İlahiyat Studies

A Journal on Islamic and Religious Studies

Volume 6   Number 1   Winter / Spring 2015

IS

EDITORIAL BOARD

ILAHIYAT STUDIES
Volume 6, Number 1, Winter/Spring 2015

CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITORS

Greetings and welcome back to *Ilahiyat Studies*. It is our distinct pleasure to introduce the new issue of the journal. With this issue, we are publishing three articles and five book review essays related to various disciplines of Islamic and religious studies.

The first article, "Sunnī-Shi'ī Interaction in the Early Period: The Transition of the Chains of Ahl al-Sunna to the Shī'ā" by Bekir Kuzudişli examines the time when and by whom, and through which channels the so-called Sunnī narrations (*isnād*s) were incorporated into the Shī'ī ḥadīth collections despite the fact that they are very rare to be found within the classical Shī'ī tradition. The article also attempts to present an overview of the historical development of Shī'ī ḥadīth narrative (*riwāya*). In doing so, Kuzudişli compares and contrasts al-Barqī's *Kitāb al-maḥāsin* and al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq's work with the same title.

In his article, "A Study on the Usage Forms and Course of Meaning of *Ṣāḥib sunna* as a Praising (*Taʿdīl*) Term" Sezai Engin presents a nuanced analysis of the different usages of *ṣāḥib sunna,* attempting to determine the meanings ascribed to it, and the way and the extent to which the historical conditions and context have influenced the term within *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* studies over the course of time. The article also argues that depending upon the various variables, such as the author, the period, the kind of work, and its openness in meaning, the *ṣāḥib sunna* may have an extensive structure of meaning. This diversity emanates from semantic diversity vis-a-vis the use of the concept of *sunna* in various Islamic sciences including ḥadīth, fiqh, and kalām.

Abdullah Karahan and Mehmet Şakar's article "A Treatise on Predestination: *Sharḥ Ḥadīth Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā* of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Izniqī" presents a critical analysis of a treatise by one of the Ottoman scholars Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Izniqī, who was among those who discussed the well-known and much debated ḥadīth "Discussion

between Adam and Moses," which addresses the issue of predestination, among others, from various perspectives including ḥadīth, kalām, and more specifically Islamic mysticism, *taṣawwuf.* As a Sufi scholar, understandably al-Izniqī seems to have treated the ḥadīth through a Sufi approach and presented markedly different point view, which, according to the authors, come closed to Ibn ʿArabī's views on the topic.

Apart from the articles and the books under review, there has been no major change worthy of note regarding *Ilahiyat Studies* except that our industrious book review section editor Kadir Gömbeyaz and assistant editor Seda Ensarioğlu have successfully defended their doctoral dissertations. We, as the editorial team, would like to extend our heartfelt congratulations to both Kadir and Seda. An extra congratulations goes to Kadir who has a new position as an assistant professor of Islamic Theology and Theological Sects at Kocaeli University in Kocaeli, Turkey.

We hope to see you all soon.

ARTICLES

Sunnī-Shīʿī Interaction in the Early Period
– The Transition of the Chains of Ahl al-Sunna to the Shīʿa –

Bekir Kuzudişli

৵৹৶

A Study on the Usage Forms and Course of Meaning of Ṣāḥib sunna
*as a Praising (*Taʿdīl*) Term*

Sezai Engin

৵৹৶

A Treatise on Predestination: Sharḥ Ḥadīth Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā *of*
Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Izniqī

Abdullah Karahan & Mehmet Şakar

৵৹৶

SUNNĪ-SHĪʿĪ INTERACTION IN THE EARLY PERIOD
– The Transition of the Chains of Ahl al-Sunna to the Shīʿa –

Bekir Kuzudişli
Istanbul University, Istanbul-Turkey

Abstract

The objective of this study is to examine when and by whom Sunnī narrations (*isnād*s) such as "companion > successor…" were incorporated within the Shīʿī ḥadīth canons, even though these references are rarely seen in the Shīʿī tradition. This study does not merely reveal how the mentioned chains/*isnād*s passed from Ahl al-sunna to the Shīʿa but also provides significant ideas with regard to the historical journey of the Shīʿī ḥadīth narrative (*riwāya*). Thus, I hope to obtain clues about the origins of certain narratives that the Shīʿa 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-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl" within *Kitāb al-maḥāsin* by al-Barqī, who treats the era of the eleventh imām and *al-Ghayba al-ṣughrā* (The Lesser Occultation), and *Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl* by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, 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-aʿmāl*, Shīʿa, Shīʿī ḥadīth, Sunnī ḥadīth

Introduction

One of the most notable features of the narratives in Shīʿī 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 Shīʿa, namely, *al-Kāfī* by al-Kulaynī (d. 329/940), *Man lā yaḥḍuruhū l-faqīh* by Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381/991), known as al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, and *Tahdhīb al-aḥkām* and *al-Istibṣār* by al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067), shows that Shīʿī 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 Shīʿī readers, whereas in polemical works against Ahl al-sunna by, for example, al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān (d. 260/873) and al-Ṭabarī al-Shīʿī (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 fulānun*/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, *Nihāyat al-dirāya fī sharḥ al-risāla al-mawsūma bi-l-Wajīza li-l-Bahāʾī* (ed. Mājid al-Gharbāwī; Qom: Nashr al-Mashʿar, 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. ʿAlī Akbar al-Ghaffārī, Qom: Jamāʿat al-Mudarrisīn, 1983), 498.

[3]   Accordingly, al-Faḍl 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 Shīʿī scholars here."; al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān, *al-Īḍāḥ* (ed. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Urmawī; Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tehrān, 1984), 92-93.

[4]   Al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān uses the expression "*ḥaddathanā*/he narrated us" three times. He cites these ḥadīths from al-Ḥumaydī, Ibn Abī Surayj, and Isḥāq; see *ibid*., 359, 366, and 373, respectively.

As noted above, in ḥadīth sources addressing Shīʿī 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 Shīʿī 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 Shīʿī 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 Shīʿī scholars that companions and successors fabricated ḥadīths against ʿAlī and Ahl al-bayt, even though no such evidence is confirmed by Sunnī sources.

Ahl al-sunna chains can be found dispersed in many Shīʿī sources. To determine the limits of this article, however, I will confine the discussions to a comparison between the chapter "Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl" in *al-Maḥāsin* by Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Khālid al-Barqī (d. 274/887), who lived in the era of the eleventh imām Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī (d. 260/864) and during the period of the Lesser Occultation (260-329/864-941), and the book also titled *Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl* 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-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl*

Al-Maḥāsin is a 3rd century AH work on Shīʿa, written during the Lesser Occultation by al-Barqī about, among other things, the reward (*thawāb*) and the punishment (*ʿiqāb*) 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 deeds[5] 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-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl,* written as a separate volume, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq 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-Ṣadūq is one thousand one hundred and eighteen. In addition to the content of the work by al-Barqī, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq 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-Ṣadūq.[10] Two ḥadīths transmitted by al-Barqī are quoted by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq 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-Ṣadūq. 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 Jaʿfar Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsin* (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-aʿmāl;" *ibid.,* I, 72), whereas 143 are in "ʿIqāb al-aʿmāl;" *ibid.,* I, 125).

[8]   Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl* (ed. Ḥusayn al-Aʿlamī; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Aʿlamī li-l-Maṭbūʿāt, 1989), 132 ff. (hereafter referred to as *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*).

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

[10] Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 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-Anṣarī, Uthāma ibn Zayd, Umm Salama, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Masʿūd, Ubayy ibn Kaʿb, and other *ṣaḥābī*s. Nevertheless, al-Barqī mentions the names of only three *ṣaḥābī*s 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-maḥāsin*, 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 Shīʿī 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-Ṣadūq, there are some Sunnī *isnād*s maintained by Shīʿī 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 *ṭarīq*s through both Sunnī and Shīʿī *rijāl* sources. Indeed, as I will explain below, both Sunnī and Shīʿī *rijāl* literature used to quote the early narrators; however, after a certain point, the narrators are mentioned only in Shīʿī *rijāl* sources and not in Sunnī ones. Below, in consideration of the relatively often repeated chains in the work of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, 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 Shīʿī links.

a. Sayf ibn ʿAmīra Narratives

In the work by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, the most repeated narrative (5 times) from a *ṣaḥābī* is the *ṭarīq* transferred via "…Sayf ibn ʿAmīra > his son Ḥusayn > his brother ʿAlī…" or "his son ʿAlī > 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-Ṣadūq as follows:

> As narrated via chain of Muḥammad > ʿAmr ibn ʿAbasa al-Sulamī > Shahr ibn Ḥawshab > ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām > Sayf ibn ʿAmīra[15] > his son Ḥusayn > his brother ʿAlī ibn Sayf > Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā > ʿAbd Allāh ibn Jaʿfar al-Ḥimyarī > al-Ṣadūq's father > al-Ṣadūq, 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-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 20, 25, 30, 232, 233.

[15] For the name record, see al-ʿAllāma Ibn al-Muṭahhar Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yūsūf al-Ḥillī, *Īḍāḥ al-ishtibāh* (ed. Sheikh Muḥammad al-Ḥassūn; Qom: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1990), 194. The name is marked with a vowel-point as "ʿUmayra" in *Taqrīb* by Ibn Ḥajar as edited by Muḥammad ʿAwwāma (Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb* [ed. Muḥammad ʿAwwāma; n.p.: Dār al-Rashīd, 1986], 262). ʿAwwād Maʿrūf and Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ oppose and argue that the correct version should be "ʿAmīra." See Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ and ʿAwwād Maʿrūf, *Taḥrīr Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* (Beirut: Muʾassasat 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 Mālik, Abū Hurayra, and other *ṣaḥābī*s 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 Ẓabya[18] > 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 l-Qāsim Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad, *al-Muʿjam al-ṣaghīr* (Beirut & ʿAmmān: al-Maktab al-Islāmī & Dār ʿAmmār, 1985), II, 239; id., *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn* (ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Salafī; Beirut: Muʾassasat 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-Arnāʾūṭ; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1988), XXXII, 185; ʿAbd ibn Ḥumayd, *Muntakhab min Musnad* (eds. Ṣubḥī al-Badrī al-Sāmarrāʾī 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 ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām and Sayf ibn ʿAmīra is subject to a transition from the Sunnī to the Shīʿī chain.

Sunnī rijāl sources depict ʿAbd 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 ʿĀṣim 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 Qurʾān. The narratives were seventy lengthy ḥadīths."[22] Despite certain disputes on his behalf, ʿAbd 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-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1070) claims that the problem originates from Shahr, and ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd has no fault.[23] Narratives by ʿAbd 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 ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Bahrām is the lack of information about his relation to the Shīʿa. In any event, the fact that Shīʿī 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 ʿAmīra, a frequent name in the chains of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, he is a narrator mentioned in both Sunnī and Shīʿī biographical works. Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449) mentions Sayf ibn ʿAmīra in the title of *tamyīz* in his *al-Tahdhīb* and quoted the *jarḥ* of al-Azdī

---

[22] Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* (Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1952), VI, 8; Abū l-Ḥajjāj Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yūsuf al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl fī asmāʾ al-rijāl* (ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf, Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1983), XVI, 411.

[23] Al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, XVI, 412 ff.

[24] *Ibid.*, 413.

[25] Indeed, according to Sheikh ʿAlī al-Namāzī, al-Sheikh al-Ṭūsī mentions the name of ʿAbd 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 Shīʿī biographies provide no information about Ibn Bahrām; ʿAlī al-Namāzī Shāhrūdī, *Mustadrakāt ʿilm rijāl al-ḥadīth* (ed. Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī 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 *wahm*s."[28] As a result, assessments about Sayf do not include any implication of his being Shīʿī. However, Sunnī sources relate that Abān ibn Taghlib, one of Sayf's teachers, was a renowned Shīʿī.[29]

Shīʿī sources esteem Sayf ibn ʿAmīra among the companions of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and Mūsā al-Kāẓim.[30] According to Khūʾī, "In many chains, he is mentioned as Sayf ibn ʿAmīra. There are up to 297 chains including his name." This information indicates that his narratives were quoted more often in Shīʿī books than in Sunnī sources.[31] Sayf ibn ʿAmīra 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 Wāqifī, 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, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* (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 ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl fī naqd al-rijāl* (ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ and ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1995), I, 5.

[30] Khūʾī, Abū l-Qāsim ibn ʿAlī Akbar, *Muʿjam rijāl al-ḥadīth wa-tafṣīl ṭabaqāt al-ruwāt* (5th edn., n.p.: 1992), IX, 382.

[31] Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, IX, 384.

[32] Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Najāshī, *Fihrist asmāʾ muṣannifī l-Shīʿa al-mushtahar bi-rijāl al-Najāshī* (ed. Mūsā al-Zanjānī; 5th edn., Qom: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1995), 189. As Khūʾī indicates, the term "reliable" is not present in some copies from al-Najāshī. However, certain Shīʿī scholars mention the word "reliable" for al-Najāshī's book, whereupon the said word should be present in his book (Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, IX, 382).

[33] Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī, n.p.: Muʾassasat Nashr al-Faqāha, 1997), 140.

[34] Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, *Khulāṣat al-aqwāl fī maʿrifat al-rijāl* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī; Qom: Muʾassasat Nashr al-Fuqāhāʾ, 1996), 160; al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, *Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd* (ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āl Baḥr al-ʿulūm; Najaf: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Ḥaydariyya, 1972), 108; Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, IX, 382.

[35] Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, IX, 383.

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

In contrast, the isnāds of Sayf ibn ʿAmīra mentioned by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq,[37] al-Najāshī,[38] and al-Ṭūsī[39] 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-mīzān*:

> 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 Wāqifī.

[37]   *Ibid.*, IX, 383.

[38]   Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 189.

[39]   Al-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, 140.

[40]   Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Lisān al-Mīzān* (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 İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2014), 179.

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

[43]   Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 278.

[44]   Khūʾī, *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 Ẓabya>) 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 *Rāfiḍī*s 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-Fihrist*, 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-Mīzān*, 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, ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā al-Qummī, is also among prominent Shīʿī scholars of the period.[50]

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

b. Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr Narratives

Among the narratives mentioned in the work of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, those following the line "… Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr > al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf…" also deserve an attentive examination with regard to the maintenance of *isnād*s, previously related by Sunnī narrators, in Shīʿī circles. The persons in the *ṭabaqa* of *ṣaḥāba* and *tabiʿūn* within three *isnād*s are as follows:

"Zayd ibn Arqam > Muhājir ibn al-Ḥasan > Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr > al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf > ʿAḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-Kūfī, and Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim al-Qummī…."[52]

---

[48] Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 220. For comparison, see Khū'ī, *Muʿjam*, X, 150.

[49] Edition: Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth, 1993.

[50] Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 261.

[51] For a narrative on the virtue of *kalimat al-tawḥīd*, see al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 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 Maʿmar ibn Rāshid (Abū ʿUrwa Maʿmar ibn Rāshid al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-jāmiʿ* [along with ʿAbd al-Razzāq ibn Hammām al-Ṣanʿānī's *al-Muṣannaf* ed. Ḥabib al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī; 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 Yaʿlā Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī al-Mawṣilī, *Musnad Abī Yaʿlā al-Mawṣilī* (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad; Damascus: Dār al-Maʾmūn li-l-Turāth, 1984), IV, 188; al-Ṭabarānī, *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn*, III, 384. Apparently, the narrative passed to Shīʿī circle after Sayf ibn ʿAmīra.

[52] Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 24.

"Ḥudhayfa > Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh > Zayd ibn Rāfiʿī > 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 Rāfiʿī, 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 Rāfiʿī.[56] Only Ibn Ḥajar reports the presence of Muhājir ibn al-Ḥasan in a chain, indicating that this person should be Muhājir al-Ṣāʾigh, 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-Namarī, *al-Istidhkār li-madhhab ʿulamāʾ al-amṣār fī-mā taḍammanahū l-Muwaṭṭaʾ 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-aʾimma 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, *Tahdhīb*, 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-Tahdhīb*, VIII, 120).

Zirr ibn Ḥubaysh is described as a companion of ʿAlī by al-Ṭūsī, and his many narratives are given in Shīʿī 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 ʿAṭāʾ ibn Abī Rabāḥ, another narrator. Shīʿī works seldom provide information about him.[63] However, ʿAṭāʾ 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 Shīʿī literature.

As for Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr, the common narrator in all three narratives above, he is present in both Sunnī and Shīʿī works. Al-Barqī and al-Ṭūsī consider him among companions of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. In terms of *jarḥ* and *taʿdīl*, Shīʿī works contain little information about him, and words by Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī (5th/11th century) are important for understanding Sulaymān's personality. Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī names him as "*kadhdhāb al-Nakhāʿ*/liar of Nakhāʿ," stating that he is a truly weak narrator.[65] The same author also quotes[66] the following opinion about Sulaymān: "*yakdhibᵘ ʿalā l-waqt*/he lies at once."[67]

---

61 Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, VIII, 225. For narratives by Zirr in Shīʿī literature and more information about him, see al-Namāzī, *Mustadrakāt*, III, 422-423.

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

63 See Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, XII, 158. Al-Jawāhirī reports he is unknown; Muḥammad al-Jawāhirī, *al-Mufīd min Muʿjam 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 aʿlām al-nubalāʾ* (3rd edn., Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1985), V, 78.

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

66 See Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī, *al-Rijāl*, 114. For comparison, see Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, *Khulāṣa*, 351. Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾirī 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-Nakhaʿī, Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr (ʿUmar) al-Nakhaʿī, and Sulaymān ibn Yaʿqūb al-Nakhaʿī. Al-Ḥillī collects these persons under the same name (Sulaymān al-Nakhaʿī), 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), ʿAḥmad 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 "*kadhdhāb al-Nakhaʿ*"[69] and "*kāna yakdhib^u mujāwabat^{an}*/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 *isnād*s, one of which is "Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq ʿan abīh^i ʿan jaddih^i," 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 *isnād*s.[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: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1999), V, 287.

[67] This statement originally was *yakdhib^u ʿalā l-waqf*. Al-Tustarī points out that, however, it should be *yakdhib^u 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-ʿUqaylī, *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ al-kabīr* (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn Qalʿajī; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1984), II, 134; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, IX, 15-20; al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, II, 218.

[69] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī,, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, IX, 16.

[70] *Ibid.*, IX, 20.

[71] *Ibid.*

[72] For some of his narratives, see Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, IX, 289.

[73] For Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, see Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, III, 85; for al-Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-Kūfī, see Khūʾī, *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 Shīʿī circle by means of Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr. The chains, quoted for the first time by al-Ḥusayn ibn Sayf, were later maintained by well-known Shīʿī scholars. Thus, the ḥadīths, which were generally related by Sunnī narrators until the time of Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr, were incorporated under Shīʿī ḥadīth canons from then on. Nevertheless, because Sulaymān ibn ʿAmr is described as an untruthful person in both Sunnī and Shīʿī biographical literature, I must assert the condition "if he did not fabricate these ḥadīths and narrations."

c. Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī Narrations

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

"Anas ibn Mālik > al-Ḥakam (ibn Maṣqala[74] al-ʿAbdī) > Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī > Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Ṣayrafī > Muḥammad ibn Abī l-Qāsim > Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī > al-Ṣadūq."[75]

"Ibn ʿAbbās > Saʿīd ibn Jubayr > Sālim (ibn ʿAjlān) al-Afṭas > Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī > Ayyūb ibn Sulaym al-ʿAṭṭār > Salama ibn Khaṭṭāb > Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār > 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-ʿarsh* by Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān Ibn Abī

---

[74] For reading of the name, see al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, II, 346; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Lisān al-Mīzān*, III, 255.

[75] Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 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-ʿAbdī > Abū ʿĀmir Muhājir ibn Kathīr al-Asadī > Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī > 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 Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī shows that al-Ḥakam ibn Maṣqala is mentioned only in Sunnī biographical literature. Nevertheless, this narrator is defined as a liar[79] 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 Shīʿī scholars, al-Ṭūsī mentions Muhājir ibn Kathīr al-Asadī as a companion of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq.[82] Moreover, al-Kulaynī cites a ḥadīth from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq with the sole indication of "Muhājir al-Asadī." According to Khūʾī (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 ʿAlī ibn Abī Bakr ibn Sulaymān al-Haythamī, *Bughyat al-bāḥith ʿan zawāʾid Musnad al-Ḥārith* (ed. al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad Ṣāliḥ al-Bākirī; Medina: al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya Markaz Khiḍmat al-Sunna wa-l-Sīra al-Nabawiyya, 1992), I, 252; Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-ʿArsh wa-mā ruwiya fīh[i]* (ed. Muḥammad ibn Ḥamd al-Ḥammūd; al-Kuwait: Maktabat al-Muʿallā, 1406 H), 67.

[78] Al-Haythamī, *Bughya*, I, 252; Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-ʿArsh*, 67.

[79] Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, II, 346-347.

[80] *Ibid.*; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Lisān al-Mīzān*, III, 255 (ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda) and sources given by editors.

[81] Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, IV, 193.

[82] Al-Ṭūsī, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī; Qom: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1995), 310; Muṣṭafā ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Tafrīshī, *Naqd al-rijāl* (ed. Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt li-Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth; Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt, 1998), IV, 443.

[83] Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, XX, 91.

Muhājir al-Asadī in *al-Kāfī* 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, Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī is the name to pay attention to with regard to the transition of this narrative from Ahl al-sunna to Shīʿa.

Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī, as stated in the work by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, is a narrator referred to in both Sunnī and Shīʿī books. Under the title Abū Ḥudhayfa Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī al-Khurāsānī, al-Najāshī writes the following: "Isḥāq ibn Bishr is a reliable narrator. He narrated via Abū ʿAbd Allāh Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. 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 Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī 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 Isḥāq ibn Bishr who is recorded as Abū Ḥudhayfa is in fact Isḥāq, who wrote *Kitāb al-mubtadaʾ*. He is accused of lying by numerous scholars. This Isḥāq ibn Bishr passed away in Bukhārā in 206 AH.[90] In other words, this Isḥāq ibn Bishr is from Khurāsān and not a Kāhilī. Therefore, Ibn

---

[84] Al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs*, X, 304.

[85] Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 72.

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

[87] Ibn Ḥibbān, *Kitāb al-majrūḥīn*, I, 135.

[88] See al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs*, I, 737-741; Muḥammad ʿAlī Muwaḥḥid al-Abṭaḥī, *Tahdhīb 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-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, *Khulāṣā*, 318; al-Tafrīshī, *Naqd al-rijāl*, I, 191.

[89] See al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, I, 184 ff.

[90] *Ibid.*, 185-186.

Ḥibbān is wrong to describe him as "al-Kāhilī" and to talk about only one Isḥāq ibn Bishr.

Isḥāq, who is described as al-Kāhilī, is actually Isḥāq ibn Bishr ibn Muqātil. Unlike previous ones, the identity (*kunya*) of the latter is Abū Yaʿqūb. Many scholars describe Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī as a liar as well. Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī is from al-Kūfa and died in 228 AH.[91] Reports by Sunnī scholars reveal he was not related to Shīʿa.

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

In our present chains, Isḥāq ibn Bishr is always mentioned with the adjective "al-Kāhilī." Pursuant to this distinction, this Isḥāq is not the Abū Ḥudhayfa Isḥāq ibn Bishr cited by al-Najāshī. Accordingly, in the above-given chain of Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān ibn Abī Shayba, he identifies his master as Abū Yaʿqūb al-Kāhilī.[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 Yaʿqūb ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī citing al-ʿUqaylī.[94] Ibn Ḥibbān, however, refers to Abū Ḥudhayfa Isḥāq ibn Bishr for the same ḥadīth.[95]

In addition to Ibn Ḥibbān and al-Najāshī, Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣfahānī (d. 430/1038) introduces Abū Ḥudhayfa Isḥāq ibn Bishr as "al-

---

[91] *Ibid.*, 186-187.

[92] Al-Abṭaḥī, *Tahdhīb al-maqāl*, III, 84; al-Māmaqānī, *Tanqīḥ al-maqāl fī ʿilm al-rijāl* (ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Māmaqānī; Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt, 2002), IX, 69 (editor's note).

[93] Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-ʿArsh*, 67.

[94] Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, I, 186.

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

Kāhilī."[96] However, in an earlier period, Ibn ʿAdī (d. 365/976) and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī stated that these were two different persons.[97]

According to some recent Shīʿī authors, Abū Yaʿqūb Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī also had a tendency toward Shīʿa, like Abū Ḥudhayfa Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Khurāsānī. For example, grounded on the ḥadīth "A *fitna* will follow after my life. Be dependent on ʿAlī during this sedition…,"[98] in which he mentions the biography of Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī in al-Dhahabī, Muḥsin al-Amīn (d. 1371/1951) asserts that he had Shīʿī inclinations.[99] Contemporary Shīʿī authors share this conviction.[100]

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

However, Ibn ʿAdī cites a ḥadīth via Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī, in which Caliph Abū Bakr is explicitly described as the most virtuous

---

[96] Abū Nuʿaym Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Iṣbahānī, , *Kitāb al-ḍuʿafāʾ* (ed. Fārūq Ḥamāda; al-Dār al-Bayḍāʾ: Dār al-Thaqāfa, 1984), 61.

[97] Ibn ʿAdī, *al-Kāmil fī ḍuʿafāʾ al-rijāl* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1988), I, 337, 342; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, VI, 324, 326.

[98] Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, 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 Shīʿa (Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Aʿyān al-Shīʿa*, III, 267). Prior to the words above, Muḥsin al-Amīn indicates that in the mentioned chain line, the name of Isḥāq ibn Bishr is definitely mentioned, and he might be a Kāhilī. According to the author, this ḥadīth may be the reason why Ahl al-sunna described Isḥāq as a liar; see *ibid*.

[100] Al-Abṭaḥī, *Tahdhīb al-maqāl*, III, 84.

[101] Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Iṣāba fī tamyīz al-ṣaḥāba* (ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī; Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1991), VII, 354.

[102] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kitāb al-muttafiq wa-l-muftariq* (ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āydin Ḥamīdī; Damascus: Dār al-Qādirī, 1997), I, 434. Indeed, the narrative told by al-Khaṭīb in biography of Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Asadī reveals his Shīʿī 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 ʿAlī 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 Isḥāq 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 Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī 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 Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī, whereas the narrators of Isḥāq in the Shīʿī literature are Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Ṣayrafī[106] 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 Topgül, *Erken Dönem Şiî Ricâl İlmi: Keşşî Örneği* (PhD. dissertation; Istanbul: Marmara University, 2015), 20, 213, 281.

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

[107] al-Ṭūsī, *Tahdhīb al-aḥkām fī sharḥ 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, *Khulāṣa*, 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-Ṣayrafī,[110] whereas al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq 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 Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī, for quoting *munkar ḥadīth*s 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-Ṣadūq 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-Ṣaffār quote narratives from him.[114] This assessment, however, is not accurate because it is Muḥammad ibn Zayd whom al-Ṣadūq 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 Khūʾī, 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-Fihrist*, 223; Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, XVII, 320.

[110] Al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsin*, 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 Maṣqala. In biographical works, the name Ḥakam ibn Miskīn, who relates narratives in the mentioned *ṭabaqa*, cannot be found.

[111] Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 54.

[112] Al-Najāshī, *Rijāl*, 338.

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

[114] Al-Bihbahānī, *Taʿlīqa ʿalā Minhāj al-maqāl* (n.p.: n.d.), 305.

[115] See Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, XVI, 203; al-Tustarī, *Qāmūs*, IX, 186.

[116] Khūʾī, *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-Tahdhīb*.[118]

Consequently, Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī contributed to knowledge of that ḥadīth among both Sunnī and Shīʿī narrators. Although it is doubtful whether Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī 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 Isḥāq al-Kāhilī to spread his ḥadīths:

"Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī was lying. He sat on the road to Qabīṣa's[119] 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 "ʿAmr ibn Khālid > al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿUlwān," 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, *Tahdhīb al-aḥkām*, III, 261.

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

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

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

[122] For ʿAmr ibn Khālid see Ibn ʿAdī, *al-Kāmil*, V, 123; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, XXI, 606; al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, III, 257; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *al-Tahdhīb*, VIII, 24-25. For al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿUlwān see al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdād*, VIII, 62-64; al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, I, 542.

[123] For ʿAmr ibn Khālid see al-Ṭūsī, *Ikhtiyār maʿrifat al-rijāl –(al-maʿrūf bi-Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, (ed. Mahdī al-Rajāʾī; Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt, 1984), II, 498; id, *al-Istibṣār fī-mā ukhtulifa min al-akhbār* (ed. Ḥasan al-Mūsawī al-Kharsān; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1984), I, 66; Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, VII, 34; for al-

A general evaluation in consideration of the previously mentioned chains and other Sunnī chains in *Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl* by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq reveals the following.

The first striking point is that Ahl al-sunna references in the chapters "Thawāb al-aʿmāl" and "ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl" of *al-Maḥāsin* by al-Barqī are less than those in *Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl* by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq; however, al-Ṣadūq's work provides an indisputable place to al-Barqī, al-Ṣaffār, and ʿAḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, who are all notable scholars from Qom. Therefore, these authors knew ḥadīths through Ahl al-sunna. These ḥadīths treated not Shīʿī-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 ʿĪsā, includes no reference that begins with a ṣahābī other than the Ahl al-bayt. However, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq 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. ʿAḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, 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-Maḥāsin* by al-Barqī in consideration of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq's references shows that al-Barqī is mentioned in three narratives cited by al-Ṣadūq through a ṣahābī.[124] Strikingly enough, these chains are not included in *Kitāb al-maḥāsin*.[125] There may be two reasons for this. First, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq 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 ʿUlwān see al-Bihbahānī, *Taʿlīqa*, 144; al-Namāzī, *Mustadrakāt*, III, 154; Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, V, 376. For negative opinions about al-Ḥusayn, see al-Māmaqānī, *Tanqīḥ al-maqāl*, XXII, 258.

[124] For these narratives, see al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 22, 73, 80.

[125] During my research on *al-Maḥāsin*, I came across no such chains; likewise, the relevant chapter in *Biḥār al-anwār* shows that the mentioned narratives do not refer to *al-Maḥāsin*. In the reference order under the previous footnote, see Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār al-jāmiʿa li-durar akhbār al-aʾimma al-aṭhār* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Wafāʾ, 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 Mālik > al-Ḥakam > Isḥāq ibn Bishr al-Kāhilī > Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Ṣayrafī > Muḥammad ibn Abī l-Qāsim > Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī"[126] is also given by al-Barqī in *al-Maḥāsin*. Al-Barqī adopts the ḥadīth with the same line as Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Ṣayrafī; however, he writes "someone" (*rajul*) instead of Anas ibn Mālik and seems reluctant to identify the name of the ṣaḥābī.[127] This is because of the negative image of Anas ibn Mālik[128] because, according to Shīʿīs, he concealed the *ḥadīth al-ṭayr*.[129]

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

---

[126] Al-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 54.

[127] It is difficult to obtain a final conclusion here. In *Kitāb al-maḥāsin*, al-Barqī relates via Anas ibn Mālik, even though only in a single narrative (Al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsin*, 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 Mālik, the servant at the moment, hears the prayer, he asks for one of the Anṣār to come. As ʿAlī 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 ʿAlī in. As ʿAlī 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, ʿAlī reminds Anas of the incident, but the latter responds that he forgot about it. Thereupon ʿAlī asks Allah to punish him (Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, IV, 151). Shīʿa consider this ḥadīth *mutawātir*. Among Ahl al-sunna scholars, al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī relates the ḥadīth in *al-Mustadrak*, classifying it authentic pursuant to conditions prescribed by al-Bukhārī and Muslim (Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī, *al-Mustadrak ʿalā l-Ṣaḥīḥayn* [ed. Yūsuf ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Marʿashlī; Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.], III, 131). Nevertheless, ḥadīth scholars al-Dhahabī above all (al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ* [eds. Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ and ʿAlī Abū Zayd; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1983], XIII, 233) oppose him, whereas some others deem it a fabrication (Ibn Taymiyya, *Minhāj al-sunna al-nabawiyya* [ed. Muḥammad Rashād Sālim; Riyadh: Jāmiʿat al-Imām Muḥammad ibn Suʿūd 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-ḍaʿīfa wa-l-mawḍūʿa wa-atharuhū l-sayyiʾ fī l-umma* (Riyadh: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1992), XIV, 176-185.

[129] For detailed information about the matter, see Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, IV, 149.

one ḥadīths includes only thirty-eight *isnād*s 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 ʿAlī is more suitable for caliphate in terms of knowledge and virtue. Thus, *Baṣāʾir* did not include many ḥadīths conveyed by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq via al-Ṣaffār, 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 Saʿīd al-Ahwadhī (3rd/9th century), the master of both ʿAhmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā and ʿAhmad ibn Abī ʿAbd Allāh al-Barqī, is not mentioned in Ahl al-sunna chains given by al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq or al-Barqī. *Kitāb al-zuhd,* one of the extant works by al-Ḥusayn ibn Saʿīd, 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 ʿAhmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā and al-Barqī, his two disciples, are mentioned as well as explicit mention of al-Ṣaffār, whereas Ahl al-sunna *isnād*s almost never appear in his book, and the name of al-Ḥusayn ibn Saʿīd is absent in the later works I studied.

The same applies to prominent Shīʿī 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 Saʿīd al-Ahwadhī relates most narratives (Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr [31 narratives], Muḥammad ibn Sinān [10 narratives], ʿUthmān ibn ʿĪsā [7 narratives], al-Ḥasan ibn Maḥbūb [7 narratives], ʿAlī ibn al-Nuʿmān [6 narratives], al-Naḍr ibn

---

[130] Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār, *Baṣāʾir al-darajāt al-kubrā fī faḍāʾil āl Muḥammad* (ed. Muḥammad Sayyid Ḥusayn al-Muʿallim; Beirut: Dār Jawād al-Aʾimma, 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 *isnād*. In this chain line of "Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī > some persons > Ibn Abī ʿUmayr > al-Barqī's father > al-Barqī" (al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsin*, 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-maḥāsin*, 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 *isnād*s but not in the chapters I study in *al-Maḥāsin* (Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl). See al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-maḥāsin*, 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-Ṣadūq,[137] whereas Ṣafwān 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, Ṣafwān 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-Ṣaffār 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 Ṣafwān 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-ʿāmma* (Ahl al-sunna) and *al-khāṣṣa* (Shīʿa), but they confused them. They began to narrate knowledge of *al-ʿāmma* via *al-khāṣṣa*, and that of *al-khāṣṣa* via *al-ʿāmma*. I gave up deriving ḥadīth from *al-ʿāmma* 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-Ṣadūq, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl*, 246.

[138] al-Ṭūsī, *Ikhtiyār maʿrifat al-rijāl*, II, 854.

from *al-ʿāmma*; 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-ʿāmma*.[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 Murjiʾa, 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 Isḥāq 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 *taʿdīl* 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 *isnād*s 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-Maḥāsin* 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 Ḥātim (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 Ḥātim > 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 Ḥātim, 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 Ḥātim, settled in Egypt and is defined as "*ṣadūq* and *thiqa*" by Ibn Abī Ḥātim

---

[143] Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, XVI, 169.

[144] *Ibid.*, 163.

[145] Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, *Rijāl*, 273; Khūʾī, *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] Khūʾī 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-ashhur al-thalātha*.[154] In this version, however, it is ʿAḥmad ibn Ḥasan al-Qaṭṭān who conveys the ḥadīth from Ibn Abī Ḥātim[155] to al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq. According to Khūʾī, Aḥmad ibn Ḥasan, another frequent figure in numerous works of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq,[156] may be among *al-ʿāmma* (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] Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, VII, 292.

[152] *Ibid.*, 292.

[153] *Ibid.*, *Muʿjam*, V, 90.

[154] Al-Ṣadūq, *Faḍāʾil al-ashhur 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-wāfī 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] Khūʾī, *Muʿjam*, II, 93.

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

In addition to narratives through Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq mentions Ahl al-sunna *isnād*s, which apparently made the transition to Shīʿī 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-Ṣadūq, pro-Shīʿa 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 Shīʿī books. Indeed, because the last Imām went into the Occultation and the long-lasting Occultation period caused havoc, Shīʿī 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-Ṣaffār, about the number of Imāms and the Occultation of the final Imām. Nevertheless, al-Ṣaffār and, later, al-Kulaynī used only Ahl al-bayt references to prove that there are twelve Imāms,[160] whereas Ibn Abī Zaynab al-Nuʿmānī al-Baghdādī (d. ca. 360/970), a disciple of al-Kulaynī, preferred to prove via Sunnī *isnād*s that there would be Twelve Imāms and related two chapters to this problem.[161] In addition, al-Nuʿmānī does not mention the name of his masters in Sunnī chains, with the exception of a few,[162] and he records them as *muʿallaq*. One or two generations later, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Khazzāz al-Qummī (4ᵗʰ/10ᵗʰ century), a disciple of al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, 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 ʿAwwāma; Jedda & Damascus: Shirkat Dār al-Qibla & Muʾassasat ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān, 2006), VI, 334; Isḥāq ibn Rāhūya, *Musnad Isḥāq ibn Rāhūya* (ed. ʿAbd al-Ghafūr ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Balūshī; Medina: Dār al-Īmān, 1991), III, 954.

[160] Al-Ṣaffār, *Baṣāʾir*, II, 111; Abū Jaʿfar Thiqat al-islām Muḥammad ibn Yaʿqūb ibn Isḥāq al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī* (ed. ʿAlī Akbar al-Ghaffārī; 2ⁿᵈ edn., Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1968), I, 534.

[161] Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn Abī Zaynab al-Nuʿmānī, *Kitāb al-ghayba* (ed. Fāris Ḥassūn Karīm; Qom: Anwār al-Hudā, 2001), 104, 117.

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

as Anas ibn Mālik, ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū Hurayra, and ʿĀʾisha 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-Īḍāḥ* by al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān. However, there is a significant difference. As noted above, al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān obligatorily mentioned Ahl al-sunna *isnād*s – albeit incompletely – when he quoted ḥadīths to present the controversies of Ahl al-sunna. Nonetheless, the main objective of both al-Nuʿmānī and al-Khazzāz in writing their books was to protect and maintain confused Shīʿīs who were inclined to leave Shīʿa 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-Nuʿmānī, at the end of most chapters, advises Shīʿīs 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-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl" in *Kitāb al-maḥāsin* by al-Barqī and *Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl* 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 Shīʿī 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, Shīʿī 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 Shīʿī 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-maḥāsin* by al-Barqī treat few Ahl al-sunna chains, al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq's references reveal that both al-Barqī and

---

[163] ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad al-Khazzāz, *Kifāyat al-athar fī l-nuṣūṣ ʿalā l-aʾimma al-ithnā ʿashar* (ed. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥusaynī; Qom: Maṭbaʿat al-Khayyām, 1981), 8.

[164] Al-Nuʿmānī, *Kitāb al-ghayba*, 27 ff; al-Khazzāz, *Kifāyat al-athar*, 7.

[165] See al-Nuʿmānī, *Kitāb al-ghayba*, 58, 64, 103 ff.

his contemporary ʿAḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā and al-Ṣaffār 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-Ṣadūq is that the persons in the transition era were generally active in both Sunnī and Shīʿī 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 Shīʿī 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 Shīʿī literature can be found in both Sunnī and Shīʿī 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 *madhhab*s. This fact is compatible with a modern study of pro-Shīʿī narrators in Ahl al-sunna biographies. The mentioned study asserts that 94% of pro-Shīʿa 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: Shīʿī 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, Shīʿī 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-ʿAshariyya," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39/3, 521-534. However, after the Greater Occultation, both Shīʿī and Sunnī references include numerous narrations that there are Twelve Imāms. See al-Khazzāz, *Kifāyat al-athar.*

[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*.

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-Abṭaḥī, Muḥammad ʿAlī Muwaḥḥid, *Tahdhīb 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-atharuhᵘ l-sayyiʾ fī l-umma*, 14 vols., (Riyadh: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1992).

al-Amīn, Muḥsin, *Aʿyān al-Shīʿa*, 10 vols., (ed. Ḥasan al-Amīn; Beirut: Dār al-Taʿāruf, 1983)

al-Barqī, Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, *Kitāb al-maḥāsin*, 2 vols., (ed. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1370).

al-Bihbahānī, Muḥammad Bāqir al-Waḥīd, *Taʿlīqa ʿalā Minhāj al-maqāl* (n.p., n.d).

al-Dhahabī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl fī naqḍ al-rijāl*, 8 vols., (eds. ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ and ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1995).

al-Dhahabī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalaʾ*, 25 vols., (eds. Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ and ʿAlī Abū Zayd; 3rd edn., Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1985).

al-Faḍl ibn Shādhān, *al-Īḍāḥ* (ed. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Urmawī; Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tehrān, 1984).

al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muḥammad, *al-Mustadrak ʿalā l-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, 4 vols., (ed. Yūsuf ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Marʿashlī; Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.).

al-Haythamī, Abū l-Ḥasan Nūr al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn Abī Bakr ibn Sulaymān, *Bughyat al-bāḥith ʿan zawaʾid Musnad al-Ḥārith*, 2 vols., (ed. al-Ḥusayn Aḥmad Ṣāliḥ al-Bākirī; Medina: al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya Markaz Khidmat al-Sunna wa-l-Sīra al-Nabawiyya, 1992).

al-Ḥillī, al-ʿAllāma Ibn al-Muṭahhar Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf, *Īḍāḥ al-ishtibāh* (ed. Sheikh Muḥammad al-Ḥassūn; Qom: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1990).

al-Ḥillī, al-ʿAllāma Ibn al-Muṭahhar Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf, *Khulāṣat al-aqwāl fī maʿrifat al-rijāl* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī, Qom: Muʾassasat Nashr al-Faqāha, 1996).

al-Ḥillī, al-Ḥasan Ibn ʿAlī Ibn Dāwud, *Rijāl Ibn Dāwūd* (ed. Muḥammad Ṣādiq Āl Baḥr al-ʿulūm; Najaf: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Ḥaydariyya, 1972).

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *al-Istidhkār li-madhhab ʿulamāʾ al-amṣār fī mā taḍammanahū al-Muwaṭṭaʾ min maʿānī al-raʾy wa-l-āthār*, 30 vols., (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn al-Qalʿajī; Damascus: Dār al-Quṭayba & Aleppo: Dār al-Waʿy, 1993).

Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad al-Rāzī, *al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl*, 9 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 1952).

Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad al-Rāzī, *Tafsīr Ibn Abī Ḥātim*, 10 vols., (ed. Asʿad Muḥammad al-Ṭayyib; Ṣaydā: al-Maktaba al-ʿAṣriyya, n.d.).

Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf*, 26 vols., (ed. Muḥammad ʿAwwāma; Jedda: Shirkat Dār al-Qibla & Damascus: Muʾassasat ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān, 2006).

Ibn ʿAdī, ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAdī al-Jurjānī, *al-Kāmil fī ḍuʿafāʾ al-rijāl*, 7 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1988).

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

Ibn Ḥajar 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-Jīl, 1991).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Lisān al-Mīzān*, 10 vols., (eds. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda and Salmān ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda; Beirut: Maktabat al-Matbūʿāt al-Islāmiyya, 2002).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, 11 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1405/1984).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Taʿjīl al-manfaʿa bi-zawāʾid rijāl al-aʾimma al-arbaʿa*, 2 vols., (ed. Ikrām Allāh Imdād al-Ḥaqq; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, n.d.).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Taqrīb* (ed. Muḥammad ʿAwwāma; n.p.: Dār al-Rashīd, 1986).

Ibn Ḥibbān, Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān 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-Waʾy, 1975).

Ibn Ḥibbān, Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān 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. Ḥabib al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī; Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1983).

Ibn Taymiyya, *Minhāj al-sunna al-nabawiyya*, 9 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Rashād Sālim; Riyadh: Jāmiʿat al-Imām Muḥammad ibn Suʿūd al-Islāmiyya, 1986).

Isḥāq ibn Rāhūya, Abū Yaʿqūb Isḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm, *Musnad Isḥāq ibn Rāhūya*, 5 vols., (ed. ʿAbd al-Ghafūr ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Balūshī; Medina: Dār al-Īmān, 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 Ṣādiq Āydin 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-athar fī l-nuṣūṣ ʿalā l-aʾimma al-ithnā ʿashar* (ed. ʿAbd al-Laṭīf al-Ḥusaynī; Qom: Maṭbaʿat al-Khayyām, 1981).

Khū'ī, Abū l-Qāsim ibn ʿAlī Akbar, *Muʿjam rijāl al-ḥadīth wa-tafṣīl ṭabaqāt al-ruwāt*, 24 vols., (5th edn., n.p.: 1992).

Kohlberg, Etan, "From Imāmiyya to Ithnā-ʿAshariyya," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 39/3, 521-534.

al-Kulaynī, Abū Jaʿfar Thiqat al-islām Muḥammad ibn Yaʿqūb ibn Isḥāq, *al-Kāfī*, 8 vols., (ed. ʿAlī Akbar al-Ghaffārī; 2nd edn., Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1968).

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

al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī, *Biḥār al-anwār al-jāmiʿa li-durar akhbār al-aʾimma al-aṭhār*, 110 vols., (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Wafāʾ, 1983).

al-Māmaqānī, ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muḥammad, *Tanqīḥ al-maqāl fī ʿilm al-rijāl*, 34 vols. (not completed yet), (ed. Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Māmaqānī; 1st edn., Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt, 2002).

al-Mawṣilī, Abū Yaʿlā Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Musnad Abī Yaʿlā al-Mawṣilī*, 14 vols., (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad; Damascus: Dār al-Maʾmūn li-l-Turāth, 1984).

al-Mizzī, Yūsūf ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, al-*Tahdhīb al-kamāl fī asmāʾ al-rijāl*, 35 vols., (ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1983).

Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān ibn Abī Shayba, *al-ʿArsh wa-mā ruwiya fīhi* (ed. Muḥammad ibn Ḥamd al-Ḥammūd; al-Kuwait: Maktabat al-Muʿallā, 1406 H).

al-Najāshī, Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Fihrist asmāʾ muṣannifī l-Shīʿa al-mushtahar bi-rijāl al-Najāshī* (ed. Mūsā al-Zanjānī; 5th edn., Qom: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1995).

al-Namāzī, ʿAlī al-Namāzī Shāhrūdī, *Mustadrakāt ʿilm rijāl al-ḥadīth*, 8 vols., (ed. Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī al-Namāzī; Tehran: Shafaq, 1991).

al-Nuʿmānī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ibn Abī Zaynab, *Kitāb al-ghayba* (ed. Fāris Ḥassūn Karīm; Qom: Anwār al-Hudā, 2001).

al-Ṣadr, Ḥasan ibn Hādī, *Nihāyat al-dirāya fī sharḥ al-risāla al-mawsūma bi-l-Wajīza li-l-Bahāʾī* (ed. Mājid al-Gharbāwī; Qom: Nashr al-Mashʿar, n.d.).

al-Ṣafadī, Abū l-Ṣafāʾ Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak, *Kitāb al-wāfī bi-l-wafayāt,* 29 vols., (eds. Aḥmad al-Arnāʾūṭ and Dhikrī Muṣṭafā; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2000).

al-Ṣaffār, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan, *Baṣāʾir al-darajāt al-kubrā fī faḍāʾil āl Muḥammad*, 2 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Sayyid Ḥusayn al-Muʿallim; Beirut: Dār Jawād al-Aʾimma, 2007).

al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *Faḍāʾil al-ashhur al-thalātha* (ed. Mīrzā Ghulām Riḍā ʿIrfāniyān; Beirut: Dār al-Maḥajja al-Bayḍāʾ, 1992).

al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *al-Khiṣāl* (ed. ʿAlī Akbar al-Ghaffārī; Qom: Jamāʿa al-Mudarrisīn, 1403/1983).

al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *Tawḥīd* (ed. Hāshim al-Ḥusaynī al-Ṭahrānī; Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.).

al-Sheikh al-Ṣadūq, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *Thawāb al-aʿmāl wa-ʿiqāb al-aʿmāl* (ed. Ḥusayn al-Aʿlamī; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Aʿlamī li-l-Maṭbūʿāt, 1989).

Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ and ʿAwwād Maʿrūf, *Taḥrīr Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, 4 vols., (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1997).

al-Ṭabarānī, Abū l-Qāsim Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad, *al-Muʿjam al-ṣaghīr*, 2 vols., (Beirut & ʿAmmān: al-Maktab al-Islāmī & Dār ʿAmmār, 1985).

al-Ṭabarānī, Abū l-Qāsim Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad, *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn*, 4 vols., (ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Majīd al-Salafī; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1989).

Tafrīshī, Muṣṭafā ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Naqd al-rijāl*, 5 vols., (ed. Muʾassasat ʿĀl al-Bayt li-Ihyāʾ al-Turāth; Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt, 1998).

Topgül, Muhammed Enes, *Erken Dönem Şiî Ricâl İlmi: Keşşî Örneği* (PhD. dissertation; Istanbul: Marmara University, 2015).

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

al-Ṭūsī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *al-Fihrist* (ed. Jawad al-Qayyūmī; 1st edn., n.p.: Muʾassasat Nashr al-Faqāha, 1997).

al-Ṭūsī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *Ikhtiyār maʿrifat al-rijāl –(al-maʿrūf bi-Rijāl al-Kashshī)*, 2 vols., (ed. Mahdī al-Rajāʾī; Qom: Muʾassasat Āl al-Bayt, 1984).

al-Ṭūsī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *al-Istibṣār fī mā ukhtulifa min al-akhbār*, 4 vols., (ed. Ḥasan al-Mūsawī al-Kharsān; Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1984).

al-Ṭūsī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* (ed. Jawād al-Qayyūmī; Qom: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1995).

al-Ṭūsī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan, *Tahdhīb al-aḥkām fī sharḥ al-Muqniʿa 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: Muʾassasat al-Nashr al-Islāmī, 1999).

al-ʿUqaylī, Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn ʿAmr, *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ al-kabīr*, 4 vols., (ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn Qalʾajī) (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1984).

A STUDY ON THE USAGE FORMS AND COURSE OF MEANING OF *SĀḤIB SUNNA* AS A PRAISING (*TAʿDĪL*) TERM

Sezai ENGİN

Eskişehir Osmangazi University, Eskişehir-Turkey

Abstract

Ṣāḥib sunna is one of the most common terms in *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* literature. This concept signifies a reason for preference in the determination of narrators from whom a ḥadīth will be transmitted in written form or through narration. Therefore, this article concentrates on the different usages of *ṣāḥib sunna* over the course of time, the meanings ascribed to it, the influence of historical circumstances on its meaning, and the value of being described as *ṣāḥib sunna* within *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* studies. *Ṣāḥib sunna* is apparent in ḥadīth sources as a term of accreditation (*taʿdīl*) since earlier periods; in *riwāya* terminology, however, it is used in *ṭabaqāt-tarājim* works as a term that expresses the competence of a narrator in terms of delivering the narrative, particularly since the 3rd century AH. It is possible to assert that *ṣāḥib sunna* has an extensive structure of meaning depending on the author, the period or the kind of work, and this openness in meaning primarily originates from semantic diversity regarding the use of the concept of "Sunna" in different sciences such as ḥadīth, uṣūl al-fiqh, and kalām.

Key Words: *Ṣāḥib sunna*, *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl*, ḥadīth, Sunna, *ʿilm al-rijāl*

Introduction

Al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl, namely, discrediting and accrediting, is the most notable branch of *ʿilm al-rijāl*; its progress has occurred in parallel with the rise of critical mentality in Islamic thought as of the mid-2nd century AH. In this period, there was a rise in the number of ḥadīth scholars; moreover, movements such as *bidʿa* and *ilḥād* became widespread, whereupon the fabrication of ḥadīths tragically grew. These facts brought about the rapid development of *al-jarḥ* and *al-taʿdīl*.[1] Accordingly, the 2nd and 3rd centuries AH witnessed periods of *tadwīn* (codification) and *taṣnīf* (classification), and studies concentrated on narrators and made use of discrediting and accrediting terminology in criticisms regarding the *rijāl* (transmitters) of ḥadīths. *Al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl*, which signifies the determination of reliability/credibility of the narrators and the transmission of them to posterities, brought about many terms in its definition of narrators.[2]

These terms, the most important elements of the *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* discipline, appeared as a result of a specific process. Scholars of *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* ascribed various meanings to these terms over the course of time by preferring different usages; they also studied the grade of such wordings used for the acceptance or criticism of narrators with regard to their narratives.[3] Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 327/938) was the first person to collect discrediting and accrediting terms and to classify them according to the judgments they express. Prior to Ibn Abī Ḥātim, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī (d. 198/813-814) and al-Jūzjānī (d. 259/873) also classified narrators in terms of acceptance and refusal.[4] In later periods, Ibn Abī Ḥātim's classification was adopted wholesale by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d.

---

[1] Emin Âşıkkutlu, *Hadiste Ricâl Tenkîdi (Cerh ve Ta'dîl İlmi)* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 1997), 27-61.

[2] For grades and terms regarding *al-jarḥ* and *al-taʿdīl*, see Abū l-Faḍl Jalāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr al-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb al-rāwī fī sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī* (ed. Badīʿ al-Sayyid al-Laḥḥām; Damascus: Dār al-Kalim al-Ṭayyib, 2005), II, 400-405; Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Sharḥ al-Nukhba Nuzhat al-naẓar fī tawḍīḥ Nukhbat al-fikar fī muṣṭalaḥ ahl al-athar* (ed. Nūr al-Dīn ʿItr; 3rd edn., Damascus: Maṭbaʿat al-Ṣabāḥ, 2000), 136-137; also see İzmirli İsmâil Hakkı, *Hadis Tarihi* (ed. İbrahim Hatiboğlu; Istanbul: Dârulhadis, 2002), 198-200.

[3] Âşıkkutlu, "Cerh ve Ta'dîl," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, VII, 394.

[4] Âşıkkutlu, *Hadiste Ricâl Tenkîdi*, 171.

463/1071), Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (d. 643/1245) and al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277). Furthermore, al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348), al-ʿIrāqī (d. 806/1404), Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449), al-Sakhāwī (d. 902/1497), and al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) classified the wordings in an even more detailed manner.[5]

The ḥadīth critics employed discrediting and accrediting expressions in their criticisms of narrators, instead of using extensive explanations,[6] to provide the reader with easier access to information and to clearly delineate the positive and negative aspects of a narrator.[7]

These critical terms in biographical works underwent evolutions even from their first appearances.[8] The determination of the appearance of these wordings and their semantic evolution is very important with respect to the value of discrediting and accrediting.[9] However, there are several issues that need to be taken into consideration at this stage. For example, specialists on *al-jarḥ* and *al-taʿdīl* have used terms that incorporate common meanings but have also ascribed different meanings to the same words. Therefore, the author using an expression becomes as important as the expression itself about the narrator. The determination of the semantic framework of these wordings or expressions serves as a guide to the recognition and introduction of a narrator. Consequently, it is vital to consider the first appearance of a discrediting and accrediting term, its first user, its various forms of usage, and the eventual meanings ascribed to it if we are to determine and analyze the term.

---

[5] Aşıkkutlu, "Cerh ve Taʿdîl," 398; For further information about studies on *al-jarḥ* and *al-taʿdīl* see Ahmet Yücel, *Hadis İlminde Tenkit Terimleri ve İlgili Çalışmalar* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 1998), 31-50.

[6] Yücel, *Hadis İlminde Tenkit Terimleri,* 22.

[7] Muḥammad Ḍiyāʾ al-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī, *Dirāsāt fī l-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* (Medina: Maktabat al-Ghurabāʾ al-Athariyya, 1995), 289.

[8] G. H. A. Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early Ḥadīth* (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 176. In his evaluation based on *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* by Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Juynboll describes the usage of discrediting and accrediting expressions in biographies as arbitrary pursuant to his critical approach on the issue; nevertheless, he has some notable opinions about the question.

[9] Yücel, *Hadîs Istlahlarının Doğuşu ve Gelişimi: Hicrî İlk Üç Asır* (2nd edn., Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2014), 112.

Ṣāḥib sunna is one of the most common expressions in *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* literature.[10] The term signifies a "possessor of Sunna", which is a notable reason for the preference of narrators from whom the ḥadīths will be written or transmitted. Therefore, this study focuses on its usage in *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* literature as well as the scholars who prefer to use this expression in their relevant studies and the meanings they ascribe to the word. Moreover, it is important to note whether the expression was used in biographies of some prominent figures and the value and reflections of *ṣāḥib sunna* in the context of the concepts of *aṣḥāb al-sunna* or *aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth* in the following periods.

Usages of *Ṣāḥib sunna* in *al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* Literature

Ṣāḥib sunna is employed as an accrediting expression in *ṭabaqāt* and *tarājim* works. It is either used individually or accompanied by other accrediting terms. Most often, it is indicated together with the term *thiqa* (ثقة/trustworthy) in the form of *thiqa ṣāḥib sunna* (ثقة صاحب سنة).[11] Numerous assessments of narrators, which are attributed to al-ʿIjlī (d. 261/875), include such examples.[12]

Ṣāḥib sunna is also employed in combination with certain expressions in biographies. The most common combination is *ṣāḥib sunna wa-jamāʿa* (صاحب سنة وجماعة),[13] which was frequently preferred by Ibn Saʿd (d. 230/845). He sometimes added "there are ḥadīths he narrates" (وكانت عنده أحاديث) after this combination.[14] Ibn Saʿd also used

---

[10]   For *taʿdīl* expressions used in ḥadīth studies see Yücel, *Hadis İlminde Tenkit Terimleri*, 135-141.

[11]   Abū Bakr Kāfī, *Manhaj al-Imām al-Bukhārī fī taṣḥīḥ al-aḥādīth wa-taʿlīlihā (min khilāl al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ)* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2000), 137; ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān ibn Yaḥyā al-Muʿallimī, *al-Tankīl bi-mā fī taʾnīb al-Kawtharī min al-abāṭīl* (ed. with notes by Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh, and ʿAbd al-Razzāq Ḥamza; 2nd edn., Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1986), I, 414; II, 612.

[12]   Abū l-Ṣafāʾ Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak al-Ṣafadī, *Kitāb al-wāfī bi-l-wafayāt* (eds. Aḥmad al-Arnāʾūṭ and Dhikrī Muṣṭafā; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2000), VI, 261; IX, 166; XX, 57; XXII, 134; XXVII, 129; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* (eds. Ibrāhīm al-Zaybaq and ʿĀdil Murshid; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1996), I, 28.

[13]   Al-Muʿallimī, *al-Tankīl*, I, 282.

[14]   Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Saʿd ibn Manīʿ al-Zuhrī, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās; Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968), VI, 386.

this term in the form of *ṣāḥib sunna wa-faḍl wa-khayr* (صاحب سنة وفضل وخير).”[15]

Al-ʿIjlī occasionally opted for another form in the use of the expression: “*ṣāḥib sunna wa-ittibāʿ* (صاحب سنة واتباع).”[16] The same usage is also seen in *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ*[17] and *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*[18] by al-Dhahabī (d. 748/1348). Apparently, al-Dhahabī also employed the form “*ṣāḥib sunna wa-ḥadīth* (صاحب سنة وحديث).”[19] Al-Yāfiʿī (d. 768/1366) used “*ṣāḥib sunna wa-ḥadīth*” only once, in the biography of Abū Zayd Jaʿfar ibn Yazīd al-Ḥamawī (d. 554/1159).[20] As for Ibn Ḥibbān (d. 354/965), he often preferred “*ṣāḥib sunna wa-faḍl* (صاحب سنة وفضل).”[21] Occasionally, the expression is used with the addition of *Qurʾān*, in which case it is indicated as “*ṣāḥib sunna wa-Qurʾān* (صاحب سنة وقرآن).”[22]

Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) included previous usages of the expression in his *Ṭabaqāt al-ḥuffāẓ*. These include “*ṣāḥib sunna wa-jamāʿa* (صاحب سنة وجماعة),”[23] “*ṣāḥib sunna wa-faḍl wa-khayr* (صاحب سنة وفضل وخير),”[24] “*ṣāḥib sunna wa-ʿibāda* (صاحب سنة وعبادة),”[25] and

---

[15] Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, VII, 358-359.

[16] Abū l-Ḥasan Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ṣāliḥ al-ʿIjlī, *Maʿrifat al-thiqāt min rijāl ahl al-ʿilm wa-l-ḥadīth wa-min al-ḍuʿafāʾ wa-dhikr madhābihim wa-akhbārihim* (ed. ʿAbd al-Karīm ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm al-Bastawī; Medina: Maktabat al-Dār, 1985), I, 312, 372, 411.

[17] Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ* (ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yaḥyā al-Muʿallimī; 3rd edn., Hyderabad: Majlis Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyya, 1955-1958), III, 813, 936, 1130; IV, 1256.

[18] Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ* (eds. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf, Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ, *et al.*; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1981-1988), X, 369, 490.

[19] Al-Dhahabī, *al-ʿIbar fī khabar man ghabar* (ed. Abū Ḥajar Muḥammad al-Saʿīd ibn Basyūnī Zaghlūl; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1985), III, 22.

[20] ʿAfīf al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Asʿad ibn ʿAlī al-Yamānī al-Yāfiʿī, *Mirʾāt al-jinān wa-ʿibrat al-yaqẓān fī maʿrifa mā yuʿtabar min ḥawādith al-zamān* (ed. Khalīl al-Manṣūr; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1997), III, 235.

[21] Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad Ibn Ḥibbān ibn Aḥmad al-Tamīmī, *Kitab al-thiqāt* (Hyderabad: Maṭbaʿat Majlis Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyya, 1973), VIII, 155, 180, 254; IX, 47, 116, 118.

[22] Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl fī naqd al-rijāl* (ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī; Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.), II, 224.

[23] Al-Suyūṭī, *Ṭabaqāt al-ḥuffāẓ* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1983), 145.

[24] *Ibid.*, 208.

"*ṣāḥib sunna wa-ittibāʿ* (صاحب سنة واتباع)."[26] As can be seen in his works, al-Suyūṭī used the form "*ṣāḥib sunna wa-ʿibāda*," unlike his predecessors.

To comprehend the signification of any critical term, we have to take into account the accompanying terms used by critics.[27] Apart from the word *thiqa*, the accompanying terms to *ṣāḥib sunna* note the virtues and benevolence of the narrator, thus proving he was a man of *jamāʿa* and *ʿibāda* and was on the right path or subject to the Sunna of the Prophet Muḥammad. Biographers who prefer *ṣāḥib sunna* as an accrediting qualification seek to feature the character of narrators rather than their competence with regard to narratives. They frequently use this expression after the term *thiqa*, as they intend to assess the personal traits and attitudes of the narrator with respect to Sunna because they do not consider him to be troubled by fairness and recording.

Users of *Ṣāḥib sunna* as a means of Acceptance and Meanings Ascribed to the Term

Similar to *ṣāḥib al-ḥadīth*, a term that was used in the ṣaḥāba era prior to the emergence of *ṭabaqāt* and *tarājim* authors,[28] the appearance of *ṣāḥib sunna* occurred during the same period, albeit in plural form.

A narrative, quoted from Muʿādh (d. 17/638), reveals that it was important to attribute a ḥadīth to a *ṣāḥib sunna*. Once Muʿādh discovered that the persons brought in his presence were *aṣḥāb al-sunna*, he could not help crying before saying, "If I knew that you were *aṣḥāb al-sunna*, I would come to your home and narrate

---

[25]   *Ibid.*, 360.

[26]   *Ibid.*, 456.

[27]   See Yücel, *Hadis İlminde Tenkit Terimleri*, 184.

[28]   Abdullah Aydınlı, "Ehl-i Hadîs," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, X, 507. According to Aydınlı, the terms of *ahl al-ḥadīth* and *ṣāḥib al-ḥadīth* are synonymous. His ground is the words, "You are our successors and *ahl al-ḥadīth* after us" by Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī. In later periods, Shuʿba was considered as *ṣāḥib al-ḥadīth*, whereas Farqad Ṣabākhī and ʿAbd Allāh ibn Nāfiʿ were not so described. However, the important point here is that the term of *ṣāḥib al-ḥadīth* dates back to the time of the ṣaḥāba.

ḥadīths to you."[29]

In the following periods, the concept of *ṣāḥib sunna* was associated with the emergence of *isnād* (chain of transmission). In earlier periods, no chain was questioned, whereas the practice changed for the authentication of narratives in later eras. As the search for an *isnād* began, the ḥadīths by *ṣāḥib sunna* were written down whereas others not by *ṣāḥib sunna* were ignored.[30] Ibn Sīrīn (d. 110/729) explains this fact as follows:

كانوا لا يسألون عن الإسناد، ثم سألوا بعدُ ليعرفوا من كان صاحب سنة أخذوا عنه، ومن لم يكن صاحب سنة لم يأخذوا عنه

They were not used to searching for an *isnād*. Then, they began to seek *isnād* for information. They derived ḥadīth from *ṣāḥib sunna*, and did not collect from others.[31]

Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778) utilizes the expression *ṣāḥib sunna* in an interpretation as follows:

إذا بلغك عن رجل بالمشرق صاحب سنة وآخر بالمغرب فابعث إليهما بالسلام وادع لهما ما أقل أهل السنة و الجماعة

If a ḥadīth (or any knowledge) comes to you from persons who are *ṣāḥib sunna*, one of whom is from the East and one from the West,

---

[29] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit, *al-Jāmiʿ li-akhlāq al-rāwī wa-ādāb al-sāmiʿ* (ed. Maḥmūd Ṭaḥḥān; Riyadh: Maktabat al-Maʿārif, 1983), I, 332.

[30] Rifʿat Fawzī ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, *Tawthīq al-sunna fī l-qarn al-hijrī al-thānī: Ususuhū wa-ittijāhātuhū* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1981), 148.

[31] Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Faḍl al-Dārimī, *Musnad al-Dārimī al-maʿrūf bi-(Sunan al-Dārimī)* (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad al-Dārānī; Riyad: Dār al-Mughnī li-l-Tawzīʿ wa-l-Nashr, 2000), IV, 496; Also see Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Itḥāf al-mahara bi-l-fawāʾid al-mubtakira min aṭrāf al-ʿashara* (eds. Zuhayr ibn Nāṣir al-Nāṣir, Maḥmūd Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Muḥsin, *et al*.; Medina: Wizārat al-Shuʾūn al-Islāmiyya wa-l-Awqāf wa-l-Daʿwa wa-l-Irshād & al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, 1994-2004), XIX, 427.

send them your regards and pray for them. Indeed, how few are people who belong to *sunna* and *jamāʿa*.[32]

Zāʾida ibn Qudāma al-Thaqafī (d. 161/777) also uses the same term. When Ḥusayn al-Juʿfī (d. 203/819) asked Zāʾida about someone, Zāʾida said the person was *ṣāḥib sunna*, whereupon al-Juʿfī says that he does not mind the expression, indicating "*Ṣāḥib sunna?* They are sons of Abū Bakr." In response, "Killers of ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān were also sons of Abū Bakr," says Zāʾida, insisting that the term *ṣāḥib sunna* matters because it signifies a higher value of acceptance and accreditation.[33] Moreover, rumor has it that Zāʾida ibn Qudāma narrated ḥadīths from *ṣāḥib sunna* but not from others.[34]

Wakīʿ ibn al-Jarrāḥ (d. 197/812) reportedly employed *ṣāḥib sunna* as a word of accreditation. According to Wakīʿ, *thiqa ṣāḥib sunna* is a second-rank accrediting expression. For him, the expressions that primarily accredit a narrator are *athbat al-nās* and *thiqa thiqa*, whereas secondary qualifications are *thiqa* and *thiqa ṣāḥib sunna*. Wakīʿ uses *ṣāḥib sunna* not individually but as a part of an accrediting expression.[35] For example, when ʿAlī ibn Khashram (d. 257/871) asked Wakīʿ about Faḍl ibn Mūsā (d. 191-192/806-807), Wakiʿ praised ʿAlī ibn Khashram, saying "he is *thiqa* and *ṣāḥib sunna*."[36] Wakīʿ ibn al-Jarrāḥ also describes what it means to be *ṣāḥib sunna*:

من طلب الحديث كما جاء، فهو صاحب سنة، ومن طلبه ليقوي به رأيه، فهو صاحب بدعة

---

[32]   Abū Zakariyyāʾ Yaḥyā ibn Ibrāhīm al-Salmāsī, *Kitāb manāzil al-aʾimma al-arbaʿa Abī Ḥanīfa wa-Mālik wa-l-Shāfiʿī wa-Aḥmad* (ed. Maḥmūd ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Medina: al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, 2002), 69.

[33]   Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, I, 332.

[34]   Abū l-Qāsim Kamāl al-Dīn ʿUmar ibn Aḥmad Ibn al-ʿAdīm, *Bughyat al-ṭalab fī tārīkh Ḥalab* (ed. Suhayl Zakkār; Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.), VIII, 3735; Abū l-Ḥajjāj Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yūsuf al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl fī asmāʾ al-rijāl* (ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf; 6th edn., Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1994), IX, 277; al-ʿIjlī, *Maʿrifat al-thiqāt*, I, 367.

[35]   Muḥammad al-Fīrwānī, "al-Imām Wakīʿ: ḥayātuhū wa-āthāruhū," *Majallat al-buḥūth al-Islāmiyya* 12 (1985), 342.

[36]   Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit, *Kitāb talkhīs al-mutashābih fī l-rasm wa-ḥimāyat mā ashkala minhu ʿan bawādir al-taṣḥīf wa-l-wahm* (ed. Sukayna al-Shihābī; Damascus: Dār Ṭalās li-l-Dirāsāt wa-l-Tarjama wa-l-Nashr, 1985), 86.

Ṣāḥib sunna is the person who gets a ḥadīth as it is; the one who learns ḥadīth in order to strengthen his view is *ṣāḥib bidʿa*.[37]

By these words, Wakīʿ asserts how he cares about authenticity in the narration of ḥadīths and refuses to consider ḥadīth as a means to strengthen a certain point of view. This determination by Wakīʿ might originate from his attitude against Muʿtazila and other *bidʿa* groups with respect to issues such as *khalq al-Qurʾān*, etc.[38]

According to relevant sources, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī, who passed away in 198 AH, one year after Wakīʿ, is another scholar who applied the term. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī used the expression to describe Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855). For him, anyone who loves Ibn Ḥanbal is a *ṣāḥib sunna*.[39]

In chronological terms, the first ones to use the expression are Muʿādh, one of the *ṣaḥāba*/Companions, and Ibn Sīrīn. Nevertheless, Zāʾida ibn Qudāma appears to be the first scholar to employ it exclusively as an accrediting expression, as his interpretation directly concerns the status of a narrator. As for the upcoming period, it is impossible to determine whether Wakīʿ or ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī was the first person to use *ṣāḥib sunna,* as both scholars are contemporary and passed away almost at the same time. Nevertheless, we can assert that its appearance as an accrediting term dates back to the second half of the 2nd century AH.

As said above, Ibn Saʿd frequently used the expression *ṣāḥib sunna,* whose usage became ubiquitous upon the compilation of *ṭabaqāt* and *tarājim* works. Ibn Saʿd mentions the term as another trait of many *thiqa* narrators. For him, however, being *ṣāḥib sunna* does not necessarily mean that the person is *mutqin* (in other words, exact). Accordingly, in one of his biographies, Ibn Saʿd categorizes the narrator as *ṣāḥib sunna* but indicates that his ḥadīth narrative is weak[40] or that there are many mistakes[41] in his narratives.

---

[37] Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, IX, 144.

[38] For attitude of Wakīʿ, see Mehmet Emin Özafşar, "Vekîʿ b. Cerrâh," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XLIII, 8.

[39] Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Idrīs Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *Kitāb al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* (ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yaḥyā al-Muʿallimī; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1952-1953), I, 308.

[40] Ibn Saʿd, *al-Ṭabaqāt*, VII, 360.

Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn (d.233/848) also employs the term for the criticism of narrators. Concerning Nuʿaym ibn Ḥammād (d. 228/843), Ibn Maʿīn initially says *laysa fī l-ḥadīth bi-shayʾ*;[42] nevertheless, he later indicates "However, he is *ṣāḥib sunna*," and thus accredits the mentioned narrator.[43]

Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal is another scholar who used this common means of accrediting. In his comments about Wahb ibn Jarīr (d. 206/821), Ibn Ḥanbal asserted that Wahb was never seen together with Shuʿba (d. 160/776) but that Wahb was *ṣāḥib sunna*; thus, Ibn Ḥanbal tried to appreciate the narrator.[44] Moreover, being *ṣāḥib sunna* is a reason for preference among narrators in the eyes of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal. He claims that Wahb ibn Jarīr ibn Ḥāzim is *ṣāḥib sunna* and that, accordingly, he is more favorable than Hammām (d. 132/750).[45] Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal prefers the same expression for accrediting Warqāʾ ibn ʿUmar, whom Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/889) asks

---

[41] *Ibid*, VII, 488.

[42] This wording by Ibn Maʿīn adds *fī l-ḥadīth* to his *laysa bi-shayʾ*. Two expressions are almost synonymous. There are different comments about usage of *laysa bi-shayʾ* in the time of Ibn Maʿīn. *Kadhdhāb* (fabricating, lying) narrators and narrators with relatively less ḥadīths are included in such comments. Besides, it is related that Ibn Maʿīn uses the same term for reliable narrators. Therefore, it is unclear whether he means discrediting or accrediting a narrator through this expression; see Erdinç Ahatlı, "Yahya b. Maîn'in Eserleri ve Kullandığı İhtilaflı ve Garib Lafızlar," *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 1 (1996), 227; there is ambiguity about the meaning of this expression emphasized by Ahatlı; nevertheless, there is a concord between ḥadīth scholars that no ḥadīth should be derived from a narrator with such a description. See Yücel, *Hadis İlminde Tenkit Terimleri*, 108.

[43] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit, *Tārīkh Madīnat al-salām wa-akhbār muḥaddithīhā wa-dhikr quṭṭānihā l-ʿulamāʾ min ghayr ahlihā wa-wāridīhā* (ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf; Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2001), XV, 419; al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, XXIX, 475; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, IV, 235.

[44] Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, IV, 351; Also see Bashīr ʿAlī ʿUmar, *Manhaj al-Imām Aḥmad fī iʿlāl al-aḥādīth* (Riyadh: Waqf al-Salām al-Khayrī, 2005), 820. Wahb's father makes the same comment for his son, see Ibn ʿAdī, *al-Kāmil fī ḍuʿafāʾ al-rijāl* (eds. ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd, ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ, and ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ al-Sayyid Sulaymān Abū Sinna; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1997), VIII, 342.

[45] Al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkira*, I, 199.

after. When it was reported that Warqāʾ was a Murjiʾī, Ibn Ḥanbal said that he had no such information.[46]

Al-ʿIjlī serves as a reference source in regard to the usage of the expression in biography works after him, as he is the scholar who most frequently applied the term for the criticism of narrators. According to him, the narrative of a narrator who is ṣāḥib sunna may bear "the quality of ḥujja (evidence)" if he narrated from thiqāt (reliable transmitters).[47] According to al-ʿIjlī, the term ṣāḥib sunna signifies that a narrative by such a narrator is acceptable and can serve as evidence. In another analysis where he separately uses the concepts of ḥadīth and sunna, ṣāḥib sunna has a meaning outside or different from ḥadīth knowledge. Concerning Ibrāhīm ibn al-Taymī (d. 92/710-711), al-ʿIjlī uses the qualities ḥasan al-ḥadīth and ṣāḥib sunna in addition to thiqa, rāwiyat^an li-tafsīr al-Qurʾān wa-ṣāḥib al-tafsīr.[48] Therefore, al-ʿIjlī ascribes to ṣāḥib sunna a meaning beyond mere knowledge of or competence in ḥadīth narrative. Likely, this meaning includes the significance of the Sunna concept, which is historically considered to have a broader sense than ḥadīth.

The most interesting usage of the expression is that it can be employed for persons who love some others. The characterization of those who love certain historical persons as ṣāḥib sunna is first seen in an ʿaqāʾid study by Abū Muḥammad al-Barbahārī (d. 329/940-941).[49] In his Sharḥ al-Sunna, al-Barbahārī dubs as ṣāḥib sunna those who love Abū Hurayra (d. 58/678), Anas ibn Mālik (d. 93/711-712), and Usayd ibn Ḥuḍayr (d. 20/641).[50] Al-Barbahārī also adds names such as Yūnus ibn ʿUbayd (d. 139/756), Wahb ibn Jarīr,

---

[46]　Al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, XXX, 435.

[47]　Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, II, 329.

[48]　Al-ʿIjlī, *Maʿrifat al-thiqāt*, I, 201.

[49]　Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Khalaf al-Barbahārī is a Ḥanbalī scholar who defends Salafī creed against Muʿtazila, and who studied the sciences of fiqh, ethics and *ādāb* through Abū Bakr al-Marwazī, the disciple of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal. See Ahmet Saim Kılavuz, "Berbehârî," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, V, 476.

[50]　Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Khalaf al-Barbahārī, *Sharḥ al-Sunna* (ed. Abū Yāsir Khālid ibn Qāsim al-Radādī; Medina: Maktabat al-Ghurabāʾ al-Athariyya, 1993), 119.

Ḥammād ibn Salama (167/784), Mālik ibn Anas, al-Awzāʿī, Zāʾida ibn Qudāma, and Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal to this category.[51]

An evaluation by Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 277/890) includes a relevant example. According to al-Rāzī, one from Baghdād who loves Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal is *ṣāḥib sunna* and one who dislikes Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn is a *kadhdhāb* (fabricator).[52] According to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī, Baṣrans who love Ḥammād ibn Zayd (d. 179/795), Kūfans who love Zāʾida and Mālik ibn Mughawwal (d. 158/775), Damascans who love al-Awzāʿī (d. 157/774) and Abū Isḥāq al-Fazārī (d. 188/804), and Ḥijāzians who love Mālik ibn Anas (d. 179/795) are *ṣāḥib sunna*.[53] According to Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Ṭabarī (d. between 307-314/919-926), one is *ṣāḥib sunna* if he is from Khurāsān or Rayy and loves Abū Zurʿa (d. 264/878) and Abū Ḥātim.[54] Qutayba ibn Saʿīd (d. 240/855) produces a similar interpretation of the issue. According to him, the most prominent figure of his time is Ibn al-Mubārak (d. 181/797). Then, he names Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, whom he calls "youngster," as the leading personality and claims that one who loves him is *ṣāḥib sunna*. For Qutayba, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal would have left behind al-Thawrī, Layth (d. 175/791) and al-Awzāʿī if he were their contemporary.[55] In his *al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl*, Ibn Abī Ḥātim uses the following chapter title indicating that one who loves Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal is *ṣāḥib sunna*:

<div dir="rtl">

باب استحقاق الرجل السنة بمحبة أحمد بن حنبل

</div>

---

[51] Al-Barbahārī, *Sharḥ al-Sunna,* 191-121; also see Abū l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn Ibn Abī Yaʿlā al-Farrāʾ, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila* (ed. ʿAbd Raḥmān ibn Sulaymān al-ʿUthaymīn; Riyadh: al-Amāna al-ʿĀmma li-l-Iḥtifāl bi-Murūr Miʾat ʿĀm ʿalā Taʾsīs al-Mamlaka, 1999), III, 66-67.

[52] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Madīnat al-salām*, XVI, 263; also see Saʿdī Mahdī al-Hāshimī, *Ikhtilāf aqwāl al-nuqqād fī l-ruwāt al-mukhtalaf fīhim maʿa dirāsat hādhihī l-ẓāhira ʿinda Ibn Maʿīn* (Medina: Majmaʿ al-Malik Fahd li-Ṭibāʿat al-Muṣḥaf al-Sharīf, 2005), 50.

[53] Abū l-Qāsim Thiqat al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Hibat Allāh Ibn ʿAsākir, *Tārīkh Madīnat Dimashq wa-dhikr faḍlihā wa-tasmiyat man ḥallahā min al-amāthil aw ijtāza bi-nawāḥīhā min wāridīhā wa-ahlihā* (ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū Saʿīd ʿUmar ibn Gharāma al-ʿAmrawī; Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995-2000), VII, 128.

[54] Al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, XXIV, 389.

[55] ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ Mazīd, *Manāhij al-muḥaddithīn fī l-qarn al-awwal al-hijrī wa-ḥattā ʿaṣrinā l-ḥāḍir* (Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyya al-ʿĀmma li-l-Kitāb, 2002), 240.

"Chapter on why a lover of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal deserves to be *ṣāḥib sunna*"

Under this title, he collects relevant assessments by Qutayba ibn Saʿīd and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī. According to Qutayba ibn Saʿīd, one who loves Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal is *ṣāḥib sunna wa-jamāʿa*. As said above, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī claims that one who loves Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal is *ṣāḥib sunna*.[56]

The term is very often used for Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, likely because of the Miḥna where his debates on *khalq al-Qurʾān* played a major part.[57] The discussions on *khalq al-Qurʾān* appeared in the late first century AH., prior to Miḥna,[58] and these debates became very influential on the criteria for discrediting and accrediting. There are many discrediting expressions in the works concerning this issue.[59] Miḥna had a decisive effect on the evaluations of ḥadīth narrators and the relations between scholars.[60] For example, al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870) tells that for many scholars, those who assume that the

---

[56] Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl*, I, 308.

[57] In a letter to the Baghdād governor Isḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm in 218 AH., Caliph al-Maʾmūn wanted him to query the qāḍīs and ḥadīth scholars such as ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yūnus, Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn, and Zubayr ibn Ḥarb with respect to *khalq al-Qurʾān*. Many scholars, who were added to list in a following letter, acknowledged that Qurʾān is created. However, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Muḥammad ibn Nūḥ, Sajjāda, and al-Qawārīrī objected to this view. In the wake of tortures, Sajjāda and al-Qawārīrī backed down, while Ibn Ḥanbal and Muḥammad ibn Nūḥ insisted on their opinion. See Hayati Yücesoy, "Mihne," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXX, 26-27.

[58] Talat Koçyiğit, *Hadisçilerle Kelamcılar Arasındaki Münakaşalar* (4th edn., Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1989), 187. Jaʿd ibn Dirham, a scholar in the time of Marwān the Caliph (rule: 127-132 AH.), was the first ever person to claim that Qurʾān was created. See *ibid.*, 192.

[59] See ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda, "Halk-ı Kur'an Meselesi: Raviler, Muhaddisler, Cerh ve Ta'dil Kitaplarına Tesiri," (translated into Turkish by Mücteba Uğur), *Ankara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 20 (1975), 311; also see Özafşar, *İdeolojik Hadisçiliğin Tarihî Arka Planı: Mihne Olayı ve Haşeviye Olgusu* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 1999), 67.

[60] Yücel, *Hadis Tarihi* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2012), 84.

Qurʾān is *makhlūq* (created) are *kāfir* (infidel/unbeliever).[61] Again, al-Bukhārī reports that ʿUbayda ibn ʿĀʾisha said they would never perform *ṣalāt* behind anyone who says "the Qurʾān is created."[62] Conceivably, the accrediting terms about Ibn Ḥanbal also originate from Miḥna events. Qutayba ibn Saʿīd, Abū Ḥātim and Ibn Abī Ḥātim,[63] scholars subject to the same Miḥna events, also claim that those who love Ibn Ḥanbal are *ṣāḥib sunna*, which is probably in reaction to these incidents. As is known, Ibn Ḥanbal was subject to Miḥna. Nevertheless, he allocated a central role to the Sunna and practices by *al-aṣḥāb al-kirām* (noble Companions) in his creed and severely criticized *ahl al-bidʿa*. Thus, Ibn Ḥanbal began to represent *ahl al-ḥadīth*.[64] The ḥadīth circles who were victims of Miḥna gathered around Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and made him a symbol.[65] He was considered to be *ṣāḥib sunna*, and the most important factor for this qualification should be his attitude during discussions concerning the creation of the Qurʾān. In these debates, he responded to questions about the issues other than the Qurʾān and Sunna, such as theological ones, saying "I don't know… Give me something from the book of Allah or Sunna of the Prophet, so I can say it …,".[66]

Apart from the aforesaid names, those from Anbār who love Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn Aṣram (d. 336/947), Abū Jaʿfar al-Ḥudhāʾ (d.?) and al-Muthannā ibn Jāmiʿ al-Anbārī (d.?) were also described as *ṣāḥib sunna*.[67] Likewise, it is claimed that one who is from ʿUkbarā and sympathizes with Abū Ḥafṣ ibn Rajāʾ (d.?),[68] or one from Baghdād and loves Abū l-Ḥasan ibn Bashār (d. 313/923) and Abū Muḥammad al-Barbahārī is also *ṣāḥib sunna*.[69]

---

[61] Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl al-Bukhārī, *Khalq afʿāl al-ʿibād wa-l-radd ʿalā l-Jahmiyya wa-aṣḥāb al-taʿṭīl* (3rd edn., Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1990), 8, 11, 14.

[62] Al-Bukhārī, *Khalq afʿāl al-ʿibād*, 12.

[63] Ibn Abī Ḥātim is among victims of Miḥna. Maʾmūn threatens him, whereupon, for fear of death, he admitted that Qurʾān is created. See Koçyiğit, *Münakaşalar*, 197.

[64] Yusuf Şevki Yavuz, "Ehl-i Sünnet," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, X, 526.

[65] Özafşar, *İdeolojik Hadisçiliğin Tarihî Arka Planı*, 153.

[66] Koçyiğit, *Münakaşalar*, 209.

[67] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Madīnat al-salām*, III, 414.

[68] *Ibid.*, XIII, 93.

[69] *Ibid.*, XIII, 534.

The most striking point about this *ṣāḥib sunna* attribution is the indication of city and region names. It is not coincidental that not a more general statement but specific places, such as Baghdād, Damascus, al-Anbār, al-Kūfa and al-Ḥijāz, are associated with certain persons. Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, for example, was born in Baghdād and spent much of his scientific career there. Ḥammād ibn Zayd was from al-Baṣra. During his lifetime, his status in al-Baṣra was similar to those of Sufyān al-Thawrī in al-Kūfa, Mālik ibn Anas in al-Ḥijāz, and al-Awzāʿī in Damascus.[70] Al-Awzāʿī was considered the "fiqh authority" of the Damascus (Syria) region in his time. Therefore, each personality is associated with the region where he was born and was active in scientific terms. In brief, sympathy for these persons in their cities became a means to becoming *ṣāḥib sunna*.

Ṣāḥib sunna is also used for expressing that ḥadīths, narrated by a narrator, can be derived and written down. For example, al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995) indicates that Layth ibn Abī Salīm (d. 143/760) "is *ṣāḥib sunna*; his ḥadīths can be derived."[71] As is known, the validity of quoting narratives from *hawā* and *bidʿa* followers is controversial. According to ʿAlī ibn Ḥarb (d. 265/879), no ḥadīth should be quoted from them because they are liars. If a ḥadīth is to be written down, it should be obtained from *ṣāḥib sunna*.[72] Likewise, according to Ibn Maʿīn, if Abū Nuʿaym al-Faḍl ibn Dukayn (d. 219/834) dubs someone as Murjiʾī, that person is *ṣāḥib sunna* and *lā baʾs bihī*,[73] in other words, ḥadīths can be written down through him.

Ṣāḥib bidʿa is also employed as an antonym of *ṣāḥib sunna*. This usage is exemplified by al-Awzāʿī, who claimed that one who talks benevolently about him is *ṣāḥib sunna*, whereas one who casts

---

[70] Tayyar Altıkulaç, "Hammâd b. Zeyd," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA),* XV, 489.

[71] Al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, VI, 181.

[72] See Abū l-Faraj Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, *Sharḥ ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī* (ed. Hammām ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Saʿīd; Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2001), 357; Abū l-Khayr Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad al-Sakhāwī, *Fatḥ al-mughīth bi-sharḥ Alfiyyat al-ḥadīth li-l-ʿIrāqī* (ed. ʿAlī Ḥusayn ʿAlī; 3rd edn., Dār al-Imām al-Ṭabarī, 1996), II, 60.

[73] Al-Dhahabī, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl*, III, 350; the expression "*lā baʾs bihī*", often used by Ibn Maʿīn, indicates that the narrator is reliable; see Ahatlı, "Yahya b. Maîn'in Eserleri ve Kullandığı İhtilaflı ve Garib Lafızlar," 225-226.

aspersions on him is *ṣāḥib bidʿa*.[74] In the biography of Aḥmad ibn Aṣram ibn Khuzayma (d. 285/897), al-Dhahabī uses *ṣāḥib sunna* as an antonym of *ahl al-bidʿa* to accredit him. For al-Dhahabī, Aḥmad ibn Aṣram is *ṣāḥib sunna,* and, accordingly, Ibn Aṣram is strictly against the followers of *bidʿa*.[75]

Qualification as *ṣāḥib sunna* is also used as a reason for preference between narrators. According to the father of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī, Zāʾida ibn Qudāma is more reputable than Abū ʿAwāna (d. 176/792) because the former is *thiqa* and *ṣāḥib sunna*.[76]

Principally an expression for accrediting, *ṣāḥib sunna* is also employed for discrediting the narrators. A narrator is discredited by saying that he is not *ṣāḥib sunna*, whereupon he is considered to be lacking a notable quality for acceptance. For example, Ibn ʿAdī al-Jurjānī (d. 365/976) does not acknowledge ʿAbd Allāh ibn Dāwūd al-Wāsiṭī (d. ?) as a *ṣāḥib sunna* narrator.[77]

Abū Muḥammad al-Barbahārī offers an expansion in the meaning of *ṣāḥib sunna* in addition to its semantic framework within *ṭabaqāt* and *tarājim* works. In his *Sharḥ al-Sunna*, al-Barbahārī describes a person as *ṣāḥib sunna* if he:

1. Believes in the Qurʾān and its content without the slightest doubt in his heart[78]

2. Prays for the salvation and peace of the ruler[79]

3. Embodies all characteristics of Sunna.[80]

Al-Barbahārī depicts people with opposite behaviors or attitudes as *ṣāḥib hawā* or *ṣāḥib bidʿa*. Frequent use of and extensive explanations about *ṣāḥib sunna* in the works by al-Barbahārī can be

---

[74]   Abū l-Faḍl Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Mukarram ibn ʿAlī Ibn Manẓūr, *Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq li-Ibn ʿAsākir* (eds. Rūḥiyya al-Naḥḥās, Riyāḍ ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Murād, Muḥammad Muṭīʿ Ḥāfiẓ et al.; Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1984-1989), XIV, 320.

[75]   Al-Dhahabī, *Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-aʿlām* (ed. ʿUmar ʿAbd al-Salām Tadmurī; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1990-2000), XXI, 53.

[76]   Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *al-Jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl*, III, 613.

[77]   Ibn ʿAdī al-Jurjānī, *al-Kāmil*, V, 399.

[78]   Al-Barbahārī, *Sharḥ al-Sunna*, 107; Ibn Abī Yaʿlā, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila*, III, 60.

[79]   Al-Barbahārī, *ibid*, 116; Ibn Abī Yaʿlā, *ibid*, III, 65.

[80]   Al-Barbahārī, *ibid,* 132; Ibn Abī Yaʿlā, *ibid*, III, 71-72.

revealed through his point of view. Al-Barbahārī severely objects to propagators of Shīʿa, kalām scholars of Muʿtazila and Ahl al-sunna, and the kalām method; instead, he insists on the need to return to the Qurʾān and Sunna. Moreover, he opposes any *bidʿa*, claiming they should be rejected. Therefore, he lays stress on the sound comprehension and knowledge of religion and highlights the Qurʾān and Sunna. According to him, sound knowledge about the Qurʾān and Sunna should be obtained from persons, who learned and practiced the original form of Islam, such as Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Mālik ibn Anas, al-Fuḍayl ibn ʿIyāḍ (d. 187/803), ʿAbd Allāh ibn Mubārak and Bishr ibn al-Ḥārith [Bish ibn al-Ḥāfī] (d. 227/841).[81] This is why he considers Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and Mālik ibn Anas to be *ṣāḥib sunna*.

Biographies of ṣaḥāba reveal another usage of the term, this time concerning the Four Caliphs. The comments regarding the superiority of ʿUthmān and ʿAlī above one another have set the stage for the usage of *ṣāḥib sunna*. This comment is attributed to Ibn Maʿīn. According to him, whoever sets the superiority line as Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān and ʿAlī, but admits the priority and superiority of ʿAlī is *ṣāḥib sunna*. Similarly, whoever states the line as Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿAlī and ʿUthmān and accepts the priority and superiority of ʿUthmān is also *ṣāḥib sunna*. Hārūn ibn Isḥāq relates that when he said to Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn that there are some persons who mention Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān, and not ʿAlī, Ibn Maʿīn had some very harsh words about them.[82]

The above-mentioned assessment by Ibn Maʿīn can be evaluated as an effort to find a compromise. Ibn Maʿīn wanted to prevent faith and madhhab debates around ʿUthmān and ʿAlī and tried to highlight the value of both ṣaḥābī. Ibn Maʿīn stated that the sympathy for and acceptance of the virtues of both serves as a means to become *ṣāḥib sunna*.

According to current comments about the meaning of *ṣāḥib sunna*, the term signifies ḥadīth scholars who are attentive to obeying Sunna in all their deeds and thoughts, who are competent in

---

[81] Kılavuz, "Berbehârî," V, 477.

[82] Abū ʿUmar Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namarī, *al-Istīʿāb fī maʿrifat al-aṣḥāb* (ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī; Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1992), III, 1116.

certifying the *isnād*s of ḥadīths and who can distinguish the eligible ḥadīth narratives from the non-eligible.[83] Moreover, the term is used in plural form as *aṣḥāb al-sunan* (أصحاب السنن) with the same meaning.[84]

Certain Personalities Qualified or not Qualified as *Ṣāḥib sunna*

Ṣāḥib sunna is used to describe certain well-known personalities in *rijāl* literature. For example, there is an effort to accredit al-Aʿmash (d. 148/765) qualifying him as *ṣāḥib sunna*, though he is known one who made *tadlīs* (concealment, giving the impression that one has narrated from an authority, whereas in this instance he has not).[85] Al-Dhahabī also categorizes Ḥammād ibn Salama with the same expression.[86] According to information reported by al-Khaṭīb, Zāʾida ibn Qudāma qualifies Sufyān al-Thawrī, who was near Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālisī (d. 204/819), as being *ṣāḥib sunna*, saying "Narrate ḥadīth from this friend of mine, oh Abā l-Ṣalt!"[87] In another work, al-Thawrī is called *ṣāḥib sunna wa-ittibāʿ*.[88]

Abū Yūsuf (d. 182/798), the disciple of Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767), is also described as being *ṣāḥib sunna* in biographies. Strikingly, two separate expressions are employed in assessments about Abū Yūsuf. These terms are *ṣāḥib sunna* and *ṣāḥib al-ḥadīth*. This fact is important, as it reveals that the terms "sunna" and "ḥadīth" had different significations in early periods. Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn relates that Abū Yūsuf was both *ṣāḥib sunna* and *ṣāḥib al-ḥadīth*.[89] ʿAmr ibn Muḥammad explains that he does not like to narrate ḥadīth from

---

[83] Aydınlı, *Hadis Istılahları Sözlüğü* (4th edn., Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2011), 265.

[84] *Ibid*, 30.

[85] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Madīnat al-salām*, X, 5; Abū Ibrāhīm ʿIzz al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl Amīr al-Ṣanʿānī, *Tawḍīḥ al-afkār li-maʿānī Tanqīḥ al-anẓār* (ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd; Medina: al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya, n.d.), I, 353.

[86] Al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkira*, I, 203.

[87] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, I, 333.

[88] Al-ʿIjlī, *Maʿrifat al-thiqāt*, I, 411.

[89] Al-Dhahabī, *Manāqib al-Imām Abī Ḥanīfa wa-ṣāḥibayhⁱ Abī Yūsuf wa-Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan* (eds. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī and Abū l-Wafāʾ al-Afghānī; Hyderabad: Lajnat Iḥyāʾ al-Maʿārif al-Nuʿmāniyya, n.d.), 63.

aṣḥāb al-raʾy other than Abū Yūsuf and that the latter is *ṣāḥib sunna*.[90]

For Abū Yūsuf, Sunna precisely signified the practices of the Prophet. This comprehension is apparent in his many judgments and practices.[91] Moreover, he had a pro-ḥadīth approach because he believes in the necessity of transmitting the Sunna through *isnād*s.[92] This attitude held by Abū Yūsuf toward the Sunna of the Prophet and ḥadīths must have played a part in his being described as *ṣāḥib sunna* even though he was a member of *ahl al-raʾy*.

Al-Shāfiʿī (d. 204/820) is also mentioned among the *ṣāḥib sunna*s. Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥakam (d. 268/881) indicates that he learnt most of his knowledge from al-Shāfiʿī, including *qiyās*, and therefore al-Shāfiʿī is *ṣāḥib sunna*.[93] The lexicographer Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim Ibn Sallām (d. 224/838) bears the same qualification. Abū Manṣūr al-Harawī (d. 370/980) mentions Abū ʿUbayd among the linguistic scholars of the third group, introducing him as a scholar, a man of letters, a jurist and *ṣāḥib sunna*.[94] Al-Harawī also describes Abū l-Haytham al-Rāzī (d. 226/840), another linguistic scholar of the third group, as *ṣāḥib sunna*.[95] Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071) is credited through qualification as *ṣāḥib sunna wa-ittibāʿ*.[96] Qutayba ibn Saʿīd, who deems Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal as *ṣāḥib sunna*, is also described as *ṣāḥib sunna wa-jamāʿa*, in addition to reportedly quoting *thabt* [sound] narratives.[97]

---

[90] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Madīnat al-salām*, XVI, 372; Ibn ʿAdī al-Jurjānī, *al-Kāmil*, VIII, 466; al-Dhahabī, *Manāqib al-Imām Abī Ḥanīfa*, 63.

[91] For some of these judgments and practices, see Mehmet Özşenel, *Ebû Yûsuf'un Hadis Anlayışı* (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2011), 24-29.

[92] *Ibid*., 156.

[93] Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Intiqāʾ fī faḍāʾil al-thalātha al-aʾimma al-fuqahāʾ: Mālik wa-l-Shāfiʿī wa-Abī Ḥanīfa wa-dhikr ʿuyūn min akhbārihim wa-akhbār aṣḥābihim li-l-taʿrīf bi-jalālat aqdārihim* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, n.d.), 73.

[94] Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Azharī al-Harawī, *Tahdhīb al-lugha* (ed. Muḥammad ʿIwaḍ; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2001), I, 18.

[95] *Ibid*., I, 23.

[96] Al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkira*, III, 1130.

[97] Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shihāb al-Dīn Yāqūt ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥamawī, *Muʿjam al-buldān* (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1995), I, 468.

Nevertheless, this common term was not applied for ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān. According to a narrative related by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in *Tārīkh Baghdād*, ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd (d. 144/761) was asked about the validity of the *fatwā* by ʿUthmān concerning "his making his spouse inheritress of ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's property after a period of delay," whereupon ibn ʿUbayd responded, "ʿUthmān is not *ṣāḥib sunna*"[98] and expressed that he did not mind ʿUthmān's views.

It is very interesting that a ṣaḥābī, a caliph, such as ʿUthmān is not qualified as *ṣāḥib sunna*. If the term is generally to be understood as "holding knowledge of Sunna," it is unlikely that a caliph would not have a good grasp of Sunna knowledge. We think that the comment by ʿAmr originates from certain criticisms against ʿUthmān during his caliphate. These criticisms include the following: he compiled the Qurʾān but burnt its other copies, he performed the prayer of resident instead of a prayer of traveler in Minā, and he climbed over the step of Muḥammad at the *minbar* of the Prophet in Medina.[99]

We should analyze evaluations about ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd to determine the value of his comments about ʿUthmān. ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd al-Baṣrī is considered to be one of the founders of Muʿtazila and ranks among the earliest ḥadīth narrators; nevertheless, because he rejects *qadar*, ḥadīth scholars do not accept him as being *thiqa* and even accuse ʿAmr of lying and fabrication.[100] Views on ʿAmr often focus on his status as a narrator; however, comments concerning ʿUthmān by a person who is accused of unreliability and lying are open to discussion. On the other hand, ʿAmr ibn ʿUbayd is not the only person to produce such comments on ʿUthmān.

Conclusion

In chronological terms, the semantic circle of discrediting and accrediting expressions expanded over the course of time. There are terms for which there is common agreement about their meaning as

---

[98] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Madīnat al-salām*, XIV, 63.

[99] Adnan Demircan, "Üçüncü Halife Osman'a Yöneltilen Bazı Eleştirilere Bâkıllânî'nin Cevapları," *İSTEM: İslâm San'at, Tarih, Edebiyat ve Mûsikîsi Dergisi* 4/8 (2006), 9-26.

[100] Avni İlhan, "Amr b. Ubeyd," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA),* III, 93-94; about ʿAmr and for claims of him being a Qadarī, also see W. Montgomery Watt, *İslâm Düşüncesinin Teşekkül Devri* (translated into Turkish by Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı; Istanbul: Sarkaç Yayınları, n.d.), 147-149.

well as many expressions that undergo expansion and differentiation in signification. This is the consequence of a natural process depending on the factors of man and time. In narrator critiques, some changes may occur in the wording of certain findings; as a result, *al-jarḥ* and *al-taʿdīl* experts may ascribe different meanings to the same term. Therefore, it is impossible to restrict such terms to having only a single meaning. Nevertheless, it is probable that the closest sense can be determined through a determination of which meaning is primarily focused on by scholars.

As an accrediting word, *ṣāḥib sunna* has been employed since the earliest periods. In particular, biographers such as Ibn Saʿd, al-ʿIjlī, and others utilized this term for accreditation in their work. Al-ʿIjlī serves as a notable reference for the usage of this term in following works. Widespread usage of *ṣāḥib sunna* within *ṭabaqāt-tarājim* terminology began in the 3rd century AH. The term principally notes the competence of a narrator with regard to his narrative. The discrediting and accrediting expressions during the first two centuries AH concentrated on the acceptability of narratives by a narrator, whereas as of the 3rd century AH, the terms were intended to describe one's competence regarding narratives.[101]

Bringing together all usages in relevant works, the prerequisites for employment of the term for a person can be summarized as follows:

1. Sympathy for scholars such as Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, al-Awzāʿī and Mālik ibn Anas

2. Acquire and narrate a ḥadīth as is

3. Object to *bidʿa*

4. Be attentive to obeying Sunna and competent with regard to ḥadīth science

5. Sincere commitment to the Qurʾān and its content

6. Pray for salvation of and peace for the ruling authority.

Due to differences in the expansion of meanings about *ṣāḥib sunna*, the term does not match to a single signification. In particular, it is impossible to restrict the meaning of *ṣāḥib sunna* merely to being

---

[101] See Yücel, *Hadis Istlahlarının Doğuşu ve Gelişimi*, 116, 188.

the opposite of *ṣāḥib bidʿa* or to claim that *bidʿa* is the antonym of Sunna. Lovers of al-Awzāʿī were called *ṣāḥib sunna*, and his haters were named *ṣāḥib bidʿa*; nevertheless, this was only a temporary usage. In the following periods, the meaning of the term underwent a notable expansion.

In fact, the association of *ṣāḥib sunna* with sympathy or antipathy toward a person is also a habit of the relevant era. Indeed, this usage is now limited to scholars who lived in a certain period. Generally, discussions on the creation of the Qurʾān constitute the historical ground with respect to the accrediting of scholars during the 2nd and 3rd centuries AH. That the term became a criterion, especially in the person of Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, insofar as his lovers were described as *ṣāḥib sunna*,[102] and the indication of such by scholars such as al-Barbahārī are consequences of a natural process. Ibn Ḥanbal, who stood out among the few objectors of Miḥna,[103] inevitably became a symbolic figure for Sunna. As he was always a defender of Sunna, sympathy for him was set as a criterion for being *ṣāḥib sunna* to give due credit to such a personality.

An analysis of author and work basis is necessary for an accurate interpretation of the meaning of the term. This principle, which is valid for many discrediting and accrediting expressions, should be used for *ṣāḥib sunna* as well. An evaluation of *Sharḥ al-Sunna* by al-Barbahārī reveals semantic nuances between its usage in *ʿaqāʾid* literature and *ṭabaqāt-tarājim* works. In *ʿaqāʾid* literature, *ṣāḥib sunna* is often reduced to being the opposite of *bidʿa*, whereas *ṭabaqāt* works utilize it in a broader sense. Therefore, the determination of the true meaning of the term involves various factors such as the author and the type and time of the work.

We think that the expansive meaning of *ṣāḥib sunna* originates from the word *sunna*. In the terminology of the Islamic sciences, *sunna* is ascribed various meanings depending on specialty. In spite of certain disputes, *sunna* is generally considered as being synonymous with ḥadīth. In *uṣūl al-fiqh*, it signifies the deeds that should be fulfilled in an exact manner and without any binding. In kalām, *sunna* is conceived as the "path of the Prophet and companions with regard to faith and deeds." In ṣaḥāba and tābiʿūn-

---

[102]   See Özafşar, *İdeolojik Hadisçiliğin Tarihî Arka Planı*, 67.
[103]   *Ibid.*, 81.

related usage, *sunna* is also employed to note the exemplary behaviors of companions such as Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, in addition to those of the Prophet.[104]

Moreover, the current interpretation on *ṣāḥib sunna* comprises only a part of its previous meanings. The usages and meanings, which we tried to determine and analyze in chronological terms, reveal that it once had a broader sense than is known or used today. Apart from comments on its meaning, the accrediting quality of the term is very high, as is seen in the value ascribed to it by Wakīʿ ibn al-Jarrāḥ. As said above, this accrediting value is evident because Wakīʿ and later biographers and *al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* scholars use the term alongside *thiqa*.

REFERENCES

Abū Ghudda, ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ, "Halk-ı Kur'an Meselesi: Raviler, Muhaddisler, Cerh ve Ta'dil Kitaplarına Tesiri," (translated into Turkish by Mücteba Uğur), *Ankara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 20 (1975), 307-321.

ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, Rifʿat Fawzī, *Tawthīq al-sunna fī l-qarn al-hijrī al-thānī: Ususuh*ᵘ *wa-ittijāhātuh*ᵘ (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1981).

Ahatlı, Erdinç, "Yahya b. Maîn'in Eserleri ve Kullandığı İhtilaflı ve Garib Lafızlar," *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 1 (1996), 211-232.

Altıkulaç, Tayyar, "Hammâd b. Zeyd," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA),* XV, 489.

Aşıkkutlu (as Âşıkkutlu), Emin, *Hadiste Ricâl Tenkîdi (Cerh ve Ta'dîl İlmi)* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 1997).

Aşıkkutlu, Emin, "Cerh ve Taʿdîl," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (*DİA*), VII, 394-401.

Aydınlı, Abdullah, *Hadis Istılahları Sözlüğü* (4ᵗʰ edn., Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2011).

Aydınlı, Abdullah, "Ehl-i Hadîs," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA),* X. 507-508.

al-Aʿẓamī, Muḥammad Ḍiyāʾ al-Raḥmān, *Dirāsāt fī l-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl* (Medina: Maktabat al-Ghurabāʾ al-Athariyya, 1995).

---

[104] For hereby meanings of Sunna and more, see Murteza Bedir, "Sünnet," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA),* XXXVIII, 150.

al-Barbahārī, Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī ibn Khalaf, *Sharḥ al-Sunna* (ed. Abū Yāsir Khālid ibn Qāsim al-Radādī; Medina: Maktabat al-Ghurabāʾ al-Athariyya, 1993).

Bedir, Murteza, "Sünnet," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA),* XXXVIII, 150-153.

al-Bukhārī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl, *Khalq afʿāl al-ʿibād wa-l-radd ʿalā l-Jahmiyya wa-aṣḥāb al-taʿṭīl* (3rd edn., Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1990).

al-Dārimī, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Faḍl, *Musnad al-Dārimī al-maʿrūf bi-(Sunan al-Dārimī),* 4 vols., (ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad al-Dārānī; Riyad: Dār al-Mughnī li-l-Tawzīʿ wa-l-Nashr, 2000).

Demircan, Adnan, "Üçüncü Halife Osman'a Yöneltilen Bazı Eleştirilere Bâkıllânî'nin Cevapları," *İSTEM: İslâm San'at, Tarih, Edebiyat ve Mûsikîsi Dergisi* 4/8 (2006), 9-26.

al-Dhahabī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān *al-ʿIbar fī khabar man ghabar,* 4 vols., (ed. Abū Ḥajar Muḥammad al-Saʿīd ibn Basyūnī Zaghlūl; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1985).

al-Dhahabī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān, *Manāqib al-Imām Abī Ḥanīfa wa-ṣāḥibayhi Abī Yūsuf wa-Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan* (eds. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī and Abū l-Wafāʾ al-Afghānī; Hyderabad: Lajnat Iḥyāʾ al-Maʿārif al-Nuʿmāniyya, n.d.).

al-Dhahabī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān, *Mīzān al-iʿtidāl fī naqd al-rijāl,* 5 vols., (ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī; Beirut: Dār al-Maʿrifa, n.d.).

al-Dhahabī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ,* 25 vols., (eds. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf, Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ, et al.; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1981-1988).

al-Dhahabī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān, *Tadhkirat al-ḥuffāẓ,* 5 vols., (ed.; ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yaḥyā al-Muʿallimī; 3rd edn., Hyderabad: Majlis Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyya, 1955-1958).

al-Dhahabī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān, *Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhīr wa-l-aʿlām,* 53 vols., (ed. ʿUmar ʿAbd al-Salām Tadmurī; Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1990-2000).

al-Fīrwānī, Muḥammad, "al-Imām Wakīʿ: ḥayātuhū wa-āthāruhū," *Majallat al-buḥūth al-Islāmiyya* 12 (1985), 315-352.

al-Ḥamawī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shihāb al-Dīn Yāqūt ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *Muʿjam al-buldān,* 7 vols., (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1995).

al-Harawī, Abū Manṣūr Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Azharī, *Tahdhīb al-lugha,* 8 vols., (ed. Muḥammad ʿIwaḍ; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2001).

al-Hāshimī, Saʿdī Mahdī, *Ikhtilāf aqwāl al-nuqqād fī l-ruwāt al-mukhtalaf fīhim maʿa dirāsat hādhihī l-ẓāhira ʿinda Ibn Maʿīn* (Medina: Majmaʿ al-Malik Fahd li-Ṭibāʿat al-Muṣḥaf al-Sharīf, 2005).

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Abū ʿUmar Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Namarī, *al-Istīʿāb fī maʿrifat al-aṣḥāb,* 4 vols., (ed. ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī; Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1992).

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Abū ʿUmar Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Namarī, *al-Intiqāʾ fī fadāʾil al-thalātha al-aʾimma al-fuqahāʾ: Mālik wa-l-Shāfiʿī wa-Abī Ḥanīfa wa-dhikr ʿuyūn min akhbārihim wa-akhbār aṣḥābihim li-l-taʿrīf bi-jalālat aqdārihim* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, n.d.).

Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Idrīs, *Kitāb al-jarḥ wa-l-taʿdīl,* 9 vols., (ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yaḥyā al-Muʿallimī; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1952-1953).

Ibn Abī Yaʿlā al-Farrāʾ, Abū l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābila,* 3 vols., (ed. ʿAbd Raḥmān ibn Sulaymān al-ʿUthaymīn; Riyadh: al-Amāna al-ʿĀmma li-l-Iḥtifāl bi-Murūr Miʾat ʿĀm ʿalā Taʾsīs al-Mamlaka, 1999).

Ibn al-ʿAdīm, Abū l-Qāsim Kamāl al-Dīn ʿUmar ibn Aḥmad, *Bughyat al-ṭalab fī tārīkh Ḥalab,* 12 vols., (ed. Suhayl Zakkār; Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, n.d.).

Ibn ʿAsākir, Abū l-Qāsim Thiqat al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Hibat Allāh, *Tārīkh Madīnat Dimashq wa-dhikr faḍlihā wa-tasmiyat man ḥallahā min al-amāthil aw ijtāza bi-nawāḥīhā min wāridīhā wa-ahlihā,* 80 vols., (ed. Muḥibb al-Dīn Abū Saʿīd ʿUmar ibn Gharāma al-ʿAmrawī; Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1995-2000).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Itḥāf al-mahara bi-l-fawāʾid al-mubtakira min aṭrāf al-ʿashara*, 19 vols., (eds. Zuhayr ibn Nāṣir al-Nāṣir, Maḥmūd Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Muḥsin, et al.; Medina: Wizārat al-Shuʾūn al-Islāmiyya wa-l-Awqāf wa-l-Daʿwa wa-l-Irshād & al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, 1994-2004).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Sharḥ al-Nukhba Nuzhat al-naẓar fī tawḍīḥ Nukhbat al-fikar fī muṣṭalaḥ ahl al-athar,* (ed. Nūr al-Dīn ʿItr; 3rd edn., Damascus: Maṭbaʿat al-Ṣabāḥ, 2000).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb,* 4 vols., (eds. Ibrāhīm al-Zaybaq and ʿĀdil Murshid; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1996).

Ibn Ḥibbān, Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Tamīmī, *Kitab al-thiqāt,* 10 vols., (Hyderabad: Maṭbaʿat Majlis Dāʾirat al-Maʿārif al-ʿUthmāniyya, 1973).

Ibn Manẓūr, Abū l-Faḍl Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Mukarram ibn ʿAlī, *Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq li-Ibn ʿAsākir,* 31 vols., (eds. Rūḥiyya al-Naḥḥās, Riyāḍ ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Murād, Muḥammad Muṭīʿ Ḥāfiẓ et al.; Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1984-1989).

Ibn Rajab al-Ḥanbalī, Abū l-Faraj Zayn al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, *Sharḥ ʿIlal al-Tirmidhī* (ed. Hammām ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Saʿīd; Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2001).

Ibn Saʿd, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Manīʿ al-Zuhrī, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā,* 8 vols., (ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās; Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1968).

al-ʿIjlī, Abū l-Ḥasan Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ṣāliḥ, *Maʿrifat al-thiqāt min rijāl ahl al-ʿilm wa-l-ḥadīth wa-min al-ḍuʿafāʾ wa-dhikr madhāhibihim wa-akhbārihim,* 2 vols., (ed. ʿAbd al-Karīm ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm al-Bastawī; Medina: Maktabat al-Dār, 1985).

İlhan, Avni, "Amr b. Ubeyd," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA),* III, 93-94.

İzmirli İsmâil Hakkı, *Hadis Tarihi* (ed. İbrahim Hatiboğlu; Istanbul: Dârulhadis, 2002).

Ibn ʿAdī, Abū Aḥmad ʿAbd Allāh al-Jurjānī, *al-Kāmil fī ḍuʿafāʾ al-rijāl,* 9 vols., (ed. ʿĀdil Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Mawjūd, ʿAlī Muḥammad Muʿawwaḍ, and ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ al-Sayyid Sulaymān Abū Sinna; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1997).

Juynboll, G. H. A., *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early* Ḥadīth (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Kāfī, Abū Bakr, *Manhaj al-Imām al-Bukhārī fī taṣḥīḥ al-aḥādīth wa-taʿlīlihā (min khilal al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ)* (Beirut: Dār Ibn Ḥazm, 2000).

al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit, *al-Jāmiʿ li-akhlāq al-rāwī wa-ādāb al-sāmiʿ* (ed. Maḥmūd Ṭaḥḥān; Riyadh: Maktabat al-Maʿārif, 1983), I, 332.

al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit, *Kitāb talkhīs al-mutashābih fī l-rasm wa-ḥimāyat mā ashkala minhu ʿan bawādir al-taṣḥīf wa-l-wahm* (ed. Sukayna al-Shihābī; Damascus: Dār Ṭalās li-l-Dirāsāt wa-l-Tarjama wa-l-Nashr, 1985).

al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Thābit, *Tārīkh Madīnat al-salām wa-akhbār muḥaddithīhā wa-dhikr quṭṭānihā l-ʿulamāʾ*

min ghayr ahlihā wa-wāridīhā, 16 vols., (ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf; Beirut: Dār al-Gharb al-Islāmī, 2001).

Kılavuz, Ahmet Saim, "Berbehârî," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, V, 476-477.

Koçyiğit, Talat, *Hadisçilerle Kelamcılar Arasındaki Münakaşalar* (4th edn., Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları, 1989).

Mazīd, ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Bāsiṭ, *Manāhij al-muḥaddithīn fī l-qarn al-awwal al-hijrī wa-ḥattā ʿaṣrinā l-ḥāḍir* (Cairo: al-Hayʾa al-Miṣriyya al-ʿĀmma li-l-Kitāb, 2002).

al-Mizzī, Abū l-Ḥajjāj Jamal al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Yūsuf, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl fī asmāʾ al-rijāl,* 35 vols., (ed. Bashshār ʿAwwād Maʿrūf; 6th edn., Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 1994).

al-Muʿallimī, ʿAbd al-Rāḥmān ibn Yaḥyā *al-Tankīl bi-mā fī taʾnīb al-Kawtharī min al-abāṭīl,* 2 vols., (eds. with notes by Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī, Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh, and ʿAbd al-Razzāq Ḥamza; 2nd edn., Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1986).

Özafşar, Mehmet Emin, *İdeolojik Hadisçiliğin Tarihî Arka Planı: Mihne Olayı ve Haşeviye Olgusu* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 1999).

Özafşar, Mehmet Emin, "Vekîʿ b. Cerrâh," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XLIII, 8-9.

Özşenel, Mehmet, *Ebû Yûsuf'un Hadis Anlayışı* (Istanbul: Klasik Yayınları., 2011).

al-Ṣafadī, Abū l-Ṣafāʾ Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak, *Kitāb al-wāfī bi-l-wafayāt,* 29 vols., (eds. Aḥmad al-Arnāʾūṭ and Dhikrī Muṣṭafā; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, 2000).

al-Sakhāwī, Abū l-Khayr Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad, *Fatḥ al-mughīth bi-sharḥ Alfiyyat al-ḥadīth li-l-ʿIrāqī,* 5 vols., (ed. ʿAlī Ḥusayn ʿAlī; 3rd edn., Dār al-Imām al-Ṭabarī, 1996).

al-Salmāsī, Abū Zakariyyāʾ Yaḥyā ibn Ibrāhīm, *Kitāb manāzil al-aʾimma al-arbaʿa Abī Ḥanīfa wa-Mālik wa-l-Shāfiʿī wa-Aḥmad* (ed. Maḥmūd ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Medina: al-Jāmiʿa al-Islāmiyya, 2002).

al-Ṣanʿānī, Abū Ibrāhīm ʿIzz al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl Amīr, *Tawḍīḥ al-afkār li-maʿānī Tanqīḥ al-anẓār,* 2 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd; Medina: al-Maktaba al-Salafiyya, n.d.).

al-Suyūṭī, Abū l-Faḍl Jalāl al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr, *Tadrīb al-rāwī fī sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī,* 2 vols., (ed. Badīʿ al-Sayyid al-Laḥḥām; Damascus: Dār al-Kalim al-Ṭayyib, 2005).

ʿUmar, Bashīr ʿAlī, *Manhaj al-Imām Aḥmad fī iʿlāl al-aḥādīth* (Riyadh: Waqf al-Salām al-Khayrī, 2005).

Watt, W. Montgomery, *İslâm Düşüncesinin Teşekkül Devri* (translated into Turkish by Ethem Ruhi Fığlalı; Istanbul: Sarkaç Yayınları, n.d.).

al-Yāfiʿī, ʿAfīf al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Asʿad ibn ʿAlī al-Yamānī, *Mirʾāt al-jinān wa-ʿibrat al-yaqẓān fī maʿrifat mā yuʿtabar min ḥawādith al-zamān,* 4 vols., (ed. Khalīl al-Manṣūr; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya, 1997).

Yavuz, Yusuf Şevki, "Ehl-i Sünnet," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, X, 525-530.

Yücel, Ahmet, *Hadîs Istlahlarının Doğuşu ve Gelişimi: Hicrî İlk Üç Asır* (2ⁿᵈ edn., Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2014).

Yücel, Ahmet, *Hadis İlminde Tenkit Terimleri ve İlgili Çalışmalar* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 1998).

Yücel, Ahmet, *Hadis Tarihi* (Istanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Vakfı Yayınları, 2012).

Yücesoy, Hayati, "Mihne," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXX, 26-28.

A TREATISE ON PREDESTINATION
– *Sharḥ Ḥadīth Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā* of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Iznīqī –

Abdullah Karahan
Uludağ University
&
Mehmet Şakar
Uludağ University

Abstract

The ḥadīth that is well-known in Islamic theology as "Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā/Discussion between Adam and Moses" often comes to the fore in debates about predestination because of its content. Almost any scholar studying fate has an affirmative or contrary comment on this ḥadīth. The Ottoman scholar Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Iznīqī (d. 885/1480) was among those who analyzed the ḥadīth. He joined the discussion with a specific treatise that became important on this issue. As a Sufi scholar, he treated the ḥadīth through the Sufi approach and brought a different point of view. This study seeks to introduce the precious treatise by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda to present scientific circles through analysis, interpretation, and translation.

Key Words: *Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā*, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Iznīqī, predestination, *qadar*, problem of fate

Introduction

With regard to predestination, relevant parties use many forms of proof to support their views or refute those of opponents. These

pieces of evidence consist of the Qurʾān verses, ḥadīths and rational deductions and are discussed in depth among scholars. Some of this proof is at the center of debates due to its importance and constitutes the major axis of the problem of fate, with affirmative and opposing opinions expressed by scholars according to their sides in the discussion. The ḥadīth known as "Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā/Discussion between Adam and Moses," which is at the core of this study, has an important place among this evidence. The ḥadīth is considered proof, especially among the followers of the Jabriyya school, due to fatalist elements within its content.

As for Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda al-Izniqī, this Ottoman scholar attached so much importance to the ḥadīth that he wrote a separate treatise on it. The author sought to contribute to relevant discussions through a treatise and made interesting assessments. In fact, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda was a Sufi scholar, and under the influence of his disposition, he created a rather Sufi framework for the ḥadīth. Consequently, a different aspect of the issue comes to the fore. The Jabriyya school interprets the ḥadīth in such a manner that it relates Adam's removal from Heaven/descent to earth to predestination. Al-Izniqī, however, took an alternative view, and his comments address not only the problem of predestination but also that of prophecy.

This work is chosen not only because of its genuine content but also because one of the four existing copies of the treatise is with handwriting of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda himself, thus ensuring a solid line of authors. Indeed, the presence of the manuscript written by the author himself is crucial for determining to whom it belongs.

Life of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda

Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda Muḥyī al-Dīn Meḥmed ibn Mawlā Quṭb al-Dīn al-Izniqī was the son of Quṭb al-Dīn al-Izniqī (d. 821/1418), a notable scholar and Sufi of the Ottoman era. He was named Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda after his father. A descendant of the Prophet, he was born and raised in Iznik. He was among the elite disciples of Mullā al-Fanārī (d. 834/1431), the renowned Ottoman scholar.[1]

---

[1] Ṭāshkuprī-zāda ʿIṣām al-Dīn Abū l-Khayr Aḥmad ibn Muṣṭafā ibn Khalīl, *al-Shaqāʾiq al-Nuʿmāniyya fī ʿulamāʾ al-Dawla al-ʿUthmāniyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1975), 65; Bursali Meḥmed Ṭāhir Efendī, *ʿUthmānli Muʾalliflari* (Istanbul: Maṭbaʿa-i ʿĀmira, 1333), I, 159; Reşat Öngören, "Kutbüddinzâde İznikî," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXVI, 489-490.

After higher education in religious sciences, he joined the Sufis and lived as a scholar who combined *sharīʿa* with *ṭarīqa*. According to his comments in his *al-Taʿbīr al-munīf wa-l-taʾwīl al-sharīf*, he participated in the Zayniyya order, and his sheikh was ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Rūmī (d. after 865/1461), a caliph of Zayn al-Dīn al-Ḥāfī.[2] Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda was also a member of the Bayrāmiyya order.[3] Certain expressions in his works indicate that he attained sheikhdom in both orders.[4]

Moreover, he pursued the views of the Akbariyya school, which are attributed to Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī (d. 638/1240) and were presented by scholars such as Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī (d. 751/1350) and Mullā al-Fanārī in Anatolia.[5]

The Arabic and Turkish works by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda made significant contributions to Ottoman scientific circles. In particular, *Fatḥ Miftāḥ al-ghayb*,[6] a commentary that he wrote at the behest of Meḥmed II on *Miftāḥ al-ghayb* by Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī, and *Tanwīr al-awrād*,[7] a commentary on *Awrād al-Zayniyya* by Zayn al-Dīn al-Ḥāfī, are his well-known works. Another notable work by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda is *Muzīl al-shakk fī aqsām al-kafara*,[8] which treats the position of people in the afterlife whom the message of Islam does not reach. In the introduction to the text, he gives certain explanations about the validity of the faith of Pharaoh and the situation of the unbeliever in Hell. Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda wrote this work under the influence of severe conflicts and havoc after Muḥyī al-Dīn

---

[2] Citing the noted work by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda: Reşat Öngören, "Bir Rüya Yorumcusu Olarak Mutasavvıf-Âlim Kutbuddinzâde Mehmed İznikî," *Uluslararası İznik Sempozyumu (5-7 Eylül 2005) (International Iznik Symposium [5-7 September 2005])* (Iznik: İznik Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2005), 382.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Öngören, "Kutbüddinzâde Iznikî," 489.

[6] MS Istanbul, Râgıb Paşa Library, 692; MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Şehid Ali Paşa, 1271; Konya Mevlânâ Museum, 1632. (Öngören, "Kutbüddinzâde Iznikî," 489).

[7] MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Amcazâde Hüseyin Paşa, 290; Fâtih, 2852; Lâleli, 1593.

[8] MS Istanbul, Râgıb Paşa Library, 692; MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 2504, 4223.

Ibn ʿArabī claimed that the faith of Pharaoh at the moment of the beginning of eternal punishment was valid.[9] Defending this important claim about Pharaoh, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda shows that he is a follower of the views put forth by Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī and the Akbariyya school.

Additionally, his notable works include the ḥadīth commentaries, such as *Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā* *ʿalayhimā l-salām*,[10] *Risāla fī qawl al-Nabī* *ʿalayhi l-salām* *al-ʿulamāʾ warathat al-anbiyāʾ*,[11] and *al-Taʿbīr al-munīf wa-l-taʾwīl al-sharīf*[12] on interpretation of dreams. He also produced Turkish treatises[13] on *tarāwīḥ* prayer[14] and *jihād*,[15] the literature ascribes other works to him as well.[16]

Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, who was a professor at Iznik Orhan Gazi Madrasa and qāḍī and muftī of Iznik,[17] passed away in Iznik in 885/1480. His tomb is near that of his father in Iznik.[18]

---

[9]   Öngören, "Kutbüddinzâde Iznikî," 489.

[10]   MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 4223; Lâleli, 1593; MS Istanbul, Râgıb Paşa Library, 692.

[11]   MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 4223; Fâtih, 2852.

[12]   MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 1733; Hasan Hayri, 112.

[13]   Öngören, "Kutbüddinzâde Iznikî," 489.

[14]   MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 1802.

[15]   MS Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Ayasofya, 1802.

[16]   For further information see Öngören, "Kutbüddinzâde Iznikî," 489. Also see Būrsāli Meḥmed Ṭāhir, *ʿUthmānli Muʾalliflari*, I, 160; Ismāʿīl Pāshā al-Baghdādī, *Hadiyyat al-ʿārifīn asmāʾ al-muʾallifīn wa āthār al-muṣannifīn* (eds. Mahmut Kemal İnal and Avni Aktuç; Istanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1955), II, 211.

[17]   Muḥammad Majdī Efendī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-shaqāʾiq* (ed. Abdülkadir Özcan; Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989), I, 125.

[18]   For further information see Ṭāshkuprī-zāda, *al-Shaqāʾiq*, 65; Muḥammad Majdī Efendī, *ibid.*, I, 124-125; Ḥājī Khalīfa Muṣṭafā ibn ʿAbd Allāh Kātib Chalabī, *Süllemü'l-Vusûl ilâ Tabakâti'l-Fuḥûl* [*Sullam al-wuṣūl ilā ṭabaqāt al-fuḥūl*] (eds. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Maḥmūd ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Arnaʾūṭ and Ṣāliḥ Sadawī; Istanbul: IRCICA Yayınları, 2010), III, 224; Kātib Chalabī, *Kashf al-ẓunūn ʿan asāmī l-kutub wa-l-funūn* (eds. M. Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; Ankara: Maarif Vekaleti, 1943), II, 1655, 1768; Būrsāli Meḥmed Ṭāhir, *ʿUthmānli Muʾalliflari*, I, 159-160; Ismāʿīl Pāshā al-Baghdādī, *Hadiyyat al-ʿārifīn*, II, 211; Öngören, "Kutbüddinzâde Iznikî," 489.

Treatise *Sharḥ Ḥadīth Iḥtijāj Ādam wa-Mūsā*^{ʿalayhimā l-salām}

The treatise is the commentary of the ḥadīth on a discussion between Moses and Adam and tells of the sending of Adam from Heaven down to earth due to his mistake and the resulting obligation of man to live on earth.

The meaning of the ḥadīth is as follows:

Adam (pbuh) and Moses (pbuh) argued in the presence of their Lord. In the end, Adam beat Moses. Moses told Adam "You are Adam, whom Allah created by His hand, into whom He blew His soul, before whom He got His angels to prostrate and whom He placed in Heaven. However, you caused the sending of men down to earth due to your mistake." In response, Adam said: "You are a chosen one whom Allah found worthy as a messenger and talked to in person, whom He handed the plates that included explanation of everything, whom He brought to his convent of dignity as a confidant. How many years before Allah created me did He write Torah?" he asked. "Forty years beforehand," answered Moses. Thereupon, Adam asked once again, "Did you see the verse, 'Adam rebelled his Lord and went astray'"?[19] As Moses responded "Yes," Adam said: "Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!" Upon this answer, Muḥammad (pbuh) said, "Adam won this debate."[20]

As told in the ḥadīth, Moses sees Adam as the reason for the expulsion of man from Heaven and his obligation to live on earth and criticizes him, bringing him, in a sense, to book. In return, Adam defends himself, claiming that he cannot be accused because his sin was prescribed as destiny by Allah even before his creation. The Prophet recognizes Adam in the discussion and puts forth a significant verdict about destiny.

The progress of this discussion, reportedly between Adam and Moses, and relevant explanations show that it includes certain important, evidential information about the question of destiny.

---

[19] Q 20:121.

[20] Muslim, "Qadar", 15. For similar texts, see al-Bukhārī, "Anbiyāʾ," 29; "Qadar," 11; Muslim, "Qadar," 13-14; al-Tirmidhī, "Qadar," 2; Abū Dāwūd, "Sunna," 17; Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, II, 248, 264, 268, 398.

Accordingly, Muslim scholars, and theologians above all, have put forth arguments on various aspects of the ḥadīth.

The first matter of debate is whether such a quarrel between Adam and Moses is possible and where and when, if ever, it took place. The second question is whether Adam's fate was written prior to his creation and if so, when. Another point about the ḥadīth is whether the sinning of Adam as a prophet damages his prophecy. Adam's response to Moses: "Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!" and the Prophet's declaration that he is the winner of the debate constitute the most controversial aspects of the narration (*riwāya*). Indeed, these phrases and their content seem to support the fatalist approach, known as the compulsory approach in Muslim theology and adopted by the Jabriyya. As a natural consequence of intense discussion on the narration, there is also debate regarding whether the ḥadīth is authentic.

An extensive emphasis on the above controversies would go far beyond the frame of this article. Nevertheless, for a solid assessment of the interpretations by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda on the ḥadīth, the approach of Muslim scholars on these points should be treated at least in general terms.

Before addressing the matters of debate, it is necessary to verify the authenticity of the narration. The narration reached posterity through the Prophet and companions such as Abū Hurayra, ʿUmar, Jundub ibn ʿAbd Allāh and Abū Mūsā; therefore, it has many lines of narration. Musa Bağcı determined sixty-eight different paths/chains of narration/transmission for the ḥadīth.[21] By means of these various chains of transmission, the ḥadīth appears in almost all renowned and reputable ḥadīth sources, *al-Kutub al-sitta* above all.[22] Almost all scholars and Sunnī theologians acknowledge the ḥadīth as authentic;[23] some even consider it multiple successive (*mutawātir*).[24]

---

[21] Hacı Musa Bağcı, *İnsanın Kaderi: Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2009), 228-235.

[22] For further information about chains of transmitters and their sources, see *ibid.*, 228-235.

[23] Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq ibn Manda, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Jahmiyya* (ed. ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Faqīhī; n.p., 1982), 71-72; Abū ʿUmar Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr al-Namarī, *al-Tamhīd li-mā fī l-Muwaṭṭaʾ min al-maʿānī wa-l-asānīd* (eds. Saʿīd Aḥmad Aʿrāb, Muḥammad al-Fallāḥ et al.; Maghreb:

The latter have mostly put forth their views in consideration of chains of transmission. Evaluations of the text are not mere criticism; rather, they intend to prove that the sections, which allegedly conflict with the Qurʾān, do not actually bear such contradiction. According to scholars from the Jahmiyya and Muʿtazila schools, the noted ḥadīth runs counter to the Qurʾān and is fabrication.[25] They never give credit to such criticisms of chains of transmission, and put forth their views in consideration of elements that they see as contrary to the Qurʾān in the text.

The first matter of debate about the ḥadīth is when and where the discussion between the two prophets took place. According to Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ (d. 544/1149), the discussion occurred on earth and in the lifetime of Moses; the Almighty Allah probably resurrected Adam upon the request of Moses and brought him into his presence. Likewise, in the night journey, the Prophet also came together with other prophets at Bayt al-Maqdis and led them in the prayer. Again, Moses and Adam may have had this discussion in the lifetime of Moses.[26] According to al-Qābisī (d. 403/1012), Ibn Baṭṭāl (d. 449/1057) and Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071), Allah may have brought together the souls of both prophets in Heaven after the

---

Wizārat ʿUmūm al-Awqāf wa-l-Shuʾūn al-Islāmiyya, 1992), XVIII, 12, 13; id., *al-Istidhkār al-jāmiʿ li-madhāhib fuqahāʾ al-amṣār wa-ʿulamāʾ al-aqṭār fīmā taḍammanahᵘ al-Muwaṭṭaʾ min maʿānī l-raʾy wa-l-āthār wa-sharḥ dhālika kullihᶦ bi l-īʿjāz wa-l-ikhtiṣār* (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn Qalʿajī; Cairo: Dār al-Waʿy, 1993), XXVI, 84, 85; Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn ibn Masʿūd al-Baghawī, *Sharḥ al-Sunna* (eds. Zuhayr al-Shāyīsh and Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ; Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1983), I, 124, 126; Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Shifāʾ al-ʿalīl fī masāʾil al-qaḍāʾ wa-l-qadar wa-l-ḥikma wa-l-taʿlīl* (ed. Muṣṭafā Abū l-Naṣr al-Shalabī; Jeddah: Maktabat al-Sawādī, 1991), I, 46; Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī bi-sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (eds. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī and Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb; Cairo: Dār al-Rayyān, 1986), XI, 514.

24 Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr*, al-Istidhkār*, XXVI, 85.

25 *Ibid*.; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī*, Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 518.

26 Abū l-Faḍl ʿIyāḍ ibn Mūsā l-Yaḥṣubī Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, *Ikmāl al-muʿlim bi-fawāʾid Muslim* (ed. Yaḥyā Ismāʿīl; Manṣūra: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 1998), VIII, 137; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 514; Abū Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (ed. Muḥammad Munīr Abdah Aghā l-Dimashqī *et al.*; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, n.d.), XIX, 60.

demise of Moses.[27] Some scholars, however, claim that the discussion will take place in the afterlife,[28] grounded in a phrase of Abū Dāwūd (d. 275/889) in his *Sunan*.[29] For Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1201), the narrative can be a mere exemplary saying referring to the initial phrase of the ḥadīth, which reads: "If they ever met, such a discussion would take place between them."[30]

Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda makes no specific remark on where Adam and Moses met and argued. Nevertheless, the following phrases in the treatise may hint that it took place in *barzakh*:

> As Moses was resurrected at *barzakh*, he thought about the response of his father, Adam, and found out the truth; thereupon, he was acquainted with the secrets and eternal knowledge thanks to the attribute of "walī," which is the true way of closeness to Allah Almighty; thus, he accepted the response of his father. Therefore, all the curtains that had hindered and dominated him due to provisions of being a prophet in his lifetime were lifted. In proportion to his divergence from earthly life, the veils were removed and the first lights of the truth became apparent.

The second issue with the narrative is whether Adam's destiny was sealed prior to his creation and if so, when it was sealed or even whether that destiny was predetermined. The following passage in the narrative states that the destiny of Adam was sealed forty years before his creation:

> "How many years before Allah created me did He write Torah?" he asked. "Forty years beforehand," answered Moses. Thereupon, Adam asked once again, "Did you see the verse, 'Adam rebelled his Lord and went astray'? As Moses responded "Yes," Adam said: "Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!"

According to Ibn al-Ṭīn (d. 611/1214), the forty years signify the period between the time when Allah said in the verse, "*I am going to*

---

27   Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Tamhīd*, XVIII, 16; Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Khalaf Ibn Baṭṭāl al-Qurṭubī, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī li-Ibn Baṭṭāl* (ed. Abū Tamīm Yāsir ibn Ibrāhīm; Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2003), X, 314; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 514; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XIX, 60.

28   Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 514.

29   Abū Dāwūd, "Sunna," 17.

30   Al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XIX, 60.

place a caliph on earth"[31] and the time when He blew His soul into Adam.[32] Ibn al-Jawzī claims that Adam waited as soil before the blowing of spirit. Ibn al-Jawzī grounds his view in a narrative[33] in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* that indicates that forty years passed between formation of Adam from soil and the blowing of soul into him.[34] According to some scholars, the beginning of the forty years signifies the time of writing on the tablets, and its end is the time of Adam's creation.[35] Al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277), however, adopts a different approach. According to him, "Adam's experiencing this event means that it was written in *al-Lawḥ al-maḥfūẓ*, Torah, or the tablets. It is inappropriate to refer to destiny itself here because destiny is eternal. Allah knows beforehand all incidents to come. His knowledge does not take shape subsequently."[36] Al-Māzarī (d. 536/1141) says the following: "This expression indicates that Allah wrote it forty years prior to the creation of Adam. Nevertheless, it may also signify that Allah disclosed this fact to angels or carried out an act to which He attributed the mentioned date. Otherwise, the will and discretion of Allah is eternal (*qadīm*)."[37]

In his treatise, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda makes no evaluation regarding when Adam's destiny is written.

Another issue regarding this ḥadīth is whether Adam's commission of the forbidden deed constitutes a sin, and if so, whether this sin prejudices his being a prophet.

According to some theologians, Adam's commission of forbidden deed is a sin. In fact, the deeds عصى and غوى in the verses are used for those who commit major sins.[38] According to most commentators and Kalām scholars, Adam touched the forbidden tree or fruit forgetting the ban, as indicated in the verse "*but he forgot; and We*

---

[31] Q 2:30.

[32] Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 517; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XXIII, 158.

[33] Muslim, "Qadar," 15

[34] Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 517; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XXIII, 158.

[35] al-ʿAynī, *ibid.*

[36] Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf al-Nawawī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-Sharḥ al-Nawawī* (Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Miṣriyya, 1930), XVI, 201.

[37] Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 517.

[38] Abū ʿAbd Allāh Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb -al-Tafsīr al-kabīr* (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1981), XXII, 127.

found not his part no firm resolve."[39] According to *sharīʿa*, one cannot be held responsible for deeds that he unwittingly commits; therefore, Adam's behavior should be described as a mistake (*zalla*) rather than a sin.[40] For some scholars, this prohibition by Allah signifies exoneration and not *ḥarām*. Therefore, they consider Adam's flouting of the prohibition as abandoning the good rather than rebellion or a sin.[41] Certain Muʿtazilī scholars evaluate the behaviors of prophets that cause suspicion of sin as mistakes of *taʾwīl* (interpretation) and *ijtihād* (diligence). Although Almighty Allah meant that it was forbidden to eat the fruit of any trees of that type, Adam thought that only the fruit of the particular tree to which He had pointed was forbidden, whereupon he obtained the fruit from another tree of the same type and erred in diligence.[42]

The scholars who describe this act by Adam as a sin or mistake also disagree about whether this incident took place before or after he became a prophet.

According to Sunnī authorities, Adam ate the forbidden fruit before becoming a prophet. Nevertheless, some scholars claim the opposite, including, for example, the Ḥashwiyya and certain Muʿtazilīs.[43] Apart from Ḥashwiyya, Ahl al-sunna agrees that prophets are protected from deliberately committing major or minor sins after becoming prophets. Generally, Shīʿa and Muʿtazila share this opinion. They take this view because otherwise, the purpose of their coming to earth becomes void and their reliability among people is harmed. According to these scholars, certain mistakes can occur after becoming a prophet; however, they are not deliberate and take place

---

[39]   Q 20:115.

[40]   Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmiʿ li-aḥkām al-Qurʾān* (ed. ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 2006), I, 459; Abū l-Khayr ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar al-Bayḍāwī, *Anwār al-tanzīl wa-asrār al-taʾwīl* (ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Marʿashlī; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, n.d.), IV, 41; Abū l-Barakāt ʿAbd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Nasafī, *Tafsīr al-Nasafī* (Istanbul: Dāru Qaḥramān, 1984), III, 68.

[41]   Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, XXII, 127; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, I, 459.

[42]   Al-Rāzī, *ibid.*, III, 8; al-Qurṭubī, *ibid.*, I, 459.

[43]   Abū l-Yusr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn* (ed. Hans Peter Linss; Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Azhariyya li-l-Turāth, 2003), 172; Abī Bakr Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Bidāya fī uṣūl al-dīn* (ed. Bekir Topaloğlu; Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1979), 54; al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, III, 7; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, I, 459.

through error or forgetting.[44] According to Ahl al-Sunna, the commission of minor sins by a prophet before becoming a prophet is permissible if there is no reasonable cause that makes the transition to prophet impossible, it occurs rarely and the prophet repents afterward. Nevertheless, they cannot commit minor sins often or a major sin at all prior to becoming prophets. Most Muʿtazilī and Khārijī claim that prophets are also protected from sin before becoming prophets. According to Ḥashwiyya and some Khārijī, Murjiʾī and Muʿtazilī scholars, prophets are not free of committing minor or major sins either before or after becoming prophets.[45]

As for Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, he considers Adam's eating of forbidden fruit as a mistake rather than a sin. Nevertheless, according to him, this mistake is not actual; rather, Allah deliberately made Adam make this error to teach people, who must live on earth, certain lessons more effectively. Therefore, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda describes this sin as esoteric, probably influenced by the theory of unity of existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*) and the related immutable entity (*aʿyān thābita*) approach of Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī.[46] These influences are even more apparent in the following expressions, which are indicated as the fifth component of wisdom in the explanation of the purposes and wisdom of Adam's commission of this esoteric mistake at the behest of Allah:

> The object learns that the verdict of Allah is conclusive with regard to inflicting punishment for his crime. Because sin, eternally, is a necessity of the *ʿayn* [*thābit*] of the object. Allah rules a sin for the object [toward sinning] only because of His knowledge on his/her

---

[44] Al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 172; al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Bidāya*, 54; al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, III, 7; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, I, 459.

[45] Al-Bazdawī, *Uṣūl al-dīn*, 172-176; al-Ṣābūnī, *al-Bidāya*, 54; al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, III, 7-8; al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, I, 459. For further information, see Ferruh Kahraman, "Hz. Âdem'in Yasak Ağaca Yaklaşması," *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 15/27 (2013/1), 207-220.

[46] We do not provide many details on this issue because it is not the direct theme of our paper. For further information on this issue, see Ekrem Demirli, "Vahdet-i Vücûd," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXXXII, 431-435; Süleyman Uludağ, "A'yân-ı sâbite," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, IV, 198-199; Hatice Arpaguş, "Sofyalı Bâlî Efendi'nin Kazâ ve Kader Risâlesi ve A'yân-ı Sâbite Açısından İnsanın Sorumluluğu," *Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 30/1 (2006), 51-88.

[object] *ʿayn* [*thābit*] of the object. Therefore, it is nothing but the self/existence of the object that pushes his *nafs* to sin. Once the object understands this, he discovers that Allah's order is just the opposite of his will. Thus, the object comprehends the justice of Allah while He punishes.

At this point, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda seems to mean the following: When an object commits a sin, this is a consequence of his *ʿayn thābit* in pre-eternity. In pre-eternity, an object has the attribute of sinning or not sinning. Allah only gives a verdict on how the object will act pursuant to his attributes and his *ʿayn thābit*. Otherwise, Allah does not make His objects sin. It is the *ʿayn thābit* of the object that pushes him to sin. As for Adam, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda claims that Adam actually has no attribute of sinning in his *ʿayn thābit* because he is a prophet and distant from sins. However, Allah makes something that is not in Adam's *ʿayn thābit* happen to Adam to teach His objects that His verdict is valid with respect to punishing crimes by objects.

Adam's response to Moses, "will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!" and the Prophet's declaration that Adam is the winner of the debate constitute another point of discussion. Indeed, these expressions can serve as evidence of the meaning of destiny (*qadar*) and the part of human will in Adam's deeds. Therefore, the views of various Islamic schools about fate and the will of man in his deeds are important to carry out a solid assessment of this section of the ḥadīth. In fact, each order has a different interpretation regarding these questions.

At first glance, Adam's words, "will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!" give the impression that man has no will in his deeds and must live the destiny written for him. This view is coherent with the Jabriyya's approach to fate. According to Jabriyya, led by Jahm ibn Ṣafwān (d. 128/745), man is but a convict in the face of destiny. He has no will or freedom to choose. No one can commit any act or deed except Allah. In this respect, there is no difference between man and non-living things. Man has no power, intention or freedom

to choose. All occurs at the discretion of Allah, pursuant to His will, desire and power.[47]

Nevertheless, Sunnī scholars do not interpret the ḥadīth in this manner. According to them, Adam sinned in this instance not because of his fate; instead, he tries to indicate that the reason for his expulsion to earth is destiny. In other words, he does not take refuge in fate for his sin and does not try to use it as an excuse.[48] As a prophet, Adam knows that it is not a valid creed to absolve him from his sin, putting forth "fate as evidence." In fact, Allah condemns polytheists who, after committing a sin, say that "*If Allah had willed, we would not have associated [anything] and neither would our fathers.*"[49] Indeed, as indicated in the verse "*Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves, and if You do not forgive us and have mercy upon us, we will surely be among the losers,*"[50] Adam acknowledges his fault. And Allah says that He forgives him.[51] There is no need to allege an excuse for an already forgiven sin. Because Allah, through His eternal knowledge, knows all that the object will undergo, this should be construed as a predestination of what that object will live.[52] Moreover, in Sūrat al-Baqara, Allah indicates that man will live on earth, and not in Heaven, even before the creation of Adam.[53] Therefore, the deception of Adam by Devil is only a motive for sending man to earth.[54] The following interpretation on the ḥadīth by al-Khaṭṭābī (d. 388/998) can help better understand the Sunni approach to this issue. Most people understand from the expression "*qaḍāʾ* and *qadar* is from Allah" that the object is under an obligation

---

[47] Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir ibn Ṭāhir al-Baghdādī, *al-Farq bayna l-firaq wa-bayān al-firqa al-nājiya minhum* (ed. Muḥammad ʿUthmān al-Khusht; Cairo: Maktabat Ibn Sīnā, n.d.), 186.

[48] Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Tamhīd*, XVIII, 15; id., *al-Istidhkār,* XXVI, 88; Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Shifāʾ al-ʿalīl*, I, 56-57.

[49] Q 6:148.

[50] Q 7:23.

[51] Q 2:37.

[52] Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Tamhīd*, XVIII, 15; id*., al-Istidhkār*, XXVI, 88; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XV, 307.

[53] Q 2:30.

[54] Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd ibn Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭābī, *Maʿālim al-Sunan wa-huwa sharḥ Sunan al-Imām Abī Dāwūd* (ed. Muḥammad Rāghib al-Ṭabbākh; Aleppo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-ʿIlmiyya, 1932), IV, 323; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XV, 307; XIX, 60.

and compulsion with regard to fulfillment of fate. Some even think that this is why Adam got the better of Moses in the above-mentioned debate. Nevertheless, this is not the case. Indeed, Allah's knowledge precedes the deeds and will of objects; these appear at His discretion, and He creates what is good and evil for such deeds and will.[55]

Qadariyya and Muʿtazila do not accept a conception of *qadar* and *qaḍāʾ* as decisive of human deeds; according to these schools, man can commit any good or evil act under his own will. Man creates and builds his future with his own hands, without intervention by Allah. In other words, the will of man is absolute, and no one interferes.[56] In this respect, Adam committed the mistake/sin that led to his expulsion from Heaven by his own will. Adam's words refer to no obligation. Certain Muʿtazilī scholars, such as Abū ʿAlī al-Jubbāʾī (d. 303/916), refuse this ḥadīth on the grounds that it presents fate as the reason behind Adam's sin. According to these scholars, if this ḥadīth were sound, then the prophets would no longer be prophets. Orders and bans would have no meaning if fate were an excuse for sinners. If it were permissible to hide behind predestination after ignoring an order or violating a prohibition, such a person could not be condemned.[57] Moreover, those who do not refuse the ḥadīth do not consider it evidence because it descends via single report (*khabar al-wāḥid*). According to Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209), the Muʿtazila criticizes this ḥadīth on the following grounds: If we declare Moses the winner, then Moses condemns Adam for committing a minor sin. In this case, Moses would have to be ignorant; however, ignorance is impermissible for a prophet. Another justification is that it is not appropriate that Moses uses a rough tongue on Adam. Moreover, Moses already knows that Adam is not the reason for mankind's unhappiness and expulsion from Heaven but rather that it is Allah who willed this predicament. Adam has put forth proof that is actually inadequate. If this justification were valid, heathens such as Pharaoh and Haman could provide the same explanation for their situations. This justification, however, would be mostly void; therefore, Adam's reasoning is also invalid. Muʿtazila also criticizes

55 Al-Khaṭṭābī, *Maʿālim al-Sunan*, IV, 322.

56 Al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad, *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-ʿadl* (eds. Tawfīq al-Ṭawīl, Saʿīd Zāyad, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, and Ibrāhīm Madkūr; Cairo: Wizārat al-Thaqāfa wa-l-irshād al-Qawmī, al-Sharika al-Miṣriyya, 1960-65), VIII, 3-4.

57 Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Shifāʾ al-ʿalīl*, I, 46.

the ḥadīth in that according to this narrative, Muḥammad is in a position of approving something that is clearly untrue and unfair. Later, al-Rāzī tried to find a more sensible basis for the ḥadīth to respond to the Muʿtazilī criticisms.[58] The Qadariyya also inveighs against the assumption that Allah wrote the event that would happen to Adam forty years beforehand. According to Qadariyya, Allah does not know something until it occurs. According to Ashʿariyya, however, predestination of the incident by Allah in the ḥadīth is proof that the abovementioned claim by Qadariyya is void.[59]

In his *al-Tamhīd*, Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr (d. 463/1071) indicates that the ḥadīth on the discussion between Adam and Moses is the most explicit for proof of fate among narratives from Muḥammad and that it annuls the Qadarī view.[60]

For al-Baghawī (d. 516/1122), any unilateral assessment without consideration of the fate or will of an object will be erroneous:

> In fact, both were equal on the verdict they were discussing. No one has the right to disregard the "essential" fate; however, no one has the right to disregard the will, which is the "cause," either. Whomever disregards one of these two (overlooks "essential" or "cause"), he deviates from the true objective and approaches one of two extremist schools, namely, Qadariyya or Jabriyya.[61]

According to Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, upon Adam's winning response to Moses "Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!" the following question springs to mind: "If the predestination of the crime of Adam before his creation would absolve him from condemnation, the predetermination of the sins of his offsprings prior to their birth should have exempted them from torment and absolved them from condemnation."

Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda touches upon certain views that seek an answer to this question; nevertheless, he states that none provides a reasonable answer and that such evaluations do not mesh with the

---

[58] Al-Rāzī, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb*, II, 53

[59] Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Ismāʿīl al-Ashʿarī, *al-Ibāna ʿan uṣūl al-diyāna* (ed. Bashīr Muḥammad ʿUyūn; Damascus: Maktabat Dār al-Bayān, 1990), I, 156.

[60] Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, *al-Tamhīd*, XVIII, 17.

[61] Al-Baghawī, *Sharḥ al-Sunna*, I, 127.

ḥadīth text. In this respect, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda cites the opinions of his father Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī[62] but indicates that these do not solve the problem either and puts forth his own views. According to Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, the incident that befell Adam is an esoteric mistake entailing various problems and wisdom, and Allah deliberately had Adam commit this error. Adam wins the debate, giving the evidence that he is but a toy in the hands of the will and pleasure of Allah, who made him commit the mistake. However, that Adam had to commit this mistake does not mean he has no will in his deeds; moreover, it does not mean that mankind must live the fate predetermined for him, as Jabriyya asserts. According to Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, this incident is a single and special event ordered by Allah to better teach people certain lessons. Later, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda tries to explain the ḥadīth through his own view by means of a detailed interpretation of wisdom and affairs with regard to Adam's commission of this error at the behest of Allah. He has a Sufi approach to the problem and explaining the noted profundity and problem.

The section in which the Prophet declares Adam the winner of the debate is another point of discussion between Ahl al-sunna and Muʿtazila, and Jabriyya schools. According to Sunnī scholars, the word "Ādam" in the expression "فحج ادم موسى" at the end of the ḥadīth should be read as *marfūʿ*, and on that basis, Adam wins the discussion.[63] Nevertheless, pursuant to some grammatical assessments, the Qadariyya maintains that the word "Mūsā" is *marfūʿ*, whereupon Moses wins the debate.[64] This is because Moses's victory is more suitable to the Qadariyya comprehension of destiny. According to Qadariyya, if Adam is considered victorious, then a prophet holds fate responsible for commission of a sin. In this case, any rebel against the prophets of Allah can use the same excuse grounded on the example of Adam.

For Ahl al-sunna, it is inarguably clear that the word "Ādam" should be *marfūʿ* pursuant to Arabic grammar, and it would be

---

[62]   The treatise comprehensively touches upon Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī's explanations on the ḥadīth. For all the remarks by Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī on the solution to the problem, see the relevant paragraphs under the title of "Translation of the Treatise."

[63]   Ibn Baṭṭāl, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, X, 315; al-Baghawī, *Sharḥ al-Sunna*, I, 126; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *Fatḥ al-bārī*, XI, 517; al-ʿAynī, *ʿUmdat al-qārī*, XV, 307.

[64]   Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *ibid.*

pushing the term too far to read the word as *manṣūb*. Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1448), al-ʿAynī (d. 855/1451) and al-Qasṭallānī (d. 923/1517), the most famous commentators on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, indicate the consensus on reading the word "Ādam" as *marfūʿ* and that it is irregular, exceptional and therefore disreputable to read it as *manṣūb*.[65] Moreover, in his *al-Musnad,* Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855) asserts that the expression "فحجه أدم" in a narrative through Abū Hurayra reveals that the word "Ādam" is *marfūʿ* and solves the problem in the *iʿrāb* of the phrase.[66]

According to Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064), Moses was beaten in the debate because he accused Adam of something that the latter never did, namely, causing man's expulsion from Heaven. This expulsion is not an act by Adam but rather by Allah. If Moses had condemned Adam for eating fruit from the forbidden tree, leading to expulsion from Heaven, then this reproach would have been appropriate and Adam would have had nothing to say.[67]

The treatise extensively treats on who won the debate between Adam and Moses. After introducing various opinions and their justifications, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda gives a detailed account of opinions from his father al-Izniqī, as well as from scholars, such as al-Baghawī and ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Suhūmī al-Ḥanafī (d. 763/1361). We will not touch upon the details to avoid pushing the limits of this study; however, we will put forth the following words by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda on why the evaluations by the above scholars, including his father, are not satisfactory to him:

> You should know that according to all of these responses, Adam silenced Moses because Moses laid the mentioned sin exclusively at Adam's door, overlooking the influence of Allah. Nevertheless, a more attentive approach will reveal the following meaning in Adam's words: "O Moses! You overlook the true power, the dominant and strongest overwhelming power, and show the impotent and almost non-present power of the object as the only reason behind my sin;

---

[65] Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī*, ibid*.; al-ʿAynī, *ibid*., XXIII, 158; Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Qasṭallānī, *Irshād al-sārī li-sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Būlāq: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Kubrā al-Amīriyya, 1305), IX, 358.

[66] Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, *ibid*.; al-ʿAynī, *ibid*., XXIII, 158.

[67] Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī ibn Aḥmad Ibn Ḥazm al-Qurṭubī, *al-Iḥkām fī uṣūl al-aḥkām* (ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir; Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda, 1983), I, 26.

such a behavior is inaccurate and beneath you. Dispute, in other words, the effort to prove the correctness of one's view through bilateral evidence in order to attain the true solution of a problem, can be carried out with proof that lacks opposition, or by means of preferring the stronger evidence over the other."

For Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, Adam is victorious because he notes that Adam is but a toy in the hands of the will and dominance of Allah, who necessitated the occurrence of this esoteric mistake, which comprises complexity and profundity. After discussing these complex aspects and profundity, Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda describes how Moses is convinced and accepts Adam's response:

> As Moses was resurrected at *barzakh*, he thought about the response of his father, Adam, and discovered the truth; thereupon, he was acquainted with the secrets and eternal knowledge thanks to the attribute of "walī," which is the true way of closeness to Allah Almighty; thus, he accepted the response of his father. Therefore, all the curtains that had hindered and dominated him due to provisions of being a prophet in his lifetime were lifted. In proportion to his divergence from earthly life, the veils were removed, and the first lights of the truth became apparent.

Copies of the Treatise

There are four remaining copies of the treatise at various libraries. One is the author's copy, written by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda in person. According to the colophon, the dictation of the treatise was completed in late Rabīʿ al-ākhir in 863 AH (March 1459). This copy, available under no. 290 in the Amcazade Hüseyin Section of Süleymaniye Library, takes place between leaves 37b-40a of a corpus that includes other works by the same author.[68] The treatise is written in *taʿlīq* script and each page consists of 21 lines, with some notes by the author in the margins. These notes, apparently added by the author afterward, include an additional verse to clarify the matter, certain explanatory/evocative information and citations from relevant scholars, such as Ibn ʿArabī or al-Qūnawī.

---

[68] The edited text of the treatise, given at the end of this paper, is based on this copy. Accordingly, letters and phrases that are different in other three versions are marked and shown in the footnotes.

The copy at Fatih Library no. 2852 is between leaves no. 104b-108a of a corpus.[69] It is also written in *taʿlīq* script and each page consists of 17 lines; the beginnings of phrases are highlighted with red lines. There is almost no word difference between this copy and that written by the author; according to the colophon, it was written in Shawwāl 827 AH (May 1468) and does not bear the name of the copyst. It must have been scripted by the author himself or one of his disciples because it was written in the lifetime of Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda, it is almost identical to the author's version, and its calligraphy is similar to that of the author.

The third copy is located under no. 692 at Râgıb Paşa Library, between leaves 226b-230a of a corpus that comprises five works by Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda.[70] The name of the copying person is not given but should be copied from the author's version because authors' notes are invariably copied. The copy is written in *naskh* style and each page consists of 21 lines; the pages are edged with red lines.

The final known copy of the treatise is found under no. 4223 in the Hacı Mahmud Efendi section of Süleymaniye Library, between leaves 27b-34a of a corpus.[71] The name and date of the scripture is unknown; the text is written in legible naskh script and each page consists of 17 lines. The notes in the author's version are also copied on the edges of the pages.

Translation of the Treatise

The Messenger of Allah (pbuh) spoke as follows:

Adam (pbuh) and Moses (pbuh) argued in the presence of their Lord. In the end, Adam beat Moses. Moses told Adam "You are Adam, whom Allah created by His hand, into whom He blew His soul, before whom He got his angels to prostrate and whom He placed in Heaven. However, you caused the sending of men down to earth due to your mistake." In response, Adam said: "You are a chosen one whom Allah found worthy as a messenger and talked to in person, whom He handed the plates that included explanation of everything, whom He brought to his convent of dignity as a confidant. How many years before Allah created me did He write Torah?" "Forty years

---

[69] This copy is indicated with the symbol (ف) in the edited text of the treatise.

[70] This copy is indicated with the symbol (رب) in the edited text of the treatise.

[71] This copy is indicated with the symbol (حم) in the edited text of the treatise.

beforehand," answered Moses. Thereupon, Adam asked once again, "did you see the verse, *'…Adam disobeyed his Lord, and went astray?'*" [Q 20:121]. As Moses responded "yes," Adam said: "Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!" Upon this answer, Prophet Muḥammad (pbuh) said, "Adam won this debate."[72]

Adam's response and how he silenced Moses prompted several relevant objections. Namely, if the predestination of the crime by Adam before his creation would have absolved him from reprimand, then he would have exempted his offsprings from wrath and reprimand because their sins were also decided before their respective creation.

Due to this complex situation in the ḥadīth, some scholars said that these words belonged to Jews; however, the narrator quotes the *riwāya* from Muḥammad because he stepped in mid-conversation and did not hear it in full.

For others, however, the word "Ādam" is *mansūb*; therefore, Moses is the winner.

According to a third group, the criticism by Moses of Adam is not appropriate because it takes place after Adam's penitence and forgiving by Allah.

In the eyes of some scholars, issues such as liability, *kasb* (deed through will) and the need for warning against sins are valid only after this life; therefore, because this condemnation takes place in the afterlife, it has no meaning but to bring Adam into contempt; however, in the afterlife, such embarrassment is to no avail.

According to certain scholars, the reprimand by Moses occurs after the truths are revealed in the afterlife and physical circumstances disappear; for others, Moses, during his condemnation, is not assigned this duty by Allah; therefore, his reprimand is not appropriate.

My father Quṭb al-Dīn, who was born in Niğde and lived in Iznik as a zealous scholar and virtuous person, wrote the following in his *ḥashiya* called *Talfīqāt to Maṣābīḥ*:

---

[72] Muslim, "Qadar," 15. For similar texts, see al-Bukhārī, Anbiyāʾ, 29, "Qadar," 11; Muslim, "Qadar," 13-14; al-Tirmidhī, "Qadar," 2; Abū Dāwūd, "Sunna," 17; Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad*, II, 248, 264, 268, 398.

None of the above-mentioned responses about the complicated aspect of the ḥadīth comply with the text of the ḥadīth. This is because Adam says, "Will you now reprimand me because of a deed that Allah wrote to happen forty years beforehand!" Nevertheless, one's departure from this world of servitude does not absolve him from reprimand. Otherwise, no sinner could have been reprimanded in the afterlife due to his crimes in this world. Moreover, if one says that condemnation is carried out only by Allah, this would be ignoring the condemnation of sins by prophets and scholars in this world and by angels in the afterlife; however, this is not the case. In the afterlife, the true situation about the question of *qaḍāʾ* and *qadar* will be unearthed, and this emergence will not remove condemnation and wrath due to disobedience. If you look for a solid, final and complete response in order to annihilate all these strong objections, you should know the following:

The phrase "Will you now reprimand me…" by Adam includes two indications: (1) Moses gets ahead of himself in condemnation, and (2) the predestination of the sin of Adam before his emergence in the realm of existence. Therefore, this expression is accepted as certain (*naṣṣ*) about these two indications. Some scholars ground it in the first indication. Nevertheless, you learn/know that it is unreasonable. Then, the reason for Adam's rejection of the condemnation by Moses should be that the condemning takes place due to something that is decided prior to his creation. This is the only way to make the objection against the ḥadīth discussable. Then, we will give the following answer:

The mentioned sin by Adam took place through two forces. We have to take both forces into consideration. Nevertheless, as Moses opposes Adam only because of the force of the object, Adam argues against Moses for the latter associates the sin only with the will of Adam and overlooks the true/authentic divine will that caused the disobedience. In short, as Moses brings along evidence and gets into discussion with Adam, the latter opts for responding and silencing him by not proving the weakness, but disproving his claim. Adam, in a manner, said the following: "Yes, I deserve condemnation and reprimand due to my disobedience. Indeed, Allah said, *'Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves'* [Q 7:23], *'…Adam disobeyed his Lord and erred'* [Q 20:121], *'…Did I not forbid you from that tree…?'* [Q 7:22] and *'…Satan caused them to slip out of it…'* [Q 2:36]. However, you –

Oh Moses – also erred seemingly, by grounding on a claim that I sinned on my own, and by attributing this sin only to my will. In fact, you are a prophet who knows that the true and victorious will with regard to disobedience (and any other deed) is that of Allah! What befits your status was to take both [the will of the object and the divine will] into account. Indeed, as a prophet, you know that overlooking one of the two would be the consequence of a Jabrī or Qadarī approach."

There are many examples for this point [indicated by Adam]. For instance, the Prophet told Abū Hurayra, "The pen of God has already written and settled what will become of you."[73] Hearing these words, Abū Hurayra only focused on the cause and deemed it the only factor for the consequence; thereupon, he said he wanted to be desexualized or to marry in order to protect himself from the malice of lust. Muḥammad, however, did not accept these wishes because Abū Hurayra considered the causes the only factor, overlooked the will of Allah, and ignored the fact that the causes may not always bring the expected consequences.

Assessments by (my father) Quṭb al-Dīn al-Iznīqī are essentially as above. Similar explanations are available in the commentary of *Maṣābīḥ* called *Manhal al-yanābīʿ*.[74] The relevant opinions have the same focus: The two [the power of the object and the omnipotent power of Allah] are inseparable; one is, so to speak, the foundation of the building, while the other signifies the stories. Whomever tries to separate them will demolish the building.

The same approach, albeit through different words, can be found in *Sharḥ al-Sunna*: "In fact, both were equal on the issue in discussion. Nobody has the right to disregard the 'true' predestination, just as nobody has the right to disregard the will, which is the 'cause.' Whomever does one of the two [overlooks 'truth' or 'cause'] deviates from the purpose and draws close to two extremist views, namely, the Qadarī and Jabrī approaches."[75] Allah knows best of all.

---

[73] al-Bukhārī, "Qadar," 2.

[74] This work is a commentary of the famous *Maṣābīḥ al-sunna* by al-Baghawī (d. 516/1122) and is written by ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Suhūmī al-Ḥanafī (d. 763/1361).

[75] Al-Baghawī, *Sharḥ al-Sunna*, I, 127.

Remember that according to all these responses, Adam silenced Moses because Moses attributed the mentioned sin only to the object, overlooking the influence of Allah. Nevertheless, a more attentive analysis will show [the meaning of Adam's words]: "Oh Moses! You overlook the true force, the dominant and strongest, overwhelming and victorious power, and show the weak, impotent power of the object as the only reason behind the occurrence of sin; this inaccurate behavior is not worthy of someone like you." A dispute can be carried out based on proof without opposition; it can also occur in the form of preferring the stronger of two pieces of evidence.

The object [Muḥammad Quṭb al-Dīn-zāda], destitute of the mercy of Allah Almighty, says the following about analysis and review of this ḥadīth thanks to His assistance and guidance to success:

Adam defeated Moses because the former showed that the reason behind the occurrence of this formal error, which includes many issues and much wisdom, is nothing but a type of toy in the hands of the dominant Allah with regard to will and wish.

The referenced issues and wisdom include the following:

1. The object's recognition of Allah's sovereignty and power. This takes place as follows: Allah rules something in such a way that the object can never oppose; the object has no power to reverse the verdict due to the endless power of Allah, and he errs.

2. The object learns of Allah's attribute of "gentleness." That is, Allah does not punish the object at once and allows him to repent, apologize and pray for forgiveness of his sins.

3. The object discovers Allah's "favor" after He accepts the apology of His object. Indeed, Allah Taʿālā speaks as follows: "*They said, 'Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves…'*" [Q 7:23].

4. The object learns the "grace" of Allah following His forgiveness and seeing how He abundantly bestows the merits of repentance.

5. The object learns that the verdict of Allah is conclusive with regard to inflicting punishment for his crime. Because sin, in pre-eternity, is a necessity of the *ʿayn* [*thābit*] of the object. Allah rules a sin for the object [toward sinning] only because

of His knowledge on the *'ayn* [*thābit*] of the object. Therefore, it is nothing but the self (existence) of the object that pushes his *nafs* to sin. Once the object understands this, he discovers that Allah's order is just the opposite of his will. Thus, the object comprehends the justice of Allah while He punishes.

Remember that pursuant to these five points, the object learns that Ḥaqq wants to be known through His attributes of honor, gentleness, favor, grace, and justice. Thus, the object prefers Allah over himself, and does not compete with Him for dominance and finally attains the stage of "surrender." Moreover, he forgets his crime, blesses the benedictions by Allah, and begins to "observe His sublime attributes." He comes together with Ḥaqq and becomes indifferent to all others, which is a desirable transformation. Rigor is the remembrance of annoyances at the moment of happiness.

6. The object knows the truth of things as they are and becomes prudent enough not to err in comprehending the truths. In other words, when he sees his good deeds, including final repentance, he interprets them as the favor and benediction of Allah. When he sees evil deeds, he understands that they are flaws of his self and a necessity of his being. Thus, the object takes a step forward in terms of observing the benediction and distinguishing the flaws. This is a supreme position because there is no better point of view for an object.

7. Divine perfection becomes apparent in the object as the attributes belonging to the self of the object disappear, as well as the veils of egocentrism. Due to self-complacency, an object may think himself impeccant and immaculate; in this case, the divine perfection within the object remains "capacity/potential" and cannot become actual. When Allah tests His object through a fallacy, the self of the object is overwhelmed, tends toward Allah and repents Him. Thereupon, Allah forgives/erases his sin, the veils are removed and divine perfection becomes visible. As a result, the object becomes much closer to Allah than before the fallacy. The case of Solomon (pbuh) is an example. When Solomon (pbuh) swore of his love for horses, the wind, which blows sometimes as a breeze and sometimes as a storm, was put under his order instead of the repented

love. This wind blew every day at this behest, in the morning and in the evening over a period of two months.

8. The object contemplates the unity of Ḥaqq in every occurrence. Allah brings whomever He likes to the stage of "togetherness" (*jamʿ*) or into heresy through the veil of "separation."[76] Once an object attains the stage of togetherness, he sees no competent being other than Allah.

9. The emergence of the requisites of the status in which the manifestation, perfection and conduct in his nature come together. If [Adam] had not descended to the lower/material world, he would not have observed actual providences by Allah, such as remorse, collection, trouble, test, forgiveness, mercy and punishment. Therefore, even if Adam's descent seems, at first glance, an expulsion, it is in fact to clothe him with the garments of closeness and manifestation.

10. The perfection of Adam is revealed. In other words, Adam left for the realm of responsibility and undertook a burden that even the heavens and earth refrained from carrying. He remained on his path despite his lust, the perverting potential of anger and his misleading demons. If Allah did not expel him to this world, one might have thought that Adam's perfection was innate, totally dependent on the favor of Allah, without any increase in his perfection worthy of such honoring and grace. Nevertheless, his error revealed his perfection in the realm of justice and favor; consequently, he became worthy of the following verse: *"And We have certainly honored the children of Adam…"* [Q 17:70].

---

[76] "Togetherness" (*jamʿ*) means "to be preoccupied only by Ḥaqq," "turn away from sensible world toward the holy realm," "turn away from all other things thanks to contemplation of Allah," and "to see that all things and beings are present thanks to Allah;" "separation" (*tafriqa*) means "the preoccupation of self with bodily forces, to get overwhelmed by them in their affairs and tastes." (ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kamāl al-Dīn ibn Abī l-Ghanāʾim al-Qāshānī, *Laṭāʾif al-iʿlām fī ishārāt ahl al-ilhām* (eds. Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Raḥīm al-Sāyiḥ *et al.*; Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 2005), I, 322-324.

The following comments can also be given in response [to objections about Adam's expulsion from Heaven to earth in the ḥadīth]:

a. This [Adam's expulsion from Heaven by Allah and descent to earth] can also be in the form of simulation. The purpose here is to show that even a person with such high status in terms of knowledge and closeness to Allah can be reprimanded; his situation is manifested through verses such as "*Adam disobeyed his Lord and erred*" [Q 20:121] and *"Did I not forbid you from that tree and tell you that Satan is to you a clear enemy?"* [Q 7:22], and to teach the objects that Adam was expelled and sent, together with Eve, to earth to ensure that the sons of Adam, who may sink into misleading fallacy/pride, have no doubt about the torment of Allah but also that they do not despair of His grace. This is because a person, bestowed with such abundant divine benediction – for Adam, these blessings include that Allah, in person, created him, blew into him a soul from His own, taught him all names, ordered angels to grovel to him, chose him as a special person, and placed him in Heaven – and Heaven with the best possible food and beauties, is subject to a clear prohibition although he needs no forbidden thing; however, when he sins, he does not lose the grace of Allah and his repentance is accepted: "*Then, his Lord chose him and turned to him in forgiveness and guided him*" [Q 20:122].

b. This [expulsion of Adam from Heaven down to earth] might have occurred to draw attention to the negative influence of evil friends and the need to refrain from such an attitude. Accordingly, the Qurʾān reads "… *when you see those who engage in offensive discourse concerning Our verses, then turn away from them*" [Q 6:68], while Muḥammad says: "Be friends only with the pious."[77] In other words, the fallacy will be committed by disobedient descendants of Adam.

c. Additionally, Adam's formal fallacy may have occurred to demonstrate that sinning is one of the innate attributes of

---

[77] Research on the source of the ḥadīth failed to locate the expression "*be friends only with the pious.*" The only present version is "Be friends only with the believers, let the pious eat your food" in works by al-Tirmidhī ("Zuhd," 55) and Abū Dāwūd ("Adab," 19).

mankind. That is, Adam was created for the complete appearance of all possible things. Accordingly, Muḥammad speaks as follows: "Had you not sinned, Allah would destroy you and replace you with a community who sins but asks for His mercy afterward; then, He would forgive them."[78] Creatures are either innocent like angels or evil like demons or are not liable. As a fourth possibility, creatures are "liable", open to obedience and disobedience; this is the best manifestation/appearance and mirror to explain the situation. I believe you understood that by "liable creatures" I mean mankind.

d. Rumor has it that when Satan, after worshipping Allah for eighty thousand years, was cursed because of Adam, Allah granted him, pursuant to His fairness, the right to take revenge on Adam in exchange for his long-lasting worship – thus Allah says: "*And whoever does good an atom's weight will see it then*" [Q 99:7]. Thereupon, Satan asked Allah to make Adam and his sons deviate from the right path through groundless doubts and allow for him until doomsday. In this case, it is as if Satan sells all his deeds in exchange for this request. Because Adam's crime was not sincere/true but only formal, Allah apparently punished him with expulsion for his sin. Nevertheless, as the verse "*Indeed, I will make upon the earth a successive authority*" [Q 2:30] reveals, He actually intended to draw His object closer and render him valuable by making him caliph. Consequently, Adam, before he knew it, did what his creation truly required. This is why Satan envied and angels admired him.

e. There is another possible and interesting response from this weak object in need of the grace of his Lord [to clarify the obscurity in the ḥadīth]: Adam probably saw what *Upper Pen* and *qadar* wrote about him, noted the wisdom [of committing that sin] – this wisdom is that "there is no influence other than Allah, to whom all verdict, deed and influence belongs"– and flawlessly comprehended the meaning of the verse "*Everything will be destroyed except His face. His is the judgment, and to Him you will be returned*" [Q 28:88], whereupon he understood

---

[78] Muslim, "Tawba," 11.

that he had attained a privileged status to raise him from the world of order and knowledge (ʿālam al-amr wa-l-ʿilm) to the world of verdict (ʿālam al-ḥukm) and that appreciation of a good deed or condemnation of a bad one cannot emerge from him as an object. If "order" and "knowledge" conflict with "situation" and "maʿrifa," this occurs because the situation is weak or is not as it should be. This means the victory of body over soul, a reversion, and an embrace of one's own choice, leaving aside the will and preference of God. The Almighty Lord says as follows: *"And your Lord creates what He wills and chooses; not for them was the choice …"* [Q 28:68] and *"It is not for a believing man or a believing woman, when Allah and His Messenger have decided a matter …"* [Q 33:36]. As the intuitions and supremacy of the situation fade and such persons gather themselves, they see the right situation of "knowledge" and "order" as it is and the true condition of "situation" in its aspect, whereupon they sink into sorrow for missing the opportunity to surrender to Allah. This sorrow is what pushes them to repent and pray for forgiveness. However, these are sins committed during the "situation," and even the most cautious are not safe in regard to avoiding such sins. Indeed, the Messenger of Allah said, "*When I chagrin, I too ask for mercy of Allah seventy times a day.*"[79]

As for Moses, his status as a prophet was overwhelming. His boldness in forbidding the denounced is proof of his character. His harsh attitude is evidenced in his relationship with Khiḍr, his older brother Aaron, the Egyptian Copt, the Samaritan, and his tribe. As grace bestowed by Allah, the secret of predestination is hidden from the prophet and is not revealed to him, as a requisite of prophecy. Otherwise, the prophet would know that some of his orders would not take place and that his efforts would not provide some people with benefit, whereupon he would become too dispirited to carry out his assigned task of communicating the message to the people. In fact, however, his duty is nothing but notification –regardless of whether his orders are fulfilled. If the secret of predestination were not hidden from the prophet, then he would have abandoned the duty of notification or his duty would have been too difficult to overcome. Therefore, Allah bestows upon His prophets by

---

[79]   Muslim, "Dhikr," 41-43.

concealing the secrets of predestination from them in accordance with His benevolence. This fact does not harm their status as prophets or diminish their genuine attributes of perfection.

There is, however, a point to consider at this stage: Any deed by Moses, his every move, and any behavior against or in relation to him occur pursuant to the will of Allah and His "actual," if not "verbal," order, although the prophet remains unaware of this fact. His killing of the Copt is an example. His deed was the right one. Allah knew that if that Copt lived, he would drive a wedge among Israelites and cause massive sedition. Thus, Allah inspired the heart of Moses to kill this man in such a manner that the prophet never distinguished that all took place upon the will and actual order of Allah to prevent sedition.

As Moses rose in *barzakh* and discovered the truth through the answer of his father Adam, he became acquainted with secrets and innate sciences thanks to the attribute of *"walī,"* the true way of closeness to Allah. Therefore, all the curtains that had hindered and dominated him due to provisions of being a prophet in his lifetime were lifted. In proportion to his divergence from earthly life, the veils were removed and the first lights of the truth became apparent. In the afterlife, Moses immediately comprehended the secret of Allah's will upon the response of his father Adam; nevertheless, he notably failed to completely comprehend the news from Khiḍr. Khiḍr showed Moses that the latter had killed the boy; however, Moses refused and could not remember that he had killed the Egyptian Copt. Khiḍr remarked upon Moses's status before his innocence about this murder was conveyed to him, saying, *"And I did it not of my own accord"* [Q 18:82]. Khiḍr also showed Moses how the latter bore a hole through the ship. At first glance, this act seemed like destruction; however, in fact, it was an escape from bandits. Khiḍr did this as a reaction to being thrown into the water in a coffin, which appeared to be destruction but was in fact salvation from the hands of Pharaoh.

Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī quoted the following from his sheikh, Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī – may Allah refresh their souls: "He (Ibn ʿArabī) came together with Khiḍr. Khiḍr told him: 'I prepared many questions for Moses, son of ʿImrān, in order to demonstrate to him that any incident that happened to him from his birth until our meeting, occurred through the will and irreversible knowledge of

Allah. However, he could not endure even just three of these questions.'" Additionally, our Prophet said the following: "If only my brother Moses kept quiet and Khiḍr told us all this news!"[80]

As for the Muḥammadan temperament, he (pbuh) neither becomes complacent nor is affected by reprimand when he observes the secret of the will of Allah because he (pbuh) sees these secrets and prays to Allah in prudence. No other prophet is like him. The prophets, who are perfect in every aspect, know these secrets not because they are messengers but because they are *awliyaʾ*. They are the examples in the following verses: *"He released the two seas, meeting side by side. Between them is a barrier so neither of them transgresses"* [Q 55:19-20].

Let us end our words here because this ḥadīth is a bottomless sea. May Allah make us the objects who obtain pearls from beneath and who find the brightest of them!

Hereby the treatise is completed on the last Saturday of Rabīʿ al-ākhir in the year eight hundred sixty three, having been written and reviewed by Muḥammad Quṭb al-Dīn, an object in need of the benevolence of Allah.

---

[80]   al-Bukhārī, "Anbiyāʾ," 27.

رسالة في شرح حديث احتجاج آدم و موسى عليهما السلام[1]
لقطب الدين زاده الإزنيقي

قال النبي عليه السلام احتج آدم موسى[2] عند ربهما فحج آدم موسى قال موسى عليه السلام أنت آدم الذي خلقك الله بيده و نفخ فيك من روحه و أسجد لك ملائكته و أسكنك في جنته ثم أهبطت الناس بخطيئتك إلى الأرض فقال آدم عليه السلام أنت موسى الذي اصطفاك الله برسالته و بكلامه وأعطاك الألواح فيها تبيان كل شيء وقربك نجيا فبكم وجدت الله كتب التوراة قبل أن أخلق قال بأربعين عاما قال آدم فهل وجدت فيها و عصى آدم ربه فغوى قال نعم قال أفتلومني على أن عملت عملا[3] كتبه الله تعالى علي أن أعمله قبل أن يخلقني بأربعين سنة. قال عليه السلام[4]: فحج آدم موسى.[5]

وعلى جوابه[6] وإلزامه اعتراض مشكل[7] لأن تقدير[8] ذنب آدم قبل خلقه لو كان[9] رافعا اللوم عليه[10] لكان[11] تقدير ذنوب أولاده قبل خلقهم دافعا العذاب

---

1. عملنا في هذا التحقيق: اعتمدنا في هذا التحقيق على أربعة نسخ: راغب باشا، محمود أفندي، فاتح و عمجه زاده حسين. و اخترنا منها نسخة عمجه حسين ـ وهو ما خطه يد المألف ـ أساسا و أشرنا إلى النسخ الأخرى في الهامش برموز. إن كان هناك ما سقط أو ما اختلف مع هذا الأصل ـ هي : لنسخة راغب باشا ب"رب"، و لنسخة محمود أفندي ب"حم"، و لنسخة فاتح ب"ف". و خرجنا كل ما يحتاج استخراجه من آية قرآنية و حديث نبوي.

2. في (حم) "مع موسى"

3. في (حم) "على عمل"

4. في (حم) "قال النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم"

5. أخرجه البخاري في كتاب القدر (١١) و مسلم في كتاب القدر (١٤) والترمذي في كتاب القدر (٢) وأبو داود في كتاب السنة (١٧) وأحمد في المسند (٢، ٢٤٨، ٢٦٤، ٢٦٨، ٣٩٨)

6. في (حم) و(رب) "اعلم أن جوابه"

7. في (حم) و (رب) "اعتراضا مشكلا"

8. في (حم) "هو أن تقدير"

9. في (حم) و (رب) "إن كان"

10. في (حم) "عنه"

11. في (حم) و (رب) "كان"

عنهم و رافعا الملام عليهم ولصعوبته¹² قال بعض هذا الحديث حكاية عن اليهود إلا أن الراوي لما دخل عليه¹³ في أثناء الحديث و ظن أنه عليه السلام أخبر عن نفسه روى عنه عليه السلام و قال بعض آدم منصوب و الغالب موسى. أجاب¹⁴ بعض بأن لوم موسى عليه السلام كان بعد التوبة و الغفران ولذا لم يكن موجها. وبعض بأن اللوم كان بعد خروجه عن دار التكليف والكسب والحاجة إلى الزجر فلم يكن في لومه¹⁵ سوى التخجيل و هو في ذلك الوقت غير مفيد.¹⁶ وقوم بأن موسى عليه السلام ليس مأمورا بلوم آدم من قبل الله تعالى فلم¹⁷ يكن موجها. وقال المولى العالم العامل والكامل الفاضل والدي مولانا قطب الدين النكيدي¹⁸ مولدا والإزنيقي محتدا¹⁹ هذه الأجوبة غير مناسبة لمتن الحديث لأن آدم عليه السلام قال أفتلومني على عمل قدره الله تعالى²⁰ قبل خلقي مع أن الخروج عن دار التكليف لا يرفع اللوم وإلا لا يكون أحد من العصاة ملوما على عصيانه في الآخرة و لو كان اللوم مخصوصا بالله تعالى لا يكون لتوبيخ الأنبياء و العلماء في الدنيا وتوبيخ الملائكة في الآخرة²¹ على العصاة وجه و ليس كذلك و أيضا يظهر في الآخرة حقيقة الحال في مسئلة القضاء و القدر ولا يدفع ذلك الظهور اللوم و التعذيب على المعصية فلا بد في دفع ذلك الاعتراض القوي²² من جواب شافٍ و كلام وافٍ و إذا أردت الجواب المستقيم فاعلم أن قول آدم عليه السلام أفتلومني إلخ مشتمل على قيدين كون موسى مباشرا في اللوم و

---

¹² في (حم) "ولصعوبة هذا الإشكال و ليس كذالك"

¹³ في (حم) "على النبى صلى الله عليه و سلم"

¹⁴ في (حم) و (رب) "وأجاب"

¹⁵ في (حم) "في لومه فائدة"

¹⁶ في (حم) و (رب) " وقوم بأن اللوم كان بعد ظهور الحقائق في العالم العلوى و اضمحلال الرسوم و الإطلال"

¹⁷ في (حم) "ولم"

¹⁸ في (حم) "النكيد"

¹⁹ في (حم) و (رب) "في حواشيه على المصابيح المسماة تلفيقات"

²⁰ سقط من (ف) و(رب) "الله تعلى"

²¹ في (ف) "وتوبيخ الملائكة في الملائكة في الاخرة"

²² سقط من (حم) "القوي"

كون ذنب آدم مقدَّرا قبل وجوده فيكون الكلام نصا في ذينك القيدين [23] فذهب البعض إلى الأول وقد عرفت أن لاوجه له فتعين أن الإنكار راجع إلى لومه على مقدر قبل [24] فتوجه الاعتراض فنجيب أن عصيان آدم صدر بواسطة القدرتين فلا بد فيه [25] من ملاحظتهما لكن لما نظر موسى إلى مجرد قدرة العبد فأنكر [26] آدم على موسى في تخصيصه قدرة آدم بصدور المعصية من غير ملاحظة القدرة الغالبة الربانية فالحاصل أن موسى لما كان محاجا ومناظرا [27] مع آدم سلك آدم معه طريق المباحثة و الإلزام بتزييف دليله لا بتضعيف مدعاه فكأنه قال إني وإن كنت مستحقا باللوم و التوبيخ بصدور العصيان مني ولهذا قال ربنا ظلمنا أنفسنا [28] وقال [29] تعالى "و عصى آدم ربه" فغوى [30] وقال "ألم أنهكما عن تلكما الشجرة" [31] وقال "وأزلهما الشيطان" [32] لكنك يا موسى أخطأت بإسناد تلك المعصية إلى قدرتي بعبارة دالة في الظاهر على استقلالي مع أنك نبي عارف بأن الأصل والمستقل [33] فيها قدرة الله تعالى بشأنك أن تظهر [34] إلى [35] الجانبين لما عرفت أن النظر بأحدهما مجردا ينبئ عن الجبر أو القدر و أمثال هذه النكتة كثيرة منها قوله عليه السلام [36] لأبي هريرة رضى الله عنه جف القلم بما أنت لاقٍ [37] يعني [38] إن

---

[23] سقط من (ف) "قيدين"

[24] في (حم) و (رب) و(ف) "+ خلقه"

[25] سقط من (حم) "فيه"

[26] سقط من (حم) "أنكر"

[27] في (حم) "وناظرا"

[28] الأعراف (٢٥)

[29] سقط من (حم) "ألله"

[30] طه (١٢١)

[31] الأعراف (٢٢)

[32] البقرة (٣٦)

[33] في (حم) و (رب) "والغالب "

[34] في (رب) "أن تنظر" هذا هو الصواب

[35] سقط من (حم) "إلى"

[36] في (حم) "قول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم"

[37] أخرجه البخاري في كتاب القدر (٢) عن أبي هريرة

[38] سقط من (حم) "يعني"

أبا[39] هريرة نظر[40] إلى السبب و زعم أنه تام في وجود المسبب ودفعِه[41] وقال أريد أن أختصي حتى أسلم من شر الشهوة الباعثة إلى[42] الزنا أو التأهل فرد[43] النبي عليه السلام كلامه لتأدية[44] بظاهره إلى ملاحظة السبب و ترك الطرف الأقوى وذهوله عن أن تأثير الأسباب باعتبار السنة الإلهية لا بالإيجاب و العلية[45]. تم محصول كلامه. و يقرب من هذا الجواب ما ذكر في شرح المصابيح المسمى *منهل الينابيع*[46] بهذه العبارة. وإجماع[47] القول في هذا الباب أنهما أمران لا ينفك أحدهما عن الآخر لأن أحدهما بمنزلة الأساس و الآخر بمنزلة البناء فمن رام الفصل بينهما فقد رام هدم البناء ونقضه. و في شرح السنة بعبارة أخرى وهى أن الحكم الذي تنازعاه فهما[48] فيه سواء لا يقدر أحد أن يُسقِط الأصل الذي هو القدر ولا أن يُبطِل الكسب الذي هو السبب و من فعل واحدا منهما خرج عن المقصد[49] إلى أحد الطرفين أى إلى مذهب القدر أو الجبر.[50] والله أعلم.

اعلم[51] أن هؤلاء الأجوبة تشعر بأن إلزام آدم عليه السلام موسى راجع إلى تخصيص موسى جانب العبد وحده بلا ملاحظة جانب الله تعالى لكن النظر الدقيق[52] يفيد أن تخصيصك يا موسى قدرة العبد الضعيفةَ الأثر بل العديمةَ[53] الأثر بصدور المعصية بغير ملاحظة القدرة الغالبة القاهرة[54] هي

---

[39] في (حم) "فإن"

[40] في (حم) لما نظر

[41] في (حم) "فنفِي في دفعه "

[42] في (حم) "على"

[43] في (حم) "رد"

[44] في (حم) "التأدبه"

[45] في (حم) "والغلبة"

[46] هذا الكتاب لعلاء الدين السهومي الحنفي المتوفى في سنة ٧٦٣ هـ. ١٣٦١ م.

[47] في (حم) و (رب) و(ف) "وجماع"

[48] في (حم) "فيهما"

[49] في (حم) "القصد"

[50] مصابيح السنة للبغوى في ١، ١٢٧

[51] سقط من (رب) "اعلم"

[52] في (حم) و (رب) "فكأنَّ آدم يقول أن النظر الدقيق"

[53] في (ف) "القديمة"

الأصل والرُّجْحى والقُوَّى غير موجه بين⁵⁵ مثلك وقد يقع المعارضة بالترجيح كما يقع بالبرهان الذي لا معارض له.⁵⁶ يقول العبد الفقير بعون الله تعالى وتوفيقه في حل هذا الحديث وتدقيقه، أن⁵⁷ غلبة آدم على موسى بالحجة⁵⁸ بإشارته إلى أنه كان كرة لصولحان⁵⁹ إرادة الله و مشيئته التي اقتضت صدور هذه الزلة الصورية المشتملة على حكم و مصالح من وجوه: أحدها معرفة العبد عزته تعالى بأن حكم عليه بما لا يمكن رده فأذل نفسه بما لم يقدر على دفعه لكمال عزه. وثانيها معرفة حلمه⁶⁰ تعالى بأن لم يعاجل⁶¹ بالعقوبة وأمهله حتى تاب واعتذر إليه واستغفر عن ذنبه⁶². و ثالثها معرفة الآية⁶³. ورابعها "ربنا ظلمنا أنفسنا"كرمه تعالى في قبول العذر منه كما قال معرفة فضله تعالى بالعفو عنه وإفاضة⁶⁴ ثواب التوبة عليه. وخامسها معرفة العبد أن حجة الله قائمة عليه في عقابه على ذنبه لأن الذنب مقتضى عينه في الأزل فلم يحكم عليه به⁶⁵ إلا لعلمه التابع لمقتضى عينه فعينُه هى التي جَنَتْ على نفسه فإذا عرف ذلك عرف أن أمر الله بخلاف إرادته لِأَنْ يعرف العبد عدله في عقابه. اعلم أن العبد يعرف في الوجوه الخمسة أن مراد الحق كونه معروفا بصفة العزة والحلم والكرم والفضل والعدل فيؤثر اللهَ على نفسه ولاينازعه في ملكه فيبلغ مقام التسليم بل يكون في مشاهدة صفاته العُلى

---

⁵⁴ في (حم) و (رب) "القاهرة التي"

⁵⁵ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "عن"

⁵⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "إذا تأملت ما قالوا عرفت أنهم ما قدروا على افتراع ابكار معانيه ولا فتقوا رَتْقَ مبانيه لأنهم نَزَّلوا معناه منزلتهم وهم من أهل الظاهر. والحالُ أن النبى عليه السلام يشير أحيانا لمقام أهل الطريقة وأحيانا لمقام أهل الحقيقة، وهذا رمز منه عليه السلام إلى ما عليه أهلُ الحقيقة. وإن شئت كشف الإشارة فاستمع ما يقول العبد الفقير..."

⁵⁷ في (حم) و (رب) "و هو أن"

⁵⁸ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "بالحجة"

⁵⁹ في (حم) و (رب) و(ف) "لصولجان"

⁶⁰ في (حم) "حكمه"

⁶¹ في (حم) "لم يعجل"

⁶² في (حم) "الذنبه"

⁶³ في (حم) و (رب) "وقال الله تعالى فتاب عليه و هدى"

⁶⁴ في (حم) "وإفاضته"

⁶⁵ في (حم) "فلم يحكم به عليه"

ذاهلا عن الجناية شاكرا لأنعمه والحضورُ مع الحق والذهولُ عما سواه مطلوب شريف فإن ذكر الجفاء في وقت الصفاء جفاء. وسادسها معرفة العبد حقائق الأشياء كما هى وكونه بصيرا لا يخطئ⁶⁶ في الإدراك بحيث أن راى حسناته التي من جملتها التوبة النصوح يحمل انها منَّة من الله وفضل وإن رأى سيئاته يعرف أنه من عيوب نفسه ومقتضى ذاته فيكون سايرا بين مشاهدة المنة وتطلع عيب⁶⁷ النفس وهذا مقام سني لأنه لم يبق للعبد⁶⁸ رؤية⁶⁹ حسنة. وسابعها إن ظهور الكمالات الإلهية على العبد بفناء صفات نفسه ورفع حجاب أنانيته ولهذا قد يكون الكمالات غير خارجة من القوة إلى الفعل بصفة نفسه⁷⁰ كالعُجب ورؤية تزيُّن نفسه بالعصمة والتطهر فإذا ابتلاه الله بهفوةٍ تنكسر⁷¹ نفسه⁷² فيتوب وينيب حتى تمحي⁷³ وترتفع الحجب وتظهر⁷⁴ كمالاتها وتحصل⁷⁵ من القربة أضعاف ما كانت له قبل الهفوة كما كان لسليمان عليه السلام حين تاب عن حبه⁷⁶ الخيل وعُوِّض بالريح تجري بأمره رخاءً أو عاصفةً وكانت تجري بأمره كل يوم⁷⁷ مسيرة شهرين غدوها شهر ورواحها شهر. وثامنها شهود انفراد الحق في كل ما يصدُر يهدي من يشاء إلى الجمع ويضل من يشاء باحتجابه بالتفرقة فلا يرى مصرِّفا غيره في كل تعريف⁷⁸. وتاسعها وجود مقتضى ما ركب في خميرته من مقام جمعية

---

⁶⁶ في (حم) "لاعظاء"

⁶⁷ في (ف) "معيب"

⁶⁸ في (حم) و (رب) "لا يبقى فيه"

⁶⁹ في (حم) و (رب) "مروية"

⁷⁰ في (حم) و (رب) "فيتوب وينيب و يرتفع الحجب ويظهر كمالاتها ويحصل من القربة اضعافا ما كانت له"

⁷¹ في (حم) و (رب) "تنكر"

⁷² سقط من (حم) و (رب) "نفسه"

⁷³ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "حتى تمحي"

⁷⁴ في (حم) "يظهر"

⁷⁵ في (حم) "يحصل"

⁷⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "حبة"

⁷⁷ في (ف) "مرة"

⁷⁸ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "تصريف"

التجليات والكمالات والأطوارات ولو ⁷⁹ لم ينزل الى العالم العنصري السفلي لم يشاهد ما فيه من ظهورات التصرفات الأفعالية من القهر والقبض والبلايا والمحن والعفو والمغفرة والانتقام وغير ذلك فهذا في الصورة طرد في المعنى ⁸⁰ تقريب والِباس ⁸¹ خلع من التجليات. وعاشرها إظهار كماله حيث اُلقى في دار التكليف وحمل عليه⁸² الامانةُ التي لم يحملها السموات والارض واستقام ⁸³ مع ما فيه من الشهوة الصادرة⁸⁴ عنه⁸⁵ والقوة الغضبية العايقة ومن الشياطين العدوة المضلة⁸⁶ ولولاه لربما توهم متوهمٌ إن كماله وهبي فضلي لا يرى فيه زيادة كمال بحيث يستحق هذا التكريم والتفضيل فبهذا⁸⁷ الزلة ظهر كمالُه في عالمي العدل والفضل وكان لايقا⁸⁸ لتشريف كرّمنا⁸⁹. ويمكن أن يقال في الجواب أنه يحتمل أن يكون هذا على صورة المواضعة تعليما للعباد وموعظة⁹⁰ بأن الذي كان من العلم والقربة⁹¹ بهذه "وعصى آدم ربه فغوى"المنزلة والمكانة عُوتب وشُهِّر حاله بقوله تعالى⁹² ألم انهكما عن تلكما الشجرة وأقل لكما إن الشيطان لكما عدو⁹³ وقوله" وأُخرج من الجنة وأُهبط الى الأرض مع حوّا⁹⁴ لئلا يغتر أولاده ولا " مبين

---

⁷⁹ في (رب) "ولو لم يعص ولم ينزل"

⁸⁰ في (رب) "وفي المعنى"

⁸¹ في (حم) و (رب) "والبأس"

⁸² سقط من (ف) "عليه"

⁸³ سقط من (ف) "مع ما فيه من الشهوة الصادرة عنه والقوة الغضبية العايقة ومن الشياطين العدوة المضلة"

⁸⁴ في (رب) "الصادة"

⁸⁵ سقط من (رب) "عنه"

⁸⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "من الإنس والجن"

⁸⁷ في (رب) "فبهذه"

⁸⁸ في (ف) "وكان لا"

⁸⁹ في (حم) و (رب) "ولقد كرمنا" و الآية من سورة الإسراء (٧٠)

⁹⁰ في (حم) و (رب) "وموعظة للأولاد"

⁹¹ في (ف) "والاصطفاه"

⁹² في (حم) و (ر) "بقول"

⁹³ في (ح) "وقول"

⁹⁴ في (حم) و (رب) و(ف) "حواء"

يأمنوا من مكر الله ولئلا[95] يقنطوا من رحمة الله لأن من كان منعما عليه بجلائل النعم وهى التي تعرف في حق أبينا آدم عليه السلام من خلقه[96] بيده ونفخ روحه وإنباء الأسماء كلها[97] وأمر الملائكة بالسجود واصطفائه[98] وإسكانه الجنة وغيرها وكان مخاطبا عيانا بصريح النهى مع عدم الاحتياج الى المنهى عنه لكونه في جنةٍ أكلها دائمة[99] من اطايب الأشربة والأطعمة ما[101]. "فتاب عليه وهدى"خاب من رحمته وقُبِل توبته كما قال تعالى[100] ويحتمل أن يكون فيه إِشارة إِلى أن مصاحبةَ سوء الأخدان والإخوان[102] فلا تقعد بعد الذكرى مع "مؤثِّرة يجب الاحتراز[103] كما نطق به الكتاب[104] " القوم الظالمين.[105]

والحديث "لا تصاحب إلا تقيا"[106] يعني أن صدور الزلة من جهة الذراري العصاة في صلبه عليه السلام. ويحتمل أن يكون صدور صورة الزلة منه ليندرج فيما قُصد من خلقة الإنسان وبيانه أنه خُلق لاستيفاء[107] الأقسام الممكنة الايجاد كما يفهم من قوله[108] عليه السلام "لو لم تذنبوا لذهب الله[109] بكم ولجاء بقوم يذنبون ويستغفرون الله فيغفر[110] لهم"[111] لأن الخلق

---

[95] في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "وارشادا على أن لا يقنطوا"

[96] في (حم) "خلقني"

[97] سقط من (حم) و(ف) "كلها"

[98] في (حم) "واصفيائه وفي ف واصطفابه"

[99] في (حم) "دائم"

[100] في (حم) "قال الله تعالى"

[101] طه (١٢٢)

[102]ا في (حم) "الاخوان والاخدان"

[103]ا في (حم) "الاحتراز عنها"

[104]ا في (حم) و (رب) "لكتاب الكريم"

[105] الأنعام (٦٨)

[106] أخرجه الترمذي في الزهد (٥٥) عن السعيد الخدري

[107] في (ف) "الاستيفاء"

[108] في (حم) "قول النبي"

[109] في (رب) "لم يوجد الله"

[110] في (حم) "فغفر"

[111] أخرجه مسلم في كتاب التوبة (١١) عن أبي هريرة

معصومون¹¹² كالملائكة وإما شريرون كالشياطين وإما أنهم ليسوا بمكلفين فبقى¹¹³ قسم مكلف من شأنه الطاعة والمعصية وهو المظهر الأتم والمراة المثلى أعني الإنسان فافهم ويحتمل أن إبليس لما عبد الله ثمانين الف سنة في رواية وكان ملعونا بسببه¹¹⁴ فجازاه¹¹⁵ من تلك العبادة بأخذ انتقامه منه بمقتضى عدله كما قال تعالى "ومن¹¹⁶ يعمل مثقال ذرة خيرا يره"¹¹⁷ فإن إبليس¹¹⁸ طلب¹¹⁹ إغواءه وطلب الإنظار بوسوسة¹²⁰ أولاده فكأنه باع كل عمله بهذه الطلبة وإذا كان عمله ظاهريا لا بالإخلاص جازاه بالطرد الظاهري وحقيقته¹²¹ في المعنى تقريب وتكريم بالإستخلاف في الأرض وهو المراد من خلقته كما قال تعالى¹²² "إني جاعل في الأرض خليفة"¹²³ فكأنه في الحقيقة من حيث لا يشعر ساعيا¹²⁴ لما اقتضى فطرته وهو الذي كان محسودا¹²⁵ له ومغبوطا¹²⁶ للملائكة منه¹²⁷.

وهنا جواب¹²⁸ عجيب عند الفقير الغريب¹²⁹ وهو أن آدم عليه السلام لعله لما¹³⁰ كان مطلعا على ما جرى القلم والقدر¹³¹ في حقه ومشاهدا

---

¹¹² في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "إما معصومون" هذا هو الصواب

¹¹³ في (حم) "فيبقى"

¹¹⁴ في (حم) "بسبب آدم عليه السلام"

¹¹⁵ في (حم) "و رب فجازاه الله تعالى"

¹¹⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "وف فمن"

¹¹⁷ الزلزال (٧)

¹¹⁸ سقط من (ف) "ابليس"

¹¹⁹ في (حم) و (رب) "لما طلب"

¹²⁰ في (حم) و (ف) "لوسوسة"

¹²¹ في (ف) "وبالحقيقية"

¹²² في (حم) "قال الله تعالى"

¹²³ البقرة (٣٠)

¹²⁴ في (حم) و (رب) "ساعيا من حيث لا يشعر"

¹²⁵ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "كان به محسودا"

¹²⁶ ف (حم) "ومضبوطا"

¹²⁷ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "منه"

¹²⁸ في (حم) و (رب) "جواب آخر"

¹²⁹ في (حم) "غريب"

الحكمَ وهو أن لا يرى مؤثرا الا الله ولا حكما ولا أثرا ولا فعلا إلا له ومتحققا عنده عيانا معنى قوله "كل شيئ هالك إلا وجهه له الحكم"[132] أشار[133] إلى أنه عليه السلام في مقام لا يتأتى منه استحسان حَسَنَةٍ[134] واستقباح سيئته[135] لصعوده من عالم الأمر والعلم إلى عالم الحكم فإن عارض الأمرُ[136] الحالَ والمعرفةَ فإنما يكون لضعف الحال ولعدم صحته فذلك انتكاسٌ وغلبةُ الجسم الروحَ ورجوع القهقرى وترك إرادة الحق واختياره مع اختيار نفسه قال الله[137] تعالى "وربك يخلق ما يشاء ويختار ما كان لهم الخيرة"[138] وقال تعالى[139] "وما كان لمؤمن ولا مؤمنة إذا قضى الله ورسوله أمرا أن يكون لهم الخيرة"[140] فإذا زال الوارد وغلبةُ الحال من هذه الطائفة[141] وتمكنوا عرفوا صحة العلم والأمر في طوره وصحة الحال في طوره فيتحزنون لما فاتهم من التسلّم للأمر[142] فذا سبب توبتهم واستغفارهم لكن هذا من ذنوب الأحوال لا يأمن من[143] مثلها أرباب التمكين أيضا ولهذا قال[144] عليه السلام "انه ليغان على قلبي فأستغفر الله في اليوم سبعين مرة"[145]. أما موسى عليه السلام فكان جهةٌ نبوته قويةً يدل عليها[146] صولته

---

[130] سقم من (رب) "لما"

[131] في (حم) "أو القدر"

[132] القصص (٨٨)

[133] في (حم) و (رب) "فأشار"

[134] في (حم) "حسنته" هذا هو الصواب

[135] في (حم) و (رب) "سيئة وفي ف سيئه"

[136] سقط من (حم) و (رب) "والعلم"

[137] سقط من (رب) "ألله"

[138] القصص (٦٨)

[139] سقط من (ف) "و قال تعالى"

[140] الأحزاب (٣٦)

[141] سقط من (ف) "من هذه الطائفة"

[142] في (حم) و (رب) "لما فاتهم من موجب الأمر"

[143] سقط من (ف) "من"

[144] في (حم) "قال النبي"

[145] أخرجه مسلم في كتاب الذكر و الدعاء (٤١)

[146] في (حم) "عليه"

في النهي عن المنكر مصداقه شأنه مع الخضر وأخيه هارون ومع القبطيِّ و السامري وقومه [147] ومن شأن النبوة أن يُطوى على النبي سرُّ القدر رحمةً من الله به لئلا يغتر همته عن إبلاغ ما أُمر بتبليغه علما بعدم وقوع المأمور به وكون سعيه بلا طائل في حق البعض والحال أن منصبه التبليغ فقط سواء وقع المأمور به أو لا ولو لم يطو لربما يتقاعد عن التبليغ [148] أو يشق عليه [149] فمنَّ الله على الأنبياء بالستر رحمة بهم فذا لا يوجب نقصا في مراتبهم النبوية ولا يقدح في كمالاتهم الخصيصة [150] بهم لكن ينبغي أن يعرف أن جميع أفعال موسى عليه السلام وحركاته وما جرى عليه ومنه إنما كان بإرادة الله تعالى وأمره بالفعل [151] لا بالقول [152] وإن لم يشعر به كقتله القبطي فإنه الحق الصواب لِما كان الله يعلم أنه لو بقى أفسد [153] ما [154] بين بني إسرائيل وأَفضى إلى فتنة عظيمة فرد الله بإلهام القتل في ستر سِرِّ [155] موسى من حيث لا يعلم [156] ظاهره أنه كان بإرادته [157] وأمره الفعلى الفتنة هذا فلما [158] تنبه في النشأة البرزخية من جواب أبيه آدم عليه السلام على حقيقة الحال سلَّم جوابَه بحكم ولايته التي هى جهة قربه بها يطلع على الأسرار والعلوم اللَّدُنِّية وزال [159] الحجاب الذي كان ملكةً فيه بحكم النبوة الظاهرة السلطنة في النشأة الدنياوية [160] فيقدر [161] بعد العهد من هذه النشأة زال الحجاب وظهر تباشير

---

[147] سقط من (حم) و (رب) "وقارون"

[148] سقط من (حم) و (رب) "فقط سواء وقع المأمور به أو لا ولو لم يطو لربما يتقاعد عن التبليغ"

[149] في (حم) و (رب) "أو ليشق عليه"

[150] في (ف) "الخصيص"

[151] في (حم) و (رب) "الفعلي"

[152] في (حم) و (رب) "القولي"

[153] في (حم) و (رب) "الأفسد"

[154] سقط من (حم) "ما"

[155] في (حم) "في سر موسى" وفي (رب) "سرير"

[156] في (حم) و (رب) "لا يشعر"

[157] في (رب) "إراداته"

[158] في (حم) "إما أنه" وفي (رب) "إما أنه لما"

[159] في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "لأنه زال"

[160] في (حم) و (رب) "الدنيوية"

الحق. ألا ترى كيف تنبه موسى عليه السلام لسر الإرادة[162] من جواب أبيه سريعا في ذلك العالم ويتفطن[163] من اِنْباء الخضر حيث أرَى موسى قتل الغلام فأنكر عليه ولم يتذكر قتله القبطي فقال له الخضر ما فعلتُه عن أمري منبها[164] على مرتبته قبل أن يُنبّأ أنه كان معصومة[165] الحركة في نفس الأمر وأراه[166] خرق السفينة التي ظاهرها هُلْكٌ وباطنها نجاة عن[167] يد الغاضب[168] جاعلا له في مقابلة التابوت الذي كان في اليم مُطْبقا عليه فظاهره هلك[169] وباطنه نجاة من يد الغاصب فرعون أن يذبحه[170].

روى صدر الدين القُونَوي عن الشيخ العربي[171] رَوَّح الله روحهما أنه اجتمع مع خضر[172] عليه السلام فقال له كنتُ قد اعددتُ لموسى بن عمران مسئلة[173] تنبيها منه[174] لموسى[175] أن جميع ما جرى عليه من أول ما ولد إلى زمان اجتماعه بإرادة الله[176] وعلمه الذي لا يمكن وقوع خلافه فلم يصبر على ثلاث مسائل وقال نبينا عليه السلام "ليت أخي موسى سكت حتى يقصّ علينا من أنبائها"[177].

---

[161] في (رب) "فبِقَدْرٍ"

[162] في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "سر الإرادة"

[163] في (حم) و (رب) و(ف) "ولم يتفطن " والصواب هو

[164] في (حم) "متنبها"

[165] في (حم) و (رب) و(ف) "معصوم"

[166] في (حم) و (رب) "وارادة"

[167] في (حم) و (رب) "من"

[168] في (رب) "الغاضب" هذا هو الصواب

[169] في (حم) و(ف) "هلاك"

[170] في (حم) و (رب) "أن يذبحه فأنكر عليه"

[171] في (ف) "ابن العربي"

[172] ا في (حم) "الخضر"

[173] في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "الف مسئلة" والصواب هو

[174] في (حم) "له وفي رب تنبيها لموسى"

[175] سقط من (حم) "لموسى"

[176] في (حم) و (رب) "كان بإرادة الله تعالى وأمره الفعلي"

[177] في (حم) "أنبائهم"، وفي (ف) "أنبائهما"

وأما المحمدي المشرب فلا يأخذه عند شهود سر القضاء والإرادة فتور
ولا¹⁷⁸ لومة لائم لأنه يرى ذلك ويدعو إلى الله على بصيرة ولم يكن غيره من
الأنبياء كذلك¹⁷⁹ . وعلم هذه الأسرار للأنبياء الكمّل من كونهم أولياء لا من
كونهم رسلا فإنهم على مثال "مرج البحرين يلتقيان بينهما برزخ لا يبغيان."

فلنختم¹⁸⁰ الكلام هنا فإنه بحر عميق. لا يدرك غوره جعلنا الله من
الغواصين المستخرجين من الأصداف درره ومن الفايزين من الدرر غرره.¹⁸¹
قد¹⁸² وقع الفراغ¹⁸³ تقريرا وتحريرا¹⁸⁴ في أواخر¹⁸⁵ ربيع الآخر ليلة السبت
سنة ثلاث وستين وثمانمأة¹⁸⁶ من يد الفقير محمد قطب الدين.¹⁸⁷

---

¹⁷⁸ في (حم) "ولا يثبطه"

¹⁷⁹ في (حم) و (رب) و (ف) "إلا شاذا أو نادرا"

¹⁸⁰ في (حم) "لنختم"

¹⁸¹ في (رب) "انتهى الرساله هنا"

¹⁸² سقط من (حم) و (رب) "قد"

¹⁸³ في (حم) و (رب) "من تأليف هذه الرسالة"

¹⁸⁴ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "تقريرا وتحريرا"

¹⁸⁵ في (ف) "في أواخر شوال سنة اثنى وسبعين وثمانمأة"

¹⁸⁶ في (حم) و (رب) "بحمد الله والمنة"

¹⁸⁷ سقط من (حم) و (رب) "من يد الفقير محمد قطب الدين"

REFERENCES

Abū Dāwūd, Sulaymān ibn al-Ashʿath al-Sijistānī, *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, 5 vols., (Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1981).

Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Shaybānī, *al-Musnad*, 6 vols., (Istanbul: Çağrı Yay., 1982).

Arpaguş, Hatice, "Sofyalı Bâlî Efendi'nin Kazâ ve Kader Risâlesi ve Aʿyân-ı Sâbite Açısından İnsanın Sorumluluğu," *Marmara Üniversitesi İlâhiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 30/1 (2006), 51-88.

al-Ashʿarī, Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Ismāʾīl, *al-Ibānah ʿan uṣūl al-diyānah* (ed. Bashīr Muḥammad ʿUyūn; Damascus: Maktabat al-Dār al-Bayān, 1990).

al-ʿAynī, Abū Muḥammad Badr al-Dīn Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad, *ʿUmdat al-qārī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 25 vols., (eds. Muḥammad Munīr Abdah Aghā l-Dimashqī et al.; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, n.d.).

al-Baghdādī, Abū Manṣūr ʿAbd al-Qāhir ibn Ṭāhir, *al-Farq bayn al-firaq wa-bayān al-firqa al-nājiya minhum* (ed. Muḥammad ʿUthmān al-Khusht; Cairo: Maktabat Ibn Sīnā, n.d.).

al-Baghawī, Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn ibn Masʿūd, *Sharḥ al-Sunna*, 16 vols., (ed. Zuhayr al-Shāyīsh and Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ; Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1403/1983).

al-Baghdādī, Ismāʿīl Pāshā ibn Muḥammad, *Hadiyyat al-ʿārifīn asmāʾ al-muʾallifīn wa āthār al-muṣannifīn*, 2 vols., (eds. Mahmut Kemal İnal and Avni Aktuç; Istanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1955).

Bağcı, Hacı Musa, *İnsanın Kaderi-Hadislerin Telkin Ettiği Kader Anlayışı* (Ankara: Ankara Okulu Yayınları, 2009).

al-Bayḍāwī, Abū al-Khayr ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿUmar, *Anwār al-tanzīl wa-asrār al-taʾwīl*, 5 vols., (ed. Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Marʿashlī; Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāth al-ʿArabī, n.d.).

al-Bazdawī, Abū al-Yusr Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, *Uṣūl al-dīn* (ed. Hans Peter Linss; Cairo: al-Maktaba al-Azhariyya li-l-Turāth, 2003).

al-Bukhārī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn İsmāʿīl, *al-Jāmīʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, 8 vols., (Istanbul: al Maktaba al Islāmī, 1979).

Bursali Meḥmed Ṭāhir Efendī, *ʿUthmānli Muʾalliflari*, 2 vols., (Istanbul: Maṭbaʿa-i ʿĀmira, 1333).

Demirli, Ekrem, "Vahdet-i Vücûd," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXXXII, 431-435.

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Abū ʿUmar Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *al-Istidhkār al-jāmiʿ li-madhāhib fuqahāʾ al-amṣār wa-ʿulamāʾ al-aqṭār fīmā taḍammanahū l-Muwaṭṭaʾ min maʿānī l-raʾy wa l-āthār wa-sharḥ*

*dhālika kullih*ᶦ *bi-l-īʿjāz wa-l-ikhtiṣār*, 30 vols., (ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿṭī Amīn Qalʿajī; Cairo: Dār al-Waʿy, 1993).

Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr, Abū ʿUmar Yūsuf ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *al-Tamhīd limā fī l-Muwaṭṭaʾ min al-maʿānī wa-l-asānīd*, 26 vols., (eds. Saʿīd Aḥmad Aʿrāb, Muḥammad al-Fallāḥ et al.; Maghreb: Wizārat ʿUmūm al-Awqāf wa-l-Shuʾūn al-Islāmiyya, 1992).

Ibn Baṭṭāl, Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī ibn Khalaf al-Qurṭubī, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī li-Ibn Baṭṭāl*, 10 vols., (ed. Abū Tamīm Yāsir ibn Ibrāhīm; Riyadh: Maktabat al-Rushd, 2003).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Abū l-Faḍl Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī, *Fatḥ al-bārī bi-sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 13 vols., (eds. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī and Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb; Cairo: Dār al-Rayyān, 1986).

Ibn Ḥazm, Abū Muḥammad ʿAlī ibn Aḥmad al-Qurṭubī, *al-Iḥkām fī uṣūl al-aḥkām*, 8 vols., (ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir; Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda, 1983).

Ibn Manda, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq, *al-Radd ʿalā l-Jahmiyya* (ed. ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Faqīhī; n.p., 1982).

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Abū Bakr, *Shifāʾ al-ʿalīl fī masāʾil al-qaḍāʾ wa-l-qadar wa-l-ḥikma wa-l-taʿlīl*, 2 vols., (ed. Muṣṭafā Abū l-Naṣr al-Shalabī; Jeddah: Maktabat al-Sawādī, 1991).

Kahraman, Ferruh, "Hz. Âdem'in Yasak Ağaca Yaklaşması," *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 25/27 (2013/1), 191-226.

Kātib Chalabī, Ḥājī Khalīfa Muṣṭafā ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *Kashf al-ẓunūn ʿan asāmī al-kutub wa-l-funūn*, 2 vols., (eds. M. Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; Ankara: Maarif Vekaleti, 1943).

Kātib Chalabī, Ḥājī Khalīfa Muṣṭafā ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *Sullam al-wuṣūl ilā ṭabaqāt al-fuḥūl*, 6 vols., (eds. Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, Maḥmūd ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Arnaʾūṭ and Ṣāliḥ Saʿdāwī Ṣāliḥ; Istanbul: Ircica Yayınları, 2010).

al-Khaṭṭābī, Abū Sulaymān Ḥamd ibn Muḥammad, *Maʿālim al-sunan wa-huwa sharḥ Sunan al-Imām Abī Dāwūd*, 4 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Rāghib al-Ṭabbākh; Aleppo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-ʿIlmiyya, 1932).

Muḥammad Majdī Efendī, *Ḥadāʾiq al-Shaqāʾiq*, 5 vols., (ed. Abdülkadir Özcan; Istanbul: Çağrı Yayınları, 1989).

Muslim, Abū l-Ḥusayn Muslim ibn al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushayrī, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 5 vols., (ed. Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī; Cairo: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Kutub al-ʿArabiyya, 1955).

al-Nasafī, Abū l-Barakāt ʿAbd Allāh ibn Aḥmad, *Tafsīr al-Nasafī*, 4 vols., (Istanbul: Dāru Kahramān, 1984).

al-Nawawī, Abū Zakariyyā Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi-sharḥ al-Nawawī*, 18 vols., (Cairo: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Miṣriyya, 1930).

Öngören, Reşat, "Bir Rüya Yorumcusu Olarak Mutasavvıf-Âlim Kutbuddinzâde Mehmed İznikî," *Uluslararası İznik Sempozyumu (5-7 Eylül 2005) [International Iznik Symposium (5-7 September 2005)]* (Iznik: İznik Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları, 2005), 381-387.

Öngören, Reşat, "Kutbüddinzâde Iznikî," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, XXVI, 489-490.

al-Qāḍī ʿAbd al-Jabbār, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Jabbār ibn Aḥmad, *al-Mughnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-ʿadl,* 20 vols., (eds. Tawfīq al-Ṭawīl, Saʿīd Zāyed, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn et al.; Cairo: Wizārat al-Thaqāfa wa-l-Irshād al-Qawmī, al-Sharika al-Miṣriyya, 1960-65)

Qāḍī ʿIyāḍ, Abū l-Faḍl ʿIyāḍ ibn Mūsā l-Yaḥṣubī, *Ikmāl al-muʿlim bi-fawāʾid Muslim*, 9 vols., (ed. Yaḥyā İsmāʿīl; Manṣūra: Dār al-Wafāʾ, 1998).

al-Qāshānī, ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kamāl al-Dīn ibn Abī l-Ghanāʾim, *Laṭāʾif al-iʿlām fī ishārāt ahl al-ilhām*, 2 vols., (eds. Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Raḥīm al-Sāyiḥ et al.; Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 1426/2005).

al-Qasṭallānī, Abū al-ʿAbbās Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, *Irshād al-sārī li-sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 10 vols., (Būlāq: al-Maṭbaʿa al-Kubrā al-Amīriyya, 1305).

al-Qurṭubī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, *al-Jāmiʿ li-aḥkām al-Qurʾān*, 24 vols., (ed. ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbd al-Muḥsin al-Turkī; Beirut: Muʾassasat al-Risāla, 2006).

al-Rāzī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Fakhr al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar, *Mafātīḥ al-ghayb -al-Tafsīr al-kabīr*, 32 vols., (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr, 1981).

al-Ṣābūnī, Nūr al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Maḥmūd Abī Bakr, *al-Bidāya fī uṣūl al-dīn* (ed. Bekir Topaloğlu; Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1396/1979).

Ṭāshkuprī-zāda, ʿIṣām al-Dīn Abū al-Khayr Aḥmad ibn Muṣṭafā ibn Khalīl, *al-Shaqāʾiq al-Nuʿmāniyya fī ʿulamāʾ al-Dawla al-ʿUthmāniyya* (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1975).

al-Tirmidhī, Abū ʿĪsā Muḥammad ibn ʿĪsā, *al-Jāmiʿ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, 5 vols., (eds. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir, Muḥammad Fuʾād ʿAbd al-Bāqī and Yūsuf Kamāl al-Ḥūt; Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyya, 1987).

Uludağ, Süleyman, "A'yân-ı sâbite," *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, IV, 198-199.

BOOK REVIEWS

Education and Learning in the Early Islamic World
edited by Claude Gilliot

Asma Afsaruddin

❧❦

The Proofs of Prophecy
by Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (A Paralel English-Arabic text translated,
introduced, and annotated by Tarif Khalidi)

Muhammad U. Faruque

❧❦

On Taqlīd: Ibn al Qayyim's Critique of Authority in Islamic Law
by Abdul-Rahman Mustafa

Caterina Bori

❧❦

*Mariage et séparation à Damas au Moyen Age: Un corpus de 62
documents juridiques inédits entre 337/948 et 698/1299*
by Jean-Michel Mouton, Dominique Sourdel & Janine Sourdel-
Thomine

Konrad Hirschler

❧❦

Fifty Years in the East: The Memoirs of Wladimir Ivanow
edited with annotations by Farhad Daftary

Amanda Propst

❧❦

Education and Learning in the Early Islamic World, edited by Claude Gilliot (The Formation of the Classical Islamic World, 43), (Surrey, UK & Burlington, VT-USA: Ashgate Variorum, 2012), xc + 410 pp, ISBN: 978-0-86078-717-4, £180.00 (hb)

This is a hefty collection (381 pages) of nineteen essays edited by Claude Gilliot, a scholar of medieval Islam. The essays have been written by Western Orientalist scholars on the topic of Education and Learning in the Islamic World between 600 to 950 CE. The editor divided the collection into five parts: 1) Pedagogical Tradition, 2) Scholarship and Attestation, 3) Orality and Literacy, 4) Authorship and Transmission, and 5) Libraries. The authors included in the volume are: Ignaz Goldziher, Christopher Melchert, Albert Dietrich, Richard Bulliet, Sebastian Guenther, Johannes Pedersen, Gilliot himself, Jan Just Witkam and Georges Vajda, Fritz Krenkow, Stefan Leder, Richard Walzer, Johann Fuch, Isabel Fierro, Adolph Grohmann, Ruth Mackensen, David Wasserstein, Max Weisweiler, and Manuela Marin. All these articles have been published before. Gilliot appends a fairly lengthy Introduction to the volume in which he provides an overview of Orientalist scholarship on education and learning in Islam and includes, perhaps less explicably, a discussion of the early history of the Arabic script. The editor provides a helpful bibliography at the end of the volume on medieval Islamic education which includes sources in Arabic and Western languages. Sources in Persian and Turkish, however, are conspicuously missing which is a pity since they would have considerably enhanced the usefulness of the bibliography.

As is inevitable in such a collection, the quality of the articles is not consistently even and some of the older articles seem rather dated in content and tone. Ignaz Goldziher and Johannes Pedersen, for example, would fall into this category. Goldziher's references to women's education will now have to be regarded as superseded by Asma Sayeed's recent comprehensive study of women's scholarship and transmission of learning, published by Cambridge University Press (2013) under the title *Women and the Transmission of Religious Knowledge in Islam.* Pedersen's treatment of the *wāʿiẓ* or preacher is perhaps still useful to a certain degree but should certainly be augmented with the more substantial treatment of the *wuʿʿāẓ* and the

quṣṣāṣ in the later work by Jonathan Berkey (*Popular Preaching and Religious Authority in the Medieval Islamic Near East*, University of Washington Press, 2001). Richard Walzer's discussion of the process of translation of Greek philosophical texts into Arabic should now be supplanted by Dimitri Gutas's comprehensive treatment of the same and of the Arabic translation movement as a whole during the eighth and ninth centuries of the Common Era (*Greek Thought, Arabic Culture: The Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement in Baghdad and Early Abbasid Society*, Routledge Press, 1998).

Among some of the noteworthy essays are two by Sebastian Guenther, one of which is on Ibn Saḥnūn (d. 256/870) who believed that a proper education should include study of the Arabic language and of proverbs, epistolary, calligraphy, poetry, history, arithmetic, and not least of all, etiquette, and proper behavior. The other essay is on the views of the celebrated belle-lettrist al-Jāḥiẓ (d. 255/869) on holistic education, termed in Arabic *adab*, whose Greek equivalent is paideia.

Albert Dietrich's study comparing Umayyad and ʿAbbāsid perspectives on education is illuminating of different approaches to learning and pedagogy that developed over time. He discovered that Umayyad rulers tended to emphasize the inculcation of traditional Arab virtues of chivalry, courage, and hospitality as part of the educational training of their sons. ʿAbbāsids focused on the acquisition of knowledge *(ʿilm)* which included study of the Qurʾān, ḥadīth, and religious law, as well as on *adab* which stressed the acquisition of practical skills and worldly refinement, such as medicine, geometry, poetry, genealogy, the playing of musical instruments, and polite conversational skills. The purview of classical and medieval education clearly changed and evolved according to historical contexts, reaching in some ways its apogée during the ʿAbbāsid period with its emphasis on both religious and secular sciences.

There are two essays dealing with education in Muslim Spain. The first by Isabel Fierro makes the case that the study of Islamic law began in Spain as a discipline separate from the study of ḥadīth. The second by Manuela Marin looks at intellectual life in al-Andalūs in the early period and identifies as many as 22 scholars who were prominent during this time.

A noteworthy essay by Max Weisweiler discusses the role of the *mustamli*, who assisted in dictation by relaying the speech of the professor to large groups of students who would copy down these dictations. Audition of lectures (*samāʿ*) and transmission of learning *(riwāya)* were key components of learning in the pre-modern world which culminated in the awarding of the coveted *ijāza* (lit. permission to transmit learning and therefore a certificate or diploma) to successful students, a process described by Witkam and Vajda. These became standard academic procedures in the *madrasa*, the critical institution of higher learning, which emerged and spread in the Islamic world after the fourth/tenth century. Unfortunately there are no studies in this volume of the *madrasa* since Gilliot ends his survey of Islamic education before this period. Instead, we have Melchert's discussion of the *ḥalaqa,* the study circle, which despite its generally informal structure was nevertheless regulated by rather detailed rules of decorum and participation, as he points out.

By compiling these essays together, Gilliot makes these studies conveniently available in a single volume. Comparison of these essays written over a century makes us realize that academic scholarship on such an important topic is getting better and more sophisticated, especially as more sources have come to light and less ideological attitudes prevail among Orientalist scholars.

Asma Afsaruddin
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana-USA

The Proofs of Prophecy, by Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, (A Paralel English-Arabic text translated, introduced, and annotated by Tarif Khalidi (Islamic Translation Series – al-Ḥikma), (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 2011), xxiii + 266 + 243 (Arabic text) pp., ISBN: 978-0-8425-2787-3, $39.95 (hb)

This book introduces the reader to one of the most intriguing debates that took place between two important thinkers of the tenth century (AD), namely the famous *Ismāʿīlī dāʿī* (religious missionary) Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. ca. 322/933) and the even more celebrated physician and philosopher Abū Bakr al-Rāzī (d. 313/925). The translator of this text, Tarif Khalidi, is a well-known scholar of Islamic history, who has previously translated the sacred scripture of Islam, the Qurʾān. The book, in the original Arabic, was authored by Abū Ḥatim who engages in a bitter polemic with Abū Bakr on several important issues such as prophecy, the eternity of the world, faith and reason, imitation (*taqlīd*) of the philosophers, evolution of the sciences, and so forth.

As the translator of this book points out, this is a "triumphalist" text (p. xxi) in that its author takes every opportunity to reduce the arguments of its opponent (i.e. Abū Bakr) to a set of meaningless babbles, and proclaims its own self-fulfilling victory. This is also amply indicated by the derogatory use of the word "heretic (*mulḥid*)" when referring to the opponent. Nevertheless, Abū Ḥātim states that although he does not produce verbatim what transpired during the debate between him and Abū Bakr, he attempts to reconstruct the main arguments from memory. However, he includes several incidental details so as to contextualize the debate in real time, and convince his reader in the process.

According to Abū Ḥātim, Abū Bakr shows utter contempt for all religions and prophets, describing them as consisting in nothing more than myths and superstitions. Moreover, Abū Hātim's account of Abū Bakr narrates that the latter considers religions to be the cause of enmity and hatred among mankind since they only divide people. Astonishing as they may seem, these daring views stand out in the context of the tenth century Islam, when such "free-thinking" was certainly not the usual standard of the day. And to this day, numerous

studies made on Abū Bakr al-Rāzī paint a "heretic" out of him, in which he is portrayed as a thinker who denied the truth of prophecy. However, there is one big caveat with such an interpretation of Abū Bakr, and the translator seems to grasp this point very well when he states that it depends on accepting Abū Ḥātim's account of the former as "authentic" (p. xvii). This becomes even more problematic as such supposedly "heretical" views of Abū Bakr are not found anywhere in his extant works. Thus we have no way to ascertain if Abū Bakr had indeed proclaimed such views. Unfortunately, the translator's introduction does not treat this issue in any considerable detail. The picture, however, is further complicated by a recent study on Abū Bakr by an Iranian scholar, who claims that none of Abū Ḥātim's charges about the former bear any substance.[1] According to this study, Abū Bakr was an orthodox thinker who never denied prophecy and other related doctrines.

The book is divided into seven parts, each consisting of a number of chapters. The work on the whole is characterized by a high degree of polemical attacks. Abū Ḥātim seizes on the opportunity to not only lambaste his opponent's views, but also to provide proofs for prophecy, miracles, and the doctrine of *imāmate* (leadership) and "preach" the superiority of Islam over all other religions, and Christianity in particular. The text thus is replete with citations from both Old and New Testaments, showing Abū Ḥātim's wide-ranging familiarity with the Bible. Such familiarity has helped him to selectively quote from these sacred texts, which best suited his polemical purposes.

According to Abū Ḥātim, Abū Bakr does not accept the validity of sacred scriptures, and argues instead that they are replete with mutual contradictions. As for example, the Law of Moses was abrogated by Jesus, while the Law of Jesus was superseded by the Prophet Muḥammad. The Torah contains anthropomorphic descriptions of God, which would go against reason. In response, Abū Ḥātim debunks all of Abū Bakr's arguments by pointing out that the writings of the Greek philosophers, whom the latter valorizes, also contain contradictory statements. He then argues that religions do not differ in essence, but only in outward manifestation. Abū

---

[1]　On this issue, see Aḥadfarāmarz Qarāmalikī, *Naẓariyyi-yi akhlāqī-yi Muḥammad b. Zakariya Rāzī* (Tehran: The Iranian Institute of Philosophy, 2013).

Ḥātim also informs his readers that Abū Bakr denies the inimitability (*iʿjāz*) of the Qurʾān, and faults its superstitious and contradictory nature. In Abū Bakr's view (as Abū Ḥatim would have it), the works of famous classical scientists such as that of Euclid, Ptolemy, and Galen are more rational in content and substance than the Holy Scripture. For his part, Abū Ḥātim responds by declaring the superiority of the Qurʾān over all other religious scriptures, and by arguing how the latter contains guidance for all humanity, Muslims and non-Muslims alike.

Another novel suggestion put forth by Abū Ḥātim is that the true originators of "the rational sciences" are the prophets rather than the scientists. Abū Ḥātim quips that if the sources of the sciences had been other than a single source, i.e. God, then the scientific principles, so "well-ordered and harmonious," would have been diverse and full of contradictions (p. 225). Abū Ḥātim also suggests that the authors of great scientific books such as Hippocrates, Euclid, Galen, Ptolemy, and so forth are in reality "metonyms" for the names of the wise men who actually wrote these books. In other words, behind these famous names lie the names of unknown "prophets" who had penned these books. He attempts to prove his point by having Abū Bakr say that the real author of the book written by Apollonius for instance, was a believer in creationist theories. Moreover, he points out that Hermes, who is counted among the philosophers, is, in fact, the prophet Idrīs, as he is known in the Qurʾān. It is however striking to note that Abū Ḥātim concedes that these great scientific books do contain valuable principles (p. 207).

Abū Ḥātim belabors to show that philosophers disagree a great deal concerning principles in philosophical sciences. He also exhibits elementary knowledge of the history of philosophy, as can be seen from his treatment of the topic and the mentioning of the names of numerous ancient philosophers such as Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, Democritus, Philochus, Melissus, and Pythagoras. However, his cursory knowledge of Greek philosophy becomes apparent from his statements regarding Plato and Socrates and other Greek philosophers. For instance, he states that Plato and Socrates believed in three principles, namely God, form, and matter (p. 98). Concerning Thales he mentions that the former is of the opinion that God is intellect/mind (*ʿaql*) with respect to the world.

Tarif Khalidi's translation of *A'lām al-nubuwwa* of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī is standard, exact, and accurate, apart from a few stylistic errors which need not concern us here. The introduction at the beginning of the book also provides the reader with a helpful context of the tenth century Islam of the 'Abbāsid caliphate. All in all, *The Proofs of Prophecy* is an important contribution to the burgeoning body works in Islamic intellectual history, and as such, it would be of interest to both students and scholars of Islamic philosophy and comparative religion.

Muhammad U. Faruque
University of California, Berkeley, CA-USA

On Taqlīd: Ibn al Qayyim's Critique of Authority in Islamic Law, by Abdul-Rahman Mustafa (Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), vii + 242 pp., ISBN: 978-0-19-993751-6, $78.00 (hb)

This book presents the translation of the section on *taqlīd* of *Iʿlām al-muwaqqiʿīn ʿan Rabb al-ʿālamīn* by the Ḥanbalī damascene scholar, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 751/1350). *Iʿlām al-muwaqqiʿīn* is a long treatise about the methodology of *iftāʾ*. The translated text is rather long (pp. 61-192). It covers part of volume three and four of the Saudi edition of *Iʿlām* edited by Mashhūr ibn Ḥasan Āl Salmān, which is part of a *silsila* dedicated to Ibn al-Qayyim's works (*Silsilat maktabat Ibn al-Qayyim*). This series is different from two other Saudi ones published in Mecca by Dār ʿĀlam al-Fawāʾid which edits richly annotated texts of Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn al-Qayyim with extensive introductions. These two series - supervised by the scholar Bakr ibn ʿAbd Allāh Abū Zayd - are titled *Āthār al-Imām Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya wa-mā laḥiqahā min aʿmāl* and *Āthār Shaykh al-islām Ibn Taymiyya wa-mā laḥiqahā min aʿmāl*. They are now indispensable tools for anyone working on Ibn Taymiyya and his pupil, and it is regrettable that *Iʿlām al-muwaqqiʿīn* is not yet available to us among these useful editions. The one used by the translator offers a long introduction and a detailed apparatus mainly of erudite quotations and discussion of Ḥadīth.

The translation is preceded by a lengthy introduction on the concept of *taqlīd* (pp. 1-60) and is followed by glossary, notes, bibliography, and index. The introductory pages discuss the issue of *taqlīd* from different angles: its origins, its meanings in legal theory and practice, the theological problems it arose. They take into consideration the relevant secondary literature (Norman Calder and Sherman Jackson *in primis*) and refer to a good number of sources from different schools and periods. After that, the introduction moves on to tackle the subject specifically in Ibn al-Qayyim and describes the main principles leading the Ḥanbalī scholar in his battle against *taqlīd*.

The introduction offers insightful remarks on the subject and draws attention to the importance and complexity of the concept of

taqlīd even beyond the boundaries of the history of Islamic law. Yet, the present reviewer feels that - as currently organized - these introductory pages might well represent the first kernel of a book on the subject, rather than introducing the reader to the translated section. This is exactly what one misses, for together with the broad legal and theological debates on *taqlīd* and its implications that Abdul-Rahman Mustafa outlines, and we thank him for this, one would like to know much more about *taqlīd* in Ibn al-Qayyim's *Iʿlām* to start with (Ibn al-Qayyim does not discuss the topic only in volume three and four, for instance), then in his other works. Similarly, one would like to know if and how Ibn al-Qayyim develops his ideas on *taqlīd* from Ibn Taymiyya, seldom mentioned in the section from *Iʿlām*, and if so from which of his works. In fact, it is only when read in conjunction with Ibn Taymiyya that Ibn al-Qayyim's own preoccupations can be fully appreciated. One would also like to be informed about Ibn al-Qayyim's other sources and how he engages with the intellectual tradition that preceded him. Overall, we would expect that when dealing with such a topic the historical context would stand out much more than it actually does, as Ibn al-Qayyim and his master were no idle minds, they had a precise agenda, they responded to the challenges of their time. In fact, Ibn al-Qayyim's discourse on *taqlīd* sounds like a sweeping blow to the authority of the four *madhāhib*. It implicitly questions the social, professional, and legal structures associated with the Sunnī schools of law in a historical period in which the quadruple judiciary system, established by Baybars in 1265, and the practice of *taqlīd* in the judiciary was deep-rooted, and intended to assure flexibility and predictability in the dispensation of justice. These are the conclusions Yossef Rapoport reached in one notorious article of his which Mustafa does not seem to be aware of.[1] In the Mamlūk period, appointment deeds constrained judges to rule within the established doctrine of their own school of law.[2] It suffices to read some of the fatwās of the powerful Chief Shāfiʿī Qāḍī of Damascus, Taqī al-Dīn al-Subkī (d. 756/1355), a contemporary and arch enemy of Ibn Taymiyya, to feel how robust the authority of the schools (and their representatives) was, and how disturbing Ibn Taymiyya's and Ibn al-Qayyim's

---

[1]   Yossef Rapoport, "Legal Diversity in the Age of *Taqlīd*: The Four Chief *Qāḍīs* under the Mamluks," *Islamic Law and Society* 10/2, The Madhhab (2003), 210-228.

[2]   See *ibid.*, 214-217 for a wide array of sources confirming this point.

doctrines must have been in this regard.[3] It is again al-Subkī that in one of his fatwās is asked to provide an answer to whether *taqlīd* is permissible for the layman in matters of faith.[4] This would have been a nice topic to add to and discuss in the pages on *taqlīd* and theology (pp. 29-36).

Mustafa often refers to Ibn al-Qayyim and a group of scholars like him as "traditionalists." While a proper explanation of what Mustafa means by this label is not provided (is he implicitly referring to George Makdisi's definition of the terms traditionist/traditionalists?),[5] it is also not always clear whom he associates with Ibn al-Qayyim. Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn ʿAqīl are mentioned along a couple of times. One may want to add that "traditionalist" is a tricky tag.[6] Especially, once we venture into the arguments that characterize the pages on *taqlīd* and the dispute (*munāẓara*) that Ibn al-Qayyim enacts between a *ṣāḥib al-ḥujaj* (see below) and an "imitator," we wonder whether "traditionalist" is really the most appropriate way to describe Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya and, by reflex, Ibn Taymiyya. In this regard, it may perhaps be useful to differentiate between the argumentative method and the aims of these two scholars. At page 27, al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870), Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), and al-Ṣanʿanī (d. 1182/1768) are all labeled as classical Salafīs. Is this used to distinguish them from modern/nowadays Salafīs? And what are the common elements that justify their characterization as such?

The translated text on *taqlīd* that follows is long and rather repetitive. Repetition has the merit of making one's own point clear. The text is divided into two sections. In the first one (pp. 60-82), Ibn al-Qayyim describes the forbidden types of *taqlīd*, which implies that there are permissible ones (not discussed in the translated text

---

[3]   See the discussion of Norman Calder, "Scholars, Muftis, Judges and Secular Power: the Need for Distinctions," in Norman Calder, *Islamic Jurisprudence in the Classical Era* (ed. Colin Imber; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511676574.005, especially, pp. 135-138, 140.

[4]   Abū l-Ḥasan Taqī al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn ʿAbd al-Kāfī al-Subkī, *Fatāwā al-Subkī* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Qudsī, 1356 H. [1936]), II, 365-368.

[5]   George Makdisi, "Ashʿarī and the Ashʿarites in Islamic Religious History I," *Studia Islamica* 17 (1962), 37-80, at p. 49.

[6]   See Christopher Melchert, "Traditionist-Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law," *Islamic Law and Society* 8/3 Hadith and Fiqh (2001), 383-406, in particular 385-386.

though), and describes the difference between *taqlīd* and *ittibāᶜ*, the first being following somebody's without authoritative arguments, the other following somebody with arguments. The second chapter (pp. 83-192) is shaped in the literary form of a "*munāẓara* between one who uncritically accepts somebody else's views and doctrines (*muqallid*) and one who knows by means of arguments (*ṣāḥib al-ḥujaj*)." This is the whole point, in fact, and the first basic principle leading the dispute against *taqlīd*. Knowledge can happen only with "proofs;" knowledge without proofs, such as *taqlīd*, is not a valid form of knowledge; and when *taqlīd* is practiced, but justified by the use of authoritative arguments, then it is no longer *taqlīd* (pp. 91-92, 94, 127, *passim*). Or, otherwise said: "The basic principle is that the opinions of another may not be accepted without proof except in cases of necessity" (p. 166; *Iᶜlām,* V, 574). Hence, Ibn al-Qayyim elaborates his arguments against *taqlīd* on different levels. The first one is epistemological: *taqlīd* represents a wrong way of knowing. Knowledge is produced by "authoritative arguments" (*ḥujaj*), "indicators" (*adilla*), decisive proofs (*barāhīn*), and inference (*istidlāl*). Without these knowledge remains a conjecture (*ẓann*) and a conjecture does not produce certainty (p. 79) nor allows truth to be attained. Ibn al-Qayyim goes as far arguing that God created in man an innate disposition (*fiṭra*) to submit to authoritative arguments (*ḥujaj*) and proofs (*adilla*) rather than blindly follow his own teachers (pp. 169-170).

The second level of argument is that of authority: indulgent "imitation" of the later generations, or even of the schools' founders, undermines the authority of the Book, the Prophet, the Rāshidūn, the Companions, and the Salaf as a whole. The Qurᵓān and the Sunna, the latter includes the sayings of all the ranks of people just mentioned, should have absolute precedence over anybody else's saying. The debate is, then, not only about *who* is authoritative, but also *how* and *why* certain forms of authority came to be devalued (see Introduction, p. 20). There is a lot at stake here, it is not only the legal structures of the *madhhab* and the models of authority promoted by the *madhhab* that are openly questioned; implicitly also other forms of competing religiosities are (see Introduction, p. 27), such as Shīᶜism or Sufism with their respective notions of *walāya* and *wilāya*.

The translation from the Arabic flows smoothly without being hampered by too many Arabic terms transliterated into brackets or

too many footnotes. Yet, what one misses is exactly this: commentaries, explanations, specification of technical terms, which allow the reader to stay closer to the Arabic text. Briefly, when we read "proof," which is definitely one of the key words of this whole section on *taqlīd*, we would like to know whether the Arabic is *dalīl*, *ḥujja, burhān*, or *bayyina*. When we read the lists of the *muqallidūn*'s statements in favor of "imitation" and the responses of Ibn al-Qayyim against them, we would like to know who exactly is Ibn al-Qayyim engaging with; whether the legal issues he mentions mirror some of the public debates of the time, like that on triple divorce. Essentially, what we completely miss here is that meticulous recovery of a text's subtext that makes scholarly research so valuable. The footnotes apparatus is in fact limited to identifying the full names and death dates of the people mentioned by Ibn al-Qayyim and locating the Ḥadīth in their respective collections, a range of information that Mustafa abridges from the Arabic edition (p. 59). At times we are given very brief explanations of the legal issues at stake.

In the end, as it stands this translation lacks something. It is not of much help to the advanced student or the specialist who, being able to read the Arabic text by him/her-self, will suffer from the dearth of context, information, and commentary. Neither it is of help to the beginner who will suffer from the absence of basic information necessary to the text's full understanding. For instance, when the *ḥadīth al-Shajja* is mentioned (p. 83, 126), one assumes that a student needs to be told what this *ḥadīth* is about. Or when Ibn Taymiyya is mentioned (pp. 137-138) as being criticized because of his teachings in the madrasa of Ibn al-Ḥanbalī, a *waqf* specifically dedicated to Ḥanbalī doctrine, one would expect some historical commentary, an effort to trace this episode of opposition in historical and biographical sources. *En passant,* this might have also been a useful element towards the text's dating. In addition, the critique against Ibn Taymiyya here is interesting per se because it confirms that his method was perceived as dragging him away from his own *madhhab*.

The same lack of explanations affects the translator's choices. So one is left to wonder why Mustafa translates *zubur* as "sects" (p. 120) when Ibn al-Qayyim himself explains that: "*Zubur* are the written books (*al-kutub al-muṣannafa*) that people are pleased to follow over the Book of God and over what He sent His Messenger with" (*Iʿlām*, III, 524), or why he omits the conclusive passage from the text

(*Iʿlām*, IV, 36: *wa-qad aṭalnā fī l-qiyās wa-l-taqlīd* etc…) which conveys a nice and clear-cut "The End" signal missing from the translation which, in fact, seems to end abruptly.

Finally, the book is not carefully edited. Many items quoted in the Introduction's footnotes are missing from the bibliography. The appearance of Chapter I and II respectively at pages 214 and 215 of the footnotes is puzzling because the translation does not display such headings. The choice of a double system of footnotes, text notes, and end notes, is not practical.

In sum, the book testifies for a new interest towards the works and thought of Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyya, the most renown follower and exegete of Ibn Taymiyya, who was – until a few years ago – a great absentee from Western discussions on intellectual histories of the post-formative period. We welcome it as such.[7] Nonetheless, it is not easy to say who this book was thought for. For the reasons outlined above, it is not so useful for scholars, it is insufficiently explicative for students, it is an abstruse 14th century piece of scholarship for non-specialist readers. Perhaps it was thought for Muslims unfamiliar with Arabic but wishing to familiarize with the sources of their own scholarly tradition? Perhaps. Yet, the book is published by a prestigious University Press and in a fashion that suggests an academic target. Abdul-Rahman Mustafa must have invested a good deal of his time in making a Medieval Arabic text accessible into readable English and in putting together an introduction which shows a good degree of reading and research skills. It is a pity that the translation is not accompanied by that framework of commentaries and scholarly research that would have made it a more valuable contribution to the field.

---

[7] See Caterina Bori and Livnat Holtzman (eds.), *A Scholar in the Shadow: Essays in the Legal and Theological Thought of Ibn Qayyim al-Ǧawziyya*, special issue of *Oriente Moderno* 90/1 (2010) (Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente C.A. Nallino). This reference is regularly given throughout the book with only one of its editors. Also see Birgit Krawietz and Georges Tamer, in collaboration with Alina Kokoschka (eds.), *Islamic Theology, Philosophy and Law: Debating Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013).

REFERENCES

Bori, Caterina and Holtzman, Livnat (eds.), *A Scholar in the Shadow: Essays in the Legal and Theological Thought of Ibn Qayyim al-Ǧawziyya*, special issue of *Oriente Moderno* 90/1 (2010) (Roma: Istituto per l'Oriente C.A. Nallino).

Calder, Norman, "Scholars, Muftis, Judges and Secular Power: the Need for Distinctions," in Norman Calder, *Islamic Jurisprudence in the Classical Era*, edited by Colin Imber (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 116-166, http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511676574.005.

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr, *Iʿlām al-muwaqqiʿīn ʿan Rabb al-ʿālamīn*, 7 vols., (ed. Abū ʿUbayda Mashhūr ibn Ḥasan Āl Salmān; Dammām: Dār Ibn al-Jawzī, 1423 H. [2002 or 2003]).

Krawietz, Birgit and Tamer, Georges, in collab. with Kokoschka, Alina (eds.), *Islamic Theology, Philosophy and Law: Debating Ibn Taymiyya and Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013).

Makdisi, George, "Ashʿarī and the Ashʿarites in Islamic Religious History I," *Studia Islamica* 17 (1962), 37-80, http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1595001

Melchert, Christopher, "Traditionist-Jurisprudents and the Framing of Islamic Law," *Islamic Law and* Society 8/3, Hadith and Fiqh (2001), 383-406.

Rapoport, Yossef, "Legal Diversity in the Age of *Taqlīd*: The Four Chief *Qāḍīs* under the Mamluks," *Islamic Law and Society* 10/2, The Madhhab (2003), 210-228.

al-Subkī, Abū l-Ḥasan Taqī al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn ʿAbd al-Kāfī, *Fatāwā al-Subkī*, 2 vols., (Cairo: Maktabat al-Qudsī, 1356 H. [1936]).

Caterina Bori
Alma Mater Studiorum, Università di Bologna, Bologna-Italy

***Mariage et séparation à Damas au Moyen Age: Un corpus
de 62 documents juridiques inédits entre 337/948 et
698/1299***, by Jean-Michel Mouton, Dominique Sourdel & Janine
Sourdel-Thomine (Documents relatifs à l'histoire des croisades,
21), (Paris: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 2013), 326
pp., ISBN 978-2-87754-296-8, €40.

This volume makes available extraordinary documents on legal
practices related to marriage for future research. While similar
documents have been known, most of these originated from Egypt,
pertained to the first three Islamic centuries and little is known about
the historical context of their preservation. The importance of the
documents in this volume thus goes back to three aspects: they refer
to the Middle Period, they originated in Syria, specifically Damascus,
and most importantly they form a coherent corpus. All documents are
part of the *Şâm Evrakları* held in Istanbul in the Türk ve İslam
Eserleri Müzesi. They were brought to Istanbul from Damascus in the
late Ottoman period. In Damascus they had been part of the
"Gheniza"-style storehouse for disused documents and books, the
Qubbat al-khazna. The *Şâm Evrakları* have not been made accessible
for research in the last decades, which is – to put it mildly –
regrettable. They simply form the most important known collection of
documents from Syria for the Middle Period and the fact that they are
kept behind closed doors seriously impedes historical research. It can
only be hoped that the Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi changes its
attitude and opens up this splendid collection.

For the time being we only have photographs of documents which
fall into two main collections: One is held in Berlin and goes back to
the early twentieth century when a German-Ottoman expedition
opened the Qubbat al-khazna and photographed mostly non-Arabic
material. The second collection goes back to the early 1960s when
Dominique Sourdel and Janine Sourdel-Thomine had the opportunity
to work on the *Şâm Evrakları* and took numerous photographs. The
material in this second collection has led to numerous publications,
the most important of which has been the collection of pilgrimage
certificates (*Certificats de pèlerinaged'époqueAyyoubide* [Paris:
Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 2006]). The present

volume is thus the second major publication of material with a Qubbat al-khazna-*Şâm Evrakları*-Paris photographs *isnād*.

As expected, this is fascinating and ground-breaking material: The volume contains 62 complete, partial, and fragmentary documents. Around half of them are marriage contracts with separation documents and receipts settling the outstanding dowry forming two further large bodies. While only 28 of these are explicitly dated internal criteria allowed the editors to convincingly date the remaining documents. Even though they span some 350 years there is a distinctive clustering in the Burid, Zangid, and Ayyubid periods so that roughly two-thirds of the documents fall into the much shorter period between the early sixth/twelfth and the mid-seventh/thirteenth century.

In the books first, and briefer, part (pp. 11-61) the editors analyze this material and propose ways of how it can be used in future research projects. Obviously all these suggestions have to be read against the background that this is a small sample for a long period. Furthermore, we do not know whether this sample is representative of marriage-related documents in Damascus at large and to what extent legal processes and archival practices have prioritized the conservation of certain documents at the expense of others. Nevertheless, they allow new insights and suggest tendencies that cannot be ignored in future research on Islamic family law or Syrian history. The editors note that the most striking feature emerging from these documents is the instability of marriage and high divorce rate. While thirty-eight of the documents deal with marriage, nineteen documents are concerned with separation in one way or the other. In addition for the majority of the women appearing in the documents the marriage contracts deal with their second or even third marriage.

One of the most laudable aspects of this first part is the editors' constant drive to make diachronic arguments to identify changes over time. This allows them for instance to track the variation of coinages used such as the emergence of silver *dirham*s in the Ayyūbid period, while gold *dīnār*s were predominant in other periods. One of the most fascinating trends concerns the social profile of those who marry: In the ʿAbbāsid and Fāṭimid periods grand Arab families, a sort of tribally identified aristocracy, dominate. With the Būrid period these families disappear and if they are still represented they are clearly of modest economic status. In contrast traders and craftsmen,

especially those dealing with textiles, but also farmers (*fallāḥ*), bakers (*khabbāz*), grocers (*baqqāl*), beer sellers (*fuqqāʿī*), fish merchants (*sammāk*), and butchers (*qaṣṣāb/jazzār*), start to play the most salient role, which might indicate the development of a new urban society. Most surprisingly, the military and the *ʿulamāʾ* (except as witnesses and legal authorities) hardly appear.

The second part (pp. 69-243) provides for each document an edition, translation, and brief commentary highlighting the most striking features. This is partly hideously difficult material and the editors deserve full credit for their work on the documents. Their corpus successfully establishes the formulary of these legal documents and their work will serve as a reference work for future research in this regard. When it comes to the reading of names there is evidently more room for interpretation and one might for instance occasionally disagree with the literal reading of professional *nisba*s that is adopted in the translation. The book thankfully includes reproductions of the documents. They are of varying quality, but on account of the inaccessibility of the material this is as much as we can currently get. The index is rather sparse and contains only personal names. For a volume which will only be read from beginning to end in few cases, an index of technical terms would have been very useful. However, overall this is a wonderful book which will have a considerable impact in studies on Islamic law and Syrian history.

Konrad Hirschler
SOAS, University of London, London-UK

Fifty Years in the East: The Memoirs of Wladimir Ivanow,
edited with annotations by Farhad Daftary (London: I.B. Tauris
Publishers in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies,
2015), xvi + 256 pp., ISBN: 978-1-78076-841-0, £25.00

Even when considering a sub-discipline that traces its substantive
origin to a time as recent as the 20th century, it is easy for the scholar
and student – much less the casual reader – to take Ismāʿīlism as an
outgrowth of disembodied, medieval manuscripts. With
indispensable texts such as Farhad Daftary's on Ismāʿīlī history and
doctrines, the reader is confronted with reliable, well-sourced
information; less apparent is the considerable physical, political, and
interpersonal effort spent in collecting manuscripts, the
contemporary ethnographic significance of investigating a
marginalized Shīʿī sect further split into smaller groups, and the role
of broader political forces in the focused life of a scholar. Daftary's
introduction to Wladimir Ivanow's memoirs *Fifty Years in the East*
lays out the seminal role in the development of Ismāʿīlī studies that
Ivanow played, but Ivanow's memoir itself should not be relegated to
another title in the Ismāʿīlī bibliography.

Ivanow left Russia after the October Revolution in 1917 and spent
the rest of his life living in India, Persia, and traveling between them
and throughout the Middle East. He did not live as an adventurer,
colonist, or solider, though – he was only ever there to pursue his
studies and collect manuscripts, and the way in which he made his
living throughout seems to have been incidental. While it is a work
by a major scholar of Shīʿī Islam, because Ivanow's travels covered
India, Central Asia, and the Middle East and is accordingly interesting
to any student or scholar of those regions, the book rightfully belongs
in the genre of travelogue. In this genre, it stands out as it neither
makes an exotic spectacle of these regions nor does it fail to mention
the surprising and the bizarre that Ivanow encountered daily in his
years abroad.

The book begins with the author's own preface, a hesitant
acquiescence to demands from his friends and colleagues to write his
autobiography. Conceding that some autobiographical material might
help later students understand his methodology, he explains that the

memoir is divided into two sections with one that is autobiographical, and the other that is a non-chronological collection of impressions and experiences from his wide travels. Daftary's introductory material consists of two articles: an introduction to the biography of Ivanow and his academic importance, and then an article on the role of his work in the development of modern Ismāʿīlī Studies. In this second article Daftary also completes an integral task: he capably and succinctly outlines Ismāʿīlī history and its study by Western scholars, and then he contextualizes Ivanow's role in that development. To demonstrate both the lasting contribution of Ivanow to Ismāʿīlī studies and the continued vibrancy and quicker pace of study within the field, Daftary brings the narrative beyond the contribution of Ivanow to the present day and the efforts of the Aga Khan.

As indicated in the preface, Ivanow wrote his memoir in two parts, autobiographical and impressionistic. In the autobiographical section, he deals with the major events of his life – the boring days of secondary school, choosing to live abroad, never being able to return to Russia after the revolution – with a resigned detachment and a matter-of-fact tone. In his section on impressions, he collects highly specific anecdotes and vignettes from his years fails to fall into the gross generalizations of the Orientalists a century before him. Readers, especially those from within Islamic Studies, will delight in what was amusingly similar in his day: he complains that cramming Arabic verbs was not so different than Latin ones, though they were more unpleasant (p. 43) and that "like many incipient orientalists" he began his study of Islam with Sufism but ended up "greatly" confused (p. 103). Likewise, readers will appreciate challenges that are less common in today's world: for instance, when he looked for books in Bukhara's markets, he had to be familiar enough to recognize the book midway through, as pages would regularly be missing (p. 116).

At the end of the book, Daftary also provides three helpful appendices: an annotated bibliography of Ivanow's works, a list of the publications by the Islamic Research Association, and a list of the publications of Ismaili Society which he helped to found. Daftary's annotations throughout Ivanow's memoir are useful, complete, and welcome and should be taken in conjunction with the appendices as a separate reference material for students interested in the development of Ismāʿīlī studies. I did not find an instance where I desired the explication of a note where there was not one. However,

I do suspect that many second-language students of Arabic and Persian would have appreciated if non-English terms had been transliterated with diacritical marks as they would be in other scholarly works.

The value in this memoir is twofold. First, Ivanow captures the spirit of a geographical wide region of the world in the early 20th century from the fascinating perspective of a scholar of Ismāʿlism. Rather than relegating the people and places he saw to a timeless orient, he sharply and poetically recognizes the dynamic, changing world of his time: in describing the once-beautiful Hamun marsh in Persia, he notes that it was overgrown and full of pelicans and flamingoes, but now covered in salt and mud (p. 97). He records the sometimes gradual, sometimes immediate spread of modernity without eulogizing or romanticizing. Second, his life reminds us that in very recent history, the collection of new information meant considerable time "in the field." Scholars and students today compete for mere months abroad in far-flung archives or villages; regional experts glean insights on a place from a few weeks' stay. Ivanow shows us another level of connection with the people and places that made possible his life's work.

Amanda Propst
Georgetown University, Washington D.C.-USA

GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The papers submitted to *Ilahiyat Studies* should make some noticeable contribution to Islamic and religious studies. The papers will be held to imply that it contains original unpublished work and is not being submitted for publication elsewhere.

Since *Ilahiyat Studies* sends all papers for review, a copy should be submitted in a form suitable for sending anonymously to the reviewers. Manuscripts are evaluated by anonymous peer review, therefore, authors must remove all identifying information from their texts. Authors should refer to themselves in the text and citations in the third person. For example, instead of writing "I argue (Nasr, 2007)…." write "Nasr (1997) argues…"

All submissions are assessed by referees, but the Editorial board reserves the right to decide what articles will be published.

Unsolicited book reviews may not be published.

Full name(s) of author(s) must be listed, along with university or professional affiliation, address, city, state, country, phone/fax number(s), and email address where you can be reached. Provide a two-sentence biography that we can use in your article. Current information only.

All papers must include an abstract of no more 150 words.

It is strongly advised that the length of the article should not exceed 8000 words. Book reviews and conference reports must not exceed 1500 words. All pages should be numbered consecutively.

All papers should have an introductory section in which the objectives and methodology of the article are explained and a final section, which summarizes the main points, discussed and the conclusions reached.

Manuscripts should be typed double-spaced on one side of the A4 only. Tables, graphs and figures should be on separate pages. All submissions should be in MS-Word (2003, 2007 or higher) format. Leave margins of at least 4 cm on top, bottom, and sides.

A reference list must be included at the end of the manuscript in the following style:

Journal Article & Entry

Eichner, Heidrun, "Dissolving the Unity of Metaphysics: From Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī to Mullā Ṣadrā al-Shīrāzī", *Medioevo* 32 (2007), 139-197.

Buckley, J. Jacobsen and Albrile, Ezio, "Mandaean Religion", (trans. from Italian by Paul Ellis), *Encyclopedia of Religion: Second Edition*, (editor in chief: Lindsay Jones; USA: Thomson Gale, 2005), VIII, 5634-5640.

Book

Kātib Chalabī, Ḥājī Khalīfa Muṣṭafā ibn ʿAbd Allāh, *Kashf al-ẓunūn ʿan asāmī l-kutub wa-l-funūn*, 2 vols., (eds. M. Şerefeddin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge; Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1941-1943).

Michot, Yahya M., *Ibn Sīnā: Lettre au Vizir Abū Saʿd: Editio princeps d'après le manuscrit de Bursa, traduction de l'arabe, introduction, notes et lexique* (Beirut: al-Burāq, 2000).

Book Chapter

Janssens, Jules, "The Reception of Avicenna's *Physics* in the Latin Middle Ages" in I. Vrolijk and J. P. Hogendijk (eds.), *O ye Gentlemen*: *Arabic Studies on Science and Literary Culture in honour of Remke Kruk* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2007), 55-64.

Online Citation

Rudolph, Kurt, "Mandaeans: ii. The Mandaean Religion", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Online Edition, 20 January 2010, available at www.iranica.com/articles/mandaeans-2-religion

Page references to works referred to in the text should take the following form: (Touraine, 1995: 9-10). The verses of the Qurʾān should be referred to as follows: Q 2:23; Q 17:108; the references from the Old and New Testament should carry chapter name and number, and verse number.

Text and references must follow the format outlined in The Chicago Manual of Style, 15th edition.

Arabic words should be transliterated according the style used by the Library of Congress.

Contents