible to accept the claim of anyone’s narration in *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* except with explicit textual evidence. And, even with this, it does not necessarily mean tawthīq (of that narrator), as mentioned. Rather, to explain the falsity of whoever claims knowledge of the narrators of that book. An example of this is al-Ṣadūq explicitly mentioning that he took ḥadīth from *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*. He mentioned in the beginning that he transmits in *al-Faqīh* from sources, including *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*. Then he states in the book, “In the book of Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā ibn ‘Imrān al-Ash‘arī from — Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim from —Muḥammad ibn Sinān...”<sup>2</sup>

This is clear textual evidence that is neither interpretable nor open to (different) possibilities that proves Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim and Muḥammad ibn Sinān are from the narrators of this book. Other than this cannot be accepted in relation to establishing the existence of so-and-so a narrator in *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*. Therefore, only if there is clear textual evidence (will we accept such a claim). If not, then such a claim remains unfounded. This is simply because the claim lacks clear proof. In addition to this, also bearing in mind that the mere existence of a narrator in this book does not necessarily give credit to him.

In any case, I reviewed all the names that al-Dāwurī mentioned. I took assistance from the book *al-Mufīd min Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, so as to know the condition of

---

1 Āṣif Muḥsinī: *Buḥūth fi ‘Ilm al-Rijāl* (4th ed.), p. 477 (in the margin).

2 Al-Ṣadūq: *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruḥu al-Faqīh*, 1/562. ḥadīth no. 1549.

the narrators whom the proponents of this principle claim that they exist in the book. Accordingly, the number of narrators, whose names are complete—so as to ease study of their biographies—whom the book *al-Mufīd* judged to be Majhūl are 135, which is a summary of the statements of al-Khūī. Therefore, what tawthīq are they speaking of?

All of this knowing that I have left out the biographies of two-hundred narrators who share similar names with many narrators, or are unknown and require the researcher to extend much effort in figuring out the state of each narrator. I also did not mention the narrator who has been described as ‘weak,’ or has been described as ‘malignant,’ or such a narrator whose tawthīq has not been established. This is only regarding the majhūl narrators!

After this, how can it be said that whoever exists in the chain of narration of *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* is regarded as reliable, knowing that the number contains narrators more than half of who are either majhūl, ḍaʿīf, or *khabīth* (wretched)?

## Chapter Two

### Between al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī: The Critics Whose Statements in al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl Are Relied Upon

- 2.1 The critics of the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah whose statements are relied upon in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl
- 2.2 The non-Imāmī critics whose statements are relied upon in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl according to the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah
- 2.3 The methodology of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī in dealing with contradictory statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl
- 2.4 Al-Khū'ī's position on the statements of tawthīq of his scholarly predecessors



## 2.1 The critics of the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah whose statements are relied upon in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl

### 2.1.1 Al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ

Al-Ṭūsī states:

نصر بن صباح يكنى أبا القاسم من أهل بلخ لقي جملة من كان في عصره من المشايخ و العلماء و روى عنهم إلا أنه قيل أنه كان من الطيارة غال

Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ, given the *kunya*h (teknonym) Abū al-Qāsim, is from the inhabitants of Balkh. He met most of the teachers and scholars in his time and narrated from them. However, it has been said that he was an *ghālin* (extremist) from the Ṭayyārah.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ṭūsī was not the only one to describe al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ as being extreme (i.e., in his views). In fact, both Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī<sup>2</sup> and al-Najjāshī agreed with him.<sup>3</sup>

The issue of al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ's extremism has been questioned and it was (eventually) rejected by the scholars of the Imāmiyyah. In fact, he was effectively absolved from the (allegations of) extremism and any reliance thereupon.<sup>4</sup>

In short, there is a difference of opinion regarding al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ. Opinions range between being reliable, good, weak, and extreme. However, despite this, he

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 494, biography number 6385.

2 Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī: *al-Rijāl*, p. 120, biography number 201.

3 Al-Najjāshī: *al-Rijāl*, p. 428, biography number 1149, without describing him with weakness (d'uf).

4 Al-Kalbāsī: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah li Abī al-Ma'ālī al-Kalbāsī*, 1/336. See his book: *al-Du'āfā'*, 3/38 by Ḥusayn al-Sā'idī. Al-Māmaqānī stated al-Naṣr to be "deemed weak, with the more preponderant position being that he is good," as mentioned in *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/158. Hāshim Ma'rūf al-Ḥasanī regarded him to be of those who "initiated the foundations for the science of narrators and the in-depth study thereof, such that the narrations of the deviant and accused were not mixed up with the narrations of those deemed reliable of the Shī'ah, whose creed and beliefs of Shī'ism is balanced." From the book *Dirāsāt fi al-Ḥadīth wa al-Muḥaddithīn* of Hāshim Ma'rūf al-Ḥasanī, p. 28.

is frequently relied upon by Abū ‘Umar al-Kashshī in matters related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl in his book. In fact, because of this, al-Khawājū’ī states:

أنه لو لم يكن نصر بن صباح ثقة معتمدا عليه يلزم أن يكون كتاب الكشي في الأكثر بلا فائدة لأنه أكثر من النقل عنه

If Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ was not a *thiqah* and not to be relied-upon, this would render most of al-Kashshī’s book unbeneficial since he frequently transmits from him.<sup>1</sup>

It is a known fact that almost every person that came after al-Kashshī frequently narrated from al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ—which al-Kashshī transmits; however, they differ about whether his statements are acceptable. This difference of opinion is based on the condition of al-Naṣr himself. At this juncture, it is important for us to know the opinions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū’ī on this matter.

### **The position of Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥillī regarding the statements of tawthīq of al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ**

Al-Ḥillī considers the statements of al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ in matters of al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl as unreliable, even though he (i.e., al-Ḥillī) frequently mentions him in his book al-Khulāṣah. However, at times, he mentions his opinion and then mentions his condition and the fact that he is unreliable. Other times, he mentions a statement of his and approves of it without mentioning his condition. Thus, under the biography of Ja‘far ibn Bashīr, we find al-Ḥillī saying:

قال الكشي قال نصر أخذ جعفر بن بشير فضرب ولقي شدة حتى خلاصه الله تعالى ومات في طريق مكة وصاحب المأمون بعد موت الرضا عليه السلام

Al-Kashshī states, “Naṣr said, ‘Ja‘far ibn Bashīr was taken and beaten. He met with a lot of difficulty until Allah ﷻ freed him from it. He died on

---

1 Abū al-Ma‘ālī Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbāsī narrated from him in *al-Fawā’id al-Rijāliyyah*, 3/501.

the way to Makkah. He was the companion of al-Māmūn after the death of al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.”<sup>1</sup>

This (is mentioned) without al-Ḥillī mentioning any dispraise of al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ!

At times, we find al-Ḥillī expressing his opinion on Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ, as he states under the biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Sariyy:

قال الكشي في موضع آخر قال نصر بن الصباح علي بن إسماعيل ثقة وهو علي بن السري فقلب إسماعيل بالسري ونصر بن الصباح ضعيف عندي لا أعتبر بقوله لكن الاعتماد على تعديل النجاشي له

Al-Kashshī states in another place, “Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ said, “Alī ibn Ismā‘īl is a thiqaḥ. He is ‘Alī ibn al-Sariyy; (the name) Ismā‘īl was substituted with al-Sariyy.” Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ is ḍa‘īf according to me; I do not take into consideration his statements. However, the reliance (on him) is based on al-Najjāshī’s ta‘dīl of him.<sup>2</sup>

In short, the original position of al-Ḥillī in his book is a rejection and non-reliance upon the opinions of Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ regarding narrators. This is because he explicitly stated that he is weak on more than one occasion. However, he contradicts this opinion in other places.

### **The position of al-Khū‘ī regarding the statements of tawthīq of al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ**

The opinion of al-Khū‘ī regarding al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ is similar to al-Ḥillī’s. At times, he mentions him in affirmation of his statement.<sup>3</sup> Other times, he mentions him in confutation of his statement. Perhaps his opinion about Ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ is

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 89, biography number 190.

2 Ibid, p. 181, biography number 539.

3 This occurs frequently in *Mu‘jam al-Rijāl*, as under the biography of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Khawātimī (7:593560), and other such places.

what he stated under the biography of ‘Alī al- Sanadī, “Al-Kashshī states, ‘Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ; ‘Alī ibn Ismā‘īl said he is a thiqaḥ.’ He (‘Alī ibn Ismā‘īl) is ‘Alī ibn al-Sanadī, with the epithet (*laqab*) Ismā‘īl al-Sanadī.” Then al-Khūṭ followed this up by saying, “There is no reliance on the statement of Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ.”<sup>1</sup>

Under the biography of Ḥammād ibn ‘Īsā, he also stated, “In general, Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ’s words are not to be relied upon.”<sup>2</sup>

Based on this opinion, it becomes necessary to impose upon both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ a rejection of all the narrations and opinions that appear in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* in which al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ appears. As a result, it becomes similar to what al-Khawājūṭī stated in his previous statement, “This would render most of al-Kashshī’s book of no benefit.”<sup>3</sup>

### 2.1.2 Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī al-Najjāshī (d. 450 AH)

He is Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-‘Abbās al-Najjāshī al-Asadī al-Kūfī.

Al-Ḥillī stated:

ثقة معتمد عليه عندي له كتاب الرجال نقلنا منه كتابنا هذا وغيره أشياء كثيرة

According to me, (he is) reliable (and) to be relied-upon. He has a work on narrators; we have transmitted this book and many other things from him.<sup>4</sup>

Al-Khūṭī stated:

هو خريت [ ماهر أو حاذق ] هذه الصناعة و المتسالم عليه بالوثاقة

He is an expert of this craft and is considered reliable.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 13:50, biography number 8195.

2 Ibid, 7:241, biography number 3972.

3 Abū al-Ma‘ālī Muḥammad al-Kalbāsī narrated this from him in *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, 3/501.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 27, biography number 118.

5 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 2/166, biography number 685.



Baḥr al-‘Ulūm (d. 1212 AH) described him saying:

أحد المشايخ الثقات و العدول الأثبات من أعظم أركان الجرح والتعديل وأعظم علماء هذا السبيل أجمع  
علماؤنا بالاعتماد عليه و أطبقوا على الاستناد في أحوال الرجال إليه

One of the reliable and trustworthy teachers. (He was) from the greatest ‘pillars’ of the science of al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl and scholars of this path. There is a consensus among our scholars regarding his reliability and relying on him for knowing the conditions of narrators.<sup>1</sup>

Āghābuzruk al-Ṭahrānī stated:

وهو أفضل من خط في علم الرجال أو نطق بضم لا يقاس بسواه ولا يعدل به من عداه بل قوله المقدم عند  
المعارضة على غيره من أئمة الرجال

And he is the most virtuous to have written and spoken on the science of al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl. In this regard, no one else’s (statements) can either be measured by his nor reverted to. In fact, when there is contradictory evidence, his statement is to be preferred over the other imāms of the science of narrator evaluation.<sup>2</sup>

He is the author of one of the primary works on narrator evaluation according to the Imāmiyyah, famously known as *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*. This has already been discussed.

Whoever studies the *Khulāṣah* of al-Ḥillī will see the extent to which he follows the statements of al-Najjāshī. Under his comments in *al-Khulāṣah* regarding the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Maymūn, al-Shahīd al-Thānī states:

أن الذي اعتبرناه بالاستقراء من طريقة العلامة في الخلاصة أن ما يحكيه أولا من كتاب النجاشي ثم يعقبه  
بغيره إن اقتضى الحال

1 Baḥr al-‘Ulūm: *Rijāl Baḥr al-‘Ulūm (al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah)*, 2/35.

2 Āghābuzruk al-Ṭahrānī: *al-Dharī'ah*, 10/154.

That which we consider through empirical evidence through al-‘Allāmah in *al-Khulāṣah* is what he narrates from al-Najjāshī firstly. Thereafter, if the situation requires, (we consider) whatever he criticizes thereafter of al-Najjāshī’s statements with others’ (statements).<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī, as well, respects and venerates the statements of al-Najjāshī to such an extent that he commences many biographies with “al-Najjāshī stated.”<sup>2</sup> Thus, it is the first thing he begins the biographies with.

A-Ḥillī in *al-Khulāṣah*, despite him generally refuting the narrations of his opponents in relation to creedal matters, prefers the statements of al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī over the method that he (himself) follows. Under the biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Faḍḍāl, he stated, “Al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī both testified to his reliability. Therefore, I rely upon his narration, even though his school (of thought) is *fāsid* (incorrect).”<sup>3</sup>

In short, according to everyone, he is unquestionably reliable.

### 2.1.3 Al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān

Al-Najjāshī states:

الفضل بن شاذان بن الخليل أبو محمد الأزدي النيشابوري (النيسابوري) كان أبوه من أصحاب يونس  
و روى عن أبي جعفر الثاني وقيل [عن] الرضا أيضا عليهما السلام وكان ثقة أحد أصحابنا الفقهاء  
والمتكلمين وله جلالة في هذه الطائفة وهو في قدره أشهر من أن نصفه

---

1 Abū al-Ma‘ālī Muḥammad al-Kalbāsī transmitted from him in *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, 1/457. The book’s editor, Muḥammad Ḥusayn, points this out in the marginal notes, “The explanatory remarks of the al-Shahīd al-Thānī on *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*: 33.”

2 As in many biographies—we can say that all of al-Najjāshī’s book was emptied and placed into *Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* of al-Khūṭī. See, for example, the following biography numbers in the first volume: 28, 37, 43, 69, 73, and 78. All of them commence with al-Najjāshī’s words. This is al-Khūṭī’s method in his entire *Mu‘jam*.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 177, biography no. 526.

Al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān ibn al-Khalīl Abū Muḥammad al-Azdī al-Nayshābūrī (al-Naysābūrī); his father was from the companions of Yūnus. He narrated from Abū Ja‘far al-Thānī. It has been said that he also narrated from al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. He was a thiqaḥ, one of our jurists and theologians. He has a prestigious rank in this group. He is, in his notoriety, more famous that we can describe him.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī described him saying:

وهذا الشيخ أجل من أن يغمز عليه فإنه رئيس طائفتنا

This shaykh is greater than can be pointed out. He is the leader of our group.<sup>2</sup>

Despite al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān being praised by the Imāmī scholars and them narrating many narrations in his virtue, we find, at the same time, him saying, “Verily Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is in the seven skies above the ‘arsh, as He described Himself. And He is a *jism* (i.e., has a body).”

According to the latter-day Imāmī scholars, this type of belief is considered a major and unforgiveable sin. In the same narration, the Infallible (according to the Imāmiyyah) says about him:

هذا الفضل بن شاذان مالنا وله يفسد علينا موالينا ويزين لهم الأباطيل وكلما كتبنا إليهم كتابا اعترض علينا في ذلك وأنا أتقدم إليه أن يكف عنا وإلا والله سألت الله أن يرميه بمرض لا يندمل جرحه منه في الدنيا ولا في الآخرة

This al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān; what do we have to do with him? He has corrupted our *mawālī* (associates) and beautified falsities for them. Every time we wrote to them, he objected. I approached him to stop this, and if he does not. By Allah, I asked Allah to afflict him with such a disease that

1 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 306, biography number 840.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 229, biography number 769.

will neither heal in this world nor the Hereafter.”<sup>1</sup>

In short, despite what al-Ma‘ṣūm stated about him, we find al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān reliable according to both al-Ḥillī<sup>2</sup> and al-Khūṭī<sup>3</sup> in rulings about narrators. However, al-Khūṭī does not consider what ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Qutaybah—the student of al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān—transmits from his teacher, despite the fact that most of the statements of al-Faḍl are transmitted via this same Ibn Qutaybah. This is because al-Khūṭī states, “‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Qutaybah, even though he is from al-Kashshī’s teachers, his reliability is unestablished. Therefore, what he transmits from al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān is not proven.”<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl; Rijāl al-Kashshī*, p. 541, biography number 1026. In attempting to censure the narrator of this story, al-Khūṭī states, “‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Qutaybah—he has not been deemed reliable. Therefore, the narration is not to be relied upon.” He stated this in *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 14/315. In response, I (i.e., the author) say: ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Qutaybah was deemed reliable by Aḥmad al-Baṣrī in *Fā‘iq al-Maqāl*, p. 135 (no. 714); al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 177 (no. 527); al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1:109; al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, 5/446. Al-Majlisī made *taḥsīn* (i.e., deemed it to be sound) in *Rijāl al-Majlisī*, p. 265 (no. 1283). The scholars of the Shī‘ah have many excuses and justifications regarding this narration. Among them is what is mentioned in *al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī* (p. 214)—it is important to note what justification is mentioned of the incident in the text of al-Kashshī’s book; it seems as though the justification is from the words of al-Ṭūsī who summarized the book, and not from al-Kashshī himself—who mentioned the narration. What indicates to this is the fact that it came near the end of these justifications. “It is said that al-Faḍl has 160 works, we have mentioned some of them in *al-Fihrist*.” This proves that it is the words of al-Ṭūsī which he mixed with the text (of the ḥadīth); this increases the doubt in the reality of this book and, as such, it is necessary to point out. (I say) for arguments sake: If the justification is from al-Kashshī’s own words, he is narrating it from Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb Abū ‘Alī al-Bayhaqī. Accordingly, the question arises here: Is Aḥmad ibn Ya‘qūb reliable? The answer is no. Al-Shāharūdī states in *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, “They did not mention him” (1/458). Therefore, nothing is known of his condition except that he prayed for al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān. Does he become reliable by merely praying for al-Faḍl? This is, indeed, strange. How can he be relied upon in making taḍṭīf of a narration that has an authentic chain?

2 As in the book *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* of al-Ḥillī under biography numbers 140, 165, 405, and many other such places.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, vol. 1 (biography no. 190, vol. 4, biography no. 1581, and other such places.

4 *Ibid.*, 8/175 (no. 4524).

### 2.1.4 The Qūmmīs

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī (d. 626 AH) states in *Muʿjam al-Buldān*:

قم بالضم وتشديد الميم وهي كلمة فارسية وهي مدينة مستحدثة إسلامية لا أثر للأعاجم فيها وأول من مصرها طلحة بن الأحوص الأشعري قال البلاذري لما انصرف أبو موسى الأشعري من نهاوند إلى الأهواز أتى قم فأقام عليها أياما وافتتحها وقيل وجه الأحنف بن قيس فافتتحها عنوة وذلك في سنة ٢٣ للهجرة وذكر بعضهم أن قم بين أصبهان وسأوة وأهلها كلهم شيعة إمامية وكان بدء تمصيرها في أيام الحجاج بن يوسف سنة ٨٣

Qum—a Persian word... It is a newly developed Islamic city with no trace of non-Arabs in it. Ṭalḥah ibn al-Aḥwas al-Ashʿarī founded it... Al-Balādhurī stated, “When Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī left Nahāwand for al-Ahwāz... he came to Qum and remained there for a few days and (eventually) conquered it. It has been said that al-Aḥnaf ibn Qays conquered it by force in the year 23 AH. Some have mentioned that Qum stands between Aṣbahān and Sāwah... All of its people are Imāmī Shīʿah. The beginning of it becoming a city-state was in the days of al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, in the year 83 AH.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥamawī states:

كمدان هو اسم قم في أيام الفرس فلما فتحها المسلمون اختصروا اسمها كما ذكرنا في قم

Kumdān: The name of Qum in the days of the Persians. When the Muslims conquered it, they shortened it to Qum, as we have mentioned in (the section on) Qum.<sup>2</sup>

Before speaking on this matter, it is necessary for us to know the underlying reason as to why the Qummīs were granted a distinct level of reverence by the Imāmī scholars, and why they venerate them in all of the different sciences.

Qum and its people, according to what the Imāmiyyah believe, enjoy a special status, to such an extent that they mention narrations about them. From these narrations comes what al-Majlisī mentioned of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq’s statement:

---

1 *Muʿjam al-Buldān*, 3/436.

2 *Ibid.*, 3/497.

أهل قم مغفور لهم قال فوثب الرجل على رجله وقال يا ابن رسول الله هذا خاصة لأهل قم قال نعم ومن يقول بمقاتلتهم ثم قال أزيدك قال نعم حدثني أبي عن أبيه عن جده قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله نظرت إلى بقعة بأرض الجبل خضراء أحسن لونا من الزعفران وأطيب رائحة من المسك وإذا فيها شيخ بارك على رأسه برنس فقلت حبيبي جبرئيل ما هذه البقعة قال فيها شيعة وصيك علي بن أبي طالب قلت فمن الشيخ البارك فيها قال ذلك إبليس اللعين عليه اللعنة قلت فما يريد منهم قال يريد أن يصددهم عن ولاية وصيك علي ويدعوهم إلى الفسق والفجور فقلت يا جبرئيل أهو بنا إليه فأهوى بنا إليه في أسرع من برق خاطف فقلت له قم يا ملعون فشارك المرجئة في نسائهم وأموالهم لأن أهل قم شيعتي وشيعة وصيي علي بن أبي طالب

“The people of Qum are forgiven.”

A man jumped up on to his feet and said, “O, son of the Messenger of Allah! Is this specific to the people of Qum?”

He said, “Yes. And whoever says the same as they do.”

Then he said, “Should I give you more (information about them)?” The man answered, “Yes.”

He said, “My father narrated to me, from his father, from his grandfather who said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, ‘I looked at a green patch (of the earth) on the mountain ground, better in colour than saffron and better smelling than musk. Suddenly, there was an elderly man with a hooded cloak kneeling down. I said, ‘My love, Jibrīl, what is this patch?’ He said, ‘In it are the Shī’ah of your waṣīyy (authorized agent), ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.’ I said, ‘Who is the elderly man kneeling in it?’ He said, ‘That is the accursed Iblīs, may the curse (of Allah) be upon him.’ I said, ‘What does he want from them?’ He said, ‘He wants to stop them from the wilāyah of your waṣīyy and invite them to open transgression and immorality.’ I said, ‘O Jibrīl, lunge (the both of us) towards him.’ And so, he lunged towards him faster than a lightning bolt. I said to him, ‘Get up, O accursed one and (rather) associate with the *Murji’ah* in their women and possessions for the people of Qum are my Shī’ah (group) and the Shī’ah of my waṣīyy, ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.’”<sup>1</sup>

1 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 57/218, ḥadīth no. 48.

They narrate from al-Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq that he said:

على قم ملك رفر ف عليها بجناحيه سلام الله على أهل قم يسقي الله بلادهم الغيث وينزل عليهم البركات  
ويبدل الله سيئاتهم حسنات

Upon Qum is an angel that flaps its wings over them ... May the peace of Allah be upon the people of Qum (and) may He grant them abundance in water in their town and bring forth blessings. And may He change their bad actions to good ones.<sup>1</sup>

What is important at this juncture for us is the high academic standing for the people of Qum. Al-Majlisī states:

وروي عن الأئمة عليهم السلام لولا القميون لضاع الدين

It has been narrated by the Imāms عليهم السلام, “Had it not been for the Qummīs, the religion would cease to exist.”<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, the people of Qum are the protectors of the religion and the Sharī‘ah. Therefore, the scholars of the Imāmiyyah rely upon their statements—from which includes what they mention about (the science of) al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl. To such an extent that Rafī‘ al-Dīn al-Rashtī considered the words “the Qummīs reliance upon him, and the Qummīs narrating from him” as something favourable for a particular narrator.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 57/217, ḥadīth no. 46.

2 Ibid., 57/217, ḥadīth no. 43.

3 Al-Rashtī: *Risālat fi ‘Ilm al-Dirāyah*—printed among the booklets in *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābili, 2/311. ‘Alī al-Naqwī al-Hindī mentioned something similar in his book *al-Jawāhir al-‘Azīzah fi Sharḥ al-Wajīzah* (p. 391); Ḥasan al-Ṣadr: *Nihāyat al-Dirāyah*, p. 416; al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī: *al-Fawā‘id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 49; al-Kajūrī al-Shīrāzī: *al-Fawā‘id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 107; Mullā ‘Alī Kanī: *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl fi ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 208; ‘Alī al-Burūjardī: *Ṭarā‘if al-Maqāl*, 2/263; Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Kalbāsī: *al-Fawā‘id al-Rijāliyyah*, 1/253; ‘Alī al-Khāqānī: *Rijāl al-Khāqānī*, p. 102, and many others.

In describing the poet, Aḥmad ibn ‘Alawiyyah al-Aṣbahānī, al-Amīnī writes:

و حسبنا آية لثقتنا اعتماد القميين عليه مع تسرعهم في الوقعة بأدنى غميرة في الرجل

The fact that the Qummīs rely upon him suffices us as a proof to indicate his reliability and their hastening to his defence for the slightest of blemishes in the man.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, the scholars of the Imāmiyyah made the Qummīs a means by which judgements of narrations are passed. If they intend tawthīq of a narrator, they mention the reliance the Qummīs have on him. But if they perceive some benefit in making tawthīq of him despite the Qummīs judging him to be weak, the situation changes and they then say as Baḥr al-‘Ulūm (d. 1212 AH) said:

في الاعتماد على تضعيف القميين وقدحهم في الأصول والرجل كلام معروف فإن طريقتهم في الانتقاد تخالف ما عليه جماهير النقاد

There is a well-known discussion regarding the Qummīs’ *taḍ‘īf* (rendering a narrator as weak) in the primary works and the works of narrator criticism; their method in criticizing (narrators) is different to the majority’s method of criticism.<sup>2</sup>

As for the Qummīs, according to al-Ḥillī, they are the ‘pillars’ of al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl. To such an extent that he would refrain from and suspend judgement on a narrator if he found an (existing) opinion of the Qummīs regarding him. An example of this is al-Ḥillī’s statement under the biography of al-Ḥusayn ibn Yazīd ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Nawfalī:

---

1 ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad al-Amīnī al-Najafī – *al-Ghadīr*, 3/350.

2 Baḥr al-‘Ulūm: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah (Rijāl Baḥr al-‘Ulūm)*, 2/368. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī states, “There is a well-known discussion regarding the Qummīs’ *taḍ‘īf* (rendering a narrator as weak) in the primary works and the works of narrator criticism; their method in criticizing (narrators) is different to the majority’s method of criticism, as well as their hastening to criticize without any apparent reason are things which cause the expert and intelligent (person) to doubt.” *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 1/65.



قال قوم من القميين أنه غلا في آخر عمره والله أعلم وقال النجاشي وما رأينا له رواية تدل على هذا وأما عندي في روايته توقف لمجرد ما نقله عن القميين وعدم الظفر بتعديل الأصحاب له

A group of people from the Qummīs stated, “He became extreme (in his views) at the end of his life. And Allah knows best.” Al-Najjāshī states, “We have not seen a narration proving this.” As for my opinion, there is to be a suspension of judgement on his narrations for the mere fact of what he (i.e., al-Najjāshī) narrated from the Qummīs. And also because of the fact that the companions (i.e., our scholars) were unable to successfully ascertain any type of statement of ta’dīl for him.<sup>1</sup>

The evidence here lies in the fact that al-Ḥillī refrained from making tawthīq of the narrator and placed him among the weak narrators, despite the fact that al-Najjāshī cleared his name from the accusation of holding extreme views. Al-Ḥillī did not enact his normal judgement of presuming his ‘adālah<sup>2</sup>—which he employed in making tawthīq of many (other) narrators. All of this because of the respect and reverence he holds for the Qummīs’ criticism of this narrator.

As for al-Khūī, he recounts their statements mostly through what al-Najjāshī, al-Ṭūsī, or Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī narrate from them.<sup>3</sup> The Qummīs are many, the most famous of them include Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī, Ibn al-Walīd—who was previously mentioned in the book *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*—and others.

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 399, biography no. 1340. As for what al-Ḥillī narrated from al-Najjāshī, this is found in *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 38, biography no. 77.

2 In explaining the understanding of the presumption of ‘adālah (*aṣālat al-‘adālah*) according to al-Ḥillī, Bāqir al-Ayrawānī states in his book, *Durūs Tamhīdiyyah fī al-Qawā’id al-Rijāliyyah* (p. 122): “I.e., the presumed state of every Imāmī about whom no statements of tawthīq or taḍfīf appear is ‘adālah (i.e., that he possesses integrity). And despite al-Ḥillī’s respect for al-Najjāshī, he did not attempt to exonerate him for any wrongdoing from the narrator; he feared (for himself) the rebuke of the Qummīs and so he suspended judgement.

3 As in many biographies, among them in *al-Mu’jam*, numbers 521, 861, 3435, and many other such places.

### 2.1.5 Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī

The opinions of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī expressed in his book, *al-Rijāl*, are regarded to be from the problematic issues. In fact, it led to many scholarly debates among the scholars of narrator criticism of the Imāmiyyah.

Before speaking about his condition of acceptability and opinions, we need to firstly ascertain who Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, the author of the book, is. Imāmī scholars differed in answering this question. They hold the following two opinions:

1. The book is written by Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Ibrāhīm Abī al-Ḥusayn al-Wāsiṭī al-Baghdādī. Famously known as Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī.<sup>1</sup>
2. The book is written by al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Ubayd Allāh ibn Ibrāhīm Abī al-Ḥusayn al-Baghdādī, who died in the year 411 AH.<sup>2</sup> He is the father of Aḥmad in the first opinion. Al-Shahīd al-Thānī<sup>3</sup> held this view. This view is not too popular with the latter-day scholars.

Therefore, the preponderant views are between the son and his father. However, most of the Imāmī scholars hold the view that the book was authored by the son, Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Māmaqānī states, “Al-Ghaḍā'ir is the plural of al-Ghaḍārah. It is pottery made from pure, green clay. The work of their ancestors was to make the aforementioned type of pottery. Or, al-Ghaḍā'ir is the plural of al-Ghaḍīrah. It is smooth land with pure soil and sweet water; it was their dwelling” (*Tanqīh al-Maqāl*, 1/57).

2 Al-Ṭūsī alluded to the date of his death in his work on ḥadīth narrators, p. 425, biography number 6117.

3 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī transmitted this from him in *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/45. He ascribed it to him in the marginalia saying, “In his authorizations for the father of al-Bahā'ī, See: *al-Biḥār*, 18/160.” Al-Tustarī refuted the opinion of al-Shahīd al-Thānī.

4 Of those who held this opinion are: al-Māmaqānī *Tanqīh al-Maqāl*, 1/57; Zakiyy al-Dīn al-Qahbā'ī (d. 1021 AH): *Majma' al-Rijāl*, 1/108; Muḥammad al-Bahbūdī: *Ma'rifat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 110; Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kullīyyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 84; 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 37; Muḥammad al-Sanad: *Buḥūth fī Mabānī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 308; Mīr Dāmād Muḥammad al-Astarābādī: *al-Rawāshih al-Samāwiyyah*, p. 81 (35) He says about him, “(He is) Quick to make taḍṭīf for the slightest reason.”; Muḥammad al-Karbāsī: *Ikhlāl al-Manhaj fī Tahqīq al-Maṭlab*, p. 109; Baḥr al-'Ulūm: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, 4/153; Ḥusayn al-Rāḍī: *Tārīkh 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 106; Muṣṭafā al-Tiffarishī: *Naqd al-Rijāl*, 2/98; al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/446; 'Abd al-Nabīyy al-Kāzīmī states in *Takmilat al-Rijāl* (1/212), “Thus, most hold the view that it is Aḥmad.”

After establishing that the book is written by the son, Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghaḍā'irī—as most believe—the question arises: What is Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ghaḍā'irī's condition in terms of acceptability and what is his academic standing?

The Imāmī scholars differed and hold two distinct positions in this regard:

The first position holds that he is unreliable. Al-Māmaqānī (d. 1351 AH) states:

اعترف جمع منهم الشيخ نجل الشهيد الثاني و صاحب النقد و الميرزا المجلسي في البحار و صاحب الحاوي [ عبد النبي الجزائري ] و غيرهم بعدم الوقوف على جرح فيه ولا تعديل بل في البحار أن صاحب رجال ابن الغضائري إن كان الحسين فهو من أجلة الثقات و إن كان أحمد فلا أعتد عليه كثيرا و على أي حال الاعتماد على هذا الكتاب يوجب رد أكثر أخبار الكتب المشهورة

A group from among them, including the son of al-Shahīd al-Thānī, the author of *al-Naqd*, al-Mirzā al-Majlisī in *al-Biḥār*, and the author of *al-Ḥāwī* ('Abd al-Nabī al-Jazā'irī), and others admitted to not having come across a statement of jarḥ nor ta'dīl about him. In fact, in *al-Biḥār*<sup>1</sup>, the author of *al-Rijāl* of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, if it is al-Ḥusayn, then he is one of the most venerated reliable narrators. And if the author is Aḥmad, then I do not rely much on him. In any case, relying on this book necessitates rejecting most of the narrations in the famous works.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Tiffarishī (d. 1021 AH) states:

لم أجد في كتب الرجال في شأنه شيئا من جرح ولا تعديل

I did not find anything about him in terms of jarḥ or ta'dīl in the books of narrator criticism.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 AH) criticized him and his knowledge saying:

1 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 1:41.

2 Al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/57.

3 Muṣṭafā al-Tiffarishī: *Naqd al-Rijāl*, 1/119.

إن ابن الغضائري غير مصرح بتوثيقه ومع ذلك قل أن يسلم أحد من جرحه أو ينجو ثقة من قدحه وجرح أعظم الثقات وأجلاء الرواة الذين لا يناسبهم ذلك وهذا يشير إلى عدم تحقيقه حال الرجال كما هو حقه أو كون أكثر ما يعتقده جرحا ليس في الحقيقة جرحا

Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's tawthīq has not been explicitly made. Despite this, rarely is there someone who is free from his criticism, or is a reliable person ever saved from his criticism (against him). He has criticized the most reliable and venerated narrators, those who are undeserving of such criticism. This shows his inability to scrutinize the conditions of the narrators as required. Or, it shows that most of what he considers as a jarḥ (against a narrator) is, in reality, not a jarḥ.<sup>1</sup>

And he states:

و بالجمله بعد تتبع رواية ابن الغضائري يحصل وهن بالنسبة إلى تضعيفاته وإنكاره مكابرة

In summary, after scrutinizing the narrations of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, there develops a sense of weakness in relation to the narrators he deemed weak; his rejecting (the status quo) is sheer obstinance.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī gave him the epithet “*al-Ta'ān* (the highly critical)” and said about him:

وتضعيف ابن الغضائري ضعيف لو انفر

---

1 Muḥammad Bāqir (al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī): *Fawā'id al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī 'alā Manhaj al-Maqāl aw Ta'līqat al-Waḥīd 'alā Manhaj al-Maqāl*, 1/333. The strange thing is that al-Waḥīd himself described Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī saying, “He is from the venerable and reliable teachers, those that do not require explicit textual evidence to prove that they are reliable. He is the one who is mentioned by the teachers in relation to (information about) narrators. They (also) consider his statements in the sum total of statements and they bring forth his statements in opposition to the statements of (other) great and reliable people” (Ibid., 2/61).

2 Ibid., 1/336.

The *taḍ'īf* (deeming others to be weak narrators) of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī is in and of itself weak, if no other critic corroborates his opinion.<sup>1</sup>

The second position makes tawthīq of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī. This is the opinion of some of the latter-day scholars.<sup>2</sup>

### The Imāmī scholars' position regarding Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's work

Ja'far al-Subḥānī summarized for us the Imāmī scholars' position on this work in the following manner<sup>3</sup>:

1. It is fabricated by some of the adversaries of the Shī'ah so as to create disorder among them;
2. It is a definitively established work and admissible as a valid proof as long as it does not contradict the tawthīq of al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī;
3. It is an established work and Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī is an extreme critic; his words are to be given preference over al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī;

---

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 4/261. He named him "*al-ṭā'ān* (highly critical)" in vol. 5, p. 414.

2 Among them: al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *Amal al-Āmāl*, 2/12 (relying on what al-Ḥillī relied upon); Aḥmad al-Baṣrī, "Nothing related to his jarḥ or ta'dīl was mentioned. The closest opinion (to the truth) is to accept what he narrates." *Fā'iḳ al-Maqāl*, p. 82 (biography no. 65); al-Māmaqānī (*Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/8) states, "Relied upon in ta'dīl, not in jarḥ." The editor of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's book, Muḥammad Riḍā al-Jalālī, held the view that he is reliable. He bases this opinion on the fact that both al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī prayed for Allah's mercy to be upon him, and because Ibn Ṭāwūs, al-Ḥillī, and Ibn Dāwūd relied upon him, as mentioned in the introduction to his edited edition of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's *al-Rijāl* (p. 14). In *al-Mufīd min Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* (p. 26) (an abridgement of al-Khūṭ's statements), al-Jawāhirī states, "(He is) reliable because he is from the teachers of al-Najjāshī." In *Zubdat al-Maqāl* (1/112), Bisām Murtaḍā states something similar. Abū al-Ma'ālī al-Kalbāsī regards him as being "from the leading and most prominent of companions," as in *Samā al-Maqāl* (1/23). It appears that al-Qahbā'ī makes tawthīq of him, as in *Mu'jam al-Rijāl* (1/108).

3 Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 89.

4. It is an established work of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī; however, his jarḥ and tawthīq are not valid. This is because his foundational basis for al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl was not based on actual testimony or (other) circumstantial evidence; rather, it was merely based on his independent discretion (*ijtihād*) in the text of the ḥadīth.
5. It is an established work; however, his jarḥ is to be rejected and his ta'dīl is to be accepted.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Subḥānī refuted two arguments of those who contested the work of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī. Firstly, in refuting the claim that the attribution of this book to Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī is incorrect, al-Subḥānī states:

وما ذكره [ الخوئي ] صاحب معجم رجال الحديث من قصور المقتضى وعدم ثبوت نسبة هذا الكتاب إلى مؤلفه غير تام لأن هذه القرائن تكفي في ثبوت النسبة ولولا الاعتماد عليها للزم رد كثير من الكتب غير الواصلة إلينا من طرق الرواية والإجازة و على الجملة لا يصح رد الكتاب بهذه الوجوه الموهونه

What al-Khūī, the author of *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, mentioned of the necessary shortcomings (i.e., of this view) and the lack of proof in attributing this book to its author is incomplete. This is because the circumstantial evidence is sufficient in establishing this attribution. If there is to be no reliance on it, it would necessitate the rejection of so many books that never reached us via *riwāyah* (narration) and *ijāzah* (permission). On the whole, it is incorrect to reject this book based on these weak reasons.<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, regarding the claim that Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī was highly critical in relation to making jarḥ of narrators, al-Subḥānī states:

---

1 Commenting on this opinion, Riḍā al-Jalālī states, “This is a questionable position that is rejected by a consensus; the basis for accepting and rejecting (ḥadīth) is the accurate ascription of the book and the soundness of the book’s methodology. It is not possible to make a distinction in that between ta'dīf and tawthīq” (*Muqaddimat Rijāl Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī*, p. 22).

2 Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 91.

لا يصح رد تضعيفاته بحجة أنه كان خارجا عن الحد المتعارف في مجال الجرح بل الحق في عدم قبوله هو ما أوعزنا إليه من أن توثيقاته وتضعيفاته لم تكن مستندة إلى الحس والشهود والسماع عن المشايخ والثقات بل كانت مستندة إلى الحدس والاستنباط وقراءة المتون والروايات ثم القضاء في حق الراوي بما نقل من الرواية ومثل هذه الشهادة لا تكون حجة لا في التضعيف ولا في التوثيق نعم كلامه حجة في غير هذا المجال كما إذا وصف الراوي بأنه كوفي أو بصري أو واقفي أو فطحي أو له كتب والله العالم بالحقائق

It is not correct to reject his statements rendering narrators weak on the basis that he went beyond the normal conventions of jarḥ. In fact, the truth in his non-acceptance is what we suggested in that his statements of tawthīq (of narrators) is not based on actual tangible facts, testimony, and hearing from reliable scholars and teachers; rather, it was based on conjecture and a (superficial) reading of ḥadīth texts and narrations. Based on this, he would pass judgement about the narrator based on what was narrated by him. This type of testimony is not a valid form of admissible proof, not in making taḍīf of narrators nor tawthīq. Yes, his words are authoritative in other than this field, like if he described a particular narrator as being a Kūfan, or being from Baṣrah, or being a wāqifi (i.e., attributed to the Wāqifiyyah), or being a faṭḥī (i.e., followers of ‘Abd Allāh al-Aṭṭah), or stating that a narrator has (authored) particular books. And Allah is the knower of truths.<sup>1</sup>

In short, from the words of al-Subḥānī, it seems as though he regards the book to be reliable, and that he does not consider Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī as being extreme in his criticism of narrators. However, he still does not accept his criticisms. This is not because he is not eligible to critique narrators, or, because he is too extreme in his criticisms (as some Imāmī scholars claim). Rather, it is because of the methodology that Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī undertook in giving rulings on the narrators—from his personal discretion and reading of the (ḥadīth) texts and narrations, and then judging the narrator based on what was transmitted of the narration. This is a very important issue.

If we asked al-Subḥānī the following: Where did you come to know that the opinions of Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī are based on guesswork and his own deductions?

---

1 Ibid., p. 103.

And after proving that it is, indeed, his book, what is the difference between his opinions and the opinions of al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī? We know that al-Ṭūsī's does not explain the source for many of his opinions and whether or not they are taken from the Imāmiyyah's predecessors. Or, whether or not they are based on his deductions and personal discretion.

Al-Subḥānī does not have a proof for what he is saying. In fact, Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī would, at times, pass judgement (on narrators) based on what he transmitted from the statements of the Imāmī scholars.<sup>1</sup>

What is the position of both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī?

### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī

Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī relied on the opinions of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī related to narrators and frequently transmitted from him, to such an extent that he became famous for doing so. Whoever examines his book, *al-Khulāṣah*, will clearly see that.<sup>2</sup> The scholars of the Imāmiyyah pointed out al-Ḥillī's reliance on Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī and they deduced his tawthīq for him. Under the biography of Ḥudhayfah ibn Manṣūr al-Khuzā'ī, al-Ḥillī states:

والظاهر عندي التوقف فيه لما قاله هذا الشيخ

It seems as though, according to me, judgement should be suspended regarding him on account of what this Shaykh (i.e., Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī) said.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Of those who depend on the work of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, as collected by Ḥusayn al-Sā'idī: 1) Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, 2) Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, 3) Ḥusayn 'Abd Allāh al-Tustarī, 4) Ibn Tāwūs, 5) 'Ināyat Allāh al-Qahbā'ī, 6) al-Dāmād in his *Rawāshih*, 7) al-Khawājūṭ, 8) al-Fāḍil al-Tūnī, 9) al-Wahīd al-Bahbahānī, 10) al-Kalbāsī, 11) Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī—author of *al-Qāmūs*, 12) Ja'far al-Subḥānī, 13) 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī. This is what Ḥusayn al-Sā'idī gathered in his work, *al-Du'afā' min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/88.

2 This is the case for many biographies; he considered him like the other great scholars, those whose statements are mentioned. See biographies: 62, 72, 188, 1253, 1248, 1257, and tens of others.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 121 (biography no. 350). The actual text of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī reads, "His ḥadīth are not sound (*ghayr naqīyy*). He narrates authentic and problematic reports; his case is doubtful. His ḥadīth can be admissible as supporting reports." (Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī: *al-Rijāl*, p. 50, biography no. 30).



Al-Ḥillī suspended judgement on Ḥudhayfah because of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's statement, despite transmitting his tawthīq from both al-Mufīd and al-Najjāshī. Commenting, al-Karbāsī (d. 1175 AH) states:

لا يخفى دلالة كلام العلامة على تعديل ابن الغضائري لأن توثيق الشيخ المفيد والنجاشي لا يحصل معه التوقف إلا بتقدير كون ابن الغضائري ثقة... وإنما المقصود هنا التنبيه على أن العلامة قائل بتوثيق ابن الغضائري فقط بل لقوله مع النقل المذكور فكأن العلامة تحققت هذا

It is not hidden from al-'Allāmah's words that he makes ta'dīl of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī. This is because tawaqquf or suspending judgement on a narrator is not gained when the likes of al-Mufīd and al-Najjāshī make tawthīq; this can only be assumed if Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī is considered a thiqaḥ... What needs to be iterated here is the fact the al-'Allāmah is essentially making tawthīq of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī and his statement, despite what has been narrated (from the others). It is as if al-'Allamah confirmed this.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 AH) also pointed out al-Ḥillī's reliance on Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī. He states:

من تتبعه وجش [يقصد الخلاصة و رجال النجاشي] أيضا وجاهما يقبلان قوله مطلقا

Whoever examines “*ṣād ha*” and “*jīm shīn*” (i.e., *al-Khulāṣah* and *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*) as well, will find that they, too, accept his statements without any exception.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭī states:

يظهر من العلامة في الخلاصة أنه يعتمد على هذا الكتاب ويرتضيه

---

1 Muḥammad Ja'far ibn Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Khurāsānī al-Karbāsī: *Iklīl al-Manhaj fi Tahqīq al-Maṭlab*, p. 177.

2 Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī: *Ta'liqah 'alā Manhaj al-Maqāl li al-Astarābādī*, p. 330. He means by “*ṣād ha*” *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* of al-Ḥillī and “*jīm shin*” *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*.

It appears as though al-‘Allāmah in *al-Khulāṣah* relies on this book and is pleased with it.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, al-Ḥillī transmits his statements and acknowledges them as if they are generally acceptable (facts). And if he objects to him, he objects just as he does to the other scholars—those whose statements he usually relies on, such as the likes of al-Najjāshī, al-Ṭūsī, and others.

### The position of al-Khūī regarding Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī

Al-Khūī’s position on the statements of jarḥ of Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī is completely different to al-Ḥillī’s. While al-Ḥillī would mention his rulings and transmit them as if they are generally accepted facts, we find al-Khūī falsifying them and not accepting them when they are transmitted from his book—that is currently in circulation. His argument is based on the inauthentic attribution of the current book to Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī. He states:

إن الكتاب المنسوب إلى ابن الغضائري لم يثبت بل جزم بعضهم بأنه موضوع وضعه بعض المخالفين  
ونسبه إلى ابن الغضائري

The attributed book to Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī is not proven (to be his). In fact, some have asserted that it is a fabrication made and attributed to Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī by some of his adversaries.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, al-Khūī considers the attribution of this book to Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī as incorrect. In fact, he went beyond merely doubting the attribution to him by saying it was fabricated by some of his adversaries!

In another place, he makes tawthīq of Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī himself and criticizes his book. He states:

---

1 Al-Khūī: *Mu’jam al-Rijal*, 1/96.

2 Al-Khūī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/96.

أما ابن الغضائري فهو ثقة ومن مشايخ النجاشي فلا مناص من الاعتماد عليه وقد اعتمد عليه النجاشي نعم  
إن الكتاب المنسوب إليه لا يعتمد عليه لعدم ثبوت نسبه إليه

As for Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, he is reliable and from the teachers of al-Najjāshī. Inevitably, he is to be relied upon; al-Najjāshī relied on him. Yes, the book attributed to him cannot be relied upon since it has not been (authentically) proven to be his.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭ did not discredit Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī and his knowledge; rather, he objected to what was narrated from his book on account of it being, according to him, wrongfully attributed to him. As for accepting Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī if the transmission is proven to be from him, there is no escaping the fact that al-Khūṭ accepts his opinion. Al-Khūṭ states:

ونحن إنما لا نعتد على التضعيفات المذكورة في رجال ابن الغضائري لعدم ثبوت هذا الكتاب عنه وأما  
لو ثبت منه تضعيف بنقل النجاشي أو مثله لاعتدنا عليه لا محالة

We do not rely on the aforementioned statements of taḍīf in *al-Rijāl* of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī since it has not been proven to be his. However, if a statement of taḍīf is established via the transmission of al-Najjāshī or someone similar, we most certainly rely on it.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭ bases this opinion of his while refuting al-Shahīd al-Thānī—who claimed he has an authentic chain to Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's book. He states:

فإن الشهيد قدس سره يذكر في طريقه إلى هذا الكتاب العلامة [الحلي] وأنه يروي هذا الكتاب بطريق  
العلامة إليه وقد عرفت أن المظمأن به أن العلامة لا طريق له إلى هذا الكتاب

Al-Shahīd (may his status be sanctified) mentions al-ʿAllāmah (al-Ḥillī) in his chain to the book, and that he narrated this book via al-ʿAllāmah. You know for certain that al-ʿAllāmah does not have a chain to this book.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 10/22.

2 Ibid., 8:129.

3 Ibid., 1/41.

Thus, al-Khūṭī believed that al-Ḥillī did not have a chain for this book. In fact, the teacher of al-Ḥillī, Ibn Ṭāwūs, does not have a chain for this book. Al-Khūṭī states:

إن الكتاب المنسوب إليه [ابن الغضائري] لم تظهر صحة نسبه إليه وقد صرح الشيخ [الطوسي] بأن له كتابين ومدحهما غير أنه لم ينسخهما أحد من أصحابنا وعمد بعض ورثته إلى إتلاف هذين الكتابين وغيرهما من الكتب وقد ذكر [ابن طاووس] في التحرير الطاووسي أيضا أنه لا طريق لنا إلى كتابه والعلامة [الحلي] أيضا لا طريق له إليه وإن أكثر النقل عنه

The book attributed to him (Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī) does not appear to be authentically attributed to him. Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) stated that he has two books—that he praised; however, no one from our companions transcribed them. Some of his heirs destroyed these two, and other books. Ibn Ṭāwūs also mentioned in *al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī* that neither we nor al-'Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) has a chain to the book<sup>1</sup>, even though the latter frequently transmits from him.<sup>2</sup>

It is strange that al-Khūṭī, when he wanted to make tawthīq of Jābir ibn Yazīd al-Ju'fī, he relied on what al-Ḥillī transmitted from Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī. He states:

ينبغي أن يقال أن الرجل لا بد من عده من الثقات الأجلاء لشهادة علي بن إبراهيم [القمي صاحب التفسير] والشيخ المفيد في رسالته العديدة وشهادة ابن الغضائري على ما حكاها العلامة

It is appropriate to rather say that the man (i.e., Jābir ibn Yazīd al-Ju'fī) is counted among the venerable *thiqāt* (reliable narrators) because of 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm (al-Qummī's—the author of the *Tafsīr*) testimony, al-Shaykh al-Mufīd's testimony in his *al-Risālah al-'Adadiyyah*, and Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's testimony in his favour—according to what is transmitted by al-'Allāmah.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ibn Ṭāwūs mentioned that he collected the primary works *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, *al-Fihrist*, *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, *Fihrist al-Najjāshī* and then stated, "I have contiguous chains for all of them except for the work of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī." *Muqaddimat al-Taḥrīr al-Ṭāwūsī*, p. 25.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāḥ*, 4/191.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/344 (biography no. 2033). He states something similar under the biography of Ḥabīb ibn Mu'allal al-Kuth'amī, 5/204 (biography no. 2578).

However, in dealing with the rulings of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, al-Khū'ī acts contradictorily. Whoever reads *al-Mu'jam* will see him on many occasions mentioning his opinions. In fact, he raises him among the (valid) scholars who hold varying views, as will be seen from the following examples.

1. Under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī 'Uthmān (Sajjādah), al-Khū'ī mentioned the scholars' opinions regarding him and, among such opinions comes, "Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī stated, 'Al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī 'Uthmān Abū Muḥammad (Sajjādah)—he is weak according to the Qummīs. And in his madhhab, there is an increase.'"<sup>1</sup>

After a few lines, al-Khū'ī states, "The man, even though 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm makes tawthīq of him because he exists in the isnād of his *Tafsīr*, however, despite that, it is not possible to rely on his narration for the mere fact that al-Najjāshī testified that the scholars made taḍ'īf of him. Similarly, Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī made taḍ'īf of him. Yes, if there was no clear taḍ'īf, it would be possible for us to pass a judgement in favour of him being reliable, despite his false beliefs. In fact, even if his beliefs were borderline kufr, we would still be able to do so.

Therefore, al-Khū'ī—despite critiquing the book of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī—draws conclusions with it, at times. This is clearly contradictory! With this, Muḥammad al-Sanad's words are incorrect when he states, "What is clear from the writings of al-Khū'ī, the author of the *Mu'jam*, is that he relied on him in several places, whether it be in the process of distinguishing between narrators who have similar names, or, in gathering the required evidences under the biography of individual narrators."<sup>2</sup>

Thus, al-Khū'ī did not restrict himself to what Muḥammad al-Sanad mentioned; rather, he went beyond that by mentioning the difference

---

1 Ibid., 6/24 (biography no. 2941).

2 Muḥammad al-Sanad: *Buḥūth fī Mabānī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 310.

(of opinion) regarding some narrators, as can be seen from the previous biography.

2. Under the biography of Mufaḍḍal ibn Ṣāliḥ, al-Khūṭī states, “Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī and, in a similar manner, al-Najjāshī stated that Jābir al-Ju’fī is himself reliable. However, a number of unscrupulous people narrated from him who were deemed weak, among them is al-Mufaḍḍal ibn Ṣāliḥ.”<sup>1</sup>

In a similar manner, we find al-Khūṭī, when required, relying on the opinions of Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī. In another place, he says about Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī’s opinions, “There is no reliance on what is transmitted from him in terms of tawthīq and taḍṭīf (of narrators)!”<sup>2</sup>

This is a clear contradiction. Thus, in short, al-Khūṭī in most instances wherein mentioned Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī rejects his opinions; however, he contradicts this position, at times, as evident in the previous examples.

### 2.1.6 Al-‘Aqīqī

Al-Ṭūsī states:

علي بن أحمد العلوي العقيقي ..... له كتاب الرجال .... قال أحمد بن عبدون وفي أحاديث العقيقي  
مناكير

‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-‘Alawī al-‘Aqīqī... He has a book on narrators... Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdūn said, “And in the aḥādīth of al-‘Aqīqī are *munkar* (unacceptable) reports.”<sup>3</sup>

‘Abbās al-Qummī states:

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 5/378.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam al-Rijāl*, 18/274, under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Muṣāḍif (no. 11824).

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 127, no. 426.

العقيقي بفتح المهملة و المشناة التحتانية بين القافين نسبة إلى عقيق المدينة واد فيه عيون ونخيل

Al-‘Aqīqī; attributed to Wādī al-‘Aqīq. It contains springs and date palms.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī placed him in the second section of his work that is dedicated to weak narrators, those whose opinions are rejected, and those on whose opinions judgement is suspended.<sup>2</sup>

What then is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding al-‘Aqīqī and his statements about narrators?

### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl from al-‘Aqīqī

One who peruses al-Ḥillī’s *al-Khulāṣah* will find him frequently citing and relying upon the opinions of al-‘Aqīqī. To such an extent that al-Ḥillī states that he transmits from his work his *Kitāb al-Rijāl*:

قال السيد علي بن أحمد العقيقي في كتاب الرجال أبان بن أبي عياش كان سبب تعريفه هذا الأمر سليم  
ابن قيس

Al-Sayyid ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-‘Aqīqī stated in *Kitāb al-Rijāl*, “Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh: Sulaym ibn Qays is the reason for him defining this issue.”<sup>3</sup>

Ḥusayn al-Sā‘idī states:

ومن كتبه الرجال وصلت منه نسخة إلى العلامة الحلبي اعتمد عليها في ستة موارد

And from his books is *al-Rijāl*. A copy of it reached al-‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī; he relied upon it in six places.<sup>4</sup>

1 ‘Abbās al-Qummī: *al-Kunā wa al-Aqāb*, 2/464, no. 485.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 365, no. 1437.

3 Ibid., p. 325, no 1280.

4 Ḥusayn al-Sā‘idī: *al-Du‘afā’ min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 3/372, no. 227.

Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī (d. 1216 AH) states:

وقد أكثر العلامة في (ص) [الخلاصة] من النقل عن كتابه الرجال وعد قوله في جملة أقوال العلماء الأبدال وكثيرا ما يدرج الرجال في المقبولين بمجرد مدحه وقبوله

Al-‘Allāmah frequently transmits from his work *al-Rijāl* in al-Khulāṣah. He counts his statements among the statements of the greatest scholars. Often times, he enters narrators into the category of acceptable on account of al-‘Aqīqī’s praise and acceptance (of them).<sup>1</sup>

Thereafter, al-Ḥā’irī quotes six examples—I do not think he intended to exhaust all of the examples (with these six), as is apparent from the previous text of Ḥusayn al-Sā’idī. This is because what Ḥusayn al-Sā’idī mentioned is simply inaccurate; I examined the places where al-Ḥillī transmits from al-‘Aqīqī in *al-Khulāṣah* and found them to be more than twenty-eight places.<sup>2</sup>

What is mentioned by Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī and understood therefrom is that there seems to be a complete reliance of al-Ḥillī on al-‘Aqīqī in many narrators’ biographies. This is correct; however, it is not without exception. Under the biography of Khaythamah ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states:

قال علي بن أحمد العقيقي إنه كان فاضلا وهذا عندي لا يقتضي التعديل وإن كان من المرجحات

‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-‘Aqīqī states, “He was virtuous.” This, according to me, does not necessitate a ta’dīl, even though it gives preponderance to it.<sup>3</sup>

This comment of al-Ḥillī has two possible meanings:

1. Al-Ḥillī considers the statements of al-‘Aqīqī to merely give credit (i.e., to an already existing opinion on a narrator) and he does not completely rely on them; or

---

1 Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī al-Māzandarānī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Aḥwāl al-Rijāl*, 4/340, no 1948.

2 As in biography numbers 213, 361, 385, 427, 473, and many other places.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 139, no. 385.



2. Al-Ḥillī does completely rely on the statements of al-‘Aqīqī; however, the word he used to describe the narrator, “*fāḍil* (virtuous),” is not an explicit form of *ta’dīl*. Had al-‘Aqīqī clearly expressed his *ta’dīl* using another, clearer word, al-Ḥillī, as is his practice, would have accepted it.

Whoever reflects on this, it is not possible for him to definitively confirm one of the two possibilities. This is because the issue is merely a possibility. It can be said, “I am not definitively sure, but I think the second (opinion) is closer to the truth.” Because among the citations—which exceed more than twenty-eight—al-Ḥillī only redressed (al-‘Aqīqī) here. And this too because of the usage of the word “*fāḍil*,” not because of al-‘Aqīqī’s actual statements of *tawthīq*, which, as it seems, al-Ḥillī frequently relies upon. Despite this, al-Khūī adopted the first opinion, as is clear from his statements in refutation of those who validate the *tawthīq* of al-‘Aqīqī.

What makes matters worse—and may be the cause of further confusion—is the following question: How could al-Ḥillī place al-‘Aqīqī in the category of weak (narrators) and, despite this, still cling to his statements of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*?

Speaking about al-Ḥillī and Ibn Dāwūd, Ḥusayn al-Sā’idī answers this question saying:

ولا يستفاد من اعتمادهما [على أقوال العقبتي في الجرح والتعديل] وثاقته لأنهما يجتزئان في المدح و  
القدح بما يوجب الظن ويجزئ بمثله في عدم المعارض وقد ذكراه في الضعفاء ولم يعدها من الموثقين  
رغم اعتمادهما على رجاله

His reliability cannot be understood from their reliance (on the statements of al-‘Aqīqī related to *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*) because they are both contented by that which establishes probability in approbation and disparagement [of a narrator]. Such probability can be sufficed upon when there is no opposing view. [In his case] They both mentioned him among the weak (narrators) and they did not count him among the reliable ones, despite their reliance on his work on narrators.<sup>1</sup>

1 Ḥusayn al-Sā’idī: *al-Ḍu‘afā’ min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 3/368 (no. 227).

## The position of al-Khūṭī regarding the statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl from al-'Aqīqī

Al-Khūṭī agrees with what Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī believed in that al-'Aqīqī is amongst those whose narrations is not to be accepted. Al-Khūṭī expressed this saying:

توصيف الشيخ [الطوسي] الرجل بالمخلط أو أن في أحاديثه مناكير وإن لم يدل على ضعفه في نفسه إلا أنه يكفي في عدم اعتباره عدم ثبوت وثاقته

Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) description of the man as *mukhallat* (confused), or that his ḥadīth contain *munkar* (wholly unacceptable) reports—even though it does not prove that he himself is weak; it is, however, sufficient in disregarding him because his reliability has not been proven.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī presented the opinion of those who consider al-'Aqīqī as reliable and refuted it in a manner that serves our purpose, here. He states:

إن العلامة يعتمد على علي بن أحمد العقيقي وقد استشهد بكلامه في عدة موارد [ وهذا يقتضي توثيقه ] والجواب عن ذلك ما تقدم من أن العلامة يعتمد على كل إمامي لم يرد فيه قدح فلا أثر لاعتماده على أن العلامة لم يظهر منه الاعتماد على العقيقي وإنما ذكر كلامه في عدة موارد مدحا أو جرحا للرجل الذي يترجمه كيف وقد عد العقيقي في القسم الثاني ونقل كلام الشيخ فيه

Al-'Allāmah relies on 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-'Aqīqī and he has cited his words in several places (this implies his *tawthīq*). The answer to this is as follows: What has already been stated in that al-'Allāmah normally relies on every Imāmī narrator about whom no criticism has been mentioned. Therefore, there is no sign of him (particularly) relying on him. Although, it does not even appear that al-'Allāmah actually relied on al-'Aqīqī; rather, he only mentioned his words in a number of (different) places when attempting to praise or criticize a narrator that he was offering a biography of. How can he consider al-'Aqīqī reliable when he placed him in the second category (of weak narrators) and narrated the words of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) regarding him?<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam al-Rijāl*, 12/281 (no. 7931).

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam al-Rijāl*, 12/281 (no. 7931).

Al-Khūṭī, based on al-‘Aqīqī being weak and not accepting his statements related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl, states:

أما توثيق العقيقي فإن ثبت بنقل ابن داود فلا أثر له أيضا فإنه ضعيف

As for the tawthīq of al-‘Aqīqī, if it is proven from the narration of Ibn Dāwūd, then it is of no consequence. This is because he is weak.<sup>1</sup>

Based on the words of al-Khūṭī, he believes that:

1. The criticism is related to al-‘Aqīqī himself and, as such, he is weak according to him.
2. The criticism is in relation to the chain of al-Ḥillī up to al-‘Aqīqī. Al-Khūṭī states, “Alī ibn Aḥmad (al-‘Aqīqī)—his reliability has not been proven. Still, the chain of al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) and Ibn Dāwūd to him is majhūl (unknown).”<sup>2</sup>

Despite all of this, we see that al-Khūṭī, if there is a need, mentions the statement of al-‘Aqīqī in support of him and upholds it without any compunction. Under the biography of al-Naḍr ibn ‘Uthmān al-Nawā, al-Khūṭī states, “Al-‘Aqīqī states, ‘He died confused. Al-‘Allāmah mentioned him in the second chapter under the letter ‘nūn’ of the second category.”<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, under the biography of Abū Ruwaym al-Anṣārī, al-Khūṭī drew a conclusion based on al-‘Aqīqī’s stance. He states, “In *al-Khulāṣah*, al-‘Allāmah states, “Alī ibn Aḥmad al-‘Aqīqī al-‘Alawī: weak.”<sup>4</sup>”<sup>5</sup> There are similar examples in other places. This, bearing in mind that al-‘Aqīqī’s words here are transmitted

---

1 Ibid., 8/32 (no. 4206).

2 Ibid., 19/237 (no. 12488).

3 Ibid., 20/174 (no. 13079).

4 In other words, the narrator Abū Ruwaym is weak because of al-‘Aqīqī’s statement [translator’s note].

5 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam al-Rijāl*, 22/169 (no. 14292).

to us via al-Ḥillī, without the slightest reference to al-‘Aqīqī being weak. or, the fact that al-Ḥillī’s chain to al-‘Aqīqī is problematic, as al-Khūṭī mentions in several places. All of this proves that there exists no yardstick (in accepting or rejecting al-‘Aqīqī); rather, it is sheerly based on (the individual’s) utility: if there is utility in criticizing him via the chain of al-Ḥillī and explaining that al-‘Aqīqī is weak, then it is used (to their advantage), otherwise, it is not.

### 2.1.7 Al-Barqī (d. 274 AH)

Al-Barqī, whose statements are transmitted in *al-Rijāl*, is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khālīd al-Barqī, the author of *Rijāl al-Barqī*. Al-Ṭūsī states:

أبو جعفر أصله كوفي.... وكان ثقة في نفسه غير أنه أكثر الرواية عن الضعفاء واعتمد المراسيل

Abū Ja‘far, originally a Kūfan ... He himself is a *thiqah*; however, he frequently narrates from weak narrators and relies upon *marāsīl* (broken) reports.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Najjāshī mentioned something similar.<sup>2</sup>

Ibn al-Ghaḍā‘irī states:

طعن التميمون عليه وليس الطعن فيه إنما الطعن في من يروي عنه فإنه كان لا يبالي عمن يأخذ على طريقة أهل الأخبار

The Qummīs have criticized him. The criticism is not against him; rather, it is against those he narrates from. This is because he did not care whom he took from, as per the methodology of the ḥadīth scholars.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Ḥillī states, “According to me, his narration(s) are acceptable.”<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 48, no. 65.

2 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 76, number 182.

3 Ibn al-Ghaḍā‘irī: *Rijāl Ibn al-Ghaḍā‘irī*, p. 39, numbers 10 and 207.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 63, no. 72.

The majority of the Imāmiyyah either make tawthīq or taḥsīn (i.e. regard him as a good narrator).<sup>1</sup>

### **What is the opinion of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūṭī regarding the statements of his tawthīq?**

In the introductory remarks, I mentioned the condition of his book, *al-Rijāl*—which, in reality, is a work on *ṭabaqāt* (prosopographies) and not a work on *jarḥ* and *taʿdīl*. Al-Khūṭī relies heavily on it in terms of distinguishing between the generations of narrators. Despite that, both him and al-Ḥillī transmit his statements from him regarding those narrators who have been criticized, despite their small amount.

### **The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the jarḥ and taʿdīl of narrators of al-Barqī**

In his *al-Khulāṣah*, al-Ḥillī frequently relied upon al-Barqī. For example, he narrates the following from al-Barqī under the biography of Dāwūd ibn Abī Zayd, “Well-known to be truthful.” Consequently, al-Ḥillī places him in the first category of reliable narrators in his book.<sup>2</sup>

Under the biography of Suwayd ibn Ghaflah, al-Ḥillī narrates from al-Barqī who said, “He is from the close associates of Amīr al-Muʾminīn.”<sup>3</sup>

Under the biography of Fuḍāyl ibn Muḥammad ibn Rāshid, al-Ḥillī states, “(He is) reliable. Al-Barqī stated this.”<sup>4</sup>

---

1 For details regarding this difference of opinion, see: *Takmilat al-Rijāl* of ʿAbd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī, 1/238; and *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* of al-Māmaqānī, 1/82.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 142 (no. 391). See al-Khūṭī’s discussion on the chapter discussing differences (of opinion) regarding the name of a narrator in *al-Muʿjam*, 8/94 (no. 4374).

3 *Ibid.*, p. 163 (no. 475). It has been said that his name is Suwayd ibn ʿAflah.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 228 (no. 767). The book’s editor pointed out an error of al-Ḥillī in that the tawthīq is not directed at the biographee.

Thus, we find al-Ḥillī completely relying on his statements to such an extent that even if al-Barqī alone made tawthīq of someone (al-Ḥillī would rely on him), as long as others do not oppose him. This is the case for Ibrāhīm ibn Ishāq—Abū Ishāq al-Aḥmarī al-Nahāwandī; under his biography, al-Ḥillī states, “Al-Barqī states, ‘He is a shaykh; there is no problem with him.’” Al-Ṭūsī deemed him weak in his work on narrators.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, al-Ḥillī placed him in his second category of weak narrators<sup>2</sup>, and those whose statements are rejected or judgement suspended. Despite al-Ḥillī’s reliance on him, he preferred the statement of al-Ṭūsī over al-Barqī’s. Upon examining al-Khulāṣah, we find al-Ḥillī narrating his opinions related to the jarḥ and tawthīq of narrators more than his opinion regarding the ṭabaqāt of narrators—which is the essence of his book.

### The opinion of al-Khūṭī regarding the jarḥ and ta’dīl of narrators of al-Barqī

Al-Khūṭī relied upon the opinions of al-Barqī in *al-Rijāl*. This goes back to the book being reliable, according to him. When mentioning the primary sources of narrator evaluation (which he considers as five—the first of which is *Rijāl al-Barqī*), he states in his *Mu’jam*:

المعبر عنه في فهرست الشيخ بطبقات الرجال وقد اعتنى العلامة [الحلي] بهذا الكتاب في الخلاصة وذكر في إجازته الكبيرة وغيرها طريقه إلى فهرست الشيخ وإلى ما اشتمل عليه الفهرست من الكتب

What is expressed in the *Fihrist* of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) is that it is a work on the ṭabaqāt of narrators. Al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) gave attention to this work in *al-Khulāṣah*. He mentioned in his *al-Ijāzah al-Kabīrah* and other places his chain to *al-Fihrist* of al-Ṭūsī and whatever other books it contains.<sup>3</sup>

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 414 (no. 5994). In another place of the same work (p. 383, no. 5635), al-Ṭūsī states, “Ibrāhīm ibn Ishāq. Reliable.” This is either another person—as is the opinion of al-Khūṭī in *al-Mu’jam* (1/185) or, it is the same person and it could be that the contradiction between his jarḥ and ta’dīl goes back to the mistakes committed by al-Ṭūsī.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/95.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/95.

Al-Khūṭ did not object to whether the book is proven (to exist), as he did with other books. However, because of the scarcity of al-Barqī's rulings related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl, as mentioned, we find that al-Khūṭ did not hesitate in using al-Barqī's book for the sake of defining the *ṭabaqah* (generation) of a narrator. Thus, in tens of biographies do we find al-Khūṭ determining the *ṭabaqah* of a narrator by relying upon what al-Barqī believed. Examples of this are many—if we do not say altogether that al-Khūṭ completely transcribed the *Ṭabaqāt* of al-Barqī into his *Mu'jam*.

The evidences for this are many. The following is an example. Under the biography of Abān ibn Abī 'Ayyāsh Fayrūz, al-Khūṭ states:

ذكره البرقي في أصحاب السجاد وفي أصحاب الباقر من أصحاب الحسن والحسين عليهم السلام

Al-Barqī mentioned him among the companions of al-Sajjād, and among the companions of al-Bāqir, from the companions of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn عليهما السلام.<sup>1</sup>

### 2.1.8 Al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 AH)

Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī, the indisputably relied-upon (scholar) of the Imāmiyyah. Al-Najjāshī states:

محمد بن الحسن بن عليّ الطوسي أبو جعفر جليل في أصحابنا ثقة عين

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ṭūsī, Abū Ja'far, revered among our companions, reliable, eminent.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ḥillī sates:

شيخ الإمامية قدس روحه رئيس الطائفة جليل القدر عظيم المنزلة ثقة عين صدوق عارف بالأخبار

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/129, number 22. See (also) biography numbers 47, 50, 55, 73, 90, 98, 101. This is only taken from the first half of the first volume.

2 Ibid, p. 403, number 1068.

The shaykh of the Imāmiyyah (may Allah sanctify his soul), the leader of the sect, of a high standing and great prominence, reliable, eminent, trustworthy, knowledgeable of (ḥadīth) reports.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī states:

إني لم أظفر في علماء الإسلام من هو أعظم شأنًا منه

I have not come across someone of greater prominence than him among the scholars of Islam.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ṭūsī is the author of the book *al-Rijāl*, *al-Fihrist*, and an abridgement of al-Kashshī's work, *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl*. All of these form part of the primary works of ḥadīth narrator criticism according to the Imāmiyyah. Similarly, he is the author of *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* and *al-Istibṣār*, both of which are regarded as part of the four-primary works of ḥadīth, upon which the Imāmī school is based upon. He also has other works that are relied upon in the school.

Both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī frequently transmit from his works and rely on his opinions—which are duly considered in the rulings on narrators. To such an extent that al-Ḥillī gives preference to his views over al-Najjāshī's. For example, under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Khālid ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Barqī, al-Ḥillī states, "He is weak."<sup>3</sup> The relied-upon (statement), according to me, is the statement of ta'dīl of Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī.<sup>4</sup>

In short, there is no dispute among the scholars of the Imāmiyyah regarding his greatness and acceptability of his statements.

---

1 Al-Ḥillī, *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 249, number 845.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 16/262.

3 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 335, no. 898.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 237 (no. 813). He is the father of Aḥmad al-Barqī, the author of *al-Rijāl*. Al-Khūṭī has an opinion that al-Ḥillī "did not prefer the statements of al-Ṭūsī over al-Najjāshī; rather, he merely mentioned his reliance on the statements of al-Ṭūsī, since the words of al-Najjāshī are not clear in relation to his taḍīf" (17/73, no. 10715). This is strange coming from al-Khūṭī because al-Najjāshī's words are quite clear about the taḍīf of Muḥammad ibn Khālid. He states, "And Muḥammad is weak in ḥadīth." In what clearer language can his weakness be expressed?



## 2.2 The non-Imāmī critics whose statements are relied upon in al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl according to the Shī‘ah Imāmiyyah

### 2.2.1 Ibn ‘Uqdah (d. 332 AH)

When commencing with the discussion on Ibn ‘Uqdah, it is necessary to firstly explain a number of issues so as to know who this person is, his madhhab, what has been said about him, and how several scholars of the Imāmiyyah used him to promote and publicize their own madhhab. Three different positions can be spoken about here:

1. The opinion of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah,
2. The opinion of the Imāmiyyah regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah,
3. The opinions of both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah.

#### 1. The opinion of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah

Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852 AH) sums up the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah on Ibn ‘Uqdah. He states:

أحمد بن محمد بن سعيد بن عقدة الحافظ أبو العباس محدث الكوفة شيعي متوسط ضعفه غير واحد وقواه آخرون قال بن عدي صاحب معرفة وحفظ وتقدم في الصنعة رأيت مشائخ بغداد يسيئون البناء عليه ثم قوى بن عدي أمره .... عن الدارقطني قال اجمع أهل الكوفة أنه لم ير من زمن بن مسعود احفظ من أبي العباس بن عقدة .... وقال البرقاني قلت للدارقطني أيش أكثر ما في نفسك من بن عقدة قال الإكثار بالمناكير ... [ قال ] الدارقطني كان رجل سوء يشير إلى الرفض [وقال] لم يكن في الدين بالقوي وأكذب من يتهمه بالوضع إنما بلاؤه هذه الوجادات وقال أبو عمر بن حيويه كان بن عقدة يملئ مثالب الصحابة أو قال مثالب الشيخين فتركت حديثه... [قال] أبو بكر بن أبي غالب بن عقدة لا يتدين بالحديث لأنه كان يحمل شيوخا بالكوفة على الكذب يسوي لهم نسخا ويأمرهم أن يرووها ثم يرويها عنهم ... وقال بن عدي وسمعت بن مكرم يقول كنا عند بن عثمان بن سعيد في بيت وقد وضع بين أيدينا كتب كثيرة فنزع بن عقدة سراويله وملأه منها سرا من الشيخ ومنا فلما خرجنا قلنا ما هذا الذي تحمله فقال دعونا من ورعكم هذا قال [قال] عبدان ابن عقدة قد خرج عن معاني أصحاب الحديث فلا يذكر معهم وقال حمزة السهمي ما مثل أبي العباس بالوضع... وقال مسلمة بن قاسم لم يكن في عصره أحفظ منه وكان يزن بالشيعة والناس يختلفون في أمانته فمن راض ومن ساخط به وقال أبو ذر الهروي كان ابن عقدة رجلا سوء وقال بن

الهرواني أراد الحضرمي أبو جعفر يعني مطينا أن ينشر أن بن عقدة كذاب ويصنف في ذلك فتوفي رحمه الله قبل أن يفعل

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd ibn ʿUqdah al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū al-ʿAbbās—the muḥaddith of Kūfah. A moderate Shīʿī. More than one (critic) has judged him to be weak, while others have strengthened his status as a narrator. Ibn ʿAdī states, “A man of knowledge, possessing of a (strong) memory, and advanced in the science. I saw the mashāyikh of Baghdād misusing/abusing his praise, then Ibn ʿAdī strengthened his affair...” On the authority of al-Dāraquṭnī who said, “The people of Kūfah agreed that, since the time of Ibn Masʿūd, they never saw someone with a greater memory than Abū al-ʿAbbās Ibn ʿUqdah...” Al-Barqānī states: “I said to al-Dāraquṭnī, ‘What is the most detestable thing about Ibn ʿUqdah, according to you?’ He said: ‘(The fact that he) frequently cites *manākīr* (wholly unacceptable reports).’” Al-Dāraquṭnī states, “He was an evil man; he inclined to (the doctrine of) *Rafd*.” Al-Dāraquṭnī states, “He was not firm in the religion. Whoever accuses him of fabricating is a liar; his problem is on account of these *wijādāt*.” Abū ʿUmar ibn Ḥayyawayh stated, “Ibn ʿUqdah would dictate the shortcomings of the Ṣaḥābah (or he said, “the shortcomings of the *Shaykhayn* (i.e., Abū Bakr and ʿUmar) and so I abandoned his ḥadīth.” (He also said) Abū Bakr ibn Abī Ghālib ibn ʿUqdah is not trustworthy with ḥadīth because he would make the shuyūkh to lie; he would equate (different) copies (of books) and order them to narrate from them. Thereafter, he would narrate it from them... Ibn ʿAdī stated, “I heard Ibn Mukarram saying, ‘We were with Ibn ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd in a house. He placed a large number of books in front of us. Thereafter, Ibn ʿUqdah removed his lower garment and filled it with the books away from the sight of us and the Shaykh. When we left, we said, ‘What is this you are carrying?’ He said, ‘Leave us from this piety of yours.’ ʿAbdān ibn ʿUqdah said, ‘He departed from the meanings of the people of ḥadīth and so he is not mentioned with them.’ Al-Ḥamza al-Sahmī stated, “There isn’t the likes of Abū al-ʿAbbās in relation to forgery (of ḥadīth) ...” Maslamah ibn Qāsim stated, “There was no one in his era who memorized

---

1 The term *wijādāt* refers to ḥadīth which are discovered and then subsequently narrated without formally receiving it from a teacher. [translator’s note]

more ḥadīth than him. He was accused of Tashayyu‘ and the people differed regarding his trustworthiness; some were pleased with him and others were not.” Abū Dharr al-Harawī stated, “Ibn ‘Uqdah was an evil man.” Ibn al-Harwānī stated, “Al-Ḥaḍramī Abū Ja‘far (i.e., Muṭayyin) wanted to spread that Ibn ‘Uqdah was a liar and he wanted to write something in this regard. He died before he could do so.”<sup>1</sup>

This, in summary, is the opinion of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah. He is one of the narrators about whose condition there is a difference of opinion. As mentioned, some have criticized him in detail.

## 2. The opinion of the Imāmiyyah regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah

Al-Ṭūsī states:

أمره في الثقة والجلالة وعظم الحفظ أشهر من أن يذكر وكان زيدا جاروديا وعلى ذلك مات وإنما ذكرناه في جملة أصحابنا لكثرة روايته عنهم وخلطته بهم وتصنيفه لهم

His affair in terms of reliability, greatness, and vast memory is too famous to be mentioned. He was a Zaydī Jārūdī and he died with this belief. We only mentioned him amongst our companions because of the large number of narrations he has from them, his interacting with them, and his writings for them.<sup>2</sup>

And like this, we find al-Najjāshī venerating him and (also) mentioning a very important and beneficial point in that he is: “Zaydī Jārūdī.” Thus, he is not from the Imāmiyyah. Al-Najjāshī mentioned something similar.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, there is no validity for what al-Tustarī stated in that Ibn ‘Uqdah is an Imāmī Twelver because I could not find anyone of the early generation of Imāmī scholars to state this.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī: *Lisān al-Mīzān*, 1/263 (summarized).

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 56 (biography no. 86).

3 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 93 (biography no. 233).

4 Al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/604 (no. 546).

## The attempt of some Imāmī researchers to exploit Ibn ‘Uqdah in order to propagate their views

Some Imāmī researchers attempted to exploit the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā’ah’s praise of Ibn ‘Uqdah and conceal the criticism raised against him in order to propagate their Imāmī madhhab. I will mention their and discuss them accordingly.

Aḥmad al-Raḥmānī al-Hamdānī stated:

أيها الفارئ أحب أن تسير معي حتى ننظر في تراجم رجال من الموالين لأهل البيت عليهم السلام فإنهم رضوان الله عليهم نبذوا و قدحوا لتشييعهم ومقتوا لولايتهم جزاهم الله عن صاحب الولاية خير الجزاء... [ثم ذكر منهم ابن عقدة ثم قال]... ومن دسائس المعاندين لأهل البيت التي دسوها لإبطال كل ما ورد في فضل علي عليه السلام أنهم جعلوا آية تشيع الراوي وعلامة بدعته وروايته فضائل علي عليه السلام ثم قرروا ما يرويه المبتدع فيه تأييدا لبدعته فهو مردود ولو كان من الثقات والذي فيه تأييد التشيع عندهم هو ذكر فضل علي عليه السلام فعلى هذا لا يصح حديث في فضله عليه السلام لأن فيه تأييدا لبدعة الراوي في نظرهم فإذا وجدت أحاديث متواترة أو كانت في صحاحهم ولم يجدوا طريقا إلى الطعن فيها يميلون إلى مسلك آخر وهو أن يتأولوها ويصرفوا ألفاظ الأحاديث بما يوافق أهواءهم

O, reader! I would love for you to journey with me so that we can see the biographies of men who were loyal to the Ahl al-Bayt عليه السلام. They were rejected and criticized because of their Tashayyū‘ and disliked because of their wilāyah. May Allah reward them on behalf of *Ṣaḥīb al-Wilāyah* with the best reward... (then he mentioned Ibn ‘Uqdah and stated) And from the machinations of the Ahl al-Bayt’s adversaries—those who conspire to invalidate everything that has been narrated about the virtue of ‘Alī عليه السلام—is that they made the act of narrating virtues of ‘Alī عليه السلام a sign of the narrator’s Tashayyū‘ and his heresy. Then, they established that whatever the innovator narrates in support of his heresy is rejected, even though he may be from the reliable narrators. What is considered as support for Tashayyū‘ is the mentioning of ‘Alī’s عليه السلام virtue. Based on this, a ḥadīth narrated on his virtue is inauthentic.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 I say: Simply paging through the two Ṣaḥīḥ collections of Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim can dispel this claim. They have both dedicated entire chapters to the virtues of ‘Alī عليه السلام, all of which are authentically traced back to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. The authentic virtues of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib are sufficient such that they spare us the need to rely on falsely attributed reports.

This is because it contains, according to them, evidence that supports the innovator's heresy. Thus, if you find *mutawātirah aḥādīth* (mass transmitted reports) in their authentic collections, and they could not find fault with them, they adopt another method; that is, they interpret and manipulate the words of the aḥādīth in accordance with their whims.<sup>1</sup>

In his attempting to let pass a number of weak aḥādīth, al-Maḥmūdī states:

تلقي الفريقان رواياته بالقبول مع كونه تابعا و مؤمنا بمناقب بعض أئمة أهل البيت (ع) وهو ذنب غير مغفور عند بعض من يدعي الإسلام

Both groups have received his narrations as accepted, despite his following and believing in the virtues of some of the Ahl al-Bayt's Imāms. This is an unforgiveable sin, according to some of those who claim (to profess) Islam.<sup>2</sup>

Ḥāmid al-Naqwī states:

فظهر أنه لا ذنب لابن عقدة إلا ما ذكره السيوطي بقوله وعنده تشيع

It appears as though there is no fault with Ibn 'Uqdah except for what al-Suyūṭī mentioned, "He has *Tashayyu*."<sup>3</sup>

This is how the statements are presented. (If taken) literally, someone who does not know the reality of things will be confused and astonished.

**Firstly**, al-Raḥmānī, al-Maḥmūdī, and al-Naqwī ignored what is stated about Ibn 'Uqdah regarding the detailed criticism and the difference of opinion regarding his condition according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah, and, likewise, the Imāmiyyah.

---

1 Aḥmad al-Raḥmānī al-Hamdānī: *al-Imām 'Alī*, pp. 280-281.

2 Al-Maḥmūdī: *Nahj al-Sa'ādah*, 7/470.

3 Ḥāmid al-Naqwī: *Khulāṣat 'Abaqāt al-Anwār*, 1/98.

**Secondly**, what al-Maḥmūdī mentioned (“Both groups have received his narrations as accepted.”) is far from the truth, as it will soon come. In fact, it is a baseless claim, if we do not say and assume that it is an outright lie.

**Thirdly**, the detailed answer will be two-fold:

1. the person of Ibn ‘Uqdah, and
2. the madhhab of Ibn ‘Uqdah.

### **The person of Ibn ‘Uqdah**

The statement, “Then, they established that whatever the innovator narrates in support of his heresy is rejected, even though he may be from the reliable narrators,” which al-Raḥmānī used to describe the Ahl al-Sunnah, as well as al-Naqwī’s statement, “There is no fault with Ibn ‘Uqdah except for what al-Suyūfī mentioned, ‘He has *Tashayyu*’” can both be responded to by the fact that Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī mentioned in *al-Khulāṣah* high-praise of Ibn ‘Uqdah and his exalted rank; however, he placed him in the second category of his book, under the title, “Mentioning the weak narrators, and those whose statements I reject, or those whose opinions I suspend judgement on.”<sup>1</sup>

Based on this, it can be said to al-Naqwī that there is no fault of Ibn ‘Uqdah in that al-Ḥillī placed him in the second category except that he is a Zaydī! Where, then, is the agreement between the two groups that his narrations are acceptable, as al-Raḥmānī claims!

Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī isn’t the only person to reject his narrations. Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī—a contemporary of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī—placed him in the second category of his book that is dedicated to “unknown and criticized (narrators).” Ibn Dāwūd mentioned the pre-eminence of Ibn ‘Uqdah and his vast memory. This

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 321 (biography no. 1263).

fact did not ‘intercede’ for him, according to Ibn Dāwūd, because of his Zaydī Jarūdī madhhab.<sup>1</sup>

As for al-Raḥmānī’s statement criticizing the methodology of the Ahl al-Sunnah, “Then, they established that whatever the innovator narrates in support of his heresy is rejected, even though he may be from the reliable narrators,” the answer is as follows. It is similar to what al-Bahbūdī confirmed regarding the methodology of the latter-day Imāmī scholars in dealing with the people of heresy. He describes them saying:

و المتأخرون منهم يوردون أحاديثهم في أبواب الفقه فإذا كانت موافقة لرايهم يسكتون عن الطعن فيهم و إذا كانت مخالفة لرايهم يردون أحاديثهم بالطعن فيهم مشيا على الخطة التي أبدعها أبو جعفر الطوسي في كتابه تهذيب الأحكام كأنهم في سعة وخيار

The latter-day scholars among them reject their aḥādīth in the chapters of fiqh. When they are in accordance with their opinion, they remain silent and raise no criticisms against them. And when they go against their opinion, they reject their aḥādīth by raising criticisms against them. All of this in following the method created by Abū Ja’far al-Ṭūsī in his book, *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*. As if they had the ability and choice (i.e., to do this on their own).<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, what many of the Imāmī scholars found reprehensible from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā’ah, is actually found in their own methodology and theory. However, this is only propagated for the sake gaining support for their madhhab to those who do not know the realities of the issues.

Presenting the condition of Ibn ‘Uqdah as if he the well-pleased Imām, and as if he is acceptable according to both groups, as we have seen, is rejected by what was mentioned by the Imāmī scholar, ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī. Under the biography of

---

1 Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī: *Kitāb al-Rijāl*, p. 229 (biography no. 39) under the second section “Bāb al-Hamzah.”

2 Muḥammad al-Bahbūdī: *Ma’rifat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 148.

Ibn ‘Uqdah, he mentions three distinct opinions of the Imāmī scholars’ regarding accepting his opinions related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl:

1. Accepted;
2. Not accepted; and
3. (Requires) more detail: his statements of ta’dīl are accepted and his statements of jarḥ are not.<sup>1</sup>

If we were to ask the scholars of the Imāmiyyah: What is the reason for the difference of opinion when you agree to Ibn ‘Uqdah’s vast memory and exalted status? The answer: The difference of opinion is in the madhhab, nothing else! All of this with the caveat that none of the Imāmī scholars have criticized the person of Ibn ‘Uqdah, as did the Ahl al-Sunnah. As mentioned, some of them have provided a detailed criticism of him. As for the second issue, it will be discussed in detail in the section on the Zaydiyyah.

### **3. The opinions of both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah**

#### **3.1 The opinion of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah**

Whoever peruses the book of al-Ḥillī will find him, in several places, relying on his statements related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl without commenting further. In other places, he regards his words as merely lending weight to others’ (opinions), nothing more. Or, he does not rely on him. Examples are as follows:

#### **Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī relying on what is mentioned by Ibn ‘Uqdah**

Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb al-Naḍrī<sup>2</sup>, Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states:

---

1 ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī: Takmilat al-Rijāl, 1:243.

2 Ibn Ḥajar states, “Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb al-Naḍrī—with a ‘nūn.’ It has been said his name is *al-Miṣrī*—with a *kasrah* on the ‘mīm...’ Ibn Mandah states, ‘He is unknown among the people of Shām and neither the people of Egypt. *continued...*”



من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عداده في الشاميين قال ابن عقدة في حديثه نظر

(He is) from the Companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. He is counted among the people of Shām. Ibn ‘Uqdah states, “His ḥadīth are questionable.”<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, al-Ḥillī added him in the category of weak narrators on account of what Ibn ‘Uqdah stated.<sup>2</sup>

Under the biography of al-Ḥārith ibn Abī Risn, al-Ḥillī stated:

قال ابن عقدة أنه أول من ألقى التشيع في بني ود

Ibn ‘Uqdah stated, “He is the first person to introduce Tashayyu’ to Banī Wudd.”<sup>3</sup>

Thus, al-Ḥillī relied on his words without any compunction, and placed him in the first category of ‘relied-upon narrators’. This occurs a lot, including biography numbers 377, 431, 765, and others.

Commenting on a narration, al-Ḥillī states:

---

*continued from page 248*

He is mentioned among the Ṣaḥābah” (*al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah*, 6:/0). In *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* (9/94), Ibn Ḥajar states, “He is counted among the Ṣaḥābah. He has one ḥadīth—there is a difference (of opinion) regarding its chain... Ibn al-Sakan states, ‘The ḥadīth of this Muḥammad is not proven. It is famously narrated from ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Sa’dī. This Muḥammad is not known among the Ṣaḥābah.’”

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 391 (biography no. 1575).

2 A person can say: Al-Ḥillī added this Ṣaḥābī in the category of weak narrators because he is counted among the people of Shām—in other words, he is from the companions of Mu’āwiyah who waged war against ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib—and this, according to al-Ḥillī and others from the Imāmiyyah, necessitates him being weak. I would say: This is possible; however, ostensibly speaking, he relied on what Ibn ‘Uqdah stated. Had his intention been that he is from the companions of Mu’āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, he would have explicitly stated so.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 123 (biography no. 320).

وهذا الحديث وإن كان في طريقه الحسين بن المختار وهو واقفي إلا أن ابن عقدة وثقه

Even though this ḥadīth contains al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Mukhtār—who is a wāqifi—in its chain; however, Ibn ‘Uqdah made tawthīq of him.<sup>1</sup>

### **Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī not relying on the statements of Ibn ‘Uqdah, or regarding them as merely lending weight to others’ opinions**

Under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn Sayf ibn Salmān al-Tammār, al-Ḥillī states:

قال ابن عقدة عن علي بن الحسن أنه ثقة قليل الحديث ولم أقف له على مدح ولا جرح من طرفنا سوى هذا والأولى التوقف فيما ينفرد به حتى تثبت عدالته

Ibn ‘Uqdah stated on the authority of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan, “He is reliable. He narrates few ḥadīth.” From our chains, I have not come across any statement of praise or criticism except for this. It is better to suspend judgement on what he narrates in isolation until his integrity is established.<sup>2</sup>

Here, al-Ḥillī did not consider what Ibn ‘Uqdah stated.

Under the biography of al-Ḥakam ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Nu‘aym, al-Ḥillī stated:

روى ابن عقدة عن الفضل بن يوسف قال الحكم بن عبدالرحمن خيار ثقة ثقة وهذا الحديث عندي لا أعتد عليه في التعديل ولكنه مرجح

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Mukhtalif al-Shī‘ah*, 1/304 (under “‘adam jawāz mass al-muḥdith kitābat al-Qur’ān).

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 108 (biography no. 271 – under the first category: those relied upon)! The scholars of the Imāmiyyah mention the contradiction of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī in that he makes tawthīq of the man, at times, and places him in the category of weak narrators! Or, he suspends judgement on him, as is the case in this biography. And despite that, he places him in the first category. This is a clear contradiction, contrary to the methodology and chapters of the book. Thus, we find al-Khūṭ commenting on the opinion of al-Ḥillī stating, “As for al-‘Allāmah’s suspending judgement, on the one hand, it has not been proven that the man is from the truthful sect. This is based on his concluding that the report of the Wāqifah and others is not considered as authoritative proof.” (*al-Mu‘jam*, 5/348, biography no. 2869).

Ibn ‘Uqdah narrated on the authority of al-Faḍl ibn Yūsuf who said, “Al-Ḥakam ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān is outstanding. He is reliable, reliable.” I do not rely on this ḥadīth in relation to (statements of) ta’dīl; however, it can be used to lend weight to others’ opinions.<sup>1</sup>

It seems as though al-Ḥillī considered the narration of Ibn ‘Uqdah only inasmuch as a *murajjih* (to lend weight to others’ opinions). Therefore, he placed the narrator in the first category.

The evidences for this are many in al-Ḥillī’s *al-Khulāṣah*, as in biography numbers 272, 273, and 211.

Responding to two ḥadīths, al-Ḥillī states:

بضعف سندهما أما الأول فإنه مرسل وأما الثاني فإن راويه كان ابن عقدة وهو زيدي وفي رجاله من لا  
نعرف فلا احتجاج

Because both their chains of narration are weak. As for the first, it is *mursal* (halted). As for the second ḥadīth, its narrator is Ibn ‘Uqdah. He is a Zaydī. And among the narrators are those who we do not know. Therefore, it is not admissible as proof.<sup>2</sup>

And like this, we do not find a precise opinion for al-Ḥillī regarding Ibn ‘Uqdah; at times, he judges him to be weak, and, other times, he relies on him.

### 3.2 Al-Khūṭī’s opinion regarding the statements of Ibn ‘Uqdah related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl

While Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī judges Ibn ‘Uqdah to be weak and places him in the category of weak narrators in his book, we find al-Khūṭī making tawthīq of

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*. p. 131 (biography no. 348).

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Muntahā al-Maṭlab fī Taḥqīq al-Madḥab*, 4/164 (under Kitāb al-Ṣalāh – the section of the Qiblah).

him and accepting his narrations and statements related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl. The basis for this difference of opinion goes back to the difference in their methodological approach. According to al-Ḥillī, the narrator who is not a Twelver Imāmī is outright considered rejected, whereas al-Khūṭī's methodology is based on accepting the narrator, irrespective of his madhhab and his 'adālah. Al-Khūṭī's methodology even includes the kuffār, if they are deemed reliable—as will come in due course.

Al-Khūṭī states:

ذكرنا أنه لا يعتبر في حجية الخبر العدالة ولهذا نعتمد على توثيقات أمثال ابن عقدة و ابن فضال وأمثالهما

We have mentioned that he does not consider 'adālah (integrity) in establishing the authoritativeness of a report. Therefore, we rely on the statements of tawthīq from the likes of Ibn 'Uqdah, Ibn Faḍḍāl, and others.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī has a detailed discussion with regard to what is transmitted from Ibn 'Uqdah. It is as follows:

Al-Khūṭī does not accept what Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī transmitted from Ibn 'Uqdah. Al-Khūṭī takes the reason for his rejecting it to be the weakness of al-Ḥillī's chain to Ibn 'Uqdah. If al-Ḥillī says: "Ibn 'Uqdah says," there is, according to the methodology of al-Khūṭī, to be no consideration given to it. Examples of this are many. Al-Khūṭī states:

قد يتفق أن العلامة [الحلّ] وابن داود يحكيان عن ابن عقدة توثيقاً لأحد إلا أنهما لا يذكران مستند  
حكايتهما والعلامة [الحلّ] لم يذكر فيما ذكره من الكتب التي له إليها طريق في إجازته الكبيرة كتاب  
الرجال لابن عقدة

It may happen that al-'Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) and Ibn Dāwūd transmit a (statement of) tawthīq of Ibn 'Uqdah of someone; however, they do not mention the basis for their transmission. Al-'Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) did not

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1:41.

mention *Kitāb al-Rijāl* of Ibn ‘Uqdah as one of the books that he has a chain to in his *al-Ijāzah al-Kabīrah*.<sup>1</sup>

In another place, he states:

إن توثيق ابن عقدة وإن كان يعتمد عليه إلا أنه لم يثبت فإن العلامة [الحلي] ذكره مرسلًا و الطريق إليه مجهول

The tawthīq of Ibn ‘Uqdah, even though it is relied-upon, it is not proven. This is because al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) mentioned it as *mursal* (halted) and the chain to it is *majhūl* (unknown).<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭ’s criticism of al-Ḥillī’s chain to Ibn ‘Uqdah is massively transmitted from him in his *Mu‘jam*, as in the following biographies: Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amm al-Ḥasan<sup>3</sup>, Ḥamd ibn ‘Uthmān<sup>4</sup>, Muṣaddiq ibn Ṣadaqah<sup>5</sup>. However, al-Khūṭ makes a distinction between what Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī transmits from Ibn ‘Uqdah and what al-Najjāshī transmits from Ibn ‘Uqdah. While al-Khūṭ drops the chain of al-Ḥillī to Ibn ‘Uqdah, we see him accepting what al-Najjāshī transmits from Ibn ‘Uqdah. An example of this is what al-Najjāshī mentioned under the biography of Dāwūd ibn Zirbī:

ثقة ذكره ابن عقدة

Reliable. Ibn ‘Uqdah mentioned him.<sup>6</sup>

Al-Khūṭ states in his *Mu‘jam*:

---

1 Ibid., 1:45.

2 Ibid., 8/95.

3 Ibid., 17/258 (biography no. 11133).

4 Ibid., 17/292-293 (biography no. 11243).

5 Ibid., 19/187 (biography no. 12403).

6 Al-Najjāshī: *al-Rijāl*, p. 160 (biography no. 424).

سقوط كلمة (ثقة) عن نسخة النجاشي الواصلة إلينا وفي شهادتهما كفاية على الثبوت وحينئذ لا ينبغي الإشكال في وثاقة الرجل بشهادة المفيد وبشهادة ابن عقدة على ما ذكره النجاشي

The word *thiqah* (reliable) is dropped from the copy of al-Najjāshī's book that reached us. Their testimony is sufficient to prove it. In that case, there should be no issue with the reliability of the man because of the testimony of al-Mufīd and Ibn 'Uqdah, based on what al-Najjāshī mentioned.<sup>1</sup>

This follows al-Ḥillī's position from what al-Ṭūsī mentioned on the authority of Ibn 'Uqdah. Here, we find al-Khūṭī confused. While we find him authenticating the chain of al-Ṭūsī to Ibn 'Uqdah in one place, we find him saying that the (same) chain is unknown in another place. An example of this is as follows. After judging the chain of al-Ṣadūq to Ibn 'Uqdah as weak, al-Khūṭī states:

لكن طريق الشيخ [الطوسي] إليه صحيح وإن كان فيه أحمد بن محمد بن موسى الأهوازي [ابن الصلت] لأنه من مشايخ النجاشي

However, the chain of *al-Shaykh* (al-Ṭūsī) to him is sound, even though it contains Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Mūsā al-Ahwāzī (Ibn al-Ṣalt)—since he is from the teachers of al-Najjāshī.<sup>2</sup>

However, al-Khūṭī states under the biography of Abū Khālid al-Qammāṭ:

تقدم عن الشيخ [الطوسي] في ترجمة كنكر عن ابن عقدة أن اسم أبي خالد القمط كنكر... ثم قال الخوئي لرد ما قاله الطوسي... وأما كنكر فلم تثبت تكنيته بأبي خالد القمط وإنما هو مكنى بأبي خالد الكابلي فإن طريق الشيخ [الطوسي] إلى ابن عقدة مجهول

Under the biography of Kankar on the authority of Ibn 'Uqdah, it has already been mentioned from al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) that the name of Abū Khālid al-Qammāṭ is Kankar... (Thereafter, al-Khūṭī states in refutation of what al-Ṭūsī stated) ... As for Kankar, his agnomen, Abū Khālid al-Qammāṭ,

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 8/106 (biography no. 4396). In the copy of al-Najjāshī's book that I relied on; the editor verified the word "thiqah" (p. 160, biography no. 424).

2 Ibid., 3/66 (biography no. 871 of Ibn 'Uqdah).

is not proven. Rather, his agnomen is Abū Khālīd al-Kābulī. (This is given preference) because the chain of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) to Ibn ‘Uqdah is *majhūl* (unknown).”<sup>1</sup>

Thus, it becomes clear for us that the *tawthīq* of the (different) chains, according to al-Khūṭī, is based on the perceived benefit that can be derived from it. If it is in his best interest to authenticate the chain, he states: ‘*ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic),’ even though it contains so-and-so. And if there is a perceived benefit in deeming the chain weak, he will render it weak and pay no attention to his previous reason of *tawthīq*!

In order for this idea to be clear, I will mention this example. We have already seen that al-Khūṭī confirms the invalidity of what al-Ḥillī transmitted from Ibn ‘Uqdah; however, when he desired to make *tawthīq* of al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Ulwān, he stated:

قال ابن عقدة إن الحسن كان أوثق من أخيه [الحسين] و أحمد عند أصحابنا ذكره [الحلي] في الخلاصة القسم الثاني... [قال الخوئي معقباً] أقول في كلام ابن عقدة دلالة على وثاقة الحسين وكونه محموداً

Ibn ‘Uqdah stated: “Al-Ḥasan<sup>2</sup> is more reliable than his brother (al-Ḥusayn) and more praiseworthy according to our companions. (Al-Ḥillī) mentioned him in al-Khulāṣah in the second category...” (Al-Khūṭī comments) Ibn ‘Uqdah’s words indicate towards the reliability and praiseworthiness of al-Ḥusayn.”<sup>3</sup>

Thus, al-Khūṭī did not mention any criticism related to the chain of al-Ḥillī to Ibn ‘Uqdah, as is his habit. Simply put, he desired to make *tawthīq* of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Ulwān and so he took the words of Ibn ‘Uqdah and transmitted it as if it was

---

1 Ibid., 22/152 (biography no. 14240). In *Malādhdh al-Akhyār fī Fahm Tahdhīb al-Akhhbār* (16/698), Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī judged the chain of al-Ṭūsī to Ibn ‘Uqdah as *majhūl* (unknown). The chain of al-Ṭūsī to the books of Ibn ‘Uqdah in *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* is the same chain which al-Ṭūsī mentions in *al-Fihrist*. See: *al-Fihrist* (p. 56, biography no. 86).

2 He is al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Ulwān al-Kalbī, the brother of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Ulwān—the person al-Khūṭī wanted to make *tawthīq* of.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/34 (biography no. 3508). What he transmitted from al-Ḥillī’s book is on p. 338 (biography no. 1337).

generally accepted! This, knowing that al-Khūī stated under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Ulwān:

وثقه ابن عقدة أيضا ذكره العلامة في ترجمة الحسين بن علوان في القسم الثاني ولكن طريقه إلى ابن عقدة مجهول فلا يمكن الاعتماد عليه

Ibn ‘Uqdah also made tawthīq of him. Al-‘Allāmah mentioned him under the biography of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Ulwān in the second category. However, his chain to Ibn ‘Uqdah is unknown. Therefore, it is not possible to rely upon it.<sup>1</sup>

And so, he uses as binding proof and employs the same text in one place, and rejects it in another!

### 2.2.2 Ibn Faḍḍāl (al-Taymalī)

‘Abbās al-Qummī states:

يطلق (ابن فضال) على ١- علي بن الحسن بن علي بن فضال ٢- الحسن بن علي بن فضال

Ibn Faḍḍāl can apply to:

1. ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl, and
2. Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl.<sup>2</sup>

Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī (d. 1216 AH) states:

ابن فضال علي بن الحسن بن علي بن فضال وقد يطلق على أخويه أحمد و محمد وعلي أبيه الحسن ومن بين الثلاثة في الأخير أشهر

Ibn Faḍḍāl: ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl. At times, the name Ibn Faḍḍāl applies to his brothers, Aḥmad, Muḥammad, and ‘Alī. His father is al-Ḥasan. Among the three, the last (i.e., ‘Alī) is the most famous.”<sup>3</sup>

1 Ibid., 5/376 (biography no. 2929).

2 ‘Abbās al-Qummī: *al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb*, 1/432-433 (summarized).

3 Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī al-Māzandarānī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Aḥwāl al-Rijāl*, 7/326 (biography no. 4046). Al-Ardabīlī states the exact same thing in *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt* (2/435).



Al-Khūṭ states:

إن ابن فضال يطلق على الحسن بن علي بن فضال وعلى أبنائه علي وأحمد ومحمد والمشهور منهم الحسن وابنه علي

Ibn Faḍḍāl applies to al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl, and his children, ‘Alī, Aḥmad, and Muḥammad. The more famous from them is al-Ḥasan and his son, ‘Alī.<sup>1</sup>

The issue revolves a number of narrators. However, what al-Qummī and al-Khūṭ mentioned is correct: Those who are known in relation to al-jarḥ wa al-taḍdīl and frequently narrating are: ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl and his father, al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl. Here are their conditions.

1. ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl

Al-Ṭūsī states:

فطحي المذهب ثقة كثير العلم واسع الرواية والأخبار جيد التصنيف غير معاند كان قريب الأمر من أصحابنا

(Belonging to the) Faḥḥī<sup>2</sup> school. Reliable. (Possesses) a lot of knowledge

---

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 24/17 (under the first biography of this volume, no. 15159). ‘Alī Akbar al-Turābī mentions him in a similar manner in *al-Mawsūʿah al-Rijāliyyah* and *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Wasāʾil* (p. 557, no. 7428).

2 Al-Shahrastānī states in *al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl* (1/195), “The Aḥḥāḥiyyah consider Imāmah as having transferred from al-Ṣādiq to his son, ‘Abd Allāh al-Aḥḥāḥ. He is the brother of Ismāʿīl from him maternal and paternal side. Their mother is Fāṭimah bint al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī. He was the oldest of the children. They claimed that he stated, ‘Imāmah is to be (handed over) to the oldest child of the Imām.’” Al-Kashshī states, “They consider ‘Abd Allāh ibn Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad as the (rightful) Imām. They were called that because it was said that he (i.e., ‘Abd Allāh al-Aḥḥāḥ) had a flat head. Some of them said he had flat feet.” (*Rijāl al-Kashshī*, p. 254, no. 472). Al-Kashshī has more on this which can be reviewed in its place. Ibn Manzūr states, “*Faḥḥī* ‘*al-faḥḥāḥ*,’ broad space in the centre of the head... An ‘*aḥḥāḥ*’ man is someone who has a flat head” (*Lisān al-ʿArab*).

and narrates extensively. Writes well. Not stubborn. He was close to our companions.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Najjāshī states:

كان فقيه أصحابنا بالكوفة ووجههم وثقتهم وعارفهم بالحديث والمسموع قوله فيه سمع منه شيئا كثيرا ولم نعثر فيه على زلة فيه ولا ما يشينه وقل ما روى عن ضعيف وكان فطحيا ولم يرو عن أبيه شيئا

He was the jurist of our companions in Kūfah, their prominent personality, their trustworthy one, their knowledgeable scholar of ḥadīth—whose words are heeded. Much was heard from him. We have not come across any fault in him nor anything (negative) to detract from his reputation. Rarely did he narrate from a weak narrator. He followed the Faṭḥī school. He did not narrate anything from his father.<sup>2</sup>

This is the condition of the man; there is no difference of opinion in the fact that he is a Faṭḥī and not from the Imāmiyyah. Therefore, after mentioning the scholars praise for him, al-Ḥillī—who has difficulty in accepting (the narrations of) non-Imāmīs—states:

فأنا أعتمد على روايته وإن كان فاسد المذهب

Thus, I rely on his narrations, even though he follows an incorrect school (of thought).<sup>3</sup>

## 2. Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl

Al-Ṭūsī states:

كان فطحيا يقول بإمامة عبد الله بن جعفر ثم رجع إلى إمامة أبي الحسن عليه السلام عند موته... كان جليل القدر عظيم المنزلة زاهدا ورعا ثقة في حديثه ورواياته

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 122 (no. 393).

2 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 257 (no. 676).

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 177 (no. 526).

He was a Faṭḥī. He would believe in the Imāmah of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far. Then he reverted back to (following) the Imāmah of Abū al-Ḥasan (i.e., Mūsā al-Kāzīm) عليه السلام before his death. He was highly venerated and of great stature. He was an ascetic, pious, and reliable in his ḥadīth and narrations.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Najjāshī states:

كان الحسن عمره كله فطحيا مشهورا بذلك حتى حضره الموت فمات وقد قال بالحق رضي الله عنه

Al-Ḥasan was a Faṭḥī for his entire life and known for this until (just before) death appeared. He died with the truth (i.e., he believed in the Imāmah of Mūsā al-Kāzīm before passing away).<sup>2</sup>

Al-Najjāshī bases his opinion on al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl’s retraction (in creed) on a narration that Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah ibn A‘yan narrated for us. However, both al-Māmaqānī<sup>3</sup> and Muḥsin al-Amīn<sup>4</sup> transmit the statement of al-Shahīd al-Thānī for us under his commentary on *al-Khulāṣah* of al-Ḥillī:

في هذا السند محمد بن عبد الله بن زرارة وحاله مجهول

In this sanad is Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah. His condition is unknown.”

Baḥr al-‘Ulūm ascribed this opinion to the commentary of al-Shahīd al-Thānī on *al-Khulāṣah* of al-Ḥillī (manuscript).<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 76 (no. 164).

2 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 35 (no. 72).

3 Al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/299.

4 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 5/208.

5 He mentioned this in the marginalia of his edited version of ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī’s book, *Takmilat al-Rijāl* (1/402). Commenting on the narration of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah, Aḥmad ibn Ṭāwūs states, “(I say) I did not verify the condition of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah. The remaining narrators are reliable” (*al-Tahrīr al-Ṭāwūsī*, p. 76 (biography no. 95 of al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl).

In short, there is a difference of opinion regarding whether or not he actually retracted his original doctrinal position of the Faṭḥī's and followed the school of the Imāmiyyah. This is based on the authenticity of this narration. And despite both al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī praising him, and the fact that al-Ḥillī placed him in the first category of narrators that are relied-upon, Ibn Idrīs al-Ḥillī (d. 598 AH) states:

هذين الخبرين المرسلين وراوي أحدهما فطحي المذهب كافر ملعون مع كونه مرسلا وهو الحسن بن فضال وبنو فضال كلهم فطحية و الحسن رأسهم في الضلال

These two reports are *mursal* (halted) and the narrator of one of them follows the Faṭḥī school. He is an accursed disbeliever—in addition to the ḥadīth being *mursal*. He is al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl. The sons of Faḍḍāl all follow the Faṭḥī school. Al-Ḥasan is their leader in misguidance.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī included him in the first category of narrators specific to those who are relied-upon.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps al-Ḥillī remained silent when placing him in the first category—despite his false belief—goes back to al-Ḥillī's authenticating the narration of his reverting back to the Imāmiyyah, the narration which al-Shahīd ruled that one of its narrators is *majhūl* (unknown).

After explaining the condition of Faḍḍāl's children, we will now see how both Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūṭī dealt with them.

## 1. The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the statements of tawthīq and narrations of Ibn Faḍḍāl

Al-Ḥillī frequently uses as authoritative proof the statements of Faḍḍāl's children related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl. For example, under the biography of Dāwūd ibn Farqad, al-Ḥillī states:

1 Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr ibn Aḥmad ibn Idrīs al-Ḥillī: *al-Sarā'ir al-Ḥawī li Tahrīr al-Fatāwī*, 1/495. He stated this under “*Taqṣīm al-Khums li Aqṣām Sitta.*”

2 *Al-Ḥillī Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 98 (no. 223)

قال ابن فضال داود ثقة ثقة

Ibn Faḍḍāl states, “Dāwūd is reliable, reliable (*thiqah thiqah*).”<sup>1</sup>

Under the biography of Ḥafṣ ibn Sālim, al-Ḥillī states:

قال ابن فضال... ثقة لا بأس به

Ibn Faḍḍāl states... “Reliable. No problem with him.”<sup>2</sup>

Under the biography of Ismāʿīl ibn Ḥuqaybah (it is also said that his name is Ibn Jufaynah), al-Ḥillī states:

قال محمد بن مسعود سألت علي بن الحسن بن فضال عن إسماعيل بن جفينة قال صالح وهو قليل الرواية

Muḥammad ibn Masʿūd<sup>3</sup> said, “I asked ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl about Ismāʿīl ibn Jufaynah and he said, ‘(He is) *ṣāliḥ* (righteous). He has few narrations.’”<sup>4</sup>

However, al-Ḥillī significantly contradicted himself regarding the sons of Faḍḍāl. After placing both of them in the category of accepted narrators in *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* and some of his other jurisprudential works, using their statements of *al-jarḥ wa al-taʿdīl* as authoritative and learning (via them) about narrators, we also find him frequently criticizing them as well! At times, we find him saying:

وما رواه الحسن بن فضال في الموثق

---

1 Ibid., p. 141 (no. 389).

2 Ibid., p. 127 (no. 333).

3 Muḥammad ibn Masʿūd ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Ayyāsh (known as al-‘Ayyāshī) is highly venerated by the Imāmiyyah. He frequently transmits the statements of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl. Al-Māmaqānī mentioned that the person from whom Muḥammad ibn Masʿūd transmits from in terms of relying and depending on in matters related to *al-jarḥ wa al-taʿdīl* is ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl (*Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/299).

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 57 (no. 48).

And that which al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl narrated is among the relied-upon.<sup>1</sup>

Here, he regarded his ḥadīth among the reliable (ones). In another place, we find him responding to one of the narrations saying:

وعن الرواية بضعف السند فإن طرقها علي بن الحسن بن فضال عن أبيه وهما ضعيفان

And regarding the narration, because of the weakness of the chain. This is because in its chains is ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl, from his father. And both of them are weak.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. The opinion of al-Khūṭī regarding the statements of tawthīq of Ibn Faḍḍāl

Al-Khūṭī was clearer than al-Ḥillī in dealing with the statements of Faḍḍāl’s sons related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl. He clearly states:

نعتمد على توثيقات أمثال ابن عقدة وابن فضال وأمثالهما

We rely on the statements of tawthīq from the likes of Ibn ‘Uqdah, Ibn Faḍḍāl, and their likes.<sup>3</sup>

In regards to ‘Amr ibn Khālīd al-Wāsiṭī, he states:

وثقه ابن فضال وحيث أن بني فضال موثقون فنعتمد على توثيقاتهم

Ibn Faḍḍāl made tawthīq of him. And since the sons of Faḍḍāl are reliable, we rely on their statements of tawthīq.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Mukhtalif al-Shī‘ah*, 4/216 (under “Ḥukm Qaṭ‘ al-Saṭī”). Something similar is found on p. 212 under the third chapter “Al-Saṭī Hal al-Ṭahārah Sharḥ fihi?”

2 Ibid., 3/414 (under “al-Ikhtilāf fī Muftiriyat al-Ḥuqnah”).

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam al-Rijāl*, 1/41.

4 *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 9/100 (commentary) “Lā yajūz aqwal min khams takbīrāt - ṣalāt al-mayyit.”

For al-Khūṭī's tawthīq of Ibn Faḍḍāl, we see him giving preference to his statements over the principle that assumes tawthīq of all the narrators of *Tafsīr al-Qummī*. In presenting the issues through which it is possible to make tawthīq of 'Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah al-Baṭā'inī, al-Khūṭī states:

وقوعه في تفسير علي ابن إبراهيم... وهذا الوجه وإن كان صحيحا إلا أنه معارض بما تقدم عن ابن فضال من قوله إن علي بن أبي حمزة كذاب متهم فلا يمكن الحكم بوثاقته وبالنتيجة يعامل معاملة الضعيف

Him existing in the *Tafsīr* of 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ... This angle, although it is sound, it goes against what was already mentioned by Ibn Faḍḍāl that 'Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah is a liar and accused (of forgery). Therefore, it is not possible to judge him to be reliable. As a result, he is to be treated as weak.

It appears from the opinion of al-Khūṭī that the Ibn Faḍḍāl whom he narrates statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl from is 'Alī ibn Faḍḍāl. He states:

وقد سأل محمد بن مسعود علي بن فضال عن مثل ذلك كثيرا فأجابه ابن فضال ببيان حال الوثاقعة وعدمها

Muḥammad ibn Ma'sūd asked 'Alī ibn Faḍḍāl about that a lot and Ibn Faḍḍāl answered him by explaining the condition of reliability and lack thereof (of a narrator).<sup>1</sup>

Relying on the venerable status of Ibn Faḍḍāl, some of the Imāmī scholars invented a principle to make tawthīq of *majhūl* (unknown) narrators. For example, in regards to Ḥammād al-Nawā', al-Khūṭī states:

قال الوحيد البهبهاني (١٢٠٦هـ) روى عنه ابن فضال لعل فيه إيماء إلى اعتداد ما به [فقال الخوئي] أقول ظهر مما ذكرناه غير مرة أنه لا وجه للحكم بحسنه والاعتداد به

Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 AH) states, "Ibn Faḍḍāl narrated from him. Perhaps there is an indication in this that he relies upon what he narrates." (Al-Khūṭī states) It appears from what we have mentioned on

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam al-Rijāl*, 19/176 (biography no. 12384).

more than one occasion that there is neither a reason to judge him to be a good narrator nor to rely on him.<sup>1</sup>

The reason for this ruling is that when a reliable person narrates from a person it does not necessarily demonstrate his tawthīq (for that narrator), according to the methodology of al-Khūṭī.

### 2.2.3 Ibn Numayr

The scholars of the Imāmiyyah consider the statements of Ibn Numayr related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl as admissible proof. Yet, they differ as to who this Ibn Numayr actually is, despite agreeing that he is from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah: Is he “‘Abd Allāh”, or his son, “Muḥammad?” The reason for the difference of opinion is because al-Ḥillī only mentions him as “Ibn Numayr,” without specifying (his full name). According to al-Khūṭī, he is “Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Numayr.” Under the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Numayr, he states:

الظاهر أن ابن نمير الذي ينقل العلامة في الخلاصة عنه توثيقاً أو تضعيفاً ولكنه لم يعتمد على قوله....  
هو محمد بن عبد الله هذا

Ostensibly, the Ibn Numayr who al-‘Allāmah transmits statements of tawthīq and taḍfīf from in *al-Khulāṣah* (even though he does not rely on his statements) ... is this Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam al-Rijāl*, 7/258. Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī has elucidated in his annotations to *Manhaj al-Maqāl li Astarabādī* (1/145) that amongst the indications of tawthīq is an “esteemed (*jalīl*) person narrating from him” and “esteemed people narrating from him”, when his annotations to the book were added to the beginning of the book during its publication. Al-Khūṭī rebutted him in numerous places, saying, “Esteemed people narrating from a person or even people of consensus narrating from him, or even the early generation relying on him, does not indicate his reliability.” (*Al-Mu’jam*, 14/117) He later clarifies the reason for his opinion, “It is mentioned that the narrations of an esteemed individual from another is an indication of his reliability and strength, similarly is the case when a group of esteemed individuals narrate from him, or a reliable narrator from his teachers [is proof that his teacher is reliable], this has been rebutted on more than one occasion previously; that those knowledgeable in Fiqh and Ḥadīth on many occasions narrate from unreliable individuals.” He stated this in *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 1/520, *Kayfiyah Ta’alaq al-Nadhr bi al-Nāfilah*.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 24/54 (biography no. 15203).



Al-Ardabīlī (d. 1101 AH) held that none of the two names should be specified. He states:

ابن نمير هو عبد الله و ابنه محمد من علماء العامة... إنما ذكرته مع كونه من رجال المخالفين لأن العلامة كثيرا ما ينقل منه توثيق بعض الرواة فينبغي أن يكون معلوما

Ibn Numayr: he is ‘Abd Allāh and his son is Muḥammad. He is from the scholars of the ‘*Āmmah* (i.e., the Ahl al-Sunnah) ... I only mentioned him—despite him being from the narrators of the opposition (i.e., the Ahl al-Sunnah)—because al-‘Allāmah frequently transmits the tawthīq of several narrators from him and, as such, it should be known.<sup>1</sup>

In short, to make a distinction between the two is difficult and the matter is merely plausible, nothing more. However, the situation is easy to resolve because both the father and son are reliable and from the Ahl al-Sunnah. Al-Tustarī mentioned that the father is ‘Abd Allāh.<sup>2</sup>

Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852 AH) states:

عبد الله بن نمير بنون مصغر الهمداني أبو هشام الكوفي ثقة صاحب حديث من أهل السنة من كبار التاسعة مات سنة تسع وتسعين وله أربع وثمانون

‘Abd Allāh ibn Numayr al-Hamdānī Abū Hishām al-Kūfī. Reliable. A person of ḥadīth from the Ahl al-Sunnah. From the seniors of the ninth generation. He died in the year 299 and was eighty-four years old.”<sup>3</sup>

Ibn Ḥajar states:

---

1 Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt wa Izāhat al-Ishtibāhāt ‘an al-Ṭuruq wa al-Isnād*, 2/437. Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl al-Māzandarānī states exactly the same thing in his book, *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Ahwāl al-Rijāl*, 7/331 (biography no. 4065). The text reads, “I only mentioned them because al-‘Allāmah, in several places, narrates his tawthīq, from Ibn ‘Uqdah.”

2 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 6/:641 (biography no. 4561).

3 Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī: *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, 1/327.

محمد بن عبد الله بن نمير الهمداني بسكون الميم الكوفي أبو عبد الرحمن ثقة حافظ فاضل من العاشرة  
مات سنة أربع وثلاثين

Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Numayr al-Hamdānī al-Kūfī Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. Reliable. Ḥadīth master. Virtuous. From the tenth generation. He died in the year 234.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, Ibn Numayr, as Ibn Ḥajar mentioned, is from the *ḥuffāz* (ḥadīth masters) of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah. Despite this, we find the Imāmiyyah using his statements<sup>2</sup> of al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl as admissible proofs in their books. This, too, despite the difference of opinion they have about accepting his statements.

### 1. Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī’s position on the statements of tawthīq of Ibn Numayr

The statements of Ibn Numayr related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta‘dīl recur in al-Ḥillī’s *al-Khulāṣah*; however, at times, he mentions and affirms without any remarks<sup>3</sup>, and other times, he only considers them as *murijjihāt*, or statements to lend weight (to others’ pre-existing opinions).

Under the biography of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Abī Dhī‘b, al-Ḥillī states:

ضعفه ابن نمير وليس هذا عندي موجبا للطعن لكنه من مرجحات الطعن

Ibn Numayr made taḍṭīf of him. This, according to me, does not necessitate an actual criticism against him; rather, it can serve as lending weight to his criticism.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 1/490.

2 Among them, al-Ṭūsī in *al-Rijāl*—under the biography of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Abī Dhī‘b (p. 293, biography no. 3284).

3 As in al-Ḥillī’s *al-Khulāṣah* under the biography of al-Ḥārith ibn Ghūṣayn (p. 123, no. 321).

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 376, biography no. 1500.

Under the biography of Jamīl ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Nāfi’, al-Ḥillī states after mentioning Ibn Numayr’s tawthīq of him:

وهذه الرواية لا تقتضي عندي التعديل لكنها من المرجحات

This narration does not necessitate, according to me, a ta’dīl; however, it can serve as lending weight to it.<sup>1</sup>

This is how al-Ḥillī deals with the statements of al-jarh wa al-ta’dīl of Ibn Numayr. Perhaps the reason for this (contradictory behaviour) is the fact that he is regarded as one of the Ahl al-Sunnah’s *huffāz* (ḥadīth masters)—those people whose opinion cannot be relied upon when there is a difference in creed. And, as such, their statements can only go so far as being considered murijjihāt, or to lend weight to other (Shī‘ī) opinions, nothing more.

## 2. Abū al-Qasim al-Khū‘ī’s position on the statements of tawthīq of Ibn Numayr

Al-Khū‘ī’s opinion differs to what al-Ḥillī believed. While al-Ḥillī generally considered the statements of Ibn Numayr as authoritative only to the extent that it can lend weight to other (Shī‘ī) opinions, we see al-Khū‘ī not considering them at all. Commenting on the words of al-Ḥillī under the biography of Jamīl ibn ‘Abd Allāh, al-Khū‘ī states:

قال العلامة [الحل] في الخلاصة روى ابن عقدة عن محمد بن عبد الله بن أبي حكيم قال سألت ابن نمير عن محمد بن جميل بن عبد الله بن نافع الخياط فقال ثقة وقد رأيت وأبوه ثقة ثم قال [الحلي] وهذه الرواية لا تقتضي عندي التعديل لكنها من المرجحات أقول [هو الخوئي] بل لا تكون من المرجحات أيضا فابن نمير لم يوثق من طرفنا ومحمد بن عبد الله مجهول

Al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) states in *al-Khulāṣah*, “Ibn ‘Uqdah narrated from Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ḥakīmah who said, ‘I asked Ibn Numayr about Muḥammad ibn Jamīl ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Nāfi’ al-Khayyāṭ and he

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 93, biography no. 211.

said, ‘Reliable. I saw him. His father is (also) reliable.’” Thereafter, he (al-Ḥillī) states, “This narration does not necessitate, according to me, a ta’dīl; however, it can serve as lending weight to it (*murajjihāt*).”

I say (al-Khūṭī): In fact, it can’t even lend weight to others’ opinions. Ibn Numayr was not considered reliable via our (Shīṭī) chains. Furthermore, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh is *majhūl* (unknown).<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī states:

أما توثيق ابن نمير فلا أثر له

As for Ibn Numayr’s tawthīq, it holds no weight.<sup>2</sup>

And he states:

ابن نمير لم تثبت وثاقته وغير بعيد أن الرجل من العامة

Ibn Numayr’s reliability has not been verified. And it is highly plausible that the man is from the ‘Āmmah (i.e., the Ahl al-Sunnah).<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 5/135 (biography no. 2376).

2 Ibid., 8/32 (biography no. 4206 of Khālid ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān).

3 Ibid., 7/220 (biography no. 3951).

### 2.3 The Methodology of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī when the scholars' statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl contradict

Contradictory statements in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl from the scholars' is one of the more significant issues that the scholars of narrator criticism have dealt with. And because of the sheer number of contradictions in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl present in the Imāmiyyah's dictionaries of narrator evaluation, some of them have even gone the way of completely eliminating the science of narrator criticism [or attempting to do so]. Here we have al-Baḥrānī complaining about the excessive number of contradictions in this chapter:

فلاضطراب كلامهم في الجرح والتعديل على وجه لا يقبل الجمع والتأويل فترى الواحد منهم يخالف نفسه فضلا عن غيره فهذا يقدم الجرح على التعديل وهذا يقول لا يقدم إلا مع عدم إمكان الجمع وهذا يقدم النجاشي على الشيخ وهذا ينازعه ويطلبه بالدليل وبالجملة فالخائض في الفن يجزم بصحة ما ادعيناه والبناء من أصله لما كان على غير أساس كثر الانتقاض فيه والالتباس

And so, because of their confusing statements in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl—statements that cannot accept *jam' wa tāwīl* (combining/reconciling and interpreting)<sup>1</sup>, you see one of them contradicting himself—let alone others. One person (for example), prefers the jarḥ over the ta'dīl. And then this (other) person says it is not to be preferred unless it is proven that *jam'* (i.e., the act of combining the opinions together) is impossible. Another person (for example) prefers al-Najjāshī over al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī). And then another person argues with him and demands proof from him. In short, whoever gets into this subject will attest to the accuracy of what we claim. And because the edifice (of this science) was not built upon sound principles, there is a lot of confusion and criticism against it.<sup>2</sup>

Both Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūī are of those who dealt with the scholars' differences in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl in their respective books. However, before getting into the details regarding the different approaches

---

1 The process of gathering and reconciling between all the statements and interpreting them in such a manner whereby they no longer remain contradictory [translator's note].

2 Al-Muḥaqqiq al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nādirah*, 1/23.

adopted by the scholars in dealing with the contradictory statements in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl, it is necessary to mention two issues that are particularly related to al-Khūṭ in this section. Firstly, al-Khūṭ has adhered to a method before getting into the contradictory statements of the scholars of narrator criticism. That is, that the statement should be proven to come from that particular scholar. We have already seen that al-Khūṭ immediately rejects the statements of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, Ibn Numayr, and al-'Aqīqī because they are not proven, according to his viewpoint, to have come from them. Therefore, he generally does not occupy himself with considering their statements.

Secondly, al-Khūṭ does not regard the statements of the latter-day Imāmī scholars of narrator criticism as included in the discussion on contradictory reports. This is because he categorically does not consider them valid, as will be discussed in detail in the next section.

Similar to al-Khūṭ, there are several issues specifically related to al-Ḥillī in this regard. Firstly, al-Ḥillī considers the statements of some of the scholars of narrator criticism among the statements that merely lend support to others' pre-existing statements and, as such, do not enter into the core of the difference. This is evident from what we have seen of him considering the statements of Ibn Numayr as merely lending support for others (statements), while al-Khūṭ rejects them altogether.

Secondly, al-Ḥillī has adhered to a methodology in which he differs with al-Khūṭ. This is because the creed of the person making jarḥ or ta'dīl has a great bearing on the acceptance of his statements, if authentically attributed to him. This is contrary to the opinion of al-Khūṭ who does not consider the person who is making jarḥ or ta'dīl's creed and neither the creed of the narrator when accepting and not accepting his statements, since it is not considered in (determining) *'adālah* (integrity).

These four issues are broad lines and general principles that are not universal. It is necessary to point an issue at this juncture, that is, that the scholars of

the Imāmiyyah did not define a precise principle in regards to contradictory statements from the scholars of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl. For example, al-Subḥānī states:

إذا تعارض الجرح و التعديل فهل يقدم قول الجارح مطلقا أو المعدل كذلك أو يقدم الكثير منهما على الأقل

When there is a contradiction between a (statement of) jarḥ and (a statement of) ta'dīl, is the statement of the one making jarḥ to be preferred absolutely, or, is the statement of the one making ta'dīl to be preferred absolutely, or, is the one with more (statements) to be preferred over the one with less (statements)?<sup>1</sup>

We find al-Subḥānī dealing with the issue of contradictory statements without getting into the one making jarḥ or one making ta'dīl as a person. This is an adhered to method; while we find another principle mentioned by more than one person, among them, 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī. He states:

مما ينبغي أن يشار اليه البحث فيه ما ذكر من تقدم قول الشيخ النجاشي عند المعارضة بينه وبين قول غيره من الرجاليين المتقدمين أمثال الكشي والطوسي

Among the things that should be discussed is what was mentioned regarding giving the statement of Al-Shaykh al-Najjāshī's preference when there is a contradiction between it and the statement of other narrator critics' from the early generation, such as al-Kashshī and al-Ṭūsī.<sup>2</sup>

Here, we find much difference in the matter. While the first principle is not associated with individuals; rather, with proof and evidence. While we find the second (principle) presents the opinion of the individual himself as a proof to be preferred over others by taking into account his status, notability, and knowledge.

---

1 Al-Subḥānī: *Durūs Mūjazzah fi 'lmay al-Dirāyah wa al-Rijāl*, p. 194. 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī alluded to this in his book, *Uṣūl 'ilm al-Rijāl* (p. 160).

2 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'ilm al-Rijāl* (p. 166).

The two issues can be summarized in the following manner. Firstly, when there is a contradiction between the statements of jarḥ and ta'dīl, which of the two is to be given preference? Al-Faḍlī states:

وصلت الأقوال في المسألة بتفصيلاتها إلى تسعة أقوال ولكن المهم هو التالي

There are nine (different) opinions, with all of their detail, on the issue. However, the most important are the following.

Then he mentioned the following three opinions, which I have summarized as follows:

1. Overall preference of jarḥ;
2. Overall preference of tawthīq;
3. Detail: 1) The possibility of jam', or gathering and reconciling between the varying statements, and 2) the impossibility of jam', or gathering and reconciling between the varying statements.<sup>1</sup>

In short, these are the opinions on the issue. However, al-Faḍlī in his discussion on the impossibility of reconciliation alluded to the following:

الرجوع إلى المرجحات من الأكثرية والأعدلية الأضبطية ونحوها

Returning (i.e., to find an answer) to the (different) *murijjāhāt* (i.e., the statements that merely lend support to others', pre-existing ones') in the form of *akthariyyah* (majority opinions), *ʿadaliyyah* (opinions that contain narrators with the most integrity), and *adbaṭiyyah* (opinions that contain narrators with the most precision).

---

1 Al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 160. Al-Faḍlī provides (further) detail which can be reviewed in its appropriate place. Of those who spoke in detail on the issue is 'Alī al-Fānī al-Aṣḥānī in *Buḥūth fī Fiqh al-Rijāl* (Chapter 6, p. 133).



Thus, we find al-Faḍlī alluding to, or directing towards—even though it be from a distance—the second principle that is related to the individual person making *tawthīq*, the individual person making *jarḥ*, and their ‘*adālah* and *ḍabt* (precision). In addressing this issue, al-Astarābādī states:

التحقيق أن شيئاً منها ليس بأولى من التقديم من حيث هو جرح أو تعديل وكثرة الجراح أو المعدل أيضاً لا اعتداد بها بل الحق بالاعتبار في الجراح أو المعدل قوة التمهّر وشدة البصّر وتعود التمرّن على استقصاء الفحص و إنفاق المجهود

In reality, none of them is worthier of being preferred (over others) in terms of *jarḥ* or *ta’dīl*. There is also no consideration to be given to the fact that there may be more people making *jarḥ* or *ta’dīl*. In fact, the truth in regards to what is to be considered in the person making *jarḥ* or *ta’dīl* is the strength of his ability, the foresightedness, and the practice of thoroughly investigating and exercising all conceivable effort therein.<sup>1</sup>

Like this, we find some of the Imāmī scholars considering (as the most correct view) the most knowledgeable person’s opinion in the science, even if the criticism raised against the narrator is detailed, as will be seen.

Secondly, preferring the statement of al-Najāshī over others when there are contradictory opinions from the scholars of *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl* is the position of the majority of Imāmī scholars, irrespective of the principle of preferring *jarḥ* or preferring *ta’dīl*. This is what al-Astarābādī expressed in his previous statement with the words, “What is to be considered in the person making *jarḥ* or *ta’dīl* is the strength of his ability, the foresightedness, and the practice of thoroughly investigating and exercising all conceivable effort therein.” Al-Subḥānī states:

و الحق أن علماء الرجال الذين هم أصحاب الجرح والتعديل ليسوا على درجة واحدة في الوقوف على خصوصيات الراوي فمنهم واقف على خصوصيات الراوي بكافة تفاصيلها ومنهم من هو دون ذلك وإن كان له معرفة بالرجال فلذلك إذا تعارضت تزكية النجاشي مع جرح الشيخ [الطوسي] فيقدم الأول على الثاني وما هذا إلا لأن النجاشي كان له إمام واسع بهذا الفن في حين أن الشيخ [الطوسي] مع جلالته صرف عمره الشريف في علوم شتى

1 Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ḥusaynī al-Astarābādī: *al-Rawāshih al-Samāwiyyah (al-Rāhishah 32)*, p. 169.

The truth is that the scholars of narrator criticism—those who are the people of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl—are not on one level in terms of knowing the specifics of the narrator. There are those who know the specifics of the narrator with all of its detail, and there are those who know less than that, even though they have (general) knowledge of narrators. Thus, when there is contradiction between the statement of al-Najjāshī that deems a particular narrator as reliable and the statement of Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī), the former's opinion will be preferred over the latter. This is simply because al-Najjāshī possessed extensive knowledge of this science, whereas Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī), despite his notability, dedicated his noble life to a number of (different) sciences.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khāqānī (d. 1334 AH) states:

يؤخذ بقول الأرحم منهما كيف كان لكثرة اطلاعه وسعة باعه أو لكونه الأتقن أو الأخير بحاله...ومن ذلك ترجيح تزكية النجاشي على جرح الشيخ [الطوسي] وتزكيتها على جرح ابن الغضائري لتسرعه بالقدح جدا

The most preponderant opinion will be taken from the two, whatever it may be. This is because of his extensive and profound knowledge, or, because he is more precise or he knows more about his condition... From this comes giving preference to the tawthīq of al-Najjāshī over the jarḥ of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī), as well as both of their statements of tawthīq over the jarḥ of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī because of how hasty he is in criticizing (narrators).<sup>2</sup>

Baḥr al-'Ulūm (d. 1212 AH) preferred the statement of al-Najjāshī regarding narrators over Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh al-Ṭūsī and justified it doing so with five reasons.<sup>3</sup>

From here, we find that the Imāmī scholars, in general, rely on individuals more than the principle of preferring a detailed jarḥ or ta'dīl, or any other such

1 Al-Subḥānī: *Durūs fi 'Ilmay al-Dirāyah wa al-Rijāl*, p. 194.

2 'Alī al-Khāqānī: *Rijāl al-Khāqānī*, p. 56.

3 Baḥr al-'Ulūm: *Rijāl Baḥr al-'Ulūm*, 2/46-47.

principles since they tied preponderancy with (particular) individuals, as is clear from the previous texts. Based on this, the correct opinion according to the majority of Imāmī scholars is to not rely on the issue of preferring a detailed jarḥ. To such an extent that Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Kalbāsī (d. 1315 AH) has an entire chapter in his work, *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah*, on “The Contradiction between the statements of al-Najjāshī and Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī).”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kalbāsī—like the majority of scholars—preferred the statement of al-Najjāshī over al-Ṭūsī’s:

والأظهر تقديم قول النجاشي على قول الشيخ [الطوسي]

The clearer (opinion) is preferring al-Najjāshī’s statements over the statements of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī).<sup>2</sup>

Most of the scholars attributed their preferring al-Najjāshī’s statements over al-Ṭūsī’s because of the incessant amount of the latter’s errors and his overall carelessness in his works. To such an extent that al-Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn a-Shahīd stated in *Muntaqā al-Jammān*, “I do not know how the carelessness of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) reached this extent.”<sup>3</sup>

## The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī on the differences of al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl

### 1. Al-Ḥillī

Al-Ḥillī does not have a clear methodology in dealing with this issue. This is evident from scrutinizing his dealing with the places of difference (of opinion). There are many examples of his non-committal on this issue.

---

1 Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Kalbāsī: *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah*, 2/313.

2 Ibid., 2/316. He cited the opinions of the scholars on the issue.

3 Al-Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Shahīd: *Muntaqā al-Jammān*, 1/35. He mentioned this when explaining the (act of) differentiating between the names of narrators’ that have been confused because of sharing the same name.

1. At times, he prefers the statement of al-Ṭūsī over al-Najjāshī's. Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Khālīd ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Barqī, he states:

قال النجاشي إنه ضعيف الحديث والاعتماد عندي على قول الشيخ أبي جعفر الطوسي من تعديله

Al-Najjāshī states, “He is weak in ḥadīth.” According to me, reliance is upon the statement of al-Shaykh Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī relating to his ta'dīl.<sup>1</sup>

Under the biography of Dāwūd ibn Kathīr al-Raqiyy, he states:

قال الطوسي إنه ثقة... وقال النجاشي إنه ضعيف جدا و الغلاة تروي عنه... [ثم قال الحلبي] وعندي في أمره توقف والأقوى قبول روايته لقول الشيخ الطوسي وقول الكشي أيضا

Al-Ṭūsī states, “He is a *thiqah* (reliable)” ... Al-Najjāshī states, “He is very weak. The extremists narrate from him...” (Then al-Ḥillī states) According to me, judgement on his matter is to be suspended. The stronger opinion is to accept his narrations because of al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī's statement, as well as al-Kashshī's statement.<sup>2</sup>

2. At times, we find al-Ḥillī preferring the statement of al-Najjāshī over al-Ṭūsī's, as under the biography of Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā ibn 'Ubayd al-Yaqṭīnī. Al-Ḥillī states:

قال شيخنا الطوسي إنه ضعيف... وقال النجاشي إنه جليل في أصحابنا ثقة عين... [ثم قال الحلبي] والأقوى عندي قبول روايته

Our teacher, al-Ṭūsī stated, “He is weak.” ... Al-Najjāshī stated, “He is venerated among our companions. Reliable. Eminent...” (Thereafter, al-Ḥillī states) The stronger opinion, according to me, is to accept his narrations.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 237 (no. 813).

2 Ibid., p. 140 (no. 388). A contradiction appears from the text of al-Ḥillī; however, he ends it by accepting his narration.

3 Ibid., p. 241 (no. 821).

3. Al-Ḥillī has a statement that shows that even if the sayings of both al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī agree to the tawthīq of a man, he does not immediately accept it until it is free from any contradictory evidence. For example, under the biography of Ḥumayd ibn Ziyād, al-Ḥillī states:

ثقة عالم جليل واسع العلم كثير التصانيف قاله الطوسي قال النجاشي... كان ثقة واقفا وجها فيهم... ثم قال الحلّ [فالوجه عندي قبول روايته إذا خلت عن المعارض

Reliable. A great scholar. Very knowledgeable. A prolific writer. Al-Ṭūsī stated this. Al-Najjāshī states ... “He was reliable. A wāqifī. Prominent...” (Thereafter, al-Ḥillī states) The (correct) viewpoint is, according to me, to accept his narrations when they are free from any contradictory evidence.<sup>1</sup>

Here, he preferred their tawthīq on condition of it is free from any contradictory evidence. This, despite the fact that the narrator is from the more prominent figures of the Wāqifiyyah Shī'ah, those whose statements are not accepted by al-Ḥillī since they do not adhere to the (original) doctrine of the Imāmiyyah.

Like this, we find al-Ḥillī preferring the statement of al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī if they concur upon the tawthīq of a man over his principal of not accept the narration of a non-Imāmī.

4. At times, he gives preference to his principle of not making tawthīq of a non-Imāmī over the tawthīq of both al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī! Under the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Anmāṭī, al-Ḥillī states:

قال الشيخ أبو جعفر الطوسي إنه ثقة وكذا قال النجاشي إلا أن النجاشي قال إنه ثقة لا بأس به وقال [النجاشي] ثقة روى عن أبي الحسن عليه السلام ووقف [ثم يعقب الحلّي] قائلا [عندي توقف فيما يرويه

Al-Shaykh Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī states, “He is reliable.” And, like this, al-Najjāshī said the same except that he added, “He is reliable. There is no

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 129 (no. 341).

problem with him.” Al-Najjāshī stated, “Reliable. He narrated from Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام and stopped (i.e., at Mūsā al-Kāzim).” (Thereafter, al-Ḥillī commented saying) According to me, judgement of what he narrates is to be suspended.<sup>1</sup>

Here, he suspended judgement on the narrator because he is from the Wāqifah, despite al-Najjāshī and al-Ṭūsī’s tawthīq of him. Then, we see him contradicting this (position) under the biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl, al-Ḥillī states after mentioning his tawthīq from al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī:

فأنا أعتمد على روايته وإن كان فاسد المذهب

Thus, I rely on his narration, even though he has a false madhhab.<sup>2</sup>

In summary, whoever scrutinizes the statements of al-Ḥillī in his attempts to give a preponderant view, it will be clear to him that he does not attach much importance to the principle of preferring jarḥ over tawthīq. And neither did he adhere to preferring the statement of one scholar over another; rather, he dealt with each narrator according to what he saw from his own personal discretion.

## 2. The position of al-Khūṭī

Before getting into the view of al-Khūṭī regarding the differences of opinion, it is worthy of pointing out that al-Khūṭī, in most biographies—if not all—begins with al-Najjāshī’s opinion, if found. This gives the general impression that al-Khūṭī prefers al-Najjāshī’s opinion over others.

Al-Khūṭī has a methodology different to that of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī in dealing with the differences between al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī in al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl. This is apparent in some of the biographies that have already been mentioned in the methodology of al-Ḥillī.

---

1 Ibid., p. 314 (no. 1233).

2 Ibid., p. 177 (no. 536).

Under the biography of Dāwūd ibn Kathīr al-Raqqī, we find al-Ḥillī making his tawthīq by preferring al-Ṭūsī's tawthīq of him over al-Najjāshī's taḍīf. Al-Khūṭī judged him to be weak by relying on al-Najjāshī's taḍīf of him and by justifying it with a number of points. Among them, I will mention the following. Al-Khūṭī mentions the statement of al-Kashshī:

لم أسمع من مشايخ العصابة يطعن فيه

I did not hear from the teachers of the group that he was criticized.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī comments:

عدم سماع الكشي لا ينافي سماع النجاشي وشيخيه من غير طريقه

Al-Kashshī not hearing does not negate al-Najjāshī and his two teachers hearing via other than him.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Najjāshī criticized the tawthīq of al-Ṭūsī and al-Kashshī by explaining that the affirmative (criticism) supersedes the negative. This is because he gave preference to the text of al-Najjāshī in which he stated:

ضعيف جداً والغلاة تروي عنه قال أحمد بن عبد الواحد قلّ ما رأيت له حديثاً سديداً

He is very weak. The extremists narrate from him. Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Wāḥid stated, "Very rarely have I seen him having a sound ḥadīth."<sup>3</sup>

Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā ibn 'Ubayd al-Yaqtīnī, he preferred the tawthīq of al-Najjāshī over the criticism of al-Ṭūsī. He has lengthy justifications for accepting al-Najjāshī's tawthīq.<sup>4</sup>

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 408 (no. 766).

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 8/192 (biography no. 4429). He is referring to Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī and Ibn 'Abdūn with "the two teachers of al-Najjāshī."

3 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 156 (no. 410).

4 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 18/118 (biography no. 11536).

While justifying his preferring al-Najjāshī's statement over al-Ṭūsī's, al-Khūṭī states:

النجاشي أضبط

Al-Najjāshī is more precise.<sup>1</sup>

And, like this, we find al-Khūṭī preferring al-Najjāshī's statement over al-Ṭūsī's and explicitly stating that he is more precise than him. However, this is not always the case. In fact, it is based on his perceived benefit. The following proves this. Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Ja'far al-Asadī, al-Khūṭī states:

لا شك في وثاقته ولم يخالف فيها اثنان إنما الكلام في فساد عقيدته وقوله بالجبر والتشبيه وهذا هو مقتضى كلام النجاشي في ترجمته وقد تقدم عنه في ترجمة حمزة بن القاسم العلوي العباسي أن له كتاب الرد على محمد بن جعفر الأسدي والنجاشي على جلالته ومهارته لا يمكن تصديقه في هذا القول فإنه معارض بما تقدم عن الشيخ [الطوسي] من أن الأسدي مات على ظاهر العدالة ولم يطعن عليه المؤيد بما ذكره الصدوق... فإن اعتماد الصدوق على رواية أبي الحسين الأسدي يكشف عن حسن عقيدته وإيمانه وقد ذكر الصدوق بعد ذلك بقليل أنه لا يفتي برواية سماعة بن مهران لأنه كان واقفا

There is no doubt regarding his reliability and no two people disagreed about it. Rather, the issue has to do with his false belief and his opinion regarding *jabr* (determinism) and *tashbīh* (anthropomorphism). This is the essence of al-Najjāshī's words under his biography. It has already been mentioned from him under the biography of Ḥamzah ibn al-Qāsim al-'Alawī al-'Abbāsī that he has book *al-Radd 'alā Muḥammad ibn Ja'far al-Asadī*. And despite his greatness and expertise, al-Najjāshī's words cannot be believed in this regard since it contradicts what has already been mentioned from Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) in that al-Asadī died whilst ostensibly possessing 'adālah, and without being criticized—which is supported by what al-Ṣadūq mentioned... Al-Ṣadūq's reliance on the narration of Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Asadī reveals the soundness of his creed and faith. Shortly thereafter, al-Ṣadūq mentioned that he does not give fatwā on the narration of Samā'ah ibn Mihrān because he is a wāqifī.<sup>2</sup>

1 Ibid., 9/64 (biography no. 5042 – under the biography of Sa'd ibn Sa'd).

2 Ibid., 16/178 (biography no. 10411).



There are a number of points to consider from this. Firstly, al-Khūṭī preferred al-Ṭūsī's words over al-Najjāshī's, even though he admitted that al-Najjāshī is more precise.

Secondly, al-Khūṭī did not state what he previously stated under the biography of Dāwūd ibn Kathīr, "Al-Kashshī not hearing does not negate al-Najjāshī and his two teachers hearing via other than him." Accordingly, he did not say here: "Al-Ṭūsī's not hearing does not negate al-Najjāshī's hearing on account of the narrator's false beliefs and that he is a *mushabbih* (anthropomorphist)!"

And like this, we find al-Khūṭī invalidating in one place what he finds a basis for in another place. The evidences for this are many. This is because things are based on *maṣlahah* (expediency), or perceived benefit, according to him. The following evidence is sufficient for us. Al-Khūṭī states:

محمد بن أحمد بن خاقان وإن حكى الشيخ [الطوسي] توثيقه من العياشي إلا أن النجاشي ضعفه وكذلك ابن الغضائري على ما حكاه العلامة وابن داود و الحسن بن الحسين اللؤلؤي وإن وثقه النجاشي إلا أنه ضعفه محمد بن الحسن بن الوليد والصدوق و أبو العباس بن نوح إذا لا يمكن الاعتماد على هذه الرواية

Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Khāqān. Even though Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) narrated his tawthīq from al-'Ayyāshī, al-Najjāshī deemed him weak. As did Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, based on what al-'Allāmah and Ibn Dāwūd narrated. Al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥusayn, even though al-Najjāshī made tawthīq of him, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, Ibn al-Walīd, al-Ṣadūq, and Abū al-'Abbās ibn Nūḥ made taḍīf of him since it is not possible to rely on this narration.<sup>1</sup>

Here we find al-Khūṭī relying on al-Najjāshī's taḍīf. Not long thereafter, he rejected the tawthīq of al-Najjāshī—who is a "master of the field," as he addressed him. In summary, the matter revolves around his perceived benefit; if it is in preferring al-Ṭūsī's statement, he gives it preference, and if it is in preferring al-Najjāshī's statement, he gives it preference.

---

1 Ibid., 5/204 (biography no. 2578).

In fact, when al-Khūī wants to adapt the difference of opinion in his favour, he states, as under the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Zayd:

أنك قد عرفت من الشيخ [الطوسي] تضعيف عبد الله بن أبي زيد وعرفت من النجاشي توثيقه وقد يقال إن توثيق النجاشي لأصبيته يتقدم على تضعيف الشيخ وهذا كلام لا أساس له فإن الأصبطية لو أفادت فإنما تنفيذ في مقام الحكاية لا في مقام الشهادة وبعدها كان كل من الشيخ والنجاشي يعتمد على شهادتهما لا يكون وجه لتقديم أحدهما على الآخر فهما متعارضان وبالتتبع لا يمكن الحكم بوثاقة عبد الله بن أبي زيد فلا يحكم بحجية روايته والله العالم وقد يتوهم أن كلام النجاشي بما أنه صريح في وثاقة عبد الله في الحديث يتقدم على كلام الشيخ في التضعيف فإنه ظاهر في الضعف من جهة الرواية والحديث إذ من المحتمل إرادة أنه ضعيف في مذهبه والنص يتقدم على الظاهر والجواب عن ذلك أولاً أن تقدم النص على الظاهر إنما هو لأجل قرينته على إرادة خلاف الظاهر من الظاهر وهذا إنما يكون في ما إذا كان الصريح والظاهر في كلام شخص واحد أو في كلام شخصين يكونان بمنزلة شخص واحد كما في المعصومين (عليهم السلام) وأما في غير ذلك فلا مناص من أن يعامل معاملة المعارض والوجه فيه ظاهر هذا مضافاً إلى عدم احتمال إرادة الضعف في المذهب من كلام الشيخ [الطوسي] بعد تصريحه بأنه خاصي

You know from Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) the taḍīf of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Zayd. And you know from al-Najjāshī his tawthīq. It can be said: the tawthīq of al-Najjāshī is to be preferred over the taḍīf of al-Shaykh because he is more precise. This statement has no basis because if being more precise was beneficial, it would only be in relation to narration, not in testimony. And since both al-Shaykh and al-Najjāshī’s testimonies are reliable, there is no reason to prefer one over the other since they are contradictory. As a result, it is not possible to pass judgement on ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Zayd being reliable and, as such, a ruling deeming his narration as authoritative cannot be given. And Allah knows best.

It may be presumed that the words of al-Najjāshī—since they are explicitly making tawthīq of ‘Abd Allāh in ḥadīth—are to be preferred over the words of al-Shaykh and his taḍīf for the reason that it only appears as though it is in relation to the (narrator’s) weakness in narration and ḥadīth. And it is quite possible that he is only weak in relation to his own school (and not broadly in relation to narration and ḥadīth). In such an instance, the explicit statement is to be preferred over the manifest statement.

The answer to this possibility is as follows. Firstly, preferring an explicit statement over a manifest statement is only because it holds a closer association (to the desired meaning) than the manifest statement since the latter holds the propensity to (also) mean something different to its apparent meaning. This is only applicable when both the explicit and manifest (texts) are in relation to the words of one person, or, the words of two people who hold the status of one, as is the case with the Infallibles عليهم السلام. As for other situations, there is no escaping the fact that it is to be treated as a contradictory issue. The reason for this is self-evident. This is in addition to the words of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) being impossible to mean that the narrator’s weakness is in relation to his own school, (especially) after he explicitly stated that the narrator is from the Khāṣah [the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah].<sup>1</sup>

Here, al-Khūṭī has a methodology different to the one before. Here, he regarded the conflicting statements of al-Najjāshī and al-Ṭūsī sufficient grounds to suspend judgement on the narrator. He did not say that al-Najjāshī is more precise, or that he is an “expert in the field,” as he referred to him as; rather, he regarded this statement as having no basis. What is amazing is the fact that this is precisely what al-Khūṭī stated. All of this goes back to the notion of *maṣlaḥah* (expediency), or what he perceives to be the most beneficial.

For the sake of benefit, I will mention and critically analyse here how al-Khūṭī dealt with al-Najjāshī’s differences with other scholars. After making taḍfīf of one of the narrations, al-Khūṭī states:

لمفضل بن عمر الواقع في سندها لأنه وإن وثقه الشيخ المفيد قده حيث ذكر أن من شيوخ أصحاب أبي عبد الله (ع) وخاصته وبطانته وثقاته الفقهاء والصالحين رحمهم الله المفضل بن عمر الجعفي إلا أن النجاشي وابن الغضائري قد ضعفاه ومع تعارض التوثيق بالتضعيف لا يمكننا الاعتماد عليه أبداً على أنه يمكن أن يقال أن النجاشي حسبما وقفنا عليه أضبط من المفيد قده فإنه قد يرى منه بعض المناقضات ولم نر من النجاشي قده مثله مثلاً ذكر المفيد في محكي كلامه في الإرشاد في باب النص على الرضا (ع) ما

1 Ibid., 11/98 (biography no. 6677). I cited the rest of the statement because it contains beneficial knowledge related to ḥadīth.

هذا نصه ممن روى النص على الرضا (ع) بالإمامة من أبيه والإشارة منه بذلك من خاصته وثقاته وأهل الورع والعلم والفقه من شيعته داود بن كثير الرقي... و محمد بن سنان

وهذا كما ترى توثيق صريح منه فده لمحمد بن سنان إلا أنه ناقضه في موضع من محكي رسالته التي صنفها في كمال شهر رمضان ونقصانه حيث قال بعد نقل رواية دالة على أن شهر رمضان لا يتقص أبدا ما هذه عبارته وهذا حديث شاذ نادر غير معتمد عليه في طريقه محمد ابن سنان وهو مطعون فيه لا تختلف العصابة في تهمة وضعفه ومن كان هذا سبيله لا يعتمد عليه في الدين

وهذا صريح في تضعيف الرجل وهما كلامان متناقضان ولم ير من النجاشي قده المناقضة في الكلام فهذا يرجح تضعيف النجاشي قده في المقام مع معاضدته بتضعيف شيخه أعني ابن الغضائري لأنه أيضا ثقة ومن مشايخ النجاشي قدهما إذا الرواية غير قابلة للاستدلال بها على شيء هذا

Al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar that is in the chain of narration, even though al-Shaykh al-Mufīd made tawthīq of him when he mentioned “from among the teachers of the companions of Abū ‘Abd Allāh, his closest confidants, and reliable and righteous scholars is al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar al-Ju‘fī;” however, al-Najjāshī and Ibn al-Ghaḍā‘irī both made taḍīf of him. And when the tawthīq conflicts with the taḍīf, it is not possible for us to ever rely upon him. However, it can be said that al-Najjāshī, according to what we have come across—is more precise than al-Mufīd. This is because certain contradictions have been seen from the latter and we have not seen something similar with al-Najjāshī. For example, under the chapter of “The Explicit Text on (the Imāmah of) al-Riḍā,” al-Mufīd mentions in *al-Irshād* the following, “Of those who have narrated textual evidence on the Imāmah of al-Riḍā’s from his father, and his father indicating towards that—from among his close confidants, those whom he relied upon, those from the people of piety, knowledge and fiqh from among his group—is Dāwūd ibn Kathīr al-Raqqī... and Muḥammad ibn Sinan.”<sup>1</sup>

As you can see, this is an explicit tawthīq of Muḥammad ibn Sinān from him; however, he contradicted this in another place in his work regarding the complete and incomplete (days of the) month of Ramaḍān. After transmitting a narration that indicates that the month of Ramaḍān

1 Al-Mufīd: *al-Irshād fī Ma‘rifat Ḥujaj Allah ‘alā al-‘Ibād*, 2:284 (*al-Naṣṣ ‘alā Imāmat ‘Alī ibn Mūsā*).

never decreases, he states the following text that reads, “And this ḥadīth is *shādh* (anomalous), rare, and not to be relied upon. In its chain is Muḥammad ibn Sinān, and he has been criticized. The group does not differ regarding him being criticized and weak. And whoever’s way this is, he is not to be relied upon in the religion.”<sup>1</sup>

This is an explicit statement of taḍīf of this person. Both statements are clearly contradictory. No contradiction can be seen from al-Najjāshī’s statements and, thus, his statement of taḍīf is to be given preference in this instance, and (it is also to be given preference) because of the supporting evidence from his teacher (i.e., Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī—who is also reliable and from the teachers of al-Najjāshī), who also made taḍīf of him. Therefore, based on this, the narration cannot be used as admissible proof.<sup>2</sup>

Let us analyse the words of al-Khū’ī and draw conclusions. Firstly, al-Khū’ī judging the narration to be weak because of the existence of al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar. Secondly, al-Khū’ī mentioning the opinion of al-Najjāshī making taḍīf of al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar and the opinion of al-Mufīd making his tawthīq.

Thirdly, after al-Khū’ī mentioned the difference of opinion regarding al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar between al-Najjāshī and al-Mufīd, he states, “Based on this, it is not possible to say that al-Najjāshī—based on what we have come across—is more precise than al-Mufīd.” And he mentioned something of the contradictions of al-Mufīd and immediately thereafter, he gave preference to the taḍīf of al-Najjāshī over the tawthīq of al-Mufīd.

And he stated, “No contradiction can be seen from al-Najjāshī’s statements and, thus, his statement of taḍīf is to be given preference in this instance, and (it is also to be given preference) because of the supporting evidence from his teacher (i.e., Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī—who is also reliable and from the teachers of al-Najjāshī), who (also) made taḍīf of him.”

---

1 Al-Mufīd: *Jawābāt Ahl al-Mawṣil fī al-‘Adad wa al-Ru’yah*, p. 20.

2 Al-Khū’ī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 1/420-422 (commentary under “taqḍīm mawārid al-Nāfilah ‘alā al-Intiṣāf”).

This is how al-Khūṭī provides a basis for this issue and generates his ruling based on the study of this subject; however, when there was a perceived benefit in making *tawthīq* of al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar, he completely overturned his previous words and stated, in another place:

وأما المفضل بن عمر ففيه كلام طويل...والظاهر أنه ثقة بل من كبار الثقة...نعم ذكر النجاشي أنه فاسد المذهب مضطرب الحديث قال وقيل إنه كان خطابيا والظاهر أنه أراد بهذا القائل ابن الغضائري على ما نسب إليه وكيفما كان فقد عدّه الشيخ المفيد (قده) في إرشاده من شيوخ أصحاب أبي عبد الله عليه السلام وخاصته وبطائه ومن ثقات الفقهاء الصالحين وعدّه الشيخ الطوسي في كتاب الغيبة من السفراء الممدوحين وذكر في التهذيب في باب المهور والأجور رواية عن محمد بن سنان عن مفضل بن عمر ثم ناقش في سندها من أجل محمد بن سنان فحسب وهو كالصريح في العمل برواية مفضل وعدم الخدش من ناحيته وعدّه ابن شهر آشوب من ثقات أبي عبد الله عليه السلام ومن بطائه أضف إلى ذلك الروايات المعتمدة الواردة في مدحه كما مر وما خصه الصادق عليه السلام من كتاب التوحيد وبعد هذا كله فلا يعبأ بكلام النجاشي من أنه فاسد المذهب كما أن ما ذكره من أنه مضطرب الرواية غير ثابت أيضا وعلى تقدير الثبوت فهو غير قادم بوثاقة الرجل غايته أن حديثه مضطرب أي قد ينقل ما لا يقبل التصديق أو يعتمد على أشخاص لا ينبغي الاعتماد عليهم فالظاهر أن الرجل من الأجلء الثقة حتى أن الشيخ مضافا إلى عدّه إياه من السفراء الممدوحين اعتمد عليه في التهذيب كما عرفت

As for al-Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar, there is a lengthy discussion on him... Ostensibly, he is reliable. In fact, from the more senior reliable narrators... Yes, al-Najjāshī mentioned he has a false school (of belief) and is confused in ḥadīth. He said, “It is said that he is a *khaṭṭābī*.” It appears as though he intended Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī by this statement, according to what was attributed to him. Whatever it may be, al-Shaykh al-Mufīd counted him in his *Kitāb al-Irshād* among the teachers of the companions of Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام, his close confidants, and from the reliable (and) righteous jurists. In *Kitāb al-Ghaybah*, al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī counted him among the praiseworthy *sufarā’* (ambassadors). And he mentioned a narration in *al-Tahdhīb* under the chapter “*Muhūr and Ujūr* (Dowries and Remunerations)” on the authority of Muḥammad ibn Sinān, from Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar. Thereafter, he disputed the chain of narration on account of Muḥammad ibn Sinān and nothing more. This is like he is explicitly acting on the narration of Mufaḍḍal and not venturing into finding fault with him. Ibn Shahr Ashūb counted him from among the reliable (narrators) of Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام

and his closest confidants. Add to this the reliable narrations in his praise, as mentioned. And (considering) the fact that al-Ṣādiq singled him out in (dictating) *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* (to him). After all of this, no attention is to be given to the words of al-Najjāshī in that he has a false school (of belief). And what he mentioned regarding him being confused in ḥadīth is also not proven. Assuming it is proven, it does not affect the reliability of the man. The most that can be said is that he is merely confused in ḥadīth, i.e., he transmits that which cannot be verified, or, he relies on individuals who are not supposed to be relied upon. Ostensibly, the man is of the great (and) reliable narrators to such an extent that al-Shaykh, in addition to counting him among the praiseworthy ambassadors, relied upon him in *al-Tahdhīb*, as you know.<sup>1</sup>

Firstly, after al-Khūī previously stated:

Al-Najjāshī, according to what we have come across, is more precise than al-Mufīd.

And:

No inconsistency has been seen from his words and so, with this, al-Najjāshī's taḍīf is to be given preference.

Here, we find him saying:

After all of this, the words of al-Najjāshī are insignificant.

Secondly, after al-Khūī supported the taḍīf of al-Najjāshī in the previous text, and he (further) supported it with the statement of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, we find him here rejecting al-Najjāshī saying:

Whatever it was, al-Mufīd counted him in his *Kitāb al-Irshād* among the teachers of the companions of Abū 'Abd Allāh ﷺ, his innermost and

---

1 Al-Khūī: *Kitāb al-Ṣawm*, 1/339-340 (commentary) “Ḥukm al-Jimā' ma'a al-Ikrāh aw al-Muṭāwa'ah).

closest confidants, and from among the most reliable (and) righteous jurists. Al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī counted him in *Kitāb al-Ghaybah* among the praiseworthy *sufarā'* (ambassadors)... He is, for all practical purposes, acting on the narration of Mufaḍḍal and not venturing into finding fault with him. Ibn Shahr Ashūb regarded him from among the reliable (narrators) of Abū 'Abd Allāh عليه السلام and from among his closest confidants. Add to that the reliable narrations mentioned in his praise, as already mentioned!

This is the methodology of al-Khūṭī; in his first statement, he found fault with al-Mufīd when, under the biography of al-Mufaḍḍal ibn 'Umar, he contradicted himself and, thus, rejected his statement on account of this contradiction. He then preferred the statement of al-Najjāshī over his. And exactly what happened to al-Mufīd happened to him—in relation to the exact same narrator!

In summary, the methodology of al-Khūṭī when the scholars differ—specifically al-Najjāshī, al-Ṭūsī and al-Mufīd—entails a lack of adherence to one of the two opinions. In fact, he does not even adhere to the principle of preferring the detailed criticism over the general tawthīq; rather, he makes tawthīq or taḍīf according to the benefit he perceives. The quotations above are sufficient evidence for you.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 For the sake of benefit, Muḥammad al-Sanad made a comparative analysis between the books *al-Fihrist* and *al-Rijāl* of al-Ṭūsī and the book of al-Najjāshī. He speaks about who is preferred. There is much good in this discussion. It can be reviewed in his book, *Buḥūth fī Mabānī 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 318.



## 2.4 The position of al-Khūī in light of the scholars' statements of tawthīq before him

Considering how late the era of al-Khūī is in relation to his predecessors, he found himself facing many of their opinions related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl. Their statements can be divided in the following manner.

### 2.4.1 The position of al-Khūī on the statements of the early generation of scholars

By the early generation of scholars, I mean the authors of the primary sources of narrator criticism, their predecessors, and their contemporaries.

Al-Ṭūsī, al-Najjāshī, al-Kashshī, and all those that I mentioned whose statements related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl are accepted, all belong to this generation. According to al-Khūī, all of these scholars' statements related to the jarḥ and ta'dīl of narrators are valid. When mentioning what establishes the reliability or goodness of a narrator, al-Khūī states:

نص أحد الأعلام المتقدمين ومما ثبت به الوثاقة أو الحسن أن ينص على ذلك أحد الأعلام كالبرقي وابن قولويه والكشي والصدوق والمفيد والنجاشي والشيخ وأضرابهم... ولهذا نعتمد على توثيقات أمثال ابن عقدة وابن فضال وأمثالهم

One of the notable scholars from the early generation states (it), such as al-Barqī, Ibn Qūlawayh, al-Kashshī, al-Ṣadūq, al-Mufīd, al-Najjāshī, al-Shaykh, and their likes... It is for this reason we rely on the statements of tawthīq of the likes of Ibn 'Uqdah, Ibn Faḍḍāl, and their likes.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, there is no doubt that al-Khūī relies on the statements of the early generation of scholars. And so, when he mentions their statements, he mentions them because he relies on them. However, he stipulates that the attribution of

---

1 Al-Khūī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/41.

jarḥ or ta'dīl to the person should be proven, as is the case of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī's statements, or Ibn Numayr, or others about whom there is a difference of opinion regarding the validity of al-Ḥillī and others to this scholar. And that he considers the differences of opinion of the early generation a valid difference. And he considers the differences among the early generation of scholars as real and attaches no real importance to the statements of the latter-day scholars when they contradict the statements of the scholars from the earlier generations, no matter their standing.

Two issues should be noted. Firstly, al-Khūṭī makes a distinction between the tawthīq of one of the early generation of scholars of a particular narrator and the process of their authenticating his narration, or his (mere) presence in the chain of narration that has been authenticated. There is a difference, here, which al-Khūṭī explains:

إن تصحيح القدماء لرواية لا يدل على وثاقة الراوي ولا على حسنه

The earlier generations' authenticating a narration is neither indicative of the narrator's reliability nor his uprightness.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī adds further clarification with his statement:

التصحيح [للمرواية] غير التوثيق [للمراوي] فإن معناه حجية الرواية والاعتماد عليها ولعل ذلك لبناء الصدوق على أصالة العدالة الذي كان معروفا عند القدماء بل إنه (قده) لم ينظر في سند الرواية بوجه وإنما يعتمد في ذلك على ما رواه شيخه ابن الوليد كما صرح (قده) بذلك فهو تابع له ومقلد من هذه الجهة ومن المعلوم أن ذلك لا يكفي في الحجية عندنا نعم لو وثقه أو مدحه كفى ولكنه لم يذكر شيئا من ذلك وإنما هو مجرد التصحيح والعمل بروايته الذي لا يجدي بالنسبة إلينا

The authentication of the narration is not the authentication of the narrator. It means that the narration is authoritative and can be relied upon. Perhaps that is based on al-Ṣadūq's presumption that all narrators known to earlier generations possess *'adālah* (integrity). In fact, he did

1 Ibid., 4:96 (no. 1493).

not look at the chain of narration in any way, but rather relied on what his teacher, Ibn al-Walīd, narrated, as he explicitly mentioned. Therefore, from this perspective, he is a follower and adherent of his. It is well known that this is, according to us, not sufficient to establish its authoritativeness. Yes, it would have been sufficient if he made *tawthīq* or praised him; however, he did not mention anything of the kind. It is merely the act of authenticating and acting on his narration. And this is, in relation to us, serves no purpose.<sup>1</sup>

Secondly, regarding al-Khūī's distinction between the earlier generation of scholars' reliance on a narrator and their *tawthīq* of him, he states:

إن اعتماد القدماء على رواية شخص لا يدل على توثيقهم إياه وذلك لما عرفت من بناء ذلك على أصالة العدالة التي لا نبني عليها

The reliance of the earlier generation of scholars on the narration of an individual is not indicative of their *tawthīq* of him. This is because of what you already know in terms of the presumed state of *'adālah* (integrity)—which we do not ascribe to.<sup>2</sup>

## 2.4.2 The position of al-Khūī on the statements of the latter-day scholars

Al-Khūī clearly states the distinction between the statements of the early generation of scholars' and those after them. He states:

ومما تثبت به الوثاقة أو الحسن أن ينص على ذلك أحد الأعلام المتأخرين بشرط أن يكون من أخير عن وثاقته معاصرا للمخبر أو قريب العصر منه كما يتفق ذلك في توثيقات الشيخ منتجب الدين أو ابن شهر آشوب وأما في غير ذلك كما في توثيقات ابن طاووس والعلامة وابن داود ومن تأخر عنهم كالمجلسي لمن كان بعيدا عن عصرهم فلا عبرة بها فإنها مبنية على الحدس والاجتهاد جزما وذلك فإن السلسلة قد انقطعت بعد الشيخ [الطوسي] فأصبح عامة الناس [لا قليلا منهم مقلدين يعملون بفتاوى

1 Al-Khūī: *Kitāb al-Ṣawm*, 1/295-296 (commentary) (Kaffārat Ṣawm Qaḍā' Shahr Ramaḍān).

2 Al-Khūī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 3/122 (no. 932).

الشيخ ويستدلون بها كما يستدل بالرواية على ما صرح به الحلبي في السرائر وغيره في غيره... وعلى الجملة فالشيخ [الطوسي] هو حلقة الاتصال بين المتأخرين وأرباب الأصول التي أخذ منها الكتب الأربعة وغيرها ولا طريق للمتأخرين إلى توثيقات رواياتها وتضعيفهم غالبا إلا الاستنباط وإعمال الرأي والنظر... وقد تحصل مما ذكرناه أن ابن طاووس والعلامة وابن داود ومن تأخر عنهم إنما يعتمدون في توثيقاتهم وترجيحاتهم على آرائهم واستنباطاتهم أو على ما استفادوه من كلام النجاشي أو الشيخ في كتبهم قليلا ما يعتمدون على كلام غيرهما وقد يخطئون في الاستفادة كما سنشير إلى بعض ذلك في موارد كما قد يخطئون في الاستنباط فتري العلامة يعتمد على كل إمامي لم يرد فيه قدح يظهر ذلك مما ذكره في ترجمة أحمد بن إسماعيل بن سمكة وغير ذلك وتري المجلسي يعد كل من للصدوق إليه طريق ممدوحا وهو غير صحيح... وعليه فلا يعتد بتوثيقاتهم بوجه من الوجوه

And from those things that establishes the reliability or upstandingness of a narrator is when it is documented by one of the notable latter-day scholars, on condition that the one informing of his reliability is a contemporary of his, or close in time to him. As would be the case of the statements of tawthīq of al-Shaykh Muntajib al-Dīn, or Ibn Shahr Ashūb. As for other instances, such as the statements of tawthīq of Ibn Ṭāwūs, al-'Allāmah, Ibn Dāwūd, and whoever came after them, such as al-Majlisī. As for those distant from their era, there is no consideration for their statements because they are based on personal discretion and conjecture. That is to say that the (scholarly) chain came to an end after al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) and so most people—save a few—began (blindly) following, acting on the verdicts of al-Shaykh, and using them as authoritative proof, just as the narration stated by al-Ḥillī in *al-Sarā'ir* and by other such scholars in other places is used authoritatively... In short, al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) he is the link between the latter-day scholars and the authors of the principal works from which the four books—and others—are taken from. Generally, there is no way for the latter-day scholars to issue statements of tawthīq and taḍīf on the narrators of ḥadīth except through inference, employing personal reason and speculation... What results from what we have mentioned is that Ibn Ṭāwūs, al-'Allāmah, Ibn Dāwūd, and those who came after them only relied—in their statements of tawthīq and preferential statements—on their (personal) opinions and inferences, or what they gained from the words of al-Najjāshī and al-Shaykh in their books. Rarely do they rely on other than the statements of these twos. At times, they erred in doing so,

as we will soon point out in its appropriate places. Just as they, at times, erred in their (personal) deductions. Thus, you see al-‘Allāmah relying on every Imāmī who has no criticism levelled against him. This is clear from what he has mentioned under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Samakah and others. You (also) see al-Majlisī regarding every person who has a chain to al-Ṣadūq as praiseworthy—which is incorrect... Therefore, their statements of tawthīq are not valid in any way.<sup>1</sup>

It seems as though al-Khūṭī is dividing the phase of the latter-day scholars into two:

1. The one informing of his reliability is a contemporary of the narrator, and
2. Or the one informing of his reliability is close to him in relation to time, as would be the case of the statements of tawthīq of al-Shaykh Muntajib al-Dīn, or Ibn Shahr Ashūb. The statements of these scholars are accepted.

After al-Khūṭī regarded the tawthīq of Ibn Shahr Ashūb as part of the category of being contemporaneous to the narrator, or close to him in relation to time—which is acceptable, according to him—we find him stating under the biography of ‘Umar ibn Tawbah:

وثاقته أيضا غير ثابتة إذ إن التوثيق إنما هو من ابن شهر آشوب وقد ذكرنا في المقدمة أنه لا أثر لتوثيق المتأخرين الرواة المتقدمين فإنه مبني على الحدس والاجتهاد

Him being considered reliable is not proven because the tawthīq is from Ibn Shahr Ashūb. We have mentioned in the introduction that the statements of tawthīq in favour of the early generation of narrators that come from the latter-day scholars are ineffectual and hold no weight. This is because such statements are based on conjecture and personal discretion.<sup>2</sup>

This is contradictory, unless the era of ‘Umar ibn Tawbah is from the era of Ibn Ashūb. And, in fact, this is the case; the generation of ‘Umar ibn Tawbah is among

---

1 Ibid., 1/42, 43, 44.

2 Ibid., 14/27 (no. 8721).

the narrators who transmit from Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. And the demise of Ja'far is 148 AH. If this is not the case, what, then, does his statement “or close to him” signify?

The second category: the statements of tawthīq of Ibn Ṭāwūs, al-ʿAllamah, Ibn Dāwūd, and those who came after them, such as al-Majlisī who was distant from their era. No consideration is to be given such statements because they are definitively based on conjecture and personal discretion. Therefore, they are rejected. A person may say: If al-Khūī did not rely on the statements of tawthīq of the latter-day scholars, then why did he mention them in his book? Al-Khūī answers saying:

لم نتعرض لتوثيقات المتأخرين فيما إذا كان توثيق من القدماء لعدم ترتب فائدة على ذلك نعم تعرضنا لها في موارد لم نجد فيها توثيقاً من القدماء فإننا وإن كنا لا نعتمد على توثيقات المتأخرين إلا أن جماعة يعتمدون عليها فلا مناص من التعرض لها

We did not give any attention to the statements of tawthīq of the latter-day scholars in cases where there already exist similar statements from the earlier generation of scholars since there is no benefit in doing so. Yes, we have given such statements attention in places where we found no statements of tawthīq of the earlier generation. And so, even though we do not rely on the statements of tawthīq of the latter-day scholars, a number of scholars have and, as such, there is no escaping the fact that they need be mentioned.<sup>1</sup>

In explaining and detailing the reason for rejecting al-Ḥillī's statements of tawthīq of narrators and (also rejecting the statements) authenticating the narrations, al-Khūī states:

فالظاهر أن توثيقاته كتصحيحاته مما لا يمكن الاعتماد عليه لأنه على عظم منزلته وجلالته لا يحتمل عادة أن يكون توثيقه كقوله فلان ثقة شهادة حسية منه (قدس سره) بأن يكون قد سمع وثاقه من يوثقه ممن رآه وهو ممن سمعها وهكذا إلى أن ينتهي إلى عصر الراوي الذي يوثقه وذلك لطول الفصل بينه وبين من يوثقه من الرواة وتخلل برهة بين عصريهما بحيث لا يحتمل معهما الشهادة الحسية بوجه فإنه بعد عصر الشيخ

---

1 Ibid., 1/13.

[الطوسي] إلى مدة مديدة كان العلماء يتبعون آراءه وأقواله حتى سموهم المقلدة على ما ذكره الشهيد الثاني في درايته فلا يحتمل معه عادة أن يكون العلامة قد سمع توثيق راو عن زيد وهو عن عمرو وهكذا إلى أن ينتهي إلى عصره فتوثيقاته شهادة حدسية ومستندة إلى اجتهاده ومن الظاهر أن اجتهاد أي فقيه [لا] يكون حجة على فقيه آخر ومن هنا يتضح الحال في توثيقات معاصريه أو المتأخرين عنه ممن حاله كابن طاووس والمجلسي قدس الله أسرارهم لأنها شهادات حدسية وإلا فمن البديهي أن توثيق العلامة (قده) لا يقصر عن توثيق أهل الرجال كالنجاشي والشيخ وأضرابهما فالمتحصل أن توثيقات العلامة كتصحيحاته غير قابلة للاعتماد

Ostensibly, his statements of *tawthīq* are like his statements of authentication, which cannot be relied upon. This is because—despite his high-rank and greatness—it is usually not possible for his statement “so-and-so is reliable” to be an actual testimony from him such that he heard about that individual’s reliability from someone whom he directly saw making *tawthīq* of him and he (i.e., the person whom al-Ḥillī saw and hear the *tawthīq* from) heard this in a similar, contiguous manner until it ends in the era of the narrator which he made *tawthīq* of. The reason for this is because of the lengthy separation between him and the person who makes *tawthīq* of that narrator, as well as the gap in time between their two eras. Both of these factors make it practically impossible to have a tangible form of testimony (of that narrator). After the era of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī), for a very long time the scholars used to follow his opinions and statements to such an extent that they were named the *Muqallidah* (Followers), according to what al-Shahīd al-Thānī mentioned in his study. Thus, it is generally not possible that al-‘Allāmah heard the *tawthīq* of a narrator from (for example) Zayd, who heard it from (for example) ‘Amr and like this until the era of the narrator. Therefore, his statements of *tawthīq* are conjecture-based testimonies and more so based on his personal discretion. It is a known phenomenon that the personal discretion of one jurist is not<sup>1</sup> a binding authoritative proof for another jurist. From here, the situation becomes clear regarding the statements of *tawthīq* of his contemporaries, or those who came after him whose condition is like that of Ibn Ṭāwūs and al-Majlisī. This is because they are testimonies based on conjecture.

1 I inserted the word ‘no’ so the statement makes sense, even though it does not appear in the copy of the book.

Otherwise, it is obvious that the tawthīq of al-‘Allāmah is not lesser (in status) than the tawthīq of the expert narrator critics such as al-Najjāshī, al-Shaykh, and their likes. As a result, the statements of tawthīq of al-‘Allāmah are like his statements of authentication—unreliable.<sup>1</sup>

### 2.4.3 The position of al-Khūṭī on the statements of al-Ḥillī regarding narrators

In section two, the general opinion of al-Khūṭī regarding the latter-day scholars was elucidated. And also, that he counted al-Ḥillī among the second category of latter-day scholars. It is now appropriate to specifically mention al-Khūṭī’s opinion regarding the statements of tawthīq of al-Ḥillī.

Under the biography of Yūnus ibn Khabbāb, al-Khūṭī states:

أن توثيقات المتأخرين كالعلامة [الحل] وغيره لا يعتمد عليها فيما لم يظهر مستندهم فالرجل غير ثابت الوثاقة

The statements of tawthīq of the latter-day scholars such as al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) and others are not reliable in instances wherein the basis (for these statements) is not clear. After all, the man’s reliability is not proven.<sup>2</sup>

And like this, we find that al-Khūṭī emphasizes the issue of knowing the chain of al-Ḥillī and others of the latter-day scholars of transmission through which they held these opinions. If the basis for what they are claiming is sound, then he relies on their statement. And he does not rely on their opinion about a narrator if it is merely based on their personal discretion of them.

The clearest example of this is al-Khūṭī’s statement under the biography of ‘Alī ibn Abī al-Mughīrah. He states:

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 1/71 (in the commentary). He stated this under “Suqūṭ Nāfilat al-Zuhrayn fī al-Safar.”

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 21/203 (no. 13857).



بقي الكلام في وثاقة الرجل فقد وثقه العلامة [الحلي]... وابن داود... فإن كان منشأ توثيقهما هو فهم التوثيق من عبارة النجاشي في ترجمة ابنه الحسن فيأتي الكلام عليه وإن كان المنشأ أمراً آخر فهو مجهول لنا ولا يمكننا الاعتماد على توثيقهما المبني على الحدس والاجتهاد فالعبرة باستفادة التوثيق من كلام النجاشي

The discussion remains on the reliability of the man. Al-'Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) made tawthīq of him...and Ibn Dāwūd...If the basis of their tawthīq comes from what is understood from the text of al-Najjāshī under the biography of his son, al-Ḥasan, then this will be soon spoken about. And if the basis is something else, he is *majhūl* (unknown) for us; it is not possible for us to rely on their tawthīq, a tawthīq based on conjecture and personal discretion. Thus, due consideration is in using the tawthīq from the words of al-Najjāshī.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 12/266 (no. 7885).

## Chapter Three

### **The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the narrations of their adversaries in creed (the people of heresy—in their view) and those who are wanting in integrity (‘adālah)**

- 3.1 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding their intra-creedal adversaries from the Imāmiyyah Shī‘ah
- 3.2 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding their intra-creedal adversaries from the non-Imāmī Shī‘ah
- 3.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding non-Shī‘ī narrators
- 3.4 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding non-Muslim narrators
- 3.5 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding narrators wanting in ‘adālah



### 3.0 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the narrations of their adversaries in creed (the people of heresy, in their view), and those who are wanting in ‘adālah

In general, the science of al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl is, according to al-Ḥillī, closely tied together with issues pertaining to creed. As a result, the narrator criticized is, according to him, he who differs with him in creed. And this is the line of thinking that al-Ḥillī liked for himself; he placed most of the narrators who differ with him (in creed) in the second category of his book, and he placed most of the Imāmī narrators—those who have are not known to have statements of jarḥ or tawthīq (in their favour or against them)—in the first category. This is based on what is referred to as *aṣālat al-‘adālah*, or the presumption of an Imāmī narrator’s integrity.

On the other hand, we find al-Khūṭ disagreeing with what al-Ḥillī believed; the belief of the narrator has no impact on accepting or rejecting his narration. We can see their difference of opinion manifest in the words of al-Khūṭ who summarized al-Ḥillī’s methodology saying:

أما تصحيح العلامة [الحلي] فلما ظهر لنا بعد التتبع في كلماته من أنه كان يصحح رواية كل شيعي لم يرد فيه قلدح..... [ثم ساق أمثلة ثم قال].... نعم فيمن ادعي الاجماع على قبول روايته يعمل برواياته من جهة الاجماع وإن لم يكن شيعيا والحاصل أنه [الحلي] يرى أصالة العدالة ويرى أن الشرط المعتبر في الراوي هو العدالة دون الوثوق ومن هنا يصحح رواية كل شيعي لم يظهر منه فسق ولا يعتمد على رواية غير الشيعي وإن كان ثقة وثقه الشيخ أو النجاشي أو هو نفسه (قده)..... وحيث أن الرجلين في محل الكلام شيعيان ولم يظهر منهما فسق فروايتهما مصححة عند العلامة [الحلي] وعلى مسلكه ومثل هذا التصحيح كيف يفيد غيره ممن يعتبرون الوثاقة في الراوي ولا يكتفون بأصالة العدالة حيث لا يجدون أي توثيق لهما في الرجال

As for al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī’s) statements of authentication, since it appears to us—after studying his words—that he would authenticate the narration of every Shīṭ who has no criticism levelled against him... (then he cited several examples and said) Yes, we act upon the narrations of a person whom there is a consensus about regarding the acceptance of their

narrations, even though they may not be a Shīṭī. However, this is from the perspective of consensus (*ijmāʿ*). In summary, he (al-Ḥillī) considers the presumption of (an Imāmī narrator's) integrity, and the (only) condition that he considers in the narrator is 'adālah, not reliability. From here, he authenticates the narration of every Shīṭī who appears to have no (outward) *fisq* (sin). And he does not rely on the narration of a non-Shīṭī, even though he may be reliable<sup>1</sup> based on the tawthīq of al-Shaykh, or al-Najjāshī, or even himself... And since the two men under discussion are Shīṭī, and they appear to have no outward sin, their narration is authentic, according to al-'Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) and his methodology. How can the likes of this authentication be of benefit to other than him (i.e., al-Ḥillī), such as those who take into consideration the reliability of the narrator (in accepting or rejecting his narration) and are not satisfied with merely the condition of aṣālat al-'adālah, (especially) since they do not find any statement of tawthīq for the two in the (books of) narrator criticism?<sup>2</sup>

Whoever contemplates on al-Khūṭī's words will arrive at a number of conclusions, the most important of them being:

1. Al-Khūṭī's lack of reliance on the statements of tawthīq of al-Ḥillī since they are based on his personal discretion, and
2. Al-Khūṭī considers “‘adālah the (only) condition to be considered in the narrator, not his reliability.”

Al-Khūṭī takes into consideration the complete opposite of this. Under the biography of Ismāʿīl al-Shaʿrī, he states:

---

1 In confirming this, Ḥusayn al-Sāʿidī states, “The methodology of al-'Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) assumes that the narration of someone who subscribes to a false school (of belief) is not accepted, and that judgement regarding it should be suspended, even if there is a statement of tawthīq (of the narrator)” (*al-Du'afā' min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/97).

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 1/73 (commentary). He stated this under “*Suqūṭ Nāfilat al-Zuhrayn fī al-Safar*”. See, as well: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 2/57, no. 441, under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Ismāʿīl ibn 'Abd Allāh.

ذكره العلامة في الخلاصة في القسم الثاني... وقال كان عامياً.... وصرح بذلك الشيخ [الطوسي] في العدة عند البحث عن حجية الخبر عند تعارضه ولكنه مع ذلك ذكر أن الأصحاب عملت بروايته ويظهر منه [أي الطوسي] أن ما يعتبر في العمل بالرواية إنما هو الوثاقة لا العدالة وأن فسق الجوارح والمخالفة في الاعتقاد لا يضر بحجية الخبر.... فمراده - قدس سره - من الاستشهاد بالرواية إنما هو جواز العمل بأخبار العامة إذا كان موثقاً بهم وعدم اعتبار العدالة في حجية خبر الواحد وقد عد الرجل ممن هو متحرج في روايته وموثوق به في أمانته وإن كان مخطئاً في أصل الاعتقاد وعليه كانت رواياته حجة على ما نراه من عدم اعتبار العدالة في الحجية

Al-‘Allāmah mentioned him in *al-Khulāṣah*: under the second category... and he said, ‘He was an ‘āmmī (i.e., a Sunnī) ...’ This was stated by al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) in *al-‘Uddah*<sup>1</sup> under the section pertaining to the authoritative value of a report when it is conflicting. However, despite this, he mentioned that the companions acted on his narrations. It appears from him (i.e., al-Ṭūsī) that he considers *wathāqah* (reliability) and not *‘adālah* (integrity) when acting (or not acting) on a narration, and that a sin of the body parts and a difference in creed does not negatively affect the authoritative value of a report... And so, what he means by citing the narration is that it is permissible to act on the reports of the ‘Āmmah (Sunnīs) when he deems them reliable and that *‘adālah* is not considered (i.e., as a condition) in determining the fact that the *khāb al-wāḥid* (isolated report) holds authoritative value. He is counted among those who is disappointing in his narration and reliable in terms of his integrity, even though he is mistaken in relation to the foundation of his creed. Based on this, his narrations are a binding proof—according to what we see in terms of not considering the condition of *‘adālah* (i.e., in a narrator) in determining the authoritative value (of a *khāb al-wāḥid*).<sup>2</sup>

While the methodology of al-Ḥillī is that “*‘adālah* is the (only) condition to be considered in the narrator, not (his) reliability,” we find al-Khūṭī (on the other hand) saying: “According to what we see in terms of not considering (the condition of) *‘adālah* (i.e., in a narrator) in determining the authoritative value (of a *khāb al-wāḥid*).”

1 He is referring to *‘Uddat al-Uṣūl* or *al-‘Uddah fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* of al-Ṭūsī.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/22, biography no. 9128 of Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Rāfi‘ al-Sha‘īrī.

According to al-Khūṭī, a non-Imāmī is not considered as possessing of ‘adālah; however, despite this, we find him relying on him if he trusts him. For this reason, we find him saying:

ذكرنا أنه لا يعتبر في حجية الخبر العدالة ولهذا نعتمد على توثيقات أمثال ابن عقدة وابن فضال وأمثالهما

We have mentioned that (the condition of) ‘adālah is not taken into consideration in determining the authoritative value of the khabr. It is for this reason we rely on the statements of tawthīq from the likes of Ibn ‘Uqdah, Ibn Faḍḍāl, and others.<sup>1</sup>

This is because Ibn ‘Uqdah is a *Zaydī* in madhhab and Ibn Faḍḍāl is a *Faṭḥī*. A conflict in the (creedal) school of thought is regarded as a form of criticism on the narrator’s ‘adālah. Based on this, draw an analogy on all of the (other) people of heresy—in their view.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 1/41.

2 For more on the ruling of the narrations of the people of heresy in the view of the Imāmiyyah, see: Kitāb al-Ḍu‘afā’ min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth of Ḥusayn al-Sā‘idī, 1/80.

### 3.1 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding their intra-creedal adversaries from the Imāmiyyah Shī‘ah

#### 3.1.1 The Mukhammisah and the ‘Alīyyā’iyyah

Al-Ḥillī states:

معنى التخميس عند الغلاة لعنهم الله أن سلمان الفارسي والمقداد وعمار وأبا ذر وعمر بن أمية الضمري هم الموكلون بمصالح العالم

The meaning of *al-takhmīs*, according to the extremists (may Allah curse them), is that Salmān al-Fārisī, al-Miqdād, ‘Ammār, Abū Dharr, and ‘Umar ibn Umayyah al-Ḍamrī are all entrusted with the affairs of the world.<sup>1</sup>

Regarding the *Mukhammisah*, Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī (d. 1216 AH) states:

والربّ عندهم علي عليه السلام

The Lord, according to them, is ‘Alī عليه السلام.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 365, no. 1435, biography of ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Kūfī. Similarly, see the book: *Kitāb Taṭawwur al-Fikr al-Siyāsī al-Shī‘ī min al-Shūrā ilā Wilāyat al-Faqīh* of Aḥmad al-Kātib, p. 260.

2 Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Aḥwāl al-Rijāl*, 7/438. See also: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl* of al-Ṭūsī (*Rijāl al-Kashshī*), p. 398, no. 743 under the biography of Bashshār al-Sha‘īrī when he likened some of their ideas with the ‘*Alīyyāwīyyah* (or the ‘*Alīyyā’iyyah*). Al-Kashshī states, “The ‘*Alīyyāwīyyah* believe that ‘Alī عليه السلام fled and appeared among the Hāshimī ‘Alawites. Despite being Allah incarnate, he revealed that he is His servant and His messenger, Muḥammad (i.e., in his form). The companions of Abū al-Khaṭṭāb agreed to four individuals: ‘Alī, Fāṭimah, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn عليهم السلام. And that the meaning of the three individuals, Fāṭimah, al-Ḥasan, and al-Ḥusayn is a mere deception and the only reality is ‘Alī because he is the first of these individuals in the Ummah. They deny the person of Muḥammad عليه السلام and claim that Muḥammad is a servant (and ‘Alī is Lord). They placed Muḥammad in the position of what the Mukhammisah placed Salmān, and they made him a messenger of Muḥammad. They agreed with them in issues related to *ibāḥāt* (antinominalist behaviour), *ta‘īl* (divesting Allah of His attributes), and *tanāsukh* (transmigration of the soul). The ‘*Alīyyā’iyyah* are called the ‘*Alīyyā’iyyah Mukhammisah* (Five ‘*Alīyyā’iyyah*). They claim that Bashshār al-Sha‘īrī, when he rejected the divinity of Muḥammad and placed it into ‘Alī—and made Muḥammad the servant of ‘Alī and rejected the message of Salmān, he metamorphosized into “the form of a bird”. It is said (that it means) ‘alyā’ that in the ocean. For this reason, they name them the ‘*Alīyyā’iyyah*. (see: *Miqbās al-Hidāyah* of al-Māmaqānī, 2/361).

Perhaps these are the people who are referred to as the *Nuṣayriyyah*. Al-Mulla Kanī states:

لا يخفى الآن عند الشيعة عوامهم و أكثر خواصهم لا سيما شعرائهم إطلاق النصيري على من قال بربوبية  
علي عليه السلام

It is not hidden now among the Shī'ah—both their common people and leading personalities (especially their poets—that the term *Nuṣayrī* refers to the person who believes in the divinity of 'Alī عليه السلام.<sup>1</sup>

Ja'far al-Subḥānī states:

فرقة العلياوية وهم الذين يقولون بربوبية علي بن أبي طالب عليه السلام وربما يفسر النصيرية أيضا بهذا  
المعنى

The sect of the 'Aliyyāwiyyah—those who believe in the divinity of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. At times, the *Nuṣayriyyah* are also understood in this sense.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ḥillī, as per his normal practice in not accepting his adversary in creed, rejected the narration of the Mukhammis. We see this clearly under the biography of 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Kūfī when al-Ḥillī placed him in the second category of his book that is specific to weak narrators, those whose statements are rejected and judgement is suspended.<sup>3</sup> As for al-Khūṭī, he wrote a biography on 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Kūfī, mentioned the opinions of the scholars, remained quiet and did not express a view regarding him!

The basic principle is that al-Khūṭī, when he writes a biography of a person, and he does not mention any *jarḥ* or *tawthīq* regarding him and remains silent, the person is regarded as *majhūl*, according to him. Anyone who reflects on the statements of the scholars, those who criticized 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Kūfī, will find

1 'Alī Kanī: *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 223.

2 Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 418.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 365, no. 1435.



them related to his belief and not necessarily accusing him of lying. Al-Khūṭī does not regard this as a valid form of criticism in a narrator, as is known from his reputation. Him remaining silent led to the scholars who summarized his book being confused because they know that criticism of a narrator’s creed is not actually a criticism in determining his reliability—according to al-Khūṭī. An example of this is as follows. Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī ruled that ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Kūfī is *majhūl*.<sup>1</sup> In another place, he transmits the statements of the scholars whom al-Khūṭī mentioned and did not comment further! Bisām Murtaḍā did something similar.<sup>2</sup> This shows that the person summarizing the book has a confused view since he did not definitively mention al-Khūṭī’s opinion on the person.

Commenting on al-Ṭūsī’s previous words, al-Khūṭī clearly expressed his opinion on the false belief saying, “He is counted among those who is *mutaḥarrij* (disappointing) in his narration and reliable in terms of his integrity, even though he is mistaken in relation to the foundation of his creed. Based on this, his narrations are a binding proof—according to what we see in terms of not considering (the condition of) *‘adālah* (i.e., in a narrator) in determining the authoritative value (of a solitary narration).”<sup>3</sup>

This is the original position, according to al-Khūṭī. A person can say that al-Khūṭī considers him as weak because he endorsed the statements of his predecessors. (I say) this is possible; however, it contravenes the methodology of al-Khūṭī who comments—positively or negatively—on the statements related to ‘aqīdah (creed). The clearest example for what I am saying is what al-Khūṭī mentioned under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī ‘Uthmān – or al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Uthmān Sajjādah. Al-Khūṭī states:

---

1 Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 385, under the name ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Kūfī.

2 Ibid., p. 383, under the name ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad Abū al-Qāsim; Bisām Murtaḍā: *Zubdat al-Maqāl min Mu‘jam al-Rijāl*, 2/19.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/22, biography no. 9128 of Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Rāfi‘ al-Sha‘rī.

قال أبو عمرو [الكشي] على السجادة لعنة الله ولعنة اللاعنين والملائكة والناس أجمعين فلقد كان من العليائية الذين يقعون في رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وليس لهم في الاسلام نصيب

Abū ‘Amr (al-Kashshī) states, “May the curse of Allah, the curse of the cursers, the angels and everyone be on Sajjādah. He was from the ‘Aliyyā’iyyah, those who defame the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. They have no portion in Islam.”<sup>1</sup>

(Al-Khūṭī states:) “The man, even though ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm made tawthīq of him since he appears in the isnād of his *Tafsīr*, however, despite that, it is not possible to rely on his narrations because of the testimony of al-Najjāshī that states the companions made taḍṭīf of him. Similarly, Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī also made taḍṭīf of him. Yes, if there were no apparent statements of taḍṭīf (against him), it would be possible for us to judge that he is reliable, despite his false belief. In fact, despite his kufr as well!”<sup>2</sup>

Thus, we find the reason of al-Khūṭī suspending judgement on the narrator is not because of his kufr, or because he disparaged the Prophet ﷺ, rather, he made taḍṭīf of him because of al-Najjāshī testimony (against him)! In summary, whoever disparages the Prophet ﷺ is acceptable in narration, according to al-Khūṭī. And his kufr is not a valid reason for criticizing him! Furthermore, the Imāmiyyah come and find fault with the Ahl al-Sunnah’s accepting the narration of the Nawāshib! I do not know, is disparaging ‘Alī رضي الله عنه greater and more repugnant than disparaging the Prophet ﷺ. We just require a little bit of fairness.

In summary, the original position in the methodology of al-Ḥillī is to reject the narrations of all those who are his adversaries in creed, except for in a limited number of issues. For example, if the individual is among the people of *ijmā’*. (On the other hand,) the original position of al-Khūṭī is to accept the narration of a narrator, irrespective of his belief. To such an extent that even if the narrator

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma’rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 571, no. 1082.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 6/78, no. 2941.

were to “disparage the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ” (Allah’s protection be sought), as long as he was not deemed weak by one of the earlier generation of scholars.

### 3.1.2 The Mushabbihah and the Mujassimah

*Tajsīm/Tashbīh* (anthropomorphism) is a theological issue that is mentioned in some books of creed. It has nothing to do with the sciences of ḥadīth. The different sects disputed in relation to the beliefs of every sect with *Tashbīh* or *Tajsīm*. Neither *Tashbīh* nor *Tajsīm* are clearly defined; rather, each sect interprets it according to their belief of it. Thus, we find al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436 AH) defining the *Mushabbihah* for us saying:

الذين يذهبون إلى أن الله تعالى جسم طويل عريض

Those who believe that Allah has a broad (and) tall body.<sup>1</sup>

At times, the Imāmiyyah use the word “*Tashbīh*” to mean that person who establishes the *ṣifāt* (qualities) of the Lord in a way that is befitting to Him, as stated by Ibn Taymiyyah in his refutation of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī:

وتسمية هذا الرافضي وأمثاله من الجهمية معطلة الصفات لأهل الإنبات مشبهة كتسميتهم لمن أثبت خلافة الخلفاء الثلاثة ناصبيا بناء على اعتقادهم فإنهم لما اعتقدوا أنه لا ولاية لعلي إلا بالبراءة من هؤلاء جعلوا كل من لم يتبرأ من هؤلاء ناصبيا كما أنهم لما اعتقدوا أن القدمين متماثلان أو أن الجسمين متماثلان ونحو ذلك قالوا إن مشبة الصفات مشبهة

This Rāfiḍī and his likes from the Jahmiyyah referring to the *Ahl al-Ithbāt*—those who deny the attributes of people for people—as *Mushabbihah* is like them referring to the person who affirms the *Khilāfah* of the three *Khulafā’* as a *Nāṣibī*. Because when they believed that there is no *wilāyah* (sovereignty) to ‘Alī except by disavowing these people, they made everyone who does not disavow from them a *Nāṣibī*. Just as they believed that the *qadamayn* (two feet) are similar to one another, or the *jismayn*

1 Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā: *Rasā’il al-Murtaḍā*, 2/285.

(two bodies) are similar to one another, etc., they say those that affirm the attributes are Mushabbihah.<sup>1</sup>

Baḥr al-‘Ulūm (d. 1212 AH) states:

التشبيه هو التجسيم بكل ألوانه المبحوثة في كتب الكلام وبه يقول عامة الأشاعرة وتبرأ منه الإمامية الإثني عشرية

Tashbīh is Tajsīm in all of its (various) shades, as discussed in the books of *kalām* (scholastic theology). Most of the Ashā‘irah believe this and the Twelvers disassociate themselves from it.”<sup>2</sup>

Had Baḥr al-‘Ulūm been aware of the books of narrator criticism, he would know that many senior and notable narrators of the Imāmiyyah were Mujassimah Mushabbihah. Thus, when did the Imāmiyyah disassociate themselves from Tajsīm?

What is clear from this is that ‘Tashbīh’ and ‘Tajsīm’ are negative words. Everyone who this was attributed to disassociated themselves from it to such an extent that Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī judged that the Mushabbihah are *najis* (impure), in fact, apostates. He states:

الكافر نجس وهو كل من جحد ما يعلم بثبوته من الدين ضرورة سواء كانوا حربيين أو أهل كتاب أو مرتدين وكذا الناصب والغلاة والخوارج والأقرب أن المجسمة والمشبهة كذلك

The disbeliever is *najis* (impure). He is every person who rejects that which is known to be established in the religion as *ḍarūrah* (necessary). Regardless of whether they are combatants, People of the Book, or apostates. And, similarly, the *Nāṣib*, *Ghulāt* (Extremists), and *Khawāwij*. The view closest to the truth is that the Mujassimah and Mushabbihah are similar.<sup>3</sup>

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah*, 2/607.

2 Baḥr al-‘Ulūm: *Rijāl Baḥr al-‘Ulūm*, under the letter ‘hā’, 4/17.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Tahrīr al-Aḥkām*, 1/158.

The one who examines the biographical works of the Imāmī school will find that many senior-ranking reliable narrators were Mushabbihah/Mujassimah. According to a group of them, this constitutes misguidance to such an extent that the Shī'ah disavow and make *takfīr* (excommunicate) of one another. Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 AH) states:

إن كثيرا من الشيعة يخالف بعضهم بعضا ويذمون ويقدمون ويكفرون وربما كان ذلك من ديانتهم بأنهم كانوا يرون من الآخر ما هو في اعتقادهم باجتهادهم غلوا أو جبر أو تشبيه أو استخفاف به تعالى

Many of the Shī'ah differ, criticize, rebuke, and make *takfīr* of one another. Perhaps that is part of their religiosity in that they consider from the other that which they believe—according to their *ijtihād*—to be extreme, or Jabr, or Tashbīh, or disrespect to Allah <sup>1</sup>.

The creed of Tashbīh and Tajsīm is the creed of the Qummīs, those whom the Imāmiyyah consider the leaders of the school. Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436 AH) states:

القميين كلهم من غير استثناء لأحد منهم إلا أبا جعفر بن بابويه بالأمس كانوا مشبهة مجبرة وكتبهم وتصانيفهم تشهد بذلك وتنطق به

Yesterday, all of the Qummīs—without exception to any of them save Abū Ja'far Ibn Bābawayh—were Mushabbihah/Mujbirah. Their books and writing testify to and speak of that.<sup>2</sup>

So much so that al-Murtaḍā regarded Tashbīh as a sign of the people of Qum. He states:

ليت شعري أي رواية تخلص وتسلم من أن يكون في أصلها وفرعها واقف أو غال أو قمي مشبه مجبر

How I wish that any narration would be free and safe from the fact that its root and branch contain a Wāqifī, or extremist, or a Qummī Mushabbih Mujbir.<sup>3</sup>

1 Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī: *Ta'liqah 'alā Manhaj al-Maqāl*, p. 366.

2 Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā: *Rasā'il al-Murtaḍā*, 3/310.

3 *Ibid.*, 3/310.

After it has become clear that Tajsīm has spread among the seniors of the early generation of Imāmiyyah, specifically among the people of Qum—as mentioned by al-Murtaḍā and as will be seen, what is the position of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūṭī regarding their narrations?

### **The position of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī regarding narrations from the Mushabbihah/Mujassimah**

We have already seen that Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī is among the more stringent critics in accepting narrations from a non-Imāmī. However, at this juncture, we are dealing with an Imāmī who is (also) a Mushabbih. In general, despite his Imāmī creed, he contradicts al-Ḥillī in certain (other) creedal issues. A narrator being an Imāmī is, according to Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, regarded to be among the accepted.

Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn al-Khalīl al-Sakkāk, al-Ḥillī states:

قال النجاشي أن له كتاب سماه التوحيد وهو تشبيه

Al-Najjāshī states that he has a book that he named al-Tawḥīd. And it is Tashbīh<sup>1,2</sup>

Despite what al-Najjāshī stated, al-Ḥillī placed him in the first section dedicated to those narrators who are relied upon, despite the fact that he wrote a work on Tashbīh!

However, al-Ḥillī contradicted this course of action in the biography of Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Awn al-Asadī; he placed him in the first section (of his book). And, despite that, he states in his biography:

---

1 Commenting on the statement of al-Najjāshī, “It is Tashbīh,” Alī al-Burūjirdī states, “i.e., it is not (a book on) Tawḥīd; rather, it is a book on Tashbīh and *shirk* (polytheism)” (*Ṭarā‘if al-Maqāl*, 1/348, no. 2603).

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 244, no. 831.

كان ثقة صحيح الحديث إلا أنه روى عن الضعفاء وكان يقول بالجبر والتشبيه فأنا في حديثه من المتوقفين

He was reliable, sound in ḥadīth. However, he narrated from weak narrators. And he used to believe in the doctrine of Jabr and Tashbīh. Therefore, I suspend judgement on his ḥadīth.<sup>1</sup>

This is regarded to be from the contradictions of al-Ḥillī in that he placed the narrator in the first section, despite his explicit statement of suspending judgement on his ḥadīth. However, what is difficult to say for certain is: Why did al-Ḥillī suspend judgement on his ḥadīth? Is it because he “narrates from weak narrators?” Or, is it because “he believes in Jabr and Tashbīh”?

Both are possible; however, the opinion closest to the truth in regards to rejecting his narration is because of the fact that he narrates from weak narrators, not because he believes in Jabr and Tashbīh. This is because al-Ḥillī accepted the narration of Muḥammad ibn al-Khalīl al-Sakkāk, despite the fact that he wrote on (the issue of) Tashbīh. What further emphasizes this is the fact that al-Ḥillī also made tawthīq of Hārūn ibn Muslim ibn Sa’dān al-Kātib. In *al-Khulāṣah*, he states:

ثقة وجه كان له مذهب في الجبر والتشبيه

Reliable. Distinguished. He belonged to the (creedal) school of Jabr and Tashbīh.<sup>2</sup>

In summary, al-Ḥillī does not regard the creed of Tashbīh a reason to make taḍīf of the narrator, or to reject his narration, as is clear from the previous examples.

### **Al-Khūṭī’s position on the Mushabbihah**

On more than one occasion, al-Khūṭī expressed the fact that the false belief of a narrator does not negatively impact his ‘adālah. We have seen something in this

---

1 Ibid., p. 265, no. 943.

2 Ibid., p. 291, no. 1073.

regard already. Tashbīh and Tajsīm form part of a person’s false belief which, according to al-Khūṭī, has no negative impact. If al-Khūṭī attempted to negate this from some of the narrators, he would do so not because it is a criticism of his narration. Rather, it is merely from an academic standpoint: Is it established that he holds a false belief or not?

Commenting on al-Ḥillī’s suspending judgement on the narration of Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn ‘Awn al-Asadī, al-Khūṭī states:

إننا لو تنزلنا وسلمنا أن محمد بن جعفر كان قائلًا بالجبر والتشبيه فلا ينبغي الشك في الاعتماد على روايته بناء على ما هو الصحيح من كفاية وثاقة الراوي في حجية روايته من دون دخل لحسن عقيدته في ذلك

If we, for the sake of argument, agree that Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far believed in Jabr and Tashbīh, then there should (still) be no doubt in the reliability of his narration. This is based on what the reliable position is; that is to say that the narrator’s reliability is a sufficient in determining the authoritative value of his narration, without any interference into the soundness (or lack thereof) of his belief.<sup>1</sup>

It is proven with authentic chains of narration from Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān—who is one of the senior narrators of the Imāmiyyah—that he was from those who believed in the doctrine of Tajsīm, to such an extent that al-Khūṭī affirmed the authenticity of the narration. He states:

إن هناك روايتين صحيحتين دلنا على انحراف يونس وسوء عقيدته... [منها]... عن علي بن مهزيار قال كتبت إلى أبي جعفر محمد بن علي بن موسى الرضا عليهم السلام جعلت فداك أصلي خلف من يقول بالجسم ومن يقول بقول يونس يعني ابن عبد الرحمان؟ فكتب عليه السلام لا تصلوا خلفهم ولا تعطوهم من الزكاة وابرأوا منهم برئ الله منهم وهاتان الروايتان لابد من رد علمهما إلى أهلها وهما لا تصلحان لمعارضة الروايات المستفيضة المتقدمة التي فيها الصحاح مع اعتضاها بتسالم الفقهاء والأعظم على جلالة يونس وعلو مقامه حتى إنه عد من أصحاب الاجماع كما مر على أنهما لو سلما صدورهما لا لعة فهما لا تنافيان الوثاثة التي هي الملاك في حجية الرواية

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 16/180, no. 10411.



There are two authentic narrations that prove the deviation of Yūnus and his false belief... (from them) ... On the authority of ‘Alī ibn Mahziyār, “I wrote to Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, ‘May I be ransomed for your sake! I read ṣalāh behind someone who believes in Tajsīm and believes in the belief of Yūnus (i.e., ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān)?’

He عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام wrote, ‘Do not read behind them. And do not give them zakāh. Disassociate yourselves from them, Allah will disassociate from them.’”

It is necessary that the knowledge of these two narrations be addressed by its rightful people. They are not good enough to conflict with the previously mentioned sound narrations which include the ṣaḥīḥ as well. As mentioned, this is in addition to such narrations being supported by the fact that jurists and other great scholars acknowledge the greatness of Yūnus and his high rank to such an extent that he is counted among the people of *ijmā‘* (scholarly consensus). All of this assuming that these narrations were not mentioned because of a defect; in such a case, they still do not negate the narrator’s reliability since this is what is required in determining the authoritative value of a narration.<sup>1</sup>

The point here is that al-Khūṭī does not regard the false belief of a narrator a valid factor such that it negates the tawthīq of a narration, even though the narrator likened Allah to His creation!

### 3.1.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the Ghulāt (Extremists): the Ahl al-Ṭayyārāh, the Ahl al-Irtifā‘, and the Mufawwiḍah

In general, *ghulū* (extremism) denotes a certain transgression of boundaries. In *al-Miqbās*, al-Māmaqānī states:

الغلو بمعنى التجاوز عن الحد قال الله تعالى لا تغلوا في دينكم أي لا تتجاوزوا الحد وقد يقال للرجل فلان كان من أهل الطيارة ومن أهل الارتفاع ويريدون بذلك أنه كان غالبا

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 21/226, no. 13863.

Extremism means to transgress the boundary. Allah ﷻ states, “Do not commit excess in your religion,” i.e., do not transgress beyond the boundary. It can be said of a person, ‘So-and-so is from Ahl al-Ṭayyārah and from Ahl al-Irtifā’;’ intending thereby that he is extreme (in his views).<sup>1</sup>

The Imāmiyyah differ greatly regarding the definition of an extreme narrator. This is based on the fact that they differ upon what constitutes the foundations of creed. Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 AH) states:

إن القدماء كانوا مختلفين في المسائل الأصولية أيضا فربما كان شيء عند بعضهم فاسدا أو كفرا غلوا أو تفويضا أو جبرا أو تشبيها أو غير ذلك وكان عند آخر مما يجب اعتقاده

The early generation of scholars would also differ regarding the foundations of creed. Thus, something could be considered, according to some of them, false, or constituting extreme disbelief, *Tafwīd* (Delegation), Jabr, Tashbīh, or other such related beliefs. While, according to others, believing in these issues could be essential.<sup>2</sup>

What makes recognizing an extreme person from others even more difficult is the fact that there is no real distinction made between the extremists since they spread amongst and assimilated with the Imāmiyyah. This is because they were directly from them. As Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī acknowledged, the Imāmī scholars were uncertain in applying the word ‘extreme’ to a narrator. He states:

إن الغلاة كانوا مختلفين في الشيعة ومخلوطين بهم مدلسين أنفسهم فبأدنى شبهة كانوا القدماء والقيمين يتهمون الرجل بالعلو والارتفاع

The extremists<sup>3</sup> were hidden amongst and intermingled within the Shī’ah. They deceitfully obfuscated themselves and lived among them. Therefore,

---

1 Al-Māmaqānī: *Miqbās al-Hidāyah*, 2/397.

2 Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī: *Ṭa’līqah ‘alā Manhaj al-Maqāl*, 1/129.

3 The extremists from the Twelver Shī’ah. They are not an independent group from them, as it appears from the text of al-Ḥā’irī.

the early generation and Qummīs would accuse a person of extremism with a slight uncertainty.<sup>1</sup>

On account of this difference of opinion in belief and defining what extremism<sup>2</sup> is, the opinions of the scholars of narrator criticism differed in relation to many narrators who the term “from the *Ahl al-Ṭayyārah*,” or “extreme,” or other similar words was applied to. To such an extent that al-Māmaqānī, alluding to this problem, stated:

لا يخفى عليك أنه قد كثر رمي رجال بالغلو وليسوا من الغلاة عند التحقيق

It is no secret to you that many narrators have been accused of being extreme and the reality is that they are not from the extremists.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the words of *ghulū* (extremism) and whatever is in its meaning are regarded to be words of dispraise.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī al-Astarābādī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Ahwāl al-Rijāl*, 1/77. His words are similar to what al-Wahīd al-Bahbahānī mentioned in *Ta’liqah ‘alā Manhaj al-Maqāl* (1/129); however, because of the sheer amount of difference regarding the wording, I attributed the words to al-Ḥā’irī. It is possible that al-Ḥā’irī narrated the words of *al-Bahbahānī bi al-ma’nā* (i.e., not verbatim) since the subject-matter is one, despite the different wording.

2 See: *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah* of Abū al-Ma’ālī al-Kalbāsī, 3/611, 613 and beyond. He speaks about the meaning of *ghulū* (extremism) and the differences of opinion therein.

3 Al-Māmaqānī: *Miqbās al-Hidāyah*, 2/397.

4 See: *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth* of ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī, p. 121; *Mu’jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah* of Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī, p. 108 and 111; *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Ahwāl al-Rijāl* of Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī, 1/114 – see the marginalia for an excellent discussion on the subject-matter; *al-Ri’āyah li Ḥāl al-Bidāyah* of al-Shahīd al-Thānī, p. 123; *Ma’rifat al-Ḥadīth* of al-Bahbūdī, p. 117; *al-Fawā’id al-Rijāliyyah* of al-Kajūrī, p. 118; *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Ahkāmuhu* of Ja’far al-Subḥānī, p. 169. As for what is printed among *Rasā’il fī Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of al-Bābilī, see: *Wuṣūl al-Akhyār ilā Uṣūl al-Akḥbār* of al-Ḥusayn al-‘Āmilī, 1/492; *al-Wajīzah fī ‘ilm al-Dirāyah* of al-Bahā’ī, 1/545; *Manzūmah Mūjaz al-Maqāl* of ‘Abd al-Raḥīm al-Aṣbahānī al-Ḥā’irī, line no. 145 under the title “*Alfāz al-Jarḥ*,” 2/501; *al-Wajīzah fī ‘ilm Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of al-Aṣfahānī al-Hamdānī, 2/563, and other places.

In discussing the opinions of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī and Ibn al-Walīd, I previously mentioned something regarding the scholars' position on the statements of Taḍīf of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī—which is regarded as something that stems from the difference between the school of the Qummī Imāmiyyah and the other Imāmī scholars on the meaning of ghlū.

It can also be said that it is necessary to note that when the latter-day scholars of the Imāmiyyah would use the term 'ghlū,' for one of the narrators, it is necessary to know the intent of the scholar who is using the word. Here, al-Karbāsī (d. 1175 AH) in *Iklīl al-Manhaj* reproaches the Qummīs for not knowing the meaning of ghlū. He states:

القيون لم يتضح عندهم معنى الغلو ومنهم من يقول إنّ من يقول بعدم جواز السهو على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فهو غال ولأمثال ذلك أسندوا الغلو إلى كثير من أصحابنا مع صحة عقيدتهم واستقامة رأيهم

The meaning of ghlū isn't clear to the Qummīs; among them are those that say that whoever says that it is not permissible for the Prophet ﷺ to commit a mistake is an extremist. For example, they attributed (this form of) ghlū to many of our companions, despite them having a correct creed and holding a sound opinion.<sup>1</sup>

On the contrary, we find the statement of al-Ṣadūq (d. 381 AH):

علامة المفوضة والغلاة وأصنافهم نسبتهم مشايخ قم وعلماؤها إلى القول بالتقصير

A sign of the Mufawwiḍah and Ghulāt and their types is their attributing Taqṣīr, or negligence to the mashāyikh of Qum and their scholars.<sup>2</sup>

And, like this, we find every scholar accusing the other of negligence and not clearly defining the meaning of ghlū; as mentioned, all of this stems from the difference of opinion on their creed.<sup>3</sup>

1 Muḥammad Ja'far ibn Muḥammad al-Khurāsānī al-Karbāsī: *Iklīl al-Manhaj fī Taḥqīq al-Maṭlab*, p. 221.

2 Al-Shaykh al-Ṣadūq: *al-I'tiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmiyyah*, p. 101. See, also: *Ma'rifat al-Ḥadīth* of al-Bahbūdī, p. 120, and: *Biḥār al-Anwār* of al-Majlisī, 25/344.

3 See: *al-Ḍu'afā' min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* of Ḥusayn al-Sā'idī, 1/113.

## The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the extremists

We have already seen the severity of al-Ḥillī's opinion regarding the creed of a narrator; if he is an Imāmī, al-Ḥillī presumes his 'adālah and regards him as acceptable in narration—if there is no jarḥ mentioned about him. However, despite his opinion of regarding the Ghulāt as Imāmīs, we find al-Ḥillī inserting them into the second section of his book, a section that is dedicated to weak narrators and those whose statements judgement is suspended.

This frequently occurs in his book, *al-Khulāṣah*, as is the case under the biographies of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad Mufaḍḍal<sup>1</sup>, Sulaymān al-Daylamī<sup>2</sup>, 'Alī ibn Ḥassān ibn Kathīr al-Hāshimī<sup>3</sup>, and 'Alī ibn Ḥasakah<sup>4</sup>. Yes, at times, these narrators combine other negative qualities alongside extremism; however, it appears from al-Ḥillī's doing that extremism is among the reasons for rejecting a narration. What highlights this is the fact that al-Ḥillī placed Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ in the second section and presented his biography saying:

يكنى أبا القاسم البلخي غالي المذهب وكان كثير الرواية

His agnomen was Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkhī. Extreme in madhhab. He narrated a lot.<sup>5</sup>

He did not mention a reason for placing him in the second section, despite the fact that he narrates a lot. In fact, he is a teacher of al-Kashshī from whom he narrates frequently in *al-Rijāl*; however, he described him as “extreme in madhhab.”

Perhaps the reason for this is the fact that al-Ḥillī considers the ghulāt to be disbelievers and apostates. He states:

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 332, no. 1307.

2 Ibid., p. 350, no. 1386.

3 Ibid., p. 366, no. 1439.

4 Ibid., p. 367, no. 1442.

5 Ibid., p. 413, no. 1676.

الغلاة فإنهم وإن أقرؤا بالشهادة إلا أنهم خارجون عن الإسلام

The Ghulāt, even though they acknowledged the *shahādah* (testimony), they are out of the fold of Islam.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī did not suffice in rendering them disbelievers; he also judged them to be impure. He states:

والمسلمون على اختلاف مذاهبهم أطهار عدا الخوارج والغلاة

The Muslims, despite their different madhhabs are pure, except for the Khawārij and Ghulāt.<sup>2</sup>

Similarly, he states:

الخوارج والغلاة لا يصلى عليهم

(Janāzah) Ṣalāh is not to be read on the Khawārij and Ghulāt.<sup>3</sup>

These severe rulings show us the reason al-Ḥillī rejects the Ghulāt's narration.

If al-Ḥillī mentions one of the Ghulāt in the first section, it is because there is a difference of opinion among the scholars regarding his condition and he preferred one of the two opinions over the other, as in the biography of Dāwūd ibn Kathīr al-Raqī:

والأقوى قبول روايته لقول الشيخ الطوسي وقول الكشي أيضا

The stronger (opinion) is to accept his narration because of al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī's statement, as well as al-Kashshī's.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Muntahā al-Maṭlab*, 1/152, under *al-As'ār wa al-Awānī al-Mushtabihah*.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Tahrīr al-Aḥkām*, 1/50, under *al-Muḍāf wa al-Āsār*.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Tahrīr al-Aḥkām*, 1/125, under *Man yuṣallā 'alayhi*.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 140, no. 388.

He states something similar under the biography of Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā ibn ʿUbayd.<sup>1</sup>

## The position of al-Khūʿī regarding the extremists

Al-Khūʿī explains *ghulū* to us saying:

الغلاة على طوائف (فمنهم) من يعتقد الربوبية لأمر المؤمنين أو أحد الأئمة الطاهرين فيعتقد بأنه الرب الجليل وأنه الإله لمجسم الذي نزل إلى الأرض وهذه النسبة لو صحت وثبت اعتقادهم بذلك فلا إشكال في نجاستهم وكفرهم ... (ومنهم) من ينسب إليه الاعتراف بألوهيته سبحانه إلا أنه يعتقد أن الأمور الراجعة إلى التشريع والتكوين كلها بيد أمير المؤمنين أو أحدهم - ع - فيرى أنه المحيي والمميت وأنه الخالق والرازق وأنه الذي أيد الأنبياء السالفين سرا وأيد النبي الأكرم ... (ومنهم) من لا يعتقد بربوبية أمر المؤمنين - ع - ولا بتفويض الأمور إليه وإنما يعتقد أنه - ع - وغيره من الأئمة الطاهرين ولادة الأمر وأنهم عاملون لله سبحانه وأنهم أكرم المخلوقين عنده فينسب إليهم الرزق والخلق ونحوهما - لا بمعنى إسنادها إليهم - ع - حقيقة لأنه يعتقد أن العامل فيها حقيقة هو الله - بل كإسناد الموت إلى ملك الموت والمطر إلى ملك المطر ... فعد هذا القسم من أقسام الغلو نظير ما نقل عن الصدوق قده عن شيخه ابن الوليد إن نفي السهو عن النبي - ص - أول درجة الغلو والغلو - بهذا المعنى الأخير - مما لا محذور فيه بل لا مناص عن الالتزام به في الجملة

The extremists are of different groups. Among them are those who believe in the divinity of Amīr al-Muʿminīn or one of the pure Imāms. And so, his belief is that ʿAlī is God incarnate that descended unto the earth. If this attribution (of creed) is correct and their belief therein is proven, then there is no doubt regarding them being impure and their disbelief.

Among them are those who attribute some form of recognition to the divinity of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ رَبَّنَا رَبَّكَ; however, they (also) believe that all the legislative and administrative affairs (of this world) are in the hands of and regulated by Amīr al-Muʿminīn or one of the Imāms. Thus, he considers him (i.e., ʿAlī) the *Muhyī* (One who gives life) and the *Mumīt* (One who gives death), and that he is the Creator, Sustainer, and that he is the one who clandestinely assisted the previous Prophets as well as assisted the noble Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

1 Ibid., p. 241, no. 821.

Among them those who do not believe in the divinity of Amīr al-Mu'minīn and do not delegate authority (Tafwīd)<sup>1</sup> of worldly matters to him; rather, they believe that he and the other pure Imāms are the leaders, and that they work on behalf of Allah ﷻ, and that they are the noblest of creation by Him ﷻ. And so, issues related to creation, sustenance, etc. are attributed to them, not in the sense of actual attribution to them since, in reality, Allah ﷻ is the doer; rather, similar to how death is attributed to the Angel of Death, or rain to the Angel of Rain ... This category is regarded to be one of the categories of ghulū, similar to what was transmitted on the authority al-Ṣadūq, from his teacher, Ibn al-Walīd, 'Denying the possibility of the Prophet ﷺ committing mistakes is the first level of extremism. Extremism in this last meaning is not forbidden; in fact, on the whole, it is something that is inevitable to observe.'<sup>2</sup>

Thus, al-Khū'ī judges a category of the Ghulāt to be impure. In fact, he even made Takfīr of them, as we have seen from his words. According to him, they are of varying degrees. Al-Khū'ī emphasizes they are not all of the same degree with his statement:

أن الغلو له درجات ولا مانع من أن يكون شخص غاليا بمرتبة ويلعن غاليا آخر أشد منه في الغلو

Extremism is of varying degrees. There is nothing in the way of a person being extreme to a certain extent and, at the same time, he curses another person more extreme than him.<sup>3</sup>

Whoever knows the methodology of al-Khū'ī regarding 'adālah (of a narrator), he will soon come to know his opinion on the narrations of the extremists. Al-Khū'ī does not suspend judgement in accepting a narration based on the false belief of a narrator. Al-Khū'ī's statement emphasizes this:

1 There will be more on Tafwīd later on.

2 Al-Khū'ī: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 2/73-75, under the section *Najāsat al-Ghulāt*.

3 Al-Khū'ī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 20/150, no. 13043.



There is no inconsistency in (possessing) a false belief and being reliable.<sup>1</sup>

A person may say that the words of al-Khūṭī here do not include the extremists, those whom he declared disbelievers; rather, it is only applicable to those whom he judged to be Muslim.

In response to this, I say: We have already seen that al-Khūṭī includes in his methodology even the disbeliever, the most extreme, such as the Mukhammisah—those whom no one doubts their apostasy. As he states under the biography of Sajjādah:

نعم لو لم يكن في البين تضعيف لأمكننا الحكم بوثاقته مع فساد عقيدته بل مع كفره أيضا

Yes, had there not been a clear statement of Taḍīf<sup>2</sup>, it would be possible for us to judge that he is reliable, despite his false creed. In fact, even despite his disbelief as well.<sup>3</sup>

Whoever of the extremists' narrations were rejected by al-Khūṭī, the reason for rejecting was not necessarily because of extremism, since this goes contrary to his normal practice. Rather, the reason for taḍīf and rejecting his narrations are for reasons other than (holding a) false belief and extremism. At times, a narrator would hold a false, extreme belief in addition to the earlier generation of scholars' stating that he is either weak, or he lies, or any other reason which, according to al-Khūṭī, is regarded as a reason for deeming the narrator weak. This is precisely what is found under the biographies of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Shamūn<sup>4</sup>, Dāwūd ibn Kathīr al-Raqī<sup>5</sup>, and 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim al-Ḥaḍramī<sup>6</sup>.

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, 1/29, commentary under *l'tibār Idhn al-Walī*.

2 What he means is that had it not been for some of the previous scholars, such as al-Najjāshī, it would be possible to judge that he is reliable.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 6/78, no. 2941.

4 Ibid., 16/234, no. 10509 and 5/349, no. 2874.

5 Ibid., 8/126, no. 4429.

6 Ibid., 11/304, no. 7076.

In addition to the earlier generation of scholars explicitly stating he is a liar, a narrator would also be considered weak when there is documented evidence of an infallible cursing him, as is the case with Fāris ibn Ḥātim<sup>1</sup>.

At times, al-Khūṭī would reject the narration of a narrator, not because of the statement of an earlier, relied-upon scholar, or, because of what was attributed to him in terms of being extreme; rather, on account of there not existing a statement of tawthīq in his favour—since al-Khūṭī does not believe in the narrator’s presumption of ‘adālah. This is the case in the biography of Khaybarī ibn ‘Alī; al-Khūṭī mentions the statements of the scholars regarding him, including the statement of al-Najjāshī:

خيرى بن علي الطحان كوفي ضعيف في مذهبه ذكر ذلك أحمد بن الحسين يقال في مذهبه ارتفاع

Khaybarī ibn ‘Alī al-Ṭaḥḥān is a Kufī. (He is considered) weak in his school. Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn mentioned this. It is said that there is extremism in his school.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭī commented saying:

ما ذكره النجاشي عن أحمد بن الحسين من ضعفه في مذهبه فإن الضعف في المذهب لا يدل على ضعفه في حديثه

What al-Najjāshī mentioned from Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn that he is weak in his school; this does not mean that he is weak in his ḥadīth.<sup>3</sup>

Thereafter, al-Khūṭī suspended judgement on accepting his narrations, not because of his false (creedal) school; rather, because of the fact that there was no previous statement of tawthīq in his favour.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 14/258, no. 9311.

2 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 154, no. 408.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, 1/29, commentary under *I’tibār Idhn al-Walī*.

4 The following biography emphasizes for us the fact that al-Khūṭī, when he does not find any statement of tawthīq or criticism for the narrator, he is rejected in narration and has an unknown condition.

*continued...*

And like this, al-Khūṭ's methodology in dealing with the Ghulāt reveals itself. In summary, ghulū, no matter how extreme the narrator's belief is, it does not impact the acceptance of his narrations since holding such a false belief—even if it reaches the level of disbelief—does not negatively affect the narrator.

We should know that the Mufawwiḍah is a sect among the Ghulāt. Al-Majlisī (d. 1111 AH) states:

والمفوضة صنف من الغلاة وقولهم الذي فارقوا به من سواهم من الغلاة اعترافهم بحدوث الأئمة وخلقهم ونفي القدم عنهم وإضافة الخلق والرزق مع ذلك إليهم ودعواهم أن الله تعالى تفرد بخلقهم خاصة وأنه فوض إليهم خلق العالم بما فيه وجميع الأفعال

The Mufawwiḍah are a group of extremists. The statement by which they separated themselves from the other Ghulāt is that they acknowledged the Imāms came into existence, that they were created, that they denied their eternity from them, and (denied) the act of creating and sustaining (creation) from them, as well as their claim that Allah ﷻ specifically created them, and that He handed over to them the affairs of the world and all actions.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ṣadūq (d. 381 AH) states:

روي عن زرارة أنه قال قلت للصادق - عليه السلام - إن رجلا من ولد عبد الله بن سبأ يقول بالتفويض قال - عليه السلام - وما التفويض؟ قلت يقول إن الله عز وجل خلق محمدا صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم وعلياً - عليه السلام - ثم فوض الأمر إليهما فخلقنا ورزقا وأحييا وأماتا فقال كذب عدو الله إذا رجعت إليه فافقرأ عليه الآية التي في سورة الرعد

---

*continued from page 322*

Al-Khūṭ states under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Baḥr al-Rahnī, “The man, even though it is not proven that he is weak, we have mentioned on more than one occasion that the book that is attributed to Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī is not actually authentically attributed to him. **Additionally, his reliability is not established.** What al-Najjāshī intended with his statement regarding his ḥadīth and that they are “close to being sound” is that there is no extremism in them. Therefore, his uprightness is still not established **since his condition is unknown.**” (*al-Mu'jam*, 16/133, no. 10324.)

1 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 25/345.

قُلْ مَنْ رَبُّ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ قُلِ اللَّهُ ۚ قُلْ أَفَاتَّخَذْتُمْ مِنْ دُونِهِ أَوْلِيَاءَ لَا يَمْلِكُونَ أَنْفُسَهُمْ نَفْعًا وَلَا ضَرًّا ۚ قُلْ هَلْ يَسْتَوِي الْأَعْمَىٰ وَالْبَصِيرُ ۗ أَمْ هَلْ تَسْتَوِي الظُّلُمَاتُ وَالنُّورُ ۗ أَمْ جَعَلُوا لِلَّهِ شُرَكَاءَ خَلَقُوا كَخَلْقِهِ فَتَشَبَّهُهُ الْخَلْقُ عَلَيْهِمْ ۚ قُلِ اللَّهُ خَلِقُ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُوَ الْوَاحِدُ الْقَهْرُ

فانصرفت إلى رجل فأخبرته بما قال الصادق - عليه السلام - فكانما ألقمته حجرا أو قال فكانما خرس

It was narrated from Zurārah that he said, “I said to al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام, ‘A man from the descendants of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ stated the belief of Tafwīḍ.’

He عليه السلام said, ‘And what is Tafwīḍ?’

I said, ‘He says that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ created Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and ‘Alī عليه السلام, and then he handed over the matter to them. Thus, they created (creation), gave (everyone) sustenance, grant (people) life, and grant (people) death.’

He said, ‘The enemy of Allah lied. When you return back to him, read to him the verse in Sūrah al-Ra’d, “**Or have they attributed to Allah partners who created like His creation so that the creation [of each] seemed similar to them?**” Say, “**Allah is the Creator of all things, and He is the One, the Prevailing.**”<sup>1</sup>

I left for the man and informed him of what al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام said. It was as if I threw a stone at him. Or, he said, ‘It was as if he became mute.’<sup>2</sup>

This text explicitly proves that the descendants of Ibn Sab’a had a role to play in the spreading of many false beliefs early on among the Imāmiyyah. As in this narration, the Ahl al-Bayt fought and warned against such beliefs; despite this, it has become widespread among the beliefs of the Imāmiyyah in these times. In fact, it is among the unescapable beliefs that are necessary to believe in!

1 Sūrah al-Ra’d: 16.

2 Al-Ṣadūq: *al-I’tiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmiyyah*, p. 100.

### 3.1.4 The position of Ibn al-Muṭahhir al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the claimants of the Bābiyyah<sup>1</sup>

After the Imāmiyyah's belief in the occultation of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī and their belief that he is the awaited Mahdī, they became confused since it contradicts the philosophy of Imāmah—which is founded on leading the people. Thus, questions were raised to the Imāmiyyah. Aḥmad al-Kātib states:

السؤال الكبير الذي فرض نفسه هو إذا كانت الإمامة محصورة في هذا الشخص ولا تجوز لغيره من الناس العاديين غير المعصومين وغير المعيّنين من قبل الله تعالى فلماذا يغيب ويختفي ولا يظهر ليقود الشيعة والمسلمين ويؤسس الحكومة الإسلامية التي لا بد منها ما دام أن الأرض لا يجوز أن تخلو من إمام والإمام الغائب لا يمكن أن يمارس إمامته وقيادة الناس؟ وما هو سر الغيبة و إلى متى يغيب وما هو واجب الشيعة في حالة الغيبة

The great question that effectively poses itself is: If Imāmah is confined to this person, and it is not permissible for other ordinary people who are neither infallibles nor selected by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, then why go into occultation and hide? And why would he not appear so as to lead the Shīʿah and Muslims, and establish an Islamic government—which is required? As long as it is not permissible for the earth to be void of an Imām, the absent Imām is unable to exercise his (function of) Imāmah and lead the people. What is the secret of the occultation? And for how long will he remain in hiding? And what are the Shīʿah to do during this occultation?<sup>2</sup>

---

1 There is another, contemporary Bābiyyah that was founded by Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Aḥsāʿī. It is also referred to as the Shaykhiyyah. Al-Sayyid al-Ṣadr al-Aḥsāʿī declared this (group) as disbelievers, as al-Burūjirdī narrated in *Ṭarāʾif al-Maqāl* (1/61 no. 131). Muḥsin al-Amīn states, “Today, all of the people of al-Aḥsāʿ are Shīʿah Imāmiyyah; however, most of them are Shaykhiyyah, according to what is said they following the path of al-Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Aḥsāʿī (*Aʿyān al-Shīʿah*, 1/195). See, also: *Silsilat Mādihā Taʾrif* of Dr. Aḥmad al-Ḥuṣayyīn (2/502 under the section of the Bābiyyah. He has an entire chapter on them; they are a group from the Twelver Imāmiyyah. Similarly, the Bābiyyah are attributed to al-Shaykh al-Rashtī, the student of al-Aḥsāʿī. Most of the students of al-Rashtī are among the leaders of the Bābiyyah. In any case, whoever wants details regarding the reality of the Shaykhiyyah, Bābiyyah, al-Aḥsāʿī, and al-Rashtī should read the book *al-Shaykhiyyah Nashʾatuhā wa Taṭawwuruhā wa Maṣādir Dirāsatiḥā* of al-Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl al-Ṭālaqānī.

2 Aḥmad al-Kātib: *Taṭawwur al-Fikr al-Siyāsī al-Shīʿī min al-Shūrā ilā Wilāyat al-Faqīh*, p. 241.

After these pressing questions, some of the Imāmiyyah who disseminated the doctrine of *Ghaybah* (Occultation) and appropriated it afterwards embarked upon claiming the doctrine of the “Bābiyyah” and that there is a *bāb* (door) through which the Imām can be reached, or, what is referred to as the *Sifārah* (Mediatorship). And so, they became the link between the absent Mahdī and his followers who believe in him during the time of the *al-Ghaybah al-Sughrā* (Minor Occultation).

The Imāmiyyah ended up having praiseworthy ambassadors (called *sufarā'*) and ‘doors,’ and blameworthy ambassadors and ‘doors,’ those who consume the peoples’ wealth unjustly. Al-Ṭūsī enumerated them in his book, *al-Ghaybah*.<sup>1</sup>

These people are referred to as the Bābiyyah or the Sufarā'. They are the old Bābiyyah. In reality, they are an offshoot from the belief in Ghaybah.

The Imāmiyyah granted the ‘doors,’ or ambassadors, the quality of ultimate sanctity, even after their death. According to some, this continued even after their death. In his book *al-Miṣbāh*, a-Kafamī (d. 905 AH) mentions *istighāthah* (asking for help) through the ‘doors’ and that they continue performing the duty of ambassadorship even after their death. He mentions the words of the *istighāthah* through them saying:

تقصد النهر أو الغدير وتعتمد بعض الأبواب إما عثمان بن سعيد العمري أو ولده محمد بن عثمان أو الحسين بن روح أو علي بن محمد السمري فهؤلاء كانوا أبواب المهدي عليه السلام فتنادي بأحدهم وتقول يا فلان بن فلان سلام عليك اشهد أن وفاتك في سبيل الله وأنت حي عند الله مرزوق وقد خاطبتك في حياتك التي لك عند الله عز وجل وهذه رقعتي وحاجتي إلى مولانا صلى الله عليه وآله فسلمها إليه فأت الثقة الأمين ثم ارمها في النهر أو البئر أو الغدير تقضى حاجتك إن شاء الله تعالى

(After reading the du‘ā’ of *istighāthah*,) you proceed to the river or brook and rely on some of the *Abwāb* (Doors); either ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-‘Amrī, or his son, Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān, or al-Ḥusayn ibn Rawḥ, or ‘Alī ibn

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah*, p. 343. And see: *Rijāl al-Khāqānī*, p. 175.

Muḥammad al-Samarrī. These are the doors of the Mahdī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. And so, you will call out to one of them and say, ‘O, so-and-so, the son of so-and-so, peace be upon you. I bear witness that your death is in the path of Allah and that you are alive by Allah receiving provisions. I addressed you in your life that you have with Allah. This is my note and my need to our master صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Pass it on to him for you are the reliable, trustworthy one. Then, throw it into the river, or well, or brook—your need will be fulfilled, Allah willing.”<sup>1</sup>

According to the Imāmiyyah, the issue of the Bābiyyah became an issue of creed and, according to them, the four ambassadors that were mentioned in the previous du‘ā’ of istighāthah are beyond reproach and the formal method of ascertaining tawthīq since they reached a high-ranking and noble level.

After this overview, what then is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the person who claims Bābiyyah?

Al-Ḥillī often follows his method in rejecting the narration of the ideological deviant (according to him). Based on this, al-Ḥillī rejected the narration of the claimant of the Bābiyyah because of his false belief. Despite this, he places him in the first section of his book!

Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bilāl, al-Ḥillī states:

من أصحاب أبي محمد العسكري ( عليه السلام ) ثقة وقال الشيخ [الطوسي] في كتاب الغيبة أنه من المذمومين أبو طاهر محمد بن علي بن بلال فنحن في روايته من المتوقفين

From the companions of Abū Muḥammad al-‘Askarī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. Reliable. Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) states in *Kitāb al-Ghaybah*, “From among those that have been criticized is Abū Ṭāhir Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bilāl.” We suspend judgement on his narrations.”<sup>2</sup>

1 Ibrāhīm al-Kafāmī: *Jannat al-Amān al-Wāqiyah wa Jannat al-Īmān al-Bāqiyah (al-Miṣāh)*, p. 405. See, also: *Biḥār al-Anwār* of al-Majlisī, 99/235, 91/30.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 242, no. 825.

When analyzing the actions of al-Ḥillī, we find him mentioning the narrator in the first section and, following al-Ṭūsī, explicitly stating his *tawthīq*.<sup>1</sup> However, al-Ḥillī suspended judgement on his narration. The reason being is that he claimed (adherence to) the Bābiyyah.

We find that al-Khūī held a view different to that of al-Ḥillī's; the former cited the scholars' praise for Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bilāl. Thereafter, he followed up this praise with the following criticism:

ومع هذا كله فقد أخلد إلى الأرض واتبع هواه وادعى البابية قال الشيخ [الطوسي] ومنهم (المذمومين الذين ادعوا البابية لعنهم الله) أبو طاهر محمد بن علي بن بلال وقصته معروفة فيما جرى بينه وبين أبي جعفر محمد بن عثمان العمري نضر الله وجهه وتمسكه بالأموال التي كانت عنده للامام وامتناعه من تسليمها وادعائه أنه الوكيل حتى تبرأت الجماعة منه ولعنوه وخرج فيه من صاحب الزمان ما هو معروف... والمتلخص من جميع ما ذكرنا أن الرجل كان ثقة مستقيماً وقد ثبت انحرافه وادعائه البابية ولم يثبت عدم وثاقته فهو ثقة فاسد العقيدة فلا مانع من العمل بروايته بناء على كفاية الوثاقة في حجية الرواية كما هو الصحيح

And despite all of this, “*he clung to earthly life and followed his carnal desires*”<sup>2</sup> and claimed adherence to the Bābiyyah. Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) states, “And among them (the reprehensible ones, those who claimed Bābiyyah—may Allah curse them): Abū Ṭāhir Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bilāl. His story is well-known in regards to what transpired between him and Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān al-'Amrī (may Allah enlighten his face) and his hoarding the wealth that he was holding for the Imām and refusing to hand it over. As well as his claiming that he is the *wakil* (agent) to such an extent that the group exonerated themselves from him and cursed him. Famous judgements from *Ṣāḥib al-Zamān* (i.e., the Twelfth Imām) have been issued against him.”<sup>3</sup>

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 401, no. 5886. Al-Ṭūsī clearly contradicts himself regarding this narrator because he criticizes him in his *Kitāb al-Ghaybah*. See: *al-Rasā'il al-Rijāliyyah* of al-Kalbāsī, 1/71 and 4/177.

2 In reference to the Qur'ān, Sūrah al-A'āf: 176. [translator's note].

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah*, p. 400.



The sum-total of all that we have mentioned is that the man is upright and reliable. His deviation and claiming (adherence to) the Bābiyyah is proven. Him not being reliable is yet to be proven. Therefore, he is reliable and holds a false belief. As such, there is no harm in acting on his narration based on the fact that reliability (in narrating ḥadīth) is sufficient in determining the authoritative value of a narration—as the view correct holds.<sup>1</sup>

How can he be an upright (and) reliable narrator when the Imām cursed him and, “*he followed his own desire and adhered (instead) to the earth,*”<sup>2</sup> as al-Khūī expressed? He hoarded money that did not belong to him and falsely claimed that he was a *bāb* (door) to the Imām and the *Ṣāhib al-Sharīah* (lawgiver), until he was warned against it. In summary, the methodology of al-Khūī includes all of this and it does not negatively affect his *tawthīq*. What is important is that al-Khūī is satisfied with the narrator, even if he expressed what he expressed! As for the *Ṣaḥābah*, there is no consolation for them.

---

1 Al-Khūī: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 17/332, no. 11305.

2 In reference to the Qurʾān, Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 176. [translator’s note].

## 3.2 Intra-creedal adversaries from the non-Imāmī Shī'ah

The Shī'ah split into numerous sects. Many scholars of the Imāmiyyah alluded to this in their biographical works. As a result, they would attribute to the narrator his madhhab, or (creedal) school, and what group he belonged to. In this section, I will mention the four most important Shī'ī sects other than the Twelvers and how al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī dealt with them.<sup>1</sup>

### 3.2.1 The Wāqifah and the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī regarding them

Ḥusayn al-Shākīrī states:

الواقفة أو الواقفية فرقة من الشيعة أنكروا وفاة الإمام الكاظم موسى بن جعفر (عليه السلام) وأنكروا بذلك إمامة ولده الرضا (عليه السلام) وتسمى هذه الفرقة أيضا الممطورة أو الكلاب الممطورة

The Wāqifah, or the Wāqifiyyah, is a sect from the Shī'ah that deny the death of al-Imām al-Kāẓim Mūsā ibn Ja'far عليه السلام. In this manner, they deny the Imāmah of his son, al-Riḍā عليه السلام. This sect is also named the Mamṭūrah, or the Kilāb Mamṭūrah.<sup>2</sup>

Ḥusayn al-Shākīrī also states:

هم الواقفون على الإمام الكاظم (عليه السلام) والقائلون إنه حي يرزق وإنه هو القائم من آل محمد (عليهم السلام) وأن غيبته كغيبته موسى بن عمران عن قومه ويلزم من ذلك - على ضوء هذا الادعاء - عدم انتقال الإمامة إلى ولده الإمام الرضا (عليه السلام)

---

1 I did not mention the sect of the Ismā'īliyyah, those who believe in the Imāmah of Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far al-Ṣādiq because I did not find any narrators described as being an Ismā'īlī with sufficient academic merit deserving of a comment. I am not claiming that it does not exist; however, this is based on what I was, after a fair amount of effort, unable to find.

2 Al-Ḥājj Ḥusayn al-Shākīrī: *Mawsū'ah al-Muṣṭafā wa al-'Itrah*, 13/287 (under the marginalia). I chose this definition over others because of the others lack of clarity, or because they are too lengthy in the other books of the sects. See: *Rijāl al-Khāqānī*, p. 137; *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl* of Mullā Kanī p. 223; *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah* of al-Kajūrī, p. 124; *Kulliyāt fi 'Ilm al-Rijāl* of al-Subḥānī, p. 412. Al-Kashshī dedicated an entire chapter on them (p. 455, narrations 860 to 909).

They are those who stop at al-Imām al-Kāẓim عليه السلام and believe that he is alive and being given provisions. And that he is al-Qā'im, or the one that carries out the order of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ رَبَّنَا from the family of Muḥammad عليه السلام. And that his ghaybah is like the occultation of Mūsā ibn 'Imrān from his people. Based on this claim, it is inevitably not possible for the Imāmah to transfer to his son, al-Imām al-Riḍā عليه السلام.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Rashtī, famously known as *Sharī'atmadār* mentions that “the Sab'iyyah and the *Malāḥidah*” are among their nicknames.<sup>2</sup>

The Imāmī scholars judged this Shī'ī sect to be disbelievers and out of the fold. They also frequently criticize them and describe them with the most repugnant of words, such as “dogs,” “like donkeys and cows.” For this position, the scholars of the Imāmiyyah cite as evidence narrations attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt. In fact, they even cite verses of the Qur'ān that were (allegedly) revealed about them. Al-Kashshī narrates on the authority of 'Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah al-Baṭā'inī—he was the leader of the Wāqifah:

قال أبو إبراهيم [ موسى بن جعفر ] عليه السلام إنما أنت وأصحابك يا علي أشباه الحمير

Abū Ibrāhīm (Mūsā ibn Ja'far) عليه السلام said, “Verily, you and your companions, O 'Alī, resemble donkeys.”<sup>3</sup>

Al-Kashshī narrates on the authority of 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Zubayrī who said:

كتبت إلى أبي الحسن عليه السلام أسأله عن الواقعة فكتب الواقف حائد عن الحق ومقيم على سيئة إن مات بها كانت جهنم مأواه وبئس المصير

I wrote to Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام asking him about the Wāqifah.

1 Al-Ḥājj Ḥusayn al-Shākirī: *al-Naḥlat al-Wāqifiyyah*, p. 16 (*Silsilat al-Thaqāfat al-Islāmiyyah*, 15).

2 Al-Jlānī al-Rashtī: *Risālat fi 'Ilm al-Dirāyah* which is printed among *Rasā'il fi Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of al-Bābilī, 2/340.

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 404, no. 757.

He wrote, “The Wāqif deviates from the truth and persists in evil. If he dies with this belief, Jahannam is his abode—and what a miserable abode (it is).”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ said:

سئل عن الواقعة فقال يعيشون حيارى ويموتون زنادقة

He (i.e., al-Riḍā) was asked about the Wāqifah and he said, “They live confused and die as *zindīqs* (heretics).”<sup>2</sup>

Al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of Yūsuf ibn Ya‘qūb who said:

قلت لأبي الحسن الرضا عليه السلام أعطي هؤلاء الذين يزعمون أن أباك حي من الزكاة شيئا؟ قال لا تعطهم فإنهم كفار مشركون زنادقة

I said to Abū al-Hasan al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, “Should I give some zakāh to these (people) that claim your father is alive?”

He said, “No. Do not give them. For indeed they are *zindīqs* (heretics), polytheists, disbelievers.”<sup>3</sup>

The Imāmiyyah were not satisfied with criticizing the Wāqifah until they (also) made the Qur’ān to be revealed about them! Al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of Bakr ibn Ṣāliḥ who said:

سمعت الرضا عليه السلام يقول ما تقول الناس في هذه الآية؟ قلت جعلت فداك فأبي قال قال قول الله عز وجل وَقَالَتِ الْيَهُودُ بَدَأَ اللَّهُ مَعْلُومَةً ۖ عَلَّتْ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَلُعِنُوا بِمَا قَالُوا بَلْ يَدَاهُ مَبْسُوطَتَانِ يُثَبِّتُ كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ ۚ قُلْتَ اختلفوا فيها قال أبو الحسن عليه السلام ولكني أقول نزلت في الواقعة إنهم قالوا لا إمام بعد موسى فرد الله عليهم بل يده مبسوطتان واليد هو الإمام في باطن الكتاب وإنما عنى بقولهم لا إمام بعد موسى بن جعفر

1 Ibid., p. 455, no. 860.

2 Ibid., p. 456, no. 861.

3 Ibid. p. 456, no. 862.

I heard al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ saying, “What do people say about this verse?”

I said, “May I be made your ransom! Which verse?”

He said, “The statement of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, ‘And the Jews say, “The hand of Allah is chained.” Chained are their hands, and cursed are they for what they say. Rather, both His hands are extended; He spends however He wills.’”

I said, “They differ regarding it.”

Abū al-Ḥasan عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ said, “However, I say that the verse was revealed regarding the Wāqifah. They say that there is no Imām after Mūsā. And so, Allah refuted them, “Rather, both His hands are extended.” The hand is the Imām in the innermost (meaning of the) Book. What is meant by their statement is that there is no Imām after Mūsā ibn Ja‘far.”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of Muḥammad ibn ‘Āṣim who said:

سمعت الرضا عليه السلام يقول يا محمد بن عاصم بلغني أنك تجالس الواقعة؟ قلت نعم جعلت فداك  
أجالسهم وأنا مخالف لهم قال لا تجالسهم فان الله عز وجل يقول وَقَدْ نَزَّلَ عَلَيْكُمْ فِي الْكِتَابِ أَنْ إِذَا  
سَمِعْتُمْ آيَاتِ اللَّهِ يُكْفَرُ بِهَا وَيُسْتَهْزَأُ بِهَا فَلَا تَقْعُدُوا مَعَهُمْ حَتَّى يَخُوضُوا فِي حَدِيثٍ غَيْرِهِ إِنَّكُمْ إِذَا مَثَلْتُمْ  
يعني بالآيات الأوصياء الذين كفروا بها الواقعة

I heard al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ saying, “O, Muhammad ibn ‘Āṣim. It has reached me that you sit with the Wāqifah?”

I said, “Yes, may I be made your ransom! I sit with them but I oppose them.”

He said, “Do not sit with them. For indeed, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى states, “And it has already come down to you in the Book that when you hear the verses of Allah [recited], they are denied [by them] and ridiculed; so do not sit with them until they enter into another conversation. Indeed, you would then be like them.”

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 456, no. 863.

By “the verses,” he means the *awṣiyā’* (guardians), those whom the Wāqifah deny.”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of Sulaymān ibn al-Ja‘farī who said:

كنت عند أبي الحسن عليه السلام بالمدينة إذ دخل عليه رجل من أهل المدينة فسأله عن الواقعة فقال أبو الحسن عليه السلام مَلْعُونِينَ “أَيْنَمَا تُفْعَوُا أُحْدُوا وَفُتِلُوا تَقْتِيلًا وَالله إن الله لا يبدلها حتى يقتلوا عن آخرهم

I was by Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام in Madīnah when a person from Madīnah entered and asked him about the Wāqifah.

Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام said (quoting the verse), “*Accursed wherever they are found, [being] seized and massacred completely.*’ By Allah, Allah will not change them until the last of them are killed.”<sup>2</sup>

Al-Majlisī (d. 1111 AH) commented on this narration saying:

لعل المراد قتلهم في الرجعة

Perhaps what is meant is to kill them in the Raj‘ah<sup>3, 4</sup>.

On the authority of Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Riḍā عليه السلام:

أن الزيدية والواقفية والنصاب عنده بمنزلة واحدة

The Zaydiyyah, the Wāqifiyyah, and the Naṣṣāb, according to him (al-Ṣādiq), are (all) one.<sup>5</sup>

1 Ibid., p. 457, no. 864.

2 Ibid., p. 457, no. 865.

3 Referring to the Shī‘ī doctrine which claims that the Imāms and some of their supporters as well as their enemies will be brought back to life and return with the emergence of the Twelfth Imām. (Translator)

4 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 48/265.

5 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 460, no. 873.

Al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of Ibn Abī ‘Umayr, from the person who narrated to him who said:

سألت محمد بن علي الرضا عليه السلام عن هذه الآية *وَجُودٌ يُؤْمِنُ خَشِعَةً* قال نزلت في النصاب والزيدية والواقفة من النصاب

I asked Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Riḍā عليه السلام about the verse: “[Some] faces, that Day, will be humbled.”

He said, “It was revealed about the Naṣṣāb and the Zaydiyyah. The Wāqifah are from the Naṣṣāb.”<sup>1</sup>

The Imāmī scholars were not satisfied with describing them as “resembling (of) donkeys,” “disbelievers,” “heretics,” “apostates,” “polytheists,” and the fact that their “abode is Jahannam—and what a terrible abode (it is),” and that “they live confused and die as *zindīqs* (heretics),” and many other such words. They even likened them to impure dogs and cows. Al-Majlisī states:

كانوا يسمونهم وأضرابهم من فرق الشيعة سوى الفرقة المحقة الكلاب الممطورة لسراية خبيثهم إلى من يقرب منهم

They would name them and their likes from among the sects of the Shī‘ah—except for the correct sect—*al-Kilāb al-Mamṭūrah* (wet dogs) because of their filth spreading to those close to them.<sup>2</sup>

Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī (d. 1186 AH) transmitted from al-Shaykh al-Bahā‘ī (d. 1030 AH) that he said:

إن متقدمي أصحابنا كانوا يسمون تلك الفرق بالكلاب الممطورة أي الكلاب التي أصابها المطر مبالغة في نجاستهم والبعد عنهم

1 Ibid., p. 460, no. 874.

2 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 48/267.

Our earlier companions would name those sects “*Al-Kilāb al-Mamṭūrah*,” i.e., the dogs that were hit by rain as an exaggeration of their impurity and (maintaining) distance from them.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 AH) disputed ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī for describing ‘Ammār al-Sābāṭī al-Faṭḥī as being from the *Al-Kilāb al-Mamṭūrah*<sup>2</sup>. He states:

قوله من الكلاب الممطورة اشتباه لا ينبغي صدوره من مثله فإن البقر تشابه عليه والكلاب الممطورة من ألقاب الواقعة الجاحدين المكذبين لا الفطحية وبينهما بعد المشركين

His statement, ‘from *al-kilāb al-mamṭūrah*,’ is a misgiving that should not have been issued by someone like him. For “indeed, (all) cows look alike to him.”<sup>3</sup> *Al-Kilāb al-Mamṭūrah* is from the names of the *Wāqifah*, the deniers, not the *Faṭḥiyah*. The difference between the two is (like) the difference between the East and the West.<sup>4</sup>

I have mentioned their condition at length so that the reader is aware of the extent to which the Imāmī scholars were concerned with defaming and insulting them, despite their being Shī‘ah and sharing with the Imāmiyyah in the foundational doctrine of Imāmāh. So how about someone who does not believe in Imāmāh at all!?

---

1 Al-Muḥaqqiq Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadā’iq al-Nāḍirah*, 5/190, under the heading “Those who leave the Twelver sect from among the Shī‘ah sects.

2 ‘Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī: *Takmilat al-Rijāl*, 2/222 (under the biography of ‘Ammār al-Sābāṭī).

3 In reference to *Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 70 (translator’s note).

4 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 5/20. Perhaps al-Kāzīmī was correct with this description because the *Wāqifah*, despite them being famously known as *al-kilāb al-mamṭūrah* by the Imāmī scholars, it does not mean that the other opposing sects to the Imāmiyyah cannot be described as such. This is what al-Baḥrānī cited from al-Bahā’ī when he said, “Our earlier companions would name those sects “*al-kilāb al-mamṭūrah*, i.e., the dogs that were hit by rain. These words of his are not restricted to the *Wāqifah*. This is self-evident.



## The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī on the narrations of the Wāqifah

After this harsh stance of the Imāmiyyah towards the Wāqifah Shī'ah, we will see how al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī dealt with them.

### 1. The position of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī on the Wāqifah

Al-Ḥillī's methodology in his book, *al-Khulāṣah*, is characterized by strictness and rigidity towards narrators of the Wāqifah. Consequently, he accepts nothing from them. And despite their large number, he included them in the second section of his book that is dedicated to both weak narrators and those whose statements are rejected. He also rejected much from them, despite admitting that they are reliable. In fact, it is said about some of them that they are “thiqah thiqah!” Examples of this are many, including the following.

Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn 'Ammār ibn Ḥayyān al-Taghlibī, his statement:

ثقة عين روى عن أبي الحسن موسى (عليه السلام) قاله النجاشي وقال أبو جعفر بن بابويه إنه واقفي فإنا في روايته من المتوقفين

Noteworthy (and) reliable. He narrated from Abū al-Ḥasan Mūsā عليه السلام. Al-Najjāshī stated this. Abū Ja'far ibn Bābawayh stated, “He is a Wāqifi.” Accordingly, we suspend judgement on his narration.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī mentioned him in the first section. Despite that, he suspended judgement on his narration—even though there is textual evidence of his tawthīq from al-Najjāshī. Ibn Bābawayh did not criticize him; rather, he only stated that he is a Wāqifi.

Al-Ḥillī suspended judgement on the person who al-Najjāshī stated is “thiqah thiqah” for no other reason than his (creedal) school, as is the case with 'Abd al-Karīm ibn 'Amr ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Khat'amī. Under his biography, al-Ḥillī states:

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 262, no. 921 under the first section.

قال النجاشي أنه كان ثقة ثقة عينا وكان واقفيا وذكر الشيخ الطوسي رحمه الله والكشي أنه كان واقفيا وقال ابن الغضائري إن الواقفة تدعيه والغلاة تروي عنه كثيرا [قال الحلبي] والذي أراه التوقف عما يرويه

Al-Najjāshī states, “He is a thiqah thiqah and noteworthy. He was a Wāqifi.” Al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī and al-Kashshī mentioned that he was a Wāqifi. Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī states, “The Wāqifah claim him and the *Ghulāt* (Extremists) narrate much from him.” [Al-Ḥillī states] I consider suspending judgement on what he narrates.<sup>1</sup>

This is regarding a narrator about whom there is textual evidence of his tawthīq. As for the narrator whose narration he rejects for no other reason than (the issue of) Waqf (i.e., being a Wāqifi), they are tens of such narrators.<sup>2</sup> Examples of this are many. In fact, in the first three biographies in the second section, he rejects their narrations because they are Wāqifah.<sup>3</sup>

This harshness is not without exception. What al-Ḥillī states in his book, *al-Khulāṣah*, is at variance with what he mentions in his other writings—if there is a perceived benefit in this. For example, al-Ḥillī states here:

هذا الحديث وإن كان في طريقه الحسين بن المختار وهو واقفي إلا أن ابن عقدة وثقه

This ḥadīth, even though its chain contains al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Mukhtār (who is a Wāqifi), Ibn ‘Uqdah made tawthīq of him.<sup>4</sup>

Bearing in mind that, according to al-Ḥillī, Ibn ‘Uqdah is ḍa’if!

Al-Ḥillī also supports the narration of a Waqifi when most of his companions’ act on it, and also when the narration is famously known. He states:

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 381, no. 1532 in the second section.

2 Such as biography numbers 1236, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1254, 1301, 1302, 1332, 1334, 1335, 1336, and many others.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 313 and 314, nos. 1228, 1229, 1230.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Mukhtalif al-Shī’ah*, 1/304-305, the impermissibility of touching the writing of the Qur’ān without wuḍū’.

عن أبي بصير قال سألت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام عن الكر من الماء كم يكون قدره قال إذا كان الماء ثلاثة أشبار ونصفا في مثله في ثلاثة أشبار ونصف في عمقه في الأرض فذلك الكر من الماء وهذه الرواية عمل عليها أكثر الأصحاب إلا أن في طريقها عثمان بن عيسى وهو واقفي لكن الشهرة تعضدها

On the authority of Abū Baṣīr who said, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام about a quart of water. How much is it?”

He said, “When the water is three-and-a-half hand spans and the same amount into the ground, then this is a quart of water.”

Most of the companions act on this narration even though its chain (of narration) contains ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Īsā. He is a Wāqifī. However, the fact that it is well-known notoriety strengthens it.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. The position of al-Khūṭ on the Wāqifah

Contrary to the harshness of al-Ḥillī, we find al-Khūṭ accepting the narration of the Wāqifah, without any objection. And, why not? He even accepts the narration of the extreme Mukhammisah!

Al-Khūṭ explicitly stated that he accepts the narrations of the Wāqifah, despite the severe criticism laid against them that has already been mentioned in the narrations that they attribute to the Ahl al-Bayt. In fact, al-Khūṭ, at times, even defends the Wāqifah and refutes Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. Under the biography of al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Mukhtār, al-Khūṭ states:

ذكره العلامة في القسم الثاني... وترك العمل بروايته من جهة بنائه على أنه واقفي والأصل في ذلك شهادة الشيخ في رجاله على وقفه ويرده أولا أن الوقف لا يمنع العمل بالرواية بعد كون راويها ثقة والحسين بن المختار ثقة كما عرفت

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Muntahā al-Maṭlab*, 1/39, the amount constituting a *kurr* (quart). He states the same thing under, proving the (menstrual) habit of a woman, 2/312.

Al-‘Allāmah mentioned him in the second section<sup>1</sup>... He left acting on his narration based on the fact that he is a Wāqifī. The basis for him being regarded as a Wāqifī is the testimony of al-Shaykh in his book, *al-Rijāl*.

The response to this is, firstly, that (the doctrine of) Waqf does not prevent a person from acting on the Wāqifī’s narration after it is proven that he is a thiqah. And, as you know, al-Ḥasan ibn Sayf is a thiqah.<sup>2</sup>

In a similar manner, al-Khūṭ explains the methodology of al-Ḥillī regarding the Wāqifah. Under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn Sayf, he states:

أما توقف العلامة رحمه الله فمن جهة أنه لم يثبت كون الرجل من الفرقة المحقة على ما بنى عليه من عدم حجية خبر الواقعة ونحوهم

As for al-‘Allāmah (may Allah have mercy on him) suspending judgement<sup>3</sup>, it is based on the fact that it has yet to be proven that the man (i.e., the narrator) is from the correct sect. This is premised upon his view that the report of the Wāqifah and their likes holds no authoritative value.<sup>4</sup>

This does not mean that al-Khūṭ accepts the narration of every Wāqifī; rather, he requires that the narrator’s tawthīq is proven, irrespective of his (creedal) school. And so, he deals with him like an Imāmī; if a tawthīq has been issued in his favour, he (too) makes tawthīq of him. And if his weakness is established for a reason other than his (creedal) school, he (too) considers him weak. And if there is no criticism or praise established about him, then he remains unverified and his narration is rejected. An example of this is what al-Khūṭ mentioned—after a long discussion—under the biography of Ḥamzah ibn Buzay’:

فالمتحصل مما ذكرناه أن الرجل واقفي لم يوثق

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 337, no. 1332.

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/94, no. 3653.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 108, no. 271.

4 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 5/348, no. 2869.

Based on what we have mentioned, the conclusion is that the man is a Wāqifī whose tawthīq has not been made.<sup>1</sup>

And with this, the position of al-Khūṭ is clear to us; he does not see anything wrong with accepting the narration of the Wāqifah, even though they were described by Imāmī scholars as “resembling donkeys,” “disbelievers,” “heretics,” “apostates,” “their abode is Jahannam—and what a terrible abode (it is),” “they live confused and die as *zindīqs* (heretics),” “polytheists,” “cows,” and “impure dogs”!

### 3.2.2 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding the Faṭḥiyyah

Al-Shahrastānī (d. 548 AH) states:

الأفطحية قالوا بانتقال الإمامة من الصادق إلى ابنه عبدالله الأفتح وهو أخو إسماعيل من أبيه وأمه وأمهما فاطمة بنت الحسين بن الحسن بن علي وكان أسن الأولاد زعموا أنه قال الإمامة في أكبر أولاد الإمام

The Aftāḥiyyah consider Imāmah as having transferred from al-Ṣādiq to his son, ‘Abd Allāh al-Aftāḥ. He is the brother of Ismā‘īl from his maternal and paternal side. Their mother is Fāṭimah bint al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī. He was the oldest of the children. They claimed that he stated, “Imāmah is for the oldest child of the Imām.”<sup>2</sup>

Al-Kashshī dedicated an entire separate chapter to them and said:

هم القائلون بإمامة عبد الله بن جعفر بن محمد وسموا بذلك لأنه قيل إنه كان أفتح الرأس وقال بعضهم كان أفتح الرجلين وقال بعضهم إنهم نسبوا إلى رئيس من أهل الكوفة يقال له عبد الله بن فطيح والذين قالوا بإمامته عامة مشايخ العصابة وفقهاؤها مالوا إلى هذه المقالة فدخلت عليهم الشبهة لما روي عنهم عليه السلام أنهم قالوا الإمامة في الأكبر من ولد الإمام إذا مضى ثم منهم من رجح عن القول بإمامته لما امتحنه بمسائل من الحلال والحرام لم يكن عنده فيها جواب ولما ظهر منه من الأشياء التي لا ينبغي أن

1 Ibid., 7/279, no. 4035.

2 Al-Shaharastānī: *al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl*, 1/195.

يظهر من الإمام ثم إن عبد الله مات بعد أبيه بسبعين يوماً فرجع الباكون إلا شذاذا منهم عن القول بإمامته  
إلى القول بإمامة أبي الحسن موسى عليه السلام

‘They consider ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad as the (rightful) Imām. They were given that name because it was said that he (i.e., ‘Abd Allāh al-Aḩḩāḩ) had a flat head. Some of them said he had flat feet. Some of them said that they were associated to a leader from the people of Kūfah who was known as ‘Abd Allāh ibn faṩṩh.

Most of the scholars of the group and its jurists were inclined towards this view.<sup>1</sup> Uncertainty came into them because of what was narrated about them that they said, “Imāmah is for the oldest child of the Imām if he lives.”

---

1 This proves that the aḩḩādīth that the Imāmiyyah use for proving the doctrine of Imāmah and for textually stating the Imāms with their names were not known among the scholars of the Imāmī sect. It is for this reason there is a dispute every time an imām dies as to who will succeed him. Muḩammad al-Bahbūdī acknowledged this reality and said, “The context of Imāmah in the Twelve Imāms with their personalities and characters—as we know them today —was not penned out from the beginning. Rather, it developed in different stages and times. Accordingly, our companions in the time of al-Imām Abū Ja‘far al-Bāqir, after understanding the meaning of Imāmah and believing in his Imāmah and the Imāmah of his forefathers, would only believe that the Imāms are twelve. This belief was without them knowing who they specifically were in terms of their persons, names, characteristics, and qualities, except for the past Imāms and the Imām currently in their presence. This is why we find that some of the elite among them coming to the present Imām and asking him to introduce them to the Imām Qā‘im (i.e., the one who will carry out the orders of Allah) who will come after him. And so, he would not answer them except in a confined location and safe from enemies out of fear for themselves and for being assassinated. Therefore, the texts were few and the reports were obscure to them. Dark suspicions entered their hearts every time an Imām from the Imāms of the pure family passed on. The Shī‘ah differed regarding the Imām Qā‘im after him; they did not know who to follow and what they are returning to? This, despite having senior jurists, masters of ḩadīth, theologians, and faithful people among them. If they had at their disposal these many texts that were narrated from the era of the Minor Occultation and shortly before it, the issue at hand would not have led them to this glaring division and belief in these false desires.” (*Ma‘rifat al-ḩadīth*, p. 153). This proves to us that the aḩḩādīth the Imāmiyyah use to prove the Imāms varied in the time of the *Ghaybah Ṣuḩrā* (Minor Occultation) and beyond.

Subsequently, there were those among them who withdrew from the opinion of his Imāmah when he was tested with issues related to ḥalāl and ḥarām and had no answers. Also, because of the fact that certain things manifested themselves that were not appropriate to have come from the Imām. Furthermore, ‘Abd Allāh passed away seventy days after his father and so the others reverted from the opinion of his Imāmah to the Imāmah of Abū al-Ḥasan Mūsā عليه السلام save a few among them.<sup>1</sup>

The Imāmiyyah’s position on the Faṭḥiyyah is different to their position on other sects of the Shī‘ah. This is because the hostility of the Imāmiyyah to the Faṭḥiyyah was significantly less compared to their hostility towards the other dissenting sects. Perhaps the reason for this is what al-Kashshī previously mentioned, “Most of the scholars of the group and its jurists are inclined towards this view.”

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī explains the reason why the Imāmiyyah did not criticize the Faṭḥiyyah so much. He states:

اعلم أولاً أن الفطحية أقرب المذاهب الباطلة إلى مذهب الإمامية وليس فيهم معاندة وإنكار للحق وتكذيب لأحد من الأئمة الإثني عشر (عليهم السلام) بل لا فرق بينهم وبين الإمامية أصولاً وفروعاً أصلاً إلا في اعتقادهم إمامة إمام بين الصادق والكاظم (عليهما السلام) في سبعين يوماً لم تكن له راية فيحضروا تحتها ولا بيعة لزمهم الوفاء بها ولا أحكام في حلال وحرام وتكاليف في فرائض وسنن وآداب كانوا يتلقونها ولا غير ذلك من اللوازم الباطلة والآثار الفاسدة الخارجية المريية غالباً على إمامة الأئمة الذين يدعون إلى النار سوى الاعتقاد المحض الخالي عن الآثار الناشئ عن شبهة حصلت لهم عن بعض الأخبار وإنما كان مدار مذهبهم على ما أخذوه من الأئمة السابقة واللاحقة صلوات الله عليهم كالإمامية ومن هنا تعرف وجه عدم ورود لعن وذم فيهم وعدم أمرهم (عليهم السلام) بمجانبتهم كما ورد ذم الزيدية والواقفة وأمثالهما ولعنهم

Firstly, know that the Faṭḥiyyah are the closest of false (creedal) schools to the school of the Imāmiyyah. There is no opposition, denial of the truth, and belying any of the Twelve Imāms عليهم السلام. In fact, there is no actual difference between them and the Imāmiyyah in terms of their legal theory and (its) branches. However, in their creed is (the belief of) the Imāmah

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 254, no. 472.

of an Imām between al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام and al-Kāẓim عليه السلام for seventy days. He did not have a banner for them to rally under, nor any allegiance they were obliged to fulfill, nor any ḥalāl and ḥarām rulings (to advise on), nor were there any duties related to *farā'id* (compulsory acts), sunan, and *ādāb* (etiquettes) for them to receive from him, nor any other types of false requirements and incorrect external reports that mostly cause doubt regarding the authority of those leaders who call people to the Hell Fire. There is only a sheer belief, free from any reports. A belief which stemmed from a misgiving concerning certain reports. Their doctrine was based on what they received from the previous and subsequent Imāms عليهم السلام, such as the Imāmiyyah. From here, you understand the reason for not cursing and rebuking them, and also why the Imāms did not instruct (their followers) to abstain from them, as the Imāms were reported to have ordered the rebuking and cursing of the Zaydiyyah, Wāqifah, and their likes.<sup>1</sup>

For this reason, they were the closest of groups to the Imāmiyyah to such an extent that some of the Imāmī scholars described some of the Faṭḥiyyah as “from the companions,” or, “(possessing of) integrity.” Other Imāmīs have objected to this to such an extent that al-Khūṭ rejected those who objected to Mu‘āwiyah ibn Ḥakīm—despite being a Faṭḥī—being described as ‘adal, or possessing of integrity.<sup>2</sup> Al-Khūṭ states:

أما توصيفه بالعدالة فقد ذكرنا في ترجمة محمد بن سالم بن عبد الحميد أن المراد بالعدالة في كلام الكشي هو الاستقامة في مقام العمل بالمواظبة على الواجبات والاجتناب عن المحرمات وهذا لا ينافي فساد العقيدة من جهة كونه فطحيا وأما عده من فقهاء أصحابنا والاعتناء بشأته فهو من جهة التزامه بالأئمة الاثني عشر وإن زاد عليها واحدا وهو عبد الله الأفظح فالمراد من أصحابنا من يلتزم بإمامتهم ومعابرة بن حكيم منهم ومما يكشف عن ذلك قول النجاشي في ترجمة علي بن الحسن بن علي بن فضال كان فقيه

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 5/13.

2 Al-Kashshī described him like this. In describing a number of Faṭḥī narrators, he states about him, “All of these people are Faṭḥī (in creed). They are among the most prominent scholars upright jurists” (*Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)* of al-Ṭūsī, p. 563, no. 1062. Al-Najjāshī described him saying, “Reliable. Venerable.” Al-Najjāshī did not mention anything concerning his (doctrinal) school (*Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 412, no. 1098.)



أصحابنا بالكوفة ووجههم وثقتهم وكان فطحيا وأما ما احتمله بعضهم من حمل كلام الكشي على أنه كان فطحيا أولا ثم رجع عن ذلك بعد موت عبد الله بن أفضح فهو عجيب فإن معاوية بن حكيم لم يدرك زمان عبد الله الأفضح جزما على أنه خلاف ظاهر عبارة الكشي من أن معاوية بن حكيم فطحي على الإطلاق

As for him being described as possessing of ‘adālah, we have mentioned under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Sālim ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd that the meaning of ‘adālah in the words of al-Kashshī is to be upright in terms of upholding the compulsory acts and refraining from the prohibited ones. This does not contradict the false belief he holds of being a Faṭḥī. As for regarding him “among the jurists of our companions” and “granting him prominence,” it is because of his adherence to the Twelve Imāms—even though he added one more to them, ‘Abd Allāh al-Aṭṭah. The meaning of “from our companions,” is he who adheres to their Imāmah. And Mu‘āwiyah ibn Ḥakīm is from them. What reveals this is the statement of al-Najjāshī under the biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl, “He was the jurist from our companions in Kūfah, their luminary, and their reliable personality. He was a Faṭḥī. As for some of them upholding the words of al-Kashshī that he was firstly a Faṭḥī and then he renounced that after the death of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aṭṭah, this is odd; Mu‘āwiyah ibn Ḥakīm categorically did not reach the time of ‘Abd Allāh al-Aṭṭah. Nevertheless, it is at variance with the text of al-Kashshī which states that Mu‘āwiyah ibn Ḥakīm is, unrestrictedly, a Faṭḥī.<sup>1</sup>

By means of all of this compassion with the Faṭḥiyyah, al-Majlisī comes along and explains the opinion of the Imāmī scholars about them without any Taqiyyah. He states:

كتب أخبارنا مشحونة بالأخبار الدالة على كفر الزيدية وأمثالهم من الفطحية والواقفة وغيرهم من الفرق  
المضلة المبتدعة

The books of our (ḥadīth) reports are replete with reports indicating to the disbelief of the Zaydiyyah and their likes from the Faṭḥiyyah, Wāqifah, and other heretical, misguided sects.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 19:/223, no. 12471.

2 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 37/34.

When we understand this background to the position of the Imāmiyyah on the Faṭḥiyyah, it becomes possible for us to know the opinion of both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding them.

### 1. The position of al-Ḥillī on the Faṭḥiyyah

The methodology of al-Ḥillī in dealing with the Faṭḥiyyah is not very much different to how he deals with the other opposing sects, despite the former being the closest in belief to the Imāmiyyah. This is taking into consideration the difference of opinion that exists on account of which al-Ḥillī rejects the tawthīq of a narrator—unless of course a claim of consensus is made; in which case al-Ḥillī accepts and makes tawthīq of him, even though he, in al-Ḥillī’s view, holds a false belief. The following biographies will clarify this for us.

#### ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr

Al-Ḥillī states:

[قال الكشي] إن عبد الله بن بكير ممن اجتمعت العصاة على تصحيح ما يصح عنه واقرؤا له بالفقه [فقال الحلبي] فأنا اعتمد على روايته وإن كان فاسد المذهب

(Al-Kashshī states:) ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr is from those whom the group agrees upon regarding authenticating what is authentically established from him. They admit to his fiqhī<sup>1</sup> abilities. (Al-Ḥillī states:) Therefore, I rely on his narrations, even though he holds a false belief.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ḥillī refuted those who questioned the tawthīq of Ibn Bukayr even though he was not an Imāmī. He states:

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma’rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 375, no. 705. Al-Ḥillī does not transmit the text verbatim; rather, he does so in meaning (*bi al-ma’nā*). This is because al-Kashshī mentions him under the heading, *Tasmiyat al-fuqahā’ min aṣḥāb Abī ‘Abd Allāh*, among a number of (other) narrators and not individually.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 195, no. 609.

لا يقال في طريق الرواية ابن بكير وهو فطحي فكيف جعلتم الرواية في الصحيح لأننا نقول قال الكشي  
أجمعت العصابة على تصحيح ما يصح عن ابن بكير

It cannot be said that the chain of narration contains Ibn Bukayr—who is a Faṭḥī. And so, how can you place the narration in the authentic (category)? (We do so) because we say that al-Kashshī states, “There is a consensus among the group (of Shī‘ah) on authenticating what is authentically transmitted from Ibn Bukayr.”<sup>1</sup>

This clearly shows that he made tawthīq of him because of the *ijmā‘*.

### Abān ibn ‘Uthmān al-Aḥmar

Al-Ḥillī mentions the previous statement of al-Kashshī and his claiming consensus on accepting some narrators, among them Abān ibn ‘Uthmān. Thereafter, al-Ḥillī states:

والأقرب عندي قبول روايته وإن كان فاسد المذهب للإجماع المذكور

Accepting his narrations is, according to me, (the opinion) closest (to the truth). This, despite the fact that he, by the aforementioned consensus, holds a false belief.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the tawthīq of al-Ḥillī goes back to the *ijmā‘* which al-Kashshī mentioned, not because they are, in his view, reliable narrators.

When al-Ḥillī came to the biography of ‘Ammār al-Sābāṭī, he mentioned al-Najjāshī’s<sup>3</sup> tawthīq of him and a narration of the infallible proving his praise of him.<sup>4</sup> Thereafter, he stated:

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Mukhtalif al-Shī‘ah*, 7/51, under the chapter “*al-‘Aqd ‘alā al-ukhtayn murattaban*”.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 74, no. 121.

3 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 290, no. 779.

4 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 406, no. 763. It is the first opinion of Abū al-Ḥasan (al-Kāzīm Mūsā ibn Ja‘far), “I asked Allah to gift me with ‘Ammār al-Sābāṭī and He granted him to me!”

The correct view, according to me, is that his narrations are favourable.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, we find al-Ḥillī treating his narrations as favourable, despite al-Najjāshī's explicit statement (of tawthīq) and the infallible's narration in praise of him. However, under the biography of 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Faḍḍāl—who is a Faṭḥī, he states:

شهد له بالثقة الشيخ الطوسي والنجاشي فأنا اعتمد على روايته وإن كان مذهبه فاسدا

Al-Ṭūsī and al-Shaykh al-Najjāshī testified to his reliability. Therefore, I (too) rely on his narrations, even though his (doctrinal) school is false.<sup>2</sup>

In summary, when al-Ḥillī sees the statements of both al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī in agreement regarding the tawthīq of a narrator, he gives preference to their tawthīq over his own principle of rejecting the narrations of his (creedal) opposition.

It can be said that al-Ḥillī makes tawthīq of narrators who hold opposing beliefs for several reasons, including when:

1. the statements of both al-Ṭūsī and al-Najjāshī are in agreement regarding the tawthīq of a narrator, and
2. the narrator is among those whom al-Kashshī cites a consensus on regarding their tawthīq.

However, al-Ḥillī did not adhere to all of these issues. He made tawthīq of a man in *al-Khulāṣah* and considered him weak in his (other) jurisprudential works, and vice-versa. This, despite the fact the he is from the opposing sects. Thus, the

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 382, no. 1533.

2 Ibid., p. 177 (biography no. 526).

reason for deeming him to be weak is only because he opposes him in his belief. An example of this is when he made tawthīq of ‘Alī ibn Asbāṭ. In the first section of *al-Khulāṣah*, he states:

فأنا اعتمد على روايته

Therefore, I rely on his narrations.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, as we have already seen, he made tawthīq of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr. And when there was a perceivable benefit in deeming a narration weak, he stated:

أنه ضعيف السند فإن ابن بكير فطحي المذهب وإن كان ثقة وفي طريقه علي بن أسباط وهو فطحي أيضا  
وسهل بن زياد وهو ضعيف

It is weak in terms of its sanad because Ibn Bukayr is a Faṭḥī in his (creedal) school, even though he is reliable. ‘Alī ibn Asbāṭ, who is also a Faṭḥī, is in the chain. Sahl ibn Ziyād is also in the chain and he is weak.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, he rejected the ḥadīth on account of three reasons, among which is the fact that Ibn Bukayr is a Faṭḥī. In the same book just a few pages before this, we find him saying:

عبد الله بن بكير وإن كان فطحيًا إلا أن المشائخ وثقوه

‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr, even though he is a Faṭḥī, the scholars made tawthīq of him.<sup>3</sup>

If a person were to say that this is an error from al-Ḥillī, or, perhaps he simply made a mistake, I would unequivocally state that it is an actual methodology that he is following. The examples clearly demonstrate what I have mentioned

---

1 Ibid., p. 185, no. 549.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Mukhtalif al-Shī‘ah*, 3/100, under “*ṣalāt al-safar ḥukm al-musāfir li al-tijārah*”.

3 Ibid., 3/71, “*Law tabayyana fiṣq al-iīām aw kafara ba’d al-ṣalāh*”.

since his actual position is based on where there lies more of a perceived benefit. Likewise, al-Ḥillī deemed Ibn Bukayr weak in another place. Commenting on a narration, he states:

بالمع من صحة السند فإن في طريقه القاسم بن عروة ولا يحضرني الآن حاله وابن بكير وهو فطحي

The sanad cannot be authentic. It contains al-Qāsim ibn ‘Urwah—his condition is not coming to me at this time—and Ibn Bukayr. He is a Faṭḥī.<sup>1</sup>

Also, under the previously mentioned ‘Alī ibn Asbāṭ, he states about him after rejecting his narrations in his book, *Mukhtalif al-Shī‘ah*:

وفي طريقها علي بن فضال وهو فطحي وعلي بن أسباط وإن كان فطحيا إلا أن الأصحاب شهدوا لهما بالثقة والصدق

In its chain of narration is ‘Alī ibn Faḍḍāl. He is a Faṭḥī. (It also contains) ‘Alī ibn Asbāṭ, and even though he is a Faṭḥī, the companions have testified to their reliability and truthfulness.<sup>2</sup>

In each of the books, he has an opinion at variance with his other opinion. For this reason, the scholar is unable to accurately determine the methodology of al-Ḥillī because he himself did not follow a clear method on narrators. Even Muḥammad al-Bustānī (who wrote an introduction to the book, *Muntahā al-Maṭlab*) acknowledged this reality, even though he initially attempted to exonerate al-Ḥillī from such a claim. And so, when he felt that his attempt at exonerating him fell short, he presumed incertitude because the matter lacked clarity. In a lengthy discussion that is very important, he states:

إسقاط المؤلف [الحلي] حين الرواية ثم العمل بها حيناً آخر حيث يصرح في الحالة الأولى بسبب ذلك وهو ضعف الراوي كما لو كان فطحياً أو واقفياً أو غيرهما من أمثال سماعة وعمار وابن فضال وابن بكير وسواهم ولكنه وفي الحالة الثانية يصرح بأن الراوي ثقة مع أن الراوي هو نفسه في الحالتين أي إنه بسبب

1 Ibid., 1/280, “*Istihbāb al-maḍmaḍah wa al-istinshāq fī al-wuḍū‘*”.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Muntahā al-Maṭlab*, 2/368, “*Aḥkām al-ḥayḍ wa kayfiyyātuhu*”.

من كون أولئك الرواة قد تأرجح القول في وثاقتهن وعدمها حيث وثقهن البعض وقدهن فيهم بعض آخر حينئذ نجد عند التأييد لوجهة نظره يصرح بوثاقتهن من قبل أهل التعديل والجرح مع أنه في كتابه الرجالي المعروف يحسم الموقف حيناً فيميل إلى الترجيح بوثاقتهن ويتردد بالنسبة إلى آخرين وأما في حالة أخرى نجده يقدح بهم وهذا ما يمكن ملاحظته على سبيل الاستشهاد بالنسبة إلى ابن فضال حيث نجد في ذهابه إلى عدم أجزاء الغسل عن الوضوء يسقط رواية ابن فضال القاضية بالأجزاء قائلاً بأنه فطحي كذلك بالنسبة لإسقاطه روايتين لحظناهما عند حديثنا عن روايات تبينت النية في سفر رمضان حيث أسقطهما لمكان ابن فضال فيهما ولكنه بالنسبة لحكم الحائض المبتدئة مثلاً يعلق على رواية في طريقها ابن فضال نفسه قائلاً وهو فطحي إلا أن الأصحاب شهدوا له بالثقة والصدق بل نجد في إيراد رواية أخرى لابن فضال تتعلق بوجود الغسل في صحة الصوم بالنسبة إلى الحائض يستشهد بقول النجاشي عن ابن فضال فقيه أصحابنا بالكوفة ووجههم وثقتهم وعارفهم بالحديث الخ والأمر كذلك بالنسبة إلى رواة آخرين مثل عمر واسحاق وحيث يسقط رواياتهم عند الرد ويضفي عليهم طابع الوثاقة عندما يعزز برواياتهم ووجهة نظره مشيراً إلى أن الأصحاب شهدوا بالثقة لهذا الراوي أو ذلك إنه من الممكن أن نقول المؤلف حينما سكت عن عمار أو سماعة أو ابن فضال أو غيرهم فلأن مناقشيه يعتمدون رواياتهم مثلاً وأنه لا يعتمدهم في حالة تقديمه لأدلة الخاصة لكن حينما يؤكد على أن الأصحاب شهدوا لهم بالثقة حينئذ كيف يسوغ له أن يرفض رواياتهم التي لا تتسق مع وجهة نظره وبكلمة جديدة إن المؤلف إما أن يكون مقتنعاً بوثاقتهن وهذا هو الصحيح لدليل أنه وثقهن كما لحظنا في النماذج السابقة فضلاً عما أوضحه أيضاً في كتابه الرجالي وإما أن يقتنع بعدم وثاقتهن فحينئذ لا معنى للاعتماد على رواياتهم إلا في حالة الإلزام وهذا ما لا ينطبق على حالة الرواة المشار إليهم طبيعياً لو كان المؤلف مقتنعاً بعدم وثاقتهن كما هو الحال بالنسبة إلى راو مثل أحمد بن هلال مثلاً فحينئذ عندما يسكت عن الظن به نفس ذلك بأنه يستهدف إلزام المخالف بروايته كما حدث بالنسبة إلى استدلاله على مطهرية المستعمل في رفع الحدث الأصغر وعند ما يطعن بالرواية نفسها كما حدث بالنسبة إلى استدلاله على مطهرية المستعمل في رفع الحدث الأكبر حيث نفت الرواية ذلك حينئذ نفس موقفه بأن قناعته الحقيقية بعدم وثاقة الراوي المذكور تفرض عليه ذلك وأن عدم طعنه إنما جاء إلزاماً للمخالف فحسب أما في حالة كونه قد اقتنع بوثاقة الراوي كما هو الحال بالنسبة لبعض الفطحيين والواقفيين حينئذ فإن رفض رواياتهم يظل محل تساؤل

The author (al-Ḥillī) dropping a narration in one instance and then acting on it in another such that he explicitly mentions in the first situation the reason—which is because of the narrator being weak on account of being a Faṭḥī, or Wāqifī, or something else like Sammā'ah, 'Ammār, Ibn Faḍḍāl, Ibn Bukayr, and others. However, in the second situation, he explicitly mentions that the narrator is a 'thiqah,' despite the fact that the narrator is the same (person) in both situations. In other words, because of the fact that there is uncertainty regarding the narrators' "reliability or lack thereof" such that some of them have made their tawthīq and others have criticized them,

then, in such an instance we find him, when supporting his point of view, explicitly stating their reliability by means of the people of jarḥ and ta'dīl. This, “despite the fact that in his famous book on narrators the position is, at times, settled; he inclines towards preferring their tawthīq and remains hesitant in relation to others.” In another situation, we find him criticizing them. This can be seen, by way of example, with Ibn Faḍḍāl. In holding his view that ghusl is not sufficient for wuḍū'—he drops the narration of Ibn Faḍḍāl that says it (i.e., ghusl) is sufficient (for wuḍū'). He claims that he is a 'Faṭḥī'.

Similarly, in relation to dropping two narrations, we noticed them when we were speaking about the narrations in relation to renewing the intention (for fasting) while on journey in Ramaḍān. He dropped them because of Ibn Faḍḍāl's position in the narrations. However, regarding the ruling of a lady who first experiences her menstruation, for example, he comments on a narration narrated by Ibn Faḍḍāl himself saying: “He is a Faṭḥī. However, the companions have testified in favour of his reliability and truthfulness.” In fact, in relation to the necessity of a menstruating woman to make ghusl for her fast to be valid, we find him mentioning another narration of Ibn Faḍḍāl by citing al-Najjāshī's statement, “He was the jurist from our companions in Kūfah, their luminary, reliable personality, and their knowledgeable ḥadīth scholar...” It is the same situation in relation to other narrators, such as 'Umar, Iṣḥāq, and others; he drops their narrations “when disproving” and labels them “reliable” when reinforcing his view with their narrations, indicating that the companions have testified in favour of this or that narrator's reliability. It is conceivable for us to say that the author, when he remains silent about 'Ammār, or Sammā'ah, or Ibn Faḍḍāl, or others, it is as if his interlocutors rely on their narrations, for example. And that he does not rely on them if he presents his own evidence. However, when he affirms that the companions have testified to their reliability, in this instance, how is it possible for him to reject their narrations which are not in harmony with his point of view. Stated differently, the author is either convinced of their reliability—which is the correct view—because of the proof that he made tawthīq of them. This is



clear from the previous examples, in addition to what he also clarified in his book on narrators. Or, he is convinced that they are not reliable. In such an instance, there is no meaning to relying on their narrations except in the instance of *ilzām*, or forcing proof on someone to accept an argument. This does not apply to the case of the narrators referred to (above). Naturally, if the author was convinced with them not being reliable, as is the case with the narrator Aḥmad ibn Hilāl, for example, then when he remains silent and has no opinion on him, we interpret that to mean that he is looking to impose a proof on his interlocutor with that narrator’s narration. This is precisely what happened when he attempted to prove that the purity of water (remains) after it was used for removing a minor impurity. When he ‘criticized’ an actual narration, as it happened when he attempted to prove that the purity of water (remains) after it was used for removing a major impurity—when the narration denies that. In this instance, we interpret his position such that his actual conviction that the aforementioned narrator is unreliable was imposed upon him. And the fact that he did not criticize him only came because he wanted to “force proof” on his interlocutor (to accept the argument). As for the situation where he is convinced of the narrator’s reliability—as is the case with some of the Faḥḥī and Wāqifī narrators—then, the rejection of their narrations remains questionable.<sup>1</sup>

For me, this is not just a question, but I consider it a clearly defined methodology that al-Ḥillī follows and is satisfied with. This methodology is that he does not adhere to the principles he laid out when there is no perceived benefit in doing so. Adherence to these principles only occurs when there is a perceived benefit therein. This is one of the greatest criticisms of the Akhbāriyyah against those Uṣūlī scholars who claim to follow a method of critical analysis. At the head of this (Uṣūlī school), is al-Ḥillī. Perceiving this reality, al-Baḥrānī al-Akhbārī (d. 1186 AH) states:

---

1 Introduction to *Muntahā al-Maḥḥab*, 1/68. The examples I mentioned are different to the examples mentioned by al-Bustānī. This was done in order for the discussion to be (more) complete and for the information therein to be more certain.

فلاضطراب كلامهم في الجرح والتعديل على وجه لا يقبل الجمع والتأويل فترى الواحد منهم يخالف نفسه فضلا عن غيره فهذا يقدم الجرح على التعديل وهذا يقول لا يقدم إلا مع عدم إمكان الجمع وهذا يقدم النجاشي على الشيخ وهذا ينازعه ويطلبه بالدليل وبالجملة فالخائض في الفن يجزم بصحة ما ادعيناه والبناء من أصله لما كان على غير أساس كثر الانتقاض فيه والالتباس

Because their words related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl are confusing such that they can neither be reconciled nor (reasonably) interpreted. Thus, you will see one of them contradicting himself, let alone others. This person gives preference to the jarḥ over the ta'dīl. This (other) person says that it (i.e., the jarḥ) is only to be given preference when there is no possibility of jam' (reconciliation). This (other) person prefers al-Najjāshī over al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī). This (other) person disagrees with him and demands proof (for his claim). In summary, anyone who gets into the science will conclusively agree that what we are claiming is correct. When an edifice lacks a foundation, there is much criticism and confusion.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. The methodology of al-Khūṭ in dealing with narrators of the Faṭḥiyyah

Al-Khūṭ dealt with the narrators of the Wāqifah similar to how he dealt with other narrators. As mentioned previously on numerous occasions, having a false creed has no bearing, according to al-Khūṭ, on determining the acceptability of a narrator's narration. An example of this is the documented text of al-Khūṭ on (the doctrine of) Waqf not negatively affecting the tawthīq of a narrator. Under the biography of 'Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr, he states:

إنك قد عرفت توثيق عبد الله بن بكير من الشيخ والمفيد وعلي ابن إبراهيم وعد الكشي إياه من أصحاب الاجماع فلا ينبغي الاشكال في وثاقته وإن كان فطحيا

You already know of the tawthīq of 'Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr from al-Shaykh, al-Mufīd, and 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm. Al-Kashshī counted him among the people of consensus. Thus, there should be no problem with his reliability, even though he is a Faṭḥī.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Muḥaqqiq al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nādirah*, 1/23.

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 11/131, no. 6745.

### 3.2.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding the Kaysāniyyah

Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436 AH) defines them as:

أول من شذ عن الحق من فرق الإمامية "الكيسانية" وهم أصحاب المختار وإنما سميت بهذا الاسم لأن المختار كان اسمه أولا كيسان وقيل وإنما سمي بهذا الاسم لأن أباه حمله وهو صغير فوضعه بين يدي أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام قالوا فمسح يده على رأسه وقال كيس كيس فلزمه هذا الاسم وزعمت فرقة منهم أن محمد بن علي عليه السلام استعمل المختار على العراقيين بعد قتل الحسين عليه السلام وأمره بالطلب بثأره وسماه كيسان لما عرف من قيامه ومذهبه وهذه الحكايات في معنى اسمه عن الكيسانية خاصة فأما نحن فلا نعرف إلا أنه سمي بهذا الاسم ولا نتحقق معناه وقالت هذه الطائفة بإمامة أبي القاسم محمد بن أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام ابن خولة الحنفية وزعموا أنه هو المهدي الذي يملأ الأرض قسطا وعدلا كما ملئت ظلما وجورا وأنه حي لم يموت حتى يظهر الحق وتعلقت في إمامته بقول أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام يوم البصرة أنت ابني حقا وأنه كان صاحب رأيته كما كان أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام صاحب رؤية رسول الله [صلى الله عليه وسلم] وكان ذلك عنده الدليل على أنه أولى الناس بمقامه

The first sect of the Imāmiyyah to deviate from the truth was the Kaysāniyyah. They are the companions of al-Mukhtār. The reason they were given this name is because al-Mukhtār's name was originally Kaysān. It is said that he was given this name because his father carried him when he was young and placed him before Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام. They (i.e., those that were present) said that he wiped over his head and said: 'Kayyis (Intelligent). Kayyis.' From then on, this name stuck with him.

One of their sects claimed that Muḥammad ibn 'Alī عليه السلام elected al-Mukhtār to govern over the 'Irāqīs after al-Ḥusayn عليه السلام was killed. He ordered him to seek revenge and named him Kaysān because of what he knew of his (outstanding) performance and manner.

These incidents are in reference to the meaning of his name originating from the Kaysāniyyah. As for us, we only know that he was given this name without knowing the particular reasons as to why. This sect believes in the Imāmah of Abū al-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام, Ibn Khawlah al-Ḥanafiyah. They claim that he is the Mahdī that will "fill the earth with equity and justice" as it was "filled with oppression and tyranny." They also claim that he is alive and has not died, and that he will not die until the truth manifests. Regarding his Imāmah, they attach the statement

of Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام on the day of Baṣrah, “You are truly my son.” And that he was his flag bearer just as Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام was the flag bearer of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم. This was sufficient evidence for him to conclude that he is the most deserving of people for this position.<sup>1</sup>

Concerning narration number 204, al-Kashshī states:

والمختار هو الذي دعا الناس إلى محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب ابن الحنفية وسموا الكيسانية وهم المختارية وكان لقبه كيسان ولقب بكيسان لصاحب شرطه المكنى أبا عمرة وكان اسمه كيسان وقيل إنه سمي كيسان بكيسان مولى علي بن أبي طالب عليه السلام وهو الذي حمله على الطلب بدم الحسين عليه السلام ودله على قتلته وكان صاحب سره والغالب على أمره وكان لا يبلغه عن رجل من أعداء الحسين عليه السلام أنه في دار أو في موضع إلا قصده فهدم الدار بأسرها وقتل كل من فيها من ذي روح وكل دار بالكوفة خراب فهي مما هدمها

Al-Mukhtār is the one to call people to Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. They are called the Kaysāniyyah. They are the Mukhtāriyyah. His nickname was Kaysān. He was given the nickname after one of his personal; bodyguards, known as Abū ‘Amrah (and) whose name was Kaysān. It is said that he was named Kaysān because of Kaysān, the (prominent) *mawlā* (client) of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. He is the one who made him seek revenge for the blood of al-Ḥusayn عليه السلام and directed him to kill him. He was his secret keeper and he reigned over his affair. The news of a man from the enemies of al-Ḥusayn عليه السلام that he was in a (particular) house or in a (certain) place would not reach him except that he pursued him. He destroyed the house with its people (inside) and killed everyone therein with a soul. Every house that is in ruins in Kūfah was destroyed by him.

However, al-Khūṭī rejected what al-Kashshī mentioned. Under the biography of al-Mukhtār ibn Abī ‘Ubaydah al-Thaqafī, he states:

أنه نسب بعض العامة المختار إلى الكيسانية وقد استشهد لذلك بما في الكشي من قوله والمختار هو الذي دعا الناس إلى محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب ابن الحنفية وسموا الكيسانية وهم المختارية وكان [لقبه] كيسان... إلى آخر ما تقدم وهذا القول باطل جز ما فإن محمد بن الحنفية لم يدع الإمامة لنفسه حتى يدعو المختار الناس إليه وقد قتل المختار ومحمد بن الحنفية حي وإنما حدثت الكيسانية بعد وفاة محمد

1 Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (also named ‘Alam al-Hudā): *al-Fuṣūl al-Mukhtārah*, p. 296.

بن الحنفية وأما أن لقب مختار هو كيسان فإن صح ذلك فمنشؤه ما تقدم في رواية الكشي من قول أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام له مرتين يا كيس يا كيس فثنى كلمة كيس وقيل كيسان

Some of the 'Āmmah' attributed al-Mukhtār to the Kaysāniyyah. The statement of al-Kashshī was cited for this (claim), "Al-Mukhtār is the one to call people to Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. They were named the Kaysāniyyah. They are the Mukhtāriyyah. His nickname<sup>2</sup> was Kaysān..."

This statement is patently false. Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah did not call to Imāmah for himself until al-Mukhtār called people towards it.<sup>3</sup> Al-

---

1 Among the things the reader will find strange is al-Khūṭī's statement that this is something the 'Āmmah attributed to al-Mukhtār. And by the 'Āmmah, he means the Ahl al-Sunnah! Abū 'Amr al-Kashshī mentioned this in his book—and he is from the early generation of Imāmiyyah. Al-Ṭūsī did not omit this when he worked with al-Kashshī's book. And so, what is the Ahl al-Sunnah's connection to what al-Kashshī mentioned? Al-Kashshī did not attribute this opinion to anybody. In fact, he mentioned it as a personal opinion of his. However, this skeptical approach practiced by some Imāmī scholars, whereby they lay every criticism found in the books of the Imāmiyyah on the opposition is incorrect and lacks academic integrity. And what confirms the fact that those who described al-Mukhtār as a Kaysānī are the scholars of the Imāmiyyah, as Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī mentioned in his work on narrators. Under al-Mukhtār's biography, he states, "Some of our companions suggested that he is of the Kaysāniyyah." Therefore, I do not know why al-Khūṭī neglected the statement of al-Kashshī and the admission of Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī and threw the blame on the Ahl al-Sunnah!

2 In the *Mu'jam* of al-Khūṭī, it is written as "*wa kāna baqiyyat Kaysān.*" However, what I have stated here is correct because it's transmitted from al-Kashshī.

3 Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr (d. 774 AH) states that al-Mukhtār "called, in secret, to his Imām, the Mahdī, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. He is Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. He gave him the nickname al-Mahdī. Accordingly, many of the Shī'ah followed him in this and left (the ranks of) Sulaymān ibn Surād. The Shī'ah became two factions, the majority of whom were with Sulaymān wanting to go out to the people so they can avenge (the death of) al-Ḥusayn. The other faction was with al-Mukhtār wanting to go out and call to the Imāmah of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. This was without the instruction and approval of Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. Rather, they fabricated these words and projected them on to him in order to spread it to the people and to achieve their corrupt goals" (*al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, 8/248). Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar states, "It is said that he was initially a Khārījī, then a Zaydī, and then a Rāfiḍī" (*al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah*, 6/349).

Mukhtār was killed while Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah was alive. The Kaysāniyyah only came into being after the death of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. As for the claim that the nickname of Mukhtār was Kaysān, if it is correct, then it is based on the statement of Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام that was previously mentioned in the narration of al-Kashshī, 'O, Kayyis. O, Kayyis.' He repeated the words 'Kayyis' twice. It was said (that he said) 'Kaysān.'"<sup>1</sup>

In summary, the Kaysāniyyah are a sect from the sects of the Shī'ah that claim Imāmah for Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.

### 1. The position of al-Ḥillī on narrators of the Kaysāniyyah

The position of al-Ḥillī on the Kaysāniyyah is no different to the other opposing sects of the Shī'ah. This sect practically does not exist and its narrators are very few. Therefore, al-Ḥillī only mentions the great Ṣaḥābī, Abū Ṭufayl 'Āmir ibn Wāthilah.<sup>2</sup>

He included him in the section of weak narrators and only mentioned the following:

عامر بن واثلة بالباء المنقطه فوقها ثلاث نقط كيساني

'Āmir ibn Wāthilah is a Kaysānī.<sup>3</sup>

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 19:102, 109, 110, no. 12185.

2 Al-Dhababī states, "'Āmir ibn Wāthilah, Abū Ṭufayl al-Kinānī. He saw the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and narrated from him, Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and Mu'ādh. Al-Zuhrī, Qatādah, and Ma'rūf ibn Kharrabūdh narrated from him. He was from the ardent lovers of 'Alī عليه السلام. With him, the (era of the) Ṣaḥābah came to an end. According to the correct view, he died in the year 110 AH (*al-Kāshif*, 1/527). He was the last Ṣaḥābī to pass away عليه السلام.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 379, no. 1523. Al-Ḥillī isn't the only person to regard this great Ṣaḥābī as weak; 'Abd al-Nabī al-Jazā'irī also made taḍ'īf of him in his book, *Ḥāwī al-Aawāl*, 4/153, no. 1901. They did not mention any reason for this taḍ'īf except for (being from) the Kaysāniyyah!

Al-Ḥillī did not mention a reason to place him in the section of weak narrators except for the fact that he described him as a Kaysānī!

## 2. The position of al-Khūṭī on narrators of the Kaysāniyyah

Despite earnestly searching, I could not find anything of al-Khūṭī related to the Kaysāniyyah in terms of accepting or rejecting their narrations. However, what has been consistently reported from al-Khūṭī regarding his ruling on the people of different sects proves to us his opinion on a Kaysānī narrator. This is because he does not reject the narration of a narrator merely because of his (creedal) school, as he states in relation to one of the narrators of the Wāqifah:

أن الوقف لا يمنع العمل بالرواية بعد كون راويها ثقة

(The belief of) Waqf does not prevent acting on a narration after establishing the narrator is reliable.<sup>1</sup>

Under the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr, he states:

فلا ينبغي الإشكال في وثاقته وإن كان فطحيا

Thus, there should be no problem with his reliability, even though he is a Faṭḥī.<sup>2</sup>

From what we know of al-Khūṭī’s methodology, when we extend it, it can also apply to the Kaysāniyyah.

### 3.2.4 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the Zaydiyyah

Al-Shahrastānī (d. 548 AH) defines the Zaydiyyah saying:

أتباع زيد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنهم ساقوا الإمامة في أولاد فاطمة رضي الله عنها ولم يجوزوا ثبوت الإمامة في غيرهم إلا أنهم جوزوا أن يكون كل فاطمي عالم زاهد شجاع

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/94, no. 3653.

2 Ibid., 11/131, no. 6745.

سخي خرج بالإمامة أن يكون إماما واجب الطاعة سواء كان من أولاد الحسن أو من أولاد الحسين رضي الله... وجوزا خروج إمامين في قطرين يستجمعان هذه الخصال ويكون كل واحد منهما واجب الطاعة

وزيد بن علي لما كان مذهبه هذا المذهب أراد أن يحصل الأصول والفروع حتى يتحلى بالعلم [فتتلماذ] في الأصول لواصل بن عطاء الغزال الأثني رأس المعتزلة... وصارت أصحابه كلهم معتزلة... ولما سمعت شيعة الكوفة هذه المقالة منه وعرفوا أنه لا يتبرأ من الشيخين رفضوه حتى أتى قدره عليه فسميت رافضة..... [الزيدية] أصناف ثلاثة جارودية وسليمانية وبترية

The followers of Zayd ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. They supported the function of Imāmah within the children of Fāṭimah عليها السلام and did not permit it outside of them. However, they permitted every Fāṭimī scholar that is generous, brave, and an ascetic that proclaims Imāmah as an Imām who it is compulsory to obey, whether he is from the children of al-Ḥasan or the children of al-Ḥusayn عليه السلام... They (also) permitted two Imāms in two (different) areas to come out who share these qualities and whose obedience is compulsory.

And when this madhhab was Zayd ibn ‘Alī’s madhhab, he desired to acquire (knowledge pertaining to) the *uṣūl* and *furū’* (i.e., of the religion) so that he may be adorned with knowledge. (As such, he studied) in *uṣūl* under Wāṣil ibn ‘Aṭā’ al-Ghazzāl al-Althagh, the leader of the *Mu’tazilah*... All of his companions became *Mu’tazilah*... When the Shī’ah of Kūfah heard this rhetoric from him and they knew that he did not renounce the Shaykhayn, they rejected him until his destiny came to him. And so, they were named the Rāfiḍah... They (the Zaydiyyah) are three groups: Jārūdiyyah, Sulaymāniyyah, and Batriyyah.<sup>1</sup>

On the whole, they are from the sects of the Shī’ah. Al-Majlisī transmits for the ruling of the Imāmiyyah regarding the Zaydiyyah with his statement:

The books of our (ḥadīth) reports are replete with reports indicating to the disbelief of the Zaydiyyah and their likes from the Faṭḥiyyah, Wāqifah, and other heretical, misguided sects.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Shahrestānī: *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, 1/135 (summarized from the original text).

2 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 37/34.



This is the overall position of the Imāmiyyah regarding them; they are disbelievers for their denial of one of the Twelve Imāms of the Imāmiyyah. Al-Khūṭī explicitly stated this. In a discussion that includes the Zaydiyyah and the other non-Imāmī Shīṭī sects, he states:

[إن] إنكار الولاية والأئمة (عليهم السلام) حتى الواحد منهم والاعتقاد بخلافه غيرهم وبالعتقاد المخرافية كالجبر ونحوه يوجب الكفر والزندقة وتدل عليه الأخبار المتواترة الظاهرة في كفر منكر الولاية وكفر المعتقد بالعتائد المذكورة وما يشبهها من الضلالات

(Indeed,) denying the *Wilāyah* (Successorship), the Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ—even one<sup>1</sup> of them—and belief in fictitious beliefs other than their *khilāfah*, such as *Jabr* and the likes necessitates disbelief and *Zandaqah*. This is indicated by the clear, massively-transmitted reports regarding the disbelief of the person who denies the *Wilāyah* and the disbelief of the person who holds the aforementioned beliefs and other similar misguided beliefs.<sup>2</sup>

In fact, it comes in al-Kulaynī’s *al-Kāfī* on the authority of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Mughīrah who said:

1 The words of al-Khūṭī “even one” includes every non-Imāmī sect of the Shī‘ah

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Miṣbāḥ al-Faqāhah*, 1/504, “*Ḥurmat al-ghaybah mashrūṭ bi al-Imān*”. Al-Khūṭī has a similar discussion scattered in some of his jurisprudential works. However, if he explicitly states the opponents are from the people of Islam, he intends thereby that they are ostensibly Muslim, in relation to this world only. If he does not explicitly state this, then they are, in reality, disbelievers. After a long discussion, al-Khūṭī states, “Thus, the correct ruling is that all opponents of the Twelver Shī‘ah are *ṭāhir* (pure) and their Islam is correct, **ostensibly**. There is no difference in this between the people of disagreement **and others, even though all of them are, in reality, disbelievers**. These are the people we refer to as “Muslims in the world and disbelievers in the hereafter” (*Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 2/87 under the section “*Ḥukm ghayr al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah min firaq al-Shī‘ah*”). For a more detailed discussion on the Imāmiyyah’s *takfīr* of (their) opponents, see: *Mawqif al-Shī‘ah min Ahl al-Sunnah* of Muḥammad Māl Allāh; *Mawqif al-Shī‘ah al-Imāmiyyah min Bāqī Firaq al-Muslimīn* of ‘Abd al-Malik al-Shāfi‘ī. Without a doubt, this is the finest and most extensive book on the subject. It is some 444 pages. He also has the book, *al-Fikr al-Takfīrī ‘inda al-Shī‘ah Ḥaqīqatun am Iftirā’?*; *Al-Barā‘ah min al-Mushrikīn bayna al-Ma‘nā al-Shar‘ī wa al-Tāwil al-Shī‘ī* of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Abd Allāh Āl ‘Alī; *Al-Shī‘ah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah wa Takfīruhum li ‘Umūm al-Muslimīn* of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Salaṭī; *Zāhirat al-Takfīr fī Madhhab al-Shī‘ah* of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Dimashqiyyah.

قلت لأبي الحسن (عليه السلام) إن لي جارين أحدهما ناصب والآخر زيدي ولا بد من معاشرتهما فمن  
أعاشر فقال هما سيان من كذب بآية من كتاب الله فقد نبذ الإسلام وراء ظهره وهو المكذب بجميع القرآن  
والأنبياء والمرسلين قال ثم قال إن هذا نصب لك وهذا الزيدي نصب لنا

I said to Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام, “I have two neighbours that I must interact with, one is a Nāṣib and the other is a Zaydī. Who should I associate with?”

He said, “They are the same. Whoever belies a verse from the Book of Allah has flung Islam behind his back. He has (also) belied all of the Qur’ān, the Prophets, and the Messengers.”

Then he said, “This (person) is Naṣb for you and this Zaydī is Naṣb for us.”<sup>1</sup>

It is well known that equating the Nawāṣib with the Zaydiyyah is indicative of a great hostility between the Zaydiyyah and the Imāmiyyah.<sup>2</sup>

## 1. The position of al-Ḥillī on narrators of the Zaydiyyah

Al-Ḥillī continued with his methodology in rejecting the narration of a non-Imāmī. This also holds true for the Zaydiyyah. As such, he rejected the narrations of many Zaydīs, as it appears in *al-Khulāṣah*. Al-Ḥillī made the reasons for accepting the narration of the Zaydī the fact that he left his school and entered into the school of the Imāmiyyah. This is evident from many biographies, including the following.

### Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa‘īd ibn Hilāl

Al-Ḥillī states:

كان زيدياً أولاً ثم انتقل إلى القول بالإمامة وصنف فيها وفي غيرها

---

1 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfi*, 8/235, ḥadīth no. 314; *Mir’āt al-‘Uqū* of al-Majlisī, 26/180.

2 For more information, see: *Nazrat al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah li al-Zaydiyyah bayna ‘Adā’ al-Ams wa Taqīyyat al-Yawm* of Muḥammad al-Khiḍar.

He was initially a Zaydī and then he moved to the view of Imāmāh. He wrote on this topic and others.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī added him to the first section because he reverted from his school to the Imāmiyyah. Had this not been the case, his place would be in the second section of his book, *al-Khulāṣah*.

### **Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sulaymān**

Al-Ḥillī states:

وكان زيديا ثم عاد إلينا

He was a Zaydī. Then he reverted back to us.<sup>2</sup>

He is like the previous person.

Among the reasons that al-Ḥillī placed narrators into the first section of his book is the fact that they debated with the Zaydiyyah. Under the biography of Khālid ibn Saʿīd Abū Saʿīd al-Qammāṭ, al-Ḥillī states:

قيل أنه ناظر زيديا فظهر عليه فأعجب الصادق (عليه السلام) ذلك

It is said that he debated a Zaydī and defeated him. This impressed al-Ṣādiq

عليه السلام.<sup>3</sup>

As for the remaining Zaydiyyah, regardless of their different denominations, al-Ḥillī included them in the second section of *al-Khulāṣah*. There are tens of such narrators, including:

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 49, no. 10 – section one.

2 Ibid., p. 265, no. 945 – section one.

3 Ibid., p. 137, no. 371 and p. 295, no. 1099, under the biography of Yazīd Abū Khālid al-Qammāṭ.

- Aḥmad ibn Rashīd – Zaydī<sup>1</sup>
- Thābit al-Ḥaddād Abū al-Miqdām – Zaydī Batrī<sup>2</sup>
- Al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy al-Hamdānī al-Thawrī al-Kūfī – he is attributed to the Zaydiyyah Ṣāliḥiyyah<sup>3</sup>
- Ziyād ibn al-Mundhir
- Abū al-Jārūd al-Hamdānī al-Kūfī al-A‘mā al-Tābī‘ī – Zaydī in madhhab. The Jārūdiyyah from the Zaydiyyah are attributed to him.<sup>4</sup>

And like this, we find al-Ḥillī adding the Zaydiyyah—with all of their (different) denominations—to the second section (of his book) because of their lack of ‘adālah, according to him. This, despite the fact that he would regard some of them as reliable, as is the situation with Ibn ‘Uqdah. Al-Ḥillī narrates for us praise of him saying:

جليل القدر عظيم المنزلة

Exalted ranking (and) lofty standing,<sup>5</sup>

Despite this, al-Ḥillī included him among the weak narrators and those whose narrations are rejected!

---

1 Ibid., p. 324, no. 1271.

2 Ibid., p. 329, no. 1300.

3 Ibid., p. 337, no. 1330.

4 Ibid., p. 348, no. 1378.

5 Ibid., p. 321, no. 1263. Al-Shaykh Ḥasan, author of *Ma‘ālim [al-Dīn]*, states in his book, *Muntaqā al-Jammān*, “Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Uqdah, even though he follows a false (creedal) school, his condition related to his exalted rank, reliability, and trustworthiness is famous among our companions. It cannot be denied.” (1/203). And thus, they make the Imāmī scholar the criterion in determining whether or not to act on the narrations of a non-Imāmī narrator. If there is some perceivable benefit in making his tawthīq, they say as the author of *Muntaqā al-Jammān* says. And if there is some perceivable benefit in rejecting his narrations, they argue, as is the methodology of al-Ḥillī, that he is a Zaydī who follows a false (creedal) school.

## 2. The position of al-Khūṭī on narrators of the Zaydiyyah

Several times already have we seen the position of al-Khūṭī on those who hold false beliefs—in his view; he does not consider such false beliefs as an impediment to accepting such a person’s narrations and deeming him reliable, even if it reaches disbelief. Regarding Ziyād ibn al-Mundhir Abū al-Jārūd, al-Khūṭī states:

وأما أبو الجارود فهو وإن كان زيديا فاسد العقيدة ولكن الظاهر أنه موثق لوقوعه في إسناد كامل الزيارات  
ولشهادة الشيخ المفيد في الرسالة العددية بأنه من الأعلام الرؤساء المأخوذ عنهم الحلال والحرام والفتيا  
والأحكام الذين لا يطعن عليهم ولا طريق إلى ذم واحد منهم

As for Abū al-Jārūd, he is, ostensibly (even though he is a Zaydī possessing a false belief), reliable since he appears in the isnād of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*. And also due to the fact that al-Shaykh al-Mufīd testified in numerous letters that he is among the prominent leaders from whom ḥalāl and ḥarām are taken, as well as legal opinions and rulings. Such individuals who can neither be censured nor disparaged in any way.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī even regards the aḥādīth of the Zaydiyyah and others in creedal opposition to him among the authentic<sup>2</sup> in terms of authoritative value. He states:

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, 4/179, commentary under “*Qatī al-baqqa wa al-bargūth*”.

2 In general, the Imāmiyyah divide aḥādīth into:

- *Ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic): That which is narrated by a *thiqah* (reliable) Imāmī;
- *Ḥasan* (fair): That which is narrated by a *mamdūh* (praiseworthy) Imāmī;
- *Muwaththaq* (reliable): That which is narrated by a non-Imāmī *thiqah*;
- *Ḍaʿīf* (weak): That which falls short of the aforementioned conditions.

For more information, see: *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth* of ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī, p. 106. The authoritative value of every ḥadīth differs according to its rank. As such, the ḥasan will not be preferred over the ṣaḥīḥ when they contradict each other. With the previous text, al-Khūṭī wanted to explain the authoritative value of the muwaththaq ḥadīth which is narrated by a non-Imāmī so that it can reach the same level of admissible proof as the ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth. In doing so, he is rejecting the opinion of those who believe that only the ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth is admissible as proof. Consequently, it becomes necessary to accept the muwaththaq aḥādīth because most of the Imāmiyyah’s narrations revolve around non-Imāmīs.

إن أكثر الرواة بين زيدي أو فطحي أو واقفي أو غير ذلك من الفرق غير الإثني عشرية وقد أثبتنا في محله أن الموثق حجة كالصحيح

Most of the narrators are between being a Zaydī, or Faṭḥī, or Wāqifī, or other non-Twelve sects. We have already established in its (appropriate) section that the reliable narrator is an admissible proof, just like the ṣaḥīḥ.<sup>1</sup>

This is how al-Khūṭ establishes his methodology; the Zaydī is a thiqaḥ, even though he holds a false belief. At times, his ḥadīth can reach a level equal to a ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth in terms of its authoritative value. How different is his opinion and the opinion of al-Ḥillī who completely disregards them!

---

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 8/154, commentary under “*Fīmā law inḥaṣara al-mumāthil bi al-kāfir*”.

### 3.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding non-Shīī narrators

This topic deals with the narrators that have nothing to do with Shīism. It will include such narrators whom the Shīah deem completely out of their framework and creed, such as the Nawāṣib. Those who the Imāmiyyah refer to as the ‘Āmmah (commonality). With this term, they imply the Ahl al-Sunnah and Khawārij.

#### Note

Before getting into an explanation of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī’s respective positions on these groups, it is necessary to first explain a very important matter. Namely, that the Imāmiyyah do not see a difference between the Nawāṣib and the Ahl al-Sunnah (the ‘Āmmah). This is clear from the statements of Imāmī scholars themselves and also from what they attribute to the Ahl al-Bayt—who they themselves are free from. The evidence for this is as follows. Ibn Idrīs al-Ḥillī (d. 598 AH) mentions in his book, *Mustazrafāt al-Sarā’ir*:

عن محمد بن علي بن عيسى قال كتبت إليه [يعني علي بن محمد الهادي] أسأله عن الناصب هل أحتاج في امتحانه إلى أكثر من تقديمه الجبت والطاغوت واعتقاد إمامتهما فرجع الجواب من كان على هذا فهو ناصب

On the authority of Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ṭsā: I wrote to him (i.e., ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Hādī<sup>1</sup>) asking him regarding the Nawāṣib: When testing him (i.e., the Nāṣib), do I require anything more than asking him regarding him giving preference to al-Jibt and al-Ṭāghūt<sup>2</sup> and the belief of their Imāmah?

He responded, “Whoever is upon this is a Nāṣib.”<sup>3</sup>

---

1 He is ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ja’far ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام since Ibn Idrīs al-Ḥillī mentioned the narration under the heading, “What we have extracted from the book, *Masā’il al-Rijāl wa Mukātabātuḥum Mawlānā Abā al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī...*” See: *Mustazrafāt al-Sarā’ir*, p. 581.

2 He means Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليهما السلام with his statement “al-Jibt and al-Ṭāghūt.”

3 Ibid. See, also: *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* of al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī, 9/491 under the chapters of Ṣadaqah, “*Wujūb al-khums fī al-Ma’ādīn Kullihā min al-Dhahab wa al-Fiḍḍah wa al-ṣufr*”, no. 12560.

This text clearly proves that the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah—the 'Āmmah—are Nawāṣib because of their view of giving preference to the Imāmah of the *Shaykhayn* (i.e., Abū Bakr and 'Umar) and 'Uthmān over 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

There is another equally explicit text. Under the heading “Meaning of the Nāṣib”, al-Ṣadūq narrates on the authority of Abū 'Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام:

ليس الناصب من نصب لنا أهل البيت لأنك لا تجد رجلا يقول أنا أبغض محمدا وآل محمدا ولكن  
الناصب من نصب لكم وهو يعلم أنكم تتولوننا وأنكم من شيعتنا

The Nāṣib is not someone who shows enmity to us, the Ahl al-Bayt, because you will not find a person that says, 'I hate Muḥammad and the family of Muḥammad.' Rather, a Nāṣib is the one that shows enmity to you while knowing that you take care of us and are from among our Shī'ah.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, al-Ṣadūq—who is one of their predecessors—explains to us the meaning of a Nāṣib and, as such, includes the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah in his narration, those who oppose the Imāmiyyah.

The reality of the matter is that the Nāṣib and the Sunnī are synonymous according to most of the Imāmiyyah. Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī (d. 1186 AH) states:

والمستفاد من هذه الأخبار أن مظهر النصب المترتب عليه الأحكام والدليل عليه إما تقديم الجب  
والتطاغوت أو بغض الشيعة من حيث التشيع فكل من اتصف بذلك فهو ناصب تجري عليه أحكام النصب  
نعم يجب أن يستثنى من خير تقديم الجب والتطاغوت المستضعف كما عرفت من الأخبار المتقدمة  
وغيرها أيضا فيختص الحكم بما عده وعموم ذلك لجميع المخالفين بعد إخراج هذا الفرد [المستضعف]  
مما لا يعتريه الريب والشك بالنظر إلى الأخبار المذكورة كما عليه أكثر أصحابنا المتقدمين الحاكمين  
بالكفر وكثير من متأخري المتأخرين كما قدمنا نقل كلام بعضهم

What is gathered from these reports is that the phenomenon of Naṣb—upon which actual rulings are applicable and evidenced for—is either

---

1 Al-Ṣadūq; *Ma'ānī al-Akhhbār*, p. 365. He also narrates this in *Thawāb al-A'māl*, p. 207, under the chapter, “The punishment of someone who makes ṣalāh and leaves out salutation on the Prophet.



through giving preference to al-Jibt and al-Ṭāghūt, or through simply having hatred of the Shīrah because of the nature of Shīrism itself. Accordingly, everyone who is described with that is a Nāṣib and the relevant rulings of Naṣb<sup>1</sup> will apply to him. Yes, as you are well aware, it is necessary to exclude the weak report of giving preference to al-Jibt and al-Ṭāghūt from the previous reports and others as well. Accordingly, the ruling will apply to everything else. After removing this individual (weak) report, the above ruling will apply across the board to all of the opposition. And, just as most of our earlier generation of companions (those who regard the opposition as disbelievers) and many of the latter, latter-day scholars held, there is no doubt and uncertainty in this when considering the aforementioned reports. This is clear from some of their statements we cited earlier.<sup>2</sup>

Abū al-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmilī states:

الحق أن كل من نصّب غير الأئمة فهو في الحقيقة ممن نصب العداوة للأئمة

1 By ‘rulings,’ he is referring to those related to *najāsah* (ritual impurity), *hadr al-damm* (thwarting of blood), the usurping of wealth, and other such things that are associated with the warring disbelievers.

2 Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadāʾiq al-Nādirah*, 5/186, under “The ruling on the opposition”. Some of the Imāmī scholars have attempted to object to those who hold this view. However, Muḥammad Amīn al-Astarābādī states, “It is possible to make the dispute between the two groups in wording only, *khilāf lafẓī* (i.e., and not in meaning). It can be said that the meaning of erecting enmity towards the Ahl al-Bayt عليهم السلام is that which broadly includes erecting enmity towards them with their leading personalities and erecting enmity towards them under a broad principle, such as if it were to be said, ‘We hate everyone who hates the Shaykhayn’ (*al-Fawāʾid al-Madaniyyah*, p. 452). It is true what he is saying. The difference (of opinion) and the attempt at making a distinction between a Nāṣibī and a Sunnī by some Imāmī scholars ceases to exist when we understand what both of their ultimate fates will be in the end; each of them will remain forever in the fire because of not believing in, according to them, a foundational pillar of Islam—Imāmah. It may be said that the harm (inflicted) will be based on the degree of disbelief since Kufr itself is of varying degrees. As such, the Nāṣibī who openly displays enmity will be considered more of a disbeliever than the Sunnī who, in his actual state, is a Nāṣibī who does not open display enmity. The truest example of this are the narrations that I have mentioned and those that explicitly prove that the Sunnī is a Nāṣibī.

The truth is that every person who designated other than the Imāms is, in reality, among those who have erected enmity towards the Imāms.<sup>1</sup>

Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā‘irī (d. 1112 AH) states:

روي عن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم أن من علامة النواصب تقديم غير علي عليه

It was narrated from the Prophet ﷺ, “Verily, among the signs of the Nawāṣib is preferring others over ‘Alī.”

Then he stated:

إن الأئمة عليهم السلام وخواصهم أطلقوا لفظ الناصبي على أبي حنيفة وأمثاله مع أن أبا حنيفة لم يكن ممن نصب العدو لأهل البيت عليهم السلام بل كان له انقطاع إليهم ويظهر لهم التودد

Verily, the Imāms ﷺ and their close associates applied the word Nāṣibī to Abū Ḥanīfah and his likes, despite the fact that he was not among those who displayed enmity towards the Ahl al-Bayt ﷺ. In fact, he was devoted to them and expressed his love for them.”<sup>2</sup>

Thereafter, al-Jazā‘irī held the view that it is permissible to kill the opposition and that it is (legally) permissible to usurp their wealth.<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps I may end this note with a statement from Ḥusayn al-‘Uṣfūr. He states:

---

1 Abū al-Ḥasan al-‘Āmilī: *Muqaddimat Tafṣīr Mir‘āt al-Anwār wa Mishkāt al-Asrār*, p. 308 under the chapter “*al-Nūn min al-buṭūn wa al-tāwīlāt*”. In the marginalia, the author has an excellent discussion around the authenticity of the Tafṣīr’s attribution to the author. He cites from the book *Mawqif al-Shī‘ah min Ahl al-Sunnah* of Muḥammad Māl Allāh, p. 25.

2 Ni‘mat Allah al-Jazā‘irī: *al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, 2/307. There is an error in the book *Mawqif al-Shī‘ah min Ahl al-Sunnah* of Muḥammad Māl Allah. He mentions that the page numbers are 206 and 207. However, when going back to the primary source, it turns out there was a typo. What I have asserted (here) is correct.

3 Ibid.

أخبارهم [يقصد أهل البيت بزعمه] تنادي بأن الناصب هو ما يقال عندهم سنيا

Their reports (he means the Ahl al-Bayt, according to him) state that a Nāṣibī is the one that is referred to by them as a Sunnī.<sup>1</sup>

And so, we conclude that the Nāṣibī and the Sunnī are synonymous according to the majority of the Imāmiyyah. What is forthcoming in terms of separating the Nāṣibī into one section and the Sunnī into another is merely from the perspective of the said narrator being described as such in the biographical works. Accordingly, if it is mentioned that he is a Nāṣibī, I added him to the section on the Nawāṣib. And if he is described as being an ‘Āmmī, I added him to the section on the ‘Āmmah, even though I maintain that the two schools, or the two words are, according to the Imāmiyyah, synonymous.

## 1. The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding the Nawāṣib

When the scholar understands the philosophy of Imāmī thought (which is based on the fact that the reason for the existence of all of creation is the Ahl al-Bayt, and that they are the proofs of Allah in this world that are to be obeyed and given preference to over others), he will then come to realize the danger of the Nawāṣib in the view of the Imāmiyyah. This is because the Nāṣibī is someone who displays enmity towards the Ahl al-Bayt<sup>2</sup> and, in this way, he is in direct opposition to the Imāmī creed. As a result, the Nawāṣib represent the polar opposite of Imāmī thought because of their hatred towards ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and their giving others preference over him.

For this reason, as Ni‘mat Allah al-Jazā‘irī (d. 1112 AH) cited a consensus stating that the Imāmiyyah regarded the Nāṣibī in the following manner:

---

1 Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Uṣfūr al-Darāzī al-Baḥrānī: *al-Maḥāsin al-Nafsāniyyah fī Ajwibat al-Masā’il al-Khurāsāniyyah*, p. 145; cited from the book *Mawqif al-Shī‘ah min Ahl al-Sunnah* of Muḥammad Māl Allāh, p. 20.

2 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, 2/306.

أنه أنجس من الكلب وأنه شر من اليهودي و النصراني و المجوسي و أنه كافر نجس بإجماع علماء الإمامية

He is more impure than a dog, eviler than a Jew, Christian, and Zoroastrian.  
And he is an impure disbeliever by consensus of the Imāmī scholars.<sup>1</sup>

### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the Nawāṣib

We have already seen that al-Ḥillī does not accept the narrators that are in (doctrinal) opposition to him from among the sects of the Shī'ah, despite the fact that they are from the Shī'ah—those who revere 'Alī and prefer him over others. They only oppose the Imāmiyyah in relation to secondary issues and not primary. So, what will be his position on the person who completely rejects Imāmah and displays hostility towards it? If we were to extrapolate based on his methodology, we would know that he would, *a priori*, reject the narration of the Nawāṣib. I have not found any textual evidence in al-Ḥillī's book on the issue of a narrator's Naṣb.

### The position of al-Khūī regarding the Nawāṣib

Al-Khūī followed his methodology that believed there is no correlation between the creed and 'adālah of a narrator and accepting or rejecting his narrations. It is from here we come to know his opinion on the Nawāṣib, those whose Naṣb, or hostility to the Ahl al-Bayt is inconsequential to their tawthīq. An example is as follows. In regards to Aḥmad ibn Hilāl al-'Abratāī, al-Khūī mentions:

لا ينبغي الإشكال في فساد الرجل من جهة عقيدته بل لا يبعد استفادة أنه لم يكن يتدين بشيء ومن ثم كان يظهر الغلو مرة والنصب أخرى ومع ذلك لا يهمننا إثبات ذلك إذ لا أثر لفساد العقيدة أو العمل في سقوط الرواية عن الحجية بعد وثاقة الراوي والذي يظهر من كلام النجاشي صالح الرواية أنه في نفسه ثقة ولا ينافيه قوله يعرف منها ويتكر إذ لا تنافي بين وثاقة الراوي وروايته أموراً منكراً من جهة كذب من حدثه بها بل إن وقوعه في إسناد تفسير القمي يدل على توثيقه إياه

There should be no issue regarding the incorrectness of the person in terms of his creed. In fact, it is not farfetched to say that he was entirely

---

1 Ibid., 2/306.

irreligious. Hence, at times, he would express extreme views and, at other times, he would express Naşb. Despite all of this, determining such things is of no concern to us since such false beliefs or actions are of no consequence in lessening the authoritative value of the narration—after establishing the narrator’s reliability. From al-Najjāshī’s words “*ṣāliḥ al-ḥadīth* (suitable in ḥadīth),” it appears that he himself is a thiqaḥ and that his statement “*yu’raf wa yunkar* (i.e., he narrates things that are both known and unacceptable)” does not negate this. This is because there is no inconsistency in the narrator’s reliability and him narrating unacceptable things from those who falsely narrate them to him. In fact, his appearing in the isnād of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* proves his tawthīq.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī also states:

قيل في حقه [أحمد بن هلال] ما سمعنا بمتشيع رجوع عن تشيعه إلى النصب إلا أحمد بن هلال وكان يظهر الغلو أحيانا ولذا استفاد شيخنا الأنصاري أن الرجل لم يكن يتدين بشيء للبون البعيد بين الغلو والنصب فيعلم من ذلك أنه لم يكن متدينا بدين وكان يتكلم بما تشتهيه نفسه ولكن كل ذلك لا يضر بوثاقة الرجل وأنه في نفسه ثقة وصالح الرواية ولا تنافي بين فساد العقيدة والوثاقة

It was said about Aḥmad ibn Hilāl: “We have not heard about a Shī’ī who retracted from his (belief in) Shī’ism to Naşb except for Aḥmad ibn Hilāl. At times, he would express such extreme views that our teacher al-Anṣārī concluded that the man was entirely irreligious because of the vast difference that existed between his extreme views and his Naşb. From this, it becomes known that he was not religious in terms of a particular religious viewpoint; he would (rather) speak based on his inner desires. Still, all of this does not negatively affect his reliability; he is in and of himself a thiqaḥ and *ṣāliḥ* (suitable) to narrate. There is no inconsistency in the false belief of a person and his reliability (as a narrator).<sup>2</sup>

And he stated:

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 3/152, no. 1008.

2 Ibid., 1/29, *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, under the commentary of “*i’tibār idhn al-walī*”.

أن الأظهر أنه ثقة وإن كان فاسد العقيدة بل كان خبيثا

The preponderant view is that he is a *thiqah*, even though he holds a false belief. In fact, he is evil.<sup>1</sup>

Although al-Khūṭī attempted to deny some of the charges laid against Aḥmad ibn Hilāl, he also stated:

أن أحمد بن هلال أيضا موثق وقابل للاعتماد على رواياته على ما بيناه في محله وأن ما ذكره في حقه مما لا أساس له وعلى تقدير صحته وتماميته غير مناف لوثاقته

Aḥmad ibn Hilāl is also reliable and his narrations are worthy of being relied upon. This is based on what we have (already) explained in its appropriate place. There is no basis for whatever they have mentioned about him. Even if it is assumed to be completely sound and accurate, it does not negate his reliability (as a narrator).<sup>2</sup>

And he stated:

رفضه كثير من الأصحاب وطعنوا في دينه لأنه كان يتوقع الوكالة فلما خرج التوقيع باسم أبي جعفر محمد بن عثمان وكيل الناحية المقدسة توقف فيه ورجع عن التشيع إلى النصب بل قيل إنه لم يسمع شيوعي رجع إلى النصب ما عداه... والذي تحصل لدينا بعد التدبر في حاله أن الرجل فاسد العقيدة بلا إشكال إلا أن ذلك لا يقدر في العمل برواياته ولا يوجب سقوطها عن الحجية بعد أن كان المناط فيها وثاقة الراوي عندنا لا عدالته وعقيدته

Many of the companions rejected and criticized him in relation to his religious practice. This is because he expected (the function of) *wakālah* (agency). And when a signature with the name of Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān came out as the *wakīl* (agent) (i.e., instead of him), he stopped and retracted his belief in Shī'ism for Naṣb. In fact, it is said that it was never heard that a Shī'ī retracted (his views) for Naṣb except for him... After reflecting on his condition, we have come to realize that the man

1 Ibid., 5/38, *Ṣalāt al-Ṭawāf*.

2 Ibid., 1/259, *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, under the commentary of the section “*ṭuruq fi ma'rifat al-zawāl*” (*al-Dā'irah al-Hindīyah*).

unequivocally holds a false belief. However, that does not impact acting on his narrations, and it does not necessitate lessening their authoritative value, especially considering the fact that the ‘illah, or causative reasoning (for accepting or rejecting narrations) is, according to us, the reliability of the narrator himself, not his ‘adālah and belief.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, al-Khūṭī mentions the allegations raised against Aḥmad ibn Hilāl. They are as follows:

- He is a Nāṣibī, extremist;
- He is not particularly religious;
- He is a ṣūfī, a fraud, and a cursed profligate<sup>2</sup>;
- He is evil; (and)
- He speaks based on his inner desires.

He refutes some of these allegations and then states, “Even if it is assumed that it is completely sound and accurate, it does not negate his reliability (as a narrator).”

Thus, contrary to al-Ḥillī, we find that (the doctrine of) Naṣb, or hostility towards the Ahl al-Bayt, has no impact on determining whether a narrator’s narration is to be accepted or rejected. This is according to al-Khūṭī. However, because there was some perceived benefit in (rejecting) Aḥmad ibn Hilāl, al-Khūṭī overturned his normal methodology and stated about one of the narrations:

ضعيفة السند لوجود أحمد بن هلال والحسين بن أحمد

(It has) a weak chain because Aḥmad ibn Hilāl and al-Ḥusayn ibn Aḥmad exist in it.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 2/308, *Kitāb al-Ṣawm* under “*ṣawm al-ḍayf bi dūn idhn muḍīfihi*”.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 3/150, no. 1008.

3 Al-Khūṭī: 9/330, *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, under the chapter “*min al-mustaḥabb ladā al-mashhūr ghusl yawm al-mubālahah jumlah mā qīla bistihbāb ghuslihā*”.

## 2. The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah

### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah

In general, al-Ḥillī's position on narrators of the Ahl al-Sunnah is no different to the standard position he holds against his adversaries. As such, the basic principle in relation to the Ahl al-Sunnah is that their narrations are rejected for no other reason than the fact that they, according to al-Ḥillī, doctrinally oppose him, even though such narrations contain reliable narrators. This extreme methodology has been successively transmitted from al-Ḥillī, whether in his jurisprudential works, or in his book *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*. The evidences for this are many, including the following.

In refuting one of the narrations, al-Ḥillī states:

الرواية ضعيفة السند لأن عمارة عامي وابن فضال فطحي وكذا مصدق بن صدقة وعمر بن سعيد فإذا سقط الاحتجاج بها

The narration has a weak sanad because 'Ammār is an 'Āmmī (i.e., a Sunnī), Ibn Faḍḍāl is a Faḥḥī, as is Muṣaddiq ibn Ṣadaqaḥ and 'Umar ibn Sa'īd. Thus, the narration is inadmissible as a form of proof.<sup>1</sup>

This is explicit in the fact that the narration is rejected simply because of al-Ḥillī's difference of opinion in *madhhab* (theological school) with them.

Here is another example. Al-Ḥillī mentions:

قد روى الشيخ [الطوسي] عن طلحة بن زيد عن جعفر عن أبيه عن علي عليه السلام قال لا جمعة إلا في مصر يقام فيه الحدود [قال الحلبي] لأننا نقول أن طلحة بن زيد عامي فلا تعويل على روايته ويمكن أن يحتمل على التقيّة

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Mukhtalif al-Shī'ah*, 3/553, *Afḍaliyyat tatābu 'al-qaḍā' 'alā tafriqihī*.



Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī)<sup>1</sup> narrated on the authority of Ṭalḥah ibn Zayd, from Ja'far, from his father, from 'Alī عليه السلام who said, "There is no jumu'ah except in a city in which the *hudūd* (legal punishments) are carried out." (Al-Ḥillī states:) Because we say that Ṭalḥah ibn Zayd is an 'Āmmī (i.e., Sunnī), his narration, therefore, cannot be relied upon. It is possible to interpret this as Taqiyyah.<sup>2</sup>

This is clear in the fact that al-Ḥillī rejected the narration simply because the narrator is described as an 'Āmmī. Had al-Ḥillī not believed the narrator is weak, he would not have resorted to the statement, "It is possible to interpret this as Taqiyyah," since stating Taqiyyah is an acknowledgment of the correctness of the narration's issuance.

In summary, according to al-Ḥillī, among the reasons of criticism against a narrator is the fact that he belongs to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah, even though he has not been accused of being weak, or lying, or other such reasons of rejection.

Regarding *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, al-Ḥillī's opinion is clearly discernable through tens of narrators' biographies. This is because he included the narrators from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah in the second section of his book for no reason other than the fact that they are, in his view, from the 'Āmmah. Examples of this are many, including the following:

### 1. **Aḥmad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Aṣfahānī al-Ḥāfiẓ Abu Nu'aym (the author of *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā'*)**

Al-Ḥillī narrates from Ibn Shahr Ashūb that he is an 'Āmmī. And for this reason, he placed him in the second section.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Istibṣār*, 1/420, no. 1617, under the chapter "*al-qawm yakūnūna fī qaryatin hal yajūzu lahum an yajtamī'ū aw lā?*"

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Muntahā al-Maṭlab*, 1/319, under "*ṣalāt al-jumu'ah*".

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 324, no. 1274. Of note, al-Shāharūdī mentioned in his book *Mustadrakāt 'ilm Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* that al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū Nu'aym al-'Allāmah al-Sunnī is from the forefathers of al-Majlisī al-Shī'ī, the author of *Bihār al-Anwār* and *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* (1/346, no. 1098).

## 2. Aṣram ibn Ḥawshab al-Bajalī

Al-Ḥillī states, “‘Āmmī *thiqah* (reliable Sunnī).” And with this, he included him in the second section!<sup>1</sup>

## 3. ‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb al-Rawājīnī

Paradoxically, al-Ḥillī described him as an ‘Āmmī and, thus, included him in the second section. However, this ‘Abbād, according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah, is accused of being a Rāfiḍī!<sup>2</sup>

## 4. Fuḍayl ibn ‘Iyād

Al-Ḥillī states, “A Baṣrī, *thiqah*, ‘Āmmī.”<sup>3</sup>

## 5. Muḥammad ibn Ishāq

Al-Ḥillī states, “The author of *al-Siyar*. From among the companions of al-Bāqir عليه السلام, ‘Āmmī.”<sup>4</sup> Al-Ḥillī did not mention a reason for him being weak except for his describing him as an ‘Āmmī.

---

1 Ibid., p. 326, no. 1286.

2 Ibid., p. 380, no. 1526. The reader would be perplexed at how al-Ḥillī described ‘Abbād as being from the Ahl al-Sunnah when he is among the most infamous of people described as being a Shī‘ī and holding extreme views therein! The statements of the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars regarding ‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb and him being attributed to the Shī‘ah and the Rāfiḍāh are many. Among them, what Ibn Ḥibbān stated, “He was a Rāfiḍī who used to call towards Rafḍ.” (*al-Majrūḥīn*, 2/172, no.797). Al-Dhahabī states, “(He was a staunch Shī‘ī” (*al-Kashshāf*, 1/532, no. 2581). Ibn Ḥajar (*Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, 5/95) mentioned statements of the scholars regarding him, including the following, “Al-Ḥākīm stated that Ibn Khuzaymah used to say, “‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb: a *thiqah* in his narration and suspected in his religion—narrated to us.” Abū Ḥātīm stated, “(He is a) reliable scholar.” Ibn ‘Adī stated, “I heard ‘Abdān mention on the authority of Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah or Hannād ibn Sarī that both of them, or one of them declared him a *fāsiq* and attributed to him the fact that he used to curse the Salaf.” Ibn ‘Adī stated, “‘Abbād has *ghuluww* (extremism) in his Shī‘ism. He narrated *aḥādīth* that he was criticized for related to virtues and criticisms.” Ṣāliḥ ibn Muḥammad stated, “He would curse ‘Uthmān. I heard him saying, ‘Allah is more just than to place Ṭalḥah and Zubayr into Jannah since they pledged their allegiance to ‘Alī and then they fought him.” Al-Khū‘ī made *tawthīq* of him in *al-Mu‘jam* (10/236, no. 6517).

3 Ibid., p. 387, no. 1553. Al-Khū‘ī made *tawthīq* of him in *al-Mu‘jam*, 14/352, no. 9446.

4 Ibid., p. 392, no. 1577.

## 6. Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī

Al-Ḥillī states, “The author of *al-Tārīkh*. An ‘Āmmī in his (creedal) school.”<sup>1</sup>

## 7. Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘īd al-Qaṭṭān

Al-Ḥillī states, “Abū Zakariyyā: Thiqaḥ, ‘Āmmī.”<sup>2</sup> And despite describing him as a thiqaḥ, he is including in the section of weak narrators for no other reason than him being from the Ahl al-Sunnah!

## 8. Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah

In explaining the reason as to why he placed him in the second section, al-Ḥillī states, “He is neither from our companions nor counted among them.”<sup>3</sup>

## 9. Sufyān al-Thawrī

Al-Ḥillī states, “He is not from our companions.” Similarly, we find no convincing reason from al-Ḥillī as to why he rejected many of the greats—despite the fact that he described them as reliable—other than a difference in madhhab!

Al-Ḥillī discarded his own methodology when there was no benefit in adhering to it. We have already seen much of this. I will mention another example specific to the narrators of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Al-Ḥillī states:

وحفص [بن غياث] وإن كان عاميا إلا أن روايته مناسبة للمذهب

And Ḥafṣ (ibn Ghiyāth), even though he is an ‘Āmmī, his narrations are appropriate for the madhhab.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Ibid., p. 399, no. 1605.

2 Ibid., p. 417, no. 1690.

3 Ibid., p. 355, no. 1407.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Muntahā al-Maṭlab*, 1/168, “*Adam najāsat mā lā nafas lahu sā’ilah min al-ḥayawānāt bi al-mawt*”.

And like this, his narrations are considered, accepted, and acted upon, despite al-Hillī's criticism of him since there is, according to him, a perceived benefit in his narrations being in accordance with the madhhab.

### The position of al-Khūī regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah (al-Āmmah)

Al-Khūī continued with his methodology in accepting the narration of the (creedal) opposition, even if the difference (in creed) leads to disbelief. Accordingly, al-Khūī paid no attention to the creed of a narrator. He has explicitly stated accepting the narration of an 'Āmmī (Sunni), even though he is not an 'ādil, or upright as a narrator, according to his view. His statement reads:

إننا لا نعتبر العدالة في الراوي فلا يلزم أن يكون إمامياً بل تكفي مجرد الوثاقة وإن كان عامياً

We do not take into consideration 'adālah (integrity) in the narrator. Thus, it is not necessary for him to be an Imāmī; rather, reliability is sufficient— even if he is an 'Āmmī.<sup>1</sup>

In refuting those who make taḍ'īf of Ismā'īl al-Sukūnī-al-Sha'īrī, al-Khūī states:

روايته حجة على ما نراه من عدم اعتبار العدالة في الحجية... [وقال الخوئي ردا من ضعفه] احتمال أن التضعيف لأجل أن السكوني كان عامياً فكان الضعف في مذهبه لا في روايته

His narration is authoritative based on what we consider in terms of the non-consideration of 'adālah in establishing authoritative value (of the report) ... (In refuting those who make taḍ'īf of him, al-Khūī states) There is a possibility that the taḍ'īf is because of the fact that al-Sukūnī is an 'Āmmī. Therefore, him being weak is in relation to his (doctrinal) school of thought, not because of his narrations.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Khūī: *Kitāb al-Ṣawm*, 1/294. commentary under the chapter of “*Mā yūjib al-kaffārah al-iftār 'alā muḥrim kaffārat al-jam'*”.

2 Al-Khūī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/22, no. 1290.

This is not always the case with al-Khūṭī. He does not always reject a narration on account of a narrator believing in an opposing school of thought; rather, he (also) rejects him if one from the earlier generation of Imāmī scholars criticized him. In this instance, he accepts the criticism if the chain to the critic is verified and the criticism about him is proven to be true. Here, the reason for rejection is because of the criticism, not because of the creedal difference—which al-Khūṭī has stated on numerous occasions that the ‘adālah of the narrator is not considered. Rather, the reason for acceptance is, according to him, the (narrator’s) reliability.

What further emphasizes this is al-Khūṭī’s comments on a narration which contains Ismā’īl ibn Abī Ziyād al-Sukūnī as one of its narrators. He states:

قيل إنه عامي إلا [أنه] غير قادم في وثاقته في الرواية

It is said that he is an ‘Āmmī; however, (he) is not criticized in terms of his reliability in narration.<sup>1</sup>

Under the biography of ‘Abbād ibn Ṣuhayb, he states:

لا إشكال في وثاقة عباد بن صهيب بشهادة النجاشي وعلي بن إبراهيم في تفسيره وكذا لا إشكال في كونه عاميا

Because of the testimony of al-Najjāshī and ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm in his *Tafsīr*, there is no contention regarding the reliability of ‘Abbād ibn Ṣuyahb. Similarly, there is no disagreement regarding the fact that he is an ‘Āmmī.<sup>2</sup>

In providing a basis for and explaining a certain principle that he understood from the words of al-Najjāshī, al-Khūṭī states under the biography of Ghiyāth ibn Kalūb:

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 4/427, “*Mawārid karāhat mubāsharat al-ghayr*”.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 10/233, no. 6146.

وذكر الشيخ في العدة أنه من العامة ولكنه عملت الطائفة بأخباره إذا لم يكن لها معارض من طريق الحق ويظهر من مجموع كلامه أن العمل بخبر من يخالف الحق في عقيدته مشروط بإحراز وثاقته وتحرزه عن الكذب وعليه فيحكم بوثاقه (غياث بن كلوب) وإن كان عاميا

Al-Shaykh mentioned in *al-'Uddah* that he is from the *'Āmmah* (i.e., the Ahl al-Sunnah). However, the group (i.e., the Shī'ah) acted upon his reports when there is no opposing evidence that comes via the truth (i.e., the Shī'ah). It appears from the sum total of his words that acting on the narration of someone whose creed differs with the truth (i.e., the Shī'ah) is conditional upon ascertaining the narrator's reliability and assuring he is free from lying. Based on this, Ghiyāth ibn Kalūb is ruled to be reliable, even though he is an *'Āmmī*.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the (creedal) school of the narrator, according to al-Khūī, did not affect his *tawthīq* of the individual in the aforementioned instances. However, al-Khūī in other instances assumes *Taqiyyah*, even though its *isnād* is reliable. When he wanted to bolster the position of his legal school on the issue of the possibility of menstruation and pregnancy occurring at the same time, he rejected the narration which was at odds with his opinion. He states:

[ما] رواه النوفلي عن السكوني عن جعفر عن أبيه (ع) أنه قال قال النبي (صلى الله عليه وآله) ما كان الله ليجعل حيضا مع حبل يعني إذا رأت الدم وهي حامل لا تدع الصلاة إلا أن تري على رأس الولد إذا ضربها الطلق ورأت الدم تركت الصلاة وهي وإن كانت واضحة الدلالة على عدم اجتماع الحيض مع الحمل إلا أنها لا تقاوم الأخبار الصحيحة الكثيرة الدالة على جواز اجتماعهما وذلك لأنها وإن كانت موثقة بحسب السند غير أنها موافقة للعامة والراوي عن الإمام (عليه السلام) هو السكوني وهو عامي فتحمل الرواية على التقية لا محالة

What al-Nawfalī narrated on the authority of al-Sukūnī, from Ja'far, from his father عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who said that the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, "Allah would not make menstruation (occur) with pregnancy." In other words, when she sees blood—and is pregnant, she should not forgo the prayer. However, if she sees the head of the child when the labour pains begin and she sees blood, she should leave the prayer.

1 Ibid., 14/254, no. 9302.

This, despite its meaning being unambiguous in that menstruation (i.e., menstrual blood) does not gather together with pregnancy, it cannot contend with the many (other) authentic reports that indicate that it is possible for them to come together. This is because, even though it is reliable in terms of its sanad, it is in accordance with the (view of the) ‘Āmmah. And, the narrator from the Imām عِدَيْهِ السَّلَام is al-Sukūnī; he is an ‘Āmmī. Therefore, the narration must be assumed to, without a doubt, have been narrated because of Taqīyyah.<sup>1</sup>

And like this, when there is a perceived benefit in rejecting the narration of an ‘Āmmī, al-Khūṭ assumes it was because of Taqīyyah. Or, he explicitly states that the narrator is an ‘Āmmī, even though he is reliable in another place. An example of this is al-Khūṭ’s rejection of the narration:

عن علي (ع) قال إذا مات الرجل في السفر مع النساء ليس فيهن امرأته ولا ذو محرم من نسائه قال يوزرته إلى ركبته ويصبين عليه الماء صبا ولا ينظرن إلى عورته ولا يلمسنه بأيديهن وهي وإن كانت صريحة الدلالة على المراد إلا أن في سندها الحسين بن علوان وهو عامي لم يوثق

On the authority of ‘Alī عِدَيْهِ السَّلَام who said, “When a man dies on a journey with women, and there isn’t among them his wife and other *māhrams* (unmarriageable kins) of his, they should place a lower garment over him until his knees and pour a fair amount of water over him. They should not look at the *‘awrah* (areas of his body that are legally required to be covered) and not touch him with their hands.” This narration, even though it is clear in its meaning, has a sanad that contains al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alwān. He is an ‘Āmmī whose tawthīq has not been verified.<sup>2</sup>

Here we find al-Khūṭ saying:

الحسين بن علوان وهو عامي لم يوثق

Al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alwān. He is an ‘Āmmī whose tawthīq has not been verified.

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 6/102, “*Ijtīmā’ al-ḥayḍ ma’a al-irdā’ wa al-ḥaml*”.

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 8/161, “*inḥiṣār al-mumāthil fī al-mukhālīf*”.

While in the *Muʿjam*, we find al-Khūṭ making tawthīq of him and justifying this position of his.<sup>1</sup> In fact, we find him emphasizing his tawthīq in the same *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* (as above). On the authority of al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlwān, he states:

وثقه ابن عقدة حيث قال وأخوه الحسن أوثق منه فإنه أفعال التفضيل فيدل على أن الحسين ثقة أيضا غاية الأمر أن الحسن أوثق فلا إشكال في سند الرواية من هذه الجهة أيضا

Ibn ʿUqdah made tawthīq of him when he stated, “His brother, al-Ḥasan, is more reliable than him.” This is an *ism al-tafāṭil* (relative form) and so it indicates that al-Ḥusayn is also reliable. At most, al-Ḥasan is more reliable. And so, from this perspective, there is also no issue in the narration’s sanad.<sup>2</sup>

Based on this, I do not know what he means by the statement, “In its sanad is al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlwān. He is an ʿĀmmī who has not been verified.” However, I will say the following: We have (already) seen how al-Ḥillī dealt with narrators of the Faṭḥiyyah in that he makes tawthīq of them *if* there is some perceived benefit in doing so. On the other hand, he will criticize them *if* there is a perceived benefit in doing so. Al-Khūṭ does the same thing in these instances. Therefore, the methodology in this particular instance is one and the same, even though they establish a foundational basis for the acceptance and rejection of narrations in another place. As such, the entire issue goes back to his perceived benefit in any given instance, irrespective of whether it is a jarḥ or a tawthīq. Whoever critically analyzes the overall methodology of the Imāmī scholars, and not just al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ’s, he will safely say without a shadow of doubt that they place absolutely no importance on asānīd. Even those that claim that they are the latter-day *Uṣūlī Shīʿah* and the only thing to be considered, according to them, is being aligned with the madhhab. And how is this not the case? They authenticate *Nahj al-Balāghah* and it is without any isnād at all! Similarly, they (also) authenticate al-Ṭabarsī’s book, *al-Iḥtijāj!*

---

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/34, no. 3508.

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*, 9/99, “*ḥukm mā idhā kāna al-mayyit tīflan*”.



### 3. The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding the Khawārij

Al-Shahrastānī (d. 548 AH) states:

كل من خرج عن الإمام الحق الذي اتفقت الجماعة عليه يسمى خارجيا سواء كان الخروج في أيام الصحابة على الأئمة الراشدين أو كان بعدهم على التابعين بإحسان والأئمة في كل زمان

Every person who dissents from the rightful Imām—he upon whom the *jamā'ah* (group) agrees upon—is called a Khārījī, whether the dissent occurred in the time of the Ṣaḥābah against the Rightly Guided Imāms, or after them against the *Tābi'īn* (Followers) of good and the Imāms in every time.<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Taymiyyah states:

الخوارج الحرورية الذين كانوا من شيعة عليّ ثم خرجوا عليه وكفروه وكفروا من والاه ونصبوا له العداوة وقتلوه ومن معه ... وهؤلاء هم الذين نصبوا العداوة لعلي ومن والاه وهم الذين استحلوا قتله وجعلوه كافرا وقتله أحد رؤوسهم عبدالرحمن بن ملجم المرادي فهؤلاء النواصب الخوارج المارقون إذ قالوا إن عثمان وعلي ابن أبي طالب ومن معهما كانوا كفار مرتدين

The Ḥarūriyyah Khawārij—those who were from the group of 'Alī and then revolted against him, charged him with disbelief, charged those who supported him with disbelief, founded hostility towards him, fought him and those who were with him... These are the people who founded hostility towards 'Alī and his supporters. They are the ones who deemed it permissible to kill him and made him a disbeliever. One of their leaders, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muljam al-Murādī<sup>2</sup> killed him. Therefore, they are the

1 Al-Shahrastānī: *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, 1/132.

2 It comes in *Lisān al-Mīzān*, 3/439 of Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, “'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muljam al-Murādī, that Khārījī deceiver. He is not deserving of ḥadīth being narrated from him. I don't think he has any narrations. He was a devout servant of Allah. However, his ending was not favourable; he killed Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام in order to draw near to Allah with his blood, as he claimed. His arms, legs, and tongue were cut off. His eyes were gouged out and then he was burned. We ask Allah for forgiveness and well-being... Before this, he was from his Shī'ah.”

*continued ...*

Nawāṣib Khawārij defectors because they said that ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī, and those with them are disbelievers and apostates.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, the Khawārij share with the Nawāṣib in their hatred of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. Based on this, it is possible to say that ever Khārijī is a Nāṣibī but every Nāṣibī is not necessarily a Khārijī since the Nawāṣib did not revolt against the Ummah with the sword, as did the Khawārij.

### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the Khawārij

Al-Ḥillī rejected many narrations of narrators merely on account of having a different belief. What then if the narrator combines between beliefs of *Naṣb* and *Khurūj* (i.e., the beliefs of the Nawāṣib and the Khawārij)?

There is no doubt that the position of his is clear. He has explicitly mentioned that they are ritually impure<sup>2</sup>, their dead are not to be washed<sup>3</sup>, and that prayer should not be performed behind them<sup>4</sup>. In fact, al-Ḥillī believed that they are disbelievers. He states:

عندنا أن الخوارج كفار وأن من سب الإمام وجب قتله

According to us, the Khawārij are disbelievers and that it is compulsory to kill whoever curses the Imām.<sup>5</sup>

---

*continued from page 385*

In *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* (5/109), Ibn Ḥajar states, “He lived in the Age of Ignorance and migrated during the Khilāfah of ‘Umar. He read to Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal. This was mentioned by Abū Sa‘īd ibn Yūnus. Thereafter, he became one of the senior members of the Khawārij. He is the most wretched of this Ummah because of killing ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. This is established by a verified text from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. Because of this, ‘Alī’s children killed him. As mentioned by al-Dhahabī, this took place in the month of Ramaḍān in the year 44 (AH).”

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā*, 4/467.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Tahrīr al-Aḥkām*, 1/50, *al-Muḍāf wa al-Āsār*.

3 Ibid., 1/117, *Ghusl al-Arwāt - al-Taghsīl*.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Tadhkirat al-Fuqahā’*, 2/398, *Ḥukm al-Ṣalāh fī al-Makān al-Maghṣūb - furū’*.

5 Ibid., 9/409, *fī ḥukm al-Khawārij*.

On the whole, the Khawārij are very few in number in the biographical dictionaries of narrators of the Shī'ah because they mostly existed in the generation that fought 'Alī رضي الله عنه. As such, there is no possibility for them to have narrated from him or his descendants. I am not claiming that they do not exist in some asānīd; rather, the aim here is merely to point out that their narrators rarely exist and are practically not even mentioned. If they are mentioned in the biographical dictionaries of narrators, we will find them, in general, being mentioned in stories and situations narrated about them, not in the sense of being actual narrators in the asānīd. Whoever looks up *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* under the biographies of 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Kawā (no. 711), Mirdās ibn Uthaybah (no. 828), and Nawfil ibn Farwah (Qurrah) al-Ashjaī (no. 843) will see that all of these individuals existed in the generation of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه.

Similarly, al-Shāharūdī mentioned in *Mustadrakāt 'Ilm al-Rijāl* a number of people whom he regarded as being from the Khawārij; however, they too are not mentioned in the asānīd. Rather, they are mentioned in battles, situations, and stories.<sup>1</sup>

Based on this, I did not find any of the Khawārij mentioned in *al-Khulāṣah* of al-Ḥillī except for what was mentioned in the biography of Ash'ath ibn Qays al-Kindī.<sup>2</sup> Al-Ḥillī states regarding him:

---

1 As in the following biographies: al-Akhnas ibn Qays, he said: "Amīr al-Mu'minīn killed him." (no. 1895); al-Ashras ibn Ḥassān: "He rebelled against Amīr al-Mu'minīn" (no. 2021); Burj ibn Mushir: "From the Khawārij." (no. 2058); al-Ja'dī ibn Na'jah: "From the leaders of the Khawārij." (no. 2487); Ḥurqūs ibn Zuhayr: "Leader of the Khawārij. Amīr al-Mu'minīn killed him." (no. 3235); Zur'ah ibn Burj: "From the leaders of the Khawārij. (He has) his ugly words with Amīr al-Mu'min." (no. 5734). And like this, they are mostly mentioned in situations and stories, not because they are narrators of an isnād. For this reason, it is known that they are scarce in both the asānīd and in the biographical works of the Imāmiyyah. Al-Shāharūdī was concerned with collecting most of their names because his book is a completion on the biographical works of the Imāmiyyah. Accordingly, he collected whatever was not mentioned by his predecessors. As such, he mentioned most of the Khawārij after al-Ṭūsī's book.

2 Ibn Ḥajar states in *al-Iṣābah*, 1/87, "Al-Ash'ath ibn Qays ibn Ma'dikarib ibn Mu'āwiyah ibn Jabalah ibn 'Adī ibn Rabī'ah ibn Mu'āwiyah al-Akrāmīn ibn Thawr al-Kindī. His agnomen was Abū Muḥammad. Ibn Sa'd states, 'He visited the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم in the tenth year (AH) with seventy riders from Kindah. He was one of the kings of Kindah. He was the companion of Mirbā' Ḥadramawt. Ibn al-Kalbī stated this.' Al-Bukhārī and Muslim included his narrations in their respective Ṣaḥīḥ collections. His name was Ma'dikarib."

ارتد بعد النبي (صلى الله عليه وآله) في ردة أهل ياسر زوجه أبو بكر أخته أم فروة وكانت عوراء فولدت له محمدا وكان من أصحاب علي (عليه السلام) ثم صار خارجيا ملعونا

He apostatized after the Prophet ﷺ during the apostasy of the family of Yāsir. Abū Bakr married his sister, Umm Farwah, to him. She was one-eyed. She gave birth to Muḥammad. He was from the companions of ‘Alī عليه السلام and then he became an accursed Khārijī.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 325, no. 1278 in the second section. As for al-Ḥillī’s statement, “He apostatized after the death of the Prophet ﷺ,” it is true. However, al-Ḥillī rejected his return to Islam and that he participated in al-Qādisiyyah, Nahāwand, and Jalūlā’, as mentioned by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr in *al-Istī‘āb*. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr also mentioned: “Aslam, the *mawlā* (client) of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb: It is as if I am looking at al-Ash’ath ibn Qays (after he was captured in the wars of apostasy. He was chained speaking to Abū Bakr. Abū Bakr was saying to him: ‘I did and I did.’ Until the end of that, I heard al-Ash’ath saying, ‘Keep me behind for your war and marry me to your sister.’ Abū Bakr did so.” He also mentioned something which proves that he repented, turned back, and was remorseful. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (1/42) states, “Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah narrated on the authority of Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Khālid who said: ‘I witnessed a funeral in which Jarīr and al-Ash’ath were present. Al-Ash’ath came to Jarīr and said, ‘I became an apostate and you did not.’” As for al-Ḥillī’s statement that “he became a Nāṣibī,” it is at variance with the biography of al-Ash’ath in that he was among the supporters and those who were loyal to ‘Alī عليه السلام. Al-Bukhārī narrates in *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, 3/59, on the authority of Ḥayyān Abū Sa‘d al-Taymī who said, “Al-Ash’ath ibn Qays was cautioned about the fitan. It was said to him, ‘Are you going out with ‘Alī?’ He said, ‘And who do you have as an imām (that is) the likes of ‘Alī?’” Ibn Sa‘d mentioned in his *Ṭabaqāt*, 3/37, the following: “Al-Ash’ath ibn Qays sent his son, Qays ibn al-Ash’ath on the morning ‘Alī was struck. He said, ‘O, my son. See how Amīr al-Mu‘minīn is this morning. He went, looked at him, and then returned. He said, ‘I saw his eyes deep in its sockets.’ Al-Ash’ath said, ‘My eyes have been struck, by the Lord of the Ka‘bah.’ How is it possible for al-Ḥillī to claim that al-Ash’ath was a Nāṣibī when these texts clearly show his love and affection for ‘Alī عليه السلام. In fact, even more than this. In *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, 3/294, it states, “Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Khālid stated on the authority of Ḥakīm ibn Jābir, ‘When al-Ash’ath ibn Qays passed away and his daughter was under al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī, al-Ḥasan said, ‘When you wash him, do not move him until you inform me. They informed him and so, he came and washed his body with camphor (water).’ We have mentioned on the authority of more than one person that he died in the year 40 (AH).” We have the right to ask: How did al-Ḥasan read ṣalāh on an apostate Nāṣibī? Perhaps this is sufficient in explaining the inauthenticity of al-Ḥillī’s words and his extreme prejudice against al-Ash’ath ibn Qays. As for al-Ḥillī’s describing Umm Farwah as ‘one-eyed,’ I have tried my utmost but I could not find one of the scholars of biographical narration mentioning this description. Therefore, I do not know where al-Ḥillī got this from. Assuming it is proven to be true, it (still) is not indicative of any shortcomings of Umm Farwah. May Allah be pleased with her and have mercy on her.

Similarly, under the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Kawā and Nawfal ibn Qurrah. As I mentioned, we do not find these individuals in the *asānīd* of the of Imāmiyyah; rather, only stories (about them) and positions (they took) are transmitted from them. If they are mentioned, it is merely done so prefatorily and to explain the Imāmiyyah’s position on them. Perhaps this is what prompted al-Ḥillī to completely drop them and outrightly reject their narrations. Based on my findings, he only had reason to mention them in his book in these places.

### The position of al-Khūṭī regarding the Khawārij

We know the methodology of al-Khūṭī which states that the narration of every (creedal) opponent is accepted. However, I did not find a specific opinion of al-Khūṭī on the Khawārij in terms of narration. Yes, he mentioned some of the Khawārij; however, he did not address what we are dealing with in terms of the affect the narrator’s creed has on the acceptance or rejection of a narration. Despite this, when we take into consideration al-Khūṭī’s opinion on those who are normally in (creedal) opposition to him, the narrator that is described to be from the Khawārij is not to be regarded as a barrier to accepting his ḥadīth in his view. As he stated, “There is no contradiction between possessing a false creed and being reliable (as a narrator).”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī states:

فساد العقيدة لا يضر بصحة رواياته على ما نراه من حجية خبر الثقة مطلقا

Based on what we consider in terms of the unrestricted authoritative value of a reliable person’s report, a false creed does not impact the authenticity of his narrations.<sup>2</sup>

Despite this, and despite my efforts, I could not find any textual evidence from al-Khūṭī wherein he made *tawthīq* of any one from the Khawārij.

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, 1/29, commentary under “*i tibār idhn al-walī*”.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 3/153, no. 1008 under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Hilāl.

### 3.4 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding non-Muslim narrators

The discussion regarding the disbelievers—both those that are disbelievers from inception, or those who apostatized—is not very different to al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī's position on oppositional narrators. We can extrapolate from al-Ḥillī's position on those who oppose in relation to creed and infer his general opinion on narrations of the disbelievers.

We have seen that al-Ḥillī does not accept those who oppose him in creed because, in his view, they do not possess the requisite 'adālah. Based on this, he made the second section of his book the presumed position of those who oppose him in creed. We also know that both *al-kufr al-aṣlī* (original disbelief) and an apostasy from Islam are of the greatest factors in impairing 'adālah. In fact, al-Ḥillī regarded the non-apostasy of a narrator from among the reasons of tawthīq. Under the biography of Abū Dharr رضي الله عنه, he states:

أحد الأركان الأربعة روي عن الباقر (عليه السلام) أنه لم يرتد مات رحمه الله في زمن عثمان بالربذة له  
خطبة يشرح فيها الأمور بعد النبي (صلى الله عليه وآله)

One of the *Arkān Arba'ah*<sup>1</sup> (four pillars). It is narrated from al-Bāqir عليه السلام that he did not apostatize. He died, may Allah have mercy on him, in the time of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه in al-Rabadhah. He has a sermon in which he explains issues after the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the reason for mentioning Abū Dharr رضي الله عنه in the first section is non-apostasy. This becomes even more clearer in the biography of Salmān al-Fārisī رضي الله عنه. Al-Ḥillī states:

---

1 *Arkān Arba'ah*: Literally means four pillars and according to the Shī'ah it refers to those Companions who, according to them, did not apostatise after the demise of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. It refers to Abū Dhar, Salmān al-Fārisī, 'Ammār ibn Yāsir, and Miqdād ibn Aswad رضي الله عنهم. [Translator's note]

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 96, no. 215 – section one.

سلمان الفارسي رحمة الله عليه مولى رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وآله) يكنى أبا عبد الله أول الأركان الأربعة حاله عظيم جدا مشكور لم يرتد

Salmān al-Fārisī, may Allah have mercy on him, the *mawlā* (client) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. His agnomen is Abū ‘Abd Allāh. The first of the four pillars. His status is very great. Thankfully, he did not apostatize.<sup>1</sup>

This is different to the opinion of al-Khūṭī who does not consider the false belief of a narrator as having a negative impact on accepting or not accepting his narration, even if it reaches the extent of disbelief. Perhaps the best example of al-Khūṭī accepting the narration of a disbeliever comes from his statement under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī Sajjādah. He states:

الرجل وإن وثقه علي بن إبراهيم لوقوعه في إسناد تفسيره إلا أنه مع ذلك لا يمكن الاعتماد على رواياته لشهادة النجاشي بأن الأصحاب ضعفوه وكذلك ضعفه ابن الغضائري نعم لو لم يكن في البين تضعيف لأمكننا الحكم بوثاقته مع فساد عقيدته بل مع كفره أيضا

The individual, despite the fact that ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm made *tawthīq* of him because he appears in the *isnād* of his *Tafsīr*, it is not possible to rely on his narrations. This is because of al-Najjāshī’s testimony that states that the companions made *taḍīf* of him. Similarly, Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī made *taḍīf* of him. Yes, if there was no clear *taḍīf*, we would be able to pass judgement that he is reliable, despite his false belief. In fact, despite his disbelief as well.<sup>2</sup>

A person might say that al-Khūṭī included a narration in the biography of Yaḥyā ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl stating that Yaḥyā did not become an apostate after al-Ḥusayn. The narration is as follows:

عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام قال ارتد الناس بعد قتل الحسين عليه السلام إلا ثلاثة أبو خالد الكابلي ويحيى بن أم الطويل وجبير بن مطعم ثم إن الناس لحقوا وكثروا

1 Ibid., 164, no. 477 – section one.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 6/78, no. 2941.

On the authority of Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام who said, “The people became apostates after the killing of al-Ḥusayn عليه السلام except for three: Abū Khālid al-Kābulī, Yaḥyā ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl, and Jubayr ibn Muṭ‘im. Then the people joined them and increased.”<sup>1</sup>

As in the text of the narration, al-Khūṭī made tawthīq of these three because they did not apostatize. In response, I say the following:

1. As for the narration, al-Khūṭī made taḍīf of it under the biography of Jubayr ibn Muṭ‘im. Accordingly, he undeniably did not rely on it.<sup>2</sup>
2. As for Abū Khālid al-Kābulī, al-Khūṭī made tawthīq of him because he appears in the *Tafsīr* of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī. After it has been documented that al-Khūṭī accepts the narration of someone who holds a false belief—or even disbelieves, there is no correlation between him not apostatizing and accepting or rejecting his narration.
3. As for Jubayr ibn Muṭ‘im, this narration does not benefit to him. The lack of apostatizing the narration speaks of is not a reason for his tawthīq in al-Khūṭī’s view. Al-Jawāhiri, the one who abridged al-Khūṭī’s book stated that he is *majhūl* (unknown) according to al-Khūṭī.<sup>3</sup>
4. As for Yaḥyā ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl, al-Khūṭī’s opinion on him need be known. Despite al-Khūṭī’s taḍīf of the narration of not apostatizing under the biography of Jubayr ibn Muṭ‘im, we find al-Khūṭī using the narration as proof. He did not even scratch in its isnād. He simply mentioned it among the proofs for accepting the narration of Yaḥyā ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl!<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Ibid., 21/37, no. 13488. The original narration is in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, p. 123, narration no. 193, under the biography of Yaḥyā ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl.

2 Ibid., 4/356, no. 2073.

3 Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 102.

4 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 21/37, no. 13488.



However, al-Khūī could have made it a mere supportive narration and not a corroborative one for accepting the narration of Yaḥyā. This is because he mentioned several matters which inform of the narrator's good condition. Accordingly, he included the narration among these other matters as supportive evidence for accepting his narrations. This does not conflict with his explicit and unambiguous text that possessing a false belief—or even disbelief—does not negate, as we have already seen, the tawthīq of the narrator.

### 3.5 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding narrators wanting in ‘adālah

Previously, I mentioned the position of both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding the sects that oppose the Imāmiyyah. In reality, the narrators in these sects are, according to them, wanting in ‘adālah since they disagree with the philosophy of Imāmah. This section is specific to narrators who are wanting in ‘adālah, not because of creedal differences, rather, on account of committing sins, such as lying, consuming alcohol, theft, and malevolence. Many Imāmī scholars rebuked the Ahl al-Sunnah for accepting narrations of those who are wanting in ‘adālah. Now, here before you are the opinions of senior Imāmī scholars on the narration of someone who is wanting in ‘adālah. Before commencing with this, it is necessary to explain what the meaning of ‘adālah is according to both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī. Al-Ḥillī states:

التحقيق أن العدالة كيفية نفسانية راسخة تبعث المتصف بها على ملازمة التقوى و المروءة ويتحقق  
باجتناب الكبائر وعدم الإصرار على الصغائر

It is a matter of fact that ‘adālah is a deep-rooted psychological condition that causes the person described with it to maintain both a steady consciousness of Allah and a state of moral probity. It comes about through abstaining from major sins and not persisting on minor ones.<sup>1</sup>

Generally speaking, this is what ‘adālah is. There is no doubt that acknowledging major sins such as lying, drinking alcohol, and other such sinful acts impairs it.

Al-Khūī believed that:

أن العدالة المعتبرة في الراوي أن يكون ثقة متحرزا في روايته عن الكذب وإن كان مخالفا في الاعتقاد  
فاسقا في العمل

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Mukhtalif al-Shī‘ah*, 8/484, “*fīmā tataḥaqqaq bihi al-‘adālah*”.

The considered ‘adālah in a narrator is that he should be a *thiqah* (reliable) and on guard against lying in his narrations, even though he disagrees in creed and commits sinful acts.<sup>1</sup>

And so, you can see that al-Khūṭ does not regard physical sinful acts as something that negatively affects ‘adālah. On the other hand, we see al-Ḥillī considering such acts as violating ‘adālah.

In general, the difference of opinion between the Imāmiyyah regarding the meaning of ‘adālah is many-sided. They have many opinions, all of which nullify one another.<sup>2</sup>

The purpose here is not to explain the difference in the meaning of ‘adālah according to the Imāmiyyah; rather, it is to point out the fact that everyone agrees “the liar, the consumer of alcohol, the violator of the infallible’s command, the stealer, and the malicious” is committing a sin. As such, it is important for us to know the opinion of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding such narrators in terms of accepting or rejecting their narrations.

It is important to note that what I am about to mention in the next section is based on the idea of *ilzām* (forcing proof on the Imāmiyyah to accept an argument). This is to say that they, as will be mentioned, make *tawthīq* of a group of narrators while they criticize the Ahl al-Sunnah and condemn them whenever they find the *tawthīq* of a person who has been accused of *bid‘ah* (heresy) or committing a sinful act. As such, it is necessary to explain the reality of their own condition and explain that for whatever reason they slander the Ahl al-Sunnah, it too is found recorded in their books.

---

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/159. no. 3818.

2 To know the Imāmiyyah’s differences in the meaning of ‘adālah, see: *Mu‘jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah* of Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī, p. 101; *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Aḥkāmuhu* of Ja‘far al-Subḥānī, p. 134; *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth* of ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī, p. 109; and *Buḥūth fī Fiqh al-Rijāl* of al-Fānī al-Aṣḥāhānī, p. 62.

## 1. The lying narrator (al-rāwī al-kadhdhāb)

Al-Ḥillī wrote a biography on ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr and made tawthīq of him. He ignored everything that was mentioned by most people who also wrote his biography. This Ibn Bukayr is accused of lying about Zurārah; he attributed to him that which he did not say. The strange thing is that al-Kashshī states:

إن عبد الله بن بكير ممن اجتمعت العصاة على تصحيح ما يصح عنه واقرؤا له بالفقه

‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr is among those whom the group (i.e., the Shī‘ah) agree upon regarding the authenticity of what is authentically transmitted from him and also approve of him in relation to issues of jurisprudence.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, al-Ḥillī turned a blind eye to his lying. However, he states:

وأما ما ذكره الشيخ في الاستبصار فلا ينافي الحكم بوثاقته غايته أن الشيخ احتمل كذب عبد الله بن بكير في هذه الرواية بخصوصها نصره لرأيه ومن المعلوم أن احتمال الكذب لخصوصية في مورد خاص لا ينافي وثاقة الراوي في نفسه

As for what al-Shaykh mentioned in *al-Istibṣār*, it does not negate ruling him as reliable. The most that can be said is that al-Shaykh took into consideration the lying of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr in this narration specifically so as to support his opinion. It is well-known that the possibility of lying due to a specificity in a particular instance does not negate the narrator’s reliability in and of itself.<sup>2</sup>

Here we see al-Khūṭī’s explicitness regarding the person who lies in a specific instance in support of his opinion is acceptable in narration. This does not negate the narrator’s reliability! It is worth noting that this is the same Ibn Bukayr that al-Kashshī transmits a consensus on regarding his tawthīq. Thus, they are in agreement regarding the tawthīq of a narrator who they know to be involved in clear lies.

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma’rifat al-Rijāl*, (Rijāl al-Kashshī), p 375, no. 705.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 11/132, no. 6744.

Clearer than this is what al-Khūī stated under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād al-Marwazī. This is one of the strangest statements of al-Khūī:

وأما ما في كتاب أبي عبيد الله الشاذاني (محمد بن نعيم) من قول فضل بن شاذان من أنه ظهر له منه (أحمد بن حماد) الكذب فهو لم يثبت لأن محمد ابن نعيم لم تثبت وثاقته على أن ظهور الكذب أحيانا لا ينافي حسن الرجل فإن الجواد قد يكبو

As for the statement of Faḍl ibn Shādhān in the book of Abū ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Shādhānī (Muḥammad ibn Nu‘aym) that it appeared to him that he lies, it is not proven. This is because Muḥammad ibn Nu‘aym’s reliability is not proven. Although, the appearance of lying, at times, does not negate the uprightness of the person. For sometimes, even the horse stumbles.<sup>1</sup>

It is necessary to note that al-Khūī does not consider the statement of al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān regarding the accusation of Aḥmad lying as established. However, after rejecting the statement of al-Faḍl, he established the following principle saying, “The appearance of lying, at times, does not negate the uprightness of the person. For sometimes, even the horse stumbles.” Thus, when al-Khūī wants to make tawthīq of a narrator, he is even willing to accept lying from him. In fact, he considers it “stumbling from a horse.” If this is not the situation, what is the meaning of the statement, “The appearance of lying, at times, does not negate the uprightness of the person. For sometimes, even the horse stumbles?”

I do not know how his statements regarding the tawthīq of someone who lies is consistent with:

إن ارتكاب المحرم مع ثبوت وثاقة شخص وتحزره عن الكذب لا يوجب الحكم بضعفه

Committing the impermissible while it is proven that the individual is reliable and abstains from lying does not necessitate a judgement that he is weak.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 2/113, no. 542.

2 Al-Khūī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/141, no. 3781.

Thus, we see al-Khūṭī regarding the narrator who abstains from lies as not indicative of a judgement of weakness. Therefore, the contrary understanding is that if a narrator does not abstain from lying, as in the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr and Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād, then this necessitates a judgement indicating to his weakness. However, al-Khūṭī abandoned such analogous thinking and principles that he established and judged both narrators to be reliable. He considered the first to support his own opinion and the other as a horse’s stumbling!

I did not find any additional commentary from al-Ḥillī on Ibn Bukayr aside from the fact that he made tawthīq of him. However, Ḥammād al-Marwazī placed him in the section of weak narrators and stated about him:

روى [الكشي] عنه أشياء ردية تدل على ترك العمل بروايته

Al-Kashshī narrated bad things from him which indicate that his narrations are not to be acted upon.<sup>1</sup>

Among the issues that al-Kashshī mentioned was his suspecting him of lying, which al-Khūṭī justified as the “stumbling of a horse.”

It is possible to say that al-Ḥillī drops the tawthīq of a narrator when it is proven that he lies. This is according to the places I have come across. Al-Khūṭī does not consider the pronouncement of certain forms of lying a reason to reject the narrator’s narration, except in what they fabricate against the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ.

## 2. The narrator who consumes intoxicants

Previously, we have seen that al-Ḥillī’s definition of ‘adālah excludes those who commit major sins. However, under the biography of Abū Hurayrah al-Bazzāz, he states:

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 323, no. 1267 in the second section.

قال العقيقي ترحم عليه أبو عبد الله (عليه السلام) وقيل إنه كان يشرب النبيذ فقال أيعز على الله أن يغفر لمححب علي (عليه السلام) شرب النبيذ والخمر

Al-‘Aqīqī states: Abū ‘Abd Allāh ﷺ supplicated to Allah asking Him to have mercy on him. It is said that he used to consume nabīdh and he responded, “Is it difficult for Allah to forgive a lover of ‘Alī ﷺ who consumed nabīdh and alcohol?”<sup>1</sup>

And so, al-Ḥillī placed him in the first section despite the fact that he used to consume nabīdh. A person cannot say that the nabīdh spoken about here is the *ḥalāl* (permissible) one since the text of the narration reads, “Is it difficult for Allah to forgive a lover of ‘Alī ﷺ who consumed nabīdh and alcohol?” He regarded the consumption of nabīdh among the things that Allah can forgive for a lover of ‘Alī ﷺ. Had this nabīdh been the permissible type, it would not require Allah to forgive him for consuming it since he did not commit a sin. In fact, more than this is the fact that the text of the narration also mentions alcohol. Has alcohol also become permissible? It may be said that the reason for al-Ḥillī including him in the first section is because of the infallible’s supplication which interceded for him, according to al-Ḥillī. This is merely a possibility; however, the original position is to accept him despite his drinking alcohol.

Despite this, we see al-Ḥillī including Abū Najrān in the second section of his book. He mentioned that he used to consume nabīdh.<sup>2</sup> This indicates that al-Ḥillī’s position is unclear regarding the narrator who consumes nabīdh. At times, we find such a narrator in the first section, and, other times, he includes him in the second section.

Whoever examines the books of narrator criticism of the Shī‘ah will see them mentioning the reasons for impugning narrators and regarding the “consumption of nabīdh” among such reasons. However, when they are faced with “reliable”

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 306, no. 1155 in the first section of agnomens.

2 Ibid., p. 422, no. 1722, in the second section under “Agnomens”.

narrators of the Imāmiyyah whom it is proven that they consumed nabīdh, they look for endless excuses on their behalf.<sup>1</sup>

As for al-Khūṭī, he does not regard verifying sin—be it major or minor—a valid reason to make taḍfīf of a narrator and reject his narration. He states:

أن العدالة المعتبرة في الراوي أن يكون ثقة متحرزا في روايته عن الكذب وإن كان مخالفا في الاعتقاد  
فاسقا في العمل

The considered ‘adālah in a narrator is that he should be a *thiqah* (reliable) and on guard against lying in his narrations, even though he disagrees in creed and commits sinful acts.<sup>2</sup>

This text clearly shows that sinful acts have no bearing on narration. Based on this, proving that a narrator drinks alcohol or nabīdh—whether ḥalāl or ḥarām—does not affect the accepting or rejecting the narration of a narrator. Therefore, we see al-Khūṭī stating under the biography of ‘Amr ibn Muslim Abū Najrān al-Tamīmī:

عن حنان بن سدير عن أبي نجران قال قلت لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام إن لي قرابة يحبكم إلا أنه يشرب هذا النبيذ قال حنان وأبو نجران هو الذي كان يشرب النبيذ إلا أنه كنى عن نفسه قال فقال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام فهل كان يسكر فقال قلت أي والله جعلت فداك إنه ليسكر فقال فيترك الصلاة قال ربما قال للجارية صليت البارحة فربما قالت له نعم قد صليت ثلاث مرات وربما قال للجارية يا فلانة صليت البارحة العتمة فتقول لا والله ما صليت ولقد أيقظناك وجهدنا بك فأمسك أبو عبد الله عليه السلام يده على جبهته طويلا ثم نحى يده ثم قال له قل له يتركه فإن زلت به قدم فإن له قدما ثابتا بمودتنا أهل البيت

On the authority of Ḥannān ibn Sudayr from Abū Najrān who said:

I said to Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, “I have a relative that loves you (i.e., the Ahl al-Bayt), but he drinks nabīdh.”

1 See: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah* of Mahdī al-Kajūrī, p. 128 and *Ṭarā'if al-Maqāl* of ‘Alī al-Burūjirdī, 2/271.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/159, no. 3818.



Ḥannān said, “Abū Najrān was the one who used to drink nabīdh; however, he used to express this (about himself) indirectly.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh عبدالله asked, “Does he get intoxicated?”

He said, “Yes, by Allah. May I be sacrificed for you; he does get intoxicated.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh عبدالله asked, “Does he leave ṣalāh?”

He said, “At times, he would say to his maid, ‘Did I read ṣalāh last night?’ And she would sometimes say to him, ‘Yes, you read ṣalāh three times.’ Other times, he would say to his maid, ‘O, so-and-so, did I read ‘ishā ṣalāh last night?’ And she would say, ‘No, by Allah, you did not read ṣalāh. We woke you up and tried very hard with you.’”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh held his hand on his forehead for a long time. Thereafter, he removed his hand and said to him, “Say to him that he should abandon it. If a foot slips, verily, he has another foot grounded in our, the Ahl al-Bayt’s, love.”<sup>1</sup>

And like this, al-Khūṭ mentioned the biography of ‘Amr ibn Muslim—whose text I have transmitted in its entirety. He cites a narration that states the infallible’s praise for the narrator. Furthermore, al-Khūṭ remains silent and does not even comment one word further! As such, he did not disapprove of the isnād nor the *matn* (text). When he came to the section on agnomens, he stated:

أبو نجران تقدم في عمرو بن مسلم

Abū Najrān: He was already mentioned in (the biography of) ‘Amr ibn Muslim.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 14/139, no. 9002.

2 Ibid., 23/69, no. 14886.

And like this without the slightest indication of disapproval for him drinking the impermissible nabīdh by virtue of the narration’s text, as is his habit in pursuing the reprehensible statements.<sup>1</sup> This emphasizes the fact that proving that has no effect on the accepting of a narration. However, despite this ambiguity, and al-Khūṭī’s acknowledgement of the narration, both Bisām Murtaḍā and al-Jawāhirī that ‘Amr ibn Muslim, Abū Najrān, is majhūl according to al-Khūṭī.<sup>2</sup>

In another place, al-Khūṭī attempted to refute the accusation of drinking nabīdh from Abū Ḥamzah al-Thumālī—which is established with an authentic chain. He sought many excuses on his behalf. However, he did not do this because he regards it as something which negatively affects his narration; rather, as it seems, it was simply a matter of trying to verify whether it was proven to be true or not.

### 3. The narrator who defies a command of the infallible

The Imāmiyyah regard the defiance of an infallible’s statement as among the major sins since, in reality, it is a rejection of Allah ﷻ and a violation of His command. This is because the infallible does not speak except what he is commanded to by Allah. Ibn Qūlawayh narrated in *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* on the authority of al-Kāzim Mūsā ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad that he said:

ألا وإن الراد علينا كالراد على رسول الله جدنا ومن رد على رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وآله) فقد رد على الله

Truly, the person that defies us is like the person that defies the Messenger of Allah, our grandfather. And the person that defies the Messenger of Allah ﷻ has indeed defied Allah.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Kulaynī (d. 329 AH) narrated on the authority of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq that he said:

1 As he did in the biography of Dī‘bil ibn ‘Alī al-Khuzā‘ī. He only criticized the isnād of the narration that proves Dī‘bil drank alcohol. *al-Mu‘jam*, 8/151, no. 4465.

2 Bisām Murtaḍā: *Zubdat al-Maqāl min Mu‘jam al-Rijāl*, 1/118; al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 437.

3 Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh: *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, p. 553 (*Nawādir al-Ziyārāt*).

الراد علينا الراد على الله وهو على الله حد الشرك بالله

The person who defies us defies Allah. And he is on the brink of committing *shirk* (polytheism) with Allah.<sup>1</sup>

And like this, the Imāmiyyah establish a foundational principle for defying an order of the infallible imām. The problem leads to defying Allah and then committing shirk with Him **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى**!

Based on this, what is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī on the narrator who defies an order of the infallible?

Firstly, al-Ḥillī mentions the biography of ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Abān al-Rāzī (known as ‘Allān) and includes it in the first section saying:

ثقة عين

Reliable. Prominent.<sup>2</sup>

He mentioned nothing of his condition (i.e., as a narrator). This very ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Abān al-Rāzī (known as ‘Allān) has a situation that al-Najjāshī mentioned under his biography. He states:

وقتل علان بطريق مكة وكان استأذن صاحب عليه السلام في الحج فخرج توفف عنه في هذه السنة فخالف

And ‘Allān was killed on the way to Mecca. He sought the *ṣāḥib*'s<sup>3</sup> permission for Ḥajj and left. He desisted from it this year, and, as such, disobeyed.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfī*, 1/67, *Kitāb Faḍl al-‘Ilm*, Bāb: Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth, ḥadīth no. 10. In *Mir‘āt al-‘Uqūl*, 1/221; al-Majlisī states, “Reliable, the companions have accepted him.”

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 187, no. 558.

3 According to the Imāmiyyah, “*al-ṣāḥib* (the Companion),” “*ṣāḥib al-Bayt* (Companion of the House)” refers to Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, the awaited Mahdī, as mentioned by Muḥammad Riḍā in *Mu‘jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Dirāyah* (p. 85).

4 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 261, no. 682.

In other words, he sought permission from the infallible before going for Ḥajj. He received permission and rather decided to hold off. He ignored the order of the infallible. In fact, it may even be perceived as a display of indifference to the opinion of the infallible, or a ridicule of thereof since he is asking him in order to oppose him!

It is not possible for al-Ḥillī to have not known of ‘Allān’s disobedience in this regard. Al-Najjāshī mentioned it in his book—which is the most important source of his book, *al-Khulāṣah*. Al-Ḥillī mentioned the entire text of al-Najjāshī; however, he omitted the incident of the narrator’s disobedience to the infallible’s command!

Based on this, it is possible to say that al-Ḥillī does not consider the narrator’s defiance of an infallible’s command as having any negative affect on the acceptance or rejection of his narration. If this was not the case, he would not have included the narrator in the first section without any comment on the story. However, al-Ḥillī stated:

إن مخالفة علي بن محمد إعلان لأمر الحجّة سلام الله عليه بتوقفه عن الخروج لا ينافي وثاقته

‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ‘Allān’s defiance of the Ḥujjah’s عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام command by desisting from going out does not negate his reliability (as a narrator).<sup>1</sup>

This is clear from al-Khūṭī; defying the infallible does not negate the person’s reliability. According to al-Khūṭī, a narrator’s reliability is the basis for accepting his narration.

Secondly, regarding Ḥarīz ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Sijistānī, al-Najjāshī states:

كان ممن شهر السيف في قتال الخوارج بسجستان في حياة أبي عبد الله عليه السلام وروي أنه جفاه  
وحجبه عنه

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 13/138. no. 8403.

He was among those who used the sword to fight the Khawārij in Sijistān in the life of Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. It is narrated that he shunned and avoided him.<sup>1</sup>

The reason for the infallible Imām’s shunning and avoiding Ḥarīz goes back to his defying the infallible’s command that stated he should not go out and fight the Khawārij. In a narration, there were those who wanted to intercede for Ḥarīz by Ja’far al-Ṣādiq after he avoided him. However, he did not permit it. Al-Kashshī narrated:

عن عبد الرحمن بن الحجاج قال استأذن فضل البقباق لحريز على أبي عبد الله (ع) فلم يأذن له فعاوده فلم يأذن له فقال له أي شييء للرجل أن يبلغ من عقوبة غلامه؟ قال على قدر جريرته فقال قد عاقبت و الله حريزا بأعظم ممّا صنع فقال ويحك أنا فعلت ذلك أنّ حريزا جرّد السيف قال ثم قال لو كان حذيفة ما عاودني فيه بعد أن قلت له

On the authority of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥajjāj who said: “Faḍl al-Baqqāq<sup>2</sup> sought permission for Ḥarīz from Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. He did not grant him permission. He went back to him. He did not grant him permission.

He said to him, “To what extent can a man exact punishment on his servant?”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said, ‘According to the extent of his crime.’

He said, ‘I punished him, by Allah, more than what he did!’

---

1 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 144, no. 375.

2 Al-Najjāshī states, “Al-Faḍl ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, Abū al-‘Abbās (al-Baqqāq). Mawlā. Kūfan. Reliable. Prominent.” (*Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 308 no. 843) Despite al-Faḍl acting boldly towards the infallible imām—to such an extent that under the commentary following the text of the narration, it reads in the marginalia of al-Tiffarishī’s book, *Naqd al-Rijāl* (1/410, edited by Mu’assasat Āl al-Bayt li Iḥyā’ al-Turāth), “The indication of Abū al-‘Abbās’s bad manners is clearer, unless it is because of his lack of knowledge regarding good etiquette.” (I say) As the narration attests to, if al-Baqqāq was impolite with the imām, how can al-Najjāshī judge him to be “reliable (and) prominent?”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام said: ‘Woe unto you! Why did you do that! Ḥarīz unsheathed the sword.’

Then Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام said, ‘If it was Ḥudhayfah, he would not come back to me regarding him after I already told him.’”<sup>1</sup>

When al-Ḥillī came to his biography, he commented on the statement of al-Najjāshī that the infallible “avoided him” saying:

وهذا القول من النجاشي لا يقتضي الطعن فيه لعدم العلم بتعديل الراوي للجفاء وروى الكشي أن أبا  
عبدالله حجبه عنه وفي طريقه محمد بن عيسى مع قول فيه أن الحجب لا يستلزم الجرح لعدم العلم  
بالسر فيه

This statement of al-Najjāshī does not necessitate a criticism of him because of the lack of knowledge regarding the ta’dīl of the narrator who narrated the ḥadīth (i.e., of the Imām avoiding him). Al-Kashshī narrated that Abū ‘Abd Allāh shunned him. In its chain is Muḥammad ibn Ṭsā; in addition to what was stated about him, the Imām’s shunning him does not necessitate a jarḥ because there is no knowledge as to what was the secret in doing so.<sup>2</sup>

In summary, al-Ḥillī attempted to blemish the isnād of this shunning. Despite this, he did not regard the act of shunning—the actual reason for it being the disobedience of the infallible’s command—as negatively affecting the narrator. He justified that because of not knowing the secret of the Imām’s shunning him.

As for al-Khūṭī, he was clearer and more obvious. In the biography of Ḥarīz, he states:

إن تجريد السيف من دون إذن الإمام (عليه السلام) وإن كان ذنباً كما يظهر من الصحيحة إلا أنه قابل  
للزاول بالتوبة ولا شك

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma’rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 383, no. 717.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 134, no. 360

Unsheathing the sword without the Imām's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام consent, even though it is a sin as it appears from the authentic reports, it is, without a doubt, possible to remove it through the act of repentance.<sup>1</sup>

Thereafter, he took to vindicating Ḥarīz.

This emphasizes that al-Khūṭī does not regard the narrator's act of disobeying the command of an infallible Imām as a reason to disqualify his narration from being accepted. This is especially the case if we consider his earlier definition of 'adālah, a definition that does consider sinful acts a means of diminishing (a narrator's) 'adālah.

#### 4. The narrator that denies or usurps the wealth of the infallible

We have already seen that disobeying a command of the infallible is regarded as a sin, according to the Imāmiyyah. What then is the situation of denying him his wealth? As such, what is the opinion of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the person who is described as such?

##### 1. Manṣūr ibn Yūnus ibn Barzaj

Under the biography of Manṣūr ibn Yūnus ibn Barzaj, it comes that he denied the money of 'Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ja'far al-Riḍā. In this regard, al-Kashshī states:

حدثني حمدويه قال حدثنا الحسن بن موسى قال حدثني محمد بن أصبغ عن إبراهيم عن عثمان بن القاسم قال قال لي منصور بزوج قال لي أبو الحسن عليه السلام ودخلت عليه يوما يا منصور أما علمت ما أحدثت في يومي هذا قلت لا قال قد صيرت عليا ابني وصيي والخلف من بعدي فادخل عليه فهنته بذلك وأعلمه أنني أمرتك بهذا قال فدخلت عليه فهنته بذلك وأعلمته أن أباه أمرني بذلك قال الحسن بن موسى ثم جحد منصور هذا بعد ذلك لأموال كانت في يده فكسرها وكان منصور أدرك أبا عبد الله عليه السلام

Ḥamdawayh narrated to me — al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā narrated to us — Muḥammad ibn Aṣḡagh narrated to me — from Ibrāhīm — from 'Uthmān ibn al-Qāsīm who said, Manṣūr Barzaj said to me:

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 5/232, no. 2645.

Abū al-Ḥasan عبدالحسن said to me when I met him one day, “O, Maṣṣūr. Do you not know what I did on this day?”

I said: ‘No.’

Abū al-Ḥasan عبدالحسن said, “I have made ‘Alī, my son, my waṣī (legatee) and the successor after me. Go to him and congratulate him on this. And also inform him that I ordered you to do this.”

He said, “I went to him, congratulated him, and informed him that his father ordered me to do this.”

Al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā related, “After that, Maṣṣūr denied him his money that he had with him and ‘broke’<sup>1</sup> it. Maṣṣūr met Abū ‘Abd Allāh عبدالله.”<sup>2</sup>

When al-Ḥillī came to this biography, he including it in the second section and said:

---

1 In explaining the words ‘broke it,’ al-Majlisī in *Bihār al-Anwār*, 49/14, states, “It is metaphor for disposing and spending it carelessly.” Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī in *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā’il*, 5/341 states, “The words from Ḥasan (ibn Mūsā) are clear in that the denial was for consuming the wealth, not because of him lacking understanding and other similar reports. This does act does not support the quality of reliability. In spite of this, it is necessary to give preference to al-Najjāshī’s words in order for his supporting the narration of Ṣafwān, Ibn Abī ‘Umayr, and all the venerable others.” Similarly, al-Nūrī (p. 342) states, “You know that the narration is regarded as being from among the reasons of Maṣṣūr’s praise. The attribution of denying the emphatic statement and consuming the money to him is from al-Ḥasan, the teacher of Ḥamdayh. Therefore, the attributing that statement to ‘Uthmān, as it appears in *al-Khulāṣah*, is very doubtful. The weakness of the narration on account of him and Ibrāhīm being majhūl is another doubt. Thereafter, dividing the reports of denial (of his appointment) and that it was (actually) because of wanting to consume the wealth—despite being a possibility—is a third problem. **Opening this door (of criticism) necessitates closing the door of accepting (criticism) in many other instances.** Even if it was done and it was necessary based upon what we have mentioned regarding the disconnection and weakness (of the report) as well as the scholars not censuring him. And Allah knows best.” What is meant by disconnection is that al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā did not meet al-Riḍā, as he mentioned that earlier in the same source.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma’rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 468, no. 893.



الوجه عندي التوقف فيما يروييه و الرد لقوله لوصف الشيخ [الطوسي] له بالتوقف

The correct position, according to me, is to suspend judgement in what he narrates and to reject what he states because of al-Shaykh's (al-Ṭūsī's) describing him with *Waqf* (i.e., being a *Wāqif*).<sup>1</sup>

Thereafter, al-Ḥillī mentioned the story of denying the money. Except that his words were explicit in the reason for rejecting him, suspending judgement on him, and including him in the second section: disagreeing in (creedal) school of thought—the school of the *Wāqifah*. Thus, as it appears, the rejection was not because of him denying the infallible's money.

Al-Khūṭī was even more obvious than al-Ḥillī in making *tawthīq* of someone who denies (the *Imām*) money. He states:

إن صريح الكشي أن الحسن بن موسى هو الذي نسب الجحد وأخذ الأموال إلى منصور ولكن ظاهر الصدوق أن هذه النسبة إما من نفسه أو من أبيه وكيف كان فالرواية مرسلّة والنسبة غير ثابتة وعلى تقدير الثبوت فهو لا ينافي الوثاقة وعليه فالرجل ثقة إمامي كما هو ظاهر كلام النجاشي أو غير إمامي كما صرح به الشيخ

Al-Kashshī explicitly stated that al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā is the one to attribute the denial and taking of money to Manṣūr. However, the apparent meaning of al-ṣādūq's (i.e., his words) is that this attribution is either from himself, or from his father<sup>2</sup>. In any case, the narration is *mursal* and the attribution is not proven.<sup>3</sup> Even if it is assumed proven, it does not negate (the individual's) reliability. Accordingly, the man is an *Imāmī* and he is reliable. This is according to the apparent meaning of al-Najjāshī's words. Or, as al-Shaykh stated, he is a non-*Imāmī*.<sup>4</sup>

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 408, no. 1650.

2 As it appears on 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā of al-ṣādīq, 2/32.

3 Contrary to the opinion of al-Khūṭī, Muḥammad al-ʿĀmilī made *tawthīq* of the narration. He states: "Al-Kashshī narrated a comprehensive ḥadīth with a valid isnaḍ. This is because he denied the text concerning the explicit appointment of al-Riḍā due to wealth that he had in his possession." (*Madārik al-Aḥkām*, 6/47, under the commentary of "al-*Imsāk 'an al-Kadhīb*").

4 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 19/383, no. 12716. *Al-Najjāshī*, p. 366, no. 989; and al-Ṭūsī mentioned it in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 343, no. 5119.

This clearly shows the narrator's tawthīq, even if it is proven that he denied the infallible's wealth!

## 2. Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bilāl Abū Ṭāhir

Al-Ṭūsī mentioned in his book, *al-Ghaybah*, a number of reprehensible *sufarā'* (representatives) of the awaited Mahdī. And among them, he counted Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bilāl Abū Ṭāhir.<sup>1</sup> Al-Ḥillī including him in the first section of *al-Khulāṣah* saying:

ثقة قال الشيخ في الغيبة أنه من المذمومين أبو طاهر محمد بن علي بن بلال فنحن في روايته من المتوقفين

Reliable. Al-Shaykh stated in *al-Ghaybah* that Abū Ṭāhir, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bilāl is among the reprehensible ones. Accordingly, we suspend judgment on his narrations.<sup>2</sup>

He mentioned him in the second section citing al-Ṭūsī that he is among the reprehensible ones.<sup>3</sup>

Here, it appears to us that al-Ḥillī was not absolutely certain regarding the narrator's condition, though he stated his tawthīq, and then suspended judgement on him, and then stated that he is reprehensible! That is because he mentioned him once in the first section and another time in the second section. Al-Ḥillī's suspending judgement on the narrator could be because of what al-Ṭūsī mentioned in *al-Ghaybah* in that he claimed *wakālah* (agency) and the Imāmiyyah disavowed themselves from him, cursed him, and other such things. All of which, according to him, would be a reason to diminish the narrator's credibility.

However, al-Khūī was clearer about this narrator. After citing some of the Imāmi scholars praise for him, he states:

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Kitāb al-Ghaybah*, p. 400, narration no. 375. Al-Ḥillī enlisted them in his work, *al-Khulāṣah*, p. 432.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 242, no. 825.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 405 (no. 1638).

ومع هذا كله فقد أخلد إلى الأرض واتبع هواه وادعى البابية قال الشيخ [الطوسي] ومنهم (المذمومين الذين ادعوا البابية لعنهم الله) أبو طاهر محمد بن علي بن بلال وقصته معروفة فيما جرى بينه وبين أبي جعفر محمد بن عثمان العمري نضر الله وجهه وتمسكه بالأموال التي كانت عنده للإمام وامتناعه من تسليمها وادعائه أنه الوكيل حتى تبرأت الجماعة منه ولعنوه وخرج فيه من صاحب الزمان ما هو معروف [ثم عقب الخوئي قائلا] ... والمتلخص من جميع ما ذكرنا أن الرجل كان ثقة مستقيما وقد ثبت انحرافه وادعائه البابية ولم يثبت عدم وثاقته فهو ثقة فاسد العقيدة فلا مانع من العمل بروايته بناء على كفاية الوثاقة في حجية الرواية كما هو الصحيح

Despite all of this, he “adhered (instead) to the earth and followed his own desire” and claimed to be a ‘door (i.e., representative)’ of the Imām. Al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) stated, “Among them (the reprehensible ones who claimed representative, may the curse of Allah be upon them) is Abū Ṭāhir Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bilāl. His story is famous regarding what transpired between him and Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān al-‘Amrī (may Allah enlighten his face) and his holding the money he had for the Imām and refusing to hand it over.<sup>1</sup> It is also famously known that he claimed to be the *wakīl* (agent) until the *jamā‘ah* (group) disowned him, cursed him, and what is famously known from *Ṣāhib al-Zamān* (i.e. the awaited Mahdī) was said about him. (Thereafter, al-Khūṭī commented saying) ... Summarizing from everything we have mentioned, the man is reliable (and) upright. His deviancy and claiming to be a ‘door’ (i.e., a representative of the Imām is established, and him being unreliable is not established. Therefore, he is a *thiqah* with a false belief. As such, there is no impediment to acting on his narrations. This is premised on the correct opinion that only a narrator’s reliability determines the authoritative value of his narration.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore, the narrator, if he withheld the infallible’s wealth and followed his desires, and the Imāmiyyah cursed him, and “he adhered (instead) to the earth,” there is still no impediment, according to al-Khūṭī, in making his *tawthīq!*

1 In describing him, Bisām Murtaḍā states in *Zubdat al-Maqāl* (2:348): “They ‘adhered (instead) to the ground” and were desirous of and took *Ṣāhib al-Zamān*’s/imām’s wealth.”

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 17/333-335, no. 11305.

### 3. Ziyād ibn Marwān, or Ziyād al-Qindī

Al-Ṭūsī states in *al-Ghaybah*:

روى ابن عقدة عن علي بن الحسن بن فضال عن محمد بن عمر بن يزيد وعلي بن أسباط جميعا قالا قال لنا عثمان بن عيسى الرواسي حدثني زياد القندي وابن مسكان قالا كنا عند أبي إبراهيم عليه السلام إذ قال يدخل عليكم الساعة خير أهل الأرض فدخل أبو الحسن الرضا عليه السلام وهو صبي فقلنا خير أهل الأرض ثم دنا فضمه إليه فقبله وقال يا بني تدري ما قال دان؟ قال نعم يا سيدي هذان يشكان فيّ قال علي بن أسباط فحدثت بهذا الحديث الحسن بن محبوب فقال بتر الحديث لا ولكن حدثني علي بن رثاب أن أبا إبراهيم عليه السلام قال لهما إن جحدتماه حقه أو خنتماه فعليكما لعنة الله والملائكة والناس أجمعين يا زياد لا تنجب أنت وأصحابك أبدا قال علي بن رثاب فلقيت زياد القندي فقلت له بلغني أن أبا إبراهيم عليه السلام قال لك كذا وكذا فقال أحسبك قد خولطت فمر وتركني فلم أكلمه ولا مررت به قال الحسن بن محبوب فلم نزل تتوقع لزياد دعوة أبي إبراهيم عليه السلام حتى ظهر منه أيام الرضا عليه السلام ما ظهر ومات زنديقا

Ibn ‘Uqdah narrated on the authority of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl — from both Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Yazīd and ‘Alī ibn Asbāṭ — ‘Uthmān ibn Ṭīsā al-Rawāsī said to us — Ziyād al-Qindī and Ibn Muskān narrated to me:

We were with Abū Ibrāhīm عليه السلام when he said, “The best of the people of the world has come to you at this time.”

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā عليه السلام entered and he was a child.

We said, “The best of the people of the world!”

Then he came near, embraced him, kissed him and said, “O, my son. What did they say?”

He said, “Yes, my master, these two are having misgivings about me.”

‘Alī ibn Asbāṭ stated, “I narrated this ḥadīth to al-Ḥasan ibn Maḥbūb and he said, ‘He omitted from the narration. No! Rather, ‘Alī ibn Ri‘āb narrated to me that Abū Ibrāhīm عليه السلام said to them, ‘If you two are denying him his right, or cheated him, then may the curse of Allah, all the angels, and all the humans be upon you. O Ziyād, You and your companion will never be successful ever.’ ‘Alī ibn Ri‘āb said, ‘I met Ziyād al-Qindī and said to him, ‘It has reached me

that Abū Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ said this and that to you.’ He said, ‘I think you are confused. He passed and left me. I did not speak to him nor pass by him.’ Al-Ḥasan ibn Maḥbūb stated, ‘We never expected Abū Ibrāhīm’s supplication against Ziyād to actually materialise until the actions he perpetrated in the days of al-Riḍā came to the fore and he died a zindīq.’”<sup>1</sup>

The man died as an accursed apostate. However, al-Khūṭī has an opinion regarding him. He states:

فالرجل من الثقات وإن كان قد جحد حق الإمام عليه السلام وخانه طمعا في مال الدنيا فإن قلت إن شهادة الشيخ المفيد راجعة إلى زمان روايته النص على الرضا عليه السلام ولذا قد وصفه بالورع فلا أثر لهذه الشهادة بالنسبة إلى زمان انحرافه قلت نعم إلا أن المعلوم بزواله من الرجل هو ورعه وأما وثاقته فقد كانت ثابتة ولم يعلم زوالها

The man is from among the reliable narrators, even though he denied the right of the Imām عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and deceived him in hope of the wealth of this world. If you say that Al-Shaykh al-Mufid’s testimony in his favour goes back to the time of his narration of the text on al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and for this reason he described him with possessing a high level of Allah-consciousness, then this testimony is of no affect in relation to the time of his deviance. I say: Yes; however, what is known about the man is that his Allah-consciousness disappeared. As for his reliability, it is (still) proven and it is not known that it disappeared!<sup>2</sup>

The man left believing in Imāmah hoping for the ephemeral things of this world. Consequently, he preferred his dunyā over his dīn. He denied and deceived the Imām. However, according to al-Khūṭī, this does negatively affect his ‘adālah. Accordingly, there is no problem in the man deceiving the Imām, yet, according to al-Khūṭī, he is a thiqaḥ!

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Kitāb al-Ghaybah*, p. 68, narration no. 71. Baḥr al-‘Ulūm states in *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, 2/353, “The last narration has a considered isnad like the first. The chain of narration up to Ibn Maḥbūb is reliable. As it seems from him his words in *al-Fihrist* under his biography, al-Shaykh took it from Ibn ‘Uqdah’s work.”

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/330, no. 4811.

## Chapter Four

### The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī and the scholars of the Imāmiyyah on the Ṣaḥābah

- 4.1 Statements of the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars regarding the Ṣaḥābah
- 4.2 The position of the Imāmiyyah regarding the Ṣaḥābah
- 4.3 The position of the Imāmiyyah regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah and its impact on their narrations
- 4.4 A comparative analysis between the position of the Imāmiyyah on the Ṣaḥābah and their own reliable narrators from the Imāmiyyah



In this chapter, I will present the position of the Imāmiyyah on the Ṣaḥābah and how they dealt with them in terms of accepting and rejecting narrations. However, it is appropriate before that to shed some light on the Ṣaḥābah in general, based on the views of Muslim scholars. Similarly, to shed light on the fact that all of them possess integrity, are acceptable in narration, and that none of them are excluded from this. I will not mention any verses and aḥādīth concerning their virtue because of how famous they already are; rather, I will restrict myself to the statements of Islam’s scholars, those who laid the foundations for the sciences of ḥadīth terminology.

## 4.1 Statements of the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars on the Ṣaḥābah

### Al-Amīr al-Ṣan‘ānī

من مهمات هذا الباب أي باب معرفة الصحابة القول بعدالة الصحابة كلهم في الظاهر واعلم أنه استدل الحافظ ابن حجر في أول كتابه الإصابة على عدالة جملة الصحابة فقال الفصل الثالث في بيان معرفة حال الصحابة من العدالة اتفق أهل السنة على أن الجميع عدول ولم يخالف في ذلك إلا شذوذ من المبتدعة وقد ذكر الخطيب في الكفاية فصلا نفيسا في ذلك فقال عدالة الصحابة ثابتة معلومة بتعديل الله لهم وإخباره عن ظهارتهم واختياره لهم

From among the important issues in the chapter, i.e., the chapter on knowing the Ṣaḥābah, is the belief that states that all of the Ṣaḥābah have ‘adālah (integrity). Know that al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar in the beginning of his book, *al-Iṣābah*, concluded that all of the Ṣaḥābah have ‘adālah. He states, “Chapter Three – an explanation of knowing the condition of the Ṣaḥābah in terms of ‘adālah: The people of the Sunnah agree that all (of the Ṣaḥābah) are ‘udūl (possess integrity). No one disagrees to this save a few of the innovators. In *al-Kifāyah*, al-Khaṭīb mentioned a valuable chapter regarding this. He states, ‘The ‘adālah of the Ṣaḥābah is well-established and known by virtue of Allah’s approbation of them, His informing (us) of their purity, and His choosing them.’”<sup>1</sup>

1 Al-Ṣan‘ānī: *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār*, 2/434.

## Al-Zarkashī

الصحابة عدول كلهم فلا يضر الجهل بأعيانهم نص عليه الإمام أحمد في رواية الأثرم عنه وبه جزم أئمة الحديث والأصول ولا يتجه فيه خلاف

All of the Ṣaḥābah are 'udūl (possess integrity). Accordingly, not knowing their names does not negatively affect their status. Al-Imām Aḥmad documented this in a narration of al-Athram from him. The Imāms of ḥadīth and uṣūl are absolutely certain regarding this and there is no disagreement about it.<sup>1</sup>

## Al-Imām al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 AH)

الصحابة كلهم عدول من لا بس الفتن وغيرهم بإجماع من يعتد به

All of the Ṣaḥābah are 'udūl (possess integrity) including those who were connected to the civil strife or otherwise. This is by consensus of those whose opinion is considered.<sup>2</sup>

## Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Jamā'ah (d. 733 AH)

الصحابة كلهم عدول مطلقا لظواهر الكتاب والسنة وإجماع من يعتد به بالشهادة لهم بذلك سواء فيه من لا بس الفتنة وغيره ولبعض أهل الكلام من المعتزلة وغيرهم في عدالتهم تفصيل واختلاف لا يعتد به

All of the Ṣaḥābah, without exception, are 'udūl (possess integrity). This is based on the literal meanings of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, and by the unanimity of those whose opinion is considered by virtue of their testimony in their favour. This applies to both those who were connected to the civil strife and others. Some of the people of *kalām* (scholastic theology) from among the Mu'tazilah and others have (more) details and differences of opinion (on the matter) that are baseless.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Zarkashī: *al-Nukat 'alā Ibn al-Ṣalāh*, 1/462.

2 Al-Suyūṭī: *Tadrīb al-Rāwī*, 2/214.

3 Ibn Jamā'ah: *al-Manhal al-Rāwī*, p. 112.



## Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Fihrī

فنقول الصحابة رضوان الله عليهم عدول بأجمعهم بإجماع أهل السنة على ذلك

Thus, we say: All of the Ṣaḥābah (may Allah be pleased with them) are ‘udūl (possess integrity) by virtue of the Ahl al-Sunnah’s consensus on the matter.<sup>1</sup>

## Ibrāhīm al-Abnāsī

أن الإرسال جائز خصوصا إرسال الصحابة عن بعضهم فإن الصحابة كلهم عدول

Irsāl is permissible, especially when a Ṣaḥābī does it from another Ṣaḥābī, as all of the Ṣaḥābah are ‘udūl (possess integrity).<sup>2</sup>

## Al-Imām Zayd al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī

لا شك أن الصحابة الذين ثبتت صحبتهم كلهم عدول

There is no doubt that the Ṣaḥābah whose companionship is established are ‘udūl (possess integrity).<sup>3</sup>

## Al-Sakhāwī (d. 902 AH)

باتفاق أهل السنة عدول كلهم مطلقا كبيرهم وصغيرهم لا بس الفتنة أم لا

By consensus of the Ahl al-Sunnah, all of them, young and old, whether they were involved in the civil strife or not, are all ‘udūl (possess integrity).<sup>4</sup>

## Ibn al-Mulaqqin

والجهالة بهم لا تضر لأنهم عدول

---

1 Al-Fihrī: *al-Sunan al-Abyan*, p. 131.

2 Ibrāhīm ibn Mūsā ibn Ayyūb al-Burhān al-Abnāsī: *Al-Shadhā al-Fayyāh*, 1/294.

3 Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Irāqī: *al-Taqyīd wa al-Īdāh*, p. 148.

4 Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī: *Fath al-Mughhith*, 3/108.

And not knowing who they are (i.e., in the isnād) does not harm because they are all ‘udūl (possess integrity).<sup>1</sup>

Finally, al-Imām Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, al-Zubaydī, and Raḍī al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī al-Ḥanafī state:

الصحابة كلهم عدول

All of the Ṣaḥābah are ‘udūl.<sup>2</sup>

This isn’t the opinion of the ḥadīth scholars alone; rather, it is (also) the belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah. The belief that all of the Ṣaḥābah have ‘adālah is mass transmitted. Accepting all of their narrations is a matter of creed; it is not restricted to the sciences of ḥadīth. Herewith are the statements of the scholars in this regard.

### Al-Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī (d. 324 AH)

وكل الصحابة أئمة مأمونون غير متهمين في الدين وقد أثنى الله ورسوله على جميعهم وتعبدنا بتوقيعهم وتعظيمهم وموالاتهم والتبري من كل من ينقص أحدا منهم رضي الله عنهم أجمعين

All of the Ṣaḥābah are trusted Imāms, unsuspected in their religion. Allah and His Messenger praised all of them and required us to venerate, respect, and show loyalty to them, and to reject anyone who disparages them (may Allah be pleased with all of them).<sup>3</sup>

### Al-Qāḍī Iyāḍ

قال أيوب السخيتاني من أحب أبا بكر فقد أقام الدين ومن أحب عمر فقد أوضح السبيل ومن أحب عثمان فقد استضاء بنور الله ومن أحب عليا فقد أخذ بالعروة الوثقى ومن أحسن الثناء على أصحاب محمد صلى

1 Sirāj al-Dīn Ibn al-Mulaqqin: *al-Muqni’ fi ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*, p. 138.

2 Abū ‘Amr Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ: *Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, p. 31; Muḥammad Murtaḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Zubaydī: *Bi Lughat al-Arīb fi Muṣṭalah Āthār al-Ḥabīb*, p. 192; Raḍī al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥalabī al-Ḥanafī: *Qafw al-Athar fi Ṣafwat ‘Ulūm al-Athar*, 2/192.

3 Al-Ash‘arī: *al-Ibānah fi Uṣūl al-Diyānah*, p. 251.

الله عليه وسلم فقد برئ من النفاق ومن انتقض أحدا منهم فهو مبتدع مخالف للسنة والسلف الصالح وأخاف ألا يصعد له عمل إلى السماء حتى يحبهم جميعا ويكون قلبه سليما

Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī stated, “Whoever loves Abū Bakr has upheld the religion. And whoever loves ‘Umar has made the path clear. And whoever loves ‘Uthmān has been illuminated by the *nūr* (light) of Allah. And whoever loves ‘Alī has taken the most reliable grip (*al-‘urwat al-wuthqā*). And whoever courteously praises the Companions of Muḥammad ﷺ, he is free from hypocrisy. And whoever attacks one from among them, then he is an innovator and has opposed the Sunnah and the pious predecessors. I fear that his (good) deeds will not ascend to the skies until he loves all of them and his heart is sound (towards them).”<sup>1</sup>

## Al-Imām al-Lālikāī

وترحم على جميع أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا نسب أحدا منهم لقوله عز وجل وَالَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَلِإِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًّا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّكَ رَءُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ

And we supplicate for Allah’s mercy to descend on the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ. We do not curse any one of them because of the statement of Allah, “And (there is a share for) those who came after them, saying, ‘Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts (any) resentment toward those who have believed. Our Lord, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.’”<sup>2</sup>

## Ibn Taymiyyah

أهل السنة متفقون على عدالة الصحابة

The Ahl al-Sunnah all agree on the ‘adālah of the Ṣaḥābah.<sup>3</sup>

1 Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyāq: *al-Shifā*, 2:43.

2 Hibat Allah ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Maṣūir al-Lālikāī Abū al-Qāsim: *I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah*, 1:181.

3 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā*, 35/54.

## Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī

اعلم أن الذي أجمع عليه أهل السنة والجماعة أنه يجب على كل أحد تركية جميع الصحابة بإثبات العدالة لهم والكف عن الطعن فيهم والثناء عليهم فقد أثنى الله سبحانه وتعالى عليهم في آيات من كتابه

Know that what the Ahl al-Sunnah agree upon is that it is compulsory for everyone to pronounce the integrity of all of the Ṣaḥābah, to desist from criticizing them, and to praise them, for Allah ﷻ praised them in (numerous) verses of His Book.<sup>1</sup>

## Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 505 AH)

واعتماد أهل السنة تركية جميع الصحابة والثناء عليهم

The belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah is to pronounce the integrity of all the Ṣaḥābah and praise them.<sup>2</sup>

## Al-Imām al-Ṭaḥāwī

Explaining in general terms without excluding any one of the Ṣaḥābah, Imām al-Ṭaḥāwī states:

ونحب أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا نفرط في حب أحد منهم ولا نتبرأ من أحد منهم ونبغض من يبغضهم ويغير الخير يذكرهم ولا نذكرهم إلا بخير وحبهم دين وإيمان وإحسان وبغضهم كفر ونفاق وطغيان

And we love the Companions of the Messenger ﷺ. We do not go to excess in loving any one of them, nor do we repudiate any one of them. We abhor anyone who harbours hatred or speaks ill about them. We only speak about them as befits their status. Their love is (part of) religion, faith, and goodness (*iḥsān*). And hating them is disbelief, hypocrisy, and tyranny.<sup>3</sup>

1 Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī: *al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah*, 2/603.

2 Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī: *Iḥyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn*, 1:115.

3 Al-Imām al-Ṭaḥāwī: *al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah*, p. 57.

## Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597 AH)

In explaining Allah’s words:

يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا

*Seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval.*

Ibn al-Jawzī stated the following:

يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَهُوَ الْجَنَّةُ وَرِضْوَانًا وَهُوَ رِضَى اللَّهِ عَنْهُمْ وَهَذَا الْوَصْفُ لِجَمِيعِ الصَّحَابَةِ عِنْدَ الْجَمْهُورِ

They seek bounty—which is Jannah—from Allah and (His) approval—which is Allah being pleased with them. This characteristic applies, according to the majority (of scholars), to all of the Ṣaḥābah.<sup>1</sup>

This is in general. Whoever pursues the statements of the Imāms of the Sunnah on this subject will find much good.<sup>2</sup> I mentioned this introduction so that we recognize the mistake of those who were influenced by the statements of the Imāmiyyah in their criticism of the Prophet’s ﷺ Companions. You will see such a person speaking about a Ṣaḥābī who committed a mistake. In doing so, he attempts to make the definition of ‘adālah inapplicable to him! And he does not pay attention to the statements of the Imāms of ḥadīth criticism in this field. The reader that has been influenced by the statements of the Imāmiyyah and has attempted to conform with them in applying the conditions of ‘adālah on the Ṣaḥābah will come to know that the Imāmiyyah who disparage the Ṣaḥābah on the pretext that sins have occurred among them, or because of them making takfīr, they themselves do not adhere to what they are trying to impose on the

---

1 Ibn al-Jawzī: *Zād al-Masīr*, 7/446.

2 In his book, *A’lām al-Ajyāl bi’tiqād ‘Adālat Aṣḥāb al-Nabī al-Akhyār*, Ibrāhīm Sa’īdāy collected many statements related to establishing the ‘adālah of the Ṣaḥābah according to the Ahl al-Sunnah. Most of these statements are different to what I have cited here. See p. 25 of his book; he collected twenty-three statements of Islamic scholars on the ‘adālah of the Ṣaḥābah.

Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah. In fact, they mention the mistakes of one among them and intend thereby all of the Ṣaḥābah, especially the seniors among them, the early ones—except those excluded by them.

Whoever is influenced by what the Imāmiyyah claim to be fairness in regards to the Ṣaḥābah, he will be confused if he is obligated to apply the words of the Imāmiyyah related to 'adālah on the senior Ṣaḥābah such as Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Ā'ishah, and others رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. His words will come back contradictory and he will attempt to differentiate between the senior Ṣaḥābah and others without any form of rational and logical evidence.

For this reason, adhering to the approach of the Imāms by saying that all of the Ṣaḥābah, without exception, possess 'adālah, and accepting their narrations is the right and correct opinion. This belief does not, by any stretch of the imagination, imply that anyone of the Companions is infallible. Ibn Taymiyyah states:

وسائر أهل السنة والجماعة وأئمة الدين لا يعتقدون عصمة أحد من الصحابة ولا القرابة ولا السابقين ولا غيرهم بل يجوز عندهم وقوع الذنوب منهم والله تعالى يغفر لهم بالتوبة ويرفع بها درجاتهم ويغفر لهم بحسنات ماحية أو بغير ذلك من الأسباب

All of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah and the Imāms of the religion do not believe in the infallibility of any of the Ṣaḥābah, nor the family, nor the predecessors, nor anyone else. Rather, according to them, it is permitted for such people to commit sins. And Allah can forgive them through repentance and raise them by virtue of it. And He can forgive them through good deeds erasing (bad deeds), or for other reasons.<sup>1</sup>

And he stated:

نحن لسنا ندعى لواحد من هؤلاء العصمة من كل ذنب بل ندعى أنهم من أولياء الله المتقين وحزبه المفليحين وعباده الصالحين وأنهم من سادات أهل الجنة ونقول إن الذنوب جائزة على من هو أفضل منهم من الصديقين ومن هو أكبر من الصديقين ولكن الذنوب يرفع عقابها بالتوبة والاستغفار والحسنات

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū' al-Fatāwā*, 35/69.

المأخية والمصائب المكفرة وغير ذلك وهؤلاء لهم من التوبة والاستغفار والحسنات ما ليس لمن هو دونهم وابتلوا بمصائب يكفر الله بها خطاياهم لم يبتل بها من دونهم فلهم من السعي المشكور والعمل المبرور ما ليس لمن بعدهم وهم بمغفرة الذنوب أحق من غيرهم ممن بعدهم

We do not claim infallibility from every sin for any one of these people; rather, we claim that they are the pious friends of Allah, His successful party, His righteous servants, and that they are the leaders of the people of Jannah. And we say that (committing) sins are permitted for those greater than them from the *Ṣiddīqīn* (Truthful ones) and those greater than them. However, the punishment for them is lifted through repentance, seeking Allah's forgiveness, and good deeds that erase bad deeds, and expiating misfortunes, and through other such means. These people have of repentance, seeking forgiveness, and good deeds what others below them do not have. They are afflicted with calamities in such a manner where others beneath them are not afflicted in the same manner. Through these calamities Allah atones for their sins. They enjoy an appreciated and acceptable effort which others after them do not. They are more deserving of having their sins forgiven than those after them.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, it is necessary that all of the *Ṣaḥābah's* virtue and rank be known. Based on what the approach of the *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah* is, the class of the *Ṣaḥābah* is judged as possessing integrity and virtue. In fact, this is based on the approach of the *Imāms* of Islam. As such, those who criticize any of them are far from the truth.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, 4/336.

2 Past and present, the scholars of Islam have written a number of works in defence of the *Ṣaḥābah* and in explaining their virtues. There are many such works and cannot be enumerated. I will point out what I have come across: *ʿAqīdat Ahl al-Sunnah fī al-Ṣaḥābah wa Ahl al-Bayt* of ʿAlā Bakr; *Ṣabb al-ʿAdhāb ʿalā man Sabb al-Aṣḥāb* of Maḥmūd Shukrī al-Alūsī; *al-Ṣaḥīḥ al-Musnad min Faḍāʾil al-Ṣaḥābah* of Muṣṭafā al-ʿAdawī; *al-Risālah al-Wāzīʿah li al-Muʿtadīn ʿan Sabb Ṣaḥābat Sayyid al-Mursalīn* of al-Imām Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamzah al-Ḥusaynī; *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Mawāqif al-Aṣḥāb* of Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Ghursī; *Bal Ḍalalta* of Khālīd al-ʿAsqalānī; *al-Intiṣār li al-Ṣaḥb wa al-Āl min Iftirāʾāt al-Ḍāll* and *Maḥḍ al-Iṣābah fī Taḥrīr ʿAqīdat Ahl al-Sunnah wa Mukhālīfihim fī al-Ṣaḥābah* of Dr. Ibrāhīm ibn ʿAmir al-Raḥīlī; *Abū Hurayrah wa Aqlām al-Ḥāqīdīn* of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Zarī; *al-Burhān fī Tabrīʾat Abī Hurayrah min al-Buhtān* of ʿAbd Allāh al-Nāṣir; *continued..*

## 4.2 The position of the Imāmiyyah regarding the Ṣaḥābah

The Imāmiyyah enjoined the theory of “*naṣṣ* (textual evidence) on the Khilāfah of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.” In other words, they state that he was appointed as the Khalīfah after the Prophet ﷺ—without intermission—through direct textual evidence from the Qur’ān and the Sunnah. They made this theory the greatest pillar for themselves, as al-Kulaynī (d. 329 AH) narrated:

عن أبي جعفر محمد الباقر قال بني الإسلام على خمس على الصلاة والزكاة والصوم والحج والولاية ولم يناد بشيء كما نودي بالولاية وروى كذلك عن جعفر الصادق قال أثنائي الإسلام ثلاثة الصلاة والزكاة والولاية لا تصح واحدة منهن إلا بصاحبيتها

On the authority of Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad al-Bāqir: “Islam was founded upon five: upon *ṣalāh* (prayer), *zakāh* (charity-tax), *ṣawm* (fasting), *ḥajj* (pilgrimage), and *wilāyah* (successorship). Nothing was proclaimed as *wilāyah* was.”

---

*continued from page 423*

Abū Hurayrah Ṣāḥib Rasūl Allah Dirāsah Ḥadīthiyyah Tārīkhiyyah Hādīfah of Dr. Ḥārith ibn Sulaymān; *I‘lām al-Ajyāl bi’tiqād ‘Adālat Aṣḥāb al-Nabī al-Akhyār* of Ibrāhīm Sa‘īdāy; *Ḥiqbah min al-Tārīkh* of ‘Uthmān al-Khamīs; *Irshād al-Ghabī ilā Madhhab al-Āl fī Ṣaḥb al-Nabī* of al-Shawkānī; *al-Fawā‘id al-Badī‘ah fī Faḍā‘il al-Ṣaḥābah* wa *Dhamm al-Shī‘ah* of Aḥmad Farīd; *Mawsū‘at al-Difā‘ ‘an Aṣḥāb Rasūl Allah (Mawqif al-Shī‘ah al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah min al-Ṣaḥābah)* of Dr. ‘Abd al-Qādir ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Aṭā Sūfi; *Minḥāj al-Sunnah* of Ibn Taymiyyah; *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāsim* of Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālikī; *al-Inṣāf fīmā fī Tārīkh al-‘Aṣr al-Rāshidī min al-Khilāf* of Dr. Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Khalīfah; *Shahādāt Khumaynī fī Aṣḥāb Rasūl Allah* of Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Shaqrah; *Abū Bakrah min Fuḍalā‘ al-Ṣaḥābah* of Nāẓim al-Misbālī; *Min Aqwāl al-Munṣifī fī Mu‘āwiyah* and *al-Intiṣār li al-Ṣaḥābat al-Akhyār fī Radd Abāṭil Ḥasan al-Mālikī* of ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-‘Abbād; *Radd Muftarayāt al-Shī‘ah al-Imāmiyyah ‘alā al-Khulafā‘ al-Rāshidīn al-Thalāthah* of ‘Abd Allāh al-‘Alī; *al-Thanā‘ al-Mutabādal bayn al-Āl wa al-Aṣḥāb* of Marzaz al-Buḥūth fī Mabarrat al-Āl wa al-Aṣḥāb; *Ruḥamā Baynahum* and *Ṣuḥbat Rasūl Allah* of al-Ṣāliḥ al-Darwaysh; *Barā‘at al-Ṣaḥābah min al-Nifāq* of Mundhir Sa‘d; *al-Ḥisām al-Maslūl ‘alā Muntaqidi Aṣḥāb al-Rasūl* of Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Ḥadramī (famously known as Baḥraq). Undoubtedly, I left out a lot of what has been written on this subject. This is what I came across from what Muslim scholars have written in the past and present in defense of the noble Companions ﷺ—specifically the works that confirm the correlation between the ‘adālah of the Ṣaḥābah and the belief of Muslims, and not simply issues related to terminology.



Similarly, he narrated on the authority of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq who said: “The founding structures of Islam are three: ṣalāh, zakāh, and wilāyah. One of them is not valid except with its two counterparts.”<sup>1</sup>

In fact, they made the doctrine of Imāmah higher than the rank of Prophethood and that no prophet reaches the rank of Imāmah—which is greater than Prophethood—except after having gone through tests. Makārim al-Shīrāzī states:

إن منزلة الإمامة الممنوحة لإبراهيم عليه السلام بعد كل هذه الاختبارات تفوق منزلة النبوة والرسالة

The rank of Imāmah granted to Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was after these tests. This rank surpasses the rank of Nubuwwah and Risālah.

And he stated:

الإمامة آخر مراحل مسيرة إبراهيم التكاملية بما تقدم في بيان حقيقة الإمامة يتضح أنه من الممكن أن تكون لشخص منزلة النبوة وتبليغ الرسالة بينما لا تكون له منزلة الإمامة وهذه المنزلة تحتاج إلى مؤهلات كثيرة في جميع المجالات وهي المنزلة التي نالها إبراهيم (عليه السلام) بعد كل هذه الامتحانات والمواقف العظيمة وكانت آخر مرحلة من مراحل مسيرته التكاملية

Imāmah is the last stage of Ibrāhīm's path of completion because of what was already mentioned in explaining the reality of Imāmah. Clearly, it is possible for an individual to reach the rank of Nubuwwah and Risālah, while not enjoying the rank of Imāmah. This rank requires many qualifications in all fields. It is a rank that Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام reached after all of these tests and great positions he took. Imāmah was the last station from the stations of his journey to completion.<sup>2</sup>

The sentiments of al-Shīrāzī did not come out of a vacuum. This thought is narrated in *al-Kāfi* with a long narration that is centered on explaining the

---

1 Both narrations have been narrated by al-Kulaynī in *al-Kāfi*, 2/18, *Kitāb al-Īmān wa al-Kufr*, *Bāb Da'ā'im al-Islām*, ḥadīth no. 1 and 4. There are many similar narrations in the chapter.

2 Nāṣir Makārim al-Shīrāzī: *al-Amthal fī Tafṣīr Kitāb Allah al-Munazzal*, 1/368-371.

importance of the station of Imāmah, and that had it not been for Imāmah, the peoples' religion would not be complete. In describing this narration, al-Khūṭī states:

رواية مبسوطه شريفة فيها بيان مقام الإمام عليه السلام وأن منزلة الإمامة منزلة الأنبياء وأنها خلافة الله  
وخلافة الرسول صلى الله عليه وآله

A simple praiseworthy narration. In it is an explanation of the Imām's ﷺ rank, and that the station of Imāmah is a station of the prophets, and that it is the Khilāfah of Allah and the Khilāfah of the Messenger ﷺ.<sup>1</sup>

The Imāmiyyah's statements explaining this thought and arguing in favour of it have been massively transmitted by them. Therefore, whoever opposes the Imāmiyyah on the issue of Imāmah is at odds with the basis of the religion and the most important of its foundations. It is for this reason they judged as apostates all of those who opposed them regarding Imāmah; according to them, such people are contravening the religion's very foundation. The first example of removing the legal right to appoint an Imām given by the Imāmiyyah is the noble and truthful Ṣaḥābah. Their belief is that the Ṣaḥābah usurped the position of 'Alī رضي الله عنه, a position that was originally appointed by Allah.

Based on this, the Imāmiyyah regard the Ṣaḥābah as the vilest of creation and the first to introduce deviation in the religion. When we know this, it is possible for us to understand the position of the Imāmiyyah regarding the Ṣaḥābah in terms of narration. They would consider them the first to conceal the aḥādīth of the Prophet ﷺ which state the appointment of 'Alī رضي الله عنه! Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456 AH) transmits for us the following statement of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam:

كيف يحسن الظن بالصحابه أن لا يكتنوا النص على علي وهم قد اقتتلوا وقتل بعضهم بعضاً؟

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 11/39, no. 6578. The narration is narrated in *al-Kāfi*, 1/199, *Kitāb al-Hujjah*, *Bāb Nādir fī Faḍl al-Imām wa Ṣifātihi*, ḥadīth no. 1.

How can there be a good opinion of the Ṣaḥābah (and say) that they did not conceal the text (stating the appointment) of ‘Alī when they fought and killed one another?<sup>1</sup>

The position of the Imāmiyyah on the Ṣaḥābah will become clear through the following (sections).

#### 4.2.1 The opinion of the Imāmiyyah on the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah

The Imāmiyyah judged the Ṣaḥābah to be apostates because of their opposing the belief of Imāmah, as they claim. They based the Ṣaḥābah’s apostasy on their alleged concealing the mass transmitted texts (i.e., regarding the appointment of ‘Alī as successor). Al-Māzandarānī (d. 1081 AH) states:

والنصوص في خلافته بلغت حد التواتر معنى وقد سمعها السابقون منهم مشافهة ولم ينص أحد من الأنبياء على وصيه مثل ما نص به نبينا (صلى الله عليه وآله) أو عن بصيرة في الدين فدل على أنهم ارتدوا عن الدين بعد إسلامهم

---

1 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Faṣl fī al-Mīlāl*, 4/83. Al-Imām al-Dhahabī states, “Thus, Allah kept the Rāfiḍah away. How misguided they are, and how strong their inner desires are! How can they acknowledge the virtue of one of them and disregard the rights of the nine and slander them by claiming they concealed the textual evidence of ‘Alī being the Khalīfah. By Allah, nothing like that happened. And (they claimed) that they turned the matter away from him, according to their claim, and opposed their Prophet. And that they hastened to pledge allegiance to a man from Banū Taym who (merely) is a business man and earns. Not out of a desire for his wealth and reverence for his family and men. Woe unto you! Would a person with a little bit of intelligence do this? If this was permissible for one, it would not be permissible for a group. If its occurrence was permitted for a group, it would be impossible to occur when the condition is like this where there are thousands of leading Muhājirīn, Anṣār, cavaliers of the Ummah, and champions of Islam. However, there is no trick to recovering from, it is a chronic disease. And guidance is light that Allah places in the heart of whom He wants. Thus, there is no power save Allah.” (*Sīyar A’lām al-Nubalā’*, 1/140). Ibn Taymiyyah states, “The original belief of the Rāfiḍah is that the Prophet ﷺ explicitly stated ‘Alī’s appointment as a deputy, and that he is an infallible Imām. And that whoever opposed him, disbelieved. And that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār concealed the textual evidence (i.e., stating his Khilāfah), disbelieved in the infallible Imām, and followed their desires. They (also) changed the religion and altered the Sharī’ah. They oppressed and transgressed. In fact, they disbelieved save a small group, around ten or more. Then they say that Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and their likes remained hypocrites. Some of them say that they initially believed, then disbelieved.” (*Majmū’ al-Fatāwā*, 3/356).

The texts regarding his Khilāfah have reached the level of mass transmission in meaning. The predecessors from them heard of it verbally. None of the Prophets stated his successor as our Prophet ﷺ stated it, or so deliberately in the religion. This shows that they apostatized from the religion after their Islam.<sup>1</sup>

In *al-Kāfi*, al-Kulaynī (d. 329 AH) stated:

عن حمران بن أعين قال قلت لأبي جعفر (عليه السلام) جعلت فداك ما أفلنا لو اجتمعنا على شاة ما أفينناها؟ فقال ألا أحدثك بأعجب من ذلك المهاجرون والأنصار ذهبوا إلا - وأشار بيده - ثلاثة

On the authority of Ḥumrān ibn A‘yan who said, “I said to Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام, ‘May I be sacrificed for your sake. How few are we? If we gathered on a sheep, we would not be able to eat all of it.’

He said, ‘Shall I not inform you of something stranger than that? The Muhājirīn and the Anṣār all left except—and he indicated with his hand—three.’<sup>2</sup>

By virtue of another narration in *al-Kāfi*, the names of these three are documented along with the inclusion of a few other Companions:

عن أبي جعفر (عليه السلام) قال كان الناس أهل ردة بعد النبي (صلى الله عليه وآله) إلا ثلاثة فقلت ومن الثلاثة فقال المقداد بن الأسود وأبو ذر الغفاري وسلمان الفارسي رحمة الله وبركاته عليهم ثم عرف أناس بعد يسير

On the authority of Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام who said: “After the Prophet ﷺ, the people became apostates save three.”

I said, “Who are the three?”

1 Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Māzandarānī: *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, 5/221.

2 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfi*, 2/244, *Kitāb al-Kufr wa al-Īmān, Bāb Qillat ‘Adad al-Mu’minīn*, ḥadīth no. 6.

He said, “Al-Miqdād ibn al-Aswad, Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, and Salmān al-Fārisī, may the Mercy of Allah and His blessings be upon them. Then, after some time, the people came to know (i.e., that ‘Alī was more rightful to the position of amīr than others).”

In explaining who remained and did not apostatize, al-Māzandarānī stated:

المقداد بن الأسود وأبو ذر الغفاري وسلمان الفارسي كما مر ولا حاجة إلى استثناء أهل البيت كما زعم لأن هلاك الناس بهم وبترك محبتهم فهم غير داخلين في المواضع ولا إلى استثناء من رجع عن الباطل ثانياً لأن المقصود إثبات الهلاك في الجملة وغير الثلاثة ارتدوا بعده وإن رجع قليل منهم فتاب

Al-Miqdād ibn al-Aswad, Abu Dharr al-Ghifārī, and Salmān al-Fārisī, as mentioned. There is no need to exclude the Ahl al-Bayt, as it is claimed, because the peoples’ ruin was on account of them and abandoning their love (i.e., having love for them). As such, they do not apply in the situations. There is also no need to exclude those who retracted from their false belief. The point (here) is to prove that everyone was ruined save these there; they all apostatized after him, even though some of them retracted and repented.<sup>1</sup>

Even those whose Islam remained intact—as evidenced—were not saved from people having doubts about their religion. Al-Kashshī narrated that Abū Ja‘far stated:

ارتد الناس إلا ثلاثة نفر سلمان وأبو ذر والمقداد قال قلت فعمار قال قد كان حاص حبيصة ثم رجع ثم قال إن أردت الذي لم يشك ولم يدخله شيء فالمقداد فأما سلمان فإنه عرض في قلبه عارض أن عند أمير المؤمنين (عليه السلام) اسم الله الأعظم لو تكلم به لأخذتهم الأرض وهو هكذا فليب ووجئت عنقه حتى تركت كالسلعة فمر به أمير المؤمنين (عليه السلام) فقال له يا أبا عبد الله هذا من ذلك بايع فبايع وأما أبو ذر فأمره أمير المؤمنين (عليه السلام) بالسكوت ولم يكن يأخذه في الله لومة لائم فأبى إلا أن يتكلم فمر به عثمان فأمر به ثم أناب الناس بعد وكان أول من أناب أبو ساسان الأنصاري وأبو عمرة وشيبة وكانوا سبعة فلم يكن يعرف حق أمير المؤمنين (عليه السلام) إلا هؤلاء السبعة

1 Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Māzandarānī: *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, 12/348.

“The people apostatized except for three: Salmān, Abū Dharr, and al-Miqdād.”

I said, “And ‘Ammār?”

He said, “He doubted and then returned.”

Then he said, “If you are referring to the person who never doubted nor did any doubt enter him, then it is al-Miqdād. As for Salmān, he thought that Amīr al-Mu‘minīn had knowledge of *al-Isim al-A‘zam* (Allah’s Great Name). He was thinking that had Amīr al-Mu‘minīn simply mentioned it, the earth would swallow them (i.e., those pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr instead of ‘Alī عليه السلام). His clothes were tied around his neck (to be dragged) and he was struck such that it left a mark on him. Amīr al-Mu‘minīn passed by him and said, ‘O, Abū ‘Abd Allāh. This is for that (i.e., this is punishment for the negative thought you had). Pledge allegiance to him (i.e., to Abū Bakr).’ And so, he pledged allegiance. As for Abū Dharr, Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ordered him to remain silent. In matters of Allah’s religion, he did not fear the blame of the blamers. And so, he refused (i.e., the order) and intended on speaking. ‘Uthmān passed by him and ordered to be done to him whatever he ordered. Thereafter, people began turning to the truth. The first of those who began turning to the truth was Abū Sāsān al-Anṣārī, Abū ‘Amrah, and Shatīrah. They were seven. Only these seven knew the right of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn عليه السلام.<sup>1</sup>”

Even those who were judged to be Muslim, they too were not free from people doubting their belief. This is why I say that the default position of the Ṣaḥābah after the death of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, according to the Imāmiyyah, is apostasy from the religion. The Imāmī scholar, ‘Alī al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdi emphasizes this saying:

مقتضى الأخبار الكثيرة الناطقة بارتداد ما عدا الثلاثة أو الأربعة بعد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم (صلى الله عليه وآله) هو كون الأصل في كل صحابي بقي بعد النبي (صلى الله عليه وآله) ولم يستشهد في زمانه

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Ṭūsī)*, 11/24.

صلى الله عليه وآله هو الارتداد لتقديم غير المنصوص عليه بالولاية على المنصوص عليه أو الفسق بالتقصير في حقه فلا يمكن توثيق غير من استثنى إلا بدليل شرعي

What is necessarily understood from the many reports that speak about the apostasy of everyone save three or four after the Prophet ﷺ is that the default state of every Ṣaḥābī that remained alive after the Prophet ﷺ and was not martyred in his time is apostasy. The reason for this is because of giving preference to others who were not appointed by textual evidence for the position of successorship over someone who was appointed by virtue of textual evidence. Or, because of being sinful for neglecting his right. Therefore, it is not possible to make tawthīq of those who were not excluded except with legal evidence.<sup>1</sup>

I am amazed at the statement of al-Māmaqānī which emphasizes the fact that the default position regarding the Ṣaḥābah is apostasy, even though it cannot be proven in the case for an actual Ṣaḥābī. He states:

لا يقال أن من شهد بيعة الرضوان كان عدلا فيلزم استصحاب العدالة فيه إلى أن يثبت فسقه وارتداده ومن شك في ارتداده وفسقه فالأصل فيه العدالة

It cannot be said that whoever witnessed the *Bay'at al-Riḍwān* (i.e. the Pledge at Ḥudaybiyyah) has integrity and, as such, this state of integrity is presumed to have continued with him until his transgression and apostasy is proven, and that whoever's apostasy and transgression is doubted, then the default is 'adālah.

Thereafter, al-Māmaqānī continues:

إن أخبارنا قد تواترت بأنه ارتد بعد النبي (ص) جميع الناس بنقض البيعة إلا ثلاثة أو أربعة أو خمسة فمن يثبت توبته بعد ذلك وقوله بخلافة علي بلا فصل عنده حسن الحال ومن شككنا في توبته فيصحه الارتداد العام إلى أن يثبت خلافه

Our reports are mass transmitted in that everyone after the Prophet ﷺ apostatized by breaking the allegiance except for three, or four, or five. Thus, whoever's repentance is established after that as well as his belief

1 'Alī al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt 'Ilm al-Rijāl* (Introduction), 1:67 (no. 6.)

in the Khilāfah of ‘Alī without any interruption, we regard him as having a good condition. And whoever we doubt regarding their repentance, then the general (state of) apostasy will remain with him until it is proven otherwise.<sup>1</sup>

‘Alī Khān al-Madanī (d. 1120 AH) states:

فمن علمنا عدالته وإيمانه وحفظه وصية رسول الله في أهل بيته وأنه مات على ذلك كسلمان وأبي ذر  
وعمار واليناه وتقربنا إلى الله تعالى بحبه ومن علمنا أنه انقلب على عقبه وأظهر العداوة لأهل البيت ع  
عادبناه لله تعالى وتبرأنا إلى الله منه ونسكت عن المجهولة حاله

Thus, if we know about his ‘adālah, his faith, and the fact that he protected the waṣīyyah (bequest) of the Messenger of Allah regarding the family of his house, and he died on that (belief), such as Salmān, Abū Dharr, and ‘Ammār, then we sympathize with him and we gain closeness to Allah through loving him.<sup>2</sup> And he who we know that turned his back and expressed hatred toward the Ahl al-Bayt, we show enmity towards him for the sake of Allah, absolve ourselves from him to Allah, and remain silent about his condition being unknown.<sup>3</sup>

What kind of excessiveness is this! The ruling on the entire generation is that they left the religion, or that they are all transgressors—despite the fact that the occurrence of their transgression is in opposition to the apparent meanings of the narrations that speak about apostasy and leaving the religion. And that this ruling will remain until each one of them can prove they are innocent from it? Al-Māmaqānī, al-Shāharūdī, and Khān forgot about all of the sacrifices the Ṣaḥābī made throughout his Islam. Based on this, if the Ṣaḥābī was on the front line in all of Islam’s wars, was among the first forerunners, witnessed Bay‘at al-Riḍwān, made Ḥajj and ‘Umrah, travelled, spoke, and prayed with the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and witnessed all of this, his default position (despite all of this) is apostasy after the death of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, even though in reality, his apostasy has not actually been proven?! This is because al-Māmaqānī, al-Shāharūdī, and the other

---

1 ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/216.

2 How few of them there are!

3 ‘Alī Khān al-Madanī: *al-Darajāt al-Rafī‘ah fī Ṭabaqāt al-Shī‘ah*, p. 11.



Imāmī scholars were not sure of the veracity of his faith! To such an extent that they did not even presume his default state of īmān—which was established with certainty! Rather, they preferred doubt over certainty. We seek refuge with Allah from such grave errors.

People of the Ahl al-Sunnah: Do we not then have a similar right to say that the default of all Imāmī narrators after the death of al-Imām Ja‘far al-Šādiq is also apostasy since the view of their majority is that the Imām after Ja‘far is his son, ‘Abd Allāh al-Aḫṭaḥ, who died a short while after his father? This illustrates to the Imāmiyyah the falsity of their belief in the Imāmah of ‘Abd Allāh to the Imāmah of Mūsā ibn Ja‘far. We also say that it is necessary for every narrator to have textual evidence proving his repentance and returning back to the truth because we do not know whether he apostatized or not. And whoever’s repentance we doubt, then the presumption of general apostasy will remain with him until proven otherwise!

These are the words of al-Shāharūdī and al-Māmaqānī. We have the right to apply them to every difference of opinion there is between the Imāmiyyah at the death of every Imām. Stranger than this is the fact that many of their scholars accept the narrations of the non-Imāmī Shī‘ah, despite their apostasy due to not following the Imām of their time and period. And due to the inexistence of any textual evidence on the ‘adālah of any particular one of them. They do not apply the same standards to those who enjoyed the companionship of the Prophet ﷺ!

In explaining the different sects affiliated to Islam, Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā‘irī (d. 1112 AH), a student of al-Majlisī states:

الإمامية قالوا بالنص الجلي على إمامة علي وكفروا الصحابة ووقعوا فيهم وساقوا الإمامة إلى جعفر الصادق عليه السلام وبعده إلى أولاده المعصومين عليهم السلام ومؤلف هذا الكتاب من هذه الفرقة وهي الناجية إن شاء الله

The Imāmiyyah believe in the Imāmah of ‘Alī through explicit text. They make takfīr of the Ṣaḥābah and slander them. They carry Imāmah to Ja‘far

al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام and then his infallible children عليهم السلام after him. The author of this book is from this sect—the successful (sect), Allah willing.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, al-Jazā'irī explains to people what his sect is, the one that he boasts about. And he names them “the successful.” The sect to promote the ruling of apostasy on the Companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم! I do not know what type of success the person is speaking about after he ruled that the Companions, the best of creation, as disbelievers!

In *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*, it comes that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه said:

إن الناس كلهم ارتدوا بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله غير أربعة إن الناس صاروا بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله بمنزلة هارون ومن تبعه ومنزلة العجل ومن تبعه فعلي في شبه هارون وعتيق في شبه العجل وعمر في شبه السامري

Everyone apostatized after the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم except four. After the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, the people became similar to the position of Hārūn and those who followed him and the position of the calf and those who followed him. Thus, ‘Alī resembled Hārūn, ‘Atīq<sup>2</sup> resembled the calf, and ‘Umar resembled al-Sāmīrī.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī: *al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, 2/244-245.

2 Like this, they give nicknames to the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. Accordingly, by ‘atīq here, Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq is meant. The Ṣaḥābah have other nicknames. In exposing some of the nicknames of Taqiyyah, al-Majlisī states, “On the authority of Abū Baṣīr who said: ‘He will be brought to Jahannam. It has seven doors. The first is for the tyrant. He is Zarīq. Its second door is for Ḥabtar. The third door is for the third. The fourth is for Mu‘āwiyah. The fifth door is for ‘Abd al-Malik. The sixth door is for ‘Askar ibn Hawsar. The seventh is for Abū Salāmah. They are the doors for anyone who follows them. (Al-Majlisī states:) The explanation: al-Zarīq is a metaphor for Abū Bakr since the Arabs would regard blue eyes as an evil portent. Al-Ḥabtar is ‘Umar. Al-Ḥabtar is a fox. Perhaps he was given this nickname because of his plotting and planning. In other narrations, it occurred in the opposite manner—and it is more evident (like this) since al-Ḥabtar as the first is more appropriate. It could be meant here as well. And the only reason why the second was preferred is because it is more wretched, harsh, and severe. ‘Askar ibn Hawsar is a metaphor for some of the khulafā’ of Banū Umayyah and Banū al-‘Abbās. Similarly, Abū Salāmah. It is not farfetched that Abū Salāmah is a metaphor for Abū Ja‘far al-Dawānīqī. It is possible that ‘Askar is a metaphor for ‘Ā’ishah and all the other people of Jamal since the name of ‘Ā’ishah’s camel was ‘Askar. It is narrated that he was a shayṭān.” (*al-Biḥār*, 8/301).

3 *Kitāb Sulaym Ibn Qays*, p. 162.

Even the Anṣār, those who helped the religion of Allah, were not free from being excommunicated. This is what al-Kulaynī (d. 329 AH) states:

عن عبد الرحيم القصير قال قلت لأبي جعفر (عليه السلام) إن الناس يفزعون إذا قلنا إن الناس ارتدوا فقال يا عبد الرحيم إن الناس عادوا بعد ما قبض رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وآله) أهل جاهلية إن الأنصار اعتزلت فلم تعتزل بخير جعلوا يباعدون سعدا وهم يرتجزون ارتجاز الجاهلية يا سعد أنت المرء وشعرك المرجل وفحللك المرجم

On the authority of ‘Abd al-Raḥīm al-Quṣayr who said:

I said to Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام, “The people are alarmed when we say that the people all apostatized.”

He said, “O, ‘Abd al-Raḥīm! All the people returned to Jāhiliyyah after the demise of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم. The Anṣār withdrew but they did not withdraw in goodness. They pledged their allegiance to Sa‘d, while singing the poetry of the period of Jāhiliyyah, ‘O Sa‘d! You are the man of our hopes, your mane is well-groomed and your steed runs hard.’”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Māmaqānī states:

وجود الفساق والمنافقين في الصحابة بل كثرتهم فيهم وعروض الفسق بل والارتداد لجمع منهم في حياته والآخريين بعد وفاته

The existence of transgressors and hypocrites among the Ṣaḥābah. In fact, there were many among them. There were displays of immorality from some of them. In fact, there was also apostasy by some of them in his life and others after his death.<sup>2</sup>

Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī (d. 1266 AH) states:

---

1 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfī*, 8/296.

2 ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/213, *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, no. 28.

أن عليا عليه السلام كان يجوز له قتل الجميع إلا خواص شيعته لأن الناس جميعا قد ارتدوا بعد النبي صلى الله عليه وآله يوم السقيفة إلا أربعة سلمان وأبا ذر والمقداد وعمار ثم رجع بعد ذلك أشخاص والباقيون استمروا على كفرهم حتى مضت مدة أبي بكر وعمر وعثمان فاستولى الكفر عليهم أجمع حتى آل الأمر إليه عليه السلام ولم يكن له طريق إلى إقامة الحق فيهم إلا بضرب بعضهم بعضا وأيهم قتل كان في محله إلا خواص الشيعة الذين لم يتمكن من إقامة الحق بهم خاصة والله العالم

It was permissible for ‘Alī عليه السلام to kill everyone except for the select among his group. This is because everybody apostatized after the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم on the Day of Saqīfah except for four: Salmān, Abū Dharr, al-Miqdād, and ‘Ammār. Thereafter, a few individuals returned back (i.e., to the truth) and the remaining continued in their disbelief until the time of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān passed. Disbelief completely apprehended them until eventually the matter came to him عليه السلام. He had no way of establishing the truth amongst them except by making them fight one another. Whoever was killed, he was (rightfully killed) in his place, except for select members of the Shī‘ah; those with whom he was unable to establish the truth with. And Allah is the Knowledgeable.<sup>1</sup>

With this, it becomes clear to us the reason why there are so few whom the designation of *ṣuḥbah*, or companionship is true for, according to the Imāmiyyah. This was because they were so scarce in relation to the entire group of *Ṣaḥābah*. Thus, when al-Ḥillī mentions a *Ṣaḥābī* from among those who lived after the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, we usually find him doing so with the clause that “he returned back to Amīr al-Mu’minīn.” In other words, he repented after his apostasy, or that “he has a narration proving his virtue.” This is a principle that al-Shāharawī mentioned. That is to say that the default position on the *Ṣaḥābah* is apostasy, or *fiṣq* (transgression) as long as there is no evidence that removes this description from off of them. This is considering the multitude of narrations which they report. In fact, it is considering the fact that this meaning is mass transmitted according to them.

There are many such examples of this.

---

1 Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Jawāhirī: *Jawāhir al-Kalām*, 21/347.

Under the biography of Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, al-Ḥillī states:

من السابقين الذين رجعوا إلى أمير المؤمنين

From the forerunners who returned to Amīr al-Muʿminīn.<sup>1</sup>

He placed him in the first section.<sup>2</sup>

He stated something similar under the biography of Burayd al-Aslamī<sup>3</sup>, Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Anṣārī<sup>4</sup>, Khuzaymah ibn Thābit<sup>5</sup>, Zayd ibn Arqam<sup>6</sup>, ʿAmr ibn al-Ḥamiq<sup>7</sup>, ʿImrān ibn al-Ḥusayn<sup>8</sup>, ʿUthmān ibn Ḥunayf<sup>9</sup>, ʿUbādat ibn al-Ṣāmit<sup>10</sup>, Adī ibn Ḥātim<sup>11</sup>, Qays ibn Saʿd ibn ʿUbādah<sup>12</sup>, and Abū al-Haytham ibn al-Tayyahān<sup>13</sup>. Al-Ḥillī mentioned all of these Ṣaḥābah and stated their returning back to the rank of ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. For this reason, he added them to the first section. Despite this, they also collected, at times, evidence proving their praise, or text stating that they did not continue in their apostasy, according to what the Imāmiyyah believe.

What emphasizes this is what al-Ḥillī mentioned under the biography of Usāmah ibn Zayd:

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 302, no. 1133.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 302, no. 1133.

3 Ibid., p. 82, no. 165. Perhaps what is intended here is Buraydah ibn al-Ḥuṣayb al-Aslamī, the great Ṣaḥābī.

4 Ibid., p. 93, no. 212.

5 Ibid., p.139, no. 380.

6 Ibid., p.148, no. 423.

7 Ibid., p. 213, no. 698.

8 Ibid., p. 218, no. 720.

9 Ibid., p. 220, no. 720.

10 Ibid., p. 224, no. 747.

11 Ibid., p.226, no. 754.

12 Ibid., p. 231, no. 784.

13 Ibid., p. 302, no. 1134.

قال الكشي روى أنه رجع ونهينا أن نقول إلا خيرا في طريقه ضعف ذكرناه في كتابنا الكبير والأولى عندي التوقف عن روايته

Al-Kashshī stated, “He narrated that he returned. We have been prohibited to say nothing but good.” In its chain is weakness. We have mentioned him in our book, *al-Kabīr*. According to me, it is better to suspend judgement on his narration.<sup>1</sup>

If we deconstruct the doing of al-Ḥillī, we will see him placing him in the first section. Despite this, as he stated above, because al-Kashshī’s narration has a weak isnād, it is not proven, according to al-Ḥillī, that he returned to Amīr al-Mu’minīn. Therefore, he suspended judgement on him and did not definitively state he is weak. However, on the whole, he is unsatisfactory in narration, even though he placed him in the first section.

Under the biography of Jundub ibn Junādah Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, al-Ḥillī states:

إنه لم يرتد

He did not apostatize.<sup>2</sup>

Under the biography of Ḥujr ibn ‘Adī, he stated:

من أصحاب أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام

From the companions of Amīr al-Mu’minīn عليه السلام.<sup>3</sup>

He stated something similar under the biography of Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Ibid., p. 76, no. 131. The origin of the narration is in *al-Kashshī*, p. 39 no. 81.

2 Ibid., p. 96, no. 215.

3 Ibid., p.129, no. 343.

4 Ibid., p. 131, no. 349.

Under the biography of Sahl ibn Ḥunayf, he states:

كَبَّرَ عَلَيْهِ أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ خَمْسًا وَعِشْرِينَ تَكْبِيرَةً فِي صَلَاتِهِ عَلَيْهِ

Amīr al-Mu'minīn made twenty-five takbīrs over him in his ṣalāh on him.<sup>1</sup>

And for reasons like these, al-Ḥillī placed these names in the first section. If we were to reflect over them, we would find them revolving around the relationship between 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and that Ṣaḥābī. Either because of companionship he enjoyed with him, or returning to the truth after apostasy, or other such similar reasons. However, when he came to the biography of al-'Abbās ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, he stated:

عم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله سيد من سادات أصحابه وهو من أصحاب علي أيضا

The uncle of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. A leader from the leaders of his companions. He was also from the companions of 'Alī.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭī responded saying:

لا إشكال في إسلام العباس فلا مانع من التسليم عليه كرامة لرسول الله (صلى الله عليه وآله) على أنه لم يثبت صدور هذه الزيارة من المعصومين (عليهم السلام) وملخص الكلام أن العباس لم يثبت له مدح ورواية الكافي الواردة في ذمه صحيحة السند ويكفي هذا منقصة له حيث لم يهتم بأمر علي بن أبي طالب (عليه السلام) ولا بأمر الصديقة الطاهرة في قضية فدك معشار ما اهتم به في أمر ميزابه

There is no issue regarding the Islam of al-'Abbās. As such, there is no impediment to saying salām over him [when visiting the greave of the Messenger صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ] out of honour for the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. However, it should be kept in mind that this is not proven from the Infallible Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام. In short, there is no praise established in favour of al-'Abbās. *Al-Kāfī's* narration in criticizing him has an authentic chain. This

1 Ibid., p. 185, no. 461

2 Ibid., p. 209, no. 676.

is sufficient to diminish his status since he did not care much for the affair of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. And neither the affair of al-Ṣiddiqah, the pure, [referring to Fātimah عليها السلام] on the issue of Fadak, even to a tenth of what he was concerned about his own gutter.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, al-Ḥillī relied on the fact that he was from the companions of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. However, al-Khūṭ was not satisfied with this. He regarded his lack of support for what happened to the Ahl al-Bayt, as al-Khūṭ claims—despite his Islam—as a criticism in his narrations. In fact, al-Khūṭ regarded this as sufficient for diminishing his status. However, it is safer to submit and remain silent out of honour the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم. It is for this reason that al-Māmaqānī states something similar to what al-Khūṭ stated about al-‘Abbās, the uncle of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم:

ألف عين لأجل عين تكرم ولو بالسكوت عنه

Because of one eye, a thousand eyes are honoured, even if it is by remaining silent.<sup>2</sup>

Under the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās, al-Ḥillī states:

كان محبا لعلي عليه السلام وتلميذه

He was a lover of ‘Alī عليه السلام and his student.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, al-Ḥillī does not accept from the Ṣaḥābah except when they return back to ‘Alī, or there is specific textual evidence in his praise, or they died before the death of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. This proves to us what al-Shāharūdī stated in that the default position on the Ṣaḥābah is apostasy, as has already been mentioned.

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 10/254, no. 6189.

2 ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/81.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 190, no. 586.



Al-Ḥillī did not mention many of the Ṣaḥābah, especially the seniors among them—all of them are seniors رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. In fact, he placed ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd in the second section because, as he claims, was confused.<sup>1</sup>

If someone were to say: What do the Imāmiyyah do regarding those whom they do not know their end result, did they apostatize or not?

The answer to this is clear from the statement of al-Māmaqānī. Under the biography of the great Ṣaḥābī, Ya‘lā ibn Murrah Wahb al-Thaqafī, he states:

شهد الحديبية وباع بيعة الرضوان وشهد خيبر والفتح و هو ازن و الطائف و روى رواية في فضل الحسين  
ولم أعرف عاقبة أمره

He witnessed al-Ḥudaybiyyah, pledged allegiance at Bay‘at al-Riḍwān, and witnessed Khaybar, al-Fatḥ, Hawāzin, and al-Ṭā‘if. He narrated a narration on the virtue of al-Ḥusayn. I do not know the end-result of his affair.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, after enlisting all of these sacrifices, efforts, and his narrating virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt, despite all of this, al-Māmaqānī did not know his end-result? Therefore, when he mentioned a summary of his opinion, he stated:

صحابي مجهول

Unknown Ṣaḥābī.

Al-Māmaqānī established a basis for his words saying:

من استشهد من الصحابة في إحدى غزوات النبي (ص) أو سراياه ولم يبق إلى زمان ارتداد من عدا الأربعة  
أو الثلاثة نبني على إيمانه وحسن حاله

Whoever of the Ṣaḥābah was martyred in one of the Prophet’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ battles or expeditions, and he did not remain until the time of apostasy—

1 Ibid., p. 369, no. 1455.

2 ‘Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 3/333.

save the four or three—we build on their īmān and uprightness of their condition.<sup>1</sup>

And like this, they emphasize the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah. As for the Imāmī narrator Ḥumrān ibn A‘yan, he never apostatized! Al-Ṭūsī narrates:

أن أبا جعفر قال لما ذكر حمران بن أعين لا يرتد والله أبدا ثم أطرق هنيئة ثم قال أجل لا يرتد والله أبدا

Verily Abū Ja‘far said, when he mentioned Ḥumrān ibn A‘yan, “He never apostatized, by Allah.”

Then he joyously bowed his head and said, “Yes. By Allah, he never apostatized.”<sup>2</sup>

The reason goes back to, as I mentioned, the belief in apostasy which took place after the death of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, as the Imāmiyyah claim. And which had a great affect on the acceptance or rejection of the Ṣaḥābah’s narrations.

#### 4.2.2 Companionship with the Prophet does not indicate to virtue, according to the Imāmiyyah

After the Imāmiyyah regarded apostasy as the default position on the Ṣaḥābah, they held the view that a man’s companionship with the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ does not indicate towards the virtue of a Ṣaḥābī. This is because companionship, or ṣuḥbah, did not protect them from apostasy. This opinion, in reality, stems from the view that most Ṣaḥābah apostatized.

Al-Māmaqānī states:

اتفق أصحابنا الإمامية على أن صحبة النبي (ص) بنفسها وبمجردها لا تستلزم عدالة المتصنف بها ولا حسن حاله وأن حال الصحابي حال من لم يدرك الصحبة في توقف قبول خبره على ثبوت عدالته أو وثاقته أو حسن حاله ومدحه المعتمد به مع إيمانه وخالفنا في ذلك جمهور العامة

---

1 Ibid., 1/215.

2 Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī: *Kitāb al-Ghaybah*, p. 346. no. 296.

Our Imāmī companions agree that the Prophet's ﷺ companionship itself and it alone neither necessitates integrity of the person described with it nor does it necessitate that he has an upright condition. The condition of a Ṣaḥābī is like the condition of a person who did not have companionship in that judgement is suspended on their narration (and is lifted) based on establishing his integrity, or reliability, or uprightness of his condition and acceptable praise of him with his īmān. The vast-majority of the 'Āmmah (Ahl al-Sunnah) disagree with us on this.<sup>1</sup>

Hishām Āl Qaṭīf states:

المصاحبة وحدها لا تدل على فضيلة و شرف يميز صاحبها ويقدمه على الآخرين

Companionship alone is not indicative of virtue and nobility such that it distinguishes such a person and gives him preference over others.<sup>2</sup>

In speaking about Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ja'far Murtaḍā al-Āmilī states:

أما جعله صاحباً للنبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم فهو أيضاً لا فضيلة فيه لأن الصحبة لا تدل على أكثر من المرافقة والاجتماع في مكان واحد... فالصحبة من حيث هي لا فضل فيها

As for him making him a companion to the Prophet ﷺ, this too, is not a virtue in his favour. This is because companionship does not prove anything more than association and coming together in one place ... Therefore, there is no virtue of companionship, as such.<sup>3</sup>

On the whole, this is the Imāmiyyah's position on the companionship of the Prophet's ﷺ Ṣaḥābah.

1 'Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/213, *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, no. 28.

2 Hishām Āl Qaṭīf: *Wa min al-Ḥiwār Iktashafat al-Ḥaqīqah*, p. 90.

3 Ja'far Murtaḍā: *al-Ṣaḥīḥ min Sīrat al-Nabī al-A'zam*, 4/25.

### 4.3. The position of the Imāmiyyah on the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah and the impact of that on their narrations

After the Imāmiyyah ruled all of the Ṣaḥābah to be apostates save a few, it is these few that became, in their view, the actual Ṣaḥābah. Whoever apostatized are not from the Ṣaḥābah, and they represented the vast majority of the Ummah [according to the Shī'ah] at that time. Consequently, they became two groups with no third. The first are the people of faith and goodness. They are the followers of 'Alī عليه السلام. The second are the people of disbelief, transgression, and sin. They are those who did not believe in the doctrine of Imāmah, opposed, fought, or, did not support 'Alī عليه السلام. As will be seen, this belief had a major impact on the acceptance or rejection of the Ṣaḥābah's narrations.

After this, many narrations or positions indicating the virtue of one or a group of the Ṣaḥābah challenged the position of the Imāmiyyah. On account of which such a Ṣaḥābī would be considered acceptable in narration. Consequently, they dealt with these narrations in such a manner whereby they would harmonize them with their beliefs, beliefs that preferred the view that the Ṣaḥābah possess no 'adālah and that their narrations are to be rejected.

Thus, their belief in the apostacy or transgression of the Ṣaḥābah became a means to judge these narrations. Either by nullifying and completely rejecting their authenticity, or, by interpreting them in such a manner whereby they contradict the actual intended meanings therefrom and also alter them into something contemptible. There are many such examples of this.

#### 4.3.1 Examples of the Imāmiyyah denying established virtues of the Ṣaḥābah

There are numerous aḥādīth on the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام. Some of them are ṣaḥīḥ and others not. However, the Imāmiyyah do not regard everything that has been narrated about their virtue as authentic.

Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd (d. 656 AH), the Mu‘tazilī Shī‘ī, explains to us the reality of what is, in their view, referred to as virtues of the Ṣaḥābah. He mentions—without an isnād, obviously—that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه:

كتب إلى عماله أن الحديث في عثمان قد كثر وفشا في كل مصر وفي كل وجه وناحية فإذا جاءكم كتابي هذا فادعوا الناس إلى الرواية في فضائل الصحابة والخلفاء الأولين ولا تتركوا خبرا يرويه أحد من المسلمين في أبي تراب إلا وتأتوني بمناقض له في الصحابة فان هذا أحب إلي وأقر لعيني وأدحض لحجة أبي تراب وشيعته وأشد عليهم من مناقب عثمان وفضله. فقرئت كتبه على الناس فرويت أخبار كثيرة في مناقب الصحابة مفتعلة لا حقيقة لها وجد الناس في رواية ما يجرى هذا المجرى حتى أشادوا بذكر ذلك على المنابر وألقي إلى معلمي الكتاتيب فعلموا صبيانهم وغلما نهم من ذلك الكثير الواسع حتى رووه وتعلموه كما يتعلمون القرآن وحتى علموه بناتهم ونساءهم وخدمهم وحشمهم فلبثوا بذلك ما شاء الله

Wrote to his governors that the ḥadīth regarding ‘Uthmān have increased and spread in every city, direction, and region. Therefore, when this letter of mine reaches you, call the people to the narrations on the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah and the first Khulafā’. And do not leave a report transmitted by any of the Muslims regarding Abū Turāb except that you bring me something regarding the Ṣaḥābah that contradicts it. This is more beloved to me, more pleasing to my eye, it invalidates even more the evidence of Abū Turāb and his group, and it is severer on them than merely the virtues and merits of ‘Uthmān. Thus, his letters were read to the people and countless reports were transmitted regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah. Reports that were forged, not actual ones. People found these types of narrations to such an extent that they celebrated their mention on the mimbars, and it was given to the teachers of the schools. Then, they taught their children and young ones much of that to such an extent that they narrated and learnt it just as they learnt the Qur’ān. And to such an extent that they taught it to their daughters and women, their servants and slaves. They remained like this as Allah willed.<sup>1</sup>

The Imāmiyyah are of the view that Anas and Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنهما were among those who were exploited by the hypocrites and the accursed to invent aḥādīth. Muḥammad Ṣādiq states:

1 Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd: *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*, 11/45. ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī transmitted this in his work, *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 137.

حاولوا بواسطة أناس مثل أبي هريرة وغيره أو عزوا إليهم أن يختلقوا أحاديثنا مثل هذا الحديث لكي يمحوا ذلك العار عن جباههم وبعد أن أدى أبو هريرة وظيفته قام أتباع أولئك الملعونين بنشر تلك الأحاديث و ضبطها والاستفادة منها لخدمة عقيدتهم وقادتهم

They attempted to, via people such as Abū Hurayrah and others, to instruct them to fabricate aḥādīth like this ḥadīth in order to wipe the shame off their foreheads. After Abū Hurayrah completed his task, the followers of those accursed began disseminating those aḥādīth, recording them, and benefitting from them in order to serve their belief and leaders.<sup>1</sup>

After mentioning a number of virtues of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq—both authentic and otherwise—Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Qummī al-Shīrāzī states:

أن هذه أخبار آحاد تفرد المخالف بنقلها وقد بينا في الفاتحة ضعف روايتهم وأن هذه الأحاديث وضعوها في زمن بني أمية والناس كانوا يتقربون إلى ملوكهم بوضع أمثال هذه الأحاديث وكانوا يتتبعون مناقب أهل البيت ويضعون للخلفاء الثلاثة ومعاوية بإزائها

These reports are *āḥād* (singular). The opposition transmitted them. We have explained in the beginning the weakness of their narrators and the fact that these aḥādīth were fabricated in the time of Banū Umayyah. The people used to gain closeness to their kings by fabricating the likes of these aḥādīth. They would pursue the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt and fabricate in its opposition aḥādīth of the three Khulafā' and Mu'āwiyah.<sup>2</sup>

Speaking about the 'adālah of the Ṣaḥābah, 'Abd al-Mun'im Ḥasan states:

هؤلاء الصحابة بأنفسهم يهدمون هذه النظرية من أساسها بأقوالهم و أفعالهم أما ما وضع من فضائل مكذوبة لهم فلا يحتاج أمرها إلى ذكاء خارق لمعرفة ضعفها ووهنها سندا ومتنا

These Ṣaḥābah themselves razed this theory from its very foundation by their own words and deeds. As for the lies that were fabricated regarding

1 Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Najmī: *Aḍwā' 'alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, p. 254.

2 Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Qummī al-Shīrāzī: *Kitāb al-Arba'in fī Imāmat al-A'imma al-Ṭāhirīn*, p. 507.

their virtue, its issue does not require extraordinary intelligence to know they are weak and feeble, both in terms of the sanad and matan.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Māmaqānī states:

احتج المخالفون في تعديل جميع الصحابة بعدة أخبار مجعولة عليها آثار الجعل

The opposition use a number of made-up reports to prove the ‘adālah of all the Ṣaḥābah. These reports have signs of being made-up.<sup>2</sup>

Thereafter, he cited several narrations, some of which are authentic and agreed-upon, and others not like that. Despite this, he regarded all of the aḥādīth as lies!

The Imāmiyyah explain that the source of Abū Bakr’s virtues—which have no basis in their view—is his daughter, ‘Ā’ishah al-Ṣiddīqah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, the daughter of al-Ṣiddīq!

Describing Umm al-Mu’minīn, ‘Alī al-Mīlānī states:

تدعي لأبيها ولنفسها ما لا أصل له

She claims for her father and herself that which there is no basis for.<sup>3</sup>

Muḥammad al-Tijānī emphasizes this opinion and even adds Ibn ‘Umar among those who fabricated aḥādīth. He states:

فضائل أبي بكر المذكورة في الكتب التاريخية مروية إما عن ابنته عائشة وقد عرفنا موقفها من الإمام علي فهي تحاول بكل جهدها دعم أبيها ولو بأحاديث موضوعة أو عن عبد الله بن عمر وهو أيضا من البعيدين عن الإمام علي

1 ‘Abd al-Mun‘im Ḥasan: *Bi Nūr Fāṭimah Ihtadayt*, p. 154.

2 ‘Abd Allah al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/214, no. 28.

3 ‘Alī al-Mīlānī: *Risālah fī Ṣalāt Abī Bakr*, p. 44.

The virtues of Abū Bakr mentioned in the books of history are either narrated by his daughter, ‘Ā’ishah—whose position on al-Imām ‘Alī we already know. She tries her best to support her father, even if it be with fabricated aḥādīth. Or, they are narrated by ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar. He too, is among those who are far from al-Imām ‘Alī.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Nūrī al-Tustarī (d. 1019 AH) states:

فمع ظهور عداوتها لأُمير المؤمنين وكذبها عند الشيعة اتهامها بجر النفع والفخر لأبيها ولنفسها في خصوص هذه الرواية

Together with her visible hostility towards Amīr al-Mu’minīn and her lying to the Shī’ah, she is (also) suspected in this particular narration of drawing benefit and glory to her and her father.<sup>2</sup>

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was also not safe from being accused. Let us consider the position. Al-Bukhārī (d. 256 AH) narrates:

عن عثمان بن موهب قال جاء رجل من أهل مصر وحج البيت فرأى قوما جلوسا فقال من هؤلاء القوم فقالوا هؤلاء قريش قال فمن الشيخ فيهم قالوا عبد الله بن عمر قال يا ابن عمر إني سألتك عن شيء فحدثني هل تعلم أن عثمان فر يوم أحد قال نعم فقال تعلم أنه تغيب عن بدر ولم يشهد قال نعم قال تعلم أنه تغيب عن بيعة الرضوان فلم يشهدا قال نعم قال الله أكبر قال ابن عمر تعال أبين لك أما فراره يوم أحد فأشهد أن الله عفا عنه وغفر له وأما تغيبه عن بدر فإنه كانت تحته بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وكانت مريضة فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إن لك أجر رجل ممن شهد بدرا وسهمه وأما تغيبه عن بيعة الرضوان فلو كان أحد أعز بطن مكة من عثمان لبعثه مكانه فبعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

1 Muḥammad al-Tjānī: *Thumma Ihtadayt*, p. 168.

2 Nūr Allāh al-Tustarī: *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*, p. 217. Similarly, he is referred to as Nūr Allāh al-Shūshtarī. As mentioned by al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī in *Amal al-‘Āmāl* (2/336), he was killed in India because of writing this book. It is said that he died because he lied to the ruler of India when he claimed to follow the Shāfi’ī school and not be an Imāmī. Despite the fact that, at that time, the ruler did not differentiate between a Sunnī and a Shī’ī; rather, he would deal with them equally. And so, he got upset because he knew that Nūr al-Tustarī lied to him. Consequently, he lashed him five times and subsequently died from the injuries he sustained. It is also said that he died for other reasons. See: *Fayḍ al-Ilāh fī Tarjamat al-Qāḍī Nūr Allah* of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī, p. 29.



عثمان وكانت بيعة الرضوان بعد ما ذهب عثمان إلى مكة فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بيده اليمنى هذه يد عثمان. فضرب بها على يده فقال هذه لعثمان فقال له ابن عمر اذهب بها الآن معك

On the authority of ‘Uthmān ibn Mawhim:

An Egyptian who came and performed Ḥajj of the Ka‘bah saw some people sitting. He enquired, “Who are these people?”

Somebody said, “They are the tribe of Quraysh.”

He said, “Who is the old man sitting amongst them?”

The people replied, “He is ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar.”

He said, “O, Ibn ‘Umar. I want to ask you about something. Please tell me about it. Do you know that ‘Uthmān fled away on the day (of the Battle) of Uḥud?”

Ibn ‘Umar said, “Yes.”

The (Egyptian) man said, “Do you know that ‘Uthmān was absent on the day (of the Battle) of Badr and did not join?”

Ibn ‘Umar said, “Yes.”

The man said, “Do you know that he failed to attend the Pledge of al-Riḍwān and did not witness it (i.e., Ḥudaybiyyah)?”

Ibn ‘Umar said, “Yes.”

The man said, “Allahu Akbar!”

Ibn ‘Umar said, “Let me explain to you (all of these three things). As for his fleeing on the Day of Uḥud, I testify that Allah has excused him and has forgiven him. As for his absence from the Battle of Badr, it was due to the

fact that the daughter of Allah’s Messenger ﷺ was his wife and she was sick then. Allah’s Messenger ﷺ said to him, ‘You will receive the same reward and share (of the booty) as anyone of those who participated in the Battle of Badr (if you stay with her).’ As for his absence from the Pledge of al-Riḍwān, had there been any person in Makkah more respectable than ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān (to be sent as a representative), Allah’s Messenger ﷺ would have sent him instead. And so, Allah’s Messenger ﷺ sent ‘Uthmān. And the incident of the Pledge of al-Riḍwān happened after ‘Uthmān had gone to Makkah. Allah’s Messenger ﷺ held out his right hand saying, ‘This is ‘Uthmān’s hand.’ He stroked his (other) hand with it saying, ‘This (pledge of allegiance) is on behalf of ‘Uthmān.’ Then Ibn ‘Umar said to the man, ‘Bear (these) excuses in mind with you.’”<sup>1</sup>

Let us think about al-Amīnī’s commentary on this narration. He states:

ألا تعجب من هذه الأعذار المفتعلة الباردة وقد خفيت على الصحابة يوم بدر البالغ جمعهم ثلاثمائة وأربعة عشر رجلا وعلى الذين يبيعوا تحت الشجرة و كانوا ألفا وأربعمائة أو أكثر لم يعلم بها إلا رجلين أحدهما ابن عمر الذي كان يوم بدر وأحد صبيبا لم يبلغ الحلم وقد استصغره رسول الله في اليومين وكان له يوم بيعة الرضوان ست عشر سنة وثانيهما نفس عثمان الغائب عن هاتيك المواقف فالرواية مدبرة بين اثنين بين صبي وغايب

Are you not amazed by these cold, fabricated excuses, which were hidden from the 314 Ṣaḥābah on the Day of Badr, and (also) from the 1400 or more who pledged allegiance under the tree? Only two men knew of such excuses, one of them being Ibn ‘Umar who was only a young boy who never reached adulthood on the Day of Badr and Uḥud. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ considered him too young (to join) on these two days. On the Day of the Pledge of Riḍwān, he was sixteen years old. The second was the same ‘Uthmān who was absent from these circumstances. Thus, the narration revolves around two people: a young boy and an absent person.<sup>2</sup>

The strange thing regarding al-Amīnī’s behaviour with this narration is the fact that he did away with all of the principles of ḥadīth and he obstinately attempted

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, “Kitāb Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah – Bāb Manāqib ‘Uthman”.

2 Al-Amīnī: *al-Ghadīr*, 10/71, “*Akhbār Ibn ‘Umar fī al-Manāqib*”.

to invalidate the narration with excuses, all of which contain oddities. Let us critically analyze al-Amīnī's statements.

Al-Amīnī's statement: "(one of them being) Ibn 'Umar who was only a young boy who never reached adulthood on the Day of Badr and Uḥud. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ considered him too young (to join the battle) on these two days. On the Day of the Pledge of Rīḍwān, he was sixteen years old."

What does al-Amīnī condemn?

Firstly, we ask regarding 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān's fleeing the Battle of Uḥud: Is this something specific to him, or did other Ṣaḥābah do the same?

Can al-Amīnī specifically list those who fled from those who did not flee in order to make this a defect in so-and-so and not others? Also, what is the evidence for the Ṣaḥābah whom the Imāmiyyah are pleased with of going out (in the Battle of Uḥud) in relation to this proof?

Let us assume that fleeing impaired his credibility. Did Allah not forgive him and other Ṣaḥābah with His words:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَوَلَّوْا مِنْكُمْ يَوْمَ الْتَقَى الْجَمْعَانِ إِنَّمَا اسْتَزَلَّهُمُ الشَّيْطَانُ بِبَعْضِ مَا كَسَبُوا وَلَقَدْ عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ حَلِيمٌ

*Indeed, those of you who turned back on the day the two armies met (at Uḥud) - it was Satan who caused them to slip because of some (blame) they had earned. But Allah has already forgiven them. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Forbearing.<sup>1</sup>*

Is this verse that clearly indicates forgiveness of the one who slipped on the Day of Uḥud also from the lies of the young boy and the absent person?!

Secondly, al-Amīnī's disapproval of the fact that Ibn 'Umar was a young boy on the Day of Uḥud does not hold much weight. Al-Amīnī himself acknowledged that

---

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 155.

Ibn ‘Umar was sixteen years old on the Day of the Pledge of Riḍwān. If we were to ask: What was the age of this young boy when the Prophet ﷺ returned him back on in the Battle of Uḥud? Here is where it becomes problematic for al-Amīnī and those who support him. Ibn ‘Umar was fourteen years old at the time. Al-Bukhārī narrates on the authority of ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that **“Ibn ‘Umar was presented to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ on the Day of Uḥud and he was fourteen years old. He did not give him permission.”** Thus, we say to al-Amīnī: Is the narration of someone who reached sixteen years of age acceptable?! There is no doubt that the answer will be in the affirmative, unless his criticism as in relation to the person of Ibn ‘Umar and not his age—which is obviously the case—; however, he has to resort to creating doubts and concealing the truth.

Thirdly, al-Amīnī’s statement, “Only two men knew of such excuses.” We ask him: Who stated that the story was only known by ‘Uthmān and Ibn ‘Umar, where did this conclusion come from? The basis for this story is a conversation between Ibn ‘Umar and a man of provocation. There is no evidence to be found that mentions the story was unknown by everyone except for ‘Uthmān and Ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا.

Based on al-Amīnī’s rational, we can impose on him the argument that every story that is narrated by one person—and he is reliable—and no one else shares in narrating the story, then we can judge it to also be false. Nobody will say this. In fact, the narration that changed all the narrations that criticize Zurārah into Taqīyyah is the narration of his son! His children narrate it on the authority of the son. And no one in the Ummah knew of it except via the family of Zurārah!

Do we not have the right to say, as per the logic of al-Amīnī, that the narration is rejected because in its chain is the son of Zurārah and he has no one to share in its narration?

And like this, the entire Ummah is made into liars. The Ummah that lived with the Prophet ﷺ and fought alongside him, and yet there remains nothing of their virtues except for lies or what is doubtful!

### 4.3.2 The Imāmiyyah belying the Ṣaḥābah and describing them as liars

The Imāmiyyah believe that the greatest lie against Allah and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ is the opinion that states the selection of other than ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. And after they believed that the vast-majority of Ṣaḥābah believed in this lie, it was massively-transmitted after that that their scholars openly declared belying the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ, especially those who narrate the most among them<sup>1</sup>. Some of their belying the Ṣaḥābah has already been mentioned. Here, I will also add the statement of al-Majlisī about ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا:

امرأة لم تثبت لها العصمة بالاتفاق وتوثيقها محل الخلاف بيننا وبين المخالفين وسيأتي في أخبارنا من ذمها و القدح فيها و أنها كانت ممن يكذب على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله

A lady whose infallibility is not established by consensus. Her tawthīq is a mater of dispute between us and the opposition. Later on (in the book), our reports will show criticism and disapproval of her, and that she was among those who lied against the Messenger of Allah ﷺ.<sup>2</sup>

To give credit to this opinion, the Imāmiyyah attributed this to al-Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq (d. 381 AH). He states in *al-Khiṣāl*:

حدثنا محمد بن إبراهيم بن إسحاق الطالقاني رضي الله عنه قال حدثنا عبد العزيز بن يحيى قال حدثني محمد بن زكريا قال حدثنا جعفر بن محمد بن عمارة عن أبيه قال سمعت جعفر بن محمد عليهما السلام يقول ثلاثة كانوا يكذبون على رسول الله أبو هريرة وأنس بن مالك، وامرأة

Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Ishāq al-Ṭālqānī narrated to us — ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Yaḥyā narrated to us — Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā narrated to me —

---

1 Ibn Kathīr (d. 774 AH) transmitted on the authority of al-Imām Aḥmad that he said, “The Companions who narrated the most are six: Anas, Jābir, Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn ‘Umar, Abū Hurayrah, and ‘Ā’ishah” (*Ikhtisār ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*); as mentioned in *al-Bā’ith al-Ḥathīth*, p. 27 of Aḥmad Shākir, the commentary of *Ikhtisār ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*.

2 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 28/149.

Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Ammārah narrated to us — from his father who said: “I heard Ja'far ibn Muḥammad عنه say:

“Three (people) would lie against the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم: Abū Hurayrah, Anas ibn Mālik, and a woman!”<sup>2</sup>

The strange thing is that when al-Khūī came to the biographies of both Anas ibn Mālik<sup>3</sup> and Abū Hurayrah<sup>4</sup>, he mentioned this narration as a proof to show that Anas and Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنهم were from the liars whose narrations are not acceptable. However, al-Khūī did not discuss the narration's isnād, as is his practice with senior narrators of the Imāmiyyah who have been criticized. He let it go as if it was to be presumed as acceptable. In the isnād is someone who al-Khūī criticized. For example, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Ishāq al-Ṭālqānī. Regarding him, al-Khūī states:

وثاقته لم تثبت وليس في ترضي الصدوق عليه دلالة على الحسن، فضلا عن المدح

His reliability is not proven. Al-Ṣadūq being pleased with him is not an indication of his uprightness, let alone praise.<sup>5</sup>

This indicates a methodological defect in al-Khūī's reasoning in dealing with narrators in problematic narrations. This is because, on the one hand, he uses

---

1 In explaining who the intended woman is, al-Majlisī states, “I.e., ‘Ā'ishah” (*Biḥār al-Anwār*, 2/217).

2 P. 190. In the narration's isnād is “Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Ammārah from his father.” I could not find a biography for this Ja'far. However, al-Shāharūdī states in *Mustadrakāt 'ilm al-Rijāl* (2/209), “They did not mention him.” This proves that there is no stated opinion of this individual in the Imāmiyyah's dictionaries of narrator criticism from the likes of al-Khūī, al-Māmaqānī, and al-Ardabīlī. Based on this, the narration cannot be acceptable because of his condition being unknown. Also, in the isnād appears “from his father.” He is Muḥammad ibn 'Ammārah. Al-Shāharūdī states, “They did not mention him” (7/254). Which fair-minded person would infer from a narration such as this?

3 Al-Khūī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/149, no. 1566.

4 Ibid., 11:79 (no. 6643).

5 Ibid., 15:231 (no. 9961).

every means to make taḍīf of any narration that criticizes Zurārah<sup>1</sup>, Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān<sup>2</sup>, or others from the Imāmī narrators, yet, on the other hand, when a narration criticizes the Ṣaḥābah, he lets it go and infers from it without any suggesting his opinion on its isnād!

Describing ‘Ā’ishah and the aḥādīth she narrates, Ghālib al-Sīlāwī states:

هذا لا يدل على العلمية بل كانت تكذب على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

This does not indicate towards (her) knowledgeability; rather, she would lie against the Prophet ﷺ.<sup>3</sup>

‘Abd al-Ṣamad Shākir states:

إن عائشة تكذب و لا ترى حتى في كذبها على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حرجا وتضل حفصة و سودة و صفية و تشوقهن إلى الكذب فيكذبن و الكذب من المحرمات على أن الكاذب لا تقبل روايته

‘Ā’ishah lies and she does not see it as a problem, even if it is against the Prophet ﷺ. She led astray Ḥafṣah, Sawdah, Ṣafīyyah and lured them into lying. And so, they would (all) lie. And lying is from the prohibited acts. Besides, the liar’s narration is not accepted.<sup>4</sup>

This is the nature of their scholars with the house of the Prophet’s ﷺ family. In fact, Muḥammad al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī, the author of *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, would not even mention ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا by name; rather, he referred to her as the ‘*Khāṭi’ah* (Sinner).’ Like his statement about Ṣuhayb al-Rūmī:

أن الخاطئة أرسلته ...

The *Khāṭi’ah* (Sinner) sent it...<sup>5</sup>

1 Ibid., 8/225, no. 4671.

2 Ibid., 21/209, no. 13863.

3 Ghālib al-Sīlāwī: *al-Nawār al-Sāṭi’ah min al-Gharrā’ al-Tāhīrah Khadījah Bint Khuwaylid*, p. 216.

4 ‘Abd al-Ṣamad Shākir: *Naẓarah ‘Ābirah ilā al-Ṣiḥāḥ al-Sittah*, p. 156.

5 *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, 4/271.

And his statement about ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Khalaf al-Jumaḥī:

قتل لعينا يوم الجمل وكان من أتباع الخاطئة

He was killed cursed on the Day of the Camel. He was from the followers of the *Khāṭi’ah* (Sinner).<sup>1</sup>

And his statement about ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī ‘Uthmān ibn al-Akhnas:

ملعون من جند الخاطئة

Cursed. From the army of the *Khāṭi’ah*.<sup>2</sup>

The Imāmiyyah have a similar position on Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه. Accordingly, al-Ḥillī did not include him in his book. We have already seen some of this. Here, I add the statement of al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) about him. He begins his biography with:

أبو هريرة المعروف الكذاب

Abū Hurayrah, the well-known liar.<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was not safe from criticism. Therefore, al-Ḥillī did not even mention him in *al-Khulāṣah*. When al-Khūṭ came to his biography, he transmitted the following narration of al-Kashshī:

عن أبي جعفر عليه السلام قال ألا أخبركم بأهل الوقوف؟ قلنا بلى قال أسامة بن زيد وقد رجع فلا تقولوا إلا خيرا ومحمد بن مسلمة و ابن عمر مات منكوثا

On the authority of Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام who said, “Shall I not inform you of the people of wuqūf (i.e., the people that paused in pledging allegiance to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه)?”

1 Ibid., 4/468.

2 Ibid., 4/468.

3 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 11/553, no. 976.



We said, “Of course.”

He said, “Usāmah ibn Zayd; he returned (i.e., to the truth). Therefore, do not say anything (about him) except for good. And Muḥammad ibn Maslamah. Ibn ‘Umar died in disgrace.”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭ transmitted the narration and let it go as if it was presumed to be acceptable since the apparent meaning of it is a criticism of Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. However, when he wanted to make tawthīq of Usāmah ibn Zayd رضي الله عنه, he mentioned it and explained that it is weak and disconnected.<sup>2</sup> Why did he not explain its condition when he inferred from it here? This proves the methodology of al-Khūṭ: authentication or rejection of narrations is based on his perceived benefit of the situation, nothing else.

Al-Tustarī attacked Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه at length. He described him as someone who does not follow Qur’ān and the Sunnah, but rather, following his father.<sup>3</sup>

### 4.3.3 The Imāmiyyah altering the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah into vices

Many of the Ṣaḥābah had praises and virtues mentioned about them that the Imāmī scholars did not let pass without expressing their opinion on them. This was done while explaining them in light of their ideological background that considers the Ṣaḥābah to be apostates. There are many such examples of this.

Commenting on a statement of one of the predecessors, al-Burūjirdī (d. 1313 AH) states:

ما سبقكم أبو بكر بصوم ولا صلاة ولكن بشيءٍ وقر في نفسه

---

1 Al-Khūṭ: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 11/286, no. 7036. See: *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, p. 39, no. 81. In another narration, the word is ‘*maknūnan*,’ meaning ‘(he died) on a path other than correct one because he did not return back to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.’

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 3/184, no. 1091.

3 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 6/538, no. 4448.

Abū Bakr did not precede you with fasting and prayer; rather, with something that was settled inside of him.

Thinking it to be a ḥadīth, al-Burūjirdī stated:

ومراده صلى الله عليه وآله هو حب الرئاسة التي صار مفتونا به ويزعم أتباعه الرعاع أن المراد به الخلوص والاعتقاد بالله ورسوله

What he صلى الله عليه وسلم intended is (Abū Bakr's) love of leadership that he became infatuated with. His hooligan followers claim that the meaning of his words is sincerity and belief in Allah and His Messenger.<sup>1</sup>

With what evidence did he change this clear text of admiration and praise to a criticism of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه? There is no evidence except that he commented on the ḥadīth from the position of his belief in the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah and, as such, converting their good deeds into despicable ones.

Another example comes from Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Qummī who used the following to prove that falsify Abū Bakr's khilāfah by claiming that he is a tyrant. According to him, even if he repented from his tyranny, he is still a tyrant! He states:

ومن ظلم الأول المنافي لإمامته أنه كان مشركا يعبد الأصنام والشرك أعظم الظلم ولفظة (الظالمين) عام يشمل جميع من ظلم سواء تاب بعده أو لم يتب

And from the tyranny of the first one to reject his Imāmah is that he was a polytheist that worshipped idols. Polytheism is greater than tyranny. The word 'tyrants' is a general term that includes everyone who tyrannizes, whether he repented thereafter or not.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the repentance of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq is supposed to be a virtue for him. Through it, the ruling of tyranny is annulled—assuming that he used to worship

---

1 'Alī al-Burūjirdī: *Ṭarā'if al-Maqāl*, 2/600.

2 Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Qummī al-Shīrāzī: *Kitāb al-Arba'īn fī Imāmat al-A'imma al-Ṭāhirīn*, p. 510.

idols before his Islam. This is because Islam erases whatever came before it. Despite this, the repentance of al-Ṣiddīq—which is regarded as being from his virtues—did not erase, in the Imāmiyyah’s view, the characteristic of tyranny since it is inseparable from him. This is how the positions of the Imāmiyyah towards the Ṣaḥābah are rooted, even if they contradict the clear texts of the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, and the simplest of rational principles. Can it be said that Salmān the Persian, the devout believer, was unjust throughout his life, even after his conversion to Islam, since he was a Magian and then a Christian? Who would say this?

This is another picture that explains how the scholars of the Imāmiyyah dealt with what is normally understood as virtue and bravery of the Ṣaḥābah. Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Qummī states:

والعجب كل العجب أن أهل السنة عدوا من فضائل عمر أنه قال حين أسلم لا نعبد الله سراً بعد هذا اليوم  
ولعمري لو كانوا يطلعون على ما ذكرناه لجحدوه وكنموه لكن الله قد أعمى قلوبهم وختم على سمعهم  
كما قال تعالى

أَمْ تَحْسَبُ أَنَّ أَكْثَرَهُمْ يَسْمَعُونَ أَوْ يَعْقِلُونَ إِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ سَبِيلًا

ومما يدل أيضا على أن إسلام عمر وقوله لا نعبد الله سرا كان على سبيل المخادعة أنه لم يكن من أهل  
الشناعة وعظم القدر ومن الرؤساء المطاعين في قريش والعرب فلا وجه لمنعه عبادة الله سرا إلا ما  
ذكرناه من المخادعة ونقض ما أبرم الرسول صلى الله عليه وآله

The strangest thing is that the Ahl al-Sunnah regard from among the virtues of ‘Umar the following statement of ‘Umar when he became Muslim, “We will not worship Allah in secret after this day.” By my life, if they only knew what we mentioned, they would deny it and conceal it. However, Allah has blinded their hearts and sealed their hearing. As Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى states, “Or do you think that most of them hear or reason? They are not except like livestock. Rather, they are (even) more astray in (their) way” (al-Furqān: 44).

What also proves that the Islam of ‘Umar and his statement, “We will not worship Allah in secret.” was a hoax is that he was not from the people of

bravery nor of high-standing, nor from the obeyed chiefs from the Quraysh and the Arabs. Therefore, there is no real benefit in his refusal to worship Allah in secret except for what we have mentioned of it being a hoax and a violation of what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ concluded.<sup>1</sup>

If this report<sup>2</sup> is authentic, and we were to critically analyze the words of al-Qummī, we would find him turning what is to be understood as a virtue, an act of bravery, and an open proclamation of the truth, into a hoax and an act of timidity! In doing so, he is attempting to question the intention (of ‘Umar) and claim knowledge of the innermost parts of the souls. This is something that is impossible to have knowledge of and it can never be subjected to a fair, academic analysis.

If a scholar were to reflect on the reason the Imāmī scholars criticized Ṣuhayb al-Rūmī رضي الله عنه, he will see something strange. Al-Khūṭī regarded the reason for his criticism a narration which contains:

أن صهيبا كان عبد سوء يبكي على عمر

Ṣuhayb was an evil slave. He cried over ‘Umar.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Ḥillī mentioned the same narration in *al-Khulāṣah* under the biography of Bilāl ibn Abī Rabāḥ<sup>4</sup> رضي الله عنه. Perhaps this is the main reason for not mentioning

---

1 Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Qummī al-Shīrāzī: *Kitāb al-Arbaʿīn fī Imāmat al-Aʿimmah al-Ṭāhirīn*, p. 578.

2 Despite all of my efforts, I could not find a sanad for this report. Al-Qurṭubī transmits it without an isnād in his Tafsīr under the verse, “O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message. And Allah will protect you from the people. Indeed, Allah does not guide the disbelieving people” (al-Māʾidah: 67).

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 10/155, no. 5949.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 82, no. 166. The reason for mentioning the narration under the biography of Bilāl رضي الله عنه is because the text of the narration, as it appears in al-Kashshī, reads as follows, “Bilāl was a devout slave and Ṣuhayb was an evil slave. He would cry over ‘Umar.” (p. 38, no. 79). It comes in the book, *al-Ikhtisāṣ* (p. 73), attributed to al-Mufid, “May Allah curse Ṣuhayb, for verily, he would be hostile towards us. In another narration, he ‘would cry over *ra ma ‘a*.” By *‘ra ma ‘a*, they mean ‘Umar رضي الله عنه!

Ṣuhayb al-Rūmī in the book, *al-Khulāṣah*—despite the fact that Ṣuhayb’s crying and sadness is regarded as a virtue for him according to all the Muslims.

The worst of what a person will come across is the book written by one of the senior Imāmī scholars. His name is ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad al-Bakrī. He practices the most repulsive form of Taqīyyah. He titled the book “*From the Life of the Khalīfah ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb*” and depicts himself as a member of the Ahl al-Sunnah in the introduction. Then he begins criticizing ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضي الله عنه in a very disgusting manner. He justifies the criticism by saying it is found in the books of history! Of the things he regards as a criticism against ‘Umar رضي الله عنه is what Ibn Sa’d narrated in *al-Ṭabaqāt*:

عن سالم بن عبد الله أن عمر بن الخطاب كان يدخل يده في دبرة البعير ويقول إني لخائف أن أسأل عما بك

On the authority of Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh: ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb used to insert his hand into the injured area (*dabarah*) of the camel and say, “Verily, I fear that I will be questioned about what has happened to you.”<sup>1</sup>

What did he intend with this narration?

The picture might become clearer when we narrate what the editor of *Biḥār al-Anwār* mentioned. He states:

نود أن نختم بحثنا هذا ببعض الكلمات المأثورة عن خليفة القوم

We wish to end this discussion of ours with some words transmitted from the Khalīfah of the people.<sup>2</sup>

The Imāmī scholars regard this as an act of homosexuality by ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (we seek Allah’s protection from this statement) since, according to their claim,

---

1 Muḥammad ibn Sa’d: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, 3:286.

2 Marginalia of *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 1:2809.

he placed his hand into the backside (*dubur*) of the camel and he was happy about it (we seek Allah’s protection from this statement). This is what they intended, and this is what I heard from them! If this is not the case, how did this become something that diminishes his status رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

The reality of the matter is that the narration Ibn Sa’d mentioned contains the word ‘*dabarah*,’ not ‘*dubur*.’ Going back to the dictionaries, we find that the former word is different to the latter. The former, as mentioned by al-Zubaydī is as follows:

الدَّبْرَةُ: بِالتَّخْرِيفِ: قَرْحَةُ الدَّائِبَةِ وَالبَعِيرِ

*Al-Dabarah*: the ulcer of an animal and camel.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, they are ulcers that appear on the rear of the camel. Bird and crows peck at it causing it to bleed. It is among the well-known illnesses among the Arabs that affects the rear of a camel or animal. Ibn Manẓūr states, “A she-camel pressed, or squeezed, and having her flesh bruised by her load. A camel oppressed by the weight of a load, and squeezed; having his back or side by a heavy load, or bruised so that it is swollen, and galled; having his side squeezed by a heavy load so that a disease has been the consequence, which has disordered his lungs.”<sup>2</sup>

Here, we ask: What is wrong with ‘Umar placing his hand into the ulcer of the camel? How did this diminish his status!

This was from his humility, may Allah be pleased with him. Despite being the chief Khalīfah of the Muslims, he would cure their camels by himself from these ulcers that would afflict them. He would tend to them himself while remembering Allah saying, “Verily, I fear that I will be questioned about what has happened to you.” May Allah have mercy on ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

---

1 Al-Zubaydī: *Tāj al-‘Arūs*, 1/2809.

2 Ibn al-Manẓūr: *Lisān al-‘Arab*, 3/393. Although the author quotes Ibn Manẓūr’s *al-Lisān*, the above definition was taken from Lane’s *Lexicon* for an easier read. (Translator’s note)

The thing that led these people so far away from the truth is both jealousy of the great leaders of Islam ﷺ, and sheer ignorance of the Arabic language. If it is not because of a lack of knowledge of the language, then it is not far fetched that it was done with ill-intentions. May Allah grant us ‘*āfiyah* (well-being).

From the examples of turning virtues into vice is what al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) commented on the virtue of Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه. Al-Bukhārī (d. 256 AH) narrates on the authority of Anas رضي الله عنه:

دخل النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم على أم سليم فأنته بتمر وسمن قال أعيذوا سمنكم في سقائه وتمركم في وعائه فإني صائم ثم قام إلى ناحية من البيت فصلى غير المكتوبة فدعا لأم سليم وأهل بيتها فقالت أم سليم يا رسول الله إن لي خويصة قال ما هي؟ قالت خادمك أنس فما ترك خير آخرة ولا دنيا إلا دعالي به قال اللهم ارزقه مالا وولدا وبارك له فإني لمن أكثر الأنصار مالا وحدثني ابنتي أمينة أنه دفن لصلبي مقدم حجاج البصرة بضع وعشرون ومائة

The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم paid a visit to Umm Sulaym and she placed before him dates and clarified butter. The Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم said, “Return the clarified butter and dates to their respective containers for I am fasting.”

Then he stood somewhere in her house and offered an optional prayer and then he supplicated for Umm Sulaym and the members of her family. Then Umm Sulaym said, “O Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم! I have a special request (today).”

He said, “What is it?”

She replied, “(Please supplicate for) your servant, Anas.”

(Anas رضي الله عنه narrates:) So, the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم did not leave out any good of the world or the Hereafter except that he supplicated for it to Allah for me and said, ‘O Allah! Give him (i.e., Anas) wealth and children. And bless him.’ (Because of this supplication,) I am one of the richest of the Anṣār. My daughter, Umaynah told me that when al-Ḥajjāj came to Baṣrah, more than one hundred and twenty of my offspring had been buried.<sup>1</sup>

1 Al-Bukhārī: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 2/699.

What is understood from this ḥadīth is that the Prophet ﷺ supplicated for Anas ibn Mālik's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ goodness and Allah accepted the supplication of His Prophet ﷺ. Subsequently, Anas رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was blessed in his wealth and children. This proves the love the Prophet ﷺ had for Anas and his high-status with him رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. However, the Imāmī scholar, al-Tustarī, has another opinion. Let us see how he interprets the ḥadīth. He states:

هذا الدعاء لم يكن له بل عليه فإنه - صلى الله عليه وآله - دعا لمن أعطاه من لبن غنمه بالرزق والكفاف ولمن منعه بالمال الكثير وقد قال تعالى فَلَا تُعْجِبْكَ أَمْوَالُهُمْ وَلَا أَوْلَادُهُمْ ؕ إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُعَذِّبَهُمْ بِهَا فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَتَزْهَقَ أَنْفُسُهُمْ وَهُمْ كَافِرُونَ

This is not a supplication for him; rather, it is against him. This is because the Prophet ﷺ supplicated for sustenance and for the right amount thereof for the one whom he gave milk from his sheep. And he (also) supplicated for the one who prevented him from having a lot of wealth. Allah سبحانه وتعالى states:

*“So let not their wealth or their children impress you. Allah only intends to punish them through them in worldly life and that their souls should depart (at death) while they are disbelievers.”<sup>1,2</sup>*

This is a very strange and arbitrary course in turning something that is praiseworthy into a criticism. What did Anas رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ keep away from the Prophet ﷺ for al-Tustarī to say, “And he (also) supplicated for the one who prevented him from having a lot of wealth”?!

In the ḥadīth, Umm Sulaym رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا presented dates and clarified butter to the Prophet ﷺ. This is a great display of hospitality. However, he رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was fasting. And so, he consoled her by offering ṣalāh in her house and supplicating for her and her family so that he could “return the favour” in a most beautiful

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 55. Al-Tustarī wrote the beginning of the verse with the letter wāw. This is a mistake. It is supposed to be as I wrote it, with the letter fā.

2 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 2/201, no. 985.



manner and not have to break his fast. How can it be a criticism when he صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ supplicated for barakah with his words, “**And bless him.**” Is al-Tustarī saying that a supplication for barakah is a criticism (against Anas رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ)? How did this praiseworthy act that Allah and His Messenger honoured Umm Sulaym رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا and her son, Anas رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, turn into something that diminishes his status? This is due to the ideological background of al-Tustarī that declares the Ṣaḥābah to be disbelievers.

Here, I have the right to ask al-Tustarī and those who agree with him: Did al-Kashshī not narrate that the infallible Imām said to Bishr ibn Ṭarkhān:

أُنعى الله ولدك وكثر مالك

May Allah increase your offspring and grant you abundant wealth.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Tustarī himself mentioned this narration under the biography of Bishr ibn Ṭarkhān in the same volume!<sup>2</sup> He did not say what he said about Anas ibn Mālik رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, “This is not a supplication for him; rather, it is against him. This is because the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ supplicated for sustenance and for the right amount thereof for the one whom he gave milk from his sheep. And he (also) supplicated for the one who prevented him from having a lot of wealth. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَعَالِيهِ السَّمَاوَاتِ states, “So let not their wealth or their children impress you. Allah only intends to punish them through them in worldly life and that their souls should depart (at death) while they are disbelievers.”

Why did this same supplication become something praiseworthy here and a form of criticism for Anas?

This is a clear contradiction in their dealing with the infallibles, according to them, and the Companions of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. The reason for this

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Maʿrifat al-Rijāl* (Rijāl al-Kashshī), p. 311, no. 563.

2 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 2/331, no. 1121.

goes back to their interpretation of texts and judging the Ṣaḥābah through their preconceived notions of disbelief and hypocrisy, and arbitrarily interpreting texts contrary to their apparent meanings. All of this in order for it to be in line with their beliefs. *We seek Allah's protection.*

#### 4.4. A comparative analysis between the position of the Imāmiyyah on the Ṣaḥābah and their own reliable narrators from the Imāmiyyah

##### 4.4.1 Al-Khūī and the Imāmī scholars justifying mistakes committed by their reliable narrators

The position of the Imāmiyyah regarding the Ṣaḥābah and how they judge them to be apostates (except a few among them), belie them in their virtues, and turn much of such virtues into vices has already been mentioned, as has the fact that they did not seek excuses for them. However, the vehemence shown towards the Ṣaḥābah is an odd position when compared to the opinion they hold regarding those whom they regard as reliable; they make excuses for them that are neither interpretable nor justifiable. There are many such examples of this.

In general, we have seen the positions of al-Māmaqānī and al-Shāharūdi on Imāmī narrators. According to them, the default position of the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم Companions is apostasy. In their view, this is considering the fact that they did not pledge allegiance to the Imām of their time, 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. What they both failed to realize (and intentionally so, I think) is the fact that the default state of a Muslim is *salāmah*, or integrity. In preferring the former over the latter, they are giving preference to doubt over certainty and are essentially demanding every Ṣaḥābī to furnish explicit evidence and present it to the Imāmī scholars in order to prove that he did not apostatize!

When the situation is like this, we, the Ahl al-Sunnah, have the right to say that when Ja'far al-Ṣādiq passed away, the majority of the Imāmiyyah held the view that the Khalīfah after him was to be his son, 'Abd Allāh al-Afṭaḥ. This is an error on their part; it was necessary for them to have pledged their allegiance to Mūsā

ibn Ja‘far. This is, in reality, apostatizing from the religion of Allah ﷺ since they did not pledge their allegiance to the rightful imām. Furthermore, when ‘Abd Allāh al-Afṭaḥ passed away, the mistake (they committed) became clear to the majority of the Imāmiyyah and, accordingly, they abandoned the Imāmah of al-Afṭaḥ and reverted to the Imāmah of Mūsā ibn Ja‘far—except a few among them. From here, we can say: Do we not have the right to apply the statements of al-Māmaqānī and al-Shāharūdī on the Imāmī narrators and say that the default in relation to all of the Imāmī narrators is apostasy because of their failure to pledge allegiance to the Imām of their time? Furthermore, do we also not have the right to say that it is not correct for us to give a judgement that none of them possess ‘adālah unless they have explicit evidence proving that he retracted from such apostasy?

The Imāmiyyah did not apply this (type of thinking) except on to the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ. As for their ‘reliable’ narrators, they are beyond such doubts and misgivings.

### ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah

Different to their position on the Ṣaḥābah, the following narration displays one of many depictions of the Imāmiyyah seeking excuses for their narrators for their actions or shortcomings from criticisms raised against them by the infallibles. Al-Khashshī narrates:

عن علي بن أبي حمزة قال قال لي أبو الحسن يعني الأول عليه السلام يا علي أنت وأصحابك أشباه الحمير

On the authority of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah who said: “Abū al-Ḥasan (i.e., the first) ﷺ said to me, ‘O, ‘Alī. You and your companions resemble donkeys.’”<sup>1</sup>

This is clearly a criticism. However, the Imāmī scholars have a different position. Al-Fānī states:

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 404, no. 757.

وهذه الرواية تمتاز بخصوصية وهي أن الدم الوارد فيها قد صدر في حقه زمن الكاظم (عليه السلام) ورغم ذلك لا يصح الاستدلال بها على التضعيف بالمعنى المخل وذلك لأن تشبيهه بالحمير يعود لا محالة لوجه شبه بينهما أما من حيث رؤيته لكثير من الوقائع من دون أعمال التدبير لاستخلاص النتائج الموصلة للحيلة والنجاة أو من حيث إن ما يعمل له لن يرى ثوابا عليه كما أن الحمير تستعمل للنقل والحمل من دون أي مكافأة على عملها سوى التعب والكلل وما شاكلهما من احتمالات وهذا كما ترى لا دلالة فيه على تكذيب ابن أبي حمزة بقدر ما له نظر لأمر سلوكية وعقائدية خصوصا مع ملاحظة سائر النصوص الأخرى بل قد يتعين من خلالها أن عليا كان يحمل قابليات الانحراف والوقف منذ زمن الكاظم (عليه السلام)

This narration has a unique feature. That is to say that the criticism mentioned in the narration was mentioned about him in the time of al-Kāzīm عليه السلام. Despite this, it is incorrect to deduce therefrom that the narration is weak because it carries an offensive meaning. This is because the Imām likening him to a donkey goes back to the fact that there is some type of resemblance between the two. Either because of the fact that he sees many incidents without actively seeking decisions that would lead to his protection and survival. Or, because of the fact that whatever he does, he will never see the reward thereof, just as the donkey is used for transporting and carrying without any reimbursement for his work; all he receives in return is tiredness, exhaustion, and whatever other similar sufferings there may be. As you can see, it is not indicative of (the Imām's) belying Ibn Abī Ḥamzah as much as it is a behavioural and creedal issue, especially considering all of the other texts. In fact, it becomes clear through considering (all of) the texts that he used to bear tendencies of deviation and *Waqf* from the time of al-Kāzīm عليه السلام.<sup>1</sup>

What if the text was as follows, “O Abū Hurayrah. You and your companions resemble donkeys!”

There is no doubt that the condition would change and this would, for the Imāmiyyah, become among the greatest criticisms against Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه. In fact, they would write volumes on it. However, when they wanted to make

1 Al-Fānī: *Buḥūth fī Fiqh al-Rijāl*, p. 201.

tawthīq of their narrator, they converted every criticism levelled against him into a perceivable good, even though it was done in an arbitrary manner.

## Zurārah ibn A'yan

Al-Kulaynī narrated:

[عن] علي بن إبراهيم، عن أبيه عن ابن أبي عمير عن هشام بن سالم، عن زرارة قال دخلت أنا وحميران أو أنا وبكير على أبي جعفر عليه السلام قال قلت له إنا نمد المطمار قال وما المطمار؟ قلت: الترفمن وافقنا من علوي أو غيره توليناه ومن خالفنا من علوي أو غيره برئنا منه فقال لي يا زرارة قول الله أصدق من قولك فأين الذين قال الله عز وجل:

إِلَّا الْمُسْتَضْعَفِينَ مِنَ الرِّجَالِ وَالنِّسَاءِ وَالْوِلْدَانِ لَا يَسْتَطِيعُونَ حَبْلَةً وَلَا يَهْتَدُونَ سَبِيلًا

أين المرجون لأمر الله؟ أين الذين خلطوا عملا صالحا وآخر سيئا؟ أين أصحاب الأعراف أين المؤلفه قلوبهم وزاد حماد في الحديث قال فارتفع صوت أبي جعفر عليه السلام وصوتي حتى كان يسمعه من على باب الدار وزاد فيه جميل عن زرارة فلما كثرت الكلام بيني وبينه قال لي: يا زرارة حقا على الله أن لا يدخل الضلال الجنة

On the authority of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm — from his father — from Ibn Abī ‘Umayr, from Hishām ibn Sālim — from Zurārah who said: Ḥumrān and I, or Bukayr and I came to Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام.

I said to him, “We are extending the *miṭmār*!”

He said, “What is the *miṭmār*?”

I said, “The *tarr* (plumb line). Thus, whoever agrees with us from, whether an Alawite or otherwise, we ally with him. And whoever disagrees with us, whether an Alawite or otherwise, we absolve ourselves of him.”

---

1 A *maṭmār* is a plumb line that is used to ensure a structure is centred. It is like a scale that determines (the weight) of something. Al-Māzindarānī states, “A man says to his friend when he is upset, ‘I will suspend you on the plumb line.’” (*Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, 10/53). The meaning is, “We weigh people; whoever agrees with us, we protect him. And whoever disagrees with us, we absolve ourselves of him.”

He said to me, “O Zurārah. The statement of Allah is more truthful than your statement. Where are those whom Allah ﷻ says about, ‘*Except for the oppressed among men, women, and children who cannot devise a plan nor are they directed to a way.*’<sup>1</sup> Where are those who seek the command of Allah? Where are those who mixed a good deed with a bad one? Where are the people of *al-A’rāf*? Where are *al-Mu’allafat Qulūbuhum* (those whose hearts are brought together for Islam)?”

And Ḥammād added<sup>2</sup> in the ḥadīth, “Then the voice of Abū Ja’far and my voice rose until he could hear it from the door of the house.”

Jamīl added, “From Zurārah: When the discussion between myself and him amplified, he said to me, ‘O Zurārah. Incumbent upon Allah is that the misguided do not enter Jannah.’”<sup>3</sup>

This clearly shows that Zurārah is raising his voice at the infallible Imām and is opposing him in his opinions. However, Imāmī scholars have ready explanations. Al-Majlisī (d. 1111 AH) states:

هذا مما يقدح به في زرارة ويدل على سوء أدبه ولما كانت جلالته وعظمته ورفعة شأنه وعلو مكانه مما أجمعت عليه الطائفة وقد دلت عليه الأخبار المستفيضة فلا يعاب بما يروهم خلاف ذلك ويمكن أن يكون هذه الأمور في بدء أمره قبل كمال معرفته أو كان هذا من طبعه وسجيته ولم يمكنه ضبط نفسه ولم يكن ذلك لشكه وقله اعتنائه أو كان قصده معرفة كيفية المناظرة في هذا المطلب مع المخالفين أو كان لشدة تصلبه في الدين وحبه لائمة المؤمنين حيث كان لا يجوز دخول مخالفهم في الجنة

This is from the things that Zurārah is criticized for and is a proof of his ill-manners. Because his eminence, greatness, high-rank, and elevated-status is agreed upon by the Group (based on well-known reports), everything

---

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 98.

2 Al-Majlisī states, “Ostensibly, his statement, ‘And Ḥammād added,’ is from the words of Ibn ‘Umair. The ḥadīth is also narrated from Ḥammād and Jamīl on the authority of Zurārah. There is also an addition in the narration of Jamīl on the narration of Ḥammād and so he also pointed it out” (*Mir’āt al-Uqūl*, 11/107).

3 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfī*, 2/383, *Kitāb al-kufr wa al-īmān - Bāb: Aṣṅāf al-nās*, ḥadīth no. 3.

giving the opposite impression of this is not to be given attention. It is possible that these issues occurred at the beginning of his affair, before the perfection of his knowledge. Or, this was simply part of his natural disposition and character and he could not contain himself, not because of his misgivings and lack of care. Or, his intention was to show how to debate on this type of discussion with the opposition. Or, because of his relentless commitment to the religion and love for the Imāms of the believers such that he would not permit the opposition's entry into Jannah.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Majlisī acknowledged that this is ill-manners towards the infallible Imām; however, did he discard the 'adālah of Zurārah? The answer is: no. In fact, he sought four excuses for him and justified his actions. He even made these excuses a means of praise for Zurārah!

Had it been 'Umar, 'Alī al-Kūrānī would have said:

فهل ترون من مناقب عمر سوء أدبه مع النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وعدم اقتناعه بكلامه

Do you consider 'Umar's ill-manners towards the Prophet ﷺ and him not being content with his ﷺ words as being from his virtues?<sup>2</sup>

Al-Māzindarānī states:

دل على سوء أدب زرارة وانحرافه والحق أنه من أفاضل أصحابنا وأنه منزّه عن مثل ذلك وكأن قوله هذا كان قبل استقراره على المذهب الصحيح أو كان قصده معرفة كيفية المناظرة في هذا المطلوب وتحصيل المهارة فيها لينظر مع الخوارج وأضرابهم ورأى أن المبالغة فيها لا تسوّؤه (عليه السلام) بل تعجبه

It proves the ill-manners and deviation of Zurārah. The truth is that he is one of the most virtuous of our companions and above such a thing. It is as if this statement of his occurred before settling into the correct school. Or, his intention was to show how to debate on this type of discussion and gain

---

1 Al-Majlisī: *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl*, 11/107.

2 'Alī al-Kūrānī: *Alf Su'āl wa Ishkāl*, 2/352.

expertise therein so as to oppose the Khawārij and their likes. He figured his exaggerating in this would not offend him عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام; rather, it would please him.<sup>1</sup>

When Zurārah’s lack of manners with the infallible becomes of his virtues but the (Prophet’s) supplication for Anas رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ becomes a criticism against him!

Compare what has been mentioned with what al-Kūrānī mockingly stated about ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb:

أما سوء أدب عمر فلا شيء فيه فكأن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله كان يستحقه بل هو فضيلة ومنقبة لعمر  
بدليل رضى النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وأنسه وسروره به

As for ‘Umar’s ill-manners, there is nothing to it. It is as if the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was deserving of it! In fact, it is a virtue and praise for ‘Umar because of the fact the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was pleased, content, and happy with him.<sup>2</sup>

And like this, they find fault with the Ṣaḥābah. Al-Kūrānī mockingly states about ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ something similar to the statement of al-Māzindarānī, “... exaggerating in this would not offend him عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام; rather, it would please him.”

Does al-Kūrānī adhere to this statement of his and also apply it to Zurārah ibn A‘yan? The answer is no. This is because Zurārah is above these misgivings and “beyond such a thing,” as per the description of al-Māzindarānī!

Commenting on the statement of al-Māzindarānī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sha‘rānī states:

قوله على سوء أدب زرارَةَ وانحرافه أما سوء الأدب فهو كذلك وأما الانحراف فلا يدل كلامه عليه إذ رب محب يطيش فيخرج عن الأدب لاعن الحب وليس كل أحد معصوما عن الزلل أما رأيت ولدًا برا بوالديه قد يتفق عند الغضب أن يخشن الكلام ويهجر الوالد ثم يندم من قريب ويعتذر وروي عن ابن عباس أشد من ذلك بالنسبة إلى أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام وكان تابعا وليا له من أول عمره إلى آخره بعد ذلك العتاب

1 Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, 10/54.

2 ‘Alī al-Kūrānī: *Alf Su‘āl wa Iskhāl*, 2/333.



وقبله بل يدل هذا الحديث على أن زرارة [كَانَ] مفرطاً في الولاية مبالغاً فيه زائداً متجاوزاً عن الحد الذي كان يرضى به الإمام عليه السلام وكان يرى أن كل متخلف عن أهل البيت كافر وردعه عنه الإمام عليه السلام بأن المستضعفين من الضلال في الجنة

His statement, “(It proves) the ill-manners and deviation of Zurārah.” As for the part of ill-manners, it is true. As for the part of deviation, his words do not indicate towards this. Many a lover acts reckless and, as such, departs from proper etiquette; however, he does not depart from love. Every person is not completely perfect such that he commits no mistakes. Have you not seen a child that is normally obedient to his parents, when angry, utters something rude and (temporarily) abandons the parent? Then, he regrets it soon thereafter and apologizes? Something even harsher than this was narrated from Ibn ‘Abbās in relation to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. He was a loyal friend that followed him from the beginning of his life to the end, after that rebuke and before it. In fact, this ḥadīth proves that Zurārah was extreme in his belief of *Wilāyah*, exuberant, excessive, and transgressed the boundaries that the Imām عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was pleased with. And he would consider every person that differed with the Ahl al-Bayt a disbeliever and the Imām عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام deterred him from that with the weak of the misguided being in Jannah.<sup>1</sup>

I do not know, is Zurārah more learned about the religion of the Imāmiyyah than the infallible? Or, is his love for Tashayyū‘ greater than the Infallible’s? This is the Imāmī scholars’ justification, from where they do not even know. The Imām is ‘pleased’ with Zurārah raising his voice against him, and yet for ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, this is reprehensible and bad manners!?

In summarizing the opinion of Zurārah’s ill-manners with the Imām, Mīr Dāmād al-Astrābādī (d. 1040 AH) states:

ومن جهة إسائه في الأدب بالنسبة إلى الصادق عليه السلام اتكالا على ارتفاع منزلته عنده وشدة اختصاصه به

1 Commentary of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sha‘rānī on *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi* of Muḥammad Ṣālih al-Māzindarānī, 10/54, in the margin.

Regarding his ill-manners towards al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, (it is overlooked by) relying on his elevated status and extreme prominence he enjoyed with him.<sup>1</sup>

Subḥān Allāh! This is how the ill-manners of Zurārah is converted into a praiseworthy act deserving of reward!

### **Al-Faḍl ibn ‘Abd al-Malik**

Zurārah isn’t the only one to be impolite with the infallible; rather, even al-Faḍl ibn ‘Abd al-Malik was ill-mannered towards the infallible. Al-Khūṭī acknowledges this, however, he stated:

إن هذه الصحيحة وإن دلت على جرأة الفضل وسوء أدبه بالنسبة إلى الإمام عليه السلام، إلا أنها لا تنافي وثاقته، ولعلها كانت زلة منه فتذكر بعدها

The authentic report, even though it proves the audacity of al-Faḍl and his ill-manners with the Imām عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, it does not negate his reliability. Perhaps it was a mistake on his part and he only remembered thereafter.<sup>2</sup>

Let us turn to al-Khūṭī’s statement, “Perhaps it.” He assumed the ill-manners with the Imām to be a mistake that the narrator ‘perhaps’ remembered afterwards. If we asked al-Khūṭī: What is your evidence for this justification and for al-Faḍl remembering afterwards? The answer would be: “Perhaps.”

### **‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr**

We have already seen that this narrator was involved in lying against Zurārah. The Imāmī scholars even acknowledged that. However, al-Khūṭī justified it stating:

أما ما ذكره الشيخ في الاستبصار فلا ينافي الحكم بوثاقته غايته أن الشيخ احتمل كذب عبد الله بن بكير في هذه الرواية بخصوصها نصره لرأيه ومن المعلوم أن احتمال الكذب لخصوصية في مورد خاص لا ينافي وثاقة الراوي في نفسه

1 Commentary of al-Mīr Dāmād on *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, 2/381.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 14/326, no. 9385.

As for what al-Shaykh mentioned in *al-Istibṣār*, it does not negate the ruling that states he is reliable. The most that can be stated is that al-Shaykh took into consideration the lying of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr in this narration specifically, in support of his opinion. It is known that considering lying in one specific instance does not negate the reliability of the narrator in and of himself.<sup>1</sup>

This is very strange! Al-Khūṭī acknowledges that the man lied, yet he justifies it and brings out this lie of his in a good way, which is to support his own opinion!

How can something like this be believed? He mixes truth with lies to support his opinion as well. However, because he was a reliable narrator according to al-Khūṭī, it is necessary to even justify a lie of his which they acknowledge came from him! As for the Ṣaḥābah, absolutely nothing is acceptable from them.

### **Aḥmad ibn Ḥammād al-Marwazī**

This narrator is also involved in lies. However, al-Khūṭī thinks that it is not proven from him. Despite this, al-Khūṭī states justifying such behaviour:

على أن ظهور الكذب أحيانا لا ينافي حسن الرجل فإن الجواد قد يكبو

However, the appearance of lying, at times, does not negate the uprightness of the person. After all, even the horse stumbles.<sup>2</sup>

And like this, al-Khūṭī regards the lying Imāmī narrator as a horse and, what he lied about a mere ‘stumble’ since, even horses stumble! We have the right to ask: Why was it not said about Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه or what he stated that it, too is a “stumbling of a horse?” And despite the fact that it is a lie, it does not negate the uprightness of Anas رضي الله عنه? The fact of the matter is that the issue is confusing. The scholar does not know what to remark!

---

1 Ibid., 11/132, no. 6745.

2 Ibid., 2/113. no. 542.

## ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm (famously known as ‘Allān)

The infallible Imām prohibited him from Ḥajj. He paid no attention to his command and opposed him. In justifying this behaviour, al-Khūṭī states:

إن مخالفة علي بن محمد إعلان لأمر الحجّة سلام الله عليه لتوقفه عن الخروج لا ينافي وثاقته مع أنه  
يمكن أن علي بن محمد لم يفهم من أمره سلام الله عليه أنه أمر مولوي، فلعله حمله على الإرشاد كما  
لعله الغالب في أوامره الشخصية إلى أصحابهم

‘Alī ibn Muḥammad, ‘Allān, opposing the command of al-Ḥujjah عليه السلام by stopping him from going out does not negate his reliability. While it is possible that ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad did not understand from his command that it was a divine command. Perhaps he understood it to be merely a suggestion, just as it might be the general case regarding their personal affairs with their companions.<sup>1</sup>

Ibrāhīm al-Shabbūṭ, a contemporary Imāmī scholar states:

إن مخالفة إعلان لأمر الصحاب عليه السلام في التوقف عن الحج في السنة التي حج فيها لا تعارض توثيقه  
فلعله كان نصيحة تختيارية

‘Allān’s disobeying the command of al-Ṣāhib عليه السلام in not going for Ḥajj in the year he went for Ḥajj does not negate his tawthīq. Perhaps it was optional advice.<sup>2</sup>

This is how the excuses come, “It is possible...” and “Perhaps it...” The reality of the matter is that he disobeyed what the infallible commanded him to do. However, because he was an Imāmī, this disobedience was forgiven. This is contrary to their position on the Ṣaḥābah. In a lengthy discussion rebuking the Ṣaḥābah<sup>3</sup>, al-Tījānī states:

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 13/138, no. 8403.

2 Ibrāhīm al-Shabbūṭ: *Dirāsāt fī Rijāl al-Ḥadīth (Thiqāt al-Ruwāt)*, p. 246, no. 482.

3 Al-Tījānī commented on what al-Bukhārī narrated in regards to the incident of al-Ḥudaybiyyah. The narration mentions, “When the writing of the peace treaty was concluded, Allah’s Messenger said to his companions, “Get up and slaughter your sacrifices and get your head shaved.” *continued...*

وأنا لي هنا وقفة فلا يمكن لي أن أقرأ مثل هذا ولا أتأثر ولا أعجب من تصرف هؤلاء الصحابة تجاه نبيهم وهل يقبل عاقل قول القائلين بأن الصحابة رضي الله عنهم كانوا يمثلون أو أمر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وينفذونها فهذه الحادثة تقطع عليهم ما يرومون هل يتصور عاقل بأن هذا التصرف في مواجهة النبي هو أمر هين أو مقبول أو معذور... أنا لا أكاد أصدق ما أقرأ وهل يصل الأمر بالصحابة إلى هذا الحد في التعامل مع أمر الرسول... فلا أراني إلا مسلما ومتحيرا ماذا عساني أن أقول وبم أعتذر عن هؤلاء الصحابة

I stopped here for I could not read this kind of material without feeling rather surprised about the behaviour of those Companions towards their Prophet. Could any sensible man accept some people's claims that the Companions may Allah bless them always obeyed and implemented the orders of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ for these incidents expose their lies and fall short of what they want! Could any sensible man imagine that such behaviour towards the Prophet is an easy or acceptable matter or even an excusable one... Allah, be praised! I could not believe what I had read. Could the Companions go to that extent in their treatment of the Messenger... I found myself resigned and perplexed. What could I say? What excuse could I find for those Companions...<sup>1</sup>

Why didn't al-Tījānī say what al-Khūī said, "While it is possible that 'Alī ibn Muḥammad did not understand from his command that it was a divine command. Perhaps he understood it to be merely a suggestion?"

This is the approach followed; there is no excuse for the mistakes of the Ṣaḥābah— if there are any. And even if they have an acceptable excuse, no excuse is sought

---

*continued from page 476*

By Allah none of them got up, and the Prophet ﷺ repeated his order thrice. When none of them got up, he left them and went to Umm Salamah and told her of the people's attitudes towards him. Umm Salamah said, "O the Prophet of Allah! Do you want your order to be carried out? Go out and don't say a word to anybody till you have slaughtered your sacrifice and call your barber to shave your head." So, the Prophet ﷺ went out and did not talk to anyone of them till he did that, i.e., slaughtered the sacrifice and called his barber who shaved his head. Seeing that, the companions of the Prophet ﷺ got up, slaughtered their sacrifices, and started shaving the heads of one another, and there was so much rush that there was a danger of killing each other." (*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Kitāb al-Shurūt, Bāb: *al-Shurūt fī al-Jihād wa al-Muṣālahah ma'a Ahl al-Ḥarb wa Kitābat al-Shurūt*, 2/973).

1 Muḥammad al-Tījānī: *Thumma Ihtadāyṭu*, p. 94.

for them. Their actions are understood in the vilest possible manner. As for the Imāmī narrator, they bring forth excuses on his behalf, even though they are neither believable nor interpretable, or they can be equally applied to what stemmed from some of the Ṣaḥābah.

### Abū Baṣīr

He has a number of positions. Firstly, al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of Ḥammād al-Nāb:

جلس أبو بصير على باب أبي عبد الله عليه السلام ليطلب الأذن فلم يؤذن له فقال لو كان معي طبق لأذن  
قال فجاء كلب فشعر في وجه أبي بصير قال أف أف ما هذا قال جلسه هذا كلب شعر في وجهك

Abū Baṣīr sat at the door of Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام to seek permission to enter. Permission was not granted to him.

He said, “If I had a dish (of food) with me, I would have been granted permission.”

A dog came and urinated on the face of Abū Baṣīr.

He said, “Uff! Uff! What is this?”

The one that was sitting with him said, “This dog urinated in your face.”<sup>1</sup>

Whoever reflects on this text with an eye of fairness, he will have no doubt that it is suggestive of Abū Baṣīr criticizing the infallible Imām. It is quite clear that Abū Baṣīr accused the infallible Imām of having a voracious stomach and that he only cares about those who bring him food. As for the one coming to seek knowledge,

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 173, no. 296. There is a difference of opinion between the scholars of the Imāmiyyah regarding this Abū Baṣīr. There are several people that share this name. Al-Kashshī mentioned this narration under the biography of Abū Baṣīr Layth ibn al-Bakhtarī. As mentioned in *al-Mu‘jam* (15/153), al-Khūṭī was of the opinion that it is Yaḥyā ibn al-Qāsim.

as Abū Baṣīr claims, he does not care about him! This sufficiently proves a criticism (against Abū Baṣīr). However, Imāmī scholars have another opinion. Mahdī al-Kajūrī (d. 1293 AH) criticized the isnād. Despite this criticism, assuming it is authentic (and this is what I want to explain), he justifies his actions saying:

الظاهر أن هذا مما مازح به البواب كما هو المتعارف في يومنا بل في قوله ليطلب الإذن دلالة على أن المراد فلم يؤذن له في طلب الإذن فتدبر ولا أقل من الاحتمال المساوي وشغل الكلب على التقدير الأول إنما هو لسوء الأدب بالنسبة إلى خدام الإمام عليه السلام فلا يصلح قرينة على كونه بالنسبة إليه عليه السلام

It seems as though the doorkeeper was joking with him—as is customary in our days. In fact, there is an indication in his statement “to seek permission” that the meaning is “and so permission was not granted to him” to seek permission. Think about it. This is equally possible. Assuming the first, the dog urinating (on him) was because of the ill-manners shown towards the servants of the Imām عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. Therefore, it is not suitable to presume it was in relation to the Imām عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.<sup>1</sup>

Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī states:

احتمال أن يكون الغرض التعريض بالبواب أو أن الطبق بمعنى المال أو المنزلة

It is possible that the intent was to expose the doorkeeper, or that the dish signified wealth or status.<sup>2</sup>

Imāmī scholars never stopped looking for excuses for their narrators to such an extent that, among his excuses, al-Māmaqānī stated:

لعل غرضه أمر صحيح وهو التأسف على تقديم هدية نظرا إلى قوله سبحانه يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِذَا نُجِئُكُمْ الرُّسُولَ فَاقْدُمُوا بَيْنَ يَدَيْ نَجْوِيكُمْ صَدَقَةٌ

1 Mahdī al-Kajūrī: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 161. Al-Mashkīnī mentioned the same in *al-Wajīzah*, p. 58.

2 Abū al-Hādī al-Kalbāsī: *Samā al-Maqāl fī 'Ilm al-Ḥadīth wa al-Rijāl*, 1/369.

Perhaps his intention was (based) on a valid concern. That is, the regret over not presenting a gift on the basis of Allah's سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ statement, "O you who have believed, when you [wish to] privately consult the Messenger, present before your consultation a charity."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, al-Māmaqānī made Abū Baṣīr's mocking the Imām an attempt at his ijtihād in trying to understand the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ. Al-Tustarī was shocked by this excuse and said:

فمع إباء الخبر عن حملة أي ربط له بالآية والصدقة للمساكين لا للمعصوم

Thus, in addition to denying the report its proper place, what connection is there to the verse? Ṣadaqaḥ is for the *masākīn* (needy), not the infallible.<sup>2</sup>

What if Abū Hurayrah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was in place of Abū Baṣīr in this narration? Would the response of the Imāmī scholars be the same as it was with Abū Baṣīr? There is no doubt that they would interpret his words in the worst possible manner and consider it a mockery against the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. This would be among the things that would necessitate leaving the religion.

Abū Baṣīr has another position which indicates a clear criticism of the infallible's knowledge. He gave a fatwā on that which he had no knowledge. Despite this, Imāmī scholars sought excuses on his behalf and pulled him out of criticizing the infallible imām. With an authentic chain, al-Ṭūsī narrated in *al-Istibṣār*:

عن شعيب العرقوفي قال سألت أبا الحسن عليه السلام عن رجل تزوج امرأة لها زوج ولم يعلم قال ترجم المرأة وليس على الرجل شيء إذا لم يعلم قال فذكرت ذلك لأبي بصير قال فقال لي والله جعفر عليه السلام ترجم المرأة ويجلد الرجل الحد وقال بيديه على صدره يحكه ما أظن أن صاحبنا تكامل علمه

On the authority of Shu'ayb al-'Aqraqūfī who said:

1 Sūrah al-Mujādilah: 12.

2 Al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 12/443.



I asked Abū al-Ḥasan (al-Kāzīm) about a man who married a woman who (already) had a husband and he did not know. He said, “The women will be stoned and there is nothing (i.e., punishment) on the man if he did not know.”

I mentioned that to Abū Baṣīr and he said, “By Allah, Ja’far عليه السلام said to me, ‘The woman will be stoned and the man will be given the punishment of lashing.’ Rubbing his hands on his chest, he said, ‘I do not think our companion’s knowledge is complete.’”<sup>1</sup>

This text clearly suggests a criticism of the Imām’s knowledge. However, al-Khūṭī has another opinion. He states:

هاتان الروايتان لا بد من رد علمهما إلى أهله فإن الرجل إذا لم يثبت أنه كان عالما بأن المرأة لها زوج فما هو الوجه في ضربه الحد ومجرد احتمال أنه كان عالما لا يجوز إجراء الحد عليه هذا من جهة نفس الرواية وأما من جهة دلالتها على ذم أبي بصير فغاية الأمر أنهما تدلان على أنه كان قاصرا في معرفته بعلم عليه السلام في ذلك الزمان لشبهة حصلت له وهي تخيله أن حكمه عليه السلام كان مخالفا لما وصل إليه من آبائه عليهم السلام وهذا مع أنه لا دليل على بقاءه واستمراره لا يضر بوثاقته مضافا إلى أن الظاهر أن المراد بأبي بصير في الرواية يحيى بن القاسم دون ليث المرادي فإنك ستعرف أنه لم يثبت كون ليث من أصحاب الكاظم عليه السلام

In order for these two narrations to be understood (correctly), they need to be explained by those who are competent. If it is not proven that the individual had (prior) knowledge of the woman (already) having a husband, then what is the reason for him to receive the punishment? It is not permissible to enact the punishment on him based on the mere possibility of him knowing beforehand. This is in terms of the actual narration. As for both of them suggesting a criticism of Abū Baṣīr, the most that can be said is that they prove that he did not completely know the extent of the Imām’s عليه السلام knowledge at that time—because of a doubt that occurred

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Istibṣār Fīmā Ikhtalafa min al-Akhbār*, 3/189, under the chapter *al-Rajul yatazawwaj bi imrāah thumma ‘alima ba’damā dakhala bihā anna lahā zawjan*, ḥadīth no. 687). Similarly, he narrated it in *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*, 7/487 under the chapter *al-Ziyādāt fī fiqh al-nikāh*, no. 165. Al-Majlisī made tawthīq of him in *Malādhah al-Akhyār*, 12/510.

to him. The doubt being that he imagined that his judgement عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was contrary to what reached him from his forefathers عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ. This, in addition to the fact that there is no proof of him remaining and maintaining this position which, in such an instance, would not negatively impact his reliability. Furthermore, it seems as though the Abū Baṣīr (mentioned) in the narration is Yaḥyā ibn al-Qāsim, not Layth al-Murādī. You will soon come to know that it is not proven that Layth is from the companions of al-Kāzīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.<sup>1</sup>

Here, we see al-Khūṭī delegating the meaning of the narration to the Ahl al-Bayt, despite how clear the criticism is the narration. However, because the narrator is an Imāmī (and not a Ṣaḥābī), al-Khūṭī acted in this manner. In this way, issues are oversimplified. This statement would be similar to one of the Ṣaḥābah saying to the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, “Your knowledge is not complete!” What if ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān said this to the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, will the Imāmiyyah say that ‘Uthmān was excused? Or, a doubt occurred to him? Or, “there is no proof of him remaining and maintaining this position which, in such an instance, would not negatively impact his reliability.” Or, we will delegate the understanding of the narration to the people of knowledge?

But, because the person who pronounced this statement was an Imāmī, it is necessary to understand it in the best possible manner, even though it is considered disbelief according to the foundational principles of the Imāmī school. As for al-Khūṭī’s statement that it is Yaḥyā ibn al-Qāsim who is intended in the

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 15/155, no. 9798. Refer to al-Māmaqānī’s *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 2/46, for his discussion on this issue. He mentions that some of the reasons mentioned by the Imāmī scholars in justifying the narration are not acceptable. He states, “In fairness, it is contrary to its apparent meaning. However, it needed to be done because it does not make sense that Abū Jaʿfar would carry out the punishment on a person that did not know the lady had an existing husband, as is self-evident.” Thus, he is acknowledging that this occurred from Abū Baṣīr and, despite that, he sought an excuse for him because the matter did not make sense! Did the scholars of the Imāmiyyah seek excuses for the Ṣaḥābah when they did not shave their heads in al-Ḥudaybiyyah? No. Rather, they understood their actions in the worst possible manner.

narration, I say that this, too does not make a difference. Ibn al-Qāsim is a thiqāh that has a high standing with the Imāmī scholars, among them al-Khūṭī. He made tawthīq of him in *al-Muʿjam*.<sup>1</sup> Regardless of what is meant, how can words that clearly denounce the Imām’s knowledge ever be justified?

As for his statement, “there is no proof of him remaining and maintaining this position,” it is nothing more than conjecture in that it is assumed that the narrator repented and turned back to Allah for his actions. In fact, al-Khūṭī is the one that is required to prove that Abū Baṣīr desisted from his actions.

### Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān

He is one of the senior narrators of the Imāmiyyah. There are several clearly defamatory narrations from the infallible Imam with authentic chains. Of them, what al-Ṣaḍūq narrated:

عن علي بن مهزيار قال كتبت إلى أبي جعفر محمد بن علي بن موسى الرضا عليهم السلام جعلت فداك أصلي خلف من يقول بالجسم ومن يقول بقول يونس بن عبد الرحمن فكتب عليه السلام لا تصلوا خلفهم ولا تعطوهم من الزكاة وابعءوا منهم برئ الله منهم

On the authority of ‘Alī ibn Mihzayār who said:

I wrote to Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā عليه السلام, “May I be ransomed for your sake! (Should) I read ṣalāh behind the person who holds anthropomorphist beliefs, and the person who believes in what Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān believes in?”

He عليه السلام wrote back, “Do not read ṣalāh behind them and do not give them of zakāh. Disassociate yourselves from them, Allah will disassociate from them.”<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 21/79, no. 13599.

2 Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī al-Ṣaḍūq: *al-Amālī*, p. 229, no. 3, # 47.

As it seems, the narration contains the anthropomorphic belief of Yūnus. According to the Imāmiyyah, this necessitates disbelief, as has already been mentioned. The infallible gave a ruling that ṣalāh should not be read behind him, that zakāh should not be given to him, and that Allah disassociated from him; despite this, the Imāmī scholars have another opinion. In justifying this, al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 AH) states:

والسند في غاية الصحة الحكاية المكاتبه ويمكن أن يكون قول يونس قول اشتهر في ذلك الزمان نسبتة إليه ولم يكن قوله واقعا أو يكون قوله يعنى ابن عبد الرحمن من بعض الرواة اجتهادا وكان خطأ أو أن الغرض منه كان دفاعا عنه وتخليصا له عن بعض يد الحساد أو غير ذلك

The chain of narration of the written report is very much authentic. It is possible that the statement of Yūnus was famously attributed to him at that time and not actually his. Or, it can be that his statement, i.e., Ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān’s, was actually an effort by some narrators, and it was a mistake. Or, the purpose of it was to defend him and free him from the hands of some jealous people. Or other such reasons.<sup>1</sup>

As we see, he sought whatever excuses he was able to by using the words, “It is possible,” or, “It can be that.” In fact, he even sought excuses with things he was unable to justify such that he ended his words with, “Or other such reasons.” Therefore, his words prove that he did not have a definitively explicit opinion on the narration and so, for the sake of Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, he began justifying on his behalf by any means necessary, even if it meant contravening the outward meaning of the text. The scholars of the Imāmiyyah did not do this with the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

Al-Khūṭī states:

إن هناك روايتين صحيحتين دلتا على انحراف يونس وسوء عقيدته

There are two authentic narrations that prove the deviance of Yūnus and his false belief.

1 Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī: *Ta’līqah ‘alā Manhaj al-Maqāl*, p. 366.

After al-Khūṭī acknowledged that the narration he mentioned is authentic, he stated:

It is necessary that the knowledge of these two narrations be addressed by its rightful people. They are unable to conflict with the previously mentioned sound narrations which include ṣaḥīḥ as well. As mentioned, this is in addition to such narrations being supported by the fact that jurists and other great scholars acknowledge the eminence of Yūnus and his high standing to such an extent that he is regarded among the people of *ijmāʿ* (scholarly consensus). All of this is under the assumption that these narrations were not mentioned because of highlighting a defect; in such a case, they still do not negate the narrator's reliability since this is what is required in determining the authoritative value of a narration.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, al-Khūṭī handed over the matter to the Ahl al-Bayt and entrusted the narration's meaning to them, despite admitting that the narration is authentic and that it proves deviation and false belief of the narrator. Why did al-Khūṭī not deal with it in the way he dealt with the Ṣaḥābah after establishing with certainty the Ahl al-Bayt's criticism of him. The only reason is because Yūnus, the anthropomorphist—as the narration states—is a revered Imāmī. As such, excuses *must* be sought on his behalf, even though they are illogical and contradict the apparent meaning of the text. In fact, even entrusting the narration's meaning to the Ahl al-Bayt! Al-Khūṭī did not entrust the matter to the Ahl al-Bayt in this narration alone. Under the biography of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, he states:

إن هناك رواية واحدة صحيحة السند دلت على ذم هشام بن الحكم... عن أبي الحسن الرضا عليه السلام قال أما كان لكم في أبي الحسن عليه السلام عظة ما ترى حال هشام بن الحكم فهو الذي صنع بأبي الحسن عليه السلام ما صنع وقال لهم وأخبرهم أترى الله أن يغفر له ما ركب منا

There is one narration with an authentic chain of narration that reveals a condemnation of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam... On the authority of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā عليه السلام, “Is there not for you in Abū al-Ḥasan a lesson? Do you not see

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 21/226, no. 13863.

the condition of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam? He is the one who did what he did to Abū al-Ḥasan عنه السلام. He said to them and informed them, ‘Do you think Allah will forgive him for what he done to us.’”<sup>1</sup>

Then al-Khūṭī attempted to justify the narration and ended with the following words:

وكيف كان فهذه الرواية غير قابلة للتصديق فلا بد من رد علمها إلى أهلها

Whatever the case, this narration is not believable. Consequently, the understanding of it needs to go back to its qualified people.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭī was of the opinion that the matter be handed over to the Ahl al-Bayt as they are the people of knowledge, despite the fact that the narration actually comes from them in that Hishām is being held responsible for the murder of Mūsā ibn Ja‘far. Why are they not convinced of what they said?! Assume for a moment that it is not possible to believe in the narration. How then, can he believe in the narration that criticizes the Ṣaḥābah and contains therein accusations against Anas, ‘Ā’ishah, and Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنهم of lying? And they are not even authentic!

Here the flaw is clear in that he prefers the weak narration when it is in conformity with his opinion, and he rejects the authentic narration when it opposes his opinion. Thus, there is no real academic methodology according to al-Khūṭī when dealing with the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

It is important to point out what Ibrāhīm al-Shabbūṭī stated regarding the narrations that criticize Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. He states:

إن في روايات الدم ما هو صحيح أيضا والجواب إن الحال كذلك ولكن هذا الصحيح شأنه شأن ما روي من صحيح في حق زرارة ومحمد بن مسلم وبريد العجلي ومعروف بن خربوذ وهشام بن الحكم وأبي بصير وغيرهم من العدول الأثبات وهو صحيح ولكن يلزم التوقف فيه على كل حال فهيهات من

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 278, no. 496.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 20/315, no. 13358.

أئمة الهدى أن يناقضوا أنفسهم في أصحابهم ولكن قد تكون ظروف خاصة ومصالح معينة وتوجيه غير معروف لدينا فهم عليهم السلام أعرف بالحال وقت صدوره منهم لذلك لا ينبغي البناء عليه في مقابل المدح المستفيض الذي يورث اليقين والعدالة والوثاقة في يونس بن عبد الرحمن

There is also an authentic narration among the narrations of criticism. The answer: The situation is like that; however, the authentic report is similar to the authentic reports narrated about Zurārah, Muḥammad ibn Muslim, Burayd al-ʿIjlī, Maʿrūf ibn Kharrabūdh, Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, Abū Baṣīr, and other reliable and upright narrators. It is authentic; however, judgement on it needs to be suspended regardless. It is completely out of the question that the Imāms of guidance would contradict themselves in regards to their companions. Rather, it could be based on special circumstances, particular interests, and a direction unbeknownst to us. After all, they عليهم السلام know better the condition in which these statements were made. Therefore, it is not appropriate to build upon a premise which clashes with such extensive praise that it gives a sense of conviction, ‘adālah, and reliability regarding Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān.<sup>1</sup>

And like this, the justifications differ. If they knew that their excuses do not stand up to the facts mentioned in the authentic narrations, they would say as al-Shabūṭ stated: “...direction would be unbeknownst to us. After all, they عليهم السلام know better the condition in which these statements were made.” Or, as al-Khūī stated, knowledge of the narration should be handed over to Ahl al-Bayt! Accordingly, excuses that are unknown are sought after for them which, as a practice, is contrary to how they deal with the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

I end with the vindication offered by Jaʿfar al-Subḥānī for one of the anthropomorphists, Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam. After it is proven that there are authentic reports that prove his belief in *Tajsīm*, he states:

إن هذه الآراء مما يستحيل أن يتحلل بها تلميذ الإمام الصادق عليه السلام الذي تربى في أحضانه

---

1 Ibrāhīm al-Shabbūt: *Dirāsāt fī Rijāl al-Ḥadīth (Thiqāt al-Ruwāṭ)*, p. 446, no. 769.

These are from among the opinions that are impossible for a student brought up in the arms of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام to uphold.<sup>1</sup>

According to the opinion of al-Subḥānī, whoever was brought up in the arms of al-Ṣādiq, it is impossible for him to uphold corrupt opinions to such an extent that he essentially becomes protected (*maʿṣūm*) from mistakes! As for those who were brought up by the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, and who accompanied him like his shadow, all of them apostatized except for a few that can be counted on the fingers of one hand. What is wrong with you? How do you make judgement?

### Abū Ḥamzah al-Thimālī Thābit ibn Dīnār

Accused of drinking nabīdh by al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl. In general, if it is mentioned by one of the narrators that he drinks nabīdh, then it is, according to the Imāmī school, generally considered a form of criticism. Listing the different causes of defamation of a narrator, signs of disparagement, reasons for rejecting a and deeming a narration to be weak, ʿAlī al-Burūjirdī (d. 1313 AH) states:

ومنها يشرب النبيذ أو يأكل الطين وهما تفسيق مع ذكر السبب نعم ما ذكر في الأجلة من أنهم يشربون النبيذ كما في ثابت بن دينار وابن أبي يعفور أو يأكلون الطين كما في داود بن القاسم فعدم الثبوت والجهل بالحرمة وقبل الوثاقة وأمثالها محتملة

Among them: he (i.e., the narrator) drinks nabīdh or eats dirt. Both of these are considered grounds for transgression whereby the reason is mentioned.

Yes, there is mention of some of our distinguished narrators, such as Thābit ibn Dīnār and Ibn Abī Yaʿfūr drinking nabīdh, as well as the likes of Dāwūd ibn al-Qāsim eating dirt. However, it is possible that these narrations have not been proven to be true, or these narrators were unaware of it being ḥarām, or such actions occurred before (them) being deemed reliable, or other such reasons. These are all possibilities.<sup>2</sup>

1 Jaʿfar al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fi ʿIlm al-Rijāl*, p. 418.

2 ʿAlī al-Burūjirdī: *Ṭarāʾif al-Maqāl*, 2/271.



Thus, when al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl accused Abū Ḥamzah al-Thumālī of drinking nabīdh, al-Khūṭī confronted him in justifying the latter’s actions saying:

وكيف كان فعلي بن الحسن لم يدرك أبا حمزة ليكون إخباره عن شربه النبيذ إخبارا عن حس بل إنما هو شيء سمعه ولعله اعتمد في ذلك على إخبار من لا يوثق بخبره أو أن أبا حمزة كان يشرب النبيذ الحلال فتخيل علي بن الحسن أنه النبيذ الحرام

Whatever the case may be, ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan did not meet Abū Ḥamzah such that his informing about him drinking nabīdh can be considered something perceptible. Rather, it is something he only heard. Perhaps he relied on the report of someone whose reliability in reports is not established. Or, Abū Ḥamzah would drink ḥalāl nabīdh, but ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan thought it was ḥarām nabīdh that he drank.<sup>1</sup>

And like this, al-Khūṭī dealt with those who he wanted to make tawthīq of. He assumed his actions in the best possible manner and mentioned statements like “Perhaps it,” or “Or that...” In doing so, he enlisted an unlimited number of excuses in order to support this Imāmī narrator. Interesting enough, al-Khūṭī mentioned that “‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan did not meet Abū Ḥamzah such that his informing of Ḥasan drinking nabīdh is actually from him. Rather, it is something he merely heard.” Here, we have the right to ask al-Khūṭī: Were the rulings of al-Najjāshī and al-Ṭūsī on narrators based on something perceptible?

Most of what al-Najjāshī mentioned, in fact, all of what he mentioned, is regarding narrators whom he never met. He mentions rulings about them with no basis. Why did al-Khūṭī not object to them? However, when he wanted to make tawthīq of a person, he made tawthīq, even though, had it been applied in another instance, it would have destroyed the foundation and part of the pillars of al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl (according to the Imāmiyyah).

Describing the condition of al-Thumālī, al-Bahbūdī states:

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/296, no. 1960.

إنما وثَّقه الأصحاب لا اعتقادهم أنَّ فسق الجوارح وخطأ الأفعال لا يضر بالصدق وعندني أن خبر الفاسق مردود إليه حتى يعرف صدقه من ناحية أخرى وهذا الرجل كان فاسقا لشربه النبيذ على ما ذكره الرجالي الأقدم علي بن الحسن بن فضال وأدعاء أبي حمزة في ترك شرب النبيذ لا يقبل وخصوصا عند موته أو قبل موته فإن الفاسق ما دام فاسقا غير مؤتمن وتوبته لا تفيد في أخباره السابقة شيئا

The companions made tawthīq of him because of their belief that transgression of the limbs and actions that are considered mistakes do not negatively affect the narrator's truthfulness. According to me, the report of a fāsiq is rejected until his truthfulness is ascertained from another perspective. Because of what al-Ḥasan ibn Faḍḍāl, one of the foremost scholars of narrators mentioned, this person was a fāsiq because of drinking nabīdh. The claim that Abū Ḥamzah gave up on drinking nabīdh is not acceptable, especially at the time or just before his death. This is because a fāsiq, as long as he remains a fāsiq, he is considered untrustworthy and his repentance is of no benefit<sup>1</sup> in relation to his past reports.<sup>2</sup>

### Ḥarīz ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Sijistānī

Al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī made tawthīq of him. He too disobeyed the command of the infallible. Despite that, al-Khūṭī justified it in a manner that I could not find proof for. While acknowledging that it is a criticism that is proven with an authentic chain, al-Khūṭī states:

وإن كان ذنبا كما يظهر من الصحيحة إلا أنه قابل للزوال بالتوبة ولا شك في أن حريزا ندم على فعله حينما ظهر له عدم رضى الإمام به فإن الحجب كان وقتيا من جهة تأديب حريز لثلا يصدر منه مثل ذلك فيما بعد فإن الحجب لو كان دائما لشاع وذاع مع أنه لم يذكر إلا في هذه الرواية ويؤيد ذلك أن الإمام عليه السلام قد أذن لحريز بعد حجبه في الدخول عليه إكثار حريز من الرواية عن الصادق عليه السلام واحتمال أن تكون جميع هذه الروايات قد صدرت قبل الحجب بعيد جدا كما لا يخفى

1 In the original version, it was written as “*lā ufid* (with a ‘yā’); however, what I have written here (i.e., ‘*lā tufid* (with a ‘tā’)) is more correct.

2 Muḥammad al-Bahbūdī: *Mā’rifat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 188. See: *Naẓariyyat al-Sunnah fī al-Fikr al-Imāmī* of Ḥaydar Ḥubb Allāh, p. 778. The author transmitted from al-Bahbūdī his justifying the weakness of al-Thumālī.

Even though it is a sin, as it appears from the authentic reports, it is possible to have it removed by means of repentance. There is no doubt that Ḥarīz was remorseful for his actions when he saw that the Imām was not pleased with him. As such, debarring him was temporary, in order to teach Ḥarīz so that such a thing would not come from him again. If the debarring was permanent, it would be widespread and common knowledge. This is in addition to the fact that it is only mentioned in this one narration. What further proves this is that the Imām عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ granted permission to Ḥarīz—after debarring him—to enter his presence; (subsequently), Ḥarīz narrated a lot from al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. It is highly unlikely and practically self-evident that the possibility of all these narrations occurring before him being debarred.<sup>1</sup>

Even the sins of the Ṣaḥābah can be forgiven by means of repentance.

I could not find the basis for his statement, “Ḥarīz was remorseful...” This is in all likelihood based on his having a good opinion of him.

The statement he made on how the barring must have been temporary and not permanent (because of the fact that it would have been common knowledge and widespread) is a claim with no evidence. Despite this, al-Khūī looked for whatever excuse was possible for him to such an extent that he made a claim without any evidence! Did the scholars of the Imāmiyyah venerate and treat the Companions of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ the same way they treated the companions of the infallibles? Fairness is something great.

### **Muḥammad ibn al-Khalīl al-Sakkāk**

In mentioning his books, al-Najjāshī states:

له كتاب سماه التوحيد وهو تشبيهه ونقض عليه

---

1 Al-Khūī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 5/232, no. 2645.

He has a book that he named *al-Tawhīd*. It is *tashbīh* (anthropomorphism).  
He has been criticized for it.<sup>1,2</sup>

See how many excuses al-Māmaqānī made. Commenting on the statement of al-Najjāshī, “It is *tashbīh*,” al-Māmaqānī states:

لم أفهم معناه لأن اشتغال كتابه على ما هو في نظر غيره تشبيه لا ينافي كونه إمامياً ولعل غرضه ليس هو  
مقابلة قول الشيخ بقول النجاشي بل مجرد بيان أن في كتابه ما فهم غيره منه التشبيه ونقضه [ونحن] نقول  
أن الرمي بالتشبيه عند القدماء كالرمي بالعلو يبادرون إليه بأدنى شيء والرجل لا يعقل في حقه التشبيه ولو  
كان في كتابه ما يظهر منه ذلك فلا بد من توجيهه لجلالته وكيف يعقل التشبيه ممن خلفه مثل يونس بن  
عبد الرحمن أم كيف يمكن ذلك ممن اعترف الفضل بن شاذان بكونه خلفه وتلميذه أم كيف يمكن ذلك  
ممن ترجم عليه مثل الفضل بن شاذان فالحق ان الرجل إمامي ممدوح فهو في أعلى درجات الحسن

I do not understand what he means. The fact that the book contains, according to the view of someone else, *tashbīh*, does not negate the fact that he is an Imāmī. Perhaps his intention was not to counter the statement of al-Shaykh with the statement of al-Najjāshī; but rather to explain that there is, in his book, what others understood to be *tashbīh* and criticized him. (And we<sup>3</sup>) say that being accused of *tashbīh* by the early generation is similar to being accused of *ghuluww* (extremism). For the slightest reason, they would hasten to brand someone an extremist. *Tashbīh* for such a person does not make sense, even if such a belief appears in his book. Focus should rather be on his greatness. How can *tashbīh* be understood from

---

1 Commenting on the statement of al-Najjāshī “It is *tashbīh*,” ‘Alī al-Burūjirdī (d. 1313 AH) states, “In other words, it is not (a book on) *tawhīd*; rather, (it is a book) on *tashbīh* (anthropomorphism) and *shirk* (polytheism)” (*Ṭarā’if al-Maqāl*, 1/348, no. 2603). This ‘Alī al-Burūjirdī is different to Sayyid al-Ṭā’ifāh, al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Ṭabāṭabā’ī al-Burūjirdī (d. 1380 AH). From the works of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Burūjirdī is *Tartīb Asānīd al-Kāfī*. This is a portion of the massive encyclopedia on narrators that contains *Tartīb Asānīd al-Kutub al-Arba’ah* and *Tartīb Asānīd Kutub al-Ṣadūq*. He also has a famous book, *Jāmi’ Aḥādīth al-Shī’ah*, and other works. Muḥammad Riḍā al-Jalālī mentioned a lengthy biography on him in *al-Manhaj al-Rijālī wa al-‘Amal al-Rā’id fī al-Mawsū’ah al-Rijāliyyah li al-Burūjirdī*.

2 Al-Najjāshī, p. 328, no. 889; al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 244, no. 831.

3 The original book contained the letters “waw and ḥā.” This was unclear so I changed it to “and we (wa nahnu)” as translated above. This is closer to the intended meaning.

a person who was succeeded by the likes Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān? Or, how is that possible from someone whom al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān admitted that he is his successor and his student? Or, how can that be possible from someone whom al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān offered a supplication of mercy for? The truth is that the individual is a praiseworthy Imāmī. Thus, he is in among the highest levels of respectability.<sup>1</sup>

This is what al-Māmaqānī concluded. Also bearing in mind that he believed every Ṣaḥābī that lived after the death of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ became an apostate—unless he proves his Islam (as already discussed). Al-Māmaqānī did not say that he does not “understand the meaning” of the Ṣaḥābah’s apostasy, and that their apostasy was “according to the view of others only”, and not a reality. Or, that apostasy from them “does not make sense” because of all of their efforts in the path of Allah. Or, apostasy “does not make sense” from them because of their greatness and the Qur’ān’s praise of them. Or he did not say, “How can they apostatise knowing that Allah is pleased with them?” As he stated, “Or how can that be possible from someone whom al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān offered a supplication of mercy for? He searched for all of these excuses for him knowing that there is the testimony from one of their Imāmī experts, al-Najjāshī, stating that he (i.e., al-Sakkāk) wrote on tashbīh! Here, al-Māmaqānī only attacked the expertise and trustworthiness of al-Najjāshī so as to free this Imāmī narrator from what the Imāmī scholars testified to. As for the Ṣaḥābah, according to al-Māmaqānī they are all disbelieving apostates! What is (wrong) with you? How do you make judgement?

### **Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Awn al-Asadī**

Al-Najjāshī states regarding him:

كان يقول بالجبر والتشبيه

He used to believe in jabr and tashbīh.<sup>2</sup>

1 ‘Abd Allah al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 3:115.

2 Al-Najjāshī, p. 373, no. 1020.

Attempting to support him, al-Ḥusayn al-Burūjirdī, *Sayyid al-Ṭāʿifah* according to the Imāmiyyah states:

القول بالجبر من مثله عجيب والقول بالتشبيه أعجب لكن لما لم ينقل إلينا كلامه في المسألتين كنا في فسحة من ذلك إذ يحتمل أن يكون رميه بهما مستندا إلى ما لو وقع إلينا لم نستفد منه ذلك

The belief in jabr from the likes of him is strange. And the belief in tashbiḥ is even stranger. However, because his actual statements regarding these two issues have not been transmitted to us, we have the flexibility in this regard as it is possible that him being accused of such beliefs is based on that which if something similar occurred to us, we (too) would not conclude that he holds such beliefs.<sup>1</sup>

And the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābī isn't strange! And the opinion that all except a few of them apostatized isn't stranger! I do not know why they paid no attention to the opinion of al-Najjāshī on the individual in that he believes in tashbiḥ! Al-Najjāshī neither attributed this opinion to someone who does not know the narrator nor did he mention it from someone that is not qualified to give such opinions. Rather, it is an opinion from al-Najjāshī himself! Despite that, the ruling did not appeal to Imāmī scholars such as al-Burūjirdī, despite them knowing full well that they were unable to find an opinion opposing it. As such, they do not have a statement of their predecessors to oppose the words of al-Najjāshī; rather, all they have is a defence of an Imāmī narrator, even though the early generation of Imāmī scholars maintained that he held serious blasphemous beliefs according to the view of the Imāmiyyah, such as the belief in tashbiḥ.

### **Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā al-Ashʿarī**

By agreement, he is a thiqah according to the Imāmiyyah. You need only what al-Najjāshī stated about him:

---

1 This is how Muḥammad Riḍā al-Jalālī narrated it from him in his book, *al-Manhaj al-Rijālī li al-Burūjirdī* (p. 111). In the marginalia, al-Jalālī states regarding the source: “*Nihāyat al-Taqrīr*, 2/311, with a slight change and clarification.”

The undisputed scholar of the Qummīs, their luminary, and their jurist.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kulaynī narrates a long narration the gist of which is that Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā rejected and concealed the testimony regarding the waṣīyyah of Imām Abū Jaʿfar al-Thānī Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Jawwād to his son, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Thālith ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Hādī. That is because when he was requested for the testimony of this waṣīyyah (which he testified to and was considered the second witness to it), the people requested the first witness who witnessed with him, as mentioned in a lengthy story. When Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad was requested for the testimony with his companion, he refused and declined. It comes in *al-Kāfi*:

فأنكر أحمد [بن محمد بن عيسى] أن يكون سمع من هذا شيئاً فدعاه أبي [أي الشاهد الأول الذي كان معه] إلى المبالهة فقال لما حقق عليه [وفي رواية فخاف منها أي المبالهة] قال قد سمعت ذلك وهذا مكرمة كنت أحب أن تكون لرجل من العرب لا من العجم...

Aḥmad (ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā) denied hearing anything of this and so my father called him (i.e., the first witness that was with him) to a *mubāhalah* (invocation of Allah’s curse). When it was actualized (in a narration, ‘He feared it, i.e., the *mubāhalah*’), he said, ‘I heard that (i.e., the waṣīyyah). This was something special that I wanted an Arab to have, not a non-Arab...’<sup>2</sup>

Regardless of whether the narration is authentic or not, what concerns us is how the Imāmī scholars dealt with Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā in his concealing the testimony and not wanting to express it except after (if the narration is authentic) fear (i.e., of the *mubāhalah*). If the person denying the testimony was a Ṣaḥābī, the Shīʿī printing houses would have gleefully included this in the books which prove the disbelief of the Ṣaḥābī. It would be similar to how their scholars lengthily recorded the criticism of Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه who, according to their

1 Al-Najjāshī, p. 82, no. 198.

2 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfi*, 1:324 (Bāb: *al-Ishārah wa al-Naṣṣ ʿalā Abī al-Ḥasan al-Thālith* – narration no. 2).

claim, concealed the testimony that ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه requested from him— despite the fact that the narration is a lie against Anas رضي الله عنه and not authentic.<sup>1</sup> What is your opinion? Did the Imāmī scholars do with Aḥmad the same they did with Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه? Bearing in mind that Aḥmad lied by claiming he heard something. Let us see. Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī states:

لا ينبغي التأمل في وثاقته ولعله كان زلة صدرت فتاب

It is not appropriate to think about his reliability. Perhaps it was a mistake that occurred and he (subsequently) repented.<sup>2</sup>

Muḥammad Riḍā al-Jalālī narrates for us words from al-Ḥusayn al-Burūjirdī. He states:

ما يحكى عن خيران الخادم من أنه كتم الشهادة على وصية أبي جعفر عليه السلام... إن ثبت كان زلة وقعت منه في شبابه ولا يصلح لمعارضة ما دل على عدالته حينما تكامل سنه وصار الشيوخ يتحملون الحديث عنه فكم للإنسان من حالات مختلفة تعتوره في مدة حياته

What has been narrated on the authority of Khāyṙān al-Khādīm in that he (i.e., Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad) concealed the testimony of Abū Ja‘far’s عليه السلام waṣīyyah... If it is proven, it was a mistake that took place in his youth. As such, it cannot contravene what proves his ‘adālah when he matured and when the scholars took ḥadīth from him. How many different experiences does a person experience in the course of his life?<sup>3</sup>

1 Ibn Taymiyyah states in *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah*, 8/157: Ibn Abī al-Dunyā wrote a book regarding those whose supplications are answered; although, he did not mention an isnād for the aforementioned stories from ‘Alī. Therefore, judgement need be suspended until their authenticity is verified, despite the fact that they (already) contain certain lies therein, such as his supplication for Anas to get leprosy, and the supplication against Zayd ibn Arqam to become blind.” The point here is not to prove whether Anas was afflicted with leprosy or not; rather, the question is: Did the leprosy occur because of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib’s supplication? This is the lie.

2 Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl*, 1/341.

3 This is how Muḥammad Riḍā al-Jalālī narrated it from him in his book, *al-Manhaj al-Rijālī li al-Burūjirdī*, p. 203.



If it is proven to be true, then it is because of the indiscretion of youth, according to al-Burūjirdī. If only the scholars of the Imāmiyyah said this about Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه! Ponder over the following text which the Imāmī scholars apply to the companions of the infallibles (according to them) and deny it for the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. Speaking about him, al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī states:

وهؤلاء الخمسة من عيون الطائفة ووجوهها والعثرة المنقولة عن أحمد من كتمان الشهادة كبعض العثرات المنقولة عن غيره من الأعاظم فقل سلموا عنها إلا أنهم جبروها بما تقدم عليها وتأخر منهم مما صار سببا لعدم الاعتناء وإعراض الأصحاب عنها وعدم عددهم إياها من قوادح علو مقامهم فضلا عن الخلل في عدلتهم

These five are from the most eminent and distinguished of the group. The mistake reported about Aḥmad regarding his concealing the testimony is similar to the mistakes reported about other notables. Very rarely are people free from such errors. However, they repaired such mistakes with what (good) came before and after it. All of which became a reason for the scholars turning away from it, paying no attention to it, and not considering it to be a criticism of their high-standing, let alone impact their ‘adālah.<sup>1</sup>

Are these words not similar to the words of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah when responding to some of the Shī‘ī resentment raised against the Ṣaḥābah in that they too have good deeds, which we hope will be reparation for them. Ibn Taymiyyah states:

ولهم من السوابق والفضائل ما يوجب مغفرة ما يصدر منهم ان صدر حتى أنه يغفر لهم من السيئات ما لا يغفر لمن بعدهم لأن لهم من الحسنات التي تمحو السيئات ما ليس لمن بعدهم... ثم اذا كان قد صدر من أحدهم ذنب فيكون قد تاب منه أو أتى بحسنات تمحوه أو غفر له بفضل سابقته أو بشفاعته محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم الذي هم أحق الناس بشفاعته أو ابتلى ببلاء في الدنيا كفر به عنه فإذا كان هذا في الذنوب المحققة فكيف بالأمور التي كانوا فيها مجتهدين إن أصابوا فلهم أجران وان اخطأوا فلهم اجر واحد والخطأ مغفور لهم

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 4/54.

They enjoy such precedence and virtues that necessitate forgiveness of what they did, if they did anything, to such an extent that they can be forgiven for such bad deeds that nobody else after them can be forgiven for (i.e., if they committed the same bad deeds). This is because they enjoy such good deeds that others after them do not enjoy through which the bad deeds are removed... Furthermore, if a sin befell one of them, then he definitely repented from it, or he brought such good deeds that can remove it. Or, he is forgiven by virtue of his antecedence to Islam. Or, he is forgiven by the intercession of Muḥammad ﷺ since they are most deserving of his intercession. Or, they were afflicted with such an affliction in this world that it expiated whatever they did. If this is in relation to actual sins (they committed), what then about those issues they exercised their *ijtihād* (personal discretion) in; if they were correct, they receive two rewards, and if they were incorrect, they receive one reward and the mistake is forgiven.<sup>1</sup>

However, the scholars of the Imāmiyyah deprive such forgiveness for the first forerunners of the Ṣaḥābah and yet al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī affords it to Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā and his likes!

#### **4.4.2 Practical application of the criticisms that al-Khūʿī and other Imāmiyyah raised against the Ṣaḥābah and that which they regarded as being from the reasons of criticism against reliable narrators according to the Imāmiyyah**

I will end this chapter with a comparative analysis and a display of some examples that the Imāmiyyah consider to be a criticism of the Ṣaḥābah against reliable Imāmī narrators. This will be done in order for the scholar to realize that the Imāmī scholars did not deal fairly with the Ṣaḥābah, as they did with their reliable narrators. I reiterate that the Imāmiyyah were not impartial with their reliable narrators; rather, they went out of their way and overlooked the big and small criticisms for them. This is different to the methodology they followed in dealing with the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ.

---

1 *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā*, 3/155.

Anyone who sees what the Imāmī scholars have written on the ‘adālah of the Ṣaḥābah as well as gathered from their lives in order to use as a criticism of their ‘adālah will know that all of this can easily be applied to their so-called reliable narrators. However, this did not happen nor will it ever happen since they know that in doing so will result in overthrowing all of their aḥādīth that go through those whom they consider reliable—if they applied the same methodology in their dealing with the Ṣaḥābah.

I must point out something important here, which is to say that everything the Imāmī scholars have collected and disseminated through all of their possible means on the Ṣaḥābah was not for the sake of deposing their ‘adālah—as they claim. Rather, as per their claim, it is for establishing the apostasy that occurred after the death of the Prophet ﷺ. Thus, discussions concerning the alleged mistakes of Ṣaḥābah such as Zayd or ‘Umar only stem from their opinion that states they were apostates. If an Imāmī scholar was forced to admit that whatever he mentioned about so-and-so Ṣaḥābī was incorrect, and what he thought to be a criticism turned out to be false, then will this new judgement mean that that Ṣaḥābī now has ‘adālah?

The answer is no. Firstly, because he believes that he is an apostate. According to him, this is one of his foundational beliefs. Secondly, he gathered everything that he considered as a criticism against this companion *after* pronouncing his apostasy. And they only openly make takfīr or accuse them of apostasy when the Imāmī scholar’s uncertainties regarding the Ṣaḥābah are proven to be false and exposed.

Let us now look at some of their criticisms against the Ṣaḥābah and apply them to their narrators.

### **Abū Hurayrah** رضي الله عنه

The Imāmī scholars have heavily criticized him to such an extent that al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 AH) stated under his discussion on the Ṭābī‘ī, Ṭāwūs ibn Kaysān:

إن من كان شيخه أبا هريرة وراويہ مجاهد وعمرو بن دينار لحري بأن يعد من كلاب أصحاب النار

Whoever's teacher is Abū Hurayrah and his narrators are Mujāhid and 'Amr ibn Dīnār, it is appropriate to consider such people to be from the dogs of the people of the Fire.<sup>1</sup>

This is regarding the person who narrates from him. What then about him رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ!?

Most scholars of the Imāmiyyah described him as a liar and untrustworthy. They tried to overemphasize the amount of his narrations to such an extent that Mujtabā al-'Irāqī, the editor of 'Awālī al-Lāālī exaggerated the amount and stated in the book's marginalia:

أبا هريرة تفرد وانفرد بنقل اثني عشر ألف حديث من غير مشارك

Abu Hurayrah has isolated reports. He alone transmitted twelve thousand ḥadīth that nobody transmitted.”<sup>2</sup>

The number he mentioned has no grounds of authenticity. In disapproval, al-Amīnī states:

[و و و يرون] آلاف من السنة النبوية فقد أخرج بقي بن مخلد في مسنده من حديث أبي هريرة فحسب خمسة آلاف وثلاثمائة حديث وكسرا و أبو هريرة لم يصحب النبي إلا ثلاث سنين

[And so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so narrate] thousands of the Prophetic Sunnah. Baqī ibn Makhlad included a ḥadīth in his *Musnad* under Abu Hurayrah. He counted them to be a little more than 5300 ḥadīth. And Abū Hurayrah only spent three years with the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.<sup>3</sup>

Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī states:

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 1/151.

2 Al-Ḥāshiyah, 1/16.

3 Al-Amīnī: *al-Ghadīr*, 7/115, *Ghāyat Juhd al-Bāḥith*.

وقد نظرنا في مجموع ما روى من الحديث عن الخلفاء الأربعة فوجدناه بالنسبة إلى حديث أبي هريرة وحده أقل من السبعة والعشرين في المائة... وقد عرفت أنه [روى] ٥٣٧٤ [حديث] تجد الأمر كما قلناه فلينظر ناظر بعقله في أبي هريرة وتأخره في إسلامه وخموله في حسبه وأميته وما إلى ذلك مما يوجب إقلاله... فكيف يمكن والحال هذه أن يكون المأثور عن أبي هريرة وحده أضعاف المأثور عنهم جميعا أفتونا يا أولي الألباب

We have looked at all of the aḥādīth narrated by the Four Khulafā' and found that the total was 27% less than the total aḥādīth of Abū Hurayrah... You are aware that he narrated 5374 aḥādīth. You will find the matter to be as we stated. Let a person with his intelligence look at Abū Hurayrah and consider how late he became Muslim, his lethargy, his illiteracy, and other similar factors that would naturally reduce the number of his ḥadīth... When the situation is like this, how is it possible that the reports from Abū Hurayrah alone are more than of all of theirs combined? O people of intelligence, give us a ruling!<sup>1</sup>

Before everything, we ask Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī: What is the connection of these calculations and ratios in relation to memorization? And what is the connection of illiteracy at that time in relation to the faculty of memorizing? This Shī'ī scholar is trying to criticize Abū Hurayrah with something that is not even a real criticism, even if it means using words that carry no weight and are only being stated for the sake of making it seem like he is saying a lot.

Regardless of the validity of the Imāmī scholars' claim regarding the number of Abū Hurayrah's<sup>2</sup> ﷺ narrations, I say: Let us assume for the sake of argument

1 Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī: *Abū Hurayrah*, p. 45. Perhaps the real name of the book is *Akādhib Abī Hurayrah* (The Lies of Abū Hurayrah), as stated by al-Khū'ī in *al-Mu'jam*, 11/79. It appears the book has another title, *Ḥayāt Abī Hurayrah* (The Life of Abū Hurayrah). Similarly, it is called *Abū Hurayrah*, as stated in *al-Dharī'ah* of al-Ṭahrānī (7/115, no. 604).

2 'Abd al-Mun'im Ṣāliḥ al-'Alī refuted this doubt. He states, "It should be noted that this number is not the number of independent texts; rather, it is the total number of what Baqī ibn Makhḥlad narrated, included both the repetitions and weak narrations. Therefore, the amount of purely authentic texts—excluding the repetitions—is little in relation to this number. As such, do not be deceived by the ambiguity of the critics that claim he narrated five thousand independent texts. *continued...*

that someone who narrates this number of aḥādīth in this amount of time is a liar. Let us look at the number of narrations narrated by the Imāmiyyah’s reliable narrators’ and compare it to what Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه narrated in this amount of time.

### Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim

Al-Kulaynī (d. 329 AH) narrates:

عن علي بن إبراهيم عن أبيه قال استأذن علي أبي جعفر عليه السلام قوم من أهل النواحي من الشيعة فأذن لهم فدخلوا فسألوه في مجلس واحد عن ثلاثين ألف مسألة فأجاب عليه السلام وله عشر سنين

On the authority of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm, from his father: A group of Shī‘ah from the districts came and asked permission to enter the home of Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام. He granted them permission and they entered. In one gathering, they asked him thirty thousand questions and he answered all of them. At the time, he was ten years old.<sup>1</sup>

According to Ibn Shahr Āshūb in *al-Manāqib*:

---

*continued from page 501*

The evidence for this is the fact that al-Imām Aḥmad narrated 3848 aḥādīth in his *Musnad*. These aḥādīth include many repetitions both in terms of their words and meanings, as is his habit in the *Musnad*. This also includes such aḥādīth that have a weak chain of narration. Thus, the number of purely authentic texts—excluding the repetitions—is much less than the original number” (*Difā‘ an Abī Hurayrah*, p. 267). He quoted this from the book, *Abū Hurayrah wa Aqlām al-Ḥāqīdīn* of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Zarī (p. 13).

We must not forget that these aḥādīth are also narrated by other Ṣaḥābah and not him alone. Also, we must not forget the fact that many of the texts that the Imāmiyyah narrated with their chains of narrations concur with what Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه narrated. ‘Abd Allah al-Nāṣir undertook a study in which he collected all of the ḥadīth texts that the Imāmiyyah found problematic because of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه and then extracted the exact texts from their books—with their chains of narration. See his amazing book: *al-Burhān fī Tabrī‘ at Abī Hurayrah min al-Buhtān*. For more information, also see Dr. Ḥārīth ibn Salmān’s book, *Abū Hurayrah: Ṣāhib Rasūl Allah Dirāsah Ḥadīthiyyah Tārīkhiyyah Hādīfah*.

1 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfī*, 1/496, under “Mawlid Abī Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Thānī”.

روى إبراهيم بن هاشم قال استأذنت أبا جعفر ليقوم من الشيعة فأذن لهم فسألوه في مجلس واحد عن ثلاثين ألف مسألة فأجاب فيها وهو ابن عشر سنين

Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim narrated: I sought permission from Abū Ja'far for a group of Shī'ah to enter. He granted them permission. Then, in one sitting, they asked him thirty thousand questions. He answered all of them. He was ten years old.<sup>1</sup>

We have the right to ask: How did Ibrāhīm ibn Hisham, or these *Shī'ah* that he permitted to enter the house of the Imām, hear thirty thousand questions in one sitting?

If the Imāmī scholars heavily criticized Abū Hurayrah for narrating so much, where are they when it comes to this narration—which is authentic?! Do we find any of them criticizing its narrators saying that he is a liar? Never! In fact, they made-up numerous responses. There has also been a lot of difference of opinion regarding the response to this narration. However, we find none of them accusing Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām of lying, even though the narration is technically impossible to be true since it does not only mention the answers to the questions, but the Imām would be asked and then he would respond. This continued until the amount of questions reached thirty thousand. All in one gathering!

As mentioned in his edited version of *al-Kāfī*, 'Alī Akbar Ghifārī offered three excuses on behalf of Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām, none of which contain an accusation of lying.

As for al-Māzindarānī, the commentator of *al-Kāfī*, he skipped passed it and did not comment on it. Remarking on the ḥadīth, the editor of the book, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sha'rānī states the reason al-Māzindarānī did not offer any commentary saying:

---

1 Ibn Shahr Āshūb: *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib*, 3/490, under “*Manāqib Abī Ja'far Muḥammad Ibn 'Alī*”.

سكت الشارح عن هذا الخبر لأنه من كلام إبراهيم بن هاشم غير منقول عن معصوم حتى يحتاج إلى توجيه ما يرى فيه من المحال ظاهراً إذ لا يبعد الخطأ من إبراهيم بن هاشم

The commentator remained silent on this ḥadīth because it contains the words of Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām, and it was not transmitted from an infallible such that it would require an explanation for what appears to be considered impossible. It is not farfetched for Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim to have committed a mistake.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, al-Māzindarānī left commenting on it because it was impossible for him to believe in the narration. And the editor did not consider it farfetched for Ibrāhīm to have committed a mistake. And despite the inhibition of al-Māzindarānī and the standpoint of al-Sha'rānī, they both did not accuse him of lying, even though the narration is, for all practical purposes, impossible. Al-Majlisī states:

يشكل هذا بأنه لو كان السؤال والجواب عن كل مسألة بيتاً واحداً أعني خمسين حرفاً لكان أكثر من ثلاث ختمات للقرآن فكيف يمكن ذلك في مجلس واحد ولو قيل جوابه عليه السلام كان في الأكثر بلا ونعم أو بالإعجاز في أسرع زمان ففي السؤال لا يمكن ذلك ويمكن الجواب بوجه

This is problematic since if the question and the answer for every issue occurred in one *bayt*, i.e., fifty letters, then that would work out to more than three completions of the Qur'ān. So, how is that possible in one sitting? If it is said that the answers were mostly with a “Yes,” and “No,” or they were answered miraculously in the fastest time, then it is still problematic because the questions cannot be posed in such a manner. It is possible to answer this in several ways.<sup>2</sup>

He then went on to mention seven reasons, all of which are basically contrived. Not even one of the reasons contains an accusation of him lying, as they concluded about Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه! Where are these so-called five thousand narrations in relation to the thirty thousand that were heard in one gathering!? This issue only requires a little bit of balance in dealing with the Ṣaḥābah.

1 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, 7/292.

2 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, 50:93.



## Jābir al-Ju'fī

Al-Kashshī narrates:

عن جابر بن يزيد الجعفي قال حدثني أبو جعفر عليه السلام بسبعين ألف حديث لم أحدث بها أحدا قط ولا أحدث بها أحدا أبدا قال جابر فقلت لأبي جعفر عليه السلام جعلت فداك إنك قد حملتني وقرأ عظيمًا بما حدثتني به من سركم الذي لا أحدث به أحدا فربما جاش في صدري حتى يأخذني منه شبه الجنون قال يا جابر فإذا كان ذلك فاخرج إلى الجبان فاحفر حفيرة ودل رأسك فيها ثم قل حدثني محمد بن علي بكذا وكذا

On the authority of Jābir ibn Yazīd al-Ju'fī who said, “Abū Ja'far عليه السلام narrated seventy thousand ḥadīth to me. I did and will not narrate them to anyone.”

Jābir said to Abū Ja'far عليه السلام, “May I be ransomed for your sake. You have burdened me with a heavy load by narrating to me of your secrets—which I will not narrate to anyone else. Sometimes, it simmers in my chest until a sense of madness overtakes me.”

He said, “O Jābir, when that happens, go to the cemetery<sup>1</sup>, dig a hole, place your head in it, and then say, ‘Muḥammad ibn 'Alī narrated this and that to me.’”<sup>2</sup>

Many sources actually say it was seventy thousand.<sup>3</sup> Thus, Imām Abū Ja'far Muḥammad al-Bāqir narrated seventy or ninety thousand ḥadīth. They are the ḥadīth that he ordered him to conceal. In addition to this, there are another seventy thousand ḥadīth. Al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī (d. 1104 AH) states:

---

1 As it appears in *al-Kāfī*, another narration contains the word is “*al-jabbānah*.” Al-Māzindarānī states, “*Al-jabbānah*: it appears with a tashdīd on the *bā'*. The existence of a *hā'* (at the end) appears more than without it. The word refers to a prayer area in the desert. It also refers to the cemetery because the prayer area usually exists inside of it.” (*Sharḥ Uṣul al-Kāfī*, 12/177).

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 194, no. 342.

3 See: *Biḥār al-Anwār* of al-Majlisī, 2/69; *Mustadrak Safīnat al-Biḥār* of al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī, 2/17; *al-Rasā'il al-Rijāliyyah* of Abū al-Ma'ālī al-Kalbāsī, 4/395; *Khātimat al-Mustadrak* of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, 4/204.

وروي أنه روى سبعين ألف حديث عن الباقر عليه السلام وروى مائة وأربعين ألف حديث

It is narrated that he narrated seventy thousand ḥadīth from al-Bāqir عليه السلام.

And he narrated a total of 140 000 ḥadīth.<sup>1</sup>

What concerns us here is what he narrated from Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir, which is seventy thousand ḥadīth. Al-Kashshī narrated:

عن زرارة قال سألت أبا عبد الله عن أحاديث جابر؟ فقال: ما رأيته عند أبي إلا مرة واحدة وما دخل علي قط

On the authority of Zurārah who said, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh about the aḥādīth of Jābir.”

He said, “I did not see him by my father except on one occasion. And he never entered my presence.”<sup>2</sup>

This *thiqah* claims that he narrated seventy thousand ḥadīth from al-Bāqir. Then al-Imām al-Ṣādiq, the son of al-Bāqir comes and explicitly states when he was asked about his aḥādīth, “I did not see him by my father except on one occasion. He never entered my presence.” This is clearly the infallible belying al-Ju‘fī. What then is the position of the Imāmī scholars regarding this *thiqah*? Did they judge him to be lying, as they accused Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه? The answer is no. Al-Khūṭī justified this saying the following:

وأما قول الصادق عليه السلام في موثقة زرارة (بابن بكير) ما رأيته عند أبي إلا مرة واحدة وما دخل علي قط فلا بد من حمله على نحو من التورية إذ لو كان جابر لم يكن يدخل عليه سلام الله عليه وكان هو بمرأى من الناس لكان هذا كافيا في تكذيبه وعدم تصديقه فكيف اختلفوا في أحاديثه حتى احتاج زياد إلى سؤال الإمام عليه السلام عن أحاديثه على أن عدم دخوله على الإمام عليه السلام لا ينافي صدقه في أحاديثه لاحتمال أنه كان يلاقي الإمام عليه السلام في غير داره فيأخذ منه العلوم والأحكام ويرويها إذن لا تكون الموثقة معارضة للصحة الدالة على صدقه في الأحاديث المؤيدة بما تقدم من الروايات الدالة على جلالة ومدحه وأنه كان عنده من أسرار أهل البيت سلام الله عليهم

1 Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah*, 30/329, no. 12.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 191, no. 335.

As for the statement of al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام in the authenticated narration of Zurārah (from Ibn Bukayr), “I did not see him by my father except on one occasion and he never entered my presence,” it need be understood as a form of *tawriyah*, or dissimulation. This is because if Jābir did not enter his presence عليه السلام, and he was in the sight of people, this would have sufficed in belying and not believing him. Thus, how did they differ on his aḥādīth to such an extent that Ziyād needed to ask the Imām عليه السلام about his aḥādīth. This is over and above the fact that not entering the Imām’s presence does not negate his truthfulness in his aḥādīth because it is possible that he would meet the Imām outside of his house and take (different forms of) knowledge and rulings from him and narrate them. In such a case, the authenticated narration does not go against the companionship indicative of his truthfulness in aḥādīth supported by the aforementioned narrations proving his greatness and praise. It also does not oppose the fact that he was considered from the secret-keepers of the Ahl al-Bayt عليهم السلام.<sup>1</sup>

I have several points of consideration regarding the statement of al-Khūṭī. Firstly, al-Khūṭī acknowledged that the narration is not weak and he did not object to its name being “authenticated.”

Secondly, Bisām Murtaḍā refuted al-Khūṭī’s statement, “it need be understood as a form of *tawriyah*, or dissimulation,” saying:

لماذا الحمل على التورية مع عدم وجود قرينة أو شيء يشبهها

Why does it need to be understood as *tawriyah* when there is no evidence or anything to prove it?<sup>2</sup>

Bisām Murtaḍā’s statement is correct, especially considering the authenticity of the chain of narration. Even al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī acknowledged this fact and said:

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/334, no. 2033.

2 Bisām Murtaḍā: *Zubdat al-Maqāl min Mu’jam al-Rijāl*, 1/239.

إما محمول على التقية عن زرارة وهو في غاية البعد أو موضوع

It is either understood to be Taqiyyah from Zurārah. This is extremely farfetched. Or, (it is) fabricated.<sup>1</sup>

As for his statement, “Or (it is) fabricated.” This is unacceptable as al-Khūṭī acknowledged the authenticity of the chain of narration.

Thirdly, as for al-Khūṭī’s statement, “This is over and above the fact that not entering the Imām’s presence does not negate his truthfulness in his aḥādīth because it is possible that he would meet the Imām outside of his house and take (different forms of) knowledge and rulings from him and narrate them.” I say: This is quite strange! Imām al-Ṣādiq was asked about the aḥādīth of Jābir. He was not asked, “Did Jābir visit you?” His answer was explicit in his denial.

As for the statement of al-Khūṭī, “because it is possible that he would meet the Imām outside of his house.” I say: Was this hidden from the infallible Imām yet known by al-Khūṭī?!

What I wish to emphasize is the fact that al-Khūṭī and other Imāmī scholars, when an Imām clearly criticizes an Imāmī narrator—and such a criticism is proven with an authentic isnād, they search for excuses (on his behalf), even though they are implausible. In fact, this is even the case when their words result in a clear rejection of the infallible’s words. As for how they deal with the actions of the Ṣaḥābah, as I clarified previously, they only assume the worst possibilities.

Al-Qummī and al-Ju’fī are not the only ones in this regard. Al-Kashshī also narrates the following narration:

عن محمد بن مسلم قال ما شجر في رأبي شيء قط إلا سألت عنه أبا جعفر عليه السلام حتى سألته عن ثلاثين ألف حديث وسألت أبا عبدالله عليه السلام عن ستة عشر ألف حديث

---

1 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 4/216.

On the authority of Muḥammad ibn Muslim who said, “No opinion of mine ever occurred to me except that I asked Abū Ja‘far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ about it, to such an extent that I asked him about thirty thousand aḥādīth. And I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ about sixteen thousand aḥādīth.<sup>1</sup>

This amount is only in relation to questions (he asked)! Thus, the total number of questions is forty-six thousand aḥādīth. This is different to the aḥādīth that he heard? Despite all of this, the person is a trustworthy thiqaḥ. And yet accusations are made against the Companions of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ!

**Note:**

Many scholars of the Imāmiyyah accused the Ṣaḥābah of concealing aḥādīth of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and, based on this, they permitted cursing them. Of those that hold this opinion is ‘Alī al-Kūrānī. In his discussion on criticizing the Ṣaḥābah, he states:

إن الكتمان المذموم في الآية شامل لكتمان اليهود ولكتمان قريش لصفات النبي وآله وكتمان فضائلهم صلوات الله عليهم فما رأيكم نعيد آية الكتمان لنعرف حكم اللعن فيها قال الله تعالى إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْتُمُونَ مَا أَنزَلْنَا مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَالْهُدَىٰ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا بَيَّنَّ لِلنَّاسِ فِي الْكِتَابِ أُولَٰئِكَ يَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّهُ وَيَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّعْنُونَ فَمَنْ هُم الَّذِينَ يَشْمَلُهُمْ هَذَا اللَّعْنُ وهل لعنهم واجب أو مستحب

The reprehensible form of concealing in the verse includes the Jews’ concealing, the Quraysh’s concealing the characteristics and virtues of the Prophet and his family. Based on this, what is your opinion? We repeat the verse of concealment (*āyat al-kitmān*) in order for us to know what the ruling of cursing is therein. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى states:

*Indeed, those who conceal what we sent down of clear proofs and guidance after We made it clear for the people in the Scripture, those are cursed by Allah and cursed by those who curse.<sup>2</sup>*

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 163, no. 276.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: v. 159.

Therefore, who are those whom this curse includes? And is cursing them compulsory or preferable?<sup>1</sup>

Would it not be fair for the scholars of the Imāmiyyah, among them al-Kūrānī, to include Jābir al-Ju‘fī in this curse? Based on their principle and their accusation of him, why would he not be cursed? As mentioned in the previous narrations, Jābir al-Ju‘fī admitted to having concealed seventy or ninety thousand ḥadīth! From here, the difference in dealing is clear; they turn a blind eye to their narrators and write countless pages on the permission to curse the Ṣaḥābah because they concealed knowledge. Unless it is said that there is no real benefit in the Ummah knowing these seventy thousand aḥādīth, and the only person to benefit from the thousands of ḥadīth (which accumulate to more than the entire number of narrations in the Shī‘ah’s four relied-upon books combined!) is Jābir al-Ju‘fī and no one else!

### ‘Ā’ishah bint Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا

The scholars of the Imāmiyyah accused Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا of lying against the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ on many occasions. However, I will only challenge them on one issue. That is to say that she would fabricate virtues in favour of her father, al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Previously, I narrated the statement of ‘Alī al-Mīlānī describing Umm al-Mu’minīn, “She claims for her father and for herself that which there is no basis for.”<sup>2</sup>

I also narrated the statement of Muḥammad al-Tījānī, “The virtues of Abū Bakr mentioned in the books of history are either narrated by his daughter, ‘Ā’ishah—whose position on Imām ‘Alī we already know. She tries her best to support her father, even if it be with fabricated aḥādīth. Or, they are narrated by ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar. He too, is among those who are distant from Imām ‘Alī.”<sup>3</sup>

---

1 ‘Alī al-Kurānī: *Alf Su‘āl wa Ishkāl*, 2/63.

2 ‘Alī al-Mīlānī: *Risālah fī Ṣalāt Abī Bakr*, p. 44.

3 Muḥammad al-Tījānī: *Thumma Ihtadayt*, p. 168.

I also narrated the statement of Nūr Allāh al-Tustarī (d. 1019 AH), “Together with her visible hostility towards Amīr al-Mu’minīn and her lying to the Shī’ah, she is suspected in this particular narration of drawing benefit and glory to her and her father.”<sup>1</sup>

Let us pause here and apply what the Imāmī scholars have said about Umm al-Mu’minīn and her father on to one of their narrators, Zurārah ibn A’yan. Al-Kashshī narrated sixty-two narrations under his biography. These narrations are broadly divided into two categories:

1. narrations criticizing him, and
2. narrations praising him.

Both categories contain authentic and weak narrations. The number of narrations criticizing him are not insignificant. So, what is the position of the majority of Imāmī scholars regarding these narrations and what is their answer this problem?

In order to support Zurārah, Imāmī scholars relied on a narration narrated for us by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah ibn A’yan, the son of Zurārah. Because of this narration, they changed all of the narrations criticizing him into *Taqiyyah*. The narration is narrated by al-Kashshī and reads as follows:

عن عبد الله بن زرارة قال قال لي أبو عبد الله عليه السلام اقرأ مني على والدك السلام وقل له إني إنما أعيبك دفاعاً مني عنك فإن الناس والعدو يسارعون إلى كل من قربناه وحمدنا مكانه لإدخال الأذى في من نحبه ونقربه يرمونه لمحبتنا له وقربه ودنوه منا ويرون إدخال الأذى عليه وقتله ويحمدون كل من عبناه نحن وأن نحمد أمره فإنما أعيبك لأنك رجل اشتهرت بنا ولميلك إلينا وأنت في ذلك مذموم عند الناس غير محمود الأثر لمودتك لنا ولميلك إلينا فأحببت أن أعيبك ليحمدوا أمرك في الدين بعيبك ونقصك ويكون بذلك منا دفع شرهم عنك

On the authority of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah who said:

---

1 Nūr Allāh al-Tustarī: *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*, p. 217.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام said to me, “Send my salām to your father and say to him, ‘My criticism of you is actually a means of protecting you. The reason for this is because the people and the enemy are hastening to harm all those who we draw near, praise, and love. They criticize such people because of our love for them and because of their closeness to us. They look to harm such people, to kill them, and praise all those who we criticize. I am only criticizing you because you are a person who has become well-known among us and because of your inclination towards us. You are criticized for that by the people and unpraiseworthy because of your love and inclination towards us. Therefore, I wanted to criticize you so they can rather praise your affair in the religion because of your vice and deficiency. Through this, we would have safeguarded you from their evil...”<sup>1</sup>

I ask: Is there even one narration that supports what ‘Abd Allāh, the son of Zurārah, is using to assist his father?

The answer is no! The basis for the narration is the children and grandchildren of Zurārah. With this, they turned every authentic, explicit criticism of their father into Taqiyyah!

At this point, I say: Does the Ahl al-Sunnah not have the right to say that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah and his family lied for the benefit of their father, Zurārah? Especially considering the fact that the number of narrations criticizing him are not insignificant. In fact, the infallible not only criticized Zurārah, he also criticized the entire family of A‘yan. With a chain of narration deemed *ḥasan* (good) by al-Amīnī, al-Kashshī narrates:

عن إسماعيل بن عبد الخالق عن أبي عبد الله (ع) قال ذكر عنده بنو أعين فقال والله ما يريد بنو أعين إلا أن يكونوا عليّ

On the authority of Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abd al-Khāliq, from Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام who said when the Banū A‘yan was mentioned in his presence, “By Allah. Banū A‘yan does not desire except to be (i.e., gain ascendancy) over me.”<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 138, no. 221.

2 Ibid., p. 149, no. 238.



Al-Muḥaqqiq al-Muṣṭafawī stated the words of the ḥadīth to be “except to be over me” In the edited version of Maḥdī al-Rajā’ī, it comes as:

إلا أن يكونوا على غلب

“...except to get the upper hand.”<sup>1</sup>

This is a clear criticism of all the family of A‘yan. This is not the only narration criticizing the family of A‘yan. Al-Kashshī narrated:

عن حمدويه قال حدثني أيوب عن حنان بن سدير قال كتب معي رجل أن أسأل أبا عبدالله (عليه السلام) عما قالت اليهود والنصارى والمجوس والذين أشركوا هو ممّا شاء أن يقولوا قال قال لي إن ذا من مسائل آل أعين ليس من ديني ولا دين آبائي قال قلت ما معي مسألة غير هذه

On the authority of Ḥamdawayh who said — Ayyūb narrated to me — from Ḥannān ibn Sadīr who said, “A man wrote with me asking Abū ‘Abd Allāh ﷺ regarding what the Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians, and those who committed shirk said: Is it from what He wanted them to say?”

He said to me, “That is to do with issues of the family of A‘yan; it has nothing to do with my religion or the religion of my forefathers.”

I said, “I do not have another issue other than this.”<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭī remained silent avoided giving a judgement on this narration.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Muḥsin al-Amīn stated:

السند فيه أيوب مشترك و المتن ينحو نحو ما مر ويومي إلى التقيّة

The sanad contains Ayyūb. He is mushtarak.<sup>4</sup> The text is similar to what has already been mentioned and it suggests Taqīyyah.<sup>5</sup>

1 *Ta’līqah al-Mīr Dāmad ‘alā Rijāl al-Kashshī*, 2/364.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma’rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 153, no. 250.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 8/251, no. 4671.

4 I.e., he has a name common to others and so it can be referring to someone else. (translator’s note)

5 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 7/55.

This Ayyūb is a student of Ḥannān ibn Sadīr and the teacher of Ḥamdawayh ibn Naṣīr. His name cannot be confused with someone else's, as Muḥsin al-Amīn claims. In the narration of al-Kashshī, his full name is clearly mentioned:

حمدويه قال حدثنا أيوب بن نوح عن حنان بن سدير

On the authority of Ḥamdawayh who said — Ayyūb narrated to me — from Ḥannān ibn Sadīr.<sup>1</sup>

This Ayyūb is a well-known thiqah. How can he escape al-Amīn such that he claims the name is *mushtarak* (homonyms) in this instance?!<sup>2</sup>

In spite of this, under the section of “Ayyūb,” al-Amīn himself stated the following:

أيوب في البحار هو أيوب بن نوح وقد يعبر عنه باین نوح

Ayyūb in *al-Biḥār* is Ayyūb ibn Nūḥ. He is also referred to as Ibn Nūḥ.<sup>3</sup>

This further proves that there is no homonymity in this instance; rather, as it appears, it was done evadingly and knowingly.

Many Imāmī scholars<sup>4</sup> made Ḥannān's tawthīq. When Ibn Ṭāwūs came to the biography of Ḥannān ibn Sadīr, he narrated from the infallible that he used to be very pleased with him.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 296, no. 524; p. 203, no. 358; and p. 638, no. 344.

2 The following people made tawthīq of him: al-Māmaqānī in *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/19; al-Ḥillī in *al-Khulāṣah*, p. 59, no. 524; al-Najjāshī, p. 102, no. 254; al-Majlisī in *al-Wajīzah*, p. 165; al-Tiffarishī in *Naqd al-Rijāl*, 1/259. The following people corroborated his tawthīq: Baḥr al-'Ulūm in *Rijāl Baḥr al-'Ulūm*, 1/386, under “*Banū Darrāj*”; al-Khūṭī in *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Khūṭī*, 4/169, no. 1621; al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī in *al-Rijāl*; al-Ṭūsī in *al-Fihrist*, p. 44, no. 59. Abū Ṭālib al-Tabjīl al-Tabrīzī also made his tawthīq in *Mu'jam al-Thiqāt*, 21/128.

3 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Sh'ah*, 3/523.

4 The following people made tawthīq of him: al-Majlisī in *al-Wajīzah*, p. 203; al-Khūṭī in *al-Mu'jam*, 7/313, no. 4110; al-Ṭūsī in *al-Fihrist*, p. 93, no. 256; al-Māmaqānī, 1/46; Abū Ṭālib al-Tabjīl al-Tabrīzī in *Mu'jam al-Thiqāt*, p. 47, no. 306; al-Tiffarishī, 2/174; al-Burūjirdī in *Ṭarā'if al-Maqāl*, no. 3840; al-Shabastarī in *al-Fā'iq fī Ruwāt wa Aṣḥāb al-Ṣādiq*, 1/490 no. 1005; and Aḥmad al-Baṣrī in *Fā'iq al-Maqāl*, p. 107, no. 366.

5 Aḥmad ibn Ṭāwūs: *al-Tahrīr al-Ṭāwūsī*, p. 87, no. 119.

When Ibn Ṭāwūs wanted to comment on the part of the narration that states, “That is from among the issues of the family of A‘yan; it has nothing to do with my religion or the religion of my forefathers,” he stated:

إن حنان بن سدیر واقفی ومثله متهم

Hannān ibn Sadīr is a Wāqifi and the likes of him is accused.<sup>1</sup>

Ibn Ṭāwūs’s saying that the infallible was “very” pleased with him did not dry up until the tables were turned—when the criticism was directed at Zurārah!

In summary, the isnād is authentic and there is no doubt therein. Accordingly, how can we rely on the family of A‘yan after these narrations? The Imāmiyyah continue accusing Umm al-Mu‘minīn of lying about the virtues of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه and, despite the many criticisms against Zurārah and his family, they continue believing them. The issue became one of Taqiyyah in this narration only. The difference is clear in their dealing with the Companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and his wives, and their dealing with Zurārah and his family!

A question arises here for the scholars of the Imāmiyyah: Is a criticism against Zurārah that is based on an authentic chain also considered Taqiyyah? Their readily-available and well-known response will be, “Yes, without a doubt!”

How can the criticism against him be Taqiyyah when it actually proved to be true after the death of the infallible? Al-Kashshī narrated the following with an isnād deemed *ḥasan* (fair) by al-Amīnī<sup>2</sup>:

---

1 Ibid., p. 123, no. 170, under the biography of Zurārah, ḥadīth no. 17.

2 *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 7/50. Al-Khūṭī tried to criticize the isnād because of the existence of Jibrīl ibn Aḥmad in the ḥadīth, 8/251, no. 4671, under the biography of Zurārah. Despite the fact that al-Khūṭī authenticated a narration that contains the same Jibrīl ibn Aḥmad in the isnād. Under the biography of al-Mu‘allā ibn Khanīs, he states, “This narration is authentic” (*al-Mu‘jam*, 19/261, no. 12525). When al-Khūṭī wants to make tawthīq of Zurārah, he criticizes the asānīd of the narrations that speak negatively of Zurārah by stating they contain Jibrīl ibn Aḥmad. And when he wants to make tawthīq of al-Mu‘allā ibn Khanīs, the narration amazingly becomes authentic, even though it contains the same Jibrīl ibn Aḥmad!

عن محمد بن مسعود عن جبريل [جبرئيل] بن أحمد عن محمد بن عيسى العبيدي عن يونس عن خطاب بن مسلمة عن ليث المرادي قال سمعت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام يقول لا يموت زرارة إلا نائها

On the authority of Muḥammad ibn Mas‘ūd — from Jibrīl (Jibrāīl) ibn Aḥmad — from Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā al-‘Ubaydī — from Yūnus — from Khaṭṭāb ibn Maslamah — from Layth al-Murādī who said, “I heard Abū ‘Abd Allāh ﷺ saying, “Zurārah will not die except forlorn.””<sup>1</sup>

This is exactly what happened. Zurārah died forlorn and did not recognize the Imām of his time. According to the Imāmiyyah, this is a death upon Jāhiliyyah. This belief is based on the following narration from the Prophet ﷺ:

من مات ولم يعرف إمام زمانه مات ميتة جاهلية

Who dies and does not recognize the Imām of his time has died a death upon Jāhiliyyah.<sup>2</sup>

This is what actually happened. Al-Kashshī narrates the following with an isnād authenticated by al-Amīnī<sup>3</sup>:

عن محمد بن عبد الله ابن زرارة عن أبيه قال بعث زرارة عبدا ابنه يسأل عن خبر أبي الحسن عليه السلام فجاءه الموت قبل رجوع عبده إليه فأخذ المصحف فأعلاه فوق رأسه وقال إن الإمام بعد جعفر بن محمد من اسمه بين الدفتين في جملة القرآن منصوص عليه من الذين أوجب الله طاعتهم على خلقه أنا مؤمن به قال فأخبر بذلك أبو الحسن الأول عليه السلام فقال والله كان زرارة مهاجرا إلى الله تعالى

On the authority of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Zurārah — from his father who said, “Zurārah sent his son, ‘Ubayd, asking about the news of Abū al-Ḥasan ﷺ. Death came to him before ‘Ubayd returned to him. He took the *Muṣḥaf*, raised it above his head and said, “The Imām after Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad is that person whose name is in-between the two covers of the entire Qur‘ān. Allah has required His creation to obey him. I believe in him.”

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 149, no. 240.

2 Al-Ṣadūq: *Kamāl al-Dīn wa Tamām al-Ni‘mah*, p. 437.

3 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah*, 7/53.

He said, “Abū al-Ḥasan al-Awwal (i.e., al-Kāzīm) was informed of this and he said, ‘By Allah. Zurārah was a *muhajir* (emigrant) to Allah <sup>سُبْحَانَ تَعَالَى</sup>.’”<sup>1</sup>

This is an explicit text that emphasizes that Zurārah was forlorn and he did not recognize the Imām of his time. According to the Imāmiyyah, this is considered a death upon Jāhiliyyah.

Justifying this, al-Khūṭ states:

هذه الروايات لا تدل على وهن ومهانة في زرارة لأن الواجب على كل مكلف أن يعرف إمام زمانه ولا يجب عليه معرفة الإمام من بعده وإذا توفي إمام زمانه فالواجب عليه الفحص عن الإمام فإذا مات في زمان الفحص فهو معذور في أمره ويكفيه الالتزام بإمامة من عينه الله تعالى وإن لم يعرفه بشخصه وعلى ذلك فلا حرج على زرارة حيث كان يعرف إمام زمانه وهو الصادق عليه السلام ولم يكن يجب عليه معرفة الإمام من بعده في زمانه فلما توفي الصادق عليه السلام قام بالفحص فأدرکه الموت مهاجراً إلى الله ورسوله

These narrations do not indicate a sense of weakness and disgrace of Zurārah. This is because it is compulsory on every legally capable person to recognize the Imām of his time and it is not compulsory to recognize the Imām after him. When the Imām of his time passes away, it is compulsory to search for the next Imām. When he dies in that period of investigation, he is considered excused. It is sufficient for him to adhere to the Imāmah of who Allah appoints, even if he does not know who the actual person is. Based on this, there is no issue with Zurārah since he recognized the Imām of his time—who was al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام—and it was not compulsory on him to recognize the Imām after him in his time. When al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام passed away, he went to search (for the next Imām), but death caught up with him while he was a *muhajir* (emigrant) towards Allah and His Messenger.<sup>2</sup>

Everything that al-Khūṭ mentioned emphasizes the statement of the Imām regarding Zurārah’s forlornness and his death upon Jāhiliyyah. However, it was necessary for al-Khūṭ to seek whatever excuses were possible for him. I do not know what the evidence and basis for al-Khūṭ’s statement “the time of searching” is? What searching is this? They constantly repeat that the narrations regarding

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Maʿrifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 155, no. 255.

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 8:240 (no. 4671).

the Imāms is documented with *Tawātur* (mass transmission). It is impossible according to the Shīrī understanding then for such a continuously reported matter to be unknown to Zurārah. It is the most important pillar of Imāmiyyah. Did Zurārah not know the pillar of the religion?

In summary, when there is a perceived benefit in assisting the narrator, we find them inventing strange principles, such as the “time of searching” principle!

#### 4.4.3 An example of al-Khūī’s approach with the Ṣaḥābah

Upon investigating al-Khūī’s approach in justifying the errors of reliable Imamīs, we find that he relies a lot on investigating the narrations asānīd. He also tries very hard to present what is not authentic when it is in the context of their criticism. And yet it is not possible to present a weak narration when it criticizes one of the senior Imāmī narrators. However, al-Khūī has a different approach with the Ṣaḥābah. When it is a criticism against the Ṣaḥābah, he gives preference to what does not have an isnād over a narration that has authentic isnād in praise of them. Before us, we have an example of this phenomenon. Under the biography of the great Ṣaḥābī, Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr, al-Khūī states:

أسيد بن حضير (حسين) ابن سماك (سمالة) أبو يحيى بن أخت أبي بكر ويقال أبو عبيد سكن المدينة يقال له حضير الكتاب قتل يوم بغاث أخى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وبينه وبين زيد بن حارثة من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله رجال الشيخ أقول في عبارة الشيخ اضطراب وتشويش فإن يوم بغاث يوم معروف بين الأوس والخزرج وكان حضير والد أسيد رئيس الأوس في ذلك اليوم على ما في أسد الغابة وغيره فالمقتول يوم بغاث هو والد أسيد لا نفسه وأما المؤاخاة فقد كان بينه وبين زيد بن حارثة... وعلى كل حال فقد اعتمد على الرجل العلامة حيث ذكره في القسم الأول في الخلاصة وقد تعجب منه غير واحد إذ لم يذكر الرجل بمدح ولم يثبت إيمانه بل قيل إنه كان من أعداء أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام وهو الذي حمل الحطب إلى باب بيت فاطمة عليها السلام لاضرامه أقول لعل العلامة اعتمد عليه لما رواه الصدوق بسند صحيح عن أبان ابن عثمان الأحمر من أن جماعة مشيخة عدوه من النقباء الاثني عشر الذين اختارهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله بإشارة من جبرئيل الخصال أبواب الاثني عشر باب النقباء الاثني عشر الحديث ٧٠ ولكن قد تقدم في ترجمة أسعد بن زرارة أن الرواية وإن كانت صحيحة إلا أنه لا يمكن الاعتماد عليها

Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr (Ḥuṣayn), Ibn Sammāk (Samālah), Abū Yaḥyā ibn Ukht Abī Bakr. It is said that he is Abū ‘Ubayd. He lived in Madīnah. It is said

that he is Ḥuḍayr al-Kātā'ib. He was killed on the Day of Bu'āth. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ made a brotherly bond between him and Zayd ibn Ḥārithah. He is from the Companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ (*Rijāl al-Shaykh*). I say: The text of al-Shaykh is problematic and confusing. The Day of Bu'āth is a well-known day among the Aws and Khazraj. Ḥuḍayr was the father of Usayd, the chieftain of Aws in those days, according to *Usd al-Ghābah* and others. Thus, the person killed on the Day of Bu'āth is the father of Usayd, not him.

As for making a brotherly bond between him and Zayd ibn Ḥārithah... In any case, al-'Allāmah relied upon him since he mentioned him in the first section of *al-Khulāṣah*. More than one person was amazed by this since there is no praise mentioned about him and his *īmān* is not established. In fact, it is said that he was among the enemies of Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام. He was responsible for carrying the wood to the door of Fāṭimah's house عليه السلام to set it on fire.

I say: Perhaps al-'Allāmah relied on him because of what al-Ṣadūq narrated with an authentic chain: “On the authority of Abān ibn 'Uthmān: A number of scholars regarded him to be of the Twelve Chieftains whom the Messenger of Allah ﷺ chose because of an indication from Jibrīl (*al-Khiṣāl*, chapter on the Twelve Chieftains, ḥadīth no. 70). However, it has already been mentioned under the biography of As'ad ibn Zurārah that it is not possible to rely upon the narration, even though it is authentic.”<sup>1</sup>

What did al-Khū'ī do in the biography of this Ṣaḥābī? We see him acknowledging the authenticity of the Twelve Chieftains' narration which, as the narration described, came via an indication from Jibrīl. There is no doubt that this is a praise recorded in favour of Usayd رضي الله عنه. Despite his acknowledgement, we find him preferring “*Qīla* (It is said)” over an authentic story!

And like this, even though the Ṣaḥābī's praise is established through an authentic isnād, we see that “*Qīla*” has the real authority according to al-Khū'ī!

---

1 Al-Khū'ī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/125, no. 1489.

## Chapter Five

### The Principles of al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl Between al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī

- 5.1 The principles of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl according to al-Khū'ī and al-Ḥillī related to the tenants of Shī'ī faith
- 5.2 The positions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī concerning the statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl that come from the infallible Imāms—according to the Imāmī Shī'ah
- 5.3 The relationship that connects the Imām with the narrator
- 5.4 The positions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī concerning riwāyah and its sciences
- 5.5 Miscellaneous principles in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl
- 5.6 Principles of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl established by al-Khū'ī
- 5.7 Beneficial points in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl touched upon by al-Khū'ī





## 5.1 The principles of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl according to al-Khūṭī and al-Ḥillī related to the tenants of Shī'ī faith

In this chapter, I will be mentioning the principles inherent to the relationship between the narrator and the infallible imām in the view of the Imāmiyyah, as well as the effect the narrator's belief has on his narration, according to both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī.

### 5.1.1 The narrator's unyielding commitment to Shī'ism

In general, Imāmī scholars regard a narrator's inexorable commitment to his faith as something praiseworthy. This is because it proves his adherence and devotion to the Shī'ī school. However, al-Khūṭī does not regard such a commitment from a narrator as having an impact on the acceptance or rejection of a narration. Regarding a narration in which a narrator's unyielding commitment to his faith is understood as praiseworthy, al-Khūṭī comments:

التصلب في التشيع لا يلازم الوثاقة فضلا عن العدالة

The unyielding faith and commitment to Shī'ism is not indicative of (a narrator's) reliability, let alone his 'adālah.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī mentions this opinion under the biography of Sulaymān ibn Sufyān al-Mustariq. Whereas, when al-Ḥillī wrote his biography<sup>2</sup>, he did not mention the issue of a narrator's commitment to the faith. I also did not find anything in which al-Ḥillī explains his opinion in this regard.

### 5.1.2 The narrator's open proclamation of Raj'ah

Open proclamation of the doctrine of *Raj'ah* (Return)<sup>3</sup> does not simply mean belief therein; rather, it also means disseminating this belief and completely complying

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 9:276 (no. 5455).

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 154 (no. 447).

3 Shī'ī belief that the Imāms as well as some of their supporters and enemies will return to this world after dying, before Qiyāmah. [Translator's note]

thereto. We know the attention given by al-Ḥillī to the belief of a narrator which, based on it, a narrator's report is accepted or rejected. Therefore, al-Ḥillī states under the biography of Maysarah ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz:

اثنى عليه آل محمد عليهم السلام، وهو ممن يجاهر في الرجعة

The Family of Muḥammad ﷺ praised him. He is from those who openly proclaimed (the doctrine of) Raj'ah.<sup>1</sup>

He places him in the first section with the acceptable narrators, according to him. What emphasizes the fact that al-Ḥillī accepts a narration merely on account of his open proclamation of Raj'ah is what he mentioned under the biography of Najm ibn A'yan; he did not mention anything about his condition (as a narrator) except that “he openly proclaimed Raj'ah.”<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, we find in the methodology of al-Khūṭ that he does not include creedal issues in determining the tawthīq or taḍīf of narrators. Consequently, when al-Khūṭ came to the biography of Najm ibn A'yan, we find him restricting his words to:

قال العلامة في الخلاصة... روى العقيقي عن أبيه عن عمران بن أبان عن عبد الله بن بكير عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام أنه يجاهد في الرجعة وقال ابن داود من القسم الأول نجم بن أعين كان مجاهدا في الرجعة

Al-'Allāmah states in *al-Khulāṣah*, “...Al-'Aqīqī narrates from his father — from 'Imrān ibn Abān — from 'Abd Allāh ibn Bukayr — from Abī 'Abd Allāh ﷺ that he used to fight for the sake of Raj'ah. Ibn Dāwūd states from the first section, 'Najm ibn A'yan was a mujāhid<sup>3</sup> in Raj'ah.’<sup>4</sup>

Al-Khūṭ restricted himself to what he transmitted from al-Ḥillī and Ibn Dāwūd and he did not comment further. This emphasizes the fact that he did not regard the open proclamation of Raj'ah—let alone belief therein—as being a proof of the

1 Ibid., p. 279, no. 1022.

2 Ibid., p. 286, no. 1053.

3 It was written as “*mujāhidah*.” Perhaps it was a mistake and written instead of “*mujāhirah* (someone who openly proclaims).” And (all) knowledge is with Allah.

4 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 20/137, no. 13008.

tawthīq of a narrator. Accordingly, Bisām Murtaḍā summarized al-Khūṭī's opinion of Najm ibn A'yan by saying he is "majhūl."<sup>1</sup>

### 5.1.3 The narrator's recognition of the truth (Shī'ism) and belief therein

This opinion is similar to the open proclamation of Raj'ah in that they both share in stating the truth and fully complying thereto. What can be said of open proclamation can be said here. Under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn al-Qāsim, al-Ḥillī states:

روى الكشي عن حمدويه عن الحسن بن موسى قال بعد أن حكى قصة ذكرناها في الكتاب الكبير إن  
الحسن بن القاسم يعرف الحق بعد ذلك ويقول به

Al-Kashshī narrated from Ḥamdawayh — from al-Ḥasan ibn Mūsā. After narrating an incident that we mentioned in al-Kitāb al-Kabīr, he states, "Al-Ḥasan ibn al-Qāsim recognized the truth after that and stated it."<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ḥillī placed him in the first section in consideration of his recognition of the truth, that is, Shī'ism, and his support of it. And like this, other such biographies.<sup>3</sup>

When al-Khūṭī came with his biography of the same narrator, he commented on al-Ḥillī's insertion of him into the first section:

وكانه مبني على أصالة العدالة

It is as if it is based on *aṣālat al-'adālah*, or the presumption of (the narrator's) 'adālah.<sup>4</sup>

This proves that al-Khūṭī does not regard stating the truth as from the reasons of determining a narrator's tawthīq because, had that been the case, he would

---

1 Bisām al-Murtaḍā: *Zubdat al-Maqāl min Mu'jam al-Rijāl*, 2/504.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 103, no. 235.

3 As in biographies 345, 517, and 543.

4 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 6/90, no. 3067.

not have said that al-Ḥillī based his tawthīq on the presumption of the narrator’s ‘adālah. And for this reason, he regarded him (i.e., al-Ḥasan ibn al-Qāsim) in summarizing the book of al-Khūṭ as “majhūl.”<sup>1</sup> This is because both of them considered the fact that al-Khūṭ did not regard the (narrator’s) recognition of the truth and belief therein from among the reasons of tawthīq.

#### 5.1.4 The narrator’s disproportionate defense of the Prophet’s Family and disputing and quarrelling with his opposition

Al-Ḥillī regards a narrator’s disputing against his opposition about the Prophet’s family صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ as of the reasons to accept his narration. This is because such a person does not merely believe in the truth; rather, he is willing to argue for the sake of it. This is greater than merely believing in the truth—which al-Ḥillī accepts the narrator for. Therefore, al-Ḥillī includes Ḥamzah ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭayyār in the first section<sup>2</sup> because of the fact that Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq asked (Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى) to have mercy on him, supplicated for his radiance and happiness, and was staunch in defending the Ahl al-Bayt.

When al-Khūṭ offered Ḥamzah ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭayyār’s biography, he stated, after mentioning two narrations:

إن الكشي ذكر روايتين قويتين تدلان على حسن ابن الطيار وجلالته... عن هشام بن الحكم قال قال لي أبو عبد الله عليه السلام ما فعل ابن الطيار قال قلت مات قال رحمه الله ولقاه نضرة وسرورا فقد كان شديد الخصومة عنا أهل البيت... [و] عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام فقال ما فعل ابن الطيار فقلت توفي فقال رحمه الله أدخل الله عليه الرحمة ونضره فإنه كان يخاصم عنا أهل البيت... [و] عن الطيار قال قلت لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام بلغني أنك كرهت مناظرة الناس وكرهت الخصومة فقال عليه السلام أما كلامه مثلك للناس فلا نكرهه من إذا طار أحسن أن يقع وإن وقع يحسن أن يطير فمن كان هكذا فلا نكره كلامه [عقب الخوئي فقال] ثم إن هذه الروايات راجعة إلى محمد بن الطيار والد حمزة لا إلى حمزة نفسه كما توهمه جماعة وذلك فإن الطيار المذكور في هذه الروايات كان من الاعلام والمناظرين وقد مات في حياة الصادق عليه السلام على ما نطقت به الروايتان المادحتان وقد مر أن حمزة بن الطيار

1 Bisām Murtaḍā: *Zubdat al-Maqāl min Mu‘jam al-Rijāl*, 1/317; Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī: *al-Muḥḍ min Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 151.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 120, no. 305.

Al-Kashshī mentioned two strong narrations which prove the reliability and greatness of Ibn al-Ṭayyār... From Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam who said:

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said to me, “What did Ibn al-Ṭayyār do?”

I said, “He died.’

He said, “May Allah have mercy on him and give him radiance and happiness. He was staunch in our, the Ahl al-Bayt’s, defense.”

... And from Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام who said, “What did Ibn al-Ṭayyār do?”

I said, “He passed away.”

And so, he said, “May Allah have mercy on him. May Allah show him mercy and radiance for, verily, he used to staunchly defend us, the Ahl al-Bayt.”

... And from al-Ṭayyār who said, “I said to Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام, ‘It has reached me that you dislike debating the people and dislike argumentation.’

So, he عليه السلام said, ‘As for words such as yours to the people, we do not dislike it. When it flies, it is better for it to fall, and when it falls, it is better for it to fly. Whoever is like this, we do not detest their words.’

(Al-Khūṭī commented saying:) Furthermore, these narrations go back to Muḥammad ibn al-Ṭayyār, the father of Ḥamzah, not to, as a number of people suspected, Ḥamzah himself. That is because the aforementioned al-Ṭayyār in these narrations was from among the notables and the debaters. He died in the life of al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام, according to what was stated by the two narrations in praise of him. It has already been mentioned that Ḥamzah ibn al-Ṭayyār narrated from Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام and Muḥammad ibn Sinān—who did not meet al-Ṣādiq—narrated from him. So, how then can the narrations that praise apply to Ḥamzah? Rather, they are definitely in reference to his father.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7:294 (no. 4071).

If we were to critically analyze al-Khūṭī's words—regardless of whether al-Ṭayyār was the father or son—we can conclude the following. Al-Khūṭī stated:

إن الكشي ذكر روايتين قويتين تدلان على حسن ابن الطيار وجلالته

Al-Kashshī mentioned two strong narrations proving the reliability and greatness of Ibn al-Ṭayyār.

And when we review the narration, we find that it includes:

دعاء المعصوم وترحمه على الراوي

The infallible's supplication and asking Allah to have mercy on him.

And:

أن الله لقاء نضرة وسرورا

that Allah will cause him to meet radiance and happiness.

And:

أنه شديد الخصومة عن آل البيت

That he used to staunchly defend the Ahl al-Bayt.

Based on this, I say the following. Firstly, the infallible's supplication and asking Allah to have mercy on him does not prove tawthīq of a narrator, according to al-Khūṭī. This will be seen later on.

Secondly, as for the narrator debating and arguing for the sake of the family of the Prophet ﷺ, I do not consider this to be a valid form of his praise, according to al-Khūṭī. Debating and arguing contribute to the narrator's defence of the Prophet's ﷺ family. I have found an opinion of al-Khūṭī in which it is

possible to build upon. Under the biography of ‘Abd al-A‘lā, the *mawlā* (client) of Sālim’s children, al-Kashshī narrated:

عن عبد الأعلى قال قلت لأبي عبدالله عليه السلام إن الناس يعتبرون علي بالكلام و أنا أكلم الناس فقال أما  
مثلك من يقع ثم يطير فنعم و أما من يقع ثم لا يطير فلا

From ‘Abd al-A‘lā who said: I said to Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, “People reprimand me with words while I speak to people.”

He said, “As for someone like you who falls and then flies, yes. As for the person that falls and then does not fly, then no.”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī comments on the opinion that states ‘Abd al-A‘lā is sound in narration because the Imām was pleased with and approved of his debating:

أنه لا ملازمة بين أن يكون الرجل قويا في الجدل و المناظرة و أن يكون ثقة في أقواله و المطلوب في  
الرواي هو الثاني دون الأول

There is no correlation between the man being capable in debating and argumentation and being reliable in his statements. What is required in the narrator is the former, not the latter.<sup>2</sup>

I can extend the above statement and say that there is equally no correlation between the man being staunch in his arguing on behalf of the family of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and being reliable in his statements. What is required in the narrator is the latter, not the former. This is because it is consistent with the methodology of al-Khūṭī, which excludes the belief (and all its necessary correlations, such as actively calling towards it, or debating and arguing in favour of it) of a narrator as a reason for determining his *tawthīq*.

Thirdly, after it has become clear that al-Khūṭī does not regard argumentation or debate (in favour of the Prophet’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ family) among the reasons of

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 319, no. 578.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*: 10/279, no. 6240.

determining a narrator's tawthīq, nothing of the narrations remain for us except for the fact "that Allah will cause him to meet radiance and happiness." Perhaps the statement of al-Khūṭī, "Then al-Kashshī mentioned two strong narrations which prove the reliability and greatness of Ibn al-Ṭayyār," goes back to this text, not because he argues and debates about the family of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. From here, I say that al-Ḥillī considers arguing in defense of the family among the reasons of tawthīq, contrary to the opinion of al-Khūṭī who does not consider it as having any impact on the status of a narrator.

If an objector were to say that al-Khūṭī mentioned a number of narrations under the biography of al-Ṭayyār, among them those which include supplication, happiness, and receiving of radiance and happiness, as well as narrations that only include debating and arguing (in favour of the Prophet's صلى الله عليه وسلم family) and regarding this as indicative of the narrator's reliability; thus, based on this, al-Khūṭī made a distinction between debating and argumentation.

I would say that this is possible. However, it conflicts with the general methodology of al-Khūṭī and his explicit statement that there is no necessary correlation between the person being capable in argumentation and debate, and him being reliable in his statements. It is very close to staunchly arguing.

And Allah knows best.

## 5.2 The positions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī concerning the statements of al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl that come from the infallible Imāms—according to the Imāmī Shī'ah

### 5.2.1 The Imām or one of the notables asking Allah to have mercy on the narrator

Under the chapter "*Naṣṣ al-Imām*," 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī states:



يراد بذلك أن يروى في الكتب الرجالية نص صريح أو ظاهر عن أحد الأئمة المعصومين (ع) في تقييم حال راو من الرواة توثيقاً أو تضعيفاً ولا خلاف بين علمائنا في الاعتماد على مثل هذه النصوص الشريفة الأخذ بمؤدباتها

What is intended thereby is that an explicit or apparent text is narrated in the books of narrator evaluation from one of the infallible Imāms on the evaluation of a narrator's condition, either a *tawithīq* or *taḍīf*. There is no difference of opinion among our scholars on relying on the likes of these noble texts and accepting the implications therein.<sup>1</sup>

Thereafter, al-Faḍlī cited several examples for the principle that he mentioned, such as the infallible Imām giving glad tidings of Jannah to the person, or saying that he is among the protectors of the religion.

The Imām or any notable's asking Allah for His mercy or pleasure (for the narrator) is the most famous of what they state regarding a narrator. The Imāmī scholars have spoken at length on this issue. Al-Māmaqānī enumerated the reasons of *tawthīq* and mentioned among them, "The Imām's asking Allah for His mercy, or His pleasure, or the like for the narrator." Thereafter, al-Māmaqānī explains his opinion saying:

فإنه لا يعقل صدور ذلك منه إلا بالنسبة إلى ثقة عدل بل الترحم و الترضي و نحوهما من المشايخ فيبد  
ذلك كما لا يخفى على الفطن اللبيب

It does not make sense for such statements to come from him except because they are in relation to a person who is reliable and upright. In fact, scholars asking Allah for His mercy or His pleasure for a narrator informs of this. This is not unknown to the intelligent, astute person.<sup>2</sup>

This is the point of view of those who consider the supplication of mercy and pleasure from the luminaries—the infallible being at the head of such people—

---

1 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 120.

2 'Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/210, *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, no. 24.

as indicative of the narrator's uprightness, reliability, integrity, or as a form of general praise, according to the famous difference of opinion.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Kāzimī states:

فكيفما كان [لا] يكون إلا عن ثقة يرجع إليه الأجلاء

Whatever the case may be, it is not (but) regarding a reliable person, someone who the luminaries revert back to.<sup>2</sup>

Many of the latter-day Imāmī scholars held this opinion.<sup>3</sup>

What concerns us here is the opinion of both Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūṭ. As it appears in some biographies, al-Khūṭ considers the supplication of the infallible for a narrator among the reasons for placing him in the first section. Under the biography of Ḥamdān ibn al-Mu'āfā, he states:

مولى جعفر بن محمد عليه السلام روي عن الكاظم والرضا عليهما السلام أنهما دعوا له

The *mawlā* (client) of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad عليه السلام. It was narrated from al-Kāzim and al-Riḍā عليه السلام that they supplicated for him.<sup>4</sup>

Al-Ḥillī did not mention anything except for this so that he could place the narrator in the first section. This indicates that he regarded the supplication

---

1 See: *Mu'jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah* of Muḥammad Kāzim, p. 39. See, also: *Nihāyat al-Dirāyah* of Ḥasan al-Ṣadr, p. 422.

2 Al-Kāzimī: *Uddat al-Rijāl*, p. 23. Transmitted from marginalia of *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* of Abū 'Alī al-Ḥā'irī, 1/94. See, also: *Mu'jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah* of Muḥammad Kāzim, p. 39.

3 Among them: al-Māmaqānī (his words in this regard have already been mentioned); al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī (as stated in *Mustadrakāt 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, 1/59 and 3/84, no. 4147; Muḥammad al-Jalālī in his work, *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 342 (Despite the fact that he did not mention the words “pleasure” or “mercy;” rather; he stated: “tawthīq of the infallible”); Abū 'Alī al-Ḥā'irī in *Muntahā al-Maqāl*, 1/94. In *Uṣūl 'Ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, Muslim al-Dāwūrī inclined to give detail and make a distinction between “mercy” and “pleasure” and questioned the opinions of al-Khūṭ (see: 2/131).

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 133, no. 355.

of the infallible among the reasons for accepting the narrator, irrespective of whether it is regarded as a *tawthīq*, *taḥsīn* (i.e., considering the narrator upright), or any other level of a narrator's acceptability.

Under the biography of 'Abd al-Malik ibn A'yan (Abū al-Ḍurrīs), he states:

روي ترحم الصادق عليه السلام عليه

The supplication of mercy of al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام for the narrator has been narrated.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps what emphasizes the fact that al-Ḥillī considers the supplication of mercy among the reasons of *tawthīq* is what comes in the biography of 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Abd Allāh. Al-Ḥillī states:

قال الكشي عن محمد بن مسعود قال حدثنا محمد بن نصير قال حدثنا أحمد ابن محمد بن عيسى قال كتب إليه علي بن الحسين بن عبد الله يسأله الدعاء في زيادة عمره حتى يرى ما يحب فكتب إليه في جوابه تصير إلى رحمة الله خير لك فتوفى الرجل بالخزيمية

Al-Kashshī states from Muḥammad ibn Mas'ūd — Muḥammad ibn Naṣīr narrated to us — Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Isā narrated to us — 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Abd Allāh wrote to him asking about the supplication for an increase in his age so that he can see that which he loves. He wrote back to him with the answer, "Being in the mercy of Allah is better for you."

And so, the man passed away in al-Khuzaymiyyah.<sup>2</sup>

Then al-Ḥillī commented:

والظاهر أن المسؤول بالدعاء بعض الأئمة عليهم السلام وهذه الرواية لا تدل نصاً على عدالة الرجل لكنها من المرجحات

1 Ibid., p. 206, no. 661.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 510, no. 985.

It appears that the one responsible for making the supplication was some of the Imāms عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. This narration does not explicitly prove the ‘adālah of the man; however, it seems to be from the favourable narrations.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps al-Ḥillī did not consider the supplication of mercy explicit enough. The statement of the infallible “in the mercy of Allah” could mean that he desired for him to take himself away (i.e., to die). And for this reason, the mad died after this statement. Therefore, al-Ḥillī counted it among the favourable narrations.

Had the supplication of mercy been explicit, as in other biographies, it would not be merely from the favourable narrations; rather, it would be counted among the evidences which directly indicate the narrator’s tawhīq and acceptance of the narration.

From the statements of al-Ḥillī, it is clear that he accepts the supplication of mercy on condition that the chain of narration through which it is transmitted to the infallible is authentic, as in the biography of Ḥamzah ibn Bazī. He mentions a narration in which it comes:

ذَكَرَ بَيْنَ يَدَيَّ أَبِي الْحَسَنِ الرِّضَا عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ حَمِزَةَ بْنَ بَزِيعٍ فَتَرَحَّمَ عَلَيْهِ سَاعَةً

Ḥamzah ibn Bazī was mentioned in front of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and so he asked Allah to have mercy on him for a moment.

Al-Ḥillī commented:

وهذا الطريق لم يثبت صحته عندي

According to me, the authenticity of this chain has not been verified.<sup>2</sup>

And despite al-Ḥillī’s statement regarding the chain’s inauthenticity, we see him placing Ḥamzah ibn Bazī in the first section. He did the same under the

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 184, no. 545.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 121, no. 308.

biography of Abū Ḥarīr al-Qummī.<sup>1</sup> He also did the same under the biography of Kulayb ibn Mu‘āwiyah al-Ṣaydāwī<sup>2</sup> when he criticized the chain of narration of the supplication of mercy because it contained a Wāqifī narrator. Despite that, al-Ḥillī placed him in the first section and suspended judgement on his ta‘dīl!

I can summarize by saying: al-Ḥillī considers the supplication of mercy and pleasure of the infallible from among the reasons of accepting the narrator, when the chain through which it is narrated is authentic and the expression used is explicit. If the chain is not authentic, al-Ḥillī makes it more favourable towards accepting the narrator.

As for al-Khūṭī, it has been mass transmitted from him that he does not take into consideration the supplication of mercy and pleasure of the infallible for the narrator. According to him, it has nothing to do with accepting or rejecting the narrator’s narration. Thus, it is not indicative of reliability or uprightness. He states:

الترحم بنفسه لا يقتضي التوثيق ولا يكشف عن حسن الحال وقد رأينا الصدوق كثيرا ما يترحم ويترضى على مشايخه وفيهم الضعيف وغيره وأن ذلك منه لا يكشف إلا عن كونه شيعيا إماميا لا يزيد عليه بشيء كيف وقد ترحم الصادق (ع) على جميع زوار قبر الحسين (ع) وفيهم الفاسق والكذاب وشارب الخمر أفهل ترى أن ترحم الصدوق وترضيه أعظم شأنًا من ترحم الصادق (عليه السلام)

The supplication of mercy in and of itself does not necessitate tawthīq and it does not reveal the uprightness of the narrator’s condition. We have seen al-Ṣadūq many a time supplicating to Allah for Him to have mercy and be pleased with his teachers, among them are those who are weak, etc. This coming from him only reveals that he is an Imāmī Shī‘ī, and it adds nothing more. Why would this not be the case? Al-Ṣādiq supplicated to Allah for Him to have mercy on the all the visitors of al-Ḥusayn’s grave, among them would be the liar, sinner, and someone who drinks alcohol. Do you think al-Ṣadūq’s supplicating and asking Allah to be pleased with a person is greater than al-Ṣādiq’s doing the same?<sup>3</sup>

1 Ibid., p. 303, no. 1139.

2 Ibid., p. 232, no. 793.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 4/232, “*Sharā’iṭ Sujūd al-Tilāwah*”.

Al-Khūī also stated:

أنك قد عرفت أن الترحم لا يدل على المدح فضلا عن الوثاقة

You know that asking Allah to have mercy (on a narrator) is not indicative of his praise, let alone his reliability.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūī disputed those who said that the act of asking Allah to have mercy is a proof of the narrator's *tawhīq*. He states:

استدل على حسن من ترحم عليه أحد الاعلام كالشيخ الصدوق ومحمد ابن يعقوب [الكليني] وأضرابهما بأن في الترحم عناية خاصة بالمترحم عليه فيكشف ذلك عن حسنه لا محالة

والجواب عنه أن الترحم هو طلب الرحمة من الله تعالى فهو دعاء مطلوب ومستحب في حق كل مؤمن وقد أمرنا بطلب المغفرة لجميع المؤمنين وللوالدين بخصوصهما وقد ترحم الصادق عليه السلام لكل من زار الحسين عليه السلام بل إنه سلام الله عليه قد ترحم لأشخاص خاصة معروفين بالفسق لما فيهم ما يقتضي ذلك كالسيد إسماعيل الحميري وغيره فكيف يكون ترحم الشيخ الصدوق أو محمد بن يعقوب [الكليني] وأمثالهما كاشفا عن حسن المترحم عليه؟ وهذا النجاشي قد ترحم على محمد بن عبد الله بن محمد بن عبيد الله بن البهلول بعد ما ذكر أنه رأى شيوخه يضعفونه وأنه لأجل ذلك لم يرو عنه شيئا وتجنبه

When one of the notables, such as al-Ṣadūq, Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb (al-Kulaynī), and others like them ask Allah to have mercy on a narrator, it is inferred therefrom that this act indicates his uprightness it indicates their special attention on him. Certainly, this reveals his uprightness.

The response to this is as follows. *Taraḥḥum* is the act of seeking mercy from Allah ﷻ. It is a required and desired supplication for every believer. We have been commanded to seek Allah's forgiveness for all believers, and for one's parents, in particular. Al-Ṣādiq asked Allah to have mercy on all those who visited al-Ḥusan عليه السلام at his grave. In fact, he عليه السلام asked Allah to have mercy on certain individuals known to be sinners because of what

1 Al-Khūī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 10/215, no. 6102.

was inside of them that necessitated such a supplication, such as al-Sayyid Ismā'īl al-Ḥumayrī and others. How then does the act of asking for Allah's mercy by al-Shaykh al-Ṣadūq, Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb (al-Kulaynī), or their likes reveal the uprightness of the narrator? Here we have al-Najjāshī asking Allah to have mercy on Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Ubayd Allāh ibn al-Bahlūl<sup>1</sup> after mentioning that he saw his teachers making taḍīf of him, and because of that, he stayed away from him and did not narrate anything from him.<sup>2</sup>

What al-Khūṭī mentioned regarding asking Allah to have mercy is the same thing he states regarding Allah being pleased. He states:

وليس في ترضي الصدوق (قده) عليه دلالة على الحسن فضلا عن الوثاقة

There is not in al-Ṣadūq asking Allah to be pleased with the narrator an indication of his uprightness, let alone his reliability.<sup>3</sup>

### 5.2.2 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the negative statements that come from the infallible about a narrator

After many Imāmī scholars made the words of praise that were uttered by the Imām a form of tawthīq for narrator (admitting there is disagreement regarding some its details), they also made the words of the Imām's dispraise of a narrator a proof for leaving him out. This is irrespective of whether it was because of the narrator lying, or sinning, or because of his animosity towards the Imām. Cursing

---

1 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, pp. 55-58, no. 207. When I went back to al-Najjāshī's *al-Fihrist*, I saw him giving the title as "Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Ubayd Allāh." It was not "Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Ubayd Allāh al-Bahlūl," as al-Khūṭī mentioned it. His text reads as: "I saw this Shaykh. He was a friend of my father. I heard much from him. I saw our scholars making taḍīf of him. Therefore, I did not narrate anything from him and I stayed away from him. He was from the people of knowledge, strong etiquette, good poetry, and beautiful handwriting. May Allah have mercy on him and pardon him."

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/74.

3 Ibid., 15/230, no. 9961.

is among the most severe words that come from the Imām against a narrator. When it is authentically proven to have come from an Imām that he cursed, belied, or testified that a particular narrator is destined to the fire (and the Imāmī scholars did not justify such a statement from the Imām as a form of Taqīyyah), then it is indicative of a serious criticism of that narrator and it is sufficient grounds for rejecting his narration. I have not come across any difference of opinion among the Imāmiyyah on this issue. It also appears to me there is agreement on this issue from both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī.

Perhaps it is sufficient for me to mention one example—using the Imām’s cursing a narrator as a form of indicating a rejection of his narration. Under the biography of ‘Urwah ibn Yaḥyā al-Nakhhās al-Dahqān, al-Khūṭī states:

قال ملعون روى الكشي حديثا في طريقه محمد بن موسى الهمداني وحديثا آخر عن علي بن محمد بن قتيبة عن أبي حامد أحمد بن إبراهيم المراغي أن أبا محمد (عليه السلام) لعن عروة بن يحيى الدهقان و أمر شيعته بلعنه

Extreme (and) cursed. Al-Kashshī narrated one ḥadīth which contains Muḥammad ibn Mūsā al-Hamdānī. He narrated another ḥadīth from ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Qutaybah — from Ḥāmid Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Marāghī that Abū Muḥammad عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ cursed ‘Urwah ibn Yaḥyā al-Dahqān and ordered his followers to curse him.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī placed him in the second section because the infallible Imām not only cursed him, but he also ordered for him to be cursed.

As for al-Khūṭī, under the biography of Ja‘far ibn Wāqid, he states:

قال الكشي في ترجمة جماعة منهم جعفر بن واقد حدثني محمد بن قولويه والحسين بن الحسن بن بندار القمي قالوا حدثنا سعد بن عبد الله قال حدثني إبراهيم بن مهزيار ومحمد بن عيسى بن عبيد عن علي ابن مهزيار قال سمعت أبا جعفر الثاني (عليه السلام) يقول وقد ذكر عنده أبا الخطاب لعن الله أبا الخطاب ولعن أصحابه ولعن الشاكين في لعنه ولعن من قد وقف في ذلك وشك فيه

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 383 (no. 1536). See: *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, p. 573 (no. 1086).



Al-Kashshī stated under the biographies of several people—among them Ja‘far ibn Wāqid—Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh and al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Bundār al-Qummī narrated to me — Sa‘d ibn ‘Abd Allāh narrated to us — Ibrāhīm ibn Mahzyār and Muḥammad ibn ‘Isā ibn ‘Ubayd narrated to me — from ‘Alī ibn Mahzayār: I heard Abū Ja‘far the Second عليه السلام saying (when Abū al-Khaṭṭāb was mentioned in his presence), “May Allah curse Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, and curse his companions, and curse those who doubt that he needs to be cursed, and curse those who hesitate and doubt therein.”<sup>1</sup>

According to al-Khūṭī, this action is sufficient to render criticism of the man since he did not bother to do anything except for transmit the Imām’s cursing of the narrator in order to prove his condition.

### 5.3 The relationship that connects the Imām with the narrator

#### 5.3.1 The meaning of “khāṣī” and its implications

In *al-Rijāl*, al-Ṭūsī mentions the word “khāṣī” when discussing several narrators under the chapter, “Those who did not narrate from the Imāms.”<sup>2</sup> So, what does this word signify? Al-Māmaqānī states:

خاصي وفيه احتمالان أحدهما كون المراد به الشيعي مقابل العامي والثاني كون المراد به أنه من خواص الأئمة عليهم السلام وعلى الأول فهو دال على كونه إماميا وعلى الثاني فهو دال على المدح المعتمد به بل يمكن استفادة التوثيق منه لبعدهم تمكينهم عليهم السلام من صيرورة غير الثقة من خواصهم لكن استعمال اللفظ في الأول في هذه الأزمنة أشيع وإن كان في الأزمنة السابقة بالمساواة إن لم يكن بالعكس

Khāṣī: This word has two possibilities:

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 5/105, no. 2333; *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, p. 529, no. 1012.

2 See: *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, biography nos. 5957, 6092, 6095, 6096, 6185, 6188, 6189, 6193, 6314, 6318, 6319. These are the only biographies I found in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* and all of them were under the chapter, “Those who did not narrate from one of the Imāms.” It is not clear to me the reason why this word is only mentioned in this final chapter of his book and not in the other chapters even once—a book that contains 5919 biographies! In fact, he omitted it entirely from his (other) book, *al-Fihrist*. Also, al-Najjāshī did not mention it!

1. it means (the narrator is a) Shī'ī, instead of an 'Āmmī (i.e., Sunnī), or
2. it means the narrator is among the most select individuals of the Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ.

Assuming the first possibility, it is indicative of the narrator being an Imāmī. And assuming the second possibility, it is indicative of the narrator being praiseworthy. In fact, it can be used as (a form of) tawthīq of the narrator since they عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ would not allow a non-thiqāh to be of their close associates. However, the first usage of the word in these times is more widespread, even though they were used equally in the past, if not conversely.<sup>1</sup>

'Alī al-Burūjirdī (d. 1313 AH) states:

إن ذكره في بعض الرواة خاصة له نوع من الخصوصية فيشعر بالمدح

It being mentioned about certain specific narrators is a type of uniqueness that suggests praiseworthiness.<sup>2</sup>

Several Imāmī scholars have agreed with him regarding this opinion.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 'Abd Allāh al-Māmaqānī: *Miqbās al-Hidāyah*, 2/239.

2 'Alī al-Burūjirdī: *Ṭarā'if al-Maqāl*, 2/260.

3 Several Imāmī scholars are of the opinion that the word “khāṣī” is from the words of praise (of the narrator), including the following: Rafī ibn 'Alī al-Jīlānī al-Rashtī (famously known as Sharī'at-Madār) in a work related to the higher studies of ḥadīth (*ilm al-dirāyah*); however, it is possible that it means the opposite of an 'āmmī (p. 312.). When mentioning the words of tawthīq and praise of a narrator, al-Mullā 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn 'Alī Riḍā al-Aṣfahānī al-Hamdānī (d. 1383 AH) states in his book, *al-Wajīzah fī 'ilm al-Dirāyah*: “Khāṣī. It can be regarded as a praise.” (p. 561). Both of these books are printed among *Rasā'il fī Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of Abū al-Faḍl Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī (vol. 2). See also: *Mu'jam Muṣṭalḥāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 59 and 174 – under the discussion of the words, “*Min khawāṣṣ al-Shī'ah wa min khiyār al-Shī'ah* (From the close associates of the Shī'ah and from the select of the Shī'āh)”; *Fawā'id al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī 'alā Manhaj al-Maqāl*, 1/125 no. 2.

After addressing the issue, al-Khāqānī (d. 1334 AH) concludes saying:

الظاهر أن الخاصي نسبة إلى الخاصة والعامي نسبة إلى العامة فكما ان الخاصة والعامة متقابلان فكذا  
الخاصي والعامي ولا ريب أن الخاصة ظاهر في الشيعة وحينئذ فلم يبق ظهور في المدح والمدار عليه  
كما عرفت والله أعلم

Seemingly, the khāṣī is an attribution to the khāṣṣah and the ‘āmmī is an attribution to the ‘āmmah. Just as the khāṣṣah and the ‘āmmah are opposites, so too, is the khāṣī and the ‘āmmī. There is no doubt that the khāṣṣah appears in relation to the Shī‘ah. Accordingly, it does not remain applicable to and give the impression of praise, as you know. And Allah knows best.”<sup>1</sup>

What concerns us here is the opinion of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ on the matter.

It seems from how al-Ḥillī dealt with the word “khāṣī” in *al-Khulāṣah* that it is from the reasons for accepting the narration of a narrator and placing him in the first section, irrespective of whether he regards it as a simple praise or an actual tawthīq. This becomes very clear to us when we look at the biography of Ḥaydar ibn Shu‘ayb al-Ṭāliqānī. Al-Ḥillī only mentioned one word about him: *Khāṣī*.

This is the word that al-Ṭūsī used for him in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, al-Ḥillī placed him in the first section.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Khūṭ held the opinion that this word is not useful in terms of the acceptance or rejection of a narration. He states:

و أما ما ذكره الشيخ من أنه خاصي فلا دلالة فيه على الحسن فضلا عن الوثاقة

As for what al-Shaykh mentioned in that he is a “khāṣī,” there is no indication therein of his uprightness, let alone his reliability.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Khāqānī: *Rijāl al-Khāqānī*, p. 329.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 423, no. 6096.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 127, no. 332.

4 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/328, no. 4140.

From here, the difference between al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the word and its connotations is clear.

**Note:**

From the conduct of al-Khūṭī in his *Muʿjam*, it appears that he makes a distinction between the word “khāṣī” and the words, “*khawāṣṣ aṣḥāb al-Imām* (from the close associates of the Imām’s companions).” This is because his usage of the word “khāṣī” is clear in that it neither denotes *tawthīq* nor uprightness. As for their statement, “*khawāṣṣ aṣḥāb al-Imām*,” it is from the reasons of deeming the narrator upright. Under the biography of ‘Abd al-Salām ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, al-Khūṭī states:

عده [ابن شهر آشوب]... من خواص أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام ويكفي هذا الحكم بحسنه

Ibn Shahr Āshūb counted him to be ... among the close associates of al-Ṣādiq’s عندنا companions. This ruling is sufficient in regarding him to be upright.<sup>1</sup>

Regardless of al-Khūṭī’s contradiction in his acceptance of the sayings of Ibn Shahr Āshūb (who is one of the latter-day scholars), which contradicts his methodology, what is important is al-Khūṭī’s distinction between the word “khāṣī” and the words “*khawāṣṣ aṣḥāb al-Imām*.”

### 5.3.2 The Imām making *tawkīl* (delegating) of the narrator

Some Imāmī scholars consider the act of *tawkīl* (delegation) of the Imām of a person—in matters related to the religion or otherwise—a reason among the reasons of investigating his ‘adālah, especially if the person has no previous *tawthīq* mentioned in the dictionaries of narrator evaluation. Thereafter, they differ regarding the Imām making *tawkīl* of a person: Does it necessitate his *tawthīq* or not?

---

1 Ibid., 11/21, no. 6516.

Al-Ayrawānī states:

فبينما البعض يصّر على دلالة التوكيل لا على الوثاقة فقط بل على العدالة ويستدل على ذلك بأن الوكيل إذا لم يكن عادلا فتوكيله محرم لأنه نحو ركون إلى الظالم الذي نهت عنه الآية الكريمة

وَلَا تَرْكُنُوا إِلَى الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا فَتَمَسَّكُمُ النَّارُ وَمَا لَكُم مِّنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مِنْ أَوْلِيَاءَ ثُمَّ لَا تُنصَرُونَ

نجد آخرين ينكرون دلالة الوكالة على الوثاقة بحجة أننا نجد كثيرا من وكلائهم عليهم السلام قد صدر الذم في حقهم وقد عقد الشيخ الطوسي في كتابه الغيبة بابا خاصا للوكلاء الذين صدر الذم في حقهم

While some insist that the act of *tawkīl* indicates not only reliability, but *‘adālah* as well. They infer from this that if the *wakīl* (agent) is not *‘ādil*, then the act of *tawkīl* is *ḥarām* because it is somewhat like relying on an oppressor. The following verse prohibits this:

*And do not incline toward those who do wrong, lest you be touched by the Fire, and you would not have other than Allah any protectors; then you would not be helped.*<sup>1</sup>

We find others denying that the act of *Tawkīl* is an indication of reliability. They argue that we find many *wakīls* about whom criticism was raised against. Al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī dedicated a specific section in his book, *al-Ghaybah*, that speaks about *wakīls* who have been criticized.<sup>2</sup>

And like this, we find among the Imāmī scholars those who generalize and do not provide specific details on the issue of agency; according to them, *tawthīq* is concluded from every act of *Tawkīl*. Others, also generalize the issue at hand and say that the act of *Tawkīl* does not necessitate *tawthīq*.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Sūrah Hūd: 113.

2 Bāqir al-Ayrawānī: *Durūs Tamhīdiyyah fī al-Qawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 152. As it seems, perhaps al-Ayrawānī did not consider the details as he did not touch upon them.

3 Of those who mentioned that *wakālah* necessitates *tawthīq* without mentioning any details regarding it is Mahdī al-Kajūrī al-Shīrāzī, as mentioned in his book, *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 103. From those who opposed the notion of agency necessitating *tawthīq* or *taḥṣīn* of a narrator is al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī. As it appears to me, he does not make a distinction between the *tawkīl* of compulsory issues and personal matters. (*Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 5/263).

Some scholars of the Imāmīyah went into details regarding the type of wakālah (that is required for accepting a narrator).<sup>1</sup> For example, if the wakālah is related to *sharʿī* (legal) matters, then there is no problem in it indicating *tawthīq*, *ʿadālah*, and accepting of narrations in general. They mention that the khums tax, legal opinions, and other similar issues are among the considered *sharʿī* matters.

Also, if the wakālah has to do with non-legal matters, such as protecting an *amānah* or something else, then *tawthīq* or *taʿdīl* of the narrator is not a necessary outcome. How many a people are trustworthy in protecting someone’s wealth yet they lie in narrating reports!

If the word “*wakālah* (agency)” is left open about a narrator and we are unable to determine the type of agency he was entrusted with, then is he to be relied-upon or not? Ḥusayn Marʿī responded to this saying:

التفصيل المذكور أحرى بالاعتماد فإن علم حال الوكيل من أي قسم فهو وإلا فلا يعتمد عليه لأنه أعم من أن يكون من الأول أو من الثاني

The aforementioned details are more deserving to be relied-upon. If the condition of the *wakīl* (agent) is known in terms of what type of wakālah it is, then it is fine. If not, it is not to be relied-upon since it is more general than being from the first or the second.<sup>2</sup>

What is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūʿī on this difference of opinion?

---

1 Of those who went with this detailed analysis is ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī in *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 125; Muslim al-Dāwarī in *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl bayna Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 2/301; Ḥusayn ‘Abd Allāh Marʿī in *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī al-Dirāyah wa al-Rijāl*, p. 100; Jaʿfar al-Subḥānī in *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Aḥkāmuhu*, p. 164. From the words of Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Jalālī, it appears that he too, held the view of providing detail (i.e., of the type of agency required for a narrator be reliable), as it appears in his book, *Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 371. He states, “In summary, *tawkīl* requested by the Ahl al-Bayt عليهم السلام is in and of itself indicative of reliability as long as there is not a stronger impediment opposing it, excluding *tawkīl* in relation to financial matters.” Muḥammad al-Sanad in his book (as well), *Buḥūth fī Mabānī ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 159.

2 Ḥusayn Marʿī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī al-Dirāyah wa al-Rijāl*, p. 100.

## Al-Ḥillī on the Imām making tawkīl of the narrator

While examining *al-Khulāṣah* of al-Ḥillī, it became clear to me that he inclines towards the act of wakālah being from the reasons of accepting the narration of a narrator. This is evident from his making tawthīq of those about whom it is said that is a wakīl. Under the biography of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd Rabbih, al-Ḥillī states:

روى الكشي عن محمد بن مسعود قال حدثني محمد بن نصير قال حدثني أحمد بن محمد بن عيسى أنه كان وكيلا وهذا سند صحيح

Al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of Muḥammad ibn Mas‘ūd — Muḥammad ibn Naṣīr narrated to me — Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭsā narrated to me that he was a wakīl. This is an authentic chain of narration.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, al-Ḥillī placed him in the first section because his agency is established through an authentic chain. Al-Ḥillī did not mention a reason for his tawthīq except for agency.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī explicitly stated that al-Ḥillī would consider general agency from the reasons of tawthīq, as transmitted from al-Kāzīmī.<sup>3</sup>

From those who also stated that al-Ḥillī considers general agency as a form of tawthīq is ‘Alī al-Burjirdī (d. 1313 AH). He states:

أشرونا أن مجرد الوكالة كاف في الوثاقة وقد ذهب إليه العلامة [الحلي]

We have alluded to the fact that agency alone is sufficient in determining reliability. Al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) held this view.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 117, no. 288.

2 See biography numbers 256, 163, 187, 334, 500, 517, 585, 529, 546, 615, 670, 762, 768, 782, 827, 828, 898 and others.

3 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā’il*, 5/263.

4 ‘Alī al-Burjirdī, 2/328. See also: *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah* of al-Kalbāsī, 3/649-650.

## Al-Khūī on the Imām making tawkīl of the narrator

Al-Khūī differed with al-Ḥillī on the issue of the tawthīq of a wakīl. On more than one occasion, he explicitly stated that the act of wakālah by the infallible Imām is not indicative of his tawthīq or uprightness. In refuting the issue of assuming ‘adālah from the act of wakālah, al-Khūī states:

الوكالة لا تستلزم العدالة ويجوز توكيل الفاسق إجماعا وبلا إشكال غاية الأمر أن العقلاء لا يوكلون في الأمور المالية خارجا من لا يوثق بأمانته وأين هذا من اعتبار العدالة في التوكيل وأما النهي عن الركون إلى الظالم فهو أجنبي عن التوكيل فيما يرجع إلى أمور الموكل نفسه هذا وقد ذكر [الطوسي] في كتابه الغيبة عدة من المذمومين من وكلاء الأئمة عليهم السلام فإذا كانت الوكالة تلازمها العدالة فكيف يمكن انفكاكها عنها في مورد وبعبارة أخرى إذا ثبت في مورد أن وكيل الإمام عليه السلام لم يكن عادلا كشف ذلك عن عدم الملازمة وإلا فكيف يمكن تخلف اللازم عن الملزوم وبهذا يظهر بطلان ما قيل من أنه إذا ثبتت الوكالة في مورد أخذ بلازمها وهو العدالة حتى يثبت خلافه ثم إنه قد يستدل على وثاقه كل من كان وكلاء من قبل المعصومين عليهم السلام في أمورهم بما رواه محمد بن يعقوب عن علي بن محمد عن الحسن بن عبد الحميد قال شككت في أمر حاجز فجمعت شيئا ثم صرت إلى العسكر فخرج إلي ليس فينا شك ولا في من يقوم مقامنا بأمرنا رد ما معك إلى حاجز ابن يزيد ورواه الشيخ المفيد أيضا والجواب عن ذلك أن الرواية ضعيفة السند ولا أقل من أن الحسن بن عبد الحميد مجهول مضافا إلى أن الرواية لا تدل على اعتبار كل من كان وكلاء من قبلهم سلام الله عليهم في أمر من الأمور وإنما تدل على جلالته من قام مقامهم بأمرهم فيختص ذلك بالنواب والسفراء من قبلهم سلام الله عليهم

Wakālah does not necessitate ‘adālah. Without issue, and by virtue of consensus, it is permissible to make tawkīl of a *fāsiq* (transgressor). The fact of the matter is that intelligent people do not delegate people in relation to financial matters whose trustworthiness is not verified, and so where is this compared to considering ‘adālah in a wakīl?

As for the prohibition of relying on an oppressor, it is foreign to tawkīl in that it goes back to matters of the appointer of the wakīl himself. (Al-Ṭūsī) mentioned in his book, *al-Ghaybah*, a number of criticized narrators from among the agents of the Imāms. Thus, if ‘adālah was a necessary correlation of wakālah, how is it possible to separate it in one instance (and not the other)?

Stated differently, if it is proven in one instance that the wakīl of the Imām is not ‘ādīl, then this reveals that it is not a necessary correlation. Otherwise,



how is it possible that the *lāzim* (consequent) falls away from the *malzūm* (antecedent)? With this, the falseness of what is stated becomes clear: if agency is established in one instance, its consequent will come with it—which is ‘adālah—until the opposite is proven.

Furthermore, the reliability of everyone who was a wakīl of the infallibles عليهم السلام in their affairs may be inferred from what was narrated by Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb — from ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad — from al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd who said, “I was in doubt regarding the affair of Ḥājiz (i.e., his wakālah with the Imām) and so I gathered something and set off to al-‘Askar. He came out to me and said, “There is no doubt in us and in those who stand in our place with our affair. Return what is with you to Ḥājiz ibn Yazīd.” Al-Shaykh al-Mufīd narrated this as well.

The answer to this is as follows. The narration has a weak chain of narration and no less than the fact that al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd is *majhūl* (unknown). In addition to this, the narration does not prove that there is to be a reliance on everyone that was a wakīl on their behalf عليهم السلام for a particular issue. Rather, it proves the greatness of the person who stood in their place for a particular matter. As such, this is restricted to their *nawwāb* (representatives) and *sufarā’* (ambassadors).<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī states:

الوكالة لا تلازم الوثاقة ولا الحسن

Wakālah neither necessitates reliability nor uprightness.<sup>2</sup>

And he stated:

الوكالة لا تستلزم العدالة ولا الوثاقة

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/71.

2 Ibid., 1/280. biography no. 318.

Wakālah neither necessitates ‘adālah nor *wathāqah* (reliability).<sup>1</sup>

It appears from the words of al-Khūī that wakālah does not necessitate integrity, reliability, and uprightness. Also, al-Khūī makes a distinction between the *safīr* (ambassador) of the Imām and his *wakīl* (agent) because he considers *sifārah* (ambassadorship) more special. In arguing the meaning of one of the narrations, he states:

أنه على تقدير تسليم الوكالة فلا دلالة فيها على السفارة التي هي أخص من الوكالة

Conceding that there is agency, there is still no indication therein on ambassadorship which is more special than agency.<sup>2</sup>

Of those that agreed with al-Khūī is al-Tustarī. In refuting al-Māmaqānī, he explains his opinion on how wakālah of a narrator does not necessitate *tawthīq* saying:

كثيرا ما يستند المصنف في الحسن إلى الوكالة عنهم عليهم السلام مع أنها أيضا أعم

Many a times, the author bases uprightness (of a narrator) on the fact that he was a *wakīl* on their behalf عَنْهُمْ وَسَلَّمَ, despite the fact that it, too is broader.<sup>3</sup>

It seems that the opinion of al-Khūī is correct; especially if we asked the following question to both proponents of this view (i.e., those who say that all forms of wakālah necessitate ‘adālah and acceptance of (the narrator’s) narration, and those who require more detail as to what type of wakālah it is (i.e., for the narrator to be presumed acceptable): When the agency is for supra-rational (*ta‘abbudī*) matters (which you agreed necessitates *tawthīq*), will you also make *tawthīq* of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ delegated for issues of Imāmah and

1 Ibid., 17/221. biography no. 11055.

2 Ibid., 1/280. biography no. 318.

3 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/70.

leading the people in ṣalāh?<sup>1</sup> This is the greatest thing a person can be delegated for. This was at the end of the Prophet's ﷺ life because he was afflicted with illness. Their answer will be, without a doubt, “No.”

This is one of the most important proofs that can be forced upon those who regard wakālah as indicative of ‘adālah. What is it that made it specific to the companions of the infallible Imāms and removed from the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ?!

The contradiction of this opinion is clear and manifest.

It is possible for us to say that rejecting this principle would be a clear criticism of the Infallible who entrusts a man for a worldly or legal matter and yet he is not considered reliable or trustworthy, especially considering the claim of the Imāmiyyah that their infallible Imāms know what the hearts of man conceal. Was the Infallible unaware of this yet al-Khūṭ knew of it? This proves the falsity of many creedal issues in the Imāmī school, especially those extreme issues related to Imāms having knowledge of everything, including what the hearts conceal.

#### Note:

Similar to the Imām's tawkīl is what is known as “*wiṣāyah* (executorship)” in that a narrator is a *waṣī* (executor) (i.e., on behalf of the Imām) for a particular issue. Al-Khūṭ's opinion on *wiṣāyah* is similar to his opinion on *wakālah*. This is clear from the biography of Muḥammad ibn Nu‘aym al-Ṣaḥḥāf. Al-Khūṭ states:

استظهر بعضهم أن منشأ توثيقه هو أن محمد بن أبي عمير أوصى إليه وترك امرأة لم يترك وارثا غيرها، فكتب إلى عبد صالح فكتب إليه أعط المرأة الربع واحمل الباقي إلينا فإن محمد بن أبي عمير لا يوصي إلا إلى ثقة أمين وهذا أيضا من الغرائب فإن محمد بن أبي عمير هذا غير محمد بن أبي عمير الثقة المعروف فإن هذا من أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام وتوفي في زمان الكاظم عليه السلام على ما تقدم في ترجمته

---

1 Because of what al-Imām al-Bukhārī narrated in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, “On the authority of ‘Ā’ishah who said, ‘The Messenger of Allah ﷺ ordered Abū Bakr to lead the ṣalāh while he was sick. And so, he used to lead them.’ (1/24, Bāb: *Man qāma li janb al-Imām li ‘illah*).

على أن الوصاية إلى شخص لا تدل على وثاقته في الرواية غاية الأمر أن تدل على أمانته في الأموال وعلى ما ذكرنا فمحمد بن نعيم الصحاف مجهول الحال

Some of them have claimed that the basis for his tawhīq is Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr. He was made a waṣī (executor) (i.e., Muḥammad ibn Nuʿaym al-Ṣaḥḥāf). Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr only left behind a wife and no other heirs. So, he wrote to the pious slave (i.e., the Imām). And he wrote (back) to him, “Give the women one-fourth and bring the remaining to us.”<sup>1</sup> Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr would only make a reliable and trustworthy person an executor. This, too is also strange. This Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr is not the same well-known thiqaḥ. This one is from the companions of al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام; he died in the time of al-Kāzīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, based on what was previously mentioned in his biography. The most that can be said is that it proves his trustworthiness in relation to wealth. Thus, based on what we have mentioned, Muḥammad ibn Nuʿaym al-Ṣaḥḥāf’s condition is unknown.<sup>2</sup>

Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan Abū Khālīd al-Qummī al-Ashʿarī, al-Khūṭ states:

قال الوحيد [البهبهاني] يظهر من غير واحد من الأخبار كونه وصي سعد بن سعد الأشعري وهو دليل الاعتماد والوثوق وحسن الحال وظاهر في العدالة

Al-Waḥīd (al-Bahbahānī) states, “It appears from more than one report that he was the waṣī of Saʿd ibn Saʿd al-Ashʿarī. This is a proof of reliance on him, his reliability, and his upright condition. It also seems to suggest ʿadālah.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Khūṭ commented on this, saying:

ويدفعه أن الوصاية لا تكشف عن العدالة ولا تدل على الاعتماد والوثوق به بما هو راو وإنما يدل على الوثوق بأمانته وعدم خيانتة وبين الأمرين عموم من وجه وعليه فالرجل مجهول الحال

1 Al-Kulaynī: *Al-Kāfi*, 7/126.

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 18/322, biography no. 11944.

3 Al-Khūṭ: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 16/217, biography no. 10484.

What disproves this is the fact that *wiṣāyah* does not reveal ‘*adālah* nor does it prove reliance and reliability in what he narrates. Rather, it proves reliability in relation to his trustworthiness and his non-deceptiveness. There is a generality between the two issues from one perspective. Based on this, the individual’s condition is unknown.<sup>1</sup>

With this, it is clear that al-Khūṭ does not consider any form of *wakālah* or *wiṣāyah* to have any impact on accepting or rejecting the narrator’s report. Despite this, it is as if there is a contradiction in the words of al-Khūṭ because he says, “Rather, it proves reliability in relation to his trustworthiness and his non-deceptiveness.” And, before this, he says, “...*wiṣāyah* does not reveal ‘*adālah* nor does it prove reliance and reliability in what he narrates.”

It is as if there is a contradiction here. How can a person be reliable, not deceive, and be trustworthy in worldly affairs and not be trustworthy in legal matters, especially considering the fact that he is from the Muslims? And especially considering the fact that the Imāmiyyah do not rely much on the issue of *ḍabṭ* (precision) of a ḥadīth narrator; rather, they only observe his ‘*adālah*, as is the situation with al-Khūṭ. The problem is that ‘*adālah* emerged because of his non-deceptiveness and his reliability. In summary, the issue that al-Khūṭ gave a foundation to is inaccurate and requires further scrutiny.

### 5.3.3 The Imām’s writing and correspondence with the narrator

Imāmī scholars differ regarding whether a narrator’s writing and maintaining correspondence with the Imām is considered a form of his *tawthīq*. I am referring to the *tawthīq* of the person who the letter is sent to, not the messenger<sup>2</sup> or carrier

---

1 Ibid.

2 Al-Māmaqānī mentioned many reasons for *tawthīq* and counted among them, “the Imām sending a messenger to an enemy of his or someone else; that necessarily means the narrator has integrity and is reliable.” (*Tanqīh al-Maqāl*, 1/210, *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, no. 24). In refuting the opinion of al-Māmaqānī, Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī states, “Written communication from them عنه السلام is not proof of uprightness, as the author presumed ... Based on this, he deduced rulings in many places in his book. He is wrong.” (*Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/70, chapter 25).

of the Imām's correspondence. It can be defined according to what Muḥammad Riḍā stated:

هي المراسلات التي جرت بين الأصحاب والأئمة عليهم السلام وحفظت ودونت حول مسألة واحدة غالباً أو موضوع معين

They are the correspondences which occurred between the companions and the Imāms عليهم السلام. They were usually preserved and documented in regards to one issue or a particular subject.<sup>1</sup>

Based on this, can it be said that the person whom the infallible Imām sends the book or message to is reliable?

Al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī regarded the correspondences of the Imāms with their companions as a proof of the Imām's care and concern for the narrator.<sup>2</sup>

What is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī on this issue?

### **The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the Imām's writing and correspondence with the narrator**

Whoever analyzes the workings of al-Ḥillī in *al-Khulāṣah* will see that he regards the act of writing of the Imām to one of the Imāmiyyah as a proof for accepting his narrations. This is evidenced by the fact that in some biographies, he did not mention a reason for placing the narrator in the first section of his book except because he has correspondence with the Imām. Examples of this are as follows.

Under the biography of Aḥmad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far al-Ḥimyarī, al-Ḥillī restricted himself to the following words:

---

1 Muḥammad Riḍā: *Mu'jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 68.

2 Al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt 'ilm al-Rijāl*, 2/410, no. 3606 and p. 411, no. 3610.

له مكاتبة

He has correspondence (i.e., with the Imām).<sup>1</sup>

Under the biography of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far, al-Ḥillī restricted himself to the following words:

له مكاتبة

He has correspondence (i.e., with the Imām).<sup>2</sup>

This proves that al-Ḥillī regards the correspondence between the Imām and the narrator among the proofs for accepting his narrations. As a result, he included these biographies in the first section.

### **The position of al-Khūī regarding the Imām’s writing and correspondence with the narrator**

Al-Khūī disagreed with al-Ḥillī’s opinion on the matter. Throughout the methodology he espoused in dealing with those narrators who are mentioned to have had correspondence with the Imām, he did not make it a reason for accepting, making tawthīq, or establishing the ‘adālah of the narrator.

Al-Khūī did not comment on the correspondences and their impact on narrators except in a negative manner. This confirms that he attached no importance to it in the first place. Under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Ḥātim ibn Māhawayh, al-Khūī states:

قال الكشي في فضل الرواية والحديث أبو محمد جبرئيل بن أحمد الفاريابي قال حدثني موسى بن جعفر بن وهب قال حدثني أبو الحسن أحمد بن حاتم بن ما هويه قال كتبت إليه يعني أبا الحسن الثالث عليه السلام أسأله عن أخذ معالم ديني وكتب أخوه أيضا بذلك فكتب إليهما فهمت ما ذكرت ما فاعتمدا في دينكما على كبير في حينا وكل كثير التقدم في أمرنا فإنهم كافوكما إن شاء الله تعالى

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 70, no. 103.

2 Ibid., 120, no. 302.

قلت [أي الخوئي] إن هذه الرواية لا تدل على حسن الرجل أضف إلى ذلك أنها ضعيفة السند بجبرئيل بن أحمد وموسى بن جعفر بن وهب ولو سلمت دلالتها على حسن الرجل وأغمض النظر عن سندها لم يثبت بها حسنه لأنه بنفسه راوي الرواية

Al-Kashshī states under the chapter of the virtue of narration and ḥadīth: Abū Muḥammad Jibrīl ibn Aḥmad al-Fāryābī — Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar ibn Wahb narrated to me — Abū al-Ḥasan Aḥmad ibn Ḥātim ibn Māhawayh narrated to me — I wrote to him, i.e., to Abū al-Ḥasan the Third [ʿAlī al-Hādī] asking him, “Who should I take the tenets of my faith from?” His brother also wrote about this.

So, he wrote back to them, “I understood what you two have mentioned. For your religion, rely on the one who is senior in our love and has many steps in our affair. They will suffice you two, Allah willing.”<sup>1</sup>

I say [i.e., al-Khūṭī]: This narration does not indicate to the uprightness of the person. Add to that the fact that it has a weak chain of narration because of Jibrīl ibn Aḥmad and Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar ibn Wahb. If it was assumed that its meaning indicated the individual’s uprightness and a blind eye was turned to its sanad, it still would not prove his uprightness. This is because he himself is the narrator of the narration.<sup>2</sup>

In looking at the methodology of al-Khūṭī, we find that he did not deduce that Aḥmad ibn Ḥātim ibn Māhawayh is a *thiqah*, or upright, or has *ʿadālah*. And despite the fact that the narration proves that he had correspondence with the infallible Imām, the Imām responded to him with words of advice and guidance, al-Khūṭī stated, “This narration does not indicate to the uprightness of the person. Added to that the fact that it has a weak chain of narration.” The narration lacks an indication of praise and it has a weak *isnād*.

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Maʿrifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 4, no. 7.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 2/68, biography no. 476.



Under the biography of Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far al-Ḥimyarī<sup>1</sup>, al-Khūṭ mentioned the correspondence of his that al-Ḥillī touched on. Despite that, al-Khūṭ did not regard it as a reason for his tawthīq, as the person responsible for summarizing the work of al-Khūṭ stated in that Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far al-Ḥimyarī is “*majhūl* (unknown).”<sup>2</sup>

From here, the difference between the opinion of al-Ḥillī and the opinion of al-Khūṭ regarding the Imām’s correspondence with the Imām (or, vice versa) is clear.

### 5.3.4 An individual serving the Imām as a doorkeeper or attendant

Al-Māmaqānī enlisted the reasons of tawthīq and mentioned among them:

اتخاذ الإمام عليه السلام رجلا وكيلا أو خادما ملازما أو كاتباً فإنه منه تعديل له

The Imām ﷺ taking a man as a *wakil* (agent), closely connected attendant, and a scribe. This is ta’dīl of the narrator from him.<sup>3</sup>

As for the *wakil*, there has already been a discussion on it in section two. What remains for us is to see what it means when the Imām takes a doorkeeper or an attendant.

### Does taking the narrator as a doorkeeper necessitate ta’dīl?

Despite expending a lot of effort in trying to find an opinion of al-Ḥillī on this issue, it is still not clear to me. This is because he does not deal with it in his book, *al-Khulāṣah*. However, if we were to infer from his opinion on the issue of tawkīl of the narrator and draw an analogy therefrom on to the Imām taking a doorkeeper, then it is possible to say that he makes tawthīq of such a person. This is merely a possibility.

1 Ibid., 2/146, biography no. 636.

2 Al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 31.

3 Al-Māmaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*, 1/210, *al-Fawā‘id al-Rijāliyyah*, no. 24.

As for al-Khūṭī, he refuted those who considered that a reason for tawthīq. He states:

أفرط بعضهم فجعل كون الرجل بوابا للمعصوم عليه السلام دليلا على اعتباره مع أنه لا دلالة فيه للاعتبار  
بوجه من الوجوه

Some of them have gone to the extreme and made the fact that a person is a doorkeeper to the Infallible عليه السلام as evidence for him to be considered, while there is absolutely no indication therein.<sup>1</sup>

Under the biography of ‘Umar ibn Furāt, al-Khūṭī transmitted the statement:

الشيخ تقي الدين إبراهيم الكفعمي كان عمر بن فرات بوابا للرضا عليه السلام

Al-Shaykh Taqī al-Dīn Ibrāhīm al-Kaf amī: ‘Umar ibn Furāt was a doorkeeper of al-Riḍā عليه السلام.

Al-Khūṭī commented saying:

لو ثبت ذلك لم تكن فيه دلالة على الحسن فضلا عن الوثاقة

If that is true, there is still no indication of his uprightness, let alone reliability.<sup>2</sup>

This is explicit from al-Khūṭī: he does not infer tawthīq for the person the Imām made a doorkeeper.

### **Does the Imām taking the narrator as an attendant necessitate ta‘dīl?**

Under the biography of al-Qāfī, al-Ḥillī stated:

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/72.

2 Ibid., 14/56, no. 7894.

Servant of Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام. Majhūl.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī only mentioned this in his biography. Therefore, nothing is known of al-Qāfī except for the fact that he was a servant of the infallible. Despite that, al-Ḥillī did not infer any tawthīq nor take into consideration his service to Abū al-Ḥasan. Therefore, he placed him in the second section of his book. In fact, he did not even build upon the premise of *aṣālat al-'adālah*, or the presumption of the narrator's integrity.

As for al-Khūṭī, he narrated the words of al-Ḥillī regarding al-Qāfī as is and did not comment further.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭī mentioned many biographies and mentioned their service to the infallibles. Despite that, the person responsible for summarizing al-Khūṭī's *Mu'jam*, namely al-Jawāhirī, regarded them as unknown according to the methodology of al-Khūṭī. Examples of this are many, including the following:

1. Sālim al-'Aṭṭār: The servant of Abū 'Abd Allāh, majhūl.<sup>3</sup>
2. Muḥammad ibn Zayd al-Rizāmī: The servant of al-Riḍā, majhūl.<sup>4</sup>
3. Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Khurāsānī: The servant of al-Riḍā, majhūl.<sup>5</sup>
4. Muḥammad ibn al-Hamdānī: The servant of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم, majhul.<sup>6</sup>
5. Abū al-Ḥamrā': The servant of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم and from the companions of 'Alī, majhūl.<sup>7</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p.390, no. 1569.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 15/74, no. 9606.

3 Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p.243

4 Ibid., p. 529.

5 Ibid., p. 546.

6 Ibid., p. 587.

7 Ibid., p. 696.

These examples prove that al-Khūī does not consider service to the Imām a reason for accepting the report of the narrator. If it is mentioned about one of the narrators that he is a *thiqah*, and he is also described as an attendant, then the reason for him being considered is based on other facts, not because of him being described as an attendant of the Imām. Take note!

If they regarded service to the Imām a valid reason for the narrator’s *tawthīq*, as believed by al-Māmaqānī, then they need to apply it to the *tawthīq* of Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه since he served the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم for ten years!

### 5.3.5 The Imām taking the narrator as a *ḥawārī* (disciple)

Before explaining the opinions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī on the word “*ḥawārī*” and its implication in relation to *al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*, I should first explain the meaning of the word. Al-Zabīdī states:

الحواري الحميم والناصح وقال بعضهم الحواريون صفوة الأنبياء الذين قد خلصوا لهم. وقال الزجاج الحواريون خلصان الأنبياء عليهم السلام وصفوتهم قال والدليل على ذلك قول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الزبير ابن عمتي وحواريي من أمتي أي خاصتي من أصحابي وناصري قال وأصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حواريون وتأويل الحواريين في اللغة الذين أخلصوا ونقوا من كل عيب وكذلك الحواري من الدقيق سمي به لأنه ينقى من لباب البر قال وتأويله في الناس الذي قد روجع في اختياره مرة بعد أخرى فوجد نقيا من العيوب

The *Ḥawārī*: the close friend and advisor. Some of them said: The *ḥawāriyyūn*: the choicest (disciples) of the prophets that are devoted to them. Al-Zajjāj stated, “The *ḥawāriyyūn*: the purest and choicest (disciples) of the prophets عليهم السلام.”

The evidence for this is the Prophet’s صلى الله عليه وسلم statement, “**Al-Zubayr is the son of my paternal aunt and my *ḥawārī* from my Ummah.**” In other words, “(one of) my special companions and helpers.” The Companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم are *Ḥawāriyyūn*. Linguistically, the *ḥawāriyyūn* refer to those who were pure and purified from every defect. Similarly, flour that is refined is referred to as such because it is purified from the grains of

wheat. In relation to people, it means the one whose choice is deferred to time after time and it is found to be pure from any defects.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the meaning of the word explains the close relationship between the Imām and his Ḥawāriyyīn. Accordingly, the Ḥawārī is the choicest of the companions of a person and his most sincere supporter, helper, and other such similar words.

Al-Burūjirdī (d. 1313 AH) states:

عن الرضا عليه السلام وقد سئل لم سمي الحواريون الحواريين قال أما عند الناس فإنهم سموا الحواريين لأنهم كانوا يقصرون ومخلصين لغيرهم من أوساخ الذنوب ولا يخفى أن في هذا الخبر تعريضا على أهل السنة من أن التحوير والخلوص ليس بتجميل الثياب وتبييضها وإظهار التزهد كما هو دأب الثاني من خلفائهم وديدن أهل الدنيا في كل زمان ليجروا الناس إلى أنفسهم طلبا للرياسة والمال حرسنا الله من هذه القصود الفاسدة

On the authority of al-Riḍā عليه السلام: He was asked as to why the ḥawāriyyūn are called the ḥawāriyyūn. He said, “According to the people (i.e., the Ahl al-Sunnah), they are called ḥawāriyyūn because they would whiten (i.e., purify clothes)... [according to the Shī‘ah because they free themselves from the filth of sin] free others from the filth of sin [through exhortation and reminders].”<sup>2</sup>

It is apparent that this report contains an insinuation against the Ahl al-Sunnah; transformation and purity are not accomplished by beautifying clothes, whitening them, and showing asceticism, as is the practice of their second Khalīfah<sup>3</sup> and the people of this world in every era in order to draw people to themselves in pursuit of leadership and wealth. May Allah protect us from these corrupt intentions.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Zabīdī: *Tāj al-‘Arūs*, v. 1.

2 Al-Ṣadūq: *‘Ilal al-Sharā‘i’*, 1/80, Bāb: *al-‘Illat allatī min ‘ajalihā sumiyya al-ḥawariyyīn al-ḥawariyyīn*.

3 He refers to ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضي الله عنه. Far be it from him to pretend like so!

4 ‘Alī al-Burūjirdī: *Ṭarā‘if al-Maqāl*, 2/341.

It is for this reason that Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī narrated from the Imāmī scholars that it is from the words of tawthīq.

### **The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the disciples (*ḥawāriyyūn*) of the infallible Imām**

Al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī agree that every person described as being from the disciples of the Imāms is regarded among the acceptable (narrators). Here we have al-Ḥillī mentioning them in the first section of his book. This proves that he considers this description to be from the words of tawthīq, as is the case in many biographies.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, al-Khūṭī did not object to the description of ‘disciple,’ as he did with other descriptions. This further emphasizes that he accepts those that are described as being from the disciples and makes it from the reasons of relying on the narration.<sup>2</sup>

We must ask al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī a question: Is the tawthīq of the disciple specific to the companions of the Imāms, or are those who are described as disciples of the Prophet ﷺ also included?

What is evident from all of the Imāmiyyah’s dealings, including al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī, is that they apply the principle of tawthīq to the companions of the infallible Imāms and forbid it for the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ. Had this not been the case, they would have made tawthīq of al-Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ because of what Imām al-Bukhārī (d. 256 AH) narrated on the authority of Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

---

1 See: *al-Khulāṣah*. nos. 164, 217, 344, 610, and others.

2 I am unable to state with surety the position of al-Khūṭī on the word ‘*ḥawārī*’ and whether it is considered from the reasons of tawthīq. What I mentioned is closest and most evident based on what I saw of al-Khūṭī dealing with those who he described as a *ḥawārī*. However, looking at al-Khūṭī’s overall methodology, it is not possible for the word “*ḥawārī*” to be a reason of the narrator’s tawthīq. This is because it is not far from one of the meanings of the word “*khāṣī*” which al-Khūṭī did not consider. And Allah knows best.

ندب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الناس يوم الخندق فانتدب الزبير ثم نديهم فانتدب الزبير ثم نديهم فانتدب الزبير قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم إن لكل نبي حواريا وحواريي الزبير

The Prophet ﷺ called the people again and Zubayr responded to the call. The Prophet ﷺ then said, “Every prophet had a disciple and my disciple is Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām.”<sup>1</sup>

Here we have Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the disciple of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ—and the Prophet ﷺ is better than the infallible Imāms. Based on this, his discipleship is better than the discipleship of those after him. However, they did not consider this a form of praise for Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and they did not build any tawthīq upon it. In summary, all of the principles of tawthīq and seeking excuses only applies to the companions of the infallible Imāms—according to the Imāmiyyah—and the Prophet’s Companions رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ are deprived of them!

If a person like al-Tustarī<sup>2</sup> (d. 1401 AH) were to say: The report that describes Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as a disciple of the Prophet ﷺ is not authentic. I would say that the report that al-Kashshī narrated:

عن محمد بن قولويه قال حدثني سعد بن عبد الله بن أبي خلف قال حدثني علي بن سليمان بن داود الرازي قال حدثنا علي بن أسباط عن أبيه أسباط بن سالم قال قال أبو الحسن موسى بن جعفر عليهما السلام إذا كان يوم القيامة نادى مناد أين حواريو محمد بن عبد الله رسول الله الذين لم يتقوا العهد ومضوا عليه؟ فيقوم سلمان والمقداد وأبو ذر ثم ينادي مناد أين حواريو علي بن أبي طالب عليه السلام وصي محمد بن عبد الله رسول الله فيقوم عمرو بن الحمق الخزاعي ومحمد بن أبي بكر وميثم بن يحيى التمار مولى بني أسد وأويس القرني قال ثم ينادي المنادي أين حواريو الحسن بن علي بن فاطمة بنت محمد بن عبد الله رسول الله فيقوم سفيان بن أبي ليلى الهمداني وحذيفة بن أسيد الغفاري قال ثم ينادي المنادي أين حواريو الحسين بن علي عليه السلام فيقوم كل من استشهد معه ولم يتخلف عنه قال ثم ينادي المنادي أين حواريو علي بن الحسين عليه السلام فيقوم جبير بن مطعم ويحيى بن أم الطويل وأبو خالد الكابلي وسعيد بن المسيب ثم ينادي المنادي أين حواريو محمد بن علي و حواريو جعفر بن محمد فيقوم عبد الله بن شريك العامري وزرارة بن أعين وبريد بن معاوية العجلي ومحمد بن مسلم وأبو بصير ليث

1 Kitāb: *al-Jihād wa al-Siyar*, Bāb: *al-Siyar waḥdah*, 3/1092.

2 *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 4:409. Al-Tustarī regarded the report of describing al-Zubayr as a disciple to be a fabricated ḥadīth!

بن البختری المرادی وعبد الله بن أبي يعفور وعامر بن عبد الله بن جداعة وحجر بن زائدة وحمران بن أعین ثم ینادی سائر الشیعة مع سائر الأئمة علیهما السلام یوم القیامة فهؤلاء المتحورون أول السابقین وأول المقربین وأول المتحورین من التابعین

On the authority of Muḥammad ibn Qūlawayh: Sa‘d ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Khalaf narrated to me — ‘Alī ibn Sulaymān ibn Dāwūd al-Rāzī narrated to me — ‘Alī ibn Asbāṭ narrated to us — from his father, Asbāṭ ibn Sālim who said:

Abū al-Ḥasan Mūsā ibn Ja‘far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ said, “When it is the Day of Judgement, a caller will call out, ‘Where are the disciples’ of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh, the Messenger of Allah, those who did not break the covenant and did not pass over it?’ Then, Salmān, al-Miqdād, and Abū Dharr will stand.

Then, a caller will call out, ‘Where are the disciples of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, the waṣī of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh, the Messenger of Allah?’ Then, ‘Amr ibn al-Hamiq al-Khuzā‘ī, Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, Mītham ibn Yahyā al-Tammār, the *mawlā* (client) of Banī Asad, and Uways al-Qarnī will stand.

Then, the caller will call out, ‘Where are the disciples of al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ?’ Then, everyone that was martyred with him will stand and will not drag behind.

Then, the caller will call out, ‘Where are the disciples of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ?’ Then, Jubayr ibn Muṭ‘im, Yahyā ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl, Abū Khālid al-Kābulī, and Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyab will stand.

Then, the caller will call out, “Where are the disciples of Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī and the disciples of Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad?’ Then, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sharīk al-‘Āmirī, Zurārah ibn A‘yan, Burayd ibn Mu‘āwiyah al-‘Ijlī, Muḥammad ibn Muslim, Abū Baṣīr Layth ibn al-Bakhtarī al-Murādī, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ya‘fūr, ‘Āmir ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Judā‘ah, Ḥujr ibn Zā‘idah, and Ḥumrān ibn A‘yan will stand.

---

1 The word was written in the reference under the narration as “*ḥawārī*”. I changed it to “*ḥawāriyyū*” because it is more correct linguistically.



Then, he will call the rest of the Shī'ah with the rest of the Imāms on the Day of Judgement. These remarkable individuals will be the first of the forerunners, the first of the *muqarrabīn* (i.e., those brought close to Allah) and the first of the *mutaḥawwirīn* from the Tābī'īn."<sup>1</sup>

From this narration, the Imāmī scholars infer the description of many narrators as the disciples of the Imāms and that they are from the purest of followers.

A question: Does the above ḥadīth have an authentic chain?

Al-Khūṭī deemed the narration weak in more than one place in al-Mu'jam. Under the biography of Uways al-Qarnī, he described the narration as being “damaged in its isnād.”<sup>2</sup>

He stated the narration is weak under the biography of Jubayr ibn Mu'ī'im<sup>3</sup> and Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyab<sup>4</sup>.

Whoever analyzes the biographies of those narrators mentioned in the narration from the actual biographical works of the Imāmiyyah themselves, we will find them relying on the weak narration of al-Kashshī in establishing the discipleship of who they want. However, when it comes to the Ṣaḥābah, the authentic and established aḥādīth turn out to be, as the description of al-Tustarī states, invented!

### 5.3.6 The narrator keeping the company (ṣuḥbah) of the Imām

A number of Imāmī scholars have mentioned that the narrator having companionship (ṣuḥbah) with the infallible imam is from the words of ta'dīl. When stating the levels of ta'dīl, Muslim al-Dāwarī states:

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl (al-Kashshī)*, p. 9 no. 20.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/156, no. 1581.

3 *Ibid.*, 4/356, no. 2072.

4 *Ibid.*, 9/139, no. 5190.

المرتبة الرابعة ما تدل على الحسن التالي تلو التوثيق وتوجب قوة السند

The fourth level: what proves uprightness after tawthīq and necessitates strength in the sanad.<sup>1</sup>

Among the words he mentioned was, “*ṣāhib al-Imām* (a companion of the Imām).”

Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) states:

إن قولهم فلان صاحب الإمام الفلاني مدح ظاهر بل فوق الوثاقة فإن المرء على دين خليله وصاحبه فلا بدَّ وأن لا يتخذوا صاحباً لهم عليهم السلام إلا من كان ذا نفس قدسية ويشهد أن غالب من وصف بذلك من الأجلة

Their statement, “So-and-so is a companion of so-and-so Imām” is an evident form of praise. In fact, it is even above reliability because a man is on the religion of his friend and companion. Therefore, they would not take as a companion of theirs except he who has a sanctified soul. What testifies to this is the fact that most of those described as such are among the pre-eminent.<sup>2</sup>

Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī mentioned the reasons of praise, strength, acceptance of narrations and counted among them:

صاحب فلان أي واحد من الأئمة عليهم السلام فإنه يشعر بالمدح

The companion of so-and-so, i.e., one of the Imāms عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. It gives the impression of praise.<sup>3</sup>

1 Muslim al-Dāwarī: *Uṣūl ‘ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 1/55.

2 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/68.

3 Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥā’irī: *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Ahwāl al-Rijāl*, 1/92.

This is the opinion of a group of Imāmī scholars; they rely on the narrations of a person who was a companion of one of the infallible Imāms—according to them.

It is worth mentioning an issue that was touched upon by the Imāmī scholars. It is known as “deeming reliable the companions of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq”.

Muslim al-Dāwarī mentioned the difference of opinion regarding the tawthīq of four thousand companions of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq.<sup>1</sup> He states:

وقد ادعي أن كل من ذكر من أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام في كلام النجاشي والشيخ فهو ثقة إلا من نص على تضعيفه ومعناه أن من لم يذكر بمدح ولا ذم فهو محكوم [عليه] بالوثاقة وذهب إلى هذا المحدث النوري ولم يستبعده صاحب الوسائل

It is claimed that everyone mentioned from the companions of al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام in the words of al-Najjāshī and al-Shaykh is a *thiqah* (reliable) unless there is documented text stating his weakness. This means that every person about whom there is no praise and criticism mentioned is judged to be reliable.

Al-Muḥaddith al-Nūrī<sup>2</sup> is of this opinion and the author of *al-Wasā'il*<sup>3</sup> did not rule it out.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 In explaining the first person to make this claim, al-Khūī states, “This originated from al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī. Ibn Shahr Āshūb and others followed him. As for Ibn ‘Uqdah, even though it is attributed to him that he counted the companions of al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام as four-thousand and mentioned a ḥadīth for each of them, their tawthīq is not attributed to him. Al-Muḥaddith al-Nūrī thought the tawthīq was from Ibn ‘Uqdah. However, this is patently false.” (*al-Muḥjam*, 1/56). Ja‘far al-Subḥānī alluded to this issue and the connection Ibn ‘Uqdah had to it in his book, *Kulliyāt fi ‘Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 324.

2 Regarding the companions of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq, al-Nūrī states, “Ibn ‘Uqdah made tawthīq of four thousand of them and wrote a book on them.” (*Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 1/51, speaking on the *aṣl* of Zayd al-Zarrād).

3 The author of *al-Wasā'il* is al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī. However, al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī mentioned these words in his book, *Amal al-Āmil*. Under the biography of Khulayd ibn Awfā, he states, “If it is said of his tawthīq and the tawthīq of the companions of al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام—except for those whose weakness has been established—then it is not far-fetched” (1/83).

4 Muslim al-Dāwarī: *Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 2/261.

Then al-Dāwarī narrated from al-Mufīd<sup>1</sup>, Ibn Shahr Āshūb<sup>2</sup>, al-Ṭabarsī (d. 588 AH)—the author of *ʿIlām al-Warāʿ*<sup>3</sup>, al-Muḥaqqiq Najm al-Dīn al-Ḥillī (d. 676 AH)<sup>4</sup>, and al-Fattāl—the author of *Rawḍat al-Wāʿiẓīn*<sup>5</sup> that there are four thousand reliable companions of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq!

It is necessary for me to pause at this juncture: In the discussion on the Ṣaḥābah, I narrated the statement of al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī about the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ. In it, he stated:

What is necessarily understood from the many reports that speak about the apostasy of everyone save three or four after the Prophet ﷺ is that the default state of every Ṣaḥābī that remained (alive) after the Prophet ﷺ and was not martyred in his time ﷺ is apostasy. The reason for this is because of giving preference to others who were not appointed by textual evidence for the position of successorship over someone who was appointed by virtue of textual evidence. Or, because of being sinful for neglecting his right. Therefore, it is not possible to make tawthīq of those who were not excluded except with legal evidence.<sup>6</sup>

This was stated about the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ! However, when the issue was related to the companions of al-Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, we find al-Shāharūdī flipping the equation and saying:

فيمكن أن يقال الأصل الوثاقة في أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام إلا من خرج بدليل

1 *Al-Irshād*, 2/179.

2 In his book, *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib*, 3/372.

3 In his book *Kulliyāt fī ʿIlm al-Rijāl*, p. 325, al-Subḥānī alluded to this reference saying, “(Page 165, chapter 4).” Muḥammad ʿAlī Ṣāliḥ al-Muʿallim transmitted the reference from al-Dāwarī (2/262), the author of *Uṣūl ʿIlm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbiq*, saying, “*ʿIlām al-Warāʿ*, p. 284, second edition).” I narrated this because I could not find the original source.

4 In his book, *al-Muʿtabar fī Sharḥ al-Mukhtaṣar*, 1/26.

5 He is Muḥammad ibn al-Fattāl al-Naysābūrī in his book, *Rawḍat al-Wāʿiẓīn*, p. 207.

6 ʿAlī al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt ʿIlm al-Rijāl*, 1/67, under the introduction, no. 6.

It is possible to say: the presumed state of the companions of al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام is reliability, unless there is evidence to the contrary.<sup>1</sup>

This is a strange foundation to lay. It does not require much thinking in order to see how false it is! Al-Shāharūdī considers the presumed state of the Companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم to be apostasy and transgression—except for those who establish their Islam—and for the companions of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq, he considers the opposite; a presumed state of reliability “unless there is evidence to the contrary.” And, as they claim, they are in the thousands!

From here, the scholar realizes the extent to which most Imāmī scholars venerate their narrators and assume the best for them (even if they do not know of their conditions), and the extent to which they arbitrarily dispose of the Companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.

What is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭ regarding those described as being a companion of the Imām or a companion of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم?

### The opinion of al-Ḥillī on companionship

After analyzing the first section of al-Ḥillī’s *al-Khulāṣah*, we find him mentioning those who had companionship with one of the Imāms without any other description. For example, under the biography of Rumaylah, he states:

من أصحاب أمير المؤمنين

From the companions of Amīr al-Mu`minīn.<sup>2</sup>

Under the biography of Abū Shu‘āyb al-Maḥāmīlī, he states:

كوفي من أصحاب الكاظم عليه السلام

---

1 Ibid., 1/64.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, 146, no. 409. Al-Ḥillī only mentioned him as “Rumaylah.”

A Kūfan. From the companions of al-Kāẓim عليه السلام.<sup>1</sup>

Based on this, is it possible for us to say that al-Ḥillī placed both of them under the category of acceptable narrators because of their being described as having had companionship with the infallibles? The answer is no.

What further proves that al-Ḥillī does regard companionship alone as a reason for tawthīq is the methodology he follows in the following biographies.

### ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṭāwūs

Al-Ḥillī states:

من أصحاب الرضا عليه السلام، عاش مائة سنة بإختيار الرضا عليه السلام. ولم أعثر له على تعديل ظاهر ولا على جرح بل على ما يترجح أنه من الشيعة

From the companions of al-Riḍā عليه السلام. He lived for a hundred years relating about al-Riḍā عليه السلام. I did not find any seeming ta’dīl and jarḥ of him. Rather, it is likely that he is from the Shī’ah.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ḥillī stated that he is from the companions of al-Riḍā. Despite that, he said, “I did not find any apparent ta’dīl on him.” Thus, al-Ḥillī does not consider the narrator being described as being a companion of the infallible as a (form of) ta’dīl, even if it is a seeming one. Hence, he placed him in the first section because he is from the Shī’ah, not because of companionship. Placing him in the first section is based on his principle and referred to as “*aṣālat al-‘adālah* (the presumption of a narrator’s integrity).”

### ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Aṭā’

Al-Ḥillī states:

---

1 Ibid., p. 300, no. 1118.

2 Ibid., 193, no. 604.

من أصحاب الباقر والصادق عليهما السلام. قال النصر بن الصباح إنه نجيب ولا تثبت عندي بهذا عدالته خصوصاً مع ضعف النصر بن الصباح

From the companions of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq عليهما السلام. Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāh stated, “He is outstanding.” According to me, his ‘adālah is not established with this, especially considering the fact that al-Naṣr ibn al-Ṣabbāh is weak.<sup>1</sup>

This is another explicit statement from al-Ḥillī in that the narrator being described as having companionship with the Imām is not indicative of ‘adālah. Despite that, al-Ḥillī included him in the first section of his book because he based it on the presumption of the narrator’s ‘adālah, not on companionship.

### The opinion of al-Khūṭī on companionship

Al-Khūṭī was clearer regarding the narrator described with having companionship (with the Imām); he did not regard it as a reason for tawthīq or praise, whether it was in relation to the Companions of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم or concerning the difference of opinion among the Imāmiyyah on the (automatic) tawthīq of the companions of al-Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq (which amount to four thousand).

#### 1. Al-Khūṭī’s refutation against those who say that companionship with the infallible is evidence for the narrator’s tawthīq

Al-Khūṭī states:

أنت خبير بأن المصاحبة لا تدل بوجه لا على الوثاقة ولا على الحسن كيف وقد صاحب النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسائر المعصومين عليهم السلام من لا حاجة إلى بيان حالهم وفساد سيرتهم، وسوء أفعالهم

You know that companionship does not at all prove reliability and uprightness. How can it when there are such people that enjoyed companionship with the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and the other Infallibles عليهم السلام

---

1 Ibid., p. 206, no. 662.

who require no explanation of their (undesirable) condition, corrupt conduct, and evil actions?<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Al-Khūṭī's refutation against those who say that the companions of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq are reliable

In refutation of those who make tawthīq of each of the companions of al-Imām al-Ṣādiq, al-Khūṭī states:

وكيف كان فهذه الدعوى غير قابلة للتصديق فإنه إن أريد بذلك أن أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام كانوا أربعة آلاف كلهم كانوا ثقات: فهي تشبه دعوى أن كل من صحب النبي صلى الله عليه وآله عادل مع أنه ينافيها تضعيف الشيخ جماعة ... وقد عد الشيخ أبا جعفر الدوانيقي من أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام، أفهل يحكم بوثاقته بذلك وكيف تصح هذه الدعوى مع أنه لا ريب في أن الجماعة المؤلفة من شتى الطبقات على اختلافهم في الآراء والاعتقادات يستحيل عادة أن يكون جميعهم ثقات وإن أريد بالدعوى المتقدمة أن أصحاب الصادق كانوا كثيرين، إلا أن الثقات منهم أربعة آلاف فهي في نفسها قابلة للتصديق إلا أنها مخالفة للواقع ... فإن المذكورين في رجاله لا يزيدون على ثلاثة آلاف إلا بقليل على أنه لو سلمت هذه الدعوى لم يترتب عليها أثر أصلا فلنفرض أن أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام كانوا ثمانية آلاف والثقات منهم أربعة آلاف لكن ليس لنا طريق إلى معرفة الثقات منهم ولا شيء يدلنا على أن جميع من ذكره الشيخ من قسم الثقات بل الدليل قائم على عدمه كما عرفت

How can it be? This claim is not believable. If what is intended thereby is that all four thousand companions of al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام are reliable, then this is similar to the claim that states that every person who had companionship with the Prophet صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم is 'ādil. What also negates this is the fact that al-Shaykh made taḍ'īf of a number of them... Al-Shaykh regards Abū Ja'far al-Dawānīqī as one of the companions of al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام, will he be deemed reliable with this?

How can this claim be valid when there is no doubt in the fact that the group consists of various classes of narrators that have such differences of opinions and hold such different beliefs such that it is generally impossible for all of them to still be reliable?

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Hadīth*, 1/73.



If what is intended by the previous claim is that the companions of al-Ṣādiq are many, and only four thousand of them are reliable, then this in and of itself can be believable. However, it goes against reality... This is because the number of narrators mentioned in *al-Rijāl* do not exceed slightly more than three thousand. However, if this claim was presumed to be sound, then there are still no actual implications therefrom. Even if we assume that the companions of al-Ṣādiq are eight thousand and the *thiqāt* among them are four thousand, we still have no way of determining who the reliable ones are from among them, and we also have nothing to prove to us that everyone that al-Shaykh mentioned is from the section of reliable narrators. Rather, as you know, the evidence rests upon that which does not exist.<sup>1</sup>

Under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Muṭahhar, al-Khūṭī states:

وأما توصيف الصدوق إياه في المشيخة بقوله صاحب أبي محمد عليه السلام فليس فيه أدنى إشعار بوثاقه الرجل أو حسنه كيف ذلك وقد كان في أصحاب الرسول الأكرم صلى الله عليه وآله من كان فما ظنك بصاحب الإمام عليه السلام

As for al-Ṣadūq's describing him in *al-Mashyakhah* with the words, "The companion of Abū Muḥammad عليه السلام," there is not the slightest indication therein of the individual's reliability or uprightness. How can that be when there were those among the companions of the noble Messenger صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم who were there? What then do you think of the companion of the Imām عليه السلام?

With this, the position of al-Khūṭī is very clear on the narrator described as having companionship.

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/56.

2 Ibid., 3/113, no. 912.

## 5.4. The positions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī concerning riwāyah and its sciences

### 5.4.1 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī regarding the narrator who has an *aṣl* or a *kitāb*

As will be mentioned, Imāmī scholars differ regarding the *tawthīq* of a narrator who has been described as having possession of an “*aṣl*”, or primary source. However, it is essential in the beginning to explain what is meant by their statement, “He has an *aṣl*,” or, “a *kitāb* (book).”

Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī (d. 1104 AH) states:

نقل ابن شهر آشوب في كتابه معالم العلماء عن المفيد أنه قال صنفت الإمامية من عهد أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام إلى عهد أبي محمد الحسن العسكري عليه السلام أربعمئة كتاب تسمى الأصول فهذا معنى قولهم له أصل

Ibn Shahr Āshūb transmits in his book, *Ma‘ālim al-‘Ulamā’*, on the authority of al-Mufīd, “The Imāmiyyah—from the time of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn عليه السلام until the time of Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan al-‘Askarī عليه السلام—have authored four hundred kitābs. They are called the *Uṣūl* (Primary sources). This is what they mean by, ‘He has an *aṣl*.’”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Faḍl ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabarsī (d. 588 AH) states:

روي عن الصادق عليه السلام في أبوابه من مشهوري أهل العلم أربعة آلاف إنسان وصنف من جواباته في المسائل أربعمئة كتاب هي معروفة بكتب الأصول رواها أصحابه وأصحاب أبيه من قبله وأصحاب ابنه أبي الحسن موسى عليهم السلام ولم يبق فن من فنون العلم إلا روي عنه عليه السلام فيه أبواب

Four thousand from the most famous people of knowledge narrated from al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام in the (various) chapters (of knowledge). Four hundred kitābs were authored from his answers to questions. They are famously known as the books of *Uṣūl*. His companions narrated them, and the companions

1 Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah*, 30/208.

of his father narrated them before him, and the companions of his son, Abū al-Ḥasan Mūsā عليه السلام (narrated them after him). There did not remain a science from the different sciences of knowledge except that chapters on it were narrated from him.<sup>1</sup>

In defining an *aṣl*, Hādī al-Najafī states:

أنه مجمع أخبار سمعت من الأئمة عليهم السلام من دون واسطة أو معها وجمعت في زمنهم ابتداء من غير أخذ من كتاب آخر بل أخذت مما حفظ في الصدور ونحوها لتصير مصونة محفوظة عن حوادث الأيام... وقد سميت بالأصول لأنها بمنزلة أصل المذهب وعروقتها ولها دور عظيم في حفظ المذهب وعدم ضياعه

It is a collection of reports that were heard from the Imāms عليهم السلام with or without an intermediary. They were collected in their times and were not taken from another book; rather, they were taken from what was preserved in the chests (of man), etc., in order for it to be protected and preserved from the events of the days... They were named the *Uṣūl* because they represent the foundation and roots of the *madhhab* (school). They play a major role in preserving the *madhhab* and saving it from perishing.<sup>2</sup>

What is intended by their description of the narrator as someone who “has an *aṣl*,” or “a *kitāb*” is that he is one of those who collected the words of the infallible Imām in a book, whether he narrated directly from him or via an intermediary.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Ṭūsī collected in *al-Fihrist* the names of the Shīʿī authors and the authors of the *Uṣūl*. Based on the very important statements he makes in the introduction to *al-*

---

1 Al-Faḍl ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabarsī: *I'lām al-Warā bi A'lām al-Hudā*, 2:200.

2 Hādī al-Najafī: *Mawsū'at Ahādīth Ahl al-Bayt*, 1/10, introduction.

3 The Imāmiyyah have a lengthy discussion on these *Uṣūl* that they claim exist. Similarly, they unnecessarily differ in the different distinctions they make between the *Uṣūl* and the *Kitāb*. For more information, see Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī's *Mu'jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 23. He summarizes for us the opinions of the Imāmī scholars in this regard. Also see al-Kalbāsī's *al-Rasā'il al-Rijāliyyah*, 4/112; Ja'far al-Subḥānī's *Kullīyyāt fī 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 474; al-Karbāsī's *Iklīl al-Manhaj*, p. 48; al-Kajūrī's *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 99; and al-Mullā 'Alī Kanī's *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl*, p. 229.

*Fihrist*, we are able to determine his opinion—he is from the forerunners on the issue of inferring tawthīq from the authors of the *Uṣūl*. He states:

فإذا ذكرت كل واحد من المصنفين وأصحاب الأصول فلا بد من أن أشير إلى ما قيل فيه من التعديل والتجريح وهل يعول على روايته أو لا وأبين عن اعتقاده وهل هو موافق للحق أو هو مخالف له لأن كثيرا من مصنفي أصحابنا وأصحاب الأصول ينتحلون المذاهب الفاسدة وإن كانت كتبهم معتمدة

When I mention each of the authors and authors of the *Uṣūl*, it is necessary for me to point out what has been said about them in terms of jarḥ and ta'dīl, and whether or not his narrations are to be relied upon or not. And I will also explain his creed: Does it correspond to the truth or is it at variance with it? The reason for this is because many authors from our companions and the authors of the *Uṣūl* ascribe to false schools, even though their books are reliable.<sup>1</sup>

This is a clear statement from al-Ṭūsī in that the authors of the *Uṣūl* are not all on one level. Therefore, they are neither to be completely accepted nor rejected. In fact, as al-Ṭūsī stated, “... it is necessary for me to point out what has been said about them in terms of jarḥ and ta'dīl, and whether or not his narrations are to be relied upon or not. And I will also explain his creed: Does it correspond to the truth or is it at variance with it?”

Thus, in the view of al-Ṭūsī—who is Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah—that among them are those that are acceptable and those that are unacceptable.

A number of Imāmī scholars are of the opinion that a narrator's tawthīq cannot be deduced from the fact that he has an aṣl or a kitāb. This is what Ja'far al-Subḥānī alluded to when he stated:

أما دلالة كون الرجل ذا تصنيف أو ذا أصل على وثاقته ومدحه فغير معلوم لأن كثيرا من مصنفي الأصول مالوا إلى المذاهب الفاسدة كالواقفية والفتحية وإن كانت كتبهم معتمدة وذلك لأن مصطلح الصحيح عند القدماء غيره عند المتأخرين ولا يستتبع صحة حديث رجل عند القدماء وثاقته عندهم

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 29.

As for the person who is an author of a kitāb or an aṣl being (automatically) regarded as reliable or praiseworthy, this is unknown. This is because many authors of the Uṣūl incline towards false schools (of belief), such as the Wāqifiyyah and the Faḥḥiyyah, even though their books are reliable. This is because the term *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic) according to the early generation of scholars is defined differently than that of the latter-day scholars. Authenticity of the person's ḥadīth according to the earlier generation of scholars does not entail his reliability.<sup>1</sup>

In disputing the meaning of aṣl, al-Khomeini states:

وقد اتضح عدم دلالة قولهم إن له أصلا على الاعتماد به أو بصاحبه فضلا عن قولهم له كتاب

It is clear that their statement, "He has an aṣl," is not indicative of a reliance on it or its author, let alone their statement, "He has a kitāb."<sup>2</sup>

As for those who are of the opinion that the narration of a person who has an aṣl is (automatically) accepted, they differ as to the level or degree of his acceptability: Does it imply tawḥīq, or general uprightness, or uprightness in the more technical sense?<sup>3</sup>

After a general explanation and discussion on the meaning of aṣl, what is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding this difference of opinion?

### **The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the narrator who has an aṣl or a kitāb**

I did not come across any explicit statements of al-Ḥillī on this issue. However, the methodology in his book, *al-Khulāṣah*, is clear in that the narration of some narrators is not accepted, even though they are authors of the Uṣūl. This implies

1 Ja'far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fi 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 485.

2 Al-Khomeini: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah, Taḥqīq al-murād min al-aṣl*, 3/268.

3 'Alī Kanī: *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl fi 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 235. Al-Kalbāsī did an excellent job in analysing the issue in *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, 4/117.

that he does not assume tawthīq of the authors of the *Uṣūl*. The following are examples of this. Under the biography of ‘Ammār al-Sābāṭī, al-Ṭūsī states:

له أصل وكان فطحيا إلا أنه ثقة وأصله معتمد عليه

He has an aṣl. He was a Faṭḥī; however, he is a thiqaḥ and his aṣl is relied upon.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥillī commented:

والأولى عندي التوقف فيما ينفرد به

According to me, it is better to suspend judgement in what he narrates in isolation.<sup>2</sup>

It is necessary for us to note the difference between al-Ḥillī’s suspending judgement in what the narrator narrates in isolation and al-Ṭūsī’s statement, “His aṣl is relied-upon.” Despite the fact that the Imāmiyyah rely on the aṣl of this individual, al-Ḥillī suspended judgement on it.

Under the biography of al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy, al-Ṭūsī states, “He has an aṣl.”<sup>3</sup> Al-Ḥillī placed him in the second section because he is from the Zaydiyyah. He did not pay any attention to the fact that he is from the authors of the *Uṣūl*.<sup>4</sup>

Under the biography of Ziyād ibn al-Mundhir, Abū al-Jārūd, al-Ṭūsī states:

زيدى المذهب و إليه تنسب الزيدية الجارودية له أصل وله كتاب التفسير

Zaydī in madhhab. The Zaydiyyah Jārūdiyyah are attributed to. He has an aṣl and a work on tafsīr.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 43, no. 52.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 318, no. 1244, section two.

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 79, no. 176.

4 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 337, no. 1330, section two.

5 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fihrist*, p. 102, no. 305.

Al-Ḥillī placed him in the second section.<sup>1</sup>

A person can say that those whose narrations al-Ḥillī rejected, they are from the opposing sects of the Shī'ah, and they are those who from the outset are unacceptable in narration, as per the methodology of al-Ḥillī.

This is a possibility; however, what is closer to the truth to me is that al-Ḥillī does not regard the *aṣl* of a narrator as indicative of his 'adālah. Had that been the case, he would have alluded to it, even in one place. This is because he mentioned a lot about the authors of the *Uṣūl*. Despite this, as I have mentioned, he included some of them in the first section and others in the second. In short, al-Ḥillī included the authors of the *Uṣūl* in both sections of his book, the section on acceptable narrators and the section on unacceptable, or rejected narrators. Thus, it is not possible to state the opinion of al-Ḥillī with certainty on this issue. However, what seems closer to the truth is that he does not regard the (authorship of an) *aṣl* a form of independent evidence for praise of the narrator. It is merely a possibility. And Allah knows best.

### **The opinion of al-Khū'ī regarding the narrator who has an *aṣl* or a *kitāb***

The opinion of al-Khū'ī is not different to al-Ḥillī's on this issue; he does not consider the *aṣl* or *kitāb* of a narrator a proof of his *tawthīq*, praiseworthiness, or uprightness. This is clear from many examples.

Firstly, in responding to one of the narrations, al-Khū'ī states:

يمكن الخدش في سندها من جهة أن طلحة بن زيد عامي لم يوثق. نعم له كتاب معتبر لكن لم يعلم أن الرواية عن كتابه أو عنه مشافهة إذ الراوي عنه هو الكليني ولم يلتزم بنقل الرواية عمّن له أصل أو كتاب عن نفس الكتاب كما التزم الشيخ بمثل ذلك في التهذيب فمن الجائز روايته عن نفس الرجل لا عن كتابه وقد عرفت عدم ثبوت وثاقته هذا ولكن الظاهر وثاقة الرجل من جهة وقوعه في أسانيد كتاب كامل الزيارات

It is possible to scratch in its sanad from the angle that Ṭalḥah ibn Zayd is an 'Ammī whose *tawthīq* has not been made. Yes, he has a reliable *kitāb*;

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 348, no. 1378.

however, it is not known whether the narration is from his book or from him directly. This is because the person narrating it from him is al-Kulaynī and, in transmitting narrations, he did not keep to transmitting only from the actual kitāb—from those who have an aṣl or a kitāb, as al-Shaykh did in *al-Tahdhīb*. Accordingly, it is permissible for his narration to be from the actual person and not from his book. Furthermore, you already know that his reliability has not been determined. However, ostensibly, he is reliable since he appears in the asānīd of the book, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī mentioned the relied-upon kitāb of the narrator. With the word “kitāb” he does not mean that the individual authored it from inception; rather, he meant that he has a reliable kitāb that he narrates with his Shaykh, and that the Imāmiyyah relied upon this kitāb. Despite that, he stated that his tawthīq has not been determined. If al-Khūṭī considered the reliable kitāb of the individual as a proof of his reliability, he would have mentioned that. However, he inferred the tawthīq of the narrator based only on the fact that he appears in the chains of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*.

Secondly, regarding Ismāʿīl ibn Jābir, one of the narrators, al-Khūṭī states:

الكلام في الرجل نفسه فقد ذكره النجاشي وقال إسماعيل بن جابر روى حديث الأذان له كتاب وهكذا الشيخ في الفهرست ولم يوثقه أي منهما

The discussion is about the actual person. Al-Najjāshī<sup>2</sup> mentioned him and stated, “Ismāʿīl ibn Jābir: He narrated the ḥadīth of the adhān. He has a kitāb.” And like this, al-Shaykh also mentioned him in *al-Fihrist*.<sup>3</sup> None of them made his tawthīq.<sup>4</sup>

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 2/14, *Ikhtisāṣ al-buṭlān bi-ṣūrat al-ʿilm wa al-ʿamad*.

2 In *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 32, no. 71.

3 *Al-Fihrist*, p. 42, no. 49. Al-Ṭūsī provided a biography of him in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 124, no. 1246 saying, “Reliable. Praiseworthy. He has *Uṣūl* (pl. of *aṣl*). Ṣafwān ibn Yaḥyā narrated them from him.” This text further proves that the Imāmiyyah generally refer to an *aṣl* as a *kitāb* and, a *kitāb* as an *aṣl*, at times. This is because he mentioned in *al-Fihrist* that he “has a *kitāb*.” Al-Khūṭī debated the statement mentioned by al-Ṭūsī in *al-Rijāl* about Ismāʿīl ibn Jābir. He believes that the person in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* is somebody else, different to the person he offered a biography of in *al-Fihrist*.

4 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 2/272, *Mā Yuqāl badalan ʿan al-adhān fī ṣāyir al-ṣalawāt al-wājibah*.



Yes, al-Ṭūsī did not make his tawthīq in *al-Fihrist*. However, he made his tawthīq in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*.<sup>1</sup> However, the evidence is in the statement of al-Khūṭī, “None of them made his tawthīq.” If al-Khūṭī considered having an aṣl or a kitāb as proof of his tawthīq, or his uprightness, he would have mentioned that.

Thirdly, as the person who summarized al-Khūṭī’s book deduced, al-Khūṭī judged that some narrators are *majhūl* (unknown), despite the fact that they are authors of the uṣūl. There are many such examples of this, including the following.

### **Ibrāhīm ibn Yaḥyā**

He has an aṣl. The person who abridged al-Khūṭī’s book considered him to be *majhūl*.<sup>2</sup>

### **Al-Ḥasan ibn Ribāt**

He has an aṣl. The person who abridged al-Khūṭī’s book considered him to be *majhūl*.<sup>3</sup>

### **Al-Ḥusayn ibn Abī Ghundar**

He has an aṣl. The person who abridged al-Khūṭī’s book considered him to be *majhūl*.<sup>4</sup> As for those whom he mentioned that have a kitāb, they are many. Some of them include the following.

### **Ibrāhīm ibn Khālīd al-‘Aṭṭār**

He has a kitāb. The person who abridged al-Khūṭī’s book considered him to be *majhūl*.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 124, no. 1246.

2 Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī: *al-Mufīd min Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, p. 17.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 139.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 162.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 8.

## Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan – al-Ḥusayn – Ibn Sa‘īd ibn ‘Uthmān al-Qurashī

In summarizing al-Khūṭ’s opinion, al-Jawāhirī states:

مجھول له كتاب عده بعض أصحابنا من جملة الأصول

Majhūl. He has a kitāb. Some of our companions regard it as from the Uṣūl.<sup>1</sup>

## Aḥmad ibn Sulaymān al-Ḥajjāl

The author of *al-Mufīd* regarded him as majhūl.<sup>2</sup>

In summary, from the examples, al-Khūṭ does not consider the narrator being described as one of the authors of the *Uṣūl*, or *kutub* (pl. of kitāb) as a proof of his tawthīq or uprightness.

### 5.4.2 Abundantly narrating from the infallible

Some of the Imāmī scholars are of the opinion that having abundant narrations from the infallible is from the signs of the narrator’s tawthīq or uprightness. Enumerating the reasons of praise and uprightness of a narrator, Mahdī al-Kajūrī al-Shīrāzī (d. 1293 AH) states:

كونه كثير الرواية... من أسباب المدح كما يظهر من كثير من التراجم

The fact that he narrates a lot... (is) from the reasons of praise, as it appears from many biographies.<sup>3</sup>

Al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī states:

كثرة الرواية عن المعصوم بالواسطة أو بلا واسطة فإن ذلك يدل على حسنه وكماله وقدّر تحمله للمعارف  
الحقة وعلو منزلته ومقامه

1 Ibid., p. 24. There is a clear indication from his words that a kitāb refers to an aṣl.

2 Ibid., p. 29.

3 Mahdī al-Kajūrī: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 105.

Abundant narrations from the infallible, with or without an intermediary proves his uprightness, his perfection, the extent to which he receives true knowledge, and his high rank and position.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī states:

كثير الرواية يدل على المدح

Abundantly narrating proves uprightness.<sup>2</sup>

Alluding to the fact that this is the position of the Imāmī scholars, al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 AH) states:

كون كثرة الرواية عنهم (عليهم السلام) مع الواسطة أو بدونها مدحا عظيما كما عليه علماء الفن فإنهم عدوها من أسبابه لكشفها غالبا عن اهتمامه بأمور الدين وسعيه في نشر آثار السادات الميامين وهذه فضيلة عظيمة توصل صاحبها إلى مقام علي

As the scholars of the science maintain, the fact of narrating abundantly from them عليهم السلام, with or without an intermediary, is itself a great praise. They regard it as from the reasons (of praise) because it often reveals the narrator's interest in matters of religion and his efforts to spread the reports of the blessed descendants. This is a great virtue that leads such a person to the station of 'Alī.<sup>3</sup>

### The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the narrator who narrates abundantly

When considering the methodology of al-Ḥillī with dealing with those who are described as having abundant narrations from the Imām, it is difficult to state his opinion on this issue with certainty since he added such narrators in both sections of his book.<sup>4</sup>

1 Al-Namāzī al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt 'Ilm al-Rijāl*, 1/59.

2 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*, 30/289.

3 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Khātimat Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, 5/224.

4 As in the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Nuṣayr (p. 63, section one) and Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib al-Shaybānī (p. 397, no. 1601, section two).

However, I have those who have alluded to the opinion of al-Ḥillī in that he regards the phenomenon of abundant narrations as being from the reasons of praise or tawthīq of a narrator. Al-Burūjirdī (d. 1313 AH) states:

ومنها كونه كثير الرواية وهو موجب للعمل بروايته مع عدم الطعن عند الشهيد وعند صه [يقصد الخلاصة للحلي] فيها أنه من أسباب قبول الرواية وعن المجلسي في ترجمة إبراهيم بن هاشم أنه من شواهد الوثاقة ولكن الظاهر كونه من أسباب المدح والقوة كما في تراجم كثير من الرجال

And from them: the fact that he narrates abundantly. This necessitates acting on his narrations together with the fact that he was not criticized, according to al-Shahīd. According to al-Ḥillī in al-Khulāṣah, it is from the reasons of accepting narrations. According to al-Majlisī, under the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim, a narrator having abundant narrations is from the evidences of his reliability. However, it appears that it is from the reasons of praise and strength, as is the case in many narrators' biographies."<sup>1</sup>

Al-Burūjirdī deduced that al-Ḥillī is of the view that the narration of a person who is described as having abundant narrations is acceptable. Al-Jawāhirī is also of this opinion. In proving the tawthīq of Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām, he states:

فلولا أن إبراهيم بن هاشم بمكان من الوثاقة والاعتماد عندهم لما سلم من طعنهم وغمهم بمقتضى العادة ويؤيده زيادة على ذلك اعتماد أجلاء الأصحاب وثقاتهم وإكثار الكليني من الرواية عنه وعدم استثناء محمد بن الحسن بن الوليد إياه من رجال نواذر الحكمة في من استثنى كما قيل وكونه كثير الرواية جدا وقد قال الصادق (عليه السلام) اعرفوا منازل الرجال بقدر روايتهم عنا ومما يزيد ذلك كله تصريح العلامة في الخلاصة بأن الأرجح قبول روايته

Were it not for the fact that Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim enjoyed a level of trust and support with them, he would not have been safe from their criticism and insinuations, according to the custom. Moreover, it is further supported by the fact that the great companions rely on him, al-Kulaynī narrates from him, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Walīd did not exclude him from

1 'Alī al-Burūjirdī: *Ṭarā'if al-Maqāl*, 2/261.

the narrators that he excluded from *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah*, as it was said, and because of the fact that he narrates abundantly. Al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام said, “Know the rank of men according to the extent to which they narrate from us.” What emphasizes this even more is the fact that in *al-Khulāṣah*, al-‘Allāmah stated that the more preponderant opinion is to accept his narrations.<sup>1</sup>

After reflecting on the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim, it is possible to say that the opinion of al-Ḥillī is to accept his narrations. This is because he said, “The narrations from him are many. The more preponderant opinion is to accept his narrations.”<sup>2</sup>

Thus, al-Ḥillī accepted Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām because of his abundant narrations. Perhaps this is closer (to the truth).

It is possible to say that al-Ḥillī built upon the premise of what is known as “*aṣālat al-‘adālah*,” or the presumption of a narrator’s integrity in relation to Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām, especially considering his statement that he was unable to successfully find (any statements) of praise or criticism. If abundant narrations indicated the narrator’s praise according to al-Ḥillī, he would have mentioned that abundant narrations are from the signs of acceptance. This is also a possibility.

### **The opinion of al-Khūṭī regarding the narrator who narrates abundantly**

Al-Khūṭī was more explicit in his opinion on a narrator who narrates abundantly. He did not consider this from the reasons of accepting a narration. In refuting those who state that this a reason for accepting a narrator’s narrations, he states in a lengthy discussion:

استدل على اعتبار الشخص بكثرة روايته عن المعصوم عليه السلام بواسطة أو بلا واسطة بثلاث روايات... قال أبو عبد الله اعرفوا منازل الرجال منا على قدر رواياتهم عنا... قال الصادق عليه السلام اعرفوا منازل شيعتنا بقدر ما يحسنون من رواياتهم عنا فإننا لا نعد الفقيه منهم فقيها حتى يكون محدثا فقيل

---

1 Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Najafī al-Jawāhirī: *Jawāhir al-Kalām fī Sharḥ Sharā’i’ al-Islām*, 1/8.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 49, no. 9.

له أو يكون المؤمن محدثًا قال يكون مفههما والمفهم المحدث... عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام قال اعرفوا منازل الناس منا على قدر رواياتهم عنا

It is inferred from three narrations that a person is to be considered based on the abundance of his narrations from the infallible عليه السلام—with an intermediary or without:

1. Abū ‘Abd Allāh stated, “Know the ranks of men by us by the extent they narrate from us.”
2. Al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام stated, “Know the ranks of our Shī‘ah by the extent to which they narrate from us. We do not consider the *faqīh* (jurist) from them an actual *faqīh* until he is a *muḥaddath*. It was said to him, “Or, the believer is a *muḥaddath*?” He said, “He is a *mufahham*. A *mufahham* is a *muḥaddath*.”
3. On the authority of Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام who said, “Know the ranks of people by us based on the extent to which they narrate from us.”<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭ commented:

... The answer to these narrations is as follows: All of these narrations are weak. The reason why the last two narrations are weak is evident. As for the first narration, it is because of Muḥammad ibn Sinān. According to the more likely opinion, he is weak.

However, if we turn a blind eye to the weakness of the Shaykh, then the indication there in is still limited. This is because what is meant by the sentence, “the extent to which they narrate from us,” is not the amount of what the narrator narrates from them عليه السلام—even though whether he is truthful or is a liar is not known. When it is not known whether he is truthful or a liar, then this is not a praise of the narrator; sometimes the narrations

---

1 These are the first three narrations in the book, *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)* of al-Ṭūsī (p. 3).

of a liar can be more than the narrations of a truthful person. Rather, what is intended thereby is the extent to which he (authentically) receives their narrations عنه. This can only be attained after the narrator's words are proven to have authoritative value and after establishing that what he is narrating has, in fact, come from the infallible عليه.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī states:

إن كثرة الرواية إذا لم يعلم صدق الراوي لا تكشف عن عظمة الشخص بالضرورة

Abundantly narrating, when the truth of the narrator is not known, it does not necessarily reveal the greatness of the individual.

At times, a narrator can have abundant narrations and still be from among those whom the scholars have agreed is weak. Under the biography of al-Mufaḍḍal ibn Ṣāliḥ Abū Jamīlah, al-Khūṭī states:

مر غير مرة أن كثرة الرواية ورواية الأجلة وأصحاب الإجماع عن رجل لا تدلان على وثاقته وعلى تقدير تسليم الدلالة فلا يمكن الأخذ بها مع ما سمعته من النجاشي من التسالم على ضعف الرجل

It has already been mentioned more than once that a narrator who has abundant narrations, and the narrator who has both eminent people and the people of consensus narrating from, these two facts do not indicate to his reliability. Assuming this is the case, it is still not possible to accept the narrations because of what I heard from al-Najjāshī<sup>2</sup> in that the individual's weakness is essentially agreed upon.<sup>3</sup>

A narrator with abundant narrations can also, at times, be a liar and extreme in his beliefs. Al-Khūṭī states:

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/74.

2 Al-Najjāshī did not offer a biography on him; rather, he mentioned him under the biography of Jābir ibn Yazīd al-Ju'fī when he stated, "A number of people narrated from him who have been criticized and deemed weak, including 'Amr ibn Shimr and Mufaḍḍal ibn Ṣāliḥ..." (p. 128, no. 332).

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 19/312, no. 12607.

إن سهل بن زياد وقع الكلام في وثاقته وعدمها فذهب بعضهم إلى وثاقته ومال إلى ذلك الوحيد قدس سره واستشهد عليه بوجوه ضعيفة سماها أمارات التوثيق منها أن سهل بن زياد كثير الرواية ومنها رواية الاجلاء عنه ومنها كونه شيخ إجازة ومنها غير ذلك وهذه الوجوه غير تامة في نفسها وعلى تقدير تسليمها فكيف يمكن الاعتماد عليها مع شهادة أحمد بن محمد بن عيسى عليه بالغللو والكذب وشهادة ابن الوليد وابن بابويه وابن نوح بضعفه

There has been discussion on the reliability, or lack thereof of Sahl ibn Ziyād. Some are of the opinion that he is reliable. Al-Wahīd is inclined to this opinion and he suggests a number of weak proofs to substantiate it. He refers to them as “*imārāt al-tawthīq* (signs of tawthīq)”. Among such signs is the fact that Sahl ibn Ziyād abundantly narrates; eminent people narrate from him; the fact that he is a scholar of *ijāzah* (authorization); and other similar signs. These reasons are not completely self-contained. Assuming they are valid, how is it possible to rely on them when there is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭsā’s testimony that he is a liar and has extreme views, as well as Ibn al-Walīd, Ibn Bābawayh, and Ibn Nūḥ’s testimony that he is weak?<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the correction opinion is that abundant narrations is not indicative of tawthīq or uprightness since, as you can see, such a narrator can be an extremist (in his views), or a liar, or from those whom the scholars have agreed to his weakness.

### 5.4.3 The fact that the narrator narrates from eminent people and they narrate from him

Many Imāmī scholars mention the reasons of tawthīq or *taḥsīn* (deeming someone upright) of a narrator and count among them the narration of a person from eminent people, or vice-versa. Perhaps this principle was not mentioned until after it became clear that most of the Imāmī narrators are counted among the unknown, about whom nothing is known except a name! In justifying the adoption of this principle, al-Khāqānī states:

---

1 Ibid., 9/356, no. 5639.



كثيرا ما يروى المتقدمون من علمائنا رضي الله عنهم عن جماعة من مشايخهم الذين يظهر من حالهم الاعتناء بشأنهم وليس لهم ذكر في كتب الرجال والبناء على الظاهر يقتضى إدخالهم في المجهولين بل في ترك التعرض لذكرهم في كتب الرجال إشعار بعدم الاعتماد عليهم بل وعدم الاعتداد بهم ويشكل بأن قرائن الأحوال شاهدة ببعد اتخاذ أولئك الأجلاء الرجل الضعيف أو المجهول شيئا يكثر من الرواية عنه ويظهرون الاعتناء به

Many a times, our early scholars would narrate from a number of their scholars whom, as it appears from their condition, were of significant prestige. There is no mention of them in the books of narrator criticism. Building on what is apparent would imply including them among the unknown narrators. Actually, the fact that they are not mentioned in the books of narrator criticism gives the impression that there is to be no reliance on and attention given to them. It is problematic since circumstantial evidence would imply that these great individuals would not take a weak or unknown person as a teacher from whom they would frequently narrate from and express a concern for.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Bahbahānī (d. 1206 AH) states:

رواية الجليل عنه وهو أمانة الجلالة والقوة... وإذا كان الجليل ممن يطعن على الرجال في الرواية عن المجاهيل ونظائرهما فربما تشير روايته عنه إلى الوثاقة

A great person narrating from him—which is a sign of greatness and strength... When the great person is among those who also critique narrators for narrating from unknown narrators and other similar people, then this perhaps can indicate to the fact that the narrator (from whom the great person is narrating) is reliable.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, al-Bahbahānī considers the fact that when a great person narrates from him—let alone a few great people—then this is from the signs of acceptability and strength. Then he takes it a step further; that is to say that if this great person

1 Al-Khāqānī: *Rijāl al-Khāqānī*, p. 181.

2 Al-Wahīd al-Bahbahānī: *Fawā'id al-Wahīd 'alā Manhaj al-Maqāl (al-Ta'līqah)*, 1/145.

is also a critic and criticizer of those who narrate from unknown narrators, then this is not just a sign of greatness or praise; rather, it is a tawthīq of the narrator!

Al-Bahbahānī mentioned a narration of the great people from him and said:

إذا كان رواية جماعة من الأصحاب تشير إلى الوثاقة كما مر فرواية أجلائهم بطريق أولى

When the narration of a (ordinary) group of companions (from a person) suggests reliability—as mentioned already—then the narration of very great people (from a person) is an even stronger suggestion of reliability.<sup>1</sup>

In general, this is the opinion of many Imāmī scholars.

### The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī on the narrator who narrates from the greats and they narrating from him

There isn't a clear opinion of al-Ḥillī for me on this issue. However, al-Khūī was clear in his opinion: he regarded this as a reason for accepting the narration of a narrator. In refuting the previously-mentioned words of al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī, he states:

كما ادعاها الوحيد قده في التعليقة حيث ذكر أن رواية الجليل عن شخص أمانة الجلالة والقوة وكذلك رواية الأجلاء عنه أو رواية الثقة أو الجليل عن أشياخه مندفعة بما مر غير مرة من أن المعروفين بالفقه والحديث كثيرا ما يروون عن غير الثقات

As al-Waḥīd claimed in *al-Ta'līqah*—when he mentioned that the narration of a great person from a person is a sign of greatness and strength, or that the narration of a thiqah or a great person from his teachers (is also a sign of greatness); This is rebutted on account of what was mentioned on more

---

1 Ibid., 1/146. See also: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah* of al-Kajūrī, p. 106; *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Aḥkāmuhu fī 'Ilm al-Dirāyah* of al-Subḥānī wherein he dedicated an entire chapter entitled "*Riwāyat al-ajillā' 'an al-rāwī al-majhūl* (The narration of great people from an unknown narrator), p. 179. Al-Ayrawānī disputed the issue in his work, *Durūs Tamhīdiyyah fī al-Qawā'id al-Rijāliyyah* under the discussion "*Riwāyat al-thiqah*", p. 154. See also: *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl* of al-Mullā Kanī, p. 207; *Manhaj al-Maqāl* of Abū 'Alī al-Ḥā'irī, 1/523 under "*al-Mawārid al-mustathnā min afḍaliyyat al-ta'jīl*".

than one occasion, viz. many who were famous for fiqh and ḥadīth would often-times narrate from unreliable narrators.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī states:

رواية الأجلء لا تدل على الوثاقة ولا على الحسن

The narration of the greats neither proves reliability nor uprightness (of the narrator).<sup>2</sup>

Similarly, al-Khūṭī in the context of refuting this opinion, states:

رواية الأجلء ممن هو معروف بالكذب والوضع فليست بعزيرة

The greats narrating from someone who is known to lie and fabricate is not noble.<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, he states in relation to this issue:

أن اعتماد القدماء على رجل لا يدل على وثاقته ولا على حسنه

The reliance of the earlier generation on a person neither indicates his reliability nor his uprightness.<sup>4</sup>

For the sake of benefit, I will mention the statement of al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) who agreed with al-Khūṭī. He states:

قول النجاشي في جعفر بن بشير و محمد بن إسماعيل بأنهما روي عن الثقات و روى الثقات عنهما لا دلالة فيه على وثاقة كل راو و مروى عنه لهما

The statement of al-Najjāshī regarding Ja‘far ibn Bashīr and Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl that “they narrated from the reliable narrators and reliable

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 1/523, *al-Mawārid al-mustathnā min aḥdāliyyat al-ta’jīl*.

2 Ibid., 8/288, no. 4702.

3 Ibid., 17/170, no. 10938.

4 Ibid., 4/352, no. 2054.

narrators narrated from them” does not prove that every narrator of theirs and what they narrate is reliable.<sup>1</sup>

#### 5.4.4 Scholars who grant *ijāzah* (authorization to narrate) and its implication on tawthīq

‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī states:

هم العلماء الذين يستجازون في رواية الكتب المشهورة وجوامع الحديث

They are the scholars from whom authorization is sought in narrating the famous books and collections of ḥadīth.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ayrawānī illustrates it for us in the following manner:

يجيز الأستاذ التلميذ بأن يدفع له الكتاب الذي سجل فيه الروايات وجمعها فيه ويقول أجزتك في أن تروي عني الروايات الموجودة فيه ويصطلح على هذا الشكل... بتحمل الرواية بنحو الإجازة كما ويصطلح على صاحب الكتاب الذي صدرت الإجازة منه بشيخ الإجازة

The teacher authorizes the student such that he hands him the book in which he recorded and gathered the narrations, and says, “I authorize you to narrate from me the existing narration herein.” It is termed in this manner... ‘receiving the narration by way of permission.’ Just as the author of the book from whom the authorization comes is termed *Shaykh al-Ijāzah*, or the scholar of authorization.<sup>3</sup>

Most Imāmī scholars are of the opinion of making tawthīq of majhūl scholars of authorization<sup>4</sup> such that if nothing is known about a narrator, and he is a

---

1 Al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 1/73.

2 ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī: *Uṣūl ‘ilm al-Ḥadīth*, p. 147.

3 Bāqir al-Ayrawānī: *Durūs Tamhīdiyyah fī al-Qawā’id al-Rijāliyyah*, p. 158. See: *Uṣūl al-Ḥadīth wa Aḥkāmuhu* of Ja’far al-Subḥānī. He speaks on the meaning of shaykh al-ijāzah in a formidable manner.

4 Al-Waḥīd al-Bahbahānī states, “What is known is that it is considered from the reasons of uprightness (of a narrator).” (*Fawā’id al-Waḥīd ‘alā Manhaj al-Maqāl al-Ta’līqah*, 1/141). Al-Khūī states, “It is famously-known that the scholars of authorization do not require tawthīq (to be made of them)” (*al-Mu’jam*, 1/72).

scholar of authorization, they consider it a *tawthīq*, even though his condition is unknown!

What prompted most of the Imāmiyyah scholars to adopt this opinion is that they found that most of their books are narrated and authorized from names of narrators whose conditions are completely unknown. This means that many of the narrations are false due to so many of the narrators being unknown. As such, they were forced to adopt the opinion of making *tawthīq* of those who are described as being from the “scholars of authorization”—even if they did not know the reality of such a narrator’s condition! Ja‘far al-Subḥānī states:

إن قسما من مشايخ الإجازة الذين يجيزون رواية أصل أو كتاب لغيرهم غير موصوفين في كتب الرجال بالوثاقة

A number of scholars of authorization, those who grant others authorization of an *aṣl* or a *kitāb* are not described as reliable in the dictionaries of narrator evaluation.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn, the author of *al-Ma‘ālim* states:

يروى المتقدمون من علمائنا عن جماعة من مشايخهم الذين يظهر من حالهم الاعتناء بشأنهم وليس لهم ذكر في كتب الرجال والبناء على الظاهر يقتضي إدخالهم في قسم المجهولين

Our early scholars would narrate from a number of their scholars whom, as it appears from their condition, were of significant prestige. There is no mention of them in the books of narrator criticism. Building on what is apparent would imply including them among the unknown narrators.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Ja‘far al-Subḥānī: *Kulliyāt fi ‘ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 353. He has a lengthy discussion on the topic that can be referred to.

2 Al-Ḥasan ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Shahīd (the author of *al-Ma‘ālim*): *Muntaqā al-Jammān fi al-Aḥādīth al-Ṣiḥāh wa al-Ḥisān*, 1/39, no. 9. He attempted to justify not mentioning them and made excuses for it. Muḥammad al-Sanad attempted to justify the fact that there is no mention of them in the books of narrator evaluation by claiming it is not necessary to mention every single reliable narrator therein, also that the door of *ijtihād* on narrators is not closed, and other similar statements. See his book: *Buḥūth fi Mabānī ‘ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 159.

Then he attempted to infer acceptance of their narrations.

Criticizing the methodology of the *Uṣūliyyah* and describing them as being contradictory, al-Baḥrānī (d. 1186 AH) states:

لمخالفتهم أنفسهم فيما قرروه من ذلك الاصطلاح فحكموا بصحة أحاديث هي باصطلاحهم ضعيفة كمراسيل ابن أبي عمير وصفوان بن يحيى وغيرهما زعما منهم أن هؤلاء لا يرسلون إلا عن ثقة ومثل أحاديث جملة من مشايخ الإجازة لم يذكروا في كتب الرجال بمدح ولا قدح مثل أحمد بن محمد بن الحسن بن الوليد وأحمد بن محمد بن يحيى العطار والحسين بن الحسن بن أبان وأبي الحسين ابن أبي جيد وأضرابهم زعما منهم أن هؤلاء مشايخ الإجازة وهم مستغنون عن التوثيق وأمثال ذلك كثير يظهر للمتتبع

Because they contradicted themselves in what they decided on regarding that term. As such, they judged aḥādīth to be authentic when, according to their terminology, they are weak, such as the marāsīl of Ibn Abī 'Umayr, Ṣafwān ibn Yaḥyā, and others. They claim that they commit *irsāl* from reliable narrators.

And like the aḥādīth of a number of scholars of authorization who are not mentioned in the dictionaries of narrator evaluation with any praise and criticism (for and against them), such as Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Walīd, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-'Aṭṭār, al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Abān, Abū al-Ḥusayn Ibn Abī Jayyid, and their likes. They claim that these scholars of authorization are not in need of their tawthīq being made! There are many such examples for the one that searches for them.<sup>1</sup>

Muḥsin al-Amīn states:

إن جماعة من مشايخ الإجازات أو غيرهم لم يوثقهم أهل الرجال أو وثقهم البعض ولم يوثقهم البعض ولكنهم مدحوا بمدائح تقرب من التوثيق أو تزيد عليه وهؤلاء الظاهر أن عدم توثيقهم لظهور حالهم في الوثاقة

1 Al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḍirah*, 1/23.

The scholars of narrator evaluation did not make *tawthīq* of a number of scholars of authorization and others. Or, some have made their *tawthīq* while others have not. However, they have been praised in such a manner that is close to, or even more than a *tawthīq*. It is evident that their *tawthīq* was not made because of how clear their condition in being reliable is.<sup>1</sup>

Strange is the statement of al-Amīn! It is possible for us to apply this claim to every unknown narrator! I do not know why he does not bring out for us the praises which he claims are close to *tawthīq*? If we ask him to mention something of it, he would find no avenue to do so. How could he when all he knows about them is their name? These are but the excuses relied on by al-Amīn.

Evidence for what has been mentioned is the fact that they admit to there being a number of narrators whose conditions are unknown that exist in the books of narrator evaluation. And this is not a small amount; they are the scholars of authorization from whom the words of the Ahl al-Bayt are transmitted, as they claim.

Even stranger than this is the statement of al-Majlisī (d. 1111 AH) in *Malādhdh al-Akhyār* wherein he comments on unknown status of certain narrators:

وكيفما كان فالأول لم أجده في كتب أصحابنا المتقدمين بجرح ولا تعديل والثاني مذكور مهملا ولعل جهالتهما غير ضارة نظرا إلى أنهما من مشايخ الإجازة لأنهما من المصنفين أو الحافظين للأخبار وإنما يذكران في الإسناد لمجرد الاتصال وعدم قطع الإسناد

Whatever the case may be, I did not find a *jarḥ* or a *ta'dīl* of the first in the books of our earlier companions. The second is mentioned ambiguously. Perhaps their unknown status is not harmful considering the fact that both of them are among the scholars of authorization, not because they are authors or memorizers of reports. They are only mentioned in the *isnād* for the sake of *ittiṣāl* (contiguity) and so that the *isnād* is not disconnected.<sup>2</sup>

---

1 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, 3/157.

2 Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī: *Malādhdh al-Akhyār*, 1/37, ḥadīth no. 1, under the chapter "*al-Aḥdāth al-mūjibah li al-ṭahārah*."

The reality of their condition is that many among them are unknown. They are only mentioned for the sake of *ittiṣāl*, even though the condition of that narrator is not known. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī acknowledged this reality with his statement:

إننا كثيرا ما نقطع في حق كثير من الرواة أنهم لم يرضوا بالافتراء في رواية الحديث والذي لم يعلم ذلك منه يعلم أنه طريق إلى رواية أصل الثقة الذي نقل الحديث منه والفائدة في ذكره مجرد التبرك باتصال سلسلة المخاطبة اللسانية ودفع تعبير العامة الشيعة بأن أحاديثهم غير معتمدة بل منقولة من أصول قدمائهم

Many a times, we state regarding numerous narrators that they would not permit lying in relation to narrating ḥadīth. Regarding such a person, it is known that it is a path towards the narration of someone who is originally a *thiqah* from whom the ḥadīth is narrated from. The benefit in mentioning such a person is merely for the sake of *barakah* in maintaining the contiguity of the verbal chain of communication, and for the sake of deterring the reproach of the ʿĀmmah against the Shīʿah in that their *aḥādīth* are not *muʿanʿanah* (i.e., narrated using the words “*an* (from)”; rather, they are transmitted from the *uṣūl* of their predecessors.<sup>1</sup>

This is the reality of the situation. Therefore, you will rarely find a book in the sciences of ḥadīth and narrator evaluation of the Imāmiyyah except that there is an attempt to verify it, even though it is just a claim that is not based upon actual evidence. This will be seen from the refutation of al-Khūṭī.

The difference of opinion on the issue of *tawthīq* of the scholars of authorization has an impact on the acceptance or rejection of narrations. Al-Kalbāsī (d. 1315 AH) states:

يمكن أن يكون التصحيح مبنيًا على دلالة شيخوخة الإجازة على العدالة فلو كان المصحح له لا يرى دلالة شيخوخة الإجازة على العدالة بل على المدح، فلا مجال لأن يحكم بعدالة البعض المجهول بواسطة التصحيح

It is possible that the authentication is based on the *ʿadālah* (of the narrators) which is inferred from the scholars of authorization. If the

1 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah*, 30/258, no. 9:10.



authenticator only considers the presumption of praise for the scholars of authorization (and does not presume ‘adālah), then there is no possibility to, via authentication (of the ḥadīth), to judge that some unknown (narrators) have ‘adālah.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, because of the impact this principle has on the tawthīq of tens of unknown narrators that exist in their books of narrator evaluation, many scholars of the Imāmiyyah have given it much attention and have attempted to support it with every type of evidence they have at their disposal. Accordingly, they authenticate thousands of narrations that these unknown narrators transmit for them and yet, at the same time, they criticize the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ!

The proponents of this principle differ: Does it indicate to the ‘adālah of the scholar of authorization, or, is it simply an indication of his upright condition?<sup>2</sup>

### **What is the position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding the tawthīq of scholars of authorization?**

#### **The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the tawthīq of scholars of authorization**

I was unable to find an explicit view of al-Ḥillī on this subject-matter. However, considering the general methodology of al-Ḥillī in dealing with the Imāmī narrator who has no criticism levelled against him, and considering his acceptance of the narrations of Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim al-Qummī (because of their abundance, as we have already seen), it is possible for us to deduce, based on the above, that al-Ḥillī considers the tawthīq of the scholars of authorization—when he does not hold a false belief (in his view).

Based on some of the statements of al-Khūṭī, we can deduce that al-Ḥillī does consider the automatic tawthīq of the scholars of authorization. Al-Khūṭī states:

---

1 Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Kalbāsī: *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah*, 1/343.

2 Abū al-Ma‘ālī al-Kalbāsī has provided a detailed analysis of this difference of opinion in *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah* (3/292 and 4/140). See also: *Uṣūl ‘ilm al-Rijāl* of ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī, p. 149.

وماجيلويه لم يوثق وذكرنا غير مرة أن مجرد الشيخوخة لا توجب الوثاقة فمن حكم بالصحة إنما تبع العلامة في الخلاصة ولا عبرة بتصحيحه

And Mājīlūyah's tawthīq was not made. We have mentioned on more than one occasion that merely being a scholar (of authorization) does not necessitate reliability. Therefore, whoever judged the narration as authentic, did so following al-'Allāmah in *al-Khulāṣah*. And there is no consideration to be given of his authentication.<sup>1</sup>

The text of al-Khūṭī can be a proof that al-Ḥillī makes tawthīq of the scholars of authorization based on the words of al-Khūṭī. And even though the text is not explicit, or it is too deficient to infer what is intended thereby, it is, nonetheless, not farfetched. Perhaps what can support this is the statement of al-Khūṭī under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-'Aṭṭār:

تصحيح العلامة في الفائدة الثامنة من الخلاصة طريق الصدوق إلى عبد الرحمان بن الحجاج وكذا طريقه إلى عبد الله ابن أبي يعفور وفيهما أحمد بن محمد بن يحيى ويرده ما من أن تصحيح العلامة مبني على بنائه على أصالة العدالة وعلى أن أحمد من مشايخ الإجازة وكلا الأمرين لا يمكن الاعتماد عليه

The authentication of al-'Allāmah under *al-Fā'idah al-Thāminah* of *al-Khulāṣah* comes from: al-Ṣadūq to 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥajjāj and his chain to 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ya'fūr. Both of them contain Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā. What refutes this is the fact that, as mentioned, the authentication of al-'Allāmah is based on his principle of the presumption of 'adālah, and on the fact that Aḥmad is from the scholars of authorization. It is not possible to rely on these two matters.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps this text is clearer in that al-Ḥillī follows the methodology of making tawthīq of the scholars of authorization, as al-Khūṭī stated.

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, 4/270, "Kaffārat qal' al-shajarah".

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 3:121 (no. 932).

## The position of al-Khūī regarding the tawthīq of scholars of authorization

Al-Khūī mentioned his opinion regarding scholars of authorization in the introduction to his book, *al-Mu'jam*; he does not regard the narrator described as being a “scholar of authorization” a reason for his tawthīq unless one of the early generation of scholars documented it as such, or, his tawthīq is based on other reasons.

In refuting the opinion that states the tawthīq of the scholars of authorization, al-Khūī states:

إن كون الشخص من مشايخ الإجازة لا يقتضي الوثاقة كبروا بوجه فإن شيخ الإجازة راو في الحقيقة غايته على نحو الاجمال لا التفصيل فيعطي الكتاب لتلميذه ويقول أنت مجاز عني في روايته فهو لا يزيد على الراوي بشيء يعتني بشأنه كي يقتضي الإغناء عن التوفيق

The fact that a person is from the scholars of authorization does not invariably necessitate his reliability. In reality, the scholar of authorization is (just) a narrator. Not in a detailed sense, but in a more general sense, he merely gives the book to his student and says, “You are authorized on my behalf to narrate it.” Thus, he is not much different than an average narrator such that he does not require his tawthīq to be made.<sup>1</sup>

In another place, al-Khūī states:

وأما كونهما من مشايخ الإجازة لمثل الصدوق والكشي فهو أيضا كسابقيه وذلك لأن الصدوق (قده) كان ينقل الحديث عن سمعه وأخذه منه سواء أكان شيعيا أم لم يكن وموثقا كان أو غيره بل إن من مشايخ إجازته من هو ناصب زنديق كما في الضبي عليه لعائن الله حيث ذكر (قدس سره) أنه لم ير أنصب منه وبلغ من نصبه أنه كان يقول اللهم صل على محمد فردا ويمتنع من الصلاة على آله فترى أنه مع نصبه وزندقته قد روى عنه الصدوق (قده) وهو من مشايخه ومعه كيف يكون مجرد الشيخوخة له أو لغيره كافية في التوثيق ولم يصرح هو نفسه ولا الكشي بأنه لا يروي إلا عن ثقة كما صنعه النجاشي (قده) على أن ظاهر النجاشي أن الكشي لم يظهر منه اعتماد على ابن القتيبة غير نقل الرواية عنه في كتابه وقد بينا أن مجرد الشيخوخة لا دلالة له على الوثاقة

1 Al-Khūī: *Kitāb al-Ṣawm*, 1/291, “*al-Ifṭār ‘alā muḥarram kaffārat al-jam*”.

As for the fact that both of them<sup>1</sup> are from the scholars of authorization, such as al-Ṣadūq and al-Kashshī, it too is like its two predecessors<sup>2</sup>. This is because al-Ṣadūq would transmit ḥadīth from who he heard it from and would take it from him, whether he was a Shīī or not, and whether he was reliable or not. In fact, from his scholars of authorization is someone who is a *Nāṣibī Zindīq*, as is the case with al-Ḍabbī<sup>3</sup>, may Allah’s curses be upon him. He mentioned that he never saw a greater *Nāṣibī* than him and that he reached such a level in his belief that he would say, “O Allah. Send salutations upon Muḥammad alone.” And he would refuse to ask Allah to send salutations on his family. Thus, as you can see, despite his *Naṣb* and *Zandaqah*, al-Ṣadūq still narrated from him and he is among his teachers. Knowing this, how can simply being a teacher of his, or a teacher of others be sufficient in establishing tawthīq? And neither he nor al-Kashshī explicitly stated that they only narrate from reliable narrators, as al-Najjāshī did. Although, the ostensible words of al-Najjāshī are that it appears that al-Kashshī did not rely on Ibn al-Qutaybah other than in the fact that he narrated from him in his book. We have explained that merely teachership is not indicative of reliability.<sup>4</sup>

Based on this, the opinion of al-Khūī regarding scholars of authorization is clear: they are like other narrators in that require documented text that states their tawthīq from those of the past. And, according to al-Khūī, one of them being described as a “scholar of authorization” is neither a proof of his praiseworthiness or tawthīq.

#### 5.4.5 The narrator about whom it is said, “asnada ‘anhu”

Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī states:

---

1 The two are ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Qutaybah and ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn ‘Abdūs.

2 Before this, al-Khūī contested the issue of al-Ṣadūq’s supplication of mercy on a narrator and the statements of tawthīq of the latter-day scholars. According to him, both of these issues do not prove tawthīq. This is what al-Khūī means by “like its two predecessors,” i.e., there is no indication therein of tawthīq.

3 He is Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Abī ‘Ubayd al-Ḍabbī. See: *Mu‘jam al-Khūī*, 2/99, no. 514.

4 Al-Khūī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 1:69 (“*Suqūṭ nāfilah al-zuhrayn fi al-safar*”).

إني وجدت مما يعترض الباحث في أحوال الرواة والمراجع لكتب الرجال هو وصف الراوي بأنه أسند عنه وهذا الوصف قد استعمله الشيخ الطوسي رحمه الله في كتابه المعروف بالرجال وتبعه من تأخر عنه في الاستعمال ولم أجد من سبقه من الرجاليين العامة والخاصة إلى استعماله بصدد تعريف الراوي به وقد وقع الأعلام من علماء الرجال في ارتباك غريب بشأن هذا الوصف من حيث تركيب لفظه ومن حيث تحديد معناه حتى أن بعض مشايخنا الكرام توقف وصرح بأنه لم يفهم له معنى مراداً

From the things that I found a researcher objecting to in regards to the conditions of narrators and what he finds in the books of narrator evaluation is a narrator being described with, “*asnada ‘anhu*,” or, “transmitted from him.” Al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī used this in his work, famously known as *al-Rijāl* and others that came after him followed suit in using it. I have not found any of the scholars of biographical evaluation using it to describe a narrator before him, both from the *‘Āmmāh* (Ahl al-Sunnah) and the *Khāṣṣah* (Shī‘ah). Well-known scholars of narrators have fallen into a strange confusion both in terms of the word’s sequence and defining what it means, to such an extent that our noble scholars suspended judgement on it and have explicitly stated on numerous occasions<sup>1</sup> that its meaning is unknown.<sup>2</sup>

We conclude from his words that the first person from the Imāmiyyah to describe narrators with this description was al-Ṭūsī in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, not in *al-Fihrist*.

---

1 It is al-Khūṭī, as will be seen later on. Ḥasan al-Ṣadr claimed that he understood from it something that no one else before him ever understood. He states, “There is a difference of opinion on the meaning of this statement and they mention many different opinions on it. **However, what appears more likely to me in terms of its meaning is something that I have yet to see anyone else besides me mention.** The explanation requires several preliminary remarks. Firstly, this statement is only to be found in *Rijāl al-Ṣhaykh* and no other books of his nor of our companions. **Furthermore, it is only found in the chapter “*Rijāl al-Ṣādiq* عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ” in *Rijāl al-Shaykh* and no other chapters on the narrators of the remaining infallibles عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ.” He mentioned this in his book, *Nihāyat al-Dirāyah* (p. 401). We should know that Ḥasan al-Ṣadr is mistaken in what he concluded and, accordingly, built upon an incorrect principle. The claim that al-Ṭūsī only mentioned this statement under the narrators of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq is incorrect, as it will soon be seen. Rather, it also appears in relation to companions other than al-Ṣādiq’s.**

2 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī: *al-Muṣṭalah al-Rijālī Asnada ‘anhu*, (research paper in *Majallat Turāthīnā*), 3/98.

Imāmī scholars differ regarding what al-Ṭūsī intended by the statement and the explanation thereof.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, they differ on whether these words imply tawthīq or not.

Regarding the number of narrators described with this description, Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī states:

الموصوفين بهذه الكلمة في كتاب رجال الطوسي المطبوع يبلغ (٣٤١) شخصا منهم شخص واحد من أصحاب الباقر والصادق (ع) ومنهم (٣٣٠) من أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام واثنان من أصحاب الكاظم عليه السلام وسبعة من أصحاب الرضا عليه السلام ومنهم شخص واحد من أصحاب الهادي عليه السلام

There are 341 people described with these words in the printed copy of the book, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*. One of them is from the companions of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq, 330 from the companions of al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, two from the companions of the al-Kāzīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, seven from the companions of al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, and one from the companions of al-Hādī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.<sup>2</sup>

The number is not insignificant. If a scholar were to go and count these words as an indication of tawthīq, the person described as such would never be a reason for criticism of the al-Shaykh. Also, keeping in mind that nothing is known regarding the condition of many of them, if not most of them, except for al-Ṭūsī's description of them, “*asnada ‘anhu!*” Some Imāmī scholars are of the opinion of inferring tawthīq from this description.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Abū al-Ma’ālī al-Kalbāsī mentioned ten explanations from Imāmī scholars in *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah* (3/367) regarding this term.

2 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī: *al-Muṣṭalah al-Rijālī* “*Asnada ‘Anhu* (research paper disseminated in *Majallat Turāthinā*, 3/104).

3 From those who consider the statement “*asnada ‘anhu*” as a form of praise or tawthīq of a narrator is: al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī in *Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 1/87 and 4/14; al-Jilānī *al-Rashṭī in Risālah fi ‘Ilm al-Dirāyah* (printed among *Rasā’il fi Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* of Ḥāfiẓyān al-Bābilī, 2/311); ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥā’irī *al-Aṣfahānī in al-Wajīzah fi ‘Ilm Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth* (also printed in *Rasā’il fi Dirāyat al-Ḥadīth*, p. 561); al-Mullā ‘Alī Kanī in *Tawdhīh al-Maqāl* (p. 203); al-Wahīd al-Bahbahānī in *al-Ta’līqah ‘alā Manhaj al-Maqāl* (1/113). Muslim al-Dāwarī narrated from al-Muḥaqqiq al-Qummī, Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Jilānī (as it appears in *Mu’jam al-Rumūz wa al-Ishārāt*, p. 294), Muḥammad Bāqir al-Sabzawārī, and al-Majlisī that it is an indication of praise or tawthīq (*Uṣūl ‘Ilm al-Rijāl bayna al-Nazariyyah wa al-Taṭbīq*, 2/323).

In summary, the Imāmī scholars have a lengthy discussion on the meaning and indication of this statement. It seems appropriate to mention a summary of the discussion as presented by Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī. He states:

1. The verb ‘asnada’ is a past-tense verb whose active participle is mentioned and known. Its active participle is in the form of a pronoun that goes back to the narrator described with the action.
2. The pronoun in “anhu’ goes back to the Imām that regards the narrator to be from his companions.
3. What is meant with this description is that the narrator narrates from the Imām narrations that are traceable to the Prophet ﷺ, and that he has collected them into a book regarded as a *musnad*.
4. The description is not specific to the companions of the al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. Rather, narrators of Imāms al-Bāqir, al-Kāzīm, al-Riḍā, and al-Hādī عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام are also described as such, even though most of them are from the companions of Imām al-Ṣādiq عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.
5. The person described with that indicates that he was, in the beginning, an ‘Ammī in madhhab that does not acknowledge that the ḥadīth is traced back to the Imām. Rather, he only considers the words of the Imām that are *marfū’*, or elevated to the Prophet ﷺ. However, when there is external evidence that the narrator described as such is a Shīī in madhhab, then it is a proof that this narrator is very distinguished, and that he intended to collect what the Imāms narrated that are traceable to their grandfather so as to use such narrations as a proof against the others that do not believe in their Imāmah. Accordingly, the description is indicative of greatness and virtue. In any case, the description does not indicate a criticism that leads to his weakness, or a praise that leads to his reliability. Rather, it is proof of a specific methodology in the narration of ḥadīth.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī: *al-Muṣṭalah al-Rijālī “Asnada ‘Anhu”* (research paper disseminated in *Majallat Turāthīnā*, 3/142).

This is a summary of Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī's findings on the issue.

## The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī regarding their statement “asnada ‘anhu”

### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding their statement “asnada ‘anhu”

I did not find explicit text from al-Ḥillī on the meaning or indication of “asnada ‘anhu.” However, it is clear from looking at some narrators who have been described with such words in al-Ḥillī's *al-Khulāṣah* that it neither suggests a tawthīq nor a criticism of the narrator. It appears as such because of the methodology of al-Ḥillī in his *al-Khulāṣah*. Al-Ḥillī transmits tens of biographies from *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* which contain a large number of narrators described with the words “asnada ‘anhu,” yet he attached no importance to narrating such words. Examples of this include:

- Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Yaḥyā<sup>1</sup>
- Ibrāhīm ibn Naṣr ibn al-Qa'qā'<sup>2</sup>
- Iṣḥāq ibn Bishr, Abū Ḥudhayfah al-Kāhilī (al-Ṭūsī mentioned him and said: “asnada ‘anhu.” Al-Ḥillī mentioned him in the second section of weak and rejected narrators saying, “He is from the ‘Āmmah. He was a thiqaḥ.”<sup>3</sup>)

He did not transmit the words, “asnada ‘anhu!” This is the case for so many other biographies. Thus, if these words had an impact on the tawthīq of a narrator according to al-Ḥillī, he would have mentioned it in his book. As for al-Ḥillī mentioning these words in about five instances, according to what I came across<sup>4</sup>, this proves that it does not mean anything related to the strength or weakness of the narrator. In fact, he mentioned three of the five in the second section. They are biography numbers 1531, 1580, and 1685.

---

1 *Al-Khulāṣah*, p. 48, no. 6, section one; *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 155, no. 1720.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 51, no. 16, section one; *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 157, no. 1751.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 318, no. 1247, section two; *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 161, no. 1833.

4 Biography numbers 806, 807, 1531, 1580, and 1685. These are the biographies I came across.



## The position of al-Khūī regarding their statement “asnada ‘anhu”

In his *Mu‘jam*, al-Khūī mentioned the scholars’ difference of opinion regarding the words “asnada ‘anhu.” He mentioned the opinions regarding its meaning and then disputed them. He commented saying:

فتلخص أنه لا يكاد يظهر معنى صحيح لهذه الجملة في كلام الشيخ [الطوسي] في هذه الموارد وهو أعلم بمراده

It can be summed up that there does not appear to be a sound meaning for this sentence in the words of al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) in these instances. And he knows best what he intended.<sup>1</sup>

However, al-Khūī mentioned in his book the meaning of al-Ṭūsī’s statement “asnada ‘anhu.” In discussing the issue of a narrator sharing in name, he states:

أنه لا ينبغي الشك في اتحاد القاسم بن محمد الجوهري وأما ما ذكره الشيخ في أصحاب الصادق والكاظم عليهما السلام وفيمن لم يرو عنهم عليهم السلام فهو لا يدل على التغاير فإن ذلك قد تكرر في كلامه وقد بينا في المقدمة أن الذي يظهر منه أنه يذكر في أصحاب كل إمام من لقيه وإن لم يكن له رواية عنه عليه السلام وقد يصرح بذلك فيقول أسند عنه يريد بذلك أنه روى عن الإمام عليه السلام مع الوساطة ويذكر فيمن لم يرو عنهم عليهم السلام من لم يعاصر المعصوم أو عاصره وليست له رواية منه بلا واسطة

There should be no doubt in al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad al-Jawharī being one person. As for what al-Shaykh mentioned regarding the companions of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim عليه السلام, and regarding the person that did not narrate from them عليه السلام, it does not prove there is a difference (in person). This occurs often in his statements. We have explained in the introduction that what appears from him is that he mentions among the companions of every Imām those who he met, even though he does not have a narration from him عليه السلام. At times, he is explicit with this and says, ‘asnada ‘anhu,’ intending thereby that he narrated from the Imām عليه السلام via an intermediary. And he also mentions regarding the person that does not narrate from them عليه السلام those that did not live in the same time as the infallible, or, he lived in his time, but he does not have a direct narration from him.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Khūī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/101.

2 Ibid., 15/52, no. 9565.

In summary, al-Khūī does not regard the statement as from the indications of tawthīq or praise. What further emphasizes this is what he stated under the biography of al-Ḥārith ibn Ghuṣayn:

أبو وهب الثقفي كوفي أسند عنه من أصحاب الصادق عليه السلام رجال الشيخ [الطوسي] وعده العلامة [الحلي] في القسم الأول... وقال ابن عقدة عن محمد بن عبد الله بن أبي حكيم عن ابن نمير أنه ثقة خيار وتوفى سنة ١٤٣هـ وكذلك فعل ابن داود غير أنه قال وثقه ابن عقدة أقول أما توثيق ابن عقدة نفسه فلم يثبت بل إنما حكى التوثيق عن ابن نمير بواسطة محمد بن عبد الله بن أبي حكيم على ما صرح به العلامة وهما لم يثبت وثاقتهما إذن لم تثبت وثاقة الرجل

Abū Wahb al-Thaqafī. Kūfan. Asnada ‘anhu. From the companions of al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام, as stated in *Rijāl al-Shaykh* [al-Ṭūsī]. Al-‘Allāmah (al-Ḥillī) included him in the first section... Ibn ‘Uqdah said, “From Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ḥakīmah — from Ibn Numayr: He is Thiqaḥ, excellent. He died in 143 A.H.” Ibn Dāwūd did the same except that he said Ibn ‘Uqdah deemed him Thiqaḥ. I say: As for the tawthīq by Ibn ‘Uqdah himself, this is not established. Rather, he transmitted tawthīq from Ibn Numayr through Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Ḥakīmah, as has been clarified by al-‘Allāmāh. Their tawthīq is not established and therefore as a result their tawthīq of another will not be established either.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī do not regard this statement as a reason for the tawthīq of a narrator.

#### 5.4.6 The confused narrator (al-rāwī al-mukhallaf)

In the biographical dictionaries of the Imāmiyyah, some narrators have been described with ‘*takhlīf*,’ or being mixed-up and confused. As such, it is first necessary to explain the meaning of the word and the implications it has on the jarḥ of a narrator, if any.

1 Ibid., 5/17652, no. 2503. Also see 7/220, no. 3951, biography of Ḥammād ibn Shu‘ayb.

## The meaning of takhlīṭ

Imāmī scholars differ on the meaning of takhlīṭ. Muḥammad Jadīdī summarizes them saying:

مخلط أو مختلط معناه الخلط بمعنى المزج ولكن المراد منه أنواع مخصوصة منه

١ . خلط الاعتقاد الصحيح بالفساد

٢ . خلط الروايات المنكرة بغيرها

٣ . خلط أسانيد الأخبار بالآخر

٤ . خلط المطالب الصحيحة بغيرها

Mukhallaṭ or mukhtaliṭ, meaning ‘confusion,’ i.e., mixing things up. However, what is intended thereby are more specific types, namely:

1. Confusing a sound belief with a false one;
2. Confusing unacceptable reports with other non-unacceptable reports;
3. Confusing the asānīd of reports with other asānīd;
4. Confusing correct issues with incorrect issues.<sup>1</sup>

In explaining the meaning of takhlīṭ, al-Kalbāsī states:

قد يكون المنسوب إليه هو نفسه الراوي وقد يكون المنسوب إليه كتابه أو إسناده

Takhlīṭ can be attributed to the person himself (the narrator) as well as to his book. It can also be attributed to his Shaykh, or chain of narration.<sup>2</sup>

Thereafter, al-Kalbāsī cited several examples for the various types of takhlīṭ he mentioned.

---

1 Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī: *Muʿjam Muṣṭalaḥāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 151.

2 Abū al-Maʿālī al-Kalbāsī: *al-Rasāʾil al-Rijāliyyah*, 3/386, under “Maʿnā al-takhlīṭ wa al-ikhtilāṭ”.

In summary, there are numerous definitions for takhlīṭ. This is what was emphasized by Muḥammad al-Karbāsī with his statement:

التخليط في كل موضع يحمل على معنى

Takhlīṭ carries a (different) meaning in every context.<sup>1</sup>

The usage of this description in the biographical dictionaries mostly refers to a false belief. Al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) states:

وبالجملة التخليط المطلق في الراوي ينصرف إلى روايته المناكير

In summary, general takhlīṭ in a narrator applies to his narrating unacceptable narrations.<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the first is closer to the truth. It is possible.

### **The implication, or lack thereof, of takhlīṭ on jarḥ**

Because of the Imāmiyyah's difference of opinion on the meaning of takhlīṭ, there is an effect on the implication of this word in terms of accepting or rejecting the narration of a narrator described with such a word. Muḥammad Jadīdī collected all of the opinions of the Imāmī scholars on the issue. Among them are those who state that there is no affect of this word on the jarḥ or ta'dīl of a narrator. Others consider it from the words of jarḥ. And still others state that it does not suggest a criticism of the narrator himself, but rather in what he narrates.<sup>3</sup>

### **The opinion of al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī on takhlīṭ**

#### **The opinion of al-Ḥillī on takhlīṭ**

Al-Ḥillī regarded the description of a narrator with the word takhlīṭ as a reason to reject the narration. This is because such a description typically goes back to the

---

1 Muḥammad Ja'far al-Karbāsī: *Iklīl al-Manhaj fi Tahqīq al-Maṭlab*, p. 134.

2 Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī: *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 12/478.

3 See: *Mu'jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah* of Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī, p. 151.

false belief of the narrator—which is, according to al-Ḥillī, the most important reason for criticizing a narrator. What proves this is the fact that he mentioned this description about four narrators and placed them all in the second section of his book that is dedicated to both weak and rejected narrations, or such narrators about whom judgement is suspended. The narrators are as follows.

### ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd

The great Ṣaḥābī. Al-Ḥillī restricted his words to:

روى الكشي عن الفضل بن شاذان أنه خلط

Al-Kashshī narrated on the authority of al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān that he confused things.<sup>1</sup>

When we go back to al-Kashshī’s book, we find that the narration al-Ḥillī built his opinion on reads as follows:

سئل الفضل بن شاذان عن ابن مسعود و حذيفة فقال لم يكن حذيفة مثل ابن مسعود لأن حذيفة كان ركنا و ابن مسعود خلط ووالى القوم و مال معهم وقال بهم

Al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān was asked about Ibn Mas‘ūd and Ḥudhayfah. He said, “Ḥudhayfah was not like Ibn Mas‘ūd because Ḥudhayfah was a pillar and Ibn Mas‘ūd mixed things up and was close to the people (Ṣaḥābah), took their side, and defended them.”<sup>2</sup>

Thus, al-Ḥillī regarded takhlīṭ to mean a falseness related to belief in that Ibn Mas‘ūd opposed the madhhab of the Imāmiyyah by being close to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

### ‘Aṭā’ ibn Abī Rabāḥ

Al-Ḥillī restricted his words to:

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 369, no. 1456.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 38, no. 78.

من أصحاب علي عليه السلام، مخلط

From the companions of ‘Alī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. *Mukhallat* (confused).<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps what made al-Ḥillī place him in the second section of his book is the fact that ‘Aṭā’ ibn Abī Rabāḥ was not an Imāmī. Al-Tustarī (d. 1401 AH) states:

الظاهر عاميته فلم يذكر أحد تشييعه

Ostensibly, he is an ‘Āmmī. Nobody has mentioned him being a Shīṭī.<sup>2</sup>

### Salamah ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Aḥmar

Al-Ḥillī states:

من أصحاب أبي عبدالله عليه السلام أصله كوفي مخلط

From the companions of Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. He is originally a Kūfan. *Mukhallat* (confused).<sup>3</sup>

The meaning of takhlīṭ here is a confusion or mixing up of beliefs, since Salamah ibn Ṣāliḥ was not an Imāmī, as al-Tustarī stated:

لم نقف عليه في أخبارنا ولا يبعد عاميته

We have not come across anything about him in our reports. He being an ‘Āmmī is not farfetched.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 381, no. 1528. Al-Ṭūsī referred to him as “*mukhallat*” in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 75 no. 721.

2 *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*, 7/203.

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 354, no. 1399. This proves the mistake of ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Shabastarī who described Salamah ibn Ṣāliḥ as, “*Muḥaddath. Imāmī. Mukhtalaṭ*” (*al-Fā’iq fī Ruwāt wa Aṣḥāb al-Imām al-Ṣādiq*, 2/73). Al-Tustarī was correct in his statement, “We have not come across anything about him in our reports. Him being an ‘Āmmī is not farfetched.” It is for this reason al-Ḥillī placed him in the second section, because he is not an Imāmī.

4 *Qāmūs al-Rijāl*. 5/216.

## Ishāq ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Abān ibn Mirār

Al-Ḥillī placed him in the second section because, as per his description of him, he is “the source of takhlīṭ.” He also narrated the statement of Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī on him:

أنه كان فاسد المذهب

He had a false (creedal) school.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, al-Ḥillī considered the narrator being described with takhlīṭ as from the reasons of his rejection. This is because it forms part of the narrator’s false beliefs. This is generally the case.

Al-Ḥillī (also) states about a narrator that he is “mukhallat;” however, he qualifies it as in the biography of **Muḥammad ibn Wahbān Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Dabīlī**:

Reliable from our companions. Clear in narration. Little takhlīṭ (confusion).

He included him in the first section because al-Ḥillī stated that he is “from our companions.” In other words, he does not hold a false belief in his view. Thereafter, he says, “Clear in narration. Little takhlīṭ (confusion).”

Therefore, according to al-Ḥillī, little takhlīṭ in a narration while holding a sound belief is not regarded as a reason to reject the narration of a narrator. If there is takhlīṭ in creed, as is mostly the case, then this is a reason, according to al-Ḥillī, for rejecting.

### The opinion of al-Khū’ī on takhlīṭ

Al-Khū’ī differed with the opinion of al-Ḥillī on the issue of takhlīṭ. The reason for this difference of opinion goes back to their adhered to methodology in *al-jarḥ wa*

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 318, no. 1248; Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī: *al-Rijāl*, p. 41, no. 14.

*al-ta'dīl*, as mentioned previously. This is because al-Khūṭ does not consider the false belief of a narrator a reason for his *jarḥ*. This is different to the opinion of al-Ḥillī.

Similarly, *takhlīṭ* in creed or narration is not, according to al-Khūṭ, regarded as being from the reasons of a narrator's *jarḥ*. The following are examples.

In refuting those who describe Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-'Alawī al-'Aqīqī with *takhlīṭ*, al-Khūṭ states:

توصيف الشيخ الرجل بالمخلط أو أن في أحاديثه مناكير وإن لم يدل على ضعفه في نفسه إلا أنه يكفي في  
عدم اعتباره عدم ثبوت وثاقته

Al-Shaykh<sup>1</sup> describing the person as '*mukhallaṭ*,' and stating that 'his *aḥādīth* include unacceptable reports,' even though it does not prove that he himself is weak, it is sufficient in proving that he is not reliable.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Khūṭ does not consider al-'Aqīqī's description of him as '*mukhallaṭ*' a valid reason of criticism against him. The criticism is for other reasons; that is to say that his *tawthīq* is not proven to have come from the earlier generation of scholars.

Under the biography of Yaḥyā ibn al-Qāsim, Abū Baṣīr, al-Khūṭ states:

وأما قول ابن فضال إنه كان مخلطاً فلا ينافي التوثيق فإن التخليط معناه أن يروي الرجل ما يعرف وما ينكر  
فلهل بعض روايات أبي بصير كانت منكراً عند ابن فضال فقال إنه مخلط

As for the statement of Ibn Faḍḍāl, "He was confused," it does not negate *tawthīq*. *Takhlīṭ* means when a narrator narrates both what is known and what is unacceptable. Perhaps some of Abū Baṣīr's narrations were unacceptable according to Ibn Faḍḍāl and, as such, he said that he is a *mukhallaṭ*.<sup>3</sup>

1 This is Shaykh al-Ṭūsī, as mentioned in *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 434, no. 6217.

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 12/282, no. 7931.

3 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 21/89, no. 13599.



This is clear in that *takhlīṭ* in narration does not negate, according to al-Khūṭī, the acceptance of his narrations.

Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Jumhūr, al-Khūṭī states:

الظاهر أن الرجل ثقة وإن كان فاسد المذهب لشهادة علي بن إبراهيم بن هاشم بوثاقته غاية الأمر أنه ضعيف في الحديث لما في رواياته من تخليط وغلو وقد ذكر الشيخ أن ما يرويه من رواياته فهي خالية من الغلو والتخليط وعليه فلا مانع من العمل بما رواه الشيخ من رواياته

Ostensibly, the individual is a reliable, even though he follows a false school of creed. The reason for being reliable is the testimony of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim’s in his favour. The most that can be said is that he is weak in ḥadīth because of the *takhlīṭ* and *ghuluww* (extremeness) in his narrations. Al-Shaykh mentioned that what he narrates from his narrations, they are free from both *takhlīṭ* and *ghuluww*. Based on this, there is no impediment in acting on what al-Shaykh narrated from him from his narrations.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭī contradicted himself with this statement of his. How do we reconcile between his statement, “The individual is reliable,” and, “The most that can be said is that he is weak in ḥadīth”?

The meaning of ‘reliable’ according to al-Khūṭī and also what he infers from the *Tafsīr* of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī is that such a narrator’s narrations are acceptable. This is what he means by “*thiqah* (reliable).” Thereafter, al-Khūṭī contradicts himself with his statement that he is “weak in ḥadīth!”

Unless it is said that the meaning of weak here goes back to the reason of *takhlīṭ* in narration, whether it is mixing up of *asānīd*, *ghuluww*, or mixing of unacceptable reports. According to al-Khūṭī, this does not contradict being a *thiqah*!

This further proves that the Imāmiyyah are not concerned with *dabt*, or precision of a narrator. Thus, if the narrator is excessive in committing mistakes, and he narrates reports that contain *ghuluww*, are unacceptable, incorrect, and whatever

---

1 Ibid., 16/191, no. 10439.

else the minds can think of, then he is still an acceptable *thiqah*, according to some of them, like al-Khūṭī!

As for his statement, “Based on this, there is no impediment in acting on what al-Shaykh narrated from him from his narrations,” I say: al-Khūṭī similarly accepts what others, beside al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī, have narrated.

Here we have (the narrator) Muḥammad ibn Jumhūr in the sanad of some narrations that contain *ghuluww* in belief in the *Tafsīr* of al-Qummī—which al-Khūṭī believes in the *tawthīq* of its narrators. Among such narrations are the following:

1. Al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad informed us — on the authority of al-Mu‘allā ibn Muḥammad — from Muḥammad ibn Jumhūr — from Ja‘far ibn Bashīr — from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah — from Abū Baṣīr — from Abū Ja‘far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ regarding the verse:

فَأَقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلدِّينِ حَنِيفًا

*So, direct your face (i.e., self) toward the religion, inclining to truth.*

He said, “It is (referring to) *Wilāyah* (of ‘Alī)!”<sup>1</sup>

2. Al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad informed us — on the authority of al-Mu‘allā ibn Muḥammad — from Muḥammad ibn Jumhūr — from Ja‘far ibn Bashīr — from al-Ḥakam ibn Zuhayr — from Muḥammad ibn Ḥamdān — from Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ regarding the verse:

ذَلِكُمْ بِأَنَّهُ إِذَا دُعِيَ اللَّهُ وَحْدَهُ كَفَرْتُمْ وَإِنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ تُؤْمِنُوا فَالْحُكْمُ لِلَّهِ الْعَلِيِّ الْكَبِيرِ

*(They will be told), “That is because, when Allah was called upon alone, you disbelieved; but if others were associated with Him, you believed. So, the judgement is with Allah, the Most High, the Grand.*

---

1 *Tafsīr ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī*, 2/130, *Sūrah al-Rūm*: 30.

He states:

إذا ذكر الله ووجد بولاية من أمر الله بولايته كفرتم وإن يشرك به من ليست له ولاية تؤمنوا بأن له ولاية

When Allah was mentioned alone with the Wilāyah of he Who Allah commanded to his Wilāyah, you rejected and associated with Him he who has no Wilāyah. You believed that he has Wilāyah.<sup>1</sup>

3. Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī and Aḥmad ibn Idrīs narrated to us — Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-‘Alawī narrated to us — from al-‘Amrakī — from Muḥammad ibn Jumhūr — Sulaymān ibn Sammā‘ah narrated to us — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Qāsim — from Yaḥyā ibn Maysarah al-Khuth‘amī — from Abū Ja‘far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who said: “I heard him saying:

حَمَّ عَسَقَ

*Ḥā Mūmm ‘Ayn Sīn Qāf.*

is the amount of years of al-Qā‘im.<sup>2</sup>

4. Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far narrated to us — Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad narrated to us — from Aḥmad — from al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad — Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Alī al-Fizārī narrated to us — from Muḥammad ibn Jumhūr — from Faḍḍālah ibn Ayyūb who said, “Al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was asked about the statement of Allah:

قُلْ أَرَأَيْتُمْ إِنْ أَصْحَحَ مَاؤُكُمْ غَوْرًا فَمَنْ يَأْتِيكُمْ بِمَاءٍ مَعِينٍ

*Say, “Have you considered: if your water was to become sunken (into the earth), then who could bring you flowing water?”*

He said عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, “Your water is your doors, i.e., the Imāms عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. And the Imāms are the doors of Allah between Him and His creation. “... Then who could bring you flowing water?” I.e., knowledge of the Imām.”<sup>3</sup>

1 Ibid., 2:226 (Sūrah Ghāfir, v. 12).

2 Ibid., 2:240 (Sūrah al-Shūrā, v. 1-2).

3 Ibid., 2:365 (Sūrah al-Mulk, v. 30).

Thus, the extremism of Ibn Jumhūr is widespread in the books, the narrators of which al-Khūṭī regards as reliable, such as *Tafsīr al-Qummī*. Therefore, his statement cannot be accepted unconditionally such that there is no impediment from those things that al-Ṭūsī narrated from him. In fact, according to al-Khūṭī, there is no impediment regarding what other than al-Ṭūsī, such as al-Qummī, narrated.

Therefore, no matter the level of takhlīṭ the narrator reaches, his extremism (in belief), the unacceptability of his reports, he is acceptable according to al-Khūṭī, as is the situation with Muḥammad ibn Jumhūr. Regarding him, Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī states:

غال فاسد الحديث لا يكتب حديثه رأيت له شعرا يحلل فيه حرمان الله عز وجل

Extremist. False in ḥadīth. His ḥadīth are not written. I saw a poem of his in which he made *ḥailāl* the ḥarām things of Allah <sup>1</sup>.

In summary, takhlīṭ, whether in belief or in ḥadīth, does not negatively affect the narrator as per the methodology of al-Khūṭī.<sup>2</sup>

For the sake of benefit, I will mention al-Khūṭī has a strange opinion regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah's statement about a narrator that he is "mukhtaliṭ." Under the biography of 'Aṭā' ibn al-Sā'ib, he states:

ذكر غير واحد من علماء العامة من أنه ثقة في حديثه القديم ولكنه اختلط وتغير أنه كان من العامة سابقا  
ثم استبصر

More than one of the scholars of the 'Āmmah have mentioned that he is a thiqah in his old ḥadīth. However, he became confused and changed

1 Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī: *Rijāl Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī*, p. 92, no. 131.

2 For more information, see: *Ma'rifat al-Ḥadīth* of al-Bahbūdī, p. 130-214; *Rijāl al-Khāqānī*, p. 314; *Ṭarā'if al-Maqāl* of al-Burūjirdī, 2/270; *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl* of Mullā Kanī, p. 212; *Iklīl al-Manhaj* of al-Karbāsī, p. 398; *Mu'jam al-Khūṭī*, 16/67 and 4/344; *al-Rasā'il al-Rijāliyyah* of al-Kalbāsī, 3/393; *al-Ḍu'afā' min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* of Ḥusayn al-Sā'idī, 2/371; *Muntahā al-Maqāl* of Abū 'Alī al-Ḥā'irī, 4/341.

(*ikhtalaṭa wa taghayyara*): he was from the ‘*Āmmaḥ* (i.e., the Ahl al-Sunnah) previously, then he saw (the truth).<sup>1</sup>

What he means is that the word *ikhṭilāṭ* (confusion), according to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah, means to leave the Ahl al-Sunnah and join the ranks of the Shī‘ah!

**Note:**

It is appropriate here to mention the opinion of al-Khūī on the issue of *iḏṭirāb* (unresolvably problematic). It is similar to what has already been mentioned. Al-Khūī states:

إن الاضطراب في المذهب لا ينافي الوثاقة كما هو ظاهر وكذا الاضطراب في الحديث إذ ليس معنى ذلك أنه ممن يضع الحديث ويكذب كي يكون ذلك طعنا في الرجل نفسه وكاشفا عن تضعيفه إياه وإنما هو طعن في أحاديثه وأنها ليست مستقيمة ولا تكون على نمط واحد وإنما يروى الحديث تارة عن الثقة وأخرى عن الضعيف وقد يروى المناكير وغيرها فلا تكون أحاديثه على نسق واحد وعلى الجملة إن هذه العبارة لا تقتضي القدح في وثاقة الرجل كي يعارض به التوثيق المستفاد من وروده في أسانيد (كامل الزيارات)

*Iḏṭirāb* (unresolvably problematic) in the (Imāmī) madhhab does not negate reliability, as is self-evident. Similarly, *iḏṭirāb* in ḥadīth. This is because *iḏṭirāb* does not mean he is from those that fabricate ḥadīth and lies such that the criticism is levelled at the actual person and it reveals his weakness. Rather it is a criticism of his aḥādīth and the fact that they are not correct. And they are not all of the same type; at times, a ḥadīth is narrated from a Thiqaḥ, and other times, from a weak person. Unacceptable and other types of reports can also be narrated. Therefore, his aḥādīth are not all of the same type. In summary, this statement does not necessitate a criticism against the individual’s reliability such that the tawthīq conflicts with it—the tawthīq which is gained from the fact that he appears in the asānīd of *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*.<sup>2</sup>

1 Al-Khūī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 12/159, no. 7701.

2 Al-Khūī: *Kitāb al-Ṣalāh*, 5/222. “*Ḥukm mā law kānat ‘alayhi fawā‘it ayyām wa fātat minhu ṣalāt dhālik al-yawm*”.

## 5.5 Miscellaneous principles in al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl between al-Ḥillī and al-Khū'ī

On the whole, these are the principles related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl. They do not fall under one particular topic. I am bringing them together here in one place so as to complete the discussion.

### 5.5.1 Describing the narrator as a “*wajh* (prominent),” or “from the prominent (associates) of the companions

The scholars of the Imāmiyyah were of the view that to describe a narrator with the word “*wajh* (prominent),” or “from the prominent associates of the companions,” is indicative of his praise. Among those who gathered the statements of the Imāmī scholars in this regard is Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī in his book *Mu'jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*.<sup>1</sup>

#### The opinion of al-Ḥillī regarding the narrator who was a ‘*wajh*’

Al-Ḥillī, as it appears from his methodology is dealing with this description in his book, *al-Khulāṣah*, considered this description among the reasons of praise. Similarly, the words “*wajhan bi Qum* (he was prominent in Qum),” or “prominent among our companions,” since he included such terms in the first section of his book.<sup>2</sup> However, what is problematic from the above is al-Ḥillī's statement under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Abī Zāhir:

كان وجهها بقم وحديثه ليس بذاك النقي

He was prominent in Qum. His ḥadīth are not so clean.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Muḥammad Riḍā Jadīdī: *Mu'jam Muṣṭalahāt al-Rijāl wa al-Dirāyah*, p. 189.

2 As in the biography of Idrīs ibn 'Abd Allāh; al-Ḥillī mentioned that he is a ‘*wajh*’ (no. 63, p. 60). Similarly, the biography of Bisṭām ibn al-Ḥuṣayn; al-Ḥillī mentioned that he is a “*wajh* among our companions” (no. 161, p. 81). Likewise, in the biography of Tha'labah ibn Maymūn (no. 181, p. 86).

3 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 321, no. 1261.

For this reason, al-Ḥillī included him in the second section.

In response to the above, a distinction should be made regarding the following issues. Firstly, when al-Ḥillī mentions that the person is a ‘*wajh*,’ or “a *wajh* among our companions,” or “a *wajh* in Qum,” it fundamentally implies praise and reliance on him, as already mentioned.

Secondly, the statement of al-Ḥillī, “a *wajh* among our companions,” and then following it up with, “His ḥadīth are not so clean,” proves that the principle, according to al-Ḥillī, suggests a reliance on the narrator about whom it is said ‘*wajh*,’ unless it is accompanied by an expression that diminishes his status, such as, “His ḥadīth are not so clean.” This sentence clearly criticizes his narrations. For this reason, al-Ḥillī went against the original position and included him in the second section of his book<sup>1</sup>, despite the fact that he is a ‘*wajh*’ in Qum (a place which the Imāmiyyah hold in high regard—a place like no other!).<sup>2</sup>

Thirdly, after it is clear that the primary meaning of the word ‘*wajh*’ denotes praise and reliance on the narrator, according to al-Ḥillī—if the narrator is an Imāmī—conversely, the same word is a form of criticism against the narrator if he

---

1 Hāshim al-Ḥasanī, in his work *Dirāsāt fī al-Ḥadīth wa al-Muḥaddithīn*, p. 193, states, “Aḥmad ibn Abī Zāhir, or Ja’far al-Ash’arī used to narrate from weak and unknown narrators. And he himself was not strong. For this reason, his ḥadīth is not free from errors, as it comes in *al-Khulāṣah* of al-‘Allamah al-Ḥillī.” Al-Ḥillī did not mention anything disparaging concerning him except, “And his ḥadīth are not that clean.” It is not how Hāshim Ma’rūf narrated; unless, however, it is merely a commentary on al-Ḥillī, and not his actual words that he is narrating.

2 Al-Khūī states, “His ḥadīth are not so clean. This need be understood that there are *munkar* (unacceptable) reports among his narrations. This does not negate his reliability. (*al-Mu’jam*, 2/29) For more information, see: *Iklīl al-Manhaj* of al-Karbāsī (p. 101); *al-Rasā’il al-Rijāliyyah* of Abū al-Ma’ālī al-Kalbāsī (1/224, 3/139); *Samā al-Maqāl* of Abū al-Hudā al-Kalbāsī (2/268). See also the marginal notes of Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī in his book *Al-Mufīd min Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* (p. 20 under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Abī Zāhir). The best person to discuss the difference of opinion on the issue of describing him as “A *wajh* in Qum. And his ḥadīth are not so clean” is Ḥusayn al-Sā’idī in his book, *al-Ḍu’afā’ min Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* (1/167).

is a non-Imāmī since, in addition to holding a false belief (in the view of al-Ḥillī), the narrator is also a prominent person among the adversaries. According to al-Ḥillī, this is an amplified form of criticism, as is the case under the biography of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Ṭāṭārī:

كان فقيها ثقة في حديثه...واقفي المذهب من وجوه الواقفية

He was a jurist (and) reliable in ḥadīth... A Wāqifi in belief. He was from the prominent members of the Wāqifiyyah.<sup>1</sup>

After al-Ḥillī described him with possessing juristic abilities and being reliable in ḥadīth, he placed him in the second section of his book because he was a Wāqifi. Actually, he was from their more prominent members!

### The opinion of Al-Khūṭī regarding the narrator who was a ‘wajh’

Al-Khūṭī elaborated on this issue as follows:

Firstly, when it is said about a narrator that he is a “prominent person from and among our companions,” Al-Khūṭī states:

هو وإن لم يدل على وثاقته فلا أقل من دلالة على الحسن

Even though it does not prove his reliability, it is nothing less than an indication of his uprightness.<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, when it is only said about a narrator that he is a “prominent person,” al-Khūṭī explains:

أن توصيف شخص بأنه كان وجها لا يدل على حسنه فضلا عن وثاقته نعم إذا وصف بأنه كان وجها في أصحابنا كانت فيه دلالة على الحسن لا محالة والفرق بين الأمرين ظاهر

1 Al-Ḥillī: *al-Khulāṣah*, p. 363, no. 1429.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 7/133, no. 3756, under the biography of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān.



Describing a person as a ‘prominent person’ does not indicate his uprightness (as a narrator), let alone indicating his reliability. Yes, if he is described as being a “prominent person among our companions,” it is, most certainly, indicative of his uprightness. The difference between the two is clear.<sup>1</sup>

The distinction made by al-Khūṭī between the two statements is clear from this.

### 5.5.2 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī regarding those martyred in the path of Allah

Sacrificing one’s life in the path of Allah is an apparent indication of the martyr’s truthfulness of faith. And since the Imāmiyyah did not give any real attention to the issue of a narrator’s precision, they rather rely on a narrator based on his belief or positions. Accordingly, they should also have an opinion on a person who dies in the path of Allah as a martyr. What concerns us is the opinion of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūṭī since, by way of them, we are able to know the difference of opinion of the Shī‘ah on this and other such issues in this regard.

#### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding those martyred in the path of Allah

Jawwād al-Qayyūmī, the editor of al-Ḥillī’s *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* states:

ذكر المؤلف في القسم الأول بعض الرواة اعتمد عليهم لأنهم شهدوا غزوات النبي (صلى الله عليه وآله) أو أمير المؤمنين (عليه السلام) أو قتلوا معهم (عليهم السلام) فإن كان الوجه في الاعتماد حضورهم مشاهدتهم أو شهادتهم معهم (عليهم السلام) ففيه ما لا يخفى وإن كان الوجه أصالة العدالة ففيه مضافاً إلى منع المبني كما مر سابقاً إن حضورهم مشاهدتهم أو الشهادة معهم (عليهم السلام) لا تكشف عن الإيمان بالمعنى الأخص ليبني على عدالة الشهيد من جهة الأصل

The author mentioned several narrators in the first section because they witnessed the battles of the Prophet ﷺ, or Amīr al-Mu’minīn عليه السلام, or

1 Ibid., 8/288, no. 4702 under the biography of Zakariyyā ibn Idrīs. See, as well, biography no. 5440 of Sulaymān ibn Khālid al-Aqṭa’, 9/261; biography no. 13291 of Hāshim ibn Ḥayyān 20/267; and the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Sulaymān in *al-Mufīd min Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* of al-Jawāhirī. p. 8.

because they were killed alongside them عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ. If the reason is because of their presence at such places, or their martyrdom alongside them عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ, then there is nothing hidden in this. And if the reason is because there is a presumption of the narrator's 'adālah, then this, in addition to not having a sound basis (as previously mentioned) means that their attending such places and attaining martyrdom alongside them does not reveal such a unique type of faith so as to build on the martyr's presumed 'adālah.<sup>1</sup>

This clearly shows that the methodology of al-Ḥillī considers the martyrdom of the narrator a reason for accepting his narration because he mentioned everyone who was killed alongside the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or one of the Imāms in the first section, as in the biographies of dozens of narrators.<sup>2</sup>

### The position of al-Khūṭī regarding those martyred in the path of Allah

Al-Khūṭī disagreed with the opinion of al-Ḥillī. He states:

إِنَّ الشَّهَادَةَ مَعَ أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ لَا تَكْشِفُ عَنِ الْإِيمَانِ بِالْمَعْنَى الْأَخْصِ لِيَبْنِي عَلَى عَدَالَةِ الشَّهِيدِ مِنْ جِهَةِ الْأَصْلِ

Martyrdom alongside Amīr al-Mu'minīn عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ does not reveal such a unique type of faith so as to build on the martyr's presumed 'adālah.<sup>3</sup>

Based on the statement of al-Khūṭī, it is possible for us to extrapolate and extend this to the other Imāms and, before them, the Messenger صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If al-Khūṭī

1 Al-Ḥillī: *al-Khulāṣah*, p. 29, under section 'za' entitled "i'tamada al-mu'allif fī tawthīq al-ruwāt wa taḍ'īfihim 'alā umūr".

2 See: biography no. 125 of Ubayy ibn Qays (he was killed on the day of Ṣiffīn), biography no. 126 of Anas ibn al-Ḥārith (he was killed with al-Ḥusayn), biography no. 151 of Bashīr ibn Abī Mas'ūd (he was killed on the day of Ḥarrah), biography no. 145 of al-Bārā' ibn Mālik (he was killed on the day of Tustar), biography no. 175 of Thābit ibn Qays ibn al-Shimās (he was killed on the day of Yamāmah), biography no. 309 of al-Ḥārith ibn Anas al-Ashhal (he was killed on the day of Uḥud), biography no. 420 of Zayd ibn Ṣūhān (he was killed on the day of Jamal among the companions of 'Alī).

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/289, biography no. 1943.

makes tawthīq of one of the narrators described as having been a martyr then, because of what he just stated, the reason goes back to something else, not martyrdom.

### 5.5.3 The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding the person who was a wālī (governor) or wazīr (minister) for the oppressors

Since the position of the Imāmī scholars regarding narrators revolves mostly around their creedal or political positions, and not necessarily based on the narrator's actual precision and accuracy of the narration, we see them questioning the affairs of those who became workers of the unjust khalīfah (in their view), or were his scribes, or acted as a minister (for him). What concerns us in this regard are the opinions of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī.

### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding the person who was a wālī (governor) or wazīr (minister) for the oppressors

Under the biography of Ḥudhayfah ibn Manṣūr, al-Ḥillī states:

روى الكشي حديثا في مدحه أحد رواته محمد بن عيسى وفيه قول ووثقه شيخنا المفيد رحمه الله ومدحه وقال ابن الغضائري حديثه بن منصور بن كثير بن سلمة الخزاعي، أبو محمد روى عن أبي عبد الله وأبي الحسن موسى (عليهما السلام) حديثه غير نقي يروي الصحيح والسقيم وأمره ملتبس ويخرج شاهدا والظاهر عندي التوقف فيه لما قاله هذا الشيخ ولما نقل عنه أنه كان واليا من قبل بني أمية ويعد انفكاكه عن القبيح وقال النجاشي إنه ثقة

Al-Kashshī narrated a ḥadīth in his praise. One of the narrators (in the ḥadīth) is Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā; there is some contention regarding him. Our shaykh, al-Mufid made tawthīq of him and praised him. Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī stated, “Ḥudhayfah ibn Manṣūr ibn Kathīr ibn Salamah al-Khuzāʾī, Abū Muḥammad. He narrated from Abū ʿAbd Allāh and Abū al-Ḥasan عليهما السلام. His aḥādīth are not sound; he narrates authentic and problematic ḥadīth. His situation is ambiguous. His aḥādīth can serve as witness reports. It seems to me that judgement regarding him should be suspended on account of what this scholar said, and because of what was transmitted from him in

that he was a governor for the Banū Umayyah. It is far fetched to detach criticism from him (i.e., in this situation). Al-Najjāshī stated that he is a *thiqah*.<sup>1</sup>

This is explicit from him: governorship for the “unjust” and “oppressive” regimes is a reason to reject the narrator’s ḥadīth and to suspend judgement therein, as is apparent from the text.

### **The position of al-Khūṭī regarding the person who was a *wāli* (governor) or *wazīr* (minister) for the oppressors**

After al-Ḥillī expressed his opinion and did not explain how it is farfetched for a person undertaking a position of governorship—without exception—to detach criticism from a person, al-Khūṭī came along to explain and refute al-Ḥillī stating:

وأما ولايته من قبل بني أمية فلم تثبت بل قول قبل ونقل عنه ولم يعرف الناقل وعلى تقدير صحة النقل فهي لا تنافي الوثيقة بل لا تنافي العدالة أيضا إذا كانت على طبق الميزان الشرعي

As for his role of governorship for the Banū Umayyah, it is not proven. In fact, it was merely an opinion that was expressed (and not necessarily validated). This has been narrated from him; however, the transmitter is not known. Assuming the narration is correct, it does not negate his reliability. In fact, when it is placed on the legal balance, it also does not negate his ‘adālah.<sup>2</sup>

It is understood from the statement of al-Khūṭī that merely undertaking a position of governorship for the unjust does not negate the narrator’s ‘adālah and reliability, on condition that his governorship is in accordance with the legal balance—in his view. If we were to ask al-Khūṭī: What if the role of governorship does not conform to the legal balance? Will this result in him and his narrations being rejected? Based on the opinions of al-Khūṭī, we can extrapolate the fact

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 131, no. 350, section one.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 5/224.

that the governor, if he does not abide to the legal balance, he will be acceptable in narration. Not only that, it is possible for him to be a *thiqah*. This is because, according to al-Khūī, as already mentioned, an act of transgression using the limbs and holding a false belief are both not counted among the reasons for rejecting narrations.

#### 5.5.4. The position of al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding a person who transmitted a narration praising himself

According to the Imāmiyyah, there is a lot of discussion in the books of narrator criticism regarding the issue of whether or not the report of a narrator who praises himself constitutes a *tawthīq* (of himself). Some are of the opinion that the narration of a narrator who praises himself, or gives off a sense of *tawthīq* is accepted. Others, as we will see, suspend judgement on the issue.

#### The position of al-Ḥillī regarding a person who transmitted a narration praising himself

Al-Ḥillī was confused when dealing with this issue. Under the biography of Kulayb ibn Mu‘āwiyah al-Ṣaydāwī, we find him explicitly stating that judgement should be suspended regarding the person who narrates praise of himself. Al-Kashshī narrates:

عن كليب بن معاوية الأسدي قال سمعت أبا عبد الله (ع) يقول و الله إنكم لعلى دين الله و دين ملائكته فأعينوني بورع واجتهاد فوالله ما يتقبل إلا منكم فاتقوا الله وكفوا ألسنتكم وصلوا في مساجدهم فإذا تميز القوم فتميزوا

On the authority of Kulayb ibn Mu‘āwiyah al-Asadī: I heard Abū ‘Abd Allāh saying, “By Allah! Verily, you are all on the religion of Allah, and

---

1 He is the same Kulayb al-Ṣaydāwī because al-Kashshī mentioned the narration under the heading, “What has been narrated regarding Kulayb al-Ṣaydāwī” (p. 339 no. 627). Al-Najjāshī states, “Kulayb ibn Mu‘āwiyah al-Ṣaydāwī al-Asadī” (p. 318 no. 871). Al-Shāharūdī mentioned him in *Mustadrakāt ‘Ilm al-Rijāl* under the heading “Kulayb al-Ṣaydāwī al-Asadī” (6/311).

the religion of His angels. So, assist me with Allah-consciousness and hard work. For, by Allah, He does not accept except from you people. Thus, fear Allah, hold your tongues, and pray in your masājīd. When the people separate, then you too separate.”<sup>1</sup>

Commenting, al-Ḥillī states:

شهادة لنفسه فنحن في تعديله من المتوقفين

A testimony in favour of himself. Thus, regarding his ta’dīl, we suspend judgement.<sup>2</sup>

Al-Ḥillī suspended judgement regarding it because the narrator is the one who narrated a proof of his own tawthīq. Despite this, he included him in the first section!<sup>3</sup>

Under the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Maymūn al-Qaddāh, al-Ḥillī states:

روى الكشي عن حمدويه عن أيوب بن نوح عن صفوان بن يحيى عن أبي خالد القماط عن عبدالله بن ميمون عن أبي جعفر عليه السلام قال يا ابن ميمون كم أنتم بمكة قلت نحن أربعة قال إنكم نور الله في ظلمات الأرض [قال الحلبي معقبا] وهذا لا يفيد العدالة لأنه شهادة منه لنفسه

Al-Kashshī narrated from Ḥamdawayh — from Ayyūb ibn Nūḥ — from Ṣafwān ibn Yaḥyā — from Abū Khālīd al-Qammāt — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Maymūn — from Abū Ja‘far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who said, “O, Ibn Maymūn! How many are you in Makkah?”

I said, “We are four.”

---

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Ikhtiyār Ma‘rifat al-Rijāl (Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, p. 339, no. 628.

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 232, no. 793.

3 Al-Nūrī differed on this issue. In refuting the statement of al-Ḥillī, he states, “It is not in its place. The apparent meaning of it is to submit to what it is indicating towards,” i.e., praise. (*Khātimat al-Mustadrak*, 5/98).

He said, “You are the *nūr* (light) of Allah in the darkness of the earth.”

(Al-Ḥillī comments saying:) This does not suggest (the narrator’s) ‘*adālah* because it is a testimony from him in favour of himself.<sup>1</sup>

We find al-Ḥillī in another place using as proof the narrator who narrates praise of himself, as in the biography of Ḥumrān ibn A‘yan al-Shaybānī:

روى الكشي عن محمد بن الحسن عن أيوب بن نوح عن سعيد العطار عن حمرا بن أعين عن أبي جعفر عليه السلام أنه قال له أنت من شيعتنا في الدنيا والآخرة

Al-Kashshī narrated from Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, from Ayyūb ibn Nūḥ — from Sa‘īd al-‘Aṭṭār — from Ḥumrān ibn A‘yan — from Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام who said to him, “You are from our *shī‘ah* in this world and the hereafter.”<sup>2</sup>

And then he included him in the first section.

The narrator of the praise is the same Ḥumrān ibn A‘yan. Despite that, al-Ḥillī did not say that his statement is a testimony for himself, as has already been mentioned. This shows al-Ḥillī’s confusion on the matter.

### **The position of al-Khūṭī regarding a person who transmitted a narration praising himself**

Al-Khūṭī acts contradictorily on this issue. Despite his explicit statement, reasoning, and mockery of those who infer from a narrator’s narration who praises himself in the narration, we find him also, in another place, inferring from a narrator’s report in which he (i.e., the narrator) praises himself. In explaining his reasoning as to why he rejects the narration of the one who praises himself, al-Khūṭī says:

---

1 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 197, no. 614. Al-Ḥillī included him in the first section and made *tawthīq* of him for reasons other than his own testimony (in favour of himself).

2 Al-Ḥillī: *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl*, p. 134, no. 361.

وربما يستدل بعضهم على وثاقة الرجل أو حسنه برواية ضعيفة أو برواية نفس الرجل وهذا من الغرائب فإن الرواية الضعيفة غير قابلة للاعتماد عليها كما أن في إثبات وثاقة الرجل وحسنه بقول نفسه دورا ظاهرا

Some of them may infer the individual's reliability and goodness by means of a weak narration, or by means of a narration of the individual himself. This is strange! A weak narration is unreliable. Also, in establishing the individual's reliability and goodness by means of his own statement, there is (the logical fallacy of) an apparent<sup>1</sup> cyclic reasoning.<sup>2</sup>

Sarcastically, al-Khūṭ states:

الاستدلال على وثاقة شخص وعظم رتبته بقول نفسه من الغرائب بل من المضحكات

Inferring the reliability of a person and the greatness of his rank by means of his own statement is strange! In fact, it is rather funny.<sup>3</sup>

Despite this, we find al-Khūṭ inferring the tawthīq of Zurārah ibn A'yan by means of several narrations, among them what Zurārah himself narrates from the Imāms in praise of himself. In fact, he states that he is from the people of Jannah. Al-Khūṭ states in the beginning of the narration which he infers the tawthīq of Zurārah:

عن زرارة قال قال لي أبو عبد الله عليه السلام يا زرارة إن اسمك في أسامي أهل الجنة بغير ألف قلت نعم جعلت فداك اسمي عبد ربه ولكنني لقبتم بزرارة

On the authority of Zurārah who said: Abū 'Abd Allāh ﷺ said to me, "O, Zurārah! Among the names of the people of Jannah is yours without an alif?"

---

1 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍlī alludes to the reason why he rejects the narration of a person who praises himself saying, "It is clear that it necessitates cyclic reasoning. This is because the truthfulness of a narration depends on the truthfulness of the narrator. At the same time, establishing the truthfulness of the narrator from the truthfulness of the narration is required. The result of this is that truthfulness of the narrator is dependent on the narrator himself." (*Uṣūl 'ilm al-Rijāl*, p. 157).

2 Al-Khūṭ: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 1/39.

3 Ibid., 1/280, no. 318.



I said, “Yes. May I be sacrificed for you. My name is ‘Abd Rabbihi; however, I was nicknamed Zurārah.”<sup>1</sup>

Thus, despite Zurārah entering Jannah with this narration—which he narrates about himself—we find al-Khūī using it as proof. And he did not say it is “strange,” or “rather funny,” or it necessitates “cyclic reasoning,” as was repeated in several biographies! The only reason is the perceived benefit of making tawthīq of Zurārah, nothing else.

In summary, there is inconsistency from both al-Ḥillī and al-Khūī regarding the narration of a narrator who praises himself!

## 5.6 Principles of al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl established by al-Khūī

Throughout this research, I came across several principles relied upon by al-Khūī in his rulings on narrators. These principles represent various points of benefit related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl. I have not found any explicit text of al-Ḥillī on them. I have agreed for the most part in regards to these principles with the editor of *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* in the valuable introduction. This introduction represents research in which he mentions several opinions of al-Khūī related to the principles of narrator criticism. I will present them in the form of questions posed and responded to by al-Khūī.

### 5.6.1 Beneficial points related to al-Ṣadūq (d. 381 AH)

#### 1. Does al-Ṣadūq’s authentication of the narrator’s report imply his tawthīq?

This is similar to the issue of the earlier generation of scholars’ authentication of a narration: Does it also imply tawthīq of its narrators? In refuting the authentication of al-Ṣadūq of a narration that contains ‘Abd al-Wāḥid ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdūs in its chain, al-Khūī states:

---

1 Ibid., 8/229, no. 4671; al-Kashshī.

كلام الصدوق لا يدل على توثيق عبدالواحد بل و لا على حسنه فإن تصحيح الصدوق خبره غاية أنه يدل على حجيته عنده لأصالة العدالة التي بنى عليها غير واحد أما التوثيق أو المدح فلا يستفاد من كلامه

The statement of al-Ṣadūq does not prove the tawthīq of ‘Abd al-Wāhid; in fact, it does not even prove his uprightness. This is because the most that can be said about al-Ṣadūq’s authentication of his report is that he is, according to him, an authoritative proof by virtue of the presumption of integrity—a principle which more than one scholar has built upon. As for tawthīq, or praise (of the narrator), this cannot be ascertained by his statement.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Does al-Khūī make tawthīq of the narrator whom al-Ṣadūq has a chain for in *Mashyakat al-Faqīh*?

Al-Khūī states:

إن وجود طريق للصدوق إلى رجل لا يدل على مدحه

The existence of a chain (of narration) of al-Ṣadūq to a person does not indicate praise of him.<sup>2</sup>

Under the biography of Muḥammad ibn Sahl ibn Ilyasa’, he states:

وأما حكم المجلسي بأنه ممدوح فالظاهر أنه من جهة أن للصدوق إليه طريقاً وهو لا يدل على المدح

As for the ruling of al-Majlisī that he is praiseworthy, it is apparently based on the fact that al-Ṣadūq has a chain of narration to him. This does not prove (the narrator’s) praiseworthiness.<sup>3</sup>

This is irrespective of whether or not al-Ṣadūq has an authentic or weak chain to the original person. Under the biography of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Muṭahhar, al-Khūī states:

---

1 Al-Khūī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 12/24, no. 7369.

2 Ibid., 10/100, no. 5886. See, as well: p. 38, no. 5749 and 12/245, no. 7846.

3 Ibid., 17/181, no. 10955. See, also: 19/361, no. 12676.

لم يرد في الرجل توثيق ولا مدح وطريق الصدوق إليه وإن كان صحيحاً إلا أنه لا يلزم وثاقة نفس الرجل

There is no mention of tawthīq or praise of the narrator. The chain of narration to al-ṣadūq, even though it is authentic, it does not automatically assume the person is reliable.<sup>1</sup>

### 5.6.2 What is the position of al-Khū'ī regarding the statement of al-Mufīd about the narrator that he has “virtue and well-known traits?”

Al-Khū'ī states:

لا يدل على الحسن فضلاً عن الوثاقة

It is not indicative of his uprightness (i.e., as a narrator), let alone his reliability.<sup>2</sup>

### 5.6.3 Beneficial points related to the position of al-Khū'ī on the earlier generation of scholars

#### 1. When the scholars of the earlier generation authenticate the isnād of a narration, does this necessitate the tawthīq of its narrators?

‘Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī:

الصحة عند القدماء بمعنى مضمونه ثابت بشواهد الاعتماد سواء كان من جهة عدالة السند أم لا فهي عندهم أعم من عدالة الراوي فالاعتماد لا يستلزم وثاقة رجاله إذ لعل صحة الخبر و لاعتماد عليه من جهة القرائن الخارجة عن السند

Authenticity, according to the earlier generation of scholars in its full meaning is established through relying on (different forms of) evidence, whether they are from the perspective of the sanad’s veracity or not. Thus, according to them, it is broader than just the ‘adālah of the narrator.

---

1 Ibid., 3/113, no. 912.

2 Al-Khū'ī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 11/377, no. 7192.

Therefore, reliance (on the narration) does not necessitate reliability of its narrators since the report's authenticity and reliance thereon can be based on circumstantial evidence that is outside of the sanad.<sup>1</sup>

Al-Khūṭ states:

إن تصحيح القدماء لرؤية لا يدل على وثاقة الراوي ولا على حسنه

The authentication of the earlier generation of a narration neither indicates to the reliability of the narrator nor his uprightness.<sup>2</sup>

And he stated:

لا ملازمة بين الحكم بالصحة وبين التوثيق

There is no necessary correlation between a ruling of (a report's) authenticity and tawthīq (of its narrators).<sup>3</sup>

In explaining this position, he states:

إن اعتماد ابن الوليد أو غيره من الأعلام المتقدمين فضلا عن المتأخرين على رواية شخص والحكم بصحتها لا يكشف عن وثاقة الراوي أو حسنه وذلك لاحتمال أن الحاكم بالصحة يعتمد على أصالة العدالة ويرى حجية كل رواية يرويها مؤمن لم يظهر منه فسق وهذا لا يفيد من يعتبر وثاقة الراوي أو حسنه في حجية خبره

Ibn al-Walīd or other earlier notables' reliance on (in addition to the latter-day ones) the narration of a person and judging it to be authentic does not reveal the reliability of the narrator nor his uprightness. This is because it is possible the person judging the narration to be authentic relied on the (principle of) presumption of 'adālah and regards every narration narrated by a believer who does not appear to be guilty of any outward

1 'Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī: *Takmilat al-Rijāl*, 2/125.

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 4/96, no. 1439.

3 Ibid., 16/99, no. 10264.

sin as authoritative. This is of no benefit to the person who considers the reliability or uprightness of a narrator based on the authoritative value of his report.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Does the reliance of the earlier generation of scholars on a narrator imply his tawthīq?

Al-Khūṭ states:

إن اعتماد القدماء على رجل لا يدل على وثاقته ولا على حسنه

The reliance of the earlier generation of scholars on a person neither proves his reliability nor his uprightness.<sup>2</sup>

## 3. Al-Najjāshī and al-Ṭūsī narrating from a person; does this prove his tawthīq?

Al-Khūṭ states:

مجرد نقل النجاشي والشيخ [الطوسي] لا يدل على وثاقته

Al-Najjāshī and al-Shaykh (al-Ṭūsī) merely narrating (from a person) does not prove his reliability.<sup>3</sup>

## 5.7 Miscellaneous beneficial points related to al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl touched on by al-Khūṭ

### 1. Does the narration used in the pronouncement of a legal ruling imply the tawthīq of its narrators?

Al-Khūṭ states:

---

1 Ibid., 1/70.

2 Ibid., 4/353, no. 2054.

3 Ibid. 16/72, no. 10221.

أما كون روايته يفتي بها فهو على تقدير تسليمه لا يدل على وثاقة الراوي كما هو ظاهر

As for his narration being used to pass a legal ruling, it is—assuming it is accepted—not indicative, evidently, of the narrator’s reliability.<sup>1</sup>

## **2. Is the narrator’s expertise in (the art of) debating and argumentation advantageous to him such that his tawthīq and uprightness is established because of it?**

Al-Khūṭī states:

لا ملازمة بين أن يكون الرجل قويا في الجدل و المناظرة وأن يكون ثقة في أقواله

There is no necessary correlation between the narrator possessing proficiency in (the art of) debating and argumentation and him being reliable in his statements.<sup>2</sup>

## **3. Is the fact that a notable scholar narrated from a person indicative of his tawthīq?**

Al-Khūṭī states:

مر غير مرة أن رواية الأعظم عن شخص لا تدل على وثاقته ولا على عدالته

It has already been mentioned on more than one occasion that the fact of a notable scholar narrating from a person neither indicates the latter’s reliability nor his ‘adālah.<sup>3</sup>

## **4. When an infallible says to a narrator, “Your opinion is in conformity with the Sunnah,” does it imply his tawthīq?**

Al-Khūṭī states:

---

1 Ibid., 10/280, no. 6240.

2 Ibid., 10/279, no. 6240.

3 Ibid., 17/181, no. 10955.

هذا لا يدل على شيء من الوثاقة أو الحسن

This indicates to nothing of his reliability and uprightness.<sup>1</sup>

## 5. The position of al-Khūṭī regarding a narrator described with possessing a great deal of etiquette, virtue, knowledge, and an elevated standing

Al-Khūṭī states:

الرجل ضعيف لا يعتمد على روايته... ولا ينافي ذلك كثرة أدبه و فضله وعلمه وكبر منزلته فإن ذلك أمر  
و الوثاقة في الحديث أمر آخر

The narrator is weak. His narration is not to be relied upon... This does not negate the fact that he is very well-mannered, virtuous, knowledgeable, and of a high standing. This is one thing. And reliability in ḥadīth is another.<sup>2</sup>

Regarding the narrator about whom it is said that he is “*fāḍil* (virtuous)”, al-Khūṭī states:

أن الفضل لا يعد مدحا في الراوي بما هو راو وإنما هو مدح للرجل في نفسه باعتبار اتصافه بالكمالات

Virtuousness is not regarded as praise of the narrator in what he narrates; rather, it is praise of the individual himself such that he is described with (qualities of) perfection.<sup>3</sup>

Under the biography of Khaythamah ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, al-Khūṭī states:

الرجل من الحسان لا لما ذكره العقيقي من أنه كان فاضلا فإنه لا يدل على الحسن على أن العقيقي لم تثبت  
وثاقته بل لما ذكره النجاشي من أن بسطاما كان وجهها في أصحابنا وأبوه وعمومته فإن توصيف عمومة  
بسطام بذلك مدح يقرب من التوثيق، فإن كون رجل وجهها في الأصحاب والرواة مرتبة عظيمة من الجلالة

1 Ibid., 11/10, no. 6490.

2 Ibid., 16/167-168, no. 10396.

3 Ibid., 13/172, no. 8475.

The man (i.e., Khaythamah) is among the upright (narrators), not because of what al-‘Aqīqī mentioned in that he is virtuous; this does not indicate uprightness. Even still, al-‘Aqīqī did not verify his reliability. In fact, when al-Najjāshī mentioned him when he said that “Biṣṭām was a prominent figure among our companions—as was his father and uncles!” then such a description of Biṣṭām’s uncles is a form of praise that is close to tawḥīq. A man being prominent among the companions and narrators is a great status.<sup>2</sup>

## 6. The position of al-Khūṭī regarding a reliable scholar transmitting words of criticism of a narrator without mentioning the critic’s name. For example, it is said of him that he is “accused of being weak,” and we do not know who accused him.

Under the biography of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Ḥammād, al-Najjāshī states:

رَمِيَ بِالضَّعْفِ وَالْعُلُوِّ

He was accused of being weak and holding extreme views.<sup>3</sup>

Despite the fact that the person transmitting the criticism is al-Najjāshī (the most precise of men, by them), we find al-Khūṭī commenting:

وأما قول النجاشي رمي بالضعف والعلو فلم يظهر أنه أراد بذلك ابن الغضائري فإن النجاشي ممن يعتمد على قول ابن الغضائري وهو شيخه فلا وجه لعدم ذكر اسمه ونسبة الرمي إلى مجهول إذن لا يعتمد على الرمي المزبور لجهالة فالرجل المترجم لم يثبت ضعفه

As for al-Najjāshī’s statement, “He was accused of being weak and holding extreme views,” it is not clear that he intended (as the critic) Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī thereby. This is because al-Najjāshī is among those who rely on

---

1 Khaythamah was the uncle of Biṣṭām. [Translator’s note]

2 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 8/86, no. 4357.

3 Al-Najjāshī: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 238, no. 633.



the statements of Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī—and he is his teacher. As such, there is no reason for not mentioning his name and attributing the accusation to an unknown person. Consequently, because the accusation against the narrator is from an unknown, it cannot be relied upon. Therefore, the weakness of the narrator in question is not proven.<sup>1</sup>

Of note, 'Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī states under the biography of 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḥājj:

لم يرمه بالكيسانية أحد ممن علم بشخصه ونسبه إنما نقل ذلك النجاشي عن من هو غير معلوم فلا يتحقق بذلك

Nobody who has knowledge of him and his ancestry accused him of being from the Kaysāniyyah. Al-Najjāshī was the only one to narrate that from someone who is unknown. Therefore, it cannot be established as being true.<sup>2</sup>

## 7. Is the Imām's making the narrator a messenger and his requesting the infallible for counsel indicative of his tawthīq?

Al-Khūṭī states:

إن شيئاً من ذلك لا يدل على الوثاقة إذ لا يعتبر في الرسول أن يكون موثقاً في جميع أخباره ولا دلالة في طلب الوصية على عدالة الرجل وجلالته

None of that is indicative of reliability since the messenger (i.e., of an Imām) is not considered reliable in all of his reports. And there is no indication in (his) seeking counsel of the person's 'adālah and loftiness.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 10/318, no. 6334. See also: *Mustadrakāt 'Ilm al-Rijāl* of al-Shāharūdī, 1/81 under the biography of Ādam ibn Muḥammad al-Qalānisi, no. 7. Al-Shāharūdī commented on the statement of al-Ṭūsī, "He used to believe in *tafwīd* (relegating meanings to Allah)" saying, "Al-Shaykh narrated this in *al-Rijāl*. He did not specify who the person saying it is because such a person, and the saying is unknown." (*Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*, p. 406, *Bāb Man lam yarwi 'an wāhid min al-A'immah*, biography no. 5, no. 5924.

2 'Abd al-Nabī al-Kāzīmī: *Takmilat al-Rijāl*, 2/32.

3 Al-Khūṭī: *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth*, 14/112, no. 8928.

## 8. The significance of the scholars' statement “*maskūn al-riwāyah*” in the view of al-Khūṭī

Al-Khūṭī states:

مرادف للوثوق

Synonymous to *wuthūq* (reliability).<sup>1</sup>

## 9. Al-Khūṭī's position on describing the narrator as “*mustaqīm*”

Under the biography of Ṭāhir ibn Ḥātim al-Qazwīnī, al-Khūṭī states:

الكلام في روايته حال استقامته والظاهر أنها لا تقبل أيضا لعدم ثبوت وثاقته والاستقامة بمجرد ما لا تكفي في حجية الرواية

The discussion is regarding his narration while possessing *istiqāmah* (uprightness). It appears that this, too, is not acceptable since his reliability is not proven. *Istiqāmah*, or being upright itself is not sufficient in establishing authoritative value of a narration.<sup>2</sup>

Complete, by the grace of Allah.



---

1 Ibid., 16/134, no. 10325. See: *Rijāl al-Najjāshī*, p. 394, no. 1052.

2 Ibid., 10/171, no. 5999.