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Double dates denote, first, the Islamic Hijra date and then that of the common Christian era. When they appear in parentheses after an individual’s name, they denote the death date of an individual, unless otherwise noted; for example, al-Ḥibarī (286/899) or (d. [i.e. died in] 286/899). When the month is not known, the two years of the Common Era which the Hijra year straddles are noted; for example, 329/940–41.

Translations from the Qur’an are my own, unless otherwise noted, in which case the source of the translation is given. In Qur’anic references the first numeral indicates the sura and the second the verse according to the customary division; for example, 2:43 = the Qur’an, sura 2, verse 43.

The term Hadith designates the second scriptural source in Islam after the Qur’an. It denotes what is called the Islamic Tradition, namely, the teachings attributed to the Prophet Muḥammad and, for Sunnis, certain of his companions; and, for Shi’ites, attributed to the Prophet, his daughter Fāṭima, ‘Alī, and the imams descended from them. When referring to the realm of Islamic Tradition or those disciplines that relate to it, it is here written with a capital H (Hadith) but with a small h (hadith) when referring to a specific tradition or teaching.

With regard to Arabic nomenclature, an individual’s name is almost always followed by that of his father. This relationship is designated here
by the letter b the abbreviation of ibn, that is, “son of”; for example, 
Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh = Muḥammad ibn (i.e. “son of”) ʿAbdallāh.
In the footnotes, authors’ names and the titles of works are given with 
or without the article al. This is taken up in the bibliography at the end.

System of Transcription of Arabic and Persian Letters

Consonants: ’ (denotes the hamza, a laryngeal glottal stop), b, p, t, th 
(like English “th” in “think”), j (as “dj”), č (like English “China”), ḥ 
(“h” unvoiced pharyngeal), kh (like Spanish jota or the German ch 
in Buch), d, dh (like English that ), r (always strongly rolled), z, ž (like 
French gentil), s, sh (like English shy), š (emphatic s), č (emphatic ch), 
ť (emphatic t), ż (emphatic z), ‘ (indicates the voiced pharyngeal 
‘ayn), gh (as in French r, grassayé), f, q (velarized uvular stop, the 
palatodorsal articulation of k), k, g, l, m, n, w, h (laryngeal spirant), 
y (as in yak).
Vowels: short: a, i, u; long: ā, ī, ū.

Historical Points of Reference

616–19: violent tension among influential members of the 
Quraysh, particularly the Banū ʿAbd Shams, the clan 
of the Umayyads, and the Banū Hāshim, the clan of 
Muḥammad.
1/622: the Hijra: according to tradition, the emigration of 
Muḥammad and his first followers from Mecca to 
Medina (beginning of the Muslim calendar).
2/624: battle of Badr: victory of Muḥammad over the Quraysh 
of Mecca.
3/625: battle of Uḥud: victory of the Meccans over the 
Prophet’s followers.
8/630: conquest of Mecca by Muḥammad and his supporters.
11/632: death of Muḥammad. The naming of Abū Bakr as his 
successor at the saqīfa (porch) of the clan of the Banū
Sā‘īda. Death of Fāṭima, Muḥammad’s daughter, a few months after that of her father. Start of the “Wars of Apostasy”

13/634: death (by violence?) of Abū Bakr. Accession of ‘Umar to the caliphate.

15/636: beginning of Arab conquests: Damascus and most of Syria and Palestine.


36–38/657–59: civil wars of the Camel (Jamal), Ṣifin, Nahrawān. Mu‘āwiya is acknowledged as the first Umayyad caliph in Syria.

40/661: assassination of ‘Alī. Umayyad caliphate from 661 to 750.


61/680: massacre of al-Ḥusayn, younger son of ‘Alī and Fāṭima, and his family at Karbalā by the troops of the caliph Yazīd b. Mu‘āwiya.


133/750: Fall of the Umayyads to the Abbasid revolution. Beginning of the Abbasid caliphate which will last until the Mongol invasion in 656/1258.
Main Clans of the Tribe of Quraysh the Banū Hāshim (main figures) and the Family of Muhammad

The Banū 'Abd Shams (main figures)
Genealogy of the Leading Imams and the Broad Divisions of Shi'ism

Fāṭima

(1) 'Ali
(Fourth caliph after the Prophet; d. 40/661)

(2) al-Ḥasan
(49/669)

(3) al-Husayn
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(4) 'Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn (c. 92/711)

(5) Muhammad al-Baqır
(c. 115/732)

Zayd
Zaydi Shi’ism
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The Silent Qur’an & the Speaking Qur’an
The very first centuries of Islam were marked by two major and inextricably linked events which have determined the historical and spiritual evolution of this religion up to our own time: the elaboration of scriptural sources—the Qur’an and the Hadith—and a chronic violence manifest mainly in the form of civil wars.

With regard to the scriptural sources, according to the Sunni tradition which eventually comes to be considered as “orthodox,” matters transpired simply enough. The divine revelations, quite faithfully and integrally collected by the two first caliphs Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, were brought together in a unique Qur’an by a council of scholars during the reign of ʿUthmān, the third caliph (reg. 23/644–35/656)—in other words, less than thirty years after the death of the Prophet Muhammad (d. 11/632). Parallel Qur’anic recensions, deemed untrustworthy, were destroyed and the official version, the so-called vulgate of ʿUthmān, was rapidly accepted by the entire community of the faithful apart from a scattering of heretics. Moreover, as regards the Hadith, i.e., the prophetic traditions in their thousands, these were subjected to a stringent critical examination by the learned in order to distinguish those that were authentic from those that were false—a process that led to the elaboration of a large and reliable corpus established in accord with the strict rules and criteria of the science of Hadith.
Now critical research, subjecting Islamic and non-Islamic sources of all sorts to historical and philological examination for over a century and a half, offers a far more complex and problematic picture of the history of the redaction of the sacred Scriptures of Islam. A significant body of statements going back to Muhammad was quite gradually distinguished in the Qur’an and the Hadith, i.e., identified as the Word of God and prophetic traditions, respectively. The official Qur’an, assigned a posteriori to the caliphate of ʿUthmān, was established later, probably during the caliphate of the Umayyad ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān (reg. 65/685 to 86/705). Moreover, it bears all the characteristics of a protracted editorial task probably carried out by a team of scribes and qualified scholars. Merely a few decades separate the rules of the two caliphs, but these few dozen years have the force of several centuries given that between the two periods, the immeasurable effects of ceaseless civil wars and vast and dazzling conquests overwhelmed history, society, and the mindset of the first Muslims. Furthermore, even when completed and declared official, the state-sponsored vulgate took several centuries to be accepted by all Muslims. Among the scholars and tendencies opposed to the Umayyad state, a number of important figures would not accept the authenticity of “ʿUthmān’s Qur’an” and considered it a falsified version of the revelations accorded the Prophet; of these, it is the Shi’ites who articulate both the most systematic and the more numerous critiques with respect to the official Qur’an. Other recensions of the Qur’an, often quite different in form and content—as, for example, that of ʿAlī, the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet and the fourth caliph, or those of the Companions ʿAbd Allāh b. Masʿūd and Ubayy b. Kaʿb—remained in circulation at least until the fourth/tenth century. Likewise, endless discussions over the authenticity of hadiths set scholars against one another for centuries. And even when Sunnis toward the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries came to increasing agreement in accepting the corpus of what they termed the Sums of Accepted Traditions, Shi’ites established their own corpus in which the very definition of the term hadith diverged from that of the Sunnis. For the latter, Hadith is the totality of traditions traced back to the Prophet (and in some rare instances to certain of his Companions), whereas for Shi’ites the term applies to traditions going back to the Prophet, to his daughter Fāṭima, to ʿAlī, and to the imams descended from them.
As for the endemic violence in which Islam was born and took shape, it is enough to recall certain historical facts which appear settled in their broad outlines. Immediately following the Hijra, the Prophet's final years were strewn with battle after battle. Of these, the battle of Badr in the year 2/624, the first great victory of the Prophet over his Meccan opponents from his own tribe of Quraysh, seems to have left traces which those same opponents found hard to forget even after their own conversion to Islam. After Muḥammad's death—by poison according to some rare traditions—the succession to him launched a wave of violence to which I will return later. Under Abū Bakr, the first caliph, the bloody "Wars of Apostasy" (ridda) broke out because he blocked newly converted Arabs from reverting to their ancestral religion after the death of the Apostle of God. According to most accounts, Abū Bakr died a natural death, but according to others he too was poisoned. The period of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, the second caliph, was that in which the wars of the great Arab conquests occurred. He too was killed, apparently by a Persian slave. ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān, the third caliph, was swept away by what is usually called the first great civil war between Muslims. The brief rule of the fourth caliph, ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, consisted of an uninterrupted succession of civil wars: the great Battle of ʿSiffin pitted him against Muʿawiya, leader of the powerful Umayyads, his perennial enemies; it was a battle which followed upon the Battle of the Camel (Jamal) against ʿĀʾishah, the Prophet's widow, allied with two of his Companions; and it was preceded by the battle of Nahrawān against the Khārijites, old allies who had become ʿAlī’s bitterest enemies. In the end it was one of these who assassinated ʿAlī. Umayyad rule was one long series of ghastly suppressions and massacres of their adversaries, most particularly the Alids, “the people of ʿAlī,” who would come to be known as Shiʿites. The hellish cycle of bloody suppression and armed revolts was thus set in motion for a considerable length of time. The most momentous instance is the massacre of al-Ḥusayn, the Prophet's beloved grandson and the son of ʿAlī, along with almost all his family, by order of the second Umayyad caliph, Yazid I, mere decades after the Prophet's death. The Umayyads themselves were violently overthrown by a huge armed revolution, that of the Abbasids, under whom the fierce suppression of adherents, especially of Alids of all stripes yet again, continued intermittently for centuries.

The establishment of a religion, accompanied by violence, notably stemming from the complicated process of its institutionalization or from
its imposition on peoples professing other creeds, is clearly not unique to Islam; examples from Judaism and Christianity are too well known to need rehearsing here. Even so, what does seem specific to Islam is, first of all, the nature of this violence, namely, fratricidal wars bringing with them the deaths of a significant number of its most important historical figures, and then, the protractedness, extending over centuries, of bloody conflicts that frequently pitted these very persons against one another. In the present work, various aspects of the questions which have just been adumbrated will be explored in detail. Nevertheless, in order better to grasp the complex of problems to be studied, and in particular the link between historic conflicts and the formation of the canonical writings, it will be useful to say something at the outset about what can be deemed the paradigmatic and fundamental conflict par excellence; one that on both the historical and the doctrinal level lies at the root of virtually all the others, especially during the first centuries of Islam, though also, under various forms, well into our own day.

On the basis of what emerges from the sources, it appears that the death and the ticklish question of the succession to the Prophet in the year 11/632 triggered the first great explosion of violence among believers in the new Arab religion. The matter seemed predictable given that the fragile equilibrium sustaining the diverse gathering of groups and interests that new Muslims represented had been invested in the person of Muhammad. Once he was gone, the Meccan émigrés who had accompanied him on his hegira formed an opposition to the Medinan “Helpers” who had welcomed him.5 His old enemies, the recently converted members of the Quraysh, amongst whom stood the influential Umayyad family, together with his Companions Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, aimed to prevail by neutralizing the ardor of other contenders by any possible means, and most particularly the supporters of his other Companion, his cousin and son-in-law ʿAlī. The confrontations, limited at least for the time being in both time and space, were extremely violent. Following an assembly held in the “public porch” (saqīfa in Arabic) by Helpers from the clan of the Banū Sāʿida, the contest came to be reduced to opposition between Abū Bakr and ʿAlī in which the former rapidly took the upper hand and became the first caliph of Islam.6

The Islamic textual tradition has preserved two radically different representations of this episode. The great majority of the religious sources emanating from what would steadily come to be called Sunnism, the
dominant tendency in Islam, seems to have tried, in upholding the legitimacy of Abū Bakr, to mitigate, if not conceal, the violence of the confrontations and to turn Abū Bakr into a more or less consensual figure by attempting to minimize the extent of the conflicts. Nevertheless, even the Sunni historical and historiographical sources contain enough contrary elements to allow a majority of modern scholars to cast serious doubt on the supposed consensus of Muslims on the election of Abū Bakr and the assumed unity of the Prophet’s companions. According to most Sunni doctrinal works, the Prophet did not explicitly designate anyone as his successor, neither in his own statements nor by way of Qur’anic revelations (in effect, the “official” Qur’an which we know to contain no mention of this). His community therefore had recourse to ancestral tribal practices that had always marked the succession of a charismatic chief amongst the Arabs: the designation by a council of influential worthies of one of the closest companions of this chief, endowed with respectable age, manifest wisdom, and belonging to the same tribe as he. Abū Bakr met all these conditions and so was elected following the meeting of the Saqīfa, supported by well-nigh unanimous approval, with the notable exception of ‘Alī who in the end allowed himself to be persuaded as well by the wisdom of this choice and a concern to preserve the peace and unity of the community.

The supporters of ‘Alī, who was still quite young at the time (which represented a handicap in the view of some)—those termed Alids or proto-Shi’ites, the most important future minority in Islam—give a quite different version of events. According to Shi’ite sources, Muḥammad explicitly designated ‘Alī as his sole legitimate successor, and did so on several occasions. More decisive still, God Himself had announced this succession through His revelations. In their view it could not be otherwise: how could God and His Messenger have left the crucial question of succession in abeyance? Is it conceivable that they remained indifferent to the leadership of the community of believers to the extent of leaving it in vagueness and confusion? This would be contrary to the very spirit of the Qur’an, according to which the major prophets of the past had chosen successors from among their closest family members, privileged by blood ties and initiated into the secrets of their religion. True, the Qur’an recommends consultation in certain instances, but never with respect to what touches upon the succession of the prophets, which remains God’s choice. Alid-Shi’ite sources, especially in the first centuries after the Hijra,
maintain that the original and integral Qur’an, containing numerous explicit mentions and clear allusions to the members of Muḥammad’s family, and, in particular, presenting ‘Alī as his successor, was falsified, heavily censored, and fundamentally altered by ‘Alī’s enemies who usurped power upon the death of the Prophet. Furthermore, this integral Qur’an, far more voluminous than the Qur’an everyone knows, contains explicit mention of the adversaries of both Muḥammad and ‘Alī, those who quite opportunistically, and after much delay, came to Islam. To bar ‘Alī from succession to the Prophet, these adversaries, who finally did seize power, were compelled to censor all such passages and at the same time to deny the authenticity of the Prophet’s statements regarding the election of his son-in-law. One of the fundamental arguments of those who hold the official Qur’an to have been falsified and elaborated in accord with tradition through the efforts of the first three caliphs, Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān, is as follows: one of the most important areas of the Qur’an is what is called the “Tales of the Prophets” (qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā’). In these narratives earlier saints and prophets, notably such biblical figures as Adam, Noah, Abraham, Solomon, David, Moses, Jesus, together with important members of their families (parents, spouses, children, brothers, and sisters) as well as their adversaries (Satan, Nimrod, Pharaoh) are cited hundreds of times. How is it then that in the official version of the Qur’an the Prophet is explicitly cited only four times in all, that none of his enemies is mentioned, nor any member of his family—with the exception of two obscure and enigmatic figures, namely, his adopted son Zayd and Abū Lahab, his hostile uncle? How is it even conceivable that his son-in-law ‘Alī and his daughter Fāṭima, the parents of his only male progeny—that is, his two grandsons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn—along with figures of the highest importance on the religious level, could be absent from the Qur’an? This silence of the sacred text comes about for a simple reason: censorship undertaken by the men in power, themselves also enemies of ‘Alī, on the original Qur’anic text. That original text, in ‘Alī’s keeping, was hidden out of caution and guarded by the imams who descended from him; it will be publicly revealed only at the end of time. Even so, quite a large number of Shi’ite works provide citations from this hidden Qur’an which do not play any part in the official version of the Qur’an known to all. According to this account, what happened at Saqīfa, right after the Prophet’s death, was a veritable coup d’état, a protracted and shrewdly fomented conspiracy on the part of the
two strong men of the Quraysh, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, to sideline ʿAlī, to seize the new power established by Muḥammad, and to transform the religion of the Prophet into the instrument of their own ambitions.

Now, the respectability of the Companions of the Prophet, indeed the near sanctity of certain of them, and particularly the first three caliphs, on the one hand and the belief in the unimpeachable integrity of the official version of the Qurʾan, on the other, very quickly developed into the basic articles of faith of official mainstream Islam—what would come to be called Sunni orthodoxy. The uncompromising position of the Alid minority in opposition to these two doctrines would thus be deemed by various powers to be supremely subversive and heretical from both the political and the religious point of view, resulting in hideous repression and massacres of Alid populations over the course of centuries.

Moreover, these views have almost always been perceived, by Sunni authors, as well as by the great majority of Orientalists in their wake, as strictly ideological and tendentious; that is, lacking in any historical basis. Doubtless this is true; the Shi‘ite sources must be subjected to rigorous critical scrutiny, as must be the case in all scientific research. But it must not be forgotten that the Sunnite texts, especially the oldest of them, have been just as ideological and that, in any case, to gain any more nuanced knowledge of a history scarred by the hot iron of civil violence, an examination of the “archives of the opposition,” as the Shi‘ite sources might be termed, remains just as indispensable as that of the official sources which have had, for the most part, the imprimatur of power. In any case, two decisive factors tend to show that the Shi‘ite claims are not merely simplistic concoctions cooked up in the frustration of an impasse and that they need to be taken more seriously than in the past. First of all is the fact that sometimes there are echoes, rare but telling enough, in Sunni literature itself, subjected, as is well known, to severe censorship. Furthermore, with regard to the complex of problems which concerns us here, they display in their broad outlines some striking convergences with the findings of historical-critical research: on the one hand, the hectic, still puzzling history of many points in the redaction of the scriptural sources, the Qurʾan and the Hadith, and, on the other, the fratricidal struggles which burst forth immediately following the death of the Prophet, the chief victims of which were ʿAlī, his family, and his faithful followers.
The fundamental conflict setting the pair made up of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, followed by the Umayyads, in opposition to ʿAlī seems in some ways the peak of the old tensions between the two Qurayshite clans of the Banū ʿAbd Shams and the Banū Hāshim that crystallized after the emergence of Islam in hostility between the most influential members of the Quraysh and the immediate family of the Prophet and that was then radicalized after the latter’s victory at Badr. This underlies the most blatant violence that Islam experienced during the entire medieval period as well as the hostilities between Sunnis and Shi’ites up to the present day—hostilities the victims of which, in virtually every case, have been the latter, always a minority. What has just been stated concerning the disparities surrounding the elaboration of the scriptural sources, and especially the Qur’an, demonstrates the way in which the history of their redaction has been intertwined with the history of those conflicts, the center of gravity of which is obviously the question of political and religious authority as well as that of its legitimacy. The reason for this is plain: a basic feature of power lies in mastery of religious beliefs, and such mastery cannot be effective except through the control, that is, the codification, of the Scriptures.

It should be made clear from the outset that the Qur’an and the Hadith as such are not the subjects of the present work. As an explication of the Qur’an, the Hadith will form one of our principal focuses of interest, but solely as an historical and doctrinal phenomenon. We do not mean to enter into philosophical and philological discussions over the nuances of such terms as interpretation, commentary, exegesis, hermeneutic, with regard to what distinguishes or unites them; all the more so since early Islam was unaware of these categories and even the distinction between tafsīr (eventually defined *grosso modo* as “exoteric exegesis”) and ta’wil (steadily understood as “spiritual and esoteric hermeneutics”) is not always clear during the period that concerns us. These terms, except in explicitly indicated cases, will thus be used as equivalents to designate the literary process whereby the hidden meaning of a text is deciphered as it occurs in the Qur’anic text. Similarly, the technical complexities of the science of Hadith will not be broached; for example, questions connected with chains of transmitters, the authenticity of the text, the structural or literary analysis of the corpus, and so forth.

Our objective is subtle but more modest at the same time: to study certain aspects of the nexus between the historic conflicts at the beginning of
Islam and the formation of the canonical Scriptures. Different facets of this subject have been studied, and more than once, from F. Schwally to A.-L. de Prémare, by way of I. Goldziher, L. Caetani, R. Blachère, J. Wansbrough, U. Rubin, H. Djaït, C. Gilliot, H. Motzki, and many others; these are valuable studies, and they will be drawn upon throughout the present work. Still, almost all of these many studies, over nearly a century and a half, have been based on Sunni sources. Shi’ism, with its ancient sources and its take on the history of Islam, studied for only a few decades by a tiny number of scientific researchers, has been much less exploited and still remains inadequately known. The present author attempts here to fill this lacuna in a modest way by adopting a new angle of view to these issues. Over the past two decades, in my seminars at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes at the Sorbonne, I have been able to study several Shi’ite texts dating from the first three or four centuries of the Hijra; these texts are of the first importance and yet remain unjustly unknown. Critical examination of the history of these texts and of their content, whilst at the same time bringing them into conjunction with non-Shi’ite sources as well as with the results obtained by modern research, have shed increasing light on a certain historical and doctrinal logic that allows for a new reading grid, a new framework, for theorizing the articulation between civil conflicts and the formation of the scriptural corpus. These studies, in most cases the very first dedicated to these texts and to their authors, to their history and their contents in the chronological order of their redaction, make up the chapters of our work.

Chapter 1 is devoted to the Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays, “The Book of Sulaym ibn Qays,” a pseudepigraphical work attributed to a contemporary partisian of 'Alī and composed of several strata from different dates. The original kernel, the oldest layer, possibly one of the oldest Islamic writings that have come down to us, is probably to be dated from the first quarter of the second/eighth century. It is concerned chiefly with the violence set loose over the problem of the succession to Muḥammad, but it also contains important passages on the early tensions surrounding the elaboration of the scriptural sources.14

Chapter 2 examines a collection of hadiths (statements traceable to the sacred imams), dating from the third/ninth century (and very probably from the first half) on the fundamental problem of the lack of authenticity of the official version of the Qur’an and the case of the other recensions,
especially those that were in circulation in Shi‘ite circles. The work in question is the *Kitāb al-tanzīl wa l-tahrīf* (The Book of Revelation and Falsification), also known as the *Kitāb al-qīrā‘āt* (The Book of Qur‘anic Recitations) by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyārī, a capital work not only for the history of early Shi‘ism but also for the history of the Qur‘ānic redaction. The first part of this study devotes considerable attention to the problems posed by the elaboration of the Qur‘ānic corpus, both with respect to Islamic sources and modern research.\(^\text{15}\)

The *Tafsīr* (Qur‘an commentary) of al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥakam al-Ḥibari (d. 286/899), doubtless a younger contemporary of the preceding author, is the subject of chapter 3. One of the oldest Qur‘ānic commentaries to have come down to us, composed of exegetical hadiths, it poses decisive issues linked to a double dialectic: that of the connection linking Qur‘an and Hadith, on one side, and that of revelation and the necessity of interpreting it, on the other. At the same time, it appears to convey a primitive form of esotericism in which the hidden meaning of the Qur‘ān is closely bound up with historical figures and events concealed under the literal sense of the sacred Book of Islam. These figures are identified and disclosed through the exegetical teachings of the members of the Prophet’s family.\(^\text{16}\)

Last, in chapters 4 and 5, two authors from the second half of the third/ninth century and the first half of the fourth/tenth century, are studied together with their works: al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī and his *Kitāb baṣā‘ir al-darajāt* (The Book of the Perceptions of Degrees) and Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī and his *Kitāb al-kāfī* (The Book That SUFFICES, i.e., for a knowledge of religion).\(^\text{17}\) Two of the most important, and the most voluminous, older collections of Shi‘ite hadiths, these works signal the transition of Shi‘ism toward complex religious doctrines in which the infusion of ancient Iranian, Gnostic, and Neoplatonic traditions appear to generate a new doctrinal evolution: the surmounting of history by the advent of a metaphysics of an esoteric and mystical sort. Simultaneously, the connection between Qur‘ānic exegesis, Hadith, and theology appears to experience a renewal.

These texts, each representing an entire doctrinal tradition and serving to illustrate powerful intellectual tendencies, seem to have circulated in various Alid-Shia circles and enjoyed a religious import that was doubtless significant, at least among scholars and intellectuals. The more recent authors certainly knew their predecessors and earlier texts since they
often happen to cite them directly or indirectly. At the same time, each
text appears to introduce new subjects which supplement the earlier texts.
It is reasonable to assume that their contents draw on an immense store
of traditions that were formed very early on. The historical authenticity
of these traditions obviously requires that they be approached circum-
spectly; presumably, as in the case of Sunnism, a significant body of apoc-
ryphal traditions formed gradually around a kernel of authentic teachings
of the historical imams. Even so, the question of authenticity arises in a
less pointed form in Shi’ism since the imams could set their imprimatur
on any given body of hadiths up to the end of the third/ninth century. To
be sure, that is no guarantee for the historian, and yet, from the phenom-
enological standpoint, it is certainly so for the believer who draws on these
collections.18

It seems to me that critical examination of the chronological progres-
sion of these works and the evolution through which they emerged—and
which they simultaneously reflect and enrich—casts a new light on the
tortured history of nascent Islam, on the genesis of its scriptural sources
as well as on the nexus between these two phenomena. At the same time,
such scrutiny seems to expose a certain underlying coherence in the
Shi’ite perspective on the history of Islam—well beyond the unavoidable
ideological stances critical analysis can identify—that can help us to renew
the complex of problems attending the birth and earliest developments of
this religion. The present work may be considered as an attempt, however
incomplete, to present the evidence for this coherence.
The Book of Sulaym the son of Qays—Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays—also known as the Book of the Saqīfa (Kitāb al-Saqīfa), contains, at least in its earliest stratum, the oldest depiction of the Shi’ite perception of the violent events that marked the death and the succession of the Prophet. Extremely popular from the Middle Ages up to our own day—the large number of manuscripts and its countless printings appear to indicate this—the work has at the same time been both the reflection and the instigator of the most basic theological and political concepts of Shi’ism. Setting aside its contents, despite their capital importance, its considerable antiquity, partly authentic and partly presumed, since it is made up of several layers from different periods, has counted for much.

Early Shi’ite literature is still not sufficiently well known. By that I designate those writings prior to the great corpus of Shi’ite Hadith elaborated for the most part between the beginning of the third and the start of the fourth centuries AH (roughly 850 to 950 CE), the corpus formed by the compilations of the great traditionists such as al-Sayyārī, al-Ḥibarī, al-Barqī, al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī, Furāt al-Kūfī, al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Kulaynī, and a few others. Put another way, our knowledge of the sources on which these authors drew is still quite incomplete. Up until now, a few rare scholars have embarked on a critical examination of this immense and unexplored field of research: Etan Kohlberg, in his fundamental article on the “four
hundred original writings” (al-uṣūl al-arba‘u mī‘a) drew the attention of the Western scholarly world to these older works, most of which are lost and have been attributed, at least in the case of most of them, to the immediate disciples of historical imams. Moreover, in his work on Ibn Ṭāwūs, henceforth indispensable for any study of classical Shi‘ism, Kohlberg presents and studies a large number of writings, many of which are quite early. Then there is Hossein Modarressi, whose recent, and magisterial, book provides a first finely documented overview of Shi‘ite writings deemed to have been written during the first three centuries after the Hijra. This same scholar had earlier examined the question in his bibliographical work on the textual tradition in Shi‘ite jurisprudence. Lastly, Hassan Ansari has devoted several articles in Persian, as rich in suggestions for further research as they are pertinent, to the very oldest Shi‘ite literature; articles that have appeared in Iranian publications—unfortunately, little known to Western scholars—or on the Internet. These pioneering studies afford scholars numerous areas of investigation into the earliest written sources of Shi‘ism. In just the same way, the present study also endeavors to make a modest contribution with some brief bibliographical and historical notes, together with translated and annotated excerpts from a major work of nascent Shi‘ism which has, however, remained almost totally unknown.

The Work and Its Putative Author

According to Shi‘ite tradition, the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays, also called Aṣl Sulaym b. Qays, or even Kitāb al-saqīfa, is the work of Sulaym b. Qays al-Hilālī, the disciple of the first imam, ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, and accordingly one of the very first Shi‘ite, if not Islamic, writings. In the main it is devoted to a Shi‘ite perception of the events which marked the death and succession of the Prophet Muḥammad, and specifically the “conspiracy” cunningly stirred up by certain of the Prophet’s companions, particularly ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, in order to seize power by installing Abū Bakr on the caliphal throne and shunting ʿAlī aside from what belonged to him by divine right, by the will of God and His Messenger. This conspiracy thus initiates the corruption and violence of the new religion for most of its faithful.

These contents, to which we shall return when we translate several representative passages, together with the presumed antiquity of the work,
accord it a particular significance in the Shi’ite view. A hadith ascribed to the sixth imam of the Twelvers, Ja’far al-Ṣādiq, illustrates this prestige: “He among our partisans [literally: our Shi’ites] and those who love us who does not have the Book of Sulaym b. Qays al-Hilālī, is tantamount to one who has no share in our cause and who knows nothing of the basis of our doctrines [literally: “our foundations”]. This book forms the alphabet of Shi’ism and is one of the supreme secrets of the descendants of Muḥammad.”

Certain early sources record a tradition going back to the fourth imam, ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-ʿĀbidin, who supposedly said, after hearing a disciple recite the Book of Sulaym to him, “Everything that Sulaym says is truthful, may God have mercy on him. All of this forms a part of our teaching (i.e., we imams) and we recognize it.”

What can be known about Sulaym and the book that bears his name? The entries on him in Shi’ite prosopographical and bibliographical works, alongside certain critical studies, are numerous indeed. Sulaym b. Qays Abū Ṣādiq al-Hilālī al-ʿĀmirī al-Kūfī was one of the Followers (tābīʿūn, i.e., the generation which followed that of the Prophet’s companions—ṣaḥāba). A contemporary of ʿAlī (d. 40/660), and one of his most ardent initiates, he also over the course of his long life came to know the four succeeding imams, al-Ḥasan (d. 49/669), al-Ḥusayn (d. 61/680), ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn (d. ca. 92/711), and the infant Muḥammad al-Bāqir (d. ca. 115/732). According to traditional accounts, in early youth he began composing a written record of the events and dramatic conflicts that followed the Prophet’s death and marked the history of the first caliphs, basing himself on accounts collected close to ʿAlī and several of his chief supporters and disciples, such as Salmān al-Fārisī, Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, or al-Miqdād b. Aswad, as well as yet other protagonists of these events.

After the assassination of ʿAlī and the institution of the violent anti-Alid policy of repression of the first Umayyads, Sulaym was sought by the cruel anti-Alid governor of Iraq, al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf (d. 95/714), who wanted to put him to death. He escaped from Iraq and took refuge in southern Iran, in the small village of Nobandagān (pronounced Nawbandajān in Arabic), in the province of Fārs (a village of this name still exists in this province between the cities of Dārāb and Fasā), bringing his precious book along with him—the written testimony of what he deemed the greatest betrayal of the Prophet and his family, as related directly by certain of the protagonists themselves. Aged and harassed, quite rightly believing that death...
was near and fearing the complete loss of his manuscript, he discovered a trustworthy beneficiary in the person of the adolescent “Firūz” Abān b. Abī ‘Ayyāsh (d. ca. 138/755–56). Shortly afterward, Sulaym died and was buried at Nobandagān, around the year 76/695–96 according to most accounts, while al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf still held sway in Iraq, as the sources emphasize.

Abān b. Abī ‘Ayyāsh in turn took the book that Sulaym had entrusted to him to several large cities, notably Baṣra, Mecca, and Medina, so as to verify its contents with scholars and experts, religious authorities, and those witnesses to events who were still living. In the last-named city he had the book read to the fourth imam, who, after hearing it all, pronounced the solemn declaration we have already mentioned. In 138/755–56 Abān in his turn entrusted the text, which by now had been certified as correct, to the Shi‘ite traditionist ‘Umar b. Udhayna (d. ca. 169/785), a renowned disciple of both the sixth and seventh imams. Still in keeping with the traditional account, it was thanks to this personage that the Book of Sulaym came to be widely diffused through seven great Hadith experts in the Iraqi towns of Baṣra and Kūfā who received and then circulated it everywhere.

A Book with Multiple Strata

Notwithstanding the rich prosopographical tradition relating to our personage, Sulaym’s existence and therefore the authenticity of the attribution of his book were quickly cast into doubt, even among Shi‘ites, as it appears. The first to deny Sulaym’s historical existence seems to have been the Imami savant Ibn al-Ghāḍā‘īrī Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Wāṣīṭī (d. 411/1020). The information is taken up again by two authors in the seventh/thirteenth century, the Imami Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī (b. 647/1249, d. after 707/1307) in his prosopographical work (where his skepticism remains utterly ambiguous) and the Mu‘tazilite Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd (d. 656/1258) in his commentary on the Nahj al-balāgha. Among critical scholars, Modarressi also holds that Sulaym b. Qays never actually existed and was nothing more than a pen name adopted by a group of violently anti-Umayyad supporters of ‘Ali from the town of Kūfā. It is difficult to accept this assertion, which radically rejects a rich bibliographical and prosopographical tradition; moreover, even if the attribution is problematic, the putative author
must have really existed and been respected by the Alids, otherwise what legitimacy could a writing ascribed to a fictitious person have possessed? True, many elements in the reports about Sulaym b. Qays could be coded accounts bearing a hidden symbolic meaning: Sulaym (who would have actually existed) might have served as a “cipher” to designate the Alids of Kūfa at the end of the Umayyad period. The figures of Abān b. Abī ‘Ayyāsh and of ‘Umar b. Udhayna, both “clients” (mawāli, i.e., manumitted slaves) of the Banū ‘Abd al-Qays, could symbolize the role of “clients,” especially those of Iranian origin, in the reception and transmission of the work. In such a context, Sulaym’s flight to Iran and his taking refuge in a place called Nobandagan in particular seem to take on a singular import. The Persian toponym Nobandagan can have two meanings: either “the place of the new dam,” probably the true meaning of the toponym (the word can be broken down as follows: now/new + band/dam + the suffix indicating regional location qān), or “new servants,” perhaps the meaning that the account of the transmission of the Book of Sulaym seeks to evoke, with the sense of “new converts to Islam” (composed of now/new + banda/servant or adorer—the Persian equivalent of the Arabic ‘abd—plus the plural ending for terms ending with the vowel a, i.e., gān). In this way our text and the doctrines that it conveyed, under threat in Iraq, would have found a warm welcome in southern Iran among new Iranian converts and would have been brought by the latter and secretly diffused in Iraq and then elsewhere. Even “the seven experts” who spread the copy of ‘Umar b. Udhayna abroad could be metaphors for the Seven Climes, in other words, “the whole world.”

Ibn al-Ghādā‘īrī would also have deemed the work to be a forgery by Abān b. Abī ‘Ayyāsh. His exact contemporary, the renowned Imami theologian al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022), in his evocatively entitled book The Rectification of Belief, declares that some of the data in the Book of Sulaym became corrupted and should not be considered authentic. The contemporary Imami religious scholar Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sha‘rānī (d. 1393/1973) also believes that the Book of Sulaym is a forgery—an apocryphal work, to be sure—even though edited for a laudable purpose, to wit, the denunciation of the violence and injustice visited upon the Prophet’s family.

In the opposing camp, defenders of the historical existence of Sulaym and of the authenticity of his book are numerous, especially, as must needs be, among Imami Shi‘ites. Rather than going back over the many bibliographical and prosopographical sources, which have already been mentioned, here...
we deem it sufficient to emphasise certain facts: from the third/ninth century onward, Sulaym is frequently cited by Shi’ite authors and particularly by the compilers of traditions. A non-Shi’ite scholar as well-informed and erudite as Ibn al-Nadîm presents the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays, in the fourth/tenth century, as the very first Shi’ite book (awwâlu kitābin ẓahara li’l-shi‘a). By the Imamis the work was reckoned one of the “Four Hundred Original Works.” Authors as early and as prestigious as al-Mas’ūdî, al-Najâshî, al-Shaykh al-Ṭûsî, or even al-Nu‘mâni, from the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries, have stated that they had the Book of Sulaym in their possession. A single or several of the many manuscripts of the work have reached modern authors such as al-Sayyid Hâshim al-Bahrâni (d. 1107/1695–96 or 1109/1697–98) or Muḥammad Bâqir al-Majlisî (1110/1699) by way of such medieval authors as Ibn Shahrâshîb or Jamâl al-Dîn Ibn Tâwûs in the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries. The systematic doubts cast by Ibn al-Ghâḍâ’iri, almost invariably taken seriously by other Shi’ite authors, will be refuted from the eighth/forteenth century onward, by al-‘Allâmâ al-Ḥîlî (d. 726/1325) and later authors up to the twentieth century when the great Imami encyclopedist Āghâ Bozorg al-Ṭîrânî (d. 1389/1969) went so far as to question the authenticity of the Kitāb al-rijāl/al-uç’afâ’ of Ibn al-Ghâḍâ’iri—and to do so in a well-documented way—as it in fact contains a good number of elements contrary to Shi’ite beliefs. In fact, Āghâ Bozorg presents this book as a work edited by an opponent of Shi’ites and ascribed to a Shi’ite scholar in order to undermine their credibility in general and Sulaym and his book in particular.

Even so, the pseudographical character of the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays is obvious. The presence in its midst of data at times originating several centuries later than the period of its presumed author—and especially the many passages on the Abbasid Revolution or even the number twelve of the Imams—permits the historian no doubt in this regard. Even so, it is undeniable that successive redactions, extending until after the period of the historical imams at the beginning of the fourth/tenth century, developed around a very early primitive kernel. Modarressi believes that this original kernel is the oldest Shi’ite writing that has come down to us, and the arguments he puts forward, based on a meticulous intertextual study, seem apt indeed: to begin with, the work alludes in numerous passages to the unjust rulers who govern the community after the Prophet’s death, the number of which is restricted to twelve: the first three caliphs, Mu‘āwiya
and his son Yazīd, the seven descendants of al-Ḥakam b. Abī al-Ḥāṣ, namely, the Umayyad caliphs Marwān I, ʿAbd al-Malik, Walīd I, Sulaymān, ʿUmar II, Yazīd II and finally, Hīshām b. ʿAbd al-Malik. Only the first five of the imams are named explicitly, and the text insists on the fact that the imamate is carried forward in the name of Muḥammad al-Bāqir. Amongst the descendants of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, eight are presented as being “the Lords of Paradise:” the Prophet Muḥammad, ʿAlī, Jaʿfar, and ʿAmmāz (the brother and the uncle of ʿAlī, respectively), al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, Fāṭima, and finally, the Mahdi, the savior at the end of time. This tally is obviously anterior to the belief, probably dating from the beginnings of the Abbaсид dynasty, according to which the Imams of ʿAlī’s line are far superior to such personages as Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭalib and ʿAmmāz b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib, who are included in this list. Lastly, the text expresses a hope for the fall of the Umayyads that would come about through a descendant of Fāṭima generally and of al-Ḥusayn specifically—a hope in an eschatological form current among the proto-Shīʿite Alids of Kūfah whose circumstances are at times given detailed description. Hossein Modarressi emphasizes that all these elements provide proof of the fact that the original text of the Book of Sulaym was written by proto-Shiʿites of Kūfah, followers of al-Ḥusayn, during the final years of the reign of the Umayyad Hīshām b. ʿAbd al-Malik (reg. from 105 to 125/724–743). These arguments, corroborated by the statement of Ibn al-Nadīm that we know already, according to which the Book of Sulaym is the first Shiʿite work, appear definitely to indicate that the primitive kernel, which occurs in diluted form in the present Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays, represents the oldest Shiʿite book which has come down to us. It is interesting to note that the authors of the later additions did not deem it necessary to suppress this primitive kernel despite the fact that its drift sometimes contradicts these later additions.

The existence of portions added to an earlier text in accord with the needs of each epoch is stressed in equal measure by Patricia Crone in the study that she devoted to a fragment of the Book of Sulaym, providing a letter supposedly from the Caliph Muʿāwiya to Ziyād b. Abihi, his violently anti-Alid governor of Iraq. According to her, this text, emerging from milieu belonging to a Hāshimite Shiʿism with Rāfiḍite tendencies, but not necessarily Ḫusaynid, must have come into being right after the victory of the Abbasid Revolution but prior to the anti-Alid swerve of the new masters of empire, perhaps just before the revolt of Muḥammad al-Nafs
al-Zakiyya in 145/762, and in any case, not after 164/780, by which time the last great representatives of Hashimite Shi‘ism had died. These successive additions, at times in contradiction with other elements provided by the text, seem to indicate at any event that the text, in the form in which it has come down to us, has not been subjected to suppression of material and that it contains to a high degree of probability and in the great majority of manuscripts, the whole of the original kernel. Moreover, while it is easy to recognize certain additions, thanks to obvious anachronisms, conversely, it is difficult if not impossible to reconstruct the whole of the original text of the Book of Sulaym, fragmented and dispersed as it appears to be throughout the entirety of the extant text.

A Work of Enduring Popularity

Before moving on to the contents of the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays, something should be said about its editions and its manuscripts, the majority of which bear witness to the importance and popularity of this work among Shi‘ites. Our book has been published five times in Najaf (Iraq), once in Tehran, and three times in Qumm; the best, and the most recent, edition is that prepared by M. B. Anṣārī Zanjānī Khū‘īnī. A translation into Urdu exists, made by M. M. S. Rasūlavī Multānī in 1375/1956 and published in Pakistan in 1391/1971. There are two translations into Persian: first, that done by I. Anṣārī in 1400/1979, then completed in 1416/1996, printed in several hundreds of thousand copies over some fifteen years, at Tehran, Qumm, and Mashhad. Then, that of M. B. Kamara‘ī, published in Tehran in 1412/1991. The totality of the print runs of these editions exceeds several million copies.

With regard to the manuscripts of the Book of Sulaym, the rather cursory and confused elucidations of Aghā Bozorg al-Ṭihrānī have been methodically, and helpfully, supplemented by the latest editor of the text, Shaykh Muḥammad Bāqir Anṣārī, in a hundred or so pages. According to the bibilographical notices devoted to Sulaym, together with the manuscript tradition of his book, seven renowned traditionists of the twelfth/eighth century from the cities of Baṣra and Kūfa received the work from ʿUmar b. Udhayna and put it into circulation; these were Ibn Abū Ṭumayr, Hammād b. ʿĪsā, ʿUthmān b. ʿĪsā, Maʿmar b. Rāshid al-Baṣrī, Ibrāhīm b. ʿUmar al-Yamānī, Hammām b. Nāṭiʿ al-Ṣanʿānī, and ʿAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām.
al-Ṣanʿānī. It is due to these scholars that the six categories of manuscript of *The Book of Sulaym* were circulated:

a) The copies coming from al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī (d. 465/1072), the isnād (or chain of transmitters) of which go back to Ibn Abī ‘Umayr. Six copies of this type are presented by the sources; of these three have survived. They contain forty-eight hadiths and were widely diffused from the fifth/eleventh century onward in the Shi‘ite cities of Najaf, Karbala‘, and Hilla.

b) The copies coming from Muḥammad b. Ṣubayḥ b. Rajā‘ (fourth/tenth century), the chain of transmitters of which goes back to Ibn Abī ‘Umayr; copies distributed first in Yemen, then in Syria, especially in Damascus. Twenty-two copies of this have been identified, twelve of which still survive. They contain forty-one of the forty-eight hadiths of the preceding category, though presented in a different order.

c) The copies deriving from Abū Muḥammad al-Rummānī after 609/1212–13. The beginning and the end are missing and, as a result, their chain of transmitters remains unknown. Six out of the fifteen manuscripts identified by the sources have survived. They diverge from the first two categories; specifically, twenty-two of their hadiths are found nowhere else. They are divided into two distinct parts, numbering thirty-two and seven traditions, respectively.

d) The copies deriving from the version of Ibrāhīm b. ʿUmar al-Yamānī, transmitted by al-Ḥasan b. Abī Yaʿqūb al-Dīnawarī (second–third/eighth–ninth centuries). Of the nine manuscripts identified by the sources, only a single one has apparently come down to us. It contains forty traditions presented in the same order as in category b.

e) A series of ten manuscripts presented by various sources but that have not been located and the characteristics of which remain unknown to us.

f) An old copy, which seems to have belonged to Shaykh Yaʿqūb al-Manṣūrī of the city of Khorramshahr (in Iranian Khuzistan); in Kufic script, written on gazelle skin, and dating seemingly from the second/eighth century; lost in 1981 in the bombardment of the city during the Iran-Iraq War.

As one of the titles under which it is known indicates, the *Book of Sulaym* b. Qays is chiefly devoted to the events of the Saqīfa (see the introduction).
and its most deleterious consequences for the nascent Muslim community, from the Shi’ite point of view. Indeed, it was on the porch (saqīfā) of the clan of Banū Sā‘īda that the meeting took place in which the shunting aside of ʿAlī from the succession to the Prophet and the election of Abū Bakr were decided. According to Shi’ites, this fundamental betrayal of Muḥammad’s most cherished intention signals the beginning of the corruption of official, majority Islam. Whence the Shi’ite adage, “Saqīfā heralds Karbalāʾ,” that is, if the official ruling power could massacre the grandson of the Prophet and all of his family at Karbalāʾ, a few decades after the Prophet’s death, it was because of the anti-Alid coup d’État that occurred at Saqīfā.

In short, the Book of Sulaym is the account of a conspiracy, hatched long before the Prophet’s death, and aiming to remove the latter and the closest members of his family, to alter the very nature of his religion in order to take hold of power and wrest Muslims away. The protagonists of this diabolical conspiracy were ʿUmar, Abū Bakr, and Abū ʿUbayda b. Al-Jarrāḥ, their accomplice. The language of the book is simple and direct; the traditions that make it up report the events and the statements of the protagonists taken on the spot. The work contains almost no speculative elaboration of a theological stripe—nevertheless, it does include some doctrinal portions, probably added later, of a cosmological, anthropological, and imamological type—and so appears to reflect the beliefs of the Alid population of Iraq during the very first centuries after the Hijra.

To gain some sense of the work’s contents, particularly with regard to the problematic issues that concern us, I shall translate several long extracts, which, in my view, set the scene for the episodes of violence that followed the Prophet’s death and that are articulated in the scriptural sources. These excerpts will be followed by the table of contents of the work.

The first chapter (the chapters are called hadith, “tradition,” “account,” “teaching”) is dedicated to the transmission of our book. The second is devoted to the death of Muhammad and his dire predictions of the tragic destiny of his family and descendants. The excerpts translated come from chapters 3, 4, 10, and 11, which explicitly broach questions linked to the power struggles over the Prophet’s succession and their relationship with the elaboration of both the Qur’an and the Hadith.
This chapter is devoted to the occurrences at Saqīfah from the report of the Companion al-Barā’ b. ‘Āzib during the time when ‘Alī and the other members of the Prophet’s family were occupied with his funeral. The account emphasizes the various initiatives and ruses of ‘Alī’s adversaries, with Abū Bakr and ‘Umar in the forefront, to seize power while at the same time attempting to neutralize any resistance. In the process, they try to divide the Prophet’s family by tempting al-‘Abbās, one of the most respected members of the Banū Hāšim (see the figures in the front matter of this volume), with power. The importance of this chapter, like the chapter following it, lies especially in the fact that they in some ways set the scene that will serve as a backdrop for the entirety of the work.

[p. 571] Sulaym says: I heard al-Barā’ b. ‘Āzib[p. 572] say: “I feel intense affection for the Banū Hāšim [the direct lineage of the Prophet, his immediate family]. This was so as much during the lifetime of the Messenger of God [Muḥammad] as after his death. When the Messenger was at the point of death, he asked ‘Alī to allow no one other than himself to wash his body. In fact, no one is permitted to see the private parts of the Prophet without going blind. ‘Alī replied to him: ‘Messenger of God! Who then will assist me in washing you?’ The Prophet stated: ‘Gabriel and other angels.’ ‘Alī then washed the lifeless body of the Messenger. Al-Faḍl b. al-‘Abbās [another cousin of Muḥammad] poured the water, and the angels shifted the position of the body in accord with ‘Alī’s needs . . . ’”

Al-Barā’ b. ‘Āzib goes on to say: “When the Messenger died, I feared that [the men of] Quraysh [p. 572] would join forces to seize the power that reverted by right to the Banū Hāšim. Then, when people swore oaths of allegiance to Abū Bakr, I was dumbstruck like a father who has just lost his child, a feeling added on to my grief over the death of the Messenger. I began to move about, watching the influential men [of Quraysh] while the Banū Hāšim were busy with the funeral rites. Moreover, I was informed of the claims of Sa’d b. ‘Ubayda and his ignorant followers, but I never joined up with them. Later I came to know that they did not achieve their objective in the end.
I went back and forth between them [the supporters of Sa‘d? The Banū Hāshim?] and the mosque, all the while seeking out the notable men of Quraysh. Then I realized that Ābu Bakr and ‘Umar were missing. Shortly afterward, I saw them along with Ābu ʿUbaydā [b. al-Jarrāḥ], in company with the people of the Saqīfa and wearing Yemeni garments. They caught hold of everyone who passed by them and, if it was an acquaintance, they placed his hand in Ābu Bakr’s hand [i.e., they made him swear an oath of allegiance to him], whether he wished to or not! This scene, on top of the misfortune that had stricken the Messenger, drove me crazy. I went back to the mosque quickly; then I repaired to the abode of the Banū Hāshim who were keeping the house closed to everyone unknown to their family. I knocked loudly on the door and cried out, ‘O People of the Family [of the Prophet].’ Al-Fāḍl b. al-‘Abbās came to the door, and I told him that the people had sworn an oath in favor of Ābu Bakr. He replied, ‘You have covered yourself in shame until the end of time. You have disobeyed my orders.’ I [p. 573] kept silent, concealing from him the agony that tormented me.

When night fell, inside the mosque I remembered the Messenger reciting the Qur’ān. I rose up and went out, heading to the porch of the clan of the Banū Bayāda where several people were conversing quietly among themselves. They fell silent when I drew near to them. I moved away when they recognized me and called after me. I went up to them and saw Miqdād, Ābu Dharr, Salmān, ʿAmmār b. Yāsir, ʿUbāda b. al-Šāmit, Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān, and al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām. At this moment Ḥudhayfa said: ‘By God! They will do as I told you. By God, I do not lie to you nor has anyone lied to me!’ Some sought to recoup the matter [of the succession to the Prophet] by organizing a consultative meeting between the Emigrés and the Helpers. Ḥudhayfa then suggested to us: ‘Let us go to see Ubayy b. Ka‘b for he knows what I know.’

We went to Ubayy and knocked on his door. He came up behind the door and, without opening it, he said: ‘Who is it?’ Al-Miqdād replied to him. Ubayy then said:

—Why are you there?

—Open the door to us. The matter on which we have come is too important to be discussed through the door.

—No! I won’t open the door because I know the reason for your coming. I will not open my house to you because you are there to discuss the oath [regarding the caliphate].
—Indeed, yes!
—Is Ḥudhayfah with you?
—Yes.
—What he says is just. For myself I will not open my door until this matter is concluded. What will happen later [p. 574] will be yet worse. I take refuge with God.54

[ . . . ] The whole matter came to the ears of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. They sought out [their accomplices] Abū ʿUbayda b. al-Jarrāḥ and al-Mughīra b. Shuʿba and asked for their advice.55 Al-Mughīra said: ‘I think that you must meet with al-ʿAbbās b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib [the Prophet’s uncle, one of the eldest and most respected members of the clan of Banū Hāshim] and tempt him by promising him, both him and his descendants, a share in power. In this way you will be easy in your mind with regard to ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib since if al-ʿAbbās comes over to your side, that will be a compelling argument in people’s eyes and the problem of ʿAlī [now isolated] will be solved.’

Barāʾ went on to say: “On the second night after the death of the Messenger of God, the four accomplices went to the house of al-ʿAbbās. After praising God’s greatness, Abū Bakr said: ‘God sent Muḥammad for you [Muslims in general? His family in particular?] as a prophet (nabī) and for believers as a divine helpmate (wali) responsible for their affairs.56 In this way He privileged believers by choosing Muḥammad among them. Then He called him to Him and left people free to choose what is best for them, in unity, not in separation. And so the people have chosen me as its leader and responsible authority, and I have accepted. With God’s help, I fear no weakness, no hesitation, no anguish. Even so, I have been informed that I have an opponent who denounces me and goes against the will of the people [i.e., ʿAlī]. He relies on your authority [you, the Prophet’s Family], and you have become the guarantee of his safety and respectable. Now, you must either realign yourselves with the will of the people or dissuade him from going back on his decision. We have come to you to propose to you, to both you and your descendants, a part in this matter [the caliphate], for you are the uncle of the Messenger of God. We grant you this favor despite the fact that the people, aware of your rank and the rank of your companion [ʿAlī], want no part of you [p. 575].’

Then ʿUmar stepped up: ‘Now then, you, the Banū Hāshim, have only to keep quiet and stay where you are.’57 The Messenger of God belonged
just as much to you as to us. We aren’t here because we have need of you but because we don’t wish there to be any reproach or dissension from what the Muslims have unanimously decided and that matters turn for the worse between the people and yourselves. So consider what is in your interest and that of the people . . . ‘

Al-ʿAbbās then spoke [addressing Abū Bakr]: ‘As you have said, God chose Muhammad as His prophet and as the divine helpmate who is responsible for the believers. If you seize power in the Messenger’s name, be aware that you usurp our rights and if you do so in the name of the believers, then we too are a part of them, and yet no one has asked for our opinion for we have not been consulted in any way. We do not want you to hold power. Already before now we were accounted believers and kept our distance with respect to you.58 As for what you say regarding a share of power for me and my descendants, if this power belongs to you personally, then keep it for yourself, as we have no need of it, but if it is a question of the rights of the believers, then it is not for you to decide on their behalf without asking for their opinion. Lastly, if it belongs to us, we have no wish to share it with you. And you, ʿUmar, when you say that the Messenger belonged as much to us as to you, know that he was a tree of whom we are the branches, whereas you, you were merely sitting in his shade. And when you threaten us by saying that things will turn to the worse among the people, know that what you are now doing is in fact the main cause for that . . . ‘ [p. 576]. Then al-ʿAbbās recited one of his poems:

I never imagined that this matter would be deflected from the Banū Hāshim while Abū al-Ḥasan was in their midst [i.e., ʿAlī]99
Is it not he [ʿAlī] who first practiced Muslim prayer? Is he not the wisest of men concerning the vestiges of the past and the good teachings of the present?
Is it not he who is the closest Companion of the Prophet? He whom the angel Gabriel assisted during the funeral rites of the latter?
Is it not he who possesses the finest qualities among men and what he possesses other men do not have?
Who is it that has turned you away from him? Tell us so that we may recognize him, but know that your oath signals the onset of catastrophe.’”
CHAPTER 4 (EXCERPTS)

This chapter is the account of the events of the Saqīfa in the words of the Companion Salmān the Persian. It includes the account of the conspiracy of Abū Bakr and his accomplices; the resistance of ‘Alī, his isolation amidst the Muslims as well as his elaboration of a complete recension of the Qur’an; the attack and the burning down of the house of ‘Alī and Fāṭima by ʿUmar and his strongmen, the martyrdom of Fāṭima and the arrest of ʿAlī and his sons; ʿAlī’s forced acceptance of the caliphate of his enemy.

[p. 577] Sulaym says: “I heard Salmān the Persian say: ‘After the Prophet’s death, when people did what they did, Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and Abū ʿUbayda b. al-Jarrāḥ led them to the Helpers [who had their own candidate, Saʿd b. ʿUbāda] and set up ʿAlī’s argument against them, saying, “O group of Helpers! Those from Quraysh have a greater right than you in this matter since the Messenger of God came from them and the Emigrés are superior to you since God has mentioned them in his Book ahead of you and has deemed them to have priority.” The Messenger himself said, “The leaders belong to the tribe of Quraysh.”

Salmān continued, “I went to ʿAlī while he was engaged in washing the lifeless body of the Messenger . . . [when he finished the funeral rites; p. 578]. He bade me enter the room along with Abū Dharr, al-Miqdād [two of ʿAlī’s loyal supporters], Fāṭima, al-Ḥasan, and al-Ḥusayn. ʿAlī placed himself before us, and we all prayed behind him [over the dead man]. ʿAʾisha was in the house as well, but knew nothing of all this since God had veiled her gaze.

[p. 580] . . . When night had fallen, ʿAlī set Fāṭima on a donkey, took [their two sons] al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn by the hand and went knocking on the doors of all those who had fought at Badr as well as the Emigrés and the Helpers, reminding them of his rights [as proclaimed by the Prophet] and summoning them to come to his aid. Only forty-four men accepted. ʿAlī ordered them to go out at dawn [p. 581] armed and with their heads shaved, in order to swear the oath of fidelity to him and, if need be, to face death [in battle against ʿAlī’s enemies].

At dawn, only four persons came to the meeting-place . . . Abū Dharr, al-Miqdād, al-Zubayr b. al-ʿAwwām, and myself [i.e., Salmān].

[This episode repeated itself three nights in a row and every morning ʿAlī found himself with the same four men.] When ʿAlī saw the duplicity
and cowardice of people, he returned home and busied himself with compiling the Qur’an. He did not emerge from his house until he had collected and arranged it since prior to that time, the Qur’an, scattered about, had been written only on separate leaves, on bits of wood and skin, on fragments of papyrus.

When ‘Ali had collected the whole Qur’an and made a copy of it himself, both the text (tanzil) and its exegesis (ta’wil), Abū Bakr sent someone to him and demanded an oath of loyalty from him. ‘Ali sent the messenger back with the following message: ‘I am busy and I have promised not to leave my house except for prayer and to do this until I have compiled the totality of the Qur’an.’ They [i.e. Abū Bakr and his accomplices] left him in peace for several days.

After he had finished his work, ‘Ali wrapped the whole Qur’an in a cloth which he sealed. Then he went to join the people who had gathered around Abū Bakr in the mosque of the Messenger of God and in his most powerful voice, he thundered, ‘People! Since the Messenger’s death I have been occupied solely with his funeral and with collecting the entirety of the Qur’an. The entire Book is now gathered together in this piece of cloth. Not a single verse revealed by God to His Messenger is missing from it. Not a single verse of the Qur’an is missing from what I have assembled. Indeed, the Messenger had me recite every verse revealed and then he taught me its exegesis. I am bringing this to you now so that tomorrow you will not look for some pretext by declaring ‘We know nothing of that’ and so that on the Day of Resurrection you cannot claim that I have not summoned you to support me, that I have not reminded you of my rights and that I have not brought you the entirety of the Book of God.’

‘Umar answered him, ‘What we have of the Qur’an suffices us. We have no need of what you are proposing to us.’

‘Ali then returned home. ‘Umar said to Abū Bakr, ‘Send somebody to ‘Ali to compel him to give his oath or else we won’t achieve our objective [i.e., the unanimous fealty of the entire community], while if he does come over to our side we will be wholly at ease in our minds.’ Abū Bakr sent somebody to ‘Ali with the following message: ‘Respond affirmatively to the caliph of the Messenger of God (khalīfat rasūl Allāh).’ ‘Ali replied, ‘Glory be to God! Are you already ascribing lies to the Messenger? Abū Bakr and all of those who surround him know very well that God and His Messenger have designated as caliph no one other than myself!’ Abū Bakr
shot back, ‘Respond affirmatively to the commander of the believers (amīr al-muʾminīn) . . . ‘Ali sent him the following reply: ‘Glory be to God! And yet, the matter is not so old as to be forgotten so soon! Abū Bakr knows perfectly well that this title has been reserved exclusively for me. They were seven when the Messenger ordered them to greet me as “Commander of the Believers.” Among the seven, he and his comrade ʿUmar asked then whether [in the matter of this title] it was a question of a right coming from God and His Messenger? And the Prophet answered them, “Yes. It is an undeniable right on the part of God and His Messenger. ‘Ali is the Commander of the Believers, the chief among Muslims, the standard-bearer of the best amongst you . . .” After receiving this reply, Abū Bakr and his accomplices left ‘Ali in peace that day.’

. . . [‘Ali no longer left his house, p. 584] . . . ‘Umar said to Abū Bakr, ‘What prevents you from sending an envoy to ‘Ali to force him to follow you? Everyone else has sworn allegiance and on his side he has only four people with him.’ Abū Bakr was the gentler of the two, calmer and more far-sighted, ‘Umar the more aggressive, wrathful, violent . . . and he said, ‘Let’s send Qunfudh [my strongman] to ‘Ali’s house. He is an aggressive, wrathful, and violent man, a freedman from the clan of ‘Adī b. Kaʿb [the clan of ‘Umar himself].’

Abū Bakr then sent Qunfudh, together with other men, to the home of ‘Ali, but he would not let them in . . . [Upon their return,] ‘Umar gave the order, ‘Return to the home of ‘Ali and if he does not let you in, force the door.’ They went back to ‘Ali’s house and asked to enter. Fāṭima stopped them, ‘I forbid you to enter my house.’ The cursed Qunfudh remained on the spot and sent other men to inform ‘Umar of the situation . . . [p. 585]. The latter was furious and cried out, ‘What are the women doing in there!’ He then told his men to gather some firewood. He collected some himself, and they went to put the sticks all around the house of ‘Ali, Fāṭima, and their two sons. ‘Umar then shouted, addressing the couple, ‘I swear by God that you must come out and give your oath to the caliph of the Messenger of God or else I will set fire to your house and burn you up with it.’ Fāṭima intervened at this point, “‘Umar! What do we have to do with you?’

‘Umar: ‘Open the door or we will burn down your house.’

Fāṭima: “‘Umar! Have you no fear of God in so entering this house of mine [the Prophet’s daughter]?”
‘Umar did not want to go back. He asked for wood, set fire to the door, which he then forced open, and he entered the house. Fāṭima rose up before him and lamented, crying out, ‘O my father, O Messenger of God!’ ‘Umar brandished his sword in its scabbard and struck her violently on her sides. Fāṭima cried out again invoking her father. ‘Umar struck her on the arm with his whip. She sobbed in pain, ‘Messenger of God! See how Abū Bakr and ‘Umar are mistreating your children!’ At this moment ‘Alī sprang up, grabbed ‘Umar by the collar, flung him to the ground, and began hitting him violently in the face and neck, actually seeking to kill him. But then he recalled the last words which the Prophet had uttered secretly to him and said, ‘By Him who ennobled Muḥammad by prophecy, O son of Šahhāk [the mother of ‘Umar], were it not for the destiny which God has foreseen [for this community] and were it not for the oath which the Messenger made me swear, I would not have left you alive and you know it all too well!’ ‘Umar asked for assistance. His men entered. ‘Alī rushed for his sword . Qunfudh and his men attacked him and threw him to the ground; they immobilized him, bound him, and drew a cord around his throat. Fāṭima barred the door [to keep them from leading her husband away]. The cursed Qunfudh struck her a violent blow of his whip such that she bore the mark of it until her dying day [which occurred not long after]. May God damn Qunfudh and him who prescribed his behavior . Indeed, ‘Umar had ordered him to strike Fāṭima if she intervened to defend ‘Alī. This is why Qunfudh [after striking her] violently forced Fāṭima through the door of her house so that she suffered a broken rib and lost the child she was carrying in her womb. From that day on, she could not leave her bed and died a martyr . Salmān said, “When Abū Bakr and his entourage were made aware of these happenings, they all began to sob [with remorse], except for [three persons] Khālid b. al-Walīd, al-Mughīra b. Shuʿba, and ‘Umar who said, ‘Women should not meddle in our affairs.’ Abū Bakr ordered that ‘Alī, shackled and brought there by force, be freed. The latter then said to him, ‘How quickly you have usurped the place of the Messenger! By what right and in the name of what dignity do you summon people to follow you? Did you not once give an oath of allegiance to me, as God and His Messenger commanded?’ ‘Umar broke in, ‘Obey the caliph and stop your nonsense.’ ‘Alī: ‘And if I do not, what will you do?’ ‘Umar: ‘We will put you to death like a wretch [the rest of the chapter relates how ‘Alī, fearing for the life of his two sons, the Prophet’s only male descendants, decides resignedly to give his oath in favor of the caliphate of Abū Bakr].’”
CHAPTER 10 (EXCERPTS)

This chapter deals with numerous subjects. Our interest lies in the parts devoted to the problems connected with the authenticity and the transmission of the Hadith, as well as the relationship between these questions, the political events and the acts of violence committed against the members of the Prophet’s household (ahl al-bayt), and the Alids, their supporters.

[p. 620] Sulaym says, “I asked ‘Ali: ‘... people transmit many sayings concerning the interpretation of the Qur’an and the Hadith which are contrary [p. 621] to what I have heard from you. You claim that these sayings are false. Do people knowingly attribute falsehoods to the Messenger and interpret the Qur’an in accord with their [subjective] opinions?’ ‘Ali then turned to me and said, “Sulaym! Pay attention to the reply. What people have in their hands contains the real and the illusory, the true and the false, what abrogates and what is abrogated, the particular and the general, the clear and the ambiguous, what has been kept in a just fashion, and in an unjust. Even during his lifetime, people ascribed false sayings to the Messenger, such that he declared, ‘People! The false statements ascribed to me and those making up hadiths in my name have multiplied. May he who knowingly attributes false statements to me burn in hellfire.’ And these people kept on doing this even more after the death of the Messenger.

Know that no more than four types of person transmit Hadith: first, the hypocrite who pretends to be a believer and to practice Islam but at the same time has no scruple whatsoever [p. 622] in knowingly ascribing false statements to the Messenger. Even if those who hear these know that he is a liar and a hypocrite, even if they do not approve of him, they say to themselves, ‘Even so, it is a matter of a Companion of the Messenger, someone who has seen him and heard him in person. Hence, in any case he can’t lie and ascribe false statements to his master...’ Nevertheless, after Muḥammad’s death these persons tried to cozy up to the fomenters of confusion and to those who lead the way to hell [i.e., Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and their accomplices who seized power after the Prophet] and this because of their mendacity, their lies, and their double-dealing [i.e., by fabricating hadiths to justify the acts of the leaders]. And so these leaders gave them many responsibilities, forced them upon people, and, in return, obtained more and more power thanks to them...”
Second, the individual who has heard something from the Messenger but has not retained it as he should adds something to it of his own, and unintentionally so. Thus he keeps a hadith, he transmits it, and he puts it into practice, all the while declaring that he had it from Muḥammad. If Muslims, or he himself, realize that there are invented elements in what he is reporting, they reject it.

[p. 623] Third, the individual who has heard an order from the Messenger, but does not know that the latter revisited his decision at a later date [this involves the concepts of what abrogates and what is abrogated] or, indeed, conversely, he has heard a prohibition announced by the Messenger that has been annulled by him later. This individual retains what has been abrogated since he does not know the abrogating factor. If he or Muslims know that he is reporting an abrogated hadith, they steer clear of this hadith.

Lastly, the individual who does not ascribe false statements either to God or to His Messenger, since he detests falsehood, fears God, and reveres the Messenger. He learns what he has heard perfectly by heart and is not vulnerable to tricks of memory. Thus, he transmits the hadith as he ought to, retaining what abrogates and rejecting what has been abrogated.

Sulaym! The orders and prohibitions of the Prophet [i.e. the Hadith] are just like the Qur’an: they contain what abrogates and what has been abrogated, the general and the particular, the clear and the ambiguous. The Messenger’s statements had two aspects: one for the elite and another for the common folk, just like the Qur’an. Not all the people who heard the Word of God and the statements of the Messenger understood them, even when they asked for them to be explained . . .

[p. 630] Abān [a disciple and the transmitter of the Book of Sulaym] says, “I heard the Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir say: ‘. . . [p. 632] Since the Messenger of God died, we the people belonging to the Prophet’s Family have not ceased being humiliated, exiled, stripped of our rights, massacred. We fear for our own lives and for the lives of those who love us. By contrast, the liars because of their concoctions have found important positions next to their chiefs, their judges, their governors. They relate lying stories to our enemies about their past leaders [notably, the first three caliphs] and they ascribe to us positions that we have never held in order to destroy our good reputation and at the same time to sidle up to the men in power by means of duplicity and falsehood. [p. 633] This situation
reached its apogee in Mu`tawiya’s day and after the death of [the Imam] al-Ḥasan [‘Ali’s eldest son] when Shi`ites were massacred everywhere. They had their arms and legs hacked off or they were crucified on the mere suspicion of showing us affection and being attached to our cause. The tribulations continued even more violently in the time of Ibn Ziyād [the Umayyad governor of Iraq] and the murder of [Imam] al-Ḥusayn [‘Ali’s younger son]. Then came al-Ḥajjāj [another governor of Iraq], who killed Shi`ites on a massive scale under any pretext whatever. He favored those accused of Manichaeism and of Mazdaism over those who were denounced as being al-Ḥusayn’s Shi`ites.77

Hence [in this context] you can encounter an individual enjoying fine repute—and he can in fact be pious and sincere—who relates astonishing accounts of the virtues of past leaders, none of which has ever really existed. And this individual passes on this sort of report, basing himself solely on the fact that they have been recounted by many persons who are not suspected of either falsehood or impiety. These very persons relate monstrous things about ʿAlī, al-Ḥasan, and al-Ḥusayn, but God knows that all of that is falsehood and mendacity.”78

CHAPTER 11 (EXCERPTS)

This long chapter, like the preceding one, deals with many varied subjects. The translated excerpts concern ʿAlī’s recension of the Qur’ān, presented as absolutely complete, while that elaborated by the first caliphs is presented as containing numerous lacunae with regard to the original revelations as well as to the relationship of those problematic aspects with political events. The scene is set at the very outset of ʿAlī’s caliphate (see the historical references at the beginning of this volume).

[p. 656] “Ṭalḥa [a Companion of the Prophet and a future opponent of ʿAlī in the Battle of the Camel] asked ʿAlī: ‘I want to question you on a precise point. Once I saw you come out of your house carrying a sealed cloth. At that time you said, “People! It is I who have been engaged in washing, shrouding, and burying the body of the Messenger of God. I then was engaged in gathering together the Book of God and here it is, done without a single word omitted” [see chapter 4]. Now I have not seen this Qur’ān that you copied and collected with your own hands. I was a witness that ʿUmar, when he became caliph, sent a messenger to you and asked you to
deliver this Qur’an to him, but you did not wish to do so. ʿUmar then asked everyone [to collect the Qur’an]. He accepted all the verses for which there were two recorders and he rejected those which had been reported by a single witness alone. He said—and I myself was present—“After the battle of Yamāma certain men were killed and they were the only ones who knew certain parts of the Qur’an. With their death these parts have been forever destroyed.” On another occasion when ʿUmar’s scribes were putting the Qur’an in written form, a sheep came up and swallowed one page. The part which was there was lost forever; on that day ʿUthmān [the third caliph] made a copy of the Qur’an [p. 657] I heard ʿUmar as well as his companions who put the Qur’an in written form at the time of ʿUthmān say: “The Sura al-Āhzāb [the thirty-third sura of the Qur’an] had the same number of verses as Sura al-Baqara [the second sura], that the Sura al-Nūr [the twenty-fourth] comprised 160 verses, and the Sura al-Ḥujurāt [the fortieth] 90 verses.”79 So then, what prevents you from showing them your own recension [which you claim is complete]?80

Ṭalḥa went on: ‘I myself am a witness that ʿUthmān recovered the texts that ʿUmar had prepared, and he asked the copyists to reunite these texts [in a single volume]. He compelled people to read only this one version by tearing up and burning the versions of Ubayy b. Kaʿb and Ibn Masʿūd.81 What do you say to all that?’

ʿAlī replied: ‘O Ṭalḥa! In fact, each of the verses revealed by God to Muhammad is in my recension, dictated by the Messenger of God and copied by myself along with its interpretation . . . as well as all that this community requires until the Day of Resurrection . . .

[p. 658] What’s more, when he was suffering from the malady that carried him off, the Messenger secretly taught me the keys to a thousand chapters of knowledge, each of which permits access to thousands of others.82 If this community had followed and obeyed me when God called His Prophet to Him, I would have showered earthly and heavenly benefits upon it until the Day of Resurrection. Were you not present, Ṭalḥa, when the Messenger was on his deathbed and asked for a page on which to write his last will so that his community might not fall into confusion and dissension? At that time your comrade [ʿUmar] stopped him from doing it by saying, “[Let it go]. The Prophet of God is delirious!” This angered the Messenger and he let it go.83

Ṭalḥa: ‘Certainly, I witnessed that.’
VIOLENCE AND SCRIPTURE IN THE BOOK OF SULAYM IBN QAYS

‘Ali: ‘After you left, the Messenger of God said to me what he wished to write and his intention of taking all the people as his witness, but the angel Gabriel had proclaimed to him [after ‘Umar’s intervention] that God had decided that the destiny of this community would be marked by dissension and division . . .’

[p. 659] Ṭalḥa: ‘So be it, ‘Ali! But you have not answered my question: why do you not show your copy of the Qur’an?’

‘Ali: ‘O Ṭalḥa, my not answering this question is by my choice.’

Ṭalḥa: ‘Then tell me what you think about the version elaborated by ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān? Is it the Qur’an or does it contain things other than the Qur’an?’

‘Ali: ‘This version contains only the Qur’an. If you truly put it into practice, you are saved from the fires of hell and you will go the garden of paradise, for [even] this [incomplete] version contains the proof of our legitimacy [we, the Prophet’s Family], the disclosure of our right, and the necessity of obedience with respect to us.’

Ṭalḥa: ‘Then if it contains nothing but the Qur’an, that is enough for me! But, ‘Ali, to whom are you going to impart, after you are gone, your version of the Qur’an that contains [in accord with what you say] the entirety of the knowledge of hermeneutics as well as of that which is licit and that which is not licit?’

‘Ali: ‘To those to whom the Messenger has commanded me to transmit. First of all, my heir and the one who is truly responsible for the people [i.e., their legitimate leader], my son al-Ḥasan, who in turn will transmit it to my other son al-Ḥusayn. Then this Qur’an will be transmitted [p. 660] through the line of al-Ḥusayn, to his descendants one after the other . . . They are with the Qur’an and the Qur’an is with them . . .’

Let us leave off further citations at this point. What provisional conclusions can be drawn? The Book of Sulaym b. Qays is without a doubt one of the oldest documents that has come down to us in which historical problems as significant as the following are posed explicitly: the power struggles and the violence marking the succession to Muḥammad, the turbulent history and the problematical elaboration of the Qur’anic text and the body of hadiths, the connivance between the circles of power and the religious scholars, the articulation of the civil conflicts, and the constitution of the scriptural sources. These questions have been studied in a more or less detailed fashion from Wellhausen and Goldziher to Kister and Rubin along
with Beck, Juynboll, Gilliot, Donner, and others (see the bibliography), scholars who have almost exclusively based their work on Sunni sources while finding themselves constrained to launch many complex methodologies because the trustworthiness of these sources is problematic. Now the critical examination of the Shi’ite sources, offering the viewpoint of the “defeated by history,” provides insights, as useful as they are unpublished, on the complex of problems that concerns us, and they may help to refine what knowledge we possess of them. It is manifestly clear that the Shi’ites and their sources, just like the writings of their opponents, have not been sheltered from the hazards of a conflicted history: ideological inventions, tendentious fabrications of accounts, twisting of facts—points, among others, all to be considered in the course of our work. Nevertheless, two important facts appear to prompt us to take the Shi’ite sources more seriously, avoiding the ostracism that has been generally reserved for them until now: first, the at times striking convergences among the historical data that they contain, especially the oldest sources, and the results to which modern critical studies have led by other means. Then too, the fact that one finds echoes, often precise echoes, of the information in Shi’ite sources, notwithstanding that they are “non-orthodox,” in Sunni literature, and this despite the disapproval overshadowing this literature throughout the Umayyad and Abbasid periods.

To conclude this chapter, it seems to me useful to provide a summary of the Book of Sulaym as a way of offering the reader a more comprehensive idea of its contents.

Table of Contents of the Book of Sulaym B. Qays

This table of contents is merely indicative. In fact, the work contains many more subjects, and sometimes quite profusely so. The table is arranged in conformity with the aforementioned edition of M. B. al-Anṣārī.

Introduction concerning the transmission of the work.

Tradition 1: the last words of the Prophet before his death/Fāṭima’s suffering/the divine election of Muḥammad’s descendants/the twelve imams/the virtues of ‘Alī and the people in the prophetic abode/the Prophet’s predictions about the injustice done to ‘Alī.
Tradition 2: the particular garden of ‘Alī in paradise/‘Alī’s solitude after the Prophet’s death/‘Alī’s plan and the divine testing suffered by the community.

Tradition 3: the events of Saqīfa as reported by the companion al-Barā’ b. ‘Āzib: the washing of the Prophet’s body/the conspiracy of the allies of Saqīfa/the Banū Hāshim and the happenings of Saqīfa/the nighttime conspiracy to tempt al-‘Abbās and his reaction/the poems of al-‘Abbās about the usurpation of the caliphate by ‘Alī’s enemies.

Tradition 4: the events of Saqīfa as reported by Salmān the Persian: Abū Bakr’s oath/the ruses of the Qurayshites/Satan’s role/‘Alī’s ultimatum/‘Alī seeks in vain the support of the Muhājirūn and the Anṣār/the compilation of the Qur’an and ‘Alī’s summons to respect the sacred Book/the martyrdom of Fāṭima: ‘Umar sets fire to the house of Fāṭima, who is pregnant, and wounds her seriously/‘Alī’s intervention/the order to attack Fāṭima/‘Alī’s forced oath/the death of Fāṭima from her wounds as well as of the child she was carrying/the dialogue of ‘Alī and Abū Bakr/Abū Bakr fabricates statements that he ascribes to the Prophet/the cursed Leaf containing the declarations of the conspirators/the intervention of al-Miqdād b. Aswad, Salmān, and Abū Dharr/the interventions of Umm Ayman and Burayda al-Aslāmī/oaths of allegiance to Abū Bakr extracted under threat of death/the similarity of the Muslims and the Israelites.

Tradition 5: a dialogue between Satan and ‘Umar.


Tradition 7: the splitting of the community into seventy-three sects/the sect of salvation and its imams/the differences between faith (īmān) and submission (islām)/‘Alī’s prayer over Sulaym.

Tradition 8: the definition of faith/the pillars of the faith.

Tradition 9: the definition of submission.

Tradition 10: the reason for the disparities between the accounts of ‘Alī’s supporters and those of their adversaries/categories of transmitters of traditions/all knowledge is found with the Prophet, ‘Alī, and their descendants/confirmation of the truthfulness of Sulaym’s accounts by the imams/the treachery of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, and most of the community/the battles of Jamal (the Camel), Šīffīn, and Nahrawān/the repression and massacre of the Alids/fabrication, falsification, and censorship of Hadith.
Tradition 11: ‘Ali’s ultimatum and his arguments during ‘Uthmān’s reign: account of the creation of Muḥammad and of ‘Ali/the lights of the People of the Prophet’s family/the virtues of ‘Ali/innumerable allusions in the Qur’an to ‘Alī/the account of Ghadīr Khumm/prophetic traditions in praise of ‘Ali/Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, usurpers, and forgers of traditions along with a refutation of them/the obligatory nature of the walāya\(^8\) of the imams/compilation of the Qur’an/‘Alī’s codex/the codex of ʿUthmān/twelve guides in perplexity.

Tradition 12: one of ‘Ali’s last sermons on the happenings at Saqīfa and their implications.

Tradition 13: the public treasury under ʿUmar’s caliphate/injustices and unmerited privileges.

Tradition 14: the reprehensible innovations of the two first caliphs/the violent ransacking of Fadak, Fāṭima’s inheritance/the plan to assassinate ‘Ali/offenses and disrespect of the two first caliphs toward the Prophet.

Tradition 15: the sermon of ʿAlī before the Battle of Ṣiffin on the first three caliphs.

Tradition 16: the predictions of Jesus with regard to the Prophet and the imams and their usurping adversaries.

Tradition 17: ‘Alī’s sermon on the community’s trials and his predictions on the coming to power of the Umayyads and their tyranny.

Tradition 18: ‘Alī’s sermon on the illusory nature of life, the thirst for power, and the force of the passions/‘Alī’s sermon on the blameworthy innovations of the first three caliphs.

Tradition 19: Abū Dharr and other loyal followers of ‘Alī/how the community was deceived by the ruses of the first two caliphs.

Tradition 20: true faithful and true traitors/Abū Dharr, Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yaman, and ‘Ammār b. Yāsir.

Tradition 21: several accounts of the Prophet’s love for his grandsons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn.

Tradition 22: the sermon of ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ against ‘Alī and his response/the Prophet had cursed Muʾāwiyah and ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ/the old hostility of Muʾāwiyah toward ‘Alī/Muʾāwiyah’s exploitation of the assassination of ʿUthmān against ‘Alī.

Tradition 23: Muʾāwiyah’s secret letter to his governor Ziyād Ibn Abīhī on ʿUmar’s policy against ‘Alī and his followers among the Iranian mawāli (manumitted slaves).
Tradition 24: Ā’isha’s disdain of ʿAlī and the Prophet’s reaction to her.
Tradition 25: letters exchanged by ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya before and during the Battle of Ṣiffin.

Tradition 26: the arguments of Qays b. Sa’d b. ʿUbāda against Muʿāwiya’s attitude toward ʿAlī/statements by Ibn ʿAbbās against Muʿāwiya regarding the assassinations of ʿUmar and ʿUthmān and the interpretation of the Qurʾan/violent suppression of the Alids by Muʿāwiya and his campaign to rehabilitate the first three caliphs/sermons of Imam al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī against Muʿāwiya and his policies along with a eulogy of ʿAlī.

Tradition 27: Ibn ʿAbbās’s account of the Prophet’s death and ʿUmar’s scheme preventing Muḥammad from putting his will into writing.

Tradition 28: on the Battle of the Camel.

Tradition 29: ʿAlī speaks to Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr/a refutation of the tradition about the “ten persons promised salvation” (al-ʿasharat al-mubashshara).

Tradition 30: the thousand chapters of ʿAlī’s initiatory knowledge.

Tradition 31: ʿAlī is in possession of a complete knowledge of the Qurʾan and its interpretation.

Tradition 32: ʿAlī’s dialogue with the Jewish scholar on the division of the community into seventy-three sects.

Tradition 33: Ibn ʿAbbās bears witness that ʿAlī possessed the revealed book containing the names of all the blessed who are saved and the wretches among the Muslims who have strayed.

Tradition 34: account of the last day of the Battle of Ṣiffin (yawm al-harīr)/exchange of letters between Muʿāwiya and ʿAlī.

Tradition 35: other moments during the Battle of Ṣiffin/the courage of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya.

Tradition 36: accounts about the close friendship between the Prophet and ʿAlī and their love for each other.

Tradition 37: the conspirators at the moment of their death: the cases of Muʿādh b. Jabal, Abū ʿUbayda b. al-Jarrāḥ, Abū Bakr, and ʿUmar/ʿAlī’s relations with the Prophet after the latter’s death/the imams’ relations with the angels.

Tradition 38: division of the community into “people of truth” and “people of falsity”/traditions about walāya.

Tradition 39: on Ghadīr Khumm/poems by Ḥassān b. Thābit on Ghadīr/the anger of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar.
Tradition 40: the ten virtues reserved exclusively for ‘Ali/love for the people of the Prophet’s family.

Tradition 41: the last words of the Prophet regarding ‘Ali’s faithful followers/‘A’isha and Ḥafṣa, wives of the Prophet, struck by deafness/two Qur’anic verses about ‘Ali’s followers and his enemies.

Tradition 42: dialogues between ‘Abd Allāh b. Ja’far and Mu‘awiya: the Umayyads are the “cursed Tree” mentioned in the Qur’an/the Prophet’s predictions on his own murder by poisoning and the violent deaths of the imams/the Forty Sinless, beings of light/unity and dispersal of the community/sacred knowledge and the compilation of the Qur’an.

Tradition 43: a dialogue between Hammām b. Shurayḥ and ‘Ali on the subject of faith and the faithful (i.e. Shi‘ism and the Shi‘ites).

Tradition 44: the Prophet’s knowledge of the Invisible/the creation of Muhammad and ‘Ali/‘Ali is the intermediary between the Creator and creatures.

Tradition 45: the lack of respect of a member of Quraysh toward the people of the Prophet’s family and the Prophet’s reaction/the creation of the people of the Prophet’s family/the virtues of ‘Ali and the election of the imams.


Tradition 47: Salmān’s eulogy of ‘Ali.

Tradition 48: the events of Saqīfa and their implications as reported by Ibn ‘Abbās/acts of injustice and violence toward Fāṭima and ‘Ali/the burning of their house and the attack on Fāṭima by ‘Umar and Khālid b. al-Walīd/‘Ali’s resistance and arrest/death threats and humiliation/the defenders of ‘Ali and his cause/the ransacking of Fadak oasis/martyrdom and secret burial of Fāṭima/the plot to assassinate ‘Ali by Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and Khālid/their fear of violent reaction by his faithful followers.

Supplement to the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays.

Tradition 49: other accounts of the conspiracy stirred up by ‘Umar/‘Umar prevents the Prophet from writing his will on his deathbed/the Prophet does so after ‘Umar leaves, explicitly designating ‘Ali and his descendants as his sole legitimate successors.


Tradition 51: the privileged position of the people of the Prophet’s family.
Tradition 52: Salmān, Abū Dharr, and al-Miqdād summon people to support ‘Alī during ‘Umar’s caliphate/the first two caliphs usurp even ‘Alī’s surnames.

Tradition 53: ‘Alī’s reasons for leading the battles of the Camel and Ṣīfīn.

Tradition 54: ‘Alī’s words of counsel and wisdom/Qur’anic allusions to the people of the Prophet’s family.


Tradition 56: a report on the battles of the Camel, Ṣīfīn, and Nahrawān.

Tradition 57: the regrets of three Companions for not having helped ‘Alī in his struggles.


Tradition 59: ‘Alī’s prayer at the battles of the Camel, Ṣīfīn, and Nahrawān.

Tradition 60: praise of ‘Alī by the Qur’an and the Prophet and the despicable attitude of the first two caliphs toward him.

Tradition 61: the Prophet’s final recommendations before his death: gathering of the Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib/presentation of the possessors of walāya/absence of the Prophet’s wives/the twelve imams of guidance and the twelve imams of disarray/predictions of the future sufferings of the people of the Prophet’s family under the Umayyads and the Abbasids.

Tradition 62: dialogue of Salmān and the Prophet regarding the people of the Prophet’s family and the revelation of the verses concerning them/the Prophet’s predictions about the Mahdī.

Tradition 63: the exclusive privilege of ‘Alī.

Tradition 64: the infinite chapters of the initiatory knowledge of ‘Alī.

Tradition 65: discussion of ‘Alī with a Jewish scholar and a learned Christian.

Tradition 66: the account of Ibn ‘Abbās on ‘Alī’s possession of the book containing all the events in the world until the Day of Resurrection/reactions of the first two caliphs.

Tradition 67: a sermon of ‘Alī at Baṣra after the Battle of the Camel: explanation of the facts from the time of the plot of Saqīfa/betrayal of the Prophet’s mission by the first three caliphs and then by ‘Ā’isha, Ṭalḥa, and al-Zubayr/prediction of his own murder/eulogy on the nobility and courage of Muḥammad, the son of Abū Bakr.
Tradition 68: the last words of the Companion Ibrāhīm b. Yazīd al-Nakhaʿī in favor of ʿAlī and his descendants.
Tradition 69: the last hours of ʿAlī’s life and his will.
Tradition 70: sayings and counsels of ʿAlī.
Supplements to the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays.
Tradition 71: knowledge of the imam and ignorance of him.
Tradition 72: ʿAlī speaks to the sun and the daystar carries out his order.
Tradition 73: on the love of ʿAlī.
Tradition 74: Qur’anic allusion to ʿAlī.
Tradition 75: Abū Dharr, defender of the cause of the people of the Prophet’s family.
Tradition 76: sermon of Imam al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī following his truce with Muʿāwiyah and the defense of the cause of the people of the Prophet’s family.
Tradition 77: the Prophet praises al-Ḥusayn, while still a child, the father of the line of the imams descended from ʿAlī.
Tradition 78: the four persons loved by God and the Prophet/the knowledge of ʿAlī and of the imams of his lineage.
Tradition 79: the People of the Truth (i.e., the Shiʿites) and unjust power.
Traditions 80–85: Qur’anic allusions to the imams.
Tradition 86: the definition and the pillars of faithlessness and hypocrisy.
Tradition 87: ʿAlī presents the two forms of knowledge.
Tradition 88: ʿAlī presents two Qur’anic passages as prayers to alleviate the pains of childbirth.
Traditions 89–90: moral counsels of ʿAlī.
Tradition 91: prophetic predictions regarding the Mahdī.
Tradition 92: the Prophet lists the sacrosanct virtues of ʿAlī.
Tradition 93: the virtues of ʿAlī, his uncle Ḥamza, and his brother Jaʿfar.
Tradition 94: on Uways al-Qaranī.
Tradition 95: eulogy of ʿAlī.
Tradition 96: on the sunna and blameworthy innovation.
Tradition 97: on Salmān, “member” of the family of the Prophet.
Tradition 98: a few of ʿAlī’s sayings.87

As may easily be seen, the subjects are not only subversive on the political level but will very quickly be perceived as supremely heretical after the
establishment of a Sunni orthodoxy and the canonization of the personalities of nascent Islam, and especially the first three caliphs and renowned Companions. This Shi’ite perception of the history of Islam’s beginnings, radically opposed to the Sunni official version in its different forms, constitutes a source of genuine anxiety for Shi’ites, often victims of ferocious repressions on the part of first the Umayyads and then the Abbasids. The Book of Sulaym surely must have circulated under cover; its contents seem to underlie the transformation of certain Shi’ite tendencies within secret societies as well as certain doctrines within esoteric teachings of an initiatory sort. This kind of esotericism, linked with a denunciation of the treachery of almost all the important personages around the Prophet and the criminal character of official Islam under the first three caliphs and then under the Umayyads, is without doubt older than the esotericism connected with a number of principally imamological doctrines, which will steadily come to light and that we shall consider further on. Specifically Shi’ite teaching at this stage, doubtless kept secret quite quickly, would thus have consisted in denunciation of the real personality and the role of a certain number of particular historical personages, most of whom would be haloed in sanctity by the Alids’ opponents, who formed a majority very early on and were backed up by power. The fundamental importance accorded in the very economy of religion to individuals in a positive or a negative fashion underlies a Shi’ite hermeneutical doctrine applied from an early date to the Qur’an and according to which many Qur’anic verses were in fact revealed with regard to such and such a person. Hence the positive and the negative elements of the sacred text are in fact metaphors designating the holy figures of Shi’ism and their adversaries, respectively, and the hermeneutical instruction of the imams has as one of its functions, among others, to unveil these metaphors by identifying the persons intended by the divine Word.88 Several traditions justify this hermeneutical notion: “The Qur’an was revealed in four parts: one fourth concerns us (i.e., us, the People of the Prophet’s Family), one fourth deals with our Adversary, a third fourth deals with the subject of the licit and the illicit and the final fourth treats of duties and precepts. The noblest parts of the Qur’an belong to us.”89 “No one equals ‘Alī in the Book of God with respect to what has been revealed regarding him.”90 “Seventy verses have been revealed on the subject of ‘Alī with which no one else can be associated.”91 Numerous traditions from the Book of Sulaym illustrate this conception. I shall return to this at some length in the following chapters.
Presenting himself as the successor to Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus, the prophet Mâni adduced two main reasons for the decadence and corruption of past religions in his Shâbûragân, the only writing attributed to him in an Iranian language. The first is that each messenger preached only in his native country and in his own language. The second reason is that these messengers did not commit their teaching to writing in a book *ne varietur*, which meant that this teaching preserved its integrity while the prophets still lived; after their deaths, however, their communities, scattered into sects, falsified the sacred Scriptures and brought the religion into decline.¹

Value judgments aside, the ancient sage thus shares with modern researchers several fundamental ideas regarding Scriptures: namely, that they are bound to evolve as a result of ethnic, geographical, and linguistic factors as well as of historical events, the contingencies of reception, of being committed to written form and their transmission. In short, the very fact that they do have a history. Alterations to the prophetic message, its “falsification,” in Mâni’s terms, are an integral part of this history. And this too forms the theme of the fundamental text of al-Sayyârî that will be scrutinized in this chapter.² Of course, my intention here is not to trace, however briefly, the history of the redaction of the Qur’an but rather, to examine several determining factors in the varying representations that
certain Muslim scholars, belonging to all sorts of political and religious
tendencies, had of the Qur’anic revelation during the earliest centuries of
the Hijra, and to do so through the complex of problems concerning falsifi-
cation. It will thus be an attempt to set al-Sayyārī’s compilation within the
perspective of a wider religious framework of the earliest period of Islam
that was the scene of many violent conflicts as well as of numerous dis-
cussions and polemics over the Qur’anic text—controversies illustrative of
a plethora of viewpoints which later “orthodoxy,” for obvious ideological
reasons, sought to obscure. To that end, the presentation is divided into
five sections: first, the questionings prompted by historical and critical
research into the history of the Qur’an; then the vacillations and contradic-
tions within the Islamic tradition itself and the disparities recorded by the
primary sources on this very subject. Third, the attitude of Imami Shi’ites
on the question of the Qur’an’s falsification will be examined. Finally, the
two last parts will be devoted to al-Sayyārī and his work.3

Questions Raised by Western Studies

The question of the falsification of the holy Scriptures of the past is known
from the Qur’an itself (e.g., 2:59, 2:75, 2:159, 2:174, 4:46, 6:91, along with
other verses often commented upon in this sense). This will have come
directly or indirectly as a legacy of the Manichaeans, but perhaps also
from pagan authors (Celsius, Porphyry, the emperor Julian), from Chris-
tians (Tatian, Marcion) or even from the Samaritans and Ebionites who
employed it to discredit their adversaries and their scriptures.4

Scrutiny of the complex of problems regarding the falsification of the
revelation given to the Prophet Muḥammad is, to be sure, inseparable
from the history and dating of the commitment of the Qur’an to written
form. Clearly, the closer the definitive elaboration is to the period of the
revelation, the less the risk of alteration. This is the principal reason why
the most widely diffused “orthodox” tradition will assert that the deci-
sion to compile the Qur’an occurred right after the death of the Prophet
in 11/632, in Abū Bakr’s time, and that the official version, utterly faithful
to the revelations Muḥammad received, emerged during the caliphate of
ʿUthmān, barely thirty years after the death of the messenger of Allāh. We
shall return to this. It is fundamental, therefore, to ask when and under
what conditions the Qur’an as it is known, and conventionally called the
vulgate of ‘Uthmān, was compiled. To what extent was it faithful to the
“celestial messages” that the Prophet received? How did the first Muslims
perceive these problems?

In this respect the manuscript tradition of the Qur’an is of no help to us,
at least for the time being. No autograph manuscript exists from the hand
of Muhammad (it is now well known that he was not illiterate) and/or his
scribes. The oldest complete versions of the Qur’an date from the third/
ninth century. The oldest manuscripts from the pre-Abbasid period are
extremely rare and their fragmentary nature makes dating them difficult
and open to disputes among specialists. The few excerpts of the Qur’an dis-
covered on papyrus and parchment have been dated by some experts to
the end of the first and the beginning of the second century of the Hijra,
but these hypotheses have been rejected by others. For more than a cen-
tury no theory has yet managed to elicit unanimity among scholars.5

We are thus compelled to turn our attention to other sources of infor-
mation, starting with studies in the historical philology of the Qur’anic
text, if we wish to find some elements of an answer. In the most general way
these may be found in the critical study of the history of writing in Islam.
Already in the nineteenth century, in his renowned Life of Mahomet, Alois
Sprenger chose a late date for the production of books as such. He made
a sharp distinction in fact between “blocs-notes” or “aides-mémoires”
which appeared quite early, and books, which he dates from the second–
third/eighth–ninth centuries.6 This thesis was taken up and brought to
completion by Ignaz Goldziher in his magisterial study on the formation
and development of the Hadith;7 despite criticism by certain scholars, and
often for good reason, this thesis would remain dominant for most schol-
ars up until the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century.

Nevertheless, from the 1960s on, a decisive turning point occurred,
and this thesis came to be radically contested. An initial reason was the
publication of two monumental studies in support of the great antiquity
of systematic writing among scholars in the Islamic world: first, Studies in
Arabic Literary Papyri by Nabia Abbott and then the Geschichte des arabischen
Schrifttums of Fuat Sezgin. Both maintained that a systematic commitment
to written form, in poetry as it happens, existed among the Arabs from
the pre-Islamic period and that a written corpus began to develop in a
consistent fashion with the coming of Islam and particularly, during the
Umayyad period, i.e., *grosso modo* between 40/660 and 132/750. The thesis of the antiquity of the book has been discussed expertly and at great length, especially by German scholars. In the 1990s Gregor Schoeler, a specialist in the transmission of texts in Islam, revisited and analyzed the earlier studies and refined the way in which the problem is examined to a considerable extent. By introducing a pair taken from Greek, *syngrammata-hypomnema*, Schoeler was able to establish, among other things, an apt distinction between the act of “writing,” which does not always imply a written publication, and the act of “publishing,” in the sense of “making public,” which for a long time occurred solely in oral fashion.⁸

The second reason for promoting the theory of “the late book” was the discovery and editing over several decades of a growing number of very old sources, some of which are monumental and date mainly from the second half of the twelfth/eighth century: *al-Ridda wa'l-futūh*, attributed to Sayf b. ‘Umar, *al-Muṣannaf fī-l-aḥādīth wa'l-āthār* of Ibn Abī Shayba, *Taʾrīkh al-Madīna* of Ibn Shabba, or even *al-Muṣannaf* of ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ṣanʿānī. The fact that systematic works of this order of magnitude do exist appears to indicate that the tradition of the book had already been established for a certain time and went back to at least the beginning of the second, if not to the end of the first, century of the Hijra.

Similar problems in defining periods are met equally by specialists in the text and the redaction history of the Qurʾan. In confronting the problems and contradictions encountered in Islamic writings, and particularly the interval that separates the traditionally assigned date for the definitive commitment of the Qurʾan to written form (during the caliphate of ‘Uthmān: 23–35/644–656) and the earliest sources providing this information, two methodological viewpoints may be distinguished within Western research: the hypercritical and the critical, to use Schoeler’s terminology.⁹ Without claiming to be exhaustive, let us review some important instances and names embodying these two viewpoints.

The hypercritical method is held by scholars who completely, or almost completely, reject the Muslim textual tradition. To that end they invoke the protracted span of time of the transmission of written data, the abundant divergences and contradictions of the authors, the lack of an independent form of control of the transmission, the undeniable presence of historical errors and improbable accounts, the plethora of legends, etc. In this context, a decisive step was taken with the analyses of the Arabic and
Syriac specialist Alphonse Mingana beginning with his study of the transmission of the Qur’an. In taking up and extensively developing the theses of Paul Casanova on the central role of the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (reg. 65–86/685–705) and his governor al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf in the establishment of the final recension of the Qur’an, Mingana first stresses the scarcely believable nature of the Islamic sources dealing with the history of the Qur’anic redaction, because of the gap of almost two centuries that, in his view, separates the age of the Prophet from the oldest sources containing the reports of the commitment of the Qur’anic text to writing—specifically the Ṭabaqāt of Ibn Sa’d (d. 229/844) and the Ṣaḥīḥ of al-Bukhārī (d. 256/870) (it is true that, as we have seen, other, much earlier sources have been edited since Mingana’s day; we will come back to this). He then painstakingly draws on a certain number of Syriac sources coming from Eastern Christian circles during the two first centuries of Islam to conclude that an official version of the Qur’an could not have existed before the end of the seventh century of the common era and that that version, called the Codex of ‘Uthmān, must have appeared during the time of ‘Abd al-Malik.

The hypercritical approach counted other distinguished scholars among its ranks, culminating in the two resounding works of John Wansbrough: *Quranic Studies* and *The Sectarian Milieu*. Like his predecessors, this author drastically disputes the historical character of the reports dealing with the Qur’anic recension as transmitted by Muslim tradition. He assumes that the Qur’an, created out of an array of texts issuing from traditions that were originally independent of each other, could only have taken its definitive form at the end of the second/eighth century, if not at the beginning of the third/ninth century. For a number of reasons, to be considered in due course, the very late dating of Wansbrough was decisively rejected later, and not only by those inimical to the hypercritical method but also by his own successors on the methodological level, such as Patricia Crone and Michael Cook, who, relying mainly on the inscriptions of the Dome of the Rock as well as on non-Islamic writings, appear to come to the same conclusions as Mingana on the dating of the final official version of the Qur’an, namely, to the time of the caliph ‘Abd al-Malik.

Regarding the other approach, scholars using the critical method deem that a scientific examination makes it possible in an apposite way to distinguish within the heart of the Islamic textual tradition between reports and data that are more or less credible, on the one hand, and those, on the
other hand, that cannot be accepted. Here, clearly, the core problem is to find adequate criteria of assessment to establish this distinction. Exact recognition of the political and religious tendencies of the authors or the currents within which this or that text has taken shape, for example, might provide a basic criterion for evaluation. This method has been adopted by most of the great nineteenth-century scholars as well as by their successors in the twentieth century. This is the case, first of all, of the authors of the illustrious work *Geschichte des Qorâns*, beginning with Theodor Nöldeke, who after 1860 adopted the traditional Muslim account of the history of the Qur’an, and followed by those who continued his work such as Gotthelf Bergsträsser and Otto Pretzl. Nevertheless, Friedrich Schwally, author of the revised edition of the work after 1909, in following the methods Goldziher applied to the study of the Hadith, rejected a considerable number of traditional accounts (such as the first compilation made by Abû Bakr or the Qurayshite dialect of the Qur’an) in the effort to retain only the thesis according to which a significant portion of the Qur’an assumed its final form during the lifetime of the Prophet himself, together with the thesis that the definitive compilation was made during the caliphate of ‘Uthmân.14 The critical approach subsequently found some defenders of stature in Great Britain, in particular John Burton who provided it with one of its monuments, *The Collection of the Qur’an*, which appeared in the same year as Wansbrough’s *Quranic Studies*.15 Despite the fact that these two scholars base themselves on the methods of Goldziher and of Schacht to pose the fundamental problem of the trustworthiness of the Islamic tradition, with respect to what concerns the dating of the final redaction of the Qur’an, Burton comes to radically different conclusions from those of Wansbrough. Rejecting the reports regarding the codices first gathered together in Abû Bakr’s time and then in the time of ‘Uthmân—“ideological reports” that he ascribes to later doctors—Burton makes a distinction between a very old “Qur’an document” and a later “Qur’an source” to draw the conclusion that the Qur’anic text as it is known appeared mainly during the lifetime of Muḥammad himself.16

Among the many advocates of the critical methodology, we may yet again cite Schoeler who in this domain presents himself explicitly as a follower of Nöldeke.17 With respect to the definitive recension of the Qur’an, Schoeler dismisses Wansbrough’s hypotheses, basing himself on the famous Qur’an of Ṣân‘ā’ and the studies of the group under Gerd R. Puin
who have ascertained, by Carbon 14 dating, that this manuscript may be
dated to between 37/657 and 71/690, hence a short time after ʿUthmān.\textsuperscript{18}
The problem is that in the absence of a scientific edition, it is still not
known whether the many fragments of this manuscript constitute the
entire text of the Qurʾan or not. Moreover, it might be asked why, several
decades after the major discovery of this Qurʾan, Gerd Puin and his col-
laborators have published only a few brief articles on the subject.\textsuperscript{19}

The method of the critical scholars can be summed up as follows: one
must hold an ancient source or tradition to be authentic and its contents
plausible just as long as no valid reasons have been found for rejection.
Cook, a renowned representative of the hypercritical method, suggests the
following procedure with regard to this approach: we shall probably have
better success in coming close to historical truth if we reject everything
that we have no specific reason for accepting.\textsuperscript{20}

Harald Motzki, a scholar professing the critical approach, illustrates
very well the differences among Western scholars over the dating of the
final version of the Qurʾan by recounting the conclusions of four of the
most decisive among them: taking them in chronological order, Schwally
dates this version to the time of the caliph ʿUthmān, Mingana to the
caliphate of ʿAbd al-Malik, Wansbrough to the beginning of the third/ninth century, and, at the same time, Burton dates it to the time of the
Prophet Muḥammad.\textsuperscript{21}

Aside from the problems posed by the Islamic textual tradition, several
internal elements of the Qurʾanic text have continually raised questions as
well for Orientalists. For example, words and expressions that have peren-
nially remained obscure not only for modern specialists but for medieval
Muslim commentators themselves whose commentaries, as abundant as
they are contradictory—at times in a single author—illustrate uncertainty
if not downright ignorance. This is the case of the expression ǧizya ḍan yad
(Qurʾan 9:29), critical analysis of which extends from the pioneering study
of F. Rosenthal\textsuperscript{22} to the meticulous examination recently carried out by
U. Rubin.\textsuperscript{23} Meanwhile, the journal \textit{Arabica} has served for years as a forum
for learned discussions of this expression by C. Cahen, M. M. Bravmann,
and M. J. Kister.\textsuperscript{24} The word ilmāf from Sūra 106 (Quraysh) has been dis-
cussed by H. Birkeland, M. Cook, P. Crone, and U. Rubin.\textsuperscript{25} The term kalāla
(Qurʾan 4:12) has been studied at length by D. Powers in numerous pub-
lications.\textsuperscript{26} So too with the term al-ṣamad from Sūra 112 (al-Ikhlāṣ), the
problematic character of which F. Rosenthal, R. Paret, C. Schedl, U. Rubin, and A. A. Ambros, among others, have noted.\textsuperscript{27} To this list might be added—without making it at all exhaustive—the word \textit{hanif}, or, indeed, the famous individual letters, “the Openers” (\textit{al-fawāṭiḥ}), at the beginning of twenty-nine of the sūras,\textsuperscript{28} or yet, as M. Cook stresses in his introduction to the Qur’an, such terms as \textit{abābil}, \textit{sijjil}, or \textit{al-qāri’a}.\textsuperscript{29}

With respect to the redaction of the Qur’an and its evolution, the basic question that may be asked is the following: for what reasons did Muslim scholars from a very early period, within a few decades after the Prophet’s death, not know, or no longer know, the meaning of these words, these expressions, these separate letters? M. Cook, in the aforementioned work, proposes the following: either the matter of the Qur’an was not made available as Scripture until several decades after the Prophet’s death or many of the terms found in the Qur’an were for one reason or another already obsolete during the Prophet’s’s lifetime.\textsuperscript{30} It has to be acknowledged that the how and the why of this phenomenon are still far from being adequately explained. Nevertheless, this would demonstrate that there probably was an evolution in the redaction of the Qur’an, that it would have had a progressive elaboration in successive stages. We shall return to this.

Another breach involves the juridical domain. Already, in his great work \textit{The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence}, Joseph Schacht had stated that Islamic law, such as we know it from the second century of the Hijra, is surprisingly non-Qur’anic.\textsuperscript{31} Subsequently, the work of Burton on the rules of inheritance, the rights of widows, and even the stoning of adulterers,\textsuperscript{32} those already cited by David Powers on the right of inheritance,\textsuperscript{33} Motzki’s work on the \textit{muḥṣanāt/muḥṣināt} of Qur’an 4:24,\textsuperscript{34} Gerald Hawting’s analysis on the rights of a repudiated wife during her “period of waiting” (\textit{idda}),\textsuperscript{35} or Patricia Crone’s study of the Qur’anic word \textit{kitāb}, in the overlooked sense of verse 24:33 where it has the meaning “marriage contract”\textsuperscript{36}—all this tends to show that less than a century after the Prophet’s time certain important aspects of the law had become not solely non-Qur’anic (as Schacht put it) but at times firmly anti-Qur’anic. In all the cases that have been studied the general impression is that Qur’anic expositions or those ascribed to Muhammad were neglected and/or that their practical application was abandoned. Why? The reason may lie in the late and non-consensual finalization of the Qur’an, but it could also be due to the heavy
usage of ra’y, the jurist’s personal opinion and hence not deriving his reasoning directly from the Qur’an. The question remains open.

These questionings and breaches, which have still not been satisfactorily explained, underlie the hypercritical approach. Here it may be useful to recapitulate the theses of the most radical, and the most renowned, of its representatives: Wansbrough. According to him, the Qur’an originated neither in Arabia nor even in Islam. The Arabs had not founded a new religious community of their own by the time that they set out from their native land to conquer other countries. It was outside of Arabia when, following the conquests, they discovered a “sectarian milieu” in the Middle East, and particularly in Iraq, and then began steadily to adopt this “milieu” and modify it for themselves, all the while rewriting its history by “arabicizing” its evolution. In this way the Qur’an emerged from a multitude of sources at the very heart of a process whereby popular preachers (qāṣṣ, pl. quṣṣāṣ) played a leading role. Indeed, the popular sermon would have served as the means both of the transmission and the explanation of pronouncements deemed prophetical, pronouncements that emerged from this very sectarian environment. The Qur’an, originating out of this composite material, detached itself from it only gradually. The establishment of its text took place so slowly that the date of the definitive version cannot be prior to around the year 800 CE (around the 180s of the Hijra) during the first Abbasid period.

Even though Wansbrough’s arguments are often forceful, and his theories as apposite as they are suggestive, his dating of the final version of the Qur’an no longer seems defensible, as we have already indicated. Apart from the reasons already given, on codicological, archaeological and epigraphical grounds, several discoveries render it equally indefensible: in addition to the Şanā manuscript, a fragment from Khirbet el-Mird citing Qur’an 3:102ff., described by A. Grohmann and analyzed by Kister, appears to prove that a stable text was already in existence toward the end of the Umayyad period. The Nubian papyrus datable to 141/758, containing two Qur’anic verses, preceded by the formula “And God, may He be glorified and exalted, says in His book,” furnishes another indication of the same order. There are also numismatic discoveries dating from the Umayyad period, studied by Crone and Hinds, that mention the name of Muḥammad as God’s messenger as well as Qur’anic citations. Then there is the literary tradition along with textual evidence. Reports on the systematic
collecting of the Qur’an, most especially during the caliphates of Abū Bakr and ‘Uthmān, may be found in sources as early as al-Ridda wa’l-futūḥ attributed to Sayf b. ‘Umar (d. 184/800),41 al-Jāmiʿ of ‘Abd Allāh b. Wahb (d. 197/812), the Musnad of al-Ṭayālīṣī (d. 204/820), or the Kitāb ḥaḍā’il al-Qur’ān of Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām (d. 224/838).42 In his recent afore-mentioned work Motzki convincingly shows almost all of these reports are attributable to the scholar and traditionist Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhārī (d. 124/742).43 This brings us back, yet again, to the time of the first Marwānid Umayyads, as Mingana had maintained.44 This is a very early date and still, even so, several decades after the time of the third caliph. A few dozen years that may be reckoned as several centuries so enormous were the consequences, between those two epochs, of the civil wars and the great blazing conquests which overwhelmed both the history and the mind-set of the earliest Muslims.

Uncertainties and Contradictions in the Islamic Sources

Just as in Western research when such matters are investigated, the Islamic textual tradition encloses discreet but significant areas of obscurity and contradiction. These appear to indicate that the definitive commitment of the Qur’an to written form occurred later than Muslim “orthodoxy” will claim.

Let us look very quickly at the most recurrent account of Islamic tradition on the collection and the writing of the Qur’an.45 According to the versions which were to become predominant, after the Prophet’s death there was no complete codex of the Qur’an that he duly authorized. Excerpts, some long, some short, were preserved by certain Companions, some of which were written on all sorts of material. An initial recension was determined by Abū Bakr, the first caliph, acting on the advice of the future second caliph ‘Umar and effected by Zayd b. Thābit, the Prophet’s scribe, though he was reticent at first. This gave rise to the compilation of one copy, a codex tradition often calls “the codex (that is) between the two covers.” After ‘Umar’s death, this copy remained in the family, since his daughter Ḥafṣa, one of the Prophet’s wives, had inherited it. Alongside this codex, other texts existed thanks to the initiative of highly placed individuals, the best known of whom are ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, Ubayy b. Ka‘b,
'Abd Allāh b. Masʿūd (Ibn Masʿūd), or Abū Mūsā al-Asch'ārī. On the advice of his renowned general Ḥudhayfah, ʿUthmān, the third caliph, decided to have an official edition of the text of the Qurʾān established; this is what is called the “model edition” or the edition or vulgate of ʿUthmān. The task devolved upon Zayd b. Thābit once again, assisted this time by a commission made up of men from the Quraysh (oddly enough, the sources are not unanimous on either their number or their identity). This commission took as its working text the codex belonging to Ḥafṣa, ʿUmar’s daughter. The caliph then accorded an official and binding character to this edition. He dispatched copies of the reworked text into the different provincial capitals of the empire where they were to serve as reference copies. To conclude his work, he then gave the order to destroy the other editions. As we shall see subsequently, it took several centuries before this official edition came to be accepted by all Muslims as the textus receptus.

Let us now rapidly examine certain elements of the early reports which are questionable. First, on the philological plane, the most important terms in our inquiry appear to be ambiguous in the early period, beginning with the word Qurʾān itself. The term can designate statements deriving from Muḥammad. In certain traditions Qurʾān appears as a generic name to refer to everything that was heard from the Prophet (in this case we will write Qurʾān with a small q). According to a statement reported by Ibn Saʿd, Salīma b. Jarmān said, “I have collected many Qurʾāns (qurʾānan kathīrān) from Muḥammad.”46 Indeed, a clear distinction between hadith and Qurʾān—the former indicating the Prophet’s statements and the latter the words of God—seems to be late.47 Thus, in an epistle attributed to the Zaydī imam Zayd b. ʿAlī, we come upon two hadiths beginning with the phrase “Muḥammad said,” the respective contents of which may be found with slight linguistic differences in the Qurʾānic verses 5:56 and 21:24.48 Conversely, in verse 21:4, the readings waver between qāla and qul, and the commentators are anything but unanimous as to whether a statement of the Prophet or a divine injunction is at issue. Alfred-Louis de Prémare has studied another apt example of initial uncertainty between Qurʾān and hadith in the famous sermons the Prophet gave shortly before his death that tradition has called the “farewell sermons” (khutbat al-wadāʾ). In fact, certain sentences in these sermons, and especially whatever pertains to women and to the sacred months, are to be found, with slight variations, in the Qurʾān.49 Finally, we have the puzzling example of the hadith qudsī,
statements issuing from God, the transmission of which is ascribed to Muḥammad but which, nevertheless, are not to be found in the Qur’an.⁵⁰

De Prémare has emphasized as well the problematic nature of the root jama‘a in the recurring expression jam‘ al-qur‘ān.⁵¹ The root J-M-ʕ has the obvious meaning of “to collect, to assemble, to gather,” but many Muslim lexicographers tell us that it can also mean “to memorize, to retain, and to learn by heart,” though a specific verb with this last meaning exists, namely, ḥafīza. Hence, in quite a few accounts, we are told that the Qur’an was first “assembled in the hearts of men”—i.e., memorized—and then “collected”—i.e., gathered together—by one or another of Muḥammad’s Companions. To be sure, this may be merely a reflection of a dialectic between the oral and the written and yet it seems that the ambiguity affecting the verb jama‘a is deliberate and that at its origin lies a concern to evade the most blatant contradictions that were current in the accounts of the editing of the Qur’an, or, indeed, there was an intent to conceal the conflicts that raged between different political and religious tendencies on this subject. Thus ‘Āli said that he collected a complete Qur’an in a codex immediately following the death of Muḥammad. But now Ibn Abī Dāwūd, who recounts this tradition in his Maṣāḥif, stipulates at once that here the expression jama‘tu ‘l-qur‘ān kullahu actually means “I have learned the Qur’an by heart in its entirety.”⁵² To complicate matters even further, the Qur’an itself states innā ‘alaynā jam‘ahu wa-qur‘ānahu (Qur’an 75:17; literally, “Upon us is its putting together / its memorization and its ‘qur’an’”). Who is speaking and what do the terms jam‘ and qur‘ān mean here? Exegetes are far from unanimous on this.

Yet another puzzling point: many accounts report that when Abū Bakr and ‘Umar summoned Zayd b. Thābit to charge him with writing down the Qur’an, Zayd b. Thābit was at first furious and exclaimed, “Do you want to do what the Messenger of God himself did not do?”⁵³ Did Muḥammad then intend to preserve the Qur’an in the form of oral recitation (or indeed as a unique book), as was done with poetry?⁵⁴ In this scenario the studies of Fr. Edmund Beck regain all their relevance. Indeed, Beck was the first to have recognized the great similarity between the first “reciters of the Qur’an” (qārī’, pl. qurrā’) and the old rāwī, pl. ruwāt, those transmitters, especially in oral fashion, of the archaic Arabic poetry of the pre-Islamic period.⁵⁵ Now, for these ruwāt, the variants in the poetry, noticeable mainly during recitation, were not only no defect but rather were desirable since
they allowed improvements in the poem. According to Beck, it is entirely possible that the first qurrā’, who were active up to at least the middle of the second/eighth century, may have considered the variants in different recitations, present for better or worse in the different versions of the Qur’an, as useful opportunities for improving the linguistic level of the text. This may account for the hadith attributed to the Prophet and especially appreciated by the first qurrā’: “In the mushaf there are expressions in dialect (laḥn) but the Arabs will regularize them.” These reader-reciters, experts in Arabic, are sometimes called in the sources “the masters of the Arabic language” (ašḥāb al-ʿarabiyya); according to al-Ṭabarī, they reproached ʿUthmān fiercely for the official establishment of his vulgate: “There were several Qur’ans. You have abandoned them all except for one.” It is interesting to observe that in al-Sayyārī’s text, the ašḥāb al-ʿarabiyya are presented, among others, as artisans in altering the Qur’anic text. An echo of the complaint addressed to the third caliph also occurs in a statement reported in several sources under differing forms and attributed to ʿAbd Allāh, the pious son of ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and a figure admired by the qurrā’, when he said to ʿUthmān, “Let no one tell you that he has the entirety of the text of the Qur’an in his keeping. How can one know what the entirety of the text of the Qur’an is? Many things in the Qur’an have vanished forever (qad dhahaba minhu qur’ānun kathiran; literally, “many Qur’ans have vanished from it”).” Other reports also refer to the suppression of parts of the Qur’an as well as to additions. First of all the suppressions: Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām (154–244/770–858) points out in his Fadāʾil al-Qur’ān a certain number of “censorings” applied to the Qur’anic text, some of which date from before the caliphate of ʿUthmān. The two short suras “al-Ḥāfḍ” and “al-Khal,” which were part of the recension of Ubayy b. Kaʿb, along with other short texts ascribed to the codices of ʿAlī or of ʿUmar, were in the end not incorporated into the final version of the Qur’an. The same goes for certain verses: the verse on stoning (āyat al-rajm) or, indeed, the sentence: “If the son of Adam had two valleys of gold he would want a third / only earth can fill the belly of the son of Adam / God turns towards him who turns (towards Him).” Many other “missing texts” from the definitive version are mentioned, over several dozen pages, in the Geschichte des Qorāns, to cite only this work. As for the additions, al-Sayyārī alludes to these in his work, as does ʿAbd al-Masīḥ al-Kindī in his epistle as well as Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī in his K. al-Maṣāḥif. Certain
Khārijites, the ‘Ajārida, considered the sura of Joseph to be apocryphal and added at a later date to the true revelations made by the Prophet. Furthermore, Ibn Masʿūd deemed the first sura (al-Фātiha), together with the two last suras of the official vulgate, known as al-muʿawwidhatān, as prayers rather than Qur’anic revelations.

That the final codification of the Qur’anic text was linked to political and religious tensions is shown by an account reported by several sources, beginning with Bukhārī in his َṣaḥīḥ or َṬabarī in his Qur’an commentary. Ḥudhayfa, the general who participated in the conquest of Armenia in the years 25–26/645–646, is alarmed by the disparities among his soldiers—most of them originally from Iraq—with respect to recitation of the Qur’an. He then entreats the caliph ʿUthmān to establish a unique and definitive written version of the Qur’an: “Unify this community before it diverges over its Book as the Jews and the Christians have diverged (over theirs).” َṬabarī makes it clear that in this army a conflict had broken out over the Qur’anic text between the Iraqis and the Syrians (that is, between the partisans of ʿAlī and those of ʿUthmān, the Umayyads, or even between the clan of the Banū Ḥāshim and that of the Banū Umayya, the Umayyads?).

As de Prémare has aptly emphasized, this type of account appears to have more of a symbolic than an historical value. Shortly after the Prophet’s death, the Arabs, skillful merchants, had turned into great conquerors, enjoying absolutely immense powers and riches within a few short years. A few of these extremely rich and powerful men seem to have concentrated within their own persons several elements that would prove decisive in the complex of problems arising from the definitive recension of the Qur’an. In synthesizing earlier studies while continuing to follow their methods—and particularly, those of Casanova, Mingana, and Crone and Cook—de Prémare specifically delineates the portraits of three personalities of the utmost significance:

1. First, ʿUbayd Allāh b. Ziyād, called Ibn Ziyād, the cruel and renowned Umayyad governor of Iraq (from 56 to 67/675 to 686). The adopted grandson of Abū Sufyān, hence a member of the powerful ruling family, he was one of those wealthy merchants who had become a mighty conqueror. After the conquest of Transoxania, he held the strategic post of governor of Iraq during the caliphates of Muʿāwiya and Yazīd I. He violently crushed anti-Umayyad revolts, especially those of the Alids, most conspicuously
massacring the imam al-Ḥusayn, son of ‘Alī and grandson of the Prophet, along with almost all his family at Karbalā’. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyāḍ was, at the same time, an extremely literate man; he was one of the “experts in the Arabic language” (ašḥāb al-ʿarabiyya). Abū al-Faraj al-Īṣfahānī, in his Aghānī, as well as Yāqūt, in his Udābā’, each devote several lines to him. Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī writes that ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyāḍ had intervened during the establishment of the Qur’anic text. He obliged his Persian secretary Yazīd b. Hurmuz al-Fārisī to insert numerous additions: “‘Ubayd Allāh added (zāda) two thousand harf (words, letters or expressions?) to the codex,” reported Yazīd. To be sure, the secretary provides no details either on the identity of the codex in question or on the nature of the additions of which he speaks. Moreover, the ambiguity—without doubt, intentional—of the word harf leaves the door open for all sorts of hypotheses.

2. The second person is also a governor of Umayyad Iraq, the no less celebrated al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf, celebrated, sadly enough, for the horrendous tortures and massacres that he inflicted on the supporters of ‘Alī. He became governor during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (caliph from 65 to 86/685 to 705), the second and indubitably the most important caliph of the Umayyad Dynasty of the Marwānids. During this period the first ripples of doctrinal reflection began to appear following the conquests, all of which were deeply concerned with the problem of political and religious legitimacy. In this time of ceaseless civil wars, the issue of the scriptural texts took on major importance. Al-Ḥajjāj was also the conqueror of the rival caliph Ibn al-Zubayr who was based in Mecca. After more than ten years (62–73/681–692), the power of the caliph thus regained its unity. Al-Ḥajjāj was a man of letters as well and one of the great experts in the Arabic language. Ṭabarī in his History, or Jāḥiẓ in his Bayān, adduce some examples of his flamboyant prose. Moreover Ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, as well as Ibn Khallikān, inform us that al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf also effected massive interventions into the Qur’anic text. According to reports that are at times contradictory, he corrected divergent readings, arranged certain suras or verses, and improved the orthography by the introduction of the diacritical marks and vowels that had not previously existed. Based on a report by al-Samḥūdī, the historian of the city of Medina, which has been masterfully analyzed by Mingana, al-Ḥajjāj had established his own Qur’anic edition, a copy of which he sent to each of the provincial capitals of the Islamic empire in order to make it the
official version at the expense of those earlier versions that he had in any case had destroyed in Iraq. According to certain accounts, he was the first who took this initiative. But, according to other reports, he was replicating ʿUthmān’s action in having rival codices destroyed. According to still others, the other recensions remained in circulation, and it was under the Abbasids that the codex of al-Ḥajjāj was definitively set aside. The name of this governor of Iraq is also to be found in the polemic of the Christian Arab apologist ʿAbd al-Masīḥ al-Kindī, written perhaps at the beginning of the third/ninth century. In one of his epistles he (or whoever is writing under his name) states, “then, there was the intervention (i.e., in the Qur’anic text) by al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf who left no version unseized. He had many verses dropped and he added others which in the view of some pertained to the men of the Banū Umayya and the Banū al-ʿAbbās, identified (in the text) by their own names. A version in conformity with the recension ordered by al-Ḥajjāj was made in six copies: one was sent to Egypt, another to Damascus, a third to Medina, a fourth to Mecca, a fifth to Kūfa, and the final copy to Basra. As for the other earlier editions, he plunged them into boiling oil and destroyed them, in so doing imitating ʿUthmān.”

3. The third personage is the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik himself. De Prémare’s historical investigation—like those before him of Hawting on Umayyad history or of Yehuda Nevo on inscriptions from the period—reveal that the period of ʿAbd al-Malik was a defining moment in the elaboration of Islamic doctrine. With regard to the final establishment of the Qur’anic text, there is, to begin with, the caliph’s declaration reported by several sources: “I fear dying during the month of Ramadan; it was in this month that I was born; it was in this month that I was weaned and in this month I collected (jamaʿatu) the Qur’an.” To be sure, here too we can reflect that the meaning of the root jamaʿa can be debated; yet what we already know about the interventions of the two governors of Iraq at this very period into the Qur’anic text appears to indicate that here the term does not mean “memorize, learn by heart” but rather “collect, put in order.”

Other noteworthy aspects of the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik stand persuasively in direct relation with our set of problems. The inscriptions on the Dome of the Rock, meticulously analyzed by Christel Kessler and Oleg Grabar, were executed by order of this caliph. They appear to be the first actual dated illustration of a dogmatic definition of theological oneness in the Islamic
context: “Say: God is Unique, He is the Impenetrable (?—the problematic term al-šamad is here at issue), He has not begotten nor has He been begotten and He has no associate” (qul huwa allāhu aḥad allāhu š-šamad lam yalid wa-lam yūlad wa-lam yakun lahu kufu’an aḥad). The text is preceded on the inside of the Dome, on the outer southern face of the octagonal arcade, by the basmala (the formula: “In the Name of God the Compassionate the Merciful”) and the unitary formula “there is no God but Allāh who has no associate.” Apart from the final formulation, this of course constitutes Sura 112, al-Ikhlas. And yet why this divergence from the Qur’anic text? Why is the formulation that immediately follows the basmala missing from the sura? There can be no question of carelessness in such a painstaking and protracted project. Is it because the Qur’anic text had not yet been definitively established?86 Leaving aside its doctrinal aspect, the polemical character of this text is well known. Indeed, except for declarative texts, the inscriptions on the Dome of the Rock bear polemical texts of this type, directed quite specifically against Christian Trinitarian dogma and Christology.

Moreover, in accord with the studies by Amikam Elad and Yehuda Nevo, the first true glorifications of Muḥammad as the prophet of a religion independent of both Judaism and Christianity also date from the period of ʿAbd al-Malik.87 In fact, several fundamental decisions in the early history of Islam are due to this caliph:

1. The use of Arabic as the language of administration, up until then carried out by former Byzantine and/or Iranian functionaries in their respective languages.
2. The official statute concerning “protected groups” (dhimmī): Jews, Christians, and probably Zoroastrians as well, together with the imposition of the head tax (jizya) as a sign of their subjection to Islamic power and giving them the right to be protected by the latter.
3. The creation of proper Islamic coinage without any figural motif and struck solely with Arabic religious formulae.88

In this context the caliph and the other men in power who surrounded him could not be indifferent to that fundamental aspect of power which is the control of belief and the fact that the latter cannot be effective except through the control and hence the codification of the Scriptures, all the more so in a society in which dissident religious and political movements
are quite numerous. A unique scriptural Book, independent of earlier Scriptures, specifically those of the Jews and Christians, codified in accord with state dogmas, is the surest guarantee of doctrinal, hence political, security. It is interesting to observe that the second scriptural source in Islam, that is, the Hadith, seems also to have begun to assume its systematic character from the time of ʿAbd al-Malik. Thanks to Goldziher, we know that a diffident writing down of Hadith began before this date, but the studies of Michael Lecker and of Harald Motzki have demonstrated that the first person to have systematically written down Hadith was Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhri by order of the caliph Hishām (reg. 105–127/724–743); and yet, he was already a court scholar in the time of the latter’s father, namely, ʿAbd al-Malik. Thus, the initiative to establish an official Qur’anic codex, seemingly taken during the caliphate of ʿUthmān, seems to have been realized during the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik or perhaps a bit later. Meanwhile, together with the conquests and the intent of Muslim leaders to distinguish their religion clearly from both Judaism and Christianity, a continuing editorial activity—including composition, rewriting, stylistic refinement, elaboration, and correction, etc.—will have taken place. In addition, the point to be underlined, and that de Prémare did not emphasize is that the three persons I have presented (i.e., ʿUbaydallāh b. Ziyād, al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf, and ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān) have two common traits: their belonging to the Umayyad camp and their violent hostility toward the Alids.

Islamic tradition, by an immense majority, insists on the very great antiquity of the establishment of the official version of the Qur’an (the initiative taken from the time of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar and finalized by ʿUthmān) since it is well aware that the later this establishment is located the greater the risk of tahrīf (falsification). Nevertheless, despite all attempts to conceal the divergences on the part of “orthodox” authors, an examination of the hesitancies or contradictions that the sources bear along with them clearly shows that from the start a large protest movement took shape against the official version of the Qur’an. Indeed, in a society in which the different recensions might serve as the means of legitimation of diverse political and religious groups, the so-called ʿUthmānian version would have taken several centuries to be unanimously accepted by all Muslims. Without a doubt the most significant symbol is the double condemnation of Ibn Miqsam and Ibn Shannabūdha at the beginning of the fourth/tenth century for having practiced noncanonical “readings.” At the
close of the same century, in 398/1007, a polemic broke out between the Sunnis and the Shi’ites of Baghdad over the licit or illicit character of the codex of Ibn Mas‘ūd. In the end a Sunni tribunal gave orders for its destruction.⁹³ According to Ibn Nadīm, a century earlier, there still existed copies of the recension by Ubayy b. Ka‘b circulating in the region of Baṣra.⁹⁴

The Falsification of the Qur’an
According to Imami Shi’ites

Many thus believed on various grounds that the version of ‘Uthmān was not faithful to the revelations accorded to the Prophet. In a well-documented article, Hossein Modarressi demonstrates that a certain number of persons, whom later Sunnism is averse to repudiating, harshly criticized the vulgate of ‘Uthmān during the two or three first centuries of the Hijra.⁹⁵ Some of the first Mu‘tazilites and the first ‘Ajārīda Khārijites did so as well. As we have seen, the latter conspicuously rejected the authenticity of Sura 12 (Yūsuf), largely because of the sensual resonance of the story of Joseph, and so considered it a later addition.⁹⁶ Nevertheless, the most direct, energetic, and numerous accusations of falsification of the Qur’an by the first three caliphs and their entourage, held up as enemies of ‘Alī, are to be found in Imami Shi’ite sources, particularly from the pre-Buwayhid period.⁹⁷ Briefly put, these held that ‘Alī, the only true initiate and the legitimate successor to Muḥammad, was in unique possession of the complete version of the revelation accorded to the Prophet. After the Prophet’s death and the seizure of power by ‘Alī’s enemies, this version, far longer than the official one, was set aside by the authorities mainly because it included explicit homage to the first Imam, his descendants and supporters as well as quite open attacks against his adversaries. Once rejected, ‘Alī concealed his recension, to be handed down secretly to the imams of his line (see the introduction and chapter 1). These beliefs, since at least the fourth/tenth century, form part of the main and constant accusations of Sunni or Mu‘tazilite authors and heresiographers who spot in them one of the most flagrant elements of Shi’ite “heresy.” More specifically, the Imami or Twelver Shi’ites, with the drift of statements traceable back to their imams throughout the immense corpus of early Shi’ite hadith, have radically and explicitly cast doubt on the integrity of the vulgate of ‘Uthmān.
and thus have accused non-Shi’ites of having falsified the Qur’an. This thesis, coherently set out in the great treatises with abundant historical reports and Imami doctrinal elements, is mostly recounted in pre-Buwayhid Imami sources. After this period, that is, the middle of the fourth/tenth century, for quite precise doctrinal and historical reasons, the majority of Twelver scholars, beginning with Ibn Bābawayh al-Ṣadūq (d. 381/991), started to go back on this thesis and to adopt the Sunni viewpoint.98

Virtually all of the pre-Buwayhid Imami works that have come down to us, written as they often were by recognized religious authorities, evoke, at greater or lesser length, in direct or indirect manner, the falsified character of the version of the Qur’an known as the ‘Uthmānian. Aside from al-Sayyār’s work, let us cite those of al-Fāḍl b. Shādhān al-Nisābūrī (d. 260/874), Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī (d. 274/887–88 or 280/893–94), al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī (d. 290/902–3), Sa’d ʿAbd Allāh al-Ashʿarī al-Qummī (d. ca. 300/913), Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī (d. 328 or 329/939–40 or 940–941), Ibn Abī Zaynab al-Nu‘mānī (d. ca. 345/956 or 360/971), ‘Alī b. Aḥmad al-Kūfī (d. ca. 352/963 author of al-Istighātha fi bidaʿ al-thalātha) or the authors of the first Imami Qur’an commentaries such as Fūrāt b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī (d. 300/912), ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (d. ca. 307/919), Muḥammad b. Masʿūd al-ʿAyyāshī (third–fourth/ninth–tenth century).

The Buwayhid period marks the marginalization of the original “esoteric and nonrationalist” tradition, of which the sources we have just mentioned might illustrate the principal doctrines. With the close of the era of the historical imams, the surge of a certain rationalism in virtually all religious milieus, and especially the coming to power of Shi’ites at the very heart of the Sunni Abbasid caliphate, the Imami doctors, and particularly those in Baghdad, the capital, seem to have felt constrained to break at certain points with the original tradition in order to elaborate a new “rational theological and political” tendency. In seeking to come ever closer to the more and more firmly established Sunni “orthodoxy,” belief in the falsification of the official Qur’an, steadily sanctified and pronounced inseparable from the faith, could no longer be sustained.99 The greatest Imami scholars of this period will declare that the vulgate of ‘Uthmān is a faithful version of Revelation, and, at the same time, they will remain quite discreet about the religious authorities who preceded them and had maintained the contrary. Ibn Bābawayh, al-Shaykh al-Ṣadūq, seems to have been the first great Twelver author not simply to pass over silently or criticize by allusion the earlier traditions on
this matter but, indeed, to have adopted a position identical to that of the Sunnis: “In our view (i.e., the Twelver Imamis), the Qur’an revealed by God to Muhammad is identical to that which exists between the two covers [mā bayna al-daffatayn, i.e., the version of ‘Uthmān declared official] . . . whoever claims that the revealed text was ampler than the established one is nothing but a liar.”

Thus our author says nothing about the quite plentiful traditions in which there is question of falsification, censorship, and alteration (tahrīf, maḥw, tabdīl/taghyīr). His disciple and commentator, the Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022) confines himself to speaking in certain of these writings of a change that has occurred in the order (ta’līf) of certain verses or suras or even of the elimination by certain Companions of the Qur’anic exegeses of ‘Alī, exegeses appearing on the margins of the first imam’s recension.

Other thinkers, inimical to the thesis of falsification, will take up the same discourse again even while more or less developing it further, e.g., al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā ʿAlam al-Hudā (d. 436/1044), in al-Masāʾil al-Ṭabarūsyyāt al-ʿūlā, or, indeed, al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1067), in al-Ṭibyān.

This position with respect to the Qur’an, in agreement with other Muslims, henceforth became the majority view within a Twelver Shi’ism dominated by that rationalist current later known as the Uṣūliyya. We limit ourselves to a few celebrated examples which, however, do not all belong to this rationalist tendency: al-Faḍl b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbī Ṭayīb, Raḍī al-Dīn Ibn Ṭawūs (d. 664/1266), al-ʿĀlima al-Ḥillī (d. 726/1325), al-ʿĀmilī al-Bayḍāḥī (d. 877/1472), Mullā Muḥṣin al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (d. 1091/1680), al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1104/1692) . . . According to these authors’ manifold arguments, the traditions maintaining that the vulgate of ‘Uthmān underwent alteration, concocted in heterodox circles, are utterly untrustworthy and form no part of Shi’ite belief. Notwithstanding their lofty position in the transmission of doctrine, the compilers and scholars who reported these traditions without submitting them to a critical examination were lacking in both lucidity and vigilance.

Even so, there have always existed thinkers, more or less affiliated with the Akhbariyya traditionalist current (the rivals of the rationalistic Uṣūliyya)—in a minority, to be sure, and yet enjoying a certain importance in the history of Shi’ite thought—who have maintained the thesis of tahrīf precisely out of a respect for tradition. Among the most renowned after the Buwayhid period, mention may be made, in the sixth/twelfth century, of Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Ṭabarīṣī or Ibn Shahrāshūb. After the Safavid
turning point during the eleventh/seventeenth century: Muḥammad Bāqir al-Lāhijī, Muḥammad Șāliḥ al-Māzandarānī, or Niʿmat Allāh al-Jazāʾīrī. In the twelfth/eighteenth and thirteenth/nineteenth centuries: ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusaynī al-Shubbar or Aḥmad al-Narāqī. Finally, three particularly important works need to be mentioned, namely, the Qur’an commentary Miṅī al-anwār and the Diyaʾ al‑ʿalāmin fi ʿl-imāma by Abū al‑Ḥasan Sharīf al-ʿĀmili al‑Iṣfahānī (d. ca. 1140/1727) as well as the Faṣl al‑khīṭāb of Mirzā al-Ḥusayn al‑Nūrī al‑Ṭabarṣī/Ṭabrisī (d. 1320/1902).105

At the same time, a close reading of the texts seems to indicate that the attitude of the Imami scholars toward the vulgate of ʿUthmān is at times extremely complex, due no doubt to a certain sense of embarrassment, and that the thesis of the existence or nonexistence of any falsification occasionally cuts across the rationalist/traditionalist divide. We have already chosen to list several great names associated with the traditionalist current, and specifically Ibn Ṭāwūs, al‑Fayḍ al‑Kāshānī, or al‑Ḥurr al‑ʿĀmili among the opponents of tahṛīf even though in fact their positions are not always transparent. Conversely, several great names associated with the rationalist tendency also display an ambiguous attitude toward this unusually delicate issue: starting with the Buwayhid period, the Shaykh al‑Mufīd (d. 413/1022);106 in the Safavid period, the renowned al‑Majlisī (d. 1110/1699 or 1111/1700);107 or even, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as R. Brunner has shown, such famous mujtahids as Aḥmad l‑Narāqī, Shaykh Murtaḍā al‑Aņṣārī, Ākhund Muḥammad Kāẓim al‑Khurāsānī, or, indeed, the Ayatallah Khomeini.108

Of the works just cited, the Faṣl al‑khīṭāb of Mirzā al‑Nūrī al‑Ṭabarṣī/Ṭabrisī doubtlessly represents the most systematic attempt to uphold the thesis of the falsified character of the ʿUthmānīan version of the Qur’an.109 If al‑Sayyārī’s work, which al‑Nūrī draws on and quotes from extensively,110 may be considered the oldest monograph maintaining the Shi’ite notion of the falsification of the Qur’an, al‑Nūrī’s work, by thus closing the circle, may be considered the last.

Al-Sayyārī: Notes on His Life and Work

Even though al‑Sayyārī was an important figure in the exegetical literature of early Shi’ism, biographical details about him are skimpy. His full name
is Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ṭūhmad b. Muḥammad b. Sayyār. He is said to have served during the imamate of al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī as a secretary at the court of the Tāhirids (min kuttāb al-Tāhir),111 whence the title al-kātib which is sometimes accorded him.112 The Tāhirids ruled Khorasan on behalf of the Abbasids;113 al-Sayyārī must therefore have lived for a time in the capital of this region, the city of Nīṣābūr/Nishāpūr. Ibn al-Ghaḍāʾīrī (who lived in the first half of the fifth/eleventh century) is the sole author of early Imami works of rijāl who refers to our author, calling him “al-Qummī.”114 Al-Sayyārī’s connection with Qumm is discernible, in fact, through the names of certain of his masters and disciples. Hence he would have belonged to the Shiʿīte scholarly circles that were quite active in that city.115

None of the Imami sources that have come down to us gives any exact information on the dates of al-Sayyārī’s birth or death. According to the Sunnite author Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalānī (d. 852/1449), he lived towards the end of the third/ninth century.116 Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭihrānī, citing Ibn Ḥajar’s report, appears to conclude that al-Sayyārī did not live into the fourth/tenth century though he does not without wholly exclude this possibility.117 Another contemporary author, the Iranian scholar Jaʿfar Subḥānī (Sobhani), declares the year 286/899 to have been al-Sayyārī’s death date.118 Since he gives no source, the accuracy of this date remains unproved. Still, it is true that several indications place the latter’s active life in the middle of the third/ninth century. One of the authorities he cites most frequently is, in fact, Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Barqī, who lived at the beginning of this century.119 His son Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī transmits from al-Sayyārī in his Kitāb al-maḥāsin.120 Further information on the period in which our author lived is furnished by Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī, who lists him among the disciples of the tenth and eleventh imams, ʿAlī al-Hādī (d. 254/868) and al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī (d. 260/873).121 From a letter (ruqʿa) attributed to the ninth imam Muḥammad al-Jawād (d. 220/835), it turns out that the latter knew al-Sayyārī personally; however, the Shiʿīte scholar Muḥammad Taqī al-Tustarī (d. 1415/1995) maintains that the letter was written by al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī and that the text is incorrect in this respect.122 Al-Tustarī must be right as the text is reminiscent of the writings of the eleventh imam.123 In this letter, written in response to a request, al-ʿAskarī states that al-Sayyārī does not hold the position that he claims to hold and forbids anyone from entrusting anything to him.124 This cryptic message seems to indicate that al-Sayyārī had claimed to be
the imam’s representative (wakīl), having obtained the right from him to collect money (for example, the khums, i.e., a religious tax of 20 percent levied on the incomes of the faithful). According to the imam’s message, al-Sayyārī is not a wakīl and so no sum should be disbursed to him.

Our author was severely criticized by certain authors of prosopographical works (riǧāl). He is accused mainly of two things. First, of having subscribed to extremist views. In this regard, his contemporary Muhammad b. ʿAlī Ibn Maḥbūb al-Ashʿārī in his Kitāb (nawādir) al-muṣannaf accuses him of believing in metempsychosis (tanāṣukh). Many scholars from the city of Qumm during the fourth/tenth century are said to have transmitted from al-Sayyārī only traditions from which any element of “extremism” had been removed. The second accusation is that the latter reported many traditions with incomplete chains of transmission and that in general he is an untrustworthy transmitter. Nevertheless, despite these harshly critical judgments, a certain number of important authors from Qumm have transmitted from al-Sayyārī directly. Aside from Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī, mention may be made of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī (d. 290/902–903) or of ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar al-Ḥimyārī (d. after 297/909–910). Moreover, his name appears among the sources of two of the Four Books of the Imams, namely, the Kāfī of al-Kulaynī and the Tahdhīb al-aḥkām of al-Ṭūsī.

According to al-Ṭūsī, al-Sayyārī was the author of many works. He gives the titles of four: (1) Kitāb thawāb al-Qurʾān, (2) Kitāb al-tībb, (3) Kitāb al-qirāʿa, and (4) Kitāb al-nawādir. Al-Najshī lists the same titles but with K. al-qirāʿat instead of K. al-qirāʿa. He mentions another work as well: Kitāb al-ghārāt. All these writings, he says, he has at hand. Fragments of a work by al-Sayyārī are cited in the final section (entitled Mustaʿrafāt) of the Kitāb al-sarāʿir by Ibn Idrīs al-Hilli (d. 598/1202). To judge from their contents, these fragments come from the K. al-nawādir. Except for these only the Kitāb al-qirāʿat (“The Book of Recitations” or “The Book of Variant Qurʾan Readings”) seems to have come down to us.

The first author to cite that book is apparently Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muhammad b. al-ʿAbbās Ibn Māḥyār, known as Ibn al-Juḥām (d. after 328/939–940), the author of a voluminous Qurʾan commentary entitled, among other variants, Taʿwīl mā nazala min al-Qurʾān al-karīm fīl-nabī wa-ālihi (The Exegesis of What Was Revealed in the Noble Qurʾan Concerning the Prophet and His Family). The second of the two volumes of this
work, containing exegetical traditions from the sura al-Isrā’ to the end of the Qur’an, was still available to the tenth-/sixteenth-century scholar Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAlī al-Ḥusaynī al-Astarābādī al-Najafi, who cites it copiously in his Ta’wil al-āyāt al-zāhira fī faḍā’il al-ʾitra al-tāhira (Exegesis of the Manifest Verses on the Virtues of the Pure Family). These citations contain a respectable number of traditions drawn from al-Sayyārī’s book. Ibn al-Juḥām transmits from the latter through a single intermediary, a certain Aḥmad b. al-Qāsim al-Hamdānī (or Hamad(h)ānī).137

During the four centuries after Ibn al-Juḥām’s day, the Kitāb al-qirāʾāt seems not to have been cited. The only possible exception may be ʿAlī b. Mūsā Ibn Ṭawwūs (d. 664/1266), renowned for his huge library of Shiʿite texts. In two of his works he mentions the manuscript of an anonymous book entitled “The Book of Qur’anic Commentary Containing the Letter and the Spirit, the Abrogating and the Abrogated, the Clear and the Ambiguous in the Qur’an Along with the Rest of Its Words, Its Virtues and the Recompenses Linked with Them, Reported by Reliable Transmitters from Amongst the Veracious [in the plural, i.e., the holy imams; but the word may also be read in the dual, the Two Veracious, i.e., the fifth and the sixth imams] amongst the Descendants of the Messenger of God.” This manuscript, which belonged to Ibn Ṭawwūs, is described by him as “a magnificent old copy” or, again, as “an old bound Qur’an commentary.” He quotes a tradition taken from this manuscript regarding the interpretation of Qur’an 5:1 and he says that it contains four traditions regarding Qur’an 2:238 as well as two other traditions (probably on the same topic). Now, all of these hadiths may be found in al-Sayyārī’s work; moreover, the title given by Ibn Ṭawwūs corresponds to the contents of that work. It is tempting to suppose that the manuscript of Ibn Ṭawwūs contained a copy of al-Sayyārī’s text, but the information we are given does not allow for a sure identification.138 The next author who cites our work is Ḥasan b. Sulaymān al-Ḥillī (fl. 802/1399–1400). His Mukhtasar (or Muntakhab) baṣaʿir al-darajāt139 has three exegetical traditions (concerning verse 102:8) taken from al-Sayyārī.140 Al-Ḥillī refers to the latter’s work under the title Kitāb al-tanzīl waʾl-tahrīf. In classical Arabic literature it is common for the same work to be known under several titles,141 and the fact that in the sources that have come down to us al-Ḥillī is the first person to mention the book so titled is not inevitably an argument against the antiquity of the title. It is even possible to suppose that al-Ḥillī learned the title Kitāb al-tanzīl waʾl-tahrīf from the second volume of Ibn Juḥām’s Taʾwil mā nazala min al-Qurʾān,
which he owned, just as in the later case of al-Najafi, the author of the Ta’wil al-āyāt al-zāhirā.142 If this supposition proves to be true, it would mean that the book was in circulation shortly after al-Sayyāri’s death.

Direct citations from al-Sayyāri’s book are not to be found in the great compilations of exegetical traditions from the Safavid period. Nor is it mentioned directly in the monumental Bihār al-anwār of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī from the same period,143 and it does not appear in the list of his sources. Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out that after editing the Bihār al-Majlisī, assisted by some of his students, kept on seeking out other Imami sources with the aim of assembling a supplement to his encyclopedia under the title Mustadrak al-bihār.144 Al-Majlisī died before he could edit this supplement, but the list of the sources he had discovered and intended to use was published by al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsi/Ṭabrisī in his biography of al-Majlisī entitled al-Fayd al-qudsī fi tarjamat al-ʿallāma al-Majlisī. The tenth of the forty-eight works which constitute this list is identified as al-Tanzīl waʾl-taḥrīf li-Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyāri wa-yuqūl lahu Kitāb al-qirāʾāt ayādān (“Revelation and Falsification [of the Qurʾān]” by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyāri, Known as Well [under the title of] “The Book of [Variants] in [Qur’anic] Recitations.”145

It is possible, therefore, to conclude that from the very beginning of the eighteenth century, at least one manuscript of al-Sayyāri’s work was discovered or rediscovered. Scattered citations drawn from it occur in certain eighteenth- and nineteenth-century works. For example, we might mention the Hāshiyyat al-madārik of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Bihbahānī (d. 1206/1791–92 or 1208/1793–94),146 the Ghanāʾīm al-ayyām fi masāʾil al-ḥalāl waʾl-ḥarām of Abū al-Qāsim al-Jilānī, known as al-Fāḍil al-Qummi (d. 1231/1815–16 or 1233/1817–18),147 the Mustanad al-shīʿa of Aḥmad al-Narāḫī (d. 1244/1828–29),148 or, indeed, the Jawāhir al-kalām of Muḥammad Ḥasan al-Najafī (d. 1266/1850).149 In the last three of these sources,150 al-Sayyāri’s book is called Kitāb al-qirāʾāt or Kitāb al-qirāʾāt, and the same traditions are reported from it.151

Thanks to al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsi/Ṭabrisī in the second half of the nineteenth century, al-Sayyāri’s book came fully into its own. It attracted the attention of a large audience because of the fact that al-Nūrī quotes from it so extensively in two of his major works: the Mustadrak al-wasāʾil (completed on 10 Ṣa‘īd 1266/27 July 1901), but prior to that, and most especially, in his Faṣl al-khiṭāb (completed on 12 shawwāl 1298/September 7, 1881).152
Remarks on The Book of Revelation and Falsification or The Book of Variant Readings

Generally speaking, the Kitāb al-qirāʿát belongs to the school of pre-Buwayhid Imami exegesis. At the same time, it displays particular details that are unique. Like other texts from the pre-Buwayhid school, al-Sayyārī’s work is wholly composed of traditions (ḥadīth). Many of these are reported with a complete chain of transmitters (isnād). In others the name of the authority immediately prior to our author is missing; finally, other traditions have even more incomplete chains of transmitters. Most of the hadiths go back to an imam (especially Muhammad al-Bāqir or Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq) but some prophetic traditions occur there as well.

The hadiths are divided into chapters in accord with the order of the suras. Sometimes—especially with respect to short suras—two or more of the suras are gathered together in the same chapter. More than once a chapter’s title does not actually reflect its contents. Within the chapters the order of the verses does not invariably follow their order in the Qur’an. For example, the verses of Sura 3 (Āl ʿImrān) appear in the following order: 18, 7, 123, 110, 128, 33, 85, 140, 180, 183, 185, 110 (yet again), 81, 103, 92, 102, 97, etc. Moreover, verses belonging to a particular sura are occasionally cited in the chapter before or after that sura’s chapter.

The book has two opening chapters. The first (hadiths 1–17) is untitled and contains traditions in support of the thesis that the Qur’an was revealed in a single unique reading (qirā’ā) and that the Qur’an as commonly known has been censored and thus contains omissions. The second (nos. 18–31, bāb mā jā’a fī bism Allāh al-raḥmān al-raḥim) deals with the basmala (i.e., the formula “In the name of God the Compassionate the Merciful”) with particular emphasis on the duty to recite it aloud.

The characteristically Imami nature of the work becomes clear in a hundred or so exegetical traditions. In these ʿAlī plays a central part: he alone is the Commander of the Faithful (amīr al-muʾminīn; nos. 160, 440), superior to both Moses and Jesus (no. 270). He is the guide of the human race (al-hādiʿ; nos. 233, 270) and he is the way (sābit; no. 378) and the gateway (bāb) leading to God (nos. 92, 472) with whom he enjoys a position of privilege (no. 481). He is compassionate (no. 570) and he works miracles (no. 684). His jihād is identical to the Prophet’s jihād (nos. 225, 585). He is the sole legitimate successor to the Prophet (no. 162), and it is the
believers’ duty to swear loyalty and love (wālāya, hubb) to him (nos. 51, 88, 539). On Judgment Day, alongside the Prophet, he will hurl God’s enemies into the fire (no. 525). ‘Ali’s sons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn are descendants of Abraham (nos. 272, 278), and his foreknowledge of their tragic destinies made him ill (no. 279); just like their father before them, the two sons fell victim to the duplicity of the inhabitants of Kūfah (no. 450). Certain verses are interpreted metaphorically as alluding to Fāṭima, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn (no. 52). or ‘Ali (no. 672). The imams are those who possess authority (ulū ‘l-amr; no. 132); they warn mankind (no. 191), are their saviors (no. 118) and their ambassadors to God (no. 233). They have a perfect knowledge of the Qur’an (no. 451), and their knowledge constantly increases (no. 527). They carry out God’s order (qā‘im bi-amr Allāh; no. 406) while awaiting the advent of the eschatological Qā‘im (i.e., the Mahdi) (nos. 44, 98, 154, 406, 409, 558, 610, 681). Those who are faithful to ‘Ali (shi‘a) and to the other imams hold a privileged position; they are “those who have understanding” (ulū ‘l-albāb) (nos. 92, 472) and the best of mankind (no. 679); their faults will be forgiven (no. 473), and their places in paradise are assured (nos. 200, 468).

‘Ali’s enemies are mentioned at several points, sometimes by name but more usually by contemptuous titles and pejorative appellations. Thus, Abū Bakr is “the first” (al-awwal; nos. 359, 383, 474, 522, 616, 617, 621, 660, 672, 684, 698); ‘Umar “the second” (al-thānī; nos. 197, 276, 286, 359, 383, 522, 598, 616, 617, 698); and ‘Uthmān is “the third” (al-thālith; nos. 522, 600, 616, 617); elsewhere the two first caliphs are called “Such-a-one and Such-a-one” (fulān wa-fulān; no. 299), or, again, ‘Umar is called al-adlam (no. 380), Ruma‘ (no. 380), and Zufar (nos. 380, 382, 688, 725). Ā‘isha is “the Pallid” (Ḥumayrā‘; nos. 294, 408, 600). Aside from veiled references to the part she and Hafṣa played in the Prophet’s death (nos. 128, 590), her participation in the Battle of the Camel comes in for denunciation as well (nos. 294, 600). Obviously the Umayyads appear in a negative light (nos. 184, 299, 410, 511, 592, 598, 616, 677, 715, 716).

The text alludes to a certain number of Imami doctrines such as badā‘ (“divine changeability,” nos. 351, 550), ‘īṣma (“infallibility,” nos. 214, 436, 508, 517), or raj‘a (“the return of the dead to life before the Resurrection,” nos. 113, 295, 303, 490), though the terms themselves are not employed.156

Even so, a considerable number of exegetical traditions display nothing specifically Imami. For example, they deal with the lives of the prophets
(qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā‘), abrogated or abrogating verses, explanations of Qur’anic terms, the virtues (fadā’il) of certain verses or suras.

The question of the integrity of the Qur’an has an important place in the book. Thus it is stated that the original text of the sura al-Ahzāb (nos. 418–422, 427) and of the sura al-Takāthur (no. 692) were longer than what we now have or, again, the fact that the aforementioned passage about “two valleys of gold” formed part of the original Qur’an (no. 430). A large number of traditions of this sort relate to the Imami belief that many words, expressions, or passages concerning the rights and the merits of the Prophet, the imams, the ahl al-bayt, and the Shi’ites, together with the faults and crimes of their enemies (nos. 9, 14, 15, 17, 105, 106, 115, 221, 381, 551, 588, 593, 605, 623, 680), were either suppressed or altered.

As the title Kitāb al-qirā’āt indicates, different Qur’anic readings constitute the central subject of the work. In this respect the book differs from other exegetical writings of the pre-Buwayhid school in which the question of the qirā’āt occupies a lesser position. It can be said that approximately two-thirds of the traditions broach this problem. To the best of our knowledge, forty-nine of these readings are attested in no other source.157

The variant readings can be divided structurally into several categories in accord with the following divergences with respect to the vulgate of ‘Uthmān: (1) changes in vocalization, (2) the substitution of one or several words by one or several others, (3) a change in the order of the words, (4) the addition of one or several words, (5) a combination of elements in categories (1) to (4). As for the contents, the readings can be grouped into two main categories: (1) readings containing a specifically Imami message.158 These qirā’āt, which may be termed “pro-Imami,” can be divided in turn into two types (though the distinction between the two is not always clear): (1a) explicitly pro-Imami readings. These are variants in which one of the following cases is mentioned: ‘Alī (cited by name, whether by one of his epithets such as wāli, waṣī, etc.), the imams, the Prophet’s family, wāliyya, the enemies of the Prophet’s family (by name or by pejorative appellations), terms deriving from Imami law, doctrine, etc. (1b) Implicitly pro-Imami readings. These are variants, the Imami character of which can be recognized only by an initiate or revealed as a result of exegesis. (2) Neutral readings, that is, those that contain no Imami message, neither implicit nor explicit. Readings in category (1a) are almost never cited outside Imami
literature (except in polemical contexts), whereas the variants in categories (2) and sometimes (1b) occur as well in non-Imami works.

In the present work the best way to demonstrate a reading that is genuinely Imami entails putting it within the context of a dialogue between the imam and his disciple. For example, the disciple recites (or refers to) a verse in a non-Imami reading; the imam corrects him then or approves it. In other instances, the imam recites a verse following an Imami reading, and when the disciple, who has never heard this reading, questions his master about it, the latter reaffirms its validity. The imam can recite a verse following the Imami reading and require his follower to do the same, or, again, he can forbid the follower from reciting it according to a non-Imami reading. Frequently the disciple reports that he has heard the imam recite a verse in accord with the Imami reading.

An unusual feature of the Kitāb al-qirāʿāt is the relatively great frequency of references to the variant readings of Ibn Mas‘ūd. In Imami works of the pre-Buwayhid period such references are rather rare. Al-Sayyārī, by contrast, retains eleven of them. These are the only readings that do not derive from the imams, thus demonstrating the special status Ibn Mas‘ūd occupies for our author.

It is not certain that al-Sayyārī’s aim was to encourage his readers to recite the Qur’an in accord with the qirāʿāt that he reports. Still, he must have regarded it as his special task to record readings deemed reliable by the Imami community.

The Kitāb al-qirāʿāt betrays a remarkable affnity with the renowned Tafsīr (Qur’an commentary) of Abū al-Naḍr Muḥammad b. Mas‘ūd al-‘Ayyāshī. Only the first part of his work, covering suras 1 to 18, seems to have come down to us. This surviving portion shares some eighty traditions with al-Sayyārī’s work; hence it is reasonable to suppose that the total number of traditions in common between the two books could have been twice as high. Al-‘Ayyāshī’s text as it stands is the kind of version in which the chains of transmission of the hadiths have been abridged and comprise only the name of the first transmitter—and occasionally the second as well—for each tradition. When our two traditionists report the same hadith, and when al-Sayyārī furnishes a complete isnād, it is conceivable that that figured as well in the original version of al-‘Ayyāshī’s text. And so the text of the Kitāb al-qirāʿāt may help in reconstructing certain of the latter’s chains of transmission.
Al-ʿAyyāshī lived at the end of the third/ninth and the beginning of the fourth/tenth centuries; hence he must have been younger than al-Sayyārī. He could have gained some portion of his information from the latter, though the reverse hypothesis is not impossible either. Finally it is conceivable too that both authors had a common source.

To recapitulate, each of the three titles under which al-Sayyāri’s work is known relates to a specific aspect of the book. The title *al-Tanzīl waʾl-tahrīf* reflects the fact that many of its traditions are based on the Imami belief that the original text of the Qurʾan was falsified. A certain number of works with similar titles are mentioned in the sources; but, since none of them survives, nothing can be said of their possible resemblance to al-Sayyāri’s book. The title *al-Qirāʾāt* demonstrates the central position that the question of variant readings occupies in the work. Many works bearing such a title are well known in both Sunni and Shi’ite literature. Lastly, the title *al-Tafsīr*—attested solely in certain late manuscripts—underlines the fact that the work properly belongs within the genre of Qur’anic exegesis.
The Silent Qur’an and the Speaking Qur’an

From the third/ninth century on, the significant number of works bearing titles such as “Revelation and Falsification,” “Revelation and Alteration,” “The Qur’an and Falsification” show clearly that many Muslims, and especially Shi’ites, deemed the ʻUthmānian version of the Qur’an to have been falsified and censored.¹ In their eyes this state of affairs stemmed directly from the tragic events that followed the Prophet’s death: the violent shunting aside of ʻAlī, the sole legitimate successor of the messenger of Allāh, and the seizure of power, abetted by a wide conspiracy, by Abū Bakr, his companion ʻUmar, and other Qurayshite opponents of the people of the Prophet’s family. After having traduced Muḥammad and his wishes for the succession, it became necessary to falsify his book, particularly if this contained the names of his true followers and real enemies.²

Indeed, these two elements, the Sacred Family of the Prophet and the Qur’an, are inextricably linked; to betray the former ineluctably means to distort the latter. Moreover, they are intimately connected in the famous hadith of “the Two Precious Objects” (al-thaqalayn). Transmitted with many variants, accepted by Sunnis as well as by Shi’ites (though of course with different interpretations), this hadith, which goes back to the Prophet, states essentially that he left after him as a inheritance for his community “Two Precious Objects” that are inseparable, namely, his
family and the Book of God. This statement of the Prophet thus established an organic relationship between the two elements, that is, for certain believers, an equivalence in holiness as well as in the spiritual economy of Islam. Since the identity of the Qur’an was known, each major political and religious tendency in nascent Islam sought to claim the identity of the second element for its own advantage, to wit, “the family of the Prophet” (expressed variously as ‘itra, ahl al-bayt, āl al-rasūl, āl al-nabī...). Even the Umayyads, coming from the Banū ‘Abd Shams—in other words, the hereditary enemies of the descendants of Hāshim whom Muḥammad belonged to—briefly reclaimed this title (a claim that vanished very speedily after their fall). For some of the early Sunnis, according to various interpretations, this formula denoted either the wives of the Prophet or the totality of believers, that is, the entire Islamic community (the latter interpretation runs counter to the letter and the spirit of the majority versions of the hadith, according to which the Two Objects are destined for the community and are thus distinct from it). Nevertheless, on the basis of plain reasoning, most Sunnis finally came to accept that the family of Muḥammad denoted, in a global sense, all of the Banū Hāshim (which all the descendants of this clan, and, in particular, the Abbasids, maintained) or, more precisely, Muḥammad’s immediate family, namely, his daughter Fāṭima, his son-in-law and cousin ‘Alī and their two sons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn (which the proto-Shi’ite Alids and later the Shi’ites of all persuasions had always maintained).4

For the latter, the treachery of Muḥammad’s enemies who deprived ‘Alī of his succession lay squarely in the breach of the connection joining these two elements, thereby distorting the Prophet’s mission. In effect, they did violence to the Prophet’s family and falsified the divine book. In a tradition going back to the Prophet and transmitted by Shi’ites, he alerted his community: “You will be held to account over what you have made the Two Precious Objects undergo which I have left to you, namely, the Book of God and my Family. Beware, with respect to the Book, do not say that we have altered and falsified it (ghayyarnā wa-ḥarrāfnā) and with respect to my Family, do not say, we have abandoned and killed it.” In a letter attributed to the imam Mūsā al-Kāẓim and addressed to a disciple, we read: “Do not seek to embrace the faith of those who do not follow us [literally, “those who are not our Shi’ites”], do not love their religion, for they are traitors who have betrayed God and His messenger by betraying what was given
in trust. Do you know how they have betrayed these holy trusts? The Book of God was entrusted to them and they have falsified and altered it. Their true leaders [i.e., ‘Ali and his descendants] were designated to them, but they turned away from them.”

As we shall see in this chapter, according to the first Shi’ite Qur’an commentaries, the chief elements censored from the Qur’an were mainly personal names, particularly those of members of the Prophet’s family and their enemies. For those who maintained the thesis of falsification, these excisions from Scripture would have made it unavoidably unintelligible. What might be comprehended in a text specifically revealed on the matter of such and such a person if the names of those persons have been removed? Undoubtedly it was from the period of such authors as al-Sayyārī (see chapter 2) when this thesis must have been especially popular, that is, the third/ninth century or perhaps even earlier, that the two-fold doctrine dates; according to this, the Qur’an is a guide, to be sure, but a mute, a silent guide, while the imam is, parallel to it, a Qur’an, a speaking Book. Because of falsification, the Book of God has become a “Guide,” a “Qur’an,” or a “silent Book” (imām, qurān or kitāb sāmit). In order to recover its Word, the teaching of the genuine initiates—the imams, whose person and/or teaching are said to be “the speaking Qur’an” (Qur’an nātiq)—is henceforth necessary. Thus the two expressions denote the Qur’an and the Hadith, respectively, the two scriptural sources of Islam, while ushering in the problem of the intelligibility of the Scripture and, accordingly, the necessity for hermeneutics as a means of understanding. Two traditions going back to the imam Ja’far al-Sādiq appear to express this clearly: “If the Qur’an could be read as it was revealed, not even two persons would have disagreed with respect to it” and “If the Qur’an had been left as it was revealed, we would have found our names there just as those who came before us are named there [i.e., the holy figures of earlier religions].” In the light of this sort of tradition, it is falsification that has made the Book incomprehensible and so necessitated hermeneutics, the object of which is to restore its lost meaning. In Shi’ism the imam is the “hermeneut,” the interpreter par excellence and his teachings, his hadiths, are meant above all to be explicit interpretation (tafsīl, ta’bīr), exegesis (tafsīr), hermeneutics or spiritual elucidation (ta’wil) of the Book (in the early period all such terms are more or less equivalent). The imams and their teachings are what give the Word to a Qur’an struck dumb by alteration. Over time,
this radical thesis, based on that of falsification, will gradually give way
to the doctrine according to which the Qur’an itself in its original ver-
sion is a coded text on several levels, which as a result requires the imam’s
ermeneutics in order to be adequately understood.11 I shall come back to
this later.

Beginning with its earliest texts, Shi’ism defines itself effectively as a
hermeneutical doctrine. The teaching of the imam/wali (friend or ally of
God)12 exists for the essential purpose of revealing the hidden meaning
or meanings of Revelation. Without the wali’s commentaries and expla-
nations, the Scripture revealed by the prophet (nabi) remains obscure,
its deepest levels not understood. For example, in the parts belonging to
the most archaic levels of the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays, with which we are now
familiar, we already read: “Alī declared: ‘Interrogate me before you lose
me! By God, at the revelation (tanzīl) of each verse the messenger of God
recited it to me so that I might recite it in turn and I have had knowledge of
the interpretation of its hidden meaning (ta’wil).’”13

In one of the sermons ascribed to him, ‘Alī, imam and hence hermeneut
par excellence, says: “This light by which we are guided, this Qur’an which
you have asked to speak and which will not speak. It is I who will inform
you about it, about what it contains of knowledge of the future, of teaching
on the past, as a remedy for your miseries and an orderly arrangement of
your relationships.”14

The hermeneutical character of Shi’ism, propelled by the teaching
of the imams, is just as powerfully illustrated by the important, and cel-
èbrated, hadith of “the warrior of ta’wil” (mujāhid or muqātil al-ta’wil). This
is a prophetic tradition in which Muḥammad is said to have proclaimed:
“Among you [i.e., among my followers] there is one who fights for the spir-
itual interpretation of the Qur’an just as I myself have fought for the letter
of Revelation, and that person is ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib.”15

A similar sentence is put into the mouth of ‘Ammār b. Yāsir, the faith-
ful Companion of the Prophet and of ‘Alī, said to have been uttered at the
Battle of ʿIṣṭīn where the latter’s troops clashed with those of Muʿāwiya:
“By Him who holds my life in His Hand, just as once we fought our enemies
for [the letter] of Revelation, so today we combat them for its spirit.”16

It is interesting to note that according to this statement, corroborated
by others, the true issue of the Battle of ʿIṣṭīn was the protection of the
spirit of the Qur'an by ʿAlī and his followers against the threat of its anni-
hilation by the partisans of an exclusive literalness, that is, Muʿāwiya and
his supporters. For the Alids, to break the organic link between the Book
and its interpretation by the imam, and so to reduce the Word of God to its
literal sense, is to lop off what is most precious from religion. Hence it is
the entire spiritual destiny of Islam that is here at stake and therefore the
necessity of ʿAlī’s jiḥād against Muʿāwiya.17

Following the conception driven by these traditions, ʿAlī, the imam par
excellence and the “father” of all the other imams as well as the supreme
symbol of Shi’ism, comes to complete the mission of Muḥammad by dis-
closing through his hermeneutical teaching the spirit concealed beneath
the letter of Revelation. The same notion is transmitted by another pro-
phetic tradition reported by the Ismaili thinker Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī
(d. shortly after 427/1036): “I am the master of the revealed letter [of the
Qur’an] and ʿAlī is the master of spiritual hermeneutics.”18

Other traditions, reported as well by non-Shi’ite sources, emphasize
ʿAlī’s role as an initiate into the arcana of the Qur’an, traditions which of
course Shi’ite works continually cite:

Each verse revealed, without exception, said ʿAlī himself, the Prophet
recited to me and dictated to me so that I might write it in my own hand,
he taught me both the esoteric (taʾwil) and the exoteric (tafsīr) commen-
taries, what abrogates and what is abrogated, the clear and the ambigu-
ous. At the same time the Messenger of God entreated God that He might
inculcate within me both understanding and learning by heart; and in
fact, I have not forgotten a single word.19

The Qur’an was revealed in accord with seven Themes (sabʿat ahruf)20 each
of which contains an obvious level (ẓahr) and a hidden level (baṭn). ʿAlī b.
Abī Ṭālib is he who possesses knowledge of the exoteric (ẓāhir) and the
esoteric (bāṭin) [aspects of the Qur’an].21

Except for the Prophet, there is no one more knowledgeable than ʿAlī
about what is between the two covers of the Book of God.22
Last, I give the celebrated prophetic hadith as another illustration of the inseparability of the Two Precious Objects, the Family of the Prophet and the Book of God:

‘Alī is inseparable from the Qur’an and the Qur’an is inseparable from ‘Alī.23

The antiquity as well as the centrality of these doctrines doubtless explains both the antiquity and frequency of redaction of exegetical works within the Shi’ite milieu. The bibliographical and prosopographical sources list more than a hundred works of this type, compiled, by and large, during the period of the historical imams, that is, from the first/seventh century to the second half of the third/ninth century. Almost none of the works dating from before the third/ninth century has come down to us except in the form of fragments in later writings. Many of these writings are traceable back to the immediate disciples of such imams as Abū al-Jārūd (of Zaydite tendencies, born ca. 80/699), Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju‘fī (d. 127/758–759), Thābit b. Dinār, better known under the name of Abū Ḥamza al-Thumālī (d. 150/767), or Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Barqī (d. 274/887–888 or 280/893–894).24 These texts would all have been compilations of exegetical hadiths ascribed to the imams, probably without any additions on the part of the compiler who gave his name to the work.

Al-Ḥibarī and His Qur’anic Commentary

The traditionist and Qur’an commentator al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥakam b. Muslim Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Kūfī al-Washshā’ al-Ḥibarī (d. 286/899)—as the last three elements of his name most often retained by his biographers indicate—was a native of the Iraqi city of Kūfa and a dealer and/or manufacturer of fabrics and garments, since al-washy (from which al-Washshā’ derives) as well as al-hibar (whence the name al-Ḥibarī) are terms for garments, most likely of silk or based on this precious fabric.25 Notwithstanding some doubts expressed by some of his biographers, it seems clear that he was a Shi’ite with Zaydite leanings.26 Even so, the Twelvers display no reluctance in drawing on him, which shows, yet again, how porous were the
doctrinal boundaries between various Shi’ite movements, especially in the early period. Some of al-Ḥibari’s masters and transmitters can be identified through his biographers or from the chains of transmitters (isnād), either of his own works or from other similar works which cite him. Some of his masters are not Shi’ites, such as ‘Affān b. Muslim al-Ṣaffār al-Baṣrī, Ibrāhīm b. Ishāq al-Kūfī al-Ṣinī, or Jandal b. Wāliq al-Ṭaghlabī al-Kūfī; still, most are Shi’ites often with affiliations to the Zaydite branch. It is noteworthy how many of the men are from the city of Kūfā. Thus, to begin with, the imam Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Jawād (the ninth Twelver imam), al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan al-Fazārī al-Kūfī (considered a Shi’ite extremist, a ghālin), al-Ḥusayn b. Naṣr b. Muzāḥim al-Minqarī (son of the renowned author of the Waq’at Ṣīfīn), al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥusayn al-ʿUranī al-Anṣārī (one of the Zaydite leaders of the time), al-ṣaḥīḥ b. Dukayn al-Kūfī (known as a moderate Shi’ite), Mukhawwil b. Ibrāhīm al-Nahdī al-Kūfī (a Zaydite who took part in the armed uprising of Yahyā b. ‘Abd Allāh), or Yahyā b. Hāshim al-Ghassānī (an important Zaydite personage). The same phenomenon is found among his disciples and transmitters. Of the non-Shi’ites mention may be made of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Ibn al-Aṭrībī, Khaythama b. Sulaymān al-Qurashi, ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Nakha’ī al-Qāḍī. And the Shi’ites: Furāt b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī (author of the celebrated Ṣafīr), Ibn ‘Uqda Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Kūfī (Jarūdite Zaydite), Aḥmad b. Ishāq b. al-Buhlūl al-Anbārī (a Zaydite judge), al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan al-ʿAlawī al-Miṣrī together with ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-ʿAlawī al-Madānī or ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sabīrī al-Kūfī (the last three all Zaydite scholars and notables).

Two of al-Ḥibari’s works have come down to us: al-Musnad, a collection of sixty-three traditions on different subjects going back to contemporaries of the Prophet (Ḥudhayfa, Khalīd b. al-Walīd, Ibn ‘Abbās, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, Ā’isha, ‘Alī, etc.). The great majority of the traditions deal with the countless virtues and the praise, especially by the Prophet, of ‘Alī’s good qualities. The second work is of course his Qur’an commentary, which has been edited at least twice. The work is known under several titles: Tanzil al-ayāt al-munzala fi manāqib ahl al-bayt (“The Revelation of the Verses Concerning the Virtues of the Members of the Prophet’s Family”), Mā nazala min al-Qur’ān fī amīr al-muʾminin (“What Has Been Revealed in the Qur’an Concerning the Commander of the Faithful,” i.e., ‘Alī), Mā nazala min al-Qur’ān fī ahl al-bayt (“What Has Been Revealed in the Qur’an About the Members of the Prophet’s Family”), etc., and, more commonly, Taṣfīr
al-Ḥibārī (“The Qur’an Commentary of al-Ḥibārī”). The main transmitter of the book is the Iranian-born Shi’ite scholar Abū Ubayd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Īmār al-Marrūbān al-Baghdādī (b. 296/908–909, d. 384/994). The commentary as such along with its addenda contains one hundred traditions, almost all of which go back to the Companion Ibn ʿAbbās and refer to the presumed allusions or hidden meanings of the Qur’an dealing with ʿAlī, the members of his family, his followers, and his enemies. From this perspective the work may be deemed to belong, to some extent, to the genre of the asbāb al-nuzūl (“the circumstances of Revelation”) in a Shi’ite version whose identity is concealed beneath the authority of Ibn ʿAbbās, a highly revered figure for non-Shi’ites and considered “the father” of Sunni Qur’an exegesis.

To gain a clearer sense of al-Ḥibārī’s Qur’an commentary, we here translate some excerpts (omitting the chains of transmitters of traditions—isnād—not pertinent to our subject):

- Commentary on Sura 2 (al-Baqara), verse 25: “Announce the good news to those who believe and who do good works.” Ibn ʿAbbās: “[This verse] was revealed with regard to ʿAlī, Ḥamza [b. ʿAbd al-Muțṭalib], Jaʿfar [b. Abī Ṭālib] and ʿUbayda b. al-Ḥārīth b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib.”
- Qur’an 2 (al-Baqara)/45: “Fortify yourselves with patience and prayer; this may indeed be an exacting discipline but not for the humble.” Ibn ʿAbbās: “‘Humble’ is he who abases himself in prayer [before God] and who goes enthusiastically to prayer; this deals with the Messenger of God and ʿAlī.”
- Qur’an 2 (al-Baqara)/81–82: “No! He who has committed evil and whom sin engrosses .¬.¬. ” Ibn ʿAbbās: “This was revealed with regard to Abū Jahl. “Those that have faith and do good works are the heirs of Paradise and shall abide thee forever.” Ibn ʿAbbās: “This was revealed with particular regard to ʿAlī for he was the first to be converted [to Islam] and the first after the Prophet to have performed the canonical prayer.”
- Qur’an 3 (Āl ʿImrān)/61: “Come! Let us summon our sons and your sons, our wives and your wives, our people and your people and let us subject ourselves to an ordeal [literally “a reciprocal imprecation”] .¬.¬. ” Ibn ʿAbbās: “[This verse] was revealed with regard to ‘the persons’ of the Messenger of God and ʿAlī; [the expression] ‘our wives and your wives’ refers to Fāṭima; ‘our sons and your sons,’ that is, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn [sic: the two names lack the article].”
• Qur’an 4 (al-Nisā’)/1: “Fear God in whose name you make requests of one another as well as the wombs [that bore you] for God watches you . . . ” Ibn ʿAbbās: “This was revealed with regard to the Messenger of God, the members of his family and his parents; for on the Day of Resurrection all kinship will be abolished except for his.”

• Qur’an 5 (al-Mā’ida)/55: “You have no master but God and His Messenger and those who believe, who perform the prayer and give alms while bowing down.” Ibn ʿAbbās: “This was specifically revealed with regard to ʿAlī.”

• Qur’an 5 (al-Mā’ida)/67: “O Messenger! Proclaim clearly what has been sent down to you from your Lord, [for] if you do not do that, you are not delivering His message.” Ibn ʿAbbās: “This was revealed with regard to ʿAlī. The Prophet had received the command to proclaim ʿAlī [as his successor]. Then he took him by the hand and said, ʿHe whose patron (mawla) I am, ʿAlī is his patron as well. Lord! Love him who loves ʿAlī (wāli man wālāhu) and be hostile to him who is hostile to him.” This tradition is made complete by another which comments on Qur’an 13 (al-Ra’d)/43, recorded by the traditionist ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Bāqir: “God revealed to His Messenger: ʿProclaim to the people: He whose patron I am has ʿAlī as his patron as well. ’ But the Prophet, out of fear of the people, did not proclaim this. Then God revealed to him: ʿO Messenger! Proclaim clearly what has been sent down to you from your Lord, [for] if you do not do that, you are not delivering His message.’ It was then that the Messenger of God took ʿAlī by the hand, on the day of Ghadīr Khumm, and proclaimed, ʿHe whose patron I am has ʿAlī as his patron as well.’”

• Qur’an 9 (al-Tawba)/18–19: “The only ones who really visit God’s places of worship are those who believe in God and the Last Day, who perform the daily prayer, who give alms, and who fear God. Those people will be without a doubt amongst the rightly guided.” Ibn ʿAbbās: “This verse was reserved exclusively for ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib.” Qur’an: “Do you reckon giving water to the pilgrim and visiting the Sacred Mosque to be the same as those who believe in God and in the Last Day?” Ibn ʿAbbās: “[the first phrase] was revealed with regard to the [clan of] Ibn Abī Ṭālḥa, the guardians [of the Temple at Mecca], and [the second] with regard to the son of Abī Ṭālīb [i.e., ʿAlī].”

• Qur’an 9 (al-Tawba)/20–21: “Those who believe and who have migrated and striven in God’s way with their possessions and their persons
are greater in rank in God’s view. They are those who will be glorified. Their Lord gives them the tidings of mercy and approval from Him and gardens where they will have everlasting bliss.” Ibn ‘Abbās: “This was revealed solely with regard to ‘Ali.”

- Qur’an 13 (al-Ra’d)/7: “You are simply a warner and for every people a guide has been given.” Abū Barza: “I heard the Messenger of God say, ‘You are simply a warner,’ and he placed his hand on his own breast [in other words, at the verse that designated the Prophet]; and while reciting ‘and for every people a guide has been given,’ he indicated ‘Ali with his hand.”


- Qur’an 33 (al-A‘rāf)/33: “O you, people of the Household! Go wants only to remove uncleanness from you and to purify you wholly.” Ten or so traditions reported by several Companions of the Prophet (Ibn ‘Abbās, Abū al-Ḥamrā’, Anas b. Mālik, etc.), and especially by Umm Salama, the Prophet’s wife, identify “the people of the Household” of this verse with the Five of the Cloak, namely, Muḥammad, ‘Ali, Fāṭima, al-Ḥasan, and al-Ḥusayn.

- Qur’an 37 (al-Ḥā’im)/24: “Hold them firm. They are to be questioned.” Ibn ‘Abbās: “These people will be questioned about the walāya of ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭalib.”

- Qur’an 66 (Li-ma tuḥarrimū al-Taḥrīm)/4: “But if you two support one another against him [i.e., the Prophet], know that God is his protector, as well as [the angel] Gabriel and the just among the believers.” Asmā’ bint ‘Umayr: “The just among the believers’ is ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭalib.” The same verse as commented upon by Ibn ‘Abbās: “The expression ‘you two’ designates ‘Ā’isha and Ḥafṣa. ‘God is his protector’ refers to the Messenger of God. ‘The just amongst the believers’ was revealed exclusively with reference to ‘Ali.”

It seems to me that this short sample of reports, which are after all quite repetitive, is enough to provide a clear picture of the nature and contents of al-Ḥibari’s Tafsīr. The different Qur’anic verses are taken as codes designating persons or historical groups who are identified completely with personages whose religious knowledge and knowledge of the Qur’an stand
as authoritative (the Prophet’s Companions, Followers (tābi’ūn) or Shi’ite imams, etc.). In this identification of individuals “concealed” under the literal sense of the Qur’an, ‘Ali has the lion’s share by far. The deeply pro-Alid character of our Tafsīr is thus not in doubt, and yet all proceeds as though al-Ḥiḍārī, by resorting to the authority of persons who cannot be accused of Shi’ite sectarianism (notably Ibn ‘Abbās), sought on, the one hand, to establish his impartiality and his moderation and, on the other, the reality—objective because not tendentious—of the sanctity of ‘Ali as well as, to an implicitly lesser degree, that of the other members of the Prophet’s family (ahl al-bayt).

Al-Ḥiḍārī’s moderation, however, is not limited merely to this. For him, exegesis discloses the spirit of the Qur’an, its hidden meaning, when those persons about whom the Word has been revealed are identified. Nevertheless, perhaps because of his Zaydi affiliation, our author never casts doubt on the authenticity of the accepted text by asserting the notion of falsification (taḥrīf). For other tendencies too, especially in the tradition that will eventuate in Imamism, the importance of the personages and of their historic roles forms the center of gravity of the faith itself; hence such notions cannot figure explicitly in the text of Revelation. In a letter to his close disciple al-Mufaḍḍal al-Juṣflī, the sixth Imam Ja‘far al-(print)

—Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummi, al-‘Ayyāshī and others, include a large number of citations taken from this “Qur’an of ‘Alī”—citations that obviously do not occur in the Qur’an known to everyone—in which many historical personages, and especially the members of the ahl al-bayt, are mentioned by name.52 According to several traditions, all the influential members of the Quraysh (by which the enemies of the
Prophet and of ‘Alī may be understood) were named in the Qur’ān before they were effaced by those who falsified it. Leaving aside this sort of assertion, countless sources and/or exegetical traditions—Imami but also Ismaili—maintain that the positive words, expressions, or passages of the Qur’ān often symbolically designate the friends of God, most especially the ahl al-bayt and the imams, just as the negative expressions designate their opponents.

The Book of Sulaym b. Qays (chapter 1) relates a tradition that, all by itself, sums up practically all the elements examined here: the necessity for ta’wil as hermeneutics of the Qur’ān, explication of the hidden meaning of the Book, which has the effect of illumining the spirit covered by the letter along with the political stakes involved in the elaboration of the sacred Scripture and hermeneutical practice. This tradition takes the form of a dialogue between ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās (this is our Ibn ‘Abbās), an eminent member of Muḥammad’s family, and the Umayyad Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān, the relentless enemy of ‘Ali, as is well known:

Ibn ‘Abbās: “Do you forbid us [i.e., the ahl al-bayt, the members of the Prophet’s family] to read the Qur’ān?”

Mu‘āwiya: No.

Ibn ‘Abbās: Do you forbid us to seek to know its spirit?

Mu‘āwiya: Yes.

Ibn ‘Abbās: Then [in your view] we ought to read the Qur’ān without wondering what God’s intention was [in revealing this or that verse]?

Mu‘āwiya: Yes.

Ibn ‘Abbās: But which obligation is more important: to read the Qur’ān or to put it into practice?

Mu‘āwiya: To put it into practice.

Ibn ‘Abbās: But then how can we put it into practice properly without knowing the divine intention that lies hidden in what God has revealed to us?

Mu‘āwiya: Ask those who comment on the Qur’ān differently from you and the members of your family [i.e., the family of the Prophet].

Ibn ‘Abbās: By God! The Qur’ān was [mainly] revealed regarding my family and so I should ask after its meaning from the members of the family of Abū Sufyān [and others . . .]?
Muʿāwiya: ... Well, then, read the Qurʾan and comment on it, but say nothing about what God revealed in your own regard or what the Prophet proclaimed about you. Relate other traditions ... ⁵⁶

Even if it is difficult to accept the authenticity of this dialogue, at least in its totality—since Muʿāwiya readily admits that God and the Prophet have expressed themselves in favor of his historic enemies—it cannot be denied that it does explain and justify, on its own, the old, recurrent Shiʿite notion that the Qurʾan remains “mute” so long as it has not been subjected to the hermeneutics of an imam from the Prophet’s family, which is thereby identified with the authentic language, the true word of the Qurʾan that reveals “God’s intention.” Whence the conceptual pairing, mentioned earlier, of the Qurʾan as “the silent Book or Guide” (kitāb/imām ʿāmīt) and of the imam as “the speaking Qurʾan” (qurʾān nāṭiq).⁵⁷

The kind of exegesis encountered in al-Ḥibari, discerning all sorts of persons from the Prophet’s entourage beneath the veil of one Qurʾanic verse or another, occurs as well among non-Shiʿite authors—true, in much more limited measure and particularly, as already emphasized, within the context of the “circumstances of Revelation.” But it develops into a veritable literary genre within Shiʿism in which, over time, two characteristics assume ever greater amplitude: first, the suppression of non-Shiʿite individuals in the chains of transmission in favor of Shiʿites, especially the holy imams, as the main transmitters of tradition or the leading exegetes of the Qurʾanic text. Hence the persons identified beneath the veil of the letter of the Qurʾan will become, in the order of their importance, ʿAlī, the other holy members of the Five of the Cloak (thus, apart from ʿAlī, the Prophet Muhammad, his daughter Fāṭima, his two grandsons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn), the historical adversaries of the latter from the Shiʿite perspective, the other imams, the followers of these, and their enemies.

We might call this literary genre that of “personalized commentaries,” a term that is not terribly elegant but has the advantage of clarity. These are quite plentiful in Shiʿism. We may cite as examples:

In the third/ninth century, hence in al-Ḥibari’s day: Mā nazala min al-Qurʾān fī amīr al-muʾminīn (“What has been revealed in the Qurʾan with
regard to the Prince of Believers,” i.e., ‘Ali) by Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Thaqafī (d. 283/896), author of the renowned Kitāb al-ghārāt.⁵⁸

In the fourth/tenth century: the Tafsīr of Fūrāt al-Kūfī (d. ca. 300/912), a disciple of al-Ḥibarī;⁵⁹ Kitāb al-tanzīl fil-naṣṣ ‘alā amīr al-mu’minīn (“The Book of the Revelation in the Text of the Qur’ān with Regard to the Prince of Believers”—known also under other titles) of Ibn Abī al-Thaljī (d. 322/934 or 325/936–937);⁶⁰ Amā‘amīr al-mu’minīn min al-Qur’ān (“The Names of the Prince of Believers in the Qur’ān”) by Ibn Shammūn Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Kātib (d. ca. 330/941–42);⁶¹ Mā nazala fil-khamsa (“What Has Been Revealed About the Five”—i.e., the Five of the Cloak) and Mā nazala fī ‘Alī min al-Qur’ān (“What Has Been Revealed About ‘Ali Drawn from the Qur’ān”) by Abī al-‘Azīz al-Jalūdī al-BAṣrī (d. 332/944);⁶² Ta’wil mā nazala min al-Qur’ān fī ahl al-bayt (“Esoteric Interpretation of What Has Been Revealed in the Qur’ān About the Family of the Prophet’s Abode,” with variant titles) by Muḥammad b. al-‘Abbās al-Bazzāz, known as Ibn al-Ju‘aym (alive in 328/939–940);⁶³ Mā nazala min al-Qur’ān fī sāḥīb al-zamān (“What Has Been Revealed in the Qur’ān Regarding the Master of the Time,” i.e., the Mahdi—another title with variants) by Ibn ʿAyyāsh al-Jawhari (d. 401/1010), the author of the Muqta＜āb al-athar.⁶⁴


In the sixth/twelfth century: Nuzūl al-Qur’ān fī shā‘a’īmīr al-mu’minīn (“The Revelation of the Qur’ān Concerning the Rank of the Prince of the Believers) by Muḥammad b. Mu’min al-Shīrāzī (exact dates unknown);⁶⁸ Ḫaṣṣashī‘al-wahi al-mubīn fī manāqib amīr al-mu’minīn (“Particularities of the Clear Revelation Concerning the Virtues of the Prince of the Believers”) by Ibn al-Bītriq al-Ḥilli (d. 600/1203–1204; see the bibliography).

In the eighth/fourteenth century: al-Durr al-thamīn fī khamsa mi’a āyat nazalat fī amīr al-mu’minīn (“The Precious Pearl of the Five Hundred Verses Revealed Regarding the Prince of the Believers”—there are also variants of this title) by al-Ḥāfīz Rajab al-Bursī (see the bibliography).

In the tenth/sixteenth century: Ta’wil al-‘āyat al-ṣāhiba fī faḍā‘il al-‘itrat al-ṭāhiba (“Esoteric Interpretation of the Outer Meaning of the Qur’anic
Verses Revealed with Regard to the Virtues of the Pure Family,” i.e., the family of the Prophet) by Sharaf al-Dîn al-Astarabâdî.

At the turn of the eleventh/seventeenth and twelfth/eighteenth centuries: two works by Hâshim b. Sulaymân al-Bahrânî: al-Lawâmiʿ al-nûrâniyya fî asmâʾ amîr al-muʾminîn al-qurʾâniyya (“Surges of Light on the Qur’anic Names of the Prince of the Believers”) and al-Maḥajja fî mā nazala fīʾl-qâʾim al-ḥujja (“The Broad Path Towards What Has Been Revealed Concerning the Qâʾim, the Proof,” i.e., the eschatological Savior).

In the thirteenth/nineteenth century: al-Āyāt al-nâzîla fî dhamm al-jâʿirîn ʿalâ ahl al-bayt (“Verses Revealed in Denunciation of Those Who Are Unjust Toward the Prophet’s Family”) by Ḥaydar ʿAlî al-Shirwânî69 or al-Nâṣṣ al-jali fî arbaʾîn āyat fî shaʾn ʿAlî (“The Clear Text of Forty Verses on the Rank of ʿAlî”) by al-Ḥusayn b. Bâqir al-Burûjirdî.70 We observe finally that the writing of this sort of work continues to the present day within Shi’ite milieus.

Personalized Commentaries and the Beginnings of Esotericism

Al-Ḥibari’s Qur’an commentary is one of the oldest texts of its type to have come down to us. The commentary of another renowned Zaydite, Muqṭîtil b. Sulaymân (d. 150/767) is clearly much older, but, on the one hand, he was Zaydite solely in politics and Murji’ite in theology and, on the other hand, and precisely for this reason, his work, though original in many aspects, offers little that is specifically Shi’ite. Thus he stands outside the frame of our complex of problems.71 As a result, it is works such as the Tafsîr of al-Ḥibari that appeared to have introduced an initial form of esotericism into specifically Shi’ite Qur’an exegesis. In this regard, our text belongs squarely within the tradition of pre-Buwayhid exegetical works.72 These texts display several noteworthy characteristics:73 none of those commentaries that has survived treat the Qur’an as a whole; simply a more or less broad selection among the suras and/or the verses is subjected to exegesis. The commentaries are made up almost exclusively of traditions ascribed to the people of the Prophet’s family (ahl al-bayt); this is what is termed al-tafsîr biʾl-maʾthîr (literally, “commentary by traditions”). This selection is typological by nature and deals mainly with those verses best suited to receive typically Shi’ite exegesis in the spheres of theology, jurisprudence,
and history and, still more specifically, with reference to the *ahl al-bayt*, their followers and their adversaries. Exegesis of a grammatical, lexicological, philological, or rhetorical type is almost completely absent. In this respect it may suffice to mention the *tafsîrs* by (pseudo?) al-Ḥasan al-‘Askarî, the eleventh imam of the Twelvers (in the version transmitted by Abû al-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. al-Qâsim al-Astarâbâdî),\(^7\) by al-Sayyârî (third/ninth century),\(^7\) by ‘Ali b. Ibrâhîm al-Qummî (d. after 307/919), by Furât al-Kûfî (d. ca. 300/912), by al-‘Ayyâshî (d. beginning of the fourth/tenth century),\(^6\) and, of course, that of al-Ḥibarî. Moreover, I have termed this pre-Buwayhid Shi‘ism—nourished by huge bodies of hadiths (as will be seen in later chapters) or, more precisely, by the doctrines that provide its foundations—the “original esoteric and nonrationalistic” tradition.\(^7\)

Matters will change with the coming to power of the Buwayhids shortly before the end of the first half of the fourth/tenth century. The reasons for this are tangled and complex; Shi‘ite political dominance will cause this period to be termed “the Shi‘ite century” of Islam; indeed, alongside the Buwayhids at the very center of the caliphate, the Fatimids, the Carmathians, as well as the Ḥamdanîs, reign over the most significant areas of the Islamic empire. A further reason: the complete occultation of the last Twelver imam in 329/941 according to tradition. And a third and principal reason: the turn toward rationalism in Islamic thought. The combination of these historical, political, and religious factors leads, among other things, to the rise of a new class of Twelver jurist-theologians who gravitate toward the Buwayhid princes and strive to justify their rule. With the Sunni Abbasid caliphate still in place, and Sunnis still in the majority, these scholars feel a pressing need for legitimacy and respectability, and so they begin to assume a critical distance from those of their predecessors belonging to the “original esoteric and nonrationalistic” tradition. This is the beginning of the development, at the very heart of Twelver Shi‘ism, of a new “theologico-juridical, rationalist” tradition that henceforth will become predominant and majoritarian and will thrust the primitive esoteric tradition into isolation.\(^8\) As far as exegetical literature is concerned, the monumental commentary by a brilliant representative of this new tradition, al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsî (385–460/995–1067), his *al-Ṭibîyân fi tafsîr al-Qur‘ân*, is a representative indicator of this turning point. This is quite likely the first commentary on the entirety of the verses of the Qur‘ân in which specifically Shi‘ite matters are almost completely rubbed out,
sugarcoated if not indeed submerged in exegeses of a grammatical, lexicological, theological, and juridical sort. In fact, side by side with authorities belonging to the *ahl al-bayt*, others, including even Sunnis, as well as the personal opinions of the author himself (this is what is called *al-tafsîr bi’l-ra’y*), are added to the mix. From this period onward, commentaries sticking to the original tradition to which al-Ḥibari’s work belongs, will become the exceptions, except following the Safavid period, from the tenth/sixteenth century on, and the partial recollection of Imami traditionalism.

To return to al-Ḥibari’s *Tafsîr*: In what does its esotericism consist? In the first instance, it is conceivable that a perception of the text of the Qur’an as a coded message requiring exegesis to reveal its secrets could be seen in its own right as an esoteric procedure of an initiatory sort. The personalized commentary, disclosing specific historical personages beneath the veil of the Qur’anic letter, doubtless displays the oldest and the most elementary form of exegetical esotericism, destined to become ever more complex over time, as we shall see. And yet perhaps there is more. Beyond the persons so identified in the divine message, what does this genre of Shi’ite Qur’an exegesis seek to transmit? Is there a secret teaching contained in the personalized commentaries in general and in al-Ḥibari’s *Tafsîr* in particular? Does there exist some “subliminal message” that the authors of this literary genre are attempting to insinuate for the faithful?

Obviously, the persons, whether positive or negative, who are directly targeted, even if not explicitly cited by the Divine Word (according to the view of the proponents of the falsification thesis) assume in the eyes of the faithful a dimension that is paradigmatic, emblematic, polarized in a positive or a negative manner, respectively. When God deigns to speak of the members of the Holy Family of the Prophet, or of their friends or adversaries, all these figures become the protagonists of a sacred history of universal scope: they are the actors in a cosmic battle between Good and Evil. As the Qur’an ceaselessly reminds us, they repeat and reenact the battle that the prophets and saints of the past had to wage against the injustice and ignorance of their opponents. Now, the letter of the Qur’an (*tanzîl*), at least in the version commonly known, does not allow for a complete comprehension of this basic truth. Rather, the hermeneutics (*ta’wil*) of the imam makes perception possible. On the one hand, the Forces of Good and the Forces of Evil and, on the other, the letter and the spirit of the Book, those two notions underlying the literature of personalized commentary, appear
to signal the transition toward a major religious evolution: the initial form, still elementary, of what I have termed elsewhere the double view of the world characteristic of Shi’ism; the dualist vision and the dual vision, distinct and yet indissoluble and complementary. I shall come back to this at greater length in later chapters.

At this stage, the initial vision seems to come down to a dualistic conception of humanity. Accordingly, the universe is a vast battlefield where the people of Good and the people of Evil—otherwise known as the different allies of God (walī, plural awliyāʾ, i.e., prophets, imams, saints of all periods) with their followers, on one side, and their adversaries with their partisans, on the other, clash in conflict throughout the entire span of creation. Adam and Iblīs, Abraham and Nimrod, Moses and Pharaoh, Jesus and Pontius Pilate, Muḥammad/‘Alī and Abū Bakr/‘Umar are the protagonists in the long history of this combat. This dualism grows out of a “theory of opposites” (dīd, plural aḍḍād) exemplified by fundamental “couples” such as imam/enemy of imam (‘adūww al-imām), people of the right/people of the left (aṣḥāb al-yamīn/aṣḥāb al-shīmāl), guides of light/guides of darkness (a’īmmat al-nūr/a’īmmat al-zalām), or even walāya/barā’a, that is, holy love toward God’s allies and distancing from their enemies. The enemies of walāya, the dark powers of barā’a, are not necessarily pagans and unbelievers. The Israelites who betrayed Moses by joining the cult of the Golden Calf, or the Companions of the Prophet who betrayed him by rejecting ʿAlī, his sole designated successor, are not non-Israelites or non-Muslims, but rather they are those who reject the fundamental message of the founder of the religion, what Shi’ism calls walāya, the love and authority of God’s Ally, and in so doing they empty the religion of what is most profound within it. In fact, in the Islamic period, the adversaries, the enemies (‘adūww, pl. ʿadāʾ), are those who rejected ʿAlī’s walāya and afterward that of the imams descended from him. In effect, this involves almost all the Companions, and especially the first three caliphs, the Umayyads, the Abbasids, and, in a general sense, those whom Shi’ites call “the majority” (al-akthar) or “the masses” (al-ʾāmma), that is to say, those who will end up being called “the Sunnis.”

This dualistic conception, already quite old in Alid milieus—among those eventually known as Shi’ites—is naturally driven by the personalized commentaries such as that of al-Ḥibarī. As we have seen, the negative phrases and concepts of the Qur’anic text are almost systematically
connected with the adversaries, the real as well as those presumed to be on ideological grounds, of Muḥammad and of ʿAli, just as the positive statements and notions are associated in almost all instances with ʿAli, his family members or his followers. This hermeneutical attitude is plainly announced in several traditions that Shiʿite sources draw on continually:

The Qurʾan was revealed in four parts: one fourth deals with us (i.e., we, the members of the Prophet’s Family), another fourth is about our enemies, a third fourth deals with what is licit and what illicit, and a final fourth treats of obligations and precepts. The noblest portions of the Qurʾan belong to us.85

Seventy verses were revealed with regard to ʿAlī with which no one else can be associated.86

No one equals ʿAlī in the Book of God with respect to what has been revealed in his regard.87

We have already broached these traditions in considering the Book of Sulaym b. Qays (chapter 1). In a certain sense, this early work forms another textual basis for the dualistic vision since it is entirely devoted to a denunciation of the corruption of mainstream Islam after the Prophet’s death, a corruption due to the treachery and thirst for power of almost all the Companions, with the first two caliphs chief among them. The latter effectively seized control of the nascent Islamic community by shunting ʿAlī aside from a power that belonged to him by right by God’s command and that of His messenger. Moreover, the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays at the same time reports a large number of traditions containing personalized Qurʾanic commentaries:

Verses 89:25–26 are linked to Abū Bakr and to ʿUmar: “For on that Day no one will punish as He will punish. No one will bind with chains like His.”88 Verses 9:100 and 56:10 are said to be linked with ʿAli: “Those who led the way, the first of the Emigres and the Helpers [of the Prophet]” and “Those who went first are those closest [to God].”89
Verses 98:7 and 6 are associated with ‘Ali’s friends and enemies, respectively: “Those who believe and perform good works are the noblest of humankind” and “Those amongst the People of the Book who do not believe as well as the polytheists will be in hell-fire for eternity; they are the worst of humankind.”

Verses 14:37; 22:77 and 2:143 are associated with ‘Ali: “[Lord] make the hearts of certain men incline toward them”; “O you who believe! Bow down and prostrate yourselves, worship your Lord and perform good works in the hope of victory”; “We have made you a just nation so that you may testify to mankind”. The same is so for verses 11:17 and 13:43: “He who has received a revelation from his Lord and hears the Revelation proclaimed by a witness”; “He who has knowledge of the Book.”

Lastly, the famous verse 33:33 is linked with the Five of the Cloak: O you, Members of the Household! God seeks only to remove uncleanness from you and to purify you wholly.

One of the esoteric strata of this sort of Qur’an commentary consists then in justifying and in maintaining a dualistic conception of humanity in the minds of the faithful by inscribing it within the very fabric of the sacred Book.

Yet another stratum appears to play precisely the same role with respect to the second notion: the dual conception of the Word of God. Accordingly, Revelation is made up of two levels: the letter, in its patent, literal, exoteric sense, and the spirit, in its secret, hidden, esoteric dimension. The prophet-lawgivers, the messengers (nabī, pl. anbiyā’ or, more frequently, rasūl, pl. rusul) are the messengers of the letter of the divine Word destined for the majority of believers, while their imams are the messengers of the spirit of the same Word imparted to a small number of initiates. This dialectic based on the complementary pairing of the prophet and the imam, of the nubuwwa (status of prophethood) and of the walāya (status of divine alliance, of the imamate), of the letter of revelation and its spiritual hermeneutic (tanzīl/ta’wil), stands at the very center of a dual vision of the sacred Scripture in accord with which every divine Word bears at least two levels: a level manifest and exoteric (zāhir) which conceals a level that is secret and esoteric (bāṭin), with the hidden imparting meaning to the manifest. As we have seen, for the earliest Shi’ite exegetical works, the personalised tafsīrs, the essential esoteric element of the Qur’an lies in the identification of the historical persons to whom the revealed text alludes, both explicitly or implicitly.
Yet another hypothesis might be posited as well: it is possible that this dual conception of the divine Word occurred as a consequence of belief in the falsification and censorship of the Qur’an. The original, integral text containing the names of all the protagonists, preserved in the original passages of the Revelation, was sufficiently clear as not to require commentary. Recall the aforementioned tradition of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq: “If the Qur’an could be read as it was revealed, no two persons would have disagreed about it.” At that point letter and spirit had not been separated and so they existed solely as such: the letter was the spirit and the spirit the letter. The clarity of the letter and the brilliance of the spirit formed a single and unique light perceptible to all. Falsification ruptured this unity of the text and made commentary necessary. The dual conception of Scripture, making the Hadith the commentary on the Qur’an, thus came about after the notion of falsification. It is conceivable that both viewpoints—namely, the Qur’an made unintelligible through falsification (probably the older view) and so requiring hermeneutics and the intrinsically enigmatic character of the Qur’an necessitating hermeneutics by its nature—circulated together and for the most part in Shi‘ite milieus of the third/ninth century; it is even conceivable that the popularity of these viewpoints resulted from their very antiquity. Nevertheless, it is difficult to know what the majority view was at this period or even if one viewpoint excluded the other. In any case, as noted earlier, over time, and with steady marginalization of the notion of falsification from the Buwayhid period onward (see chapter 2), the first viewpoint was gradually set aside. Within this doctrinal context it is worth noting that the figure of ‘Alī, as he emerges in a striking number of verses, transcends the historical individual in order to symbolize the figure of the imam par excellence, supreme in representing not only all the guides of all times but also their very nature and function, that is, the divine alliance (wilāya).

We have already seen the organic relationship that links Revelation with the figure of the imam, the messenger of the spirit, who is the tongue of the Book without which it remains “silent.” Lacking the imam’s explications, the sacred Scripture remains only as a letter, closed because unintelligible, and consequently, inapplicable. ‘Alī is the symbol of this “master of hermeneutics” (ṣāḥib al-tawīl) who is the wali/imam, a notion that countless traditions come to illustrate. Furthermore, the first Shi‘ite imam is also the supreme symbol and the personification of wilāya, a notion that over time will take on ever greater density, as we shall see later.
The two notions are thus intimately linked. Scripture possesses a hidden level. The revelation of this level illumines the struggle between Good and Evil by identifying the personages in conflict, the Allies of God and their opponents. Thus a new relationship has been established between Qur'anic exegesis, the Hadith, ethics, and theology. Here it may be helpful to recall one piece of evidence. As we have seen, Islam was born and took shape amid violence, within a multidenominational ambience of civil wars. As a result, the first theological speculations in Islam were born within this ambience.

The endless discussions between Shi’ites, Murji’ites, Qadarites, Mu’tazilites, Jabrites, etc. revolve mainly around such vital questions as the following: Why are we engaged in ceaseless combat amongst ourselves? What lies at the origin of this violence: divine will or human actions? What constitutes legitimate authority? Does the latter derive its origins from God’s will or indeed from human choice? In other words, from determinism or from free will? Who is the just guide, who the unjust leader? Who is a believer, who an unbeliever? What are the criteria of genuine belief, of apostasy, of unbelief? What solutions are there to these problems? Shi’ite doctrinal thinking takes shape in the very same ambience, and its responses to these sorts of question are grounded in its perception of the historic events and their implications during Islam’s beginnings: treachery toward the Prophet Muḥammad and his message, conspiracy against his successor ʿAlī, distortion of his religion and falsification of his Book, thus rendered incomprehensible in its letter, the necessity for hermeneutics as a means of attaining the spirit and hence the intelligibility of the revealed text.

Finally, let us recall one other piece of evidence. In the third/ninth century, at the time when al-Sayyārī and al-Ḥibari were writing, the Shi’ites were already history’s vanquished. Their minority religion was suppressed and ostracized and for centuries they suffered countless horrific massacres. The fourth/tenth century interlude with its Shi’ite domination of the most important regions of the Islamic world would be short-lived, and the return of a pure, harsh Sunnism, ushered in by various Turkic dynasties from the fifth/eleventh century onward, would restore things to their former state, at least until the Mongol invasion. History is pitiless and cruel to the vanquished. To endure it, they must manage to keep a certain distance from it. Metaphysics and mysticism, enveloped in an ever more refined esotericism, appear to have helped the faithful in the effort to surmount these circumstances. In the following chapters we shall explore this further.
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A Representative of a Double Period of Transition

In the third/ninth century, at a period of intense activity on the part of such authors of Qur’anic commentary as al-Sayyārī and al-Ḥibarī, along with ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, al-ʿĀyyāshī, or Furyūt al-Kūfī—to cite only the most renowned traditionists (muhaddith, i.e., an expert in Hadith) whose works have come down to us—there developed a parallel body of hadith that was different in nature, that was gnostic, mystical, and initiatory. This sort of spiritual and intellectual tradition, widespread throughout the eastern Mediterranean from Late Antiquity onward, would enjoy great currency in a considerable number of Islamic streams of thought and yet it seems a given that it came into Islam by way of different Shi’ite movements, some of which are quite old. The work to be considered in this chapter, the Kitāb Baṣāʾir al-darajāt (literally, “The Book of Perceptions of Degrees,” a title we shall return to), by the traditionist al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī (d. 290/902–3), is without a doubt, with respect to the early period, the single most important extant Shi’ite source in the transmission of this form of tradition. True, the compilations of Qur’anic exegesis also contain traditions of a gnostic and mystical bent, but these are, on the one hand, quite few as well as secondary to the traditions of a historical and personalized type and, on the other, the collections such as al-Ṣaffār’s include a huge
amount of new materials dealing with far more complex themes than what the tafsīrs contemporaneous with them display.

What are the reasons, from the early traditions onward, for these new types of source that will mark the Shi’ite religion so profoundly and so enduringly that henceforth it will be specifically characterized by them? The doctrinal elaboration of a religion is always rooted in multiple and complex bases. Those that I evoke here are doubtless the most superficial, yet they have the advantage, in my view, of standing in a direct relationship with the complex of problems that concerns us.

The existence of elements of a mystical and esoteric sort are apparently quite old within proto-Shi’ism since they seem to be present among ‘Ali’s entourage, among the adepts of what has been termed “the religion of ‘Ali” (dīn‘ Alī). The swift transformation of the historic person of the first imam into a semilegendary hero and a figure of well-nigh cosmic dimensions had repercussions on the very image of his descendants, beginning with the younger son whom he had with Fātima, al-Ḥusayn, and another son whom he had with a woman whom he married after the latter’s death, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyya, the imam of the initiatory sect of the Kaysāniyya. From the accounts provided by heresiographical works on a certain number of disciples of different Shi’ite imams, especially in the second/eighth century, it can be concluded that teachings of a gnostic type were often current among circles of initiates. Nevertheless, particularly from the second half of this century and throughout the whole course of the following century, a literature developed by leaps and bounds that is as rich as it is varied and that is of a mystical, initiatory and gnostic character with a strong messianic component. In the third/ninth century this literature peaks in certain chapters of the Kitāb al-Mahāsin by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī (d. 274/887–88 or 280/893–94) and most especially in our Baṣā‘ir al-darajāt. The upsurge of this body of work, which quickly acquires imposing dimensions, is due to a twofold impasse among Shi’ites. On the historical plane, Shi’ism is a minority, marginalized and frequently persecuted with extreme violence. Apart from a few rare exceptions, this situation can be verified for the entire reign of both the Umayyads and the Abbasids; the Umayyad caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz and the Abbasid caliphs al-Saffāḥ, al-Maʿmūn or al-Muntaṣir did demonstrate some tolerance toward the Alids/Shi’ites and a relative measure of respect for the rights of the members of the Prophet’s family, but these overtures, which can often be characterized as...
“political,” were of quite brief duration and, leaving aside the fourth/tenth century, “the Shi’ite century” of Islam, it can be said that the imams’ followers were definitively overwhelmed by the followers of Sunni Islam, by now the majority. Afterward, on the religious plane, Shi’ism will be ostracized and isolated, its doctrines set at naught by the immense and uninterrupted flow of Sunni traditions, in the sense that, in reaction to virtually every Shi’ite belief that glorifies ‘Alī, his descendants, and his offspring, other traditions lauding their enemies or even appropriating those enemies for the exigencies of the cause will be elaborated. In a certain sense it comes down to the Sunnis’ word, aided by the support of a frequently repressive political power, against that of the Shi’ites, the defeated minority. Confronted with this situation, Shi’ites seem to have decided to avoid any direct confrontation, henceforth considered ineffective, and to develop other doctrinal aspects running parallel to the restitution of the rights of ‘Alī and his descendants: the formation of complex esoteric doctrines of a gnostic character developed around the mystique of the figure of the imam. The proclamation of the rights of ‘Alī and of his descendants, together with the denunciation of their adversaries, steadily gains a cosmic and metaphysical perspective. The faithful are thus summoned to achieve a transforming knowledge, a saving wisdom, by rising above the tragedy of history. What’s more, messianism confers a horizon of hope on this perspective. In this gnostic religion the historical imam is the master of secret teachings while the spiritual and cosmic imam is the final content of these teachings.

Al-Ṣaffār’s work is a perfect illustration of this evolution. As the representative par excellence of what I have elsewhere called “the original esoteric and nonrationalist tradition” of the Shi’ism in the schools of Qumm and Rayy, the Kitāb Baṣāʾir al-darajāt becomes problematic when, from the Buwayhid era onward (first half of the fourth/tenth century), “the rationalistic juridical and theological tradition” of the Iraqi school of Baghdad will become dominant and will seek, insofar as it can, to minimize the main doctrinal differences between Shi’ism and Sunnism. From this perspective al-Ṣaffār and the tendency that his work represents can be situated within a twofold period of transition: that of the development of mystical and gnostic doctrine together with historical and exegetical doctrine (represented by such authors as al-Sayyārī or al-Ḥibari) and that which signals the predominance of the school of Baghdad and the marginalization of those of Qumm and Rayy. We shall come back to this.
From the Buwayhid period onward, that is, several decades after al-Ṣaffār’s death, Imami prosopographers will display an ambiguous attitude toward him and his magnum opus. The work of the much later Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī (d. after 707/1307), one of the most renowned authors of Imami bio-bibliographical dictionaries, in drawing up a sort of “account” of earlier data, seems especially revealing in this respect: he devotes an entry to Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Farrāḵh with all the formulae of respectability and another entry to Muḥammad al-Ṣaffār, the author of the Kitāb Baṣāʿir al-darajāt, but uses none of the customary formulae of trustworthiness (tawthīq). The no less renowned scholar Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Ardabīlī (b. ca. 1058/1658) does the same in his important prosopographical work Jāmiʿ al-ruwāt. Now we know, mainly thanks to several other sources to which we shall have occasion to return, that here we are dealing with one and the same person, and, even though other authors have devoted a single entry to al-Ṣaffār, nevertheless this “doubling” just noted in al-Ḥillī and al-Ardabīlī is telling; it reflects the paradoxical attitude of almost all Twelver Shi’ite scholars, at least from the fifth/eleventh century onward, toward al-Ṣaffār: an uneasy, hesitant, and ambiguous attitude, oscillating between respect and mistrust. This reaction is all the more puzzling in that al-Ṣaffār was said to have been close to the eleventh imam al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Ṣaḵkarī (d. 260/874) and his K. Baṣāʿir al-darajāt is one of the first, if not the very first, of the great collections of Imami doctrinal traditions to have come down to us and, moreover, constitutes the oldest known source on Twelver esoteric imamology. Furthermore, al-Ṣaffār was a forerunner of the great al-Kulaynī (see chapter 5) and from him to al-Majlisī, via Ibn Abī Zaynab al-Nuʿmānī, Ibn Bābawayh al-Ṣadūq, or al-Ṭūsī, he is abundantly cited, either directly or indirectly, by great scholars. This bespeaks his importance in the elaboration and commitment to writing of Twelver doctrine. And yet the ambiguous attitude to which he is subject within his own religious milieu persists even to the present day. The works of an al-Kulaynī or of an Ibn Bābawayh—belonging to the same tradition as our author, as we shall see—have prompted and continue to prompt numerous commentaries; they have been published repeatedly, critically edited and meticulously vocalized, translated in their entirety into Persian (the other language, along with Arabic, of Shi’ism), whereas, with regard to al-Ṣaffār’s work, no commentary can be found up to the present day, there exist solely one old lithographed edition, now
impossible to find, dating from 1285/1868, and another published in limited numbers, produced on the basis of the lithographed edition, in the 1960s in a quite defective form and reprinted in 1404/1983, riddled with typographical errors and lacking either vocalization or a Persian translation. The author, a disciple of the imam and a precursor of the great al-Kulaynî, continues to be lauded, even while every step is taken to avoid engaging with his major work in any serious way. Abû Ja’far al-Ţûsî (460/1067) who in his Fihrist presented our author as having written the Başâ’îr al-darajât as well as some letters addressed to the eleventh imam, was content in his Riţâl to present al-Ṣaffâr as the imam’s disciple and to note their correspondence even while passing over his work as a compiler in silence. In the same period, Aḥmad b. ʻAlî al-Najâshî (450/1058) drafted what is perhaps the richest entry on al-Ṣaffâr, giving his complete name and a long list of his writings while simultaneously leaving the reports that linked him with the imam al-Ḥasan al-ʻAskarî unmentioned. But we must go back even further. Again according to the testimonies of al-Najâshî and al-Ţûsî, al-Ṣaffâr’s principal transmitter, namely, Muḥammad b. Ḥasan Ibn al-Walîd (343/954), a respectable traditionist, jurist, and Qur’ān commentator in Qumm, transmitted al-Ṣaffâr’s entire work with the exception of the K. Başâ’îr al-darajât.

Plainly, al-Ṣaffâr, and most especially his Başâ’îr, posed, and continued to pose, a problem. Why? Who was he and what did his main collection of hadiths represent? What is his role or the role that the early Twelver tradition ascribed to him at the time of that decisive turning point occasioned by the Occultation of the twelfth imam? The answer to these questions will shed some light on the doctrinal and historical evolution of Shi’ism as well as its relation with the scriptural writings and the upheavals of history.

Al-Ṣaffâr al-Qummi seems not to be missing from any Imami bio-bibliographical dictionary, but the most essential information about him is given by his two earliest biographers, namely, al-Najâshî and al-Ţûsî, whereas later authors simply take up the same data while inserting variations into it in line with their own preoccupations.

Al-Shaykh Abû Ja’far Muhammad (also known as Mamûla, an affectionate diminutive of Muḥammad) b. al-Ḥasan b. Farrûkh al-Ṣaffâr (“a worker in brass”) al-Qummi “al-ʻA‘râj” (“the lame”), who died in 290/902–3, was a client (a manumitted slave) of the powerful tribe of Ash‘arite Arabs in the Iranian city of Qumm; he was a contemporary of the tenth and the eleventh
imams, ‘Ali b. Muḥammad al-Naqī al-Ḥādī (d. 254/868) and al-Ḥasan b. ‘Ali al-ʻAskarī (d. 260/874). According to al-Ţūsī, he was the latter’s disciple and addressed a “questionnaire” (masā‘il) to him. On the basis of a list drawn up by al-Najṣī and taken up by several later authors, he compiled thirty-seven collections of traditions, the majority of which were works of jurisprudence, as their titles show: “The Book of Ritual Prayer” (Kitāb al-ṣalāt), “The Book of Fasting” (K. al-ṣiyām), “Ablution” (K. al-wuḍū’), “Pilgrimage to Mecca” (K. al-ḥajj), “Visiting Tombs” (K. al-mazār, i.e., the tombs of the Prophet, Fāṭima, and the imams), “Commercial Transactions” (K. al-tijārāt), “Reputation” (K. al-ṭalāq), “Legal Penalties” (K. al-ḥudud), “Ritual Obligations” or “Distributive Shares in Estates” (K. al-fara‘id), “Beverages” (K. al-ashriba), etc. All these works now seem to be lost. Doubtless, in the light of the practice at the time, these were little treatises in which traditions dealing with a specific legal matter were assembled.21 Other collections would have contained traditionally Shi‘ite doctrinal traditions: “The Refutation of Extremists” (K. al-radd ‘alā ‘l-ghulāt), “Eschatological Prophecies” (K. al-malāḥim), “The Obligation to Keep a Secret” (K. al-taqiyya),22 “The Initiated Imami Believer” (K. al-mu‘min),23 “Praises” (K. al-manqib, i.e., of the Prophet, Fāṭima, and the imams or of Imamis in general), “Blames” (K. al-mathālib, i.e., against the enemies of the imams or Imamis in general), “That Which Is Reported on the Lineage of the Imams” (K. mā ruwīya fi āwlād al-a‘īma), and, last, the K. Bāšā‘ir al-darajāt. The full title of this single compilation by al-Ṣaffār that has come down to us seems to have been, to judge from most of the manuscripts, Kitāb bāšā‘ir al-darajāt fi ‘ulūm āl Muḥammad wa-mā khaṣṣahum Allāh bihi (roughly, “Book of the Perceptions of Degrees of the Knowledge of the Descendants of Muḥammad—i.e., the imams—and What God Has Reserved Exclusively for Them in This Area”),24 better known under the abridged title Bāšā‘ir al-darajāt.25 This title was used to designate quite a few works at different periods.26 Literally meaning “perception of degrees,” it seems to mean the “progressive understanding” of a given theme. In the case of our work, it plainly denotes the progressive understanding of the initiatory Science or Knowledge (‘ilm, pl. ‘ulūm) of the imams, both that which the latter possess as well as that which has them as its object.27 Now the edition that has appeared in Iran has the title Bāšā‘ir al-darajāt fil-maqāmāt wa-faḍā‘il ahl al-bayt on its flyleaf (approximately “Book of Perceptions of the Degrees of the States and the Virtues of the Members of the Prophet’s Family”). Hence the term knowledge has been
suppressed, though this is, as we shall see, the single most important element of the title since it forms the central theme of the work.

This is a voluminous collection of hadiths—it contains 1,881 traditions with some repetitions divided into 10 sections further divided into chapters, filling 540 octavo pages in the Tabriz edition—a kind of monograph on the various facets of the initiatory knowledge of the imams—or at least what the compiler judged as such. To give a preliminary sense of the contents of the book, here are a few chapter titles:28 “the creation of the hearts and bodies of the imams and of their disciples” (section I, chapters 9 and 10), “the teaching of the imams is arduous and hard to grasp” (I/11), “their Knowledge is a secret wrapped in a secret” (I/12), “the imams are the Proof of God and His Threshold, His Face and His Side, His Eye, and the Treasurers of His Knowledge” (section II, chapter 3), “What the Sinless Ones (i.e., the Prophet, Fāṭima and the imams) have seen and known in the [preexisting] worlds of Shadows and Particles” (II/14–16), “the imams teach religion to the jinn” (II/18), “the imams are the heirs of the Knowledge of Adam and of all the initiates of the past” (III/1), “they know what transpires in the heavens and on the earth, the events that occur in heaven and in hell, those of the past and those of the future up until the Day of Resurrection” (III/6), “they keep the primordial Books and the Scriptures of earlier prophets” (III/10), “they possess the secret books of Jafr, of the Jāmiʿa, of the Muṣḥaf Fāṭima, [the books] of Genealogies, of sovereigns, and of the Blisses and the Miseries” (III/14 and IV/1–2), “they retain Adam’s shirt, Solomon’s seal, the Arc and the Tablets of Moses, the weapon of Muḥammad” (IV/4), “the imams know the supreme name of God” (IV/12), “they hear the celestial voices and have visions of forms more glorious than those of Gabriel and Michael” (V/7), “they raise the dead, heal lepers and the blind, visit the dead and are visited by them” (VI/3 and 5), “the teaching that the Prophet gave after his death to ʿAlī” (VI/6), “the imams receive inspiration by the branding of the heart and the piercing of the tympanum” (VII/3), “they know the language of birds, of wild animals, and of metamorphosed creatures” (VII/14–17), “the powers of riding the clouds’ overlapping and ascension into the heavens” (VIII/15), “the vision in the pillar of light” (IX/7–9), “the earth cannot be devoid of an imam, otherwise it would be destroyed” (X/12), “the knowledge that each imam has at the moment of his death with regard to his successor” (X/13), “other miraculous powers of the imams” (X/18) .
Al-Ṣaffār’s work, clearly based on older teachings, is the earliest extant systematic compilation of traditions about Twelver “imamology” and its epistemological theory, providing the bases of both imamate metaphysics and mysticism. At the same time, it stands as the oldest monograph bearing witness to the emergence of gnostic thought within the Shi’ite milieu. For this reason it is indubitably linked with what I have termed the original “nonrationalist esoteric” tradition and constitutes the earliest such source that has come down to us. Indeed, I believe to have shown elsewhere that it is possible to distinguish two quite different traditions on the nature and vision of the world from the earliest phase of the elaboration of Imami Shi‘ism: the first, the older, appears to have predominated from the time of the five or six last imams up until about a half-century after the definitive Occultation of the twelfth and final imam in 329/940–41. This is clearly distinguished by a character that is esoteric and mystical, if not, indeed, magical and occult. This tradition is mainly reported by the traditionists of the Iranian school of Qumm and Rayy, such as al-Ṣaffār, al-Kulaynī (see chapter 5), or even Ibn Bābawayh al-Ṣadūq (d. 381/991), the last great thinker in this tradition. The Occultation of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, identified by tradition as the hidden imam and the future savior, placed the faithful in an extremely delicate position since it left a community, whose center of gravity was in fact its very guide, without an imam. Moreover, this Occultation was contemporaneous with the emergence and ever firmer establishment of a dialectical and rationalistic theology (the well-known science of kalām) within Imamism. Lacking a charismatic leader, living in an environment that was both socially hostile and politically unstable (even if the central power, from the fourth/tenth century onward, fell to the Shi‘ite Buwayhids), and navigating an age ever more deeply marked by rationalism, Imami thinkers appear to have viewed themselves as constrained to adopt certain methods of their Sunni adversaries simply in order to be capable of facing them in theological polemics as well as to be able to justify their legitimacy by forging a compromise between the preservation of their religion as a collective institution and a concern to mitigate their distinctive singularity amid the welter of dominant Sunni ideologies. Accordingly, with al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (413/1022) and his disciples in the Iraqi school of Baghdad, the science of kalām—despite being savagely attacked in the utterances of the imams—breached the Imami milieu on a massive scale, and the “rational theological and juridical” tradition now becomes both
dominant and mainstream and will remain so until the present day, shov-
ing the old esoteric tradition, henceforth charged with heretical extremism (ghuluww), firmly to the margins. As a result of this dominance, al-Ṣaffār and his work, a genuine summa of esoteric and nonrationalist traditions, comes to appear embarrassing, particularly so for the great Imami prosopographers who adhere, almost to a man, to the rationalist tradition. Without a doubt the pressure was already discernible by the time of al-Kulaynī (d. 328 or 329/939–40 or 940–41), a generation after al-Ṣaffār. What had been presented in a clear and quite methodical manner, set out in chapters richly furnished with different versions of the same hadith, in the work of al-Ṣaffār, al-Kulaynī’s precursor and tacit master, becomes in al-Kulaynī’s work more scattered and “diluted” in contexts which at times bear little relationship to the subject of the traditions. Furthermore, a good proportion of the hadiths reported by al-Ṣaffār are missing from al-Kulaynī’s work. This process intensifies still further throughout the work of Ibn Bābawayh (381/991), a great author of the next generation. The very same course of development is perceptible in whatever bears on the esoteric and nonrationalist details regarding the Occultation and the Return of the hidden imam. From the K. al-ghayba (“The Book of Occultation”) of al-Nu‘mānī (d. ca. 345/956 or 360/971) to the Kamāl al-dīn of Ibn Bābawayh, a gradual stifling as well as an ever stronger “dilution” of a certain number of traditions with an esoteric slant is set in motion, culminating at last in the K. al-ghayba of al-Shaykh al-Ṫūsī (d. 460/1067), a great representative of rationalist Shi’ism, whose entire concern seems to be centered on rational demonstration of the Occultation and the Return. Hence, from al-Ṣaffār, living during a period when the imams are present, and passing by way of of al-Kulaynī, who writes during the minor Occultation, we can witness a steady consignment to silence of a number of traditions that are essentially of a highly original esoteric and gnostic type—and therefore susceptible to being judged “heterodox” by the majority—only to arrive at last at the rationalistic turning point with its attempts to conjoin the “orthodox” Sunni positions espoused by al-Mufīd and his main disciple al-Sharīf al-Murtadā (436/1044) with the more or less open and violent condemnation of those very traditions in the name of “reason.”

Viewed thus, the K. Baṣā‘ir al-darajāt of al-Ṣaffār can be deemed the most faithful extant document—and as a result, the one that steadily became the most vexing—in the old esoteric and nonrationalist tradition.
On the one hand, nothing but respect is due to the disciple of the imam and the precursor, if not the immediate informant, of such illustrious persons as Ibn al-Walîd, Sa‘d b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Ash‘arî, Muḥammad b. Yaḥyâ al-‘Aţţâr, Muḥammad b. Ja‘far al-Mu‘addib, al-Kulaynî, or, indeed, ‘Alî b. al-Ḥusayn Ibn Bābawayh (the father of al-Ṣadûq). Virtually all the biographers will take up the adjectives used by al-Najîshî with reference to our author: one of the most illustrious traditionists of Qumm, deserving of trust (thiqa), eminently respectable (‘aţim al-qadr), one whose texts or chain of transmissions seldom display any lacunae (qalîl al-siqâf ’l-riwâya).

On the other hand, within a milieu dominated by rationalism and anxious not to engage in any violent clashes with Sunni “orthodoxy,” the contents and the character of the Baṣā‘ir could scarcely avoid stirring up mistrust or ostracism. This will reach the extent, as we have seen, of splitting the figure of al-Ṣaffâr in two. Authors adhering to the “rational theological and juridical” tradition will report only juridical hadiths on his authority. His work will neither be pondered nor commented upon nor later even edited in a befitting manner. A remark of al-Majlisî’s, cited by al-Mâmaqânî, is telling in this regard: “If Ibn al-Walîd did not transmit the Baṣā‘ir al-darajât [and, as we have already seen, this is the sole work by his master that he did not transmit], it is because he considered its contents to be close [to the theses] of Shi‘ite extremism.” The complaint of ghuluww (extremism, exaggeration) against the esoteric, nonrationalist tradition is a classic one. Ibn al-Walîd was perhaps not so sorely mistaken, all the more so in that during the period of the minor Occultation it could be thought that the conflict between rationalists and nonrationalists was rapidly taking shape and that, in any case, apart from al-Shaykh al-Mufîd, the rationalists incessantly accused their opponents of allowing themselves to be unduly influenced by “extremist” notions, among other things.

Some Significant Anomalies

The text of the Baṣā‘ir al-darajât contains certain “anomalies” that furnish interesting supplementary information on both the book and its compiler.

a) Al-Ṣaffâr’s name appears in the chain of transmission of thirteen traditions. In eight of these the transmitter is linked with al-Ṣaffâr by
two intermediaries, namely, Abū al-Qāsim b. al-ʿAbbās (whom I have not been able to identify)\textsuperscript{39} and Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-ʿAṭṭār, whom we have met before and who is one of the main transmitters of the ʿBaṣāʿir.\textsuperscript{40} In four instances al-ʿAṭṭār is the sole intermediary between the transmitter and our author; in a single case the transmitter reports directly from al-Ṣaffār. To the best of my knowledge at the present time, it does not seem possible to identify the transmitter or transmitters of these traditions, and yet it is conceivable that one or more direct or indirect disciples of al-Ṣaffār subsequently inserted these hadiths into the original collection, and all the more so since, in almost all cases, these traditions appear at the beginning of sections (ten out of thirteen instances) or at chapter-heads (two instances). Doubtless this is also one reason why this version of the ʿBaṣāʿir is called “the long version” or “the major version” (\textit{nuskha kubrā}).\textsuperscript{41}

b) Of the 1,881 traditions that make up the ʿBaṣāʿir, not one is reported directly from the imam al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī whose disciple al-Ṣaffār was, according to several biographers, beginning with al-Ṭūsī in his \textit{Rījāl}. If this information can be trusted—and there is no valid reason to doubt it—we must suppose that our author never saw the eleventh imam in person and that any direct contact, so to speak, between the two came down to an exchange of correspondence that today seems to be lost. To be sure, we have no other works by al-Ṣaffār, but if he had met and heard the imam’s teachings directly, he would certainly have reported what he heard from him in his \textit{Kitāb baṣāʿir al-darajāt}, beyond all doubt one of his most important works. A further corroboration of this notion is that even among the later compilers, when a tradition is reported on the authority of al-Ṣaffār—even if this tradition does not figure in the ʿBaṣāʿir—the latter is never, to my knowledge, directly linked to al-Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī. Likewise our author reports nothing directly from the tenth imam ʿAlī al-Naqī al-Hādī, the imam for thirty-four lunar years from 220/835 until his death in 254/868, a mere six years before that of his successor. And the same obtains with respect to two illustrious contemporaries, namely, the first two “representatives” of the hidden imam according to tradition, the ʿUmarī (or ʿAmrī), father and son, ʿUthmān b. Saʿīd (the “representative” from 260/874 until around 267/880) and Muḥammad b. ʿUthmān (from ca. 267/880 to 305/917).\textsuperscript{42} Hence al-Ṣaffār would have collected the hadiths of the imams only through other traditionists.
Who were these traditionists? Through examination of the chains of transmitters (isnād) in the Buṣā’ir, we end up with a list of some 120 direct informants of our compiler. A large proportion of these individuals—nearly 100—designated solely by their first name, occasionally augmented by their father’s name, or indeed by their kunya alone, appears hard to identify. Some are disciples of the sixth, seventh, eighth or ninth imams (e.g., al-Sandī b. al-Rabī’, Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Ṭayālisī, al-Haytham Ibn Abī al-Masrūq al-Nahdī, etc.) whom al-Ṣaffār could not have heard directly for reasons of chronology; even so, he neglects to give the names of the intermediaries who linked him to them. Finally, others are important personages, the identification of certain of whom will help us better to discern al-Ṣaffār’s intellectual and spiritual personality and very likely, his position within the Imami Shi’ite religious hierarchy:

—ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar al-Ḥimyarī Abū al-Ṣabbās al-Qummī (d. after 293/905–906), a disciple of the tenth and eleventh imams; author of, among other works, the K. al-Imāma, K. al-Tawwīd, K. al-Arwāj, as well as a K. al-Ghayba and a correspondence with Muḥammad b. ʿUthmān al-ʿUmarī/ʿAmrī, the second “representative” of the hidden imam.

—Aḥmad b. Iṣḥāq b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Qummī al-Asḥārī, disciple of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh imams; one of the leading lights among the traditionists of Qumm. He is said to have figured among this handful of close disciples who enjoyed the privilege of beholding the hidden imam prior to his Occultation. He was one of the best-known “delegates” (wakīl) and the “thresholds” (bāb) of the imams and one of the intermediaries between the faithful and the “representatives” of the twelfth imam before the minor Occultation.

—Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Barqī [al-Kūfī?] al-Qummī (d. 274/887–888 or 280/893–894), a renowned disciple of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh imams; author of over seventy books, among which the Rijāl and the Maḥāsin have been published.

—Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sayyār, called al-Sayyārī (see chapter 2). He was accused of “extremism” since he was suspected of having introduced reports of “extremist” origin into the corpus of traditions of the imams (the accusation of takhlīt) and of allowing himself to be corrupted in his beliefs (fāsid al-madhhab, munḥarīf). Nevertheless, he remains an authority often cited not only by al-Ṣaffār but also by many others, as we have seen.
—Ayyūb b. Nūḥ al-Nakha’ī, a disciple of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh imams and the “delegate” of the latter two (al-Ṭūsī presents him as the disciple of the eighth imam as well, but this seems unlikely). A respected traditionist, his asceticism and his integrity are often cited as exemplary.

—Al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Nuʿmān al-Kūfī, a disciple of the eleventh imam.

—Al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Khashshāb, a disciple of the eleventh imam (Ibn Dāwūd errs in presenting him as having been a disciple of the eighth imam). A very respected traditionist, especially in the important Shi’ite centers that the cities of Qumm and Rayy represented.

—Al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ashʿarī al-Qummī, a great religious authority of Qumm and one of al-Kulaynī’s direct masters.

—Ibrāhīm b. Ishaq al-Aḥmarī al-Nahāwandī (d. 268/889), a disciple of the tenth imam; author of several books, among them the K. al-Ghayba, he was accused like al-Sayyārī of takhlīt and ghuluww (extremism).

—Muḥammad b. Jazāk al-Jammāl, a disciple of the tenth imam.

—Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Qummī, whom we have already come across as a source as well as a transmitter of al-Ṣaffār. The two men, no doubt associates, and “classmates,” and enjoying the same rank in the hierarchy, transmitted hadiths mutually one from the other.

—Sahl b. Ziyād al-ʿAdamī (or Adamī) al-Rāzī, a disciple of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh imams; accused of “extremism” around 255/869, he was banished from Qumm by the head of the Imami community of the city, the intransigent Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Ashʿarī, and settled in the nearby city of Rayy from whence he wrote to the eleventh imam to explain his situation. An authority whose name is often employed by al-Kulaynī and Ibn Bābawayh al-Ḥad, as well as sometimes by al-Mufīd, opinions are quite divided with respect to him.

—Yaʿqūb b. Ishaq Abū Yūsuf al-Sikkīt, a disciple of the ninth imam and a close associate of the tenth imam prior to his imamate, a great connoisseur of Arabic poetry, both pre-Islamic and Islamic. He was executed in 244/858 by order of the Abbasid caliph al-Mutawakkil because of his Shi’ism.

Al-Ṣaffār was clearly in close and unbroken communication with some of the highest Imami dignitaries, especially at Qumm and to a lesser extent at Rayy: disciples and delegates of the imams, religious authorities, renowned traditionists. The fact that several direct disciples of the imams frequented him seems to show that he held a rank within the
initiatory Imami hierarchy that was respectable but perhaps not quite exalted enough to permit him to enter into lasting contact with the pinnacles of this hierarchy, namely, the imams or the “representatives” of the hidden imam whom doubtless he never met. Furthermore, the presence of such figures as al-Sayyārī, al-Nahāwandi, or Sahl b. Ziyād, all accused of extremist heterodoxy, in the list of al-Ṣaffār’s masters, appears to confirm, if confirmation were needed, that our author belonged to the gnostic and esoteric tradition. Another allied point is that al-Ṣaffār was close to the circles of the Shuʿūbiyya, that intellectual protest movement of conquered peoples, and especially Iranians, against proponents of the supremacy of the Arab race and language. Al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī, like the renowned Ibn Bābawayh al-Ṣadūq somewhat later, defended the usage of Persian in supererogatory prayers (duʿāʾ) during the canonical prayer (ṣalāt) and on every other occasion, basing his opinion on the hadiths of the imams as well as on juridical common sense in accord with which all that has not been prohibited is licit as long as it does not go against reason. This was considered by their enemies a sign of extremism. Moreover, al-Ṣaffār is one of the very first authors to hold that the imam al-Ḥusayn’s wife and “the mother” of the entire line of succeeding Ḩusaynid imams was an Iranian princess, daughter of the last Sassanid emperor. It is noteworthy that in the traditions he reports on this subject ʿAlī speaks Persian with this princess who will become his daughter-in-law.

All this corroborates several points I noted earlier: the artificial distinction between “moderate” and “extremist” Shiʿites, the gap between the nonrationalist and esoteric tendency, and the rationalistic theological and juridical tendency, one of the classic complaints of the latter against the former residing precisely in the penchant toward extremism, and, finally, the ambiguous attitude of the rationalist intelligentsia with respect to al-Ṣaffār.

c) The most striking “anomaly” of the Baṣāʾir relates to the fundamental questions about the number of the imams and the Occultation of the last one among them. But before broaching this “anomaly,” it is necessary briefly to recall a few historical and doctrinal points. Many traditions, together with the way in which these two questions stand juxtaposed to the notion of taqiyya (the Shiʿite obligation to “keep the secret,” or “tactical dissimulation,” “the discipline of the arcane”) throughout the compilations lead us to consider that everything that touched upon the identity and
destiny of the last imam—deemed to be the eschatological savior as well—was one of the chief objectives of the duty of “keeping the secret.” Within the old corpus deriving from the “the nonrational and esoteric tradition,” especially with al-Kulaynī and Ibn Bābawayh, very many hadiths dealing with the number of the imams or the personage of the savior-resurrector (al-qā‘im)\(^{47}\) include exhortations to a considerable measure of discretion.\(^{48}\) The works of al-Nu‘mānī and Ibn ‘Ayyāsh al-Jawhari (d. 401/1011) that are especially devoted to the twelfth imam (and hence to the definitive number of the imams) open with an entire chapter on “keeping the secret,” the purpose of which is doubtless to convince the reader that, during the period of the imams, all that pertained to the last of them was indelibly marked with the seal of secrecy.\(^{49}\) True, the figure of the Islamic savior and the traditions—both Shi‘ite and non-Shi‘ite—concerning his terrible role in the bloody cleansing of the world in order to reestablish justice and peace had been long known to everyone. The anguish that eschatological accounts—mostly of Shi‘ite origin—inspired at the heart of Umayyad and especially Abbasid power is well known. Every movement of the “mahdi” sort was harshly persecuted, every such rebellion stamped out in blood.\(^{50}\)

Despite their almost complete political passivity, particularly after the drama of Karbalā‘,\(^{51}\) the imams of al-Ḥusayn’s line thus had good reason to be circumspect about everything that related to the resurrector-imam. By this logic, which later compilers sought to bring prominently to the fore, in order to safeguard the life of the mahdi, who would be simultaneously the last of the imams, it was imperative to keep the number of this last secret, along with everything that might reveal his identity, until he was in a safety that was complete, that is, a providentially provided Occultation by God. The fact that the specifications of the number of the imams (viz. twelve) as well as of the hidden mahdi are all reported by sources subsequent to the Occultation (from 260/874 on)—a fact the causes of which are clear to the historian—is doctrinally justified for the believer as well. It is from this perspective that the contradictory elements in the corpus of traditions ascribed to the imams and reported by authors subsequent to the Occultation are presented in compilations edited after this date as being so many “tactics” arising from “tactical dissimulation” (\textit{taqiyya}) in a deliberate attempt to scramble the traces and so guarantee the safety of the savior pursued by a politically hostile power. These very elements are used, are “recovered,” for the exigencies of the cause.
Among the authors whose names or texts will be put to use by later Twelver authors the following may be cited as examples:

—Ibrāhīm b. Ṣāliḥ al-Anmāṭī, ʿwāqiʿī of the fifth imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir, and who, for this reason, in his Kitāb al-Ghayba (The Book of Occultation) speaks of only five imams.52

—ʿAl-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Sumāʿa, like his master, ʿAṭī b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭaṭārī, a supporter of the seventh imam, believed in the Occultation and in the qualification of ʿmahdī (mahdawiyya) for the seventh imam. Accordingly, in his K. al-Ghayba he put forward the number seven as being the definitive number of the imams.53

—The same occurs with Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā al-Ḥaḍramī (third/ninth century) who in his Kitāb (or Ashl) reports a tradition from Jaʿfar according to which there will be seven imams after the Prophet, and the last one will be the ʿmahdī al-qāʿīm.54

—The number of the imams is eight in the K. al-Ghayba of al-Ḥasan b. ʿAṭī al-Baṭāʿīnī al-Kūfī, a partisan of the eighth imam al-Riḍā and probably the ʿwāqiʿī of this imam, as was his father.55

—ʿAbbād b. Yaʿqūb al-ʿUṣfūrī (d. 250/864), a contemporary of the tenth and eleventh imams, speaks of eleven imams in his Kitāb/Asl, but without naming them.56

The Imami arguments thus seek to prove that it was because of ʿaqīyya that the imams put forward different figures to indicate their definitive number. Moreover, in order to consolidate their arguments even further, these arguments rely on the account of acts of divine providence and the efforts of the eleventh imam, thanks to which the birth and the existence of the future hidden imam remain secret until his Occultation.57 Earlier authors, for the most part ʿwāqiʿī of one of the imams, are recovered in this way; and it is for this reason, due to the tireless efforts of such traditionists as al-Kulaynī, al-Nuʿmānī, and, above all, Ibn Bābawayh al-Ṣadūq—all active after the minor Occultation—that Imamis (imāmiyya) end up by calling themselves the Twelvers (i.e., with twelve imams: ithnāʾ ʿashariyya).58 Hence everything that tended to show that historical reality imposed the a posteriori adoption of the dogmas in question was turned to advantage by Imami Shiʿism and held out as just so many facets of ʿaqīyya with respect to the number of the imams and the identity of the resurrector.

Nevertheless, what for historians is proof of an a posteriori invention is for believers the manifestation of providential foreordaining and hidden
wisdom. Indeed, in everything connected to the number of the imams and the savior the data as presented impel the reader to distinguish two distinct phases, and the pivotal factor is, yet again, the occurrence of the Occultation: that information is not extant or is jumbled together prior to the Occultation, then becoming ever more precise subsequently; the early compilers’ silence on the subject, then the appearance of their names in the chains of transmission for traditions bearing on the same subject in later works; the prohibition on pronouncing the name of the mahdi (al-nahy `an al-ism; al-man` `an al-tasmiya), then on pronouncing it out loud (al-man` `an al-tanwih); and the lack of an exact name for the doctrine prior to the Occultation, then the naming of it as “twelver” a short time later. I think that by using such a method of presentation the old Imami corpus belonging to the esoteric tradition sought to advance the following: the imams transmitted two categories of hadith dealing with their number and the identity of the mahdi. The first category contained information that was scrambled and was meant for the general run of disciples who had to commit the traditions to written form. In this category the name of the last imam was not given. So long as the definitive number of the imams remained unknown, it could not be known who the mahdi might be; as a result, “the rule on hidden matters” that dealt with it was observed.

A second category, meant solely for intimate disciples, contained precise information on the number of the imams and the identity and the fate of the final one whose name was given. Purely to ensure the safety and the life of the mahdi, this kind of hadith had to be transmitted only orally until the coming of the Occultation; it could be put into writing only once the life of the son of the eleventh imam had been saved. The obligation to “keep the secret” as applied to the resurrector-imam was no longer necessary. Ibn ʿAyyāsh states outright that the true rationale for the division of the initiatory knowledge fashioned by the imams into “hidden knowledge” (ilm maknūn) and “knowledge disclosed” (ilm mabdhūl) lies here.

Within this context the twin cases of al-Barqī and particularly of al-Ṣaffār, two of the greatest authors who were writing during the time of the imams and whose great works have come down to us, are revealing. In his Kitāb al-maḥāsin Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī gives no information about the questions that concern us. In the first chapter of the book entitled Kitāb al-ashkāl waʾl-qarāʾin, he reports traditions concerning
the different meanings of the numbers, but he moves from the number three to ten and reports nothing regarding the number twelve, despite the fact that it was especially important for Twelvers. Even so, his name is frequently mentioned by al-Kulaynî, al-Nu‘mâni, or Ibn Bâbawayh—to mention only these important early authors—in the chains of transmission for the traditions dealing with the number of the imams and the fate, Occultation, and final Return of the twelfth imam.

The case of al-Ṣaffâr, al-Barqî’s disciple, is more complicated, as we have seen. In his Ṭaṣâ’îr he is silent on the matter of the Occultation, transmits several traditions of a general nature on the resurrector and his Return at the end of time without identifying him and, finally, a mere five traditions on the fact that the imams are twelve in number. Five hadiths out of a total of 1,881 traditions are very few; here it’s conceivable that al-Ṣaffâr resorted to the typical Shi’ite tactic of “dispersal of information” (tabdîd al-‘ilm), and all the more so in that these five traditions often have no logical connection with the chapter in which they occur. Very much as in the case of al-Barqî, al-Ṣaffâr’s authority (often under the name Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan) is widely invoked by later authors in reports of the traditions regarding all that concerns the twelfth imam, including his Occultation. And yet how may this “anomaly”—indeed, this contradiction—be explained in one and the same author—al-Ṣaffâr—a contradiction which lies in reporting traditions on the number of the imams but saying nothing about the Occultation of the last of them, especially since, after 260/874, the two dogmas had become inextricably linked within the tradition? The theme of the ghayba was well known, at least from the time of the Kaysâniyya within the imams’ entourages. Well before the twelfth imam went into Occultation, the imams’ supporters and disciples had composed many collections on the concept, examples of which we have already seen. Al-Ṣaffâr certainly did compose his Ṭaṣâ’îr, or at least its definitive version, following the minor Occultation in 260/874, since thirty years divide this date from the date of his death. Hence it is unremarkable that traditions about the twelve imams occur in his work, but why are they so few? Why did he pass over in silence the list of the imams and particularly the Occultation of the last among them, when, as noted earlier, such direct masters of his in Hadith as al-Nahâwandi and al-Ḥimyarî had each compiled a K. al-Ghayba and, indeed, while this latter, along with Aḥmad b. Ishāq al-Qummî, enjoyed close relations with the “representatives” of the
hidden imam? It is conceivable that so soon after the disappearance of the eleventh imam’s son, a definitive view of his fate had not yet taken shape; the theory of the Occultation was not yet firmly established, nor had the body of traditions about the twelfth imam been assembled in its entirety or brought to completion. It is equally conceivable that the selection of the traditions to be transmitted depended on the rank in the hierarchy of the transmitter—as is the case in many esoteric traditions—and that al-Ṣaffār (who, as we have seen, apparently did not stand in the highest ranks of the Imami initiatory hierarchy) perhaps did not have the authorization to report—at least in writing—a certain category of tradition: that dealing with a subject as sensitive as the resurrector and his Occultation.

Table of Contents of the *K. Baṣā’ir al-darajāt*

By virtue of its age and the fact that it is without a doubt the most reliable witness to the “esoteric and nonrationalist” Imami tradition, al-Ṣaffār al-Qummi’s compilation is a fundamental text for the study of the emergence and development of genuinely gnostic ideas in Shi’ism in particular and in Islam in general. In this regard, familiarity with the complete table of contents of the *K. Baṣā’ir al-darajāt* may prove helpful. Here I follow the order of the divisions in the Küčebāghī edition, which reproduces that of the lithographed edition as well as that of the majority of manuscripts with very few exceptions. To make this a bit less ponderous, the chapter numbering will not be included. Quite particular attention has been devoted to the terminology, which reached a high technical level during this period; this is all the more important since this terminology is not always obvious; many technical terms are quite anodyne in appearance. In my view, one of the main ways of gaining an adequate understanding of the text lies in disentangling the various semantic levels of the traditions intended for quite varied categories of believers. As one example, consider the word *ʿilm* (literally, science, familiarity, knowledge), a cardinal term in the entire work that is itself offered as a kind of monograph on the *ʿilm* of the imams in its various facets. To be sure, the term has the meaning of “religious science,” that of the Qur’an and the Hadith in particular, just as in the Sunnism of the same period. But in basing our examination on the old corpus of the “esoteric and nonrationalist” tradition, we come to realize that, when
the imams utter it, the word *ʿilm* denotes above all a body of knowledge
of an esoteric type that provides the bases of religious knowledge as such
even while encompassing it. In the context of this Shiʿite tradition, *ʿilm*
can thus be rendered as “secret knowledge” or “knowledge/initiatory
knowledge.” The first hadith in the *Bāṣāʾir al-darajāt*, which “opens” the
book, is the famous prophetic hadith: *taḥab al-ʿilm farʿaʿa al-lā kulli muslim.*
According to a commentary that a religious scholar from Bahrain gave
me—a scholar whom I met at the end of the 1970s and who preferred to
speak anonymously—this hadith possesses several levels, as do others. On
the first level, destined no doubt for believers who are not well advanced,
if not for non-Shiʿite disciples who attended some of the imams’ teach-
ing sessions, the hadith can be read in a literal way which agrees with
the understanding of “orthodoxy” as “the quest for religious knowledge
is a canonical obligation for every Muslim.” But on a more technical—and
characteristically Shiʿite—level, “knowledge” is understood as “secret
initiatory knowledge.” In the reasoning of the imams, this “Science”—
reserved for an elite—cannot be incumbent on just any Muslim. Moreover,
in the Imami technical lexicon, the *muṣlim* (the ordinary Muslim) is dif-
ferent from the *muʿmin* (literally, faithful believer; in the technical sense,
the faithful believer who is an initiate of the imams). At this level the
last word of the hadith cannot be read as *muṣlim* but rather, as *muṣallim,*
spelled the same in Arabic as the first term, but which is one of the many
technical appellations for the believing Shiʿite initiate, one who is wholly
“submissive” to his spiritual master the imam. At this level the prophetic
tradition would thus be interpreted as “the quest for secret knowledge is
a canonical obligation for every initiate who has submitted.” The rest of
al-Ṣaffār’s work will endeavor to determine this “science” and this “obli-
gation” and to present its multiple aspects. Thus the table of contents is
translated here in accord with the technical meanings of these terms.

Section 1: The search for secret knowledge is a canonical obligation/
the compensation of the initiator sage (*ʿālim*, the possessor of *ʿilm*, active
participle of the first form of the verbal root *ʿLM*) and of the disciple who
has been initiated (*muṭaʿallim*, active participle of the fifth form of the
same root)/the sage whose knowledge is equivalent to knowledge of God
and whose ignorance is equivalent to ignorance of God/the superiority of
the initiate in relation to the devout (*ʿābid*)/men fall into three categories:
the initiator sage, the initiated disciple, and the spume borne away by the
wave (ghuthā’); the imams are the sages, the true Shi’ites are the initiated disciples, and all others are the spume on the wave/the secret knowledge must be sought out at its source, that is, among the imams of the Prophet’s family/the imams are the source of the secret knowledge/the straying of those who turn away from the guides of truth (a’immat al-ḥaqq)/the creation of the imams’ and disciples’ bodies and hearts/the creation of the imams’ and the disciples’ bodies and spirits/the imams’ teaching are hard and difficult to grasp (ṣa‘b, mustaṣ‘ab)/ their cause is difficult to grasp/the knowledge of the Prophet’s descendants is a secret wrapped up in a secret (ṣir mustasirr)/the imams are the guides to the Prophet’s Message/they are the truthful ones (a Qur’anic expression, al-ṣādiqūn)/the distinction between the guides of justice (a’immat al-’adl) and those of injustice (a’immat al-ţawr)/recognition of the imams of guidance (a’immat al-ḥudā) and of those who lead astray (a’immat al-ţalāl)/God has made obedience (tā‘a) and affection (mawadda) for the imams an obligation/the closeness of the imams and the Prophet/the imams are the people who summon to God (a Qur’anic expression: ahl al-dhikr)/they maintain the knowledge of the licit and the illicit/they are the heirs of the Book/the Prophet’s statement regarding them, “God has given them my capacity for understanding as well as my knowledge”/the Prophet commanded faith in the knowledge of the imams and submission to them/about them God has said [in the Qur’an], “they are those who know while their enemies are those who do not know.”

Section 2: The imam is the mine of initiatory knowledge, the tree of prophecy (shajarat al-nubuwwa), the key of wisdom, the place of the law-revealing mission (mawḍī‘ al-risāla)/the Qur’anic example of the tree denotes the imams and their initiatory knowledge/the imam is God’s proof (ḥujja), the threshold (bāb), he who is responsible for the cause (wāli amr Allāh), the face, the side, the eye of God (Qur’anic expressions), the treasurer of secret knowledge/the “divine face” of the Qur’an designates the imams descended from the Prophet/the imams are the [Seven] Redoubled [Verses] (a Qur’anic expression: al-mathānī) offered to the Prophet/the angels’ holy love (walāya)75 for the imam/the love of the prophets “endowed with firm resolution” (a Qur’anic expression: ʿūl ā al-ʿazm) for the imam from the time of the preexisting world of the covenant (ʿūlam al-mīthāq)/the love of the other prophets from the world of the covenant/another chapter on walāya/the sacred nature (walāya) of ‘Ali, Prince
of the initiates (amīr al-muʾminīn)\textsuperscript{77}/the oath of allegiance of the initiates in the world of the covenant, the creation of the imams from the light of God and the fact that they “see” by means of this light/the oaths of creatures on walāya/ the imams are God’s witnesses (shuhadāʾ) among His creatures/the messenger of God recognized what he saw in the [preexisting] world of shadows (ālam al-azīla) and of particles (ālam al-dharr)/the prince of the initiates (i.e., ʿAlī) recognized what he saw in the world of the covenant/the imams recognize what they have seen in the world of the covenant/the angels frequent the imams and bring them information/the jinn frequent the imams and receive initiatory instruction from them/the imams are the treasurers of the secret knowledge of God in the heavens and on earth/the imams are God’s witnesses (shuhadāʾ) among His creatures/the imams are the heirs of the secret knowledge of Adam and of all the initiated sages [of the past]/the imams receive initiatory instruction from them/the imams are the treasurers of the secret knowledge of God in the heavens and on earth/the imams are God’s witnesses (shuhadāʾ) among His creatures/the imams are the heirs of the secret knowledge of Adam and of all the initiated sages [of the past]/the imams receive initiatory instruction from them/the imams are the treasurers of the secret knowledge of God in the heavens and on earth.

Section 3: The imams are the heirs of the secret knowledge of Adam and of all the initiated sages [of the past]/the initiates inherit knowledge one from the other and, thanks to them, it is never lost/the imams are the heirs of the secret knowledge of the prophets “endowed with firm resolution” along with that of all the other prophets/they are depositaries of divine knowledge and possess the knowledge of destinies and afflictions (al-manāyā wa l-balāyā) as well as of the genealogies of the Arabs/all that concerns the Cause (amr) has been revealed to them\textsuperscript{78}/all that happens in the heavens and on earth is known to them/they know the happenings in the heavens and the earth, in paradise and in hell, in the past and in the future until the Day of Resurrection/the knowledge acquired (ʿilm mustafād) every Friday night/the legal rulings of the prince of the initiates (ʿAlī) in accord with the Torah, the Gospel, the Psalms (Zabūr [of David] and the Qurʿan/the imams keep the primordial Books (kutub al-awwalīn), the Torah [of Moses], the Gospels [of Jesus], the Psalms [of David], and the pages (ṣuḥuf [of Abraham])/ how the descendants of Muḥammad received the tablets (alwāḥ)/the imams keep “the comprehensive page” (al-ṣaḥīfa al-jāmiʿa) dictated by Muḥammad and written by ʿAlī/another chapter on the books [of the imams]/the [secret] books al-Jafr, al-Jāmiʿa, and the collection (muṣḥaf) of Fāṭima.

Section 4: The imams hold the Books of the Prophet and of the Prince of the initiates/the book of the rulers of the earth/the book containing the list of Shiʿites designated by their names and the names of their fathers/the
imams hold the weapon (silāḥ) of Muḥammad and the signs (āyāt) of the prophets, such as the stick, the ark, and the tables of the law of Moses, the seal of Solomon, or the shirt of Adam/the compilation on the inhabitants of paradise and of hell/the imams are alone in possessing the integral version of the Qur’ān/they possess knowledge of the exoteric commentary (tafsīr) and of the esoteric hermeneutics (ta’wīl) of the Qur’ān/‘Alī knew everything that was revealed to the Prophet in all circumstances and so too do the imams of his line/the imams are the pillars (arkān) of the earth and the dazzling proof of God; they have knowledge of destinies and afflictions as well as of judgments such as “the severing Word” (a Qur’ānic expression: faṣl al-khītāb)/they are those who have been “firmly grounded in knowledge” (a Qur’ānic expression: al-rāsīkhūn fī’l-‘ilm) to whom God alludes in His Book/knowledge is established in the breasts of the imams/they possess God’s Supreme Name.

Section 5: God’s Supreme Name and the knowledge of the Book/another chapter on the Supreme Name and its supernatural powers/what the imam receives on the night of the decree (a Qur’ānic expression: laylat al-qadr, literally, “night of power”)/the Prophet read and wrote in all languages/the Prince of the initiates and “the prophet endowed with firm resolution”—which of these two possesses more knowledge?/the imams’ superiority over Moses and Khādīr/the imams hear heavenly voices and see forms (ṣuwar) more glorious than those of the angels Gabriel and Michael/the forms which the angels Gabriel and Michael, as well as the angel of death, assume when they appear to the imam/confronted by “difficult cases” (muḍīlāt) unforeseen by the Qur’ān and the Sunna of the Prophet, the imam receives inspiration (ilhām)/the imam knows [the secrets of] the soul and the conscience [of men]/even from afar, the imam knows what men do and what is going on inside them/the imam knows [the secrets of] the soul of his faithful/the [supernatural] power (al-qudra) conferred by God on the Prophet and the imams/the imams who will come home to him even before the man himself knows/the imams in Muḥammad’s line pronounce their judgments in accord with the laws of David’s descendants/even from afar, the imams know the states in which their faithful are/they know if their faithful are hiding something from them and they know their destinies.

Section 6: the imams know the date and the cause of the deaths of their faithful/they possess the knowledge of destinies and afflictions, as well as
knowledge of genealogies and the “severing Word”; they are able to resuscitate the dead, heal the blind and lepers with God’s permission/another chapter on the power of resurrecting the dead/the imams visit the [spirits of] the dead and they pay them visits in return/Muhammad’s post mortem instruction of ‘Ali/the imams are able to meet up with their dead enemies/the imams recognize the sincerity or the hypocrisy of those with whom they speak/they know the goodness or the badness, the love or the hate, of those with whom they speak with respect to themselves/the Prophet initiated ‘Ali into the entirety of secret knowledge: he associated him with his own knowledge, but not with his role as a prophet-legislator/the episode of the two fruits of the pomegranate/the imams are the heirs of ‘Ali’s initiatory knowledge/they know whether a patch of earth is fertile or barren, whether this or that group of men are on the right path or this or that other on the path of perdition/they possess the foundations (uṣūl) of the knowledge received as a legacy from the Prophet and make no pronouncements based on their own personal opinion (ra’y)/they know everything contained in the Qur’an and the Prophet’s Sunna, but they never use their own personal opinion, nor do they allow their faithful to do so/the “chapters” (abwāb) in the knowledge that the Prophet taught to ‘Ali/the “letters” (ḥurūf) the Prophet taught to ‘Ali/the Word (kalīma) the Prophet taught ‘Ali.

Section 7: the instruction (ḥadīth) ‘Ali got from the Prophet/when the imam wants to know, he knows/inspiration through marking of the heart (nakt fi’l-qalb) and piercing of the tympanum (naqr fi’l-udhn)/the imam’s threefold knowledge/the imam is “he to whom the heavenly entities speak (al-muḥaddath) and “he to whom comprehension from on high” is given” (al-mufahham)/a further chapter on the muḥaddath/what the imam receives, day by day, indeed, hour by hour, by virtue of his quality as muḥaddath/the legacy of knowledge and the operations of “marking of the heart” and “piercing of the tympanum”/the seventy aspects (wajh) of the pronouncements of the imams/they know the increase and the decrease of truth and falsehood on the face of the earth/they know all languages/they read the holy books of earlier prophets despite their diversity of language/knowledge of the language of the birds (a Qur’anic expression: mantiq al-ṭayr)/knowledge of the language of wild beasts/knowledge of the language of transformed beings (musūkh)/knowledge of physiognomy (tawassum)/the imam does not need the acknowledgment of others to be
what he is/what the Prophet said to his community respecting the imams/those among people of the past whom the imams resemble.

Section 8: The difference between the prophet as lawgiver, the prophet as messenger, and the imam/the imams retain the treasures of the earth/they hold God’s Secrets, transmit them and are their depositaries/what was confided to Muḥammad/what was confided to the Prophet he in turn confided to the imams/the imams receive divine Aid (tawfīq) when they confront instances unforeseen by the Qur’an and the Sunna/the imam recognizes his faithful and his enemies from the sight of their faces and of their names [as incised] in the clay out of which they have been created/the imams’ knowledge grows every day and every night or else it would vanish/the imams know what occurs at a distance from them/the power of spatial displacement/another chapter on the power conferred by God to the imams/the Prince of the initiates and the powers of the overlapping of the clouds and the ascension into the heavens/God summoned the Prince of the initiates to Ta‘if through the angel Gabriel acting as intermediary/the prophetic statement: “I leave you Two Precious Things (al-thaqalayn): the Book of God and my Family”/the Prince of the initiates is he who shares in (qasīm) the inhabitants of paradise and those of hell.

Section 9: The power of the penetrating glance (al-baṣār) which remains efficacious even during sleep/reading thoughts/each imam teaches his successor what he himself has learned but augmented by five new things/the deeds [of men] are made present to the Prophet and the imams/the presentation of deeds to imams both living and dead/a further chapter on the presentation of deeds to living imams/the presentation of actions in the Pillar of Light (‘amūd min nūr)/a Minaret of Light is erected where the imam is by means of which he can see what occurs in other places/a further chapter on the Pillar of Light/the birth of the imam/another chapter on the raising up of the Pillar of Light at the moment of the imam’s birth/the prophetic tradition: “my life and my death are both a good for you”/the spirits of the prophets, the imams and the faithful who have been initiated and the five spirits of the imams of the Prophet’s Family/the Holy Spirit (rūḥ al-quds) visits the imams when they need it/the Spirit (a Qur’anic expression: al-Rūḥ) of which God speaks in His Book assists and informs the Prophet and the imams/the secret knowledge of the initiate comes, now from the books that he possesses, now from the instruction he has received, and now from information inspired by the Spirit/a further
chapter on the Spirit/the difference between the [heavenly entity] Spirit and the angels/the imam knows the moment of his own death in advance/the moment at which the imam realizes that he has become imam/the Prophet bequeathed to ʿAlī the Supreme Name of God, the legacy of prophecy and the legacy of secret knowledge.

Section 10: The imams know the Prophet’s testament (ʿahd) concerning his heirs⁷⁴/just before dying, thanks to divine inspiration, they know him whom they must designate as their successor/the present imam and what he will bequeath to his successor/the moment in which the succeeding imam receives what his predecessor possesses/some imams have more knowledge than others, but the knowledge of what is licit and what illicit is identical for all of them/what is identical between the Prophet and the imams/the imams know when they will die/the earth cannot be without an imam/if only two men remained on earth, one of them would be the imam/were the world to be without an imam it would be annihilated/the [supernatural] creatures beyond the Orient and the Occident know the imams; they visit them and they hate their enemies/the imams can elicit the affection of rulers if they so desire/the imams know the inhabitants of paradise and of hell/inanimate things (ghayr al-ʾayāwānāt) converse with the imams/another chapter on the miraculous powers (aʿājīb) of the imams/every portion of truth extant in the knowledge of the great mass of people (al-ʾāmma, i.e., non-Shiʿites) comes from the teaching of the imams in Muhammad’s line, while all that arises from personal opinion (raʾy) and from reasoning by analogy (qiyyās) derives solely from the falsehoods [of the religious authorities] of the masses/submission (taslīm) vis-à-vis the imams/the statements of the Prophet and of the imams about themselves and the refutation of those who fall into extremism with regard to them as a result of their ignorance of the deep meaning (maʿnā) of these statements/against those who refute the teaching of the imams without having understood it.

Al-Ṣaffār al-Qummi’s work is illustrative of a major evolution that is surely representative of a powerful current at the very heart of Shiʿism; it will characterize branches as representative as Ismaʿilism, Ṣūfism, and, it goes without saying, Twelver Shiʿism for a long time and persistently. Gnosis, understood as a transformational and redemptive knowledge, forms the pivot of this evolution. The dogma proclaiming that Muḥammad is the last of the lawgiver-prophets appears henceforth to be
established; even so, prophecy continues, and will always continue, thanks to the gnosis of its possessor, the initiatory sage, whom Shi’ism calls the imam or the wali (the friend or ally of God, the bearer of walāya). Simultaneously the religion of the “faithful initiates” comes into a perspective, situated between two immeasurable immensities: that of the cosmos and that of the inner world. Knowledge and the sacred alliance that underlies it derive their origin from preexisting universes, both primordial and spiritual, well before the creation of the world known to the senses. Both are preserved and transmitted by the initiatory sage, the master of wisdom who is ever present in the world, so as to allow his disciples to attain to the mysteries of God, the universe, and its being. Thus history, the theater of victory for the most unjust, comes to be subsumed in a far more glorious history within which only “those who know” are saved, while the others are swept away on the wave of perdition.

The “Book of the Progressive Comprehension of Sacred Knowledge” is the earliest systematic exposition of the emergence of gnosis within Shi’ism and, indeed, perhaps within Islam more generally. Even a close reading of its table of contents demonstrates this plainly. For it contains virtually all the characteristics—obviously adapted to Shi’ite Islam—of gnostic doctrines tinged by the Neoplatonism of Late Antiquity, just as they have been masterfully synthesized by Kurt Rudolph: a dualistic vision of the world, the theater of a cosmic struggle between the forces of Good and of Evil (the friends of God, the initiatory sages, and their faithful on the one side and their enemies on the other). The Doctrine of God’s Emanations, bringing forth the pleromas and the hypostases (the creation of the preexisting of the imams from the Divine Light), but also their malevolent adversaries (the preexisting entities of the forces of ignorance). A pessimistic view of the world and of man (most people, willingly or not, are on the side of ignorance). Man is a hybrid being, a bundle of light enclosed within the shadows of matter who can only be freed through knowledge. This salvific gnosis is borne and transmitted by an eternal being of light who became incarnate to save those able to recognize him (Christ for the Gnostics, the imam for Shi’ites). This guide, the possessor of knowledge, benefits from its results to wield thaumaturgic powers. Complete salvation is effected at the end of days when all the bundles of light that were imprisoned will be freed throughout the countless cycles of history. Gnosis is concealed within the esoteric meaning of the Scriptures, covered over
by their literal meaning; hence, hermeneutics becomes indispensable for an adequate understanding of the holy Book.\textsuperscript{85}

The lack of direct sources for the two first centuries of Islam makes the study of the literary relationship between gnostic movements and the various branches of proto-Shi’ism and Shi’ism difficult. Nevertheless, numerous studies, of which the aforementioned monographs of Heinz Halm\textsuperscript{86} stand as the most thoroughgoing, have demonstrated that religious currents of a gnostic type, and especially those influenced by or loyal to the adepts of Mani (Mānī in Arabic), Bardasanes (Bardayšān), and Marcion (MARQIYYUN), remained active in Islamic regions up until the third and fourth/ninth and tenth centuries, sometimes adapting to the new Arab religion with all their intellectual and spiritual weapons and baggage. It is interesting to observe that almost all these movements occurred in Iraq (especially in the cities of Kūfa, Baṣra, and Ḥīrā), in other words, in the homeland of Shi’ism.\textsuperscript{87} On the basis of what emerges from Muslim heresiographies, but also from Imami and Ismaili texts as well as from those works coming from those Shi’ite milieus termed “extremist” (such books as the \textit{K. al-Haft wa’l-aṭilla} or, indeed, the \textit{Umm al-Kitāb}), it is reasonable to infer that the sorts of gnostic teachings that were transmitted in an initiatory manner (that is, mainly orally), were current from the time of the imams Muḥammad al-Bāqir and his son Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, within the confines of the first and second/seventh and eighth centuries. The \textit{K. baṣāʿir al-darajāt} seems to indicate that the methodical, written transmission of these teachings developed especially from the second half of the third/ninth century onward.\textsuperscript{88}
Perfecting a Religion

Remarks on al-Kulaynī and His Summa of Traditions

MOHAMMAD ALI AMIR-MOEZŻI AND HASAN ANSARI

Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb b. Ishāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī (d. 328 or 329/939–40 or 940–41) was al-Ṣaffār’s contemporary, though probably younger than he. It is well known that within the domain of Shi‘ite Hadith and the elaboration of its immense corpus, al-Kulaynī’s influence, and that of his summa of traditions, the monumental Kitāb al-Kāfī, has been decisive. Moreover, this book will be deemed the first, and without doubt the most important doctrinally, of the authoritative Four Books (al-kutub al-arba) of Imami Hadith. Even so, aside from a few rare or brief articles devoted to our author/compiler or to particular aspects of his work, no monograph synthesis, carried out in accord with historical and critical perspectives, has yet been accorded to this great scholar and to the milieu in which his magnum opus first saw the light.1 Here we shall attempt in a very modest way to fill this gap despite our awareness that within the compass of a single chapter it is hardly possible to present so vast a topic in any exhaustive fashion.

The Scarcity of Direct Sources of Information Amid Countless Uncertainties

Despite the man’s importance, and that of his work, we know little that is certain about al-Kulaynī’s life, and what we do know, when we attempt
to reconstruct the major stages of his existence, comes mostly from the chains of transmitters (sanad, isnād) in al-Kāfī, along with other such chains and certain rare sources. As is well known, Shi‘ite prosopographical works (kutub al-rijāl) have very little to say about the personal lives of the scholars whom they list. Generally speaking, the composition of independent biographical reports (tarājim), which came much later in Imami Shi‘ism than in the Sunni tradition, was not practiced during the very first centuries of Islam. In addition, the Imami prosopographical, bibliographical, and historical works are quite skimpy with respect to our scholar. Nor do Sunni sources contain much information of significance about him; for the most part they do little more than repeat the information provided by the Shi‘ite sources. One of the rare exceptions is “The History of the City of Damascus” by Ibn ‘Asākir (d. 571/1175), which does offer original information, as we shall see. Surprisingly, despite al-Kulaynī’s renown as well as his sojourn in Baghdad—true, it was a brief stay toward the end of his life—the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm (written in 377/987) makes no mention whatsoever of him, nor does the Taʾrikh Baghdād of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādi (d. 463/1071).

No information exists on al-Kulaynī’s ancestors: was he of Iranian stock or did he belong to those families of Arab origin who emigrated to Iran during the first two or three centuries of the Hijra? His father’s name was Yaʿqūb (Jacob) and his grandfather’s was Ishāq (Isaac). While it is true that Muslims bore such names, it is still reasonable to wonder whether our author’s ancestors were not Christians or Jews, linked to those Syriac or Arabic-speaking families who came originally from Mesopotamia and settled in Iran at the very beginnings of Islam. His lineage on his mother’s side is less obscure, and it’s possible that the fame of our scholar in the region from Kulayn to Rayy was owing to the established situation of his mother’s family.

The date of his birth too remains unknown. We can gain an approximate idea of the date based on the death dates of certain of his masters. His place of birth, details about his childhood and youth are unknown as well. From his nisba we know that he came from the village of Kulayn, and yet even here certain later sources express doubt about the precise geographical location of this village. Conceivably, al-Kulaynī began his studies in the modest setting of his native town and within his own family, which included several religious scholars. He was obviously able to profit
from the scientific milieu of the city of Rayy which at that time was one of the greatest intellectual centers in all Iran. Of his studies in Rayy we know almost nothing in detail. No direct information tells us whether they included anything else beside the science of Hadith; for example, the Qur’anic sciences of recitation and commentary, law, or even theology, all disciplines taught by several masters in the city. Nevertheless, it may be assumed that in accord with the traditional course of study, he would have commenced with Arabic letters and Qur’anic recitation, followed by other branches of the religious sciences. We are equally in the dark as to whether he attended the courses of the great Sunni scholars who dwelt in Rayy during this period; however, we do know of a certain number of his Imami masters in Hadith in this city. Moreover, keeping in mind the ample extent of the juridical chapters of the Kāfī, we may conclude that he had quite a solid formation in juridical studies and an extensive knowledge of the works and the various disciplines of the law, including Sunni law. His travels in quest of knowledge, in Iran and in Iraq, are not well known either and, apart from an exceptional report by Ibn ‘Asākir who records his presence in Syria, his education in various places can be deduced only by identification of his masters. Thus the list of these shows clearly that al-Kulaynī, probably following his initial training at Rayy, went on to further his Hadith studies at Qumm, seemingly just before 297/909–10. We know too that he attended the lessons of masters in Hadith in Kūfa and in Baghdad, very likely for the first time during a quite brief stay in Iraq with his maternal uncle ‘Allān al-Kulaynī, before 310/922–23. Some other names of masters suggest that our scholar made a trip to Khorasan, doubtless in pilgrimage to the tomb of the imam al-Riḍā, but also to attend courses with scholars in Nīshābūr as well as Samarqand.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the astonishing breadth of al-Kulaynī’s education in the diverse disciplines of the religious sciences cannot be gauged solely from the chains of transmission and from his book al-Kāfī, the single work of our author that has come down to us—and from these alone. His book attests to the fact that he had a firm knowledge of such foundational disciplines as Arabic literature and philology, law, theology, as well as various Qur’anic sciences and especially exegesis. These disciplines were all taught at Rayy where al-Kulaynī could have learned them under the aegis of illustrious Sunni and Shi’ite masters. His close acquaintance with the varied circles and the religious and doctrinal movements of
this city would thus have gained him intellectual riches of great profundity as well as a vast culture.

Furthermore, we know almost nothing about al-Kulaynī’s social and religious relations with the Imami communities of Rayy, Qumm, and the other urban centers of central Iran, notwithstanding that early prosopographical works named him the head of the Imamis of Rayy. The question arises in a more general manner within the framework of the nature and extent of our scholar’s relations with Imami adherents on the social, political, and doctrinal levels. Nothing is known, for example, of al-Kulaynī’s relations with the powerful families or influential individuals of his day. The same is also true for the social and political framework of his life in Rayy where numerous doctrinal tendencies intermingled. What were his relations with local power? Certainly, the disturbed tenor of the city during this period affected his life and yet perhaps the very silence of the sources on these aspects of our scholar’s life, particularly at a time charged with tension and confusion, are indicators of his frame of mind and his probable posture of aloofness regarding political affairs. Did he deliberately maintain a distance from all positive social and political activity?

So, too, it would be important to have some knowledge of his relations as one of the leading heads of the Rayy Imamis, with the central institution of the *wikāla* (the institution governing delegation from the hidden imam during the lesser Occultation) at Baghdad, relations that are likely but for which we possess no textual evidence. The distance between his hometown and the center of Imami activity in the Abbasid capital during the Occultation crisis may provide a reason for his absence from the annals of this institution. Even so, the compilation of a work as important as *al-Kāfī* may have provided a reason for establishing solid relations between al-Kulaynī and the Imami powerful men; such as, for example, his exact contemporaries, the last two “representatives” of the hidden imam during the minor Occultation. But the sources breathe not a word about all this; it appears that such relations did not even exist! As a result, only hypotheses are left us. Likewise, we know virtually nothing about the circumstances of his final journey to Baghdad, from which he never returned. Even the exact date of this journey is not known: probably shortly before 327/938–39, the very date on which the *Kāfī* was brought forth and taught at Baghdad. The scanty information that we have about this stay, together with the report of his trip to Syria as recorded in Ibn ‘Asākir’s *Ta’rikh Dimashq* and the fact
that he taught Hadith in Baalbek, allow us to suppose that al-Kulaynī probably left Rayy to make the pilgrimage to Mecca. Along the way he would have stopped for a time in Syria and upon his return he would have settled in Baghdad where he died and was buried. Some knowledge about the circumstances surrounding this final stay in the capital would doubtless help us better understand the circumstances at play in the presentation and reception of his work; for the time being, this remains problematic due to lack of sources.

There is a difference of opinion too about the date of his death. Since we don’t know his birthday, we cannot know how old he was; however, scrutiny of the identity and dates of his masters and disciples would reveal that he did not die at an especially advanced age but probably toward his sixtieth year. Last, we know nothing about his family after his death, nor even whether he left descendants. The fact that he had the kunya Abū Jaʿfar does not necessarily prove that he had a son named Jaʿfar; this kunya is quite common among Shi’ites for anyone named Muḥammad in honor of the fifth imam Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Bāqir.

As can be seen, a considerable amount of uncertainty surrounds our author’s life, thanks to the scarcity of direct information. In the following pages the attempt will be made, to the extent possible, to dissipate the fog that surrounds his existence and to do so by drawing on indirect information in critical fashion.

Some Historical Points of Reference

THE POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CONTEXTS IN SEVERAL IMPORTANT CITIES

Al-Kulaynī’s age was one in which the central power of the Abbasid caliphate was weakening while many local governments in various areas of the Islamic empire were steadily taking shape. Obviously, this fact was not unconnected with the growing strength of Shi’ite powers virtually everywhere within important parts of the empire: the coming of the Zaydis to northern Iran and the Yemen, the Ismailis in North Africa and the Maghreb, and the “infiltration” of the Abbasid caliphate, both in the capital Baghdad and especially in state finances, by powerful and influential
Shi’ite families, scholars, thinkers, politicians, and highly placed functionaries. In the second half of the third/ninth century, the Abbasid caliphate underwent major upheavals. At the heart of many of these crises lay the bitter conflicts produced by the two caliphates of the hostile brothers al-Amin (from 193 to 198/809 to 814) and al-Ma’mūn (from 198 to 218 /814 to 833). The violence of these conflicts resulted in deep disturbances to the political, administrative, and military structures of the state. One big consequence of this development was the emergence of numerous local powers which a weakened central caliphate could do nothing but accept, often with great reluctance. With regard to Iran, three important local governments are worthy of note in this period: the Zaydi Alids established their government in 250/864 with control of Ṭabaristān and the Jibāl. Almost simultaneously, the Ṣaffārids came to power in eastern Iran. Last, the Sāmānids (from 261 to 389/875 to 999) inaugurated their rule over immense regions of Khorasan and Transoxiana.

The coming to power of a Shi’ite government with Zaydi tendencies, from the shores of the Caspian Sea to the north of Rayy, proved initially to be a decisive factor in the turn of the populace to Shi’ism, and afterward, for grooming the region for the subsequent rise of Shi’ite power under the Buwayhids of Daylam. The Zaydi government was founded by al-Ḥasan b. Zayd “al-Dā’ī al-Kabīr” (d. 270/884). Upon his death, his brother Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Zayd (d.287/900) succeeded him. Shortly thereafter, weakened by local internal conflicts, the Zaydi Alids were overthrown by the Sunni Sāmānids (some of whose rulers, however, displayed obvious Shi’ite sympathies), and they were constrained to remain at the fringes of power for fourteen years. The links between Alids and Daylamites grew stronger under al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Nāṣir al-Kabīr Uṭrūsh (d. 304/917). Uṭrūsh restored a weakened Zaydi power and ruled from 301/914 until his death three years later. The importance of his brief reign lies mainly in the expansion of Islam into Gīlān and Daylam together with the propagation of Shi’ite doctrines among the populace of northern Iran.

Now let us turn to the big cities where al-Kulaynī dwelt. First of all, the old city of Rayy,15 which passed from one local power to another from the middle of the third/ninth century onward.16 Up until 272/885, the city was governed by men appointed from Baghdad. In the month of Jumāda I of that year, Muḥammad b. Zayd al-ʿAlawī, who had just succeeded his brother al-Ḥasan b. Zayd, attempted an invasion of the city but was
defeated by Idhkū Tekin, a Turkish officer of the caliph who had been dispatched expressly for this purpose from Baghdad. He returned in triumph to the city and, according to the historians, exacted a huge tax on the inhabitants, at the same time installing his trusted men in various parts of the region. Earlier, in 268/882, the Turkish officer succeeded in defeating Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-‘Aziz b. Abī Dulaf and had taken the nearby Shi‘ite city of Qumm. In 289/902 the Sāmānids were able to extend their power up to Rayy. They ruled there for several years, even though their control was broken at intervals by armies sent by the caliph or other local governments. The chaotic situation in the city went on until the arrival of the Buwayhids (reg. 322–448/933–1056), who conquered it, however, only after al-Kulaynī’s death in 329/940–41.

With regard to the establishment of Shi‘ism in Rayy, according to a report by Yaqūt al-Ḥamawī, the residents of the city formed a Sunni majority until 275/888, the year in which, during the caliphate of al-Mu‘tamid (256–279/870–892), Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan al-Mād(h)arā‘ī/Mādarānī (according to some reports, Idhkū Tekin’s scribe), conquered the city, openly declared his allegiance to Shi‘ism, and forged links with influential Shi‘ite circles in Rayy. In this way Shi‘ism spread throughout the city, even among great Sunni scholars; the renowned traditionist ‘Abd al-Rahmān Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 327/939) seems to have been constrained by the Shi‘ite conqueror to compose a book on the virtues of the members of the Prophet’s family. At the same time it is well known that prior to this date the city already had a certain number of Shi‘ite scholars and traditionists—and especially Imami ones—whom the prosopographical literature mentions. We know too that al-Kulaynī went to Rayy to collect hadiths from some masters in the discipline. Last, it should be kept in mind that the region of Rayy, the Jibāl, was already one of the main centers of Isma‘ili propaganda during this period.

The city of Qumm was another important Shi‘ite center in Iran; it was without doubt the principal site where al-Kulaynī’s studies took place. Qumm was the most important center for Imami hadith and it was there that our author could develop his skills in this discipline and take stock of the various traditions of hadith transmission. In this city, which had grown into an intellectual center of Shi‘ism from at least the time of the imam Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765), the great family of the Ash‘arites, of Arab origin, enjoyed much social and religious power; at times its influence reached...
other Imami circles in other locations. Such was the case of the Yemeni Ashʿarites of Kūfā who had been compelled because of their Shiʿism to leave Umayyad Iraq at the end of the first century of the Hijra and who had settled in central Iran in the Qumm region, where little by little they acquired some measure of power with the more or less tacit agreement of the powers that be. They enlarged and renovated the city and gradually transformed it into a solid Shiʿite enclave. The Ashʿarites knew how to deploy their great tribal influence in order to consolidate political, social, and religious bases for Shiʿism within Iran. Their notion of Shiʿism, turned into a sort of family heritage, appears to have had some influence on the religion, not solely at Qumm and Rayy (with its strong links to Qumm) but even into Iraq and Khorasan; this was the case as much in the time of the historical imams as during the minor Occultation. Certain family members during the second and third centuries were among the important disciples of the imams who had sung their praises, according to some traditions. From the second/eighth century to the middle of the fourth/tenth, several outstanding scholars and traditionists came to be recognized in the Ashʿarite family; a relatively homogeneous religious tendency seems to have characterized them while their religious and juridical authority was acknowledged even in Iraq. With the fall of the Umayyads, however, strictly Arab influence began to lose its importance within the social and political structures of Islamic civilization; as other peoples—and particularly the Iranians—rose to power in the political and cultural arena after the fourth/tenth century, the historical and religious sources stop mentioning the Ashʿarites among the influential families of Qumm.

Even so, Qumm’s spiritual and religious heft will grow continually during the Abbasid period. With the massive transference of the doctrinal traditions of Kūfā, Qumm witnesses the development in its very midst of all kinds of Shiʿite tendencies: both the adherents of teachings of an esoteric, initiatory, and gnostic sort as well as their adversaries who charge them with “exaggeration” (ghuluww); both the adepts of a form of theological rationalism as well as their opponents; and even those of anthropomorphist tendencies (mushabbīha), predestinarians (jabriyya), antitranscendentalists (foes of the doctrine of tanzih), together with those who refuted them, etc.

A word now on Baghdad, where al-Kāfī was published. The Abbasid capital played a fundamental role in the history of events and in the
political and social evolution of Imami Shi’ism throughout the entire duration of the minor Occultation (260–329/874–941). After the shifts in religious policy that came about during the caliphate of Hārūn al-Rashīd (reg. 170–193/786–809) and the imprisonment of the imam Mūsā al-Kāẓim (imamate: 148–183/765–799), together with the “pro-Alid” political developments that occurred during the caliphate of al-Ma’mūn (reg. 198–218/814–833), culminating in the designation of the imam Riḍā as the successor to the caliphate as well as to his assassination, the Shi’ite imams were transferred from Medina to Baghdad and then to a military town near Surra man raʿā, or Sāmarrā. This transfer simultaneously increased both the importance and the influence of Shi’ism in the capital to a considerable extent—not, of course, what the Abbasid caliphs had wanted. After the death of al-Mutawakkil (reg. 232–47/847–61) and the cessation of his anti-Shi’ite policies, and coinciding with the swelling influence of certain Iranian and/or Shi’ite families toward the end of the age of the historical imams of Imami Shi’ism, Baghdad was made witness to the unprecedented weight of Shi’ism within its walls. Some Shi’ite families were able to penetrate deeply into the administrative structures of the Abbasid state and in this way prepare the political space for an ever greater infiltration of Shi’ism. This infiltration worked its way even into the Abbasid vizierate; in the bitter struggles that pitched different families against one another in an attempt to attain this desirable position, Shi’ism always had something to add during this period. This state of affairs went on swimmingly during the minor Occultation when the representatives of the hidden imam, together with other responsible parties from the institution of the.wikāla (the imams’ delegation), played a not inconsiderable political role, whether openly or covertly.

Furthermore, the Baghdad of al-Kulaynī’s day experienced a large succession of important political, social, and religious events which have prompted countless studies. By way of example, mention may be made of various urban rebellions, of conflicts between powerful Iranian and Arab families, both Shi’ite and Sunni, spiritual and religious crises such as the trial and execution of al-ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz in 309/922 or indeed that of al-Shalmaghānī Ibn Abī al-ʿAzāqir in 322/934. An important reason for the recurrent violence that shook Baghdad at this time was the activism of the Ḥanbalite traditionist and preacher al-Barbahārī (d. 329/941), very influential in the popular Sunni levels of the capital and,
of course, especially among Ḥanbalites.\textsuperscript{42} He certainly played a part in the appearance of the \textit{amīr al-umārah} (literally, “commander of the commanders,” a sort of caliphal lieutenant) and the weakening of caliphal power. His notion of the two canonical obligations to command the good (\textit{al-amr bi-l-ma‘rūf}) and to forbid the bad (\textit{al-nahy ‘an al-munkar}), and in taking up arms to battle what he considered reprehensible innovations (\textit{bid‘a}) and deviations from legal obligations, sparked countless popular uprisings against Abbasid power as well as the Shi’ite populace of Baghdad, deemed heterodox.\textsuperscript{43} In fact, Shi’ites were one of the chief targets of Ḥanbalite violence, and the caliphs, in an attempt to stifle the conflagrations of religious conflicts among different religious tendencies in the capital, were constantly forced to modify their religious and political tactics and to switch their positions for or against this group or that. We possess a good number of reports about the repression exercised by the ruling powers against the Shi’ites at this time, and, in particular, the destruction of their places of assembly, most notably the mosque of Barāthā’ in 313/925.\textsuperscript{44} Concurrently, in 323/935, in the wake of the violence stirred up by al-Barbahārī and his endeavor to become the supreme religious authority of the city, the caliph al-Raḍī (reg. 322–29/934–41) adopted a number of quite severe anti-Ḥanbalite measures.\textsuperscript{45} A bit later, further clashes between Shi’ites and Ḥanbalites occurred around the mosque of Barāthā’, but in Shi’ite quarters as well, especially at Bāb al-Ṭāq, and these conflicts required the personal intervention of the caliph and of the \textit{amīr al-umārah}.

Indeed, from the time of al-Raḍī’s caliphate the actual power devolved upon the \textit{amīr al-umārah} while the caliph became a sovereign in name alone.\textsuperscript{47} The function of \textit{amīr} was handed on from one person to another until the Buwayhid princes assumed it and retained it for almost a century. Ibn al-Rā‘īq, who reigned from 324 to 326/936–38, was the first of the \textit{amīr al-umārah}. Ten years later, the Buwayhids entered Baghdad in triumph. In the meantime, during the period that separates the end of the rule of Abū al-Ḥusayn Bujkum, the successor of Ibn al-Rā‘īq between 326 and 329/938–41, and the arrival of the Buwayhids, the capital underwent extremely serious crises and violent conflicts. In 329/941 (the year of al-Kulaynī’s death), Ibn al-Rā‘īq once again came to power; a year later, however, he was assassinated by order of the new \textit{amīr}, al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd Allāh Nāṣir al-Dawla (reg. 324–53/936–64), the Shi’ite Ḥamdanid governor of the city of Mawṣil. In 334/945, Mu‘īzz al-Dawla (reg. 334–56/945–67),
the youngest of the Buwayhid brothers, conquered Baghdad and assumed the title of *amīr al-umāra*. Twelve days later, he coolly stripped the caliph al-Mustakfī (reg. 332–334/944–946) of his functions. The seizure of absolute power by these Iranian Shi’ite princes at the very center of the empire certainly smoothed the development and expansion of Shi’ism on a grand scale.48

The end of the third/ninth and the entire fourth/tenth century was a historical turning point in many ways for Shi’ism. The reasons for this are tangled and complex: the political dominance of Shi’ism, with the Faṭimid(s, the Carmathians, or indeed the Ḥamdanids in the most important regions of the empire, not to mention the Buwayhids at the center of the caliphate; the Occultation of the last imam of the Twelvers in 329/941, according to tradition, an Occultation that brought to a close the period of the historical imams; the turn toward rationalism within Islamic thought. The combination of these historical, political, and religious factors culminated among other things in the rise of a new class of Twelver jurists and theologians who gravitated to the Buwayhid princes and sought to justify their rule. Since the Sunni Abbasid caliph remained in place and the Sunnis themselves were in the majority, these scholars felt a pressing need for legitimacy and respectability, and they set out to adopt a critical distance from their predecessors belonging to the “original esoteric and nonrationalist tradition.” This is the beginning of the development at the very heart of Twelver Shi’ism of a new “rationalistic theological and juridical” tradition that will henceforth become the dominant majority position, shunting the primitive esoteric tradition to the side.49 As we shall see, al-Kulaynī and his work stand as the final bulwark of this earlier tradition against the politicization and rationalization of Imami doctrine in the Buwayhid period by the doctors of Baghdad.

**THE SCIENCE OF HADITH IN IRAN AND IN IRAQ**

From its foundation by the Abbasid caliph al-Manṣūr (reg. 136–158/754–775),50 Baghdad appears to have been an important center for the science of Hadith, harboring different tendencies and schools of collection and transmission of traditions. As far as Sunni Islam is concerned, a large number of Hadith experts, originating from such other cities in Iraq as Kūfah, Baṣra, Wāṣīṭ, and elsewhere, quickly moved to Baghdad to benefit from
the instruction offered in its Schools. In particular, the city of Kūfa, rapidly become a great center of Shi’ite Hadith, saw its Sunni scholars forsake it for the benefits of the capital. From the beginning of the third/ninth century, many traditionists from Baghdad, or those who had emigrated there, began to compile Hadith works of the *musnad* sort (roughly, works ordered by the chains of hadith transmission), following the trend of the Sunni compilers of this literary genre. Thanks to such major traditionists as Ahmad Ibn Ḥanbal (d. 241/855), Yahyā b. Ma’in (d. 233/848), or Abū Bakr Ibn Abī Shayba (d. 235/850), who were especially active in the general propagation and transmission of local traditions reported from this city or that, a large number of Hadith students, coming from places as far-flung as Khorasan, Transoxania, or North Africa, inundated the capital and created a genuine new dynamism in the science of Hadith. This era coincided with the close of the period of the Abbasid “Inquisition”—the *miḥna* occurring between 218 and 234/833–49—the reinstatement of tradition and the renewal of traditionalist tendencies. Over the third, fourth, and fifth/ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, Baghdad became a very great center for Sunni Hadith and steadily thereafter, with the developing compilation of the works of the *jāmiʿ* type (roughly, a collection ordered in accord with the themes of the hadiths) as well as the *musnad*, the traditionists increased production of technical works on criticism, criteria of authenticity, the transmitters, and various other aspects of the complex subject of Hadith. Here mention might be made of two remarkable examples of such Hadith scholars: ʿAlī b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī (d. 385/995) and al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463/1071).

With regard to Shi’ites, Baghdad attracted experts and transmitters of hadiths shortly after its elevation as capital of the Abbasids in 146/763. At the time of Mūsā al-Ḵāzim’s imamate, the sources note the presence of several Shi’ite traditionists at Baghdad, but it is especially from the final decades of the second century Hijra that the capital seems to have drawn a large number of Imami traditionists and jurists, many of whom originated from Kūfa. Scholars of every stripe were present there and were particularly active: Hishām b. al-Ḥakam (d. 179/795) and his disciples, the School of Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (beginning of the third/ninth century) on the one side, with Ibn Abī Ṭumayr (d. 217/832) and his followers on the other.
It is useful to recall one important point with respect to the area of Shi‘ite Hadith. The largely Shi‘ite city of Kūfa appears to have been the birthplace of Hadith in which all Shi‘ite tendencies are represented; and yet each of these, all the while paying due respect to their common origin and shared teachings, managed at the same time to produce their own corpus of hadiths that conveyed doctrines proper to those tendencies. At the very moment when Imami Hadith emerged in several locations, the other strains did so as well, particularly at Kūfa but in other locales too. The Zaydis of Kūfa and the Ḥijāz—but also a little later in both Iran and Yemen—brought forth monumental collections of hadiths, thanks especially to the efforts of their learned imams. In al-Kulaynī’s day, the Hadith production of two Zaydi imams, al-Hādī ʿīlā al-Ḥaqq Yahyā b. al-Ḥusayn (d. 298/911) and al-Nāṣir al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī al-Ūṯūr al-Kabīr (d. 304/917), merits mention. At Rayy, the Zaydi scholar Abū Zayd ʿĪsā b. Muḥammad al-ʿAlawi (d. 326/938) was an expert in Hadith too and transmitted Zaydi traditions from renowned Zaydi traditionists, most notably Muḥammad b. Maḥṣūr al-Murādī (d. ca. 290/903). At the same time the Ismailis had established the Fatimid empire in North Africa (in 297/909) and for obvious reasons felt the need of a coherent juridical system based on the Hadith. The monumental work of al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān (d. 363/974), based on the immense heritage of Shi‘ite Hadith—Isma‘ili as well as Zaydi or Imami—is of particular interest.

Running parallel to these tendencies throughout the minor Occultation, and as a result of the problems connected with the leadership of the community, so-called extremist currents took shape and cut themselves off from the main stem of Imami Shi‘ism. Among the most important of these, the Nuṣayriyya formed their own corpus of hadiths, based both the common heritage of Imami hadiths as well as of those offshoots known as the Ghulāt and the Mufawwiḍa. The most famous example is the work al-Hidāya al-Kubrā by al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥamdān al-Khaṣībī/Khuṣaybī (d. 334 or 358/946 or 969), considered the leading mover in the genesis of the Nuṣayrī religion as such. Hence it can be asserted that the time in which al-Kulaynī lived—that is, the end of the third/ninth and the beginning of the fourth/tenth century—was decisive for the birth and the formation of the doctrinal identity and the religious legitimacy of different Shi‘ite groups. The role of Hadith was fundamental to this evolution.
Biographical Elements

A certain amount of biographical data about our author can be inferred from information provided by various sources.

First, the nisba Kulaynī refers to the village of Kulayn,65 in the Pashāpūya district (rustāq) of Rayy.66 We know that a number of Shi’ite scholars came from this village.67 Al-Iṣṭakhrī (d. shortly after 340/951) mentions Pashāpūya as being on the outskirts (aʿmāl) of Rayy,68 and Ḥamd Allāh al-Mustawfī (d. ca. 750/1349) includes it among the four principal regions of Rayy.69 He writes too: “There (at Pashāpūya) are thirty villages, among which are Kūshk, ‘Alīābād, and Kīlīn .” It should be noted that here Kulayn is vocalized as Kīlīn. At the same time, al-Mustawfī is emphatic about the large surface area of this village. The name Pashāpūya still exists today. A region to the south of the Tehran area (toward Ghār) is called Fashāpūya or Fashāūya/Fashāwiyya.70 There is still a village by the name of Kulayn there.71 In the Varāmīn region of Tehran there is another village named Kīlīn as well,72 but this must not be confused with our Kulayn,73 despite the fact that the latter has also been called Kīlīn at times.74 Notwithstanding the insistence of the principal documents on the vocalization Kulayn, Imami sources are not wholly unanimous on the vocalization of our author’s name; the divergence is, of course, over the vocalization of the letter lām: Kulaynī or Kūlīnī.75 The instance of al-Samʿānī (d. 562/1167), who gives the reading Kūlīnī,76 is perhaps due to this confusion between Kulayn and Kīlīn.77

Since we know from the sources that the parents, or at least the maternal ancestors, of our author were originally from Kulayn, it is reasonable to assume that al-Kulaynī grew up in this village.78 His father is said to have been one of the learned men of Rayy and of Kulayn, and it is also stated that his tomb is in the latter location.79 If this is true, it is surprising that our author reports nothing transmitted from his father in al-Kāfī, unless we assume that his father died during his son’s early infancy. Our author’s family on his mother’s side included several Shi’ite scholars who were known as traditionists; for example, al-Kulaynī’s own maternal uncle ʿAllān whose disciple he was.80

At Rayy al-Kulaynī would have been in steady contact with a variety of intellectual and spiritual tendencies. In particular, he doubtless had
intimate acquaintance with Imamis and their different tendencies, all of which were present in the city, and especially those who had undergone the influence of the neighboring city of Qumm. On the one side, there were the “pro-Muʿtazilite” rationalist theologians, like Ibn Qiba al-Rāzī (d. before 319/931), and on the other, traditionists of an assimilationist persuasion, like Muḥammad b. Abī ‘Abd Allāh Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Awn al-Asadī al-Kūfī (d. 312/924).

During this period two other Shiʿite branches—the Zaydis and the Ismailis—were present and active in Rayy. Among the former, the most noteworthy individual is surely Abū Zayd ʿĪsā b. Muḥammad al-ʿAlawī (d. 326/938) whose juridical and doctrinal writings, and especially his polemics against the Imamis on the very subject of the Occultation of the imam, were famous. The expansion of Zaydism into northern Iran, with its strong transcendentalist tendencies and the popularity of these notions in Rayy during the second half of the third/ninth century, were not foreign to the development of the doctrine of tanzīḥ among the Imamis of the city. Ismaili and Carmathian activism in Rayy at this time is well known. The great philosopher and propagandist Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d.322/934) was al-Kulaynī’s contemporary and lived right in Rayy. He stood at the very origin of the famous controversies with other thinkers on the subjects of prophecy and the law. His debates with the great scholar and philosopher Muḥammad b. Zakariyyā al-Rāzī (d. 313/925), another of al-Kulaynī’s contemporaries—debates that probably took place in the presence of Mardawīj, the governor of the city—are still celebrated. It should be kept in mind that this is the period when philosophy in Islam, and especially Neoplatonic philosophy, experienced its great rise. Al-Kulaynī was certainly aware of these intellectual activities, and his major work displays indisputable traces of this. Learned discussions about divine guidance or the continuance of prophecy through the imamate, such as they crop up in Ismaili thought—for example, in the work of Muḥammad al-Nasafi (d. 332/944) and his followers or in that of Abū Ḥātim—could not have left him indifferent, so much so that he devoted one of the most important books of his Kāfī to the concept of hujja (“Proof of God,” one of the imam’s titles in Shiʿism as well as a key concept in Ismaili thought).

There were, moreover, various Sunni tendencies flourishing in Rayy. As already noted, during this period the great traditionist Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 327/939) was active and large meetings of experts in Sunni
Hadith were held. Alongside these major religious tendencies, other marginal groups are also noted as present in the city by the heresiographical and historiographical sources; for example, the Najjāriyya, the Burghūthiyya, or the Za`farāniyya, to mention only those sects of a theological character.\textsuperscript{90}

Mu'tazilism was still active as well; the two branches of Baṣra and Baghdad were present in both Iraq and Iran, most especially at Rayy.\textsuperscript{91} The renowned thinkers Abū ‘Ali al-Jubbā'ī (d. 303/916),\textsuperscript{92} Abū Ḥāshim al-Jubbā'ī (d. 321/933),\textsuperscript{93} and Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkhī (d. 319/931),\textsuperscript{94} all three of whom were among the earliest and most virulent critics of Shi‘ite theories of the imamate, were contemporaries of our author. The great traditionist theological tendencies of Sunnim, such as the schools of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī (d. 324/936)\textsuperscript{95} or of Abū Maṣṣūr al-Māturīdī (d. 333/945),\textsuperscript{96} took shape at the same time as well.\textsuperscript{97} In the realm of the rational sciences, philosophy reached a high point in the figure of the famous Neoplatonic thinker al-Fārābī (d. 339/950–51) who with his likely Shi‘ite sympathies and yet, more pointedly, philosophical leanings, especially a Neoplatonism with gnostic elements, attracted numerous followers among Ismailis.\textsuperscript{98} In the previous chapter we saw how gnostic notions developed among Imami Shi‘ites, especially among Iranian Shi‘ites. As a resident of both Rayy and Qumm, al-Kulaynī was thus at the very center of this intellectual ferment.

It seems beyond doubt that toward the end of his life, having completed the pilgrimage to Mecca and dwelt for a while in Syria, al-Kulaynī settled in Baghdad where his renowned contemporary the philosopher al-Fārābī was also living. He resided there in the principally Shi‘ite quarter of Darb al-Silsila, not far from the Kūfa Gate,\textsuperscript{99} in the southwest part of the city; this is why some sources give him the nisba al-Silsilī.\textsuperscript{100} In 327/938–39, he appears to have offered an instructional session (majlis) in Hadith in this quarter.\textsuperscript{101} Al-Kulaynī died in Baghdad; there are different opinions as to the date of his death. Al-Najāshī proposes the date 329.\textsuperscript{102} Al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī also gives the date of Sha‘bān 329 in his Rījāl—a later work than his Fihrist\textsuperscript{103}—while in that latter work he gives 328 as the date.\textsuperscript{104} Keeping in mind the preciseness of the date proposed by the Shaykh in his Rījāl, together with al-Najāshī’s rigor in his work, it appears reasonable to accept the date of 329.\textsuperscript{105} It is true, however, that in some Sunni sources,\textsuperscript{106} or indeed in the well-documented work of the Imami scholar Raḍī al-Dīn
‘Alī Ibn Tāwūs,\(^{107}\) the date 328 also occurs. In Imami tradition the month of Sha‘bān 329 is known too as being the moment of the death of ‘Alī b. Muhammad al-Simmari, the final “representative” of the hidden imam during the minor Occultation, and hence the start of the major Occultation. According to this tradition, al-Simmari’s death fell in the middle of the month.\(^{108}\) If we accept Shaykh al-Tūsī’s version in his Rijāl, we are left uncertain as to who died first, al-Kulaynī or al-Simmari. According to several reports, Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Ja‘far al-Ḥusaynī, known as Abū Qīrāṭ (d. 345/956), at this time chief (naqīb) of the Ṭālibites (descendants of Abū Ṭālib, father of ‘Alī, the first imam) of the city, led the prayers at al-Kulaynī’s funeral.\(^{109}\) There are also disagreements over the location of our author’s tomb. According to the oldest sources, he was buried in the cemetery of Bāb al-Kūfā,\(^{110}\) in other words, in the quarter where he spent the final years of his life. Ibn ‘Ubdūn, an Imami traditionist and prosopographer famous for his long life (d. 423/1032),\(^{111}\) supposedly visited al-Kulaynī’s tomb, probably some two or three decades after his death, in the quarter that he calls Sīrāt al-Ṭāṭī;\(^{112}\) he relates that a marker with our author’s name on it, and that of his father, graced the tomb.\(^{113}\) Later the same scholar would tell his renowned disciple Abū al-‘Abbās al-Najāshī that the tomb had been destroyed, most probably by a flood.\(^{114}\) Thus, according to these early reports, the tomb was located to the west of the capital in the large Shi‘ite quarter of Karkh. The tomb considered for centuries to be that of al-Kulaynī, and venerated as such by Imamis, is located east of Baghdad, at al-Ruṣāfa, a Sunni quarter throughout the Middle Ages.\(^{115}\)

**His Masters**

In this section we shall deal with al-Kulaynī’s principal masters in Shi‘ite Hadith in Rayy, Qumm, and in Iraq on the basis of the chains of transmitters in the Kitāb al-Kāfī in particular. Because of its continuing intellectual connection with Rayy, the city of Qumm would have been our author’s main site for training in the science of Hadith; there he was able to put together his first collections of traditions and familiarize himself with the diverse schools and tendencies in the study and transmission of hadiths. His masters all belonged to these various streams and played roles of greater or lesser importance in the formation of the corpus of Shi‘ite
Hadith, displaying the progression from the compilation of simple *jāmi‘* on a single theme toward more complex and voluminous *jāmi‘*:


2. Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Barqī, grandson and transmitter from the renowned Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī (d. 274 or 280/887 or 893), who was one of the “ʿidda masters” of al-Kāfī (ʿidda min aṣḥābīn). This term denotes some of our author’s indirect masters from two generations earlier. Because their names are so often used, al-Kulaynī preferred to pass over the intermediate sources between himself and these sources and to refer to them by the term ʿidda. The use of different ʿidda is very uneven in al-Kāfī. In the prosopographical works these masters are duly identified.

Through his intermediary al-Kulaynī reports from Aḥmad al-Barqī. Among these transmitters mention may be made as well of his son ʿAlī, who was the master of Shaykh al-Ṣadūq, and of al-Ḥasan b. Ḥamza al-Ṭabarî (d. 358/969).


7. Saʿd b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Abī Khalaf al-Ashʿarī al-Qummī (d. 299 or 301/912 or 914), author of a *Kitāb Baṣaʾir al-darajāt*, now lost, and of *al-Maqālāt wa-ʾl-firaq*, which has been published.

### HIS DISCIPLES AND TRANSMITTERS

Some of al-Kulaynī’s disciples, who had learned the science of Hadith from him, also possessed authorization to transmit from the *Kitāb al-Kāfī*. For others we have no knowledge of such an *ijāza*:

1. Abū ʿAbd Allāh Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm b. Abī Rāfīʿ al-Ṣaymārī, an Imami traditionist residing at Baghdad. A famous transmitter of the Kāfī and the author of numerous writings, such as the *Kitāb al-Nawādir*, none of which
has survived. He studied the *Kāfī* with al-Kulaynī in the Bāb al-Kūfa quarter at Darb al-silsila in 327/938–39.¹⁴²


4. Abū Ghālib Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Zurārī (285 to 368/898 to 979).¹⁴⁵ A well-known disciple and transmitter from al-Kulaynī who resided in Baghdad.¹⁴⁶ Mīrzā Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrīṣī lists him among those who heard the *Kāfī* directly from its author and who had authorization to copy and transmit it, thus allowing for its publication and distribution.¹⁴⁷ Abū Ghālib himself speaks of his personal copy of the *Kāfī* in his prosopographical *Risāla*.¹⁴⁸


6. Abū l-Qāsim Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. Mūsā b. Qūlūya/Qūlawayh, called Ibn Qūlawayh (d. 368 or 369/979–80 or 980–81), renowned traditionist and jurist, one of the most important disciples and transmitters of the *Kāfī*. He is the author of *Kāmil al-ziyārāt* and was one of the masters of Shaykh al-Mufid (d. 413/1022).¹⁵⁰

7. Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Dāwūd al-Qummī (d. 368/979), Imami traditionist and jurist residing in Baghdad.¹⁵¹


9. ʿAlī b. Aḥmad (or Muḥammad) b. Mūsā b. ʿImrān al-Daqqāq al-Asadī al-Kūfī,¹⁵³ one of the intermediaries in transmission of the *Kāfī* to Ibn Bābawayh al-Ṣadūq (d. 381/991).¹⁵⁴

10. ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿĪbrāhīm b. Jaʿfar al-Kātib al-Nuʿmānī, called Ibn Abī Zaynab,¹⁵⁵ the well-known author of the *Kitāb al-Ghayba* and one of the most important transmitters of *al-Kāfī*.

11. Abū ʿĪsā Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sinān al-Zāhirī, a resident of Rayy and one of the masters of Shaykh al-Ṣadūq in transmission of *al-Kāfī*.¹⁵⁶

12. Abū al-Mufaḍḍal Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh al-Shaybānī (297 to 387/910 to 997), a famous traditionist of Baghdad and transmitter of the *Kāfī*.¹⁵⁷

13. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī Majīlawayh b. Abī l-Qāsim Bundār al-Barqī al-Qummī.¹⁵⁸ Ibn Bābawayh reports on his authority.¹⁵⁹ He also transmits
from certain of al-Kulaynī’s masters such as ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī or, indeed, Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-ʿAṭṭār.¹⁶⁰

14. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsām al-Kulaynī,¹⁶¹ one of Ibn Bābawayh’s sources in transmission of the Kāfī.¹⁶²

15. Abū Muḥammad Hārūn b. Mūsā b. ʿAbd al-Shaybānī al-Tallāʿukbarī (d. 385/995), one of the most important Imami traditionists of the fourth/tenth century in Baghdad and a renowned transmitter of al-Kulaynī’s work.¹⁶³

REMARKS ON HIS SOCIAL ROLE

Despite al-Kulaynī’s religious rank and the importance of his Kāfī from his own lifetime onward, not to mention his respected position among the Imamis of Rayy, no historical or religious source of the decisive period of the minor Occultation or even those relating all sorts of events of the time along with the information regarding the delegates (wakīl, pl. wukāla’) of the imam in general and the representatives of the hidden imam in particular¹⁶⁴—despite all this, no source makes the least allusion to any connection whatsoever between our author and the Imami authorities of his time or with the reigning Abbasids. Hence, we have no information on any relation on al-Kulaynī’s part with the institution of the wikāla, neither at Baghdad nor elsewhere, or indeed any role whatsoever within the religious or fiscal system of this institution. This gap is all the more astonishing in that in his Kāfī al-Kulaynī broaches the institution of the wikāla in a rather detailed way, together with a good number of written directives (tawqīf) ascribed to the hidden imam and to his “representatives” during the minor Occultation, directives, moreover, that have a genuine social and political bearing on the consolidation of the community of believers. This goes to show that these activities and these institutions enjoyed an official status as well as a certain importance in al-Kulaynī’s eyes.¹⁶⁵

To be sure, al-Kāfī was influential in the acceptance of these institutions by the community of the faithful, although it is hard to know the degree to which its compilation stemmed from a personal decision of its author or, indeed, from a need on the part of the community’s establishment or even a directive issued by certain Imami leaders in Baghdad.

During this troubled period, certain events that occurred within the very heart of the Imami community necessitated intervention by its
leaders. The aftereffects of the claims by certain “extremists,” such as al-Shalmaghānī Ibn Abī al-‘Awāqir (d. 322/934), or, even earlier, the pronouncements of al-Hallāj (d. 309/921), prompted a massive intervention by Imami authorities of a rationalist persuasion. Nevertheless, in contrast to many other scholars dwelling in Baghdad, al-Kulaynī is not mentioned in a single report concerning these momentous events. Was he living in Rayy at this time, far from Iraq where these crises occurred? All the more reason that an extended study of the exact period when he traveled to the capital of the empire and resided there would appear to be requisite.

One part of the problem, as has been noted, is also linked with the position of the city of Rayy in comparison with such cities as Baghdad or even Qumm. During our author’s lifetime, the most important Shi‘ite cities in Iran were Qumm, Rayy, and several urban complexes in Khorasan and Transoxania, as is well known. And yet, as is also well known, among these cities Qumm enjoyed a role, with respect to religious teaching and the production of doctrinal theories, that was dominant. It suffices simply to recall the weight that the wāli of Baghdad accorded the scholars of Qumm in this period. Conversely, in Rayy where al-Kulaynī mostly resided, the Imami strain was but one of many Shi‘ite tendencies active in the city from the mid-third/ninth century on, and it flourished alongside Zaydi and Ismaili Shi‘ites in particular. Clearly, al-Kulaynī seems to have been one of the first major representatives of the Imami doctrinal stream of thought in Rayy, but his followers must not have been particularly numerous there, all the more so since the influence of other Shi‘ites—Zaydis as well as Ismailis—was far greater than that of the Imamis. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that the effect of al-Kulaynī’s activities was less significant than that of his colleagues from Qumm who were able to influence the Imami institution during the minor Occultation even into the capital. Moreover, the fact that al-Kulaynī is often dubbed “the shaykh of the Imamis of Rayy” seems to suggest that his religious and intellectual authority did not extend to the neighboring city of Qumm; otherwise, this would have been emphasized. In Qumm, at this point, the authority of ‘Alī b. Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 329/941), the father of al-Ṣadūq, seems to have been predominant. At Rayy, moreover, Imamis did not adhere to a single doctrinal tendency, and there were many doctrinal differences among them, as was indeed the case everywhere at this period. Al-Kulaynī
seems to have headed a “median” tendency, equally aloof from dialectical theology of the Muʿtazilite sort as well as the anthropomorphists and predestinarians (ahl al-tashbih waʾl-jabr), midway between the intensely esotericist tendency of Kūfa (represented, for example, by al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī) and more levelheaded local tendencies. Even so, the true influence of our man in his own city remains unknown. The unusually turbulent political situation in Rayy during al-Kulaynī’s lifetime must also be taken into account; this produced a complex state of affairs in which any exercise of authority as well as political activity became increasingly problematic. Al-Kulaynī appears to have remained, by his own choice, on the sidelines of these disturbances in order to bring the Kitāb al-Kāfī, his life’s work, to completion.

All these reasons may help to explain the striking absence of our man from the important events of the period of the minor Occultation. As has been emphasized, it’s also possible to assume that he held back voluntarily from political life, adopting a quietist, if not indeed negative, opinion toward all positive social and political action. In this regard, he stands out distinctively from a good number of his famous contemporaries who took to the thick of political life, especially at Baghdad: such a figure as Abū Sahl al-Nawbakhtī (d. 311/923) enjoyed immense power there, and for many important reasons: his religious and intellectual authority, his kinship with al-Ḥusayn b. Rawḥ al-Nawbakhtī (d. 326/938), the “third representative” of the hidden imam, his political position with the Abbasids, his belonging to the influential family of the Nawbakhtīs of Baghdad, and, last, his intellectual part in developing the theological concept of the Occultation. Again at Baghdad, another traditionist contemporary with al-Kulaynī, Ibn Hammām al-Iskāfī (d. 336/948), played a considerable part in the decisive events of the minor Occultation. And at Qumm, as has been noted, the father of al-Ṣadūq, ʿAlī b. Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 329/940–41, the year of al-Kulaynī’s death), possessed genuine power in social and political decision making. Al-Najāshī calls him “the shaykh and the elder of the people of Qumm”, from several sources we know that he stood in a close relationship with the representatives of the hidden imam while his religious authority was upheld by the wukalāʾ of Baghdad. ʿAlī b. Bābawayh personally intervened in some of the significant events of the day; for example, in the case of al-Ḥallāj. He had visited Baghdad, just as al-Kulaynī did toward the end of his life.
Moreover, `Alî b. Bābawayh undertook a religious work similar to that of al-Kulaynī: to address the needs of the Imami community, then suffering from the imam’s absence,179 he compiled his renowned work al-Imāma wa’l-taḥṣira min al-ḥayra.180

Al-Kulaynī is conspicuous by his absence from the political scene, as our sources attest. This apparent effacement on the part of a scholarly and religious figure as important as he, within a historical context as troubled as his was, cannot be without its own significance. Actually, a kind of quietism, an apolitical attitude, was apparently prevailing within Imamism for quite a long time, and very probably after the drama of Karbalā’, that is, the massacre of the third imam and his family.181 The corpus of Imami hadiths includes a number of traditions that appear to prohibit the faithful from any positive political action, whether it be rebellion against an unjust power or the quest for any political power whatsoever, and this indeed until the End of Time and the Return of the hidden imam in his mission as qā’im.182 In a subchapter of his Kāfī, al-Kulaynī himself collects an entire series of traditions, going back to the fifth, sixth, and eighth imams, that denounce all thirst for power. This subchapter has as its title “The will to command” (ṭalab al-ri’āsa; literally, “the quest for command, for leadership”).183 There we read the following statements: “He who seeks to command is lost”; “Beware those who command and who consider themselves to be leaders; by God, the man behind whom the sound of sandals arises (i.e., of his partisans) will perish himself and cause others to perish”; “cursed is he who believes himself to be a chief, cursed is he who strives to become one, cursed is he who proclaims himself such”; “Avoid leading (people) and avoid following people (who lead)”; “Seek power in no way; be not (like) a wolf devouring people in our name (i.e., we the imams) for God will make you wretched.”184 Our author repeats a prophetic tradition reported by the imam Jaʿfar: “‘the learned (fuqahā’) are the trustworthy (umānā’) bearers of (the message) of the prophets only so long as they do not engage with the world (dukhūluhum fi’l-dunyā).’ Someone then asked, ‘What does “engagement with the world mean”?’ The Prophet: ‘It means to collaborate with power (ittibā’ al-sultān).’”185 Al-Kulaynī, unlike many other scholars of his time and place, chose deliberately to stand apart from all directly political activity in order to keep faith with the quietist position advocated in the hadiths that he himself transmitted.
As a result of his compilation of the *Kitāb al-Kāfī*, Shaykh al-Kulaynī always enjoyed great respect among Imami scholars, and as much in Baghdad as in his homeland of Rayy, a respect that lasted during his own lifetime as well as later up to the present day. Al-Najāshi, the major expert of Shi’ite prosopography, presents him as the master of the Imamas and the outstanding figure in the city of Rayy during his lifetime (shaykh asḥābinā fi waqtihi bi’l-Rayy wa-wajhuhum). He adds that al-Kulaynī was both the most trustworthy and the most rigorous of traditionists with respect to the collection and attribution of hadiths (kāna awthaq al-nās fi’l-hadīth wa-athbatahum). Al-Najāshi’s estimation was doubtless based on analysis of the text of the *Kāfī* as well as our scholar’s other works. Shaykh al-‘Uṣūs also emphasizes the supreme scientific rank and trustworthiness of al-Kulaynī and places great weight on his knowledge of hadiths (thīqa ‘ārif bi’l-akhbār/jalīl al-qadr ‘alim bi’l-akhbār). Other Imami traditionists and scholars have also praised him in more or less similar terms as “the truthful master” (al-shaykh al-ṣadūq) or “the master whose reliability and soundness are unanimously accorded” (al-shaykh al-muttafaq ‘alā thiqatihi wa-amānatihi). ‘Alī b. Ṭāwūs (d. 664/1266), with his traditionalist leanings, is one of the most laudatory with respect to our author. Al-Muḥaqiq ‘Alī al-Karākī (d. 940/1534), the famous shaykh al-islām of the Safavid Shah Tahmāsb, calls al-Kulaynī “the gatherer of the traditions of the Prophet’s Family” (jāmi‘ aḥādīth ahl al-bayt). Zayn al-Dīn b. ‘Ali, the second martyr (d. 965/1558), also calls him “the master of the group (of Imamas)” (shaykh al-ḥāfa/ra’īs al-madhhab). The shaykh al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Abd al-Ṣamad (d. 984/1576) acknowledges al-Kulaynī as the greatest scholar of the science of Hadith among traditionists and the most rigorous of critics in this discipline. Muḥammad Taqī al-Majlisī (d. 1070/1660), the father of the famous al-Majlisī, author of the Bihār, considers our author a scholar directly supported (mu’ayyad) by God. Muḥammad Bāqir, his son, states that al-Kulaynī is accepted by the entire body of scholars, both Shi’ite and Sunni. Unsurprisingly, al-Kulaynī is particularly esteemed by traditionalist (Akhbārī) scholars. As is well known, he has been called by them “the chief of the traditionists” (ra’īs al-muḥaddithīn). Mullā Ṣadrā (d. 1050/1640), the great philosopher of the Safavid period, admired al-Kulaynī and was easily the most renowned of his commentators. In more recent times, praise of our man...
has resumed afresh. In some Imami sources he is even called “the propagator of Imami Shi’ite doctrine during the Occultation” or even “the great traditionist” (al-hāfiz). Al-Kulayni’s exalted position among Imamis has even been stressed by Sunni authors, who at times have termed him “the learned jurist” (al-faqīh). According to a famous prophetic tradition, Islam has a “renewer” (mujaddid) in every century; this is why, in passing from one century of the Hijra to another, a number of the most influential scholars have been upheld as the “revivers” of the time. In his Ḫamīṣ al-ʿushūl, in a list of scholars who fall into this category, the Sunni writer Ibn al-Athīr (d. 606/1210) considers al-Kulaynī the Shi’ite mujaddid for the year 300, just as he presents the imams al-Bāqir (d. ca. 114/732 or 119/737) and al-Riḍā (d. 203/818), along with al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436/1044), as the “revivers” of Shi’ism for the years 100, 200, and 400, respectively. It is noteworthy that among all the laudatory names and titles that Imamis have bestowed on al-Kulaynī the most popular appears to be thiqat al-islām, “(the master) worthy of trust in Islam.” This title, seemingly used only for the great Imami religious scholars, would have been first conferred upon him by Bahāʾ al-Dīn Muhammad al-ʿĀmili, known as Shaykh Bahāʾī (d. 1030/1621), for the purpose of accentuating the unique position of al-Kulaynī in the history of Hadith and Imami jurisprudence. The title, exemplifying al-Kulaynī’s lofty rank among his contemporaries, has continued to be in use until the present day. True, it has also been granted to other scholars, such as Shaykh al-Ṭūsī and al-Ṭabrisī, the great Qur’an commentator, but these usages have never attained the popularity of al-Kulaynī’s title. The title thiqat al-islām is equivalent to the Sunni title shaykh al-islām and seems not to have been used to designate Shi’ite scholars before the Safavid period.

Observations on the Work

The prosopographical and bibliographical sources provide us with a list of al-Kulaynī’s writings. Except for al-ʿKāfī, our scholar’s other works seem not to have survived the passage of time:

1. al-Radd ʿalā ʿl-qarāmiṭa (“Refutation of the Carmathians”), a work that given the presence of Ismailis and Carmathians at Rayy at this time,
had a certain importance, doubtless reflecting the conflicts among these groups and the Imamis to win the allegiance of the majority of Shi’ites. It must be emphasized that Carmathian and/or Ismaili esotericists were active in the town of Kulayn as well as in the region of Pashāpūya, al-Kulaynī’s homeland; a fact that justifies even more strongly his drafting of a refutation of them. As is known, the Ismaili da’wa (the institutionalized propaganda) at Rayy was headed at this time by a certain Khalaf al-Ḥallāj; the Ismailis of the region were accordingly called the Khalafiyya. Khalaf is said to have stayed in Kulayn itself from whence he spearheaded his propaganda mission. This proves yet again, if proof were needed, the long-standing presence of various Shi’ite tendencies in this region. In any case, Khalaf’s effectiveness is well known since he was apparently able to convert a large number of the inhabitants of Kulayn to his faith.  

2. Al-Rasā’il or Rasā’il al-a’imma, a collection of the “Letters of the Imams.” An older version of this work, probably dating from a time close to that of al-Kulaynī, was available to Ibn Ṭawūs (d. 664/1266). In his Kāfī, al-Kulaynī occasionally gives excerpts from the “Letters of the Imams,” very probably derived from his Rasā’il al-a’imma.

3. Kitāb al-Rijāl (“Book of Men,” i.e., transmitters of traditions), doubtless a prosopographical work. In the Kāfī some information of a prosopographical nature occurs as well.


5. Kitāb ta‘bīr al-ru’yā (“Book of Dream Interpretation”). According to information given by al-Najāšī, ascription of this work to al-Kulaynī is problematic. Nevertheless, the topic of dream interpretation does occur in the Kāfī and demonstrates our author’s interest in the subject.
THE KITĀB AL-KĀFĪ (“THE SUFFICIENT BOOK”)  

According to the bio-bibliographical sources, composition of the Kāfī took some twenty years.²²⁰ For later Imami tradition, this great compilation of hadiths constitutes one of the authoritative Four Books of Hadith that Imamis designate as al-kutub al-arba’a. Given the fact that a major portion of it is devoted to theological doctrines and beliefs (uṣūl, literally, “roots, foundations”), it can be considered the most important of the four, since the three others deal almost exclusively with jurisprudence (fūrū’, literally, “branches, derivations”) alone. The latter are the work of two other great Imami scholars, to wit, the Kitāb man lā yahdūruhu al-faqīḥ (its correct, though little used, title is Fāqīḥ man lā yahdūruhu al-faqīḥ) by Shaykh al-Ṣadūq Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381/991) and two books by Shaykh al-Ṭūsī Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan (d. 460/1068), namely, the Tahdhīb al-aḥkām and the more condensed work al-ʿIstībṣār fī māʾ kitelefa (or māʾ kitelefa fīhi) min al-akhbār.²²¹ It is for this reason that, just as al-Kulaynī will be dubbed thiqat al-islām (as discussed earlier in this chapter), Ibn Bābawayh will gain the honorific title of “leader of the traditionists” (raʾīs al-mudḥaddithīn),²²² while Shaykh al-Ṭūsī will be called “master of the group (i.e., of the Imamis)” (shaykh al-tāʾīfa) because of his central role in the elaboration and development of Imami law.²²³ True, many of the same traditions appear in these four collections; however, the objectives, the method of composition, the themes, and the scope of each one are different, with the result that none can supplant another in the Imami religious tradition. Nevertheless, as we shall see, the attention accorded the Kāfī has been far greater than that paid to the three other works; it might even be said that al-Kulaynī’s compilation possesses a hallowed status for Imamis. Shaykh al-Kulaynī and the two other author-compilers of the Four Books, Ibn Bābawayh and Shaykh al-Ṭūsī, are beyond any doubt the most important and the most influential of Imami traditionists; together with Shaykh al-Muṣīf (d. 413/1022) and his disciple al-Sharīf al-Murtadaḍ (d. 436/1044), they constitute the most important group of Imami scholars in the first centuries of the Hijra.²²⁴ As noted earlier, one major difference between al-Kāfī and the other three books is that the latter consist solely of juridical, or quasi-juridical, chapters whereas the Kāfī encompasses, in addition to jurisprudence, substantial and significant portions on doctrinal, theological, spiritual,
and historical questions; for this reason it forms a far more comprehensive collection of hadiths than the others. Last, it must be made clear that the Four Books, notwithstanding their importance and their breadth, represent only a part of the early Imami patrimony in hadith.\

While it is true that prior to the compilation of the Kāfī other attempts had been made by Imami scholars to assemble a large number of traditions, nevertheless al-Kulaynī’s work, thanks to the breadth of the themes broached as well as the considerable number of hadiths collected, represents without any doubt the first and greatest instance of the efforts to establish a true corpus of Imami hadiths, as much on the doctrinal and theological level as on the juridical—all the more so in that it was compiled at one of the most delicate and decisive moments in Imami religious history. It is perhaps for all these reasons that it both completed and/or abrogated most earlier hadith collections almost entirely.

Its methodical construction, its exploitation of a dazzling range of sources, its breadth and the pertinence of its chapters on all aspects of the faith at the juridical, doctrinal, and moral levels, make al-Kāfī the most renowned, the most commented, and the most widely consulted of Imami hadith compilations. Without doubt the most important reason for its celebrity lies in the responses it provides to the countless questions that the faithful posed during the trying period of the Occultation crisis, rightly termed “the time of perplexity” (al-ḥayra). The reconstruction of the religious authority of Imami scholars and the legitimation of doctrine, thanks to criteria based on the Qur’an and especially on its interpretation by means of the Hadith, doubtless filled the void created by the absence of the imam, at least in part, and soothed the social and political disturbances that resulted from it—especially since the influence of Shi’ites in different parts of the empire as well as in the Abbasid state system had been increasing for some time while the need for a coherent doctrinal and juridical system was growing ever more pressing. Now in his work al-Kulaynī was able to put forth a quite voluminous and extremely coherent assemblage of doctrinal and juridical traditions that derived from the imams. He thus played a leading role in the unification as well as the consolidation of the Imami faith. It is hardly a coincidence that the representatives of the two major tendencies in Imami Shi’ism, the traditionalists (akhbāriyya) and the rationalists (uṣūliyya), take the Kāfī as their point of reference, albeit to differing degrees.
By al-Najāshi’s time (d. 450/1058), and perhaps even at the time of al-Kulaynī himself, the work was also called Kitāb al-Kulaynī.230 Very probably this is the single work of the master that has come down to us.231 There are innumerable manuscripts of it in libraries throughout the world.232 Editions of it, both early and modern, run into the dozens.233 All this goes to show the huge fame and the immense popularity of the book for Imamis. Nevertheless, no truly satisfactory critical edition, especially one based on the oldest manuscripts, has yet been realized.

The Kāfī is traditionally held to be composed of three big parts: the Uṣūl (literally, “Roots,” i.e., theological doctrines and basic beliefs), the Furūʿ (literally, “Branches,” i.e., practical juridical applications), and the Rawḍa (literally, “Garden,” i.e., a miscellany of various traditions on different subjects), all of which add up to an immense gathering of 16,202 hadiths. To be sure, Imami jurists have paid greater attention to the portion of the Furūʿ, which forms a virtually complete corpus of early Imami law. The traditions that make up this part have served on countless occasions in the composition of other legal works, sometimes following a different order, though often influenced by the structure of chapters in al-Kāfī.

The two parts of the Uṣūl and the Furūʿ are divided in their turn into a number of “books” (kitāb), with each book divided into “chapters” (bāb), often but not always given a title; however, this system is not followed throughout the work. For example, the Book of Knowledge and of Ignorance (K. al-‘aql wa’l-jahl)—see further on in this chapter for this translation—contains no chapter. The number of hadiths in each chapter depends in part upon the importance of the theme treated in the chapter and in part on the volume of traditions that al-Kulaynī was able to collect on the subject. Some chapters contain only a single tradition. Others, entitled al-nawādir (literally, “rare traditions”), are not unanimously accepted by Imami scholars both with respect to their contents and to the normative value of the traditions they contain.234

In the composition of the work, in the arrangement of the books and chapters and even in the ordering of the traditions that make up a chapter (sometimes problematic hadiths stand alongside hadiths that are certain and currently operative), al-Kulaynī seems to have followed a strictly predetermined methodology. Some researchers even believe that within each chapter our author deliberately positioned the hadiths most apposite to the chapter’s theme in first place.235
With respect to the repetitions in certain chapters or to other instances in which some disorder or illogicality is evident in the titles given to some chapters or books in the *Kāfī*, these may be explained by the protracted compilation period the work entailed, by the manner of composition of certain parts, and, indeed, by the modes in which the book was transmitted by the generation of al-Kulaynī’s direct disciples as well as by the occasionally negative role played by later transmitters and copyists.

The legal portion, the *Furūʿ min al-Kāfī*, takes up five volumes of our edition and contains 11,819 traditions, or more than 70 percent, of the entire work. This gives a sense of its breadth and its importance, and yet what is specifically Shi‘ite in the book does not lie in this part. It contains twenty-six “books” on juridical subjects, the majority of which are commonplace in works of Imami jurisprudence. To be sure, in these the order of the chapters and their titles can shift from one book to another in accord with historical and social conditions as well as the requirements of the moment; however, their contents remain virtually identical. As examples, we shall mention the titles of several chapters: the Book of ritual purification (*K. al-tahārā*), the Book of cadavers (*K. al-janā‘īz*), the Book of canonical prayer (*K. al-ṣalāt*), the Book of marriage (*K. al-nikāḥ*), the Book of repudiation (*K. al-talāq*), the Book of foodstuffs (*K. al-‘īma*), the Book of inheritances (*K. al-mawārith*), the Book of judgment and juridical precepts (*K. al-qadā‘ wa‘l-ahkām*), etc. The order of the chapters in the *Furūʿ*, like the order of the hadiths within each chapter, doubtless observes the criteria of composition and compilation of the hadith collections of the period, especially those works of the old *majāmī* and *jāmī* type, but this composition no doubt also corresponds to the juridical opinions and positions of al-Kulaynī as well as his position with regard to Shi‘ite juridical tradition or traditions in general and to Imami traditions in particular. The exact grasp of subjects, the classification of themes, and the arrangement of chapters and subchapters in accord with these classifications, the attention devoted to the bases and rules of hadith transmission and juridical precepts, the new names given to the chapters, all attest to the great expertise of the author-compiler in the diverse domains of jurisprudence. As one point illustrative of this mastery, mention may be made of the repetition—as apposite as it is judicious—of certain hadiths in different chapters. In some cases, al-Kulaynī has broken up the same long hadith into several parts and used each of these parts in their appropriate chapters.
Now let us turn to the Rawda min al-Kāfī (the Garden of the Kāfī). This part contains 597 traditions dealing with manners and morality, the sermons and letters of the imams, and rules bearing on daily life. Here too are exegetical hadiths, historical information and reports, the “medical” traditions of the Prophet and the imams, the interpretation of dreams, etc. Given its nature, the Rawda often diverges in its arrangement of chapters from the other two parts, the Uṣūl and the Furūʿ; indeed, al-Kulaynī did not divide this part of his work into books or chapters. Rather, this is an anthology, a melange of all sorts of hadiths in no particular order, and so this part is utterly unlike the rest of the work.

Finally, the most important part, that of the Uṣūl, devoted to specifically Imami doctrines. This takes up eight books, comprising three big volumes in our edition, and in its totality containing 505 chapters and 3,786 hadiths. Let us take a closer look at the contents of this part; we shall give a few judiciously selected examples, for, in fact, the chapters and subchapters are infinitely more numerous. An attempt will be made to translate terms in their technical doctrinal aspect, as was done with the Baṣāʾir al-darajāt in chapter 4, but this, of course, does not obviate their other meanings, including their obvious ones:

The author-compiler’s introduction, 1:2–9.
1. The Book of Knowledge and Ignorance (K. al-‘aql wa’l-jahl), 1:10–29. This contains thirty-four traditions (undivided in chapters), among which is the long dialogue of the imam Mūsā b. Jaʿfar with his renowned disciple, the theologian Hishām b. al-Ḥakam on knowledge (hadith no. 12), and the quite celebrated cosmogonic hadith on the armies of knowledge and of ignorance (no. 14).

2. The Book of the Virtues of Initiatory Knowledge (K. faḍl al-‘ilm), 1:30–71. This contains 175 traditions divided into chapters (bāb), among which are “The Necessity of Seeking Knowledge,” “Description of Knowledge and of the Initiatory Sage,” “Initiatory Master and Initiated Disciple,” “Frequenting Initiatory Masters,” “Word and Act in Relation to Knowledge,” “Probative Authority (hujja) of the Initiatory Sage/Master,” “The Transmission of Writings and Traditions,” “Against Innovations, Personal Opinions, and Reasoning by Analogy,” “Constant Recourse to the Qur’an and the Hadith.”

3. The Book of Divine Unity (K. al-tawḥīd), 1:72–167. This contains 215 traditions divided into chapters, among which are “Creation ex nihilo of

4. The Book of Proof (that is, “apodictic proof of God” or “decisive authority,” i.e., the imam and his earthly manifestation) (K. al-ḥujja), 1:168–548. This contains 1,016 traditions divided into chapters, among which are “The Indispensable Character of the Proof,” “The Generations of the Allies or Friends of God: Prophets, Messengers, Imams,” “The Earth Cannot Be Devoid of the Proof,” “Recognition of the Imam/imam,”242 “The Imam as Sign and as Guide to God,” “the Imam as Treasure and Treasurer of Initiatory Knowledge,” “The Imam as Threshold,” “The Imam as Light,” “The Imam as Pillar of the Universe,” “Qur’anic Allusions to the Imam,” “The Imam and Initiatory Knowledge,” “The Guides of Light and the Guides of Darkness,” “Qur’an and Imam,” “Inheritance of Knowledge,” “Sacred Scriptures of the Past and the Imam,” “The Integral Qur’an of the Imams,”243 “Supernatural Powers and Objects of the Imams,” “The Secret Books of the Imams,” “Sources of the Imams’ Knowledge,” “Knowledge of the Invisible,” “Miraculous Knowledge,” “The Heavenly Inspiration of the Imam,” “The Investiture (nāṣṣ) of the Twelve Imams,” several chapters on the hidden imam, his Occultation and his messianic Return as the eschatological savior, several chapters on the nature of the imam’s body and spirit, on his faithful and his adversaries, many chapters on various aspects of the imam’s initiatory knowledge. The book ends with chapters on the lives of the twelve imams.

5. The Book of Belief and Unbelief (K. al-īmān wa’l-kufr), the entire vol. 2 (pp. 2–464).244 This contains 1,609 traditions divided into chapters, among which are “Creation of the Believer and the Unbeliever,” several cosm-anthropogonic chapters, “Difference Between islām and īmān,” many
chapters on the nature, practical application, and soteriological consequences of belief, many chapters on ethics, “Duty of Keeping Secret (taqiyya),” “Believer-Initiates as a Minority,” numerous chapters on impiety and unbelief, on the nature, practices, and results of impious ignorance, on the ethical consequences of unbelief, on sin and the status of the sinner.

6. The Book of Prayer (K. al-du‘ā’), 2:466–595. This contains 409 traditions divided into chapters, many of which are devoted to the numerous virtues of prayer and the various categories of invocation, on the requisite state of awareness during prayer, obligatory canonical prayer and supererogatory prayers, diverse invocations and sacred formulae.

7. The Book of the Virtues of the Qur’an (K. faḍl al-qur’ān), 2:596–634. This contains 124 traditions divided into chapters on the virtues of the practice of regular reading of the Qur’an, the categories of readers and of readings, specific virtues of certain verses and certain suras, allusions to the falsification of the official version of the Qur’an.

8. The Book of Frequenting (i.e., relations between human beings, K. al-‘ishra), 2:635–74. This contains 204 traditions divided into chapters on the ethics of relationships with others, and most especially on relationships among the Shi’ite faithful.

The Formation of an Entire Religion Set Apart

As its title shows, “The Sufficient Book” is intended as a complete summa of Imami articles of faith and practice. Moreover, its author-compiler states this clearly himself in his introduction. With its imposing juridical portion, the oldest and most complete synthesis of the corpus of Imami law that has come down to us, moving clearly from cultic practices to transactions while dealing with precepts and rules, and particularly with its immense doctrinal portion, moving from cosmogony to eschatology while treating theology, exegesis, ethics, religious practices, the history or even the theory of the Occultation of the last imam, this huge monument has safeguarded Twelver identity amid the countless schools of Islamic thought in an especially turbulent moment in the history of Shi’ism in general and of Twelver Shi’ism in particular. Al-Kulaynī places imamology at the center, as needs must be, to the effect that this determines and gives ultimate meaning to all other religious disciplines, thereby radically shaping Shi’ism as “the
religion of the Imam.” Keeping his distance from both the ever swelling rationalism of his coreligionists in Baghdad and those Shi’ite movements of a revolutionary and gnostic sort, more levelheaded than his older contemporary al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī in presenting Imamism as a fundamentally initiatory religion (see chapter 4), and doubtless both apolitical and quietist, al-Kulaynī is indisputably one of the most decisive representatives of the primitive esoteric and nonrationalistic tradition of the Iranian schools of Rayy and Qumm just before the rationalizing theological and juristic tradition of the politicized doctors of Baghdad asserts its dominance.

With respect to doctrine—and in contrast to the K. Baṣā’ir al-darajāt—the Kitāb mitigates what might be termed occult and magical aspects, insisting less on the thaumaturgic powers of the imams, all the while emphasizing their initiatory and hermeneutical knowledge, which encompasses all headings of knowledge. Conversely, Neoplatonic echoes are more intense than with al-Ṣaffār, as shown by the development of the cosmogonic dimension and the central role that knowledge/intelligence (equivalent to the Greek nous) plays there, the way in which the doctrine of divine emanations down through preexisting worlds and metaphysical entities is made increasingly complex, the establishment of a negative theology, or, indeed, the importance placed on the centrality of the sage’s role in the economy of the sacred. It is important to keep in mind, yet again, that al-Kulaynī is the exact contemporary of al-Fārābī, the great Neoplatonist of Islam, who dwelt in the Abbāsid capital at almost the same time. In a more general sense, his time is that of the rise of philosophical thought in Islam. Thus Neoplatonic gnosis, recast in accord with a monotheism that accepted creation, would tinge Shi’ite thought in a definitive fashion.

The works of al-Ṣaffār and al-Kulaynī, together with other Shi’ite sources composed during the century that runs from the middle of the third/ninth to that of the fourth/tenth century, show the formation of an integral religion. Among these sources, it is enough to cite the Qur’anic commentaries of al-Ḥibari, Furāṭ ak-Kūfī, al-Ṣ-Ayyāshī, ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, the works of such authors as al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, al-Barqī, or of Ibn Bābawayh, both father and son, the major works such as the Ithbāt al-waṣiyā attributed to al-Masʿūdī or, indeed, al-Nuʾmānī’s K. al-Ghayba, or the heresiographical books by a Nawbakhtī or a Sa’d b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ashʿarī, along with many others in numerous domains of knowledge. This integral religion possesses its own theology, cosmology, prophetology, historiography, jurisprudence, its
own hermeneutical doctrine, ethics, liturgy, eschatology, and heresiography, in all their complexity, and all of it turns on an omnipresent imamology of a mystical type. Let us remind the reader yet again that almost all these works, partially integral as they are, are compilations of hadiths, that is, teachings going back to the Prophet, to Fāṭima, and, above all, to the imams.

The Shi‘ite double vision of the world, at once dual and dualistic, though still rudimentary at the time of an al-Ḥiwarī and the religiosity that he represents (see chapter 3), grows ever more complex and comes to be endowed with a powerful coherence. The pair zāhir/bāṭin (manifest/hidden, exoteric/esoteric) that characterizes the dual vision applies no longer solely to the letter and spirit of Scripture but expands to encompass other domains such as theology and prophetology. God Himself has an aspect that is forever hidden, namely his absolutely unknowable essence (dhāt), as well as a revealed aspect made manifest by his Names and Attributes (asma‘ wa-ṣifāt). The God revealed through his names has a locus of manifestation par excellence, and this is the Imam as understood metaphysically, both cosmic man and theophanic being. This heavenly Imam also displays a hidden aspect, his metaphysical dimension, and an aspect that is manifest, revealed through the earthly Guide, the man or woman who is the “ally” of God (wali, pl. awliyā‘). Among terrestrial guides, the lawgiver prophets have as their mission to bring the letter of the divine message to a majority in a given community while their imams initiate a minority among the faithful into the spirit of this message. This minority of initiates are “the Shi‘ites” of each religion.

In the same way, the dualistic vision goes beyond the opposition between the members of the Prophet’s family (ahl al-bayt) and their enemies to take on a universal, transhistorical dimension. In the cosmogonic writings, this opposition is the reenactment of a primordial struggle begun at the dawn of creation between cosmic knowledge and its armies on one side and cosmic ignorance and its powers on the other. This war is perpetually engaged throughout history, setting those who are initiated—represented by God’s allies and their faithfull in all ages—in opposition to the forces against initiation, incarnated in the enemies of God’s allies. All prophets and their imams, all the saints of all periods, have had to face the ignorance and violence of their adversaries. This stubborn struggle, originating in cosmogonic times, will come to a close only with the Return of the savior at the end of days when that savior will utterly vanquish the forces of ignorance and injustice.
The present work, which I now bring to a close, if only provisionally, has had two objectives. The first of these, and the most obvious, has been to present certain early works together with their authors who remain historically significant even though unfairly neglected by the public at large. The second, less explicit objective lies in the attempt to sketch, through the history of these texts and the streams of thought that they represent, new ways of formulating the inherent problems underlying a basic question: the juncture between the scriptural sources of Islam and the ceaseless internecine wars that broke out during the very first centuries of this religion. Put another way, neither the sources, the Qur’an and the Hadith, nor the historical events and fratricidal conflicts that characterized Islam from its very origins have been scrutinized as such. These subjects have been frequently and thoroughly studied from various perspectives and in accord with diverse critical methods for more than a century and a half. But this does not mean that from now on all is clear in these areas—far from it! And it is for this reason that new perspectives and new paths of inquiry can still prove of the greatest usefulness. Specifically, apart from a few rare and recent exceptions, Shi’ite sources have not been mined in these inquiries as they might be. The chief reason for this exclusion is that these sources have been deemed as not particularly representative since they issued from a minority and so
were judged to have a strong ideological orientation. An astonishing attitude on the part of scientific researchers reputed to be impartial, especially since it has been established, and in no uncertain terms, that from Ignaz Goldziher to Michael Cook and throughout the relevant studies, stretching over more than a century, the Sunni sources themselves might also be deemed historically of dubious credibility, at the very least in their explicit pronouncements, strongly oriented as they are in the quest to establish proofs of Sunni orthodoxy and orthopraxy. In this dialectic, which sets the “right religion” in opposition to “heterodoxy,” Shi’ite sources are without a doubt just as oriented, though not necessarily to a greater degree; moreover, they offer the advantage of being the voice of a minority that was ultimately defeated, and in this respect they appear to be all the more valuable in that they frequently report details that have been censored or distorted by the victors. It hardly needs stating that both Shi’ism and Sunnism, along with their respective literatures, have at all times displayed a great diversity; even so, the features we are discussing here form doctrinal foundations that are more or less consensual on both sides. Furthermore, these are the very traits that distinguish these two great branches of Islam one from another. Hence, from a comparative and concurrent examination of both kinds of sources, the glimmer of historical reality, enigmatic as it may be on more than one score, may flash forth. Neglect of Shi’ite writings appears even more regrettable when it is realized that on certain basic questions regarding the history of nascent Islam and the genesis of its scriptural sources, these writings are at times corroborated by a great number of modern scholarly studies bearing on historical and philological areas: the occurrence of violent conflicts between the most important figures of nascent Islam and their prolongation well into the early Abbasid period;1 the especially problematic nature of the elaboration, transmission, and reception of the Qur’anic text;2 the political aspect of the elaboration of a huge portion of the corpus of Hadith, in which each theological and political party attempted to forge “prophetic” traditions so as to justify its own cause;3 the state censorship exercised against different bodies of writing of a religious or historiographical type;4 the close relationship between literature and Qur’anic exegesis, its origin and development, or, conversely, its prohibition and impoverishment, alongside the history of caliphal power.5 Last, it is important to state that a certain amount of data seen as being typically Shi’ite and freighted with a subversive charge
threatening to “orthodoxy” was, nevertheless, transmitted by prestigious Sunni authors: ʿUmar preventing the dying Prophet from revealing his last will, the oppression and repression surrounding the accession of Abū Bakr to the caliphate, the physical brutality wreaked on Fāṭima by ʿUmar, rights despised, repression and massacre of eminent members of the Prophet’s family by the caliphal power, etc.

There may be a simple reason for this final point; that is, the “paradox,” stressed for quite some time by both Muslim scholars and Orientalists, that following several major historical events—the assassination of ʿUthmān, the arbitration at Ṣiffin, the defeat of the faction of “Qurʾan reciters” (qurrāʾ) turned Khārijite, or even the murder of ʿAlī less than half a century after Muḥammad’s death—the caliphate reverts to those who had violently opposed Islam in the past, namely, the Banū Umayya (the Umayyads) from the clan of the Banū ʿAbd Shams. Indeed, they had become the enemies of their own cousins, the Prophet and his clan of Banū Hāshim, since the coming of the new Arab religion and especially after the battle of Badr in which several dozen leading figures were killed by the followers of the new prophet. In a certain sense, religious, ascetic, and local Islam had been swiftly defeated or, at the least, had been supplanted by an Islam that was political, opportunistic, and imperial. Hence Umayyad rule had every reason to obscure or distort this past in an effort to justify the present and consolidate it. It accomplished this through violence and censorship. Confronted by the savage repression of which the descendants of Muḥammad and of ʿAlī were the victims, along with the wish to conceal a history that was still fresh—except in the minds of learned Alids—a number of other scholars in the second/eighth and third/ninth centuries were themselves willing to defend the rights of the People of the Prophet’s Household, however discreetly. The examples of the historians and chroniclers Abū Mikhnaf, Sayf b. ʿUmar, al-Madāʾinī, Naṣr b. Muzāḥim, Ibn ʿIsḥāq/Ibn Hishām, Ibn Aʿtham al-Kūfī, al-Masʿūdī, al-Yaʿqūbī, or even such important traditionists as al-Bukhārī, Muslim, or, indeed, Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbal himself might be cited. Attention has been drawn from time to time to this phenomenon of pro-Hashemite, if not, indeed, pro-Alid sympathy (which cannot be explained systematically by later Abbasid propaganda), but in my opinion it has not been adequately emphasized and explored. The very least that can be said is that it prompts us to examine Shiʿite sources with somewhat less suspicion.
The prejudice against older Shi’ite literature could be explained as well by the frequent neglect of one piece of evidence: the doctrinal notions, the institutions, the theological and political splits as well as the scriptural writings of Islam first appeared amid violent fratricidal conflicts. Now any objective scrutiny of the history and ideas of this period demands the impartial study of the sources emanating from the victorious faction, but also those of the defeated, all the more so since the former have tried almost systematically to hide or alter a quantity of historical facts as important as they are compromising for them.

For all these reasons it seemed to me appropriate to concentrate my analysis on several Shi’ite works that are representative of the great streams of thought, all the while placing them within the general historical, intellectual, and spiritual context of their period and at the same time, of course, including non-Shi’ite works in my analysis. This approach struck me as useful in order to complement, as modestly as may be, the many studies that already exist into two areas of major importance in which, nevertheless, large shadow zones persist: the history of Islam’s beginnings and the history of the compilation of its Scriptures. Accordingly, the following works have been considered in their chronological order: the pseudepigraphic work Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays or Kitāb al-Saqīfa (“The Book of Sulaym ibn Qays” or “The Book of the Porch”), the oldest strata of which date from the beginning of the second/eighth century; the Kitāb al-qirā’āt or Kitāb al-tanzīl wa’t-tahrīf (“The Book of Qur’anic Readings” or “The Book of Revelation and Falsification”) by Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyārī from the third/ninth century (probably the first half); the Taṣīr (“Qur’an Commentary”) of al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥakam al-Ḥibari, also dating from the third/ninth century (probably the second half); the latter’s exact contemporary, the Kitāb baṣā’ir al-darajāt (“The Book of Perceptions of Degrees”) of al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī; last, the Kitāb al-kāf of Muḥammad b. Ya’qūb al-Kulaynī from the very beginning of the fourth/tenth century. A genuine sequence of events unfolds from a study of the history of these texts and their contents. In the following paragraphs the terms of this sequence correspond respectively to each of the works just mentioned. In the preceding chapters the present author has attempted to present these subjects in all their complexity. The results of these studies will now be laid out as simply as possible.

The Book of Sulaym is very probably one of the oldest examples of the Shi’ite tradition of the Iraqi city of Kūfah, which will indelibly stamp a
goodly number of the most fundamental doctrines and historical visions of Shi’ism, and this, indeed, down to our own day. Among these is that which bears on the history of succession to the Prophet: immediately after Muḥammad’s death, and even before his interment, the actors in a long-standing conspiracy, particularly Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, seized power, beginning with the meeting of Saqīfa, during an operation that was meticulously prepared and characterized as a “plot.” With treachery and violence, they shunted ʿAlī aside from the caliphate. And yet the latter was the sole legitimate successor to the Prophet, declared as such by him in several of his pronouncements, and even by God in the Qur’ān. Among the direct consequences of this act of naked force was the death of Fāṭima, the Prophet’s daughter, as a result of the violence she suffered at the hands of ʿUmar. Other consequences, more removed in time and less direct though just as dramatic, were the following: the assassination of ʿAlī, the seizure of power by the Umayyads, the enemies of Muḥammad and his family, the poisoning of the older grandson of the latter, the son of ʿAli, al-Ḥasan, by order of the Umayyad Muʿāwiya, the murder of al-Ḥasan’s brother, the grandson whom the Prophet loved especially, al-Ḥusayn and almost his entire family at Karbalā’ by order of Yazīd, Muʿāwiya’s son. Whence springs the Shi’ite doctrine according to which the massacre at Karbalā’ had its roots deep in the plot at Saqīfa.

In an attempt to justify these measures, caliphal power set up a complex system of propaganda, censorship, and historical falsification. First it altered the text of the Qur’ān and forged an entire body of traditions falsely ascribed to the Prophet, drawing great scholars, judges, jurists, preachers, and historians into its service—all this within a policy of repression that was as savage as it was methodical, aimed at its opponents at large, but at Alids in particular. A considerable number of non-Shi’ite sources more or less discreetly report these facts, which an abundance of modern research on these subjects in its turn frequently confirms. Hence, in this historical vision of Shi’ism, official and majority “Islam,” the religion of power and its institutions, were elaborated by the enemies of Muḥammad, his family, and his descendants, the sole legitimate guides of the community of the faithful. It was not the religion of Muḥammad, but a real “anti-Islam” imposed by tyranny and deceit.

In contrast to the Qur’ān that everyone knows, the Qur’ān revealed to Muḥammad explicitly mentions ʿAlī and his descendants, on one
side, presenting them as the true guides for Muslims, and, on the other, Muḥammad’s enemies, identified by name, and especially the first two caliphs and certain powerful men among the Umayyads and their ancestors. When they took on his power, Muhammad’s adversaries found themselves compelled to intervene on a massive scale in the Qur’anic text in order to change those passages in it that would compromise them. Helped by powerful men in government and by professional men of letters (sometimes the two aspects were united in the same individual, as was the case with ‘Ubaydallāh b. Ziyād or al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūsuf), they established the official Qur’an, as now known, but which due to all sorts of interventions ended up by displaying that disconnected and difficult to understand aspect that is all too familiar. The Book of Revelation and Falsification by al-Sayyārī, probably the oldest monograph on this subject that has come down to us, forms part of a powerful tradition from the first three or four centuries of Islam which holds that the official Qur’an, called the vulgate of ‘Uthmān, is a falsified version of the true revelation vouchsafed to the Prophet. This belief in the falsification thesis, it should be made clear, was alive in many non-Alid circles as well.

Historical and philological research on the text of the Qur’an and the history of its redaction have established that, in effect, the definitive text of the Qur’an, as it is known, is very probably the product of a complex and collective editorial labor. The establishment of this vulgate would thus date from the caliphate of the Umayyad ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān (65 to 86/685–705) and would have been carried out under his supervision. Even so, up until the third and fourth/ninth and tenth centuries other editions of the Qur’an, quite different in their form and their content, were also in circulation in the territories of Islam until the “state Qur’an” was imposed on everyone, including the majority of Shi’ites. During this period, with the establishment of Sunni “orthodoxy” under the Abbasid caliphate—one of whose principal dogmas proclaimed the divine and eternal character of the official Qur’an—it became extremely dangerous to cast doubt on its integrity. Only a minority among Shi’ites themselves continued discreetly to maintain the falsification thesis and have done so up until the present time.

Many Qur’anic passages are difficult to understand. Early Shi’ism explains this fact in two ways. According to one explanation, the oldest of all, the obscurity of the Qur’anic text is said to be the result of its
falsification. Various suppressions and additions, the work of the enemies of Muḥammad and ‘Ali, have utterly altered the revelation and damaged its original clarity. In particular, the suppression of the names of historical individuals among the followers and the adversaries of the Prophet and his religion—individuals most of whom were still alive when the text was being established—have made the once clear text virtually incomprehensible.

A second explanation, probably not as early as the first, appears to be less radical. The text of the true revelation imparted to Muḥammad has been effectively falsified by the “suppression” of entire passages (at this point “additions” are no longer mentioned; otherwise, it could never be known what comes from God and what from human intervention in the Qur’an, and so no credibility whatsoever could be accorded to the divine character of the official Qur’an). Nevertheless, what gives God’s Book its enigmatic quality is that intrinsic to it is both a manifest and literal aspect and a hidden, esoteric aspect, in other words, a letter and a spirit, to resort to St. Paul’s well-known pairing. Still later, in an effort to sweeten the explosive notion of falsification, some Shi’ite scholars would state that originally the term Qur’an denoted the text of revelation accompanied by the explanatory glosses of ‘Alī. The official vulgate was not censored; rather, the crime of ‘Alī’s opponents was to have omitted his commentaries, thereby rendering the revelations made to Muḥammad hard to understand. In all such cases the interpretation of an inspired exegete, that is, an imam deemed impeccable by Shi’ites, becomes indispensable for making the divine message comprehensible. For this reason, the Hadith is said to be requisite in order to explicate the Qur’an. From this too comes the Shi’ite doctrine that presents the Qur’an as “the Guide” or “the Silent Book” and, parallel to it, the imam and/or his teaching as “the Speaking Qur’an.”

The Qur’an Commentary (Tafsīr) of al-Ḥibarī belongs to a solid exegetical tradition, still flourishing in modern times, that I have called personalized commentaries. Adhering rather to the first tradition of explication of the obscure nature of many Qur’anic passages, these tafsīrs avail themselves of the Hadith to fill in the “empty boxes” of the Qur’an with the names of the persons about whom these passages are deemed to have been revealed, which become perfectly clear through this process. Apparently, in the very earliest Shi’ite initiatory circles, these personalized commentaries, which consisted in the identification of specific historical individuals beneath the letter of the Qur’an, embodied the earliest form of Shi’ite esotericism,
that is, a secret teaching lavished solely on those considered worthy to receive it. Indeed, within a context of fierce repression, the act of identifying individuals who were often still among the living as friends or enemies of the Prophet, and hence of God, would have been an especially tricky business, since some of those enemies or their descendants were in power. Shi’ite enthusiasm for this sort of exegesis, based on the belief in a ẓāhir and a bāṭin in the Qur’an, is without doubt one of the main reasons for the wish on the part of the Umayyads in power, as well as some of their “ideologues,” to ban all exegesis applied to the Qur’an in general or, more specifically, the discernment within it of two levels of meaning. Interpretations of an esoteric sort were systematically judged to be contrary to the spirit of “orthodoxy” and viewed as a threat to the unity and safety of the community. At the same time, the existence of trends dubbed “heretical” was exploited by those in power as a way of legitimating orthodoxy.8

To sum up, during this phase Alids justified the need for esoteric exegesis by a precise historical evolution: his whole life long, the Prophet had to face the opposition and the hypocrisy of his Qurayshite enemies. The Qur’an alludes frequently to these conflicts. Opportunistically turning to Islam, and only very recently, these same enemies, by means of a plot immediately upon the death of Muḥammad, seized his power and authority by shoving his legitimate successor violently away from the caliphate. Under such circumstances, one of the first actions power had to take was to falsify those compromising passages of the Qur’an in which the friends and the enemies of the new religion were mentioned by name. Thus made incomprehensible, the Qur’an required an interpretation, returning those personages to their original Qur’anic context so as to uncover the true meaning of the verses. Such exegesis, squelched and banned by powerful men in the new state, could only circulate in secret among initiates who stood in opposition to this power.

Many Shi’ites quickly came to realize that head-on confrontation with caliphal power brought about an impasse.9 Most of them, rightly characterized as quietists, came from among the followers of the imams of the Husaynī and Ja’farite line who later constituted Twelver Imamism. In fact, from a historical perspective, the hellish cycle of repression and rebellion ended, in almost all instances, with the triumph of Umayyad power and the bloody rout of the Alids. The revolution of the Abbasids, a family from the same Hashimite clan as the Alids, together with the brutal extirpation
of the Umayyad caliphate, gave rise to some hopes among Alids for a brief spell. The pitiless realities of power quickly resurfaced, however, and, apart from a few rare and brief periods of calm, the same cycle began afresh. The new caliphs and their ideologues realized early on that the religious institutions and the basic doctrines set in place by their predecessors could not be modified without occasioning a perilous shift in the very foundations of the empire. The idealization of the prophetic age, the canonization of the Companions of Muḥammad, the recognition of the official Qurʾan, and virtually the entire body of the Hadith, already acknowledged by previous doctors—apart from explicitly pro-Umayyad traditions—were no longer called into question. On the doctrinal level as well, the “People of ʿAlī” were henceforth marginalized, isolated, the victims of a drastic ostracism; the declaration of the legitimacy of ʿAlī and his descendants, because of their sanctity, as well as the denunciation of their enemies, was neutralized, swallowed up in a massive, unfurling, and ceaseless torrent of traditions, collected within the corpus of hadiths and Qurʾanic commentaries, in praise of the virtues of those very enemies, henceforth sanctified. ʿAlī himself was “recovered” in myriad ways, and in this propaganda war the Alids were portrayed as wild and frustrated types in whom neither their first imam nor the other imams of his line could be recognized. The word of a defeated minority thus stood against that of the victorious majority: the outcome was predictable.

Under these circumstances, Shiʾite discourse seems to have felt the need to transcend the impasse by exalting the proclamation of ʿAlī’s legitimacy and that of his descendants to a metaphysical level. The resources of other monotheistic cultures—adapted, of course, to Shiʾite doctrines—were drawn into service, especially in the area of hermeneutics. This reception appears to go well beyond the likely general influence of the Christian doctrine of the “Four Senses” of Scripture (literal, allegorical, moral, and analogical), which is itself probably an outgrowth of the four interpretative methods of Judaism (peshat: literal exegesis; remez: implicit hidden sense; derash: homiletic perception; sod: mystical and allegorical interpretation).  The sacral authority conferred upon the House of David by the Jews and upon the holy family of Jesus by Christians (the two communities were present in force in Islamic regions and especially in Iraq, the birthplace of Shiʾism, during the first centuries after the Hijra) would have been transposed onto the family of the Prophet’s household (ahl al-bayt, ahl bayt al-nabi). Gradually an ever
more complex doctrine of the imamate took shape in which the influence of Christian Neoplatonic gnostic traditions of Late Antiquity become at times discernible even in the details: the cosmic guide (imām), a metaphysical archetype of the earthly “guide,” a preexisting entity showing forth the luminous Word of God, seems to have its roots among the commentators of St. John’s Gospel and such theologians of the logos as Justin, Ignatius of Antioch, Tertullian, or Origen.12 This conception of the Word may even go back further, from Philo of Alexandria to Heraclitus of Ephesus in the sixth century BCE with his notion of logos/pre-eternal Wisdom ruling the cosmos. The imam as a locus of the manifestation of God, an ontological intersection between the divine and the human, displays more than one analogy to certain Christological doctrines, from Paul (e.g., Colossians 1:15 or 2:9) onward to Origen’s Commentary on John, the Thalia of Arius, or even the doctrines of Nestorius. The preponderance given to the divine alliance/friendship (wa{lā}ya) with gnosis (‘ilm) as its main component—in the sense of a saving and transformational knowledge passed on by the initiatory guide in an esoteric fashion—the role of hermeneutics as a factor in knowledge of the secret meaning of Scripture or even the extension of the prophetic mission through the teachings of initiates comprise the most basic themes of gnostic currents of thought. They are hugely present in the doctrines of Elkasaī, Marcion, Bardesanes, or Mani, as well as in the doctrines revealed in the Nag Hammadi texts. Last, mention should be made of the dualistic vision of history in early Shi’ism and its threefold division of humanity, made up of initiatory guides, initiated disciples, and the ignorant mass of people. These notions have important parallels with various Neoplatonic forms of gnosis in which the history of the cosmos is one of a struggle between the forces of good and those of evil, in which human beings are distributed among the Pneumatics (from Greek pneuma, “spirit”), the true spiritual masters whose inner divine spark has been activated, the Psychics (from psyché, “soul”), the adepts whose divine spark exists only in potentiality, and then the Hylics (from hylé, “matter”), ordinary people who follow only their lower instincts.13

Taking its development increasingly through the exegetical body of Hadith, in particular, metaphysics and mystical gnosis come to envelop history in order to make it possible to bypass it. Such compilations of hadiths as the Baṣā’ir al-darajāt of al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī and, even more, the Kāfī of al-Kulaynī were major factors in this turn, which reached its height.
during the third and fourth/ninth and tenth centuries. The first of these exemplifies the massive acceptance of gnostic thought within Imami Alid milieus; the second completes it in a magisterial way by adding numerous Neoplatonic doctrines to it, while at the same time comprising an enormous juridical part that has as its aim to form an entire institutionalized religion set apart from Imami Shi’ism. Both are part and parcel of a powerful spiritual and intellectual movement led mainly by traditionists (muḥaddith, that is, experts in Hadith), a movement that probably formed a majority in pre-Buwayhid Imamism and that I have elsewhere called the esoteric and nonrationalistic tradition. Such doctrinal writings as al-İdāḥ by al-Faḍl b. Shādhān and the Kitāb al-maḥāsin of al-Barqū or even the Qur’ān commentaries of Furāt al-Kūfī, of ‘Ali b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, or of al-‘Ayyāši are other important examples of this.

The “sequence” in the Shi’ite perception of things would be the following, in severely schematized form: at Muḥammad’s death his enemies shunt aside ‘Ali, his sole legitimate successor, and seize power. They treacherously put together an anti-Muḥammadan religion, supported by a falsified version of the Qur’ān, which they then present as official Islam. The persecuted Shi’ite imams (or the hadiths ascribed to them) attempt by means of hermeneutical work to save the true religion of Muḥammad by initiating a small number of the faithful into the true content of the Qur’ānic revelation. Assailed by the violent reaction of their powerful opponents, the guides introduce a metaphysical dimension into their claims by elaborating “a religion of the imam” that is broadly tinged by gnosis and by Neoplatonism.

Thus an entire religion set apart takes shape around a central pivot: the figure of the imam. The imam is not merely a historical figure, earthly, part of the perceptual world but rather a preexisting metaphysical being, the first entity created by the divine light who manifests himself on earth down through the line of the friends of God. ‘Alī is the supreme exemplification of this divine man, and he is therefore the supreme guide. In this way a complex imamological doctrine came into being, out of which all other religious disciplines and domains of the faith depend, from cosmology to eschatology, from law to theology by way of Qur’ānic exegesis, philosophy, ethics, or even liturgy. The theory that revelation contains an exoteric literal aspect and an esoteric spiritual aspect played a crucial role in its development since the hadiths about the imams, which increase as
the line of the imams grows, are presented as being fundamentally the means by which the hidden meaning of the Qur’an is revealed; at the same time, the different aspects of the figure of the imam form the main content of this hidden meaning. This “need for hermeneutics” doubtless accounts for the very early origin and the swift development of the genre of Qur’anic exegesis within Shi’ite milieus; and it is this that prompted the development of Sunni exegesis, with its many anti-Shi’ite elements, in reaction.

The centrality of the “guide” and his teachings subsumed under the form of traditions carries with it two implicit but major consequences, among others: first, the greater importance accorded to the Hadith than to the Qur’an since the former, simultaneously enriched and controlled unceasingly by a living imam, illumines the latter, which, in addition to its intrinsically enigmatic character, is believed to have undergone numerous cuts. In the plethora of its tendencies and its branches, Shi’ism turns into a fundamentally hermeneutical doctrine with a mystical faith in the figure of the imam at its center. Far from being a “religion of the Book,” it is that of a person, of a figure, that of the imam, just as Christianity is the religion of Christ. To its followers, God is not made manifest through a text, a “silent” text in any case, but through a person who is its true Word—a person whose unseen but real presence makes up the very marrow of a devotion that is mystical in nature. This inward-looking spirituality is doubtless one aftereffect of the stinging defeat of Shi’ism on the historical plane—forever a minority and persecuted in the very heart of Islam. But it was also just as marginalized in the very heart of Shi’ism with the rise to power of the Imami jurist-theologians during the Buwayhid era; in an effort to be reconciled with the Sunni majority, they would modify a fair number of their own doctrines, often extensively. It is here that the purely religious begins to turn into an instrument of politics, the ramifications of which are still with us today. By contrast, any victory on the part of this spirituality is without a doubt to be sought elsewhere: it appears to have nurtured mysticism copiously, even in Sunni practice, and this would quickly develop into a lively source of hermeneutical thought and spiritual dynamism and would remain so for centuries. That, however, is quite another story.
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Notes

Introduction

1. For a better orientation to the persons, events, and dates of the beginnings of Islam mentioned in this volume, see the historical points of reference and figures at the beginning of the volume.

2. Many of the questions broached in this introduction will be considered in greater detail in the course of the work where bibliographical references will be duly given. Nevertheless, in order not to encumber the notes unduly, the reader may also consult such standard works as The Encyclopaedia of Islam, The Encyclopaedia of the Qur’an, or the Encyclopaedia Iranica for the entries corresponding to those basic facts which may be deemed more or less well known, such as “Qur’an,” “Hadith,” “Badr,” “Muḥammad,” “Abū Bakr,” ‘Umar,” “Uṯmān,” “‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib,” “Fāṭima,” etc.

3. In this distinction, the status of the so-called sacred Hadiths (ḥadīth qudsī) presents an enigma. These are in effect “words of God” transmitted in the Prophet’s name which have, however, not found a place in the Qur’an. Their status was problematic for medieval Muslim scholars as it is for Orientalists.

4. See chapter 2.

5. The Emigrés (al-muhājirūn) were the Meccan companions of Muhammad who fled with him from Mecca in the Hijra. The Helpers (al-ānṣār) were those who welcomed them to Medina (called Yathrib at the time) and helped them to form the first community of the faithful followers of the new prophet.

6. See also chapter 1. The term saqīfā should be kept in mind. The work we shall examine in the first chapter, the Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays, is also called Kitāb al-Saqīfā (The Book of the Saqīfā).
7. E.g., Ibn Hishām, al-Balādhūrī, al-Ṭabarī, or Ibn Shabba; on the other hand, Ibn Saïd’s silence on the conflicts is telling in this regard (detailed references to these works are given in the bibliography).

8. The question of the sources dealing with the death of the Prophet and the events that immediately followed is quite complex. For virtually every sequence of various events there exist numerous accounts, some of which diverge greatly, in accord with the theological and political position of the author. Scholarly research has examined these sources at length, and the relevant bibliography is enormous. In the interests of avoiding a discussion that draws on specialized scholarship at this stage, I here offer merely a compact synthesis of the most reliable arguments.

9. On these matters, see chapter 2, as well as Kohlberg and Amir-Moezzi, Revelation and Falsification.

10. The most complete traditional synthesis of the Shi‘ite position is in Nūrī Ṭabrisī, Faṣl al-ḵīṭāb, chapters 11 and 12, pp. 234–359. The argument that the Qur’an was falsified seems to have been held by a majority of Shi‘ites up to the fourth/tenth century. After that date, for complex reasons that will be considered in the course of this work, most Shi‘ites were compelled to support the Sunni position and accept the official version of the Qur’an. Nevertheless, among Shi‘ites, the belief in its falsification has never been totally relinquished, even in our own time; see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, pp. 200–27.

11. I owe this phrase to my friend and colleague, Professor F. Hakami.


13. See the figures and historical references at the beginning of this work. The thesis according to which the conflict over succession to the Prophet was a late Shi‘ite invention intended to justify the Alid position (formerly maintained by Sauvaget-Cahen, Introduction à l’histoire de l’Orient musulman, pp. 115ff., and more recently by Sharon, “Notes on the Question of Legitimacy of Government in Islam,” pp. 121ff., Black Banners from the East, pp. 75–85; “The Umayyads as Ahl al-Bayt,” pp. 134ff.) no longer seems tenable after the authoritative studies of Madelung (The Succession to Muhammad, “Sayf b. ‘Umar”), which demonstrate in a highly convincing manner—following Caetani (Annali dell’Islam, 2:516ff.) and Lammens (“Le triumvirat d’Abou Bakr, ‘Omar et Abou ‘Oaida,” pp. 113ff.)—the genuine historical plausibility of this conflict. Madelung’s historical research has been corroborated on the doctrinal level by the meticulous analyses of van Ess, Theologie und Gesellschaft, in the chapters devoted to Shi‘ite doctrines.

14. An earlier and briefer version of this study was published under the title “Note bibliographique sur le Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays.”

15. This study has been published in slightly different form in Amir-Moezzi and Kohlberg, “Révélation et falsification,” “Remarques sur l’histoire de la rédaction du Coran.” For a critical edition of the work, see Kohlberg and Amir-Moezzi, Revelation and Falsification (the introduction to this later work is the final and updated English version of the articles mentioned at the beginning of this note).
An initial, quite different version of this study has been published under the title “Le Tafsir d’al-Ḥibari (m. 286/899).”

These chapters are based on two previous studies: first, “Al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī (m. 290/902–3) et son Kitāb baṣā’ir al-danajāt.” Second, an article cowritten with Ansari, “Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī (m. 328 or 329/939–40 or 940–41) et son Kitāb al-kāfī.”

Amir-Moezzi, “Remarques sur les critères d’authenticité du hadīth.”

1. Violence and Scripture in the Book of Sulaym Ibn Qays

1. See the introduction. Another Book of Saqqā, renowned but seemingly lost, is that of Ṭāhir b. Shabba (d. 262/876), transmitted by Abū Bakr al-Jawharī (d. after 322/934); see Ṭīhrānī, Dhārī’ā, 12:206; GAS 1:322; Kohlberg, A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work, pp. 326–27, no. 532.


5. Modarresi, Tradition and Survival.


7. For example, Anšārī, “Abū Zayd-e ‘Alawī va ketāb-e ū dar radd-e emāmiyye”; “Nahj al-balāgha pish az Nahj al-balāgha”; “Zaydīyye va manābē-e maktūb-e emāmiyye”; “Az Abī l-Qāsim Kūfī tā nevandade-ye ‘Uyūn al-mu‘jīzāt.” On the Internet, see http://ansari.kateban.com where a very large number of works by the author on our subject may be found. We cite as well the remarkable study by another Iranian scholar: Jaf’fariyān, “Shadharāt min kutub maḏūda li-Muḥammad b. Bahīr al-Ruhīnī.” Non-critical works are excluded from this list; I think, for example, of bibliographical studies—erudite but traditional—such as al-Dhārī’ā of ʿAghā Bozorg al-Ṭīhrānī.

8. Not the Kitāb al-aṣl, as indicated in Djeblī, “Sulaym b. Kays,” EI2, 9:854, doubtless following Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, 2:10–11. On aṣl, pl. uṣūl, see the article by Kohlberg cited in note 3 (the mention of Aṣl Sulaym b. Qays, on p. 147, note 96, of this article).

9. With reference, as already noted, to the saqīfa (public courtyard, forum) of the Banū Sā‘īda, a Khazrajite clan of the Helpers where, according to tradition, the discussions on the succession to the Prophet took place just after his death—discussions that resulted in the shunting aside of Ṣālīh and the election of Abū Bakr; see Lecomte, “al-Sakīfa.” I shall return to this.

10. Man lam yakun ‘indahu min shī‘atīnā wa-muhābbīnā kitāb Sulaym b. Qays al-Hilālī fa-laysa ‘indahu min amrinā shay’un wa-lā ya’lamu min asbābīnā shay’an wa-huwa abjad al-shī‘a wa-huwa sīr min asrār al Muḥammad; to my knowledge, this tradition is reported
only by later sources: Majlisī, Bihār al-anwār, 1:76 and 23:124 (the author writes that he copied the hadith of Jaʿfar from a manuscript of the Book of Sulaym dated 609/1212–1213); Hurr ʿĀmilī, Ithbāt al-hudāt, 1:663; Kāzimī, Takmilat al-rijāl, 1:467; Nūrī Ṭabarī, Mustadrak al-Wasā’il, 3:183; Māmaqānī, Tanqīḥ al-maqāl, 2:54; Tīhrānī, Āghā Bozorg, al-Dhāriʿa ilā taṣānīf al-shiʿa, 2:152. These references, like the notes that follow, are obviously not exhaustive. In general, an effort will be made to cite the oldest and/or the most pertinent of the sources.


13. Not “Abū Sāʿīd b. Qays,” as the article in EI2 has it.

14. See Gaube, Die südpersischen Provinz Arrajān/Kuh-Gilāyeh von der arabischen Eroberung bis zur Safawidenzeit, s.n.

15. On him, see, e.g., among Shiʿite authors, Barqī, Rijāl, p. 9; Ṭūsī, Rijāl, pp. 83, 106 and 156; ʿĀlāmā Ḥillī, Khulāṣat al-aqwāl, p. 207 (citing Ibn al-Ghādāʾirī). Among Sunnis (who seem unaware of the Shiʿism of Abān), see, e.g., Bukhārī, al-Taʿrīkh al-kabīr, 1:454, no. 1455; Dhahabī, Mīzān al-ʿtīdāl, 1:10–15; Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Tahdhib al-tahdhib, 1:97; all these authors consider our protagonist a “weak” (daʿīf) traditionalist. Later Imami authors have attempted to rehabilitate him (see, e.g., Astarrābādī, Manhaj al-maqāl, p. 15; Ḥindī, Istiṣqāʾ al-īfāhām, 1:563ff; ʿAmīn, Aʿyān al-shiʿa, 5:50; Zanjānī, al-ʿJamiʿ fīl-rijāl, 1:11).

16. Not “al-Ghādanfārī,” d. 411/1030 [sic], as indicated in the aforementioned article in EI2. See Ibn al-Ghādāʾirī, Rijāl, pp. 63–64 and 118–119. As we will see later, the ascription of this work to Ibn al-Ghādāʾirī has been cast into serious doubt by certain authors.


19. Regarding the ancient convergence between Iranians and Shiʿites and the existence of “coded accounts” of such convergence, see Amir-Moezzi, “Shahrbān”.

20. Ibn al-Ghādāʾirī, Rijāl, pp. 118–19; the Sunni author Ibn Khallīkān takes up the accusation again in his Wafayāt al-ʿāyān, 2:339.


23. For example, such celebrated authors as al-Faḥl b. Shadhīn al-Nāṣibūrī, ʿĀmmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī, al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥakam al-Ḥībarī, or ʿAbd Allāh b. Jaʿfar al-Ḥimyarī; see Ṭīhrānī, al-Dhariʿa, 2:152f; al-Anṣārī, in the introduction to his edition of the K. Sulaym b. Qays, 1:122ff. Our work was exploited in equal measure by the Abbasid Shi‘ites who were responsible for the anonymous edition of the work in the third/ninth century, the Akhbār al-dawlat al-ʿabbāsīyya.


25. For example, by Ibn Shahrashūb, Maʿālim al-‘ulamāʾ, p. 3; Mīr Dāmād, al-Rawāshīn al-samāwīyya, p. 98; Ṭīhrānī, al-Dhariʿa, 2:125ff and 152f; Kohlberg, “Al-uṣūl al-arbaʿumi’a,” p. 147, no. 96.


31. Ibid., pp. 168 and 206.

32. Ibid., p. 217.

33. Ibid., pp. 140 and 175.

34. Modarressi, Tradition and Survival, p. 83.


36. On this term as applied to Shi‘ites, see Kohlberg, “The Term ‘Rāfiḍa’ in Imāmī Shi‘ī Usage.” Patricia Crone understands it as denoting those who radically reject the legitimacy of the first three caliphs and other companions considered to be anti-Alid.

37. Crone, “Mawāli and the Prophet’s Family,” pp. 178–79, and Medieval Islamic Political Thought, p. 85. It should be borne in mind that the Abbasids, belonging to the clan of the Banū Ḥāshim (see the figures in the front matter of the present work) were originally Shi‘ites. It was only upon coming to power that they embraced Sunnism and turned to violent suppression of the Alids. Hossein Modarressi seems to be in
disagreement with Crone’s designation “Hāshimite but not necessarily Ḥusaynid” since, as we have seen, in his opinion the work has Ḥusaynid tendencies; this disagreement does not figure in the original English version of Tradition and Survival, but rather in the Persian translation of the work made by Qarrč’ and Ja’fariyčn, Mīrāth-e maktūb-e shī‘e az seh qarn-e nakhost-e hejrī, p. 121 (where P. Crone is not identified by name; notice of the Book of Sulaym, pp. 119–24). Even so, the two scholars can both be right, given that the Book of Sulaym is made up of fragments of dates and so probably of different Shi’ite tendencies. Dakake, “Writing and Resistance”; Gleave, “Early Shiite Hermeneutics”; Bayhom-Daou, “Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays Revisited.”

38. Thus, despite the variations of a structural nature among most of the manuscripts (Ṭihrānī, Dharī’a, 2:152–59). The most blatant instance of the preservation of the original text is in the mention of thirteen (sic) imams, a point underlying the doubts cast on the authenticity of the work by (pseudo-?) Ibn al-Gha˂č’ir (see K. Sulaym b. Qays, pp. 217–18). Al-Najāshī was aware of this version since he writes that this tradition was exploited by a Zaydi Shi’ite of the fourth/tenth century in order to add the name of Zayd b. ‘Ali to the list of twelve imams (see Rijāl, p. 330). The version of the Book of Sulaym belonging to al-Mas’dī appears to have contained only this number thirteen for the imams (al-Tanbih wa’l-ishrāf, pp. 198–199). Subsequent versions will add numerous other traditions on the number twelve of the imams (K. Sulaym, pp. 62, 109, 125, 136, 151, 166–68, 201, 207), without censuring the tradition of thirteen imams as such; see also Modarressi, Tradition and Survival, pp. 84–85.

39. In my translations I use this excellent critical edition, in three volumes with continuous pagination, published in Qumm in 1415/1995. The summary is as follows: the first volume (pp. 7–548 + 43 pp.) is devoted to a study of the work and its supposed author. Despite the great erudition which characterizes it, this work—a veritable mine of information—is quite uncritical. The second volume contains the text of the work (pp. 555–873: traditions 1–48, following the majority of the manuscripts. Pp. 877–929: traditions 49–70, according to some manuscripts. Pp. 932–967: traditions 71–98: supplements—mustadrak—collected from citations of Sulaym in other works; on the evidence, traditions 92–98 have been added to the latest edition); seventy-eight pages of a thematic index. Finally, the third volume (pp. 961–1467) contains multiple indexes, references to traditions from the Book of Sulaym in other sources, as well as the bibliography listing other editions of the work.

41. K. Sulaym b. Qays (ed. Al-Anšārī) 1:308–408.
42. A renowned Companion of the Prophet; see Lammens, “Le triumvirat Abou Bakr,” pp. 113–44 (a work with several personal slants, but, even so, a mine of information on the sources); Lecomte, “Sur une relation de la Saqīfa attribuée à Ibn Qutayba,” pp. 171–83, and “al-Sakīfa,” EI2, 8:918; Madelung, The Succession to Muḥammad, chapter 1, pp. 28ff.
43. In chapter 42 (K. Sulaym b. Qays, 2:837–38), it is stated that the Prophet’s death was caused by poisoning, hence, he experienced martyrdom. On this question in both
the sources and the secondary studies, see Kohlberg, “Western Accounts of the 
Death of the Prophet.”

44. K. Sulaym b. Qays, ed. Anšārī Zanjānī Khū’īnī, 2:571ff. The pages of the original text 
are systematically indicated in the translation. Additions between brackets […] 
are my own. In order not to overburden the text and interrupt the flow of the nar-
rative too frequently, comments and references have been kept to a minimum. 
Eulogistic formulas and numerous digressions not germane to our subject have 
not been translated. The translation strives to restore the simple unembellished 
classical Arabic of the text together with the direct tone, which is virtually that of 
straight reportage.

45. Al-Bar‘ (or al-Barrā’) b. Āzīb al-Khazrajī, a renowned companion of the Prophet.

46. This kind of contradiction, even at times in two consecutive sentences, is typical of 
the work. As we noted earlier, this is an undeniable indication of the existence of 
layers of different dates, the most recent of which (here the insertion of a member 
of the Abbasid family) have not “expelled” the earliest layers (the insistence on the 
fact that ‘Alī alone will be uniquely assisted by the angels).

47. The term translated here as “power,” from Arabic amr (literally, “matter,” “thing,” 
“order”), is a word of multiple meanings that is difficult to translate. Within the 
context of our work, it almost always has the meaning of “legitimate power,” “suc-
cession of the Prophet,” “caliphate,” in the literal sense of “representative of the 
Prophet.”

48. A candidate from among the Helpers of Medina (the Anšār) to the succession to the 
Prophet, Sa’d remained immovable until his death (which seems not to have been 
natural) to the pressure exerted by ‘Umar and Abū Bakr. In the end, the Helpers, 
constrained and compelled, rallied to the latter.

49. See note 42, this chapter, and the relevant references.

50. Literally, “garments from Ṣan‘ā‘.” Apparently this kind of clothing was worn for 
going into battle. See Mufīd, K. Al-Jamal, p. 59 (“I saw men clad in fabrics from Ṣan‘ā‘, 
armed to the teeth and holding wooden sticks in their hands”).

51. Ahl al-bayt: a consecrated expression designating the immediate family of 
Muḥammad. Many groups will claim this title in order to attach themselves to 
the Prophet and appropriate its sacrality. See Sharon, “Ahl al-Bayt—People of the 
House” and “The Umayyads as ahl al-bayt”; Amir-Moezzi, Religion discrète, index. s.v.

52. These are companions of the Prophet and supporters of ‘Alī. The first four, loyal to 
the latter until their death, will later be called the Pillars (arkān) of Shi‘ism.

53. A companion of the Prophet and the compiler of one of the most important recen-
sions of the Qur’an (see below and the following chapter).

54. In the end the text does not say what Ḫudhayfa and Ubayy b. Ka‘b knew but from 
the context the reader can infer that they were aware of the conspiracy. Moreover, 
the text implicitly emphasizes the cowardice of important personages, of whom 
Ubayy is here one of the examples; those who even while acknowledging the sacred 
rights of ‘Alī did nothing to defend them.
55. Companion of the Prophet. He was named governor of Iraq several times during the caliphates of ʿUmar and Muʿawiya.
56. The text appears to make a distinction—as in fact the Qurʾan does—between the simple Muslim (muslim) whose faith can be weak or tinged with hypocrisy and the faithful true believer (muʿmin) whose sincere faith is assured. This distinction between islām (islām) and faith (imān) will become central to Shiʿism. The former will come to denote the literal and exoteric religion of the masses, and the latter the religion of the spirit, of esoteric doctrine, of the Shiʿite minority; see Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin*, index s.v. islām, muslim, imān, muʿmin.
57. This sentence makes palpable what most of the sources agree upon: in pairing ʿAbū Bakr strives to maintain a mild and respectful position while ʿUmar, known for his legendary outbursts of anger and his violent character, presents a radical stance. Moreover, in his commentary on the *Nahj al-balāgha*, Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, who gives the same account, specifies that at this moment ʿUmar interrupted his comrade’s discourse and spoke in a threatening and extremely aggressive tone (Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, *Sharḥ*, 1:32).
58. The allusive statement of al-ʿAbbās seems to refer to the earliest period of Muḥammad’s prophetic activity. At that time, according to him, Abū Bakr was not among true believers in the Prophet’s mission.
59. Abū al-Ḥasan (literally, “father of al-Ḥasan”) is the kunya (an important element in Arab nomenclature) of ʿAlī.
60. As will be seen, this is a second account of the events of Saqīfa as reported by another companion. Generally speaking, the *Book of Sulaym* includes many repetitions of this sort; however, each new report contains new elements. Thus, another account of Saqīfa is given in the words of Ibn ʿAbbās in chapter 48 of the work.
61. Salmān al-Fārisī, a renowned companion of the Prophet and later an unshakable supporter of ʿAlī.
62. The account seems to want to accentuate the duplicity of the triumvirate of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and Abū ʿUbayda, who “reclaim” their chief adversary as a tactical maneuver in order to eliminate another, less dangerous adversary.
63. ʿĀʾisha, the daughter of Abū Bakr and the wife of the Prophet, is considered by Shiʿites as having been her father’s spy in the house of Muḥammad in order to prepare the conspiracy. In this respect, her case is similar to that of Ḥafṣa, the daughter of ʿUmar and also a wife of the Prophet (on the Shiʿite view of these two women, see Majlisī, *Bihār*, 28:18ff and 96–111). From an early period, certain Shiʿites thought that the two women had murdered the Prophet by poisoning him at the instigation of their fathers; see tradition 128 reported by al-Sayyārī—on whom see the next chapter—in Kohlberg and Amir-Moezzi, *Revelation and Falsification*; for other sources, see the commentary on this tradition (ibid., p. 103); and Kohlberg, “Shiʿī Views of the Death of the Prophet Muḥammad.” Later ʿĀʾisha will launch the Battle of the Camel against ʿAlī when he accedes to the caliphate. See also chapter 3, note 50, and the relevant text.
64. Those who had fought at Badr were considered the most loyal followers of Muhammad.

65. All Shi'ite authors are unanimous in noting this act of 'Ali, which follows immediately upon his despair at gaining power and occurs as follows: after being betrayed for the first time 'Ali senses at once that the second betrayal will consist in a falsification of the Qur'an, hence his rush to collect a complete and trustworthy version of Revelation as rapidly as possible.

66. Here one of the manuscripts contains the following additional sentences: “What abrogates and what is abrogated, its clear exposition and its ambiguous discourse, its promises and its threats, its dimensions both exoteric and esoteric (wa-näsîkhihi wa-mansûkhihi wa-muhkamihi wa-mutashâbhihi wa-wa'îdihi wa-wa'îdihi wa-zâhirîhi wa-bâtînîhi . . .); what this doubtless means is a complete version of the Qur'an with all that is necessary for a perfect comprehension of it.

67. The same manuscript as before adds the same series of terms (preceding note) to emphasize the perfection of 'Ali's recension of the Qur'an.

68. This insistence on the integral character of 'Ali's recension of the Qur'an seems a contrario to underline the imperfection and the incomplete character of other recensions, especially that possessed by Abû Bakr, 'Umar, and their confederates. The same thing is stated in an explicit way later in the text.

69. The formula is interesting: “what we have of the Qur'an . . . ” (mâ ma'a-nâ min al-Qur'ân . . .); it seems to indicate that 'Umar and his associates are satisfied with just part of the sacred Book. The text implies that it is a matter of those parts, which do not compromise them (see the introduction and chapters 2 and 3).

70. The text employs the same adjectives to characterize 'Umar and Qunfudh.

71. The occurrences reported in this sequence of events, extremely damaging to 'Umar's image, and by extension, to that of Abû Bakr, are broadly taken up, denounced and commented upon by Shi'ite authors. These two figures being among the most sacrosanct figures of “orthodox” Islam, together with many other companions denounced in the accounts, Sunni literature for the most part transmits nothing of these accounts. In this type of report, as well as in what Shi'ites have to say about the various Qur'anic recensions, Sunni literature denounces the political subversion and the doctrinal heresy of Shi'ites. Nevertheless, here and there traces of or allusions to these events crop up at times in even the most respected Sunni sources. For example, clear allusions to the account of the burning of 'Ali's house by 'Umar occur in the following Sunni sources: Ibn Hishâm (d. 218/833), Sîra, 4:306; Ibn Abî Shayba (d. 235/849), al-Muṣannaf (ed. Laḫmâm), Kitâb al-Maghâzî, 8:572; (Pseudo) Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889), al-Imâma wa'l-siyâsa, pp. 12–13; Balâdhurî (d. 279/892), Ansâb al-ashrâf, 1:586; Ṭabari (d. 310/922), Ta'rîkh (ed. Ibrâhîm), 2:443; Ibn 'Abd Rabbih (d. 328/939–940), al-'Iqd al-farîd, 4:93.
72. Allusions to the violence perpetrated by ‘Umar against Fāṭima occur in the following Sunni sources: Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), al-Farq bayn al-firaq, p. 133; Dhahabī (748/1348), Mizān al-ʿtīdāl, 1:139, no. 552 (citing Ibn ʿAbī Dārim, d. 357/967–968); Ṣafādī (d. 764/1362–1363), al-Wāfi biʾl-wafayāt, 6:17, no. 2444 (citing the Muʿtazilite al-Nazzām, d. 231/845); Maqrīzī (d. 845/1442), Khīṭāt, 2:346. In chapter 48, the Book of Sulaym gives two other accounts of violence committed by ‘Umar against Fāṭima (once for the same reason as is here evoked and on another occasion, when Fāṭima rebels against what she considers to be Abū Bakr’s plundering of the rich oasis of Fadak which the Prophet, her father, had left her as an inheritance. The Sunni sources have much to say about this too, often with embarrassment (see Vecca Vaglietti, “Fadak,” EI2).

73. On Fāṭima’s miscarriage as a result of the blows she received, and the loss of a son whom most of the sources call al-Muḥsin/al-Muḥassin, see also the Sunnis Dhahabī, Mizān al-ʿtīdāl ibid., and Ṣafādī, al-Wāfi biʾl-wafayāt, 6:17, no. 2444.

74. Two of the companions. The first was renowned for his martial exploits and his cruelty during the “wars of apostasy” and the great conquests. For the second, see note 55, this chapter, and the relevant text.

75. A few rare Sunni sources mention Abū Bakr’s remorse without always pointing out the reasons for it; see Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām (d. 224/838–839), K. Al-Amwāl, p. 144 (the author, plainly embarrassed, states outright that he does not wish to go into the details); Ṭabarānī, al-Muʾjam al-kabīr, 1:62, no. 34; Ibn ʿAbd Rabbih, 4:93 (on his deathbed Abū Bakr says, “I bitterly regret three of my actions: . . . to have allowed the violation of Fāṭima’s house.”)

76. The text denounces the connivance between political authorities, inventors of hadiths legitimating these authorities as well as the increase in power as a result of this collaboration.

77. ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād, called Ibn Ziyād, and al-Ḥajjāj b. Yūṣuf, two governors of Iraq under the Umayyad caliphs, are particularly known for their bloody suppression of anti-Umayyad movements and particularly of the Shiʿites. In the next chapter we shall see the important role that the sources grant them in the history of the redaction of the Qurʾan.

78. The text stresses the fact even transmitters acting in good faith can teach hadiths that are wholly fabricated for eminently political reasons, reasons of which they themselves may be unaware.

79. In the Qurʾan as it now stands, Sura 33 comprises 73 verses and Sura 2 has 286. Sura 24 has 64 verses, Sura 49, 18 verses. What ʿAlīa has just said means that many parts of the original revelation were lost before it was committed to written form by the authorities and that, as a result, the official Qurʾan has large lacunae over against the true Qurʾan revealed to the Prophet.

80. ʿAlīa’s remarks on the incomplete character of the official version of the Qurʾan are echoed frequently even in Sunni literature; on this, see Kohlberg and Amir-Moezzi, “Introduction, part 2,” in Revelation and Falsification, pp. 12–23; also Modarressi, “Early Debates on the Integrity of the Qurʾan.”
81. Two renowned companions of the Prophet who were known to have compiled their own recension of the Qur'an (see the following chapter).

82. A formula in Shi’ite technical vocabulary reserved for denoting initiation into the loftiest knowledge.

83. See also K. Sulaym b. Qays, chapters 14, 27 and 49. The account of the Prophet’s relinquishment of making a written will following upon ‘Umar’s offensive remark is reported by a few rare—but not minor—Sunni sources. The following references are not exhaustive; we will limit ourselves to a few that are among the most decisive. For example, the two most important Sunni compilations of hadiths include it, the first amongst them on four occasions: Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīh, ‘ilm, maghāzī, 83, marḍā, 17 and i’tiṣām 26; Muslim, Ṣaḥīh, waṣliyya 22. Al-Shahrastānī refers to the Ṣaḥīh of al-Bukhārī in his Milal. We cite it in the following (French) translation of J.-C. Vadet: “The first conflict amongst Muslims occurred then at the bedside of the dying Prophet.” Master Bukhārī recounts it thus: “When the illness from which the Prophet must die manifested all its violence he took to crying out, ‘Bring me a writing desk and parchment upon which I will mark words which will protect you forever from error.’ But ‘Umar was content to say: ‘Pain is making the Prophet’s mind to wander; we already possess the Book of God; what more do we need?’ But the commotion only increased until the moment when the Prophet exclaimed, ‘Arise and leave, I do not wish to see any further disorder around me.’ Ibn ‘Abbās commented on this incident as follows: ‘It was an unparalleled catastrophe that kept us from knowing what the Prophet wanted to put into writing.’” Shahrastānī, K. Al-Milal (The Book of Religions), trans. Vadet, p. 103; see also Shahrastānī, Livre des religions et des sectes, trans. D. Gimaret, J. Jolivet and G. Monnot, 1:125–26.

84. In the light of what went before, it can be concluded that ‘Ali acts in this way because he knows that God has decided to leave official Islam, the majority, in its ignorance. Hence he protects his Qur’anic recension for his own faithful, a minority, even as he does everything he can not to shatter the facade of unity in the community.

85. The last two interventions manifest all the signs of a later addition to the original text of the K. Sulaym b. Qays. They have a specific aim in mind: the official Qur’an has lacunae but not additions. As we shall see in the next chapter, certain tendencies and certain authors, questioning the authenticity of the official version of the Qur’an, maintained that it had been falsified and contained omissions as well as additions. These gaps with respect to the “true Qur’an” are not always completely identified. Shi’ites, without a doubt the most fervent defenders of the falsification thesis, quickly understood nevertheless that to propose the existence of additions to the Qur’an removed all trust in it. Quite simply, it would no longer be the Qur’an at all. Indeed, even if one accepts that the Qur’an has lacunae with respect to the Revelations received by Muhammad, what remains is no less the Word of God if nothing else has been added to it. Among the sources that mention the existence of additions to the official version,
see Sayyārī, *K. al-Qirāʿāt*, hadith no. 15, p. 9 (Arabic text; in this respect, the author is quite isolated amongst Shi’ites); Kindī in Tartar, *Dialogues islamî-chrétiens*, p. 190 of the translation (= Tartar, *Ḥīwār islāmî masīḥi*, p. 117 of the Arabic text); Shahristānī, trans. Gimaret-Jolivet-Monnot, 1:394 and 397. At the limits of the third and fourth/ninth and tenth centuries, al-Ashāʿī in his heresiographical work divides the Shi’ites, from the viewpoint that concerns us, into three groups: those who believe that certain parts of the Qur’an were suppressed, those who claim that certain things were deliberately added, and, last, those who accept the integrity of the official vulgate (Ashāʿī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn*, p. 47). For other sources, see the next chapter. Moreover, ‘Ali’s response means that even the incomplete official Qur’an, if read and interpreted correctly, contains enough information on the rights of the people of the Prophet’s family; as a result, it can guide the believer to salvation as long as it is correctly interpreted and understood.

86. On this notion, as complex as it is central in the Shi’ite faith, see Amir-Moezzi, “Notes à propos de la walāya imamate,” pp. 722–41; Dakake, *The Charismatic Community*.

87. The last seven traditions have been added to the final edition of the work (on the different divisions of the text and the traditions that constitute it, see note 39, this chapter). For an unknown reason, the Persian translation of this edition by Anṣārī entitled *Asrār-e āl-e Muḥammad* stops at tradition 93!

88. This hermeneutical conception lies at the foundation of Shi’ite Qur’anic commentaries, conventionally termed *tafsīr mā nazal* (literally, the commentaries [dedicated] to what has been revealed [about such and such a one]); for example, to cite only from among the oldest, the commentaries of al-Ḥibari (see further chapter 3), of Ibn Abī al-Thaljī (d. 325/936) (see Dharīʿa, 11:75), of al-Ḥasan b. al-Qāsim b. Ayyūb Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Kātib (fourth/tenth century; see Najāshī, *Rījāl*, p. 52), etc.; on this subject, see chapter 3; also, Bar-Asher, *Scripture and Exegesis in Early Imāmī Shiism*, part 3.2, pp. 104ff. It appears that the interpretation of Qur’anic references as “secret codes” designating the imams, their followers, and their adversaries, became current from the time of the historical imams; see Ashāʿī, *Maqālāt al-islāmiyyīn* (ed. Abū al-Ḥamīd), 1:75; Tucker, “Abū Maṣūr al-ʿIjlī and the Maṣūrīyya,” pp. 59–75, esp. p. 72.


91. *Nazarat fī ʿAlī sabʿūn āya lam yashrūk-hu fīhā aḥad*; a tradition going back to Mujāhid; ibid., 1:43.
2. Qur’anic Recensions and Political Tendencies

This chapter is a slightly modified version of articles by Amir-Moezzi and Kohlberg (the Hebrew University of Jerusalem) that appeared in Journal Asiatique and Apocrypha (see the bibliography). Sections 4 and 5, which are unchanged, are the work of Kohlberg. See also note 15 of the introduction.
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97. On the doctrinal turn that occurred in Imami Shi’ism during the Buwayhid period, see Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin*, parts I-1 and I-2, and “Réflexions sur une évolution du shi’isme duodécimain” pp. 63–81.
2. QUR’ANIC RECENSIONS AND POLITICAL TENDENCIES


99. On this turn in Imami Shi’ism and the early history of the two traditions, the “esoteric non-rational” and the “theologico-juridical rational,” see Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin*, parts 1–1 and 1–2, and “Réflexions sur une évolution du shi’isme duodécimain” pp. 63–81; also Amir-Moezzi and Jambet, *Qu’est-ce que le shi’isme?*, 3d part (“Évolution historique du shi’isme”).


101. Mufīd, *Awā’il al-maqlūlāt*, p. 55. It must be noted, however, that the author’s attitude with respect to the question of falsification is not always unambiguous; see Kohlberg, “Authoritative Scriptures,” pp. 296–97 and Amir-Moezzi, “Al-Shaykh al-mufīd.”

102. Majlisī, *Biḥār*, 92:40–77, to be compared with 24:153–57, 195–96, 400; on this author’s ambiguity, see Khorramshāhī, *Qorān pażāhī*, pp. 119–122. We thank Professor F. Hakami for having made this study available to us.

103. On these sources, see the studies cited, especially in note 98. For more recent sources, see in particular the two works by R. Brunner cited there.


107. Nūrī Tābrīzī, *Faṣl al-khīṭāb fi taḥrīf kitāb rabb al-arbāb*. The importance of the book and the explosive reactions to it, both Sunni and Shi’ite, that it aroused are all the more noteworthy in that the author was one of the greatest Shi’ite religious authorities of his day (see, e.g., Brunner, *Die Schia und die Koranfälschung*, pp. 39–69, and “La question de la falsification du Coran,” pp. 22–29; Khorramshāhī, *Qorān pażāhī*, pp. 89–122). Since the Iranian Revolution of 1978–1979, Sunni, and particularly Wahhabi, attacks on Shi’ism have revolved particularly around this work in an effort to prove the “heresy” of the Shi’ites. In reaction, many Imami scholars, hostile to the falsification thesis, have sought to refute it systematically in order to demonstrate the “orthodoxy” of Shi’ism with respect to the official Qur’ān. Among
the most recent refutations are: Ja‘fariyan, Ubdhuvat tahrif al-qur’ân (Persian translation: Afsâne-ye tahrif-e qor’ân); Husayni Milani, al-Taḥqiq fi nafy al-taḥrif; Mu‘arrafa, Šiyânat al-qur’ân min al-taḥrif.

110. This is why Kohlberg and I have used, alongside our manuscripts, the Faṣl al-khiṭāb to establish our edition (see Kohlberg and Amir-Moezzi, Revelation and Falsification).

111. Kishshā, Rijâl, Najaf, p. 505 in which the reading min kibâr al-ṭâhiriyâ is incorrect (cited by Quhp’ā, Majma’ al-rijâl, 1:149); Najâši, Rijâl (ed. Nâ’ini), 1:211; Ťūsî, Fihrist, p. 51, no. 70 (both cited by Quhp’ā, 1:150).

112. Najâši, Rijâl, 1:211; Ťūsî, Fihrist, p. 51, no. 70 (both cited by Quhp’ā, 1:150).


115. On these circles, see Newman, The Formative Period of Twelver Shi‘ism, passim.


118. Sobhāni, Doctrines of Shi‘i Islam, p. 94.

119. His name appears in more than seventy traditions in our edition of al-Sayyâri.


121. Ťūsî, Rijâl (ed. Āl baḥr al-‘ulûm), p. 411, no. 23 and p. 427, no. 3 (cited by Quhp’ā, 1:150); Barqû, Rijâl (ed. Mûsawi Mayâmawi), p. 61, mentions him only among al-‘Askârî’s disciples.

122. Tustârî, Qâmûs al-rijâl, 1:401–2.

123. For these writings, see Modarressi, Crisis and Consolidation, p. 17.

124. Kishshā, 505 (cited by Quhp’ā, 1:149).

125. On the role of the wakîl, pl. wukalâ‘, see Modarressi, Crisis and Consolidation, pp. 12–16.


128. Najâši, Rijâl, 1:211; Ťūsî, Fihrist, p. 51, no. 70 (Quhp’ā, 1:150).

129. See Amir-Moezzi, “Al-Ṣaffār al-Qummî,” p. 234. Al-Ṣaffâr transmits from al-Sayyâri directly as well (e.g., Baṣâ‘îr al-darajât, rev. ed. Qumm, 1404/1984, p. 125, no. 4) as indirectly, via one or more intermediaries (ibid., p. 14, no. 2; p. 69, no. 2); see Kohlberg and Amir-Moezzi, Revelation and Falsification, p. 34 of the introduction.

130. See, e.g., Ibn Ṭâwûs, Falâh al-Sâ‘îl, p. 283.
131. See the examples given by Ardabili, Jāmil ‘al-ruwāt, 1:67. Al-Sayyār’s viewpoints are reported by Kulaŷnī, Rawḍa min al-Kāfi, 4:81, no. 3; 6:307, no. 13. A partial list of al-Sayyār’s authorities as well as his transmitters is given by Khū’i, Ma‘jam riǧāl al-hadith, 24:122–24, no. 15375.

132. Ṭūsī, Fihrist, p. 51, no 70 (Quḥpā’ī, 1:150).

133. Najāshī, Riǧāl, 1:211 (Quḥpā’ī, 1:150). According to Nūrī Ṭabarsi/Ṭabrisī, Faṣl al-khiṭāb, p. 29 and Ṭihrānī, Dhārī’a, 4:454 and 17:52, no. 284, the title indicated by al-Najāshī as well as by Ṭūsī is K. al-qirā’āt. The same four titles already mentioned are also put forward by Ibn Shahrāshūb, Ma‘ālim al-'ulamā’, p. 13, no. 60. Here too the third work is called al-Qirā’āt.

134. Najāshī, Riǧāl, 1:211 (Quḥpā’ī, 1:150). Ṭihrānī, Dhārī’a, 16:262, no. 1070 mentions without giving his source, another writing by al-Sayyārī, entitled Faḥā’īl al-qurān. This may be an alternative title for the K. thawāb al-qurān.


141. See Ambros, “Unwān,” EI2; Tokatly, “The Early Commentaries on al-Bukhārī’s Ṣaḥīḥ,” p. 27.


143. In this work there are, however, indirect indications, e.g., the tradition cited after the Mukhtaṣar of al-Ḥillī in Majlisī, Bihār, 53:107, no. 153.

144. See Majlisī, Bihār, 1:46.


146. According to Nūrī Ṭabarsi/Ṭabrisī, Khātimat mustadrak al-wasāʾīl, 1:114 (cited by Māmaqānī, Tanqīḥ al-maqāl, biography n° 489; Ṭihrānī, Dhārī’a, 17:52, no. 284).
The Hāshiya of al-Bihbahānī is a commentary on the Madārik al-aḥkām of Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-ʿĀmilī called Sībṭ al-Shahīd al-Thānī (d. 1009/1600) (v. Dharihū, 6:196, no. 1079; Modarressi, An Introduction to Shiʿī Law, p. 84, note 6). We have not been able to consult this work.

Jilānī Fāḍil Qummī, Ghanīʾim al-ayām, 2:513.


All three are the work of the disciples of al-Bihbahānī; see Modarressi, An Introduction to Shiʿī Law, p. 57.

Traditions 661, 699, and 700 in our edition. All one can affirm is that someone, among the authors cited, cites directly on the basis of a manuscript of the Kitāb al-qirāʿāt.


On the characteristics of this school, see Bar-Asher, Scripture and Exegesis, pp. 71–86.

It is not possible to tell whether the chapters are original or have been added by a more or less later copyist.

On these appellations, see Kohlberg, “Some Imāmī Shiʿī Views on the Șāhāba,” pp. 162–63; Bar-Asher, Scripture and Exegesis, pp. 115–19.

For these doctrines, see the relevant articles in EJ2. Karra (“return”), a term used as a synonym of rajʿa, is also used twice (nos. 116, 691).


For a list of such readings in other pre-Buwayhid Imami works, see Bar-Asher, “Variant Readings,” pp. 51–72.

We have found two citations in Qummī ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm, Taṣfīr, 1:366 (Qurʾan 13:36) and 1:391 (Qurʾan 16:108–9); one citation in Furāt b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī, Taṣfīr, 1:302, no. 407 (Qurʾan 26:214), and none in ʿAyyāšī, Taṣfīr. Ibn Shahrāshūb (d. 588/1192) claims to have seen the name of ʿAlī in eight places in the Qurʾanic recension of Ibn Masʿūd, but he never cites this (Manāqib ʿAbī Ṭalīb, 2:106). Citations of the readings of Ubayy are also rare (they are completely lacking in al-Sayyīrī); see, e.g., Furāt, 2:404, no. 540 (Qurʾan 43:57). A considerable number of pro-Imami readings in al-Sayyīrī are identical with readings ascribed elsewhere to Ibn Masʿūd or to Ubayy.

Nos. 45, 60, 89 (containing six readings), 224, 458, 685.

In fact, he reports several readings of the same verse: see nos. 102/114, 313/314, 316/317, 464/466/467, 655/659, 665/666/667/668.


On al-ʿAyyāšī and his Qurʾan commentary, see Bar-Asher, Scripture and Exegesis, pp. 56–63.

See ʿAyyāšī, Taṣfīr, 1:2; cf. Modarressi, Tradition and Survival, p. 185.

3. The Necessity of Hermeneutics

1. See chapter 2 generally, particularly its final note.
2. See the introduction and chapter 1.
3. See now the compilation of all the sources of this hadith in the collective work Kitāb Allāh wa-ahl al-bayt fī ḥadīth al-thaqalayn; see also Bar-Asher, Scripture and Exegesis, pp. 93–98.
4. On these different clans and their ties of kinship see figures 1 and 2 at the beginning of the present volume. For discussions of the different meanings given to the formula the “Prophet’s Family” at the beginning of Islam, see Sharon, “Ahl al-bayt” and “The Umayyads as Ahl al-Bayt”; Madelung, Succession to Muḥammad, introduction; Amir-Moezzi, “Considérations sur l’expression din ʿAli,” pp. 39–51 (= Religion discrète, pp. 28–37).
6. For a list of the imams see figure 3 at the beginning of the book.
9. Of course, by “Hadith,” exegetical Hadith is meant here. Clearly, the subjects comprised by Hadith are generally far broader, including many non-Qur’ānic areas. Nevertheless, according to Shi‘ite doctrine, the most important role by far of Hadith is exegesis of the Qur‘ān, both the literal, exoteric (tafsīr) as well as the spiritual, esoteric commentary, or hermeneutics (ta‘wil).
10. Sayyārī, K. al-Qirā‘āt, hadiths nos. 8 and 9, Arabic text, p. 8.
11. Nevertheless, in Shi‘ism, or at least for one Shi‘ite party, the idea that it is indeed falsification that has rendered the Qur‘ān obscure and hard to understand still is
present if only in a latent way; see, for example, the text dating from the seventh/thirteenth century presented in Corbin, *En Islam iranien*, 4:346–47; addressed and reexamined from new perspectives in Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin*, pp. 207–8.

12. The term *wali* and the term that designates the status of the latter, i.e., *walāya*, more or less equivalent to imam and imamate, are central and fundamental in Shi‘ite Islam; on this, see Amir-Moezzi, “Notes à propos de la *walāya* imamite” (= *Religion discrète*, chapter 7).

13. *Kitāb Sulaym* b. *Qays*, tradition 31, 2:802; see also *Ṭūsī*, *Amāli*, 2:136; *Majlisī*, *Bihār*, 40:186. With respect to the pair *tanzil*/*ta‘wil*, the revelation of Scripture and the search for its hidden sense, Daniel Gimaret translates these as “the letter” and “the spirit” of the Qur’an, drawing on the famous Pauline formulation (see Shahrastānī, *Livre des religions et des sectes*, 1:543, trans. Gimaret and Monnot). In what follows here I shall have recourse to this translation, which strikes me as quite apposite.


15. *ʿAyyāshī*, *Tafsīr*, 1:15; *Khazzāz Rāzī*, *Kitāb al-athar*, pp. 76, 88, 117, 135 (on p. 66 of this work, in a tradition attributed to the Prophet, it is the *qāʿim*, the eschatological savior, who is presented as “the warrior of spiritual hermeneutics”); *Majlisī*, *Bihār*, 19:25–26; *Bahirānī*, *Burhān*, 1:17. See also Bar–Asher, *Scripture and Exegesis*, p. 88, note 1.

16. See *Masūdī*, *Nūr al-dhawāb* (ed. C. Pellat), § 1676 (trans. of Pellat, *Les Prairies d’or*, 3:655): “By Him who holds my life in His hand, just as we fought (previously) in the name of the revelation (of the Qur’an), we will surely Ϯght them today on behalf of its interpretation.”

17. *Jihād* (usually translated as “holy war”) is the verbal noun of the active participle *mujāhid*, a term found in the title of the hadith of the “Warrior of *ta‘wil*.” This hermeneutical notion of *ʿAlī*’s battles was admirably defended several centuries later by the great philosopher Mollā/Mullā Ṣadrā (d. 1050/1640) in his poetry, thus demonstrating the longevity of the doctrine; see Amir-Moezzi, “Le combattant du *ta‘wil*.”


19. Ḥākim Ḥakānī, *Shawāhid al-tanzil*, 1:35. Al-Ḥakānī’s doctrinal affiliation is uncertain. He seems to have been a Sunni Ḥanafi with strong Shi‘ite sympathies or, even more likely, a crypto-Shi‘ite practicing *taqiyya* (the duty of dissimulation); see Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work*, pp. 150–51.


24. On writings from this period, see now Modarressi, *Tradition and Survival*; also Tibrānī, *Dhāri‘a*, 4:231ff.


26. On Zaydism, see figure 3 at the beginning of the present work.

27. Notwithstanding the hesitation of a scant few Imami prosopographers to consider him a Shi‘ite (e.g., Bahránī, *Ǧhāyat al-marām*, p. 364), al-Ḥibarī’s Shi‘ism seems plain from the contents of his writings as well as his Zaydite leanings as shown by the religious identity of many of his masters and transmitters (see further on in this chapter). Among early Imamīs he is listed as such by al-Najāshī (see note 25) and the *Fihrist* of Shaykh al-Ṭūsī, p. 137, together with such modern authors as al-A‘mīn, *A‘yān al-shī‘a*, 25:342 and al-Khū‘ī, *Mu‘jam riżāl al-ḥadīth*, 4:321 and 5:224–25. On his Zaydism, Iṣfahānī Abū l-Faraj, *Maqātil al-Ṭalibiyin*, pp. 215, 251, 435–37, may be consulted with profit as well as the Zaydite work by al-Ḥārīnī al-Sayyid Yā‘yā b. al-Ḥusayn, *Tāṣīr al-maṭālīb*, pp. 55 and 61. Even so, it seems that al-Ḥibarī came to conceal his doctrinal affiliation more or less successfully since many Sunni prosopographers (see note 25), do not denounce him for Shi‘ism, even if they do emphasize that he is of low trustworthiness as a transmitter of hadith.


30. First by al-Sayyid ʿAḥmad al-Ḥusaynī: al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥakam al-Ḥirī (sic), *Mā nazala min al-Qur‘ān fi ahl al-bayt ’alayhim al-salām* (Qumm, 1395/1975); then by al-Sayyid Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ḥusaynī: al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥakam al-Ḥibarī, *Ṭafsīr* (Beirut, 1408/1987). I use this second edition, the better by far. It includes: a substantial introduction—though of a traditional cast—on the author and his work (pp. 9–229), the text of the Qur‘ān commentary composed of seventy-one traditions, on the basis of two manuscripts (pp. 231–330), emendations (*mustadrak*) to the commentary composed of twenty-nine traditions reported by our author and gleaned by the editor from other sources (pp. 333–74), a commentary on the traditions and their parallels in other works (pp. 377–542), an index (pp. 545–658), and a bibliography (pp. 659–89).


34. Tradition 4, pp. 235. According to traditional accounts, the persons cited are some of the first followers and protectors of the Prophet. All of them belong to the clan of the Banû Hâshim, i.e., the immediate family of the Prophet. With regard to the occurrence of the traditions in other sources, the reader is advised, so as not to encumber the notes unduly here, to consult the excellent overview by the editor M. R. al-Ḥusaynî, in al-Ḥibârî, *Taṣfîr*, pp. 377ff.

35. Tradition 6, p. 238.


39. Tradition 22, p. 260. The occurrences of the tradition are innumerable, especially, as one might expect, in Shi’ite works (see ibid., pp. 438–46).

40. Tradition 24, pp. 262–63. On the semantic complexity of the root *WLY* in Shi’ism and the terms connected with it, see Amir-Moezzi, “Notes à propos de la walâya imamite.” The statement is considered to have been uttered by the Prophet at Ghadir Khumm (on this place, supremely emblematic for Shi’ites, see Vecchia Vaglieri, “Ghadîr Khumm”; Dakake and Kazemi Moussavi, “Ghadîr Khumm”).

41. The account suggests that during the Prophet’s lifetime his enemies were present among Muslims and the question of his succession was a source of severe tension.

42. Tradition no. 41, pp. 285–87. The text appears to suggest that the sentence ‘He whose patron I am has ‘Alî as his patron as well’ should form part of the Qur’anic revelation. On the question of the Qur’an and the problem of falsification, see chapter 2.

43. Traditions 32 and 33, pp. 272–73 (the following phrase from the Qur’an is: “No! They are not equal before God”).

44. Tradition 34, p. 274.


46. Tradition 42, p. 288.

47. Tradition 48, p. 295. Al-Walîd was an adversary of Muḥammad and of ‘Alî.

48. Traditions 50–59, pp. 297–311. This exegesis, especially valued by Shi’ites, occurs very often, including in Sunni sources; see ibid., pp. 502–33.


50. Traditions no. 67 and 68, pp. 323–25. Asmâ’ bint Umays was the wife of Ja’far b. Abî Ṭâlib, the Prophet’s cousin, and then of Abû Bakr. ‘Ā’isha, the latter’s daughter, and Ḥafṣa, the daughter of Umar, were wives of the Prophet. Both are detested by Shi’ites because they were hostile to ‘Alî and seen as their fathers’ “hypocrite” spies in Muḥammad’s household; see Majlisî, *Bihîr*, 28:96–111, and chapter 1, note 63.

51. Ṣaffâr, *Bûṣâ‘ir al-darajât*, section 10, chapter 21, no. 1, pp. 526ff. The concept seems to be quite old in Alid circles. Around the turn of the first and second centuries of...
the Hijra, the “heresiarch” Abū Manṣūr al-‘Ijī, a disciple of the imam Muhammad al-Baqir, had already used it in his Qur’anic exegesis; see Tucker, “Abū Manṣūr al-‘Ijī and the Manṣūriyya,” p. 72. See also Friedlaender, “The Heterodoxies of the Shiites in the Presentation of Ibn Hazm,” p. 89f.


53. Sayyārī, K. al-Qirā’āt, tradition 17; Kulaynī, Uṣūl (ed. Muṣṭafawī), kitāb al-ḥujja, bāb al-nawādir, no. 3570; Nu’mānī, K. al-ghayba, chapter 21, no. 5: tradition attributed to ‘Alī: “There have been erased from the Qur’ān (muḥiyya minhu) the names of 70 people belonging to the tribe of Quraysh, along with the names of their fathers and only the name of Abū Lahab was left there in order to humiliate the Prophet since Abū Lahab was his paternal uncle.” Abū Lahab, the Prophet’s uncle and an enemy of Islam according to tradition, is cited in Sura 111 of the Qur’ān that bears his name.


55. Which means that the hermeneutic that reveals the spirit of the Qur’ān by that very fact makes the true intent of the divine Word known.

56. Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays, tradition 26, 2:782–83; see also the anonymous work of the third/ninth century, Akhbār al-dawlat al-‘abbāsiyya, p. 46; also Majlisi, Bihār, 33:173 and 44:128.

57. See Corbin, En Islam iranien, index “Qorān”; Ayoub, “The Speaking Qur’an and the Silent Qur’an,” passim.

58. Najāshī, Rījāl, p. 12; Tihrānī, Dharī’ā, 19:28. The work today appears to be lost; generally speaking, that is the case here when an edition of the text in question is not specified.


64. Najāshī, Rījāl, p. 67; Ibn Shahrashīb, Ma‘ālim al-‘ulamā’, p. 20; Tihrānī, Dharī’ā, 19:30.


66. Ibn Shahrashīb, Ma‘ālim al-‘ulamā’, p. 78.


The necessity of Hermeneutics

70. Ibid., 24:172. The work has been edited in Tehran, 1320/1902–1903 (not seen). It should be noted that Sunni authors with Shi’ite sympathies have also composed this kind of work but, of course, far less often. Such examples may be cited as the pro-mystic Abū Nu’aym al-Īṣfahānī (d. 430/1038) in his Mā nazālā min al-Qur’ān fī amīr al-mu’mīnīn (Ṭibrānī, Dhar’ī, 19:28; fragments, reported by other sources, of this work have been edited by M. B. al-Māḥmūdī in al-Nūr al-mushtā’al al-muqta-bas min kitāb mā nazal min al-Qur’an fī amīr al-mu’mīnīn; Ibn al-Fadhālī al-Nisābūrī (d. 458/1066), author of al-Īyāṭ al-nāzila fī ahl al-bayt (Ibn Ḥajar, Līsān al-miẓān, 2:251), or al-Ḥākim al-Juṣjamī al-Bayhaqī (d. 494/1100–1101), who displays Mu’tazilite and Zaydite leanings, in his Tanbih al-ghāfīlīn (Le Caire, s.d.).

71. Muqāṭil b. Sulaymān, Tafsīr; on this author and the importance of his work, see the excellent, and classic, study by Nwyia, Exégèse coranique et langage mystique, chapter 1.

72. The Buwayhids: a dynasty of Shi’ite princes who seized control of the Abbasid caliphate in the fourth/tenth century. See EI2; also chapter 2.

76. Among the best-known commentaries of the traditionalist type, suffice it to mention al-Īmām al-Īṣān al-ʿAṣkārī (attributed to), Tafsīr (Qumm, 1409/1988; for each of the works cited there are several other editions); for this work, see Bar-Asher, “The Qur’ān Commentary Ascribed to Imam Īṣān al-ʿAṣkārī.”

77. For him and his work, see chapter 2.

78. ‘Āyyāshī Abū l-Naḍr Muḥammad b. Masʿūd, Tafsīr, ed. H. Rāsūlī Māḥallātī (Qumm, 1380/1960). For these three last works, see Bar-Asher, Scripture and Exegesis, chapter 1, also “Exégèse sunnite et chiite,” in Amir-Moezzi, Dictionnaire du Coran, pp. 312–20.


81. I insist on the adjective Shi’ite since Sunni literature also has a type of “personalized commentary” that answers a quite different doctrinal concern arising from the “circumstances of revelation.” The ins and outs are wholly different on both sides.

82. Amir-Moezzi and Jambet, Qu’est-ce que le shī’isme?, part 3, chapters 1 and 2.

83. Tūsī, Abū Jaʿfar, al-Tībīyān fī tafsīr al-Qur’ān. This commentary, along with its partial paraphrase by Ṭabrīsī, al-Fāḍl b. al-Ḥasan (d. 548/1154), Majmaʿ al-bayān fī tafsīr al-Qur’an, are the two most influential works of Qur’ān exegesis in the rationalist tradition.

86. Among the best-known commentaries of the traditionalist type, suffice it to mention al-Īmālī Sayyid Ḥaydar (eighth/fourteenth c.), Tafsīr al-Muḥīṭ al-aʿẓam wa l-bahr al-khīdām; al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (d. 1091/1680), Tafsīr al-Ṣāḥī; Bahrānī Ḥāshim b. Sulaymān (d. 1107/1695–1696 or 1109/1697–1698), al-Burhān fī tafsīr al-Qur’an; Ḥuwayzī ʿAbd al-ʿAlī b. Jumʿa (d. vers 1112/1700–1701), Tafsīr nūr al-thaqalayn; ʿĀmīlī Īṣfahānī Abū l-Ḥasan al-Sharīf (d. after 1140/1727–1728), Tafsīr mirāʾāt al-anwār; Gūnābādī Sulfān ʿAlī Shāh (d. 1327/1909), Tafsīr bayān al-saʿāda. See above as well for examples of “personalized commentaries,” most of which also belong to this same tradition.

87. I insist on the adjective Shi’ite since Sunni literature also has a type of “personalized commentary” that answers a quite different doctrinal concern arising from the “circumstances of revelation.” The ins and outs are wholly different on both sides.

88. Amir-Moezzi and Jambet, Qu’est-ce que le shī’isme? chapter 1, pp. 27–40.
4. THE EMERGENCE OF GNOSIS

Levi Billig, a Jewish scholar, was the first to have taken the Kitāb Başāʾir al-darajāt—the work to be examined in this chapter—as one of his principal objects of scientific study and had begun to prepare its critical edition. His task remains unfinished. During the night of August 20, 1936, he was murdered by a lone shooter in Talpiot, a suburb south of Jerusalem. The present study is dedicated with much feeling to his memory. I am grateful to my friend and colleague Professor Etan Kohlberg for having sent me some of Levi Billig’s works and notes, along with excerpts from local newspapers of the time reporting the tragic event.

1. Halm, Die islamische Gnosis; Tucker, Mahdis and Millenarians.

6. Ansari, L’imamat et l’Occultation selon l’imamisme, especially the introduction and chapter 2.

7. Meshkāt, Tārīkh-e tashayyūr dar īrān, passim; Ja‘fariyān, Tārīkh-e tashayyūr dar īrān az āghāz tā qarn-e dahl-e ḥejrī, especially the first three chapters.

8. A few well-studied examples may suffice: the appropriation including even the expression of the “Family of the Prophet” (ahl al-bayt) by the Umayyads (see Sharon, “Ahl al-Bayt” and “The Umayyads as Aḥl al-Bayt”; Amir-Moezzi, “Considérations sur l’expression dīn ‘Alī’); the development of the literature on the “Virtues” (fāḍa‘īl) of the Prophet’s companions, particularly the first three caliphs, over against the traditions praising the “virtues” of Ālī and his family (in the bibliography see the works by A. Hakim on the image of the first two caliphs and more particularly, that of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb); the fabrication of traditions on the role of the companions in the account of the Prophet’s heavenly Ascent (mīrāj) over against Shi‘ite traditions emphasizing the imams’ capability for celestial ascent to the same extent as Muḥammad (see Colby, “the Early Imami Shi‘i Narratives and Contestation”). The authors of these studies often emphasize the fact that the Sunni traditions were elaborated in reaction to the Shi‘ite traditions which hence are older. As in other religious traditions, what is termed “orthodoxy” took shape in reaction to earlier tendencies which gradually came to be seen as “heterodox,” if not in fact “heretical.” According to other scholars, however, it is nearly impossible to know which of the two bodies of literature, Sunni or Shi‘ite, is indeed the earliest and accordingly, which underlies the other; see, e.g., the synthetic presentation by Donner, Narratives of Islamic Origins, introduction.

9. Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin et La religion discrète; Amir-Moezzi and Jambet, Qu’est-ce que le shi‘isme?, especially the second part.

10. The ascription of the K. Baṣā‘ir al-darajāt to al-Ṣaffār has been put into doubt by my friend and colleague Dr. Hassan Ansari (“Madkhal-e moṭāle‘e-yi tafṣīli dar bāre-ye Kitāb Baṣā‘ir al-darajāt va hoviyyat-e nevisande-ye ān”). This is not the place to enter into a detailed discussion, but I must admit that the latter’s arguments do not strike me as convincing nor do they succeed in casting serious doubt on the centuries of prosopographical and bibliographical traditions supporting this ascription. In any case, even if the hypothesis of Ansari were accepted, the work would then be that of Sa‘d b. ‘Abdallāh al-Ash‘arī and probably completed by Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-‘Aṭṭār, two exact contemporaries of al-Ṣaffār. Hence, this does not affect the dating involved in my argument, but solely the identity of the author of the text being examined. On al-Ṣaffār and his work, see also Newman, The Formative Period of Twelver Shi‘ism, chapter 5.
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11. On these two Imami traditions and the role played by Shi‘ite political power in the fourth/tenth century, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, pp. 33–58; Amir-Moezzi and Jambet, Qu’est-ce que le shi’isme?, part 3.

12. Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, Rījāl, s.n. (the biographical dictionaries are arranged by personal names in alphabetical order; thus it is easy to find the desired reference).

13. Ardbalī, Jāmī‘ al-ruwāt, s.n.

14. The Kitāb al-Mahāsin of Abū Ja‘far al-Barqī (d. 274/887 or 280/893) is logically a little older than the Baṣṣā‘ir al-darajāt, but it is closer to a kind of literary anthology than to a doctrinal treatise; moreover, the side of it dealing with the imamate does not make up its main subject, but is only the subject of a few chapters; see GAS, 1:538; Newman, The Formative Period of Twelver Shi‘ism, chapter 4; Vilozny, “A Shi‘i Life Cycle According to al-Barqī’s Kitāb al-Mahāsin” and “Réflexions sur le Kitāb al-‘Ilal d’Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqī.”

15. Lithograph ed., Iran, 1285/1868 (with the Nafāṣ al-raḥmān fī faḍā‘ il Salmān of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabrisī); ed. Mīrzā Muḥsin Kičebāghi, Tabriz; the editor’s introduction is dated 1380/1960, while his final note is dated a year later. A facsimile of this edition was published in Tehran in a thousand copies in 1404/1983. It is clear that Mīrzā Kičebāghi, lacking access to the manuscripts, used the lithographed edition, while, at the same time, availing himself of the “lessons” in the Biḥār al-anwār of al-Majlisī (d. 1111/1699). The text to which this note pertains was first written in 1992 (in my article “Al-‘aṣfār al-Qummī”) and then in 2011. It remained valid until a few months ago when there appeared a new edition of the Baṣṣā‘ir al-darajāt together with a Persian translation, by ‘A. Zakīzādeh Ranānī, Qumm 1391/2012, 2 vols. I have not had the time to examine this edition carefully as to its quality. Oddly enough, the editor says nothing in his introduction about the earlier editions of the work!


17. Najāshī, Rījāl (Bombay), pp. 251 and 274.


19. According to tradition, the twelfth and final Imami Shi‘ite imam had his first Occultation in 260/874, termed the “minor Occultation,” which lasted for seventy lunar years during which “the hidden imam” communicated with his followers through the mediation of the Four Representatives. In 329/940–941, a letter attributed to the imam brought the institution of delegation to an end and marked the beginning of the great Occultation, during which only a spiritual relationship with the last imam remained possible. According to Twelver Shi‘ism, this Occultation still continues and will end only with the return of the imam at the End of Time as the eschatological savior (on this question, see Amir-Moezzi, “Eschatology in Imami Shi‘ism”).

20. References to the works of Najāshī, Ṣūsī, Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī and Ardbalī (the last two making two persons out of our author) have already been given. See also ‘Allāma Ḥillī, Khulāṣat al-aqwāl, s.n.; Māmaqānī, Tanqīḥ al-maqāl, 3:103;
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21. The Imami juridical tradition, in contrast to their dogmatic tradition, displays few differences from the juridical tradition of the various Sunni schools (see Linant de Bellefonds, “Le droit imāmī,” especially p. 185). Al-Ṭūsī does not provide a list of al-Ṣaffār’s juridical collections, but limits himself to noting that the latter edited works on the model of those of al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd (i.e., b. Ḥammād al-Ahwāzī, a disciple—according to the Rijāl of al-Ṭūsī—of the eighth, ninth, and tenth imams, and the author of thirty or so collections, the titles of which are very nearly identical with those of al-Ṣaffār just enumerated. On him and for the discussions of his dates, see, e.g., Māmaqānī, Tanqīh al-maqāl, 1:328–30).

22. For this translation of taqiyya, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, index s.v. and especially the conclusion. For the notion in general and its evolution in Imami Shiʿism, see Kohlberg, “Some Imāmī-Shīʿī Views on taqiyya” and “Taqiyya in Shiʿī Theology and Religion.”

23. For this technical sense of the term muʾmin (a follower initiated into the esoteric side of the religion) and its difference from muslim (a simple Muslim who has submitted to the exoteric religion alone), see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, index s.v.

24. See the list of manuscripts given in GAL, S1, p. 319, and GAS, 1:538.

25. This is not to be confused with the lost work of the same title by al-Ṣaffār’s contemporary, Saʿd b. ʿAbdallāh al-Ashʿarī (d. 299/910 or 301/912, author of the renowned heresiographical work Kitāb al-maqālāt wa l-firaq (see the bibliography). According to H. Ansari, only the latter had compiled a work with this title at that time (see note 10, in this chapter, where I express my disagreement with this view). The book of Saʿd b. ʿAbdallāh was summarized by al-Ḥasan b. Sulaymān al-Ḥilli (edited under the title Mukhtasar Başāʾir al-darajāt, Najaf, 1370/1950); see Ṣīhrānī, Ḏhariʿa, 3:124, no. 415, and, following him, GAS, no. 30. According to the Rijāl of al-Najāshī as well as the Fihrist of al-Ṭūsī, the Başāʾir of Saʿd b. ʿAbd Allāh was devoted to praises (manāqib) of the members of the Prophet’s family and yet the summary by al-Ḥilli also comprises a number of other subjects, including gnostic and initiatory themes. According to a reference by Ṣīhrānī, Ḏhariʿa, 20:182–83, no. 2496, in editing his Mukhtasar, al-Ḥilli used, aside from the work of Saʿd, such other sources as the Başāʾir of al-Ṣaffār, the Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays (see chapter 1), the K. al-ghayba (The Book of the Occultation) by al-Nuʿmānī, and al-Ṭūsī, the Tafsīr of ʿAlī b. ʿIbrāhīm al-Qummī, al-Tanzil wa l-tahrīf of al-Sayyārī (see chapter 2), al-ʿUmda of Ibn al-Bītrīq, etc.

26. See the indexes in GAL and GAS.

27. On this technical sense of the term ʿilm in the old Shiʿite corpus, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, index s.v. and most especially, part III-2 (“Sacred Knowledge”).
28. In the last part of the present chapter, the complete table of contents of the *Baṣāʿir* will be given.

29. *Le guide divin*, parts I.1 and I.2. For everything that is stated here in summary fashion, the reader is referred to that study, where all the necessary references to the early sources, as well as to modern works, are given. See also Amir-Moezzi and Jambet, *Qu’est-ce que le shi’isme?*, part 3.

30. We have already encountered this important evolution of Imami Shi’ism in chapters 2 and 3.


32. For a study of this evolution through an analysis of the semantic shifts of the term *ʿaql* (proceeding from “hallowed understanding” to “reason”), see Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin*, pp. 15–48.

33. In an effort to avoid pointlessly multiplying or lengthening the notes, the reader conversant with Arabic is referred—for whatever concerns these individuals as well as those who come later—to the prosopographical sources already cited, and most especially to the works of al-Najḥī, al-Ṭūsī, al-ʿAllāma al-Hillī, al-Ardabīlī and al-Māmaqānī. The alphabetical arrangement of persons in these sources allow the reader to find the entries devoted to them.

34. Especially al-Ṭūsī in his *Istibsār* or al-ʿAllāma al-Hillī in his *Sharḥ-i al-islām*.


36. On the charge of *ghuluww* and the problems connected with it, see Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin*, the conclusion.

37. These “anomalies” also crop up in the edited versions as well as in the manuscripts in my possession, namely, Mashhad, Āstān-e qods I, akhbār 62–1629; Mashhad, Āstān-e qods V, akhbār 407–1933 and Tehran University, Mishkāt III, 3, 1061. For practical reasons I refer to the edition of Küchbāghī, which is readily available.


39. In the Imami *Rijāl* (or prosopographical) works, two persons named Ḥamza b. al-Qāsim were al-ʿAbbās’s contemporaries, the first of them still alive in 339/950–951 and the second having served as a direct informant of Saʿd b. ʿAbdallāh al-Ashʿarī. Both descended from Abū l-Fadl al-ʿAbbās, son of the imam ʿAli b. Abī Ṭalib. Nevertheless, the first is called Ḥamza b. al-Qāsim b. ʿAli Abū Yaʿlā and not Abū l-Qāsim in the sources, while the second is called Ḥamza b. al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad.

40. Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-ʿAṭṭār al-Ashʿarī al-Qummī, an unassailable authority in Hadith and a member of the powerful clan of the Ashʿarites of Qumm. He is often cited by al-Kulaynī. He transmits traditions on al-Ṣaffār’s authority but, as will be seen, he also cites him as a direct informant. Hence the two men transmitted hadiths mutually, one to the other.
41. The published version of the book is clearly the long version. Äaqā Bozorg al-Ťihrānī claims to have seen several manuscripts of the work, and he specifies that the lithographic edition of 1285/1868 corresponds to the long integral version (wa ādhā l-matbu‘ īawa l-Βasā‘ir al-kābīr al-kāmil), Dharī‘a, 3:125. Moreover, in its title this edition takes up the adjective al-kubrā, as does the edition of K. Ba‘reb, executed on the basis of the first version. The manuscript Mashhad 1629 bears the title K. Ba‘reb al-darajāt al-kābīr. The short version seems to be lost today. Al-Ťūsī in his Fihrist (p. 143) speaks of a supplement (ziyāda) of the Baṣā‘ir, while al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmili (d. 1104/1692) cited, as among the sources of his Wasā‘il, the two versions, long and short, of the book (Wasā‘il al-shī‘a al-ta‘ṣil masā‘il al-sharī‘a, lithograph ed., 1:5). At the beginning of the twentieth century, however, al-Ťihrānī, a recognized specialist in Shi‘ite manuscripts, wondered whether the incomplete manuscripts he had seen correspond to the short version (Dharī‘a, 3:125). Thus this learned scholar had evidently not come across a manuscript explicitly designated as the short version.

42. On the Four Representatives of the hidden imam during the minor Occultation, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, pp. 271ff.; for the formulation of the question about the tradition dealing with “the institution of the representation” (wikāla) restricted to these four persons, see Klemm, “Die vier Sufar‘ des Zwölften Imams.”

43. On the initiatory structure of Shi‘ite circles, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, pp. 305ff.


46. Saffār, Baṣā‘ir; section 11, chapter 7, no. 8, p. 335. For the legend of the Sasanian princess, see Amir-Moezzi, “Shahrbānū.” On the Arab/Persian conflict, see Amir-Moezzi, “Persian, the Other Sacred Language of Islam.”

47. In Alid or older Shi‘ite circles, the term qā‘im was more often used than mahdī (“well-guided”) to denote the eschatological savior.

48. Kulaynī, Usūl min al-Kāfī, “Kitāb al-ḥujja,” 2:117–209, 275 and 440–86; Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-dīn, passim (the entire work might be considered as a monograph devoted to the twelfth imam, his fate, his Occultation, and his Return at the end of time).


50. On these questions, see Friedlaender, Die Messiasidee im Islam; MacDonald and Madelung, “Mahdi”; Sadie, Islamic Messianism; Blichfeldt, Early Mahdism.

51. On the quietism of the Ḥusaynid imams after Karbalā‘, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, part III-1.

52. Najāshī, Rījāl, pp. 12 and 19; Ṭūsī, Fihrist, p. 14; Ibn Dāwūd, Rījāl, pp. 15 and 416. Waqīfī denotes someone who definitively ends (waqīf) the line of the imams at such and such an imam while professing that this imam is the final in the line and the eventual savior to come.

4. THE EMERGENCE OF GNOSIS


55. Ṭihrānī, Dharīʻa, 16:76, no. 382. On this author’s father, see Kashshī, Maʻrifat akhbār al-rijāl (Bombay), pp. 288–89.


58. Historical analysis of this phenomenon has been carried out in magisterial fashion by Kohlberg in “From Imāmiyya to Ithnā-ʻashariyya.”


60. Nuʿmānī, Ghayba, chapter 10, p. 217, no. 9. The fact that the name of the savior is given in separate letters as M҇MD ( = Muḥammad) must correspond to this second phase (see Kulaynī, Uṣūl min al-Ḵāfī, bab al-ishaara wa l-naṣṣ ilā Sāḥib al-dār—“chapter on the allusions and the investiture concerning the Lord of the dwelling,” i.e., the hidden imam—2:119, Kulaynī, Rawḍa min al-Ḵāfī, 1:102 and 2:76; Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-dīn, chapter 42, no. 3 and chapter 43, no. 19).

61. Ibn ʻAyyāsh, Muqtaṣab al-athar, p. 9. On the two forms of knowledge, the “hidden” and the “lavished,” which seem to have much wider significance in other contexts, see Ṣaffār, Başāʻir, section 2, chapter 21, pp. 109–12; Kulaynī, Uṣūl min al-Ḵāfī, 1:375–76. Also Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, part IV–1.

62. Barqī, Mahāsin, pp. 3–15; Kohlberg, “From Imāmiyya to Ithnā-ʻashariyya,” p. 523. A few decades later, Ibn Bābawayh will report, in his Khiṣāl, numerous traditions on the number 12, several of which are about the twelve imams (Khiṣāl, 2:264–329).


64. On the Qāʾim and his Return, see Başāʻir, pp. 24 (hadith no. 17), 28 (no. 8), 70 (no. 1), 77–78 (no. 5), 155 (no. 13), 175 (no. 2), 176 (no. 4), 183–84 (no. 36), 189 (no. 56), 193 (no. 3), 259 (no. 3), 262 (no. 1), 311 (no. 11), 356 (no. 8), 478 (no. 2), 484 (no. 1), 490–91 (no. 4), 510 (no. 15). On the number twelve for the imams: p. 280, no. 15 (section 6, chapter 5); p. 319, no. 2, p. 320, nos. 4 and 5 (section 7, chapter 5); p. 372, no. 16 (section 8, chapter 1).

65. On the tabdīd al-ilm as an esoteric procedure applied to texts, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, index s.v. The tactic seems to have been effective since these five traditions eluded the vigilance of my friend and colleague E. Kohlberg who states that al-Ṣaffār reports no tradition concerning the Occultation (which is true enough)
and the twelve imams (“From Imāmiyya to Ithnā-‘ashariyya,” p. 523). But it is conceivable that the Israeli scholar meant by that: no tradition bearing the names of the twelve imams. Indeed, the oldest text the authenticity of which is certain and in which the complete list of the imams appears seems to be the Qur’anic commentary of ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (d. shortly after 307/919), written a few years after the beginning of the minor Occultation and before the composition of the Kāfī of al-Kulaynī (Qummī, Ṭafsīr, 2:44–45).

66. Kulaynī, Uṣūl min al-Kāfī, “K. al-ḥujjā,” bāb mā yuṣalū bihi bayn daʿwā l-muḥiqaq wa l-muḥtīl fī amr al-imāma, hadiths nos. 8 and 9; bāb karāhiyyat al-tawqīfīt, no. 1; bāb al-tamīḥīs wa l-imtiḥān, nos. 2, 3 and 6; bāb mā jāʿa fī l-ithnā ʿashar, nos. 2 and 19. According to Burūjīrdī, Tartīb asanīd al-Kāfī, pp. 121–22, this Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan from whom al-Kulaynī transmits is not our Ṣaffār but rather Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭāʾī; he is the sole prosopographical author to hold this view, to the best of my knowledge; Nuʿmānī, Ghayba, chapter 10, no. 11; chapter 15, no. 6; chapter 16, no. 10; Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-dīn, 1:136, 211, 262, 286, 288–289, 330, 2:335, 344, 346, 348–50, 370, 523, 645, 649, 671–72.

67. See also Hussain, The Occultation of the Twelfth Imam, part 2.1.1.; Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, part IV-1.


69. This order seems a bit arbitrary, for the first chapters of one section are often the continuation of the last chapters of the preceding section, leading one to wonder why these chapters do not form part of the preceding section.


71. See note 23 in this chapter; also Amir-Moezzi, “Etude du lexique technique de l’ésotérisme imamite.”

72. On taslīm (noun of action—“initiatory submission”—of the second form of the verbal root SLM) and the musallam (active participle—“the initiate submissive to his initiatory master”—from the same second form), see, e.g., Ṣaffār, Baṣṣīʿr, section 10, chapter 20, pp. 520ff.; Kulaynī, Uṣūl min al-Kāfī, bāb al-taslīm wa l-musallāmīn, 2:234ff.; Ibn Bābawayh, K. al-Tawḥīd, pp. 458ff. The words islām and muslim are likewise the noun of action and active participle of the fourth form of the same verbal root SLM. To read musallām instead of muslim in well-known scriptural texts is an old practice in Shi’ism; see, e.g., traditions nos. 74, 76, 120, 129, 285, 361, and 363 as reported by al-Sayyārī in Kohlberg and Amir-Moezzi, Revelation and Falsification and the relevant commentaries.

73. The genre of “personalized commentary” that we analyzed in the Book of Sulaym b. Qays, and in al-Ḥibarī in particular, occurs quite frequently in al-Ṣaffār as well.

74. In this dualistic conception, very present in al-Ṣaffār’s work, general theoretical expositions as well as exact allusions to the imams and their historical
enemies—notably, the first two caliphs and other companions hostile to ‘Ali—are to be found, in accord with the Shi’ite viewpoint.

75. On the central notion of walāya, see Amir-Moezzi, “Notes à propos de la walāya imamite.”

76. On preexisting worlds, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, parts II-1 and II-2; also Amir-Moezzi, “Cosmogony and Cosmology in Twelver Shi’ism.”

77. The expression can be translated also as “commander of the believers” and in Sunni Islam it denotes the title of caliph or of any temporal leader. For Shi’ites, this title is reserved exclusively for ‘Ali to such an extent that even the other imams in his line cannot use it.

78. In the oldest texts, notably in the Book of Sulaym, as we have seen, the word amr designates the caliphate, the legitimate temporal power. An evolution is perceptible here, a semantic shift of the term into an interior dimension in which the imamate, represented by the terms walāya or amr, has become a cosmic function attended by its spiritual counterparts. In this respect, Pines, “Shi’ite Terms and Conception in Judah Halevi’s Kuzari” is worth consulting.

79. This assertion runs counter to the dogma of Muḥammad’s illiteracy, a miraculous sign of his prophetic status which is eventually accepted in Sunni Islam. See Goldfeld, “The Illiterate Prophet (nabī ummi)”; and especially Athamina, “Al-Nabiyy al-Ummiyy”; and Günter, “Muḥammad, the Illiterate Prophet.”

80. On muḥaddath (not to be confused with muḥaddith: expert in Hadith, traditionist), see Kohlberg, “The Term Muḥaddath in Twelver Shi’ism.”

81. See chapter 3 of the present work.

82. On the magical power of the Column of Light, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, index s.v.

83. This assertion, like many others in the work, contradicts the Sunni dogma according to which the Prophet left no testament.

84. Rudolph, Die Gnosis.

85. See also the conclusion of the following chapter.

86. Halm, Die islamische Gnosis.

87. There is no doubt that doctrines of a gnostic sort are present in many Shi’ite traditions. It is the question as to their milieus and their means of transmission within the Islamic world that prompts debate. See, e.g., Massignon, “Die Ursprünge und die Bedeutung des Gnostizismus im Islam”; Corbin, “De la gnose antique à la gnose ismaélienne” and “L’idée du Paraclet en philosophie iranienne”; Rubin, “Pre-existence and Light”; al-Qāḍī, “The Development of the Term Ḡulāt”; Halm, Kosmologie und Heilslehre der frühen Ismāʿiliyya; Bar-Asher and Kofsky, The Nusayri-‘Alawī Religion; Anthony, The Caliph and the Heretic. Conversely, for the hypothesis that gnostic themes in Shi’ism display a later character, see Bayhom-Daou, “The Second-Century Ḡulāt.”

5. Perfecting a Religion

This chapter is a slightly modified version of article by Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi and Hasan Ansari (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton) that appeared in *Studia Iranica* (see the bibliography). The last part is the work of Amir-Moezzi alone. See also note 17 of the introduction.

1. We are not taking into account the innumerable hagiographical studies devoted to our author and his work by Shi’ite scholars of the traditional sort. For Western studies, see Madelung, “al-Kulaynī,” *EI2*, 5:364; GAS, 1:540–42; Sander, *Zwischen Charisma und Ratio*, 123ff.; *Newman, The Formative Period of Twelver Shi’ism*, chapters 6 and 8; Gleave, “*Between Hadith and Fiqh*”; the monographic article by Marcinkowski, “*A Glance on the First of the Four Canonical Hadith Collections of the Twelver-Shī‘ites*,” is of a traditionalist and apologetic nature and cannot be deemed a historical and critical study.


4. This fact is all the more peculiar when one knows of Ibn al-Nadīm’s relationships with the Imami Shi’ites of the capital, as well as his familiarity with Shi’ite scholars and their works, to which indeed he devotes an entire chapter of his famous work. Might the part devoted to al-Kulaynī have been dropped from the manuscripts of al-Fihrīst? See Anšārī, “Ibn Nadīm” in DBI.


6. This date may be inferred from the fact that al-Kulaynī does not transmit directly from al-Ṣaffār al-Qummi (d. 290/902–3; see the preceding chapter) and that he transmits also—though rarely, true enough—from ‘Abdallāh b. Ja’far al-Ḥīmīrī, who departed Qumm for Kūfah in 297/909–10.
7. He had in fact heard the Kūfan master Ḥumayd b. Ziyād (d. 310/922–23).
8. Al-Kulaynī transmitted directly from Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Nishabūrī, called Bandfar, thanks to whom he came to know a large number of the reports of al-ʻAḍṣ b. ʻAbd Allāh b. ʻAbd Allāh (d. 260/873); see Burūjirdī, Tartīb asānīd Kitāb al-Kāfī, 121; also Ibn ʻAsākir, Taʻrikh madinat Dimashq.
11. Assuming, to be sure, that he began his studies at the usual age in adolescence.
12. See, among others, Amir-Moezzi, “Shahrbaṇī,” p. 515–24. Generally speaking, the bibliographic references are quite plentiful with regard to this aspect of our work. We shall limit ourselves to several that are apposite.
15. On the conquest of Rayy by Muslim troops during the caliphate of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (in the year 19, 20, or 22 Hijra), see Balādhurī, Futūḥ al-buldān, pp. 313, 316; Yāqūt, Mu‘jam al-buldān, 3:116; Suyūṭī, Taʻrikh al-khulafa‘, p. 132; on the resistance of the populace up until the time of the third caliph ‘Uthmān b. Affān, see Balādhurī, Futūḥ al-buldān, p. 315; Suyūṭī, Taʻrikh al-khulafa‘, p. 154.
19. During the reign of the emir Ismā‘īl b. Aḥmad (279–95/ 892 –908) and the caliphate of al-Muttaq (289–95/ 902–8); see Ťabarī, Taʻrikh, 8:215–16.
20. For this period, see Qurtubi, Šīla Taʻrikh al-Ṭabarī, pp. 35–36 and 95–96; also Stern, “The Early Ismā‘īlī Missionaries.”
21. See Sajjādī, “Āl-e Būya/Buwayh,” DBI.
23. For him, see Ťabarī, Taʻrikh (Cairo), 10:16; also Bahrāmīyān, “Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan al-Mādarānī,” DBI.
27. See below the section devoted to al-Kulaynī’s masters, nos. 12, 15, and 16.
28. On Shi‘ism at Qumm, see Mez, Die Renaissance des Islam, pp. 56–57; Schwarz, Iran im Mittelalter nach arabischen Geographen, pp. 560–61; Spuler, Iran in frühislamischer Zeit, p. 179; Newman, Formative Period, chapter 3. See also Lambert, “Qum.” On the history and bibliography of the “Local Histories” of this city, see Modarressi, Ketāb shenāsī-ye āthār-e marbūṭ be Qom, Qom Nāmeh, and Rāññnāmā-ye jughrāfiyā-ye tārikhī-ye
Qom. For the scholars of Qumm in the early period, see Qummī, Tadhkīrat mashāyikh Qumm.

29. Initially, since the governor was chosen from among them by the caliph, they could thus have control of the city; see al-Qummī, Tārikh-e Qomm, pp. 28, 101–2, 164. It is also reported that they often would not accept non-Shi’ite governors and judges appointed by the caliph. Furthermore, they often resisted paying various state taxes (ibid., pp. 241, 279).

30. Ibid., pp. 27, 242, 260–264, 278.


32. Nevertheless, Ash‘arite religious views at this time are still in need of more nuanced study.

33. See Qummī, Tārikh-e Qom, pp. 240–41, which offers a good analysis of the situation. On the Ash‘arite family, see Modarressi, “al-Ash‘ariyyūn.”

34. For a historical approach on the transfer of Hadith science from Kūfa to Qumm, see Qummī, Tārikh-e Qom, pp. 90–100.


39. According to a well-documented study by Verena Klemm, the institutionalization of what tradition will call “the Four Representatives” is late and the historicity of the first two representatives especially seems dubious in the extreme; see Klemm, “Die vier Sufarā’ des Zwölften Imam.” Also Amir-Moezzi, “Contribution à la typologie des rencontres avec l’imam caché.”


43. See Cook, *Commanding Right and Forbidding Wrong in Islamic Thought*, pp. 116ff.
46. Ibid., pp. xl–xli.
47. In this connection, see Waines, “The Pre-Buyid Amirate.”
49. On this turn and the two early Imami traditions, see Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin*, pp. 15–47; Amir-Moezzi and Jambet, *Qu’est-ce que le shi’isme?*, part 3; also the previous chapter of the present work.
51. Ibn Nadīm, pp. 283–84; also GAS, 1:97, 100, and 102.
52. See the examples given by Ibn Ḥaṭar, Maṭāliḥ ʿāliya, 1:4ff.
56. For the differences among these tendencies, see Modarressi, *An Introduction to Shi’i Law*, pp. 25–27.
61. On Ismaiili law at this period, see Madelung, “The Sources of Ismāʾīli Law”; Poonawala, “ʿAl-Qādī al-Nuʿmān and Ismaʿīlī Jurisprudence,”
63. On this heritage, see Modarressi, *Crisis and Consolidation*, pp. 21–29, 33–34.
64. On this author and his works, see, e.g., Friedman, “al-Husayn ibn Hamadan al-Khaṣībi” and The Nuṣayri-ʿAlawī, passim.
65. On al-Kulayni’s origins, see Ḥillī (ʿAllāma), *Rijāl*, 18; cf. Fīrūzābādī, al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ, s. v. “kalān,” 4:263; Zabīdī, Ṭāj al-ʿarūs, 9:322, s.v. “kalān”; also, Dhabah,
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This name is often mutilated in the historical sources, see Ibn Ḥawqal, Ṣurat al-ard, p. 322; Ṣaʿūdī, Muʿjam al-buldān, 2:984; al-Baghdādi, Ṣafī al-Dīn Marāṣid al-ṣīṭṭāʾ, 3:1177; Fayyād, Ganjine-ye āthār-e Qomm, 1:255–56; for the meaning of rustāq, see Yāqūt, Muʿjam al-buldān, 3:126; Amīn, Aʿyān al-shīʿa, 14:52.

This region lies 45 km southeast of present-day Tehran. See Karimān, Ray-e bāstān, 2:509 and 614; Stahl, Teheran und Umgebung, 49–54.

Farhang-e jughārīyāʾ-ye īrān, 1:183. According to this source, the village of Kulayn forms part of the region of Fashāfū, the central part of the Rayy department in the province of Tehran, 38 km southeast of the city of Rayy, 5 km to the east of the Qumm road. It has 555 inhabitants (as of 2002).

For him, see Modarressi, Crisis and Consolidation, pp. 117ff.


See, further on, for a refutation of the Carmathians among al-Kulaynī’s works.

81. For him, see Modarressi, Crisis and Consolidation, pp. 117ff.

82. See Najāšī, Rījāl, p. 373.


85. See, further on, for a refutation of the Carmathians among al-Kulaynī’s works.

86. al-Rāẉī, al-Iṣlāḥ and Aʾlām al-nubuwwa.
87. See Stroumsa, *Freethinkers of Medieval Islam.*
89. See Daftary, *The Ismāʿīlis,* pp. 167–68.
93. See Khashīm, *Al-Jubbāʾiyān,* passim.
94. Zaryāb, “Abū l-Qāsim Balkhī,” *DBI.*
103. Since he refers continually to the *Fihrist* in his *Rijāl,* particularly in the notice devoted to al-Kulaynī, *Rawḍa min al-Kāfī,* p. 439.
111. Anšārī, “Ibn ‘Ubdūn,” *DBI.*
118. On this expression and on his masters, see ‘Amīdī, *al-Shaykh al-Kulaynī al-Baghdādī*, pp. 348ff.
120. On this expression and on his masters, see Ḥāmad, *al-Shaykh al-Kulaynī al-Baghdādī*, pp. 348ff.
124. See chapter 2 and now, Kohlberg and Amir-Moezzi, *Revelation and Falsification*.
128. On him see ibid., p. 353.
137. On him, see ibid., p. 353.
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141. See, e.g., Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrikh madīnat Dimashq, 56:297–98.

142. ʿHilī (ʿAllāma), Rījāl, p. 17; Ibn Dāwūd, Rījāl, p. 35; Ardabīlī, Jāmiʿ al-ruwāt, 1:39; Bahārūnī, Luʾluʿat al-bahrayn, p. 394; Narāqī, Shuʿāb al-maqaṣīl, p. 103; Ḥāʾirī, Muntahā al-maqaṣīl, p. 298; Kh(w)ānsārī, Rawdāt, 6:119; Nūrī, Mustadrak, 3:527; Māmaqānī, Tanqīh, 3:7; Khūʿī, Muʿjam rījāl al-ḥadīth (1970), 2:21; ẒHIRĀNĪ, Ṭabaqāt (fourth century authors), p. 18 and 98.

143. Najāshī, Rījāl, p. 377, no. 1026; Nūrī, Mustadrak, 3:527; Quḥpāʾī, Majmaʿ al-ruwāt, 6:74; Wāḥid Bihbahānī, Taʿīla, p. 31; Māmaqānī, Tanqīh, 1:49.


146. For his teaching with al-Kulaynī, see Bahārūnī, Luʾluʿa, p. 394; Ḥāʾirī, Muntahā, p. 298; Kh(w)ānsārī, Rawdāt, 6:119; Nūrī, Mustadrak, 3:527; ẒHIRĀNĪ, Ṭabaqāt (fourth century), pp. 54 and 315.


149. Najāshī, Rījāl, 74, also 377, no. 1026. On the differences about his name, see Māmaqānī, Tanqīh, 1:113; ẒHIRĀNĪ, Ṭabaqāt (fourth century), p. 60. On his status as a transmitter from al-Kulaynī, see Ardabīlī, Jāmiʿ al-ruwāt, 1:81; Quḥpāʾī, Majmaʿ al-ruwāt, 6:74.

150. For his transmission from al-Kulaynī, see Ibn Qūlāwāyih’s Kāmil al-ziyārat, pp. 248, 249, 329, 330; for him, see Bahārūnī, Luʾluʿa, p. 394; Ḥāʾirī, Muntahā, p. 298; Quḥpāʾī, Majmaʿ al-ruwāt, 6:74; Narāqī, Shuʿāb, p. 103; Nūrī, Mustadrak, 3:527; Kh(w)ānsārī, Rawdāt, 6:119; Khūʿī, Muʿjam rījāl al-ḥadīth, 18:62; cf. Ibn Dāwūd, Rījāl, p. 67; and ʿHilī, Rījāl, p. 31.


152. Ḥāʾirī, Muntahā, p. 298; Nūrī, Mustadrak, 3:527; Khūʿī, Muʿjam rījāl al-ḥadīth, 18:60.


154. For the differences relating to his nasab in some isnāds in Ibn Bābawāyih, see ẒHIRĀNĪ, Ṭabaqāt (fourth century), p. 173; also Khūʿī, Muʿjam rījāl al-ḥadīth, 11:271–72; Ibn Bābawāyih, ʿUyūn akhbār al-Riddā, 1:131, no. 86, and Faqīh (1972), 2:238, no. 2292.

155. Nuʾmānī, Ghayba, pp. 94–95, etc.; also ʿHilī, Rījāl, p. 162; Ibn Dāwūd, Rījāl, p. 160; Muẓaffar, 1:24; and compare Majlisī, Mirʿāt al-ʿaqālīl, 3:199.
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158. Nūrī, Mustadrak, 3:527; Muṣaffar, 1:24; also Ḥāʾīrī, Muntahā, p. 284; and Māmaqānī, Tanqīḥ, 3:159.
161. Kh(w)ānsārī, Rawḍāt, 6:119; Nūrī, Mustadrak, 3:527; also Māmaqānī, Tanqīḥ, 3:179.
164. On the institution of wīkāla during the minor Occultation, see Klemm, “Die vier Sufarāʾ des Zwölften Imam.” On the role of the wukāla during the Occultation crisis and the importance of financial problems for the scholars, see Modarressi, Crisis and Consolidation, pp. 17–18, 92–94. On the history of this period and its doctrines, see Hussain, The Occultation of the Twelfth Imam; Sachedina, Islamic Messianism; Amir-Moezzi, “Contribution à la typologie des rencontres avec l’imam caché.”
165. E.g., Kulaynī, Rawḍa min al-Kāfī, 1:329ff. and 514ff. Nevertheless, it is useful to keep in mind that al-Kulaynī does not yet speak of the institution of the Four Representatives (al-sufarāʾ/wukāla/nuwwāb al-arbaʾa) as of a proper and formally institutionalized situation. He does mention the names of many representatives contemporaneous with the hidden imam in various cities. In her documented study “Die vier Sufarāʾ,” Verena Klemm does indeed show in a persuasive fashion that the dogma of the “unique” representation of the twelfth imam, and accordingly the leadership of one representative at a time, seems to have been invented and diffused by the powerful Nawbakhtī family following upon the wīkāla of the “third” representative, in effect, al-Ḥusayn b. Rawḥ al-Nawbakhti; see also Amir-Moezzi, “Contribution à la typologie des rencontres avec l’imam caché,” pp. 118–19.
166. See Tūsī, Ghayba, pp. 408ff., etc; also Massignon, La Passion de Hallāj, index, pp. 249–50.
167. See Tūsī, Ghayba, p. 401–5; Massignon, La Passion de Hallāj, passim. On the violent conflicts between “esotericist” Shiʿites and “rationalist” Shiʿites occasioned by al-Ḥallāj and then by al-Shalmaghānī, see Amir-Moezzi, “Savoir c’est pouvoir,” p. 275, note 120.
168. See, e.g., Pākṭāchī, “Imāmiyya” in DBI.
169. See, e.g., Tūsī, Ghayba, p. 390ff.
170. E.g., Najāshī, Rijāl, p. 77.
171. Ibid., p. 261.
172. See Kulaynī, Rawḍa min al-Kāfī, 1:95ff., 104ff., 155ff.; on al-Ṣaffār and his sources, see chapter 4 of the present work; Newman, Formative Period, p. 67ff.
174. See Anšārī, “Ibn Hammām Iskāfī,” DBI.
175. He probably died before al-Kulaynī; see Najāshī, Rijāl, p. 262; cf. Tūsī, Ghayba, p. 394.


179. For the juridical and theological implications of the Occultation and the reactions of the Imami community, see Madelung, “Authority in Twelver Shiism in the Absence of the Imam”; Kohlberg, “From Imamiyya to Ithna-ashariyya” and “Early Attestations of the Term *ithna-ashariyya*”; Modarresi, *Crisis and Consolidation*, pp. 86–105; Amir-Moezzi, “Réflexions sur une évolution du shi’isme duodécimain: tradition et idéologisation”; Amir-Arjomand, “The Consolation of Theology,” and “The Crisis of the Imamate,” and “Imam *Absconditus*.” Also, on a much wider level, see the works by Hussain and Sachedina (see the bibliography).


182. “None of us,” the imam Ja’far al-Sadiq is reported to have said, “we, the People of the Prophet’s Household, has revolted or will revolt against oppression or to defend a just cause without some terrible catastrophe ripping him out by the roots, and this will be so until our Resurrector [qā’im, i.e. “the Savior at the End of Time”] arises. Every revolt by one of us will only bring further suffering upon us (the imams) and our faithful followers” (Imam ‘Ali Zayn al-‘Abidin [ascribed to] *al-Sahifa al-sajjadiyya*, p. 22, no. 62—the sentences are numbered—*fi bayan isnad al-Sahifa*). Several of the imams are said to have declared, “Every lifted banner (i.e., every revolt) prior to the emergence of the Resurrector is tantamount to a rebellion against God (*ta‘ghut*),” Kulayni, *Rawda min al-Kafi*, 8:295; see also Nu’mani, *Ghayba*, chapter 5 in its entirety.

183. Kulayni, *al-Kafi*, 2:297ff. The term *ri’asa* denotes both religious and political leadership; a *ru’as* may also be a political head, a “leader” of men as well as a theologian or a jurist “head of a school.” The hadiths in this subchapter are of course an invitation to a quietist political attitude as well as very likely a denunciation of all other religious authority than that of the imams.

184. Kulayni, *al-Kafi*, nos. 2, 7, 3, 4, and 5, respectively. See also Majlis, 15/3:102–4 (on those who claim to be head—*al-mutara*’*isun*).


187. See Tusi, *Fihris* (1999), p. 393 and *Rijal*, p. 439. The attitude of the first generations of Imami scholars in the Buwayhid period diverges from this medley of praise. Al-Sharif al-Murtada in particular, criticizes al-Kulayni for precise doctrinal and historical reasons, charging him with having introduced a large number of traditions into his compilation that seem absurd from a rational viewpoint (see *Jawabat al-masa’il al-tarabulusiyiyat al-thalitha*, 408–9). Al-Sharif al-Murtada’s attitude is the direct result of the rationalizing turn in Imami Shi’ism during the Buwayhid period—a turn that signals the marginalization of the “original esoteric and non-rationalist tradition” in favor of an increasingly dominant “rational theological
and juridical tradition”; see Amir-Moezzi, *Le guide divin*, pp. 15–47; Amir-Moezzi and Jambet, *Qu'est-ce que le shi'isme?*, part 3.

188. See Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work*, p. 18ff.
194. Majlisi, *Mir’āt al-uqâl*, lithograph ed., 1:3 and *Bihār*, 110:152; for other laudatory opinions, see ibid., 110:34, 40, 90, 100, and 133.
198. See Kohlberg, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work*, pp. 188 and 189.
199. See, e.g., Ibn Tawús, p. 158 and *Wasā’il al-akhŷâr*, p. 189.
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206. Majlīsī, *Bihār*, 105:48; Māzandarānī, *Sharḥ Usūl al-Kāfī*, 9:359. For the title applied to other scholars, see Qummī, *al-Kunūz va l-alqāb*, 3:198. At the present time, however, the title has lost its traditional value and is used to denote students of religious sciences and mid-level theological scholars; in this regard, see Matīnī, “Bahāthī dar bāre-yeye sābeqe-yeye alqāb va ‘anāvin-e ‘olamā’,” p. 580ff.


209. Nizām al-Mulk, *Siyar al-Mulūk*, p. 263 (the author stipulates that a village called Kulayn exists in the district of Fashābūya [sic]).

210. Ibid., p. 264.

211. Ibid., pp. 264–65.


227. It is not well known quite where and until when the hadith sources prior to al-Kulaynī were preserved. Certainly Shaykh al-Ṭūsī (d. 460/1068) owned the main works in the corpus and Ibn Ṭawūs (d. 664/1266) had access to a very great number of them in his famous library; see Kohlberg, A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work. We know too that a goodly number of these old works were already lost by the time of al-Majlīsī (d. 1110/1699), toward the end of the Safavid period. A list of the Imami Hadith works available at this period, a great number of which contributed to the compilation of the monumental encyclopedia of hadiths by al-Majlīsī, the *Bihār al-anwār*, is given in the first volume of that work. Majlīsī made a colossal effort, on the financial side as well, to assemble within his working circle the greatest possible number of these works, sought out by his team in diverse corners of the Islamic world. Aside from a few minor exceptions, today we have almost all of al-Majlīsī’s sources. Some of the latter are older than the *Kāfī*, but the large majority of them are later, such as the works of Ibn Bābawah, of al-Mufid, or of Ibn Ṭawūs; see Mahdavi Rād-Ṣābīdī-Rafī‘ī, “Hadith,” pp. 125ff.

228. On the many commentaries on al-Kāfī, see, e.g., GAS, 1:541–42.


232. The majority of manuscripts dates from the great epoch of manuscript production and compilation of Shi’ite Hadith works during the Safavid era, especially in the eleventh/seventeenth century, during al-Majli‘i’s time. It is worth noting that no manuscript dating from less than three centuries after our author’s epoch has yet been identified. In his recent work, Şădrä‘i Khū‘î, Fehestgān-e noskhe-hā-ye khaṭṭī-ye hadith va ‘olām-e hadīth-e shī‘a, 5:202–319, lists 1,100 manuscripts of our work. At the library of Āstān-e Quds at Mashhad (Iran) alone, there are more than 150 manuscripts of al-Kāfī. Among the oldest: 1. Manuscript no. 13800, in naskhī script, copied in 675/1276. 2. Ms. no. 11294, in naskhī, copied in 891/1486 at Hilla; see Fekrat, Fehest-e alefbā‘i-ye kutob-e khaṭṭī-ye Āstān-e Qods-e Rīḍāvī, pp. 455–56. In the Amir al-mu‘minin Library at Najaf, there are 29 manuscripts of our work; see al-‘Amīdī, al-Shaykh al-Kulaynī, p. 159. The Mar‘āshi Library of Qumm too owns a substantial number of manuscripts of the Kāfī, for example, 1. MS no. 564, dating from the seventh/thirteenth century; 2. MS no. 268, containing the text of the book from the beginning of the K. al-talāq to the end of the K. al-Rawā‘a, copied in 953/1546, and verified by the Second Martyr Zayn al-Dīn b. ‘Alī al-‘Āmīlī; 3. MS no. 1415, copied between the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries. 4. MS no. 810, copied toward the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/forteenth centuries; see Ḥusaynī Ashkevari, Fehest-e noskhe-hā-ye khaṭṭī (Mar‘āshi), 1:259; Muttaqī and Mūṣawī, Rāḥnamā-ye noskhe-hā-ye khaṭṭī (Mar‘āshi), p. 113; see also GAS, 1:540–41.


235. See Kh(w)ānsārī, Rawdāt, 6:116; Ṣadr, Nihāyat al-dirāya, p. 545; Bahr al-‘ulūm, Dalīl al-qāda‘ al-sharī‘a, 3:139.

236. See Linant de Bellefonds, “Le droit imâmite,” 185 (“From this viewpoint [i.e., the juridical viewpoint], the divergencies (Imami Shi’ism) from Sunnism are no more acute than at the very heart of Sunnism itself”); also Watt, The Formative Period, p. 278; Stewart, Islamic Legal Orthodoxy, p. 131.
237. In this respect, one can think of a number of compilers prior to al-Kulaynī and the way in which they organized their collections. For example, the writings of al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd and his brother al-Ḥasan b. Saʿīd al-Alwāzī or indeed, Saʿīd b. ʿAbdallāh al-Asḥārī (m. 299 or 301/912 or 914); see Najāshī, Rijāl, pp. 58ff., 177.

238. Although internal scrutiny of the text as well as the many testimonies of older authors and indeed, entire generations of bio-bibliographers seems to justify no hesitation with respect to the attribution of this part of the Kāfī to al-Kulaynī (see, e.g., Najāshī, Rijāl, p. 377), nevertheless, certain Imami scholars have cast it in doubt. For example, Mullā Khalīl b. al-Ghāzī al-Qazwīnī (d. 1089/1678) thought that this part was the work of the later author Ibn Idrīs al-Ḥillī (d. 598/1202); see Efendi, Riyāḍ al-ʿulamāʾ, 2:261; Kh(w)ānsārī, Rawḍāt, 3:272. On the autonomy of this part in comparison with the rest of al-Kāfī, see Ibn Shahrāshūb, Maʿālim al-ʿulamāʾ, p. 99.

239. On the complexity of the term ʿaql in the old Shi‘īte corpus, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, pp. 15–48 (where I have often translated it as “hiero-intelligence,” especially within the framework of cosmogonic traditions). Also Crow, “The Role of al-ʿAql in Early Islamic Wisdom,” passim.

240. On the technical aspect of the term ʿilm in early Shi‘ism and its semantic evolution, see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, pp. 174–99, and “Réflexions sur une évolution du shi‘isme duodécimain,” 63–68. Also chapter 4 of the present work.

241. We write ʿImām (with a capital I) when the term in its cosmic and archetypal sense is intended, and ʿimām (with a small i) when dealing with the historical imam, the locus of manifestation of the former. This homonymy makes sense, of course, but often makes it difficult to distinguish between the two semantic levels; see Amir-Moezzi, “Remarques sur la divinité de l’Imam.”

242. In the titles that follow, distinction between the two meanings of the figure of the imam is not obvious. In order not to make reading overly ponderous, we avoid writing ʿImām/ʿimām over and over again though it is necessary to bear in mind that the notion freely subsumes both senses.

243. Al-Kulaynī is the last great author of the older tradition to support the thesis of falsification of the official version of the Qur’an and to offer numerous citations from the “Qur’an of the imams,” not to be found in the Qur’an known to all. For these traditions he draws on al-Sayyārī, among others (see chapter 2, in the present work, as well).

244. ʿImān, in the Shi‘īte technical sense, denotes initiation into the esoteric aspect of the religion and is distinct from ʿIslām which signifies submission to the exoteric religion; see Amir-Moezzi, Le guide divin, index., s.v. Also Amir-Moezzi, “Du droit à la théologie,” 50ff. The complete title of the book that is al-Kāfī is “The Book of Faith and Unbelief, of Pious Actions and of Sins” (K. al-ʿimān wa l-kufr wa l-tāʿāt wa l-maʿāṣ).  

245. Kulaynī, al-Usāil min al-Kāfī, 1:8, where the author states that his work is meant to be a sufficient source for knowledge of the religion; doubtless it is for this reason that the work is also known under the title Kitāb al- Kāfī fī ʿilm al-dīn. To the best of our knowledge, however, no manuscript bears the latter title, but simply that of Kitāb al-Kāfī.
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