

SUNNĪ-SHĪ‘Ī INTERACTION IN THE EARLY PERIOD
– The Transition of the Chains of Ahl al-Sunna to the Shī‘a –

Bekir Kuzudişli
Istanbul University, Istanbul-Turkey

Abstract

The objective of this study is to examine when and by whom Sunnī narrations (*isnāds*) such as “companion > successor...” were incorporated within the Shī‘ī ḥadīth canons, even though these references are rarely seen in the Shī‘ī tradition. This study does not merely reveal how the mentioned chains/*isnāds* passed from Ahl al-sunna to the Shī‘a but also provides significant ideas with regard to the historical journey of the Shī‘ī ḥadīth narrative (*riwāya*). Thus, I hope to obtain clues about the origins of certain narratives that the Shī‘a consider critical of Ahl al-sunna but that cannot be proven by Sunnī sources. To remain loyal to the limits of this study, I will compare the chapters “Thawāb al-a‘māl wa-‘iqāb al-a‘māl” within *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn* by al-Barqī, who treats the era of the eleventh imām and *al-Ghayba al-ṣuġbrā* (The Lesser Occultation), and *Thawāb al-a‘māl wa-‘iqāb al-a‘māl* by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, who conducted his scholarly life during *al-Ghayba al-kubrā* (The Greater Occultation) period, with regard to the use of Sunnī chains. These two works are especially important because they reflect tendencies both before and after the Greater Occultation.

Key Words: Al-Barqī, *Thawāb al-a‘māl*, Shī‘a, Shī‘ī ḥadīth, Sunnī ḥadīth

Introduction

One of the most notable features of the narratives in Shī'ī sources that differentiate them from those in Sunnī sources is that, for almost one and a half centuries, ḥadīths were transmitted by Imāms rather than by companions or successors. Moreover, even though the narratives are transmitted from one of the twelve Imāms and not attributed to the Prophet in terms of form, they are considered to come from the latter. An overview of the four canonical books of the Shī'ā, namely, *al-Kāfi* by al-Kulaynī (d. 329/940), *Man lā yaḥḍurub^ī l-faḥḥ* by Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381/991), known as al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, and *Tabdhīb al-ahkām* and *al-Istibṣār* by al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067), shows that Shī'ī scholars often pride themselves on the fact that the ḥadīths in their sources generally come through infallible Imāms who obtained this knowledge not from companions or successors but directly from the Prophet himself.¹

At this point, it is worth noting that the ḥadīths narrated by these infallible Imāms take place in books oriented toward Shī'ī readers, whereas in polemical works against Ahl al-sunna by, for example, al-Faḥḥ ibn Shādhān (d. 260/873) and al-Ṭabarī al-Shī'ī (d. early IVth/Xth century),² there are many narratives from companions and successors that are structured to convince the reader.³ Nevertheless, the narrations in these works quote narrators of the 2nd century AH together with expressions such as “*mā rawaytum*/what you narrate” or even “*rawā fulān^{um}*/someone narrated.” It is unclear how these narrations, which were most likely transmitted through one or more narrators, reached the author.⁴ Thus, it is difficult to generate an idea by means of chains in these books.

¹ Ḥasan ibn Hādī al-Ṣadr, *Nibāyat al-dirāya fī sbarḥ al-risāla al-mawsūma bi-l-Wajiza li-l-Babā'ī* (ed. Mājid al-Gharbāwī; Qom: Nashr al-Mash'ar, n.d.), 517.

² In some cases, even though the book does not bear a polemical objective, Sunnī chains are used for responses to Ahl al-sunna; al-Ṣadūq, *al-Khiṣāl* (ed. 'Alī Akbar al-Ghaffārī, Qom: Jamā'at al-Mudarrisīn, 1983), 498.

³ Accordingly, al-Faḥḥ says the following at one point: “Narratives mentioned here are their [Ahl al-sunna's] own transmissions. There is no ḥadīth coming through Ahl al-bayt or Shī'ī scholars here.”; al-Faḥḥ ibn Shādhān, *al-Idāḥ* (ed. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Urmawī; Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tehrān, 1984), 92-93.

⁴ Al-Faḥḥ ibn Shādhān uses the expression “*ḥaddathānā*/he narrated us” three times. He cites these ḥadīths from al-Ḥumaydī, Ibn Abī Surayj, and Ishāq; see *ibid.*, 359, 366, and 373, respectively.

As noted above, in ḥadīth sources addressing Shī'ī readers, narrations are transferred via Imāms. On rare occasions these books present narrations through the line “the Prophet > companion > successor,” like those in Sunnī books. Therefore, this study analyzes the Ahl al-sunna chains that continue via the “Prophet > companion > successor” channel and not by means of Imāms in Shī'ī sources. Our objective is to discover what type of ḥadīth is conveyed (i.e., whether or not these ḥadīths are about virtues of Ahl al-bayt) and when and by whom such companion-origin chains were incorporated into Shī'ī ḥadīth circles. Thus, I will examine whether the narration interactions between the two-ḥadīth circles are accurate. Based on this work, I will present an opinion about the origin of claims by classic and modern Shī'ī scholars that companions and successors fabricated ḥadīths against 'Alī and Ahl al-bayt, even though no such evidence is confirmed by Sunnī sources.

Ahl al-sunna chains can be found dispersed in many Shī'ī sources. To determine the limits of this article, however, I will confine the discussions to a comparison between the chapter “Thawāb al-a'māl wa-'iqāb al-a'māl” in *al-Maḥāsīn* by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khālīd al-Barqī (d. 274/887), who lived in the era of the eleventh imām Ḥasan al-'Askarī (d. 260/864) and during the period of the Lesser Occultation (260-329/864-941), and the book also titled *Thawāb al-a'māl wa-'iqāb al-a'māl* by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq. The two books are chosen because they treat the same subject, enable a relatively easy comparison of differences, and provide traces of periods before and after the Lesser Occultation. Whereas al-Barqī lived during the era of Imāms and the Lesser Occultation, the entire scholarly career of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq coincides with the first century of the Greater Occultation. Therefore, I will have the opportunity to examine whether the Occultation period produced any change in ideas with respect to Sunnī chains of narrators.

Use of Sunnī Chains by al-Barqī and al-Ṣadūq within the scope of *Thawāb al-a'māl wa-'iqāb al-a'māl*

Al-Maḥāsīn is a 3rd century AH work on Shī'a, written during the Lesser Occultation by al-Barqī about, among other things, the reward (*thawāb*) and the punishment (*'iqāb*) for human deeds. As the title reveals, the book lists chapters on various sins or rewards based on

deeds. Al-Barqī provides one hundred and twenty-three chapters for rewards of good deeds⁵ and seventy chapters regarding the punishment of evil deeds.⁶ There are a total of 295 ḥadīths on both matters.⁷

In contrast, in his *Thawāb al-a‘māl wa-‘iqāb al-a‘māl*, written as a separate volume, al-Sheikh al-Şadūq mentions three hundred and eighty-nine chapters for rewards of good deeds and one hundred and thirty-one for punishments of evil deeds. The total number of ḥadīths quoted by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq is one thousand one hundred and eighteen. In addition to the content of the work by al-Barqī, al-Sheikh al-Şadūq incorporates various titles in his book, such as narratives regarding what reward a person who reads every *sūra* will obtain.⁸

Both works intensely use Ahl al-bayt chains. Nevertheless, Sunnī chains exist as well. Moreover, there is an explicit difference between the two works with respect to the use of Ahl al-sunna chains. Al-Barqī mentions only seven Sunnī chains in relevant chapters,⁹ whereas this figure rises to approximately sixty in the work by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq.¹⁰ Two ḥadīths transmitted by al-Barqī are quoted by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq as well. Even though the number of ḥadīths quoted by the two authors is different, the frequency and proportion of Ahl al-sunna chains, namely, those via the “companion > successor...” channel, are remarkably higher in the work of al-Sheikh al-Şadūq. This may be interpreted as a sign that the works after the Greater Occultation more intensely include Ahl al-sunna chains than those before it.

⁵ Abū Ja‘far Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn* (ed. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1370), I, 21-25.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 75-77.

⁷ A total of 152 of these ḥadīths are in “Thawāb al-a‘māl;” *ibid.*, I, 72), whereas 143 are in “‘Iqāb al-a‘māl;” *ibid.*, I, 125).

⁸ Al-Şadūq, *Thawāb al-a‘māl wa-‘iqāb al-a‘māl* (ed. Ḥusayn al-A‘lamī; Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-A‘lamī li-l-Maṭbū‘āt, 1989), 132 ff. (hereafter referred to as *Thawāb al-a‘māl*).

⁹ Al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, I, 30, 54, 57, 61, 93, 119.

¹⁰ Al-Şadūq, *Thawāb al-a‘māl*, 20 (two narratives), 21 (two narratives), 22 (two narratives), 24, 25 (three narratives), 26, 30, 39, 44 (two narratives), 45, 54, 73, 80, 89 (two narratives), 90 (three narratives), 93, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104 (four narratives), 134, 147, 168, 183 (two narratives), 196, 216 (two narratives), 217 (two narratives), 225, 233, 237, 238, 239, 241, 246, 258, 263, 265 (two narratives), 271, 274, 304, 305, 307, 317, 328.

In contrast, the mentioned work by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq displays a diversification regarding the names of companions from whom ḥadīths are quoted. The book includes chains by means of Anas ibn Mālik, Abū Hurayra, Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbbās, Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh, Zayd ibn Arqam, Ḥudhayfa, Sahl ibn Saʿd al-Anṣārī, Uthāma ibn Zayd, Umm Salama, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd, Ubayy ibn Kaʿb, and other *ṣaḥābīs*. Nevertheless, al-Barqī mentions the names of only three *ṣaḥābīs* in the relevant chapter of his book.¹¹ Furthermore, he only quotes ḥadīths from Salmān, Abū Barza, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, Jābir ibn ʿAbd Allāh, ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbbās, and Anas ibn Mālik in the entire book of two volumes.¹² Therefore, it is interesting that in his work, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq gives a place to persons such as ʿĀʾisha and Abū Hurayra, who are severely criticized by the Shīʿīs, in addition to persons about whom the Shīʿī tradition has less intense negative beliefs.¹³ Moreover, the aforesaid narrations generally comprise ḥadīths on the ethereal return of a deed and not those praising ʿAlī or the Ahl al-bayt, which would be more expected in a Shīʿī source. This can be considered a sign of an increase not only in Sunnī-based chains but also in the number of quoted names of companions after the Occultation.

At this stage, it seems meaningful to ask how the narratives that came through the line “companion > successor” made the transition to Shīʿī ḥadīth literature. In other words, how and in what way can a narrative told by Sunnī narrators be obtained and quoted by Shīʿī scholars who primarily focus only on ḥadīths through Imāms? An analysis of references in the work by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq reveals two patterns. First, there are chains preserved by Shīʿī narrators from the second half of the 2nd to beginning of the 3rd century AH. Second, there are chains entirely preserved by Ahl al-sunna narrators until the time of al-Ṣadūq or his teachers. I will now examine these chains.

¹¹ They are Abū Barza, Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī, and Salmān. Other chains are *mursal*. See al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, I, 61, 104, 119.

¹² *Ibid.*, II, 333, 441, 487, 515 ff.

¹³ Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 80, 101, 328.

1. Chains Preserved by Shī'ī Narrators during the Middle of the Second Half of 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd Centuries AH

In the work of al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, there are some Sunnī *isnāds* maintained by Shī'ī narrators as of the middle of the second half of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd century AH. The best way to determine how this transition between circles took place may be to study the narrators in *ṭarīqs* through both Sunnī and Shī'ī *rijāl* sources. Indeed, as I will explain below, both Sunnī and Shī'ī *rijāl* literature used to quote the early narrators; however, after a certain point, the narrators are mentioned only in Shī'ī *rijāl* sources and not in Sunnī ones. Below, in consideration of the relatively often repeated chains in the work of al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, I will focus on these transitions and the narrators who made such transitions possible and will analyze the positions of the persons who are believed to have enabled the transition between Sunnī and Shī'ī links.

a. Sayf ibn 'Amīra Narratives

In the work by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, the most repeated narrative (5 times) from a *şahābī* is the *ṭarīq* transferred via "...Sayf ibn 'Amīra > his son Ḥusayn > his brother 'Alī..." or "his son 'Alī > his brother Ḥusayn..." It is the chain with the greatest representative meaning.¹⁴ For example, one of these narratives is recorded by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq as follows:

As narrated via chain of Muḥammad > 'Amr ibn 'Abasa al-Sulamī > Shahr ibn Ḥawshab > 'Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām > Sayf ibn 'Amīra¹⁵ > his son Ḥusayn > his brother 'Alī ibn Sayf > Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā > 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far al-Ḥimyarī > al-Şadūq's father > al-Şadūq, Rasūl Allāh spoke as follows: "If any Muslim man has three children and they die prior to reaching the age of puberty before him,

¹⁴ For narratives, see al-Şadūq, *Thawāb al-a'māl*, 20, 25, 30, 232, 233.

¹⁵ For the name record, see al-'Allāma Ibn al-Muṭahhar Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yūsūf al-Ḥillī, *Īdāḥ al-isbtibāb* (ed. Sheikh Muḥammad al-Ḥassūn; Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1990), 194. The name is marked with a vowel-point as "Umayra" in *Taqrīb* by Ibn Ḥajar as edited by Muḥammad 'Awwāma (Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb* [ed. Muḥammad 'Awwāma; n.p.: Dār al-Rashīd, 1986], 262). 'Awwād Ma'rūf and Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūṭ oppose and argue that the correct version should be "'Amīra." See Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūṭ and 'Awwād Ma'rūf, *Ṭabrīr Taqrīb al-Ṭabdhīb* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1997), II, 101.

or if any Muslim woman has three children and they die prior to reaching the age of puberty before her, these children will be a shield for their parents against the Fire.”¹⁶

This narrative is more common in Sunnī ḥadīth books than in Shīʿī sources. In Sunnī sources, the ḥadīth is quoted through Anas ibn Mālīk, Abū Hurayra, and other *ṣaḥābīs* via similar expressions; nevertheless, as in the narrative by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, it is also quoted by means of ʿAmr ibn ʿAbasa al-Sulamī. Among the narratives cited from ʿAmr ibn ʿAbasa,¹⁷ the following chain, narrated by Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) and ʿAbd ibn Ḥumayd (d. 249/863), is interesting in terms of our theme:

“ʿAmr ibn ʿAbasa al-Sulamī > Abū Zabya¹⁸ > Shahr (ibn Ḥawshab) > ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd (ibn Bahrām)...”¹⁹

Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal takes the aforementioned ḥadīth from ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām through Hāshim (ibn al-Qāsim),²⁰ whereas ʿAbd ibn Ḥumayd narrates it via Aḥmad ibn Yūnus.²¹ The texts given by both authors are mostly similar and compatible with the narration by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq. The only difference in the chain is that the narrator between ʿAmr ibn ʿAbasa and Shahr is not mentioned in al-Ṣadūq’s version. This may be due to either the copyists of the book or the providence of one of the narrators in the chain of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq. After ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq transmits the narration through Sayf ibn ʿAmīra, a frequent name in *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*. Therefore, this narrator indicates a separation point between Sunnī and Shīʿī links. Accordingly, I must take into account the biographies of the narrators to determine whether the narrative

¹⁶ Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 232-233.

¹⁷ Al-Ṭabarānī, Abū I-Qāsim Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad, *al-Muʿjam al-ṣagḥīr* (Beirut & ʿAmmān: al-Maktab al-Islāmī & Dār ʿAmmār, 1985), II, 239; id., *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Salafī; Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1989), I, 377.

¹⁸ For the name record, see Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Taqrīb*, 652.

¹⁹ Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad* (ed. Shuʿayb al-Arnāʿūṭ; Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risāla, 1988), XXXII, 185; ʿAbd ibn Ḥumayd, *Muntakhab min Musnad* (eds. Ṣubḥī al-Badrī al-Sāmarrāʿī and Maḥmūd Khalīl al-Saʿīdī, Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1988), 125.

²⁰ Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, XXXII, 185.

²¹ ʿAbd ibn Ḥumayd, *Muntakhab*, 125.

through ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām and Sayf ibn ‘Amīra is subject to a transition from the Sunnī to the Shī‘ī chain.

Sunnī rijāl sources depict ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām as the narrator of Shahr ibn Ḥawshab. Moreover, it is reported that Ibn Bahrām has no narratives from anyone except for a ḥadīth on prayers quoted from ‘Āṣim al-Aḥwal. Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal explains the relationship between Ibn Bahrām and Shahr as follows: “Ibn Bahrām had memorized ḥadīths of Shahr ibn Ḥawshab as if he memorized a sūra of the Qur’ān. The narratives were seventy lengthy ḥadīths.”²² Despite certain disputes on his behalf, ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām is generally considered a reliable narrator, although some scholars criticize him because of Shahr ibn Ḥawshab, who is a controversial narrator. For example, with regard to the *munkar* narratives, al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1070) claims that the problem originates from Shahr, and ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd has no fault.²³ Narratives by ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām are mentioned by al-Tirmidhī (d. 279/892) and Ibn Māja (d. 273/877) in *al-Kutub al-sitta*; al-Bukhārī (d. 256/869) also incorporated them within his *al-Adab al-mufrad*.²⁴ The important point in the biography of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām is the lack of information about his relation to the Shī‘a. In any event, the fact that Shī‘ī biographical literature almost never mentions him implies that he is a narrator who is only quoted in Ahl al-sunna circles.²⁵

As for Sayf ibn ‘Amīra, a frequent name in the chains of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, he is a narrator mentioned in both Sunnī and Shī‘ī biographical works. Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449) mentions Sayf ibn ‘Amīra in the title of *tamyīz* in his *al-Tabdhīb* and quoted the *jarḥ* of al-Azdī

²² Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *al-Jarḥ wa-l-ta’dīl* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1952), VI, 8; Abū l-Ḥajjāj Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Yūsuf al-Mizzī, *Tabdhīb al-Kamāl fī asmā’ al-rijāl* (ed. Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma’rūf, Beirut: Mu’assasat al-Risāla, 1983), XVI, 411.

²³ Al-Mizzī, *Tabdhīb al-Kamāl*, XVI, 412 ff.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 413.

²⁵ Indeed, according to Sheikh ‘Alī al-Namāzī, al-Sheikh al-Ṭūsī mentions the name of ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām in *al-Amālī* as a narrator and master of Yūnus ibn Bukayr, who in turn is a disciple of Shahr. However, al-Ṭūsī asserts that Shī‘ī biographies provide no information about Ibn Bahrām; ‘Alī al-Namāzī Shāhrūdī, *Mustadrakāt ‘ilm rijāl al-ḥadīth* (ed. Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-Namāzī, Tehran: Shafaq, 1991), IV, 373.

(d. 374/985) as “They criticized him.”²⁶ In contrast, Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965) writes his name in *Kitāb al-thiqāt*, noting, “He narrated *gharīb* ḥadīths.”²⁷ Ibn Ḥajar himself defines Sayf as a “*ṣadūq* narrator with some *wahms*.”²⁸ As a result, assessments about Sayf do not include any implication of his being Shī'ī. However, Sunnī sources relate that Abān ibn Taghlib, one of Sayf's teachers, was a renowned Shī'ī.²⁹

Shī'ī sources esteem Sayf ibn 'Amīra among the companions of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and Mūsā al-Kāzim.³⁰ According to Khū'ī, “In many chains, he is mentioned as Sayf ibn 'Amīra. There are up to 297 chains including his name.” This information indicates that his narratives were quoted more often in Shī'ī books than in Sunnī sources.³¹ Sayf ibn 'Amīra is often quoted and considered reliable by, among others, al-Najāshī (d. 450/1048),³² al-Ṭūsī,³³ and Ibn Shahrāshūb (d. 588/1192).³⁴ Only Ibn Shahrāshūb states that he was a Wāqifi, and this is most likely why al-Shahīd al-Thānī (d. 967/1559) considers him unreliable.³⁵ Nevertheless, because he is reported as a

²⁶ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tabdīb al-Tabdīb* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1984), IV, 260.

²⁷ Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī, *Kitāb al-thiqāt* (ed. al-Sayyid Sharaf al-Dīn Aḥmad; Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1975), VIII, 299-300.

²⁸ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Taqrīb*, 262.

²⁹ See Abū 'Abd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Uthmān al-Dhababī, *Mizān al-ʿitidāl fī naqd al-rijāl* (ed. 'Alī Muḥammad Mu'awwaḍ and 'Ādil Aḥmad 'Abd al-Mawjūd; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1995), I, 5.

³⁰ Khū'ī, Abū I-Qāsim ibn 'Alī Akbar, *Mu'jam rijāl al-ḥadīth wa-taḥṣīl ṭabaqāt al-ruwāt* (5th edn., n.p.: 1992), IX, 382.

³¹ Khū'ī, *Mu'jam*, IX, 384.

³² Abū I-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Najāshī, *Fibrīst asmā' muṣannifi l-Shī'a al-mushtabar bi-rijāl al-Najāshī* (ed. Mūsā al-Zanjānī; 5th edn., Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1995), 189. As Khū'ī indicates, the term “reliable” is not present in some copies from al-Najāshī. However, certain Shī'ī scholars mention the word “reliable” for al-Najāshī's book, whereupon the said word should be present in his book (Khū'ī, *Mu'jam*, IX, 382).

³³ Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fibrīst* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī, n.p.: Mu'assasat Nashr al-Faqāha, 1997), 140.

³⁴ Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, *Kbulāṣat al-aqwāl fī ma'rīfat al-rijāl* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī; Qom: Mu'assasat Nashr al-Fuqāhā, 1996), 160; al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, *Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd* (ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āl Baḥr al-ʿulūm; Najaf: al-Maṭba'at al-Ḥaydariyya, 1972), 108; Khū'ī, *Mu'jam*, IX, 382.

³⁵ Khū'ī, *Mu'jam*, IX, 383.

companion of ʿAlī al-Riḍā, he cannot be a Wāqifi; furthermore, it is theoretically controversial to deem a person an unreliable source only because he is a Wāqifi.³⁶

In contrast, the isnāds of Sayf ibn ʿAmīra mentioned by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq,³⁷ al-Najāshī,³⁸ and al-Ṭūsī³⁹ hint that Sayf had a book that reached the time of the mentioned scholars. This fact explains his influence among Shīʿī circles.

Sunnī biographical sources have little information about al-Ḥusayn and ʿAlī, the two sons of Sayf ibn ʿAmīra. Only Ibn Ḥajar relates the following about al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf in *Lisān al-mizān*:

Al-Ṭūsī mentioned him among Shīʿī narrators. He is the brother of ʿAlī ibn Sayf. Al-Ḥusayn was more knowledgeable (about Shīʿa) than his brother and had more sheikhs. He journeyed (*riḥla*) to al-Baṣra and al-Kūfa. He knew about fiqh and ḥadīth. Al-Ḥusayn narrated ḥadīths via ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥakam and others.⁴⁰

Unlike previous literature on the unreliable narrators, Ibn Ḥajar gives a place in his *Lisān* to Shīʿī transmitters who are not mentioned in Sunnī sources.⁴¹ However, this only means a type of transmission, not that the narrator in question is present in a Sunnī source.

Shīʿī biographies record ʿAlī ibn Sayf as a reliable narrator.⁴² He is among the companions of ʿAlī al-Riḍā, and al-Najāshī wrote that a voluminous book was narrated from ʿAlī ibn Sayf by quoting its *isnād*.⁴³ Moreover, his name is seen more than twenty-three times in relevant chains as an indicator of his presence in Shīʿī circles.⁴⁴

³⁶ *Ibid.*, IX, 383. The author thinks that a person can be reliable regardless of being a Wāqifi.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, IX, 383.

³⁸ Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 189.

³⁹ Al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fibrīst*, 140.

⁴⁰ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Lisān al-Mizān* (eds. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda and Salmān ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda; Beirut: Maktabat al-Matbūʿāt al-Islāmiyya, 2002), III, 170.

⁴¹ Macit Karagözoğlu, *Zayıf Raviler: Duafâ Literatürü ve Zayıf Rivayetler* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2014), 179.

⁴² For ʿAlī ibn Sayf, see al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 278; Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, *Kbulāṣa*, 189; Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, *Rijāl*, 139.

⁴³ Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 278.

⁴⁴ Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, XIII, 61.

His brother al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf is said to have two books. Al-Ḥusayn cites one of the books from his brother ʿAlī and the other from various persons.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, Shīʿī sources include nothing that says that al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf is reliable. Moreover, words by Ibn Ḥajar with reference to al-Ṭūsī are not available in present sources. This is either because Ibn Ḥajar referred to another source or due to confusion during transmission.⁴⁶

A collective reflection on the previously analyzed narrators reveals that narrators before ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām did not appear very often in Shīʿī ḥadīth sources; rather, they were known through ḥadīth narratives in Sunnī circles. Sayf ibn ʿAmīra, however, turns the tide. Indeed, Sunnī literature includes little information about Sayf, whereas Shīʿī biographical works tell about him extensively. His two sons, ʿAlī and al-Ḥusayn, are almost completely overlooked in Sunnī books; thus, I can say that the chain entirely shifted to the Shīʿī circle.

Therefore, this ḥadīth, which is recorded under the chain of “ʿAmr ibn ʿAbasa al-Sulamī > (Abū Ḥabīb) Shahr ibn Ḥawshab > ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām...” and is often quoted from other *ṣaḥāba*, passed to Shīʿī circles by means of Sayf ibn ʿAmīra due to his relationship with the Sunnī circle. From then on, the ḥadīth was preserved and incorporated by Shīʿī narrators as well. In fact, the person to maintain this ḥadīth after ʿAlī and al-Ḥusayn, the sons of Sayf, was Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā (d. 3rd/9th century), one of the greatest Shīʿī scholars of Qom province whose *Kitāb al-nawādir* has reached the present day. Accordingly, in addition to the Shīʿī world, Ibn Ḥajar says the following about his fame: “Abū Jaʿfar ʿAḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Saʿd al-ʿAllāma. He was the sheikh of *Rāfiḍīs* in Qom. He is well-known for his works...”⁴⁷

ʿAbd Allāh ibn Jaʿfar al-Ḥimyarī (d. 300/912), who is given in the chain by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq as the narrator to ʿAḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, was also a prominent scholar of Qom province and wrote about points of distinction in Shīʿa in works such as *Kitāb al-imāma*, *Kitāb al-ghayba wa-l-ḥayra*, *Kitāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-*

⁴⁵ Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 56. Al-Ṭūsī talks about only one book of his (see al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fibrīst*, 108).

⁴⁶ Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Aʿyān al-Shīʿa* (ed. Ḥasan al-Amīn; Beirut: Dār al-Taʿāruf, 1983), VI, 34.

⁴⁷ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Lisān al-Mizān*, I, 598.

badā.⁴⁸ *Qurb al-isnād* by al-Ḥimyarī has reached our day.⁴⁹ As mentioned in the *isnād* above, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq narrates the ḥadīth from al-Ḥimyarī through his father. Al-Ṣadūq's father, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā al-Qummī, is also among prominent Shī'ī scholars of the period.⁵⁰

Consequently, the above-cited references, which fell under Shī'ī ḥadīth canons via Sayf ibn 'Amīra and his two sons, later became even more widespread among Shī'ī scholars thanks to 'Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā and were more apparent in Shī'ī circles. From then on, these chains were always related by Shī'ī scholars. This fact is also valid for other Sunnī narratives that arrived through Sayf ibn 'Amīra.⁵¹

b. Sulaymān ibn 'Amr Narratives

Among the narratives mentioned in the work of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, those following the line "... Sulaymān ibn 'Amr > al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf..." also deserve an attentive examination with regard to the maintenance of *isnāds*, previously related by Sunnī narrators, in Shī'ī circles. The persons in the *ṭabaqa* of *ṣaḥāba* and *tabi'ūn* within three *isnāds* are as follows:

"Zayd ibn Arqam > Muhājir ibn al-Ḥasan > Sulaymān ibn 'Amr > al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf > 'Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā, al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī al-Kūfī, and Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim al-Qummī...."⁵²

⁴⁸ Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 220. For comparison, see Khū'ī, *Mu'jam*, X, 150.

⁴⁹ Edition: Qom: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyā' al-Turāth, 1993.

⁵⁰ Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 261.

⁵¹ For a narrative on the virtue of *kalimat al-tawḥīd*, see al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-a'māl*, 20. Al-Ṣadūq also relates this ḥadīth in another work called *al-Tawḥīd* (p. 20). Furthermore, this ḥadīth is indicated in the 2nd century AH by Ma'mar ibn Rāshid (Abū 'Urwa Ma'mar ibn Rāshid al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-jāmi'* [along with 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām al-Ṣan'ānī's *al-Muṣannaḥ* ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-A'zamī; Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1983], X, 461-462.) and later in other principal Sunnī sources (Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, III, 344, 391; Muslim, "Īmān," 279; Abū Ya'la Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Mawṣilī, *Musnad Abi Ya'la al-Mawṣilī* (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad; Damascus: Dār al-Ma'mūn li-l-Turāth, 1984), IV, 188; al-Ṭabarānī, *Musnad al-Sbāmiyyīn*, III, 384. Apparently, the narrative passed to Shī'ī circle after Sayf ibn 'Amīra.

⁵² Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-a'māl*, 24.

“Ḥudhayfa > Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh > Zayd ibn Rāfiʿ > Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr > al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf” ... (same chain).⁵³

“Ibn ʿAbbās > ʿAṭāʾ > ʿImrān ibn Abī ʿAṭāʾ > Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr > al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf > ʿAḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā...”⁵⁴

Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr is the common narrator in all narratives. If I search tābiʿūn narrators before him, Muhājir ibn al-Ḥasan, Zayd ibn Rāfiʿ, and ʿImrān ibn Abī ʿAṭāʾ do not appear in Shīʿī biographical sources.⁵⁵ Likewise, Sunnī *rijāl* books do not acknowledge the names of Muhājir ibn al-Ḥasan and Zayd ibn Rāfiʿ.⁵⁶ Only Ibn Ḥajar reports the presence of Muhājir ibn al-Ḥasan in a chain, indicating that this person should be Muhājir al-Ṣāʿigh, known as Muhājir Abū l-Ḥasan.⁵⁷ In case there is a similar mistake in the analyzed chain as well,⁵⁸ Muhājir Abū l-Ḥasan is a reliable person whose narrations are included in *al-Kutub al-sitta* except for Ibn Māja.⁵⁹ Ḥadīths narrated through ʿImrān ibn Abī ʿAṭāʾ also figure in Sunnī sources, and biographical works include assessments about this person.⁶⁰

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 24-25.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 25.

⁵⁵ For Muhājir ibn al-Ḥasan, see al-Namāzī, *Mustadrakāt*, VIII, 37. For ʿImrān ibn Abī ʿAṭāʾ, see al-Namāzī, *Mustadrakāt*, VI, 120.

⁵⁶ In a reference mentioned by Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Zayd ibn Rāfiʿ appears as a person who narrates ḥadīth via Nāfiʿ. This name, however, is not found in biographies; Abū ʿUmar Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namārī, *al-Istidbāk li-madbbab ʿulamāʾ al-amṣār fi-mā taḍammanab^h l-Muwaiṭṭaʾ min maʿānī l-raʾy wa-l-āthār* (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn Qalʿajī; Damascus: Dār Qutayba & Aleppo: Dār al-Waʿy, 1993), IV, 107.

⁵⁷ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Taʿjīl al-manfaʿa bi-zawāʾid rijāl al-aʿimma al-arbaʿa* (ed. Ikrām Allāh Imdād al-Ḥaqq; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, n.d.), 413.

⁵⁸ Accordingly, this mistake seems probable because Muhājir Abū l-Ḥasan is also among the sheikhs from whom Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr claims to have derived ḥadīths; Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād aw-Madīnat al-salām* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, n.d.), IX, 15, 20.

⁵⁹ Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tabdhīb*, X, 288.

⁶⁰ There are both *jarḥ* and *taʿdīl* about ʿImrān. Ibn Ḥajar describes him saying, “He is *ṣadūq* but has weaknesses.”; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Taqrīb*, 430. Al-Bukhārī (*Juzʾ rafʿ al-yadayn*) and Muslim have related ḥadīths through ʿImrān; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Tabdhīb*, VIII, 120).

Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh is described as a companion of ‘Alī by al-Ṭūsī, and his many narratives are given in Shī‘ī works; nevertheless, there is not much more information about him.⁶¹ Nonetheless, Sunnī references depict Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh as a reliable narrator who transmitted numerous ḥadīths and was cited by all authors of *al-Kutub al-sitta*.⁶²

The same applies to ‘Aṭā’ ibn Abī Rabāḥ, another narrator. Shī‘ī works seldom provide information about him.⁶³ However, ‘Aṭā’ is a well-known scholar according to Sunnī literature.⁶⁴

The analyses so far reveal that the mentioned narrators are included within Sunnī biographical works, whereas they are either never or rarely treated in Shī‘ī literature.

As for Sulaymān ibn ‘Amr, the common narrator in all three narratives above, he is present in both Sunnī and Shī‘ī works. Al-Barqī and al-Ṭūsī consider him among companions of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq. In terms of *jarḥ* and *ta‘dīl*, Shī‘ī works contain little information about him, and words by Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī (5th/11th century) are important for understanding Sulaymān’s personality. Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī names him as “*kadbīb al-Nakhā’* / liar of Nakhā’,” stating that he is a truly weak narrator.⁶⁵ The same author also quotes⁶⁶ the following opinion about Sulaymān: “*yakdbīb*” *‘alā l-waqt* / he lies at once.”⁶⁷

⁶¹ Khū‘ī, *Mu‘jam*, VIII, 225. For narratives by Zirr in Shī‘ī literature and more information about him, see al-Namāzī, *Mustadrakāt*, III, 422-423.

⁶² Al-Mizzī, *Tabdīb al-Kamāl*, IX, 337.

⁶³ See Khū‘ī, *Mu‘jam*, XII, 158. Al-Jawāhirī reports he is unknown; Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī, *al-Mufīd min Mu‘jam rijāl al-ḥadīth* (2nd edn., Qom: Maktabat al-Maḥallātī, 2003), 374.]

⁶⁴ He is introduced by al-Dhahabī as “Imām, Sheikh al-Islām, Sheikh al-Ḥarām”; al-Dhahabī, *Siyar a‘lām al-nubalā’* (3rd edn., Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1985), V, 78.

⁶⁵ Abū l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad ibn Ḥusayn Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī, *al-Rijāl li-Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī* (ed. Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī; Qom: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2001), 65.

⁶⁶ See Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī, *al-Rijāl*, 114. For comparison, see Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥillī, *Kbulāṣa*, 351. Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī mentions these expressions through different persons. He repeats the same evaluation in different places in his works under the names of Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān ibn Hārūn al-Nakha‘ī, Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān ibn ‘Amr (‘Umar) al-Nakha‘ī, and Sulaymān ibn Ya‘qūb al-Nakha‘ī. Al-Ḥillī collects these persons under the same name (Sulaymān al-Nakha‘ī), whereas al-Tustarī reports they are all the same person but mistakenly misspelled. All of

In Sunnī literature, Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr is accused of lying and fabricating an immediate *isnād* for any information. Depicted as a man of controversy, Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr tries to defend each lie. Thus, scholars such as ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī (d. 234/848-49), Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn (d. 233/848), Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, and al-Bukhārī describe him a liar and blame Sulaymān with the severest criticisms.⁶⁸

At this stage, Sunnī and Shīʿī references interestingly include common expressions about Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr. Indeed, the words “*kadbdbāb al-Nakba*”⁶⁹ and “*kāna yakdbib*” *mujāwabat*^{am}/he lied at once”⁷⁰ by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī are compatible with the above-given assessments by Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī. However, answering a question about menstruation, Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr gives three fabricated *isnāds*, one of which is “Jaʿfar al-Šādiq ʿan abīhⁱ ʿan jaddihⁱ,” in other words, belongs to Ahl al-bayt; this fact reveals his inclination towards both Shīʿī and Sunnī references.⁷¹ Shīʿī sources comprise his narrations through Imāms or the Prophet via Sunnī *isnāds*.⁷²

In the chains that I examine, the narrator before Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr is Ḥusayn ibn Sayf, who is depicted above as a narrator close to the Shīʿī tradition. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā al-Qummī, al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-Kūfī, and Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim al-Qummī, who are mentioned in the following level (*ṭabaqa*), are all renowned Shīʿī scholars.⁷³

them refer to Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr al-Nakhaʿī; Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs al-rijāl* (Qom: Muʿassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1999), V, 287.

⁶⁷ This statement originally was *yakdbib* ʿalā l-waqt. Al-Tustarī points out that, however, it should be *yakdbib* ʿalā l-waqt on the account of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, who cited the discrediting statement by the same chain. See al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs al-rijāl*, V, 288.

⁶⁸ Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr al-Uqaylī, *al-Duʿafāʾ al-kabīr* (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿī Amīn Qalʿajī; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1984), II, 134; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārikk Baghdād*, IX, 15-20; al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-iʿtidāl*, II, 218.

⁶⁹ Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārikk Baghdād*, IX, 16.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, IX, 20.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² For some of his narratives, see Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, IX, 289.

⁷³ For Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, see Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, III, 85; for al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-Kūfī, see Khūʿī, *Muʿjam* VI, 44-45, 75; for Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim, see al-Jawāhirī, *al-Mufīd*, 16.

Consequently, this structure is similar to the previous chapter; in other words, these narratives shifted to the Shī'ī circle by means of Sulaymān ibn 'Amr. The chains, quoted for the first time by al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf, were later maintained by well-known Shī'ī scholars. Thus, the ḥadīths, which were generally related by Sunnī narrators until the time of Sulaymān ibn 'Amr, were incorporated under Shī'ī ḥadīth canons from then on. Nevertheless, because Sulaymān ibn 'Amr is described as an untruthful person in both Sunnī and Shī'ī biographical literature, I must assert the condition "if he did not fabricate these ḥadīths and narrations."

c. Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili Narrations

Among the narratives quoted by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq in *Thawāb al-a'māl*, there are two with a similar structure, in which Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili is the common narrator. The chain of these two narratives is as follows:

"Anas ibn Mālik > al-Ḥakam (ibn Maşqala⁷⁴ al-'Abdī) > Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili > Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Şayrafī > Muḥammad ibn Abī l-Qāsim > Muḥammad ibn 'Alī > al-Ṣadūq."⁷⁵

"Ibn 'Abbās > Sa'īd ibn Jubayr > Sālīm (ibn 'Ajlān) al-Aftas > Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili > Ayyūb ibn Sulaym al-'Aṭṭār > Salama ibn Khaṭṭāb > Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Şaffār > Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan > al-Ṣadūq."⁷⁶

Among these two narratives, the *isnād* transmitted from Anas ibn Mālik will be closely examined because it is more common in relevant books. The translation of the text, given by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq after the mentioned *isnād*, is as below:

Rasūl Allāh said as follows: "Angels and those who carry the throne of Allah pray in favour of a person who enlightens one of the masjids of Allah as long as such light is on."

A century before al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, this narrative was related in Sunnī sources such as *Bughya* by Nūr al-Dīn al-Haythamī (d. 807/1405) that compiles al-Ḥārith ibn Abī Usāma's (d. 282/896) narrations and *Kitāb al-'arsh* by Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān Ibn Abī

⁷⁴ For reading of the name, see al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-i'tidāl*, II, 346; Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, *Lisān al-Mizān*, III, 255.

⁷⁵ Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-a'māl*, 54.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 238.

Shayba (d. 297/909).⁷⁷ Chains and texts narrated by the two authors are almost identical; furthermore, they are coherent with that by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq. In both books, the narrative is transmitted through the line of “Anas ibn Mālik > al-Ḥakam ibn Maṣqala al-‘Abdī > Abū ‘Āmir Muhājir ibn Kathīr al-Asadī > Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili > al-Ḥārith and Ibn Abī Shayba.”⁷⁸ The only difference from the narrative by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq is the mention of the name of Muhājir ibn Kathīr.

Research on narrators prior to Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili shows that al-Ḥakam ibn Maṣqala is mentioned only in Sunnī biographical literature. Nevertheless, this narrator is defined as a liar⁷⁹ and *matrūk*.⁸⁰

Muhājir ibn Kathīr al-Asadī, who is not included by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq but is allocated a place in the chain of al-Ḥārith and Ibn Abī Shayba, is introduced by Abū Ḥātim as “*matrūk al-ḥadīth*/whose ḥadīths are abandoned.”⁸¹ Among Shī'ī scholars, al-Ṭūsī mentions Muhājir ibn Kathīr al-Asadī as a companion of Abū ‘Abd Allāh Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq.⁸² Moreover, al-Kulaynī cites a ḥadīth from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq with the sole indication of “Muhājir al-Asadī.” According to Khū‘ī (d. 1413/1992), this Muhājir al-Asadī in al-Kulaynī’s book may be either Muhājir ibn Zayd or Muhājir ibn Kathīr al-Asadī, who is our subject.⁸³ Nevertheless, al-Tustarī (d. 1415/1995) objects to the identification of

⁷⁷ Abū l-Ḥasan Nūr al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Abī Bakr ibn Sulaymān al-Haythamī, *Bughyat al-bāḥiṭh ‘an zawā’id Musnad al-Ḥārith* (ed. al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad Ṣāliḥ al-Bākiri; Medina: al-Jāmi‘a al-Islāmiyya Markaz Khidmat al-Sunna wa-l-Sira al-Nabawiyya, 1992), I, 252; Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-‘Arsh wa-mā ruwiya fib’* (ed. Muḥammad ibn Ḥamd al-Ḥammūd; al-Kuwait: Maktabat al-Mu‘allā, 1406 H), 67.

⁷⁸ Al-Haythamī, *Bughya*, I, 252; Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-‘Arsh*, 67.

⁷⁹ Al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-i‘tidāl*, II, 346-347.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*; Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *Lisān al-Mizān*, III, 255 (ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda) and sources given by editors.

⁸¹ Al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-i‘tidāl*, IV, 193.

⁸² Al-Ṭūsī, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī; Qom: Mu‘assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1995), 310; Muṣṭafā ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Tafrishī, *Naqd al-rijāl* (ed. Mu‘assasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyā’ al-Turāth; Qom: Mu‘assasat Āl al-Bayt, 1998), IV, 443.

⁸³ Khū‘ī, *Mu‘jam*, XX, 91.

Muhājir al-Asadī in *al-Kāfi* as Muhājir ibn Kathīr, in consideration of *jarḥ* about the latter cited in al-Dhahabī.⁸⁴

Consequently, neither Sunnī nor Shīʿī literature presents comprehensive information about the narrator. Therefore, Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili is the name to pay attention to with regard to the transition of this narrative from Ahl al-sunna to Shīʿa.

Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili, as stated in the work by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, is a narrator referred to in both Sunnī and Shīʿī books. Under the title Abū Ḥudhayfa Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili al-Khurāsānī, al-Najāshī writes the following: “Ishāq ibn Bishr is a reliable narrator. He narrated via Abū ʿAbd Allāh Jaʿfar al-Şādiq. He is a member of ʿĀmma (i.e., Ahl al-sunna)” and gives the chain of a book cited by him.⁸⁵ Likewise, the Sunnī scholar Ibn Ḥibbān states that Abū Ḥudhayfa Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili is originally from the city of Balkh; he grew up in Bukhārā before settling for a while in Baghdād, where he narrated ḥadīths.⁸⁶ Unlike al-Najāshī, Ibn Ḥibbān reports that he fabricated ḥadīths by referring to reliable narrators and quoted unreal ḥadīths.⁸⁷ Such information, mentioned in both biographical sources, might have enabled the maintenance of an Ahl al-sunna-based chain in the Shīʿī circle.

Nevertheless, according to some Shīʿī authors, al-Najāshī confused the biographies of two different persons.⁸⁸ Sunnī scholars criticize Ibn Ḥibbān for the same mistake.⁸⁹

According to al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1347), the Ishāq ibn Bishr who is recorded as Abū Ḥudhayfa is in fact Ishāq, who wrote *Kitāb al-mubtadaʿ*. He is accused of lying by numerous scholars. This Ishāq ibn Bishr passed away in Bukhārā in 206 AH.⁹⁰ In other words, this Ishāq ibn Bishr is from Khurāsān and not a Kāhili. Therefore, Ibn

⁸⁴ Al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs*, X, 304.

⁸⁵ Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 72.

⁸⁶ Ibn Ḥibbān, *Kitāb al-majrūḥin min al-muḥaddithin wa-l-ḍuʿafāʾ wa-l-matrūkīn* (ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyed; Aleppo: Dār al-Waʿy, 1975), I, 135.

⁸⁷ Ibn Ḥibbān, *Kitāb al-majrūḥin*, I, 135.

⁸⁸ See al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs*, I, 737-741; Muḥammad ʿAlī Muwaḥḥid al-Abṭaḥī, *Tabdīb al-maqāl fī tanqīḥ Kitāb al-rijāl* (Qom, Sayyid Shudā, 1996), III, 82 ff. However, certain Shīʿī authors repeat the words of al-Najāshī without criticism. See Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥilli, *Kbulāşā*, 318; al-Tafrīshī, *Naqd al-rijāl*, I, 191.

⁸⁹ See al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-iʿtidāl*, I, 184 ff.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 185-186.

Ḥibbān is wrong to describe him as “al-Kāhili” and to talk about only one Ishāq ibn Bishr.

Ishāq, who is described as al-Kāhili, is actually Ishāq ibn Bishr ibn Muqātil. Unlike previous ones, the identity (*kunya*) of the latter is Abū Ya‘qūb. Many scholars describe Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili as a liar as well. Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili is from al-Kūfa and died in 228 AH.⁹¹ Reports by Sunnī scholars reveal he was not related to Shī‘a.

According to some later Shī‘ī biographers, Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili and Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Khurāsānī are two different persons; they repeat the words of al-Najāshī about Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Khurāsānī and assert that Sunnī scholars deem him a liar exclusively because of his Shī‘ī tendency.⁹² However, they do not provide significant information about Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili.

In our present chains, Ishāq ibn Bishr is always mentioned with the adjective “al-Kāhili.” Pursuant to this distinction, this Ishāq is not the Abū Ḥudhayfa Ishāq ibn Bishr cited by al-Najāshī. Accordingly, in the above-given chain of Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Abī Shayba, he identifies his master as Abū Ya‘qūb al-Kāhili.⁹³ Nonetheless, the confusion lingers in determining the fabricated narratives of the aforesaid narrators. Indeed, al-Dhahabī narrates a long ḥadīth on the encounter between the Prophet and a grandson of Satan, who had lived since the time of Nūḥ and had converted to Islam, in the biography of Abū Ya‘qūb ibn Bishr al-Kāhili citing al-‘Uqaylī.⁹⁴ Ibn Ḥibbān, however, refers to Abū Ḥudhayfa Ishāq ibn Bishr for the same ḥadīth.⁹⁵

In addition to Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Najāshī, Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣfahānī (d. 430/1038) introduces Abū Ḥudhayfa Ishāq ibn Bishr as “al-

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 186-187.

⁹² Al-Abṭahī, *Tabḍīb al-maqāl*, III, 84; al-Māmaqānī, *Tanqīḥ al-maqāl fī ‘ilm al-rijāl* (ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Māmaqānī; Qom: Mu‘assasat Āl al-Bayt, 2002), IX, 69 (editor’s note).

⁹³ Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-‘Arṣb*, 67.

⁹⁴ Al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-i‘tidāl*, I, 186.

⁹⁵ Ibn Ḥibbān, *Kitāb al-majrūḥīn*, I, 135.

Kāhili.⁹⁶ However, in an earlier period, Ibn ‘Adī (d. 365/976) and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī stated that these were two different persons.⁹⁷

According to some recent Shī‘ī authors, Abū Ya‘qūb Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili also had a tendency toward Shī‘a, like Abū Ḥudhayfa Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Khurāsānī. For example, grounded on the ḥadīth “A *fitna* will follow after my life. Be dependent on ‘Alī during this sedition...,”⁹⁸ in which he mentions the biography of Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili in al-Dhahabī, Muḥsin al-Amīn (d. 1371/1951) asserts that he had Shī‘ī inclinations.⁹⁹ Contemporary Shī‘ī authors share this conviction.¹⁰⁰

Nevertheless, it is problematic that al-Dhahabī relates the mentioned narrative in the biography of Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili because the narrator in question is Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Asadī and not Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili. Indeed Ibn Ḥajar cites the report in his *al-Iṣāba* and enunciates Ishāq ibn Bishr “al-Asadī” as its narrator.¹⁰¹ According to al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Asadī and Ishāq al-Kāhili are two different persons.¹⁰²

However, Ibn ‘Adī cites a ḥadīth via Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili, in which Caliph Abū Bakr is explicitly described as the most virtuous

⁹⁶ Abū Nu‘aym Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Iṣbahānī, , *Kitāb al-ḍu‘afā’* (ed. Fārūq Ḥamāda; al-Dār al-Bayḍā’: Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1984), 61.

⁹⁷ Ibn ‘Adī, *al-Kāmil fī ḍu‘afā’ al-rijāl* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1988), I, 337, 342; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārikh Baghdād*, VI, 324, 326.

⁹⁸ Al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-i‘tidāl*, I, 188.

⁹⁹ The qualification “from al-Kūfa” for this narrator constitutes additional evidence for the author because it is well known that many people from al-Kūfa have an inclination toward Shī‘a (Muḥsin al-Amīn, *A‘yān al-Sbi‘a*, III, 267). Prior to the words above, Muḥsin al-Amīn indicates that in the mentioned chain line, the name of Ishāq ibn Bishr is definitely mentioned, and he might be a Kāhili. According to the author, this ḥadīth may be the reason why Ahl al-sunna described Ishāq as a liar; see *ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ Al-Abṭahī, *Tabḍīb al-maqāl*, III, 84.

¹⁰¹ Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, *al-Iṣāba fī tamyiz al-ṣaḥāba* (ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī; Beirut: Dār al-Jil, 1991), VII, 354.

¹⁰² Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kitāb al-muttafiq wa-l-muftariq* (ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āyḍin Ḥamīdī; Damascus: Dār al-Qādirī, 1997), I, 434. Indeed, the narrative told by al-Khaṭīb in biography of Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Asadī reveals his Shī‘ī inclination. In the narrative, Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī says, “Muḥammad once stated he knew whether a person is *munāfiq* through three reasons: If he denied Allah and his Rasūl, he was late for *ṣalāt* and he held a grudge against ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.”

ṣaḥābī.¹⁰³ Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī also relates a ḥadīth through him, in which Muḥammad the Prophet leaves the funeral of a person only because the latter bears a grudge against ʿUthmān.¹⁰⁴ These narratives deny that the narrator belonged to or was inclined toward Shīʿa.

Indeed, there is complete chaos among Sunnī and Shīʿī sources and scholars about the identity and narratives of Iṣḥāq ibn Bishr. His identity in biographies is occasionally compatible with narratives, although this is not always the case. Sometimes he is named differently or appears with a different identity (*nisba* or *kunya*). Are these differences due to the simple confusion of narrators in biographies, or do they bear a different significance? Namely, some narrators who are maintained in both Sunnī and Shīʿī chains may have used multiple identities for a type of concealment to preserve their reputation in both circles without disclosing their identity. A single example is evidently not sufficient for such an assumption; however, a recent study reveals various examples of such behaviors.¹⁰⁵ Thus, such a possibility cannot be disregarded.

Biographies do not enable a complete identification of Iṣḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili or a determination of his Shīʿa connection. The data from the chain of the analyzed ḥadīth, however, show his influence in the transition of the narrative to Shīʿa. In fact, two Sunnī scholars, al-Ḥārith ibn Abī Usāma and Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān Ibn Abī Shayba, relate this narrative via Iṣḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili, whereas the narrators of Iṣḥāq in the Shīʿī literature are Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Ṣayrafī¹⁰⁶ and Muḥammad ibn Ḥassān.¹⁰⁷ Both narrators are mentioned in Shīʿī biographies.

Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Ṣayrafī, also known as Abū Sumayna,¹⁰⁸ is considered among the companions of ʿAlī al-Riḍā. Despite having

¹⁰³ Ibn ʿAdī, *al-Kāmil*, I, 342.

¹⁰⁴ Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kitāb al-muttafiq wa-l-muftariq*, I, 435.

¹⁰⁵ Muhammed Enes Topgöl, *Erken Dönem Şii Ricâl İlmi: Keşşî Örneği* (PhD. dissertation; Istanbul: Marmara University, 2015), 20, 213, 281.

¹⁰⁶ Al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, I, 57; al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 54.

¹⁰⁷ al-Ṭūsī, *Tabdīb al-ahkām fī sbarḥ al-Muqniʿa li-l-Shaykh al-Mufīd*, (eds. Ḥasan al-Mūsawī Kharsān and Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Mufīd; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1985), III, 261.

¹⁰⁸ For name record see Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, *Kbulāṣa*, 399.

written many books, he is reported as a liar and extremist believer by Shīʿī scholars.¹⁰⁹

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Barqī directly cites the ḥadīth in question from Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Şayrafī,¹¹⁰ whereas al-Sheikh al-Şadūq also narrates it in his work through a chain of Shīʿī narrators.¹¹¹

Al-Najāshī also blames Muḥammad ibn Ḥassān al-Rāzī al-Zaynabī, the other narrator who cites this ḥadīth from Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili, for quoting *munkar ḥadīths* and deriving narratives from unreliable narrators.¹¹² Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī describes him as unreliable as well.¹¹³ Nevertheless, according to al-Waḥīd al-Bihbahānī (d. 1205/1790), this person should be considered reliable because al-Sheikh al-Şadūq describes him as a servant of ʿAlī al-Riḍā, and renowned ḥadīth scholars such as Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-ʿAṭṭār, ʿAḥmad ibn Idrīs and al-Şaffār quote narratives from him.¹¹⁴ This assessment, however, is not accurate because it is Muḥammad ibn Zayd whom al-Şadūq calls the servant of ʿAlī al-Riḍā under the name of Muḥammad ibn Ḥassān.¹¹⁵ However, it is doubtful whether the citation of a ḥadīth by a well-known scholar from a narrator necessarily indicates the reliability and uprightness of the latter. According to Khūʿī, for example, such a narrative cannot attest to the fair or honest character of relevant person.¹¹⁶ After all, Muḥammad ibn Ḥassān also seems a controversial narrator.

Muḥammad ibn Ḥassān reportedly has many books as well, among which *Thawāb al-aʿmāl* and *Kitāb al-ʿiqāb* stand out.¹¹⁷ He

¹⁰⁹ Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 332; al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fibrīst*, 223; Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, XVII, 320.

¹¹⁰ Al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, I, 57. In this narrative, al-Barqī does not give the name of *saḥābī* (Anas ibn Mālik) and only says “someone.” Furthermore, he specifies the name of narrator who obtained the ḥadīth from saḥābī as Ḥakam ibn Miskīn. However, in Sunnī biography books, he is identified as Ḥakam ibn Maşqala. In biographical works, the name Ḥakam ibn Miskīn, who relates narratives in the mentioned *ṭabaqa*, cannot be found.

¹¹¹ Al-Şadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 54.

¹¹² Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 338.

¹¹³ Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī, *Rijāl*, 95. According to Khūʿī, the attribution of this book to Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī is not accurate (Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, XVI, 203).

¹¹⁴ Al-Bihbahānī, *Taʿliqa ʿalā Minḥāj al-maqāl* (n.p.: n.d.), 305.

¹¹⁵ See Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, XVI, 203; al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs*, IX, 186.

¹¹⁶ Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, XVI, 203.

¹¹⁷ Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 338.

might have narrated this ḥadīth in his first book. Al-Ṭūsī mentions this ḥadīth through Muḥammad ibn Ḥassān, cited by Shīʿī narrators, in his *al-Tabḍīb*.¹¹⁸

Consequently, Iṣḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili contributed to knowledge of that ḥadīth among both Sunnī and Shīʿī narrators. Although it is doubtful whether Iṣḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili was a Shīʿī narrator, his desire to announce the ḥadīths he fabricated was intense enough to attract the attention of pro-Shīʿa unreliable and fabricator narrators. The following incident, told by Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 277/890), reveals the desire of Iṣḥāq al-Kāhili to spread his ḥadīths:

“Iṣḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhili was lying. He sat on the road to Qabīṣa’s¹¹⁹ and asked us whence we were coming as we passed by. ‘We were with Qabīṣa,’ we said. Then, ‘If you like, I can narrate you the ḥadīth which Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal quoted from me,’ he added. No ḥadīth was derived and written from him.”¹²⁰

These are not the only examples about the transition of narratives, as quoted by Sunnī narrators, to Shīʿa in the middle of the second half of 2nd and the beginning of 3rd centuries AH through narrators in relation to both groups that are mostly deemed unreliable. Again, in the same work by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, narrations with the chain “‘Amr ibn Khālid > al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Ulwān,” transmitted by Shīʿī narrators after them, bear similar features.¹²¹ Both are well-known persons in both Shīʿī and Sunnī sources and are deemed unreliable by Sunnīs.¹²² In Shīʿī biographies, they are often considered reliable, but there are disputes over whether they are Imāmī.¹²³

¹¹⁸ Al-Ṭūsī, *Tabḍīb al-aḥkām*, III, 261.

¹¹⁹ Qabīṣa here may be either Qabīṣa ibn Lays or Qabīṣa ibn ‘Uqba (see Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa-taʿdīl*, VII, 126).

¹²⁰ Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa-taʿdīl*, II, 214.

¹²¹ Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 73, 80.

¹²² For ‘Amr ibn Khālid see Ibn ‘Adī, *al-Kāmil*, V, 123; al-Mizzī, *Tabḍīb al-Kamāl*, XXI, 606; al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-iʿtidāl*, III, 257; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Tabḍīb*, VIII, 24-25. For al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Ulwān see al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, VIII, 62-64; al-Dhahabī, *Mizān al-iʿtidāl*, I, 542.

¹²³ For ‘Amr ibn Khālid see al-Ṭūsī, *Ikkhtiyār maʿrifat al-rijāl – (al-maʿrūf bi-Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, (ed. Mahdī al-Rajāʿī; Qom: Muʿassasat Āl al-Bayt, 1984), II, 498; id, *al-Istibṣār fī-mā ukbtulifa min al-akbbār* (ed. Ḥasan al-Mūsawī al-Kharsān; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1984), I, 66; Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, VII, 34; for al-

A general evaluation in consideration of the previously mentioned chains and other Sunnī chains in *Thawāb al-a‘māl wa-‘iqāb al-a‘māl* by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq reveals the following.

The first striking point is that Ahl al-sunna references in the chapters “Thawāb al-a‘māl” and “‘iqāb al-a‘māl” of *al-Maḥāsīn* by al-Barqī are less than those in *Thawāb al-a‘māl wa-‘iqāb al-a‘māl* by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq; however, al-Şadūq’s work provides an indisputable place to al-Barqī, al-Şaffār, and ‘Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā, who are all notable scholars from Qom. Therefore, these authors knew ḥadīths through Ahl al-sunna. These ḥadīths treated not Shī‘ī-Sunnī polemics but rather issues such as the reward and punishment of deeds, and they were acknowledged by both circles in the 3rd century AH.

Kitāb al-nawādir, the extant work by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā, includes no reference that begins with a ṣahābī other than the Ahl al-bayt. However, al-Sheikh al-Şadūq frequently mentions his name in references. This is may seem controversial, but it may only be because *Kitāb al-nawādir* focuses exclusively on *fiqh* issues. ‘Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā, who seems reluctant to hear and relate narratives from Ahl al-sunna on the issue, seems to have left such abstention with regard to subjects about blessing or virtues.

An analysis on *al-Maḥāsīn* by al-Barqī in consideration of al-Sheikh al-Şadūq’s references shows that al-Barqī is mentioned in three narratives cited by al-Şadūq through a ṣahābī.¹²⁴ Strikingly enough, these chains are not included in *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*.¹²⁵ There may be two reasons for this. First, al-Sheikh al-Şadūq mentioned al-Barqī in the chains by mistake. However, there is no available evidence for such an error. Second, al-Barqī did not include these chains in his work, although he knew and narrated them, because

Ḥusayn ibn ‘Ulwān see al-Bihbahānī, *Ta‘liqa*, 144; al-Namāzī, *Mustadrakāt*, III, 154; Khū‘ī, *Mu‘jam*, V, 376. For negative opinions about al-Ḥusayn, see al-Māmaqānī, *Tanqīḥ al-maqāl*, XXII, 258.

¹²⁴ For these narratives, see al-Şadūq, *Thawāb al-a‘māl*, 22, 73, 80.

¹²⁵ During my research on *al-Maḥāsīn*, I came across no such chains; likewise, the relevant chapter in *Bihār al-anwār* shows that the mentioned narratives do not refer to *al-Maḥāsīn*. In the reference order under the previous footnote, see Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī al-Majlisī, *Bihār al-anwār al-jāmi‘a li-durar akbbār al-a‘imma al-aṭḥār* (Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Wafā‘, 1983), IC, 192-204; LXXXII, 313-326; ICIII, 246-259.

they were of Sunnī origin or for another reason. Indeed, the ḥadīth expressed by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq via “Anas ibn Mālīk > al-Ḥakam > Ishāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhīlī > Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Ṣayrafī > Muḥammad ibn Abī l-Qāsim > Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī”¹²⁶ is also given by al-Barqī in *al-Maḥāsīn*. Al-Barqī adopts the ḥadīth with the same line as Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Ṣayrafī; however, he writes “someone” (*rajul*) instead of Anas ibn Mālīk and seems reluctant to identify the name of the ṣahābī.¹²⁷ This is because of the negative image of Anas ibn Mālīk¹²⁸ because, according to Shī'īs, he concealed the *ḥadīth al-ṭayr*.¹²⁹

The same applies to Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār (d. 290/902). His *Baṣā'ir al-darajāt* of one thousand nine hundred and

¹²⁶ Al-Ṣadūq, *Tḥawāb al-a'māl*, 54.

¹²⁷ It is difficult to obtain a final conclusion here. In *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, al-Barqī relates via Anas ibn Mālīk, even though only in a single narrative (Al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, II, 332). This is why the term “reluctant” is preferred in the text.

¹²⁸ The outlines of *ḥadīth al-ṭayr* are as follows: The Prophet prays Allah to bring him the most beloved of His creation to eat together the roasted bird presented to him. When Anas ibn Mālīk, the servant at the moment, hears the prayer, he asks for one of the Anṣār to come. As ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib arrives, Anas does not want to allow him in, saying the Prophet is engaged in something. The same incident is repeated three times, whereupon the Prophet overhears and calls ‘Alī in. As ‘Alī explains the Prophet what happened, the latter asks Anas why he behaved so. Anas responds that he wanted one of the Anṣār to be up to his supplication. Years later, ‘Alī reminds Anas of the incident, but the latter responds that he forgot about it. Thereupon ‘Alī asks Allah to punish him (Khū'ī, *Mu'jam*, IV, 151). Shī'a consider this ḥadīth *mutawātir*. Among Ahl al-sunna scholars, al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī relates the ḥadīth in *al-Mustadrak*, classifying it authentic pursuant to conditions prescribed by al-Bukhārī and Muslim (Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī, *al-Mustadrak ‘alā l-Ṣaḥīḥayn* [ed. Yūsūf ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mar‘ashlī; Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifa, n.d.], III, 131). Nevertheless, ḥadīth scholars al-Dhahabī above all (al-Dhahabī, *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'* [eds. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā‘ūt and ‘Alī Abū Zayd; Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1983], XIII, 233) oppose him, whereas some others deem it a fabrication (Ibn Taymiyya, *Minbāj al-sunna al-nabawiyya* [ed. Muḥammad Rashād Sālim; Riyadh: Jāmi‘at al-Imām Muḥammad ibn Su‘ūd al-Islāmiyya, 1986], VII, 371), and others claim it is not a fabrication but is unreliable because it comes through many chain lines. For the opinions of Sunnī scholars, see Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, *Silsilat al-aḥādīth al-ḍa‘īfa wa-l-mawḍū‘a wa-atḥarub^h l-sayyī’ fī l-umma* (Riyadh: Dār al-Ma‘arīf, 1992), XIV, 176-185.

¹²⁹ For detailed information about the matter, see Khū'ī, *Mu'jam*, IV, 149.

one ḥadīth includes only thirty-eight *isnāds* other than the Ahl al-bayt,¹³⁰ he seems indifferent to Ahl al-sunna references to some extent. Moreover, the rare Ahl al-sunna chains are mostly mentioned in the beginning of ḥadīths that claim ‘Alī is more suitable for caliphate in terms of knowledge and virtue. Thus, *Başā’ir* did not include many ḥadīths conveyed by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq via al-Şaffār, most likely because they are not in line with the content of his work.

Consequently, the previously mentioned 3rd-century AH scholars may have known and related more Ahl al-sunna narratives in spite of the rare appearance or lack of appearance of Sunnī chains in their works.

At this stage, another interesting point is that al-Ḥusayn ibn Sa‘īd al-Aḥwadhī (3rd/9th century), the master of both ‘Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā and ‘Aḥmad ibn Abī ‘Abd Allāh al-Barqī, is not mentioned in Ahl al-sunna chains given by al-Sheikh al-Şadūq or al-Barqī. *Kitāb al-zuhd*, one of the extant works by al-Ḥusayn ibn Sa‘īd, does treat the virtues of good deeds and the punishments of evil ones, but it includes almost no Ahl al-sunna chain. In other words, it seems significant that the names of ‘Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā and al-Barqī, his two disciples, are mentioned as well as explicit mention of al-Şaffār, whereas Ahl al-sunna *isnāds* almost never appear in his book, and the name of al-Ḥusayn ibn Sa‘īd is absent in the later works I studied.

The same applies to prominent Shī‘ī narrators in the middle of the second half of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd centuries AH. For example, in a previous study on *Kitāb al-zuhd*, I found masters through whom al-Ḥusayn ibn Sa‘īd al-Aḥwadhī relates most narratives (Muḥammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr [31 narratives], Muḥammad ibn Sinān [10 narratives], ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Īsā [7 narratives], al-Ḥasan ibn Maḥbūb [7 narratives], ‘Alī ibn al-Nu‘mān [6 narratives], al-Naḍr ibn

¹³⁰ Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Şaffār, *Başā’ir al-darajāt al-kubrā fi faḍā’il āl Muḥammad* (ed. Muḥammad Sayyid Ḥusayn al-Mu‘allim; Beirut: Dār Jawād al-A‘imma, 2007), I, 25, 27, 117, 119, 128, 130, 159, 161, 183, 225, 228, 327, 332, 387, 433, 474; II, 24, 33, 34, 41, 61, 66, 98, 99, 162, 166, 172, 289, 290 (two narratives), 291 (two narratives), 292, 301, 441, 444, 445, 454.

Suwayd [6 narratives], and Ḥammād ibn ʿĪsā [5 narratives]).¹³¹ Thus, the following can be said.

All these narrators are well known in Shīʿī literature, and many ḥadīths are cited from them. Strikingly enough, these narrators seldom or never appear in Sunnī chains transmitted in Shīʿī books. For example, Muḥammad ibn ʿUmayr, from whom al-Ḥusayn ibn Saʿīd quotes the most ḥadīths, is not mentioned in Sunnī chains in relevant chapters of al-Barqī's work,¹³² and he is seen only twice in Sunnī chains given by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq.¹³³ Al-Ṣadūq has derived both narratives from well-known sources in Shīʿī literature (such as Muḥammad ibn Sinān and Abān ibn ʿUthmān) and not from Sunnī narrators.

Among the narrators above, Ḥasan ibn Maḥbūb and Ḥammād ibn ʿĪsā are each mentioned only once in Sunnī chains,¹³⁴ and al-Naḍr ibn Suwayd, ʿAlī ibn al-Nuʿmān,¹³⁵ and ʿUthmān ibn ʿĪsā are totally absent. As for Muḥammad ibn Sinān, he appears relatively more often in Ahl al-sunna chains. He is recorded five times as a narrator in Sunnī chains.

An analysis of masters from whom ʿAḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā narrates ḥadīths in *Kitāb al-nawādir* reveals a similar situation. As determined in my previous study, he most frequently narrates ḥadīths in the previously mentioned book by means of Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr (56 narratives), Ṣafwān ibn Yaḥyā (40 narratives), al-Naḍr ibn Suwayd (34 narratives), Qāsim ibn Muḥammad (22 narratives), and ʿUthmān ibn ʿĪsā (12 narratives).¹³⁶

¹³¹ Bekir Kuzudişli, *Şia'da Hadis Rivâyeti ve İsnâd* (Istanbul: Bsr Yayıncılık, 2011), 313.

¹³² In two-volume book of al-Barqī, Ibn Abī ʿUmayr is mentioned in only one Sunnī *isnâd*. In this chain line of "Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī > some persons > Ibn Abī ʿUmayr > al-Barqī's father > al-Barqī" (al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, II, 331), the source of al-Barqī is unknown.

¹³³ Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 196, 237.

¹³⁴ For Ḥasan ibn Maḥbūb, see al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, I, 295; for Ḥammād ibn ʿĪsā, see al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 304.

¹³⁵ Al-Barqī mentions the names of al-Naḍr ibn Suwayd and ʿAlī ibn al-Nuʿmān only once in Ahl al-sunna *isnâds* but not in the chapters I study in *al-Maḥāsīn* (*Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl*). See al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, II, 447, 561.

¹³⁶ Kuzudişli, *Şia'da Hadis Rivâyeti ve İsnâd*, 329.

I already noted that among these narrators, Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr, al-Naḍr ibn Suwayd, and ʿUthmān ibn ʿĪsā are rarely found in Sunnī chains. As for Qāsim ibn Muḥammad, he is seen once in the studied Sunnī references by al-Barqī and al-Sheikh al-Şadūq,¹³⁷ whereas Şafwān ibn Yaḥyā is not mentioned at all.

The comparisons so far reveal that Sunnī references give little – if any – place to famous Shīʿī narrators such as Ibn Abī ʿUmayr, Şafwān ibn Yaḥyā, al-Naḍr ibn Suwayd, and al-Ḥusayn ibn Saʿīd, who relate narratives via a ṣaḥābī, whereas al-Barqī, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, and al-Şaffār in a later *ṭabaqa* appear relatively more often.

This fact seems coherent with the finding that within the scope of the aforementioned ḥadīths, narratives that are initially transferred via Sunnī narrators are often conveyed to the Shīʿī sphere by narrators known by both circles but often deemed liars or unreliable. Accordingly, narrators such as Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr and Şafwān ibn Yaḥyā, who are famous for narrating Shīʿī ḥadīths around the middle of the second half of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd centuries AH, either faced certain difficulties in penetrating the Sunnī circle to derive their ḥadīths or deliberately refrained from such an attempt. Moreover, even if these prominent Shīʿī narrators came together with Ahl al-sunna sheikhs and listened to their ḥadīths, they were relatively reluctant to narrate them. Accordingly, when al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān's father asks Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr, “You met Sunnī scholars. Why didn't you listen to and learn their ḥadīths?” Ibn Abī ʿUmayr says, “I heard their ḥadīths. However, I noticed that many of our companions listened to the knowledge of *al-ʿamma* (Ahl al-sunna) and *al-kbāṣṣa* (Shīʿa), but they confused them. They began to narrate knowledge of *al-ʿamma* via *al-kbāṣṣa*, and that of *al-kbāṣṣa* via *al-ʿamma*. I gave up deriving ḥadīth from *al-ʿamma* to avoid a similar confusion.”¹³⁸

This near complaint may not be directly related to the situation of Shīʿī or pro-Shīʿī narrators who relate Ahl al-sunna ḥadīths in a correct manner, namely, through reference to Sunnī narrators. Nevertheless, it is important for monitoring how Sunnī narratives entered Shīʿī circles in those days. Moreover, saying “many of our companions,” Ibn Abī ʿUmayr alludes to the extensity of those who derive ḥadīth

¹³⁷ Al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsin*, I, 93; al-Şadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 246.

¹³⁸ al-Ṭūsī, *Ikbtiyār maʿrifat al-rijāl*, II, 854.

from *al-ʿamma*; the persons he notes are most likely rather unreliable narrators who were not famous for ḥadīth narratives. This may be why they confuse the origins of ḥadīths. Therefore, prominent companions of Imāms might generally have refrained from quoting ḥadīths from *al-ʿamma*.¹³⁹

The words of Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr provide a crucial clue on the meetings between Shīʿī narrators and Sunnī scholars. However, this fact does not eliminate the difficulties for certain Shīʿī narrators in access to Ahl al-sunna circles. Accordingly, al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān asserts that Ahl al-sunna scholars derived narratives from Murjīʿa, Qadariyya, and Jahmiyya, which in turn gathered narratives from Ahl al-sunna,¹⁴⁰ but Shīʿa was excluded from this sphere.¹⁴¹ However, some Shīʿī narrators concealed their identity to overcome possible problems in the Ahl al-sunna sphere. Shīʿī scholars define this fact with the concept of “*mastūr*/self-concealment.”¹⁴² Just as in the example of Ishāq ibn Bishr, some narrators supposedly changed their identities for concealment, leaving behind long-lasting disputes for upcoming scholars regarding their identification.

Consequently, when later prominent scholars from Qom, such as Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, journeyed (*riḥla*) to Iraq, they must have acted to obtain Ahl al-sunna narrations and looked for narrators who related both Sunnī and Shīʿī ḥadīths or their disciples. Alternately, it may be that they came across the mentioned narrators in Qom or another place.

The evident function of unreliable narrators in the transition of Sunnī ḥadīths to Shīʿī circles explains why Muḥammad ibn Sinān is more often seen in Sunnī references (5 times) compared to narrators such as Ibn Abī ʿUmayr, Ṣafwān ibn Yaḥyā, al-Naḍr ibn Suwayd, Ḥammād ibn ʿĪsā, and al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad. Apart from al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad, about whom there is no *jarḥ* and *taʿdil* opinion, all the above-mentioned narrators are considered reliable by Shīʿī scholars and are placed among prominent personalities in Shīʿa.

¹³⁹ Al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs*, XII, 403.

¹⁴⁰ Al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān, *al-Īḍāḥ*, 503.

¹⁴¹ Al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān focuses on why Ahl al-sunna casts out Shīʿa while not externalizing other groups with which it is in dispute; *ibid.*, 93, 102.

¹⁴² For the concept of “*mastūr*/self-concealment” and explanations in the text, see al-Māmaqānī, *Tanqīḥ al-maqāl*, XXII, 256 (Editors’ note).

Muḥammad ibn Sinān is the only exception. He is undoubtedly a Shīʿī as well, but al-Kashshī (d. 4th/10th century), Ibn ʿUqda (d. 332/944), al-Najāshī, al-Ṭūsī, and Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī deem him unreliable, whereas al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān describes him as a liar.¹⁴³ The following words by Muḥammad ibn Sinān just before his death are explanatory about his narrative sources: “I have neither listened to the ḥadīths I have hitherto narrated, nor I had the rights to narrate them. They are narrations I found.”¹⁴⁴ In another narrative, Muḥammad ibn Sinān confesses he bought the texts from the marketplace.¹⁴⁵ However, there might have been Ahl al-sunna *isnāds* among narratives he purchased.

2. Chains after the Lesser Occultation

A comparison between *Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl* by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq and the chapter with the same title in al-Barqī’s *al-Maḥāsīn* reveals that some chains in the former passed over to the Shīʿī circle after the Lesser Occultation probably in the beginning of the 4th century. Among them, those derived from Ibn Abī Ḥātīm (d. 327/938) especially stand out.

A closer look at one of these references may prove useful. The chain reads, “Usāma ibn Zayd > Abū Saʿīd al-Maqbūrī > Thābit ibn Qays al-Madanī > ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī > Yazīd ibn Sinān al-Baṣrī al-Miṣrī > Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Ḥātīm > Ḥamza ibn Muḥammad al-ʿAlawī > al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq.”¹⁴⁶ Through this chain, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq relates a ḥadīth that states that the Prophet sometimes fasted for successive days and did not fast at all for some periods.¹⁴⁷

Even though this ḥadīth cannot be found in the available works of Ibn Abī Ḥātīm, it is prevalently related in Sunnī literature via the same chain of narrators as al-Ṣadūq’s until ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Mahdī.¹⁴⁸ Yazīd ibn Sinān, who is given in the chain as sheikh of Ibn Abī Ḥātīm, settled in Egypt and is defined as “*ṣadūq* and *thiqā*” by Ibn Abī Ḥātīm

¹⁴³ Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, XVI, 169.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 163.

¹⁴⁵ Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, *Rijāl*, 273; Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, XVI, 169.

¹⁴⁶ Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 89.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁸ See Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, XXXVI, 86, and references within.

in his *al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl*.¹⁴⁹ Moreover, in his *Tafsīr*, Ibn Abī Ḥātim derives many narratives through Yazīd ibn Sinān.¹⁵⁰

As for Ḥamza ibn Muḥammad al-ʿAlawī, the master of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, he is a descendent of Zayd ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn, and there is no *jarḥ* and *taʿdīl* assessment about him.¹⁵¹ Even though in some of his works al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq's uses the expression "May Allah bless him" after the name of al-ʿAlawī,¹⁵² Khūʿī refuses to consider this as a sign of a person's *taʿdīl*.¹⁵³ Nevertheless, Ḥamza ibn Muḥammad al-ʿAlawī was most likely closer to the Shīʿa than the Sunnī circle.

al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq recalls the same ḥadīth with a similar chain in his *Faḍāʾil al-ashbur al-thalātha*.¹⁵⁴ In this version, however, it is ʿAḥmad ibn Ḥasan al-Qaṭṭān who conveys the ḥadīth from Ibn Abī Ḥātim¹⁵⁵ to al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq. According to Khūʿī, Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan, another frequent figure in numerous works of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq,¹⁵⁶ may be among *al-ʿamma* (Ahl al-sunna).¹⁵⁷

In conclusion, Sunnī narrators maintained the ḥadīth until the time of Ibn Abī Ḥātim. One generation after, it was related by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq. Two other narratives, cited from Ibn Abī Ḥātim in *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, are of a similar nature.¹⁵⁸

¹⁴⁹ Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa-taʿdīl*, IX, 267.

¹⁵⁰ See Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Tafsīr Ibn Abī Ḥātim* (ed. Asʿad Muḥammad al-Ṭayyib; Ṣaydā: al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya, n.d.), II, 438; III, 1015, 1016; IV, 1363 ff.

¹⁵¹ Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, VII, 292.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 292.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, *Muʿjam*, V, 90.

¹⁵⁴ Al-Ṣadūq, *Faḍāʾil al-ashbur al-thalātha* (ed. Mīrzā Ghulām Riḍā ʿIrfāniyān; Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍāʾ, 1992), 51.

¹⁵⁵ Here, al-Ṣadūq mentions Ibn Abī Ḥātim as ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn. The chain line is identical with other narrators that reached Usāma ibn Zayd. Even though the full name of Ibn Abī Ḥātim is given as ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Idrīs ibn Mundhir ibn Dāwūd ibn Mihrān (Abū l-Ṣafāʾ Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī, *Kitāb al-wāfi bi-l-wafayāt* [eds. Aḥmad al-Arnāʾūṭ and Dhikrī Muṣṭafā; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2000], XVIII, 135), the mentioned reference calls him "al-Ḥusayn," probably referring to a grandfather.

¹⁵⁶ See al-Ṣadūq, *al-Tawḥīd* (ed. Hāshim al-Ḥusaynī al-Ṭahrānī; Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.), 30, 152; id. *al-Khiṣāl*, 55, 98 ff.

¹⁵⁷ Khūʿī, *Muʿjam*, II, 93.

¹⁵⁸ Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 90 (two narratives).

In addition to narratives through Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-Sheikh al-Şadūq mentions Ahl al-sunna *isnāds*, which apparently made the transition to Shī'ī circles after the Lesser Occultation, more probably in the beginning of the 4th century. Nonetheless, these persons are mostly Sunnī narrators and not renowned authors whose works are still extant, such as Ibn Abī Ḥātim. Ahl al-sunna narrators preserved the chains in first three centuries. Roughly, in the time of the masters of al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, pro-Shī'a narrators began to relate them. Some of these narratives are also present in Sunnī sources.¹⁵⁹

The atmosphere following the Greater Occultation might have been influential on more frequent mentions of Ahl al-sunna chains in Shī'ī books. Indeed, because the last Imām went into the Occultation and the long-lasting Occultation period caused havoc, Shī'ī scholars stepped up to oppose the turmoil and tried to make use of any available evidence. This fact is apparent in narratives that clearly express that there are twelve Imāms. There are ever-growing number of narratives, especially after al-Şaffār, about the number of Imāms and the Occultation of the final Imām. Nevertheless, al-Şaffār and, later, al-Kulaynī used only Ahl al-bayt references to prove that there are twelve Imāms,¹⁶⁰ whereas Ibn Abī Zaynab al-Nu'mānī al-Baghdādī (d. ca. 360/970), a disciple of al-Kulaynī, preferred to prove via Sunnī *isnāds* that there would be Twelve Imāms and related two chapters to this problem.¹⁶¹ In addition, al-Nu'mānī does not mention the name of his masters in Sunnī chains, with the exception of a few,¹⁶² and he records them as *mu'allaq*. One or two generations later, 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Khazzāz al-Qummī (4th/10th century), a disciple of al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, asserts that twelve is the correct number of Imāms, building the core of his work on narratives from ṣaḥāba such

¹⁵⁹ See *ibid*, 89. For comparison see Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf* (ed. Muḥammad 'Awwāma; Jeddā & Damascus: Shirkat Dār al-Qibla & Mu'assasat 'Ulūm al-Qur'ān, 2006), VI, 334; Ishāq ibn Rāhūya, *Musnad Ishāq ibn Rāhūya* (ed. 'Abd al-Ghafūr 'Abd al-Ḥaqq al-Balūshī; Medina: Dār al-Īmān, 1991), III, 954.

¹⁶⁰ Al-Şaffār, *Başā'ir*, II, 111; Abū Ja'far Thiqat al-Islām Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb ibn Ishāq al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfi* (ed. 'Alī Akbar al-Ghaffārī; 2nd edn., Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1968), I, 534.

¹⁶¹ Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn Abī Zaynab al-Nu'mānī, *Kitāb al-ghayba* (ed. Fāris Ḥassūn Karīm; Qom: Anwār al-Hudā, 2001), 104, 117.

¹⁶² In relevant chapters, al-Nu'mānī more often mentions the name of Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān al-Duhnī. Nevertheless, I can obtain no information about this person (al-Namāzī, *Mustadrakāt*, VII, 203-204).

as Anas ibn Mālik, 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū Hurayra, and 'Ā'isha bint Abī Bakr.¹⁶³ Al-Khazzāz gives the chain in full.

Ahl al-sunna references in the previously mentioned works may also serve polemical purposes, just as in *al-Idāh* by al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān. However, there is a significant difference. As noted above, al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān obligatorily mentioned Ahl al-sunna *isnāds* – albeit incompletely – when he quoted ḥadīths to present the controversies of Ahl al-sunna. Nonetheless, the main objective of both al-Nu'mānī and al-Khazzāz in writing their books was to protect and maintain confused Shī'īs who were inclined to leave Shī'a due to doubts about the existence of the Last Imām following the Occultation.¹⁶⁴ These authors also aimed to present evidence against those outside their sect, but this always remained a secondary goal. This is why al-Nu'mānī, at the end of most chapters, advises Shī'īs to find the right path pursuant to the evidence he presents.¹⁶⁵

Conclusion and Assessment

The introduction of this study expressed the most striking point in a comparison between “Thawāb al-a'māl wa-'iqāb al-a'māl” in *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn* by al-Barqī and *Thawāb al-a'māl wa-'iqāb al-a'māl* by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq. In the latter, Ahl al-sunna references increase remarkably in number together with a diversification of ṣaḥāba from whom the ḥadīths are cited. The examples above indicate that an important part of Ahl al-sunna chains passed over to Shī'ī circles in the middle of the second half of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd centuries AH, whereas another group followed the same track after the Lesser Occultation, more probably in the beginning of the 4th century. Therefore, Shī'ī literature comprised more Sunnī narratives after the Greater Occultation. That said, al-Barqī's work includes very few Ahl al-sunna chains, whereas there are more of them in al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq's book. However, this does not simply mean that Shī'ī scholars just before and during the Lesser Occultation period did not know these narratives. In fact, even though the relevant chapter and even the entire *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn* by al-Barqī treat few Ahl al-sunna chains, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq's references reveal that both al-Barqī and

¹⁶³ 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Khazzāz, *Kifāyat al-atbar fī l-nuṣūṣ 'alā l-a'imma al-itbnā 'asbar* (ed. 'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥusaynī; Qom: Maṭba'at al-Khayyām, 1981), 8.

¹⁶⁴ Al-Nu'mānī, *Kitāb al-gbayba*, 27 ff; al-Khazzāz, *Kifāyat al-atbar*, 7.

¹⁶⁵ See al-Nu'mānī, *Kitāb al-gbayba*, 58, 64, 103 ff.

his contemporary ‘Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā and al-Şaffār of next generation were aware of such narratives. Most likely, circumstances before and during the Lesser Occultation may have caused reluctance among them to include such narratives in their books. Because there was a need for Ahl al-sunna chains regarding problems such as Twelve Imām narratives after the Greater Occultation, the interest in Sunnī references might have increased.¹⁶⁶

The most notable discovery of an analysis about Sunnī references in works by al-Barqī and al-Sheikh al-Şadūq is that the persons in the transition era were generally active in both Sunnī and Shī‘ī circles, but these narrators were often described as liars or as unreliable, especially in Ahl al-sunna sources. This may explain the origin of narratives that are used in Shī‘ī literature with reference to and against Sunnī sources but that cannot be found in Sunnī works. As things stand, persons who participated in both groups may be the reason for differences that are often against the Sunnī point of view as well.

However, narrators in Sunnī chains in Shī‘ī literature can be found in both Sunnī and Shī‘ī biographical works until the middle of the second half of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3rd centuries AH, whereas narrators are entirely separated in rest of the first half of the 3rd century, when there is almost no common narrator included in the biographies of both *madhbabs*. This fact is compatible with a modern study of pro-Shī‘ī narrators in Ahl al-sunna biographies. The mentioned study asserts that 94% of pro-Shī‘ī narrators passed away before 200 AH, and no more narrators of such quality were alive by 250 AH.¹⁶⁷ These assertions also seem coherent with the argument in another study: Shī‘ī ḥadīth narratives were relatively systematized and became more common at the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 3th century AH thanks to favorable political conditions.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Prior to the Lesser Occultation, Shī‘ī books provide no narratives about the number of Imāms save for a few exceptions with Sunnī or Ahl al-bayt references; see Etan Kohlberg, “From Imāmiyya to Ithnā-‘Ashariyya,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39/3, 521-534. However, after the Greater Occultation, both Shī‘ī and Sunnī references include numerous narrations that there are Twelve Imāms. See al-Khazzāz, *Kifāyat al-atbar*.

¹⁶⁷ Topgül, *Hadis Rivâyetinde Şiilik Eğilimi* (MA thesis; Istanbul: Marmara University 2010), 186.

¹⁶⁸ Kuzudişli, *Şia'da Hadis Rivâyeti*, 344.

In conclusion, two more points are worth noting. First, works by al-Barqī and al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq provide important clues about the transition of ḥadīths from the Sunnī to the Shīʿī circle. Nevertheless, in regional terms, both works are written by scholars from Qom. The results may provide a clue regarding other cities where the Shīʿī population is dominant, such as al-Kūfa and Baghdād. However, the chains preferred by scholars from the mentioned regions should undergo an analysis for a more accurate result.

Second, I can assume that Shīʿī scholars behaved relatively flexible and allowed for more Sunnī chains after the Greater Occultation because the theme of the books was the reward and punishment of deeds. Therefore, future studies should examine how such usages are reflected in books on other problems, particularly *aḥkām*.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Jonathan Brown and Enes Topgül for reading earlier drafts of this article, and offering valuable suggestions.

REFERENCES

- ʿAbd ibn Ḥumayd, Abū Muḥammad, *Muntakhab min Musnad* (eds. Ṣubḥī al-Badrī al-Sāmarrāʾī and Maḥmūd Khalīl al-Saʿīdī; Beirut: ʿĀlam al-Kutub, 1988).
- al-Abṭāḥī, Muḥammad ʿAlī Muwaḥḥid, *Tabdhib al-maqāl fī tanqīḥ Kitāb al-rijāl*, 4 vols., (Qom: Sayyid Shudā, 1996).
- Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī, Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *Kitāb al-ḍuʿafāʾ* (ed. Fārūq Ḥamāda; al-Dār al-Bayḍāʾ: Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1984).
- Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, 50 vols. (ed. Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1988).
- al-Albānī, Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn, *Silsilat al-aḥādīth al-ḍaʿīfa wa-l-mawḍūʿa wa-atbarub^h l-sayyiʾ fī l-umma*, 14 vols., (Riyadh: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1992).
- al-Amīn, Muḥsin, *Aḡyān al-Shīʿa*, 10 vols., (ed. Ḥasan al-Amīn; Beirut: Dār al-Taʿāruf, 1983).
- al-Barqī, Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, *Kitāb al-maḥāsīn*, 2 vols., (ed. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1370).
- al-Bihbahānī, Muḥammad Bāqir al-Waḥīd, *Taʿliqa ʿalā Minbāj al-maqāl* (n.p., n.d).

- al-Dhahabî, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Uthmān, *Mizān al-i’tidāl fi naqḍ al-rijāl*, 8 vols., (eds. ‘Alī Muḥammad Mu‘awwaḍ and ‘Adil Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Mawjūd; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyya, 1995).
- al-Dhahabî, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Uthmān, *Siyar a‘lām al-nubala’*, 25 vols., (eds. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā‘ūt and ‘Alī Abū Zayd; 3rd edn., Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risāla, 1985).
- al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān, *al-Īdāḥ* (ed. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Urmawī; Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tehrān, 1984).
- al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad, *al-Mustadrak ‘alā l-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, 4 vols., (ed. Yūsūf ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mar‘ashlī; Beirut: Dār al-Ma‘rifa, n.d.).
- al-Haythamī, Abū l-Ḥasan Nūr al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Abī Bakr ibn Sulaymān, *Bughyat al-bāḥith ‘an zawa’id Musnad al-Ḥārith*, 2 vols., (ed. al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad Šāliḥ al-Bākiri; Medina: al-Jāmi‘a al-Islāmiyya Markaz Khiḍmat al-Sunna wa-l-Sīra al-Nabawiyya, 1992).
- al-Ḥillī, al-‘Allāma Ibn al-Muṭahhar Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf, *Īdāḥ al-ishtibāḥ* (ed. Sheikh Muḥammad al-Ḥassūn; Qom: Mu‘assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1990).
- al-Ḥillī, al-‘Allāma Ibn al-Muṭahhar Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yūsūf, *Kbulāṣat al-aqwāl fi ma‘rifat al-rijāl* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī, Qom: Mu‘assasat Nashr al-Faqāha, 1996).
- al-Ḥillī, al-Ḥasan Ibn ‘Alī Ibn Dāwūd, *Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd* (ed. Muḥammad Šādiq Āl Baḥr al-‘ulūm; Najaf: al-Maṭba‘a al-Ḥaydariyya, 1972).
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Yūsūf ibn ‘Abd Allāh, *al-Istidbkār li-madbbab ‘ulamā’ al-amṣār fi mā taḍammanabū al-Muwaḥḥa’ min ma‘ānī al-ra’y wa-l-āthār*, 30 vols., (ed. ‘Abd al-Mu‘ṭī Amīn al-Qal‘ajī; Damascus: Dār al-Quṭayba & Aleppo: Dār al-Wa’y, 1993).
- Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad al-Rāzī, *al-Jarḥ wa-l-ta’dīl*, 9 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Iḥyā’ al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, 1952).
- Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad al-Rāzī, *Taḥṣīr Ibn Abī Ḥātim*, 10 vols., (ed. As‘ad Muḥammad al-Ṭayyib; Şayḍā: al-Maktaba al-‘Aşriyya, n.d.).
- Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaḥ*, 26 vols., (ed. Muḥammad ‘Awwāma; Jedda: Shirkat Dār al-Qibla & Damascus: Mu‘assasat ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān, 2006).
- Ibn ‘Adī, ‘Abd Allāh Ibn ‘Adī al-Jurjānī, *al-Kāmil fi ḍu‘afā’ al-rijāl*, 7 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1988).
- Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī, Abū l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad ibn Ḥusayn, *al-Rijāl li-Ibn al-Ghaḍā’irī* (ed. Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī; Qom: Dār al-Ḥadīth, 2001).

- Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *al-Iṣāba fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥāba*, 8 vols., (ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī; Beirut: Dār al-Jil, 1991).
- Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Lisān al-Mizān*, 10 vols., (eds. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda and Salmān ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda; Beirut: Maktabat al-Matbūʿāt al-Islāmiyya, 2002).
- Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Tabdhib al-Tabdhib*, 11 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1405/1984).
- Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Taʿjil al-manfaʿa bi-zawāʿid rijāl al-aʿimma al-arbaʿa*, 2 vols., (ed. Ikrām Allāh Imdād al-Ḥaqq; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, n.d.).
- Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Taqrib* (ed. Muḥammad ʿAwwāma; n.p.: Dār al-Rashīd, 1986).
- Ibn Hibbān, Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad ibn Hibbān al-Bustī, *Kitāb al-majrūḥīn min al-muḥaddithīn wa-l-ḍuʿafāʾ wa-l-matrūkīn*, 3 vols. in one, (ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyad; Aleppo: Dār al-Waʿy, 1975).
- Ibn Hibbān, Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad ibn Hibbān al-Bustī, *Kitāb al-Thiqāt*, 9 vols., (ed. as-Sayyid Sharaf al-Dīn Aḥmad; n.p.: Dār al-Fikr, 1975).
- Maʿmar ibn Rāshid, Abū ʿUrwa Maʿmar ibn Rāshid al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-jāmiʿ*, 11 vols., (along with ʿAbd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī's *al-Muṣannaf* ed. Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān al-Aʿzamī; Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1983).
- Ibn Taymiyya, *Minbāj al-sunna al-nabawiyya*, 9 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Rashād Sālim; Riyadh: Jāmiʿat al-Imām Muḥammad ibn Suʿūd al-Islāmiyya, 1986).
- Ishāq ibn Rāhūya, Abū Yaʿqūb Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm, *Musnad Ishāq ibn Rāhūya*, 5 vols., (ed. ʿAbd al-Ghafūr ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Balūshī; Medina: Dār al-ʾImān, 1991).
- al-Jawāhirī, Muḥammad, *al-Mufīd min Muʿjam rijāl al-ḥadīth* (2nd edn., Qom: Maktabat al-Maḥallātī, 2003).
- Karagözoğlu, Macit, *Zayıf Raviler: Duafâ Literatürü ve Zayıf Rivayetler* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2014).
- al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit, *Kitāb al-muttafiq wa-l-muftariq*, 3 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Şādiq Aydın Ḥamīdī; Damascus: Dār al-Qādirī, 1997).
- al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit, *Tārīkh Baghdād aw-Madīnat al-salām*, 14 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, n.d.).
- al-Khazzāz, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad, *Kifāyāt al-atbar fī l-nuṣūṣ ʿalā l-aʿimma al-itbnā ʿasbar* (ed. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥusaynī; Qom: Maṭbaʿat al-Khayyām, 1981).

- Khū'ī, Abū l-Qāsim ibn 'Alī Akbar, *Mu'jam rijāl al-ḥadīth wa-tafṣīl ṭabaqāt al-ruwāt*, 24 vols., (5th edn., n.p.: 1992).
- Kohlberg, Etan, "From Imāmiyya to Ithnā-'Ashariyya," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39/3, 521-534.
- al-Kulaynī, Abū Ja'far Thiqaṭ al-Islām Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb ibn Ishāq, *al-Kāfī*, 8 vols., (ed. 'Alī Akbar al-Ghaffārī; 2nd edn., Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1968).
- Kuzudişli, Bekir, *Şi'a'da Hadis Rivāyeti ve İsnād*, (Istanbul: Bsr Yayıncılık, 2011).
- al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī, *Bihār al-anwār al-jāmi'a li-durar akbbār al-a'imma al-aṭḥbār*, 110 vols., (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Wafā', 1983).
- al-Māmaqānī, 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad, *Tanqīḥ al-maqāl fī 'ilm al-rijāl*, 34 vols. (not completed yet), (ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Māmaqānī; 1st edn., Qom: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt, 2002).
- al-Mawṣilī, Abū Ya'la Aḥmad ibn 'Alī, *Musnad Abī Ya'la al-Mawṣilī*, 14 vols., (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad; Damascus: Dār al-Ma'mūn li-l-Turāth, 1984).
- al-Mizzī, Yūsūf ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān, *al-Tabḍīb al-kamāl fī asmā' al-rijāl*, 35 vols., (ed. Bashshār 'Awwād Ma'rūf; Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1983).
- Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān ibn Abī Shayba, *al-'Arṣb wa-mā ruwiya fīhi* (ed. Muḥammad ibn Ḥamd al-Ḥammūd; al-Kuwait: Maktabat al-Mu'allā, 1406 H).
- al-Najāshī, Abū l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Alī, *Fibrīst asmā' muṣannifi l-Sbī'a al-mushtabar bi-rijāl al-Najāshī* (ed. Mūsā al-Zanjānī; 5th edn., Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1995).
- al-Namāzī, 'Alī al-Namāzī Shāhrūdī, *Mustadrakāt 'ilm rijāl al-ḥadīth*, 8 vols., (ed. Ḥasan ibn 'Alī al-Namāzī; Tehran: Shafaq, 1991).
- al-Nu'mānī, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn Abī Zaynab, *Kitāb al-gḥayba* (ed. Fāris Ḥassūn Karīm; Qom: Anwār al-Hudā, 2001).
- al-Şadr, Ḥasan ibn Hādī, *Nibāyat al-dirāya fī sharḥ al-risāla al-mawsūma bi-l-Wajīza li-l-Bahā'ī* (ed. Mājid al-Gharbāwī; Qom: Nashr al-Mash'ar, n.d.).
- al-Şafadī, Abū l-Şafā' Şalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak, *Kitāb al-wāfi bi-l-wafayāt*, 29 vols., (eds. Aḥmad al-Arnā'ūṭ and Dhikrī Muṣṭafā; Beirut: Dār Iḥyā' al-Turāth al-'Arabī, 2000).
- al-Şaffār, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan, *Başā'ir al-darajāt al-kubrā fī faḍā'il āl Muḥammad*, 2 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Sayyid Ḥusayn al-Mu'allim; Beirut: Dār Jawād al-A'imma, 2007).
- al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bābawayḥ al-Qummī, *Faḍā'il al-asḥbur al-tbalātha* (ed. Mīrzā Ghulām Riḍā 'Irfāniyān; Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍā', 1992).

- al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *al-Khiṣāl* (ed. 'Alī Akbar al-Ghaffārī; Qom: Jamā'a al-Mudarrisīn, 1403/1983).
- al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *Tawḥīd* (ed. Hāshim al-Ḥusaynī al-Ṭahrānī; Beirut: Dār al-Ma'rifa, n.d.).
- al-Sheikh al-Şadūq, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *Thawāb al-a'māl wa-'iqāb al-a'māl* (ed. Ḥusayn al-A'lamī; Beirut: Mu'assasat al-A'lamī li-l-Maṭbū'āt, 1989).
- Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūṭ and 'Awwād Ma'rūf, *Ṭaḥrīr Taqrīb al-Tabdbīb*, 4 vols., (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1997).
- al-Ṭabarānī, Abū l-Qāsim Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad, *al-Mu'jam al-ṣaghīr*, 2 vols., (Beirut & 'Ammān: al-Maktab al-Islāmī & Dār 'Ammār, 1985).
- al-Ṭabarānī, Abū l-Qāsim Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad, *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn*, 4 vols., (ed. Muḥammad 'Abd al-Majīd al-Salafī; Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risāla, 1989).
- Tafriṣhī, Muṣṭafā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Naqd al-rijāl*, 5 vols., (ed. Mu'assasat 'Āl al-Bayt li-Ihyā' al-Turāth; Qom: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt, 1998).
- Topgül, Muhammed Enes, *Erken Dönem Şii Ricâl İlmi: Keşşi Örneği* (PhD. dissertation; Istanbul: Marmara University, 2015).
- Topgül, Muhammed Enes, *Hadis Rivâyetinde Şülik Eğilimi* (MA thesis; Istanbul: Marmara University, 2010).
- al-Ṭūsī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *al-Fibrīst* (ed. Jawad al-Qayyūmī; 1st edn., n.p.: Mu'assasat Nashr al-Faqāha, 1997).
- al-Ṭūsī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *Ikhtiyār ma'rifat al-rijāl –(al-ma'rūf bi-Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, 2 vols., (ed. Mahdī al-Rajā'ī; Qom: Mu'assasat Āl al-Bayt, 1984).
- al-Ṭūsī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *al-Istibṣār fī mā ukbtulifa min al-akbbār*, 4 vols., (ed. Ḥasan al-Mūsawī al-Kharsān; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1984).
- al-Ṭūsī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī; Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1995).
- al-Ṭūsī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *Tabdbīb al-aḥkām fī sbarḥ al-Muqni'a li-l-Shaykh al-Mufīd*, (eds. Ḥasan al-Mūsawī Kharsān and Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Mufīd; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1985).
- al-Tustarī, Muḥammad Taqī, *Qāmūs al-rijāl*, 12 vols., (Qom: Mu'assasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1999).
- al-Uqaylī, Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Amr, *al-Ḍu'afā' al-kabīr*, 4 vols., ('Abd al-Mu'ṭī Amīn Qal'ajī) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyya, 1984).