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ABSTRACT

The Imāms Muḥammad al-Jawād and his son Ṭāh al-Hādī were both young children when their fathers died and they became candidates for the Imāmate. The ability of al-Jawād to function fully as Imām, in the light of developments in the theory of the Imāmate, was a major issue of the time. Although brought into doubt by his age, his Imāmate was eventually accepted by prominent Shiʿites. The arguments produced in his favour focused on several points; the status of his father al-Riḍā; the attitudes of the caliphs which appeared to support his claim; already existing restrictions on the transfer of the Imāmate between brothers; the absence of suitable alternatives; and finally the precedent of Jesus, who was provided with both wisdom and knowledge, as a child, by God. There were those who accepted al-Jawād only as a prospective Imām, not to become fully functional until he had matured and acquired religious knowledge, a view which the sources emphasise was rejected. With al-Jawād’s Imāmate validated, that of al-Hādī was acknowledged without question. His Imāmate, however, was affected by a trend begun under al-Jawād; that is, the isolation of the Imām and the close control exerted over their lives by the Abbasid caliphs. Al-Hādī was isolated for some years, eventually under supervision in the capital where his actions and ability to function as Imām were restricted. This isolation had two major consequences; the creation of a distance, both physical and psychological, between the Imām and his followers, making it possible for stories of the miraculous character of the Imāmate and stereotyped accounts of his life to spread, and the development of a stronger, more independent, organisation of representatives functioning on the Imām’s behalf. The exaggerated accounts of the lives of the Imāms emphasise two basic issues which reflect Shiʿite attitudes; that of suffering and persecution, and of the eventual victory of truth and righteousness through God’s power. As for the wikāla, it developed from being composed of personal representatives of the Imām to a network of agents who channeled money, tax, gifts, questions and requests in one direction, and blessings, alms and answers in the other. In the absence of effective central control the major agents acquired greater authority, which, on occasion, they were reluctant to give up. They figured prominently in the recognition of al-Jawād and al-Hādī, and were among the few in direct contact with the Imāms, playing a powerful role in maintaining the loyalties of the Shiʿa and guiding them in times of confusion and crisis.

TRANSLITERATION

The system of transliteration used in this thesis is that of the United States Library of Congress as outlined in the Cataloguing Service Bulletin no.49, November 1958.
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Although the lives of some of the early Ithnā-Asharī Imāms have now been well studied, in particular, al-Bāqir, al-Ṣādiq and al-Riḍā, who are amongst the most outstanding of the Twelve Imāms, and the background to the occultation of the final Imām investigated, very little attention has been paid, it seems, to the Imāmates of the ninth Imām al-Jawād and his successor al-Hādī, possibly because of an assumption that their Imāmates had little real substance and that they made little contribution to the beliefs and evolution of Imāmī Shiʿīsm.

The extent and depth of their following will probably remain indeterminable; even with earlier Imāms it is difficult to draw a true picture of their support. It is undeniably true that earlier Imāms left a much deeper, much wider, and more significant body of thought for analysis and moulding into a system of law and beliefs. As the following pages hope to show, however, the accounts of their lives in the biographical sources and the prevailing circumstances of their time combine to suggest that they were, indeed, recognised by their contemporaries and played a role, however limited, in the evolution of Imāmī Shiʿīsm.
REMARKS ON THE SOURCES:

This study has concentrated on the lives of these two Imāms as reflected in the main Shi'ite biographies, with occasional reference to specific heresiographical works and to other works on single topics such as the occultation. Considerable attention has been paid to the source Ithbāt al-Waṣiyya for, in the course of analysis, it was consistently impressive in its lack of overelaboration and exaggeration. On these grounds, which are further detailed in the references where appropriate, the conclusion has been reached that Ithbāt represents a record of the earliest versions of the accounts of the Imām’s lives.

The works al-Kāfī, al-Irshād and Iṣlām were found to form a consistent block, with al-Irshād drawing heavily on al-Kāfī although including the occasional account not in the latter, and Iṣlām drawing similarly on al-Irshād. These three sources are, therefore, often referred to together. Many single accounts which are found in less well known sources have been taken from Bihar al-Anwār, a work which draws together accounts of the Imām’s lives from a wide variety of works.

For al-Jawād, as for al-Hādī, a large number of the accounts in Bihar come from al-Kharā'ī wa al-Jarā'īb by Saʿīd b. Hibbat Allāh al-Rāwandī who died in Qumm in 573 A.H. This work is specifically devoted to the miracles of the Prophet and the Twelve Imāms and, as such, is likely to contain a certain amount of exaggeration and distortion. It has not, however, been dismissed as total fabrication. The accounts have been treated as originating from contemporary sources (i.e. of the Imāms), and as being representative of a reality which may only, or partially,
have existed in the perceptions of the Imāms' followers. The detail may be distorted, but the framework of the stories themselves may contain kernels of truth. Further comments about this source are included in the text where appropriate.

The second major source of accounts of the Imāms in Bibār is Manāqib Ālit Abī Tālib by Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, Ibn Shahrāshūb who died in 588 A.H. It includes a much more varied range of incidents and a list of the ʿashāb and the main representatives of the Imāms which, although not accurate, is of some interest. Since other studies have reviewed Shiʿite sources in some detail only a few comments which were felt to be particular to this thesis have been made here.

Finally, much information about the wikāla and the adherents of the Imāms has been drawn from the endlessly fascinating work Ikhtiyār Maʿrifat al-Riāl which contains so much diverting and revealing material that it deserves particular mention and greater study in the future.
# ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


al-Māmaqānī: al-Māmaqānī, ʿAbdallāh, Taqīq al-Maqāl fī Abwāb al-Riḍā, 3 parts (lithograph) (Najaf, 1930-33)


Maqātil: al-Īṣfahānī, Abū al-Faraj, Maqātil al-Tālibīyyīn (Cairo, 1368/1949).


MAIN BIOGRAPHICAL SOURCES FROM BIHĀR:

al-ʿIḥtiṣāj: al-Ṭabarṣī, Āḥmad b. ʿAlī b. Ābī Ṭālīb, al-ʿIḥtiṣāj.


Manāqīb: Ibn Shahrāshūb, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, Manāqīb Ābī Tālīb.
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"Ali b. Mūsā b. Ja'far b. Muḥammad, known as al-Riḍā, died at Ṭūs in the year 203 A.H. in the month of Ramadān accompanying the Abbasid caliph al-Ma'mūn to the imperial capital Baghdād. After a turbulent period of uncertainty when the Islamic empire was rent by the internecine struggles of al-Ma'mūn and al-Amīn, compounded by the sporadic flashfires of Shī'ite revolts across the empire, an air of relative stability had been restored. Al-Ma'mūn was returning to the central lands of the empire, his generals in the process of squashing the revolt of Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī. His conciliatory policies towards the Shī'as most easily visible in the choice of imperial colour, green rather than the black of the Abbasids although he did not go so far as to choose white, the colour of the ʿAlids, and the appointment of the quiet scholarly al-Riḍā as heir to the caliphate had doused some of the smouldering resentments of those susceptible to the rallying cry of the Shī'as, al-Riḍā min Ahl al-Bayt."
Despite the caliph's obvious interest in and sympathy for Shi'ism, and his enthusiasm for debate and discussion, his policies were born of expediency, the necessity of holding together the vast and non-homogeneous empire bequeathed to him and his brother by Harun al-Rashid who had presided over a golden age of advancement. Once these policies had achieved their aims and begun to be counterproductive, limiting his future options, stirring resentment amongst the Abbasid family and the various court factions they were abandoned. However, although imperial colours could be changed, and some pro Shi'a policies allowed to stand to discourage moderate Shi'ism from returning to the path of revolution, the problem of the heir to the throne, al-Rida, was more difficult to overcome. Whether al-Rida died a natural death, was poisoned at the caliph's actual instigation or by other enemies within political circles, his death was a welcome solution to the reversal of his appointment as heir. Al-Ma'mun's options in his delicate task of maintaining a balance were now restored.

The solution to Al-Ma'mun's problem it may have been, but for those Shi'ites who had given their allegiance to al-Rida as the next Imam in the line of al-Ṣadiq and al-Baqir, either previous followers of al-Kazim or wāqifites who had transferred their allegiance to him when he came to prominence, and for the Shi'ite scholars occupied in the debates of the time with the elaboration of their own concept of authority in the Imamate, it only created problems.
Al-Riḍā had died in the year 202/203 A.H. when his only son and heir Muḥammad b. ʿAlī, known as al-JawĀd, was aged seven or eight years old. The child had been born when al-Riḍā was forty seven years old, a fairly advanced age for the birth of his only son, and although the child allowed for the continuation of the Imamate, the succession of a child Imam was totally without an immediately obvious precedent.

It was only some two or three years after the death of al-Riḍā and one year after al-Maʾmūn had arrived in Baghdaḏ, from where he sent for the child to come and live at court under supervision, that al-Jawād's claim to the Imamate became openly acknowledged. As one source bluntly puts it, he remained hidden with the Imamate until this time. Given the distances involved some delay was inevitable even without the confusion and the debate about the unusual situation in which they found themselves. Various other accounts in different sources present the child as somewhere between eight and eleven the most common being nine and several months or ten years old. Those that reflect an earlier or later age, since they also tend to be less reliable, may be back projecting recognition of al-Jawād to coincide more closely with the date of death of al-Riḍā. However, in 205 A.H. when al-Jawād would have been ten, al-Maʾmūn was encouraging debates and discussions on the Imamate and this could have been one factor in his emergence at this time. For his acceptance as the next Imam was not based on his own claims; he had neither scholarly reputation, nor evidence of an ascetic and pious lifestyle, nor was he immediately capable of stamping his leadership on the ashāb [i.e. his followers and
associates] in any practical matters. Since his claim was not made of
his own accord, it had to be "made" elsewhere.

One meeting, which reads more as a general indication of the tone and
direction of the debates than a verbatim record of an actual exchange
of views, took place in Bagh pérd at an undetermined date, although the
implication in the source is certainly that it was shortly after the
news of al-Riādā's death had reached them, at the house of an eminent
follower of several Imāms, "Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥajjāj"17 in Barka
Zulūl. The mood of the meeting was one of despair at the
misfortune which had occurred. It is not difficult to imagine the
reasons for this; not only had they lost the leader of their
organisation, a mature and learned man well respected by a wide variety
of sections of the population, but one who had achieved something no
other recent candidate from ahl al-bayt had. Al-Riādā had been singled
out as the most worthy of the caliphate, appointed heir, feted, courted,
and recognised as the rightful possessor of authority. For all that
his appointment as heir and the discarding of black for the green of
the Sasanids were quite blatant political moves designed to fragment
Shī'a opposition, quell Shī'a revolts and obtain the support of many
moderates, it was the closest any Imām had come in recent times to
the seat of temporal power and effectively focused attention on
al-Riādā. Now, not only had he died on the road to Bagh pérd and the pro
Shī'a policies been weakened in the wake of the revolt of Ibrāhīm b.
al-Mahdī, but they were left with no effective leadership; al-Riādā's son
was seven years old. Hardly surprising that some sections of those
who had flocked to al-Riādā as Imām were ready to transfer allegiance
to other mature members of the family and some did, preferring to follow ʿAbd al-Raḥmān or return to their ṭawāqifism rather than accept a child Imām.¹⁹

The group gathered at the meeting represented a cross section of the Shīʿite ʿaṣḥāb: al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣalt,¹⁹ Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā,²⁰ Muḥammad b. Ḥākim,²¹ ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīẓ b. al-Ḥājjāj, Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Ḥāfīẓ.²² It is this last personnage who cuts through the general pessimism and depression at their misfortune by asking bluntly:

So who is now in charge; to whom do we put our questions now whilst the boy grows up.²³

Implied in this question is the assertion that al-Jawād is the legitimate successor of his father, albeit that his actual assumption of the duties of the Imām must wait till he grows up.²⁴ The question is left unanswered as al-Rayyān reacts strongly to Yūnus' effective dismissal of the child as Imām at that point in time:

You make a show of faith but conceal doubt and disbelief. If it is God's will even if he were one day old he would be the equal of a learned shaykh; if it is not God's will even if he had lived a hundred years he would be no more than an ordinary person.²⁵

It is al-Rayyān who finds support in the gathering, the others turning on Yūnus and rebuking him. The question posed by Yūnus is a crucial one; who was now to become the leader of the Shīʿite organisation and provide not only spiritual but practical, administrative direction.
Al-Rayyān's answer has the ring of the theoretical solution to the problem, but not one which could be of much practical value. The very way in which the debate is presented, clear cut question and answer, suggests that this is a skeletal summary of the opposing arguments - the practical protests and the theological refutation, the two protagonists being representative of the two factions.

Although this particular story concerning the Imām takes place without his involvement, and therefore emphasises the role of the ṭasaba [group or association], even where al-Jawād is portrayed as acting on his own behalf to reveal himself as the true Imām, the scholars and ḥābi still play an important part.

One such story, which is recounted from several different points of view, shows al-Jawād playing an increasingly stronger role in convincing the Shī'ā of the legitimacy of his Imāmate and the argument put forward by al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣalt who, curiously, is listed as one of the ḥābi of al-Riḍā and al-Ḥādī, but not of al-Jawād. The scholars' testing of the new Imām, and their guidance of the Shī'ā as to his acceptability, takes place this time not in Baghdād, but in Medina during the ḥajj [the pilgrimage] when eighty of the leading ḥaqā'ī [legal experts] of Baghdād and the provinces gathered at the house of al-Ṣādiq to observe the child who was living with his uncle Ābdallāh b. Mūsā. The confusion of the scholars and others present is immediately apparent when they are initially happy to question the uncle and, not being satisfied with his answers, are prepared to leave without even seeing al-Jawād. Once the child does appear, answering
their questions completely and rebuking his uncle for presuming to answer in his place, those assembled are content to accept him as Imám.

The most straightforward account of this is found in the early, and possibly most accurate source, Ithbát al-Wašiyya, but it is repeated with sometimes illuminating variations in later sources with greater expansion and elaboration of some details, and curtailment or total omission of others – a common pattern for many stories. One source, which approaches the story from the same perspective, has evidently applied later attitudes and terms whilst even minor details have been changed. Abû ʿAbdallâh Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad is referred to as Jaʿfar al-Ṣâdiq, a name indicating familiarity with his reputation rather than his actual person. As to the actual mâyî [gathering or meeting] some elements are omitted and more detail of the reactions of the gathered sūlamâ' are inserted. ʿAbdallâh b. Mûsâ's answers are described as ghâyr wâliḅ [not obligatory] the implication being that no-one thought of him as the Imám but simply as the best temporary source of guidance for the moment. Neither the questions nor the answers given by ʿAbdallâh are given at all, whereas in Ithbát they are fully if not tediously recounted. As the visitors prepare to leave they are saying to each other:

If only Abû Jaʿfar were mature enough to answer questions then this situation would not exist with ʿAbdallâh, someone whose answers have no obligatory nature.

As the child is brought out the gathering is described as turning towards him and greeting him. Again the questions and answers are
completely omitted, but the gathering is described then as overjoyed, heaping invocations and praise on him. Al-Jawād's rebuke of his uncle is stated only once in the stronger terms of a second rebuke in Ithbāt:

There is only one God; it is not a trivial matter for you to stand before him on yawm al-qiyāma and have Him say; why did you give legal opinions on something you did not know whilst there existed someone in the Umma [Islamic community] more knowledgeable.

A completely different perspective on the entire incident is related elsewhere. This time the account is related by a group of ordinary Shi'a whose names are more closely linked either with the pragmatic, material functioning of the Shi'i 'organisation', or are recorded as those on the fringes of the Shi'a; Muḥammad b. Jumhūr, al-Ḥasan b. Rāshid, ʿAlī b. Mudrik ʿAlī b. Mahzayr. Their story recounts that they travelled to Medina from several countries to ask who was the successor of al-Riḍā and were directed to go to Ṣuryā, a village near Medina. They arrived to find the house crowded with people most of whom were confused as to who was the Imām. When ʿAbdallāh comes out those assembled are asking: "Is he our sāhib? ". It is the fugahā' present who provide the guidance, referring to al-Ṣādiq's oft repeated statements:

We have heard from both Abū Ja'far and Abū ʿAbdallāh that the Imāmāte cannot pass between two brothers after al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, so he is not our sāhib.
The influence of the scholars in providing evidence for the legitimacy of the new Imām is also apparent in the reports of nass, commonly translated as designation. The idea of an inherited and continuous Imāmate, and of the designation of a successor with divine guidance who encompassed the collected knowledge of the ahl al-bayt passed down from "Ali b. Abī Ṭalib, the rightful successor of the Prophet, was the particular contribution of al-Bāqir and his son al-Ṣādiq, both highly respected and acclaimed scholars. The theory, however, did not immediately become accepted practice, as the fragmentation of their accumulated following after the death of al-Ṣādiq indicates. Technically the nass consisted of statements heard by the Shi'a from the previous Imām which, they assumed, informed them of the identity of his successor. Within this general category, the types of designation vary widely in actual content. Those related by the ashāb for al-Jawād range from the most direct and blunt statements, via stories which show the depth of love and pride of the Imām for his child, to accounts of arguments or debates in which al-Riḍā was obliged to affirm the prospective existence of an heir by the criticisms of certain wāqifites who alleged that, according to al-Ṣādiq, the true Imām could not be without an heir. Added to this is a large group of reports which concentrate in greater detail on some of the crucial questions of the Imāmate of al-Jawād. These tend to confirm in one breath not only that he is al-Riḍā's successor, but that his age is no obstacle and that there is no reason to turn to a more mature member of the family in his place even as regent.
Two of the most direct statements of designation are found in one particular source - *UYūn Akhbār al-Riḍā*. These come however with rather dubious credentials, the first few links in the *isnāds* [the chain of guarantors attached to a story] being difficult to track down if not entirely unrecorded as *aṣbāb* of either al-Riḍā or al-Jawād. More direct statements would be hard to imagine:

Abū Jaʿfar is my *waṣī* and my successor after me from amongst my family.

Other direct statements are reported from more well known figures - one from Musāfīr in *Ikhtiyār al-Kaḥshī*, and one from Muṣʿammar b. Khallād who accompanied al-Riḍā to Khurāsān acting as a ḥāfiẓ [chamberlain or doorkeeper]. These accounts are each unique to one source. Some, which are interpreted by the Shiʿa as indirect statements of *nāṣg*, are widely reported, included in several sources. These range from the paternally proud statement by al-Riḍā that the child is "the greatest blessing for the Shiʿa", to greetings which he asked be passed on to al-Jawād by those present in his *maṭlis* in Khurāsān. In one example al-Riḍā’s pointing out a birthmark on al-Jawād’s shoulder, which he says was also there on al-Kāẓīm, is interpreted as designation.

These reports of *nāṣg* were probably very effective in echoing previous statements from earlier Imāms underlining the continuity of the Imāmate, and were possibly more immediately comprehensible and indeed expected by the majority of ordinary Shiʿa. It was not only the
theologians and wukalā' [representatives] who were concerned with discovering the true Imām. Those who held some Shi‘ite beliefs also required some form of reassurance that the person they were to regard as the source of infallible knowledge, and their guarantee of future salvation, was the true one. Yet they had to rely greatly on the lead given by the scholars and inner circle of ashāb for guidance in a familiar form.

In other types of report the role of the asaba is even clearer. Several names stand out amongst them. One is ʿAlī b. Aṣbāṭ who reports a considerable number of hadīths which concentrate on the age of al-Jawād and his ability to fulfil the functions of the Imāmate, as well as being a link in one of the more direct designatory hadīths. Also reporting a number of hadīths, both about the anxiety over the existence, or non-existence of an heir, and the effect on the Imāmate of his age, is one Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Abī Naqr al-Bizantī. On the more pragmatic side, several names strongly connected with the material and financial affairs of the Imāmate also appear within the sections on naṣṣ and related hadīths; Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā Il b. Bazī, ʿAlī b. Mahzāyār, Ishāq b. ʿĪsā Il b. Nawbakht, ʿṢafwān b. Yaḥyā, Zakariyyā b. Adam. People in the service of the previous Imām, or close members of the family are also represented; Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar, ʿAbdallāh b. Jaʿfar from among the latter; Muḥammar b. Khallād and Abū ʿṢalt al-Harawi from the former.

Whatever the content one thing becomes increasingly obvious. Those reporting the more reliable, and possibly contemporaneous, accounts of
come from a small circle of prominent Imāmites, whether scholars or those involved in promoting the Imām's cause in a more material way and long connected with the affairs of his family.

It was not unusual for the scholars and ashāb to be instrumental in confirming a new Imām although rarely was their role so visible. Nor was it unthinkable for them to be less than obedient and refuse to submit totally to the Imām. Even al-Ṣādiq faced a struggle to assert his own authority and supremacy against the companions and associates of his father who, with well established reputations and knowledgeable credentials, were formidable rivals as sources of guidance. Some sources show his fight against riyāsa [setting oneself up as a leader] and the mutarayyisūn [those who set themselves up as leaders probably in religious matters] in addition to his more obvious campaign to restrain the activists amongst his followers. His successor al-Kāẓim, although eventually rebuilding his following and reorganising the Shi'a, was initially passed over and ignored. Although he was considerable more mature than al-Jawād, there were those who considered him not mature or yet knowledgeable enough to fulfil the role of the Imām. One Abū Başı̄r, a reputed scholar, is reported to have said:

I think our sāhib has not yet perfected his knowledge. [or I think he has not yet totally matured.]

Abū Başı̄r was also one of those who appeared to rival the authority of al-Ṣādiq and was disgruntled when passed over by al-Kāẓim later on in
his life for one of his own students. Even al-Ridā in one of his discussions on the Imamate was pressed to carry his argument that the Imam was not chosen by man, al-Kāẓim having previously insisted that the Imam was designated by God since He alone could know in whom isma (the protection from sin and error) was present. This still left man to interpret this designation.

The role of the scholars and prominent asbāb during the period of uncertainty surrounding al-Jawād was not a flash in the pan, a sudden but temporary emergence into the limelight. The pattern persisted for the following Imam ʿAlī b. Muḥammad known as al-Hādī, or al-ʿAskarī, although the latter is also more usually and sometimes confusingly applied to his son al-Ḥasan, the last visible Imam who also resided at al-ʿAskar. For al-Hādī the reports of nāṣṣ along the lines of the previous Imams have faded almost entirely away, partially of course as a result of the increasing isolation of al-Jawād and his lack of contact with both scholars and his ordinary followers, but also because with a young child once more left as heir, the making of the Imam was again in other hands.

The major designation of al-Hādī is recounted in one main story which reflects very clearly not only the role of the prominent asbāb but also the extent to which they were obliged to act independently as a result of the Imam’s isolation. The nāṣṣ is delivered as an oral message to the father of al-Khayrānī and is couched in direct terms:

Your mawla [master or patron] sends you greetings and says I
am dying, the amr [literally, matter or cause; power or authority, here meaning the Imamate] is to my son 'Ali. You are under his command after me as you were to me after my father."

This message is overheard by Ahmad b. Muhammad b. 'Isa who was waiting to hear news of the Imam's health. Abu al-Khayrani then writes out ten copies of the message and gives them to wu`ah al-`igaba [leading figures of the group i.e the Shi'a] with instructions to open them if anything should happen before he asked for them. When al-Jawad died the leaders of the `igaba gathered at the house of one Muhammad b. al-Faraj who also wrote to Abu al-Khayrani to inform him of the meeting and apologise for not coming to him out of fear of publicity. When he arrives those present are discussing their present situation and ask for his opinion. He refers them to the notes he delivered earlier, but finds them unconvinced:

We would have preferred that there be another witness besides you in this matter."

Abu al-Khayrani turns to the eavesdropper who is curiously reluctant to confirm the designation until threatened with the oath of the mubahala. Even then he states:

I heard that, but this was a great honour and I would have preferred it to go to an Arab not one of the 'ajam [non-Arabs].
There is no indication of further discussion although it is stated that those present did not leave until they had all agreed to al-haqq - the identity of the Imam. This is stated more explicitly in the later source Iṣlām al-Wara as, "til they had recognised the Imamate of al-Hādi and all doubt had been removed". Even where the more familiar pattern of nāṣṣ recurs i.e. in Ithbāt al-Waṣīyya the names of those reporting it are either well known ʿashāb, or entirely unknown and therefore more dubious. ʿAli b. Mahzzyār, Muḥammad b. ʿIsā Il b. Bazī, Muḥammad b. al-Faraj are all names already familiar from al-Jawād's time, although these stories, concerning for the most part the question of age, are reported only in the one source. Two from unknown reporters concentrate on the child's awareness of his father's death, although one on this line is reported from a more well known reporter - al-Waṣshā'.

A more troublesome report is found uniquely in al-Kāfī - neither al-ʿIrshād nor Iṣlām where they are usually repeated have included what was allegedly the written will and testament of al-Jawād. Despite the fact that the original witness, a mawlā [client, follower] of al-Jawād is not listed in the rijāl [biographical] sources the next links are known. This waṣīyya [will, testament] places a certain ʿAbdallāh b. Musāwir in charge of his lands and wealth etc until such time as ʿAli b. Muḥammad reached his majority, and states that at that time ʿAli would take control of these matters and be responsible for his sisters and younger brother Mūsā. The date is given as Yawm al-ʿAḥad, Dhū al-Ḥijja 220 A.H. and the testament is also witnessed by a ʿAṭīṣ and another person Naṣr al-Khādim. Later sources, whilst not
rejecting the above, attribute to taqiyya [prudent fear] the apparent guardianship of the child by an adult. Although neither of the later sources relate the above they do add very illuminating comments on the confirmation of the Imāmate of al-Ḥādī:

As a result of the agreement of the āṣāba on the Imāmate of Abū al-Ḥasan and of the absence of any other claimant........there is no need to present the reports of nass. 77

This and the necessity for our Imāms at this time to use taqiyya because of fear of enemies, made it incumbent on the Shiʿa to seek evidence of their designation of successors through the process of inference to which we have referred, until the wuṭūh noted in them proof of the uqūl [insights, understanding] obligatory in the Imāmate 77

The nass was therefore a potent tool in the hands of the scholars and inner coterie of the previous Imām or those who counted themselves amongst his foremost followers. Although in previous years their influence was often masked by the ability of the Imāms to work on their own behalf and acquire an independent reputation and personally loyal followers, with the child Imāms this power was abruptly brought to the fore. It was their voice which proclaimed the legitimacy of the child Imāms, both al-Jawād and al-Ḥādī, and it was they who produced the arguments to support them.
CHAPTER ONE: FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Various sources give different dates and/or ages for the death of al-Riḍā. Al-Kāfī [I, p.486] and al-Irshād [p.461] agree on a date of 203 in the month of Šafar when he was aged fifty five, although al-Kāfī gives a deviant date of 202, aged 49 [I, p.492, n.11]. Other sources say he was forty nine [Murūj, III, p.417 but p.441 aged 53 or 47%]. "Uyun.R. [I, p.15] says he died in Ramadan 203 A.H. aged 49% which agrees with Ithbāt [p.208]. This last figure is correct only if, as several agree, he was born in 153 A.H. Al-Kāfī and al-Irshād insist on a date of birth of 148 A.H. Al-Kāmil [VI, p.248] states that he died in 203 aged 55, and gives his date of birth as 148 A.H. [p.249]

2. Annales al-Ṭabarī states the journey was begun in 202 A.H. (p.1025) and that he entered Baghdad in 204 A.H.(p.1037). See also al-Kāmil, VI, p.245 and p.253; Murūj, III, p.442; Occultation, p.44; Ibn Ṭayfūr, p.9, p.1.

3. Muḥammad b.Hārūn al-Amīn became caliph in 193 A.H. and lasted as caliph for four years and five months before being defeated by al-Maʿmūn's generals Ṭāhir b.al-Ḥusayn and Harthama b. Ṭayy [Murūj, III, p.387, p.416; al-Kāmil, VI, p.152]. Al-Amīn had been left in control of the central provinces of the empire with his brother in charge of the east, a situation bequeathed by al-Rashīd in a somewhat vain attempt to balance various factions and their military backers. Whoever broke the settlement was to forgo his right to the caliphate [Murūj, III, p.395.]

4. The early years of al-Maʿmūn's reign saw several Shiʿite revolts, the main one being in 199/815 in Kūfa by Abū al-Sarāyā and Ibn Ṭabāṭabāʾ, Muḥammad b.Ibrāhīm b.ʿIsā b.Ibrāhīm b.ʿIsā b.ʿIsā b.Ibrāhīm b.ʿIsā b.Ibrāhīm b.ʿIsā [Murūj, III, pp. 438-440]. There is no suggestion that al-Riḍā was implicated in the revolts; indeed, his help was enlisted by the Abbasid general Hārūn b. al-Musayyib to attempt to find a peaceful solution to the revolt in Mecca and Medina by Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad [Maqātil, p.540]. Al-Irshād [p.433] says ʿIsā al-Jalūdī was the general sent to fight him. See also Maqātil, pp.537ff for the revolt in Medina and Mecca and pp.542-550 for an account of the revolt in Kūfa. This sparked off other satellite uprisings in Fars, Hijāz, Yemen, al-Ahwāz for which see Occultation, p.41.

5. al-Kāmil, VI, p.241; Wafayāt, II, p.212. The pledge of allegiance to Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī took place in 202 or 203, as a result of al-Maʿmūn's choice of an ʿAlīd as heir, excluding the rest of the Abbasid family, and his abandoning of black, the colour of his predecessors.

6. Not only did al-Maʿmūn designate al-Riḍā his heir and abandon the black of the Abbasids, but he arranged his marriage to Umm Habība [al-Kāmil, VI, p.248], the marriage of his son al-Jawād to Umm al-Faḍl [See below Chapter Two], nominated al-ʿAbbās b. Mūsā b. Jaʿfar b. Isḥāq as governor of Kūfa [Occultation p.43], and confirmed Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā as governor of Mecca when he agreed to mention al-Riḍā and himself in the khutbah [the Friday prayer address]
Despite Muhammad b. Ja’far’s actions in rebelling in Medina, the caliph is said to have prayed over him at his funeral and paid off his debts, as well as taking no action against his son Yahyā who had gone to Egypt without permission [Maqṭīl, p.541; al-Irshād, p.434]. He also married ʿIshrāq b. Mūsā to the daughter of an uncle and put him in charge of the pilgrimage with the added instruction to spread the news of al-Riḍā’s appointment as heir [al-Irshād, p.472].

7. This resentment towards the caliph’s policies is recorded in several sources; ʿUyun.R., [II, p.123, n.51] and al-Kāmil, [VI, p.241, and p.245] where it is al-Riḍā who is said to be the one who informed the caliph of the fitna [civil war or dissent] which was being concealed from him by his advisors, and of the feeling of the people towards him (al-Riḍā) and his wazīr.

8. Ibn Ṣayfūr, p.10

9. The followers of al-Riḍā consisted of several groups only one of which had been attached to previous Imāms and who maintained the Imāmate of al-Jawād thereafter. One group was made up of wāqifītes i.e. those who maintained that a previous Imām was the Mahdī and returned to this belief on the death of al-Riḍā [al-Fuṣūl, p.256].

10. The age of al-Jawād at the time of al-Riḍā’s death is disputed, although there is strong emphasis on his date of birth as being in 195 A.H.. Most sources place him as between seven and eight [al-Kāfī, I, p.492; Ithbāt, pp.209-10, p.212; Murūj, III, p.464; al-Irshād, p.479; I’lām, p.344; Kashf, p.186, p.189; al-Fuṣūl, p.256]. Curiously al-Kāfī [I, p.489] also records that al-Jawād was seven when al-Riḍā was ordered to Khurāsān in 199/200, which would make him ten when his father died, this being reported on the authority of al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣalt with Yāsir al-Khādīm. Maqālāt [p.101] describes one group which maintained he was four not eight and ʿUyun.R. [III, p.148] insists al-Riḍā left for Khurāsān when al-Jawād was seven. The deviant dates seem to be trying to make his age when his father died coincide with the age at which he received recognition.

11. This age obviously depends on the date of al-Riḍā’s birth which is disputed. See note 1. Whatever the date i.e. 148 or 153 he was still either 47 or 42 when the child was born.

12. See note 2 above.

13. Ithbāt, p.216. Al-Ma’amūn sent for the boy to come to Baghdād. Other sources seem somewhat unreliable in their accounts of the initial meeting [Bihār, L, p.56, n.31 from Manāqib; pp.91-2 n.6; Kashf, pp.187-188]. The alleged testing by Yahyā b. Aktham also took place in the capital, not in Medina where the Shi’ite scholars report him living.

14. Ithbāt, p.215. The majority of sources confirm that his Imāmate was acknowledged when he was between nine and ten years old [al-Irshād, p.485; I’lām, p.351; Bihār, L, p.86, n.1 from Ikhtīṣāṣ;
Stories reflecting another earlier age may be a back projection of his recognition to coincide with the date of his father's death. See above note 9.

Ibn Tayfur, p.22ff and p.36ff

See biographical index for "Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Jaffāj.

Both accounts of the meeting imply that the meeting took place immediately after the death of al-Riḍā, making no mention of dates or the age of al-Jawād.

Ahmad b. Mūsā inherited the estate of al-Yasīra from his father and was said to be well loved by him (al-Irshād p.459). Little information about him is recorded in the main riḍāl sources, but in Aʿyān al-Shīrā the following information; Ahmad rebelled after the death of al-Riḍā and left Baghdād to fight al-Maʿmūn taking Qumm, and Rayy before arriving in Isfarayin where he was killed in a battle with al-Maʿmūn's army and buried there, despite the widespread belief that he was buried in Shīrāz. There is also the suggestion that he was part of the revolt of Abū al-Sarāyā (Aʿyān al-Shīrā, X, pp.285-8; Ikhtiyār, p.472, n.898).

See biographical index for al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣalt.

See biographical index for Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā.

See biographical index for Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm.

See biographical index for Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān.

This argument would be similar to the one in Maqālāt [p.101]. See note 10 above.

Ithbāt, p.213; Bihār, L, p.99, n.12.

This argument would be similar to the one in Maqālāt [p.101]. See note 10 above.

Ithbāt, p.213; Bihār, L, p.99, n.12.

Ithbāt, pp.213-4; Bihār, L, pp.85-6, n.1 from al-Ikhtīṣāṣ. The version in Bihār includes reference to the thirty thousand questions answered by the child. See also for stories of testing; al-Kāfī, I, p.496; Ithbāt, p.215; Bihār, L, pp.58-9, n.34; Bihār, L, p.93, n.6 from Manāqīb.

"Abdallāh b. Mūsā; Although he is mentioned in al-Irshād no details are given about him (p.458). Another "Abdallāh b. Mūsā - b. "Abdallāh b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. "Ali has more recorded details of his life in Maqāṭūl [pp.628-633; p.690; p.519] which presents him as an authoritative figure. See also Chapter 2, p.46.

Bihār, L, pp.100-1, n.12 from ʿUyūn.M.

Ibid, p.100.
30. Ibid, pp. 89-91, n. 5 from Manāqib.

31. See biographical index for Muḥammad b. Jumhūr.

32. See biographical index for al-Ḥasan b. Rāshid.

33. See biographical index for ʿAlī b. Mudārak.

34. See biographical index for ʿAlī b. Mahzayr.

35. Şuryā was, according to the story itself, a village three miles outside Medina founded by al-Kāẓim.

36. Bihār, L, p. 90, n. 5 from Manāqib. For the main concentration of reports see al-Kāfī, I, pp. 295-6; Bihār, XXV, pp. 249-261.

37. See e.g., Bihār, L, p. 18, n. 2; ʿUyūn R., II, p. 242, n. 1; Bihār, L, p. 18, n. 1; ʿUyūn R., II, p. 217, n. 23; Bihār, L, p. 34, n. 18 from Ikhtiyār; Bihār, L, p. 36, n. 25; al-Kāfī, I, p. 321, n. 11.

38. The isnāds from Bihār, L, p. 18, n. 1 and 2. The first is reported from Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad al-Nawfalī who is not listed as one of the ashāb of the Imāms, to al-Ḥusayn b. ʿĪsā al-Kharrāt also negative in the above sources. The second comes from Muḥammad b. Abī ʿAbbād to ʿAwī b. Muḥammad both negative in the major sources, although ʿAwī is mentioned as a link in ʿUyūn R. [II p. 146].


40. Ikhtiyār, pp. 506, 972; Bihār, L, p. 34, n. 18. Musāfir was one of the ashāb of al-Riḍā and, possibly, al-Hadi [R. al-Ṭūsī, p. 421]. R. ibn Dāwud [p. 344, n. 1518] lists him as mawla of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Kāẓim and māqdūl. He is seen acting as a kind of ḥālib for al-Riḍā in Khurāsān [Ikhtiyār, p. 498, n. 956], carrying out errands when retrieving a copy of the Qurʾān left with Ibn Abī Naṣr [Ikhtiyār, p. 589, n. 1101] and as involved in the dispute over finances under al-Jawād, although in this last instance it may not be the same person. [Ikhtiyār, p. 596, n. 1115].


42. Ithbāt, p. 211; al-Kāfī, I, p. 321, n. 9; Bihār, L, p. 35, n. 24; al-İrshād, p. 483; ʿİlām, p. 347; Ithbāt gives the end source as Najm al-Ṣanʿānī reporting to ʿAlī b. ʿAsbāḥ; al-Kāfī in Bihār gives Yāḥyā al-Ṣanʿānī to the same person; al-Kāfī and al-İrshād say Abū Yāḥyā al-Ṣanʿānī reporting to Muḥammad b. ʿAlī.

43. al-Kāfī, I, p. 320, n. 1; al-İrshād p. 483; ʿİlām, p. 347. It is reported by Yāḥyā b. Ḥabīb al-Zayyāt.

44. Ithbāt, p. 212; al-Kāfī, I, p. 321, n. 8; al-İrshād, p. 482; ʿİlām, p. 347. Ithbāt, al-Kāfī, ʿİlām all report it from al-Ḥasan b. al-Jahm via Muḥammad b. ʿAlī to ʿAḥmad b. Mihrān. Al-İrshād misses out the middle link. Ithbāt [p. 211; Bihār, L, pp. 101-2,
n. 15] gives a similar story from Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar to ʿAbd al-Qāsim who reports one story to ʿAlī b. Mahzūyar which is very propagandistic.

45. See biographical index for ʿAlī b. Asbāt. For reports concentrating on age see e.g., Ithḥāt p. 211; el-Kāfī, I, p. 384, n. 7; p. 494, n. 3; Bihār, L, p. 37, n1; Bihār, XXV, pp. 100-104. ʿAlī b. Asbāt is also a link in several isnāds on the same theme [Ithḥāt, p. 210; al-Kāfī, I, p. 321, n. 9; Bihār, L, p. 35, n. 24].

46. See biographical index for Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr al-Bīzanti. For reports on his authority, or where he is part of the isnād see e.g., al-Kāfī, I, p. 320, n. 5; al-ʿIrshād, p. 482; Iṣlām, p. 346; Bihār, L, p. 35, n. 22; ʿUyunī. R., II, p. 25, n. 23.

47. al-Kāfī, I, p. 384, n. 5; Bihār, L, p. 35, n. 21. He also reports the nāṣaṣ for al-Ḥādi [Ithḥāt p. 221]. See biographical index for information on Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Aṣadī.


49. Bihār, L, p. 34, n. 20; Ithḥāt, p. 215; Bihār, L, p. 58, n. 34. See biographical index for Iṣḥāq b. Ismāʿīl b. Nawbakht.


51. Ithḥāt, pp. 211; Bihār, L, p. 59, n. 34. See biographical index for Zakariyyā b. Adam.

52. Ithḥāt, p. 211. On Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar there is not much recorded.

53. See above note 40. He also appears as a reporter in stories concerning the imām’s awareness of the death of his father [al-Kāfī, I, pp. 381-2, n. 6; Ithḥāt, pp. 193-4].


55. Abū ʿAbd al-Ṣalām b. ʿAbd al-Salām b. ʿAbd al-Qāsim, who is actually ʿAbd al-Salām b. ʿAbd al-Qāsim, recorded as ʿAbd al-Qāsim but one of the asbāb of al-Riḍā [R. ʿAbd al-Qāsim, p. 567, n. 15]. He is also said to be ʿAbd al-Qāsim but one of the asbāb of al-Riḍā [R. ʿAbd al-Qāsim, p. 224, n. 938]. In ʿUyunī. R. he reports mainly to either Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbd al-Qāsim or Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-Qāsim. See e.g., Ithḥāt, p. 212 and p. 210. He is also mentioned in Bihār, L, p. 35, n. 23. See biographical index for ʿAffān b. Yaḥyā.

and hint at the difficulties faced by al-Šādiq due to those with knowledge acquired from al-Bāqir (See especially Ikhtiyār, p.169, n.283). Al-Šādiq and Zurārā in particular clashed over their views on īṣṭīfā (Ikhtiyār, p.240, n.437; p.148, n.236). The same kind of clash is reported with Muḥammad b. Muslim (Ikhtiyār, p.168, n.282; p.169, n.284). Activists during al-Šādiq's time are more easily identifiable, including the renowned Muṣallā b. Khunays (Ikhtiyār pp.376-382, nos 707-715; al-Irshād, p.412-3), Sulaymān b. Khālid (Ikhtiyār, pp.353-4, nos 662-668), Fayyā b. al-Muḥtār (Ikhtiyār, pp.353-4, n.662; pp.354-6, n.663; p.135, n.216), and ʿAbd al-Salām b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (Ikhtiyār, p.210, n.372, pp.353-4, n.662). These three actually invited al-Šādiq to Kūfa to take control of the city which, they said, was undefended. Warnings to Muṣallā not to speak openly of the cause are reported from al-Šādiq (Wasd’il al-Shī’a, XI, Bāb 24, p.463, n.23; Bāb 32, p.484, n.6). There was also the split with ʿAbū al-Khaṭṭāb who, along with his unacceptable ideas, seems to have also promoted more active pursual of power on behalf of al-Šādiq's son Ismāʿīl (Occultation p.33).

57. In fact initially, the Shīʿa of al-Šādiq assumed that his eldest son ʿAbdallāh would succeed him and only looked elsewhere when his legal advice was not satisfactory (al-Irshād, pp. 440-442, and p.432; Maqālāt, p.99, n.21; Ikhtiyār, pp.153-4, n.251 and p.254, n.472). There were also those who assumed that Ismāʿīl, who was apparently the best loved son, should inherit (Irahd, p.292), and since he had died it would pass to his son Muḥammad (Maqālāt, pp. 98-99, nos 17,18 and 19; al-Fuṣūl, pp. 250-252; Ikhtiyār, p.321, n.581 and pp. 325-6, n.590). A great deal of confusion existed at this point in time, perhaps the first occasion when, as a consequence of the cumulative teachings of al-Bāqir and al-Šādiq, the Shīʿa had actively sought a direct successor. The followers of ʿAbdallāh were called the faṭḥiyūya and included some prominent people e.g. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAli b. Faḍdal; ʿAli b. Asbāḥ; ʿAli b. Ḫadīd b. Ḫakīm; Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and ʿAbdallāh b. Ḫakeyr (R.ʾbn Dāwud, pp. 532-33). See also al-Fuṣūl, pp. 247-249 for the splits after al-Šādiq and p.253 of the same work for specific information on the accusations against ʿAbdallāh of holding Murjiʿite views.

58. Ikhtiyār, p.172, n.292 with a variant n.293 where it is recorded as "I think he has not yet matured".

59. Kashf, p.57. Note that this Abū Baṣīr may not be the famed follower of al-Šādiq. ʿAli b. Abī Ḫamza was actually the qāʿid of Abū Baṣīr, Yaḥyā b. Abī al-Qāsim [See biographical index for ʿAli b. Abī Ḫamza].


61. Ibid, p. 132, n.1. It is to al-Kāẓim that the statement is attributed that the Imām is maṣḥūn [protected from error], and therefore must be maṣūṣ [indicated as Imām by the nass] because only he can see, or be shown by God, in whom the quality of ʿismā [protection from sin and error] is present.
62. *Ali b. Muḥammad b. *Ali b. Muṣā, known as al-Ḥādi, born 212 A.H. or 214 A.H. [al-Kāfī, I, p.497 has the same dates as Kashf and Bihār. Ithbāt (p.234) insists on 214, al-Irshād p.496 on 212]. He was also known as al-ʾAskarī amongst several other names. Sources agree on his date of death as 254 A.H.

63. al-Kāfī, I, pp. 324-5, n.2; al-Irshād, p.497; Iʿlām, pp. 356-7; Kashf, pp. 234-5; Bihār, L, pp. 119-21, n.3

64. See biographical index for Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʾĪsā.

65. See biographical index for Muḥammad b. al-Faraj.

66. Abū al-Khayrdnī; Under this name the reporter is unlisted. However there is some evidence that al-Khayrdnī may be one al-Maḥmūdī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Ḥammād and the report is therefore from Aḥmad b. Ḥammād al-Marwazi his father who is listed as one of the circle of al-Jawād although weak [R. ibn Dāwud, p.420, n.25; R. al-Barqī, p.561]. The evidence includes the coincidence of identical reports with the different names used i.e. where Ithbāt (p.212) says Muḥammad al-Maḥmūdī, al-Kāfī and those sources drawing from it report it from al-Khayrdnī from his father. Ikhtiyār also reports al-Maḥmūdī as having been given the nickname from the name 'Khayr' that being the name of a slave whom he presented to the Imām [Ikhtiyār, pp.511-2, n.988]. The family does seem to have moved freely in court circles, al-Maḥmūdī being the person who advised one of the caliph's wazīrs that to try and discredit al-Jawād through having him seen drunk would not succeed [Ikhtiyār, pp.560-1, n.1058]. The notes provided to the report of this story in Bihār [L, p.94, n.7] say that his father died under al-Ḥādi and the Imām wrote expressing his condolences. Unfortunately Ikhtiyār states without any ambiguity that it was al-Jawād who did so. If the identification is correct, then either the date of death has been misreported or the story of the naṣṣ of al-Ḥādi may be from al-Khayrdnī and not his father.
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CHAPTER TWO: THE CASE FOR AL-JAWĀD

2.1 The problems of a child Imām:

The crux of the case against the recognition of al-Jawād as Imām was naturally enough his age and immaturity. That age was a problem was fairly obvious even without the restrictions imposed by the development of the role and function of the Imām.

The initial concept of a spiritual leader who was beyond the simple or basic idea of a faqīh or ālīm was introduced by al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq. Their 'Imām' possessed knowledge and qualities far beyond those acquired by ordinary lawyers and scholars. The ideas thus introduced may not have produced immediate effects in the way of total obedience and acceptance of the Imām's word as law, but the groundwork was established for later development, particularly under al-Riḍā.

One statement on the Imāmate is reported from ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. Muslim who was discussing the Imāmate with a group of people with divergent views in Merw. Although they were apparently accompanying al-Riḍā, he was not present, the discussion taking place amongst the ʿulamā'. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, having heard a variety of opinions, goes to see al-Riḍā and tells him of the disagreements. After stating the necessity of
accepting the perfection of religion by the Prophet with the complete revelation of the Qur'an and the appointment of 'Ali as Imam to clarify and elucidate, he continues:

Do they know the gadr [scope or extent] of the Imamate and its place in the Umma so well that they can choose someone. The Imamate is too great, too mighty, too high, too wide and deep for them to use their intellects to reach it or for them to choose someone on the basis of their own opinions or for them to set up an Imam of their own choice."

Further on he continues:

The Imamate is the reins of religion, the organisation of the Muslims, the ṣalāb [righteousness] of the world, the īzz [glory or might] of the believers, the Imamate is the foundation of Islam.......it is through the Imam that prayer, zakāt, fasting, pilgrimage, ḥijād [holy war], fay' [tax due on conquered lands], sadaga [alms tax], ḥudūd [prescribed punishments], and al-ḥākām [laws] as well as the protection of the realm are fulfilled. He makes legal the halāl of God and declares illegal the harām...the Imam is unique in his era - no-one comes close to him, nor does any 'Alīm equal him. There is no equal of him nor replacement for him."

If this was indeed the type of statement that al-Riḍā was making, and attempting to have accepted by Imāmī scholars and others as a description of the true Imam, then admitting the succession of a child to this position had far-ranging implications for the Imamate, particularly as regards the nature of his knowledge and its acquisition.
The succession of a child of seven, who had spent little time in his father's presence, al-Řiďā having been summoned to Khurasān when he was four or five, meant that the external acquisition of šilm [religious knowledge] through the normal process of absorbing wisdom and knowledge from the members of his family and especially his father, the Imām, was untenable. Even where reference could be made to the scrolls and documents, which were supposedly his physical inheritance, how was a child supposed to have the wisdom and experience to perform the full range of functions of interpretation and elucidation?

That age was the main pivot of discussion is evident by the concern shown in a large number of stories about this very issue. The reports of naṣṣ repeat over and over again the surprise and shock of the asbāb when informed of the succession of a child; this allegedly in the first instance when al-Jawād was three or four. In some cases al-Jawād is later informed that some doubts persist about him because of his age:

People are denying you because of your youth.

A more subtle attitude pervades the main stories of the conference and scholastic testing of al-Jawād before full recognition was accorded. There al-Jawād is portrayed as having been already accepted as al-Řiďā's successor in a limited sense. However this was only the beginning of the real debate. Given that al-Jawād, being al-Řiďā's only son and heir was the only possible alternative as Imām because of already existing restrictions, the problem then became one of the
extent to which he was to fulfil, or be portrayed as fulfilling the full range of functions of the Imām.

The initial reaction seems to have been that al-Jawād was 'Imām' in the sense that being one of ahl al-bayt, direct descendent in the line of previous Imams who were the awsiyā' [heirs] and awliyā' [lit. friends or people near to God] of God, he possessed inherently the character and embryonic wisdom which was required to guide mankind through personal example and interpretation of the Qurʾān and Sunna. However, being still a child he did not possess the knowledge which would permit him to utilise these qualities. The debate is recorded in Maqālāt where the objectors are said to have argued that:

> He was Imām only in the sense that the amr was within him and belonged to him out of all others and did not belong to anyone else at that point in time. But he did not have in him in that situation what all previous Imāms had and they alleged, therefore, that he could not provide an example for them nor lead them in prayer."

It continues by pointing out that those now responsible for the leading of the prayers, the law etc., were:

> . . . Ahl al-Fiqh, wa al-Din wa al-Salāh [pious men with religious and legal knowledge] until such time as he reaches the maturity commensurate for that."

It is worth noting that, although no debate is recorded for al-Hādī, the same question arose for the twelfth Imām, Muḥammad al-Mahdī, who
was alleged to have been a child when his father al-AskarI died. The same arguments were advanced, one group insisting that even aged four or eight he was Imām and it was obligatory to obey him, the other group that he was only theoretically Imām, with major decisions in the hands of learned scholars until he matured.12

There were, of course, some who rejected al-Jawād as Imām, whether with immediate effect, or theoretically, as a future leader. They stated that the sāhib al-zamān [i.e. the Imām] could not be a child and either proclaimed the Imāmate of Ahmad b. Mūsā through direct nass from al-Riḍā13, or returned to wāqifism on the grounds that al-Riḍā's Imāmate had been shown as false because he had left no viable successor.14

Despite this major concern over the implications of al-Jawād's age, there were both external and internal factors which offset the difficulties caused by promoting the recognition of a child Imām.

2.2 External factors: the Abbasid influence.

One of the perverse aspects of the paranoid suspicion shown by the authorities towards the Alīd family, and the sometimes constant supervision or harassment which was perceived by the Shi‘a as persecution, was that it focussed the attention of disgruntled or
rebellious elements on the very people whom the Sultan was most eager to isolate from any kind of major following. This is aptly summed up by an acquaintance of one of the caliph's advisors with some knowledge of Shi'a psychology, who is listed in Shi'ite works as one of the \textit{ashab} of the ninth, tenth and eleventh Imams. His summary of the probable reaction of the Shi'a to any attempt to persecute or discredit al-Jawad was as follows:

\begin{quote}
They say there must be at all times in every situation on earth a \textit{hujja} [someone acting as proof or evidence] of God, to act as a mediator between Him and His creation. If there is one at the same time who is his equal or greater in honour or descent, the greatest show of proof for the \textit{hujja} is the way that the Sultan directs his attention at him amongst his family and peers.
\end{quote}

Although persecution was not manifestly the policy directed at al-Jawad, al-Ma'mun having persisted with sympathetic attitudes towards the Shi'a, the attention he received as the son of the erstwhile heir to the caliphate was almost as effective in emphasising his status and making his name well known. It provided the Shi'a with endless opportunity for propaganda to support their arguments, a great deal of which revolves around the betrothal and/or marriage of al-Jawad to Umm al-Faql.

The betrothal of al-Jawad to Umm al-Faql, daughter of the caliph had been part of al-Ma'mun's policy towards the 'Alid family; al-Ridha had also been married to a daughter of the caliph - Umm Habiba. These marriages were never intended to be anything other than political
alliances and certainly were not seen as a move to an alternative dynasty, a distinction which was perhaps not fully appreciated by the Abbasid family and their supporters in Baghdad. The sources seem agreed that both father and son were married off at the same time to two daughters of the caliph.\(^19\) It could be argued that they could not have been the caliph's daughters since any of his children would be far too young. However, the last thing the caliph would have wanted was for al-Riḍā to have a child who was also related closely to the ruling family and marriage to a child bride would have been an effective solution.

As for al-Jawād's marriage, it was obviously a limited betrothal ceremony, al-Jawād being only seven years old and not even present. Historical sources mention one further event in 215 A.H. some thirteen years after the first record of the alliance in 202 A.H. Al-Jawād was summoned by the caliph to meet him in Tikrit and was instructed to consummate the marriage and return to Baghdad to celebrate it. The Imam then remained there until the time of the ḥajj when he returned with his family and dependents to Medina.\(^19\) These two events are recorded as objective reality; what else may have occurred is obscured by propaganda and, perhaps, misrepresentation. The only historical source which places the marriage in 204/5 is Ta'rikh Baghdad which, according to Manāqib, says he was nine years old when this took place.\(^20\)

Shi'ite accounts of the marriage focus on the implications of al-Ma'amūn's alleged reasons for the marriage and his refutation of the
objections of the Abbasid family. According to biographical sources, the betrothal/marriage of al-Jawād took place not in 202 A.H., but after the death of al-Riḍā when the caliph had arrived in Baghdad. Ithbāt says that he sent for al-Jawād, settled him near his palace and decided to marry him to Umm al-Faḍl.21 If the date was around 204-5 A.H. this would accord with the time at which the Imāmate in general was under discussion, and that of al-Jawād was receiving recognition, a point in favour of its authenticity. Most accounts place his age as between nine and ten,22 although two relate the initial meeting between caliph and Imām as taking place when the child was eleven.23

Despite the fact that the sources relate a quite considerable number of stories about the circumstances surrounding the marriage of al-Jawād, there remain some persistent doubts as to whether they all do indeed refer to this marriage. These doubts surface in a wide variety of different reports, and are not restricted to the accounts of the marriage ceremonies and testing of al-Jawād. One of the sources in Bihār gives the text of a letter which was written from 'Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Mūsā al-Riḍā to al-Maʿmūn in response to the proposal of marriage.24 Referring to the sadāq (bridal dower) to which every wife was entitled from her husband's wealth, the letter states:

God has made our wealth in the hereafter postponed, stored there just as your wealth is here and now in this world. I have given your daughter the means to all questions, confidences passed to me by my father who said; my father Jaʿfar passed them to me; he said my father Muḥammad passed them to me...from ʿAlī from Muḥammad ...from JibrIī from the
Lord. These are the keys of the treasures of the world...

It is immediately noticeable that the reference to "my father" is not to ʿAli al-Riḍā but to Mūsā al-Kāzīm, for the next in line is Jaʿfar. The letter is reported by an unknown source, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥārith, who was, according to the actual text, a servant of al-Riḍā, and relayed via his son Ibrāhīm. A minor slip, a subtle modification of a letter originally by al-Riḍā who was also married to the caliph's daughter, or perhaps in view of its heavily propagandistic tone and unknown reporters, an unreliable or fabricated report.

Without corroborating evidence it is impossible to decide which of the above alternatives should receive more weight. Evidence which might provide the answer must be drawn from an analysis of the main stories. As has already been suggested elsewhere, the biographical sources show clear evidence of a tendency towards the progressive elaboration of stories initially bare of any descriptive detail or overt propaganda. In this particular case this means greater emphasis on various aspects such as the caliph's respect for ahl al-bayt, and the statements by him which highlight the refutation of objections to the ʿImāmate of a child. This progression is all the more obvious since there is only one major reporter for the main core of the stories - al-Rayyān b. Shabīb, the maternal uncle of al-Muṣṭaṣīm, who reports to Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim.²⁰

One of the earliest sources and possibly the most accurate - Iḥbāt al-Waṣīyya - has a fairly straightforward account of the whole situation with a minimum of descriptive detail.²⁵ When the caliph
puts forward the proposal that al-Jawād marry his daughter, the
consternation of the Banū Ḥāshim, referred to in other sources as the
"=Abbāsiyya", is considerable. They seem alarmed and plead with the
caliph:

Do not remove from this house something God granted us
dominion over, nor strip away the rank He has given us. You
know what has occurred between us and Āl Abī Ṭālib.
Besides he is an inexperienced boy.

That these objections refer simply to al-Jawād is open to debate. The
initial form of the Abbasid's objections does not seem to be
specifically concerned with a marriage. What would the formation of
a political alliance through marriage remove from the Abbasid house?
Why would the youth and inexperience of the child be an impediment to
a betrothal or marriage, which was in any case not to be consummated
for some ten years? Only in later sources is more direct reference
made to the objections being specifically to the marriage. In the
same sources, however, considerable detail has also been added to
underline what later scholars have assumed to be the reasons behind
the objections by inserting into the speech a comparison with the
previous situation with al-Riḍā. Despite the specific reference to
the marriage these details have the effect of simply making more
obvious the real direction of their fears:

[Do not ] persevere in this plan you have decided upon, of
marrying the son of al-Riḍā [to your daughter]. We are
afraid that you will remove from us something God has
granted us dominion over and strip from us the rank He has
given us. You know what is between us and these people, both
of old and recently, and the policy of the rightly-guided caliphs before to isolate them and belittle them. We were greatly afraid of your action with al-Riḍā until God was sufficient for us in that task. O God, do not bring back to us that pain from which we had escaped. Turn aside from your opinion of Ibn al-Riḍā and choose someone you think suitable from your own family rather than someone else.  

[only the parts underlined being found in Ithbāt]

The actual phrases which form the basis of later texts and, indeed, the interpretation of them by later scholars, suggest that their fears were directed at the choice of an heir, a situation more applicable to al-Riḍā than to al-Jawād, who is nowhere referred to as having been even considered as heir to the throne. In this context it is worthwhile considering the objections put forward for al-Riḍā which are reported in Ṣiyāṣa R.:  

The Banū Hāshim were envious of him and said; you are appointing an ignorant man with no perception in controlling the caliphate. Send someone who will show you proof of his ignorance.

The caliph's reaction to the dissidents in Ithbāt is simply that "he is by God more knowledgeable of God, His Sunna, and aḥkām than the majority of you", a statement which could apply equally to his arguments in favour of al-Riḍā as al-Jawād, if not more so. This reaction is of course expanded in later sources as a vehicle of quite blatant propaganda.
The process of testing, suggested in the response of the Abbasids to the appointment of al-Riḍā, finds its parallel in the situation of al-Jawād, suggested, according to Ithbāt, by the dissidents themselves, although the later sources place it in the mouth of al-Ma'mūn, an indication of his confidence that the child is unassailable in his knowledge and emphasising the caliph's respect for, and belief in, him.33

The testing was carried out by Yaḥyā b. Aktham, described by later sources as a "Qāḍī of the era", perhaps to enlighten those of later times unaware of his status.34 No extraneous descriptive details are allowed to interfere in Ithbāt's account of the debates, which proceeds directly to the questioning on technical details about the killing of game whilst in the state of ihram [ritual consecration] during the hajj.35 Yaḥyā is portrayed as being dumbfounded not by the answer, but by the questions put by al-Jawād to discover the exact legal circumstances within the very general area on which Yaḥyā has challenged him.36

It could well be argued that the examination of legal knowledge here is exclusively reported as being of al-Jawād, with nothing to suggest that he might not have taken part in it. There are however several facets of the account open to doubt. Al-Rayyān b. Shabīb, being part of the Abbasid family, would probably have been with the caliph also during the years in Khurāsān and is mentioned in Ṣiyāsah as one of the sources of Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim.37 Yaḥyā b. Aktham was also present in at least one of al-Riḍā's debates whilst in Khurāsān (he was originally
from Merw and left to take up a position in Baṣra in 202 A.H. Given that the major figures involved, other than al-Jawād, were also present at the time of the discussions attending al-Riḍā’s appointment as heir and his marriage to Umm Ḥabība, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that even the debate itself has been transferred from the mouth of al-Riḍā to al-Jawād. This might seem too major an alteration to survive the scrutiny of scholars and lawyers, yet there is evidence of exactly this type of transference affecting al-Jawād himself.

After the marriage ceremonies a mailīs [gathering or meeting] is reported, which included the caliph, Yaḥyā and others, in which Yaḥyā put a series of provocative statements to al-Jawād on the status of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar; that there were hadīths which said that God was content with Abū Bakr; that the two were comparable figures on earth to Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl in heaven; that they were the sayyīds [lords] of the elders of paradise; that ‘Umar was the lamp of ahl al-janna [people of the garden]; that the Prophet said if he had not been sent that ‘Umar would have been etc. The Imām’s answers are as mild and placatory as is possible for them to be whilst still pointing out the absurdity of the statements by referring constantly to Kitāb Allāh and the Sunna as the basis of his arguments. Each report is undermined in a careful and rational manner without in any way attacking outright the two ‘orthodox’ caliphs. The Imām’s arguments win the day, against the well known qāḍī. However, a debate too similar for coincidence is reported in ʿUyun al-R. Not only has the debate taken place during the Imāmate of al-Riḍā rather then al-Jawād, but the reason for the lack
of overt Shi'ite bias and sentiment is revealed. The debate is recorded as taking place between the _ashāb al-hadīth_ and, not the Imām, but the caliph who refutes the views of the former on the first two caliphs as supposedly al-Jawād was doing.  

That the betrothal/marriage speeches for both al-Riḍā and al-Jawād are also similar has very little significance; formal exchanges of this type might vary little in such situations. The evidence for the transference of some of these reports from al-Riḍā to al-Jawād can never be anything more than circumstantial and must remain outwith the reach of historical certainty. Much of the interpretation which leads to the assertion of this possibility relies on allowing for a considerable amount of muddling, or subtle, though unconscious modification.

Whatever the underlying reality, the stories of the marriage, and the testing of al-Jawād which were attached to it, were perfect vehicles for the propaganda of later years, propaganda which was all the more persuasive for issuing allegedly from the mouth of the caliph al-Ma'mūn himself.

There are some sections which reveal themselves clearly as later additions, although they often build on simpler and less expansive statements which already exist. The first example of this has already been seen in al-Ma'mūn's dismissal of his family's protests where a single sentence has evolved into a much longer rebuttal:
As for Abû Ja'far, I have chosen him because of his superiority to all men of merit in knowledge and merit despite his youth, and as a result of his miraculous nature in that.\textsuperscript{42}

This is not the end of the matter. Frustrated by the refusal of the caliph to bow to outright opposition, the protestors try to suggest a compromise:

This young man, even though he has amazed you, needs direction... He is still a boy without knowledge and understanding. Therefore act with circumspection towards him so that he may become educated and may gain understanding in religion. Then after that do what you think appropriate.\textsuperscript{43}

Their attempt to placate the caliph, and at the same time block his plans is not, however, successful and is rejected in even stronger terms:

He is from the family of the House whose knowledge is from God, of those who love Him and are inspired by Him. His ancestors were always rich in the knowledge of religion and literature far beyond the populace which lacked the range of their perfection.\textsuperscript{44}

The similarity of the arguments about his age and lack of knowledge and the refutations thereof, to the debates of the Imāmi scholars is quite marked, but it is the caliph's final summing up which bears the
greatest imprint of the dilemma associated with the Imamate of al-Jawād and the solution which finally became accepted:

Even youthfulness in years does not prevent them from attaining perfection. Don't you realise that the Messenger of God began his mission by calling on the Commander of the faithful `Alī b. Abī Tālib, to follow him when he was only a boy of ten years? He did not call on anyone else of his age. Al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, gave the pledge of allegiance when they were only boys of less than six...They are offspring who follow one another so that the last of them carries out what the first of them did.415

Whatever the actual sequence of events as regards the betrothal and marriage of al-Jawād, and the propaganda which eventually became part of the stories about them, the central point remains; al-Jawād was the son and heir of al-Riḍā, whose name had been mentioned in the same breath as the caliphs in the traditional khutba (Friday sermon), and whose likeness had been stamped on the coinage of the realm.416 He had also, at whatever point in time, been officially linked with the Abbasid house through marriage. In addition, al-Ma'mūn's stated reasons for his choice of heir, that al-Riḍā was the most knowledgeable and most worthy of the position, a point proved by the endless debates arranged by the caliph between al-Riḍā and a wide spectrum of different schools of belief, echoed the Shi'ite belief in the superiority of the direct descendents of the Prophet and their rights as leaders of the Umma. If, as Ithbāt states, al-Jawād was also summoned to Baghdad to live for a time under the watchful eye of the
caliph, it could only enhance his status as a worthy candidate for becoming the focus of Shi'ite devotion and aspiration.

Nevertheless external influence alone, however powerful and persuasive, would not have been enough to create a consensus of opinion and give the Shi'a sufficient cohesion and strength to survive the consecutive succession of two child Imams.

2.3 Internal factors: the alternatives to al-Jawād.

The Imāmate of al-Jawād did not come into being in a vacuum. The factors which qualified someone for the leadership of the community, whether temporal or spiritual, had been a bone of contention from the outset. The divided loyalties within Islam were built on a foundation of disagreement as to the proper qualities and duties of the supreme leader, originally the successor to the Prophet. The contention of the core of the Shi'a that the successor was 'Alī by designation and merit was only the first in a series of continually evolving definitions of those qualified to lead the community. During the lifetime of the first five Imāms, the Shi'ite feeling which existed as an unfocussed tendency throughout the population, whether of political or spiritual origins, attached itself to a number of leaders from within the 'Alid house. With each successive generation historical events produced restrictions which technically applied to the next generation. The already existing body of rules and regulations attached to the
Imāmate was a vital factor in the rebuttal of the most natural reaction to a child Imām - the recognition of an alternative, more mature member of the family, a brother of the previous Imām, or even an uncle.

A very direct statement about this possibility is reported in al-Kāfī where al-Riḍā is asked if the Imāmate can pass to an uncle or to a brother. The answer is a blunt no only to "my son". At the time he had no son, according to the source, Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazī, a prominent member of the Shīʿa of al-Jawād. The majority of reports which touch on the question of the succession of a brother to the Imāmate are on the authority of al-Ṣādiq which is only to be expected when he was the most prolific and widely recognised of the Imāms as a teacher and lawyer. He would have been the one most likely to have had important ideas attributed to him to give them added weight and authority. However, in this instance the circumstances of his own lifetime provide ample reason to accept that it was indeed he who spoke out on this problem.

The rejection of the succession of two brothers is for the most part expressed in terms of the uniqueness of the transfer of the Imāmate between al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, and the subsequent emphatic denial of the possibility of the Ḥasanid line ever recovering the honour. It was during al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq's lifetimes, that the insistence on firstly Fāṭimid as well as ʿAlīd descent as a response to Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, and then on ʿUsaynid ancestry as a response to ʿAbdallāh al-Mahd b. al-Ḥasan [2] appeared. The latter was the father of Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyya, the ʿAlīd who presented himself as the
Mahdī, a claim supported by his father. The Ḥasanid branch, descended from al-Ḥasan b ʿAlī who gave up his claims to leadership, were ironically the more active branch of the family. Even within the Ḥusaynid line, first al-Bāqir and then al-Ṣādiq, faced the challenge of Zayd b. ʿAlī who pursued a more active claim to power.

Given this situation it would have been entirely natural for him to be obliged to answer questions from others and his own partisans as to the validity of these other claims. Thus it was that it was possible for the scholars to explain to the Shiʿa in al-Jawād’s time that:

We have heard from both Abū Jaʿfar and Abū ʿAbdallāh that the Imāmate cannot pass between two brothers after al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, so he (ʿAbdallāh b. Mūsā) is not our šāhīb."

Notwithstanding the above, of the many reports from al-Ṣādiq, there are a few which refer suspiciously closely to circumstances which only occurred for al-Jawād. One report60 has al-Ṣādiq stating categorically that even where the choice is between an older brother and a young son, the Imāmate must remain in the direct line; others mention not only brothers but also uncles.61 No matter what precedents of this kind supporters of al-Jawād could produce, there would always be some who would dismiss these reports and be drawn towards a more obviously competent and qualified member of the ahl al-bayt, basing this choice on a variety of different paths of designation. Even by al-ʿAskarī’s time there could still appear a faction which would support the Imāmate of his brother Jaʿfar, despite a lack of consensus
on the path of designation and ignoring the strong evidence against the succession of two brothers.\(^{62}\)

Who then were their main alternatives? Aḥmad b. Mūsā had initially been a rival to al-Riḍā,\(^{63}\) and one group did prefer to assert that al-Riḍā had actually given him the nass rather than al-Jawād.\(^{64}\) One of the complicating factors which derived from the Imāmate of al-Riḍā, and therefore affected his successor, was the difficulty he had, in the face of the seemingly numerically strong wāqifites\(^ {65}\) in acquiring and maintaining a following. His own Imāmate came under prolonged fire for his continued lack of successor, a situation which may have lasted many years and which in many eyes undermined his claims. No Imām could be genuine when he failed to provide for a successor to maintain God's guidance to mankind, a continuing source of infallible knowledge.

The major group of reports on this subject are reported by al-Ḥusayn b. Qiyāmā, once a follower of ʿAbdallāh b. Jaʿfar, but who turned to al-Kāẓim, before becoming a wāqifite.\(^{66}\) He throws doubt on the Imāmate of al-Riḍā by virtue of his lack of a son and a report from al-Ṣādiq that the Imām cannot remain without offspring. Al-Riḍā replies without hesitation that he will have a son to follow him.\(^ {67}\) The existence of this doubt about his Imāmate may explain why there also existed a group who asserted that Aḥmad b. Mūsā was the direct heir of al-Kāẓim, since they could not accept al-Riḍā as genuine Imām.\(^{63}\)
"Abdallāh b. Mūsā is another name which occurs within the stories about al-Jawād. He is portrayed as attempting to fill the gap left by the death of al-Riḍā by expounding his own views on legal matters."  It is even suggested by the remarks of some of the scholars that he was acceptable as a temporary source of guidance, without there being any formal obligation on the part of the Shī'a to accept his views without demur.  Although there was a son of al-Kāzīm called "Abdallāh nothing is reported about him, nor are there any traces in any heresiographical work of a suggestion that he collected even a small personal following. Despite the fact that one source refers specifically to the uncle of al-Jawād, a more obvious rival may be "Abdallāh b. Mūsā b. "Abdallāh b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. "Alī.  He was apparently sought by the authorities at the time of Abū al-Sarāyā's uprising and had been one of the names put forward to Naṣr b. Shabīb when he came to Medina seeking figures of authority within ahl al-bayt.  He seems to have remained in hiding til the time of al-Mutawakkil, but was still even so one to whom the Zaydite tendency looked for leadership. Reported only in Magāṭīl and nowhere else, is the curious, but fascinating, statement that al-Ma'mūn wrote to him after the death of al-Riḍā, calling on him to take the place of al-Riḍā and become his heir. The letter rejecting this offer is fully recounted in Magāṭīl.

There is admittedly very little here to connect him with al-Jawād, but the appearance of any name linked with al-Jawād in certain stories need not necessarily reflect actual reality. If, as the outline above suggests, this "Abdallāh b. Mūsā was a visible, albeit for the most
part, outlawed candidate for the leadership and loyalties of at least one section of the Shi'a, he must have posed a threat in the minds of the proposers of the Imāmate of al-Jawād. What could have been more effective in undermining a rival than to portray someone with an identical name, initially as an accepted figure of authority, only to show him subsequently being rebuked and outshone in his abilities by a child? The stories of al-Jawād's testing during the hijāj, in which ʿAbdalldāh appears, may well be gems of subtle propaganda. Certainly there are few facts to suggest that there is any objective core of historical reality in them, and an alternative interpretation must inevitably be sought.

To suggest this degree of manipulation of the reports may well, however, be attributing to the asbābī a more devious and consciously calculating turn of mind than is justified by the evidence. It may well be that ʿAbdalldāh b. Mūsā al-Kāẓīm despite, or perhaps because of, the lack of strong personality and religious standing, seemed the most convenient relative to act as the child's ostensible guardian. Alternatively, a lack of solid information on him may simply be indicative of the insubstantial nature of the stories.

There is no concrete evidence to indicate where al-Jawād was between 205 A.H. and 215 A.H.. It is possible that the young Imām in fact remained at court for those ten years, despite the continued assumptions of the Shi'a that he returned to Medina after the marriage, which took place in 204-5 A.H., and lived there until leaving to see al-Ma'mūn in 215 A.H. These later years are, for the most
part, ignored in the sources which prefer to concentrate their attention on the problem of his age and on the accounts of his betrothal and/or marriage.

Few other major candidates made their presence felt. It must be remembered that the discussion of the Imāmate of al-Jawād was taking place after the explosion of Zaydi revolts under al-Ma'mūn had petered out. The quashing of these revolts had seen not only the demise of many of the potential leaders, or their discredit because of the very fact of their failure, but also the conversion of some few individual figures into minions of the Abbasid administration. Many who are listed as having taken part are simply not mentioned in the sources thereafter. One who does reappear, especially in connection with al-Jawād, is ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad who supported his brother Muḥammad in 200 A.H. in Medina. He is also possibly linked with Zayd b. Mūsā, who was sent to take control of Baṣra after the success of the takeover in Kūfa. Little is mentioned about his fate after the failure of the rising in Medina and the transportation of Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar to Khurāsān with al-Riḍā; he reappears, however, to play a strong role in the orientation of the Shiʿa towards al-Jawād.

The vehicle of this propaganda was, necessarily, somewhat different from the straightforward stories supporting al-Jawād's Imāmate. On the other hand, as with previous stories, it highlighted the older generation being surpassed by its antecedents. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAmmār relates that he had spent two years in Medina learning from ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad what his brother Abū al-Ḥasan
al-Kāzīm had taught him, only to see this learned man, who was later to be reported in *al-Irshād* as a pious narrator of traditions, methodically sound and of great merit, who supported his brother, greet al-Jawād in the mosque by kissing him, extolling him and refusing to be seated before the child himself. Muḥammad objects, astonished that such a well respected man should act this way towards a mere boy. *ʿAllī* firmly silences him saying:

> If God declared not this greyhaired old man fit, but the child, and placed him where he has, should I deny his excellence. God preserve us, I am his servant.\(^{71}\)

This statement has faint overtones of that of al-Rayyān b. al-šalt at the conference of the leading Shiʿa reported to have taken place sometime after the death of al-Riḍā.\(^{71}\)

This is not the only story on these lines. One has him rebutting a wāqifīte who asked him about both al-Kāzīm and al-Riḍā. *ʿAllī* states categorically that they are both dead, giving his reasons as:

> His wealth has been divided up, his wives have remarried and the nāṭiq [the vocal Imām] after him has spoken out.\(^{72}\)

He then asserts that al-Riḍā's successor was Abū Jaʿfar, once more to the astonishment of his opponent:

> You, a man of this age, with this standing, and the son of Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad, are professing to believe this about this
"Ali b. Ja'far's answer to the effect that it is God's decision firmly echoes that of the previous report. A story with an even stronger propagandistic tone is related again in Ikhtiyār where "Ali is questioned as to the identity of the boy and calls him wasī Rasūl Allāh. He then proceeds to list the chain of such figures from al-Jawād back to the Prophet."

"Ali b. Ja'far turns up again in a very different story describing what seem to be strained relations between al-Riḍā and other members of the family. This account contains very disturbing implications either as regards the attitudes of the "Alids at the time towards non Arabs, or as regards the 'legitimacy' of al-Jawād, disturbing enough for al-Irshād to omit the bulk of the details, reducing it to a straightforward statement that al-Riḍā was treated unjustly by his brothers and uncles, but was given victory by God, and that "Ali b. Ja'far was the only one of his relatives to speak out on behalf of al-Jawād and recognise him as an Imām." Al-Riḍā's reply to the accusations, and "Ali's expressions of support, cross over into the realm of propaganda once more for he alleges that even the messenger of God said:

The son of the best of the beautiful Nubian maid-servants will be among his (<"Ali b. Abī Ṭālib) descendants. His grandson will be the Imām who goes into occultation. It will be said that he has died or been killed, or something
The reference to the occultation as being specifically that of his grandson not only immediately casts doubt on this as a contemporary statement, but is indeed strange, since it would refer not to the twelfth Imam al-Mahdi, but Ḥasan al-Askari, the eleventh Imam. In addition, the version in al-Kāfī, as well as extending this statement, says that jādduḥu ṣāḥib al-ghayba - referring therefore to al-Kāẓim?" The missing section, which occurs in al-Kāfī, shows an extremely humiliating episode for al-Riḍā and al-Jawād who must have been a very young child at the time. It is reported not from the Imāms themselves but from ʿAli b. Jaʿfar, who was discussing the events with al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAli b. al-Ḥusayn. It appears that al-Riḍā's uncles and brothers objected:

There has never been an Imām among us this colour [ḥā'il al-lawn; literally pallid, but here, black [ḥalak]].

Al-Riḍā challenges them to put the matter to the test citing as precedent the Prophet himself by sending for the qāfa, [the physionomists], without telling them why they are there. Not only do the uncles and brothers do this, but they oblige al-Riḍā to put on coarse clothing and work in the garden where the testing is to take place. The judges arrive and identify those present as the boy's uncles and great uncles, but say that his father, if anyone of those present, is the man working in the garden. The story indicates a considerable
amount of latent hostility between al-Riḍā and his relatives. Is the family implying that al-Jawād cannot be al-Riḍā's son, or simply attempting to blacken both al-Riḍā's and his son's reputation.

It has been suggested that the overall direction of the reporting of ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar's standing was, as with ʿAbdallāh b. Mūsā, to detract from his authority in favour of al-Jawād, since he was an obvious choice. There is, of course, an alternative, but one which unfortunately again has no solid evidence to back it up. As a child al-Jawād must have been in the care of someone, despite the technical assertions by the theorist that he was competent in any sphere at any age after he became Imam. There is no indication of how long he remained under the supervision of al-Maʿmūn, some historical sources implying that when he came to visit the caliph in Tikrit in 215 A.H. he was travelling from Medina. Shiʿite sources accept as read that he had returned to Medina immediately in 205 A.H., as is implied certainly by the juxtaposition of stories in al-Irshād. He may well, however, have been in Baghadād for these ten years, as concluded by al-Ḥasanī. Similarly, however much the theorists insisted that al-Jawād was capable of handling the affairs of a developing network of representatives, in practical, not to mention rational terms, a more senior figure, or figures, must have been involved. Given that so many of his immediate family were either hostile, or not available, there were few possible guardians. ʿAbdallāh b. Mūsā is named as some such figure, but there is very little information on him and none indicating his support for al-Jawād. Could ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar's statements in favour of al-Jawād be a reflection of the fact that it
was through the Imāmate of al-Jawād that he himself wielded whatever influence and power was attached to it? This interpretation must be a possibility, however slight, but the question of exactly what his role was remains, as do many others relating to this period, unanswerable.

To some extent the various reports of nass touched on previously were peripheral to the central problem. It is all very well refuting possible claims to the Imāmate from other members of the family, and the objections of those who did not accept al-Riḍā's Imāmate in the first place, but this could not guarantee success if al-Jawād's Imāmate was seen as untenable and impossible because of some major weakness. Al-Jawād's claims, by whomever they were put forward, suffered from a crucial achilles heel; the fact that he was at the time of his father's death only seven years old, and that he succeeded to the Imāmate at a point in time when major decisions were being made as to its character i.e. when he was only nine or ten years old. This would not have mattered if, in the minds of the Shi'a, the Imām served only as a focus of the devotion and reverence which some sections of the population felt were due to the family of the messenger of God. For the scholars and āshāb, however, this was not his sole function.

The Imāmate was emerging from the discussions held under al-Riḍā as an ultimate and irrefutable source of ʿilm and guidance for the Shi'a. His word was literally, if somewhat hypothetically, law and obligatory for those who acknowledged him. Therefore the Shi'a found themselves faced with questions they could not afford to ignore if they wished to
maintain a semblance of continuity in their thought, and provide a
stable focus for the loyalty and devotion of the ordinary people.

How could a child possess all the knowledge and learning required to
give judgements and guidance, and if he did indeed possess it, where
did it come from? Was he to become Imām once he had matured and
absorbed the accumulated knowledge of his predecessors or, as some
said, was he Imām even as a child because the earth must have a guide
at all times? Obscured, perhaps, by these apparent considerations, was
the fact that the Shi'a needed to maintain the principle which was the
lynchpin of Shi'ite beliefs. Knowledge taught and learned by man
unaided by divine guidance could not be the sole criteria for the
Imāmate, for then it would not be restricted to alī al-bayt. As for
the Imāmate itself, if the Imām were to be unique, unassailable and
infallibly guided, he must encompass more than the apparent and widely
available ilm reported from his predecessors and collected by their
followers, something neither learned nor acquired, but innate, inherited
in some way from his father and his father's father. That there could
scarcely have been sufficient time for it to have been physically or
materially transferred must have been a major problem.

The strong precedents in the lives and thought of previous Imāms for
the rejection of a horizontal transference of the Imāmate, combined
with the paucity of obviously qualified alternatives, were clearly
strong factors in favour of al-Jawād's Imāmate. The use of
precedents to facilitate the rejection of one opinion in a debate
frequently, however, elicits a demand for the provision of precedents
which actually support the argument. Unfortunately for al-Jawād’s supporters, precedents for his unusual situation were not quite as easy to extract and present, as the neatly packaged, relevant and reliable reports, from al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq rejecting other members of the family.
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51. Another report which seems even more likely to be a later fabrication lists the nine Imāms after al-Ḥusayn as part of its argument [Biḥar, XXV, p.253, n.10 from Manaqib.]. As for the story concerning the uncle; See Biḥar [XXV, p.253, n.12] reporting via Muḥammad b Sinān.

52. al-Fuṣūl, pp.259-60; Occultation, pp.59-62.


54. al-Fuṣūl, p.256 where al-Riḍā had given the nass to his brother. For notes on Āḥmad b. Mūsā see Chapter One note 18. Acyān al-Shīrāzī states he died after rebelling against al-Ma’mūn and that he took part in the revolt of Abū al-Ṣarāyā. See Ikhtiyār, p.472, n.898.

55. i.e. those who accepted the previous Imām and maintained their belief in him, alive or dead, thereby refusing to recognise a successor.

56. Under this name there is limited information. R. ibn Dāwūd says he argued with al-Riḍā and was a follower of al-Kāẓim (p.445, n.143). Ithbāt, [p.210] notes him as āḥsan b. Qiyām al-Ṣayrafi. The next link is more widely known. Al-Ḥusayn or al-Ḥasan b. Bashshār [Rijāl al-Barqī, p.56, n.273; R. ibn Dāwūd, p.104] follower of al-Kāẓim and al-Riḍā] who was wāṣīfīte but repented. Possibly this term was transferred to Ibn Qiyāma when the Īṣānāds were cut in some places, or is a corruption of Wāṣīṭī which is also used of Ibn Qiyāma [al-Irshād, p.482].

57. Several reports exist from this reporter with confusing variations in both content and Īṣānāds. They split into two separate types. One describes a letter written by him to the Imām and reported then to al-Ḥusayn b. Bashshār where he questioned al-Riḍā’s Imāmate on the grounds of no successor and was told there would soon be one [al-Kāfī, I, p.320, n.4; al-Irshād, p.482; Iṣām, p.346]. The second presents the audience as a visit made by Ibn Qiyāma and merges several themes. In Ithbāt [p.210] he refers back to al-Ṣādiq’s saying that the Imām cannot be without children. In another version he brings in the question of theṣāmīt Imām [the silent Imām] and the co-existence of two Imāms, al-Riḍā’s being without one casting doubt on his Imāmate [al-Kāfī, I, p.321, n.7; al-Irshād, p.482]. This story classes the reporter as wāṣīfīte. A further story develops this to ask ‘can the earth be without an Imām’ before continuing on the subject of theṣāmīt Imām, and
then the lack of offspring, giving the impression that it is a fusion of the other stories into one longer account (Biḥār, L, p.34, n.19; Ikhtiyyār, p.553, n.1044 with a similar story p.475, n.902).

58. See Chapter One note 27 for ʿAbdallāh b. Mūsā. There are various reports of the testing; Ithbāt, pp.213-4; Biḥār, L, pp.85-6, n.1 from al-Ikhtiṣās; pp.89-91, n.5 from Manāqīb; pp.99-100, n.12 from ʿUyūn M.


60. al-Irshād, p.458.

61. Only Biḥār, [L, pp.85-6, n.1] refers to him as the uncle of al-Jawād. For ʿAbdallāh b. Mūsā b. ʿAbdallāh b. al-ŷasan b. al-ŷasan b. ʿAlī, see Chapter One note 27.

62. Maqātil, p.519.

63. Maqātil, p.632.

64. Maqātil, pp.628-631 where there are two accounts of this offer and the rejection. His two sons ʿAlī and ʿAbdallāh were imprisoned under a later caliph al-Mustamīd.

65. See above Chapter One n.73 on the written will of al-Jawād which suggests that he was at court for much of his life, the will being witnessed by figures of the Abbasid court.

66. Those who were seduced into being linked with the Abbasid administration include figures such as al-ʿAbbās b. Mūsā who became governor of Kūfa; Ibrāhīm b. Mūsā who agreed to mention both al-Maʿmūn and al-Riḍā in the Khutba but was eventually arrested [Occultation p.43]; ʿIsāq b. Mūsā who was also married into the Abbasid family and sent on the ḫajj as a public relations exercise. [Maqātil p.565]

67. Maqātil, p.540

68. Maqātil, p.534, although notes indicate some question over whether it was him or ʿAlī b. Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar.


70. al-Kāfī, I, p.322, n.12; Biḥār, L, p.36, n.26. Unfortunately the source of this story is unknown in the works on riḍāl, as is the next in the chain Muḥammad b. Khallād al-Šayqal. The first known is Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad b. Khāqān al-Qalānisī, al-Nahdī reported in R. ibn Dāwūd [p.497, n.406] as being weak and a muddler of traditions.

71. See Chapter One p.6.
72. Ikhtiyār, p.429, n.803. Note that this is reported via ʿAlī b. Asbāḥ and al-Khashshāb a much stronger, and indeed more significant isnād.

73. Ikhtiyār, p.429, n.804. Included in the story are other more mundane examples of respect shown by ʿAlī to al-Jawād, at one point insisting on having the doctor use a knife for blood-letting on him first before al-Jawād, although one would have expected that a blunt knife would have been worse. He also gives the boy sandals for his feet when he stands up to leave (Bihār, L p.104 n.19).

74. al-ʿIrshād, p.481; Iclām, p.345. Both are much edited versions.


76. See biographical index under al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn.

77. The fact that al-Jawād was probably dark-skinned is also referred to in Maqātil (p.565). Some of the doubts about him on the part of the murtābūn [doubters or sceptics] of Mecca were apparently because he was shāḥid al-udama, perhaps a different way of saying the same thing (Bihār, L, p.8, n.9 from Manāqib).

78. The isnād according to al-ʿKāfī [I, p.322, n.14] is from Zakariyyā b. Yahyā b. al-Ṣaʿādīb al-Ṣayrafi. In al-ʿIrshād (p.481) he is referred to as al-Baṣrī. Under this name he is not to be found in R. ibn Dāwūd or Rijāl. However as al-Qattān, al-Tamīmī he is listed in the index of the translation of al-ʿIrshād as a Kufan follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Riḍā. R. ibn Dāwūd says he did not report directly from any Imām. He reports to ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Qāsānī [al-Ṣaʿādīb al-Ṣayrafi, p.345] probably al-Qāshānī who has a mixed reputation, a weak follower of al-Riḍā, but sound under al-Jawād. He was possibly connected to reprehensible doctrines and attacked by ʿAbd b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsā. He reports to one of the most prolific of collectors of traditions about the Imāms, Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim and his son. Al-Jawād’s mother according to al-ʿKāfī [I, p.492] was Subayka or Khayzurān, a woman of the house of Marīyā, mother of Ibrāhīm. According to al-ʿIrshād (p.480), she was a Nubian slave, and indeed, the story refers to the "son of the beautiful Nubian maidservant". Bihār [L, p.7, n.8 from Manāqib] says she was one of ʾahl Marīyā al-Qibṭiyā. Ithbāt refers only to his mother as being Subayka, the best of the women of her time, but it does not relate the story at all.

3.1 The search for precedents:

The main task was to provide evidence of earlier cases where God's instrument of guidance for mankind was similar to al-Jawād; perhaps having faced the same criticism and scepticism only to triumph with God's help and prove himself.

The best kind of precedent for al-Jawād would have been one of the earlier Imāms, but none had been quite as young as Abū Ja'far. The ideas placed in the mouth of al-Ma'mūn at the time of the betrothal which reminded the listeners of the early ages of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn when giving the pledge of allegiance, and of ʻAlī himself when he accepted Islam, respectively six and ten years of age, were the closest that they could get to a direct parallel for al-Jawād.1 A tenuous parallel was found in the situation of al-Kāẓim who, although twenty when al-Ṣādiq died, has many stories of nassā which take place during his childhood, and a few which refer to either his possession of knowledge at an early age,2 or to his having spoken whilst still an infant in the cradle.3 Of all the later Imāms, however, al-Kāẓim is the one whose Imāmate is generally accepted as having been
unrecognised for some time after the death of al-Ṣādiq. The reports of designation for him are therefore more than usually suspect. In addition, some of the very stories which relate his abilities in the cradle, and as a young child, are reported by the people who might be most anxious to discover such precedents: people such as Zakariyyā b. Adam and Muḥammad b. Sinān.\footnote{This last person is responsible for a group of stories of less restrained imagination which include another implied precedent for the young al-Jawād. It is contained within a story presenting the child as effecting a miraculous cure of Muḥammad b. Sinān's eye trouble after Muḥammad had delivered to him a letter from his father who was in Mecca, the implication being that al-Jawād was under five at the time, his father not yet having left for Khurāsān. Muḥammad responds to the child's abilities by calling him "the like of the Sāhib of Fiṭrus" and when pressed to explain the reference, relates that a 'fallen' angel, Fiṭrus, asked Jibrīl to take him to the Prophet to seek his intercession shortly after the birth of al-Ḥusayn. On reaching him the Prophet directs him to the cradle of al-Ḥusayn who restores him to favour.\footnote{Apart from these rather strained examples, however, there were simply no direct precedents for al-Jawād's circumstances among the Imāms. The emphasis is placed, therefore, on the less obvious examples of previous Prophets. There are a multitude of stories where al-Riḍā, faced with the doubtful reactions of the ḍāhīb to his designation of a}}
child, explains the parallel between the Imāmate and the Prophethood, giving as prime example the Prophet Jesus, a divinely chosen child.

On analysis these reports, and those linked to them, resolve themselves into three distinct groups. The first group is related, unsurprisingly perhaps, by members of the inner circle of the Shi‘a. From Șafwân b. Yaḥyā comes a group of reports where the child's age is frequently mentioned as three i.e. before the departure of al-Riḍā, and which refer to the parallel of Jesus; from Zakariyyā b. Adam comes one where his age is mentioned as four and where the designation is direct; and from al-Bizantī, Ibn Abī Naṣr, comes a group of reports which concentrate more on the existence of an heir—although he is also linked with Șafwân b. Yaḥyā. Where doubts are expressed by the ʾašbāḥ, in each case al-Riḍā's reaction is to state that:

This [his age] does not harm him. ʾĪsā became God's ḥulīa when he was three years old.

He goes further in one case, forestalling possible objections to the comparison of an Imām to the Prophets by saying:

The Imāmate follows the same pattern as does Prophethood.

The story from Zakariyyā is especially clever in its use of imagery. Not only does al-Riḍā say directly "It is yours", i.e. the Imāmate, to the child, but the serious nature of the child is subtly emphasised, his natural gravitas, his awareness of the history of his family, how it has
been wronged and oppressed, as well as his own duty towards it.
Seeing the boy meditating for some time, al-Riđā had asked what he was thinking about to be told:

> What happened to my mother Fāṭima. I would take those two and burn them, then scatter and spray them about agonisingly.'11

A second related group of stories which also uses the historical precedent of Jesus is related from al-Maḥmūdī/al-Khayrānī, on the authority of his father,12 who was responsible for the major report of the designation of al-Hādī. Al-Riđā's replies, drawing on the example of Jesus, go slightly further than the previous explanations. He emphasises that:

> God sent ʿĪsā b. Maryam, with authority over [gāʾir bi] his sharīʿa [revealed law] when he was younger than Abū Jaʿfar will be when he takes charge of ours.'13

A less credible report is attributed to Muḥammad al-Maḥmūdī on his father's authority, who says he heard it from a bāḏima [nursemaid] who noticed the child meditating like a shaykh and asked what he was thinking about. The story is found in only one source.14 In it the child himself mentions Jesus who:

> ...was ill when a child and described to his mother how to cure him. When she brought the medicine he cried, making her protest: "My son I am only using what you said to cure you with." He replied: "Al-ḥukm [wisdom] is that of the
Prophethood, but the body is that of a child."

The third major group of stories this time alluding to the cases of other Prophets, Joseph, Moses or John, is from `Ali b. Asbāṭ whose report is found in one form or another in eight different sources.

The basic structure common to all the reports is a visit made by `Ali to Medina with the intention of seeing al-Jawād so as to be able to describe him to his asbāb in Egypt. Here again, support for his Imamate is taken further; not only is Qur'anic evidence now produced, but the actual words are issuing from al-Jawād's mouth, a significant departure from other stories. A few of the reports deviate from this structure in one case to make a point of introducing his age, stating that he was five i.e. before he became Imam.16 In another case, `Ali informs him that they are discussing his lack of years, the implication being that he is at least nine and that he is already Imam.17

The fundamental groundwork of the Imam's answer is that:

Oh `Ali, God uses as His proof in the Imamate exactly the same as He does in Prophethood.... We gave him hukm [inherent wisdom?] as a child [19;13]....When he reached maturity we gave him hukm and `ilm [actual religious knowledge?] [12;22]. It is possible for hukm to come to someone as a child or as a man of forty years.18

Might there be here an echo of the suggestion that the hukm, in some versions given as hikma,19 was a quality of divine origin inherited by,
and inherent in, the true Imam as *hujjta* of God, whereas the "ilm, or religious knowledge, was an acquired quality of the mature Imam?

This was the kind of proposal put forward by certain parties as recorded in *Magālāt*, and is the implication of some of the statements made by the *aṣḥāb* in the portrayal of their debates and examination of al-Jawād, where the feeling is initially that, although he might be technically Imam, he is not yet fit to provide total guidance. In these previous cases, however, this view of his Imamate was rejected; each time this opinion is aired there is either a rebuttal of it by one of the *aṣḥāb*, or it is shown to be false by the subsequent actions of al-Jawād. The versions of "Ali’s story in later sources do tend to suggest the possibility that al-Jawād may have been originally accepted in a limited sense, only for the Shi‘ite scholars of later years to impose their own beliefs and manipulate the texts to support what they considered to be the truth; that he was at all times from the time of al-Riḍā’s death the true and capable Imam.

*Al-Kāfī*, for instance, produces a subtle alteration of the original quotations following the version in *Ithbāt al-Waṣīyya* until quoting:

*We gave him bukm as a child [19;13] and when he reached maturity [this part is found in both 12;22 or 28;15] and reached forty years of age [the two phrases together found in 46;15]*.
Clearly omitted is the final part of 12;22 and 28;15 referring to the later acquisition of ʿilm. The quotations were further reduced in al-Irshād and Fālā, where only 19;13 is quoted. Al-Jawād did not reach forty years of age, dying at the tender age of twenty five.

The whole idea of a second stage of the Imāmate whereby a potential Imām could become at a later date a fully functional bujā was, according to heresiographical sources and even the stories of the Shiʿa themselves, an idea debated at the time. At what point the decision was made that it was unacceptable is questionable; was it only finally rejected by scholars of the later occultation period, or was it in fact representative of the general feeling of the Shiʿa in their internal discussions, whilst being totally refuted for the benefit of the general public so that it would appear that the contemporary Shiʿa had dismissed this idea? Certainly the rejection of the split level Imāmate is emphasised in many stories.

The issue of age, whilst being the outstanding characteristic of al-Jawād's Imāmate, and therefore the focus of the biographical sources, is only cursorily dealt with in other works.

Al-Kāfī provides eight hadīths on the subject, three of which are identical to previous stories on the designation of al-Jawād. Three further stories, also dealing with al-Jawād's circumstances, are reported direct from the Imām's own mouth and via a group of ashāb closely associated with him - Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bāzī, ʿAlī b.
Of the remaining hadiths, one is from al-Ṣādiq, and is short and to the point, the circumstances which gave rise to it unfortunately left unexplained:

How would you react if the bulūj was one of this age (five)?

No answer was forthcoming, but this simply tends to suggest that it is, although somewhat abbreviated, a genuine account despite being reported via the dubious Sahl b. Ziyād. The final report is completely different, beginning as a more detailed debate about the status of Jesus at various times during his life:

Was Jesus when he spoke in the cradle God's bulūj for the people of his time?

and continuing with a discussion of ʿAlī's status during the lifetime of the Prophet. The common theme is evident; what was the position of one destined to be God's bulūj during the lifetime of his predecessor? The concept of the šāmit and the nāṭiq Imāms is clearly present in al-Bāqir's responses, although not fully elaborated, nor referred to with such technical precision. The wideranging area of the debate and the manner in which it is presented, indicate a genuine report of an early exploration of this theme. Despite this, the ages quoted dovetail suspiciously with the circumstances of al-Jawād - the age of seven being a crucial one. If it is actually an early discussion which just happened to touch on Jesus as the pattern for an immature bulūj, it was a tailor made gift for the supporters of al-Jawād.
It is notable that al-Baqir's interpretation of the status of Jesus is more complex than the brief direct statements attributed to al-Ridâ. For al-Baqir, Jesus was only briefly huṣṭa and nabî, although not mursîl [spreading God's message], when he spoke as a boy - Maryam 31. Zakariyyâ held that position save for that one moment, and then again for the next two years until he died. After his death, Yahyâ inherited both the Kitâb and hikma, although he was yet a young boy according to the Qur'ân - Maryam 21. It was only later, when Jesus reached seven years of age, that he spoke of his Prophethood and message and became huṣṭa again.

Those who saw Jesus as a precedent for al-Jawâd, admittedly superficially a close parallel, seem to have chosen to ignore the fact, that although he was able to debate with the scholars at an early age and show evidence of his later mission, he did not declare himself until a much later date, the intervening years being spent in unremarkable obscurity. Perhaps their neglect of this aspect of Jesus' life, and its significance for the parallel with al-Jawâd, is due to a lack of specific reference in the Qur'ân to the age at which Jesus completed his mission.

Notwithstanding the existence of the repeated assertions of the ashâb who supported the Imâmâte of al-Jawâd, that the child was a true and fully capable Imâm, gathering all the Qur'ânic quotations and historical precedent they could muster, there are still remarkably few instances where they attempt to explore further the implications of this stance. If a two stage Imâmâte was rejected by the contemporary ashâb, then
one would expect a great many more questions to have arisen concerning the ilm, which they may have insisted that al-Jawād possessed even as a child. Of these questions, the nature of the knowledge, and the problem of its transfer, would be among the most important.

Certain characteristics of the relationship of one Imām to another had already been discussed at an earlier time. Al-Ṣādiq and his father had gone to great lengths to establish the special status of the Imāms, and their inheritance of the accumulated knowledge of the Prophet and previous Prophets, as symbolised by their possession of the weapons of the Prophet and other scrolls and documents. Their emphasis at that stage, however, seemed to lie on a concrete inheritance of such knowledge passed on from one Imām to the next as from teacher to pupil, although accompanied by the possession of the special abilities required by the Imām and inherent in ahl al-bayt. They had also asserted though that:

No-one of ahl al-bayt who is ilm dies till he sees his successor possessed of the knowledge the equal of his or what God wills.

This statement, which is a constant theme, might explain the insistence of al-Jawād’s supporters on rejecting any split-level Imāmate, for these reports, from the most respected Imāms, said that on the death of any Imām his successor would be fully capable of taking his place. This physical transference of knowledge is indicated in several reports
about the earlier Imāms, even when their successor was a mature and capable adult:

He called Abū ʿAbdallāh, Jaʿfar his son and said: "This is the night when my promised hour comes." Then he passed on to him the highest name, the mawāridh [legacies] of the Prophets and the weapons of the Prophet.29

For the child Imāms, who were not only too young to learn in the normal way from their fathers, but were not present when they died, this could not provide a satisfactory explanation.

With the more fragmented lifestyle of the later Imāms, and the frequent separation of father and son, further pieces were added to the concepts surrounding the transfer of the authority of the Imām. Not being present at the death of his father, and living at a period of the great ferment of Mahdite ideas, al-Riḍā was frequently pressed to confirm beyond doubt that al-Kāẓim was indeed dead. His responses included the assertion that he was immediately aware of the death of his father and was not dependent on ordinary news arriving days later. Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā reports that he asked:

When does the Imām know he has become Imām - when news arrives that his sāḥib had died or when it actually happens?

He knows when it actually happens.

How does he know?
God inspires him.³⁰

The precedent already existed therefore, for the Imām being aware of his father's death and knowing that he was Imām. There are several reports which allege that al-Jawād was aware of his father's death.³¹ These reports limit themselves to describing how al-Jawād was aware of the death of al-Riḍā several days before news arrived, telling those present to make preparations for mourning. There is no reference to al-Jawād knowing the exact time of his death, nor to any miraculous episodes connected with it in two of the stories. In the third, however, al-Jawād was reported to have said:

I buried my father in Khurāsān this hour.³²

Although perhaps meant to be taken figuratively as an awareness of his father's demise, a literal interpretation of these words has become the basis for a miraculous event - the presence of al-Jawād at al-Riḍā's death in Khurāsān. Such a story is reported by Abū Ṣalt al-Harawi, possibly a servant of al-Riḍā and with him during his time in Khurāsān. He relates:

A boy whom I thought was Ibn al-Riḍā appeared, although I had never seen him before....When al-Riḍā saw him he rushed to him and held him close before sitting on the seat and wrapping the cloak around them both. They spoke softly for a while about what I do not know, and then al-Riḍā stretched out and Muḥammad covered him with the cloak.³³
The child then carries out the rites of preparation for burial, washing and shrouding the body. The preparation of an Imām for burial only by the new Imām is a concept also introduced during al-Riḍā's time, most probably linked once more to the necessity of firmly squashing the repeated rumours of al-Kāẓim's survival.\(^3\)

The account of al-Jawf’s presence at al-Riḍā's death falls into a familiar pattern of miracles: the prescience required to know of his forthcoming death; the miraculous transport from one place to another; the provision of materials for the rites by some agency other than the human hand. It also includes quite neat pieces of propaganda, in particular the insertion of the image of the cloak covering the current and future Imām, surely evoking the image of the Prophet’s cloak being thrown around the shoulders of his close family and, according to the Shi'a, his future successors.

Abū Šalt denies any knowledge of what was said between father and son, but another source, describing another conversation is not so reticent. This story by Kulthum b. ʿImrān hints at some miraculous transfer of knowledge from al-Riḍā to his baby son almost from the moment he was born.\(^2\) Kulthum noticed al-Riḍā spending the entire night murmuring to him in his cradle for several nights in a row, and commented, sarcastically perhaps, that children had been born to other people before. Al-Riḍā retorted:

>`These are not charms, I am setting him on the path to ʿilm`
It would be perfectly understandable for someone who had just had his first son born to him at the age of forty or more, to be besotted with, if not somewhat paranoid about the child, and unwilling to let him out of his sight. The same story reported elsewhere by Kulm b. ‘Imrān omits this comment in favour of a longer statement, also reported in Ithbāt, but preceding this particular story and with some textual differences. This speech returns to the comparison with previous Prophets, and its emphasis on his future death, and the consequences thereof, give it a retrospective flavour:

"A son is born to me the like of Mūsā b. ‘Imrān, parter of the seas, the like of Jesus son of Mary whose mother was holy, created pure and purified." Then he said: "He will die in anger and the people of the heavens will cry out for him and to him. God will be angry with his enemy and oppressor and it will not be long before He visits on him an agonising torture and grievous punishment."

If some ideas are only vaguely present in the reports about the transfer of authority from al-Riḍā to al-Jawād, they are more strongly hinted at by the time the circumstances were repeated for al-Hādī. Although this succession was less of a traumatic event for the Shi‘a, since the arguments over age had been faced and debated on the previous occasion, it may have stimulated the repetition of any stories, accounts etc., which would stifle any nascent doubts about al-Hādī and provide the asbāb with an opportunity to strengthen any weak aspects of their arguments.
These reports for al-Hādī rarely come on the authority of reliable sources and may represent some of the more extreme ideas circulating at the time. For instance, there are two separate, but near identical, accounts in Ithbāt about al-Hādī’s reactions on the day of his father’s death. Al-Hādī was with a mu‘addib [teacher] called Abū Zakariyya in Medina when he suddenly cried out whilst reading and asked to go into the house. When the child came out again, and hearing the sounds of mourning, those present asked why and were told:

"My father has died this hour." We said: "How do you know".

"Because something entered me of the sublimeness of God and I knew with that that my father had died."③

The child makes a similar but not quite identical statement in another story:

"Because there entered me a humbleness [dhilla] towards God I had not known before."③

The suspicion that these phrases were meant to imply that at this instant the authority and "ilm of the Imām somehow became part of the being of the new Imām is supported by several factors. A few reports point out how the new Imām is aware of matters, like debts or promises, which were known only to the previous Imām.④ There is also a small section in al-Kāfī consisting of three hadiths which are virtually identical on the problem of when the Imām knows all the "ilm of his predecessor."⑤ All three are from al-Ṣādiq, but equally all
three are repeated via `Ali b. Asbâţ, who was deeply involved in the
debate over al-Jawâd’s Imâmate. The answer provided is that the Imâm
knows:

In the last instant remaining to his soul.\[42\]

The idea of a direct link between one Imâm and the next is also
contained in a short story reported by Binân b. Nafî, \[43\] who asked
al-Riḍâ about the next Imâm and was disconcerted when he said that it
would be the child who entered. Al-Riḍâ, however continues:

Oh Ibn Nafî greet him and swear obedience for his soul is
mine and mine is the soul of the Prophet.\[44\]

That the child does indeed possess the equivalent of the knowledge of
his predecessor, is also suggested in one report about al-Hâdî which is
extremely illuminating.\[45\] He is said in the above story to be under
the guidance of a tutor. However, after the death of al-Jawâd,
Muḥammad b. Sa‘îd\[46\] reports that “Umar b. al-Faraj\[47\] came to Medina at
the time of the hâji and met with some Medinese who were not among
the supporters of ahl al-bayt. His request to them to find an
educated man of non-Shi‘ite persuasion to be put in charge of the boy
is met, and one Abû `Abdallâh al-Junaydî becomes his teacher. The
story is interesting if only for the fact that there is a clear and
unambiguous statement that the Shi‘a lost touch with the child and
received no news, written or spoken, about him, a point which will be
taken up again later. After some while the teacher confesses to being
overwhelmed by the knowledge that the child possesses, which appears
much greater than his, despite the fact that, as Muḥammad b. Saʿd points out, he remained in Medina when his father went to Iraq and was in the care of black slaves. So where, Muḥammad asks pointedly, does this ʿilm come from? For the most part it is a question which is left unanswered.

3.2 The finishing touches - propaganda:

There would have been little point to the scholar's debates amongst themselves about the proper response to a child Imām, and the answers to the problems raised by it, if there was no effort made to present their case to those who needed reassurance. If the scholars were unsure, then the ordinary followers were even more in need of guidance. Having prepared their 'brief' in the case of al-Jawād, those supporting al-Jawād had to make their point of view known.

Although propaganda is to a greater or lesser extent present in every report, if only because unwelcome aspects would rarely survive and advantageous elements always be enhanced, there are scattered throughout the sources on al-Jawād several accounts which immediately strike the eye. Not that they are in any way more credible or reliable, but they do exhibit a common sense of purpose and structure. These are accounts which are quite clearly intended as propaganda for the Imāmate of al-Jawād.
The most obvious examples are from al-Jawād himself. It must have occurred to his supporters at some point that their protestations of the validity of the child Imām would not suffice to convince the Shi'a of his legitimacy. Was it not part of their own argument that he was fully capable of speaking on his own behalf no matter his age? There are several instances when al-Jawād does speak out for himself, both at a very early age, and later when his Imāmate was being tested.

According to one source, because of the fact that he was shadīd al-udmān [heavy or dark-skinned?], doubts were raised about him by some of those in Mecca who are referred to as the murtābūn [doubters or sceptics]. His humiliating subjection to the examination of the qāfn is recorded elsewhere, although only in this account is he alone without the company of al-Riḍā, and only here are the reactions of the examiners quite so reverential, shocked that they should even be asked to examine this child. Their description of the child being:

This shining star, brilliant light, are you attacking such as this...... the blazing stars and pure women give birth to him, he can only be a descendent of the Prophet and the Amīr al-Mu'minin.

Al-Jawād is said to have been twenty-five months old at this time. Immediately following this is a passage where the child apparently spoke "with a tongue [as sharp] as a whetted sword":

Praise be to God who has created us from His light, and
chosen us amongst His creatures, made us trustees of His creation and His revelation. I am Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Riḍā b. Mūsā al-Kāẓīm...b. Fāṭīma al-Zahrā', daughter of Muḥammad the chosen. Do you doubt such as this, and libel both God and my grandfather and put me to the test of the qāfa. By God I know their secrets and inner thoughts. I know what people's fates are; I speak truly and let the truth be clear, [the truth] which God gave before the creation of all things and after the setting up of the heavens and the earth.

Although this refers to the test of the qāfa and is placed immediately after the report of it, the account ends by saying that news of it reached al-Riḍā while he was in Khurāsān, and therefore the child could not have been just two years old, the age referred to earlier. The fact that the two reports are contiguous invites the reader to infer that they were contemporaneous, just as the proximity of the reports of the betrothal celebrations and the departure of the al-Jawād from Baghdād to the testing by Yaḥyā b. Akthām invites the reader to see those events as consecutive.

Despite the chronological confusion, the aim of the statements is clear. The child is shown speaking out clearly, strongly and indeed, eloquently in terms which confirm him as a worthy successor as Imām, and aware of his situation. A speech by al-Jawād very similar to the final paragraph of the above is reported in another source. This is said, however, to have taken place after the death of al-Riḍā, when al-Jawād was taken to the mosque of the Prophet and spoke from the minbar, being only seven years old at the time:
I am Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Riḍā, al-Jawād, knowing the ancestry of people; I know your secrets and what is apparent about you, what your fate will be; this knowledge given to us before the creation of the whole of Creation, after the fanā' [cessation] of the skies and earths. Were it not for the appearance of ahl al-bāṭil [false people] and the state of the ahl al-dalāl [people in error] and the appearance of ahl al-shirk [idolators], I would tell you things which both the early and later ones would be astonished at." Then he placed a hand over his mouth and said: "Oh Muḥammad keep quiet as your fathers have done before you".

The technical arguments which rejected any concerns over al-Jawād as Imam, are also found being spoken by the child himself rather than one of his inner circle. The three accounts, which portray the child responding to doubts on his own behalf, are all reported on the authority of figures involved elsewhere in supporting him i.e. ʿAlī b. Sayf whose account begins most similarly to that of ʿAlī b. Asbāṭ although he draws on a different parallel, that of Solomon and David; Muḥammad b. ʿIsā al-Bazī whose story was repeated by ʿAlī b. Mahzīyar to Sahl b. Ziyād in 221 A.H. after the death of al-Jawād and in the first year of the Imāmate of al-Hādī; and ʿAlī b. Hassān.

In later years al-Jawād may well have been responsible for some of the words reported as being his, but it was essential that he be shown as fully accomplished whilst still a child. To this end, for instance, he is referred to as having conducted al-Riḍā's affairs in Medina while he was away. There are of course less down to earth examples of al-Jawād's pronouncements. From one ʿAskar, who was according to the
story itself a mawla of al-Jawād, comes a highly imaginative report. The Imam knowing that ‘Askar is thinking how pale and thin he is, changes before his eyes:

He grew taller and broader, filling the room to the ceiling and walls; then I saw his colour darken till he was like the darkest night; then go white like the whitest of snow; then red like the reddest of veins; then green like the greenest of leafy growth; then his body shrank till he returned to normal size and colour.

It is impossible not to be aware of the imagery and poetic language of this description, although it may seem that such language is more appropriate to events experienced whilst under the influence of narcotic substances. As he falls on his face in awe, the Imam addresses him directly:

Oh ‘Askar, [when] you doubt, we provide you with truth, [when] you weaken we must strengthen you. No-one will arrive at the truth of knowledge of us save those on whom God bestows it through us....

To establish al-Jawād as a major figure of his time a slightly different approach is noticeable in the sources. He had already been shown as besting Yaḥyā b. Aktham in answering legal conundrums. However dubious the attribution to al-Jawād is, these accounts would have formed part of the welter of stories related about him. Yaḥyā b. Aktham returns in another story which also includes a more miraculous proof of al-Jawād’s Imāmate and, of course, once more portrays the boy not only equal, but superior to one of the foremost, or at least well
known qādis, of the day. Muḥammad b. Abī al-ʻAlā relates that he had been involved in discussions with Yaḥyā concerning the knowledge possessed by the family of Muḥammad and that afterwards Yaḥyā had said:

One day I was completing the tawāf [circumambulation] of the tomb of the Prophet and I saw Muḥammad b. ʻAlī al-Riḍā also doing so. I engaged him in discussion of some of my questions and he laid them out for me. Then I said: "I would like to ask you one question, but it embarrasses me to do so." He said: "Let me tell you what it is. You want to ask about the Imām." I said: "Yes." He said: "I am he." I said: "A sign?" In his hand there was a stick and it spoke up and said: "He is my master, the Imām of this time and he is the huṭfa."

Similarly the more practical facet of the knowledge of the Imām, that of anatomy is shown as surpassing that of one of the eminent practitioners of the day - Yuhannā b. Bakhtīshū. Al-Jawād had requested a blood-letter to open a vein called al-Zāhir, which the man had never heard of. After the Imām has shown him, the blood-letter consults Yuhannā who in turn consults another authority. None of them has any knowledge of it and al-Ūṣqaf can only surmise:

Perhaps he is a Prophet or one of their descendants.

The listing of the Imāms in a direct and continuous line right back to the Prophet is a common feature of propaganda, underlining the unbroken presence of God's huṭfa, and ultimately the right of al-Jawād to stand amongst them. It occurs in the letter sent to al-Ma'mūn, probably by
al-Riḍā although attributed to al-Jawād, concerning the marriage proposal;[^2] in the story of the meeting between the caliph and the child on the hunt;[^3] and in a well crafted story told by one Mūsā b. al-Qāsim[^4] who is said to have been a respected and eminently trustworthy follower of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād. Mūsā interweaves the line of the Imāms with the tawāf, linking the succession of the Imāmate with one of the major rites of the hajj. He asks al-Jawād's permission to carry out a circumambulation dedicated to him and his father, and it is granted. Some time later he says it occurred to him to take this to its logical conclusion, and so, he tells the Imām:

One day I performed the tawāf for the messenger of God; then the next day for ʿAlī; the third for al-Ḥasan; the fourth for al-Ḥusayn; the fifth for ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn... and on the tenth day for you.

The continuity of the Imāmate could also be emphasised in another way, and the rights of a new Imām given more weight, by reference to the predictions of earlier Imāms concerning not only their own future, but also the destination of the Imāmate itself. A short story on these lines is reported by a familiar name - Muḥammad b. Sinān.[^5]

In an audience with Mūsā al-Kāẓim he is told that something will happen in the coming year, but that he should not be worried by it. Unable to resist the chance of finding out what will occur, Muḥammad continues to question the Imām as to the future eliciting among other responses:
Whoever oppresses the rights of this son of mine and opposes his Imāmate after me will be like one who did so to Ālī after the Messenger of God.  

Muḥammad fervently wishes that God will grant him long life so as to be able to support him and affirm the Imāmate of al-Riḍā. In assuring Muḥammad that he will indeed survive to do so, al-Kāẓim mentions that he will also see his son's successor and calls him by name - Muḥammad.

The combination of the designation of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād in one account by al-Kāẓim, or an even earlier Imām, is found also in a story from Yazīd b. Sulayt, who is listed as one of the close followers of al-Kāẓim. It is a fairly complex account weaving together many major Shiʿite images and beliefs; real encounters with the Imāms are interspersed with accounts of visions of Rasūl Allāh and the Amīr al-Muʾminīn, who describe the qualities of the new ḥujjā.

In Ṣuyūṭī the account is content to provide ample designatory proof for al-Riḍā alone. However, al-Kāfi has an extended account encompassing both al-Riḍā and his son al-Jawād. Al-Kāẓim, after indicating that his son would not speak out until four years after the death of al-Rashīd continues:

Oh Yazīd, if you pass this place and meet him, greet him and give him the good news that he will have a son who is amīn, maʾmūn, blessed. He will tell you that you have met me and
that the slave girl who will bear him is one of ahl bayt
Mariyya [al-Qiblīyya], the slave of Rasūl Allāh.

Yazīd naturally does meet al-Riḍā and accompanies him on the "umra
[minor hajj performed at any time of year]; on reaching the place where
he previously met al-Kāzīm, he relates the story to the Imām. When
they reach Mecca, al-Riḍā buys the woman, and later she bears the child
that al-Kāzīm had referred to. An interesting afterword from Yazīd
refers to the hostility between "Alī and his brothers and the reason
for it; that they wanted to inherit from "Alī.

Whether this story was once propaganda for al-Riḍā extended to cover
his son al-Jawād, or was an attempt to strengthen the three Imāms who
form the weakest links in the chain of the twelve Imāms, is difficult
to ascertain. Al-Kāfī's account may be the earliest, but contains the
most inconsistencies, and phrases which do suggest a retrospective
viewpoint.

The major passages describing the Imām are virtually identical. In
one instance al-Ṣādiq describes the Imām as the one whom:

God provides through him aid for this Umma, its succour, fā'il
and light, its fā'il [grace, merit or excellence] and ḥikma; the
best of those born and brought up; God spares lives for him
and rejoins that which is separated; through him He
straightens out the confused and brings together what is
asunder; He clothes through him the naked and feeds the
hungry; through him the fearful believe and God sends the
rains; the servants receive mercy through him, the best of the
old and the young. His speech is ḥukm; his silence is ʿilm. He explains to people what they are arguing about. He governs his kin before fully mature."

As a description of the role and functions of the Imām, this passage must rank as one of the most eloquent and evocative. Not many of the Imāms, however, were able, or even given the opportunity, to fulfil these roles. The actual roles fulfilled by previous Imāms, both in the eyes of their own followers and in the eyes of posterity, depended on a combination of the effects of historical circumstances, the prevailing mood, currents of debate and opinion, and on their own characters, strengths and, dare one suggest, weaknesses.
CHAPTER THREE: FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES
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3. See e.g. Kashf, p.49 reported by Zakariyya b. Adam; Ithbāt, p.186 reported by Yaʿqūb b. Sarrāj; Iṣlām, p.299 via Muḥammad b. Sinān has the same story; al-Irshād, pp.438-9; al-Kāfi, I, p.310, n.11.
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4.1 The major issue of al-Hādi’s Imāmate:

"Ali b. Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Hādi, known also by the names al-Nāqī, al-ʿAskarī and al-Mutawakkil' (a name he refused to have used because of the caliph of the same name) was, like his father, a small child when he assumed the mantle of the Imāmate in 220 A.H. Several sources mention his age at this point as circa six years and five months,² for all but perhaps a year of which he lived with his father al-Jawād. For this year leading up to the death of al-Jawād he was in the care of servants in Medina, having been left there when al-Jawād was allegedly summoned to Iraq between 218 and 220 A.H. (the latter being the year he arrived in Baghdaḍ) by the caliph al-Muṭṭaṣīm.⁴

Al-Hādi was born according to the sources in Medina in either Dhu al-Ḥijja 212 or Rajab 214.⁵ Both of these dates fall within the ten year period when little is known for certain about the whereabouts of al-Jawād. The general assumption has been made by the sources that he was resident in Medina and only left to travel to Tikrīt to formalise his marriage to Umm al-Faṣl in 215 A.H.⁶ However, if al-Jawād was kept elsewhere for these ten years i.e. in Baghdaḍ where he returned for the celebrations of the marriage, then al-Hādi may have been born elsewhere. Indeed, Ithbāt states that he was only
taken to Medina in the year that al-Jawād and Umm al-Faḍl went on the hajj sometime after 215 A.H. The exact place of his birth is scarcely of major significance for his Imāmate, but the insistence on Medina by the sources in the face of general lack of specific information, may indicate a strong desire to establish the Imām's spiritual roots in the firm rock of the holy city of Medina, resting place of the Prophet, home of the nascent Islamic Umma, and early centre and capital of the Islamic empire. Even the indecision over his date of birth has no obvious motivation nor any apparent special meaning. If born in 212 he would have been only eight and a half instead of six and a half at the time of his father's death and not a mature successor.

In fact, the issue of age caused seemingly little disruption in the smooth acceptance of al-Hādī as al-Jawād's successor. The major account of his designation presents the wujūh al-shī'a [prominent Shī'ites] as able and willing to accept the transfer of the Imāmate without a major debate or considerable soul-searching about the capabilities of a child Imām. The problem of age had been faced for al-Jawād and those who had finally accepted al-Jawād could surely have had no justifiable reservations about his son, at least on this particular count. Indeed, the only group which did not accept al-Hādī was a numerically small group who upheld the succession of al-Hādī's younger brother Mūsā.

A more important factor in al-Hādī's life was the problem of isolation and the restrictions placed on him after his father's death, a stepping up of the temporary and partial isolation imposed on al-Jawād. Only
one source openly and unambiguously admits that the Shi'a were totally
cut off from the Imam, unable to contact him either in person or in
correspondence. What would be the probability of such a policy
being pursued by the caliph? Were the circumstances such that he
felt it necessary to put a child under such close guardianship, or was
it perhaps that the loss of contact was a natural corollary of the
youth of the Imam, and had indeed occurred with al-Jawād without being
recognised as such?

4.2 The relationship between al-Mu'taṣīm and al-Jawād:

It was al-Mu'taṣīm who allegedly summoned al-Jawād and Umm al-Faql to
Baghdād after his accession in the year 218, and Shi'ite sources
portray their relationship as one of suspicion and hostility. It was
supposedly a general review of his situation which prompted the caliph
to summon al-Jawād, although the precise reasons behind his anxiety are
not spelled out. He wrote to 'Abd al-Malik al-Zayyāt to facilitate
the departure of the Imam and his wife, and the Imam arrived in the
capital in the year 220. In the ten months between his arrival in
Baghdād and his death, the sources accuse the caliph of continual
attempts, initially to discredit him, and then to provide justification
for bringing about his death.

A straightforward attempt to frame him as an active claimant of power
and a threat to the caliphate is reported in the source al-Kharājī
The caliph alleged that letters relating to the proposed rebellion had been taken from servants of the Imam. The account is concluded with al-Jawad unmasking the lies of the witnesses by invoking the powerful intervention of God. The miraculous outcome of the story, as always, tends to undermine its historical value. A more subtle, and possibly more believable, attempt to discredit al-Jawad was abandoned even before it was put into effect, because of the advice of a Shi'ite who was included in the circle of Ibn Abi Duwad.

Al-Mahmoudi's father, Ahmad b Hammad al-Marwazi, who played a major part in the transfer of the Imamate to al-Hadi, heard of the plan from the qadi who was very influential amongst the caliph's advisors. The caliph had suggested that al-Jawad's support, and his claim to be the bulla, would be undermined if he was to be seen in an intoxicated condition, heavily perfumed. In contrast to others present, who thought that this would undoubtedly destroy the belief in the Imamate of al-Jawad, al-Marwazi explains to the qadi that this would certainly not be the reaction of "these people", with whom he mixed fairly easily, and with whose beliefs he was conversant:

They say that in every era God has on earth a bulla to act as an intermediary between Him and His creation. If there exists someone in the same era who has similar qualifications or better in descent and nobility, the most convincing evidence [for the true bulla] is the way in which the Sultan directs [his efforts] against him amongst his peers.

His opinion was passed on to the caliph who understandably despaired on hearing this, of discovering any way of toppling al-Jawad from his pedestal of blamelessness and repute.
A more scholarly interpretation of the circumstances surrounding al-Jawād's relationship with al-Muṣṭaṣīm is reported by Zurqān a ṣāḥīb of Ibn Abī Duwād.\(^1\) The qāḍī returned one day, furious that in a maṭlis where many lawyers and learned men were gathered, the caliph had seen fit to turn to "this black", Muḥammad b ʿAlī, for an opinion on the penalty of amputating the hand of a thief. Initially reluctant to become involved al-Jawād eventually gave his opinion, astonishing the caliph who accepted it as the correct view. After thinking for several days, the qāḍī returned to the caliph and put some stern advice before him, considering it his duty to make clear the consequences of his actions:

The Commander of the Faithful gathered in his maṭlis lawyers, scholars etc, because of a problem of religious law, and he asked them to rule on it, and they told him their legal opinion on it. Also present were family members, leaders of the army, wazīrs and scribes. People were listening from behind the doors. Then he abandons their opinions – all of them – for the advice of a man in whose ʿīmāmate the riffraff of the Ummah believe, and of whom they claim that he is more fitted to his [caliph] position than him. Then he uses his judgement and not that of the fuqahā'.\(^1\)

The implications of the picture drawn by the qāḍī are not lost on the caliph and he proceeds to bring about al-Jawād's death. Two fuller accounts of the Imām's death by poisoning are given, one from Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī,\(^2\) the other from Manāqib which also alleges that the caliph himself was involved in his death with the connivance of the qāḍī and of Saʿīd b. al-Khaḍīb.\(^3\) Shorter statements which 'credit' Umm al-Fāl with this murder at the instigation of the caliph, or her
brother Ja'far who played on her jealousy of the mother of al-Hādī, are also recorded. 22

The fear and hostility shown quite clearly by these portraits of the last months of al-Jawād's life may have been the result of, or at the very least compounded by, a series of revolts which took place between 210-220 A.H.. In 210 A.H. the people of Qumm rebelled against an excessive tax burden, resenting the alleviation which had been granted to the people of Rayy by al-Ma'mūn, but not extended to them. 23 On this occasion the revolt was crushed, the town's defences reduced to rubble and even more tax extracted. 24 There is no indication of any connection between the revolt and the 'Alid house, let alone with the quiescent Imāms, yet the very fact that it occurred in an area with overt sympathy for the Imāmī cause may have been disturbing. Even more disturbing may have been the repetition of the revolt in 216 A.H. under the leadership of Ja'far b. Dāwud al-Qummī which lasted into the year 217. 25 Of more immediate concern for al-Mu'tašīm was the revolt in 219 of Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim in Ṭāliqān. 26 No clear reasons are given for his rebellion apart from the suggestion that he was seduced by the hero-worship of a visiting Khurāsānī, who said that he was more worthy of the Imāmate than anyone else. 27 The rebellion came to nothing, and Muḥammad was captured and imprisoned. He later escaped from his confinement and disappeared from public view, possibly, according to one source, in Wāṣif where he eventually died. 28

Although these incidents provide some measure of background motivation for al-Mu'tašīm's attitude towards al-Hādī, there are some anomalous
factors which suggest that this attitude was not a straightforward one. Ithbāt's account of the departure of al-Jawād for Iraq does not conform to the general version given. It states simply that he left for Iraq with Umm al-Faḍl after leaving his young son in Medina. There is no suggestion that this departure was on the orders of al-Muṭaṣīm. In fact it is only after the departure that Ithbāt goes on to say that al-Ma'mūn died in 218 and was succeeded by his brother. It can sometimes be misleading to assume a chronological approach in these texts, yet the impression remains that al-Jawād returned to Iraq of his own accord. Ithbāt does not ignore the existence of some hostility on the caliph's part, and does say that the caliph and Ja'far b. al-Ma'mūn attempted ceaselessly to bring about the Imām's death. That Ithbāt should report this, but say nothing to suggest the enforced return of the Imām implies that it was not at the caliph's direct insistence. Unfortunately the only source which supports this version is a much later source.

Another anomalous occasion reported in al-Kāfī, a more reliable source than those which preserve accounts of hostile incidents, shows the Imām at a meal with many of the awliyā' of the Sultān and being lobbyed for his help in presenting a case to one of the provincial governors. There is no suggestion of bad feeling or of constraint in this account.

Finally one source records the caliph's reaction to the escape of Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim:

If he revolts again we will capture him - and if he prefers
peace, and stays in hiding we will leave him alone.\(^{33}\)

This attitude seems a much less virulent one than earlier stories of his fear and suspicion towards the passive al-Jawād would have believed. In addition, al-Mufīd dismisses the reports of his death which suggest that he was murdered and concludes that it was a natural one.\(^{34}\)

The different attitudes of the caliph may be explained by the different type of threat which the Imāms posed to the Abbasid empire. It may have been that the passive spiritual excellence which al-Jawād represented was seen as more of a threat than a purely military rebellion which could be physically stamped out. Beliefs can be somewhat more difficult to eradicate, especially where the mere attempt to do so both spreads and strengthens those beliefs.

4.3 The isolation of al-Hādī and the role of Al-Faraj:

Despite these problematic indications, the caliph may have felt justified in renewing the policy followed by al-Ma'mūn and in preventing a new figurehead from being accessible. One source at least takes this view. After the death of al-Jawād, ʿUmar b. al-Faraj came to Medina on the 4th of the 'aḍ and made arrangements for al-Hādī's education by a scholar of non Shiʿite persuasion, one Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Junaydī. He was given a great deal of wealth to take charge of the child and
prevent the Râfiqa from influencing him, and the Imâm was kept in the
residence at Šuryâ under lock and key. The story is regrettably
present in only this one source; no other source dares to admit that
the Shi'a were unable to maintain contact with the Imâm upon whom the
most influential figures had decided as the successor to al-Jawâd.
Elsewhere there are only mild hints that al-Hâdî was kept under the
close guardianship of those hostile to Shi'ite beliefs and
sensibilities. It is reported that Zayd b. Mûsâ petitioned ʿUmar
several times asking to see "the son of my brother" [sic; although this
reference would seem to mean al-Jawâd, later he refers to himself as
the uncle of the child's father which would be more correct]. ʿUmar
relays the request to the child for a decision, but undoubtedly he, or
someone like him, influenced those being allowed access, and the
circumstances of their meeting.

ʿUmar b. al-Faraj al-Rukkhâj I and Muḥammad b. al-Faraj, who may or
may not have been the brother of ʿUmar, are both frequently connected
with the Imâms, although in almost diametrically opposed ways. ʿUmar
is first mentioned during the Imâmâte of al-Jawâd when he showed
scepticism of the claims made by the Shi'a about their Imâm,
challenging him to admit to possessing knowledge bordering on the
forbidden ʿilm al-ghayb [knowledge of the unknown] which strictly
speaking was God's alone:

Your Shi'a allege you know the measure of what is in the
Tigris.
Al-Hādī was later to express satisfaction when he heard of the downfall of Al Faraj, because Umar once accused his father of being drunk.40 Umar's hostility to Al Abī Tālib is recorded in historical works. On his later appointment by al-Mutawakkil to the governorship of the holy cities, he prevented them from being available to answer questions, and also prevented the populace from expressing reverence towards them with charitable gifts.41 This apparently led to the ludicrous situation where they could only enter the mosques one by one to pray, because extreme poverty meant they had only one respectable gamīṣ [shirt or gown] between them.42 Umar was also involved in the arrest and imprisonment of later Alīd rebels.43

If Umar's contacts with the Imāms in particular, and the Alīd family in general, were frequently confrontational, Muḥammad plays the role of a committed and loyal follower. In the early years only passing mention is made of his links with the Imām i.e. a demand from al-Jawād for the delivery of the khums for one year only, since it would be the only year the Imām would receive it.44 For all that his role with al-Jawād seems to have been a minor one, Muḥammad b. al-Faraj came spectacularly to the forefront of the Imām Shīʿa after his death. It was at his residence that the meeting took place to decide on the transfer of the Imāmate. It was he who took the initiative in writing to Abū al-Khayrānī inviting him to the meeting, even though Abū al-Khayrānī seems to have been in closer contact with the Imām.45 Of the leaders of the Shīʿa who approved the Imāmate of al-Hādī, only one person other than these two is named - Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Isā,46 a Qummī who overheard the crucial message from al-Jawād
informing Abū al-Khayrānī of the designation of al-Ḥādī. Consistent with his major part in confirming al-Ḥādī, Muḥammad relays information about the new Imām’s mother Jamāna, whom he allegedly bought for al-Jawād. If he did so, it would begin his association with al-Jawād before 212 or 214.

Both ʿUmar and Muḥammad fell out of favour with the accession of al-Mutawakkil in 232 A.H., although only Muḥammad received a warning from the Imām. Their subsequent fates only underline their respective attitudes and commitments; ʿUmar regained favour, as one would expect of someone whose anti-Shīʿite feelings were more in tune with the new administration, but Muḥammad was imprisoned and never regained favour to any great extent, ending his days exiled, his wealth and property stripped from him.

The gulf between the beliefs, attitudes and actions of both men make it very difficult to accept that they were probably part of the same family, yet the coincidences point to this very fact. Both may have become involved with al-Jawād, perhaps on behalf of the sulṭān, or during the time that he was at court, but they seem to have reacted quite differently to their proximity to the Imām. Whilst Muḥammad became a convert, possibly in the beginning with official connivance, another way of controlling a possible disruptive group, ʿUmar remained impervious to the appeal of the Shīʿite cause, and each went on to play strong, but completely different, parts in the lives of the Imāms.
Whether the report of the young Imām's isolation is completely genuine or not, there are certainly few reports linked to these early years, those concerning his isolation among them. These years of obscurity probably had consequences which the authorities may not have envisaged when deciding on their policy. Not only was he given time to grow up and mature out of range of the pressures of being publicly viewed as Imām, but his image would have continued to grow, the reverence and awe of his followers only heightened by the imposition of a direct physical barrier between them.

4.4 The emergence from isolation:

Al-Hādı emerges from this blackout of information after the accession of the more sympathetic caliph al-Wāthiq in 227 A.H. It had been al-Wāthiq who had led the prayers at the funeral of al-Jawād, and he was generally more favourable to the fortunes of the Alids. Ibrāhīm b. Mahzāyr recounts that the Imām wrote to his brother ʿAlī in 228 A.H. asking him to make a time-piece for him, which he did. The two brothers then delivered it personally to Sayyāla, where the Imām was resident. They then requested, and received, permission to visit him. First ʿAlī, then Ibrāhīm were called in to see him and the normal courtesies exchanged, Ibrāhīm being graciously allowed to kiss the Imām's hand. Although none of the conversation is recorded, they remained along with their servant Masrūr until the evening. One incident which may form the basis of several accounts of the Imām's extensive, in Shi'ite eyes miraculous, knowledge of languages occurred during this audience. The time piece functioned by the falling of
stones to mark the hour and Māsārūr at one point called out ḥasht’, a word correctly, if somewhat tentatively interpreted by the Imām as meaning ‘eight’. Several incidents where the Imām appears to know other languages are reported in the sources. As they finally take their leave, the Imām asks ʿAlī to send the servant back on the next day when he engages the servant in conversation in his own language. In the midst of the conversation, Naṣr al-Khādim passes by and the reaction of the young Imām is most interesting. He quickly closes the door and throws his cloak over his visitor to hide him. At a later meeting ʿAlī b. Mahzīyār asks if this was done simply out of fear of Naṣr, something he obviously finds hard to comprehend. Al-Hādī replies:

My fear of him is almost as great as my fear of ʿAmr b. Qarḥ.

This account may indicate a loosening of the restrictions on the Imām, for he seems to have been able to contact fairly well known Shi`ītes and meet with them, albeit under the guise of the ordering and delivery of a piece of work. Certainly within five years of this meeting, al-Hādī seems to have been in written contact and control of several representatives in other regions. On the other hand an element of repression is still evident in his reactions to one who, although a servant, obviously held some authority over him and controlled his freedom. The lasting impression is of a renewal of the Imām’s links with loyal followers of his father at a time when circumstances were becoming less repressive. However, cautiousness and secrecy seem to be felt necessary when making such contacts. Curiously ʿAlī b.
Mahzzyär relates later that he still had ambivalent feelings about the Imāmate of al-Hādī when he visited al-“Askar one summer. His doubts were erased by the Imam's actions and words which conformed exactly to his expectations.

After 228 A.H. there is yet again a gap with no accounts traceable to this time, and it is only at another period of transition that more is heard from al-Hādī. This time, however, there are no tentative contacts, but firm written orders, warnings and political comment.

Political comment, and awareness of the intricacies of court intrigue surrounding the succession, are evident in a story dated 232 A.H. and reported by Khayrān al-Khādim, who is described as the mawlā of Farāṣīs, the mother of al-Wāthiq. In its basic form the Imām enquires after the health of al-Wāthiq, to be told he was in ill-health and could well have died. The Imām does not believe this to have happened, but does state his opinion that his reign was essentially over. The general view, Khayrān says, was that his son would be his successor. Al-Hādī, having possibly other sources of information, is more inclined to back Jaʿfar al-Mutawakkil and, as Khayrān points out later, the Imām was perfectly correct. Later sources have added considerable interpretation to this basic outline, expanding and even twisting it, to make what may originally have been political awareness, into knowledge somehow miraculously inspired. The original story has no mention of the downfall of the wazīr Ibn al-Zayyāt, no mention of the distance and time involved in the news reaching al-Hādī from Iraq, a completely different statement about the current health of al-Wāthiq,
and takes place at an unspecified date before the death of the caliph, rather than a few days after. All these alterations are found in one or all of the stories which otherwise follow the outline in Ithbāt.

More evidence of sharp political awareness is also shown in the warning sent by the Imām to Muḥammad b. al-Faraj in Egypt. His fall from favour is recorded in 233, after the accession of al-Mutawakkil whose attitude towards Shi‘ism was very hostile. Yet again the Imām’s perfectly rational and straightforward analysis of the situation, and its possibly serious consequences for those who had shown any sympathy for the Shi‘ite cause, has been obscured by the reorientation of the story to emphasise what appears to be the Imām’s semi-miraculous knowledge of what will happen.

This is illustrated in an incident within the story where Muḥammad b. al-Faraj, still in prison, receives a letter advising him where to reside in the city, and is shortly thereafter released. It is surely not beyond the bounds of possibility that the Imām knew of, or was even responsible for obtaining, his release after eight years in prison. A later addition to the story suggests that his eventual rehabilitation and attempt to reclaim his estates did not occur until several years later. His invitation to al-‘Askar at this time was issued by Aḥmad b. al-Khaṣib, who achieved influence only in 247 A.H. after the death of al-Mutawakkil.
If these two accounts suggest awareness of the framework within which his followers lived and worked, and the effects of changes in government on their circumstances, the texts of some letters dated also in 232 A.H. show al-Hādi in complete control of the functioning of his own affairs, issuing instructions to his representatives in several areas. These letters also indicate the quite wideranging consequences of renewed official hostility or paranoia, with al-Hādi finding himself obliged to find new representatives to replace some who may have been caught up in the persecution.

A final interesting account, which may be dated to this period if it happened at all, is placed shortly before the Imām's summons to Sāmarrā'. A small, yet beautifully constructed, incident, it probably draws more on the stock phrases of propaganda than on real life events. Isḥāq b. ʿAbdallāh al-ʿAlawī, a distant family member relates that his father and uncles went to see al-Hādi in ʿUrayq before he left for Sāmarrā' to ask about four particular days of fasting from the Sunna. The Imām's precognition of their problem is one of the factors which gives this story its propagandistic ring, especially in conjunction with the highly valuable recognition by the other ʿAlids of his standing. The four days under discussion are intriguing - the day the Prophet was born, 17 Rābiʾ 1; the day he was sent with his message, 27 Rajab; the day the earth was flattened; and yawm al-Ghadīr, 18 Dhū al-Ḥijja.

Al-Hādi was eventually summoned to the capital by al-Mutawakkil, but there seems to be some difference of opinion over the year in which he left his quiet retreat for the maelstrom of imperial intrigue. One
source states that al-Hādī spent twenty years at court in Sāmarrā', indicating therefore that he left in 234 A.H. Twenty years of living at court would certainly be long enough to account for the profusion of reports about his involvement there, and might explain why the majority of reports are of al-Mutawakkil's time, since the Imām would have spent thirteen of these years there under his rule. However, the letter inviting al-Hādī to Sāmarrā' has a very specific date with it, and it is 243 A.H., only four years before the overthrow and death of al-Mutawakkil. This letter is mentioned by Ithbāt in its explanation for the departure of al-Hādī from Medina. According to this source, the caliph was advised to remove al-Hādī from the area by Burāqīya al-Abbāsī, sāhib al-salāt [leader of the prayers] in Medina, because the Imām had called for support and people had responded to it. There is no indication of the reasons for al-Hādī's sudden emergence into actively seeking support. However, a letter from the caliph was duly delivered by Yaḥyā b. Harthama inviting the Imām, in courteous terms, to come to Sāmarrā'. After delaying for three days the Imām could put the journey off no longer and left for Iraq accompanied by both Yaḥyā and Barīḥa.

The actual letter is recorded in al-Kāfī, al-Irshād and their dependent sources, and adds some intriguing but not very enlightening detail. In the text the caliph appears to be replying to a letter of complaint from the Imām, for he details the steps he has taken to deal with it. He confirms his recognition of al-Hādī's status and lineage, and announces the dismissal of ʿAbdallāh b. Muḥammad from his position in charge of both prayer and war in Medina, because of his treatment of
It is possible to infer from the letter that this Abdallah must have reported suspicions about al-Hadi to the caliph, something which is confirmed by the explanatory preface added in al-Irshad. The preface also confirms that al-Hadi had complained about the slander being directed at him. There is only one important textual difference between the version in al-Kafi and that of al-Irshad. In the latter the caliph states his confidence in the Imam's innocence and true intentions which, he says, were evident "through your piety and your words". Al-Kafi, however, has "in abandoning the attempt". What this might have been is left unexplained, but does suggest that al-Hadi had been about to become involved in something.

The tone of the letter is unusually sympathetic and reverential; the official who slandered the Imam is dismissed; orders for respect and obedience to be shown to the Imam are issued; every attempt is made to be as placatory and as overtly friendly as is possible. The writer has made every effort not to appear hostile or threatening. The offer of a military escort is tentatively suggested and left up to the Imam to accept or reject. Even the suggestion of the Imam's reluctance to leave, which is apparent in Ithbat, is not found in these accounts.

Such sympathetic sentiments and lack of paranoid persecution are most unlike the general images of the relationship between the Imams and the caliphs. Either there has been considerable rapprochement between them as a result of the length of time spent under the supervision of the court by the ninth and tenth Imams, or al-Mutawakkil was extremely
If the caliph did indeed suspect the Imām of conspiracy, or believed him to have built up a following in the Hijāz, any strong arm attempt to arrest and remove him, or threats to his well being, might have caused exactly what he wanted to avoid - an uprising on the Imām's behalf. A friendly invitation to visit the court, added to recognition of his status and a prompt response to his complaints, would be more likely to defuse the situation. This interpretation of the letter is quite hypothetical, however, for there is no direct evidence that al-Hādī had any intention of threatening the authority of the Abbasid state.

Al-Hādī's escort for the journey is most frequently given as Yaḥyā b. Harthama, although one source gives a variant as Yaḥyā b. Hubayra and another a completely different name Ātāb b. Abī Ātāb. The various accounts of the journey are reminiscent yet again of the type of stories of propaganda and miracles which are attached to the lives of the Imāms. Perhaps the clearest and most objective account is found in the historical source, Murūj al-Dhahab. This report includes the major incident which is the core of all other versions, but also adds details of the departure and arrival which are not found elsewhere.

Yaḥyā refers in this source to the difficulties he faced in Medina where he was obliged to calm public disorder by affirming that he had no orders to cause any harm to al-Hādī. An interesting point is that he also searched his house without finding any masbaḥa or Duṣā' [the
first possibly referring to the *masbaf Fātima* which allegedly contained information about the future; the second to invocations of the Imām or anything similar. On arrival in Sāmarrā', Yaḥyā reported to the caliph the favourable and reverential opinions he had heard of the Imām from various people, including the governor of Baghdad, Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Tahīr and the Turk Waṣif, reports which convinced the caliph to treat the Imām honourably.

His main report, however, is of the Imām's reading of the weather. On the way the Imām was ridiculed by his escort for taking clothes more appropriate for bad weather, and making preparations for it, despite the fact that the skies were clear. After only a few miles heavy clouds appeared and rain poured down. In contrast to other stories, the possibility inherent in the account for a miraculous interpretation of events is ignored, and the Imām's own rational explanation of his apparent foreknowledge of the storm is recorded:

> You wanted me to have known something about it that you didn't, but it is not like that. I grew up in the desert and know the winds which bring rain with them, so when I smelled the scent, I knew it was the smell of rain and I prepared for it. ²¹

The retelling of this incident in other sources is dramatised to different degrees and is even 'hijacked' by ʿAlī b. Mahzayār to form the vehicle for the strengthening of his acceptance of al-Hādī while actually in Sāmarrā'. ²²
At the other end of the scale from the nearly objective account in *Murūj* is the highly dramatic account given in *Bijār* from al-Kharāʾī. Recounted again by Yaḥyā b. Harthama it is a well constructed story, providing divine motivation for the appearance of the storm. On the way to Medina one of the company, a Shīʿite scribe was challenged in a discussion:

Did your ʿālib ʿAlī b. Abī ʿĀlib not say that there is no area of land that is not a grave, now or in the future. Look at this land - where is there anyone to die and fill up this piece of earth with graves as they allege.

On reaching Medina the caliph's letter was duly delivered and, there being no objections either from the Imām or the people of Medina, preparations were made to leave. The Imām's preparations for the journey, and Yaḥyā's surprise and amazement at them, are given much fuller treatment than in any other version. He generously considers that the Imām is simply inexperienced in travelling, and that this is why he has ordered clothing and footwear more appropriate for bad winter weather than the mid summer heat. He cannot understand, however, how the Rāfiqa can accept this person as their Imām. His amazement and the Imām's seemingly totally illogical preparations for a midsummer journey are repeated and emphasised over and over again.

On the journey itself when they reached the same place where the argument took place about the graves, clouds arose, thunder and lightning and hailstones as large as boulders crashed down on them and
eighty men who had no protective wear were killed. The Imām then brings the account full circle by saying:

Dismount and bury those who have died, for thus does God fill the earth with graves.

Although the framework of the story is the journey of the Imām to Sāmarrā', the actual events, and the interpretation of them, have little to do with the journey beyond the fact that bad weather was encountered and the Imām was prepared for it. Ithbāt includes this incident as only one of the miraculous events which took place on the road to Iraq: others include the finding of a green and watered valley which was no longer there when one of the party returned to retrieve an item left behind, and the curing of the eyes of a small boy brought by his mother to the Imām.

The arrival of al-Hādī in Sāmarrā' is also the centre of a story which appears no more than a continuation of the miraculous train of events. On arrival he was accommodated at an inn before being moved to a residence of his own. It was apparently not a well appointed inn, nor of good repute, for Ṣāliḥ b. Saʿīd, a member of the court seemingly sympathetic to the Imām, expressed his disgust that they should deliberately and continually attempt to humiliate the Imām in such a way. The Imām is unaffected by the apparent state of the inn, and with a wave of the hand shows Ibn Saʿīd where he actually is:

And I was in elegant meadows, with flowing rivers, fragrant flowers, and young women like veiled pearls, birds, antelopes
and bubbling streams.

The similarity of this description to Qur'anic images of the Garden of the believers is unmistakeable.

These accounts may add little or nothing to the historical facts of al-Hādi's life, but they show once more the incredible power of the human mind to interpret events in accordance with its own beliefs, and the strong desire to discover in a human being the certainty of truth, divine guidance, and the means of rising above the sometimes humiliating realities of a persecution which cannot be avoided. The image of a pacifist, persecuted Imām who can remain totally inviolate in the face of the base attempts of his enemies to humiliate and attack him, is one of strongest images which surfaces in the accounts of al-Hādi's life at court.
CHAPTER FOUR: FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Biṣār, L, p.113; Kashf, p.230. He refused to have this name used because of the anti-Shīʿite attitudes of the caliph of the same name.


3. Ithbāt, p.219, p.223.


5. The sources are completely undecided on when he was born. Ithbāt [p.221] gives only Rajab 214, but al-Kāfī [I, p.497; Biṣār, L, p.116, n.5] introduces the possibility that he was born in Dhū al-Ḥijja 212. Al-IRshād, [p.496] ignores the later date giving only 212, but Iʿlām [p.354] and Kashf [pp.229-30] give the two alternative dates. Biṣār quotes from a variety of other sources, two of which give only the year 212 [pp.116-117 nos.7 and 9]. Just to complicate matters further, a non-Shīʿite source reports he was born in 213 or 214 in Medina [Wafayāt, 2, p.216]. The confusion may stem once more from the desire of the sources to reconcile the dates given with other reports. One story of the designation of al-Hādi shows both him and his younger brother Mūsā asking for presents from al-Jawād on his first visit to Iraq in 215. If he had only been born in 214 this would have been difficult [Ithbāt, p.221]. The two visits are also referred to in al-Kāfī. [I, p.323, n.1]

6. Annales al-Tabarī, III, pp.1102-3; Ibn Ṭayfūr, pp.142-3; al-Kāmil, VI, p.294. Only Ibn Ṭayfūr states distinctly that he was coming from Medina.

7. Ithbāt, p.221.

8. al-Kāfī, I, p.324, n.2; al-IRshād, pp.497-8; Iʿlām, pp.356-7; Kashf, pp.234-5; Biṣār, L, pp.119-21, n.3.


10. Ithbāt,, p.223.

11. al-Kāfī, I, p.323, n.1; al-IRshād, p.497; Iʿlām, p.356; Kashf, pp.233-4; Biṣār, L, p.8, n.9 from Manāqib; see also Kashf, p.190 and p.224.

12. Biṣār, L, p.8, n.9 from Manāqib.

13. Ibid., pp.45-6, n.18. See biographical index for Muḥammad b. Awrama.

15. See biographical index for Aḥmad b. Muḥammad and above Chapter One n.66.


17. Biḥār, L, pp. 94-5, n. 7 from Ikhtiyār.

18. Ibid, pp.5-7, n.7. Zūrqān is ḍālālāt.

19. Ibid, p.6, n.7.

20. Ibid, pp.7-8, n.7.

21. Ibid, p.8, n.9 from Maṣāqib. Saʿīd b. al-Khaṭīb could be the brother of Aḥmad b. al-Khaṭīb. Unlike the latter, however, he is not listed as an actual follower of the Imāms, nor is he referred to in Mu|rūj or Maqātīl.


23. al-Kāmil, VI, p.282.


27. al-Kāmil, VI, p.312.


29. Ithbāt, p.219.


32. Ibid, p.86, n.2.

33. Maqātīl, p.587.

34. al-Irshād, p.495.

35. Ithbāt, pp.222-3.


37. See biographical index for ʿUmar b. al-Faraj.

38. See biographical index for Muḥammad b. al-Faraj.

40. Biḥār, L, pp.62-3, n.38 from Manāqib.

41. Maqātil, p.599.

42. See biographical index for ʿUmar b. al-Faraj.


44. al-Kāfī, I, p.324, n.2; al-Irshād, p.497, Iṣlām, p.356; Kashf, pp.234-5; Biḥār, L, p.119, n.3.

45. See biographical index for ʿAḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā.

46. Ithbāt, p.220.

47. Murqaj, IV, pp.19-20.


49. Maqātil, p.599.


51. Maqātil, p.593. ʿAl Abī Ṭālib gathered in Sāmarrā' and were provided for during his reign.

52. al-Kāmil, VI, p.321.


54. Ibid, p.130, nos 10, 11, 12; pp.136-7, nos 17, 18, 19; p.157, n.46. The first three are all from ʿAlī b. Mahzayr and the final four from Abū Ḥāshim, Dāwud b. al-Qāsim.

55. Naqr al-Khādīm; one person of this name was witness to the written will of al-Jawād [al-Kāfī, I, p.325, n.3; Biḥār, L, p.121, n.4]. The name is further mentioned in connection with ʿUmar b. Faraj in the year 233 when ʿUmar was imprisoned by the caliph. A servant of this name was charged with gathering and handing over sufficient money to buy the freedom of both ʿUmar and his brother Muḥammad [Annales al-Ṭabarī, III, p.1377]. The same name occurs in a short story about a seal which had been made from two coins passed on by this servant [Biḥār, L, p.155, n.43]. The first Naqr may be the mawla of ʿAḥmad b. Ṭūsuf who held official positions under al-Maʾmūn [See Chapter One n.73 and n.76]. Whether they are all the same person is indeterminable.


57. See below Chapter Nine.


60. Ithbāt, p. 224. It is mentioned in other sources: see e.g. al-Kāfī, I, p. 498.

61. In all these cases there are extra elements added in al-Kāfī and its derivatives.


64. Ibid, pp. 48-49 under the name Ibn al-Khaṣīb.

65. See below Chapter Nine.

66. Ibid.

67. Ishāq b. ʿAbdallāh al-ʿAlawī is unknown.


69. Ibid, p. 114 from Manāqib.


71. Ithbāt, p. 225.

72. Ibid, p. 225; Biḥār, L, p. 209, n. 22 from ʿUyun M. which follows Ithbāt almost exactly.

73. al-Kāfī, I, p. 501, n. 7; al-Irshād, p. 505.

74. al-Irshād, p. 504.

75. Ithbāt, p. 225; Biḥār, L, pp. 142-4, n. 27 from al-Kharāʾīj; Murūj, IV, pp. 84-5; Biḥār, L, p. 209, n. 22.


77. Biḥār, L, p. 173, n. 53 from Manāqib. This might be ʿAttāb b. al-ʿAttāb who was put in charge of diwān al-jaysh al-shakirīyya under al-Muntaṣir [Murūj, IV, p. 46].

78. Murūj, IV, pp. 84-5.

79. Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Ṭahiri; presumably part of the family of the Tāhirids, he is not referred to either in Murūj or in Maqātil as being involved with the Imāms.

80. Waṣīf, the brother of Bughā, was involved in the conspiracy against al-Mutawakkil and in putting al-Mustaʿīn on the throne [Murūj, IV, p. 47, p. 60, p. 77]. The reasons for the conspiracy had
nothing to do with the ill-treatment of the Imām, however, being the result of the threat of dispersement hanging over the Turkish sections of the army [Murūj, IV, p.50.]

81. Murūj, IV, p.85.


83. Ibid, pp.142-4, n.27.

84. Ibid, p.143.

85. Ibid, p.144.

86. Ithbāt, pp.225-6.


88. See particularly Sūrat al-‘Wāqi‘a 21-25.
CHAPTER FIVE: AL-HĀDI, THE IMĀM AT COURT

For many years al-Hādi had remained in Medina; from 220 until probably the year 233. In these thirteen years only a few incidents about his life are recorded. To some extent this must be because of his age and because these years were partially spent in the isolation of the Hijāz under the guardianship of figures considered as hostile by the Shi'ite asḥāb. It is notable, however, that many of the stories reported cluster either around the periods of renewed persecution of the Shi'a i.e. at the death of al-Wāthiq, or around the journey he was obliged to make to Sāmarrā' at the bequest of al-Mutawakkil. In this distribution they follow a pattern which is one of the features of the sources' treatment of al-Hādi's life; the focussing of attention on events and incidents portraying persecution, ridicule and suspicion aimed at the Imām.

5.1 Images of Persecution:

The reports of the early years do not form the bulk of the biographical accounts for al-Hādi. For an Imām who allegedly spent the later years of his life isolated under house arrest, it is slightly ironic that a large part of the reports concerning him relate quite specifically to the time he spent at court. It is not only that the largest proportion are of court life that is so striking, but that almost all the stories relate to the time of the unsympathetic
al-Mutawakkil. Few if any relate to the next seven years under the caliphs al-Muntaṣir, al-Mustaṣin and al-Muṭazz. There are several different factors which could account for this.

An uncharitable view might suggest that many of the stories are not contemporary, and that less scrupulous fabricators of stories would possibly have assumed that it was essential, in order for the right atmosphere to be created and the right expectations aroused in the audience, that a caliph well known for his lack of sympathy towards the Shi'a should figure in the events. Certainly if the Imām was as isolated under house arrest as the sources wish us to believe, the number of accounts about his life there is remarkable.

There could, however, be a more natural explanation of the concentration of stories, for persecution, real or perceived, was often more effective in calling attention to the Imām and enhancing his attraction for those who felt similarly downtrodden, than in dissuading loyal followers from believing in him. He was therefore more 'newsworthy' at court than in Medina. In addition he had suddenly been drawn from the politically quiet backwater of the Ḥijāz into the centre of imperial politics at the beginning of a very turbulent period, heightening his profile in contemporary events. A final factor might also be that in Iraq he had a much closer physical presence to the centres of population where his support could be found, and where there existed also sympathisers for whom the charisma of the Imām and even the faint possibility of meeting him, could be the final push towards acceptance of his position as God's huṭta. Increasing awareness of him
as a real participant in affairs, and his physical presence may, therefore, be part of the explanation of the surge of reports about this period in his life.

Not all of the stories need necessarily be accepted at face value as totally genuine, the proportion of miraculous events and exaggerated accounts being quite high, especially in sources such as al-Kharâ'îj. However, these accounts of al-Hâdi's life cannot be totally dismissed, since they may well contain a kernel of truth. Indeed it is possible to view such stories about al-Hâdi as being reflective of a different reality; that is, reality as perceived by the Shi'a and those who reported incidents, people who would be quite likely to exaggerate certain facets and ignore others.

The image that the sources keep foremost in the reader's mind is of a beleaguered, persecuted Imâm faced with humiliating ridicule throughout his time at court, the object of constant attempts to attack his good name, to belittle his status and knowledge, to stifle his ability to speak out, and even finally in danger of losing his life through the slander of his enemies. Al-Irshād actually says that he:

...resided for a time at his residence in Sāmarrā' publicly honoured. Yet al-Mutawakkil endeavoured to make him fall into a trap, but he was not able to do that.'
Al-Mutawakkil expended a lot of effort trying to damage him in people's eyes and was never able to do so.²

From the very start it seems that some of those connected to the court put the worst possible interpretation on the Imām's transfer to the capital. Yazdād, a Christian doctor and pupil of Bakhtīshū, felt no compunction in passing on information and court gossip to a scribe of his acquaintance, Ismā'īl b. Aḥmad al-Qahqālī. Leaving the palace of Mūsā b. Bughā,³ he passed by the wall of the grounds of a palace and commented to his companion:

Do you know who owns this..... this young ḥijāzī ʿAlīd.⁴

As they continued in the shadow of the wall he intimated to his friend that there were many things that he could tell him of this person....if anyone knew the unknown it was him. He added that he had heard that:

The caliph brought him here from the Ḥijāz so that prominent people would not go to him and this ʿamr [caliphate] would not be taken away from them, meaning Banū ʿAbbās.⁴

It was probably a very natural reading of the situation considering the long history of strained relations between the ʿAlīd and Abbasid houses, and the persistent belief that existed in the minds of the caliphs' as to the potential threat to their rule. This story also suggests that the Imām was not a totally anonymous figure in the capital.
Not all the oppression referred to is directed at the Imam himself; occasionally the supporters of the Imam are also seen in dire straits and seeking help from the Imam. One of his followers came to al-Hādi seeking his aid, for he explained:

This man has thrown me out and cut me off from my livelihood and religion with no reason save that he suspected me of being attached to you. If you asked something of him he would be obliged to accept it.

Receiving word from the caliph to come and see him, the man went to an audience and was granted whatever he wanted. Pausing at the door, he enquired of al-Fatḥ if the Imam had written to the caliph or been there before him to put his case. Al-Fatḥ said no, and went on to ask if he would ask the Imam for an invocation for him, since the invocation the plaintiff had asked for had obviously worked. A similar theme has been taken up in a more dubious source, which similarly shows someone about to suffer because of his suspected attachment to the Imam. Yusuf b. Yaʿqūb, a Christian scribe was called to see the caliph, and could think of no reason for it save that he had sold himself for 100 dinārs and had taken it to al-Muḥammad b. al-Riḍā. During his sojourn in Samarra', he received what he perceived as various proofs of the Imam's true status, visiting him and being called by name, then being asked for the money which was in his pocket. His interview with al-Mutawakkil is skated over, although he reports that he told the caliph all that had happened. He was apparently not punished and was allowed to leave.
The story is clearly not intended to dwell on the persecution of those loyal to the Imam, but is woven around the proofs which led, not the scribe, but his son to become Muslim, as was indeed foretold by al-Hādī. This type of story is quite in keeping with general tone of the accounts in al-Khārūjī; yet its stories may be, despite their exaggeration, often reflective of reality. It is possible that this account reflects the existence of a quiet surveillance of those who exhibited a tendency towards the family of the Prophet and in particular towards al-Hādī. It is also possible that a form of positive vetting of those in court positions might take place, especially when so many were, it seems, susceptible to the Shiʿite cause.

As for the Imam himself, the attacks on him ranged from petty ridicule and attempts to embarrass him, to serious slander and active measures to investigate his circumstances. The petty incidents tended to occur on social or public occasions, even when at prayer, although in these cases the Imam's detractors are not seen to be representative of the entire gathering. Al-Hādī went one day to the palace of the caliph, and was standing there praying when one of the 'mukhālifīn' (opponents or enemies) came to him and stood in from of him and said:

"For how much longer is this hypocrisy going on."

The Imam is perhaps justifiably angry not only at the interruption, but the implication that he is dissembling and simply putting on a show of piety. On another occasion he was invited to a banquet given by some
of the sons of the caliph. On arrival the Imām was treated with
great honour, but one young man at the gathering refused to give him
the respect which was his due and began to laugh and talk, presumably
thus interrupting the Imām. Al-Hādī silenced him by asking how he
could act this way when in three days he would be in his grave. A
similar incident occurred when the Imām was invited to another social
occasion, a banquet given by some prominent person, where a man
present began to jest and joke, and be less than respectful. The Imām
turned to him and said:

You'll not eat any of this food.

Indeed, before he could eat a servant appeared in a distressed state to
inform him that his mother had fallen off the roof and been killed.
The miraculous elements which conclude these stories, and which pervade
almost all accounts, are often a major obstacle to accepting these
incidents as genuine. Yet the incidents portrayed initially show some
very understandable human reactions on the part of the court figures.
The Imām was too obvious a target to escape the cynical disrespect
which is almost always directed by disbelievers, and those jealous of
authority, at religious or spiritual leaders, especially those whose
followers make sometimes exaggerated claims on their behalf. The
temptation to show up the Imām, and puncture the aura of religiosity
could have been overwhelming.

The caliph may himself have been caught up by this feeling sufficiently
to offer one thousand dīnārs to someone who could embarrass the Imām.
Zurāra, the hālib of the caliph, gives one version of the incident where the attempt revolves around a man from Hind who was expert at various sleights of hand. He arranged for some light loaves of bread to be baked and placed on the table. When the Imām stretched out his hand the man somehow caused the bread to move away. After the second attempt, people began to laugh. The version given in Kashf from Zurāfa al-Ḥājib hints that the trick depended on hidden jets of water which sent the food into the air every time the Imām put out his hand. These events seem, although embarrassing, reasonably good-natured, sometimes humorous, and generally trivial in nature. They strike less at the Imām in a specifically religious or political way, than at something perhaps more precious, his dignity.

Some incidents, however, appear malicious in their attempt to dishonour the Imām, or prevent him from receiving his due respect. Samīlā al-Kātib reported that the caliph had a bad opinion of one of his family nicknamed Harīsa, but that when he tried to humiliate him one day, Harīsa managed to turn the tables, causing the caliph some embarrassment instead. Far from making the caliph angry, it seems to have given Harīsa more standing in his eyes and the caliph began to listen to his opinion. According to the source, this man was "one of the malicious people", and he took the opportunity of having the caliph's ear to point out to him that:

No-one does more than you yourself as concerns Āli b. Muḥammad. There is no-one in the palace who does not serve him, or draw back the curtains for him, or open doors etc. If people knew this they would say: "If he did not recognise him
to be worth of this amr, he would not do this." Let him draw the curtains for himself and walk as others do....

The caliph apparently followed this advice and received news of what had occurred from the head of the information service. The attempt to treat the Imam as no different from others had backfired, for, as the Imam walked through, a breeze had unexpectedly blown the curtains apart in front of him. The policy was quickly dropped.

Jealousy and rivalry were also the apparent motivation in another instance where the caliph was advised on his attitude towards al-Hādī. The caliph had asked Ibn al-Sikkīt, whose full name was Abū Yūsuf, Yaʿqūb b. Ishaq al-Dawraql al-Ahwāzī, and who was acknowledged as an expert in the field of language and literature, to put a difficult question to the Imam. Al-Hādī answered it easily and Ibn al-Sikkīt went on to make a classic error – asking a question to which he himself did not know the answer:

What is the huffa now?

To which the Imam replied:

The "aql by which is known the one who lies against God and is refuted."
Ya'qūb b. Aktham was dismissive of Ibn al-Sakkīt's competence in this area of debate, but this had not stopped the linguist from asking more questions and recording the answers:

When Ya'qūb b. Aktham read this he said to al-Mutawakkil: "We do not want you to ask this man anything after my questions, because nothing will refute him and showing his knowledge will strengthen the Rāfiqa."

Sound advice, perhaps, but quite possibly motivated by jealous preservation of his own eminent position. Ya'qūb had a long history of being entangled in the lives of the Imāms, turning up in the stories of testing and debate for al-Ridā, al-Jawād and al-Hādi.

If all of the above are either trivial, or open to criticism on the grounds of dubious authenticity, there are more serious incidents reported in more reliable sources. A very rational reaction to 'information received' is found in al-Kāfi, although it has, as always, its own veneer of propaganda and sympathetic bias. Al-Baṭḥā'ī al-‘Alawi, whose name is given in the notes in Bihar as Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim b. al-Ḥasan b. Zayd b. al-Ḥasan b. “All,” had linked his fortunes to those of Banū ʿAbbās, as had his father and grandfather before him, and it was he who informed the caliph that the Imām had received both money and weapons. On hearing this, the caliph ordered Saʿīd the bālib to make a surprise night search of the Imām’s residence to seize any money or weapons hidden there. Saʿīd entered the house via the roof and found himself lost until the Imām called out to him to wait til light was brought to show him the way. The search
was carried out and a sealed purse with the seal of the caliph's mother
was found, along with a single sword hidden under a prayer mat which
was pointed out to the searchers by al-Hādī.

The presence of a sealed bag with ten thousand dīnārs in it was
explained by the caliph's mother as the result of a vow she had made
when he had been very ill, to the effect that if he was cured she would
send the money to al-Hādī. The money was untouched, and the other
bag contained only four hundred dīnārs. Saʿīd was ordered to return
the sword and purses of money, which he did, admitting to being
embarrassed at what he had been obliged to do since it had been
discovered that it was unjustified. On this occasion no incriminating
evidence was found and no further action was taken.²⁰

At some point, however, the Imām was put under house arrest and access
to him was restricted. Stories hinting at this are found in several
sources, although the majority are found in the source which is most
likely to have recorded a distorted view - al-Khardīj.²¹ Despite
this suspicion of general unreliability, it is still worth taking its
accounts into consideration since, especially as concerns al-Hādī, it
often appears to echo other accounts in less suspicious sources. It
is certainly often guilty of exaggeration, overdramatisation and the
multiplication of more stories on a particular theme than genuinely
exist, but it does possibly reflect contemporary images.²²
One reporter, al-Šaqr b. AbI Dulaf, states that the Imām was kept under some form of arrest immediately on his arrival and that he went to ask after him. Al-Zurāfī, once again a bālib of the caliph, guesses what he wishes to find out, despite the fact that al-Šaqr has said little or nothing of his true purpose, and asks him:

Perhaps you would like to ask news of your mawla?

Unwilling still to admit to his loyalty to the Imām, al-Šaqr asks what mawla he is referring to.... the caliph? The bālib then discloses that he shares the belief of al-Šaqr that the Imām is al-bagg, and promises to arrange a meeting with the Imām after the departure of the sāhib al-barīd - Head of the Post Office/Information Service. Al-Šaqr finds the Imām sitting near an open grave and fears the worst, but still asks the Imām for information about his situation. Al-Hādī reassures him and, when asked for an interpretation of an hadīth from the Prophet which al-Šaqr had found difficult to understand, is quite happy to comply.

A version of this story appears in al-Khard'i-i from a different reporter altogether with details altered in a way which heightens various aspects. In charge of the Imām here is Sa'id al-Ḥājib, who admits that the caliph had ordered him to kill al-Hādī. He still allows the reporter of the story, Ibn Awrama, to meet "the one you allege is your Imām". That this is not a separate incident is confirmed both by the fact that the sāhib al-barīd must leave before he can enter as in the previous story, and that, here also, there is an open grave in front
of the Imām. Predictably, Ibn Awrama reacts to this sight in the same fashion as the other visitor. At this point the versions part company, for the Imām explains to Ibn Awrama that he will be safe by predicting that in two days time both the ḥālib and his master would be dead. Far from placing this incident on the Imām's first arrival in Sāmarrā', this piece of information attempts to place it shortly before the caliph's death in 247 A.H. some four years later. The conclusion of the story again confirms that the two versions are one and the same story by returning to the hadith of the Prophet.

There did occur shortly before the death of al-Mutawakkil an incident which the majority of sources have interpreted as directed at the Imām. The events are first recounted in Ithbāt, although not taken up by other sources such as al-Kāfī and those which draw on it.27 The closest parallel version is found in a slightly later source Ḥudūn al-Muṣīfītāt.28 In its most simple form, the caliph ordered that Banū Hāshim should walk on foot, intending specifically that al-Ḥādī should do so. The Hāshimīs went to the Imām pleading for him to do something about it for there was no-one else "whose invocations are more often answered". The Imām replied somewhat cryptically:

There is one in this world whose nail clippings are more dear to God than the she-camel of Thamūd when it was hamstrung and the young camel cried to God. He said: "Enjoy yourself in your house for three days - this is a promise which will not be false."29
Three days later the caliph was killed. Another story on this theme agrees with Ithbāt as to the caliph's motivation i.e. to humiliate the Imām by forcing him to walk in the heat of mid summer. This policy was part of the advice given to him by his wazīr, who had counselled that it would be impossible to specifically aim such an order at one man alone, but that if all the quwwād [army officers] and nobles were included, so as to disguise the target, it might work. Consistent with the explanation that the orders were directed at the Imām, is the reaction of Zurāra when he meets the Imām resting after the exertions of the walk:

Why does he aim at you and no-one else and yet you have nothing against him in your heart.

On hearing this the Imām warns him by quoting the Qur'ān as above, although Zurāra was obliged to ask a Shi'ite teacher to tell him what it meant i.e that in three days the caliph would be dead for God would not allow the Imām's enemies to overcome him. When the prediction came true Zurāra, already obviously inclined towards the Imām, accepted the full truth and became a supporter of al-Hādī, offering to enter his service.

Only one source gives a different perspective on the motivation of the caliph. Here the object of the caliph's declaration that all should walk is said to be to honour al-Fatḥ b. Khāqān who alone would be permitted to ride. This was done so that all would know how much the caliph thought of his most trusted advisor. The conclusion is the
same; the caliph was killed along with his wazîr Ibn Khâqân, and al-Muntaṣir was in power with the aid and guidance of his backers.

One of the abbreviated versions states that Ibn al-Riḍâ had been arrested shortly before the overthrow of the caliph and given in custody to ʿAlî b. Karkar, only to be released three days later, suggesting, therefore, that the Imâm was under suspicion at the time. A final allusion to the incident in another source suggests that the caliph had ordered al-Fâṭî to poison al-Hâdî. Whether or not this humiliating ordeal and all the various versions of the events, arrest, attempted murder etc, did indeed occur at the one point in time and were actually directed at al-Hâdî, his followers and those sympathetic to him interpreted them as such and read into subsequent events the intervention of divine vengeance.

All of the above stories leave a strong impression in the reader's mind of a trying and difficult time for the Imâm. Yet not all the images of his relationship with the court and the caliph are confrontational. As al-Irshâd pointed out, he was publicly honoured, and there are accounts where he seems on goodnatured terms with the caliph, even when the discussion touched on the prickly issue of the relative merit, lineage and status of their respective families. The caliph inquired of al-Hâdî what his family thought of al-ʿAbbâs b. ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. Al-Hâdî's answer in at least one source was very evasive:

What do the descendants of my father say, Commander of the Faithful, about a man, whom God imposed obedience to his
descendants on His creation, and who then imposed obedience of Him on his descendants.\footnote{37}

This statement appears to legitimise the rule of the Abbasid family, and is read as such by the caliph who ordered for the Imām one hundred thousand dirhams. A different version of the response is somewhat more difficult to interpret:

What do the descendants of my father say, Commander of the Faithful, about a man who God imposed obedience to His Prophet upon all His creation, and imposed obedience to Him on His Prophet.\footnote{38}

The first statement may be explained by the Shi'a as an example of taqiyya [dissimulation]; the purpose of the second is unfathomable, unless it was intended to be a veiled reference to the superiority of the claim to authority by the descendants of the Prophet Muḥammad who had, according to the Shi'a, made clear his wishes as to his successor only to be disobeyed on his death.

The generosity referred to here, a gift of 100,000 dirhams for a reply which pleased the caliph, is not unrepresentative of the caliph's attitude towards his "Alid guest. On one occasion a present of fruit was sent;\footnote{39} on another, the caliph ordered an assumed debt of the Imāms taken care of.\footnote{40} The Imām was invited to the social occasions of the caliph's family and other prominent figures, although he did meet with some disrespect from other guests.\footnote{41} Additionally he was given a grant of 30,000 towards the building of a house, although the caliph
was not amused when he found that it had not been put to the purpose
for which it had been given.\textsuperscript{42}

On another occasion when the talk turned to poetry, the Imām, asked as
to his preferred poet, quoted some lines which described the rivalry
between the two houses and their relative merits, concluding:

\begin{quote}
You thought us silent, but the witnesses to our excellence
over them are the voices raised in proclamation in every
mosque:
For the Prophet of God is our ancestor and we are his
children like the rising stars.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

The caliph asked him to explain a reference in the previous lines, and
in answering the Imām once more underlines the fact that:

\begin{quote}
Is the Prophet of God my ancestor or yours?
\end{quote}

The caliph was amused by this and replied:

\begin{quote}
He is yours. We'll not take him from you.\textsuperscript{44}
\end{quote}

Even under provocation from a member of another branch of the Ālid
house, the caliph reacted with tolerant exasperation, rather than
heavy-handed oppression. One of the descendants of Ibn al-öffentiya
entered to see him, but since the caliph was busy in conversation with
his wazīr Ibn Khāqān, he remained unacknowledged for some while.
Finally the young man interrupted to say:
If you brought me here to educate me, then the lesson has been a bad one; if you brought me here to let those of this rabble in your presence know your disdain for my family, they already knew.

On hearing this rude statement, the caliph restrained his anger and replied to the effect that it was only the man's kinship and lineage that was keeping his head joined to his body. Then he turned to his wazīr and commented:

Do you see what we meet with from Āl Abī Ṭālib; either a Ḥasanī who claims for himself a crown which God has already transferred to us; or a Ḥusaynī who slanders and criticises what God gave to us before him; or a Ḥanafī who in his ignorance tries to guide our swords to spill his blood.

The argument does not end with this perspicacious summing up of the various attitudes of the branches of the Ālīd house, for the Ḥanafī reacts hotly to this opinion, accusing the caliph and his family of stripping away their inheritance, quoting yet again lines of poetry to bolster the emotional effect of his appeal. The caliph was moved by his speech to such an extent that he had to leave the chamber. The next day he ordered him to present himself yet again, and this time gave him gifts and sent him on his way.

Even where the caliph was forced by considerations of state security to act on information received about the Imām's possible possession of weapons and letters, and have his house searched by members of his
Turkish army, he appears, in one source at least, quite relieved when nothing is found and treats him with great respect. Despite the report having been heard, al-Mutawakkil invited the Imām to drink with him, but the Imām politely refused, saying he had never allowed red wine to enter his blood or flesh. The caliph happily excused him, although other stories show him more distressed that the Imām will not become one of his drinking companions. However, the midnight session was continued with a recitation of poetry which had a visibly moving effect on the caliph, and caused him to order the Imām’s debts taken care of.

If the Imām was honoured publicly and well treated, but sometimes reviled and under suspicion, his own feelings towards the court were similarly ambivalent. A non-Shī‘ite source related how when living in Sāmarrā’ he had as neighbour a ālīd brought from Medina who was believed to some kind of priest or sorcerer by the name of ālīd. Every evening they would sit and talk, and one night a qa‘īd [army officer] from the Sulṭān’s palace came by with some of his fellow officers and men and some of the Shākiriyā. The Imām was quite profuse with his greetings and enthusiasm at seeing them, but his attitude changed once they had left:

He is quite self-satisfied at the moment, but he’ll be buried before the prayer tomorrow.

The overall picture of the Imām’s relationship with the court appears to be quite varied when allowances are made for the bias of the sources and the determination of some to show the Imām as persecuted.
and under constant suspicion; on the one hand there were those who through jealousy, maliciousness or pure disinformation, combined to keep the Imam's position precarious and even at times seriously threatened; on the other hand there are indications of an honoured social role for the Imam at court, of his presence at many of the caliph's audiences, and of his ability to establish his status in the eyes of the caliph without being considered as a threat, often by means of poetry to which the court seems particularly susceptible.

An indication of what may be the real situation is found in the words of a Shi'ite sympathiser who asked the Imam:

Oh Sayyid, these times are mostly filled with obstacles to achieving things because of the fact that everyone is on his guard and is fearful. Can you show me a way of avoiding this fear?

The confused picture of both suspicion and honour, which has been heavily weighted towards the side of suspicion by the sources, may well be due to the general circumstances of the era in which he lived. At this point in time the political scene was deteriorating into factionalism; the rule of factions backed by might and force of arms leaving no room for consensus and discussion. The pendulum swing of favour and disfavour was creating an atmosphere of intrigue and counter-intrigue with all those at court constantly in fear of falling from favour and losing all their possessions, if not their life. The expropriation of lands and wealth if the owner was imprisoned, exiled or out of favour was becoming more and more a common occurrence.
Faraja and Ibn al-Zayyāt at the beginning of al-Mutawakkil's reign, and later people such as Ibn Abī Du‘ād, ūbaydallāh b. Khāqān and Ahmad b. al-Khaqīb were all caught in this very trap. Zūrārā the Wūlūb, on being informed that the Imām had predicted the downfall of the caliph, decided to take precautions just in case, and distributed all he had to people he trusted, leaving himself only a mat to sit on, an indication of the only way in which destitution could be avoided. The pattern and foundation for the seesawing of power, which was to follow al-Mutawakkil's death, were laid during his reign, and the fear and insecurity caused by it were pervasive, a constant factor in the life of the court.

As a member of that court, the Imām could not expect to escape the general circumstances of life in Sāmarrā', dominated as it was by the new garrison established especially for the new Turkish sections of the army brought into being essentially by al-Muṣṭaṣīm to lessen the caliph's dependence on the older established forces. Even al-Hādī, despite his non-political stance and concentration on spiritual authority, would have had both friends and enemies at court, and been open to the slander and gossip which might reach the ears of the caliph from any direction. In one sense he was even more visible and vulnerable because of his reputation and the knowledge that there existed within the empire those who professed loyalty to him, even though these followers varied greatly in the depth of their convictions.
5.2 The Imam's reactions: the triumph of the righteous:

The portrayal of the oppressed Imam is an important one in the sources; yet almost as important for the Shi'a are his reactions to this oppression. The contemporary heroic ideal of Shi'ite Islam is the figure of al-Ḥusayn, grandson of the Prophet, martyred pursuing the fight against oppression and the corruption, embodied in the Umayyad state, of the true Islamic ideal. In al-Ḥusayn, those who strive to realise their vision of Islam find a model to emulate and their prime example of the fight for truth and justice against overwhelming odds. Al-Ḥusayn's triumph was not to be achieved in his time, however, for his vision of a renewed Islamic Umma under sound truly Islamic leadership came to nothing. His real victory lay in the spiritual élan he imparted to the evolving currents of Shi'ism. Still, his active pursual of power and his decision not to shrink from confrontation is now heralded as the paradigm of the struggle for justice and Islamic government.

The strongest theme of the biographical accounts of later Imāms, in particular those forced into close association with the ruling circles, is not that of the triumph against tyranny and injustice through war or active struggle and the seizure of power, but is rather the moral triumph of the righteous through God's intervention and the capturing of hearts and minds. One paragraph sums up the attitude of the Imāms' as perceived by their followers:

When the pressure on me became too great, I returned to the
treasures which we inherited from our fathers which are more powerful than cavalry, weapons or spirits. By this I mean the invocation of the oppressed against the oppressor."

Al-Hādī is rarely shown taking action on his own behalf; even where appeal has been made to him by a follower for his help, he denies having personally intervened with the caliph, attributing any felicitous outcome of the situation to the intervention of God through invocation. One of his followers, who had lost his job because of his beliefs, finds his needs fully met by the caliph after visiting the Imām. Al-Hādī denies having written or spoken on his behalf saying:

God knows we never seek refuge in important matters anywhere but with him. Nor do we trust in misfortune anyone save Him. We are accustomed to receiving an answer when we ask."

The Imām is dubious of the apparent friendship offered by al-Fath b. Khāqān who had asked for an invocation for himself:

He is friends on the surface yet avoids us secretly. Invocation is only for the one who uses it. If you remain obedient to God, recognise the Prophet of God and our rights, ahl al-bayt, and ask God for something, it will not be denied you."
caliph summoned him because of suspicions about his behaviour, he is described on entering as:

Standing there, his lips moving, neither afraid nor distressed.

The soldiers, with orders to kill him, explained their inability to carry out their orders saying:

It was the strength of his awe inspiring presence. We saw around him more than one hundred swords which we could not even contemplate, and because of that we were prevented from carrying out our orders. Our hearts were filled with that.

When the Imām's house was searched for money and weapons, he again maintained a detached indifference, guiding the searchers who were detailed to carry out the search into each of the rooms, even pointing out where they might look. Descriptions of the Imām on this occasion add greatly to the aura of other-worldliness, as he seems unconcerned with the trivial anxieties of al-dunya [the material world]. On the arrival of the soldiers, he is said to be wearing a wool garment and cowl, a prayer mat lying before him, and, according to some sources, he was facing the qibla [the direction of Mecca]. When the charges against him were dismissed, the Imām wasted no energy in anger or bitterness against his detractors, quoting only a verse from the Qur'ān:
Those who do wrong will know it. What kind of change will alter them.

Where the Imam is stung into righteous indignation is in response to disrespect or ridicule from single individuals. Yet even here his reaction is not to indulge in verbal attack or enraged silence, but to invoke God's power, often in a miraculous way, to punish the offender through misfortune or death.

Many of these incidents may be heavily influenced by the later interpretation of the Shi'a, who had made a virtue of the necessity of passive inactivity. The pattern had long been set, however, by the precedent of al-Sadiq, who had claimed for his line the spiritual domain, rather than that of the world.

One final story underlines how the separation between spiritual and temporal authority was seen as the basis of al-Hadi's reactions to the caliph's power and paranoia. The account is so unreal that the story can only be allegorical, yet it represents well the general response which the sources portray as being that of the last Imams. One of the caliphs, who is not specifically identified, ordered the entire garrison of 90,000 Turkish cavalry officers in Samarra' to create an artificial hill, from the top of which he proudly showed the Imam the extent of his forces because, the source alleges:
He was afraid that Abū al-Ḥasan would order one of his house to rebel against the caliph. ¹⁵⁷

The Imām reacts by asking if the caliph will allow him to show him his army:

So he called on God and there appeared between the earth and the sky from east to west armed angels. The caliph fainted and when he recovered the Imām said: "We are not your rivals in this world; we concern ourselves with the next life. Nothing of what you think is directed against you actually is so." ¹⁶⁷
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The sources' accounts of the life and Imāmate of al-Jawād are full of what might be termed 'propaganda' stories which have a clear purpose; to support the young Imām's claim to be the successor of al-Riḍā and, despite his age, fully functional as a source of guidance and knowledge for mankind. The same is not strictly true for al-Hādī. There is little evidence of a similar need for this kind of support for his Imāmate. His age was not apparently an issue and his brother Mūsā, although attracting some support, seems to have been of little danger as a rival to his authority. What danger he did represent was possibly defused by two stories which are found amongst the accounts of al-Hādī's life.

One of the very first stories of nasq which Ithbāt recounts shows the two children being asked what present they would like their father to bring back from Iraq. Al-Hādī chose a sword, a misleading choice in view of both his and his father's track record as active claimants; Mūsā chose a bed-cover and al-Jawād is moved to comment that:

"Abū al-Ŷasan resembles me, and this one resembles his mother."

A further denigration of Mūsā shows him as an unwitting dupe of the caliph. This story has the merit also of contrasting the two brothers, and of showing once more the caliph intentionally attacking the Imām's reputation. However, when the caliph expresses his dissatisfaction
that al-Hādī will not drink with him, it appears more that he cannot understand why his offer of companionship is being spurned, than a frustrated attempt to discredit al-Hādī:

Ibn al-Riḍā used to leave me perplexed. He refused to drink with me, or be my close companion, or give me any opportunity for this.

As on other occasions, the malicious intent becomes apparent in the advice given to the caliph to seek the companionship of the Imām’s brother Mūsā, whose reputation was all that al-Hādī’s was not - or at least so the sources would have us believe. Although al-Kāfī only hints at the ulterior motive of this advice, al-Irshād makes it quite apparent:

The reports will start to spread about it with regard to the son of Ibn al-Riḍā, and people will not be able to distinguish between him and his brother. Those who come to know of Mūsā will accuse his brother of the same actions.

Al-Irshād also expands on the honours and gifts bestowed on Mūsā who was greeted with great respect. However al-Hādī, at an arranged meeting, warned him that the honours were not sincere, and that the real intention was to humiliate and destroy him. Mūsā remained impervious to his brother’s warnings against disgracing both himself and his family, and stayed at court for a further three years until the caliph died, but without ever receiving the invitation from the caliph that he had expected. Notes to the version of the story in Bihār recount that he eventually left Kūfa, which was presumably his
permanent place of residence, and moved to Qumm in 256 A.H. He was joined there by his three sisters and died in 296 A.H.  

These are the only two stories which mention al-Hādī's brother, and neither are complimentary, showing him as unsuitable or unfit for the Imamate. That there are only two suggests that he did not pose a great threat to the choice of al-Hādī. Indeed the overall lack of stories of designation might suggest that there was no alternative to al-Hādī as successor in any case.

Many of the paragraphs which allude to the protection of God provided for those who follow the Imam must be considered partially as propaganda, an attempt both to show the Imam under God's protection, and reassure the Shi'a that this was extended to them as long as they recognised the Imam. The Imam when asked directly for help to deal with the widespread fear and distrust replied:

Our Shi'a have in our wilāya, protection. If they were to plunge into the abyss of the deepest sea, or into the midst of the wildest deserts with lions and wolves, hostile spirits and men, they would be protected from their fears by their closeness to us. So trust in God, and remain loyal to your pure Imāms. Go where you please.  

Other accounts, which may have purposes other than direct support of one particular idea, emphasise an important aspect of al-Hādī's response to the Abbasid regime - his lineage and family background. At court one of al-Hādī's arguments revolved around his ancestry, where he
pointed out that he was the Prophet's direct descendant and that he was the direct heir to the Prophet's inheritance. The status of al-Hâdi is supported in other stories. Šâliḥ b. Sa'īd had recounted how the Imâm had, on his arrival in the capital, shown him a vision of the paradise which always surrounded him wherever he went. Another vision associated with his arrival in Baghdâd is described in Ithbât by al-Khaḍîr b. al-Bazzâz who is said in the account to be a learned shaykh of blameless repute, a source of knowledge for both lawyers and ordinary people. He related how he had a dream about being on the banks of the river where people had gathered in great numbers. He heard them saying that the bayt Allâh al-ḥaram was approaching:

As we stood there, I saw al-bayt covered with veils and brocade and fine Egyptian linen. It approached across the ground, till it traversed the bridge from the west bank to the east and people were circling it and walking with it until it entered the house of Khuzayma...

Some days later the shaykh went out on an errand and at the bridge found people gathered, talking of the arrival of Ibn al-Ridâ from Medina. When the Imâm had passed by and had entered the house of Khuzayma, he says:

I knew that this was the interpretation of the vision I had seen.

A very strange story, part historical, part miraculous, and part propaganda, centres on a woman who claimed to be Zaynab, daughter of Fâṭima. The two versions in the biographical sources, al-Manâqib and
al-Kharā'î,¹⁰ state that the incident occurred under al-Mutawakkil, and Murūj confirms that something did take place during this caliph's reign.¹¹ However, it gives only cursory details, saying that a woman who had claimed to be the daughter of al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī had withdrawn her claim on seeing al-Ḥadī enter an enclosure of lions and remain unharmed. Rather than be tested in the same fashion, she admitted to fabricating her story. From a few lines in Murūj, which admittedly refers to a longer version elsewhere, first al-Manāqib, and then al-Kharā'î, has embroidered on the story, with considerable detail on the initial attempts to disprove her claims and the eventual necessity of seeking Ibn al-Riḍā's advice. Also included in loving detail, especially in al-Kharā'î, is the descent of al-Ḥadī into the lion's den.¹² From the point of view of propaganda, the version in al-Kharā'î has also added a particularly advantageous element for al-Ḥadī. It reports that al-Ḥadī suggested that, since the flesh of the descendents of Fāṭima was prohibited to wild animals, the woman could be tested by making her enter a lion's enclosure. First, though the proposition had to be proved, and some of the other members of ahl al-bayt, both Ḥasanid and Ḥusaynid, were reluctant to be involved, passing the honour on to Abū al-Ḥasan. Abū al-Ḥasan was, of course, totally unaffected by the thought of being amongst the wild animals:

He [the Imām] said: "Here are a group of the descendents of both al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn. Send them in if you wish." And by God the faces of these people turned pale and some of those who hated him said: "He is trying to get someone else to do it, why not him?" ¹³
This source also suggests that the caliph was quite happy at this, seeing a possibility of ridding himself of al-Hādī's presence without being directly responsible. As the Imām remains untouched amongst the prowling beasts, an apt allegory for the way the Shi'a perceived his life at court, the wazīr became anxious:

This is not right. Get him out quickly before news of this spreads.¹³

Once again an attempt on al-Hādī has backfired, and he has been shown to stand above all those who might be his enemies and rivals, the only true descendent of Fāṭima.

One of the new elements in the stories surrounding al-Hādī is the emphasis on conversion, of the convincing of those who may not even be Muslim of the truth of the Imāmate. For al-Jawād, the emphasis had lain more on convincing erstwhile Shi'ites of his Imāmate and drawing them back into the fold. In al-Hādī's case, however, there is only one major story which seeks to show a confirmation of belief in the succession of al-Hādī to the Imāmate. This story, again occurring in two different versions from two reporters, is also entangled with one of the incidents which supposedly occurred on the Imām's journey to Sāmarra' - his preparations for bad weather in the middle of summer. ¹⁴ Considering that ʿAlī b. Mahzīyār had already met al-Hādī some years previously, ¹⁵ and had seemed to accept the young man as Imām, it is strange that he should be one of the two reporters of this confirmation. As mentioned above, however, the strengthening of belief
and acceptance presupposes an element of doubt without which the story loses its point. Here, as in the coterie of stories about his journey to Iraq, the Imām rides out prepared for bad weather on a spring day which was more like summer. The other members of the hunt, for this was the purpose of the excursion, were amazed at his behaviour. The downpour which hit them shortly thereafter goes a long way to reassuring “Ali that the Imām is what he claims, and he is fully satisfied when al-Hādī gives him advice on the legality of prayer in soaked clothes without him asking the question which was on his lips. The second version is said to be from “Ali b. Yaqtin b. Mūsā al-Ahwāzī who was initially Muʿtazīlī, but became convinced that the Imām was ḥija because of this incident. Of the two, his account is slightly more convincing in its detail and the logical development of events, including the provision of a more rational explanation of the Imām’s comment on the state of clothing for prayer. This may only mean that the reporter was a more subtle propagandist, rather than that it is the original story.

Conversions like that of the Muʿtazīlīte take place on several occasions. The Christian doctor Yazdād, who had taken such pleasure in gossiping about the arrival of al-Hādī, was eventually persuaded to tell his friend about his encounter with the Imām:

I met him one day and he was riding a black horse, wearing black clothes, a black turban and he was dark skinned. When I saw him, I stood there amazed and said to myself - I swear nothing came out of my mouth to be overheard - I said to myself: "Black clothes, horse, man. All black." As he reached me, he looked at me sharply and said: "Your heart is
blacker than what your eyes see."19

Sometime later on his deathbed, he sent for his Muslim friend and declared:

My heart has become white and is no longer black. I bear witness that there is no God but God, with no equal or partner, that Muḥammad is His Prophet, and ʿAlī b. Muḥammad is the hujjat of God for His creation.

Similarly converted was a man from Iṣfahān who had gone to court to seek restitution for wrongs done to him, and who, on seeing al-Ḥādī being brought to court with the threat of death hanging over him, was so overwhelmed by his charismatic presence that he began to implore God to save him.20 The Imām's awareness of his invocations on his behalf, and the predictions made by al-Ḥādī of his future good fortune, which came true, sufficiently affected the man to convince him that his person was indeed, as the Rāfiqa alleged, the Imām.21

Leaving aside the occasional paragraph tucked into various stories, there is one longer statement of the Imām's views on theological issues other than the Imāmate. It takes the form of several conversations, sometimes monologues, with a fellow traveller on the road to Iraq, Fathi b. Yāzid al-Jurfānī.22 The first conversation touches on the subject of the nature of God, His attributes and the description of Him by His subjects. On this subject al-Ḥādī is recorded as being most emphatic in rejecting any hint of tashbīn [the describing of God in human
terms], and of various ideas which envisaged God as either form [jisn], or image [ṣūra]:

The Creator is not described save as He describes Himself. How can He be described whom senses cannot perceive, nor dreams envisage, nor thoughts define, nor even vision encompass. He is more sublime than the descriptions of Him by those who describe Him......He created 'how', and is not defined by it; He created 'where', and is not defined by it. He is not part of how or where.23

In a later conversation, he returned to the subject of God and gave a succinct description of his own:

The one and only, Everlasting, neither begetting nor begotten; there is none like Him, Creator of all things, Former of all bodies, All-Hearing, Knowing, Compassionate, Wise, Merciful. He is beyond that which the unjust say of Him.24

The Imām's insistence on rejecting those who would describe God in anthropomorphical terms, is not entirely representative of the ideas amongst the Rāfiḍa themselves. Of six different groups recorded in Maqālāt, who held views on this issue, only one rejected any kind of ascription to God of body or image, or any kind of human attributes such as movement.25 This group, according to al-Aṣhārī, adhered to the concept of tawḥīd such as was held by the Muʿtazila.26 Tashbih was a concept which was discussed and supported to various degrees by some well known earlier Shi'ite scholars, one of whom was Hishām b. al-Ḥakam, whose views were then dissected and interpreted by later scholars according to their own opinions.27 According to the hadīths
recorded in *al-Kāfī*, the Imāms from al-Ṣādiq's time onwards were staunch proponents of *tawḥīd*, rejecting both attribution of body, and of image, to God. Since various versions of these concepts were still held by the Shī'a in later years, either these *ḥadīths* are only ascribed to the Imāms to bolster the case of those who opposed these views, or the Imāms were sometimes ignored by even those who technically accepted them as ultimate authorities on religious matters.

From his initial emphasis on *tawḥīd*, the Imām went on to describe the obedience due to the Prophet enjoined by God on His creatures, illustrating this point with such Qur'ānic quotations as:

> Obey God and the Messenger and those in authority amongst you [4:60].

At this point the version from *K. al-Dalā'il*, which is reported in *Kashf*, goes on to a long list of the religious hierarchy, ending with the *awṣiyā'*:

> .....inherited from them their knowledge and the matter was handed over to them.

*Ithbāt* contents itself with a simple reference to God and his *huṣna*, and does not contain the following paragraph which describes the Prophet and his successors.
Ibn Yazīd is obviously very affected by the Imam’s words for the next passage recorded contains warnings from the Imam against making some extreme assumptions about the Imamate. Ibn Yazīd appears to have leapt to the conclusion that the Imāms were more than they appeared to be, that they were in fact ārbāb (Lords or Gods). Rubūbiyya (the attribution of divinity to any other than God) had surfaced very early among the Shi'a. Some hadiths suggest that even ʿAlī found it necessary to refute the assertions of some of his more fanatic followers that he was the 'Lord' who held powers of creation and provision for Mankind.

It is from al-Ṣādiq, however, that a large number of refutations comes. The issue of rubūbiyya was even discussed by some who were well connected with the Imāms such as al-Mufaḍḍal b. ʿUmar. The idea never died out despite strenuous denials, for Muḥammad b. Bashīr later alleged that al-Kāẓim was Lord, and that he himself was his prophet. Little of this type of exaggeration is recorded under al-Jawād, although he did register dissatisfaction with two men who claimed to be working on his behalf—Abū al-Samḥārī and Ibn Abī al-Zarqāʾ. Nothing is recorded of the claims they were making on his behalf, but under al-Hādī several people made claims which may have necessitated the type of strong denial which is recorded in this passage.

The main source of the extreme claims made on al-Hādī's behalf seems to have been one ʿAlī b. Ṣaska al-Qummi, al-Ḥawārī who alleged, along with his pupil al-Qāsim al-Yaqīnī, that he was the bāb and nabī of
the Imām, implying therefore a higher status for the Imām himself. Either the two men began to make their claims towards the end of al-Hādi's life, or they remained a thorn in the flesh for some time, for under Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan al-Askari, ʿ Ḥamd b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā wrote about some people who were alleging very disturbing things, naming them as ʿAlī b. ʿHasa and al-Qāsim. They were interpreting the prayer and the zakāt as something other than the motions of prayer cycle, money and wealth. They were, in fact, explaining them as referring to a person. Al-Hādi had already sent out notices cursing the two and warning those who were loyal to him to avoid them.

ʿAlī b. ʿHasa had two other associates who also began making similar allegations - al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā b. Bābā and Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Sharīqī. One well known exponent of these ideas was Muḥammad b. Nuṣayr al-Numayrī who alleged also that ʿAlī b. Muḥammad had sent him as his prophet. Part of his ghulūw [extreme ideas] was said to be a belief in tānāsūkh [the transmigration of souls], rubūbiyya on behalf of Abū al-Ḥasan, and the permission of prohibited acts. However, similar accusations were made of earlier extremists, and it is therefore difficult to be certain that these did indeed reflect his true views. In his beliefs he was supported by Muḥammad b. Mūsā b. al-Ḥasan b. Furāt. Al-Askari, which could refer to either ʿAlī al-Hādi or to his son al-Ḥasan, although the early part of the story refers explicitly to ʿAlī b. Muḥammad, made quite clear the repugnant nature of the allegations made on his behalf by Ibn Bābā and al-Fahri, cursing them wholeheartedly.
In the final conversation with Ibn Yazīd, the Imām has once more to warn his companion about exaggerating the Imām's position, this time by denying that they required sustenance like other human beings:

Oh Fatḥ, in the Messengers we have a model, and they ate, drank, walked in the markets. Every body has need of sustenance save the Creator.63

The exaggerated claims made about the Imāms must be at least partially due to the isolation of the Imām in the capital. Despite being physically closer to the centres of support, the Imām does not seem to have been able to gather round him any of his loyal supporters, or to meet ordinary members freely. Many of those who relate stories about him at court are not overtly Shiʿīte, and are for the most part already connected with the court, either notables or in their employ.64 With this lack of day to day contact, a similar situation to that of al-Jawād, the ghulāt [extremists] would have had a lot of scope to make assumptions about the Imāms, and the extent of their powers and knowledge.

One aspect of knowledge referred to in a few hadīths is that of the unknown - al-ghayb. Yazīdād, the Christian doctor, considered that if anyone knew al-ghayb then it was him;65 and another non-Shīʿite considered the Imām's prediction of the death of one of the quwwād as being knowledge of the unknown.66 Denials by the Imāms that they did possess this knowledge again date from al-Ṣādiq's time. In one reported hadīth he denies any suggestion that he knew even certain natural phenomena - the number of stars, the leaves of the trees, the
water in the seas etc., and he is particularly emphatic about denying knowledge of the unknown. However, what the unknown refers to is not specified, and, indeed, in other hadiths the Imams are shown to have knowledge of things which logic would suggest were part of the unknown - what has been, what will be, the names of the Shi'a of all eras.

A later dispute in the time of al-Hasan al-Askari in which al-Faqih b. Shadhun was a prominent protagonist revolved around the extent of the Imam's knowledge. The view that he was attacking proposed that the Prophet had known all the languages which existed on earth, of people, birds, and animals, and that there must always be someone who also knew what the Prophet knew. In addition he would know the inner secrets of men, distinguishing between believers and hypocrites, and knowing the names of all those among the Shi'a of past, present and future. Amongst their claims also was the idea that wahi [Inspiration from God] had not ceased, and that it was still possible for God to inspire his bujja with knowledge relevant to his time. The Imam of the time replies to al-Faqih's query, saying that his views were partially right and partially wrong, but unfortunately there are no details in this particular account as to which of his statements was acceptable and which was not.

The Imams themselves may have denied knowledge other than that of the Kitab and Sunna, the accumulated wisdom of Prophets and
Messengers, but the miracles attributed to them are centred on the Imām's knowledge of seemingly unknowable things.

Of the many miracles reported both for al-Jawād and al-Hādi, the majority concentrate on some aspect of the Imām's knowledge, whether it be of past, present or future. The smallest category seems to be that of past events, or information relating to an earlier period. Most of the knowledge exhibited by the Imāms is of present, but hidden circumstances, and future events, areas where rational explanations were less likely to be applicable. Some of the miraculous stories told about al-Jawād portray his knowledge of the true nature of people and objects. On one occasion he correctly identifies the writing on three notes of paper, one of which belonged to al-Rayyān b. Shabīb; on another occasion he correctly identifies a letter sent by a wāqifīte, this being obvious by the fact that the wāqifīte receives no answer.

Al-Jawād is also portrayed as possessing insight into the hearts and minds of believers. When ʿAbdullāh b. Razīn attempted to acquire 'sacred soil', earth upon which the Imām had trodden, the Imām constantly changed his routine to prevent ʿAbdullāh from succeeding and falling prey to the whisperings of Satan. Similarly, on the morning of al-Jawād's marriage, Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Ḥāshīmī visited him and concluded from his behaviour:

I think that Abū Jaʿfar knew what was in men's souls, just as the Rāfidites claim.
In this type of knowledge al-Jawād is not unique, for al-Hādī also has similar accounts related about him. One Christian, who later converted to Islām, swore that he had not given voice to the thoughts in his mind, yet al-Hādī was able to repeat them.

On another occasion a man in the crowd was reassured by the Imām that a silent invocation by him of God's protection for the Imām would be answered.

When it comes to knowledge of the future, al-Jawād's knowledge is reported in the context of prescience about death, either his own or of others. He warned Ḥammād b. ‘Īsā not to leave Medina one particular year, and when Ḥammād went ahead he was drowned. Earlier in his life al-Jawād is reported as reluctant to leave Mecca because he knew that his father would leave for Khurāsān and never return. He even predicted his own death. For al-Hādī, knowledge of the future is more varied and, as befits the different circumstances of his life, more concerned with the life of the court. He predicts that the capital of Sāmarrā' would never be completed and would one day be destroyed, although this saddened him, the area having clear air and sweet water. He predicted also, in answer to a question put to him by a follower, how long the caliph al-Mutawakkil would reign, referring in his answer to Sūrat Yūsuf, and the seven fat and seven lean years in the dream interpreted by Joseph. One year after the end of these years the caliph would no longer be on the throne.

Such knowledge of abstracts is not the only knowledge available to the Imāms; others include the sex and future birth of a child.
languages, anatomy and the capacity to cure diseases both of body and mind and revive the dead.

There are a few instances where miracles first related of al-Jawād are also related of al-Hādi. The preparations made by al-Hādi for bad weather on his journey to Sāmarra' are mirrored in a similar account for al-Jawād. Another near identical story repeated for both Imāms is related by Abū Hāshim, Dāwud b. al-Qāsim, who when feeling overburdened financially, complained to the Imām and was miraculously provided with gold, in one instance out of sand.

This Dāwud b. al-Qāsim b. Ishāq b. ʿAbdallāh, Abū Hāshim al-Jaʿfarī, a descendant of Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālib, was transported to Sāmarra' in 252 A.H. and died there in 261. He lived under four Imāms, al-Riḍā to al-ʿAskarī maintaining a close position with the Imāms whilst being muqaddam ʿind al-Sulṭān. His attitude towards the ruling house is reported in various ways. Present when congratulations were being presented in Baghda'd to Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh b. Ṭāhir for his victory over Yaḥyā b. ʿUmar b. al-Ḥusayn, Abū Hāshim, caring nothing for the reactions of Muḥammad or the members of the ruling circle also present, commented:

Oh Amir, I came to congratulate you for something which, if the Prophet were alive, he would instead be consoled.

On another occasion at a gathering of various members of the Ṭālibid family, he is referred to as the most quiescent of the descendants of
Ja'far. His track record in his reports is open to criticism. He is responsible for a large number of the miracles attributed to al-Jawād and al-Hādī. For al-Jawād his stories are reported initially in al-Ḥāfīz and its dependent sources, and in Rihār are drawn from a later source - al-Khara'ī'ī wa al-Jarā'ī'ib - a work devoted exclusively to the subject of miracles, both the theory and the reality. For al-Hādī, none of Abū Hāshim's more dubious accounts are found in al-Ḥāfīz etc., although one is found in Ithbāt. The vast majority are reported in Rihār from al-Khara'ī'ī, and most are on topics such as those detailed above; the Imam's command of languages; his curing of leprosy; his command of nature shown in the silencing of birds and his control of wild animals when placed amongst them etc. A few of his accounts verge on the acceptable, reflecting possibly his experiences at court. On one such occasion, when present at the door of the caliph al-Mutawakkil, he overheard others present deciding that when the Imam appeared they would not stand up out of respect as they usually did. After all he was neither of the most noble, nor the oldest, nor the most knowledgeable. However, when the Imam was next present they could not help but stand up, showing their usual respect for him, a point which Abū Hāshim takes great delight in commenting on.

It was possible for people such as Dāwud b. al-Qāsim to spread such stories mainly because of the lack of everyday, ordinary contact between the Imam and his followers. The progressively widening gulf between both al-Jawād and al-Hādī and their followers left
considerable room for the stories and accounts which reflected more the state of mind, ideas and concerns of the Shi'a, than of the Imāms.

Contact and communication between the Imāms, increasingly drawn into the grasp of the Abbasid court, and their followers, was eventually maintained virtually only through the existence of the wikāla - a group of representatives working in various spheres of activity on the Imām's behalf.

The development of the responsibility and authority of the wikāla throughout the period of the ninth, tenth and finally the eleventh Imām, was to prove of crucial importance to the Shi'a during the next phase of their history - the period of the ghayba, the almost complete disappearance from view of the twelfth and final Imām. It was unfortunate that the ever constricting circle of people in touch with the Imām throughout the preceding years may also have had the consequence of leaving the field open for false claimants and extremists. Yet without the wikāla, and its activities on the Imām's behalf, the Shi'a might have been left without a focus for their beliefs and the means of expressing, and thus keeping alive, their devotion.
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CHAPTER SEVEN: THE WIKĀLA BEFORE AL-JAWĀD

7.1 Evidence for its origins, nature and development

Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq are recorded in many sources as scholars, thinkers and spiritual leaders, recognised as such, it would seem, by many sections of the community. By virtue of their quiescent stance and insistence on not actively claiming power through their own physical efforts, it might seem illogical to look for evidence of the origins of an 'underground' network of representatives working on their behalf.

Evidence for the existence of any 'underground network', which the wikāla is alleged to have been, will be difficult to unearth; by its very nature as an 'underground' organisation detailed notes on its structure, evolution and agents will not be, nor ever would have been, available for public consumption. As such, one can expect reasonably to find only hints or the occasional piece of evidence to suggest that a certain person carried out certain functions on the Imām's behalf. It is notable that under later Imāms from al-Jawād onwards, when written communications appear to have become accepted as the principle means of relaying messages, clearer evidence emerges. Until this time one must rely on scarce, and sometimes ambiguous, material when attempting to judge the extent and nature of Shiʿite activities on behalf of the Imāms.
It must be pointed out that what is visible may be only the tip of an iceberg, and that there is no way that the dimensions of that part which remains underwater and invisible can be known. It must also be taken into consideration that only a proportion of the asbāb of each Imām, or those known as Shi‘ite scholars or believers, were necessarily involved in active duties.

The first indications of the existence of an embryonic organisation are found under al-Ṣādiq. But what possible reason would there have been for such an organisation to exist, and to continue to exist throughout the difficult times to follow? One answer to this question, which certainly has some merit, is that the intent may have been to forge a more coherent following, to gain support and prepare the groundwork for the future — how far distant a future is indeterminable. It may be significant that of many of those who finally committed themselves to al-Kāẓim, a high proportion seem to have been convinced that he would be the one who would return as al-Mahdī and call on his followers to rise with him.\(^2\) The creation of a Shi‘ite organisation dedicated to the spreading of hadīths preparing the ground for the future rising of the al-Mahdī is a strong contender as the raison d’être of the wikāla. It may, however, have gone hand in hand with a more naturally evolved reason — a reason which can only become evident if one considers the evidence available.

It is only natural that many of those associated with al-Ṣādiq were scholars and thinkers for al-Ṣādiq’s greatness and reputation are based on his extraordinary abilities as scholar, lawyer and spiritual
charismatic. Yet one source records the first wakil as Naṣr b. Qābūs, who worked in this capacity for al-Ṣādiq for twenty years without knowing it. Despite the application of the term wakil [representative], however, there is little evidence of the duties or commissions he actually carried out for the Imām. Listed in the same source as one of the quwwām [managers, caretakers] of al-Ṣādiq is Mu'allā b. Khunays, whose predilection for openly and publicly declaiming his devotion to ahl al-bayt, and their prior rights to power, eventually led to his death at the hands of the governor of Medina Dāwūd b. ʿAlī. Dāwūd arrested Mu'allā and apparently questioned him about the Shi'a of al-Ṣādiq. Although there is no clear indication of him functioning as a representative of al-Ṣādiq here, his name is found in two other hadiths linked with ʿAbdallāh b. Abī Yaṣür who died during al-Ṣādiq's lifetime. ʿAbdallāh lived in Kūfa, visiting al-Ṣādiq only occasionally. With Mu'allā he is reported to be in Egypt on a ahd [commission] for al-Ṣādiq; some of their beliefs on the Imāmate are recorded, Mu'allā believing the Imāms to be anbiyā'; ʿAbdallāh insisting they are awsīyā', ʿulamā'. Although unfortunately there is again little detail to suggest what business he was engaged on, this does at least suggest that he did act on behalf of the Imām in some capacity. His position was assumed on his death by al-Muফādżal b. ʿUmar, another Kufan to whom the Imām wrote saying:

I have entrusted [aḥad] to you my commission [aḥd], which was formerly with ʿAbdallāh b. Abī Yaṣūr.

Al-Mu фаdżal's reputation leaves a great deal to be desired. Complaints about him from other Shi'ites, largely rejected by the Imām,
abound. A large group of pious men from Kufa - Zurara b. Bukayr, Abdallah b. Bukayr, Muhammad b. Muslim, Abu Basir, and Juqr b. Zaid, wrote directly to al-Sadiq complaining about his bad habits and the company he was keeping. The Imam in return sent a letter to them addressed to al-Mufaddal which they duly delivered. The letter, which al-Mufaddal passed on to them to verify the contents, read:

"In the name of God....... buy this, and buy this", and did not mention anything of what they had said about him.

The group gathered at his house, disconcerted at the amount of money required which they presumably are being expected to find, suggested that they would need some time to gather it. Al-Mufaddal bid them stay for a meal and sent some of his own ashab to collect the money which eventually amounted to 1000 dinars and 10,000 dirhams.

Despite the fact that there are indeed some reports of al-Sadiq being angry with al-Mufaddal principally for his connections with Abu al-Khattab, his encouragement of the aspirations of Isma'il b. Ja'far to the Imamate, and his penchant for discussing issues such as rububiyya [the attribution of divinity to other than God] and rizq [the providing for believers by someone other than God] provided by the Imams, he survived as a wakil under al-Kazim as well. Al-Kazim apparently thought well of him, and he carried out certain affairs for him - including the buying and selling of fish and fishheads.
Al-Mufaddal died under al-Ḵāżīm, and al-Riḍa for one seems to have regretted the passing of his unquestioning support.

Another wakīl, so named again by al-Ṭūsī’s al-Ghaybā, also lived throughout the reign of more than one Imām, dying allegedly during the lifetime of al-Riḍā. This was ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḥajjāj from Kūfah, a trader in al-sābirī who lived in Baghdād, and who, although accused at one time of adhering to the Kaysaniyya, is recorded both as a follower of al-Ḵāżīm and al-Riḍā. Little again is mentioned of his commissions and, indeed, he seems to have been mostly involved with the more scholarly circles and their debates. On occasion he channeled messages from al-Ḵāżīm to some of the Shiʿa, and requests and money from them to the Imām. One year it is reported that, when he left Iraq carrying a great deal of money for al-Ḵāżīm, he was also entrusted with a message for the Imām from ʿAlī b. Yaṯīn which contained requests for invocations on his behalf. ʿAlī b. Yaṯīn generously provided funds for some of the Shiʿa to undertake the ḥajj, amongst them ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. Some were given 20,000; others 10,000; even the least were granted 1000 or 500 dirhams.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān participated in one debate on tawhīd and the attributes of God which took place between Hīṣām b. Sālim and Hīṣām b. al-Ḥakam, with the added presence of such people as Jumayl b. Darraj, Muḥammad b. Abī ʿUmayr, Muḥammad b. Ḫimrān – in total fifteen of the aṣḥāb. At one point during the time of al-Ḵāżīm, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān relayed a message from the Imām to Hīṣām b. al-Ḥakam telling him to desist from debating. Hīṣām apparently did so while the caliph al-Maḥdī lived,
returning to his debates thereafter, because, he allegedly explained to Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-ʿRahmān, the message had only said "in these days".28  
Another viewpoint on the same incident, however, says that he stopped only for a month before restarting, thus forcing ʿAbd al-ʿRahmān to remind him of the Imām's orders.29  
There are hints that ʿAbd al-ʿRahmān had also been told to cease and that Hishām's disobedience was extremely irritating for him. When Hishām refused to obey, considering himself beyond such orders, ʿAbd al-ʿRahmān returns yet again to deliver a further message:

Oh Hishām, does it gladden you to have a part in the blood of a Muslim......How can you then have a part in mine. If you don't be silent, he is [I am?] for the sacrifice.

It is possible that the wikāla came into being as a result of the policies of al-Ṣādiq and the changed nature of the identity, aims and composition of the Shiʿa. Equally, there may be involved a retrospective interpretation which regards those working on the behalf of earlier Imāms, and dealing with their personal affairs, as somehow different from those who carried out the same duties for later Imāms - the shift of emphasis being from strictly personal agents to more formal representatives embodying a two-way relationship between the Imām and his followers.

From the limited glimpses of those who were designated wukalāʾ by later generations, a hazy image of the origins of the wikāla can be formed, although some conjecture is admittedly necessary to develop a coherent picture. It is suggested that originally the Imāms may have
had their own personal business representatives dealing with their essentially private affairs in various regions - Iraq, Egypt, Syria. Under al-Ṣādiq though, the Shi'a began to coalesce into an identifiable group whose loyalty became more firmly attached to a particular line of descent from the Prophet. With al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq highly visible Imāms and widely respected at a time of great instability, there may have been those who felt that they were obliged by their beliefs to render the khums or zakāt to the Imām as the true leader of the Umma, or felt impelled by pious devotion to the family of the Prophet to send gifts of money and requests for invocations. Those already representing the Imām in an area would naturally be well placed to channel gifts, requests, questions etc, to the Imām in one direction, and to deliver his responses in the other. If this was indeed the way in which the position of wakil came into being, it might explain why Naṣr b. Qābus was unaware of his position, and why al-Mufaddal b. "Umar survived as a trusted representative despite his dubious ideas and tendency to keep bad company.

7.2 Developments under al-Kāẓim

The loss of al-Ṣādiq must have been almost as great a shock to his Shi'a as the loss of al-Riḍā and the succession of a child would be later on. Such a formidable scholar and leader had stamped his mark on the nature of the Shi'a and guided it onto its quiescent path, carving out for the Imām a position of technically unassailable spiritual authority.
Although responsible for the promulgation of the theories of the inheritance of ilm, the continuous presence of the al-‘Alîm, and the nass by which the Imām’s successor was to be known, al-Šādiq left behind him an extremely confused situation in which as one Shi‘ite described it:

People were going in all directions. "[literally left and right]"

Only after “Abdallāh b. Ja‘far al-Afjaq had proved unfit in the eyes of al-Šādiq’s aṣbāh by giving answers they considered more like the thinking of the Murji‘a, and had then subsequently died, was Mūsā al-Kāzīm able to begin rebuilding a following under very difficult circumstances. There were many amongst those who were associated with later Imāms who were counted initially as part of the fudhiyya [i.e those who supported “Abdallāh], before switching their support to al-Kāzīm - i.e. “Ali b. Asbāh, al-Ḥasan b. “Ali b. Faḍqal, “Ali b. Ḥadīd b. Ḥakīm, Muṣāwliy a b. Ḥakīm, Yūnus b. “Abd al-Raḥmān and Yūnus b. Yaqūb."

Despite being fairly young, only twenty years of age, and facing strong competition from several more active groups who had also gained support from those disappointed with the policies of the Abbasid administration, al-Kāzīm would seem to have contributed greatly to the building of the wīkāla.
"Ali b. Yaqtin is once more recorded as being diligent in sending money for the Imām - delivering the khums plus the gift of a cloak to the him, and instructing Ismā'īl b. Sālim to deliver money to someone in Kūfā, buy camels and then deliver books and messages to al-Kāzīm. Two particular stories where mention is made of wealth being channeled to the Imām show how accusations were leveled at the Imām by both a member of his own family, and a member of Abbasid circles. "Ali b. Ismā'īl b. Ja'far told the caliph that wealth arrived for the Imām from east and west, and Yaḥyā b. Khālid alleged that Ja'far b. Muḥammad b. al-Ash'ath delivered the khums to al-Kāzīm. Accusations made from less than pure motives cannot be taken as absolute proof of the occurrence of such things in reality. Yet it would tend to suggest that it was not unimaginable that the Imām should attract such support and loyalty. One follower who set himself up as the Imām after al-Kāzīm, whom he alleged was in ghayba, insisted that all that was due as a percentage of wealth for the Imām should be conveyed to his awsiyāt, another indication that it might well have been accepted practice.

The strongest evidence of al-Kāzīm's activities is the situation which occurred on his death. Many of his followers seem to have been convinced that he was indeed al-Mahdī al-Muntazār who would rise to fill the earth with justice and banish tyranny. They refused to recognise any further Imām but stopped at the seventh, being known because of this as the Wāqīfa. Of those who refused to recognise a continuation of the visible Imāmate were some who were wukalā' of al-Kāzīm and who, according to several sources, denied al-Riḍā purely
and simply in order to keep large sums which had accumulated in their possession, one assumes for eventual transfer to the Imam. Four names are usually mentioned; "Ali b. Abī Ḥamza; Ziyād b. Marwān al-Qandī al-Anbārī; "Uthmān b. "Isā al-Ruwāsī and Ḥayyān al-Sarrāj. This last name is not a well known one, but Ikhtiyār does say that he was one of two wukālāʾ in Kūfa to whom al-Asḥāṣīta delivered 30,000 dinārs, the accumulated zakāt on their wealth. With al-Kāẓim in prison he had no-one to whom to send it, and when al-Kāẓim died he denied that he was dead and kept the money. If this was his actual intent i.e. to deny al-Kāẓim's death in order to keep the money, it is rather curious that he turns up in a further report, along with several others also tagged as wāqifītes, questioning al-Riḍā to determine if he was a true Imam. The faint possibility exists that in his, and other cases, there did indeed exist the belief, first and foremost, that al-Kāẓim was the last Imam, and that only as a consequence of that belief did they keep the money.

"Uthmān b. "Isā was apparently in Egypt when al-Kāẓim died and was left with large sums of money and slaves. When al-Riḍā sent for these possessions, presumably as part of the estate of his father, stating explicitly that "my father is dead", "Uthmān refused to accept this and went so far as to free the slaves. He is reported to have repented and to have eventually sent the money owing to al-Riḍā. He is also referred to as being among the fuqahāʾ of al-Kāẓim and al-Riḍā and to have been a source of al-Faḍl b. Shādhān.
The other two figures are frequently linked together particularly in their attempt to bribe Yûnûs b. ʿAbd al-Rahmân with 10,000 dînârs not to broadcast his acceptance of al-Riḍâ. ʿZiyâd was left in possession of some 70,000 dînârs and, despite the fact that he is alleged to have witnessed the naṣṣ of ʿAll by al-Kâzîm, later denied his Imâmâte. He is said to have been one of ârkân al-wâqîf (pillars of the Wâqifâl). ʿAll b. Abî Hamza was also left with 30,000, a popular sum, which was the reason for his profession of wâqifism. He was a qâʿîd of one Abû Baṣîr and is amongst the most frequently mentioned as carrying out the Imâm’s instructions. He also argued long with al-Riḍâ about his Imâmâte, but could not, it seems, be persuaded of its validity. In one justification of wâqifism, Muḥammad b. ʿIrân al-Bâqîrî in a meeting at the house of Ibn Abî Hamza related an hadîth from al-Ṣâdiq to the effect that:

There will be eight of us muhaddathûn, the seventh will be al-Qâʾîm.

This statement seems to have been taken by Abû Baṣîr to mean that al-Kâzîm would be al-Mahdî, but is rejected by him with the argument that al-Ṣâdiq had never said it would be his son.

There are a sprinkling of other names who seem to have been involved in the wikâla, or at least to have been amongst those who carried money or letters to and from the Imâm: Mûsâ b. Bakr al-Wâsîlî who was sent on business to Syria by al-Kâzîm; Maṣûr b. Yûnûs Buzurj another who denied al-Riḍâ because of the wealth he held; al-Asbâgh
b. Mūsā who carried 100 dīnārs from one of the āshāb to al-Kāẓīm and finally Ābdallāh b. Jundab who is mentioned by al-Ṭūsī as a wakīl. He was a close companion of Šafwān b. Yahyā and Ālī b. al-Nūmān, with whom he made a pact that if one should die, the others would carry out his prayers and other Islamic duties for him as long as they lived. When he died Ālī b. Mahzayār, who had come to al-Ahwāz from Fāris, took his place.

The greater frequency of such reports suggests that al-Kāẓīm was successful in rebuilding a following and in overseeing the further development of the functions of his representatives, even if his death led once more to its partial collapse.

7.3 The Wīkāla and al-Riḍā

One of the great difficulties with gauging the development of the wīkāla under al-Riḍā is that the sources not unnaturally concentrate on his appointment as heir to al-Ma’mūn and the debates arranged by the caliph. If one adds to this the fact that al-Riḍā was a scholarly, quiescent Imām at a time when active Shi‘ism, and many of his close relatives, were the main force behind the outburst of revolts throughout the empire, the lack of information on the extent of al-Riḍā’s contacts is understandable.

There are a few hints that al-Riḍā did manage to maintain the wīkāla. Šafwān b. Yahyā, a close friend of Ābdallāh b. Jundab is named as wakīl of al-Riḍā and of course some survived from previous Imāms.
Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥajjāj" and Abdallāh b. Jundab himself. One presumes that if "All b. Mahzīyār took the latter's place then he too was drawn into the wikāla, although since the date of Ibn Jundab's death is not known, the date of "All's assumption of duties cannot be ascertained either.71

A few other names are given the title wakīl for al-Riḍā none of whom figure largely in the accounts of his Imāmate i.e. Ibrāhīm b. Sālim al-Nisābūrī to whom the only reference is that he was a wakīl of al-Riḍā and one of his aṣḥāb.72 A similar situation exists for al-Faḍl b. Sīnān also of Nisābūr of whom only the fact that he was a wakīl is recorded.73 Another name which crops up does at least occupy more space in the sources, that of Iṣḥāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥuḍaynī, a follower of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād.74 He was said to have actually met al-Riḍā, being introduced to him by al-Ḥasan b. Saʿīd al-Ahwāzī who is credited with having converted him to the cause and taught him many hadīths.75 Once more it is regrettable that little information is presented as to their functions on the Imām's behalf, although in such turbulent times one doubts if normal activities were able to continue unaffected. Of more interest for al-Riḍā's time is ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. al-Muhtadī al-Qummī, if only because he represents a significant trend in the evolving composition of the Shiʿa, i.e. an increase in the numbers of prominent Qummīs. He was apparently a follower of al-Kāẓīm76 before becoming a wakīl of al-Riḍā.77 He was the grandfather of Ibn Abī al-Khaṭṭāb a close associate of al-Jawād, and is referred to as one of the best Qummīs of the time.78 He was one of the Ashʿarītes of Qumm whose names come to figure prominently in
the ranks of the Shi'a from al-Riḍā's time onwards. Only one practical instance of his duties for al-Riḍā survives. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz wrote to the Imām saying:

I have something for you. Tell me what to do with it - who do I give it to?

The answer is distinctly vague and does not really give a specific response to his question. 

The lack of information about the wikāla, and the weak numbers and standing of those referred to as wukalā', is not necessarily a reflection on the following of al-Riḍā. The definition of the wikāla which determines the names being included here is a very narrow one - specifically those who acted as 'official' representatives of the Imāms either in business affairs including acting as a conduit for zakāt, khums, gifts etc, or in passing information, delivering letters and even helping in obtaining audiences with the Imām for those able to make the necessary journey. Such figures need not be the most well known scholars, thinkers or associates of the Imām, although at times the two circles may well have overlapped. Those handling the affairs of the Imām were not, it seems, even necessarily orthodox in their thought, witness al-Mufāḍḍal b. ʿUmar's flirtations with ideas considered the province of the ghūlāt. Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā on the other hand seems to have been both wakīl and involved in scholarly circles being of sound reputation.
During al-Riḍā's time, with normal activities suspended by the extraordinary situation in which the empire found itself, it is not the *wikāla* which is of the greatest note, for the physical presence of al-Riḍā in Khurāsān, his high profile as heir apparent to the caliphate and the general atmosphere of more open debate, seems to have brought into the open many of the internal disagreements of those who counted themselves amongst his followers. In addition, a new feature of the composition of his following seems to have been an increase in the recorded numbers of those from Qumm and their assumption of a major role in Shiʻite affairs.\[32\]

One further pointer exists to some of the main characters of al-Riḍā's time - those who were involved in the validation of his successor. Whether or not the conference of leading Shiʻites did take place, the names of those allegedly involved must have been prominent figures of the time; ʻAbd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥajjāj, although said to have died during al-Riḍā's time,\[33\] was a staunch supporter of the Imāms for many years; Ṣafwān b. Yāḥyā, a *wakīl* of al-Riḍā and well known scholar and author amongst *ahl al-badīth*; Yūnus b. ʻAbd al-Rahmān who had upheld the Imāmate of al-Riḍā against the wāqifites and was expert in *kalam*;\[34\] Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm also one of the *ashbāb al-kalām*\[35\] and al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣa‘īd al-Qummī, who was with the court of al-Ma‘mūn in Khurāsān and felt some loyalty to al-Riḍā, collecting his words\[36\] and reporting many of the events of the final years of his life to Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim.\[37\] Some or all of these figures may be assumed to have actively involved themselves in the affairs of the Imām and his following.
Without these figures, or others like them, the continued existence of the organisation would have been very much in doubt. With the new Imam not fully recognised for a few years, and even then still a child and under the umbrella of the Abbasid court, leadership and guidance had to be found temporarily elsewhere.
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CHAPTER EIGHT: THE WIKĀLA UNDER AL-JAWĀD

The functioning of the wikāla during the early part of the reign of any Imām must inevitably be under considerable strain. The transfer of the Imāmate from one generation to the next was even more precarious than that of the caliphate, and this despite the theoretical existence of a means of designating a successor. After al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim the confusion and fragmentation of the Shī'a must have greatly impeded any attempts to continue the process of collecting dues, relaying requests, questions and answers. Where the wukalā' were uncertain as to the Imām they could not send on the messages they were entrusted with; where they and the ashāb were uncertain, those who were the actual source of the khums, zakāt, masā'il [questions] etc. would be left with no clear focus for their devotion. After any Imām a period of instability and uncertainty was bound to follow. In al-Jawād's case, it seems almost certain that it was three to four years after al-Riḍā's death that he was technically accepted as Imām. If one also accepts the by no means unassailable evidence which points to the conclusion that al-Jawād was summoned to Baghdād as a child in 204-5 A.H. and possibly only returned to Medina permanently in 215 A.H. after his actual marriage to Umm al-Faql, there could be as much as another ten years when the Imām was not at the centre of the organisation.

This need not mean that those who were part of the wikāla ceased to function, but it would mean that they were increasingly thrown back
onto their own resources to maintain the loyalty and devotion of supporters in their area. To do so they would have had to present someone as the visible centre of their organisation, an Imam whose Imamat was theoretically accepted and confirmed by the Shi'a scholars. Although al-Jawād was the final choice, he can have been no more than a figurehead for at least a decade from the time of al-Riḍā's death, being immature and probably kept under the guardianship of the Abbasid court until finally married off in 215 A.H. Considerable power and authority must therefore have devolved to the most prominent of the Shi'a to take decisions, accept gifts and requests, and even perhaps provide answers on the Imam's behalf.

At some point, however, al-Jawād may have stepped in to become a more concrete focal point rather than a figurehead and insisted on the actual transfer of dues gathered by those representing him into his possession. As correspondence cited below shows, al-Jawād may have been able to receive pious letters at any time, there being little in them to cause alarm and suggest that any material work was being done on his behalf. It was in the sphere of the wealth and gifts collected by his followers that he faced most difficulty in asserting his authority over well established Shi'a figures.

That such well known names, often previously connected with the Imāms in similar capacities, were now being castigated for being dilatory in sending to the Imam dues which had been handed to them, suggests that they had been left to their own devices for some time without being directly responsible to a central figure i.e. the Imam. Four names
are particularly mentioned in this connection, of whom three have
supposedly contributed to the reports of the designation of al-Jawād:
Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā, follower of al-Kāẓim and al-Riḍā who died in 210;
Muḥammad b. Sinān, whose reputation is somewhat tarnished, whose
reports supporting the Imāmate of al-Jawād include some of the more
fanciful incidents, and of whom Ṣafwān said that he was one of the
Tayyāra and Zakariyya b. Adam, also a follower of al-Riḍā and
recommended by him. The final name involved in less well known,
although probably from Qumm, as was Zakariyya, Saʿd b. Saʿd. The
situation is reported by several sources.

Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazī reports that the Imām cursed both Ṣafwān
b. Yaḥyā and Muḥammad b. Sinān for opposing his command. In
contrast, ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Dāwud al-Qummi reports that the Imām
spoke only well of them and said that they had never opposed him.
Towards the end of his report ʿAlī adds somewhat perplexedly "and this
after what had come from him about them, which I heard from our
ashāb." The fine detail of the situation is filled in by Ḍiyā al-Jawād b.
Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā who was sent for by the Imām, and who came to see
him in Medina where the Imām was staying in the house of Bazī,
perhaps an indication of the possibility that al-Jawād was only
visiting Medina. The Imām himself brings up the problem concerning
Ṣafwān and Muḥammad, but Ḍiyā is anxious that he has made no mention
of Zakariyya b. Adam and considers making a plea on his behalf.
Al-Jawād notes his discomfort and goes on to discuss Zakariyya,
commenting that he was "one of those who served my father." The
problem as the Imām delicately puts it is that:
I have need of the māl [wealth] he has.

Obviously seeing his chance to put in a word for Zakariyyā - who was a relative of his - Aḥmad quickly jumps in to say:

He is sending the money to you. He told me that if I reached him [?Imām] to tell him that what stopped me from sending it was the disagreement between Maymūn and Musāfir. 7

Al-Jawād's final comment once his instructions have been accepted is to state:

Doubt has now gone; my father had no other son but me."

This last statement is also reported by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Īsā's father. 8 The fourth member of the rebellious quartet is mentioned only rarely. Abū Ṭalīb al-Qumml, ʿAbdallāh b. al-Ṣalt, who reports the Imām once more content with the behaviour of the first three, is also surprised that no mention was made of Saʿd b. Saʿd. As with Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, he is disturbed by this omission, but on being told to return to the Imām by a servant, he is reassured by Saʿd's inclusion in their absolution from previous misdeeds. 9

Despite the upheaval of the transfer from al-Riqā to al-Jawād, several names are reported as having maintained their position throughout the period. Some who required persuasion are referred to above; others are simply listed as continuing their work as before, either because
they followed suit when more prominent figures came round to full recognition of al-Jawād, or they were already convinced and fully supportive of the young Imām. Among these are ʿAbd al-Azīz b. al-Muhtadī and Ayyūb b. Nūḥ, the latter being one of the ʿashāb of al-Riḍā and a wakīl under al-Jawād. Unfortunately much of the information about his activities pertains to the time of al-Ḥādī and al-ʿAskarī, and his position during al-Jawād's time may have been an unremarkable one, despite the fact that one source lists him first amongst the thiqāt [trusted associates] of al-Jawād. This particular source also mentions for the first time ʿUthmān b. Saʿīd al-Sammān reporting that he was the bāb of al-Jawād. Unfortunately the rijāl sources say that he served al-Ḥādī when eleven years old, which would make it difficult for him to have been bāb of the previous Imām. He did go on to more responsible and higher authority, becoming a wakīl of al-ʿAskarī and the first safīr of the twelfth Imām in occultation. Because of this dubious information which portrays him as the bāb, the rest of those listed as close to al-Jawād in this source must be considered slightly suspect. Jaʾfar b. Muḥammad b. Yūnūs al-Abwal, al-Ḥusayn b. Muslim b. al-Ḥasan, al-Mukhtār b. Ziyād al-Baṣrī, and finally Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Khaṭṭāb, are further names mentioned. The first is recorded in other sources as not one of the ʿashāb of al-Jawād, but is probably the grandson of Yūnūs b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. Of the other three only the final name is known about in any detail. Ibn Abī al-Khaṭṭāb is a prolific reporter who died in 262 A.H. and was also linked with al-Ḥādī. Although he reports many hadiths from prominent figures of al-Jawād's time in certain sources including Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā, Muḥammad b. Sinān and Ibn Abī Naṣr, he does not figure frequently in the isnāds of their
hadiths relating the designation of al-Jawād or stories about him. This must surely be curious if he was indeed a close and strong supporter of the Imām.

One figure who does seem to have been in a fairly strong position both for al-Riḍā and al-Jawād is Yaḥyā b. Abī ʿImrān of Hamdān. Al-Riḍā wrote to him warning him about Aḥmad b. Sābiq who shortly thereafter began to show signs of unacceptable behaviour, and Yaḥyā was responsible for passing on this information to the asbāb in the area. Although no further detail is available for his activities, he was replaced in Hamdān by ʿIbrāhīm b. Muḥammad who reports that al-Jawād wrote to him enclosing a sealed message which he was to open only on Yaḥyā's death. When he did so, he found he was to take over the duties of Yaḥyā in the area. The position of wakīl was to stay in his family for many generations, passing to his son ʿAlī, his grandson Muḥammad, and his great grandson al-Qāsim. As with Ayyūb most of the details preserved in letters between him and the Imām are relevant more to al-Hādi's time than al-Jawād's, although one letter is found in the section in Bihār on al-Jawād. It refers in the body of the letter, however, both to Ayyūb [b. Nūḥ] and al-Naḍr [b. Muḥammad al-Hamānī] who were causing friction in the area by eroding ʿIbrāhīm's authority as the Imām's sole representative. It was a situation which could have occurred under any of the later Imāms and did indeed occur in other regions. However, the two mentioned, in particular al-Naḍr, did not occupy such strong positions under al-Jawād and al-Naḍr is only listed under al-Hādi. The letter is more likely then to have been from al-Hādi.
Not all of the reports of the *wikāla* suggest the difficulties encountered with this group, nor do they all pertain more closely to al-Hādī than to al-Jawād. One name which recurs frequently in the sources in connection specifically with al-Jawād is ʿAlī b. Mahziyār al-Ahwāzī. It was he who put a great deal of time and correspondence into persuading ʿAlī b. Asbāḥ to give up his *futūḥ* views. Several instances of his correspondence with the Imām referring to matters often in the vaguest terms are recorded; whether they are intentionally vague because the Imām’s freedom was still restricted and there was a chance of interception, or whether they only seem vague because there was nothing of real substance to be said, is a moot point. One concern referred to specifically is that of the "Qummiyyūn", but frustratingly nothing is given in any detail. Other than this, most record pious exchanges where the Imām invokes blessings upon ʿAlī, and his future plans, and ʿAlī in return implores God to preserve the Imām.

If these were the only examples of the contacts of ʿAlī with the Imām and his activities on his behalf, one might assume that he may have been an enormously pious man devoted to the Imām, and of whom the Imām in return had a high opinion. However, more specific reference to his recording of details concerning financial matters are recorded in the *Kitāb al-Khums* of Wasāʾil al-Shīʿa. Not only is a long letter from al-Jawād to ʿAlī recording the imposition of the *khums* in 220 A.H. for that year only, the reasons behind it, and to what it should be applied preserved, but he himself reports other accounts about the *khums* and the necessity of setting it aside for the Imām as a way of
making legal earnings and possessions. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ashkarī told him that some of his friends had written to al-Jawād asking about the khums, and later he reports that Abū ʿAlī b. Rāshid informed al-Ḥādī that he had not known what to reply when the mawāli asked on what the khums was due. He had questioned the Imām who had replied:

Their lands, possessions, trades, crafts, if they have enough left after seeing to their own needs. 31

ʿAlī reports also that the wakīl Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Ḥamdānī wrote to him (the Imām or ʿAlī) asking him to clarify the amount due on their lands since there had been some disagreement about it.32 The answer is that khums was only due on the lands after provision had been made for the owner, his family and the kharāj of the Sulṭān. The dating of the correspondence to a late stage in the Imāmate of al-Jawād, and the major role played by ʿAlī b. Mahziyār in effecting the Imām’s orders, suggests that it may have been him, and possibly other wukalā, who played a strong part in the functioning of the organisation in the absence of central control. This possibility does find support in some other accounts.

It is reported that Khayrān al-Khādim, a servant of al-Riḍā,33 wrote to inform him that he had sent him eighty dirhams given to him in Ṭartūs.34 He explained that he had not known what to do and did not like to return it to the giver or do anything with it without orders. He inquired further whether he wished him to accept such things in
future. The story is confused over whether the recipient of the letter was one of the two brothers, Ibrāhīm or ʿAli b. Mahziyar, or the Imām himself. If it was one of the brothers, it could place the event before al-Jawād's assertion of his authority when someone like ʿAli might well have been responsible for decisions of this kind and the primary source of guidance for other Shiʿites. Perhaps because it seemed suspect in later years to show a wakīl assuming the final say over the acceptance of such gifts and somehow usurping the ultimate authority of the Imām, there is also a second version reported via Muḥammad b. ʿIsā, where Khayrān is said to have contacted the Imām direct, sending him the eighty dirhams and requesting advice on how to handle those who came to him wishing to recognise the Imām and wanting to know what to do. The answer is not very helpful, but a convenient one for a time when the Imām was not truly able to command obedience or provide guidance:

Do as you think best for your opinion is mine; whoever obeys you has obeyed me.

Khayrān may be one of the few Shiʿites whose account of his visit to the Imām strikes the reader as genuine. Khayrān is listed only briefly in the rijāl sources as a follower of al-Ḥādī and, indeed, it is surprising for one who is presented as being in contact with the Imām that he has to ask one of the servants about him and request that he take him to him. Since they are on the hajj and in Mecca, this necessitates only a journey to Medina where Khayrān waits for some time outside alone before asking after his guide who had already gone
in. After being informed that the man had already left, he is finally given permission to enter and finds the Imám standing before him. A prayer mat is brought for the Imám to sit on and Khayrân goes on to describe his feelings:

I was filled with awe and amazement and I was convinced that I could climb up to the dukkán [literally shop] without stairs. The Imám pointed out where the stairs were and I went up and greeted him...I took his hand and placed it against my face. He waved me to sit down with his hand, but I kept hold of it because of the amazement which had filled me.

After recovering from this state of semi paralysis, he adds that he suddenly remembered that al-Rayyán b. Shabîb had asked him to present his greetings and ask for invocations for himself and his son. The Imám seems content to do so for al-Rayyán, but not for his son despite Khayrân's repetition of the request several times. As he leaves the Imám murmurs something he cannot quite hear, so he asks the servant what it was:

Who is this who thinks to guide himself? This one was born in the lands of shirk [idolatry] and when he left went to be with those even worse than them. When God wishes to guide him He will do so.

Various elements give the report a convincingly genuine ring; the overawed reactions of Khayrân; the formal exchanges without great meaning or deep significance; the requests for invocations; the lack of any extraordinary occurrences - the Imám even points out the stairs; the final comment which contrasts quite clearly with the calm
acceptance of the devotion and awe of his visitor and his gracious accession to the request for blessings.

Not all the reported contacts contain these same elements. The main means of communication seems to have been that of written messages. A fair number of such letters on specific subjects are recorded, often verbatim, and many appear genuine i.e. some relating to "Ali b. Mahziyār, a letter concerning the death of Zakariyyā b. Adam which was intercepted by a group of Shi'a from Qumm on the hā'lī, two texts which were written from al-Ridā to al-Jawād which ring true as innocuous fatherly advice. On the other hand some letters are referred to which, while possibly being indicative of actual practice in that they refer to requests addressed to the Imām and his messages of thanks or blessings, are slightly more dubious. The main doubt about them is that they are obviously more intended as proof of the miraculous abilities of al-Jawād. Indeed, they tend to be reported in one particular source which is devoted to recounting the miracles of the Imāms. Some intended letters are never actually written, although answers or gifts are invariably received, as is discovered by Muḥammad b. Sahl b. al-Yasa al-Qummi who saw, but did not approach, the Imām.

Despite evidence of the genuine existence of some contacts between the Imām and his close followers the overriding impression is unwittingly created in the sources of an increasing gulf opening up between the Imām and his ordinary followers. Many instances of contact between al-Jawād and his asbāb are related only in the context of miracles
and are overwhelmingly from one source - *al-Kharā'ī*. A few could be genuine, mainly indicated by the status and reliability of the person reporting the story i.e. Yaḥyā b. Abī ʿImrān who reports the visit of a group of *ahl al-Rayy* to ask the Imām questions. Few fall into this category. Some reported contacts which appear dubious because they have no *isnād*, are recorded in a suspicious source, or include heavily miraculous elements, can sometimes, however, also include surprisingly real incidents; incidents which provide grounds for a reconsideration of the whole account.

Muḥammad b. al-Walīd al-Kirmānī's account contains several miraculous elements, amongst them the fact that the Imām, whom he previously had been unable to see because of the number of people, unexpectedly turns up near him in the mosque at the time of the prayer. Meeting him thus in person, al-Kirmānī assures the Imām that the doubts he had had in his heart will never return. It is the next day on making an early start and finding himself lost that he meets the Imām again. With no-one else on the road so early al-Kirmānī wanders for some time, becoming more and more thirsty and hungry without finding someone to ask the way. It is some time later that the Imām himself appears accompanied by servants carrying water and food and bids al-Kirmānī sit and drink and eat with him. After eating and drinking his fill he is told that he may ask what he will. With such an open invitation one might have expected that he ask about matters of some significance either about his own life or that of the Imām, yet his question is about the wearing of perfumes.
This unusual subject is the first hint of a more down to earth tone.

The Imām replies to his question:

My father ordered that musk be made ready for him and al-Faql wrote saying that people found fault with this. He replied: "Oh Faql, do you not know that Yusuf wore clothes embroidered with buttons of gold and sat on a chair of gold and his wisdom was in no way diminished. Sulaymān did the same." Then he ordered ambergris worth 4000 dirhams prepared for him."

This could obviously be an attempt to justify some aspects of the behaviour of the young Imām, perhaps influenced by the atmosphere of the lavish court in which he was brought up. The story does not end there, however, al-Kirmānī going on to ask him to say something of those who serve him. Al-Jawād tells him of a servant of al-Ṣādiq who was offered a position by a rich man from Khurāsān and went to al-Ṣādiq to ask his permission, referring in his argument to the length of his service and loyalty to the Imām. Al-Ṣādiq answers by telling him of the reward of those who were loyal to the Imāms:

The Messenger of God is joined to the light of God, Amīr al-Mu'mīnīn to that of the Prophet, the Imāms to the Amīr and our Shi'a to us, entering as we do, reaching our destination.

After such a statement, al-Ṣādiq's servant can do nothing else but offer to stay in his service, preferring the rewards of the hereafter to those of this world. Were this the end of the story the combination of miracle and propaganda might mark it as of dubious authenticity, an attempt both to justify certain behaviour and reassure
the loyal followers of the Imām of their eventual reward. However, it continues in a very natural way, emphasising the human weakness and uncertainty of commitment of the Shi'a in a way which is not reflective of the strident assured tones of the normal run of propaganda, with al-Kirmānī anxiously protesting:

Oh Sayyidi, were it not for my dependents in Mecca and my children, I would be glad to stay longer here.

He tries to present the Imām with a pouch of money but is told to keep it. Worried that the Imām is angry with him for not offering his services, he will not accept it back. It is these final human touches which give the story, despite its possible areas of propaganda, a genuine ring - his inability to give total devotion to the Imām, his fear that the Imām would resent this and that this was why he has rejected his gift.

A story with a similarly practical and down to earth nature is recounted by Ibrāhīm b. Abī al-Bilād. This story also paints a less rigid, less stereotyped, less superhuman picture of the Imām; here is an Imām who complains about stomach trouble. When his visitor Ibrāhīm becomes thirsty, the Imām as a good host immediately calls to a servant to bring him some nabīdh marīs [a certain type of intoxicating drink] which Ibrāhīm says is sweeter than honey. He continues:

This is what is ruining your stomach..... the people of Kūfa do not make it like this.
Ibrāhīm goes on to explain their method, including the addition of some 'seed' brought from Baṣra and added to the nabīdīh mixture. The Imam is not impressed, saying that it is ḥarām.

The story appears to have no overt propagandistic content, a comparison of notes on the preparation of a drink. The Imam admits to the human failing of stomach trouble and does not make any claim to complete knowledge of all things, having to ask not only how the Kufans make their version but even requiring explanation of the terms used. There is no suggestion of a miracle cure for himself. Admittedly this might be an attempt to strike at the reputation of the Kufans, suggesting that they are involved in something proscribed, but to do so whilst portraying the Imam as all too human would be a strange trade off, contrasting sharply with the image built up in other propaganda stories.

These events may indeed show genuine contact between the Imam and his followers, but they are few in number. One particular story which also has the ring of authenticity shows not a physical, but a psychological gulf opening up. "Abdallāh b. Razīn, on a visit to Medina, notes the Imam's habit of praying in a certain place." He determines to gather for himself some of the earth upon which the Imam treads, a desire he later attributes to the whispering of the devil. That he should even consider this, indicates that the adoration of the Imam had reached such an extreme level that religious relics embued with the power of the person were sought after, the person himself being outwith their reach. As the days go past, however, each attempt
to collect the 'sacred' soil is thwarted by the Imām varying his routine, dismounting from his animal on a mat, a rock or not at all. "Abdallāh decides to try again when the Imām enters the baths but is again thwarted. Even the attendant is surprised when the Imām does not dismount, something he had never done before. "Abdallāh blames himself for this, believing that the Imām is aware of his sinful determination. When he resolves to give up, the Imām returns to his customary routine. What is particularly of note here, despite the story's obvious appearance as a miraculous proof of the inspired knowledge of the Imām, is that "Abdallāh stays at a distance from the Imām, neither seeking an audience, nor approaching him.

Although the story does not exhibit the touches of the few previous ones which show the Imām as a three dimensional character, it is not the fault of the story; most of the 'action' is inside the mind of the narrator. It is "Abdallāh who projects his view of the Imām, and his assumptions about the Imām's powers and authority, onto the Imām. The miracle in this case is not of the Imām's creation, but belongs rightly to the mind of "Abdallāh b. Razīn. It demonstrates the growing effect of distance and isolation on the way in which the Shi‘a regarded the Imām, an increasing reverence verging on adoration, interpreting his actions in accordance with their own views of his powers and abilities.

The trend of a narrowing circle of contacts, of written messages and physical isolation, as well as a growing psychological distance and the
consequent opportunity for others to mould the character and image of the Imām, continued unabated during the lifetime of ‘All al-Ḥādi, another child Imām and one who, even more than his father, was to experience isolation and restrictions.
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When al-Jawād died, his followers did not face the same problems as they had faced when al-Ridā had died. Having already accepted one child Imām and maintained, or eventually re-established, a cohesive organisation, the succession of al-Hādī now had a ready precedent. The sources recount only one major account of the designation of al-Hādī which is relayed by only one person to prominent Shi'ītes of the time. Only two names are mentioned - Muḥammad b. al-Faraj, whose background is outlined in Chapter Five, and Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā, a Qummī of widespread repute and great stature. They, along with ten unnamed persons, discussed the succession, heard the evidence of Abū al-Khayrānī and the corroboration supplied by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā himself, and accepted ʿAlī b. Muḥammad as the new Imām.

Since there is no actual evidence of a continuation of the wīkāla during the early years of al-Hādī's Imāmate, only assumptions can be made. Muḥammad b. al-Faraj, since his name is well connected with the Imām on several counts, would have been well-placed to give direction to representatives who needed to maintain the loyalty of those attracted to the Imāmī cause. The Imām's later warnings to Muḥammad suggest that he was close to him, even if initially after the death of al-Jawād contact was lost.
One interesting short paragraph, interpreted as a miraculous sign of the Imām's powers, is recounted by him, and may throw some light on his methods of maintaining support under difficult circumstances and a lack of real contact with al-Hādī. Ibn al-Faraj had questions which he wished to ask of the Imām. According to him:

"Allāh b. Muḥammad said to me: "If you want to ask a question write it down and place it under your prayer mat and leave it an hour, then take it out and look at it." I did this and found the answer to what I had asked written on the paper."

This might be one way of obtaining answers from an Imām who was not available or approachable in the normal way. With an increasing trend towards magnification of the powers of the Imām and a readiness amongst the Shi'a to accept, if not demand, such miraculous occurrences, this could well have been a successful interim measure for providing for them.

The indications are that al-Hādī, under unsympathetic guardianship, was isolated from the Shi'a for some years. The first sign of greater freedom was the visit, albeit with its real purpose concealed, of the Mahziyār brothers in 228 A.H. Even then the Imām's actions were dictated by caution and the anxiety of being discovered. Apart from this meeting, "Ali b. Mahziyār, who makes frequent appearances in accounts of al-Jawād's life, does not appear again in biographical accounts of al-Hādī. However, he seems to have been involved with those named as wukalā' of al-Hādī in determining the application of the khums. He reported from Abū "Ali b. Rāshid, a new appointee," as he
had earlier from Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Hamdānī, both about problems related to the amount which was legally due, and on what it was to be imposed. The content of these reports will be dealt with along with the careers of the two wukalā'ī. Both ʿAlī and his brother may well have remained part of the Imām's network, for Ibrāhīm's son Muḥammad reported that his father instructed him on his deathbed to deliver wealth to a person who would only be known to him by a particular sign. The money was eventually passed on to Ḥafṣ b. ʿAmr in Baghdad, according to Ikhtiyār, a wakil of Abū Muḥammad. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Mahzīyar is also recorded as a follower of al-ʿAskarī, one of the few representatives over whom there was no dispute.

After the meeting of the Mahzīyar brothers with the Imām in Medina, there is again a gap when no information is recorded, but with the accession of al-Mutawakkil, and the consequent pressure on the Shiʿa, more incidents and communications come to light.

In 232 A.H. al-Ḥādi wrote to ʿAlī b. Bilāl, whose name has not previously been mentioned, to inform him of changes in the wikāla. From the tone of the letter ʿAlī b. Bilāl was a well respected representative whom the Imām did not wish to upset unnecessarily:

I know that you are shaykh of your area, and I wanted to write to you individually to treat you with respect. Give him [the new representative] your obedience and hand over to him all the dues.
Al-Hādī continues by asking that he inform his supporters of this, impress on them that the new wakīl had been appointed by him, and encourage them to give him all possible help. According to the riḥāl sources, Ibn Bilāl had previously been an ordinary follower of al-Jawād, and survived to be a loyal supporter of al-Askari. The only other information recorded about him, outside of the letters written by the Imam, is that he was originally from Baghdād, but moved to Wāsiṭ, and that he reported from al-Hādī one book which was transmitted by Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā.

The representative being replaced was al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd Rabbihī, although the second report of the changes refers to the son of this person, ʿAli b. al-Ḥusayn. Information from other sources records that Ibn Rāshid actually replaced ʿAli b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbdallāh who had died in al-Khuzaymiyya in 229 A.H., the year after the Imam came out of isolation. The name al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd Rabbihī is not found independently in any other source, and therefore is likely to be erroneous. ʿAli b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd Rabbihī is found in R. al-Barqī as a follower of al-Hādī, and is probably the correct name. Identification of the person involved, however, leads nowhere, since no further information about his background or work exists. It seems surprising though, that al-Hādī should not replace him until 232 A.H., a gap of three years from his death in 229 A.H.

The new appointee was Abū ʿAli b. Rāshid, possibly identifiable as al-Ḥasan b. Rāshid, who was earlier recorded as a follower of both al-Riḍā and al-Jawād. It cannot have been long after his
appointment that he spoke with the Imām about the khums, the conversation being reported by ʿAlī b. Mahziyār:

You commanded me to take up your cause and gather your dues. I told your mawāli that and some said to me: "What is his due?" I didn't know how to respond. 24

The Imām explained that what he expected was the levying of the khums on possessions and produce, and on traders and craftsmen, after they had provided for themselves. The collection of dues of one kind or another has been regarded as one of the main functions of the wikāla. Al-Jawād's letter to ʿAlī b. Mahziyār in 220 A.H. 28 and the report of Muḥammad b. al-Faraj in the same year, 29 specifically say that the khums was actually collected for al-Jawād only in that one year. Al-Jawād explained his reasoning by saying:

Some have fallen short in their obligations. When I learned of this, I wanted to clear them, and purify them...I have not imposed the khums every year, only the zakāt which God imposed. I have imposed the khums this year on gold and silver, but not on goods, animals, servants, profits on trade or produce except for certain exceptions.27

Unlike his predecessor, Abū ʿAlī b. Rāshid does provide some information about his work, although, as seems to occur often, it is related in a miraculous context. Some cargos arrived, but before he had a chance to look at the letters with them, a messenger also entered with a message to send a ledger.28 Abū ʿAlī was unaware of the existence of the ledger and it was only when he opened the cargos that
he discovered the missing book. Abū ʿAlī also questioned al-Hādī about what to do with anything they received which was destined originally for al-Jawād, although if this was twelve years after al-Jawād's death it was a long time for something to remain unclaimed. The point, however, may be that all those who may have felt loyalty to al-Jawād, had sent money or goods to him, and were only now turning to al-Hādī, should be assured that al-Hādī was his successor and could legitimately receive what had previously been sent to his father.

What was Abū Ja'far's because of the Imamate is mine. Whatever else there is, is inheritance according to the Book of God and the Sunna of the Prophet.20

Ibn Rāshid came into contact with another of al-Hādī's representatives - Ayyūb b. Nūḥ.20 Al-Hādī wrote to Ayyūb ordering both him and Abū ʿAlī to cease quarreling and stick to their own areas.21 Ayyūb was firmly ordered not to accept anything from Baghdād and al-Madā'in nor to give anyone from these areas permission to come and see the Imam, but to send them to their proper representative. Abū ʿAlī is reported to have died before al-Hādī, for when Muḥammad b. al-Faraj asked about him along with two others, he was informed that:

He lived content, and died a martyr.22

This was not the only dispute which occurred involving Ayyūb b. Nūḥ. Such disputes seem to have become more frequent under al-Hādī, and might be a consequence not only of increasingly well organised and defined areas of jurisdiction, but a greater devolution of power to the
representatives and lack of direct control from the centre. With greater status and authority accruing to them and the influence they gained by their appointment, the representatives would probably jealously guard their positions and the extent of their areas of jurisdiction. In this second dispute the Imam upheld the position of Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Hamdānī against the encroachment of both Ayyūb and another representative al-Naḍr b. Muḥammad. Al-Naḍr b. Muḥammad is one of those listed in Rihār as a trusted member of al-Hādī's followers and was also from Hamdān. The Imam wrote to them:

I have written to al-Naḍr ordering him to cease his opposition to you and his disagreement with you. I have informed him of your position in my eyes. I have also written to Ayyūb on the same matter. I have written to my followers in Hamdān ordering them to obey you and follow your commands. You are my sole wakil.

Before dealing with this dispute over jurisdiction, the Imam had confirmed receiving al-ḥisāb from Ibrāhīm. However, Ibrāhīm was another wakīl who found himself requiring more instruction from the Imam about the levying of the khums, and once more the reply is transmitted by ʿAlī b. Mahzīyar. Ibrāhīm refers initially to the instructions given by the Imam's father, but says that a difference of opinion had arisen concerning the level of provision which was excluded from the levy. The reply states that the khums was to be applied:
After providing for the land and for dependents, and after the levy of kharāj for the Sultan.

Given that Ibrāhīm was appointed by al-Jawād, this account could well apply to the time of al-Jawād and to the first year that the khums was collected in 220, when the representatives were unsure as to how much the khums was, and on what it was to be applied. Equally, it might be a request for confirmation and further clarification of al-Jawād's regulations after the Shī'a had had sufficient time to discuss the implications of his commands.

Ibrāhīm was also obliged to seek advice about a more virulent dispute which had arisen between two other followers of the Imām, a dispute which had wide reverberations throughout the Shī'a. Not only did Ibrāhīm have to seek guidance as to the relative merits of the two protagonists - al-ʿAlī ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar al-Hamdānī and al-Qazwīnī Fāris b. Ḥātim, but Ayyūb b. Nūḥ also reports receiving enquiries from Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. ʿUbayd asking him what he had heard or read about the position of the cursed Fāris b. Ḥātim. Other representatives either received warnings from the Imām, or wrote asking the Imām what the true situation was. ʿUrwa al-Dihqān wrote informing the Imām of the confusion existing amongst the Shī'a and the reply was read by Ḥāmid b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā in Qumm. The Imām, having received warnings from Ibrāhīm b. Dāwud al-Yaqūbī, told him to give him no importance, and ʿUthmān b. Sāʿid moved quickly to warn ʿAlī b. ʿAmr that Fāris b. Ḥātim was no longer trustworthy.

Although there are references to a dispute that had arisen between
another wakīl and Fāris b. Ḥātim in 248, "and to him being responsible for encouraging bidʿa [innovatory and unacceptable ideas]," there appears to have been another reason for the Imām’s anger.

Al-Jabalī, ʿAlī b. ʿUbaydallāh al-Dīnawarī had informed al-Hādī that he had sent things using Fāris b. Ḥātim as a courier. These had not arrived, and when Ayyūb also informed him that letters supposedly sent with Fāris b. Ḥātim had not reached their destination for no replies had been received, the Imām took steps to prevent this reoccurring:

God curse him and redouble his punishment. He has committed a great crime against God and us in his lies against us and his betrayal with the wealth of our mawāli. Make what Fāris has done known to our ʾasḥāb in al-Jabal and our other mawāli, but do not let any of our enemies hear of it. Warn the area of Fāris to avoid him and protect themselves from him."

Fāris b. Ḥātim was killed during the eleventh Imām’s time, although it was al-Hādī who had originally given his permission for him to be killed."

Although a great deal of wealth, sometimes tempting as Fāris b. Ḥātim’s case shows, passed through the hands of a wakīl, Ayyūb b. Nūḥ, included by the Imām in his list of trustworthy representatives, and highly praised by him, was not a rich man himself when he died. People had assumed that he had a great deal of wealth because of his position as wakīl to several Imāms, yet he had only 150 dīnārs in personal
Certainly the *wikāla* must have been responsible for channeling to the Imam quantities of money and goods. Several instances are recorded in the biographical sources about this flow of money to the Imam. In one such account it is reported that this came to the attention of the authorities. Al-Fatḥ b. Khāqān informed one Shiʿite that:

The man [caliph] had heard that wealth is coming from Qumm. He has ordered me to keep watch for it and tell him about it. Tell me which road it is coming by so that I can avoid it.°°

As in another report,°° Ibn Khāqān is shown here as pretending sympathy to the Imam's cause in a subtle attempt to pump a known Shiʿite sympathiser for more detailed information. The possibility of interception is also present in another report about the transport of dues to the Imam:

We carried money collected as *khums* and offerings, gifts, and jewels gathered from Qumm and its lands. We left seeking our Sayyid, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Hādī, but his messenger reached us on the road and told us to return and not to arrive at this time. So we returned to Qumm and kept safe what we had in our possession.°°

The dangers inherent in working for the Imam are well illustrated by the case of ʿAli b. Jaʿfar, the wakīl who had clashed formerly with Fāris b. Ḥātim. ʿAli b. Jaʿfar had been accused of working for the Imam and had been thrown into prison by al-Mutawakkil. Attempts at pleading his case by Ṣubaydallāh b. Yaḥyā b. Khāqān were rejected by
the caliph, who had pledged to keep him in jail till he died because he had been told that this man was ṭāriqīt and a wakīl of al-Hādī. He was only released when the caliph declared a general amnesty for those in prison in the hope that showing mercy would gain God's mercy and cure him of an illness. "Ali b. Ja'far, in contrast with Ayyūb, was generously treated by the Imāms al-Hādī and al-Askarī, receiving 30,000 dinārs from the first and yet more money from the latter. He was, it seems, not adverse to spending it for another Shi'ite, Abu Tāhir al-Bilāl, wrote to al-Askarī criticising the wakīl for his reckless spending, only to be told that it had been given by the Imāms and that he should mind his own business.

Aḥmad b. Ishāq al-Ash'arī who complained of debt was also generously provided with 30,000 dinārs and was another of those named in a list of those who were trustworthy. Aḥmad was associated with three Imāms, from al-Jawād through to al-Askarī, and is even said to have seen the twelfth Imām. He was said to have been very close particularly to al-Askarī and to have been a wāfid [delegate] from Qumm to the Imām.

There were several other figures from Qumm connected with the Imāms and given the title of wakīl: Aḥmad b. Ḥamza b. al-Yasa' whose father reported from al-Riḍā and who was one of the descendants of Sa'd b. Mālik; "Ali b. al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣalt who was introduced to the Imām's cause by al-Ḥasan b. Sa'id and whose father was instrumental in securing the Imāmate of al-Jawād; and Urwa b. Yahyā al-Dihqān al-Qummi, also referred to as al-Baghdādī, who was for a long time
in the service of the Imam, but who, after a long career as wakil, was seduced into kufr and excommunicated by al-Askarl for removing things from his treasury and burning what remained.

With so many people involved with the Imam, and this would not be the entire complement of representatives, it might seem contradictory to talk of the progressive isolation of the Imam. Yet a careful survey of those who were actually in contact with the Imam shows a very narrow circle of people. First and foremost, obviously, were those who were part of the Imam’s household, or his most important aides. At the head of this inner circle seems to have been the man who would later become the first safir of the Imam in occultation. Utthman b. Sa’Id was a servant in al-Hadi’s household and later became a wakil for both al-Hadi and his son. For both of these Imams he channeled money and gifts from the Shi’a into the treasury, and on occasion distributed money to loyal Shi’ites in trouble such as Ahmad b. Ish’aq. When Faris b. Hatim was causing trouble it was Utthman who arranged for messages to be passed on to those arriving who were unaware of his betrayal. The next level of the organisation – the wukalā’ – were also in contact with the Imam, mostly by letter, but occasionally in personal meetings. This would include such people as the Mahzayr brothers, Ayyub b. Nub, Ali b. Bilal, Abu Ali b. Rashid and Ali b. Ja’far.

Another group who would at least be aware of the Imam and hear of him or meet him in their daily lives would be those at court. The stories reported about his life in Samarrā’ are mainly reported by this group
of figures sympathetic to the Imam, but not technically counted amongst
his longstanding and committed supporters; people such as Zurara and Sa'id, the hālitāb of the caliph. Many are described as clerks;
Samīlā al-Kātitī, Ahmad b. ʿIsā al-Kātitī, al-Qahqalī al-Kātitī
reporting from his father; al-Kāfūr al-Khādim, Sahl b. Yaʿqūb al-Muʿaddib of Sīmarrā. Other figures
may be connected with families who were part of the Abbasid
administration; Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Ṭāhirī, and al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd
al-Qāhir al-Ṭāhirī.

But what of the ordinary Shiʿites who were after all the bedrock of
the Imam's support, and whose beliefs made up the faith of the Shiʿa?
With the Imam relatively close in geographical terms, one might have
expected many of his followers to have been able to visit him and to
form and report more personal pictures and images of the character of
the Imam and his knowledge and spiritual charisma. Yet there are very
few reports, if any which could be considered in this category, and too
many have miraculous orientations.

A common feature of several of the stories which speak of the visits
of ordinary people is an initial disappointment at being unable to
meet with the Imam after having come specifically to ask questions and
deliver gifts. One shaykh from ahl al-Nahrayn delivered money into
the hands of the treasurer, and then found that the Imam had responded
to a summons from the Sulṭān and had already left. In another
case where a man experienced a sudden conversion to the Imam's cause,
the Imam was in the midst of a crowd of people and seemingly
unobtainable and unaware of his existence. One group of Shi'a, who had arrived only to find that the caliph had placed restrictions on the Imam, waited near his residence hoping merely to see the Imam. Asked by a servant if they would know him on sight, they were positive that they would recognise him. However, when the Imam had gone by into the house along with several other people, greeting them as he passed they were unable to agree on what he looked like. After the initial let-down all of these contacts end in a most similar way, with the Imam reappearing or returning and addressing his disappointed followers, answering questions which had never been asked or acknowledging their prayers.

One cannot help but suspect that these 'happy endings' were the result of wishful thinking; a deep disappointment allied with an equally strong desire for their belief in the Imam to be justified producing an entirely different outcome to the visit from the one which they had actually experienced.

What should have been disappointment in a lack of response from the Imam has been channeled into a different interpretation in another account. Muhammad b. al-Fadl al-Baghdadi wrote to the Imam for advice about selling shops which he had inherited. He received no answer yet instead of being unhappy, the lack of response is received in the light of subsequent events for shortly afterwards the shops were burned to the ground. To a non-believer this account seems to have little to say, yet to someone with a deep faith in the Imam and
his knowledge, the lack of reply could be seen as a result of the Imam's awareness of the eventual outcome.

Abū al-Ḥasan al-Hādī died in Sāmarrā' leaving behind him an adult successor, but one who was unknown to the majority of his followers. The ṭikāla was, however, well established under the firm guidance of ʿUthmān b. Saʿīd and trusted representatives. It was as well that the wukāla' had, for the previous two Imāms, been the main instruments for confirming and establishing a new Imām, both al-Jawād and al-Hādī achieving their recognition through the efforts of such figures, for on al-Hādī's death their guidance was required yet again. As Ithbāt describes it:

Many of the Shi'a were unaware of the matter of Abū Muḥammad, except for the ṭilqāt [trusted associates] in whose presence Abū al-Ḥasan had designated his successor. The others had judged themselves to be in a situation of grave misfortune and confusion."

The situation sounds reminiscent of that which existed at the time of al-Riḍā's death. Circumstances had altered, however, for al-Jawād and al-Hādī's Imāmates had seen some developments in the relationship of the Imāms with the Abbasid regime, in the organisation of their support, and in the character and image of the Imāmate itself.
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CONCLUSIONS

The common feature of the Imāmates of al-Jawād and al-Hādı is that they were young children at the time of their father's death. As such the destination of the Imāmate, and with it the survival of Imāmi Shi'aism was out of their immediate control. Yet survive it did, with both al-Jawād and al-Hādı becoming accepted as the new Imāms, albeit for several years as mere figureheads. There are strong factors, reflected both in the sources and in the prevailing circumstances, which point to the recognition of both as Imāms in their own time, although initially only after some debate.

The power and influence of those who determined the transfer of the Imāmate, although in some ways merely a continuation of that which had existed in earlier years, was at this time unavoidably brought out into the open and recorded as such in the accounts of the Imāms' lives. Not only is this influence visible in the debates, conferences and meetings which are recorded as taking place, but the names of prominent Imāmite surface repeatedly in accounts of designation and in the stories which support the new Imāms and explain the circumstances of their Imāmates.

The succession of the two children was not without its problems and could not fail to have some consequences even if they were not immediately obvious. A major question which had to be resolved was the ability of a child to function as an ultimate source of knowledge and
final authority on religious and legal matters. The debate over the validity of the child İmam condensed into two basic viewpoints. On the one hand were those who maintained that if a child were the true successor of the previous İmam, indicated by him as such and therefore chosen by God, then he would be able to take his place from the very first, since there could be no period of time in which the earth was left without an authority whose pronouncements were irrefutable. Others argued that as a child he was only theoretically İmam, to become fully functional at a later date and that, meantime, it was up to those who were fully versed in religious matters to provide leadership.

Of the two positions the sources emphasise that the Şi'a of the time completely accepted the first view. However, analysis of various stories suggests that the initial reaction was closer to the second argument. One account repeated in various sources does show how early references to a distinction between inherent wisdom of spiritual matters [bikma] and knowledge of the details of religious law and dogma [şilm] have been progressively edited and eventually omitted altogether.

The fact that little is recorded of what might reasonably have been expected to occur in the way of further questions as to the nature, origins, and transfer of knowledge, tends to support the possibility that a two stage İmamate was temporarily accepted. Indeed, it is left for the most part to more extreme stories to give explanations of the transfer of the İmamate and the knowledge which went with it, such stories being related particularly of al-Hādī. The sources certainly do not obscure the fact that the debate took place, but their
unqualified rejection of a partially qualified Imām merely draws more attention to the possibility of its having existed.

The Shi’ite scholars based their answers to the question of the legitimacy of the child Imām on the parallel case of Jesus who took up his mission at an early age, thus also drawing a parallel between the Imāmate and the Prophethood. However, having found the precedent required to legitimise al-Jawād, the scholars do not seem to have pursued the question further.

If the Imāmates of both al-Jawād and al-Hādī relied to a large extent on the supporting voices of both scholars and other prominent Imāmites, they were also greatly affected by the attitudes and actions of the Abbasid caliphs. From the point in time when the Abbasids seized the imperial throne, they had maintained vis à vis the “Alid houses an uneasy relationship; sometimes hostile, sometimes neutral, always suspicious. Even those “Alids who had remained quiescent often suffered the consequences of the actions of other members of the family and their followers. Al-Riḍā’s elevation to the position of heir to the throne may have been originally intended as a temporary political expedient in al-Ma’mūn’s difficult task of restoring stability to his empire, but it led to the continued involvement on the part of later caliphs in the affairs of his heirs, and was probably the single most influential factor in directing the attention of the Shi’a towards al-Jawād and his successors.
The definite interest shown by al-Ma'mūn in the child by summoning him to Baghdād, by maintaining the official link between the two families in the betrothal of al-Jawād to Umm al-Faḍl, as well as his initial admission in the eyes of the Shi'a of the excellence of al-Riḍā, could only have created interest in al-Jawād as a potential Imām despite his age. Although actual accounts of the betrothal and testing of al-Jawād are limited in their reliability by evidence of possible distortion, the transference of accounts from one Imām to another and the addition of biased statements, the fact that so much propaganda supporting the child Imām is linked with this episode does indicate the role which the recognition of the caliph played in determining the acceptance of al-Jawād.

Although the caliphs obviously interfered in the lives of the Imāms, the question of whether, or rather to what extent, they may have consciously manipulated these quiescent leaders remains unanswerable. There are enough hints in some accounts, especially those which relate to the involvement of court figures with the Imāms, to speculate that the caliphs were well aware of the Imām's agents and followers, and of the way in which the character of this particular group was evolving. Did they at some point actively encourage the focusing of Shi'ite devotion on Imāms over whom they had some control, or did they simply acquiesce in the development of Imāmī Shi'ism, preferring it to its more dangerous cousins, and recognising their inability to prevent it?

Alongside the external influence of the caliph and the desire for a direct and visible successor to al-Riḍā must be placed factors such as
the lack of alternative candidates, already existing hadīths denying the
validity of the succession of a brother and, in the shadows, the
influence of major figures both from within and outwith the family whose
role can only be speculated about.

The involvement of the Abbasid family in the affairs of these Imāms
set in motion a trend which, when combined with the effect of the age of
both al-Jawād and al-Hādī on their succession to the Imāmate, was to
have a great effect on the Imāmate and the wīkāla.

Al-Jawād was probably kept under close supervision as a child whether
physically at court in Iraq or not. It is in this period that the names
of figures connected to the Abbasids begin to occur in the accounts of
the Imām's life, and that the Imām begins to appear isolated from
ordinary contact with his followers. The trend of isolation, begun
under al-Jawād and continued in patches under al-Hādī, was caused
principally by the policies of the Abbasids and the entanglement of the
Imām's lives with the Abbasid court.

The distance which was opening up between the Imām and his ordinary
followers is visible in the type of accounts reported of his life. Not
only are there many accounts which are exaggerated and distorted,
reflecting a tendency towards a magnification of the abilities of the
Imām which was only possible in the absence of real knowledge of him,
but there appears also a stereotyping of the Imām's character such that
stories told of one could easily be transferred to another. This type
of exaggeration and stereotyping was only possible in a situation where
the Imāms were increasingly out of touch with the bulk of their
followers.

Personal contact was restricted to their immediate circles; servants,
family, court figures or those in favour with the authorities, and
finally only a limited number of representatives who dealt with their
affairs. Written communication became the standard method of contact,
leaving little room for the personal touch. Lack of personal knowledge
of the Imām, his life, his speech, his actions etc., left a tremendous
gulf to be filled. Those devoted to a person or family as the living
embodiment of their faith exhibit often an unquenchable thirst, not for
their legal or theoretical pronouncements, but for details of their
everyday lives, their human contacts and relationships, and, for the
Shīʿa especially, evidence of their unique nature and proof of their
nearness to God.

Thus the accounts, especially of al-Hādī's life, are full of the images
which the Shīʿa sought; of oppression and suffering, certainly, but also
of triumph in adversity through patience, endurance, and the conquering
of the hearts and minds of the very people who were persecuting them,
the eventual assured triumph of right over wrong. The main
contribution of al-Jawād and al-Hādī for the Imāmate, therefore, was not
in the theological sphere; their contribution lay more in their image
than in their substance, more in their silence and isolation than in
their teachings.
The isolation of the Imāms, and their early inability to function as the head of the wīkāla, also had far-ranging effects on the organisation itself. During the early years of their Imāmītes, some authority and responsibility must have devolved to the representatives with the Imām acting as figurehead, a focal point for the devotion of the Shiʿa. There is some evidence to suggest that when al-Jawād began to assert his authority he faced some dissent from figures who were already well-established. On al-Jawād's death, with the ensuing renewed isolation of al-Hādī, however, the ability of the wīkāla to function without direct and immediate guidance came into its own, encouraging the recognition of al-Hādī and maintaining the network until he could take full charge once more.

The wīkāla's function in practical terms i.e. in the provision of finance and propaganda aimed at the eventual re-establishment of the ʿAlīd house at the head of the Islamic empire, was possibly not as important as the way in which it was able to maintain continuity in times of uncertainty. Along with the emerging influence of the scholars it guided the Shiʿa to recognition of the new Imām as a focus for their faith, not only for al-Jawād, but also for al-Hādī and, on his death, for al-ʿAskarī. It maintained a channel of communication between the Imām and his followers, providing for the Shiʿa an outlet for their devotion, and a means of attaining absolution for their sins and the guilt they may have felt at co-operating with the administration and not actively supporting ahl al-bayt.
It was this strong organisation, able to cope with the effective absence of an Imām, which was to be as crucial to the survival of Twelver Shi'ism in the event of the occultation of the twelfth Imām, and the confusion which ensued, as it had been for the previous three Imāms.
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(a) Names which have asterisks will be found in the main biographical index.

**TABLE A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follower of al-Ṣādiq through to al-Riḍā; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 159.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Follower of al-Ṣādiq; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 262.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Follower of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 167.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Follower of al-Riḍā; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 56.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Follower of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 330.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Follower of al-Riḍā; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 343.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not listed as reporting from an Imām; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 48.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Follower of al-Kāẓim and al-Riḍā; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 181.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Follower of al-Riḍā; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 263.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Not listed as reporting from an Imām; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 54.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Follower of al-Riḍā; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 51.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Follower of al-Kāẓim; R. al-BarqI, p. 51.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follower of al-Hādı and al-ʿAskarI; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 310.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Follower of al-Kāẓim; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 380.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Follower of al-Kāẓim; R. al-BarqI, p. 52.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Follower of al-Hādı; R. al-ṬusI, p. 409.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Follower of al-Hādı; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 87.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ghālin; R. ibn Dāwud, p. 493.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- Abd al-<Aziz b. al-Muhtadi
- Abd al-<Aziz b. Muslim
- Abdalläh b. Abī Ya‘fūr
- Abdalläh b. Bukayr
- Abdalläh b. Jundab
- Abdalläh b. Miskān
- Abdalläh b. Muḥammad al-Ahwāzī al-Ḥusaynī
- Abdalläh b. Ṣa‘īd
- Abd al-Raḥmān b. Abī Nāṣr
- Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Ḥājaj
- Abd al-Salām b. Abī al-Raḥmān

Abū =Ali b. Rāshid
Abū Baṣīr, Layth al-Bukhtārī
Abū Ḥāmid, Abīmad b. Ibrāhīm
Abū Ḥusayn b. Hilāl
Abū Ṣa‘īd, Abū Salām b. Ṣāliḥ
Abū Sulaymān
Abū Qāsim
Abū Yaḥyā al-Jurjānī

Abīmad b. Abī Dūwad
Abīmad b. Ḥammād al-Mawrazī
Abīmad b. al-Khaḍīb
Abīmad b. Ḥamza b. Bazīr
Abīmad b. Ḥamza b. al-Yassa
Abīmad b. al-Ḥasan b. Abī Faḍdāl
Abīmad b. Hilāl
Abīmad b. Ḥusayn b. Sa‘īd
Abīmad b. ‘Īsā b. Yaqtīn
Abīmad b. Ishaq
Abīmad b. Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr
Abīmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Īsā
Abīmad b. Mūsā
Abīmad b. Sābiq

=Ali b. Abī Ḥamza
=Ali b. Abī al-Ghaffār
=Ali b. Amr
=Ali b. Asbāṭ
=Ali b. Bilāl
=Ali b. Ḥadīd b. Ḥakīm
=Ali b. al-Ḥasan b. Abī Faḍdāl
=Ali b. Ḥaska
=Ali b. Ḥassān
=Ali b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī Rabbīhi
=Ali b. al-Ḥusayn b. Dāwūd
=Ali b. Ibrāhīm b. Dāwūd
=Ali b. Ja‘far al-Hamdānī
=Ali b. Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq
=Ali b. Mahzīyār
=Ali b. Muḥammad
"Ali b. al-Nu'mān
"Ali b. al-Rayyān b al-Ṣalt
"Ali b. "Ubaydallāh
al-Asbagh b. Mūsā
Ayyūb b. Nūḥ

Binān b. Nafi'
Bishr b. Bashshār

Dāwud b. al-Qāsim

al-Faḍl b. al-Shādāh
al-Faḍl b. Sinān
Fāris b. Ḥātim
al-Fāṭih b. Yazīd al-Jurjānī
Fayḍ b. al-Mukhtār

Hafṣ b. "Amr
Ḥammād b. "Isā
Ḥayyān al-Sarrāj
Hārūn b. al-Faḍl
Hārūn b. al-Ḥasan b. Maḥbūb

al-Ḥasan b. al-Jahm
al-Ḥasan b. Maḥbūb
al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā b. Bābā
al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Khashshāb
al-Ḥasan b. Naḍr
al-Ḥasan b. Rāshīd
al-Ḥasan b. Saʿīd

Hishām b. al-Ḥakam
Hishām b. Sālim

Ḥujr b. Zāʿīda
al-Ḥusayn b. Ahmad al-Taymi
al-Ḥusayn b. Bashshār
al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Madāʾīn
al-Ḥusayn b. Muslim b. al-Ḥasan
al-Ḥusayn b. Qayāmā
al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd

Ibrāhīm b. "Abdīh
Ibrāhīm b. Abī al-Bilād
Ibrāhīm b. Abī Maḥmūd
Ibrāhīm b. Dāwud al-Yaʿqūbī
Ibrāhīm b. Hāshim
Ibrāhīm b. ʾIsḥāq
Ibrāhīm b. Maḥzīyār
Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Hamdānī
Ibrāhīm b. Salām
Ibrāhīm b. Shayba

<Īsā b. Jafer

Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm
Ishāq b. Ismā‘īl b. Nawbakht
Ishāq b. Ismā‘īl al-Nisābūrī

Jafer b. Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm
Jafer b. Muḥammad al-Nawfālī
Jafer b. Muḥammad b. Yūnus
Jafer b. Suhayl
Jumayl b. Darrāj

Khayrān al-Asbāṭī
Khayrān al-Khādim al-Qarāṭīsī
Kulthum/Kulīm b. <Imrān

Mangūr b. Yūnus
Mu‘allā b. Khunays
Mu‘allā b. Muḥammad
Mu‘āwiya b. Ḥakīm
al-Mu‘aqqād b. <Umar
al-Mukhtār b. Ziyād

Muḥammad b. <Abdallāh b. Mihrān
Muḥammad b. Abī <Alī
Muḥammad b. Abī <Umayr
Muḥammad b. AbīSahmād b. Ḥammād
Muḥammad b. AbīSahmad b. Jafer
Muḥammad b. AbīSahmad b. Yaḥyā b. <Imrān
Muḥammad b. <Alī b. Bilāl
Muḥammad b. <Alī b. <Īsā
Muḥammad b. <Alī b. Jafer
Muḥammad b. <Alī b. al-Numān
Muḥammad b. <Alī al-Shaimaghānī
Muḥammad b. <Awn
Muḥammad b. Awrāma

Muḥammad b. Bashīr
Muḥammad b. al-Fāqīl
Muḥammad b. al-Faraj

Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm
Muḥammad b. al-Ḥārith
Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. <Ammār
Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Shammūn
Muḥammad b. Ḥimrān
Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Khaṭṭāb
Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Sa‘īd

Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Mahziyār
Muḥammad b. <Imrān
Muḥammad b. <Īsā b. <Ubayd
Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl b. Bazī
Moḥammad b. Jizzak
Moḥammad b. Jumhūr
Moḥammad b. al-Khalīl

Moḥammad b. Marzubān
Moḥammad b. Mūsā al-Shāriqi
Moḥammad b. Muḥammad

Moḥammad b. al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣalt
Moḥammad b. Sahl b. al-Yasad
Moḥammad b. Saʿīd
Moḥammad b. Sinān
Moḥammad b. Uthmān
Moḥammad b. al-Walīd

al-Naḍr b. Moḥammad
Naqr b. Qābus
Nūḥ b. Shuʿayb

al-Qāsim al-Yaqtīnī
al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣalt
al-Rayyān b. Shabīb

Saʿd b. Saʿd
Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā
Sahl b. Ziyād
Ṣailī b. Moḥammad
al-Ṣaqr b. Abī Dulāf
Shādhān b. al-Khalīl
Sulaymān b. Khālid

<Uthmān b. <Īsā
<Uthmān b. Saʿīd
<Umar b. al-Faraj
<Uqba b. Jaʿfar
<Urwa b. Yaḥyā al-Dihqān

Yaḥyā b. Abī <Imrān
Yaḥyā b. Aktham
Yaḥyā b. Ḥabīb
Yaʿqūb al-Sarrāj
Yaʿqūb b. Yāsīr
Yaʿqūb b. Yazīd b. Ḥammād
Yazīd b. Sulayt
Yūnus b. <Abd al-Ḥamān
Yūnus b. Yaʿqūb
Yūsuf b. al-Sukht

Zakariyyā b. Adam
Ziyād b. Marwān
Zurāra b. Aṭyah
While every attempt has been made to include all the major figures referred to in the text, and others of general interest for this period, this index could not cover all the Shī'a involved in the reports of the lives of the ninth and tenth Imāms, nor could it hope to analyse in detail the lives of major figures of preceding generations who may only have been mentioned in passing. However, it is hoped that the information will provide the basis for further research and development.

<ABD AL-'AZĪZ B AL-MUHTADĪ AL-QUMMI
A follower of al-Riḍā from Qumm who was thīqa and sāliḥ, al-Jawād having blessed him [R. ibn Dāwud p.225 n.342; R. al-Ṭūsī p.380; R. al-Barqī p.51 only follower of al-Kāẓim]. He is also recorded as one who did not report from the Imāms [R. al-Ṭūsī p.487] He was apparently the grandfather of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Khaṭṭāb. [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.183 n.392]. There is one al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Khaṭṭāb listed in R. ibn Dāwud [p.121 n.464] and in Ikhtiyār [p.613 n.1142] but this last reference says that he was born in 140 A.H. This is reported by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Khaṭṭāb. Al-Riḍā directed <Abd al-'Azīz to Yūnus if he had questions on <ilm [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.367 n.803]. He is connected with al-Jawād, receiving a letter from him containing expressions of praise and forgiveness [Ghayba.Ṭ p.225; Ikhtiyār p.506 n.976], and sending one asking for instructions [Ikhtiyār p.506 n.976]. Al-Faḍl b. Shāhān says that he was a wakil of al-Riḍā in Qumm and one of the best people in Qumm at the time [Ikhtiyār p.484 n.910; p.506 nos 974–5]. There is a further connection with the affairs of al-Jawād in his report of a letter from him about another major figure al-Ḥusayn b. Mahzūm [Biḥār L p.104 n.22]. He had one book reported by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. <Abd al-'Azīz [R. al-Najashī p.184]. See also al-Māmaqānī 11, p.155, n.6643; Maṣālim p.71.

<ABD AL-'AZĪZ B MUSLIM
He reports a debate which involved al-Riḍā in Maṣālim al-Akhbār (pp.95–103), but is recorded as a follower of al-Riḍā in only one source [R. al-Ṭūsī p.383]. See also al-Māmaqānī 11 p.155, n.6640.] which gives no further information beyond confirming him a reliable reporter.
"ABDALLAH B ABU YA'FUR"

Al-AbdI, a Kufan mawla', recorded as a follower of al-Šádiq [R.al-Barqi p.22; R.al-Ṭosi p.264]. The name of Ābū Ya'fūr was either Waqīd or Waqḍān. "Abdallāh, Ābū Muḥammad was thiqa, fa'il, close to al-Šádiq, a reciter in the mosque in Kūfa who died during the Imāmate of al-Šádiq [R.īb n. Dāwud p.197, n.817; R.al-Najashi p.157; Ikhtiyār p.246, n.454]. He is reported on several occasions travelling with Muṣallā b. Khunays, and disagreeing with his views [Ikhtiyār p.247, n.456; p.248, n.460]. He was directed for advice, when unable to contact the Imām, to Muḥammad b. Muslim [Ikhtiyār p.161, n.273]. Al-Šādiq spoke very highly of him as a follower of his father al- Başir [Ikhtiyār p.180, n.313], and as the only person who fully accepted him and obeyed him [R.īb n. Dāwud p.197; Ikhtiyār p.249, n.463; pp.249-50, n.464]. "Abdallāh held the view that there existed an Imām from abī al-hayt to whom obedience was obligatory [Ikhtiyār p.427, n.802], and considered them awṣiyya', and "ulama' [Ikhtiyār p.247, n.456]. He followed the Imām's advice on the illegality of drinking nabīdā, even though it caused him great pain, the nabīdā having been used as a medicine for stomach trouble [Ikhtiyār pp.247-8, n.459]. He died during the Imāmate of al-Šādiq in the year of the famine [Ikhtiyār p.246, n.454] and his funeral was attended by many of the Murji'ā of the Shi'a [sic] [Ikhtiyār p.247, n.458]. After his death al-Šādiq contacted al-Mufaddal b. ʿUmar to take his place [Ikhtiyār pp.248-9, n.461]. He wrote one book reported by many sources [R.al-Najashi p.157]. See also al-Māmaqāni 11 pp.165-7, n.6730.

"ABDALLAH B BUKAYR B A'-YAN"

A follower of al-Šādiq [R.īb n. Dāwud p.199 n.828; R.al-Barqi p.22; R.al-Ṭosi p.224], Ābū ʿAli al-Shaybānī who was possibly futḥī [R.īb n. Dāwud p.532; Ŧ. al-Fihrist p.188 n.405]. He was part of a large family, his father Bukayr being the brother of Zurāra b. A'-yan [Ŧ. al-Fihrist p.142], others being ʿAbd al-Mālik and ʿAbd al-Rahmān. Ibn Bukayr also had four brothers. Despite being suspected of thiqa views, he is still considered thiqa [Ŧ. al-Fihrist p.188 n.405]. His brother ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd reported from al-Ḵāṣim [R.al-Najashi pp.164-5]. He was amongst those who objected to the behaviour of al-Mufaddal b. ʿUmar [Ikhtiyār p.326 n.592]. He is listed both amongst the futḥīya [Ikhtiyār p.345 n.639] and as one of the futḥah of al-Šādiq [Ikhtiyār p.375 n.705]. Al-Faḍl

ʿABDALLĀH B JUNDAb

Al-Baṣrī [Ikhtiyār p.587 n.1099], recorded as a wakīl of both al-Kāẓīm and al-Riqā [Ghayba.] p.225] and as a follower of al-Ṣādiq, al-Kāẓīm, and al-Riqā [R. ibn Dāwud p.200 n.832 only the latter two; R. al-Barqī pp.45,50,53 adds the former; R. al-Ṭūsī all three p.226, p.355, p.379]. He was thīqa, muṭahādī, a companion of Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā and ʿAlī b. al-Nuṣārān and close enough to them to take a vow with them that whoever outlived the others would continue their Islamic duties for them if they died. [Ṭ. al-Fiḥrist p.171] His place as wakīl was taken on his death by ʿAlī b. Mahziyār [Ikhtiyār p.548 n.1038]. He has a very pious image [Ikhtiyār p.585 n.1096].

ʿABDALLĀH B MUSKĀN

The asḥāb were agreed that he was one of the most truthful and trustworthy of people, faqīh, who died in the time of al-Kāẓim. He was a follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim [R. ibn Dāwud p.213 n.888; R. al-Barqī p.22 only al-Ṣādiq]. He is listed as thīqa and had one book reported by Ṣafwān [b. Yaḥyā?] and Ibn Abī ʿUmayr [Ṭ. al-Fiḥrist p.196 n.423]. He himself reports the book of Ḥujr b. Zāʿida. His kunya was Abū Muḥammad and he was a mawla [R. al-Najāshi p.158]. He also reports the book of Sulaymān b. Khālid [R. al-Najāshi p.139]. Amongst his works are K. fi al-Imāma and K. fi al-Ḥalāl wa al-Ḥaram [R. al-Najāshi pp.158-9]. He related the situation between al-Ṣādiq and al-Mufaḍḍal when Ḥujr b. Zāʿida and ʿĀmir b. Jadhāw complained about his ideas on rizq [Ikhtiyār p.323 n.587 reporting it to Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā]. See also Maṣālim p.65.

ʿABDALLĀH B MUḤAMMAD AL-ḤUṢAYNĪ AL-AHWĀZĪ

He is one of those listed amongst the asḥāb of al-Jawād in Bihār [L. p.106 n.24 from Manāqib]. He is listed initially as a follower of
al-Ridağ and as thiqâ [R. ibn Dāwūd p. 211 n. 880; R. al-Ṭūsī p. 381 as al-Huşaynī]. He is also then listed as a follower of al-Jawād [R. al-Barqī pp. 54, 56; R. al-Ṭūsī p. 403]. His full name is given as Ābdallāh b. Muḥammad b. Ḥuşayn al-Ḥuşaynī [R. al-Najāshī p. 168; Ţ. al-Fihrist p. 195 n. 420]. He was one of those introduced to the Shi‘īte cause and to the Imām via al-Ḥasan b. Sa‘īd al-Ahwāzī [Ikhtiyyār p. 552 n. 1041]. Only one book from al-Riḑā is recorded - K, al-Ma‘ṣīl via Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. ʿUbayd [R. al-Najāshī p. 168]. See also Ma‘ṣūlim p. 64.

<Ābdallāh b Razīn
Although he reports a very enticing story about the Imām al-Jawād, he is regrettably absent from all the major riḍāl sources. His story is reported in Bīhār [I, pp. 59–61, nos. 35–36] from the works Manāqib and al-Ḳaṣfī. It is passed on to al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-As̲h̲warī.

<Ābdallāh b al-Ṣalt, Abū Ṭalīb al-Qummi
He is listed primarily as one of the followers of al-Riḑā [R. ibn Dāwūd p. 267 n. 861; R. al-Ṭūsī p. 380]. He is thiqâ and maskūn ilā rawāyiṭhī, an unusual phrasing [Ţ. al-Fihrist p. 192 n. 411; R. al-Najāshī p. 160]. He was mawlā of Banū Tamīm [R. ibn Dāwūd]. He reports the works of several lesser known figures [Ţ. al-Fihrist p. 70, p. 154, p. 372]. He wrote a book of Taafsīr which is related by his son Ālī [R. al-Najāshī p. 160], and via Aḥmad b. Abī Ābdallāh [Ţ. al-Fihrist p. 192]. He was also counted amongst the followers of al-Jawād [R. al-Ṭūsī p. 403]. He wrote verses of poetry to him which the Imām kept, and received back the same paper he had written on with the comment added ‘you have done well – may God reward you’ [Ikhtiyyār p. 245 n. 451; p. 568 n. 1075]. He also wrote to him asking permission to write elegies for al-Riḑā and was told to mourn both al-Riḑā and al-Jawād. [Ikhtiyyār p. 567 n. 1074]. It was he who reported al-Jawād praising the group who had defied him towards the end of his life [al-Jawād’s]. He reported also the condemnations of Ḥishām b. Ibrāhīm as zindiq by al-Riḑā, this from Muṣammār b. Khallād.

<Ābd al-Raḩmān b Abī Najrān
A follower of al-Riḑā and al-Jawād, Abū al-Faḍl, mawlā, Kufan and
thiqah [R.ibn Dâwud p.222 n.927; R.al-Barqî pp.54, 57; R.al-Tûsî p.403 and p.319] He was one of those who reported to al-Faql b. Shâdhân [Ikhtiyâr p.534 n.1029]. He reported from al-Riqâ and his books are said to be reliable. He passed on the K. al-Qâdâyâ of Muhammed b. Qays [R.al-Najâshî pp.175-6; T.al-Fihrist p.313] and added to it himself. Amongst his own works were K. al-Nawâdir and K. Yawm wa Layla. In T.al-Fihrist he reports quite a number of works from different authors including ܬܐܫܝܡ b. ܚܘܡܝܐ [p.175], ܣܚܝד b. ܝܣܪ ܐ [p.156], ܚܡܡܕ b. ܐܝsylvania b. [p.117], ܚܪܝז b. ܐܒܒܕܐܠistros b. [p.85] and ܝܒܝܪ b. ܝܬܝ [p.73]. The majority of these are passed on to ܐܒܡܕ b. ܘܡܡܡܕ b. ܐܝsylvania and on occasion he shares the reporting with ܐܠܝ b. ܝܕܝ [p.117,p.85], ܐܠ-adelphiaon b. ܣܚܝד [p.85] and Muhammed b. ܝܣܡܐ b. ܒܙܝܐ [p.117]. [See also al-Mâmaqânî 11 p.139, n.6339; Ma`âlim p.70].

<abd al-rahmân b al-ḥajjâj

He is recorded as a follower of al-šâdîq and al-Kâzîm according to most sources [R.ibn Dâwud p.233, n.930; R.al-Barqî p.24, p.48; R.al-Najâshî p.178; R.al-Tûsî p.353, p.230]. He is alleged to have followed Kaysanite beliefs, but to have returned to the correct path and later to have met al-Riqâ [R.ibn Dâwud p.473, n.289; T.al-Fihrist p.180, n.385]. He was called al-Bajâli, was a mawla, a Kufan who lived in Baghdâd and was a trader in al-sâbiri [R.ibn Dâwud p.233, n.930; T.al-Fihrist p.180, n.385; R.al-Najâshî p.178]. He is most strongly associated with al-šâdîq, for whom he acted as wakil [Ghayba.T pp.224-5]. He wrote one book according to T.al-Fihrist which was reported via Ibn Abî `Umâyr and ܫܦܘܢ, although R.al-Najâshî attributes to him more than one, also reported via Ibn Abî `Umâyr. His main contribution to al-Jawâd is his participation in the alleged conference of leading figures to discuss his Imâmate, added to which is the fact that it was supposed to have taken place in his house in Baghdâd [Ithbât p.212; Bihâr L pp.99-101, n.12]. However, he is said to have died during the time of al-Riqâ, which would make his personal participation dubious [R.al-Tûsî p.353; Ghayba.T pp.224-5]. He was involved with the debates of his time [see text] and his position on at least one issue of the time is recorded. A debate over ܬܘܗܝܕ and the attributes of God finds him rejecting the views of Hishâm b. al-Ḥakam, calling the latter heretic and guilty of kufr. Hishâm's
views were, from a later point of view, close to those of *tashbih*. He wrote to the Imam for guidance and was told to describe God only as He described Himself and nothing more [Ikhtiyār p.279, n.500]. See also al-Māmaqānī 11 p.141, n.6356.

*Aḥūd al-Salām b. Aḥūd al-Rahmān b. Nuṣaym*

A follower of al-Ṣādiq and *mamdūh* [R. ibn Dāwud p.225 n.939; R. al-Barqī negative], he was at one time imprisoned but released [Ikhtiyār p.210 n.372]. He was one of three who wrote proposing to al-Ṣādiq to take over Kūfa on his behalf whilst it was relatively low in numbers of fighting men [Ikhtiyār p.353 n.662]. [See also al-Māmaqānī 11, p.151, n.6589]

**Abū al-ʿAlī b. Rāshīd**

Possibly al-Ḥasan b. Rāshīd, he is listed as a follower of al-Jawād and as *mamdūh* [R. al-Barqī p.56; R. ibn Dāwud p.402 n.65] Abū ʿAlī did meet al-Jawād asking him if he should pray behind the associates of Hishām b. al-Ḥakam for people had different opinions on it. Al-Jawād tells him to follow the opinion of ʿAlī b. Ḥadīd who said no! [Ikhtiyār p.279 n.499] Several sources record information about his acting as *wakīl* for al-Ḥādi [Ghayba. pp.226-7; Ikhtiyār p.512 n.991, pp.513-4 n.992] in 232 AH when he was appointed to replace al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd Rabbīhī [n.991], or ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd Rabbīhī [n.992] His dispute with another *wakīl*, Ayyūb b. Nūḥ is also recorded, each being told to stick to his own affairs and district [Ikhtiyār p.514 see text for details; Chapter Nine] He apparently died during al-Ḥādi's time for Muḥammad b. al-Ḥaraj asked the Imam about him and was told that 'he lived happily and died a martyr' [Ikhtiyār p.603 n.1122] [R. al-Ṭūsī as al-Ḥasan b. Rāshīd p.373 a follower of al-Riḍā.]

**Abū Bāṣīr, Layth al-Bakhtārī, Al-Murādī**

Recorded as a strong follower of al-Bāqīr and al-Ṣādiq [R. ibn Dāwud p.282 n.1230; pp.393-3 n.6; R. al-Barqī pp.13,18; R. al-Ṭūsī p.278, p.134]. Although he lived during the Imamate of al-Kāẓim, he is recorded as one of his followers in only one source [R. al-Ṭūsī p358]. Possibly also called Abū Muḥammad, he was named as one of four men who were destined for *al-janna* by al-Bāqīr - others being Burayd b. Muṣāwiya a,
Muḥammad b. Muslim and Zurāra b. Aṣ–layan. [R. ibn Dāwūd pp. 392-3] He has only one book reported [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p. 262 n. 576; R. al-Najāshī, p. 245] He was one of the first ‘gang of four’ of whom the three listed above are constant participants. The fourth member alternates between Abū Başīr, Ismā‘īl al-Ja‘fārī, and al-ʿĀhwal. The four are alternately cursed and praised by al-Ṣādiq. The cursing may be linked with his problems with the mutarayyilsūn, the four being named as such in one ḥadīth [Ikhtiyār p. 169 n. 283] The term is applied it seems to those who have ‘no sooner left than interpret it [what I have said] other than it should be’ [Ikhtiyār p. 136 n. 216 with similar sentiments in Ikhtiyār p. 170 n. 287] Looking at the reporting of this situation there is a distinct pattern in those relating the pro/anti ḥadīths. On the anti side a large proportion are via Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān to Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. ʿUbayd. On the opposite side Ibn Abī ʿUmar reporting to Yaqūb b. Yazīd is a strong link. Also amongst those supporting the four and reporting to Saʿd b. ʿAbdallāh are ʿAlī b. Asbāṭ, ʿAlī b. Ḥadīd and Muḥammad b. Sinān. Both Yaqūb and ʿAlī b. Ḥadīd were at odds with Yūnus and his asbāb. Abū Başīr was the one who when told of al-Kāzīm’s answers differing from those of al-Ṣādiq said ‘I do not think our sāhib had attained his full maturity/perfected his knowledge. [Ikhtiyār pp. 171-2 nos 292, 3] See also al-Māmaqānī 111, p. 44, n. 9998.]

ABU ḤĀMĪD ʿHMAD B IBRĀHĪM AL-MARĀḠĪ

He is listed as a follower of al-Jawād in Bihār [p. 106 n. 24]. Although he is said to be māmdūb, there is no indication of him having followed al-Jawād [R. ibn Dāwūd p. 23 n. 55]. He is, however, listed as a follower of al-ʿAskārī [R. al-Ṭūsī p. 428]. One interesting situation involving him is recorded in Ikhtiyār [p. 534 n. 1019] Muḥammad b. ʿĀhmād b. Ja‘fār al-Qumī al-ʿAṣṭār wrote to the head of the area, presumably about Abū Ḥāmīd, and received a reply acknowledging his information and expressing wishes that God help him in his efforts and remain favourable towards him. Abū Ḥāmīd himself adds that this was in a long ruqṣā which included many commands and prohibitions addressed to Ibn Akhī Kathīr. The letter was passed on to ʿAlī b. al-Ḥasan al-Rāzī. The account concludes that al-Ḥasan b. Naḍr [Abū ʿAwn al-Abrash, a follower of al-ʿAskārī, R. al-Ṭūsī p. 430; Bihār p. 193 n. 3]
also wrote on behalf of the Ikhwan about what had been given out about him and that the response was passed around the mailis. See also al-Mamaqani 1, p.45-6, n.261.

ABU AL-ḤUSAYN B HİLĀL
He is recorded as one of the followers of al-Hādi and thiqā [R. ibn Dāwud p.396, n.23; R.al-TusI p.426], but no further information is recorded.

ABU ŠALT AL-HARĀWI, ʿABD AL-SALĀM B. QA-LĪV
He was in the service of al-Ridā and although sometimes said to be ʿāmmī was also thiqā and sahīh in his hadith. [R. ibn Dāwud p.224 n.938, p.474 n.295] He died in 236 A.H. [R.al-TusI p.379; Ikhtiyār index] Ikhtiyār reports that he had strong feelings of tashayyuʿ and had a great love for Al Rāṣūl Allāh [Ikhtiyār pp.615-6 nos.1148,9] He is mentioned in al-Ansāb as a ra's of the Rāfīḍa [R.al-TusI p.379, p.396], who reported to Bakr b. ʿAmr. Opinions of him vary in Mizān al-Iʿtīdāl; one considering him sāliḥ despite being steadfastly Shiʿite; others saw him as untrustworthy, untruthful, unreliable and suspected of forging hadiths [2 p.616 n.505] He arrived in Khurāsān with the army and was noticed by al-Maʾmūn who included him in his inner circle, where he remained until the caliph turned to the kalam of Jahm [Mizān as above]. His position in court circles may have been a high one for he is seen speaking with the caliph [Maqātil pp.561-2], being told by al-Ridā that he had been poisoned [Maqātil p.567] and hearing al-Ridā confirm to the distressed caliph that he knew that he was innocent, al-Maʾmūn being convinced, with reason, that people would say he was responsible [Maqātil p.571]. His reports for al-Jawād centre on the circumstances surrounding al-Ridā's death and burial [Bihār L p.49 n.27 from al-Khārāʾij and in ʿUyun.R.II p163.]

ABU SULAYMĀN ZANKAN
Although recorded in Bihār as one of the asbāb of al-Hādi, he is not listed in the major rijāl sources under this name.

ABU QĀSIM IDRĪS AL-QUMMĪ
This person is one of those said to be one of the followers of
al-Jawād in Biḥār [p.106 n.24] He is somewhat difficult to identify. He could be Idrīs b. ʿĪsā a follower of al-Riḍā who reported only one hadīth [R. ibn Dāwūd p.49 n.147; R.al-Ṭūsī p.367]. There also exists Idrīs b. ʿAbdallāh b. Saʿīd al-Asḥārī, who did not report from the Imāms but who was also a follower of al-Riḍā and al-Kāẓīm [R. ibn Dāwūd p.49 n.146; R.al-Najashi p.81; R.al-Barqū p.52]. He had a son Zakariyyā, Abū Jarīr al-Qummī who reported from al-Ṣādīq and al-Riḍā [R.al-Najashi p.131; R.al-Ṭūsī p.396]. Under Idrīs al-Qummī he is recorded in R.al-Ṭūsī as a follower of al-Jawād, but no further information is given. The only other possibility is Idrīs b. Ayyūb al-Qummī who reports to al-Yusayn b. Saʿīd in Ikhtiyār. [nos 90,92]. Al-Māmaqānī [1, p.106, n.602.] counts him as one of the followers of al-Jawād but unknown.

Abū Yahyā al-Jurjānī

Another name which figures in the list of ʿashāb given in Manāqīb [Biḥār L p.106 n.24] This person, in contrast to some of the others on the list, occupies considerably more space in the riḥāl sources. His full name was ʿAbdūl b. Dāwūd b. Saʿīd al-Faqārī listed as a follower of al-Hādī [R. ibn Dāwūd p.407 n.96; R.al-Ṭūsī p.426]. His name is also included in the lists of those not reporting from the Imāms [R. ibn Dāwūd p.27 n.73; notes to R.al-Ṭūsī p.426]. He was at one time one of the foremost members of the ʿashāb al-hadīth, ṣāhmi and a prolific author, but he eventually saw the light [Ikhtiyār p.532 n.1016; R. ibn Dāwūd p.27; R.al-Ṭūsī p.426; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.27 n.53]. He wrote on the arts of argument and debate against opponents [Ikhtiyār p.532; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.27-8]. Several of his works are directed against the Ḥāshwīyya - K. Fadāʾih al-Ḥāshwīyya [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.28]: K. Muḥbāt al-Nābīya Afl Madhhāb Aḥl al-Ḥāshw wa Fadāʾih Ma ṭ al-Najashi p.353]: K. Khilāf ʿUmar bi Ṭuwāyat al-Ḥāshwīyya - and against false traditions K. al-Radd ʿalā al-Akhbār al-Kādhība where he explained the criticism of all that was said of the virtues of earlier generations. He wrote against other groups also - the Murjiʿa, the Qadariyya and the Khwārij, and against specific persons - K. Radd al-Hanbali: K. al-Radd ʿalā al-Shajārī [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.28; R.al-Najashi p.353]. Other books have a more specifically Shiʿite nature - K. al-Muttaṣ: K. al-Rāʾa [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.28]: K. ʿUṣāq ʿal-Ṭaqqiya [R.al-Najashi p.353].
One incident is related about him by Muhammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Nisābūrī who said that Muhammad b. Tahir attacked him ordering his tongue cut out, his hands and feet amputated and him beaten and crucified. All this was allegedly because of slander directed against him by Muhammad b. Yahyā al-Rāzī, Ibn al-Baghawī and Ibrāhīm b. Śāliḥ [Ikhtiyār pp.532-3 n.1016; Ta‘al-Fihrīst p.27]. See also al-Mamaqānī 1, pp.60-1, n.344; Ma‘ālim pp.18-19.

Ahmad b Abī Du‘ād

This person is involved in several of the stories concerning al-Jawād’s time at court towards the end of his life. It is he who points out to al-Ma‘mūn the danger of allowing the Imām to be publicly acknowledged in a council as more able than other judges and recognised as giving a correct judgement by the caliph himself [Biḥār L p.6 n.7]. He suggested in one of his own meetings the possibility of discrediting the Imām by having him allegedly seen drunk. His plan, he is advised by al-Ma‘mūdī, would only focus attention on the Imām as a worthy rival in authority. [Biḥār L p.8 n.9] Finally he is named as one of those who witnessed the caliph tasting a drink which was being sent to al-Jawād. [Biḥār L p.94 n.7 from Manāqib] In historical sources Ahmad enjoys a fairly high profile. He is said to have accompanied Yahyā b. Aktham to Baṣra in 202 A.H. [Wafayāt I p.65] and to have been a frequent participant in his councils [Wafayāt I p.65; Murūj 111 p.434] When al-Ma‘mūn reached Baghdad and summoned scholars and lawyers to an audience he was amongst them. [Ibn Ṭayfūr p.36] He was recommended to the caliph by Yahyā b. Aktham and it was him whom he replaced when he became chief qāḍī. [Wafayāt I p.65] Ahmad was born in 160 A.H., died in 240 A.H. and had a record of humane intervention under al-Muṣṭaṣīm. He was a Muṣṭazīlīte and studied under Ǧājjāj b. al-ŠAlā. [Wafayāt I pp.61-2] He intervened in the conspiracy against Abū Dulaf al-Qāsim b. Ǧīsā and in favour of Muhammad b. al-Jahm al-Barmakī. He pursued a great rivalry with Ibn al-Zayyāt wazīr of al-Muṣṭaṣīm [Murūj III p.459; Wafayāt I p.69] and was involved in the persecution of Ahmad b. Hanbal. [Wafayāt I p.66] Indeed, Hitti suggested that it was he who prompted the caliph al-Ma‘mūn to proclaim the dogma of the created Qur'ān. [Hitti p.429] Favoured by several caliphs - al-Ma‘mūn, al-Muṣṭaṣīm, al-Wāthiq [Murūj
III p.478] and al-Mutawakkil [Wafayät I p.66] his career came to an end only when he suffered a paralytic stroke in 233 A.H. after the death of Ibn al-Zayyät. [MurQj IV p.14; Wafayät I p.66] His son Muḥammad, Abū al-Walād replaced him as qādī til 237 A.H. when he fell out of favour and was removed from office; fined and exiled, he died before his father who died in 240 A.H. [MurQj IV p.14; Wafayät I p.70] (See also Fihrist.N supplementary section p.2; Ta'rīkh B. IV p.141 ;<1.2>

**Ahmad b Ḥammād**

The father of Muḥammad al-Mahmūdī and, according to him, responsible for a whole series of stories relating designations of al-Jawād and al-HādI. He is recorded as a follower of al-Jawād [R.al-Barqi p.50; R.al-Tūsī p.398], but weak [R.ibn Dāwud p.420, n.25]. Despite his prominent role as concerns the designation of al-Hādī, he is not found in any of the lists of his followers. In the index to Ikhtiyār he is given as Abū al-ʿAbbās, father of Muḥammad al-Mahmūdī al-Marwāzī. Complaints were made against him by al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥusayn about his seizure of a great deal of wealth. The Imām suggested that he try and put the fear of God into him, which was tried with no success. On writing again he received the reply: "If fear of God is no use then how will you make him fear us". [Ikhtiyār p.561, n.1059]. A story is also related about his debate with Abū al-Hudhayl al-ʿAllāf on ʿismā and tawfīq. Ahmad also asked a very pertinent question about the statement in the Qur'ān about the perfection of religion. The argument was directed at the proof of a need for someone to answer any questions which could not be answered from the Sunna and Qur'ān [Ikhtiyār pp.561-2, n.1060]. The date of his death is dubious. His son relates that al-Jawād was the Imām who wrote commiserating with him on his father's death, but notes in Bihār say he died under al-Hādī [L, p.94, n.7]. Further on he is listed as a follower of al-ʿAskarī [R.al-Tūsī p.428]. The last reference may be actually to his son for the kunya is Abū ʿAli which was that of Muḥammad.

**Ahmad b Ḥamza b Bazī**

The cousin of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazī and said to be along with him one of the wuzarāʾ [R.ibn Dāwud p.27, n.72; Ikhtiyār p.564, n.1065]. He was included in a list of those who were considered thiqā by the
Imām, the others being Ayyūb b. Nūh, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Ḥamdānī and Ahmad b. ʿĪsā [Ikhtiyār pp.557-8, n.1053]. His father Ḥamza is alleged to have been a wāqifite [Ikhtiyār p.615, n.1147]. See also al-Māmaqānī I pp.59-60, n.336.

Aḥmad b Ḥamzā b al-Yasāʿ
Ibn ʿAbdallāh al-Qumī, whose father reported from al-Riḍā and who is considered thīqa [R. ibn Dāwūd p.27, n.71; R.al-Najāshī p.71; Ikhtiyār p.557, n.1053], a follower of al-Ḥādī [R.al-Ṭūsī p.409]. He had one book recorded, K. al-Nawādir. He is included amongst a list of three considered trustworthy by the Imām [Ghayba-T p.273]. See also al-Māmaqānī I p.60, n.338.

Aḥmad b al-Ḥasan b ʿAlī b Faḍqāl

Aḥmad b Ḥilāl
He is recorded as a follower of al-Ḥādī and al-ʿAskarī [R. ibn Dāwūd p.425, n.44; R.al-Ṭūsī p.410, p.428], Abū Jaʿfar, al-ʿAbartāʾī from a village near Iskāf [R. ibn Dāwūd p.425; R.al-Najāshī p.65; Maʿālim p.17]. Some sources consider him simply as ghālin [R.al-Ṭūsī, p.410; Maʿālim p.17], but others have mixed opinions, saying that some of his reports were saḥīh, whilst some were not acceptable. The main problem was the criticism directed at him by the Imām al-ʿAskarī [R.al-Najāshī p.65; R. ibn Dāwūd p.425]. His reports from Ibn Maḥbūb and Ibn Abī ʿUmayr were considered good [R. ibn Dāwūd p.425]. Two works are recorded – K.
Yawm wa Layla and K. Nawādir [R. al-Najāshi p.65]. He was born in 180 A.H. and died in 267 A.H. [R. al-Najāshi p.65; R. ibn Dāwud p.425]. A long communication about him was issued from the Imām to his followers in Iraq suggesting that they avoid him [Ghaybaṭ p.228; Ikhtiyār pp.535-6, n.1020]. The Iraqis were reluctant to accept this because of the pious reputation of Ibn Hīlāl, and they provoked an impatient reply from the Imām who was angry that they should question his judgement. In his reply restating his commands, he refers to others who had gone astray after serving the Imām for many years [Ikhtiyār p.536]. See also al-Māmaqānī I, p.99, n.553.

Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd

He is recorded as not having reported from the Imāms, nor is he reported as a follower of any particular Imām [R. ibn Dāwud p.418, n.21, n.22]. His full name is given as Ibn Saʿīd b. Mīhrān, Abū Jaʿfar, al-Ahwāzī [R. al-Najāshi p.60]. He was known according to the Qummīs as Dīnān [R. ibn Dāwud p.419; R. al-Najāshi p.60]. He reported from the shaykhs of his father, but not from ʿAbdallāh b. ʿIsā who was said to be ghālin [R. al-Najāshi p.60]. He himself was accused of ghulūw and being weak [R. ibn Dāwud p.418]. Al-Māmaqānī explains the accusation of ghulūw as being due to a disagreement over sahw [inadvertent error], the Qummīs considering that to deny this on the part of the Prophet and the Imāms was extremism [I, pp.56-7, n.324]. He wrote several works; K. al-Ṭabīʿāt [R. al-Najāshi p.60]; K. al-Anbiyāʾ; K. al-Mathālib [Ṭ. al-Fihrist, p.26; Maʿālim p.10]; K. al-Mukhtaṣar fi al-Daʿawāt [Maʿālim p.10]. He died in Qumm and was buried there [Maʿālim p.10].

Ahmad b. ʿIsā b. Yaqtīn

Although recorded as one of the asḥāb of the Imāms in Bihār, he is totally absent from the major riḥāl sources.

Ahmad b. Ishāq


**AHMAD B AL-KHAṢĪB**

He is listed mainly as a follower of al-Hādī (R. al-Barqī p. 60; R. al-Tūsī p. 409; R. ibn Dāwūd neg). His name occurs in the account of the final months of Muḥammad b. al-Faraj's life, when he had been released from prison. Aḥmad wrote to him asking him to come to al-Askar (al-Kāfī I, p. 500, n. 5; other sources see it differently: see Ithbāt p. 224; al-Irshād p. 502; Ilām p. 359; Kashf pp. 239-40). Aḥmad did live in Sāmarrā' for this is referred to in an account in Ikhtiyār where one ʿAlī b. ʿAmr al-Ṣaṭṭār had come from Qazwīn and was staying near his house in Sāmarrā' (Ikhtiyār p. 526, n. 1008). His name occurs twice in accounts surrounding al-Hādī; one where he pesters the Imām to give him a house which the Imām was in; and another where he and the Imām were travelling together (al-Kāfī I, p. 500, n. 6; Ilām p. 359; al-Irshād p. 502; Bilār L p. 139, n. 2). Shortly after this journey Aḥmad must have fallen out of favour because he was then allegedly put into the stocks as punishment and killed. Aḥmad b. al-Khaṣīb is listed as one of the aides of al-Wāthiq (Murūj III, p. 478) and as the wazīr of al-Muntaqir (Murūj IV, pp. 48-9)

**AHMAD B MUḤAMMAD B ABĪ NAṢR AL-BAZANTI**

His full name is given as Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAmr b. Abī Naṣr, Abū Jaʿfar, al-Bazantī, a Kufān (R. al-Najāshī p. 58; Ikhtiyār p. 589). He is recorded as a follower of al-Kāẓim and al-Riḍā (R. al-Barqī p. 54; R. ibn Dāwūd p. 38, n. 115; R. al-Tūsī p. 344, p. 366), and of al-Jawād (R. al-Tūsī p. 397). He is said to have met both al-Riḍā (R. al-Najāshī p. 58; Ṭ al-Fihrīst p. 36) and al-Jawād (R. al-Najāshī p. 58) and has an excellent reputation as thīqa and of high standing (R. ibn Dāwūd p. 38; Ṭ al-Fihrīst p. 36; R. al-Najāshī p. 58). He is recorded as one of the Ulūmā' of the
Shi'a amongst the asbāb of al-Kāsim (Fihrist.N p.309). Several works are reported; K. al-Jāmi' (R.al-Najashi p.58; R.ibn Dāwud p.38; T.al-Fihrist p.36) and K. al-Nawādir. He is related to Ismā'īl b. Mihrān b. Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr who, despite being accused of ghulūw, (according to Muḥammad b. Mas'ūd simply because of taqiyya), was otherwise excellent (Ikhtiyār p.589, n.1102). Ibn Abī Naṣr was honoured on one occasion by being asked by al-Riḍā to stay as his guest, even though some others who had been with him were also of high repute. He was then warned by the Imām not to become overproud and consider himself better than the other ikhwān (Ikhtiyār p.587, n.1099; p.588, n.1100). Al-Riḍā left a copy of the Qur'ān with him on his way to Khurāsān, a copy later collected by Musāfir (Ikhtiyār pp.588-9, n.1101). Ibn Abī Naṣr is involved in reporting several stories concerning al-Jawād (Bīhār L p.20, n.5; p.35, n.22; p.67, n.44; p.102. n.16). He died in 221 (T.al-Fihrist p.37) eight months after the death of Ibn Fadlān (R.al-Najashi p.58). Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. ʿUbayd heard a report from him in 210 (R.al-Najashi p.58). Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I pp.77-8, n.452; Maṣǧīm p.9

AHMAD B MUḤAMMAD B ʿĪSĀ
At one time he must have had a low opinion of Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān, because he is reported to have repented of what he had said about him and asked forgiveness of God. ʿAlī b. Ḥadīd, with whom Aḥmad was associated, was said to be showing secret inclination towards Yūnus and Hishām (Ikhtiyār p.496, n.952). One report indicates amazement at what he and other Qummīs were spreading about Yūnus, but adds that both Aḥmad b. Muḥammad and ʿAlī b. Ḥadīd had withdrawn what they had said (Ikhtiyār p.497, n.955). Aḥmad had a brother ʿAbdallāh who was given the nickname Binān (Ikhtiyār p.512, n.989). He reported even from those who were younger than himself and is said to have reported a book of Masāʿīl of al-Kāẓim from Ibrāhīm b. Abī Maʿṣūm (Ikhtiyār p.567, n.1072). In his reporting in Ikhtiyār, he reports mainly to Saʿd b. ʿAbdallāh from a wide variety of sources. See also al-Māmaqānī I, p.92, n.509.

AḤMAD B MŪṢĀ AL-KĀẒĪM

He is not listed in the biographical sources, but does figure in the heresiographical sources. After the death of al-Kāẓīm one group insisted that he had given the nass to his son Aḥmad (Maqālāt p.101). Similarly after the death of al-Riḍā, a group said that al-Riḍā had given the nass to his brother Aḥmad (al-Fuṣūl p.256). He is described in al-Iṣḥāḍ as a pious man, favoured by his father who gave him an estate called al-Yasīra. Aḥmad's generosity extended to freeing a thousand slaves (al-Iṣḥāḍ p.459). A different picture is painted in Aṣyān al-Shīʿa which says he fought with Abū al-Sarāyā, and rebelled again after the death of al-Riḍā taking Qumm and Rayy before being defeated (X pp.285-8). His association with Abū al-Sarāyā is confirmed by Ikhtiyār (p.472, n.898), but is not mentioned in Maqātīl. See also al-Māmaqānī I pp.97-8, n.544 which also says he was part of the revolt in Kūfa.

AḤMAD B SĀBIQ

He was cursed by al-Riḍā, but no reason is given (R. ibn Dāwūd p.420, n.27). Yaḥyā b. Abī ʿImrān was warned by al-Riḍā about him and, indeed, he had previously shown signs of following a different belief.
The *ashāb* noted that he had a head wound and sure enough he took to drinking wine [Ikhtiyār pp.552-3, n.1043].

**ʿALĪ B ʿABD AL-ḠAFFĀR**

He is recorded as a follower of al-Ḥādi [R.al-Barqī p.59; R.al-Ṭūsī p.418], and as acting as an intermediary between al-ʿAmrī and Yūsuf b. al-Sukht [Ikhtiyār p.526, n.1008]. No further information is recorded.

**ʿALĪ B ʿABĪ ḤAMZA**

He is recorded as a follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim [R.al-Barqī p.25, p.48; R.ibn Dawūd p.478, n.313; R.al-Ṭūsī p.242, p.353]. Al-Batāʿīnī, the qāʿīd of Abū Baṣīr, Yaḥyā b. [ʿAbī al-] Qāsim; a Kufan *mawāliʿ, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Anṣārī [R.al-Najashi p.188; T.al-Fihrist p.210]. The name of Abū Ḥamza was Sālim [R.al-Barqī p.25; R.al-Najashi p.188]. He is also given the *nisba* al-Baghdādī [R.al-Barqī p.48]. He had a brother named Jaʿfar [R.al-Najashi p.188; T.al-Fihrist p.210]. His outstanding feature was his wāqifism. He reported from both al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim [R.al-Najashi p.188], but was a prominent wāqifite [R.ibn Dawūd p.478; R.al-Najashi p.188; T.al-Fihrist p.210], who was cursed by al-Riḍā [R.ibn Dawūd p.478]. He was one of the *wukālāʾ* who refused to recognise al-Riḍā because of the wealth he held which had been collected for al-Kāẓim [Ghayba.Ṭ p.224; see Ikhtiyār pp.444-46, nos.833-838]. His reputation suffered because of his wāqifite beliefs and he is referred to as *kadhdhāb, muttaham* [Ikhtiyār p.403, n.755] and *malcūn* [Ikhtiyār p.403, n.756]. The amount he is alleged to have kept was 30,000 dīnārs [Ikhtiyār pp.404-5, n.159; p.493, n.883; Ghayba.Ṭ p.46;]. He did discuss the continuation of the Imāmat with al-Riḍā, but does not seem to have been convinced [Ikhtiyār pp.463-4, n.883]. He wrote one book reported by Ibn Abī ʿŪmayr and Ṣafwān [T.al-Fihrist p.210] and others reported by various people and mostly from Abū Baṣīr — K. al-Ṣalāt, K. al-Zakāt, K. al-Tafsīr, K. al-Jāmiʿ [R.al-Najashi p.188]. He reported one book directly from Abū Baṣīr — K. Manāsik al-Ḥāl [T.al-Fihrist p.362]. One book is recorded in Maʿālim [p.60]. See also al-Māmaqānī II pp.260-263, n.8111.

**ʿALĪ B ʿAMR**

Al-ʿAtṭār, al-Qazwīnī, he is recorded as a follower of al-Ḥādi
(R.al-Barqî p.59; R.al-Ṭûsî p.418; R.al-Najâshî p.214). He may also be listed as al-Nihâwândî (R.ibn Dâwud p.248, n.1049). Yusuf b. al-Sukht received orders to send someone to find ʿAlî who had just arrived from Qazwîn and was staying near the palace of Ibn al-Khaṭîb. He had come to complain about the waṣaṣ of Ibn Sinâ, yet was unaware of the fact that Fârîs b. Ḥâtim was no longer to be trusted (Ikhtiyâr p.526, n.1008).

ʿAlî b. Ḍâlî b. Sâlîm
Abû ʿAlîyâ al-Muqri Ḥâfiz who is recorded as a follower of al-Ridâ (R.al-Barqî p.55; R.ibn Dâwud p.481; R.al-Ṭûsî p.382), and of al-Jawâd (R.al-Barqî p.56; R.ibn Dâwud p.481; R.al-Ṭûsî p.403). He is a major figure in the reporting of hadiths associated with the İmâmate of al-Jawâd, especially concerning the issues of age and the transfer of the İmâmate (See text, Chapters One and Three). He is said to have been faṣîh and to have engaged in correspondence with ʿAlî b. Mahâzîyâr who was trying to persuade him of the error of his ways. Eventually they also involved al-Jawâd (R.ibn Dâwud p.481, n.321; проект Fihrist p.211-2, n.456; Ikhtiyâr p.562, n.1061). Opinion on whether he did finally repent of this belief is divided. ʿAlî had previously reported from al-Ridâ (R.ibn Dâwud p.481). A couple of non specific works are reported which were relayed by Ibn Abî al-Khaṭîb and Mûsâ b. Jaʿfar al-Baghdâdî (Fihrist pp.211-2). Other works include K. al-Dâlî, K. al-Tafsîr and K. al-Nawâdir (R.al-Najâshî pp.190-1). He is named as one of those who was with ʿAlî b. Ḥâtim in the mosque at Kûfâ (Ikhtiyâr p.516. n.993). See also al-Mâmaqânî which discusses in some detail his membership of the faṣîhya (II, pp.268-9, n.8172).

ʿAlî b. Bilâl

ʿAlî b. Ḥâdît b. Ḥâkim
He is listed as a follower of al-Ridâ and al-Jawâd (R.al-Barqî p.55;
R.al-Ṭūsī p.403, p.382], a Kufan mawlä of al-Azd who was brought up in al-Madā'in [R. ibn Dāwūd p.482, n.324]; al-Azdī, al-Madā'inī, al-Sābāṭī [R.al-Najāshī p.210; Ma'ālim p.561]. There is a suggestion that he held futhū views at some point [R. ibn Dāwūd p.482]. He had one book reported to "Ali b. Faqqāl [Ṭ.al-Fihirist p.214, n.423; R.al-Najāshī p.210]. He reports several others all to Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā; i.e that of Ḥārīz b. ʿAbdallāh [Ṭ.al-Fihirist p.85] and Ḥāmīd b. ʿĪsā [Ṭ.al-Fihirist p.117]. He was thoroughly mixed up in the disputes surrounding Hishām and Yūnūs. He was recommended to both Abū ʿAli b. Rāshīd and Yazīd b. Ḥāmīd by al-Riḍā as someone to whom they could look for advice. Ibn Ḥādīd strongly advises against praying behind Yūnūs and his ʿāshāb [Ikhtiyār p.279, n.499; p.496, n.951]. Apparently though, he was secretly inclined towards Yūnūs and Hishām [Ikhtiyār p.496, n.952]. Authorial comments indicate astonishment at the things said by the Qummīs of Yūnūs and point out that both Aḥmad b. Muḥammad and ʿAli b. Ḥādīd withdrew from their attack on Yūnūs and his associates [Ikhtiyār p.497, n.955]. A survey of the stories about Yūnūs reveal that those with a bias against him are reported overwhelmingly by Yaṣūb b. Yazīd [Ikhtiyār nos.941-5; nos.950-1]. A later comment about ʿAli b. Ḥādīd says he was indeed a futhū from Kūfah who later recognised al-Riḍā [Ikhtiyār p.570, n.1078]. See also al-Mamaqānī II, p.275, n.8207.

ʿALĪ b AL ʿHASAN (b ʿALĪ) b FAQQĀL

He is the son of al-Ḥasan b. ʿAli b. Faqqāl [R. ibn Dāwūd p.483, n.328], listed as a follower of al-Hādī and al-ʿAskarī [R.al-Ṭūsī, p.419, n.433], a Kufan with futhū views, but who did not report from anyone considered weak [R. ibn Dāwūd p.483]. The sons and brothers of Ibn Faqqāl [al-Ḥasan b. ʿAli b. Faqqāl] were all considered to have been futhū [Ikhtiyār p.345, n.639]. Although he figures in the reporting of many books there is no clear pattern, nor are they works of major figures. Sources seem agreed that despite being of this persuasion, ʿAli was faqīh, thīqa, extremely knowledgeable, and one whose works could not be faulted [R.al-Najāshī p.195; Ṭ.al-Fihirist p.216]. He was said to have been close to the Imāmīs who held 'twelver' beliefs, and his books on fiqh were full of excellent accounts [Ṭ.al-Fihirist p.216]. The Kufans were convinced that he had not reported anything directly
from his father, but only via his brothers. However, Ibn Bābawayh found a text which did have a direct link between them [R. al-Najṣī pp.195-6]. He was the author of many books; K. al-Ṭibb; K. Faḍl al-Kūfa; al-Dalā'il; al-Mafārif; al-Tafsīr; al-Janna; al-Khums; al-Ghayba; Ithbāt Imāmat ʿAbdallāh, and on many of the Islamic duties [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.216] Both Ṭ. al-Fihrist and R. al-Najṣī mention an unusual form of transmission, most being qirāʿan rather than ḥażāna [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.216; R. al-Najṣī p.196]. ʿAli, despite learning many of the hadīths of Ibn Abī Ḥamza and his tafsīr of the entire Qurʾān, refused to transmit them considering this source unreliable [Ikhtiyār p.552, n.1042]. Muḥammad b. Masʿūd, to whom ʿAli reported many accounts in Ikhtiyār, said of him that he considered him the most knowledgeable person among the Kufans, that he possessed every book which had come from the Imāms, and had an excellent memory. He also said that he had recognised ʿAbdallāh as Imām, but had then turned to al-Kāzim [Ikhtiyār p.530, n.1014]. See also al-Māmaqānī II pp.278-80, n.8224; Maṣūlim p.57 which counts the number of his books as thirty.

ʿALĪ B ʿHASHA
He is listed as ghālin [R. ibn Dāwud p.483, n.329], but is not recorded as a follower of a specific Imām. He was one of those who made allegations about the interpretation of zakāt and ṣalāt as not referring to the Islamic duties, but to a person, an allegation which Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā could not refute [Ikhtiyār pp.516-7, n.994]. Another person also wrote about the same situation, naming those responsible for the extreme ideas as ʿAli b. Ḥasha and al-Qāsim al-Yaqṭīnī [Ikhtiyār pp.517-8, n.995]. ʿAli al-Ḥawār was the teacher of al-Yaqṭīnī [Ikhtiyār p.518]. Al-ʿAskarī cursed both of them [Ikhtiyār p.518, n.996]. Other allegations made by him were that the Imām was eternal, and that he was his bāb and prophet [Ikhtiyār pp.518-9, n.997]. He was a Qummī [Ikhtiyār p.521, n.1001], and alleged similar things as Muḥammad b. al-Furāt before him who was condemned by al-Riḍā [Ikhtiyār p.555, n.1048]. See also al-Māmaqānī II, pp.276-7, n.8211] which lists his pupils as Muḥammad b. Mūsā al-Sharīfī, al-Qāsim al-Yaqṭīnī, and Ibn Bābā.
cALI B ḤASSĀN AL-WĀSĪTĪ
He was with a group who went to see al-Jawād and ask him questions. cAll brought gifts of toys which enraged the young Imām [Ithbāt p.215; Bihār L p.59, n.34]. He is Abū al-Ḥusayn, al-Qaṣīr, al-Munāmmīs, who lived more than one hundred years [R. ibn Dāwūd p.239, n.1009; R. al-Ṭūsī p.404 as a follower of al-Jawād; R. al-Najāshī p.212; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.214, n.464]. In Ikhtiyār he is confused with cAll b. Ḥassān b. Kathīr al-Ḥāshimī, who was waqīfīte [see index]. He reported two stories concerning al-Mufaqṣāl b. ʿUmar [Ikhtiyār p.321, n.582; p.328, n.595, both to Muṣā b. Bakr and another on the same subject p.248, n.461]. He reported from al-Ṣādiq [R. al-Najāshī p.212] to Aḥmad b. Abī ʿAbdallāh [Ṭ. al-Fihrist pp.214-5, n.464]. One of his accounts concerning al-Jawād focuses on age as the reason claimed by many as the cause for their denial of his as Imām [al-Kāfī 1 p.384, n.8 reported to Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim]. He has one work attributed to him in Maʿālim [p.58]. See also al-Mamāqānī II p.275, n.8210 where he is listed as thiqā.

cALI B AL-ḤUSAYN B ʿABD RABBĪHI
He is listed as a follower of al-Ḥādī [R. al-Barqī p.58; R. al-Ṭūsī p.417], who was a wakīl and died at al-Khuzaymiyya in 229 A.H. [R. al-Ṭūsī p.417; Ikhtiyār p.510, n.984]. He was replaced by Abū cAll b. Rāshid [Ghayba,T pp.226-7; Ikhtiyār p.514, n.992]. Under the name cAll b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbdallāh he is recorded as a follower of al-ʿAskarī who was a wakīl, was replaced by Abū cAll b. Rāshid, and died in al-Khātimiyya in 227 A.H. [R. ibn Dāwūd p.240, n.1012]. He wrote to the Imām asking for an invocation for a longer life [Ikhtiyār p.510, n.985]. Under a further name, al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd Rabbihi, he is said to have been replaced by Abū cAll b. Rāshid in 232 A.H. [Ikhtiyār p.513, n.991]. All would appear to be the same person, his actual name probably being as found in R. al-Barqī.

cALI B AL-ḤUSAYN B DĀWŪD
He reports that al-Jawād praised those whom he had previously cursed for not obeying him [Ikhtiyār p.502, n.963; pp.503-4, n.967; Ghayba,T p.225]. He is not listed in the rījāl sources under this name.
<ALI B IBRAHIM B HASHIM>

Al-Qumml, Abū al-Ḥasan, he is recorded as having not reported directly from the Imāms [R. ibn Dāwūd p.237, n.998]. His reputation appears to be sound, however, being thīqa in his ḥadīths, reliable, and correct in his beliefs [R. ibn Dāwūd p.237; R. al-Najāshī p.197]. Many of his works are recorded; K. al-Tafsīr; K. al-Nāṣikha wa al-Mansūkh; K. al-Maghāzi; K. al-Sharā'i'; Qurb al-İsnād; K. al-Manāqib; K. Tazwī' al-Ma'mūn Umm al-Fadl; K. Ikhtiyār al-Qur'ān, all reported to al-Ḥasan b. ʿUmar al-Ṣālihī [Mālim p.55; Ṣulḥ al-Fihrist pp.209-10, n.451]. Fihrist. N which refers to him as one of the learned legal scholars, adds to this list K. al-Manāqib [Fihrist. N p.311], and R. al-Najāshī adds K. al-Anbiyā'; K. al-Tawhīd wa al-Shirk; K. Fadl Amīr al-Muʾminin; K. al-Hayṣ: Risāla fi Manā Hishām wa Yūnus. It also says that al-Ḥasan b. ʿUmar wrote to ʿAḥmad and obtained from him an ʿiḥāza concerning his ḥadīth and his works [R. al-Najāshī p.197]. In Ṣulḥ al-Fihrist he reports many works, principally from his father Ibrahim, frequently to al-Ḥasan b. ʿUmar [See Index Ṣulḥ al-Fihrist].

<ALI B JAʿFAR AL-ḤAMĀDI>

A follower of al-Ḥādī [R. al-Barqī p.59; R. ibn Dāwūd p.238, n.1005; R. al-Tūsī p.418], and of al-ʿAskārī [R. al-Barqī p.61; R. al-Tūsī p.432]. He was a wakīl of both these Imāms [R. ibn Dāwūd p.238; R. al-Tūsī p.432; Ghayba.Ṭ p.226 as al-Hamāṭī]. He was imprisoned by al-Mutawakkil, but released in a general amnesty along with other prisoners after the caliph fell ill [R. ibn Dāwūd p.238; Ikhtiyār pp.606-7, n.1129]. The caliph had warned ʿUbaydallāh b. Yaḥyā b. Ḥāqān not to plead his case for he had been told that "Ali was rāfidi and a wakīl of al-Ḥādī. He was determined that he should not be released. The Imām's reaction was to seek God's help [Ikhtiyār pp.607-8, n.1130]. He was criticised by Abū Ẓāhir al-Biλāl for spending a great deal of money, a criticism which was dismissed by the Imām who said that the money had been given to "Ali by him. Al-Ḥādī also gave him a lot of money, this generosity being recorded also in Biḥār [Ghayba.Ṭ p.226; Biḥār L, pp.172-3, n.521]. He was probably involved in a bitter dispute with Fāris, the Imām eventually intervening on his side [Ikhtiyār p.523, n.1005; p.527, n.1008 where he is called al-ʿAli?]. See also al-Māmaqānī II, pp.271-2, n.8200.
ALI B JAFAR AL-ŠADIQ
The son of al-Šadiq, he is listed amongst the asḥāb of al-Šadiq and al-Kāẓim (R. ibn Dāwud p.238, n.1007; R. al-Ṭūsī p.353) and of al-Řiđā (R. al-Ṭūsī p.379). He lived initially in ʿUrayṣ in Medina (R. ibn Dāwud p.238; R. al-Najāṣī p.190) before moving to Kūfah and thence to Qumm after an invitation from its inhabitants. He died in Qumm (R. al-Ṭūsī p.379). He wrote a book of ṣalāl and ṣarām which was reported by ʿAli b. Asbāṭ (R. al-Najāṣī p.190; R. ibn Dāwud p.238). His reputation, as might be expected, was very good. He also wrote a book of Masāʿīl from al-Kāẓim and K. al-Manāṣik (T. al-Fihrist pp.212-3, n.459). He was loyal to his brother and supported him (al-Irshād p.440). He was not inactive, being mentioned as with Zayd b. Mūsā in Baṣra after the revolt of Abū al-Sarāyā (Maqdisī p.534), and as having supported Muḥammad b. Jaʿfar in Medina in the year 200 (Maqdisī p.540). He is the source of several accounts supporting al-Jawād, particularly where he gives the child precedence and explains his reasons for doing so (Bihār I p.36, n.26; al-Kāfī I p.322, n.12). He also identifies the child by tracing his ancestry to the Prophet (Ikhtiyār pp.429-30, n.804). He defended the Imāmātes of al-Kāẓim, al-Řiđā and al-Jawād when challenged by a wāqifite (Ikhtiyār p.429, n.803 which is reported via ʿAli b. Asbāṭ) and also gives an account of the betrayal of al-Kāẓim by Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Jaʿfar (al-Kāfī 1, p.485, n.8; Ikhtiyār p.263, n.478.). One of his most interesting accounts is of the humiliation of al-Řiđā and his son because of the hostility and suspicion of his relatives who insisted on testing the fact that al-Jawād was actually his son. This account was abridged in several works. See text Chapter Three. See also al-Māmaqānī II pp.272-3, n.8198.

ALI B MAHŽIYĀR
Al-Ahwāż, Abū al-Ḥasan, originally from Dawraq, a mawla, whose father converted from Christianity. ʿAli was also said to have converted to Islam when very young (R. ibn Dāwud p.251, n.1071; R. al-Najāṣī p.191; T. al-Fihrist p.231, n.498). He is listed as a follower of al-Řiđā, al-Jawād (R. al-Barqī p.54, p.55) and al-Hādī (R. ibn Dāwud p.251; R. al-Ṭūsī p.381, p.403, p.417). He reported from al-Jawād and al-Řiđā and was particularly close to al-Jawād. He held a high position with them and served as wakīl for all of them (R. ibn Dāwud p.251;
The communications which came out about him were all excellent and he is regarded as thiqā in his accounts, gālīb and without any blemish or slander, as well as having a wide knowledge of reports (R. ibn Dawud p.251; R. al-Najashi p.191; T. al-Fihrist p.231; R. al-Tusi p.381). Al-Hasan b. Shammu read a message about him from al-Jawād which was full of praise for him (Ghayba T p.225). His works are said to be well known, similar to those of al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd [in number?] although ʿAlī overtook even al-Ḥusayn in achievement with more than thirty three books. He wrote on all the Islamic duties and on areas of law. He also has other works such as K. al-Radd ʿala al-Ghulāt; K. al-Wasāyā; K. Taqīyya. In addition to these were some on topics which presumably al-Ḥusayn did not tackle - K. al-Ḥurūf; K. al-Qāʿim; K. al-Bishārāt; K. al-Abnīyā; K. al-Nawdīr; Rasāʾīl ʿAlī b. Asbāḥ (R. al-Najashi p.191). T. al-Fihrist seems to interpret the manner in which he added to Ibn Saʿīd's work to suggest that he simply added three more separate works, but al-Barqī said that he also added to each of the works - to some only a little, but to three of them a considerable amount (T. al-Fihrist p.231). Ikhtiyār agrees with sources above that he was a Christian who was originally from a village in Fars but moved to al-Ahwāz (Ikhtiyār p.548, n.1038). He took ʿAbdallāh b. Jundab's place when he died, and thirty or more works are attributed to him (Ikhtiyār p.549). A series of letters are preserved between him and the Imam, mostly fairly vague, but always exhibiting a high degree of warmth and mutual respect (Ikhtiyār p.550, n.1040). More concrete financial matters are referred to in K. al-Khums of Wasāʾīl al-Shīʿa; one from the Imam to ʿAlī himself, and others reported by him from other wukalāʾ - Abū ʿAlī b. Rāshid, Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Hamdānī (See Chapter Nine.) ʿAlī sought al-Nāṣir's explanation of a stick he came across on his travels which gave light without any sign of burning or blackening and without giving off heat. The Imam's answer was very clever: " It is nūr [light], inclining you to the people of this House and through your obedience to me and my fathers, God has shown it to you." (Ikhtiyār pp.549-60, n.1039). See also al-Maʿāmaqānī II pp.310-2, n.8534; Maʿālim p.56.
ALI B MUH MUD RIH

No information is recorded on him in any of the major sources.

ALI B AL-MU'AMAN


ALI B AL-RAYYĀN B AL-ŠALT AL-QUMMI AL-ASHARĪ

One of the followers of al-Hādi, a wakīl and thiqā (R. ibn Dāwud p. 244 n. 1031; R. al-Barqī p. 58). He is also recorded among the followers of al-Askari (R. al-Tūsī p. 433). He and his brother were responsible for a jointly written book reported via Alī b. ʿIbrāhīm (T. al-Fihrist p. 221). He is said to have possessed an actual written document from al-Hādi (R. al-Najashi p. 214). He was introduced to al-Riđa by al-Ḥasan b. ʿAṣid al-Ahwāzī after the wakīl ʿIṣḥāq b. ʿIbrāhīm. Al-Ḥasan was said to have been instrumental in their conversion to the Imam's cause (Ikhtiyār pp. 551-2 n. 1041). Further references: al-Māmaqānī II, p. 289, n. 8283; Maṣālim possibly p. 60 as Alī b. al-Salṭ.

ALI B SAYF

Ibn Amīra, al-Nakha'I, Abū al-Hasan, mawla, Kufan, who reported from al-Riđa and was thiqā. He is listed as a follower of al-Riđa (R. al-Tūsī p. 383). He had one younger brother al-Ḥusayn (R. ibn Dāwud p. 245, n. 1036; R. al-Najashi p. 213). One book which he wrote was reported via Yaḥyā b. Zakariyyā (R. al-Najashi p. 213). He informed al-Jawād that his age was the main reason for the denial of his
Imāmate [al-KāfI 1 p.383, n.3]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī II p.293, n.8318.

<ALĪ b. UBaydallāh al-Dīnawārī

He is recorded as a follower of al-Hādi [R.al-Barqī p.60; R.al-Ṭūsī p.418]. As <Alī b. Ubaydallāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib he is listed as having wrote one book; K. al-Aqudīya [Ṭ.al-Fihrist pp.224-5; Maʿālim p.59]. He wrote to the Imām saying that he had sent things with Fāris and received the reply that they had not arrived. He was told not to give anything to him again [Ikhtiyār p.525, n.1007].

AL-ʾĀṣBAGH b. Mūsā

He carried the sum of one hundred dinārs to al-Kāzim [Kashf p.49], but is not recorded in any of the major risāla sources.

AYYūB b. Nūḥ

Ibn Darrāj, al-NakhaʾI, Abū al-Ḥusayn, Kufan, wakīl of both al-Hādi and al-ʾAskari [R. Ḯ. Dāwud p.64, n.221; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.64; R.al-Najāší p.801]. He is listed as a follower of al-Riḍā, al-Jawād and al-Hādi [R.al-Barqī p.54, p.57; R. Ḯ. Dāwud p.64; R.al-Ṭūsī p.368, p.398, p.410]. He held a very high position and was considered thīqa [R.al-Ṭūsī p.410; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.64]. His father was a qāṭī in Kūfa who held correct beliefs and who had a brother Jumayl [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.65; R.al-Najāší p.801]. Al-Hādi did comment on Ayyūb saying that he was one of al-ʾĀṣ al-janna [Ghayba-T p.226]. Of his works those recorded are of a general nature: K. Nawādir [R.al-Najāší p.80], Rawāyah, Maṣāʾil from al-Hādi [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.65; Maʿālim p.22]. Muḥammad b. Sukayn b. Nūḥ said that Ayyūb reported from the riṣāla of al-Šādiq, but not from his father or uncle [R.al-Najāší p.80]. There exists a fairly large body of evidence supporting his position as wakīl. It was to him that Muḥammad b. ʿIsā b. ʿUbayd wrote to ask about the status of Fāris b. Ḥātim. Ayyūb had entrusted letters and money to him to be delivered to the Imām, as had another wakīl <Alī b. Ubaydallāh, and they had gone astray. Instructions were sent out not to trust Fāris in future [Ikhtiyār p.525, n.1007]. Although one of the most trusted representatives [Ikhtiyār pp.557-8, n.1053], he was reprimanded on occasion, being told not to oppose Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Hamānī.
Ikhtiyār pp. 611-2, n. 11361, and to cease his jurisdictional dispute with Abū ʿAlī [Ikhtiyār p. 514, n. 992]. They were ordered to restrict their activities of collecting dues, obtaining permission to see the Imām etc., to their own designated areas. When Ayyūb died people expected his estate to be considerable, but in fact he left only 150 dinārs the rest being in his possession simply because of his position as a wakīl of al-Ḥādi [Ikhtiyār p. 572, n. 1083; R. al-Najāshī p. 80]. In Ikhtiyār he reports a considerable number of reports from Ṣafwān [Ibn Yaḥyā?] to the brothers Ibrāhīm and Ḥamdawayh b. Nuṣayr. In Ṭ. al-Fihrist he reports the books of several less well known people [see index], and, along with many others, of Ibn Abī ʿUmayr [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p. 266]. He heard the ḥadīth of ʿĪsā-ī b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā-ī b. Hīlāl who came to Iraq from Mecca and eventually returned there [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p. 60]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I pp. 159-6, n. 1154.

BINĀN B NAFTĪ

He reports a designation of al-Jawād which implies a link between the souls of all the Imāms [Bihār L pp. 55-6, n. 31]. He is absent from all major rijāl sources.

BISHR B BASHSHĀR AL-NISHĀBŪRĪ AL-SHADHĀNĪ

Although listed as one of the aṣḥāb of al-Ḥādi in Bihār, he is found further recorded only as the uncle of Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Shādhānī [R. al-Ṭūsī p. 411].

DĀWŪD B ZAYD

Abū Sulaymān, Ibn Abī Zayd, Abū Zayd's name being Zanḵān, he came from Nīshābūr and was recorded as a follower of al-Jawād [R. al-Ṭūsī p. 415], and of al-ʿAskarī, and was considered thiqa [R. al-Ṭūsī p. 431]. He was one of the aṣḥāb of ʿAlī b. Muḥammad and wrote one book [Maʿālim p. 42; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p. 126]. His name is given elsewhere as possibly Dāwūd b. Buzayd of Abī Nīsābūr who was one of the reporters of the Shiʿa considered to be truthful and who wrote one book - K. al-Hudā [Fihrist. N p. 278].

DĀWŪD B AL-QĀSIM, ABŪ HĀSHIM AL-JA-FARĪ

...Ibn ʿĪsā q b. ʿAbdallāh b. Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālib, who lived during the
lives of four Imāms from al-Riḍā to al-ʿAskarī and was considered of high standing and noble [R. Ibn Dāwūd p.146, n.583]. He is listed as a follower of three Imāms; al-Jawād, al-Ḥādī and al-ʿAskarī [R. Ibn Dāwūd p.146, n.583; R. al-Barqī p.56, p.57, p.60; R. al-Ṭūsī p.401, p.414, p.431]. He was from Baghdaḍ and was close to the Imāms. He is also said to have been mugaddam ʿind al-sultān. One book is recorded of Akhbār wa Masāʾiʿ [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.131, n.280]. His father reported from al-Šādiq [R. al-Najāshī pp.119-20]. He was transported to Sāmarraʿ and imprisoned there in 252 A.H., dying in 261 [Tarikh B., VIII, p.369, n.4471]. He was one of those who was present at the congratulations of Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāḥ b. Tāhir on bringing the head of Yaḥyā b. ʿUmar b. al-Ḥusayn to Baghdaḍ after his rebellion in Kūfa [Maqātil p.644]. He was described by another ʿAlī as one of the most quiescent of the descendents of Jaʿfar b. Abī ʿAbdullāḥ [Maqātil p.698]. He is claimed as a source by al-Faḍl b. Shādhān [Ikhtiyār p.546, n.1029], and his reports apparently show something of Ḣiftā in his beliefs [Ikhtiyār p.571, n.1080]. He is responsible for a large proportion of the miraculous stories reported of the Imāms al-Jawād and al-Ḥādī, and is one of the main sources of two works dedicated to the collection of such accounts – al-Kharāʾī and ʿUyun al-Muṣṭifā. See also Maʿālim p.41.

AL-FAḌL B SHĀḌHĀN

Ibn al Khalīl, Abū Muḥammad, al-Nisābūrī, mutakallim, faqīh, jalīl, whose father was one of the associates of Yūnus and reported from al-Jawād and, some say, al-Riḍā [R. Ibn Dāwūd p.272, n.1179]. He met al-Askarī and showed him one of his works, earning the approval of the Imām who was alleged to have expressed his envy of ʿAlī Khurāsān having such a person in their midst [R. Ibn Dāwūd p.272, n.1179; Maʿālim pp.80-1; Ikhtiyār p.542, n.1027]. He is recorded as a follower of the Imāms from al-Jawād through to al-ʿAskarī in one source [R. Ibn Dāwūd p.272], and as a follower of al-Ḥādī and al-ʿAskarī in another [R. al-Ṭūsī p.420, p.434]. Not only did he meet al-ʿAskarī, but also al-Ḥādī [Maʿālim pp.80-1]. He wrote an inordinate number of works, quite impossible to list here. A large number seem to have been dedicated to refuting the views of other sections of the theological community. Some are written against specifically named persons, i.e
Ibn Karrām; Ustādh Abū ʿAlī concerning the doctrine of jism; al-Iskāfī; al-Aqamm. Others are against particular groups i.e the Bāṭinīyya and the Qarāmīṭa; those who would use philosophy in discussing tawhīd; the ghulāt etc. [Maṣālīm pp.80-1]. In Ẓal-Fihrist many more such works are mentioned, including one against the Murjiʿa [Ẓal-Fihrist pp.254-5, n.559]. Fihrist-N includes him amongst the authors of the āmīma, adding the works K. Taafsīr and K. al-Sunan fī al-Figh to the list. It adds that he had a son, al-ʿAbbās, and that he was claimed by two different groups, the Shiʿa and the Ḥashwiyya [Fihrist-N p.323]. As Ibn Shādhān b. Jafl, al-Azdī, al-Nishābūrī he is listed in R. al-Najāshī as having written over 180 works [pp.235-6]. The works listed here include a refutation of the views of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, of ʾahl al-taqīf, and of the Ḥashwiyya, as well as one positive work on al-Qāʾīm. Al-Faḍl was apparently expelled from Nīshābūr by ʿAbdalldh b. Ẓāhir after having been invited to come there [Iḥtiyyār p.539, n.1024]. He laid claim to be the successor of an impressive list of past scholars from amongst the Shiʿa [Iḥtiyyār p.539, n.1025; pp.534, n.1029]. He was involved in a dispute with others in Nīshābūr concerning the extent of knowledge of the Prophet and his successors, and the continuance of wāḥya after the Prophet's death. Al-Faḍl's view was that wāḥya had ceased with the Prophet, but that all the knowledge which he had held had passed to his successors. His statement was sent to the Imām for his comment, and he was told that some of what he said was correct, and some of it was corrupt [Iḥtiyyār pp.539-40, n.1026]. One account says that, although it was generally thought that al-Faḍl had been censured for upholding the doctrine of jism, it was in fact because of his actions against one of the Imām's wukalā'. Ayyūb b. al-Nāb was sent to Nīshābūr and stayed with some of those who supported more extreme ideas. Al-Faḍl then persuaded people that he was not a duly appointed representative of the Imām and that they should not give him any of the dues. A message cursing him was brought by al-Dīhqān. He died in 260 A.H., fleeing from the Khawārij [Iḥtiyyār pp.542-3, n.1028].

AL-FAḌL B SIMĀN
Recorded in only two sources as a wakīl of al-Ridā in Nīsāpur (R. Ibn

FĀRIS B ḤĀTIM

Ibn Māhawayh, al-Qazwīnī, he is listed as a follower of al-Riḍā [R. ibn Dāwūd p.270, n.1164], and of al-Ḥādī [R.al-Ṭūsī p.420; R. ibn Dāwūd p.270]. He is considered to have been an extremist and cursed [R.al-Ṭūsī p.420; R. ibn Dāwūd p.492]. He lived in al-ʿAskar and a few works of his are reported. Amongst those reported are K. al-Radd cal-d al-Mift; K. al-Ḥurūb; K. ʿAdad al-Aʿīmma; K. al-Radd al-ʿalā al-Janāʾīyya [R. al-Najashi p.238]. Al-Ḥādī wrote to another Qazwīnī in 250 A.H. cursing Fāris for his enmity and exaggeration [Ghayba]. He was one of three cursed by al-Ḥādī, the others being Muḥammad b. Nuṣayr and Ibn Bābā [Ikhtiyār p.520, n.999]. Several of the other wukalāʾ wrote to the Imam concerning Fāris, including Ibrāhīm b. Dāwūd al-Yaʿqūbī [Ikhtiyār p.522, n.1003] and ʿUrwa [Ikhtiyār p.522, n.1004]. The latter received a letter in return cursing Fāris and warning him to stay away from him. Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad also wrote about the dispute between Fāris and ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar, the Imam telling him to support the latter [Ikhtiyār p.523, n.1005]. This dispute is also referred to by Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā [Ikhtiyār p.527, n.1010]. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. ʿUbayd, who wrote to Ayyūb b. Nūḥ asking for information about Fāris [Ikhtiyār p.525, n.1007], reports that the Imam ordered the death of Fāris because of the dissension he had introduced into the Shi'a and views which amounted to bidʿa [Ikhtiyār pp.523-4, n.1006]. The story of his death is also recounted [Ikhtiyār pp.524-5]. See also al-Māmaqānī which refers to him as weak in the extreme [III, p.1, n.9393].

AL-FATĪB B YAZĪD AL-JURJĀNĪ

Referred to as ʿĀbīb al-Masāʾīl ʿAbū al-Ḥasan [R. ibn Dāwūd p.492; R.al-Najashi p.240], he is said to have nothing known about him. He was possibly a follower of al-Riḍā or al-Ḥādī [R. ibn Dāwūd p.492, n.377]. He is definitely recorded in R.al-Barqī as a follower of al-Ḥādī, and this source appears to be more stringent in its criteria for listing followers [R.al-Barqī p.60; R.al-Ṭūsī p.420]. He is also recorded as one who did not report direct from the Imam [R.al-Ṭūsī
p.420]. His kunya is given as Abū ʿAbdallāh [R.al-Najāshī, p.240]. One book is attributed to him in other sources [Maʿālim, p.82; T.al-Fihrīst, p.253, n.555].

AL-FAYQ B AL-MUHKĀR AL-JUʾFĪ

Al-Kūfī, recorded as a follower of al-Ṣādiq [R.al-Barqī, p.40], and of al-Bāqīr through to al-Kāẓim [R.ibn Dāwud, p.274, n.1185]. One book is attributed to him [T.al-Fihrīst, p.256, n.564]. He was considered ṭhiqa, and said to have reported from al-Bāqīr, al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim. His book was reported via his son [R.al-Najāshī, pp.239-40]. He was one of those who wrote to al-Ṣādiq about the situation in Kūfa inviting him to take the city whilst it was relatively undefended [Ikhtiyār, pp.353-4, n.662]. He also reported to al-Ṣādiq the arguments and differences of opinion which existed in Kūfa [Ikhtiyār, p.135, n.216]. See also Ikhtiyār, p.354-6, n.663 and al-Māmaqānī III, pp.16-7, n.9541.

HAFṢ B ʿAMR

Al-ʿAmrī, al-Jammāl he is recorded as a wakīl of Abū Muḥammad [R.ibn Dāwud, p.129, n.499b; R.al-Ṭūsī, p.430], and possibly had a son named Muḥammad [R.al-Ṭūsī, p.430, p.436]. He received money via Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Māḥzīyār who had been entrusted with it by his father on his death-bed along with a sign which the recipient would give him in order to validate the transfer [Ikhtiyār, pp.531-2, n.1015]. See also al-Māmaqānī I, p.354, n.3083.

HĀRŪN B AL-FAQĪL

He reports several stories concerning al-Jawād's death and al-Hādī's immediate knowledge thereof, as well as his awareness of being Imām [Bihār L, p.14, n.15; al-Kāfi, 1, p.381, n.5; Bihār L, p.135, n.16; Ithbāt, p.222]. He is absent from all major rijāl sources. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī III, p.285, n.12740 as unknown.

HĀRŪN B [AL-ḤASAN] B MAḤBŪB

Nawādir, via Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Qāsim. He is only a reporter in Ikhtiyār where he reports from several members of the family of Zūrāra—his sons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, and grandson Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh—about the relationship between Zūrāra and the Imām al-Ṣādiq [Ikhtiyār p.133, n.211]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī III, p.283, n.12743 as thīqa.

Al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Ṭaqāl

He is listed as a follower of al-Riḍā [R. al-Barqī p.54; R. al-Ṫūsī p.371] and even among his close circle [Fihrist. N p.312; T. al-Fihrist p.93], yet he was also said to have been a futḥī who only repented on his death bed [R. ibn Dāwūd p.114, n.437; p.441, n.125]. He was Kufan; his kunya was Abū Muḥammad; a mawla of Tāyim Allāh b. Thaqafi laba and, apart from his futḥī leanings, a pious man of high standing and reputation [R. ibn Dāwūd p.114; T. al-Fihrist p.93]. Of his own works are reported: K. al-Tafsīr; K. al-Ṭibb; K. al-Ibtidāʾ wa al-Mubtadaʾ [Fihrist. N p.312]. Also K. al-Ṣalāt, K. al-Diyāt, K. al-Bishārāt, and K. al-Radd ʿalā al-Ghālīyā [Fihrist. N p.94]. Other works include: K. al-Ziyārāt; K. al-Nawādir; K. al-Zuhd; K. al-Mutʿa; K. al-Nāsikh wa al-Mansūkh; K. al-Majāhīm etc. [R. al-Najjashī p.27]. Al-Faḍl b. Shadhān recounts his first hearing of Ibn Faḍlāl in the mosque in Kūfah when people were talking of a man who lived in the hills and who moved amongst wild birds and animals without them fleeing or attacking him. This description implies that he had perhaps Ṣūfī tendencies [Ikhtiyār pp.515-6, n.993; R. al-Najjashī p.26]. Al-Faḍl reports further that he heard the book of Ibn Bukayr and other hadiths from Ibn Faḍlāl [R. al-Najjashī pp.26-7; Ikhtiyār p.565, n.1067]. Ibn Faḍlāl refused the summons to an audience sent by the son in-law of Tāhir b. al-Ḥusayn who was on the ḫajj. He used to meet with Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥajjāl and ʿAlī b. Asbāḥ in the mosque of Kūfa and incite al-Faḍl to argue with al-Ḥajjāl about al-maʿrifa [R. al-Najjashī p.27 which also gives the full story of his repentance]. He died in 224 A.H. [R. al-Najjashī p.28; R. ibn Dāwūd p.114]. He had several sons, ʿAlī, Aḥmad [R. ibn Dāwūd p.419] and Muḥammad. The first two are dealt with in the index. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I, p.297-8, n.2570; Maṣālim p.28.
AL-ḤASAN B ‘ALĪ AL-WASHSHA‘

AL-ḤASAN B ‘ALĪ B YAQTĪN
Ibn Mūsā, mawla of Banū Ḥāshim, although some say he was mawla of Banū Ḥāshim, although some say he was mawla of Banū Asad, faqīh, mutakallim, he reported from al-Riḍa, and one work of Masā’il from al-Kāẓim [R.al-Najashi p.36; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.94, n.193]. He was from Baghdād [Maṣālim p.29; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.94]. He is reported as a follower of al-Kāẓim [R.al-Barqī p.51], and of al-Riḍa [R.Ibn Dāwud p.115, n.441]. In Ikhtiyār he reports many stories to Muḥammad b. ‘Isā, and also reports ‘Abdallāh b. Jundab’s bad opinion of Yūnus [Ikhtiyār p.586, n.1098]. See also al-Māmaqānī I, p.300, n.2584.

AL-ḤASAN B AL-ḤUSAYN B ‘ALĪ B AL-ḤUSAYN
There did exist a son of al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn [ al-Irshād, p.391], but of his children nothing is recorded. This person might be the son of al-Ḥusayn b. Zayd b. ‘Alī who died during the revolt of Abū al-Sarīyā [Maqātil p.543]. He is also mentioned involved in circumstances surrounding Muḥammad b. ‘Abdallāh b. al-Ḥasan, al-Nafs al-Zakiyya [Maqātil p.261]. He was in the company of Ḥasan b. Sadiq when some of the leaders of the Zaydiyya came to ask their opinion of the drinking of nabīd, which he said Zayd often did. On hearing this al-Ḥasan declares that he cannot therefore be a Prophet, nor the successor of one [Ikhtiyār p.232, n.420]. He was thrown out of the house of Abū Hārūn when the latter found out about his allegiance to Abū Ja’far [Ikhtiyār p.221, n.395].
AL-ḤASAN B AL-JAHN

Ibn Bukayr b. Aṣyan, Abu Muḥammad, al-Shaybānī, who was considered thiqa and saḥīḥ [R. ibn Dāwud p.104, n.397; R. al-Najāshī p.40; T. al-Fihrist p.87, n.1711. He is listed as a follower of al-Kāẓim [R. al-BarqI p.49; R. ibn Dāwud p.104; R. al-Ṭūsī p.347], who reported from this Imam [R. al-Najāshī p.40] and as a follower of al-Riḍā [R. ibn Dāwud p.104], from whom he also reported [R. al-Najāshī p.40]. He has one book of Masāʾil attributed to him which was reported by Ibn Faḍḥāl [T. al-Fihrist p.87; R. al-Najāshī p.40].

AL-ḤASAN B MAḤBŪB

Al-Zarrād, referred to also as al-Sarrād, Abu ʿAlī, mawla Bajīla, a Kufan who was considered thiqa and one of the four pillars of his era. He reported from al-Riḍā and from sixty of the asḥāb of al-Ṣādiq. The Shiʿa were agreed on the correctness of his reports and fiqh [R. ibn Dāwud p.116, n.459; T. al-Fihrist p.96]. He is recorded firstly as a follower of al-Kāẓim [R. al-Ṭūsī p.347; R. al-Barqī p.48, p.53], then of al-Riḍā [R. ibn Dāwud p.116; T. al-Fihrist p.96; R. al-Ṭūsī p.372], and finally, according to Ibn al-Nadīm as one of the associates of the son of al-Riḍā [Fihrist N p.309]. He was the author of many works: K. al-Maṣāḥif; K. al-Nawādir; several works on aspects of law [T. al-Fihrist p.96]. According to T. al-Fihrist, Ibn al-Nadīm added some titles to these including K. al-Tafsīr and K. al-Ṣaḥīḥ [T. al-Fihrist p.97; Fihrist N p.309]. All of his books in T. al-Fihrist are transmitted by ʿAbd b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsā, Muṣāwiyā b. Ḥakīm and Ibn Masrūq. Ibn Maḥbūb’s name al-Zarrād is explained as a reference to his ancestor Wahb, who was a slave from Sind who appealed to ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib to set him free [Ikhtiyār p.584, n.1094]. Al-Riḍā, on hearing this applied to him, said that he should be called al-Sarrād instead [Ikhtiyār p.585 n.1095]. Several comments are recorded about his authorities and those he reported to. He reported from Khālid b. Jarīr al-Bajālī who is regarded as sāliḥ [Ikhtiyār p.346, n.642], but his reports from Ibn Abī Ḥamza were regarded as suspect [Ikhtiyār p.585, n.1095]. This doubtful link was given as a reason by ʿAbd b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsā for not relating from Ibn Maḥbūb [Ikhtiyār p.512, n.989]. Allegations were made that Ibn Maḥbūb’s father rewarded him with a dirham for every hadith he wrote down from ʿAlī b. Riʿāb.
Indeed Ibn Maḥbūb transmits the book of Ibn Ri′āb to Ṭalib b. Muḥammad [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.221]. Al-Faḍl b. Shādhān claimed him as a source [Ikhtiyār p.543, n.1029] and Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. ʿUbayd was the youngest to have reported on his authority [Ikhtiyār p.537, n.1021]. His transmission of works in Ṭ.al-Fihrist is huge – almost thirty works, most of which are relayed to Ibn Abī ʿUmayr or Ḥamad b. Muḥammad. He died in 224 aged seventy five [R. ibn Dawūd p.116; R. al-Ṭūsī p.372; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.96]. Also listed in Maʿālim p.28.

AL-ḤASAN B MŪSĀ B BĀBĀ

Known sometimes simply as Ibn Bābā, al-Qūmī, he is recorded as a follower of al-Ḥādi and al-ʿAskari [R. ibn Dawūd p.442, n.130; R. al-Ṭūsī p.414, p.430]. He is also referred to as Ibn Yāya [R. ibn Dawūd p.442]. He is considered to have been ghālin [R. ibn Dawūd p.442; R. al-Ṭūsī p.414]. He was cursed by al-Ḥādi for alleging that the Imām had sent him as his bāb and that he was a prophet [Ikhtiyār p.520, n.999 which refers to him as al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad]. Sahl b. Muḥammad asked about him and was told to avoid both him and Fāris (b. Hātim) [Ikhtiyār p.528, n.1011]. No works by him are recorded.

AL-ḤASAN B MŪSĀ AL-KHASHSHĀB

He is recorded as a follower of al-Riḍā [R. ibn Dawūd p.119], and as one of the most well known and prominent members of the Imāmites [R. al-Najāshī p.33]. Several works are recorded; K. al-Radd ʿala al-Waqifa; K. al-Nawādir. He was also said to have written a work on the bālī and on the Prophets [R. al-Najāshī p.33]. Other sources record only that he wrote one work [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.98, n.207; Maʿālim p.29]. He is a prolific reporter in Ikhtiyār from many sources, principally to Ḥamdawayh. On one occasion he was in Medina with al-Jawād along with ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar when the latter explained to someone that the child was the wāṣf of the Prophet [Ikhtiyār pp.429-30, n.804]. See also al-Māmaqānī I, pp.311-2, n.2667 where he is described as Ḥasan.

AL-ḤASAN B NAQR

Identified possibly as Abū ʿAwān al-Abrash, he is recorded as a follower of al-ʿAskari and as madhmūm [R. ibn Dawūd p.568, n.22; R. al-Ṭūsī p.430]. He wrote on behalf of some of the Shiʿa asking about Abū Ḥāmid, Ḥamad
b. Ibrāhīm and received an answer which praised him [Ikhtiyār p.534, n.1019]. It was he who criticised the behaviour of al-‘Askārī at the funeral of al-Hādī, when he tore his clothes in grief. Abū ‘Awn was of the opinion that there was no precedent for this [Ikhtiyār p.572, n.1084]. The Imām replied to the criticism by quoting the precedent of Moses, and also predicted that Abū ‘Awn would die having lost his reason [Ikhtiyār pp.572-3, n.1085]. Under the name Abū ‘Awn he is recorded in al-Māmāqānī as having a weak reputation [I, p. 313, n.2677], but another person of the same name is said to be Ḥasan if not thiqā and later one of the wukālā' of the holy area during the ghayba [I, p.312, n.2675?

**AL-ḤASAN B RĀSHID**

There is some confusion over this person, a similar name being found amongst the followers of al-Ṣādiq who was a wazīr of al-Mahdī and very weak [R.ībn Dāwūd p.435 n.117]. Our Ḥasan, however, is Abū ‘Alī mawla ʿĀl al-Muhallāb from Baghdād one of rifāl al-Jawād and thiqā [R.ībn Dāwūd p.106 n.407; R.āl-Tūsī p.400]. R.āl-Barqī [p.25,p.48] lists the details only of the former as does T.āl-Fihrist [p.88 n.175] the latter stating that he was weak and corrupt. The follower of al-Jawād is also listed as follower of al-Hādī [R.āl-Tūsī p.413]. He might be one Abū ‘Alī b. Rāshīd who was later involved in the wukāla' under al-‘Askārī. He reports in Ikhtiyār to Ibn al-Rayyān [Ikhtiyār p.152 n.248] and the index indicates the belief that al-Ḥasan is identifiable with Abū ‘Alī b. Rāshīd. [R.āl-Najāshī p.29 lists one under this name as al-Ṭafāwī weak with one book being known which was good and contained much knowledge - Kāl-Nawādir]. Further references: al-Māmāqānī I, p.276, n.2433: Ma-shāлим p.31.

SEE UNDER ABŪ ‘ALĪ B RĀSHID

**AL-ḤASAN B SA‘ĪD**

Ibn Ḥammād b. Mihrān, al-Ahwāzī, Abū Muḥammad, who was thiqā and whose brother reported all that he wrote and more. Al-Ḥasan was said to have written fifty works [R.ībn Dāwūd p.107, n.414; R.āl-Barqī p.54]. He is recorded as a follower of al-Riḍā [R.ībn Dāwūd p.107; R.āl-Barqī p.54], and al-Jawād [R.āl-Tūsī p.399]. He is also recorded as Ibn Ḥammād b. Sa‘īd b. Mihrān [T.āl-Fihrist p.90, n.179]. He moved from
Kūfa to al-Ahwāz and thence to Qumm where he stayed with al-Ḥasan b. Abān. His brother died there [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.104]. He is considered thīqa [Ikhtiyār p.508, n.980; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.90; Maṣālim p.31; R.i bn Dāwud p.107]. A non Shī‘ite source says that he had a wide breadth of knowledge in fīqh, āthār, manāqib etc, and lists him as a follower of al-Jawād [Fihrist N p.310]. He was the one who brought Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm and ʿAll b. al-Rayyān after him to al-‘Ilāma and was the reason for them recognising the cause. He was said to have over fifty works to his name [Ikhtiyār pp.551-2, n.1041]. These works may have been in joint authorship with his brother, for none are actually recorded under his sole name. See also al-Māmaqānī I, pp.282-3, n.2457 where he is also said to be thīqa.

ḤAYYĀN AL-SARRĀJ
The only Ḥayyān listed amongst the Imām’s followers was said to be Kaysanite in his beliefs [R.i bn Dāwud p.451, n.164], and indeed, several accounts are given of his debating the standing of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanāfiyya with al-Ṣādiq [Ikhtiyār pp.314-5, nos 568-70]. However, the index to Ikhtiyār insists that the Kaysanite is not the same person as was later wakīl of al-Kāẓim. He accepted 30,000 dinārs from the Ashʿābī as the zakāt on their wealth and refused to pass it over to al-‘Ilāma on al-Kāẓim’s death, claiming him to be al-Qā‘im [Ikhtiyār pp.459-60, n.871]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I p.383, n.3480 as weak.

HISHĀM B AL-ḤAKAM
Abū Muḥammad, mawla Ḳinda [R.i bn Dāwud p.367, n.1643; R.al-Najāshī p.338]. He is recorded as a follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim [R.al-Barqī p.35, p.48; R.i bn Dāwud p.367]. He met both Imāms and reported many ḥadīths from them [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.356]. He moved from Kūfa to Baghdād in 199 A.H. and was said to have died there in the same year [R.i bn Dāwud p.367; R.al-Najāshī p.338; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.356]. He may also have been a mawla of Banū Shaybān [R.al-Najāshī p.338; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.356]. He was born in Kūfa, raised in Wāṣīt, but since his trade was in Baghdād, he moved there late in life [R.al-Najāshī p.338]. He lived in al-Karkh [R.i bn Dāwud p.367; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.356], in Qaṣr Wadāḥ [R.i bn Dāwud p.367; R.al-Najāshī p.338], in Darb al-Jubb [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.356]. R.i bn Dāwud says that he originally held
opinions of the Jahmiyya, but then saw the light [p.367]. He was praised by both Imāms and he engaged in discussions on the Imāmate, being skilful in his debating [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.356; R. ibn Dāwud p.367]. He was associated with Yahyā b. Khālid b. Barmak, attending his debates. He died, some say, shortly after the downfall of the Barmakids, or possibly under al-Ma'mūn [R. ibn Dāwud p.368]. One opinion says that he was a pupil of a zindiq, Abū Shākir, although Ibn Dāwud does not agree with this because of the constant praise he received [R. ibn Dāwud p.368]. Al-Barqī apparently records him as a pupil of this zindiq [R. ibn Dāwud p.525, n.531]. He died in 179 A.H. (992 A.D. or 997). Murūj reports that, as a shaykh of the Imāmiyya, he took part in the mājudsī of the Barmakids [III, p.272]. Further discussions with Abū al-Hudhayfī [IV, p.21] and “Amr b. ʿUbayd [IV, p.22] are also recorded. Hishām was referred to as a shaykh of the Rāfdī and the Mujassima [which was not held to be equivalent to tashbīh; IV, p.21]. His debate with “Amr was on the Imāmate, Hishām arguing that it should be held through nass, “Amr that it was the choice of the Umma [p.22]. Fihrist.N records him as a mutakallim of the Shiʿa Imāmiyya, an early associate of al-Jahm b. Ṣafwān before joining the Imāmīs [Fihrist.N appendix p.7]. It lists his works as found in other sources [Fihrist.N p.249]. A long list of works is recorded in Ṭ. al-Fihrist a large number being refutations of various other groups or individuals; Hishām al-Jawālīqī; Shayṭān al-Ṭaq; asbāb al-Ṭabāʾī; al-Zanādīq; asbāb al-Ithnayn; man Qāla bi Imāmat al-Maḏqūl; man ankara al-Waṣiyya; al-Muṭṭazils fī Amr Taḥṣa wa al-Zubayr. Other works include; K. al-Tawḥīd; K. Ikhtiyār fī al-Imām, K. al-Jabr wa al-Qadr; K. al-Iṣtiʿaʿa; K. al-Dalāla “alā Ḥudūth al-Asyāʾ [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.355]. R. al-Najjasī adds K. al-Maʿrīfa and K. al-Maḏālis fī al-Imāma [R. al-Najjasī p.338], and Maʿṣūm adds Ithbāt al-Ḥuṣayn “alā man khālīfa al-Shīʿa [Maʿṣūm pp.115-6]. Reports about him, his associates, and his views in sources such as Ikhtiyār are beyond the scope of this index. See also Maqālāt, E.I, and Ikhtiyār [nos 475-500, pp.255-80].

HISHĀM B SĀLĪM

from both these Imāms and was considered thīqa. His works are reported via Ibn Abī ʿUmayr; K. al-Ḥaẓīl; K. al-Tafsīr; K. al-Mīrāj (R. al-Najashi p.338). In Ṭal-Fihrist one book is reported via Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā and Ibn Abī ʿUmayr (Ṭal-Fihrist p.356, n.772). He argued with Ḥishām b. al-Ḥakam, the latter writing a refutation of his views [see above]. Reports of his views and associates in Ikhtiyār are again beyond the scope of this index to analyse. See Ikhtiyār pp.279-81, nos.500-4 and Ikhtiyār index for further references. Also Maṣālim p.116.

ḤUJR B ZĀIDA
Al-Ḥaramī, Abū ʿAbdallāh, thīqa, shābīh al-madhhab and listed as a follower of al-Ṣādiq (R. al-Barqī p.46; Ṭal-Fihrist p.100, n.381; Ṭal-Fihrist p.84, n.165; R. al-Najashi p.114). Elsewhere it is suggested he was weak [R. ibn Dāwud p.437, n.106]. He reported from al-Ṣādiq, and al-Bāqir and wrote one book reported to ʿAbdallāh b. Miskān (Ṭal-Fihrist p.84; R. al-Najashi p.114). He was critical of al-Mufaḍḍal b. ʿUmar and objected to some of his views concerning the powers of the Imām. On one occasion he is told to reject these views and avoid al-Mufaḍḍal [Ikhtiyār p.323, n.587]; on another his own objections are dismissed [Ikhtiyār p.321, n.583; p.326, n.592]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I p.255, n.2364; Maṣālim p.38.

AL-ḤUSAYN B ʿAḤMAD AL-ṬAYMĪ
He reports an incident during the caliphate of al-Maʿmūn when al-Jawād sends for a blood-letter and shows extensive anatomical knowledge (Biḥār L p.57, n.31). He is difficult to identify, the closest being al-Minqarī, al-Tamīmī who is listed as a follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Ḵāzin (R. al-Barqī p.50; R. ibn Dāwud p.443; Ṭal-Fihrist p.101; R. al-Najashi p.42; R. al-Ṭūsī p.347) who was weak and whose accounts were irregular. He may be too early to be identified as the above.

AL-ḤUSAYN B ʿALĪ B YAQTĪN
Recorded as a follower of al-Ḵāzin (R. al-Barqī p.51), and as having reported from his father (Ṭal-Fihrist p.235), he is only further listed under the name of his brother al-Ḥasan as thīqa and a follower of

**AL-ḤUSAYN B BASHSHĀR**

This figure causes some confusion, appearing in isnāds variously as al-Ḥusayn b. Bashshār (al-Irshād p.482), al-Ḥusayn b. Yāṣūr (Biḥār L p.34, n.19) and al-Ḥasan b. Bashshār (Ithbāt p.210). Under these and one further variation, this person is listed in the riḍāl sources as: [a] al-Ḥusayn b. Bashshār, a follower of al-Jawād (R. al-Barqī p.56) and of al-Kāẓim and al-Riḍā (R. al-Ṭūsī p.347); [b] al-Ḥasan b. Bashshār al-Mādā‘īnī a wāqīfīte who repented and was thiqā, a follower of al-Kāẓim and al-Riḍā (R. ibn Dāwud p.104; R. al-Ṭūsī p.347); [c] al-Ḥusayn b. Yāṣūr listed as both a follower of al-Kāẓim (R. al-Barqī p.49) and of al-Jawād (R. al-Ṭūsī p.400). Whether they are all the same person or not is impossible to determine there being no further information available. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I p.322, n.2752.

**AL-ḤUSAYN B MUḤAMMAD AL-MADĀ‘ĪNĪ**

He is recorded as a follower of al-Jawād and al-Hādī (R. al-Barqī p.57, p.58; R. al-Ṭūsī p.413), but no further information is recorded.

**AL-ḤUSAYN B MUSAḤ B AL-ḤASAN**

He is recorded as one of the thiqāt of al-Jawād (Biḥār L p.106, n.24) which only one other source agrees with (R. al-Barqī p.56). One Ḥusayn b. Musāḥ is given as a follower of al-Jawād in R. al-Ṭūsī (p.406). Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I p.345, n.3068 which records him as unknown.

**AL-ḤUSAYN B QAYĀMĀ/QIYĀMĀ**

He is responsible for the accounts of arguments, either written or in person, with al-Riḍā over his lack of heir and the damage thereby done to his Imāmat. As al-Ḥusayn he is recorded as a follower of al-Kāẓim who argued with al-Riḍā (R. ibn Dāwud p.445, n.143) and as a wāqīfīte who did not recognise al-Riḍā (R. al-Ṭūsī p.348). In the isnāds of his accounts he is referred to as ibn Qayāmā, sometimes with the additional nisba of al-Wāṣītī (al-Irshād p.482; al-Kāfī I p.321, n.7). Under this name he is recorded as questioning al-Riḍā about his
lack of heir and the implications of this [Ikhtiyår p.553, n.1044]. He was then cursed by al-Ridā because of his views [Ikhtiyår pp.553-4, n.1045]. Similar questions about the status of al-Kāzīm, particularly in the light of reports on the authority of al-Ṣādiq, are put to al-Ridā by al-Ḥasan b. Qayāmā al-Ṣayrāfī who, since he is not listed in riḍā sources under this name, may be identical with al-Ḥusayn [Ikhtiyår pp.475-6, nos 902, 904]. Also listed in al-Maṣmaṭān I p.341, n.3030 as weak.

AL-ḤUSAYN B ṢA‘ĪD

Ibn Ḥammād b. Mihrān al-Ahwāzī, a mawla of ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, originally Kufan, he moved to al-Ahwāz and then to Qumm where he died [R.ʿibn ʿDāwūd p.123, n.473]. He is listed as a follower of al-Ridā, al-Jawād and al-Hādī [R.ʿibn ʿDāwūd p.123; R.ʿal-Ṭūsī p.399, p.412; R.ʿal-Barqī p.54]. He was a prolific author reporting from al-Ridā and having over thirty books attributed to him [R.ʿibn ʿDāwūd p.123; Maṣālim p.35]. He is said to have been co-author with his brother al-Ḥasan in these thirty works [R.ʿal-Najashi p.46]. Many of their works are on legal aspects such as prayer, zakāt, the khums etc. They also include K. ʿal-Radd ʿalā al-Ghālibī [Maṣālim p.35]; K. ʿal-Taqiyya, and K. ʿal-Waṣāyā [R.ʿal-Najashi p.46]. The books are reported by al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan b. Abān, the son of the person with whom the two brothers stayed on their arrival in Qumm, and ʿAbd b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsā [Ṭ.ʿal-Fihirist p.104, n.225]. Fihirist.N also records al-Ḥusayn and his brother among the learned authors of the Shiʿa [Fihirist.N p.310]. Al-Ḥusayn is listed as one of those who reported from Muḥammad b. Ṣinān [Ikhtiyår p.508, n.980]. See also al-Maṣmaṭān I, pp.328-9, n.2817.

IBRĀHĪM B ʿABDĀ AL-NISĀBŪRĪ

Possibly Ibrahim b. ʿAbda [R.ʿibn ʿDāwūd p.16; R.ʿal-Ṭūsī p.410], he is listed as a follower of al-Jawād [R.ʿal-Barqī p.57 as Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihī], of al-Hādī [R.ʿal-Ṭūsī p.410], and possibly also of al-ʿAskarī [R.ʿibn ʿDāwūd p.16, n.26]. He was a wakil of Abū Muḥammad who ordered that he should be obeyed [R.ʿibn ʿDāwūd p.16, n.26]. Ibrahim was appointed as wakil by a letter of Abū Muḥammad [Ikhtiyår p.580, n.1089; p.509, n.983], and a further letter was sent to ʿAbdallāh b. Ḥamdawayh to
inform him of this [Ikhtiyār pp.580-1]. The appointment is also mentioned in another hadith [Ikhtiyār p.575, n.1088], and his name also occurs elsewhere [Ikhtiyār p.544, n.1029].

IBRĀḤĪM B AḤĪ AL-BĪLĀD

Listed as a follower of al-Kāẓim and al-Riqā [R.al-Barqî p.48, p.55; R.al-Ṭūsî p.342, p.368] and as a follower of al-Ṣādiq [R.Ibn Dāwūd p.12, n.9; R.al-Ṭūsî p.145]. He was Kufan and thiqā; his kunya was Abū Ismā‘īl. His father's name was Yaḥyā b. Sulaym or Sulaymān [R.Ibn Dāwūd p.12; R.al-Najashi p.18], a mawla of Banī ābdallāh b. ʿAfīn. His father was blind, but reported from the Imāms from al-Baqīr through to al-Riqā. Al-Riqā wrote to Ibrāhīm praising him [R.al-Najashi p.18]. He wrote one book which was relayed via Muḥammad b. Saḥl b. al-Yasā [R.al-Najashi p.18; T.al-Fihrist pp.9-10, n.8]. Abī b. Asbāḥ reports that the Imām spoke of him in good terms without being asked what he thought of him [Ikhtiyār p.504, n.969]. His contribution to accounts of al-Jawād is a highly believable account of his meeting with the Imām and the conversation between them [Bihār L p.101, n.13]. He used to lead his father who was blind [Ikhtiyār p.352, n.659]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I, p.10, n.40 as thiqā.

IBRĀḤĪM B AḤĪ MAḤMŪD

Al-Khurāsānī, he is recorded as a follower of al-Kāẓim [R.al-Barqî p.52], and of al-Riqā [R.Ibn Dāwūd p.13, n.13] from whom he reported [R.al-Najashi pp.19-20]. He was considered to be thiqā [R.Ibn Dāwūd p.13; R.al-Najashi p.19]. He wrote one book of Masāʾil which was reported by Abī mad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā [T.al-Fihrist p.10; R.al-Najashi pp.19-20]. He delivered a letter to al-Jawād from his father and was promised paradise by him as he had been by al-Riqā [Ikhtiyār p.567, n.1073]. Ikhtiyār adds the information that he was blind and that he lived after al-Riqā [Ikhtiyār p.567, nos. 1072-3]. See also al-Māmaqānī I, p.12, n.52 and Maṣāʾīl p.5.

IBRĀḤĪM B DĀWUD AL-YAʿQĪBĪ

Recorded as a follower of al-Jawād and al-Hādī [R.al-Barqî p.57, p.60; R.al-Ṭūsî p.397, p.410]. Other than this he is only mentioned writing
to the Imam for information about Fāris b. Ḥātim and receiving instructions back [Ikhhtiyār p.522, n.1002].

**IBRĀHĪM B ḤĀSHIM**

Abū Ishāq, al-Qummi who was originally from Kūfah but moved to Qumm and was said to have been the first to spread the hadiths of Kūfah in Qumm [R. ibn Dāwūd p.20, n.43; T. al-Fihrist p.19, n.31; R. al-Najashi p.13]. He is listed as a follower of al-Jawād [R. ibn Dāwūd p.20], but also as a follower of al-Riḍā [R. al-Ṭūsī p.369]. He was a pupil of Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān [R. al-Ṭūsī p.369; R. ibn Dāwūd p.20; R. al-Najashi p.13]. Only two of his own works are listed: K. al-Nawādir and K. Qajdyd Amīr al-Muʾminīn, both reported to his son ʿAli [T. al-Fihrist p.19; R. al-Najashi p.13; Maṣālim p.3]. However, in T. al-Fihrist he reports the works of several major figures, the majority from Ibn ʿAbī cUmayr, which he then passed on to al-Ṣaffār. They include the works of ʿAbdallāh b. Sinān [1921], Hishām b. Sālim [p.356], of Ibn Abī ʿUmayr himself [p.266], and the works of Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān which he reported directly [p.367]. In Ikhhtiyār his main link is to Muḥammad b. ʿAḥmad b. Yaḥyā. In other works he transmits frequently to his son ʿAli i.e. for al-Kāẓim, al-Jawād and al-Hādi he reports a story of nass to his son [al-Kāfi I, p.309, p.322, p.323]. For al-Jawād his reports are possibly questionable. He appears in one of the Ḥisnāds for the dubious story about the killing of al-Jawād by the caliph when al-Jawād was supposed to have remained untouched [Bihār L pp.95-8, n.9]. He spoke of al-Jawād answering thousands of legal questions [Bihār L p.93, n.6] and related one version of the gathering of scholars on the hadīth to test the boy [Bihār L p.85, n.1]. In addition, versions of the betrothal testing which give more than the name of al-Rayyān b. Shabīb as the source, say that it was transmitted by him to Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim and thence to his son. The only different Ḥisnād is in Taṣāl al-Qummi, ʿAli b. Ibrāhīm's own work. Ibrāhīm reports some accounts of the events of al-Riḍā's life from al-Rayyān b. al-Ṣaʿīd in ʿUyun R., as does his son ʿAli. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I, pp.39-42, n.217.

**IBRĀHĪM B ISHĀQ**

Recorded as one of the āṣab of al-Hādi in Bihār, he is also recorded elsewhere as one of his followers and thilqā [R. al-Barqī p.59; R. al-Ṭūsī
p.409). The name occurs in some sources with the nisba al-AhmarI [R.al-Najashi p.15; T.al-Fihrist pp.10-11], and in others as al-Nihawandi [Ma'alim p.5; Ikhtiyar p.512 n.989], but an identification of the correct person is not possible.

**IBRAHIM B MAHZIYAR**

Al-Ahwazi, Abū Ishāq who did not report from the Imāms directly, but was māmdūh [R.ibn Dāwud p.19, n.39; R.al-Ṭūsī p.399; R.al-Najashi p.13]. He is recorded as a follower of al-Jawād and al-HādI [R.al-Ṭūsī p.399, p.410]. He is said to have been of the sufara' of the Imām al-MahdI, and one whose hadiths were to be trusted [R.al-Ṭūsī p.399]. He wrote one work himself [R.al-Najashi p.13] and reported that of his brother the well known <Ali b. Mahziyar [T.al-Fihrist p.232]. He had a son Muḥammad [Ikhtiyar index] to whom he entrusted some money on his deathbed together with instructions on how to recognise the person to whom it should be given [Ikhtiyar p.531, n.1015]. This person was Ḥafṣ b. Amr al-Askari, a wakīl of al-Askari [R.ibn Dāwud p.129; R.al-Ṭūsī p.430] whose own son Muḥammad was also a wakīl [R.al-Ṭūsī p.436; R.ibn Dāwud p.308]. Ibrahim reports Khayrān asking for advice about money he has received [Ikhtiyar p.610, n.1133; Bihār L p.107, n.26; see also text] and recounts the meeting of himself and his brother with al-HādI [Bihār L p.131, n.13]. Also listed in al-ḥāmaqānī I, p.356, n.210 as thīqa.

**IBRAHIM B MUḤAMMAD AL-HAMDĀNĪ**

Listed as a follower of al-Rīḍā, al-Jawād and al-HādI [R.al-Barqi p.54, p.56, p.58; R.al-Ṭūsī p.369, p.409], and as a wakīl of al-Askari [R.ibn Dāwud p.18, n.35]. He allegedly met al-Rīḍā [R.al-Ṭūsī p.397]. His family represented the Imāms in Hamdān for many years i.e. his grandson Muḥammad b. <Ali who occupied the position with two others in the area [R.al-Najashi p.264]. Ibrahim is named amongst a group considered thīqa by the Imām [Ikhtiyar p.557, n.1053]. He seems to have been in contact with the Imām by letter quite frequently. He wrote to al-Jawād for advice in dealing with al-SāmI [Ikhtiyar p.611, n.1135], and received a communication from al-HādI confirming receipt of the accounts and informing him that letters had been sent to other parties in the area, including al-Naqīr and Ayyūb, confirming him as the sole
representative who should be obeyed [Ikhtiyār pp.611–2, n.1136]. He sent a letter with his son Ja'far to al-Hādī in 248 again seeking advice, this time about the disagreement between al-Qazwīnī and al-ʿAlī. To whom should they look to meet their needs [Ikhtiyār p.527, n.1009]. Another report of this comes from another grandson, Mūsā b. Ja'far which is much clearer in its description of the incident [Ikhtiyār p.523, n.1005]. Ibrāhīm's own son Muḥammad offered his daughter in marriage to Abū al-Ḥasan while on the hajj but, although the Imām accepted, she died on the road to Medina [Ikhtiyār p.608, n.1131]. The family has very strong connections to the Imāms from the time of al-Jawād onwards. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I, p.33, n.200. See also in the text Chapters Eight and Nine.

Ibrāhīm b. Salām
Al-Nishābūrī, listed as a follower of al-Riḍā and a wakīl [R. ibn Dāwūd p.14, n.201]. Alternative opinion names him as Ibn Salāma [R. ibn Dāwūd p.14; R. al-Ṭūsī p.367], and suggests he was a follower of al-Kāẓim or even al-Jawād, but the first information is considered correct. The only other possible reference to him may be in Maqātil where he is part of two isnāds for stories relating to Ibrāhīm b. ʿAbdallāh b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan [p.343, p.358]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I pp.17–18, n.104 as ṣhīqa.

Ibrāhīm b. Shayba
He is listed as a follower of al-Jawād [R. al-Barqī p.56], and wrote to the Imām al-Hādī about a difference of opinion over certain hadīths which were being interpreted as referring to a person and not to the actual Islamic duties as they should do. Certain people were also claiming to be the representatives of the Imām and asserting their authority, these being ʿAlī b. Ḥaska and al-Qāsim al-Yaqṭīnī [Ikhtiyār p.517, n.995]. No further information about Ibrāhīm is recorded.

ʿIsā b. Ja'far b. ʿĀṣim
He is recorded as a follower of al-Kāẓim and māmūḥ who was beaten and thrown in the river. Muḥammad b. al-Abārāj asked al-Hādī about him and others, and the Imām blessed him [R. ibn Dāwūd p.266, n.1146;
Ikhtiyār p. 603, n. 11221. No further information is recorded. See also al-Māmaqānī II, p. 359, n. 3288 which records him as thīqa.

ISHĀQ B IBRĀHĪM AL-ḤUḌAYNYI
He is listed as a follower of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād [R. al-Barqī p. 54, p. 56] who met al-Riḍā [R. al-Tūsī p. 379] and was his wakīl [R. ibn Dāwūd p. 51, n. 156]. Other than this little information is recorded. He may have had a brother Muḥammad [Ikhtiyār p. 563, n. 1064]. He was introduced to al-Riḍā and the Shi‘īte cause by al-Ḥasan b. Sa‘īd [Ikhtiyār p. 552, n. 1041] and reported to ‘Ali b. Mahzayyar the reaction of Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān to al-Riḍā’s acceptance of the position of heir to the caliph [Ikhtiyār p. 493, n. 944]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I, p. 110, n. 642 as thīqa.

ISHĀQ B ISMĀ‘ĪL B MAWBAKHT
He reports one story about al-Jawād and that to the dubious Muḥammad b. ‘Ali al-Shāmīghānī [Bihār L p. 58 n. 34; Ithbāt p. 215;].

The rijāl sources are fairly silent on him - only two recording him as a follower of the Imāms. They agree that he was a follower of al-Hādī [R. al-Barqī p. 60; R. al-Tūsī p. 411]. It is curious that he is listed in R. al-Barqī but is absent from R. ibn Dāwūd. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I, p. 111, n. 638 as unknown.

ISHĀQ B ISMĀ‘ĪL AL-NĪṢĀBŪRĪ
He is recorded in one place as one of the asḥāb of al-Jawād [Bihār L p. 106, n. 24], yet elsewhere only amongst the followers of al-‘Askarī [R. ibn Dāwūd p. 51, n. 157; R. al-Barqī p. 51; R. al-Tūsī p. 428], and as thīqa, mamdūh [R. ibn Dāwūd p. 51; R. al-Tūsī p. 428]. Abū Muḥammad wrote a very long tawqī‘ to him [Ikhtiyār pp. 575-80, n. 1088]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I, p. 111, n. 670 as thīqa.

ISHĀQ B MUḤAMMAD AL-BAṢRĪ
Abū Ya‘qūb, recorded as a follower of al-Jawād who was ghālin and corrupt in his beliefs [R. ibn Dāwūd p. 426, n. 51]. In Ikhtiyār Muḥammad b. Mas‘ūd considers him to be ghālin, for when he went to study with him, he showed him a book from al-Mufaḍḍal b. ʿUmar on tafwīd. When Muḥammad rejected it, Ishāq brought out more acceptable books from the
thiqāt [Ikhtiyār pp.530-1, n.1014]. He reports many stories in Ikhtiyār to Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbāḥ, and his name occurs in some of the isnāds of the ghulāt e.g. Ikhtiyār n.584; other names connected are Muḥammad b. Jumhūr, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Shammūn and Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh b. Mihrān. Al-Māmaqānī gives a mixed report on him; some opinion held that he was weak, accused of ghuluw concerning tafwīd and the ability of the Imāms to provide for the believers. The conclusion drawn by this later source is that in his own time he did indeed hold extreme views, but that in contemporary terms he did not. A similar situation existed, according to the source, concerning the denial of inadvertent error [I, p.121, n.689].

JA-FAR B MUḤAMMAD B ḤAKĪM

His major contribution is an account of the debate which took place between Hishām b. al-ŷakam and Hishām b. Sālim along with over fifteen other Shiʿites on the subject of God's attributes [Ikhtiyār p.279 n.500]. A further story is of the opinion that he was 'of no consequence' [Ikhtiyār p.545 n.1031] In Ikhtiyār he reports almost all his stories from Abān b. ʿUthmān to al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Khashshāb. He is listed amongst the followers of al-Kāẓim [R.al-Barqî p.49; R.al-Tūsī p.345], but is said to have been criticised [R.ibn Dāwūd p.434 n.91] He is the son, presumably, of Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm [see below]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī I, pp.223-4, n.1784.

JA-FAR B MUḤAMMAD AL-NAWFĀLĪ

He may be recorded in the sources, but none of the possible figures have the nisba al-Nawfālī, and it is therefore impossible to make a positive identification. He is, however, listed in al-Māmaqānī I, p.227, n.1880 as Ḥasan.

JA-FAR B MUḤAMMAD B YŪNUS

He is listed as amongst the thiqāt of al-Jawād in Bihār [p.106, n.24]. Al-Aḥwāl, al-Sayrāfī, mawālī Bajila [T.al-Fihrist pp.78-9; R.al-Najāshī p.93]. He has a sound reputation, thiqā and fādil, with the added detail that he was a linguist and grammarian [R.ibn Dāwūd p.89, n.330]. He is recorded principally as a follower of al-Jawād [R.al-Barqî p.56; T.al-Fihrist p89; R.al-Tūsī p.399], but also of al-Hādī [R.al-Tūsī
p.412]. He reported from al-Jawād to Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʾĪsā and wrote one work - K. al-Nawādir [R.al-Najāshī p.93]. Several of the Shiʿa came to see him with notes containing answers to their questions, except for the wāqifite whose paper was blank [Ikhtiyār p.461, n.877]. Also listed in al-Māmaqānī [I, p.227, n.1884] as thīqa, and in Maṣūlim [p.26].

JAṢFA B SUHAYL AL-ṢAYQAL

He is recorded as a follower of al-ʿAskarī [R.al-Ṭūsī p.429; R.ibn Dāwūd p.85, n.305] and as wakīl of both al-Ḥādi and al-ʿAskarī [R.ibn Dāwūd p.85; R.al-Ṭūsī p.429]. No further information is recorded.

JUMAYL B DARRĀJ

[ibn] ʿAbdallāh, Abū ʿAli, al-Nakhaʾī, of whom Ibn Faḍṣal said that he was a prominent member of this group and thīqa. He had a brother Nūḥ who was a qāḍī and was also one of the Shiʿa, but kept it hidden [R.al-Najāshī p.98; R.ibn Dāwūd p.92, n.342; T.al-Fiḥrist p.80]. He is recorded as a follower of al-Ṣādiq [R.al-Barqī p.21; R.al-Ṭūsī p.163] and al-Kāẓim [R.ibn Dāwūd p.92; R.al-Ṭūsī p.346]. It was agreed that what he reported was saḥīḥ and reliable [R.ibn Dāwūd p.92; T.al-Fiḥrist p.80, n.153; Ikhtiyār p.375, n.705]. He was older than Nūḥ and, after going blind later in life, died during the time of al-Riǧā [R.al-Najāshī p.98]. One book of his is recorded, reported via Ibn Abī ʿUmayr [R.al-Najāshī p.98] and Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā [T.al-Fiḥrist p.80], but also two others of joint authorship - one with Muḥammad b. Ḥumrān, the other with Mūrāzim b. Ḥakīm [R.al-Najāshī]. Jumayl expressed his admiration for Zurārā b. ʿAyyān on a couple of occasions and gave an account of his statement of his belief in the Imāms when on his deathbed [Ikhtiyār p.134, n.213; pp.154-5, n.252]. Ibn Abī ʿUmayr commented on his excessive devotion to carrying out his Islamic duties [Ikhtiyār p.211, n.373]. He took part in the Shiʿite debate on tawḥīd and God's attributes which was attended by many other prominent Shiʿites [Ikhtiyār p.279, n.500]. His brother Nūḥ, asked why he had entered their service [the administration?] replied that it was because of his brother who felt unable to attend the mosque because of lack of clothing [Ikhtiyār p.251, n.468]. In Maqāṭil he reports the age of
al-Hasan b. 'Ali when he died (p.76). Also listed in al-Mamaqani I, p.232, n.1933 as thiga.

KHAYRĀN AL-ASBĀTI

He may be the same person as below since a story about his visit to al-Hādi on the hajj and their conversation about al-Wāthiq and his successor is also reported by a Khayrān al-Khādim, mawlā Farā’īs Umm al-Wāthiq (Ithbāt p.223; al-Irshād p.499; al-Kāfī I, pp.498-9, n.1 Ḥalām p.1358; Bihār L, p.151, n.37). Al-Asbāti relays a very strange story concerning al-Ma’mūn allegedly killing al-Jawād in a drunken rage, but al-Jawād being alive the next day (Bihār L, p.99, n.11).

KHAYRĀN AL-KHĀDIM AL-QARĀTĪSĪ


KULTHUM/KULM B ĪMRĀN

She/He is the source of a dubious account of the transfer of inherited knowledge from al-Riḍā to his baby son (Ithbāt p.210; Bihār L, p.15, n.19). One Kulthum is listed as a follower of al-Hādi (R.al-Barqī p.62), and another separate reference is to Kulthum al-Karkhiyya also a follower of al-Hādi (R.al-Barqī p.62). The latter is also in R.al-Ṭūsī where she is said to report to Ṣ̄abd al-Rahmān al-Shāfi’ī whose name was Abīmad b. Dāwud al-Baghhdādi (R.al-Ṭūsī p.427; R. ibn Dāwud p.411, n.21). A positive identification is impossible. No information is recorded under the name Kulm.

MANŠŪR B YŪNUS BUZURJ

MU'ALLA B KHUNAYS
Al-Madani, Abû 'Abdallâh, a mawla of al-Sadiq, Kufan, who was weak and unreliable (R. ibn Dawkud p.516, n.490; R. al-Najashi p.327). He was a follower of al-Sadiq (R. al-Barqi p.25, 45; R. ibn Dawkud p.349, n.1548) who was killed by Dawkud b. 'Ali the governor of Mecca and Medina who himself died in 133 A.H. (al-Kamil, V, p.321). The governor denied responsibility for the killing, blaming it on al-Sayrafî, his chief of police (Ikhtiyâr p.379, n.710). On being brought to be executed for the killing, al-Sayrafî protested that he had been told to kill him, and was now being silenced himself (Ikhtiyâr pp.379-80, n.711; p.379, n.710). Al-Sadiq had previously warned Mu'allâ of the dangers of speaking too publicly about his beliefs (Ikhtiyâr pp.378-9, n.709) and an example is given of Mu'allâ's preaching (Ikhtiyâr pp.381-2, n.715). He went with 'Abdallâh b. Abî Ya'fûr on several commissions for the Imâm, one of which was to Egypt (Ikhtiyâr p.248, n.460). He disagreed with Ibn Abî Ya'fûr over the status of the Imâm, asserting that they were awliyâ' and amîrûmi (Ikhtiyâr p.247, n.456). He wrote one book reported via Šafwan (T. al-Fihrist p.334, n.730; R. al-Najashi p.327). See also al-Mâmaqâni, III, pp.230-2, n.11994.

MU'ALLA B MUHAMMAD
Al-Beşrî, Abû al-Hasan, whose hadiths and beliefs were confused (possibly insufficiently supported), some accounts being acceptable and others not on the grounds that he reported from some people who were recognised as weak (R. ibn Dawkud p.517, n.492; T. al-Fihrist p.335, n.731;
R. al-Najashi p.327]. Despite this several works are recorded; K. al-Inan; K. al-Kuf; K. al-Dalayl; K. al-Inama [T. al-Fihrist p.335; R. al-Najashi p.328]; K. al-Tafsir; K. Fadeli Amir al-Muminin; K. Qadayahu; K. Sirat al-Qa'im [R. al-Najashi p.328]. These works were all reported to al-Husayn b. Muqaffad b. EAmir. One further work was reported to Muqaffad b. Jumhur - K. al-Malabim [T. al-Fihrist p.335]. The two figures who report his works are strongly associated with him in his isnads in al-Kafi [II]. In virtually every case he transmits to al-Husayn b. Muqaffad from both sound reporters such as al-Washshah [approximately one third] and aAli b. Asbat [circa 5%], and from others associated with ghuluw such as Muqaffad b. Jumhur [circa 15%] and Muqaffad b. Awrama [circa 6%]. See also al-Mamaqani, III, p.233, n.12003; Maalim p.108

MU-AMMAR B KHALLAD

Sometimes vocalised Ma'mar [T. al-Fihrist p.336; R. al-Barqi p.53 follower of al-Kazim], b. Khallad b. Abi Khallad, al-Baghdadi, thiga [R. ibn Dauud p.349 n.1550; R. al-Najashi p.330; R. al-Tusi p.390] who reported from al-Ridai and wrote a K. al-Zuhd [T. al-Fihrist p.336; R. al-Najashi p.330] He reported several very direct forms of designation for al-Jawad [Bihr L p.36 n.25; IlAm p.346] to Muqaffad b. Jumhur and Ahmad b. Muqaffad [?]. Although he is the one credited with arranging an audience with al-Ridai for al-Rayyan b. al-Salt, and was therefore presumably in Khurasan with the Imam [IkhITYar p.547 n.1036, p.546 n.1035], he is also the source of a story which portrays al-Jawad informing him that his father had just died; al-Jawad having been left behind in Medina this must be impossible. [Bihr L p.64 n.40; Kashf p.216]. The latter story is the more dubious account. He apparently questioned Abu al-Hasan about those who accepted posts in government and received an answer quoted from al-Sadiq to the effect that 'aqiyya is part of my religion and that of my fathers.....[Wasail al-Shifa, XI, Bab.24, p.460, n.3 from al-Kafi]. He reports from al-Ridai in Muruj [III p.17]. Further references: al-Mamaqani III, p.234, n.12009; Maalim p.111.

MU'AWIY B HAK

Possibly vocalised as Huk Ibn Mu'awiy b. Ammar al-Duhni who
despite being *jall* al-qadr and later a follower of al-Riḍā, is also said to have held at one time *fūthū* views [R. ibn Dāwūd p.349, n.1554; R. ibn Dāwūd p.517, n.494]. He is also found in the lists of the followers of al-Jawād and al-Hāḍī, and as one who did not report directly from the Imāms [R. al-Ṭūsī p.406, p.423]. He has several works to his name on various legal matters; K. al-Ṭalāq; K. al-Hayāt; K. al-Farā'id [Ṭ.al-Fihrist pp.331-2, n.723; R.al-Najashi p.323]; K. al-Nikāh; K. al-Ḥudūd; K. al-Diyāt; Nawādir [R.al-Najashi p.323]. Ikhtiyār records only that he was amongst the *fāthiyā* of Kūfah, although he occurs in several *isnāds* reporting mainly to Ḥamdān b. Aḥmad [Ikhtiyār index]. He reports the book of Ibn Māḏūb [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.97]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, p.110, n.10633 and Maṣālim p.108.

**AL-MUFAQQAL B. 'UMAR**

Abū Muḥammad or Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Juṣfī, Kufan with an unsound reputation, being recorded as weak, corrupt in his beliefs, confused in his reports, and insignificant [R. al-Najashi p.326; R. ibn Dāwūd p.518, n.497]. He is listed as a follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim [R. ibn Dāwūd p.518; R. al-Barqī p.34; R. al-Ṭūsī p.360], but at one time was said to have been a follower of Abū al-Khaṭṭāb [R. ibn Dāwūd p.518; R.al-Najashi p.326]. Several works are attributed to him: K. Yawm wa Layla; K. Fikr; K. al-Bada' al-Khalq wa al-Hathth al-ṣāli al-ṣāhib; K. Waṣiyyya al-Mufaddal; K. al-Sharā'ī [R.al-Najashi p.326; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.337]. Despite his unsound reputation the Imāms seem to have supported him [R. ibn Dāwūd p.518]. He succeeded Ibn Aḥbā b. Ṣa'īd and ʿAmīr b. Jadhār on one occasion [Ikhtiyār pp.248, n.461], and was turned to by one of the Shi'a as a source of guidance [Ikhtiyār p.135, n.216]. However, many complaints were directed against him by Ḥujr b. Zā'ida and ʿAmīr b. Jadhār on one occasion [Ikhtiyār pp.321-2, n.583], and again by a larger group of prominent people including Muḥammad b. Muslim and Zūrār b. Bukayr (?) on another [Ikhtiyār p.326, n.592]. Their objections were directed at his extreme ideas and his associations with extremists [Ikhtiyār p.326, n.591; pp.326-7, n.592; p.323, n.587]. He was reprimanded by al-Ṣādiq at one point for his involvement with Ismā'īl b. al-Ṣādiq, about whom al-Mufaddal had spread the report that he would be the next Imām [Ikhtiyār p.325,
Al-Ṣādiq cursed him for endangering his son's life [Ikhtiyār p.323, n.586]. Despite these complaints, which later authors attribute to the period when he held Khattabī views later renounced [R. ibn Dāwud p.518], he is recorded as the representative of three Imāms and the sole channel for gifts and dues sent to them [Ghayba, p.224]. His extreme views include the discussion of rububiyya and the rīza provided by the Imāms [Ikhtiyār p.326, n.591]. Some of these reports are found in the books of the Ṭayyāra al-Ghālīy a [Ikhtiyār p.324, n.588]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, pp.238-42, n.12084; Maʿālim p.110.

AL-MUḤTĀR B ZIYĀD AL-BĀṢRĪ
He is listed as one of the thiqāt of al-Jawād [Bihār L, p.106, n.24], al-ʿAbdī, al-Baṣrī. He is recorded in only two other sources as a follower of al-Jawād and thiqā with no further details [R. ibn Dāwud p.342, n.1511; R. al-Ṭūsī p.406]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, p.206, n.11577.

MUḤAMMAD B ʿABDALLĀH B MIHRĀN
Abū Jaʿfar, al-Karkhī [R. al-Najāṣī p.270, Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.300], he is listed as a follower of al-Jawād and al-Ḥādī [R. ibn Dāwud p.506, n.449; R. al-Ṭūsī p.406, p.423]. He is described as weak and as having been accused of ghulūw and forging hadīths [R. ibn Dāwud p.506; R. al-Ṭūsī p.423; R. al-Najāṣī p.270; Ikhtiyār p.571; n.1081]. He is said to have been of non-Arab origins [R. al-Najāṣī p.270; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.300]. Despite his reputation some of the titles of his works are recorded; K. al-Mamdūḥīn wa al-Madhūmīn; K. Maqtal Abī al-Khaṭṭāb; K. Manāqib Abī al-Khaṭṭāb; K. al-Malāḥim; K. al-Nawādir, this last work being described as closest to acceptable [R. al-Najāṣī p.270]. Other works simply attribute to him one work unnamed [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.300, n.653; Maʿālim p.98]. In Ikhtiyār he reports from another person suspected of extremism, Ishāq b. Muḥammad al-Baṣrī. See also al-Māmaqānī III, pp.146-7, n.11004 which concurs with the above sources that he was weak.
MUHAMMAD B ABU ALA
A reporter of propaganda bringing together al-Jawād and Yaḥyā b. Aktham, he is absent from all major rijāl sources.

MUHAMMAD B ABU UMAYR
Al-Bazzāz, Abū Ahmad, mawlā of al-Azd, al-Azdi. He was born and lived in Baghdād [R.al-Najāshī p.251, R.ibn Dawud pp.287-8, n.1250; T.al-Fihrist p.265, n.591]. The name of Abū ʿUmayr was Ziyād b. ʿIsā. Muḥammad has an extremely high reputation being regarded as amongst the most trustworthy of people by both the ʿĀmma and the khāssa [R.al-Najāshī p.250; R.ibn Dawud p.287; T.al-Fihrist p.265]. Conflicting evidence is given about his contacts with the Imāms. The earliest source reports him purely as a follower of al-Kāẓim [R.al-Barqî p.49]. R.ibn Dawud lists him as having reported from al-Ṣādiq and al-Riḍā, and as having recognised three Imāms - the third being al-Kāẓim from whom he did not report [R.ibn Dawud p.287]. Later in the same source, however, it is said that he met al-Kāẓim and that there were hadiths where the Imām addressed him by his kunya, Abū ʿAbdallāh [R.ibn Dawud p.288; R.al-Najāshī p.250]. T.al-Fihrist records the three Imāms whom he recognised as al-Kāẓim, al-Riḍā, and al-Jawād, although he only reported from al-Riḍā [p.266]. R.al-Najāshī agrees that he heard hadiths from al-Kāẓim and reported from al-Riḍā, but mentions no other Imāms [R.al-Najāshī p.250]. He was mentioned in the books of al-Jāḥiz as reporting to Ibrāhīm b. Dāhā and was referred to as a prominent member of the Rāfiḍa [R.al-Najāshī p.250; T.al-Fihrist p.266; R.ibn Dawud p.287]. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsā is said to have reported from him the works of one hundred of the associates of al-Ṣādiq, and Ibn Abī ʿUmayr was himself a prolific author with some 94 works to his name [T.al-Fihrist p.266; R.ibn Dawud p.288]. The preservation of his works was not straightforward. Allegations were made that he knew the names and addresses of the Shiʿa, and he was arrested and imprisoned, either by al-Rashīd [R.al-Najāshī p.250], or by al-Maʾmūn after the death of al-Riḍā [R.al-Najāshī p.250; Ikhtiyār p.590; other sources refer vaguely to the Sulṭān]. As a consequence his wealth was confiscated and his books were destroyed, but he had memorised some forty volumes so that his collected hadiths were preserved in some form [R.ibn Dawud p.288]. The surviving works were renamed -
al-Nawādir [Ikhtiyār p.590, n.1103]. It is possible that he was arrested on two different occasions, the first time being under al-Rashīd when he was beaten by al-Sindī b. Shāhak because of his Shiʿite beliefs and released only when he paid a fine, out of his reputed wealth of 500,000 dirhams [Ikhtiyār p.592]. The second might have been under al-Maʿmūn. On one of these occasions, he almost gave the information to the authorities, but was strengthened by hearing the voice of Mūḥammad b. Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān calling out to him [Ikhtiyār p.591, n.1105; R. Ibn Dāwūd p.288; R. al-Najashi p.250]. Despite the damage done by the loss of his words, the consensus seems to be that, because so much was memorised, they can be regarded as murādis [R. al-Najashi p.250; R. Ibn Dāwūd p.288], although one source gives this incident as the reason why some of his isnāds are murādis.

There are still many of his works recorded; K. al-ʾIṣṭīʿāʿ wa al-Afṣā; K. al-ʾImāma; K. al-Muṭaʿ; [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.266; R. al-Najashi p.251]; K. al-Radd ʿalā Abī al-Qadr wa al-Jabar; K. Masʿīl al-Riḍā [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.266]; K. al-Kufr wa al-ʾImān; K. Ikhtilāf al-Ḥadīth; K. al-Tawḥīd etc. [R. al-Najashi p.251]. In R. al-Najashi most are reported to ʾĪbrāhīm b. Ḥāshim; in Ṭ. al-Fihrist they are reported via a wider range of people including Ayyūb b. Nūḥ and Mūḥammad b. ʾĪsā b. ʿUbayd. He was claimed by al-Faḍīl b. Shādhān as one of his sources [Ikhtiyār p.543, n.1029], and as one to whom he considered himself heir [Ikhtiyār p.539, n.1025]. He was praised by Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān [Ikhtiyār p.590, n.1104], and named as one of the fugahāʾ of al-Kāẓīm and al-Riḍā [Ikhtiyār p.556, n.1050]. In the opinion of Ibn Faḍīl he was more knowledgeable than Yūnus [Ikhtiyār p.591, n.1100]. In the well known debate arranged between the two Ḥishāms, Ibn Abī ʿUmayr spoke for and with Ḥishām b. Sālim [Ikhtiyār p.279, n.500]. Despite his wide contacts with non Shiʿite scholars, he explained that he did not transmit what he heard from them for he had seen too many others become confused by doing this, attributing the hadiths of the ʾĀmma to the khaṣṣa and vice versa [Ikhtiyār pp.590-1, n.1105]. In Ikhtiyār he reports principally from Ḥishām b. Sālim and ʾĪbrāhīm b. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. He also transmits the work of the latter to Ibn Abī al-Khaṭṭāb [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.15]. He died in 217 A.H. [R. al-Najashi p.251; R. al-Ṭūsī p.388], and appears to have been a very important and prolific authority, the number of works listed in Ṭ. al-Fihrist being impossible
to list here. See also al-Mâmaqânî, III, pp.61-4, n.10272 and Maṣālim p.91.

MUḤAMMAD B AḤMAD B ḤAMMAD AL-MAḤMŪDI/AL-Khayrānī

In none of the Isnâds of reports attributed to him is his full name recorded. He is given as Muḥammad al-Maḥmûdî who reports from his father [Ithbât pp.221-3; Bîhâr L, p.94, n.7] and as al-Khayrānî from the same source [I-lâm p.346; Kashf p.201; al-Kâfî, I, p.324, n.2; al-Irshâd, p.497; Bîhâr L, p.119, n.3; for the identification of al-Maḥmûdî with al-Khayrânî see Chapter One n.66]. As Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Maḥmûdî he is one of those listed as one of the associates of al-Jawâd in Bîhâr [L, p.94, n.7]. In the notes to one story in Bîhâr is the information that his father died during the Imâmate of al-Hâdî [Bîhâr L, p.94, n.7; Ikhtiyâr p.560, n.1058]. Muḥammad, Abû al-Aʿlî is listed more frequently as a follower of al-Hâdî and al-Askarî [R. al-Barqî p.60 as al-Baghdâdî; R. al-Ṭusi p.424]. He is found in other sources as a follower of al-Jawâd [R. ibn Dâwûd p.292, n.1266]. He was possibly given the name khayr because of his gift to the Imâm of a slave of that name, and was later given a position working for the Imâm in Medina [Ikhtiyâr pp.511-2, n.988]. He reports that Abû Jaʿfar wrote with sympathy after the death of his father calling him mahmûd [Ikhtiyâr p.511, n.986; p.559, n.1057]. This is somewhat curious considering that his father is the source for the main story of designation for al-Hâdî and was said to have died during his time.

MUḤAMMAD B AḤMAD B JAʿFAR

Al-Qumî, al-ʿAṭṭâr, wâhil, he is listed as a follower of al-Hâdî [R.al-Barqî p.60], and al-ʿAskarî [R. ibn Dâwûd p.291, n.1264; R. al-Ṭusi p.436]. As al-Baghdâdî he is listed as not having reported from any Imâm [R.al-Barqî p.60]. He wrote one letter to šâhib al-nâḥîya describing certain other Imâms [Ikhtiyâr p.534, n.1019]. See also al-Mâmaqânî III, p.67, n.10304.

MUḤAMMAD B AḤMAD B YÂḤYÂ B ʿIMRÂN B ʿABDALLĀH B SAʿD B MÂLIK

Al-Ashtarî, al-Qumî, šâhib 'Nawâdir al-Ḥikma', who was of high standing and source of many reports, but was negligent as to who he reported from [R. ibn Dâwûd p.297, n.1284]. He is possibly listed as a
follower of al-Hādi [R.al-Barqī p.60], and al-ʿAskarī [R.al-Barqī p.60 as al-Baghdādī]. His full name is given as above in R.al-Najāshī, where his kunya is also given as Abū Jaʿfar [R.al-Najāshī p.268]. He is considered thiqa in hadīth, but also to have reported some accounts from weak sources [R.al-Najāshī p.268]. He wrote several works including K. al-Imāma; K. Maqta al-Ḥusayn; K. al-Ṭibb; K. al-Malāḥim; K. Nawādir al-Ḥikma [R.al-Najāshī pp.268-9]. Other works recorded are K. al-Tawḥīd and K. al-Anbiyāʾ [Maʿālim p.91]. In Ikhtiyār he reports from Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim to a variety of people [see Ikhtiyār index]. See also al-Māmaqānī III, pp.75-6, n.10356.

MUḤAMMAD B ʿALĪ B BILĀL

Abū Tāhir, he is listed as follower of al-ʿAskarī [R.al-Barqī p.61; R.ʿibn Dāwud p.324; R.al-Ṭūsī p.435]. He was also said not to have reported from the Imāms, and to have been madhḵūm [R.ʿibn Dāwud p.508, n.455]. His dispute with Muḥammad b. ʿUthmān was apparently well known, when he seized the wealth belonging to the Imām and refused to give it up, alleging that he was a wakil [Ghayba-T p.260]. He visited the grave of Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazān [Ikhtiyār p.564, n.1066]. He reported many books from Aḥmad b. ʿAbdallāh al-Karkhī about whom he gave some details. He said that he [Aḥmad] was originally a kātib of Iḥṣāq b. Ibrāhīm, but then repented and worked on writing books. He was a pupil of Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Ḥaṭīm and was of non Arab origin [Ikhtiyār p.566, n.1071]. No works of Ibn Bilāl are recorded. For greater detail see Occultation pp.102-3.

MUḤAMMAD B ʿALĪ B ISĀ

Al-Qumārī, al-Ṭalḥi, was a prominent resident of the city, amīr over it for the Abbasids as was his father, and was a follower of al-ʿAskarī [R.ʿibn Dāwud p.325, n.1428; R.al-Najāshī p.287]. He is also recorded as a follower of al-Hādi [R.al-Ṭūsī p.422]. He wrote one book of Masāʿīl from al-ʿAskarī [R.ʿibn Dāwud p.325; R.al-Najāshī p.287; T.ʿal-Fiḥrist p.306, n.663; Maʿālim p.94]. See also al-Māmaqānī III, p.158, n.11122.

MUḤAMMAD B ʿALĪ B JAʿFAR

He is mentioned only in one source as a follower of al-Riḍā [R.al-Barqī p.54]. He reports one of the stories of the designation of al-Jawād

MUḤAMMAD B ʿALĪ B AL-NUṣRĀN, ABŪ JAʿFAR AL-ʿĀḤWAL

A very well known follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim [R. al-Barqî p.50], nicknamed muʾmīn al-Ṭaq by his associates and shaytān al-Ṭaq by his opponents [R. al-Najāṣī p.249; R. al-Ṭūsî p.359; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.323, n.698; Ikhtiyār p.185, n.324; Fihrist.N p.8 supplementary section]. Al-Bajalī, mawla, Abū Jaʿfar, Kufan, his shop was in Taq al-Muhāmīl in Kūfā [R. ibn Dāwud pp.326-7, n.1432; R. al-Najāṣī p.249]. He occasionally is included in the four men praised by al-Ṣādiq [R. ibn Dāwud p.394, n.16; Ikhtiyār p.135, n.215; p.185, n.355; p.239, n.434], and is said to have had a high standing in matters of ʿilm [R. ibn Dāwud p.327; R. al-Najāṣī p.249]. Many stories are recorded about his debates with Abū Hanīfa, one on the subject of the ṭajfa [R. al-Najāṣī pp.249-50]. Abū Hanīfa commented to him on the death of al-Ṣādiq, saying "your Imām has died." [Ikhtiyār pp.186-7]. Several accounts of debates are given: with Zayd b. ʿAlī when they argued over the Imāmāte of ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn [Ikhtiyār p.186, nos 328 and 329]: with the rebel al-Qāḥibāk, whom Muḥammad proves has appointed someone to ḩakama fī dīn Allāh", the very thing which al-Qāḥibāk had said was the reason for the desertion of ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālīb [Ikhtiyār p.187, n.330]. Al-Ṣādiq seems to have encouraged him to take part in debates because of his abilities, although often advising him on lines of argument [Ikhtiyār p.186, n.327; p.186, n.328]. Al-Ṣādiq did criticise one facet of his skills, accusing him of using qiyās which the Imām did not consider acceptable [Ikhtiyār p.188-9, n.331]. At one point he told al-Mufaddal b. ʿUmar to relay an order to al-ʿĀḥwal to cease debating [Ikhtiyār p.190, n.334]. On the death of al-Ṣādiq, al-ʿĀḥwal accompanied Hishām b. Sālim to Medina where they both were disappointed with the answers of al-Ṣādiq's son ʿAbdallāh. He wrote many works including K. ʿAbbās; K. al-ʿIḥtiyār fī Imāmat Amir al-Muʾminīn; K. Ḥalāmīhī ʿalā al-Khawārī; K. Māʿīlahī maʿa Abū Hanīfa wa al-Murīla [R. al-Najāṣī p.249]; K. ʿRadd ʿalā al-Muʿṭazzila fī al-Imāmat al-Maṣḏūl; K. Ithbāt al-Waṣiyya; K. al-Imāma; K. al-Maʿrīfa, etc. [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.323]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, pp.160-3, n.11147; al-ʿIrshād pp.420-3; Maʿālim pp.84-5
MUHAMMAD B -ALI AL-SHALMAGHANI

He was known apparently as Ibn Abi al-<Azqir (R. ibn Dawud p.508; R.al-Najashi p.293; Ma'allim p.92; Ghayba.T p.263), or Ibn Abi al-<Adh qir [T.al-Fihrist p.305] who did not report from any of the Imams. His initial beliefs were correct, but then altered and were rejected. He was arrested and killed by authorities in Baghdad. Notices about him were issued by the Imam and mention is made of the reasons why he went off the straight and narrow; that is because of envy (?) of Abi al-Qasim al-Husayn b. Roh [R.ibn Dawud p.508, n.456; R.al-Najashi p.293; T.al-Fihrist p.305, n.662; Ma'allim p.92]. He was apparently thought well of by Banu Bistam, who were eventually warned to desist from supporting him and told to curse him (Ghayba.T pp.263-5). Several works by him are recorded; K. Mähiyyat<Isma; K. al-Mubahala; K. al-Awšiyä; K. Faḍi al-Natq -al-<Samt; K. Faḍūl al-<Umratayn; K. al-Anwär; K. al-Taslīm; K. al-Zaahir bi al-<Aqlīyya; K. al-Badā' wa al-Mash'a (R.al-Najashi pp.293-4). Other works include; K. Naẓm al-Qur'an; K. al-Imāma al-Kabīr.


MUHAMMAD B -AWN AL-NASÍ BI

The only alternative source for the description of the marriage/betrothal of al-Jawād. His account is found in Bahār [L, p.79] reporting to Muḥammad b. al-Hasan. He is absent from the major rijāl works under this name. There is one Muḥammad b. Abi <Awf reported at the court of al-Mutawakkil [Murāj, IV, pp.40-41]. Al-Māmaqāni, lists one Muḥammad b. <Awf as unknown [III, n.11205].

MUHAMMAD B AWRAMA

Abū Ja'far, al-Qummi, his name may be Awrama or Urma. He is considered to be weak. He reported to al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ḥasan b. Abān who was himself thīqa in his reporting [R.ibn Dawud p.499; T.al-Fihrist p.278]. He was accused of error and ghulaw, but anything which is found in his books which is also in those of al-Ḥusayn b. Sa'īd is thought to be reliable. However, anything which is unique to him is not acceptable [R.al-Najashi p.253; T.al-Fihrist p.278, n.607; R.al-Najashi p.253]. One opinion says that he was suspected by the
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MUHAMMAD B AL-FAQL

Al-Azdī, he is listed as a follower of al-Riḍā and al-Kāzīm and as thīqa [R. ibn Dāwud p.330, n.1448]. Elsewhere he is recorded as a follower of al-Hādī [R. al-Barqī p.60; R. al-Tūsī p.423]. Nothing further is known.

MUHMAMD B AL-FARAJ AL-RUKHKHAJI

Very little information is found on him in the rijāl sources. He is listed as a follower of al-Riḍā [R. ibn Dāwud p.330 n.1448; R. al-Tūsī p.392, p.387], of al-Jawād [R. al-Tūsī p.405], and al-Hādī [R. al-Tūsī p.422] and is thīqa. He reported from al-Kāzīm and wrote one book, al-Masūlī which is reported by ʿAbd al-Halīm b. Hilāl [R. al-Najashi p.287]. The only further piece of information is that he wrote to al-Hādī asking about the fates of Abū ʿAlī b. Rāshid, ʿĪsā b. Jaʿfar b. ʿĀṣim and Ibn Bund, all of whom had been killed by the authorities [Ikhtiyār p.603 n.1122]. Other than this most details about him are contained in actual stories linked with the Imāms. Under al-Jawād he may have functioned as a wakīl in some capacity, for the Imām wrote to him asking him for al-basan possibly a covert reference to the khums. The Imām died the same year i.e 220 A.H. Bihār L p.63 n.39; I-lām p.350; Kashf p.224 all reported to Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh b. Mihrān who has a reputation for ghulūw). It was allegedly at his house that the Shiʿa gathered to discuss the transfer of the Imāmat to al-Hādī with several of the wuṭūh al-Shīʿa present, although only two are named - ʿAbdīd b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā and Abū al-Khayrānī [al-Kāfī I p.324 n.2; al-Irshād p.497; I-lām p.356; Kashf pp.234-5; Bihār L p.119 n.31]. This account implies that he was one of the leading lights of the Shīʿa of the time. In accordance with his support of al-Hādī, he is the source of two pieces of information about the Imām's mother Jamāna [Ithbāt p.220, p.221 along with ʿAlī b. Mahḍiyār]. Some time later one presumes the Imām wrote to him warning him that he was about to fall out of favour with the caliph. He was removed from Egypt in chains, his possessions confiscated, and imprisoned for eight years. Shortly after receiving another letter from the Imām whilst in prison, he was set free [Ithbāt p.224]. He made enquiries about the restoration of his estates [al-Kāfī I p.500 n.5; al-Irshād pp.501-2; I-lām pp.358-9; Kashf pp.238-9] and although he received a favourable response from the
Imām, al-Hādī also added that it would be of no benefit to him. Indeed he died before anything further occurred. Before this he was invited to al-Askar by Aḥmad b. al-Khaḍīb and it was there that he died. There is more than a suggestion in these stories of considerable involvement with the ruling circles. Although there is no direct evidence about other members of his family ʿUmar b. al-Faraj, known as al-Rukkhājī, is also connected with al-Hādī and has unmistakable associations with the Abbasid administration. [See below index]. Murūj mentions a brother of ʿUmar - Muḥammad, who fell out of favour with al-Mutawakkil several times and it could tie in with Muḥammad b. al-Faraj [IV p.19]. If Muḥammad is the brother of ʿUmar it has interesting consequences for the leadership of the Shiʿa during the time of al-Hādī. It is also worthwhile noting that Muḥammad reports to several people tagged as ghālin - Aḥmad b. Hīlāl and Muḥammad b. ʿAbdallāh b. Mīhrān. Further references: al-Māmaqānī III, p.171, n.11225.

MUḤAMMAD B ḤAKĪM
He is listed amongst the followers of al-Kāẓīm as Abū Jaʿfar al-Khathāmī [R. ibn Dāwūd p.308 n.1336], and amongst those of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓīm [R.al-Barqī p.19, p.48; R.al-Najāshī p.276; R.al-Ṭūsī p.285, p.358]. He was Kufan and had one book reported [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.290 n.625]. He is mentioned as one of the ḥāshāb al-kālām, and one whom Abū al-Ḥasan specifically told to engage in discussion with the people of Medina, even on the subject of ʿṣūlī al-qabr.[Ikhtiyār pp.448-9 nos.843-5]. Of the three ḥadīthā providing this information two are reported by Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān - one to Yaḥyā b. ʿImrān al-Hamdānī, the other to Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā [b. ʿUbayd?]. The final one is reported to Ibn Abī ʿUmāyr. Muḥammad has one son recorded as amongst the Shiʿa. [R.al-Najāshī p.276; See also Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm. Further references: al-Māmaqānī III, p.109, n.10624; Maṣālim p.94.

MUḤAMMAD B AL-ḤARĪTH
He reports a letter of the Imām responding to an offer of marriage sent by the caliph. The text says that he was a servant of al-Riḍā. He reports to his son Ibrāhīm. Most of the riḍāl sources do not record him, but one Muḥammad b. al-Ḥarīth is recorded as a follower of
al-Kāzīm (R.al-Ṭūsī p.361). See also al-Māmaqānī, III, p.98, n.10514, where there is a possible identification.

MUḤAMMAD B AL-ḤASAN B ĀMMĀR

He reportedly studied with ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar for two years and was shocked when ʿAlī deferred to al-Jawād (al-Kāfī, I, p.322, n.12; Biḥār L, p.36, n.26). He is absent from the major rijāl sources under this name. However, one Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Āmmār is recorded as a follower of al-Ṣādiq (R.al-Ṭūsī p.284). Al-Māmaqānī simply lists him as unknown (III, p.105, n.10567).

MUḤAMMAD B AL-ḤASAN B SHAMMŪN AL-BĀṢRĪ

Abū Jaʿfar al-Baghdādī, al-Bāṣrī (R.al-Ṭūsī p.407; T.al-Fihrist p.285, n.619; R.al-Najāshī p.2581, he is listed as a follower of al-Jawād (R.al-Ṭūsī p.407), al-Hādī (R.al-Ṭūsī p.424) and al-ʿAskarī (R.al-Ṭūsī p.436; R.ibn Dāwūd p.502, n.428). He is considered to have been a wāqīfīte before becoming ḍhālin (R.al-Ṭūsī p.436; R.ibn Dāwūd p.502; T.al-Fihrist p.285; R.al-Najāshī p.2581. It is recommended that his works be avoided (R.ibn Dāwūd p.502). Two works say only that he wrote one work (T.al-Fihrist p.285; Maʾālim p.98). However, some of the titles of other works are also recorded; K. al-Sunan wa al-ʿAdāb wa Makārim al-Akhlāq; K. al-Maʿrīfī; K. Nawādir. Works which are reported via Sahl b. Ziyād were considered to be acceptable (R.al-Najāshī p.259). He lived 114 years, dying in 258 A.H., and apparently reported from eighty of the asḥāb of al-Ṣādiq (R.al-Najāshī p.2581. See also al-Māmaqānī which agrees with these opinions (III, p.102, n.10548).

MUḤAMMAD B ḪUMRĀN

Al-Nahdī, Abū Jaʿfar, originally from Kūfa, but he lived in Jarjarāyā situated between Wāsiʿ and Baghdād. He was considered ṭhiqa (R.ibn Dāwūd p.309; n.1338; R.al-Barqī p.20; R.al-Najāshī p.278). There is another Muḥammad b. Ḫumrān b. ʿAfyān (R.ibn Dāwūd p.309; n.1339; R.al-Barqī p.20) who has an entry in T.al-Fihrist (p.290, n.529), but R.ibn Dāwūd is careful to point out they are not one and the same. Al-Nahdī has one work to his name, reported in 230 by ʿAlī b. Asbāḥ. In Ikhtiyār he is named as one of those present at the debate between
Hishām b. al-Ḥakam and Ibn Śālim [p.279, n.500]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, p.110, n.10633.

MUḤAMMAD B AL-ḤUSAYN B ABI AL-KHATTĀB

MUḤAMMAD B AL-ḤUSAYN B SAʿID
Abū Jaʿfar, al-Ṣāyigh, a Kufan who was said to be very weak and ghālin [R. ibn Dāwud p.503, n.430; T. al-Fihrist p.289; R. al-Najāshī p.259]. Two works are recorded; K. Nawādir [T. al-Fihrist p.289; Maʿālim p.96], and K. al-Ṭabāshīr [R. al-Najāshī p.259 He died in 269 A.H. [T. al-Fihrist p.289; R. al-Najāshī p.259]. See also al-Māmaqānī where he is said to be possibly Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Saʿīd [III, p.107, n.10591].

MUḤAMMAD B IBRĀHĪM B MAHZIYĀR
He is listed as one of the wukalâʿ and abwāb of the holy area, one over whom there is no dispute among the followers of al-ʿAskarī [R. al-Ṭūsī p.436]. He was asked by his father to pass on money to a person who would show him a certain sign, the money being intended for the Imam [Ikhtiyār pp.531-2, n.1015]. See also al-Māmaqānī III, pp.56-7, n.10222.

MUḤAMMAD B ʿIMRĀN AL-BĀQIRĪ
He could possibly be identified with a follower of al-Bāqir and
al-Ṣādiq [R.al-Barqī p.10, p.20], but otherwise seems unknown. Several possible persons are recorded in R.al-Ṭūsī [p.296].

MUḤAMMAD B ʿĪSĀ B ṢUBAYD B YAQTĪN B MŪSĀ
Al-Yaqtīnī, al-Baghdādī, al-Yūnusī [R.al-Ṭūsī p.435], Abū Jaʿfar [R.al-Najāshī p.256], he is listed as a follower of al-Hādī and al-ʿAskarī [R.ibn Dāwud p.508, n.450; R.al-Barqī p.58, p.61; R.al-Ṭūsī p.422, p.435]. Although described as ṫallī, he is also said to have been weak, having been left out of Nawādir al-Ḥikmā [R.ibn Dāwud p.508; ṭal-al-Fihrist p.311, n.675]. The opinion is stated that anything he reports from Yūnus which is unique to him should not be relied upon [R.ibn Dāwud p.508; ṭal-al-Fihrist p.311; R.al-Najāshī p.256]. Some, however, reject this and al-Ḥāfiẓ b. Shādhān was said to have praised him [R.al-Najāshī p.257]. Although not listed as a follower of al-Jawād, he is recorded as having reported from him [R.al-Najāshī p.256]. Elsewhere it is said that he did not report directly from any Imāms [R.al-Ṭūsī p.435]. Fihrist.N counts him as one of the followers of al-Hādī and al-ʿAskarī [312]. Amongst his works are K. al-Imāma; K. al-Waṣāyā; K. al-Tawqīfāt; K. al-Khums; K. al-Riḍāl; K. al-Zakāt; K. al-Nawādir [R.al-Najāshī p.257]; K. Tafsir al-Qurʾān [Maʿālim p.90; ṭal-al-Fihrist p.311]; K. al-ʿAmāl wa al-Raʿāf [Maʿālim p.90 Fihrist.N p.312]. Ibn Hamām said that whatever was in this final work from Muhammad b. Jumhūr had been relayed by al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Jumhūr [Fihrist.N p.312]. Ibn Ṣubayd wrote to Ayyūb b. Nūḥ asking about Fāris [Ikhtiyār p.525, n.1007]. Al-Ḥāfiẓ apparently thought much of him and Naṣr b. ʿṢabbaḥ said that he was one of the youngest to report from Ibn Maḥbūb [Ikhtiyār p.537, n.1021]. He was seen wearing black by Jaʿfar b. Maʿṣūf who had come to study with him. He left and did not return, but later realised that he had made a mistake [Ikhtiyār p.537, n.1022]. He also was reported to have shown his feelings when he heard of the imprisonment of the Imām, and later when the Imām was released. He is said to have reported from Muḥammad b. Sinān [Ikhtiyār pp.507-8, n.980]. In Ikhtiyār he reports most frequently from Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and Ibn Abī ʿUmayr. See also al-Māmaqānī III, pp.167-70, n.11211.
MUVAMMAD B ISMA-IL B BAZI-

Abū Ja'far, mawla of al-Manṣūr, but one of those who was of good repute and possessing much knowledge [R. ibn Dāwūd p.298, n.1290; T. al-Fihrist p.277, n.603; R. al-Najashi p.254]. He is listed as a follower of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād [R. al-Barqi p.54, p.56; R. al-Tusi p.386, p.405], and of al-Kāẓim [R. al-Tusi p.360]. Of his works only K. al-Haij [T. al-Fihrist p.277; R. al-Najashi p.254] and K. Thawāb al-Hajj [R. al-Najashi p.254] are mentioned, reported to Ibrāhīm b. Hāshim and Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā. He was a source of al-Faḍl b. Shābih [Ikhtiyār p.534, n.1029]. He and his cousin Aḥmad b. Ḥanṣa b. Bazi were counted amongst the wuzara' [Ikhtiyār p.564, n.1065; R. al-Najashi p.254], and both ʿAli b. al-Nuṣrān and Dāwud his brother left books to him [Ikhtiyār p.564, p.613; R. al-Najashi p.254]. He is recorded as having recognised al-Kāẓim [R. al-Najashi p.254-5; Ikhtiyār index]. Al-Riḍā was reported to have said of him that he wished there were more like him among the Shi'a [R. al-Najashi p.255]. ʿAli b. Mahzīyār said that he asked for a piece of clothing from al-Jawād to use as a shroud and the request was granted [Ikhtiyār p.564, n.1065; p.245, n.450]. Muḥammad b. ʿAli b. Bīlāl, on visiting his tomb said that he had heard Muḥammad report from al-Jawād that anyone visiting the tomb of a believer, who sat facing the qibla and recited certain verses, would be free from fear. He was said to have reported from Manṣūr b. Yūnus, ʿĪsā b. Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān and others of this generation [R. al-Najashi p.254]. He reports several works in T. al-Fihrist of mainly minor figures. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, pp.81-2, n.10393 where he is listed as thīqa; Maṣālim p.90

MUVAMMAD B JIZZAK AL-JAMMAL

He is recorded as a follower of al-Hādī and as thīqa [R. al-Barqi p.60; R. ibn Dāwūd p.301, n.1306; R. al-Tusi p.422], but no further information is found elsewhere.

MUVAMMAD B JUMHŪR [ B AL-ḤASAN B JUMHŪR]

Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Ṣāmmī from Baṣra is recorded amongst the followers of al-Riḍā, but has a very bad reputation – weak in his hadiths, corrupt in his beliefs, ghālin. [R. ibn Dāwūd p.502 n.425; R. al-Tusi p.387]. On the very same page is Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Jumhūr who was also a
follower of al-Riḍā and was weak and inclined to extremes (R. ibn Dāwud p.502 n.427). The two are probably one and the same person. This bad reputation is repeated in other sources (R. al-Najāshī p.260; T. al-Fihrist p.284 n.617). Some of his works include K. al-Malāḥim; K. Nawādir al-Ḥall; K. Ṣadab al-ṣīl[im (all in R. al-Najāshī); K. Ṣabīb al-Zamān; K. Wagt Khurūj al-Qā'im (only in T. al-Fihrist). Āḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd, himself accused of ghulūw by the Qummis (T. al-Fihrist p.26 n.49), is said to have relayed most of his books which did not contain ghulūw (T. al-Fihrist p.284), but elsewhere he is said to be responsible for relaying all his books (R. al-Najāshī p.260). He reports a book of Muṣallā b. Muḥammad al-Baṣrī who is reckoned confused in both hadīth and madhhab (T. al-Fihrist p.358). His sources in Ikhtiyār include Isḥāq b. Muḥammad al-Baṣrī and Yūsuf b. al-Sukht as well as Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. He is mentioned in Fihrist N as Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Jumhūr al-ʿĀmmī al-Baṣrī one of the followers of al-Riḍā, his books including K. al-Wāḥida fi al-Akhbār wa al-Manāqib in eight parts (p.312). Further references: al-Māmaqānī III, p.96, n.10508; Maʿālim p.92 lists his works also.

MUḤAMMAD B AL-KHĀLĪL AL-SĀKKĀK

Abū Jaʿfar (Ikhtiyār p.539, n.1025); he is not recorded as a follower of a specific Imām, and indeed is reported as having not reported direct from any Imām (R. ibn Dāwud p.310, n.1345). He was an associate of Hishām b. al-Ḥakam (T. al-Fihrist p.292; R. ibn Dāwud p.310; Maʿālim p.85; R. al-Najāshī p.252; Fihrist N p.250), at times referred to as his pupil (R. ibn Dāwud p.310); a mutakallim who had different opinions to Hishām on everything save the question of the Imāmate (R. ibn Dāwud p.310; T. al-Fihrist p.292, n.634; Fihrist N p.250). Several works are recorded; K. al-Maʿrīfā; K. al-Iṣṭiṣāʿa; K. al-Imāma; K. al-ṣaʿda man asbāb al-Imāma bi al-Nāṣṣ (Maʿālim p.85; T. al-Fihrist p.292; Fihrist N p.250). An interesting comment is made in R. al-Najāshī about his work on tawḥīd. This source is of the opinion that, although the work is named tawḥīd, it is actually tashbīh (R. al-Najāshī p.252). Al-Faḍl b. Shādhān named al-Sākkāk in his list of those who had preceded him, and whom he considered his forerunners (Ikhtiyār p.539, n.1025). See also al-Māmaqānī III, p.115, n.10674.
MUHAMMAD B MARZUBAN
He reports a very dubious account from Muhammad b. Sinan (Bihār L, p.66, n.43; Ikhtiyār p.583, n.1092) about his meeting with the young al-Jawād and the myth of the sāhib of Fīrūs, the rehabilitation of a fallen angel through the intervention of the newborn al-Ḥusayn. He is absent from all major riḥāl sources. The only possible identification is as an unlisted son of the Qummi Marzubān b. ʿImrān b. ʿAbdallāh b. Saʿd a follower of al-Ｒiḍā (R.ʿal-Ｔūsī p.391).

MUHAMMAD B MUSA AL-SHĀRIQI
A possible identification is Muhammad b. Musa b. ʿĪsā al-Sammān, Abū Jaʿfar al-Ḥamdānī, who was said to be weak by the Qummiś, and who was accused of forging hadiths by Ibn Wālīd (R.ʿibn Dāwūd p.511, n.471). However, he could also be Ibn al-Ḥasan b. Fursat al-Šarīʿī, who is recorded in al-Maqānī as extremely weak (III, n.11415). The only other definite information about him is that he was a pupil of ʿAlī b. Ḥaskā (Ikhtiyār p.521, n.1001).

MUHAMMAD B MUSLIM
Muhammad b. Muslim b. Riyāḥ, Abū Jaʿfar, al-Thaqafī, al-Ṭāḥān, mawla, a prominent Kufan, faqīh, who is listed as a follower of al-Ｂaqīr and al-Ṣādiq (R.ʿal-Barqī p.9, p.17; R.ʿibn Dāwūd p.336, n.1473; R.ʿal-Najāshī pp.247-8; R.ʿal-Ｔūsī p.300). He reported from both al-Baqīr and al-Ṣādiq (R.ʿibn Dāwūd p.336; R.ʿal-Najāshī p.246). He was held in high esteem by the Shiʿa having studied with the two Imāms in Medina for four years (Ikhtiyār p.167, n.280), and was the most trustworthy of people (R.ʿal-Najāshī p.247). Even the ʿAmma reported from him, and al-Ṣādiq directed Ibn Abī Yaṣīr to him for guidance (R.ʿibn Dāwūd p.336; Ikhtiyār p.161, n.273). A book containing over four hundred questions on balāl and barām is the only work attributed to him (R.ʿal-Najāshī p.247). Perhaps because of his knowledge obtained from al-Baqīr, he is named as one of the mutarayyisūn (Ikhtiyār p.169, n.283), who appear to have challenged, deliberately or otherwise, the ultimate authority of al-Ṣādiq (See under Abū Baqīr for full details). He was also one of the same quartet very highly praised by al-Ṣādiq (Ṭ.ʿal-Fihrist p.142; R.ʿibn Dāwūd pp.392-3). He had a son-in-law
Muḥammad b. Mārid [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.314]. He is said to have followed the Imām's advice on living humbly, this being the reason he took up the trade of miller [Ikhtiyār p.164, n.278]. Of his own views several comments are preserved. He apparently held the same views as Zurāra b. Aṣyan as concerns instiftaqa [Ikhtiyār p.186, n.282], and was cursed by the Imām for asserting that 'God does not know a thing until it exists' [Ikhtiyār p.169, n.284]. Also recorded are his contacts with non-Shīʿite figures. Abū Ḥanīfa sent a woman to him with a question that he himself had been unable to answer [Ikhtiyār p.162, n.275]. On two occasions he came before a qāḍī as a witness. On one of these occasions, he was rejected and al-Ṣādiq prompted another Shiʿite to trap the qāḍī and humiliate him and then ask why he had rejected the witness of someone more knowledgeable than him [Ikhtiyār pp.163-4, n.277]. On another occasion, Muḥammad denied being a follower of al-Ṣādiq saying that this group had rejected him [Ikhtiyār p.162, n.274]. The same qāḍī was challenged to produce answers to some questions with answers from the Prophet. When he cannot, he admits it is bad that he cannot do so, but that it would be worse to simply make up the isnād. His questioners can of course provide an isnād via the Imāms [Ikhtiyār p.166, n.279]. He died in 150 A.H. [R. al-Ṭūsī p.358; R. al-Najāshī p.248]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, pp.184-6, n.11371.

Muḥammad b. al-Rayyān b al-Ṣalt
He is recorded as a follower of al-Hādī [R. al-Ṭūsī p.423] and al-Āṣkārī [R. ibn Dāwūd p.310, n.1347]. Al-Āṣkārī, al-Qummi, thiqā, he wrote one book of Masāʾil [R. ibn Dāwūd p.310]. One book was written jointly with his brother Aḥmad [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.221]. He is further mentioned in Ikhtiyār [pp.537-8, n.1037].

Muḥammad b Sahl b al-Yasaʿ...
source, al-Kharā'ij, and reflects miraculous assumptions. One of the most interesting aspects of his alleged visit to Medina is that, although he saw the Imām, he did not approach him. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsā said that he washed and shrouded Ibn Sahl in the cloth which he received from the Imām [Bihār L, p. 44, n. 12]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, p. 130, n. 1083 and Maʿālim p. 93.

MUḤAMMAD B SAʿĪD

He is the source of a very interesting story concerning the isolation of al-Hādī from the Shiʿa after the death of his father, a situation engineered by ʿUmar b. al-Faraj [Ithbāt p. 222]. There are several figures recorded in the rijāl sources with these first two names; Muḥammad b. Saʿīd, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Kashshī whose beliefs were correct, but who did not report from any Imāms (R. ibn Dawūd p. 313, n. 1359); Muḥammad b. Saʿīd b. Kulthum al-Marwāzī a follower of al-Hādī, a mutakallim from Nīṣāpūr who was Khārijite before becoming Shiʿite (R. ibn Dawūd p. 312, n. 1358; Ikhtiyār p. 545, n. 1030). The latter was sought by Muḥammad b. Tāhir, but debated with him and was released. He reverted to Shiʿism after having given his pledge to take up the sword [Ikhtiyār p. 545, n. 1030]. Also a possible identification is Muḥammad b. Saʿīd b. Ghazwān (R. al-Najāshī p. 288; T. al-Fihrist p. 153), although if he was a follower of al-Riḍā he may not have still been around for al-Hādī’s succession. No positive identification is possible on the available data.

MUḤAMMAD B SINĀN

Abū Jaʿfar, al-Zāhīrī, a descendant of Zāhir mawla of ʿAmr b. al-Ḥāmil al-Khuzāʾī (R. ibn Dawūd p. 315, n. 1376; R. al-Najāshī p. 251; T. al-Fihrist p. 295). He was also said to have actually been Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Sinān, whose father died and who was then named for the grandfather who took care of him (T. al-Fihrist p. 295; R. ibn Dawūd p. 315). He is mainly listed as a follower of al-Kāẓim, al-Riḍā and al-Jawād (R. ibn Dawūd p. 504, p. 315; R. al-Tūsī p. 361, p. 386, p. 405; R. al-Barqī p. 48, p. 54, p. 57). He was accused of being weak and is sometimes referred to as ghālin (R. ibn Dawūd p. 504; R. al-Tūsī p. 295; R. al-Najāshī p. 316). Al-Faqīh b. Shādhān was not content with his hadiths, and it is recommended in one source that anything unique to him be left aside
He himself is said to have confirmed the weakness of his accounts when dying—"do not report from me because what I have said comes from books bought in the marketplace." [R. Ibn Dāwud p.504] The number of works attributed to him are equal in number to those of al-Ŷusayn b. Saʿd [T. al-Fihrist p.295], although they are not all listed. He wrote a book of Masāʿ il from al-Riḍā; K. al-Tarāʾīf; K. al-Azīla; K. al-Makāsib; K. al-Ŷail; K. al-Šayd; K. al-Waṣiyya; K. al-Širāʿ wa al-Bayʿ; K. Nawādīr [R. al-Najāshī p.252]. All that was not ghulūw or takhlīt was reported by Muḥammad b. al-Ŷusayn, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad and others [T. al-Fihrist p.295]. He himself reports books by other people, including al-Muafaqāṭ al b. ʿUmar [T. al-Fihrist p.337]. He was one of the four who were alternately praised and cursed by al-Jawād because of their reluctance to accept his full authority and send what they had collected on his behalf, the others being Šafwān b. Yaḥyā, Zakariyyā b. Adam and Saʿd b. Saʿd [Ikhtiyār pp.502-4, nos 963-7; Ghayba-T p.225]. Šafwān, on mentioning Muḥammad, said that he was one of the Ṭayyārā [Ikhtiyār p.507, n.978], and on another occasion, said that Ibn Sinān "hammā an waṣṭra"—perhaps an oblique reference to his being amongst this group [Ikhtiyār p.508, n.981; R.al-Najāshī p.252]. Several people were critical of Ibn Sinān apart from Ṣafwān. Al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, who listed him as one of his sources [Ikhtiyār p.543, n.1028], also said that he did not believe his hadīthas, and refused to relay them to others [Ikhtiyār pp.507-8, nos 979,980]. Ayyūb b. Nūḥ sent a notebook of hadīthas from Ibn Sinān to Ḥandawayh b. Nuṣayr with the proviso that "If you want to write them do so. I have written from him, but I am not going to repeat them for he said before his death that all he had told me had been found not heard or reported." [Ikhtiyār pp.506-7, n.977]. Ibn Sinān acknowledged that if anyone wanted knowledge of baḥāl and baḥām, he should go to Šafwān, and to himself for the muṣḏilāt [Ikhtiyār p.508, n.981]. A couple of examples of his leanings towards ghulūw are given in Ikhtiyār. One hadith is said to be found in K. al-Dawr one of the books of the ghulāt, where al-Jawād is alleged to have suggested to Ibn Sinān that he use him to guide people and lead them astray by cursing him and disassociating himself from him [Ikhtiyār p.582, n.1091]. This sounds very much like an attempted whitewash of Ibn Sinān by suggesting a reason for his actions. Another story on al-Muafaqāṭ al b.
Umar includes Ibn Sinān in an isnād where all are referred to as ghālin [Ikhtiyār p.322, n.584]. Despite these criticisms, some major figures are still listed as reporting from him - al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, Yūnus, Muḥammad b. ʻIsā b. ʻUbayd, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Abī al-Khaṭṭāb, Ayyūb b. Nūḥ and "others from among the thiqāt and ahl al-sīlīm" [Ikhtiyār pp.507-8, n.980]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, pp.124-9, n.10820 and Maṣālim p.91.

MUḤAMMAD b ṬUḤMĀN AL-ṮAMRI
Ibn Saʿīd al-Thamrī, Abū Jaʿfar, who did not report from the Imāms. Both he and his father were among the wukalāʾ of the twelfth Imām and held responsible positions within the Shīʿa [R. Ibn Dāwūd p.323, n.1419; R. al-Ṭūsī p.509]. He is said to have reported some Masāʾīl to ʻAbdallāh b. Jaʿfar al-Ḥimyarī [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.189]. For a more detailed account of his career see Occultation pp.99-118.

MUḤAMMAD b AL-WALĪD AL-KIRMĀNĪ
He reports a long involved story about meeting al-Jawād which, even although from al-Khārājī, is impressively genuine [Bihār L, p.87, n.3]. As al-Kirmānī he is listed as a follower of al-Jawād [R. al-Barqūfī p.57]. In other sources one Muḥammad b. al-Walīd is called al-Bajali, al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū Jaʿfar from Kūfa who was thiqā and reported pure ḥadīth from Yūnus b. Yaʿqūb and Ḥammād b. Ṭuḥmān, surviving to meet al-Ṣaffār. He may have been futhī [R. Ibn Dāwud p.512, n.475; R. al-Najāshī p.265]. Another Muḥammad, this time called al-Ṣayrafi, was weak [R. Ibn Dāwud p.512, n.473]. A Muḥammad b. al-Walīd al-Khaṭṭāb is found in Ṭ. al-Fihrist reporting the book of Ḥammād b. Ṭuḥmān [p.115] and one book of his own (pp.323-4, n.699,700). Al-Bajaḍī was present at the funeral of Muṣṭafā b. ʻAmrār along with Yūnus b. Yaʿqūb [Ikhtiyār p.388, n.727]; al-Khaṭṭāb is listed as futhī, a Kufan who may have recognised al-Riḍā [Ikhtiyār p.563, n.1062]. Whether al-Bajaḍī/al-Khaṭṭāb is identifiable with al-Kirmānī is indeterminable. See also al-Māmaqānī which lists him as unknown [III, p.197, n.11472].

MŪṢĀ B BAKR
p.359). He was of Kufan origin and said to have been wāqifite. He had one book reported to Ibn Abī ʿUmayr and Ṣafwān b. Yāhūḏ [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.341, n.747]. Another book was reported to ʿAlī b. al-Ḥakam [R. al-Najāšī p.319]. He reported a designation of al-Kāzīm [Īkhtiyār p.438, n.825], and was sent by him on errands to Syria after recovering from ill health [Īkhtiyār p.439, n.826]. In the index of Īkhtiyār he is said to have been a servant of Abū al-Ḥasan, but knew nothing of it. In the same source he reports twice on al-Muḥaddī al-Bāżī [Īkhtiyār p.321, n.582; p.328, n.595]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, p.254, n.12225.

Mūsā b. ʿUmar b. Bāżī

Mūsā b. al-Qāsim
A well crafted story underlining the continuity of the series of Imāms leading to al-Jawād is told on his authority (Bihār L, pp.101-2, n.15; al-Kāfī reporting to ʿAlī b. Mahzīyār). He reports two other accounts of the designation of al-Jawād [Īthbāt p.210; Iʿlām p.347]. His full name is given as Mūsā b. al-Qāsim b. Muʿāwiyā b. Wahb al-Bajalī, Abū ʿAbdallāh, a follower of al-Riḍā [R. ibn Dāwud p.355, n.1579; R. al-Ṭūsī p.389] and of al-Jawād [R. al-Barqī p.56; R. al-Ṭūsī p.405]. His reputation is extraordinarily sound, being thīqa, jallī, ḥasan al-tariqa, wādid al-hadīth [R. al-Najāšī p.317; R. ibn Dāwud p.356]. He was a Kufan Arab [R. ibn Dāwud p.355]. He wrote thirty odd works including books on all Islamic duties and on legal topics, as well as K. Akhlaq al-Muʾmin; K. al-Jāmiʿ; K. al-Adab, all reported to Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsā. One book of Masāʾīl from over eighty men was reported to ʿAbdallāh b. Muḥammad b. ʿIsā [R. al-Najāšī p.317]. In Īkhtiyār he is recorded only in isnāds, particularly one story where al-Kāzīm denies he is the Mahdī [Irākī n.870]. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, pp.258-9, n.12281 and Maʿālim p.107.
MUSAFIR

A mawla of Abu al-Hasan al-Kazim and madhab [R.Ibn Dawud p.344 n.1518]. He is seen acting as hajib of al-Rida in 199 A.H. calling people in for audience [Ikhtiyar p.498 n.956]. He is also recorded as a follower of al-Rida [R.al-Tusi p.392]. He reports a very direct type of designation from al-Rida while in Khurasan [Ikhtiyar p.506 n.972; Bihar L p.34 n.18]. He is also seen on an errand for al-Rida collecting a copy of the Qur'an which was left with Ibn Abi Nasr in al-Qadisiyya when al-Rida travelled to Khurasan via Bagra [Ikhtiyar pp.588-9 no.1101]. He could possibly be the Musafir referred to as one of those whose disagreements with Maymun led to the withholding of dues from al-Jawad [Ikhtiyar p.596 n.1115]. He could also be listed as a follower of al-Hadi [R.al-Tusi p.421] a servant of al-Rida. See also al-Mamadani III, p.211, n.11684.

AL-NADR B MUHAMMAD

Al-Hamdani, recorded as a follower of al-Hadi [R.al-Barqi p.59; R.Ibn Dawud p.360, n.1606], thiga [R.al-Tusi p.425]. A letter from the Imam to the wakil Ibrahim b. Muhammad says that he [Imam] had written to al-Nadr telling him to stop opposing Ibrahim and confirming his position as his representative [Ikhtiyar pp.611-2, n.1136]. No further information is recorded. See also al-Mamadani where he is said to be thiga [III, p.271, n.12473].

NAISR B QABUS


NUY B SHU-AYB AL-BAGHDADI

He is listed as one of the ashab of al-Jawad in Bihar [L. p.106 n.24].
He is recorded in only one source as a follower of al-Jawād [R.al-Tūsī p.408]. Al-Faqīl b. Shādhān considered him faqīh, ālīm and sāliḥ and possibly identified him with Nūh b. Šāliḥ [R.al-Tūsī p.408]. This identification is also made in the index of Ikhtiyār. Although no information is found in the rijāl sources under Nūh b. Šāliḥ, there is one story recorded in Ikhtiyār. A dispute took place over whether it was possible to pray alongside the Murji‘a, with al-Faqīl b. Shādhān questioning its correctness. Nūh was surprised at this, and commented that this man seemed to think that he was a greater thinker than Hishām b. al-Ḥakam [Ikhtiyār pp.558-9, n.1056]. If Nūh lived at the same time as al-Faqīl, this might indicate that he was a follower of the later Imāms. See also al-Māmaqānī where he was said to be one of the asbāb of al-Jawād and thīqa [III, p.276, n.12590].

AL-QĀSIM AL-YAQṬĪNI (B AL-ḤASAN B ALI B YAQTĪN)
Abū Muḥammad, who lived in Qumm and was weak and ghālīn [R.ibn Dāwud p.493, n.385; R.al-Najāshī p.2421. Some of his reports were acceptable and others were not. The Qummīs say he professed ṣalṭ in his beliefs [R.ibn Dāwud p.493, n.385]. Also called al-Shīrānī, and under this name is recorded as a follower of al-Hādī [R.ibn Dāwud p.494] and as being accused of ghuluw [R.al-Tūsī p.421]. Alī b. Ḥaska is reported to have been his teacher [Ikhtiyār p.521, n.1001], and he is mentioned along with him as one of those spreading ghuluw [Ikhtiyār p.517, n.994; pp.517-8, n.995]. He was cursed by al-Hādī [Ikhtiyār p.518, n.1001]. He and Alī alleged apparently similar things to Muḥammad b. al-Furāt; that is that he was a bāb and that he [al-Qāsim or the Imām?] was a prophet [Ikhtiyār p.555, n.1048].

AL-RAYYĀN B AL-ṢALT
He is listed as thīqa and a follower of al-Riḍā and al-Hādī [R.ibn Dāwud p.154, n.613; R.al-Barqūq, p.54, p.59]. Only in R.al-Tūsī is he listed also amongst the followers of al-Jawād [R.al-Tūsī p.376]. The same source notes that he did not report from the Imāms directly, although he wrote a book on the differences of opinion in the Umma. He was originally from Khurāsān, but moved to Baghdaḍ [R.al-Tūsī p.415, p.376]. He also collected the words of al-Riḍā into a book which is reported via Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.140, n.294]. According
to R.al-Najashi he was *thīqa, ṣādūq*. Muṣammar b. Khallād reports that he obtained an audience for him when he wished to ask for clothing, money and invocations before departing [Ikhtiyār p.546, n.1035]. Further information on the incident says that al-Rayyān had been sent by al-Fāqī b. Sahl to one of the districts of Khurasan [Uyūn. R., II, p.208, n.10; Ikhtiyār p.547, n.1036]. His name recurs frequently in Uyūn. R. reporting particularly to Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim [Uyūn. R. II, p.138, n.2; pp.149-50, n.22; p.175, n.5; p.212, n.17; etc]. One report in this source says that he was one of the men of al-Ḥasan b. Sahl [Uyūn. R. II, p.148]. In another report he is in conversation with the caliph al-Ḥāfīz and his testing by Yaḥyā b. Aktham, reporting it to the Qummī Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim [Ithbāt p.216; Išlām p.349; al-Īrshād p.484; Kashf p.201; Biḥār L, p.74, n.3]. Other than this his contact with al-Jawād was indirect; a note of his is recognised by the Imām by the handwriting [Išlām p.349] and Khayrān asked the Imām for blessings on his behalf [Biḥār L, pp.106-7, n.25; Ikhtiyār pp.608-10, n.1132]. He reported a story concerning al-Riḍā’s death [Uyūn. R., II, p.240, n.2] to Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim. See also al-Māmaqānī, I, pp.435-6, n.4182.

AL-RAYYĀN B SHABĪB

He was the maternal uncle of the caliph al-Muṣṭaṣīm, who lived in Qumm and transmitted to its people [R. Ibn Dāwud p.154, n.512; R.al-Najashi p.125]. He collected a book of the *Masā’il* of al-Riḍā which was reported by al-Ṣabbāgh b. Naṣr [R.al-Najashi p.125], but did not report directly from the Imāms [R. Ibn Dāwud p.154]. He is not listed as a follower of any of the Imāms, but his accounts indicate a possible attachment to them. He is the main source for accounts of the betrothal of al-Jawād and his testing by Yaḥyā b. Aktham, reporting it to the Qummī Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim [Ithbāt p.216; Išlām p.349; al-Īrshād p.484; Kashf p.201; Biḥār L, p.74, n.3]. Other than this his contact with al-Jawād was indirect; a note of his is recognised by the Imām by the handwriting [Išlām p.349] and Khayrān asked the Imām for blessings on his behalf [Biḥār L, pp.106-7, n.25; Ikhtiyār pp.608-10, n.1132]. He reported a story concerning al-Riḍā’s death [Uyūn. R., II, p.240, n.2] to Ibrāhīm b. Ḥāshim. See also al-Māmaqānī, I, pp.435-6, n.4182.

SAʿD B SAʿD

wrote one book of *Masā’il* from al-Riḍā [R. al-Najāšī p.135] which was reported to al-Barqī [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.151]. He is also recorded as reporting from al-Jawād [R. al-Najāšī p.135]. He was one of the group of four praised by al-Jawād in later life for having given him his full due [Ghayba.T p.225], and indeed, Abū Ṭālib al-Qummi was disturbed when at first his name was not mentioned with the others - Muḥammad b. Sinān, Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā and Zakariyyā b. Adam. He was eventually absolved also [Iktihār p.503, n.964]. He is not recorded in R. ibn Dāwud, but al-Māmaqānī [II, pp.13-4, n.4690] discusses his identity at length. He is listed in Ma‘ālim [p.47].

**Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā**

He is listed primarily as a follower of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād [R. al-Barqī p.55; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.188, n.770; R. al-Ṭūsī p.378, p.402], but also amongst those of al-Kāẓim [R. al-Ṭūsī p.352]. His father was well thought of by al-Ṣadīq and reported from him [R. ibn Dāwud p.188]. Abū Muḥammad, mawlid Bajila, al-Bajal, a trader, Kufan, ṭīqa, a wakeel of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād [R. ibn Dāwud p.188; R. al-Najāšī p.148], he was amongst the most trustworthy in the eyes of the aṣḥāb al-badīth [Ṭ. al-Fihrist pp.171-2, n.364; R. al-Ṭūsī p.402]. He was an associate of ʿAbdallāh b. Jundab and ʿAlī b. al-Nuṣrān, both very religious men with whom he made a pact to perform the Islamic duties of whichever of them died before the others. Ṣafwān outlived the others [R. ibn Dāwud p.188; Ṭ. al-Fihrist pp.171-2; R. al-Najāšī p.148]. The waqifītes apparently attempted to gain his support through bribery [R. al-Najāšī p.148], but did not succeed. Many works are recorded as his, and are said to be like those of al-Ḥusayn b. Sa‘īd [in number? R. al-Ṭūsī p.402; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.171-2]. A number of thirty works is quoted [R. al-Najāšī p.149], including works on the full range of Islamic legal topics [R. al-Najāšī p.149]. Others include *K. al-Shirā‘ wa al-Bayā‘*; *K. al-Tiḥyārāt*; *K. al-Farā‘īd*; *K. al-Waṣāyā* [Fihrist.N p.311; R. al-Najāšī p.149; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.172]; *K. Bishārāt al-Mu‘min*; *K. al-Majābba wa al-Waṣā‘īf* [Fihrist.N p.311; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.172]; *K. Nawādir* [R. al-Najāšī p.149]. [Note that this is not an exhaustive list] In R. al-Najāšī most are reported via Ibn Abī al-Khaṭṭāb; in Ṭ. al-Fihrist via Ya‘qūb b. Yazīd, al-Ḥusayn b. Sa‘īd, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn.
Şafwān is one of those involved in the disagreement between al-Jawād and four of the wukalā' [see Chapter 8] which is reflected by the alternate cursing and praising of him and the others - Muḥammad b. Sinān, Zakariyyā b. Adam, Saʿd b. Saʿd (Ghayba.T p.224; Ikhtiyār pp.502-4, nos 962-7; p.596, n.115]. The disagreement resulted from the delay in forwarding to the Imām dues collected on his behalf. Şafwān is also linked with Muḥammad elsewhere; on the ḫafi with him and Ibn Abī ʿUmayr [Ikhtiyār p.581, n.1090]; meeting another Shiʿite at the mosque. Şafwān's opinion of Ibn Sinān suggests that the latter was concerned with more extreme ideas. He made several remarks about Ibn Sinān's tendencies, including the assertion that he was one of the Tayyāra [Ikhtiyār p.507, n.978; Ikhtiyār p.508, n.981; see also under Ibn Sinān]. Al-Faḍl b. Shādhān claimed to be the successor to many people including Şafwān [Ikhtiyār p.539, n.1025; p.543, n.1029]. He is also listed among the associates of al-Kāẓim and al-Riḍā, and as one of the most learned along with Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān [Ikhtiyār p.556, n.1050].


SAHL B ZIYĀD
p.164). He corresponded with al-'Askarî in 255 [R.al-Najâshi p.140], and reported from all three of the later Imāms [Ikhtiyār p.566, n.1069]. One book is reported via al-Barqî [Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.164] and two others - K. al-Tawhīd and K. al-Nawādir via two relatively unknown figures [R.al-Najâshi p.140]. Al-Faḍl b. Shādhān did not respect his opinion [Ikhtiyār p.566, n.1068]. Despite his bad reputation, he occurs with reasonable frequency in isnāds. In accounts of al-Jawād he reports from some of the main figures i.e. ʿAlī b. Asbāḥ and ʿAlī b. Mahzīyār. See also al-Māmaqānī II, pp.75-6, n.5396 which concludes that he was ḥasan and Maṣālim p.50.

ṢĀLIḤ B MUḤAMMAD AL-HAMDĀNĪ
He is recorded as a follower of al-Hādī and as thiqa [R.al-Barqî p.58; R.ibn Dāwud p.186, n.758; R.al-Ṭusī p.416, p.402]. No further information is recorded.

AL-ṢAQR B ABI DULAF
Although he reports a story about al-Hādī he is not listed in any of the major rīḍāl sources.

SHĀDHĀN B AL-KHALĪL AL-NĪṢĀPŪRĪ
He is listed as one of the asbāb of al-Jawād in Bihār. He was the father of al-Faḍl b. Shādhān [R.al-Ṭusī p.402]. He reports several stories in Ikhtiyār, but is not himself involved in them. Al-Māmaqānī records that he was one of the asbāb of Yūnūs [II, p.80, n.5470], and he does indeed report praise of him [Ikhtiyār n.913].

SULAYMĀN B KHĀLĪD
Abū Rabīṣ, al-Hilālī, al-Kūfī [R.ibn Dāwud p.214,n.459], he is recorded as a follower of al-Bāqir [R.al-Barqî p.13] and al-Ṣādiq [R.al-Barqî p.32; R.ibn Dāwud p.459]. He rebelled with Zayd and had his hand cut off; he escaped, however, repented and went back to al-Ṣādiq who accepted him [R.ibn Dāwud p.459; R.al-Najāshi p.138]. His full name is given in R.al-Najāshi as Ibn Dihqān b. Nāfiʿa, who was a mawla of ʿAffī b. Maṣḍan. He was a reciter of the Qurʾān, faqīh, who reported from both al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq [R.al-Najāshi p.138]. His hand was cut off by Yusuf b. ʿAmr and he died during the lifetime of al-Ṣādiq. One
book of his is reported via "Abdallāh b. Miskān [R.al-Najāshī p.139]. He was one of three who wrote to al-Ṣādiq with the information that Kūfa was his for the taking if he so desired [For this and further information on his links with al-Ṣādiq see Ikhtiyār pp.356-61; nos 662-669]. See also al-Māmaqānī II, pp.56-7, n.5195.

<UMAR B AL-FARAJ

In 233 A.H. he fell out of favour with al-Mutawakkil despite being one of the highest ranked kuttāb [scribes]. Both possessions and wealth were confiscated to the tune of 120,000 dinārs. His brother Muḥammad fared worse losing 150,000 dinārs, although later he was allowed to purchase back his estates for a large amount. However, the caliph became angry with him a further two times and Muḥammad suffered greatly. He eventually left for Baghdad where he died [Murūj IV, pp.19-20]. As might be expected <Umar is not recorded in any of the Shiʿite sources, and indeed, his attitude towards the Imāms was hostile. He met al-Jawād, challenging him by saying "your Shiʿa allege you know the measure of what is in the Tigris", when they were both on or near the river [Ithbāt, p.219]. He was, for at least, guardian to al-Hādī. On the ḫajj he stopped in Medina to appoint a specifically non-Shiʿite educator for the boy, and to make sure that he was out of reach of the Rāfīfā [Ithbāt, pp.222-3]. It was he who was petitioned by Zayd b. Mūsā the uncle of al-Jawād for access to the boy [I·lām, p.365; Bīḥār L p.190, n.11]. These stories hint that al-Hādī, as al-Jawād, was kept well insulated from potential followers and under non partisan guardianship. Maqāṭil says that <Umar was appointed as governor of Mecca and Medina and prevented Āl Abī Ṭālib from answering the questions of the people, and prevented people from showing respect to them with charitable gifts. This continued for some time, causing the Ālids to fall into difficult straits. It was only after al-Mutawakkil died, and al-Muntaṣir became caliph, that the situation altered [Maqāṭil, p.599]. <Umar was also responsible for transporting al-Qāsim b. "Abdallāh b. al-Ḥusayn b. "Ali b. al-Ḥusayn to Sāmarrā', this person eventually dying in prison [Maqāṭil pp.617-8]. He was responsible for the detention of Yaḥyā b. <Umar b. al-Ḥusayn who went to Khurāsān under al-Mutawakkil and was arrested by "Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir. It was on <Umar's report that Yaḥyā was punished and

<UTHMĀN B ĪSĀ
Abū ʿAmr, sometimes referred to as al-ʿĀmirī, sometimes al-Kulābī, sometimes as al-Ruʿāsī, the correct version being, according to the sources, that he was a mawlah of Banū Ruʿās and a descendent of ʿUbayd b. Ruʿās [R.al-Najāshī pp.230-1; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.2061 R.ībn Dāwud p.476, n.305]. He is recorded as a follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāzīm [R.al-Barqî p.39, p.49] and elsewhere as a follower of al-Kāzīm and al-Riḍā [R.al-Ṭūsī p.380, p.355]. He was one of the most prominent members of the Wāqīfa who refused to part with the wealth collected on al-Kāzīm’s behalf [R.ībn Dāwud p.476; R.al-Najāshī p.230; Ṭ.al-Fihrist pp.206-7]. However, he was said to have repented and sent the money to al-Riḍā [R.al-Najāshī p.230; R.ībn Dāwud p.476]. He was claimed by al-Faḍl b. Shādhn among his sources and his name turns up amongst the list of the fugahā' of al-Kāzīm and al-Riḍā [Ikhtiyār p.543, n.1029; p.556, n.1050]. Because of a vision in which he saw himself dying in al-Hīr, he traveled there, and did indeed die, and was buried there [Ikhtiyār p.598, n.118; R.ībn Dāwud p.476; R.al-Najāshī p.230]. He wrote several works; K. al-Miyāh [R.ībn Dāwud p.476; Ṭ.al-Fihrist p.207; R.al-Najāshī p.230]; K. al-Qaḍāyā wa al-Aḥkām; K. al-Waṣiyya; K. al-Ṣalāt [R.al-Najāshī p.230]. He reported the beliefs of the ghālin Muḥammad b. Basīr to Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. ʿUbayd See also al-Māmaqānī II pp.247-9, n.7800.

<UTHMĀN B SAʿĪD
He is recorded in Bihār as the bāb of al-Jawād [Bihār p.106, n.24]. Al-Ruʿāsī, al-ʿAmrī, al-Sammān, al-Zayyāt, Abū ʿAmr who was jall, thiqā, a servant of al-Hādī when he was eleven years old [R.ībn Dāwud p.233, n.971; R.al-Ṭūsī p.420]. [It is not clear whether the age refers to the Imām or ʿUthmān]. He is recorded mainly as a follower of al-Hādī [R.al-Ṭūsī p.420], and al-ʿAskarī, for whom he was a wakīl [R.al-Ṭūsī p.434]. He was named al-ʿAmrī for his grandfather [Ghayba.T p.228], and al-Sammān for his trade in butter [Ghayba.T p.229]. For both al-Hādī and al-ʿAskarī he covertly channeled the gifts and
dues from the Shi'a to the Imam. He was considered trustworthy and as a full representative of the Imam. (Ghayba-I p.229) For full details on his career as the first safir of the Imam in occultation see J.M. Hussayn, Occultation, pp.85-98; Javad eAli, "Die beiden ersten safire des zwölfen Imãms", in Der Islam, XXV (1939), pp.197-227. Ûthmân died circa 267 A.H. See also al-Mâmaqânî II, pp.245-6, n.7783.

'UQBA B JA'FAR
He reports a statement from al-Riâdâ about the Imam not dying until he sees his successor (Biãr L, p.35, n.22). He is absent from major rijâl sources.

'URWA B YAHYÀ AL-DIHQÂN
Al-Nakhkhâs, he is listed as a follower of al-Hâdi (R.îbânî Barqi p.60; R.îbânî Dâwud p.477, n.306) and of al-Askarî (R.îbânî Tûsî p.433). He may also be listed under the name eAli b. Yahyâ al-Dihqân who was ghâlin (R.îbânî Tûsî p.418). Ûrwa was a Qummi wakîl of al-Askarî (R.îbânî Tûsî p.433). He was also said to be ghâlin, having lied against al-Riâdâ and Abû Muhammadd and was later cursed by the Imam Abû Muhammadd (R.îbânî Dâwud p.477, n.306). Ikhtiyâr says that he lied against al-Hâdi and al-Askarî, having seized wealth belonging to them for himself (Ikhtiyâr p.573, n.1086). It is reported that Abû eAli b. Ûrwa was in charge of a treasury belonging to the Imam which was handed over to Ûrwa who then took what he wanted and burnt the rest (Ikhtiyâr p.583, n.1086). When trying to get the Iraqis to accept his condemnation of Abû Hâlan to the Imam referred to al-Dihqân as a previous longstanding servant and associate who was seduced into kufr after being a true believer (Ikhtiyâr pp.535-6, n.1020). Whilst still in favour, al-Dihqân wrote to the Imam concerning the confusion which existed amongst the Shi'a concerning Fâris b. Hâtim (Ikhtiyâr p.528). He is also referred to as a wakîl and one of the thiqât of the Imam (Ikhtiyâr p.579, n.1088). See also al-Mâmaqânî II, p.252, nos.7884-5.

YAHYÀ B [ABD] IMRÂN
He is recorded as a follower of al-Riâdâ (R.îbânî Barqi p.54; R.îbânî Tûsî p.395), with the further nisba of al-Yûnusî allegedly derived from his association with Yûnus b. eAbd al-Rahmân (R.îbânî Tûsî p.395). He
received a letter from al-Riḍā warning him about Aḥmad b. Sābiq's extreme tendencies and charging him to communicate this to the other Shiʿites [Ikhtiyār p.552, n.1043]. Very little else is found on him in the rijāl sources. However, he is involved in some stories concerning al-Jawād. He reports the visit of a group of people of Rayy to the Imām [Biḥār L pp.44-5, n.14], and a further story tells of his replacement on his death by Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Hamdānī who received the letter of appointment two years beforehand [Biḥār L, p.37, n.2]. It is possible that Ibn Abī ʿImrān is the Yaḥyā b. ʿImrān who was killed in Qumm at the time when they refused to send the kharāj in 210 A.H. [al-Kāmil VI, p.282]. See also al-Maṣāfaqī III, p.308, n.12974 and Maqālim p.116 where he is referred to as Ibn ʿImrān.

**Yaḥyā b Akthām**

He was originally from Merw in Khurāsān, one of Banū Tamīm [Murūj III, p.436]. His name is given as Ibn ʿAmr b. Abī Rībāḥ in one source [Murūj III, p.434], but Ibn Muḥammad b. Qaṭān b. Simān in another [Taʾrīkh. B. p.191]. He was appointed as qāḍī of Bāṣra [Murūj III, p.436] at the age of twenty one [Taʾrīkh. B. p.198], accompanied there by Aḥmad b. Abī Duʿād [Wafāyāt I, p.65] in 202 A.H. He met considerable opposition there, both to his personal life, and to his legal views. He was accused of sodomy and perversion [Murūj p.434; Taʾrīkh. B. p.195] and opposed the legalization of mutaʿa, which he referred to as adultery, and made it illegal [Taʾrīkh. B. p.198]. Although finally dismissed from Bāṣra, he was appointed as qāḍī in Baghdaḏ by al-Maʿmūn [Taʾrīkh. B. p.191], and he and Ibn Abī Duʿād held great authority over several caliphs [Taʾrīkh. B. p.198]. He became by all accounts a close companion of al-Maʿmūn. Several interesting, and even amusing, stories are told of him and some of his debates are referred to [Murūj III, p.420, p.432, p.436]. Appointed to Diwān al-Ṣadaqāt for those suffering injury, he refused to give them anything and threw them in prison when they persisted. Called by the caliph to explain, he complained that they had called him Abū Saʿīd, a reference to his personal inclinations [Taʾrīkh. B. p.194]. Despite his personal quirks, he is still reported as outstanding in fiqh [Taʾrīkh. B. p.197]. He fell out of favour with al-Maʿmūn in 215 and was told to return to Iraq from Egypt [Murūj III, p.436; Taʾrīkh. B. pp.201-2 both say he did visit.
Egypt at one point, Ibn AbI Du'ād replaced him as chief qāḍī (Wafāyāt I, p.66), but Yaḥyā was favoured once more by al-Mutawakkil, who appointed him as chief qāḍī in Sāmarrā' in 239 after the disgrace of the family of Ibn AbI Du'ād (Murāj IV, p.14). As often occurred, he lost favour once more and was exiled to Baghdād, his wealth confiscated (Ta'rīkh.B. p.200). He died in 242 or 243 returning from the ḫalīf (Ta'rīkh.B. p.203).

YAḤYĀ B ḤABI B AL-ZAIYĀT
Although he reports a designation of al-Jawād (al-Irshād p.483), but is not recorded in any of the major sources.

YA-QŪB AL-SARRĀJ
He reported the designation of al-Kāẓim in the cradle (Ithbāt p.186; al-Kāfī I, p.310, n.11). He was Kufan and probably thiqā, although some doubt exists indicating that he may have been weak (R. ibn Dāwud p.379, n.1696). Sometimes he is listed as Ibn al-Sarrāj (Ṭ. al-Fihirist p.364, n.795), al-Barrāj, he had one book reported to Ibn Mahbūb (Ṭ. al-Fihirist p.364; R. al-Najāshī p.351). See also al-Māmaqānī III, pp.330-1, n.13277 and Maqālim p.118.

YA-QŪB B YĀSIR
Although he reports a major story about the caliph's reaction to the Imām's refusal to drink with him (Biḥār L, pp.159-61, n.49), he is not listed in the riḍāl sources.

YA-QŪB B YAZĪD B ḤAMMĀD
Al-Kātib, al-Anbarl, who is listed as a follower of al-Kāẓim (R. al-Barqī p.52), al-Jawād (R. ibn Dāwud pp.379-80, n.1700), and of al-Hādi (R. al-Barqī p.60; R. al-Tūsi p.425). His full name is given as Ibn Ḥammād al-Anbarl, al-Salami, Abū Yusuf al-Qummi, who was one of the kuttāb. of al-Muntasīr. He moved to Baghdād and was considered sadūq (R. ibn Dāwud pp.379-80; R. al-Najāshī p.350). He wrote several works; K. al-Badā'; K. al-Masā'il; K. Nawādir al-Ḥall; K. al-Ta'n 'Alī Yūnus (R. al-Najāshī p.350). In Ṭ. al-Fihirist he reports frequently to al-Ṣaffār, often from, or with Ibn Abī Ḫumayr. In Ikhtlyār he reports many accounts to Ḥamdawayh, again from Ibn Abī Ḫumayr. The Index
gives him as al-Kātib, al-Anbarī, who was a kātib of Abū Dulaf al-Qāsim. See also al-Māmaqānī, III, p.332, n.13291 and Maʿālīm p.118

YAZĪD B SULAYĪT

His contribution is one long hadīth encompassing several Imāms, and which, in one instance, is included as a designation of al-Jawād (Bihār L, p.25, n.17). He is listed as a follower of al-Kāzīm (R.ībn Dāwūd p.378, n.1692; R.al-Ṭūsī p.363) and one who reported a designation of al-Riḍā (R.al-Ṭūsī p.363). His nisba of al-Zaydī is said not to indicate his beliefs (R.al-Ṭūsī p.363). Two sources say of him only that his hadīth was lengthy (Ikhtiyār p.452, n.854; R.ībn Dāwūd p.37). See also al-Māmaqānī III, pp.326-7, n.13128.

YÚNUS B ʿABD AL-RAḤMĀN

Abū Muḥammad, mawlā ʿAlī b. Yaqtīn b. Mūsā or Āl Yaqtīn, he is recorded as a follower of al-Kāzīm and al-Riḍā (R.āl-Barqī p.49, p.54; R.ībn Dāwūd pp.380-1, n.1708; Fihrist N p.309). He is described as a prominent figure amongst the Shīʿa and of high standing (R.al-Najāṣhī p.348). He saw al-Ṣādiq, but did not report from him, only reporting from al-Kāzīm and al-Riḍā (R.al-Najāṣhī p.348). Al-Riḍā took advice in legal and religious matters from him (R.al-Najāṣhī p.348; R.ībn Dāwūd pp.380-1). Much wealth was offered to him by the Wāqīfa to keep quiet about his acceptance and recognition of al-Riḍā (R.ībn Dāwūd pp.380-1; R.al-Najāṣhī p.348; Ikhtiyār p.493, n.946; ʿUyūn R. I, p.91, n.2). Al-Riḍā directed ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. al-Muhtadī to seek out his advice when unable to reach him for help (R.al-Najāṣhī p.348; T.al-Fihrist p.367; R.ībn Dāwūd pp.380-1). Also reporting in his favour was al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Yaqtīn (R.al-Najāṣhī p.348). Despite these indications as to his excellent standing, he was slandered by the Qumīmīs, who said he was weak (R.ībn Dāwūd p.528, n.550; R.al-Ṭūsī p.364; R.ībn Dāwūd pp.380-1). Ibn al-Walīd considered that his works were reliable save those relayed solely through Muḥammad b. ʿIsā b. ʿUbayd, which were not regarded as usable for legal decisions (T.al-Fihrist p.367; R.ībn Dāwūd p.528). Muḥammad b. ʿIsā b. ʿUbayd was called al-Yūnusī, according to one opinion, because of his connection with Yūnus b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (R.al-Ṭūsī p.393). Also called by this nisba was Yaḥyā b. ʿImlān (R.al-Ṭūsī p.395). Fihrist N records Yūnus as
one of the associates particularly of al-Kāẓim and as a Shiʿite author of high repute (p. 309). Maqālāt says he was one of the Shiʿa who were associated with Hishām b. al-Ḥakam and that he was a Qummī (p. 127). He wrote a long list of works on legal topics [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p. 367; R. al-Najashi pp. 348–9], including one on the Imāmate and another on inadvertent error.

Reports in favour of him in Ikhtiyār are reported extensively from al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz b. al-Muhtadī and Dāwud b. al-Qāsim, many relayed via Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā b. ʿUbayd. Those criticising him come via Yaʿqūb b. Yazīd [who wrote a book concerning the accusations leveled at Yūnus], al-Ḥasan b. Rāshid and al-Ḥusayn b. Bashshār. Criticism was leveled at him by some Basrans, who alleged that he believed that al-kalām was not created [Ikhtiyār p. 490, n. 934]. On this occasion the Imām rejected Yūnus' views, but on other occasions when criticised by Basrans, and others who called him zindiq, the Imām dismisses this by saying that they simply could not understand his [i.e Yūnus'] arguments [Ikhtiyār p. 487, n. 924; p. 488, n. 928; p. 488, nos. 929–30]. Jaʿfar b. ʿĪsā b. Yaḥṭīn sought the Imām's advice on whether to continue to accept the teachings of Yūnus and Hishām, because others were calling him and his associates zindiq and kāfir for doing so [Ikhtiyār pp. 498–9, n. 956]. Yūnus himself asked several questions of the Imām, one of which aroused his disapproval. The first concerned whether or not the Garden and Hell were yet created [Ikhtiyār p. 491, n. 84; p. 491, n. 940]; the second which occasioned the ire of the Imām was whether or not Adam contained any of the essence of God, even the question in this case being rejected [Ikhtiyār p. 492, n. 942; p. 495, n. 950]; finally Yūnus questioned him on the death of Mūsā, whether it was a true death or merely one of ghayba [Ikhtiyār p. 494, n. 947]. Yūnus had several other critics, among them ʿAlī b. Ḥadīd b. Ḥakīm and Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā [Ikhtiyār p. 496, nos. 950, 952]. Al-Faḍl reports that the Qummīs eventually repented of the amazing allegations that they had made against Yūnus and Hishām [Ikhtiyār p. 497, n. 955]. Yūnus upheld the same views as Zurāra concerning istiḥsāʿ against those who supported the concept of jabr [Ikhtiyār p. 145, n. 229]. He is linked with Hishām and his attendance at the debates arranged by the Barmakids [Ikhtiyār pp. 258–9, n. 477], and asked Hishām if he had really been ordered to cease his discussions by al-Kāẓim [Ikhtiyār p. 265,
n. 479]. Yunus views on the nature of God are reported along with those of Hishām [Ikhtiyār p.284, n.503]. He did not accept the hadīths of the asbāb on the grounds that al-Ṣādiq had told Hishām not to accept anything which did not conform to the Qur'ān and the Sunna [Ikhtiyār p.224, n.401].

YUNUS B YA-QŪB
Abū ʿAli, al-Jalāb [R. al-Najashi p.348], al-BajaIī who is recorded as thīga, with a suspicion that he may have been ṣufī and weak [R. ibn Dāwud p.382, n.1709; R. ibn Dāwud p.533]. He was a follower of al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāzim [R. ibn Dāwud p.382; R. al-Najashi p.348; R. al-Ṭūsī p.363], but may have been also amongst those of al-Riḍā [R. al-Ṭūsī p.394]. He was a wakīl of Abū al-Ḥasan [R. al-Ṭūsī p.348] and wrote to al-Riḍā asking if any zakāt should be handed over to anyone who held waqīfīte views [Ikhtiyār p.456, n.862]. He wrote one book, K. al-Uṣūf [R. al-Najashi p.348; Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.368]. One of his major reports was that of a debate in Medina with al-Ṣādiq and many prominent scholars including Muḥammad b. al-Nuʿmān, Ḥumrān b. Aṣ-ṣī, Hishām b. Sālim who were invited to refute the views of a visiting Syrian [Ikhtiyār pp.188-9, n.331]. He died in Medina during the time of al-Riḍā [Ikhtiyār p.385, n.720; R. al-Najashi p.348]. See also al-ʾMāmaqānī III, pp.344-5, n.13365 and Maʿālim p.119.

YUSUF B AL-SUKHT
Abū Yaʿqūb al-Baṣrī, he is recorded as a follower of al-ʾAskarī, who did not report directly from the Imām [R. al-Ṭūsī p.437]. He is considered weak [R. ibn Dāwud p.527, n.544]. He was apparently in Sāmarrāʾ when ṢAli b. ʾAbd al-Ḡaffār came and told him that al-ʾAmrī had ordered him to send someone to meet ṢAli b. ʾAmr, who had just arrived, in order to warn him about Fāris [Ikhtiyār p.526, n.1008]. He reports in Ikhtiyār on the background of ṢAli b. Mahdiyyār [Ikhtiyār p.548, n.1038]. See also al-ʾMāmaqānī which comments that he was apparently left out of Nawādir al-ʾHikma by the Qummls [III, pp.335-6, n.13323].

ZAKARIYYĀ B ADAM
T. al-Fihrist p. 144, n. 3001, he is listed as a follower of al-Riḍā and al-Jawād [R. ibn Dāwud p. 158, n. 625; R. al-Ṭusi p. 377, p. 401]. He wrote one book of Masā’il from al-Riḍā and is said to be thiqa, jallī and of high standing in the eyes of the Imam al-Riḍā [T. al-Fihrist p. 144; R. al-Najāshi p. 131]. He spoke to al-Riḍā about leaving the people of his own house because of their stupidity, but was told not to because he relied on them for protection [R. ibn Dāwud p. 158; Ikhtiyār p. 594, n. 1111]. Al-Riḍā recommended him as an instructor to ʿAlī b. al-Musayyib [al-Hamdānī R. ibn Dāwud p. 251, n. 1068 thiqa], when the latter asked what he should do when he was distant from the Imam himself [R. ibn Dāwud p. 159; Ikhtiyār p. 595, n. 1112]. His position under al-Jawād was not as secure. Several stories relate how he was one of those praised by the Imam [Ghayba. T p. 225; Ikhtiyār p. 503, n. 964; p. 595, n. 1113; Bihār L, pp. 67–8, n. 45]. However, others involved with him, such as Muḥammad b. Sinān and Ṣafwān b. Yaḥyā, were also on the receiving end of curses, the problem being one of a delay in transferring dues to the Imam. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ʿĪsā considered making a plea on his behalf during an audience with al-Jawād, insisting that he was sending the dues. This suggests that Zakariyyā was not immediately supportive of al-Jawād, or that, whilst theoretically recognising him, he did not accept him in full authority. He does report a designation of al-Jawād when the Imam was aged four [Ithbāt p. 210]. Three months after his death some people on the baiʿa intercepted a letter from the Imam acknowledging that Zakariyyā had lived his life recognising the truth and openly professing it [Ikhtiyār p. 595, n. 1114]. See also al-Māmaqānī I, pp. 447–8, n. 4236 and Maṣālim p. 46.

ZIYĀD B MARWĀN

Abū al-Faḍl or Abū ʿAbdallāh, al-Qandī, al-Anbārī, recorded as a follower of al-Kāẓim and al-Ṣādiq [R. al-Barqī p. 49; R. ibn Dāwud p. 454, n. 185; R. al-Ṭusi p. 198, p. 350; T. al-Fihrist p. 146]. He was a wakīl of al-Kāẓim who refused to recognise al-Riḍā because of the wealth he was holding [Ghayba. T p. 227]. He was a mawla of Banū Ḥashim who reported from al-Ṣādiq and al-Riḍā, although only one book is recorded [R. al-Najāshi p. 129]. For details of his wāqifism see Ikhtiyār p. 466,
nos 886-8; p.493, n.946 and Chapter 7 of this thesis. See also al-Māmaqānī I, pp.357-9, n.4355 and Maṣālim p.45.

ZURĀRA B A‘YAN

Abū ʿAlī, Abū al-Ḥasan, Zurāra was a nickname, his real name being ʿAbd Rabbiḥi [Ṭ. al-Fihrist p.141, n.295; Fihrist N p.308]. His father, Ḍiyān b. Sunsun [or Sinbis - Fihrist N p.308], was a Roman slave of a Shaybānī who was freed after learning the Qurʾān. He had been a Christian monk [R. ibn Dawūd pp.155-7, n.619; Fihrist N pp.308-9]. He is listed as a follower of al-Bāqīr, al-Ṣādiq and al-Kāẓim [R. al-Barqī p.16, p.47; R. ibn Dawūd pp.155-7]. Considered as one of the most excellent of his time, he had acquired much knowledge from al-Bāqīr and was subsequently highly praised for preserving it by al-Ṣādiq [R. ibn Dawūd pp.156-7]. He was also, however, one of the four cursed by al-Ṣādiq [See under Abū Başīr]. R. al-Najāṣī records him as a shaykh of his time, a reciter of the Qurʾān, faqīh, mutakallim, adhīb, shākir [p.132]. Fihrist N agrees with this, calling him one of the greatest of the Shiʿa in fiqh, hadith and kalām [Fihrist N p.309]. Of his books are recorded; K. al-Istīlāṣa; K. al-Jabr; K. al-Uḥūd [Ṭ. al-Fihrist pp.142-3]. He died in 150 A.H. [R. al-Najāṣī p.132]. He had an extensive family [See R. ibn Dawūd pp.155-6; Ṭ. al-Fihrist pp.141-2]. The extensive reports in Ikhtiyār are beyond the scope of this index. For main reports see Ikhtiyār pp.133-61, nos. 208-271.
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