

JA'FAR AL-ŞĀDIQ AS A SOURCE OF SHĪ'Ī TRADITIONS

R. P. Buckley

Source: *The Islamic Quarterly* 43(1), 1999: 37–58.

The single most important figure connected with the propagation of a specifically *Shī'ī* collection of *Ḥadīth* and the attendant emergence of a body of religio-legal norms is the *Shī'ī* Imām Ja'far al-Şādiq (699–765 AD). The present discussion focuses on al-Şādiq's attested role as a relater of *Shī'ī Ḥadīth*. It does not aim to account for the rise of interest in *Shī'ī Ḥadīth* at this time.

The relevant source material available on al-Şādiq's role within the *Shī'ī* legal and doctrinal system is potentially immense, often conflicting and ambiguous. This material encompasses in the first place the many thousands of *Ḥadīth* which are ostensibly transmitted on his authority and also includes the large volume of traditions which deal with his relations with the *Shī'ī* relaters (*rijāl*), in addition to those which speak of his associations with the *Sunnī* 'ulamā'. We cannot hope to separate the true from the spurious in this large mass of information nor to arrive at a body of traditions which may with certainty originate from him, but only to arrive at a number of general conclusions, caveats and reservations regarding the accepted corpus of *Shī'ī* traditions attributed to al-Şādiq.

The status of al-Şādiq in *Shī'ī Ḥadīth*

One of the essentials of established *Shī'ī* doctrine is that the Imām is the ultimate religious authority after the Prophet Muḥammad, is protected from error (*ma'sūm*) and is endowed with an 'ilm which gives him an extraordinary and often supernatural knowledge. This necessarily had repercussions on the *Shī'ī* conception of *Ḥadīth*. Thus, almost all *Shī'ī isnāds* take one of three basic forms: they are either related solely on the authority of an Imām, they go back to an Imām who relates on the authority of his forefathers, or they go back to an Imam who transmits on the authority of the Prophet Muḥammad either directly or through a chain of his forefathers. The vast majority of *Shī'ī* traditions are not, however, derived from Muḥammad, nor are they based on a chain of an Imām's forefathers, but are

usually in the form of a question asked of one of the Imāms along with the Imām's answer. It is these which constitute the *summa* of the Imāmī and Isma'īlī schools of law. By far the largest number of such *Hadīth* are attributed to al-Ṣādiq, to such an extent that *Shī'ī* law is alternatively called Ja'farī law in deference to its major contributor. Referring to al-Ṣādiq, al-Shaykh al-Mufīd states in his *Kitāb al-Irshād*:

The people transmitted on his authority the religious sciences which travellers carried with them [around many countries] and thus his fame was spread throughout the lands. The learned scholars have transmitted on the authority of no other member of the House [Ahl al-Bayt] as much as they have transmitted on his authority. None of the Ahl al-Bayt met as many reporters of traditions [ahl al-athār wa naqalat al-akhbār] as he did, nor did the latter transmit on their authority to the same extent as they transmitted on the authority of Abū 'Abd Allāh [al-Ṣādiq].¹

An examination of the collections of *Shī'ī Hadīth* illustrates the nature of the contribution attributed to al-Ṣādiq. In one of the canonical recensions, Ibn Babawayh's *Man lā yahduruhu al-Faqīh*, al-Ṣādiq is seen to be the ultimate authority for some 60% of the traditions. No other Imām is quoted so often, the traditions not related by al-Ṣādiq being on the authority of his father al-Bāqir (some 15%), the Prophet (7%), 'Alī al-Ridā (5%), 'Alī b. Abī Tālib (5%) with al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī, Mūsā b. Ja'far and 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn supplying the majority of the remainder.

Ibn Babawayh's work, like the *Istibṣār fī mā ukhtulifa fīhi min al-Akbār* and the *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* of al-Ṭūsī, are practical manuals of Imāmī *fiqh* and contain little relating to the dogmatic position of the Imāmīs. The traditions they contain are in the broadest sense legal and are not concerned with the *Shī'ī* concept of the Imāmate, including the infallibility of the Imām, the principle of *naṣṣ* (designation) and such like. Nevertheless, al-Ṣādiq's attested sphere of authority is seen to extend beyond the legal domain, and in those collections of traditions which also record *Shī'ī* dogma, such as al-Kulayni's *al-Kāfī fī 'Ilm al-Dīn* and the later Majlisī's *Biḥār al-Anwār*, the same overwhelming predominance of Ja'farī traditions is in evidence.

Thus, the majority of *Shī'ī* traditions are ascribed to al-Ṣādiq and deal with the totality of subjects relating to the legal norms of the *Shī'ī* interpretation of Islam, with *'ibādāt*, or the ritual aspects of *Shī'ism*, and with the fundamentals of the *Shī'ī* system of belief.

Al-Ṣādiq the *muḥaddith* and jurisconsult

Unless the sources are to be discounted in their entirety, there can be little doubt that the depiction of al-Ṣādiq as a source of traditions is not spurious.

Perhaps the greatest testimony corroborating al-Šādiq's role as *muḥaddith* and jurisconsult comes from the *Sunnī* commentators. They would seem to have nothing to gain by describing al-Šādiq as such, as they accord him no extraordinary status as do the *Shī'a* and his *Ḥadīth* forms only a very small part of the *Sunnī* collections. As far as they were concerned, he was to be judged in accord with the same critical criteria as applied to other transmitters. Although the number of traditions from al-Šādiq accepted by the *Sunnīs* is somewhat meagre, the *Sunnī* scholars generally, though not unanimously, view him favourably. Al-Dhahabī describes him as authoritative and reports that both al-Shāfi'ī and Yaḥyā b. Mu'ayn said that he was trustworthy (*thiqa*).² Ibn Hajar quotes Ibn Hibbān as saying that al-Šādiq was one of the trustworthy people and masters in jurisprudence and science (*ilm*) from the family of the Prophet (*Ahl al-Bayt*), and that al-Nasā'ī also held him to be *thiqa*.³ Similarly, al-Ṭabarī relates that al-Šādiq knew many *Ḥadīth* and was trustworthy.⁴

The later *Sunnīs* and, if the reports are to be believed, those contemporaneous with him, specifically and almost exclusively depict al-Šādiq in the role of a relater of traditions and jurisconsult. In their view, al-Šādiq was primarily a transmitter of *Ḥadīth*. This was clearly his main significance and may be seen both in terms of the convention within which al-Šādiq is treated in the *Sunnī* sources, and the specific items of information contained within the convention.

Early *Tā'rikh* was not generally interested in theological or religious issues except insofar as these could be seen to have a relevance to or association with the political authorities. For this reason, the '*ulamā*' receive only scant attention in the historical sources. In other genres of *Sunnī* writing, the *Sunnī* attitude to al-Šādiq is more clearly manifested. In those "historical" works which were intended primarily to complement *Ḥadīth* studies, such as the *Dhayl* appended to al-Ṭabarī's *Tā'rikh al-Rusul wa'l-Mulūk* and al-Dhahabī's *Tā'rikh al-Islām*, occur a number of notices which typify this attitude. Although the identification of al-Šādiq as *muḥaddith* and legal opinion is occasionally explicitly stated, more usually this is indicated by the notices concerning him being of the same type as those conventional reports of the other '*ulamā*' located mainly within the two genres of *Manāqib* and *Ṭabaqāt*.

One type of notice is due to the interest displayed in the meetings and interrelationships of the '*ulamā*'. Thus, al-Šādiq is mentioned to have been associated with Mālik b. Anas when the latter sends his servant to ask about some legal issues;⁵ with Abū Ḥanīfa when he asks al-Šādiq on certain points of law at the instigation of the Abbasid caliph al-Manṣūr;⁶ and with Sufyān al-Thawrī when he questions al-Šādiq about divorce and usury.⁷

It is worth mentioning at this point that the *Shī'ī* sources are similarly replete with traditions which illustrate al-Šādiq's relationships with the early *Sunnī* '*ulamā*'. Ibn Shahrāshūb records that al-Šādiq asked several legal

questions of Ibn Abī Layla through a messenger,⁸ that he questioned Abū Ḥanīfa regarding a verse of the Qur'ān,⁹ and so on. The same source also states that Mālik b. Anas said of al-Ṣādiq:

I have never seen anyone better, wiser and more pious than Ja'far b. Muḥammad ... he was one of the greatest and most ascetic people of the country ... He had many Ḥadīth, was good company and had many useful lessons.¹⁰

Returning to the *Sunnī* sources, occasionally an individual scholar is praised as being beyond compare, as when someone states that he has never seen anyone better than Abū Ḥanīfa.¹¹ In a like manner, Abū Ḥanīfa is quoted as saying that he had

never seen anyone more knowledgeable in fiqh than al-Ṣādiq.¹²

Similarly, *Manāqib* and *Ṭabaqāt* characteristically supply the names of those who related from the main authorities, or those from whom the main authorities related. Ibn Kathīr mentions some of those from whom Abū Ḥanīfa received traditions;¹³ while al-Dhahabī mentions the sources of al-Awzā'ī.¹⁴ In conformity with this convention it is related that al-Ṣādiq quoted al-Zuhri, among others, and that al-Ṣādiq was an authority for both Mālik and Abū Ḥanīfa.¹⁵

The role of al-Ṣādiq as *muhaddith* is moreover conclusively attested by the appearance of *Ḥadīth* on his authority in the *Muwatta'* of Mālik b. Anas (713–95 AD). Mālik was his contemporary and fellow-townsmen and it is implausible that the traditions Mālik quoted from al-Ṣādiq did not actually issue from him. Al-Ṣādiq similarly appears in almost all of the canonical collections of the *Sunnīs*, these being those of Muslim (d. 875 AD), Ibn Māja (d. 886 AD), Abū Dāwūd (d. 888 AD), al-Tirmidhī (d. 892 AD) and al-Nasā'ī (d. 916 AD). The most authoritative collection, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī (d. 870 AD), however, is exceptional in that it contains none.

In all the reports it is evident that the *Sunnīs* typically relate al-Ṣādiq to the 'ulamā' in general, indicating that these were viewed as a somewhat homogeneous group in terms of their activities, and not distinguished along doctrinal lines. This may be seen in such questions as 'Who is better, Mujālid b. Sa'īd or al-Ṣādiq?'¹⁶ Mujālid was a Kufan traditionist who died 751/2 AD. He is not considered as a *Shī'ī muhaddith* so al-Ṣādiq is being compared simply in terms of being a relater of traditions and a source of legal norms without any sectarian dimensions. In general, the *Sunnī* sources place no emphasis on his asserted religious role and there is little mention of an association with the *Shī'a*.

To a certain extent, then, al-Ṣādiq appears in the *Sunnī* sources as little different from the other 'ulamā'/Imāms who devoted themselves to

discussion of Islamic norms and who likewise attracted a circle of disciples around them to hear and record their conclusions. Al-Shaykh al-Mufid relates in his *Irshād* that al-Šādiq was in the Masjid al-Haram in Mecca during the pilgrimage, giving legal decisions, answering questions and elucidating the Qur'ān.¹⁷

It is in this role as leading representative of a "school" that al-Šādiq should be partially viewed. It was during the early Abbasid period that various circles concerned with legal issues began to acknowledge an individual master whose doctrines they espoused. Thus, in Kufa there were those who followed Abū Ḥanīfa, while some followed Abū Yūsuf. In Medina there were the followers of Mālik b. Anas, while in Syria the predominant school became that of al-Awzā'ī. In much the same manner, the Shī'a in Kufa referred to al-Šādiq as their master.

Al-Kashshī, among others, records a number of accounts which testify to al-Šādiq's Kufan association and the desire there to acquire traditions on his authority. For instance, it is stated that a group of Kufans were with al-Šādiq,¹⁸ that the Kufans Mufaddal b. 'Umar and Khālīd b. Jawwāz visited him in Medina,¹⁹ that there were 900 men in the mosque of Kufa all relating on al-Šādiq,²⁰ and so on.²¹ Elsewhere it is alleged that al-Šādiq himself visited Kufa and that while he was there the 'ulamā' and good people of the town followed him.²² It is also said that he visited al-Hīra and had many followers there,²³ and even that he lived in Iraq for a while.²⁴ Furthermore, over 80% of the more than 3000 individuals mentioned by al-Ṭūsī in his list of those who related on al-Šādiq are specifically identified by the *nisba* "al-Kūfī", but the list probably includes many more. Even allowing for a good deal of exaggeration in the *Shī'ī* sources, there can be little doubt that al-Šādiq's *Ḥadīth* and opinions were much sought after by those *Shī'a* concerned with acquiring a distinctive legal code and body of dogma.

During the latter years of the Umayyad dynasty legal specialists began to adopt the expedient of imbuing their legal formulae with the authority of venerable scholars from the past. This retrospective attribution was then extended to the Companions of the Prophet, and the process, eventually reached its logical conclusion with only those traditions related directly from the Prophet being considered as acceptable. But the case was different for the *Shī'a*. At the time the traditions were acquiring what was to become a *Sunnī* validation by attributing them to notable authorities, the *Shī'a*, subject to the same impulse, were also seeking their own authorities. Although the same basic conclusions were sanctioned by both parties, the traditions within the *Shī'ī* context could not have the same *isnāds* as those of the *Sunnīs*. The Prophet was of course appealed to, but the Companions of the Prophet who formed the intervening link in the *Sunnī* chains of transmission were held by the *Shī'a* to have usurped 'Alī's right to the caliphate, and were therefore sinners and unreliable. They were castigated

because they had supported the first three caliphs, either explicitly, or implicitly in that they allowed their election instead of ʿAlī. Much of the material available on the doctrines of early *Shīʿī* groups mentions their *sabb* (castigation) of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. The rejection of the Companions as relaters of *Ḥadīth* was therefore something of a logical necessity in that if the *Shīʿa* conceded that they had the authority to transmit *Ḥadīth* and were therefore the Prophet's spiritual successors, they would find it untenable to maintain that the Companions acted incorrectly in usurping ʿAlī's right to the caliphate.

The inevitable expedient was that the *Shīʿa* would find a *Ṭālibī* to whom to ascribe their conclusions. Furthermore, the pre-eminent place which the Imāmate assumed within *Shīʿī* doctrine at the time, even being elevated to divine status on the part of some, militated against the necessity of attributing the traditions adopted by the *Shīʿa* to any source other than the Imām for validation.

One inevitable result of the absence of an *isnād* acceptable to the *Sunnīs* is the relative infrequency with which al-Ṣādiq appears within their collections of *Ḥadīth*. The six canonical works record a total of only some eighty or ninety separate traditions from him. This is despite the fact, as seen above, that the *Sunnī* commentators generally judge him to be a trustworthy relater. Similarly in contrast with the *Shīʿī* collections, there are only twenty-four transmitters of al-Ṣādiq's *Ḥadīth* in the *Sunnī* canonical collections as compared with the more than 3000 relaters on his authority listed in al-Ṭūsī's *Rijāl*. In the *Sunnī* corpus, al-Ṣādiq almost invariably relates on the authority of his father Muḥammad al-Bāqir, and all of the traditions are on the ultimate authority of the Prophet.

In the light of the relatively small number of *Sunnī* traditions which feature al-Ṣādiq as relater, it would certainly appear that he was not a great repository of Prophetic *Ḥadīth*. Had this been the case his name would surely appear more regularly among the many tens of thousands of traditions within the *Sunnī* collections. It is singularly instructive to include the *Muwattaʿaʾ* of Mālik b. Anas in the present discussion, as Mālik was a contemporary of al-Ṣādiq and furthermore was a fellow Medinan. He was therefore in an excellent position to meet with al-Ṣādiq and to receive directly from him any *Ḥadīth* that were in his possession. Moreover, with Mālik is seen the beginning of the literary period of Medinan legal studies and he thus left a more or less trustworthy record of current traditions. In fact, however, the *Muwattaʿaʾ* contains only ten *Ḥadīth* on the authority of al-Ṣādiq.

Of course, it is plausible that later *Sunnī* compilers omitted many of al-Ṣādiq's traditions from their corpus because of serious reservations regarding their authenticity. However, it certainly cannot be maintained that the import of al-Ṣādiq's traditions was unacceptable to the later *Sunnīs*, as the majority of them as found within *Shīʿī* sources contain nothing of a specifically *Shīʿī* nature.

There are doubtless a number of factors which together gave rise to the outstanding position which al-Šādiq achieved among all the other *Tālibīs* within *Shī'ism* at this time. Among these was perhaps the usurpation of the line of Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya by the Abbasids. Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya had been the main focus of attention for the early *Shī'a*, but the Abbasids claimed that his son Abū Hāshim had bequeathed his right to the Imāmate to their predecessor Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-'Abbās, a great-grandson of the Prophet's uncle. On the other hand, the Ḥasanid line was decimated by al-Manṣūr during the abortive revolt of Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh in Medina, Muḥammad himself being killed and leaving no male offspring. Meanwhile, the supporters of Zayd b. 'Alī continued to follow their own Imāms.

From the present perspective, however, it may be said that the single most crucial factor was that upon the accession of the Abbasids al-Šādiq was the only member of the *Tālibī* family to interest himself in the elaboration of law and doctrine. Furthermore, al-Šādiq's father Muḥammad al-Bāqir also appears to have had a legal presence. During al-Bāqir's time legal studies were starting to become prominent in Islam, the latter years of his life witnessing the nascent formation of the early schools of law. He was 38 years old when the Medinan Sa'id b. Musayyib died and was a younger contemporary of al-Zuhrī. Al-Kashshī acknowledges al-Bāqir's interest in legal studies when he relates:

Before Abū Ja'far [al-Bāqir] the *Shī'a* did not know what they needed to about the permitted and the forbidden except what they learned from the people. But Abū Ja'far opened [this knowledge] up for them, explained it to them and taught them.²⁵

This tradition may also be taken as an explicit recognition of the fact that until quite a late stage the *Shī'ī* and *Sunnī* legal systems were identical, the "people" mentioned here referring to the Muslim community at large. It is also worth noting that in *Sunnī* traditions al-Šādiq invariably relates from his father, and the books on *Sunnī rijāl* mention al-Bāqir and his connections with *Sunnī* traditionalists. It is stated, for example, that Abū Ḥanīfa and al-Awzā'ī related from him²⁶ as well as there being a large number of traditions which show al-Bāqir with the early *Sunnī 'ulamā'*.²⁷ The prestige which al-Bāqir acquired in this role was inherited by his son al-Šādiq, who also naturally became the transmitter of those traditions in the possession of his father.

Without these considerations, it is unlikely that those engaged in the validation of *Shī'ī* doctrine and law would have looked to al-Šādiq as the authority for their conclusions. Although there was considerable support from certain *Shī'ī* elements for 'Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥasan and his son Muḥammad, nevertheless, very few traditions were attributed to them and there is no evidence of their having particularly concerned themselves with

legal enquiry. As far as the *Shī'ī* interest in *Ḥadīth* was concerned an authority had to be found and al-Ṣādiq was considered to be the most appropriate candidate.

Fabrications

It is related that a certain Yaḥyā b. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥimmānī wrote:

I told Sharīk that some groups of people are claiming that Ja'far b. Muḥammad was weak (*da'īf*) in *Ḥadīth*, so I told him the following story: Ja'far b. Muḥammad was a virtuous man, a Muslim and pious, but a number of ignorant people surrounded him, visited him and departed saying 'Ja'far b. Muḥammad related it to us.' They related traditions all of which were objectionable and lies and ascribed them to Ja'far, asking the people for food in exchange and taking money from them.²⁸

Up to a point then, al-Ṣādiq played a similar role for the *Shī'a* in Kufa as did the early *Sunnī* 'ulamā' for their followers. One important difference was that whereas the other scholars had their circles of disciples in their locales, al-Ṣādiq's main following was not. The school of Mālīk b. Anas was in Medina, and those of Abū Ḥanīfa, Sufyān al-Thawrī and Abū Yūsuf were in Kufa, places where they lived. The norms propagated within a certain region owed much to the deliberations of the legal scholars, acting upon the raw materials available to them. These scholars affected to some extent the people in whose midst they operated and exerted an influence due to the validating *Ḥadīth* they espoused. But this can hardly have been the case with al-Ṣādiq. He can only rarely have come into direct contact with the Kufans who championed him, and his *Ḥadīth* and opinions were open to a good deal of interference between source and intended objective.

In this, there are parallels between other *Tālibīs* who, living always in Medina and far from their main support in Kufa, were used by various activists as figureheads and justification for their actions. One prime example is Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya who formed the centre-piece of al-Mukhtār's machinations.²⁹ As always in early *Shī'ī* history, the fact that the *Tālibī* leader was rarely in the centre of activity was no impediment. Indeed, the absence of the *Tālibī* in question was a distinct advantage in that his name could be invoked without much fear of his direct intervention. The significant departure in al-Ṣādiq's case was that now this activity was largely taking place on the level of legal and doctrinal elaboration.

The absence of regular and direct contact between al-Ṣādiq and the Kufan *Shī'a* greatly facilitated the process of spuriously ascribing traditions to al-Ṣādiq without him being able to do much to counter it. But as before in the early history of *Shī'ism*, al-Ṣādiq's relative impotence ensued not only

from his isolation in Medina but also from the expediency exhibited by some of his principal associates in Kufa with regard to his formally indisputable authority.

Of significance in the discussions taking place in Kufa during al-Šādiq's lifetime, and in contradistinction to established *Shī'ī* dogma, it is evident that although the Imām was indispensable as the formal validating authority for doctrinal and legal statements, views on the Imāmate had nevertheless achieved no consensus and there were a number of differing opinions as to its definition. These varied between those who considered the Imām to have simply a deeper understanding of the law, to the conception of him as the incarnation of the divine spirit and aware of the *ghayb* in all its various manifestations. The lack of a universally held belief in the indisputable authority of the Imām inevitably led to several of al-Šādiq's associates offering their own opinions despite their variance with his. It is also illustrated by accounts of several companions of the Imāms questioning their positions on certain legal issues. There are many such reports concerning Zurāra b. A'yan who, as will be seen subsequently, appears as an agent of al-Šādiq in Kufa. It is due to his influential role that Zurāra is singled out in this way, but there were probably many more of lesser importance who shared this view. In one account, Zurāra reportedly asked Muḥammad al-Bāqir where he got his information from regarding an aspect of ritual ablutions.³⁰ In other places he accused al-Šādiq of lacking understanding³¹ and elsewhere remarked that he thought that al-Šādiq was more knowledgeable than he actually was.³² On another occasion, the Kufan Ziyād b. Abī Hilāl visited al-Šādiq and asked him to confirm what he had heard Zurāra saying regarding *istita'a* (human capacity to perform an act). When al-Šādiq refused to confirm it, and Ziyād returned to Kufa and informed Zurāra that his opinion was different from that of al-Šādiq, Zurāra replied that al-Šādiq had indeed told him this.³³ The implication is that Zurāra was refusing to make his opinion conform to that of al-Šādiq while nonetheless maintaining that it issued from him.

Zurāra is also implicated in another account. Al-Ḥakam b. 'Uṭayba reportedly said that al-Bāqir related a *Ḥadīth* stating that the *maghrib* prayer was to be performed before reaching al-Muzdalifa during the pilgrimage. Al-Šādiq, however, told Zurāra that al-Bāqir never said this and that al-Ḥakam falsely attributed it to him. Zurāra was not convinced, and departed saying to himself 'I don't think that al-Ḥakam lied about his [al-Šādiq's] father.'³⁴ Thus, despite al-Šādiq's protestations to the contrary, al-Bāqir would still be cited as the authority for al-Ḥakam's *Ḥadīth*. Incidentally, the later accepted doctrine is that during the pilgrimage the *maghrib* prayer is to be held actually in al-Muzdalifa.

According to *Shī'ī* sources it was only after the occultation of the last Imām that *Shī'ī* scholars were formally accorded the prerogative of participating in the elaboration of *Shī'ī* thought. This took the form of a

consensus of opinion between the *Shīʿī mujtahidūn* which was accorded normative status. Al-Sharīf al-Murtadā (d. 1040 AD) uses this principle to validate doctrines in his *Kitāb al-Intiṣār*. Prior to this, during the presence of the Imāms, it was maintained that the Imāms possessed the ultimate authority and that while they were alive there was no need to resort to any other source for guidance. This was, however, only theoretical and did not conform to actuality.

It is evident that during al-Ṣādiq's lifetime leading *Shīʿī* thinkers resorted to personal opinion in the elaboration of law and doctrine. Al-Kashshī has preserved a couple of traditions which indicate that Zurāra b. Aʿyan, a most notable follower and agent of al-Ṣādiq and thus specifically authorised to transmit traditions on his authority, resorted to his own personal opinion (*raʾy*) in the definition of law. Ibn Miskān said:

We talked together in Zurāra's presence concerning the permitted and the forbidden, and he said something according to his own opinion (*bi raʾyihi*). I asked him: 'Is that your own opinion or a tradition (*riwāya*)?' He replied: 'Isn't someone possessing their own opinion better than a tradition (*athar*)?'³⁵

In another report, Hishām b. Sālim asked Zurāra to confirm a tradition he had related to him previously. Zurāra allegedly replied: 'By God, I wouldn't have said that except by my own opinion (*mā kuntu qultu hādhā illā bi raʾyī*).'³⁶

Several of those who purported to follow al-Ṣādiq therefore advanced opinions contrary to what al-Ṣādiq is alleged to have upheld, and presumably had groups of disciples who subscribed to their line of thinking. Jamīl b. Darrāj is quoted as saying of Zurāra: 'We used to visit him frequently and would sit around him like boys around a teacher in the Qurʾān school.'³⁷

Along with Zurāra, others who are specifically identified among those who contradicted al-Ṣādiq include Muḥammad b. Muslim, Burayd b. Muḥammad al-ʿIjlī and Ismāʿīl b. Jābir al-Juʿfī. Their relative independence from al-Ṣādiq may be seen in his pejorative description of them as *mutarayyisūn fī adyānihim*, that is, those who advance themselves as leaders in matters of religion.³⁸ Al-Kashshī provides other indications of some of the matters about which disagreement arose. Muḥammad b. Muslim was cursed by al-Ṣādiq due to his belief that God does not know things before they come into being³⁹ and Burayd b. Muḥammad was cursed because he shared the same opinion as Zurāra on *istiṭāʿa*.⁴⁰ Given the overwhelming persuasiveness of the *Hadīth* form, and its almost universal acceptance as a vehicle for articulating belief, it is understandable that many of the doctrinal conclusions reached independently of al-Ṣādiq should also find expression and hence retention as *Hadīth*.

Thus, one of the most notable aspects of the writings concerning the *Ḥadīth* and opinions of al-Šādiq is the many examples of and precautions against false attributions. When Fayḍ b. Mukhtār visited al-Šādiq and asked him about the disagreement in *Ḥadīth* that the Kufans were transmitting, al-Šādiq replied:

Yes indeed Fayḍ, it is as you describe. The people are fond of lying in our names (ūli'ū bi'l-kidhb 'alaynā) . . . I relate a tradition to one of them and no sooner does he leave me than he interprets it wrongly.⁴¹

Al-Ḥarrānī (d. 1020 AD) states in his *Tuḥaf al-'Uqūl* that al-Šādiq said:

The devil still comes among us, the Ahl al-Bayt, and he is not from us nor from those who share our religion. If he is raised and the people look upon him, he orders them to lie about us. Whenever one such liar goes another comes.⁴²

However, any restraint he could impose on those transmitting their own opinions in his name was at best minimal; the most he could do was to castigate those with whom he was in disagreement. He is quoted as saying:

There is a group which claims that I am their Imām. No by God, I am not their Imām. What's wrong with them? . . . I say one thing and they say I mean another. I am the Imām of he who obeys me.⁴³

The process of false attribution even affected a number of al-Šādiq's closest associates. As the centre of interest in al-Šādiq was in Kufa, and as he remained all his life in his birthplace Medina, it was perhaps largely through the medium of deputised agents that he was to disseminate his *Ḥadīth* and religio-legal opinions. If the reports can be considered authentic, one of these was the aforementioned Zurāra b. A'yan, apparently one of al-Šādiq's most illustrious Kufan representatives. When Fayḍ b. al-Mukhtār complained to al-Šādiq *Ḥadīth* were being falsely transmitted in his name in Kufa, al-Šādiq allegedly replied:

'If you want our *Ḥadīth* then make use of the man sitting there,' and he pointed to one of our companions. So I asked my companions about him and they said he was Zurāra b. A'yan.⁴⁴

However, as noted above, Zurāra was implicated in relating information on al-Šādiq's authority which was contrary to al-Šādiq's opinion. As will be seen subsequently, Zurāra was also cursed by al-Šādiq for creating "innovations in Islam".

It would seem that al-Mufaḍḍal b. 'Umar was similarly an agent of al-Šādiq. Al-Šādiq's followers in Kufa are said to have approached him and asked for someone they could resort to for guidance in their religion. He replied: 'I have put Mufaḍḍal over you. Listen to him and receive from him. He only tells the truth concerning God and me.'⁴⁵ Al-Mufaḍḍal was, however, later to be accused of *ghuluww* by allying himself to the notorious *ghālī* Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb who was also initially an agent of al-Šādiq.

Indeed, Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb presents us with a prime example of the way that an agent of al-Šādiq would appropriate al-Šādiq's name in the propagation of his own traditions. Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb is described by al-Qāḍī Nu'mān as 'one of [al-Šādiq's] greatest propagandists [*min aḡall du'atihī*]',⁴⁶ and there are other traditions which indicate Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb's role as one of al-Šādiq's plenipotentiaries.⁴⁷ Subsequently, however, al-Šādiq is reported to have said of him: 'Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb was stupid. I used to relate *Ḥadīth* to him but he didn't remember them and used to add his own things',⁴⁸ and referring to Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb and his followers: 'What's wrong with them?... I say one thing and they say I mean another'.⁴⁹ Elsewhere, someone remarks

I told Abī'Abd Allāh [al-Šādiq] that Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb had related such and such on his authority. 'Lies', he said. So item by item I started to tell him what he had related ... 'All lies', he said.⁵⁰

Finally, mention might also be made of Abū Baṣīr, who was considered as yet another deputy. Al-Kashshī reports an incident in which a certain Shu'ayb b. 'Aqarqūfī approached al-Šādiq and enquired: 'Perhaps we will need to ask about something, so whom shall we ask?' Al-Šādiq replied: 'Take the Asadī, that is, Abū Baṣīr.'⁵¹ Abū Baṣīr was subsequently to be accused of confusing *Ḥadīth*.

Given al-Šādiq's role as a transmitter of traditions and source of legal opinion, a certain amount of credibility may be accorded to some of his reported castigations. This is particularly the case when it concerned people whose extravagant opinions and activities could compromise his relations with the ruling authorities, such as those identified as *ghulat* like Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb. It would certainly appear as if the spurious citation of al-Šādiq as an authority was widespread among the *Shī'a* in Kufa, this reaching epidemic proportions. Just as with the early *Sunnīs* the demand for *Ḥadīth* produced the supply. It is stated that such as Abān b. Taghlib related 30,000 traditions from al-Šādiq⁵² and that Muḥammad b. Muslim received 16,000 *Ḥadīth* from him, when he visited him in Medina.⁵³ There are many such reports which could be cited. The majority of the authors of the 400 Imāmi *uṣūl*, the earliest examples of collections of *Shī'ī Ḥadīth*, are said to have been disciples of al-Šādiq. Elsewhere, this number is increased to

4,000 men⁵⁴ and al-Tunākābunī in his *Qīṣaṣ al-Ulamā* attributes an *aṣl* to each of these relaters, thus maintaining that there were 4,000 *uṣūl*.⁵⁵

The tenacious hold which such false attributions could have over those eager for al-Šādiq's *Ḥadīth* is amply illustrated in a long tradition recorded by al-Kashshī. In this, a group of *Ḥadīth* collectors from Basra visit al-Šādiq in order to hear his traditions. They are, however, unaware of his identity. In the course of the meeting the Basrans repeat some traditions ostensibly on his authority, all of them false. Al-Šādiq asks them whether they would be prepared to doubt these traditions if their purported authority were to say that they were spurious. They reply that they would not.⁵⁶

In general, the sources present a picture of a man intimately implicated in a process over which he could exercise little control. Although al-Šādiq has achieved exceptional renown for his alleged contribution to the development of *Shī'ī* thought, the other side of the coin is, as al-Kashshī remarks, that al-Šādiq was by some considered weak (*ḍa'īf*) in traditions,⁵⁷ a judgement which perhaps explains the total absence of Ja'farī *Ḥadīth* in the *Saḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, even though al-Bukhārī considers him personally to be trustworthy.

Differences within Shī'ī opinion

The false attribution of traditions to al-Šādiq was an ongoing process and did by no means cease with his death. Al-Nawbakhtī relates that the Nawūsiyya⁵⁸ have a corroborating *Ḥadīth* from al-Šādiq⁵⁹ and al-Najāshī remarks that the *ghulat* groups cite him as justification.⁶⁰ Elsewhere, al-Isfarā'īnī (d. 1078 AD) relates a story which illustrates this from the *Sunnī* point of view, whether the account is true or not:

It is said that when the Rawāfiḍ saw al-Jāhiz composing many books and writing for every group, they said to him: 'Write a book for us.' He replied: 'I don't think that there is any vagueness [in your position] for me to put in order and deal with.' So they said: 'Then direct us to something we can adhere to.' He said: 'I don't think you have any method except when you want to profess something you allege that it is what Ja'far al-Šādiq said. I can't see that you have anything else to base yourselves on apart from this.' But they persisted in their ignorance and stupidity in this disgraceful act which [al-Jāhiz] pointed out to them, and every time they wanted to invent an innovation and fabricate a lie they attributed it to al-Šādiq.⁶¹

Similarly, al-Shahrastānī remarks that

After al-Šādiq the Shī'a split up into groups, each wanting to spread their doctrines among their followers, so they ascribed them to al-Šādiq and connected them with him.⁶²

The ubiquitous citing of al-Ṣādiq as validating authority is witnessed in the collections of *Shī'ī Ḥadīth*. In these cases it is evident that the contradictory nature of the traditions has escaped rationalisation. One particular example of this will perhaps serve as illustration, and concerns the Imām's awareness of the *ghayb*, or supernatural knowledge. The *Kāfīfī 'Ilm al-Dīn* of al-Kulaynī contains a number of traditions dealing with this subject which bear witness to the conflicts within *Shī'ī* opinion and the resort to al-Ṣādiq as corroborating authority. In one report, an angry al-Ṣādiq says:

How astonishing! There are groups of people who claim that we know the *ghayb*. No one knows the *ghayb* apart from God. I wanted to beat a female servant of mine, but she ran away from me and I had no knowledge of which house she was in.⁶³

In another place, however, while it is never explicitly stated that the Imām has knowledge of the *ghayb*, it is nevertheless obvious that this is being attributed to him. Al-Ṣādiq is alleged to have claimed: 'I know what is in the sky and what on the earth. I know what is in Heaven and what in Hell. I know what was and what will be.'⁶⁴

It is not the intention to become involved in a discussion regarding specific aspects of *Shī'ī* dogma. The significant point is that al-Ṣādiq was appropriated to sanction various opinions. The mere fact that so many people, *ghulat* and others, were able to smuggle their false *Ḥadīth* into *Shī'ī* collections indicates that the early *Shī'a* were both unsure about their doctrine and receptive to a plurality of notions regarding their faith. In the time of the eighth Imāmī Imām 'Alī al-Riḍā (d.818 AD), for example, Yūnus b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān went to Kufa and found many followers of al-Ṣādiq there. He acquired their collections of *Ḥadīth* and showed these to al-Ri-Riḍā. Al-Riḍā denied the veracity of many of the *Ḥadīth* they contained and remarked that the followers of Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb were still smuggling traditions into them up to the present time.⁶⁵ The *Ḥadīth* in these collections must have been potentially acceptable to the *Shī'a* of Kufa otherwise they would not have been incorporated.

Although disagreements on doctrinal and legal issues had begun during the time of al-Ṣādiq, the process of consolidation and hence denunciation of those who related traditions contrary to the currently held positions did not cease there. Some of the traditions which had earlier gained a certain degree of acceptance would later inevitably be abrogated or adapted to suit the differing needs and circumstances of the evolving *Shī'ī* sect. An example of this concerns Yūnus b. Zibyān. Al-Ṣādiq is reported to have said of him: 'God have mercy on him and build a house for him in Paradise. He was reliable in *Ḥadīth*.'⁶⁶ This same man is later cursed by 'Alī al-Riḍā and is accused of being a *ghālī*.⁶⁷

There is also the notice on Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Shamūn, stating that he was cursed by al-Šādiq's son Mūsā al-Kāzim. However, he is also said to have been supported by al-Bāqir and to have related on al-Šādiq, indicating that he was once an associate of those Imāms.⁶⁸

Notwithstanding the fact that al-Šādiq and subsequent Imāms may indeed have expressed disapproval of certain relaters, it is probable that the denunciations and praises of the Imāms, and al-Šādiq in particular, is testimony to the doctrinal disputes within the early *Shī'a*. In this, the Imāms were used as mouthpieces for competing opinions. This procedure was analogous to that adopted by the *Summīs* in their struggle against the fabrication of traditions which they found unacceptable: they invented other traditions which made the Prophet condemn the creation of false *Hadīth*.

Thus, al-Šādiq is not only seen forcibly to assert his opinions regarding his own associates, but he also either praises or castigates those who transmitted traditions on the authority of his father al-Bāqir. Al-Bāqir himself, however, rarely does this. For example, al-Šādiq cursed Mughīra b. Sa'īd: 'May God curse Mughīra b. Sa'īd. He used to attribute lies to my father (*kāna yakdhibu 'alā abī*). May God make him taste the heat of iron,'⁶⁹ and al-Ḥakam b. 'Utayba who attributed lies to my father.'⁷⁰

Elsewhere, Ḥannān b. Sudayr wrote down a tradition which he heard from a man in Mecca purportedly on the authority of Muḥammad al-Bāqir and concerning something that the Prophet said. A few days later he repeated the tradition to al-Šādiq who denied that it came from his father.⁷¹

On the other hand, al-Šādiq is often asserted to have praised certain relaters of his father's *Hadīth*, such as Zurāra b. A'yan: 'Were it not for Zurāra, I think my father's *Hadīth* would have disappeared.'⁷²

Regarding the relaters of his own traditions, al-Šādiq highly praised Dāwūd b. Kathīr al-Raqqī 'Put Dāwūd in the same relationship with me as that of Miqdād with the Prophet.'⁷³ Miqdād b. Aswad was one of the most favoured Companions of Muḥammad. Al-Šādiq also said of Dāwūd: 'Whoever likes to look upon one of the companions of the Imām (*al-Qā'im*), let him look at this man [Dāwūd al-Raqqī].'⁷⁴ In another place, however, there are insinuations that the same Dāwūd al-Raīwas one of the leaders of the *ghulat*.⁷⁵ It is conceivable of course that Dāwūd was formerly a trusted companion of al-Šādiq and only subsequently became implicated in *ghuluww* (or visa-versa). However, this surely cannot account for all the other instances of such contradictory testimony.

It is quite common to find al-Šādiq's name used to castigate a relater, only to have him praising him in another place. It goes without saying that when there are two contradictory traditions reporting al-Šādiq's words at least one of them is most probably false. Among other cases in point are the following. Al-Kashshī preserves a tradition in which

Zurāra b. A'yan asked al-Ṣādiq about the *Ḥadīth* of Jābir b. Yazīd al-Ju'fī. Al-Ṣādiq replied: 'I have only seen him with my father once, and he's never come to me.'⁷⁶ Then in another tradition concerning Jābir, Ziyād b. Abī'l-Halāl remarked:

Our companions differed concerning the *Ḥadīth* of Jābir al-Ju'fī, so I told them that I would ask Abū 'Abd Allāh. When I went in to see him he pre-empted me, saying: 'May God have mercy on Jābir al-Ju'fī. He used to tell the truth concerning us.'⁷⁷

Jābir al-Ju'fī is reckoned by the *Shī'a* to have related traditions on the authority of al-Ṣādiq and to have composed a number of books.⁷⁸ The inconsistency in the above two reports may be explained in that Jābir really did have little to do with al-Ṣādiq and his father, but a current of *Shī'ī* opinion has countenanced the import of his traditions and has invoked al-Ṣādiq's name to validate them.

Elsewhere, al-Ṣādiq allegedly said:

There are four people most beloved to me alive and dead. These are Burayd b. Mu'āwiya al-'Ijlī, Zurāra, Muḥammad b. Muslim and [Muḥammad b. Nu'mān] al-Aḥwal. These are the most beloved to me alive and dead.⁷⁹

and

No one has kept our memory and my father's *Ḥadīth* alive apart from Zurāra, Abū Baṣīr Layth al-Marādī, Muḥammad b. Muslim and Burayd b. Mu'āwiya al-'Ijlī. If wasn't for them no one would have discovered this. They are the guardians of religion and the guarantors for my father of what God allows and disallows. They go before us in this life and in the next.⁸⁰

Conversely, he is also reported as saying: 'May God curse Burayd and may God curse Zurāra,'⁸¹ and 'No one has created such innovations in Islam as Zurāra. The curse of God be upon him. This is what Abū 'Abd Allāh says,'⁸² and 'May God curse Muḥammad b. Muslim. He used to say that God doesn't know a thing until it has occurred.'⁸³

Likewise, although there are a number of instances where al-Ṣādiq praises Abū Baṣīr, elsewhere it is also related that although he was not a *ghālī*, he used to confuse *Ḥadīth*.⁸⁴

In another place, al-Ṣādiq refers explicitly to Sālim b. Abī Ḥafṣa and Abū'l-Jārūd: 'They are liars. They would come to me and say that they were reporting me accurately. But this wasn't the case: they listened to my *Ḥadīth* and falsified it.'⁸⁵ But in al-Najāshi's *Rijāl* the Kufan Sālim b. Abī

Hafṣa (d.137/754) is considered to be *thiqa*,⁸⁶ while in the same source there is no mention of Abū'l-Jārūd being in any way suspect.⁸⁷

Another associate of al-Šādiq, Yūnus b. Zibyan, receives similar treatment. It is stated that Yūnus was accused of *ghulūḥ*,⁸⁸ and elsewhere that when one of the daughters of the *ghālī* Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb died the same Yūnus stood by her grave and said: 'Peace be upon you daughter of the prophet.'⁸⁹ Another account, however, has al-Šādiq saying of him: 'May God have mercy on him and build a house for him in Paradise. By God he was reliable (*ma'mūn*) in *Ḥadīth*.'⁹⁰

Al-Kashshī quite rightly judges that this latter *Ḥadīth* is false because of its incompatibility with the previous reports. But it does illustrate quite clearly that al-Šādiq's authority was invoked to pass judgement on certain relaters.

The discussion regarding the spurious ascription's to which al-Šādiq was subject inevitably raises serious doubts concerning the authenticity of the *Ḥadīth* attributed to him in the *Shī'ī* collections. Perhaps one further observation concerning this may be made here. Such reservations are not mitigated by an examination of the nature of al-Šādiq's traditions within the *Sunnī* corpus. One noticeable discrepancy between the *Shī'ī* and the *Sunnī* collections of *Ḥadīth* is that there is nothing in the *Sunnī* traditions of a strictly legal nature attributed to al-Šādiq, such as sales, debts, manumission, legacies, contracts and so on. Here, al-Šādiq's traditions concern affairs pertaining to Islamic ritual; half of them relate to the pilgrimage, followed by prayer and ablutions and a miscellany of others including general ethical pronouncements. Indeed, of the ten Ja'farī *Ḥadīth* in Mālik's *Muwatta'*, six concern the pilgrimage. This differs greatly from the nature of Ja'farī *Ḥadīth* in the *Shī'ī* compilations where there is a noticeable tendency towards the more strictly legal type of tradition. This may be typified with reference to Ibn Babawayh's *Man lā yaḥḍuruḥu al-Faqīh*. In this, al-Šādiq relates just over half the traditions concerning '*ibādāt*', such as regards the *ḥajj*, the '*umra*', ablutions and prayer, whereas he relates some 65% of the *Ḥadīth* relating to legal subjects, such as sales, the purchase of slaves, silent partnership, reclamation of lands, guarantees, *ḥudūd*, blood-money, judges, witnesses and so on.⁹¹ In a modern collection of al-Šādiq's *Ḥadīth* it is possible to see the large number of legal traditions attributed to him: over half of the six volumes of *Fiqh al-Imām Ja'far al-Šādiq*⁹² concern strictly legal issues: debts, mortgages, power of disposal and so on. This difference in subject matter is difficult to reconcile without acknowledging that many if not most of the legal traditions are spuriously ascribed and do not represent the general field of al-Šādiq's interests and expertise.

The traditions which constitute the external belief system of Imāmism were drawn from those espoused by a variety of conflicting parties within *Shī'ism*, none of which could justly claim that their traditions from al-Šādiq were any more authentic than the traditions of the opposing parties. On the

whole, therefore, there is no reason to consider the Ja'farī corpus enshrined within the Imāmī canonical collections as more veracious than the *Ḥadīth* which was rejected.

Nevertheless, the emergence of *Shī'ī Ḥadīth* had a momentous effect on the future course of pro-Tālibī sentiment and was clearly fundamental to the crystallisation of the various strands of *Shī'ism* into a sect. Had early *Shī'ī* adherents been unable to formulate and record a doctrinal position in contradistinction to the ruling dynasty and other interest groups, and to appropriate and record a code of norms teased on the authority of the Imāms, the likely result would have been fragmentation and eventual dissolution. With doctrine comes legitimation and the body of religio-legal norms and dogma, along with the theory of the Imāmate which is epitomised in the Imām's position as the prime repository of this, meant that the Imams could be followed for good and sufficient reasons and defended against opponents on this basis.

A most important corollary of the nascent unification of doctrine was that it not only ultimately enabled the *Shī'a* to define orthodoxy, but also to define heterodoxy and thus to stigmatise and to discipline those who went beyond the confines of the tolerable. In this way the integrity of the majority group of *Shī'a* was largely maintained.

In the last analysis, *Shī'ī Ḥadīth* enshrines and canonises an ideology to which people can subscribe, it reveals the *Shī'a* as existing and having existed in time, corroborates their social continuity, legitimates and provides a self-identity. It validates their conceptions of the past, which in turn validates the present. Al-Ṣādiq's *Ḥadīth* represents the legal and doctrinal position of the *Shī'a*, and in practice its historicity must ultimately be less important than the fact of its existence.

Notes

- 1 al-Shaykh al-Mufīd, *Kitāb al-Irshād*, trans. I K A Howard (London: The Muḥammadi Trust, 1981) p. 408. This ḥadīth is often quoted in the *Shī'ī* sources. See, for example, Muḥsin Amīn, *A'yān al-Shī'a* (Beirut: Wālī al-Ta'āruḥ li'l-Maṭbū'āt, 1980) 4:3.
- 2 al-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-Huffāz* (Hyderabad: Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Uthmāniyya, 1956) 1:166. See also Ibn Hajar, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* (Hyderabad: Maṭba'at Majlis Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif, 1325 AH) 1:103.
- 3 *Tahdhīb* 1:104.
- 4 al-Ṭabarī, *al-Muntakhab min Kitāb Dhayl al-Mudhayyal min Tā'rīkh al-Ṣaḥāba wa'l-Tābi'ūn* (Leiden: E J Brill, 1881) 3/4:2510.
- 5 *Dhayl* 3/4:2510.
- 6 al-Dhahabī, *Tā'rīkh al-Islām wa Ṭabaqāt al-Mashāhir wa'l 'Ālām* (n.p.: Maktabat al-Quds, n.d.) 6:45-6.
- 7 *Tā'rīkh al-Islām* 6:47.
- 8 Ibn Shahrāshūb, *Manāqib Āl Abī Tālib* (Najaf: Maṭba'at al-Haydariyya, 1956) p. 390.
- 9 *Manāqib* p. 390.

- 10 *Manāqib* p. 396.
- 11 *Tā'rikh al-Islām* 6:135. Concerning other *muhaddithūn*, see *Dhayl* 3/4:2503, 2514, 2515.
- 12 *Tadhkira* 1:116.
- 13 Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa'l-Nihāya* (Beirut: Maktabat al-Ma'ārif, 1966) 10:107.
- 14 *Tā'rikh al-Islām* 6:225.
- 15 *Tā'rikh al-Islām* 6:45.
- 16 *Dhayl* 3/4:2510.
- 17 *Irshād* p. 424.
- 18 al-Kashshī, *Akhhbār Ma'rifat al-Rijāl* (Mashhad: Danishgah-i Mashhad, 1970) p. 289.
- 19 *Ma'nfa* p. 326.
- 20 *Ma'rifa* p. 447. See also al-Najāshī, *Kitāb al-Rijāl* (Tehran: Muṣṭafawī Markaz Nashr Kitāb, n.d.) p. 31.
- 21 For further examples see *Ma'rifa* pp. 337, 344, 376.
- 22 *Manāqib* p. 376. al-Kashshī also remarks that al-Šādiq visited Kufa (*Ma'rifa* p. 288).
- 23 *Manāqib* p. 363. al-Kashshī similarly corroborates that al-Šādiq went to Hīra (*Ma'rifa* p. 311).
- 24 *Manāqib* p. 166.
- 25 *Ma'rifa* p. 425.
- 26 *Tā'rikh al-Islām* 6:135 and 225.
- 27 For example, al-Šaymarī records that al-Bāqir was in Medina with Abū Ḥanīfa, (*Akhhbār Abī Ḥanīfa wa Aṣḥābihi* [Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-'Arabī, 1974] p. 81).
- 28 *Ma'rifa* p. 324.
- 29 al-Mukhtār b. Abī 'Ubayd led a revolt in Kufa from 685 to 687 AD. In order to secure Shī'i backing he said that he was acting on behalf of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya. There is doubt whether Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya endorsed this, but certainly his attested endorsement served to attract further support for al-Mukhtār's revolt (see, for example, al-Ṭabarī, *Tā'rikh al-Rusul wa'l-Mulūk* [Leiden: E J Brill, 1881] 2/2:509; Ibn Khaldūn, *Tā'rikh Ibn Khaldūn* [Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-Lubnānī, 1956] 3:55).
- 30 al-Ṭusī, *al-Istibṣār fī mā ukhtulifa fīhi min al-Akhhbār* (Tehran: Dār al-Kutub al-Islāmiyya, 1390 AH) 1:62-3. Note also a certain 'Umar b. Riyāh who, upon receiving contradictory answers from Muḥammad al-Bāqir, is said to have denounced his Imāmate (al-Qummī, *al-Maqālāt wa'l-Firaq* [Tehran: al-Maṭba'a al-Haydariyya, 1963] p. 75).
- 31 *Ma'rifa* p. 147.
- 32 *Ma'rifa* p. 158.
- 33 *Ma'rifa* p. 147. Similarly, although at a somewhat later date, one of the most eminent followers of al-Šādiq, Abū Baṣīr Layth al-Bakhtarī, refused to accept the legal opinions of al-Šādiq's son Mūsā al-Kāzim because he thought that he had not yet acquired a sound knowledge of law (*Ma'rifa* p. 172).
- 34 *Ma'rifa* p. 165.
- 35 *Ma'rifa* p. 156.
- 36 *Ma'rifa* pp. 156-7.
- 37 *Ma'rifa* p. 154.
- 38 *Ma'rifa* pp. 169, 199 and 239.
- 39 *Ma'rifa* p. 169.
- 40 *Ma'rifa* pp. 148, 240.
- 41 *Ma'rifa* pp. 135-6.
- 42 al-Ḥarrānī, *Tuhaf al-'Uqūl 'an Āl al-Rasūl* (Najaf: Manshūrāt al-Maktaba al-Haydariyya, 1963) pp. 228-9.

- 43 *Ma'rifa* p. 301.
- 44 *Ma'rifa* p. 136.
- 45 *Ma'rifa* pp. 327–8. It was apparently shortly after this that Mufaddal was denounced along with his followers. See, for example, pp. 321, 323.
- 46 al-Qādī Nu'mān, *Da'ā'im al-Islām* (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1951) 1:49.
- 47 See, for example, *Ma'ifa* pp. 190, 191 and al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-Anwār* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Wafā', 1983) 47:246.
- 48 *Ma'rifa* p. 295. al-Ṣādiq is also alleged to have written to Abū'l-Khaṭṭāb reproaching him for propagating false doctrine (*Ma'rifa* p. 291).
- 49 *Ma'rifa* p. 301.
- 50 *Ma'rifa* p. 294.
- 51 *Ma'rifa* p. 171.
- 52 A'yān al-Shī'a 4:43.
- 53 *Ma'rifa* p. 167.
- 54 See E Kohlberg, "al-Uṣūl al-Arba'umī'a" in *Belief and Law in Imāmī Shī'ism* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1991) p. 130. This is taken from Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-'Uqda's (d. 944–5 AD) *Kitāb al-Rijāl wa huwa Kitāb man rāwā 'an Ja'far b. Muhammad* which is no longer extant but is quoted in al-'Allāma b. al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī's *Khulaṣat al-Aḥwāl*.
- 55 "al-Uṣūl" p. 131.
- 56 *Ma'rifa* pp. 393–7.
- 57 *Ma'rifa* pp. 208–9.
- 58 The Nawūsiyya were followers of a certain Nawūs from Basra. After al-Ṣādiq's death they believed that he had gone into occultation and would eventually return as the Mahdi. See Ibn Ḥazm, "The Heterodoxies of the Shiites in the Presentation of Ibn Ḥazm" *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 28 (1907) p. 44, and al-Nawbakhī, *Firaq al-Shī'a* (Istanbul: Staatsdruckerei, 1931) p. 57.
- 59 *Firaq al-Shī'a* p. 29.
- 60 *Rijāl* pp. 41–2.
- 61 al-Isfarā'īnī, *al-Tabṣīr fī'l-Dīn wa Tamyīz al-Firaq al-Nājiyya 'an al-Firaq al-Hālikīn* (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khānjī, 1955) p. 45. In another place, al-Isfarā'īnī reports that some of the Sabā'iyya asserted that al-Ṣādiq 'used to know all that it was necessary to know about religion or the world, both intellectual and legal affairs, to the point where if one of them was asked about [certain matters] his reply would be "we say concerning it what Ja'far said."' (pp. 40–1).
- 62 al-Shahrastānī, *Muslim Sects and Divisions*, trans. A K Kazi and J G Flynn (London: Kegan Paul International, 1984) p. 166. See also *Firaq al-Shī'a* in which it is remarked that after al-Ṣādiq's death there were arguments as to who should succeed him. Some followed Muḥammad b. Ja'far and had a *Ḥadīth* from al-Ṣādiq to support this (pp. 64–5), while others followed Mūsā b. Ja'far and also had supporting *Ḥadīth* from al-Ṣādiq (pp. 67–8).
- 63 al-Kulaynī, *al-Shāfi fī Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi* (Najaf: Maṭba'at al-Ghārī al-Ḥadītha n.d.) 3:229.
- 64 *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 3:241. See also 3:301–2 where al-Ṣādiq categorically denies that the Imām knows the *ghayb* but that God will inform him of it if he wants to know something—a sort of half-way house. Of course, the problem with asserting that al-Ṣādiq had knowledge of the *ghayb* was that it seemed to equate him with God. There are a number of examples on this theme. These contradictions are similarly evident elsewhere, see *Manāqib* p. 367 for example.
- 65 *Ma'rifa* p. 224.
- 66 *Ma'rifa* p. 365.

- 67 *Ma'rifa* p. 364.
- 68 *Rijāl* pp. 236–7.
- 69 *Ma'rifa* p. 223. See also pp. 224, 225.
- 70 *Ma'rifa* p. 209.
- 71 al-Ṭūsī, *Kitāb al-Amālī* (Najaf: Maṭba'at al-Nu'mān, 1964) 1/2:262–3.
- 72 *Ma'rifa* p. 133. See also p. 136.
- 73 *Ma'rifa* p. 402.
- 74 *Ma'rifa* p. 402.
- 75 *Ma'rifa* p. 408.
- 76 *Ma'rifa* p. 191.
- 77 *Ma'rifa* p. 192.
- 78 *Rijāl* pp. 93–4.
- 79 *Ma'rifa* p. 135. See also, for example, p. 170.
- 80 *Ma'rifa* pp. 136–7. There are many such examples, see pp. 238, 239.
- 81 *Ma'rifa* pp. 148–9 and 240.
- 82 *Ma'rifa* p. 149. See also pp. 150, 160.
- 83 *Ma'rifa* p. 169.
- 84 *Ma'rifa* p. 173.
- 85 *Ma'rifa* p. 230.
- 86 *Rijāl* p. 134.
- 87 *Rijāl* p. 121.
- 88 *Ma'rifa* p. 263.
- 89 *Ma'rifa* P. 364.
- 90 *Ma'rifa* p. 365.
- 91 This is arrived at from an examination of 1200 ritual and legal *Ḥadīth* located in al-Ṭūsī's *al-Istibṣār* and Ibn Babawayh's *Man lā yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh* (Beirut: Dār Sha'b, Dār al-Ta'āruf, 1981).
- 92 M J Mughniya, *Fiqh al-Imām Ja'far al-Şādiq* (Beirut: Dār al-Jawād, 1965).