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ABSTRACT

The present study is devoted to the role of Imam Muḥammad al-Baqir in early Islam. The first introductory chapter gives a brief social and cultural background of the period in which al-Baqir lived and surveys the Shi'i sources. The second chapter is a historical background dealing with the idea of Imamate until al-Baqir's time. The third chapter looks at some aspects of al-Baqir's life such as his laqab, his waṣṭiya, his rivals and the controversies regarding his death-dates.

Chapter four investigates al-Baqir's views on the Imamate from Qur'anic point of view as well as from the traditional angle. It also deals with some of the concepts which al-Baqir put forward such as ṭaḥṣil, ẓilāl, nūr, iṣma and others. The fifth chapter discusses some of the theological views current at the time of al-Baqir, topics such as ʿImān, taqīya, qaḍā wa al-gadar and the unity of God.

The second last chapter studies al-Baqir's image as a traditionist both, among the non-Shi'ite circle as well as the Shi'ite circle. The chapter also includes some of al-Baqir's more popular associates. The final chapter discusses al-Baqir's contribution to fiqh which involves the foundation of the Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt as well as advice to his followers and others on some legal problems amidst the varying interpretation of different scholars.
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The system of transliteration in this work follows in general the method of the Library of Congress as outlined in the Cataloguing Service Bulletin, 49 (December, 1958) except for the two diphthongs Ӧ and Ԉ where instead of the usual iyy and uww, I have preferred to use iy and uw.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

It has been generally assumed that al-Baqir led an inconspicuous life from the point of view of history.\(^1\) Scholars have not only doubted his achievements and thereby his success, but, they are even suspicious whether he claimed the Imamate for himself.\(^2\) This study seeks to examine the above claims and looks at al-Baqir's contribution not only from the Shi'ite angle but also from the general Islamic point of view.

In order to appreciate al-Baqir's role and influence more clearly, an historical background about the idea of the Imamate until his time has been given. This is followed by some aspects of his life and career which includes a discussion about his popular laqab al-Baqir and a section on his wasīya, after which his position in relation to his rivals is examined together with the controversy regarding his dates of death.

\(^1\) Donaldson, Shi'ite Religion, p.119.

The next chapter looks at al-Bāqir's views on the Imamat with Qur'ān and Ḥadīth as the bases. In defining his theory of the Imamat he puts forward certain pre-requisites so that some sort of order could be brought into the otherwise confused concept of Imamat that had then emerged amongst the various rival groups. The following chapter looks at al-Bāqir's contribution to some current theological issues of the period such as ʿImān, taqīya, ʿaqā wa al-qadar and the unity of God.

The second last chapter studies al-Bāqir's image as a traditionist (muhaddith), both among non-Shīʿite and Shīʿite circles. This chapter also includes a section on his Shīʿite associates. The final chapter looks at al-Bāqir's role as a faqīḥ who gave advice and guidance to his followers as well as others amidst the varying interpretations of the different groups at the time.

The above discussions form the main element of this study. However, it will be appropriate to give a general survey of the social and cultural background of the Islamic empire during al-Bāqir's period. This will help to provide a better picture of his contribution to that period and also give some idea of the environment and circumstances of the period in which he lived.
Social and Cultural Background to al-Bāqir's period

Al-Bāqir happened to live at a very crucial time in Islamic History. Not only did al-Bāqir witness the vast extension of the Islamic empire, he also saw the Arabization of the state administration, the introduction of purely Arab coinage as well as the development of a postal system. It was also during this period that many architectural monuments such as the Dome of Rock in Jerusalem and the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus were built and adorned.

It seems, also, that the study of the Qur'ān was a principal concern of Muslims. A little earlier in order to preserve the Qur'ānic text from corruption, steps were taken to establish a more adequate script as well as rules of Arabic grammar. The first attempts for these were made in Kūfa and Basra as it was there that the need was first felt. Medina, however, continued to be regarded as the centre of religious learning where the foundations of studies connected with the Qur'ān were laid.

The interpretation of the Qur'ān also necessitated a careful study of its grammatical structure and
vocabulary. This gave rise to the twin sciences of philology and lexicography.¹ The manner in which Qur'anic passages were applied was based on recollections of actions or sayings of the Prophet that had some bearing on the subject of the text. Rules for conducting the daily life and affairs were also sought in the practice of the Prophet (sunna); thus there came into being the science of Tradition (hadīth). The study of the Qur'ān and hadith formed the bases upon which the study of kalām (theology) and fiqh (jurisprudence) were built.²

Al-Bāqir, thus, happened to live at a time when the various scholars were pursuing these studies and even travelling far and wide in search of traditions. These traditions necessarily included much historical material, mainly with regard to the Prophet's military expeditions (maghāzī) as well as other aspects of his life (sīra). Alongside this, there also began to appear accounts of early Islamic historical material.

By the time al-Baqir succeeded his father in c.94 A.H., the various schools of law had begun


² Hitti, op.cit. p.242: Also see Gibb, op.cit.
arguing over different juridical issues; the traditionists opposed the jurists regarding the position of the *sunna* of the Prophet and the exegetes gave varying interpretations of Qur'anic ayats, all apparently based on Prophetic traditions. Furthermore, serious theological discussions also took place among the scholars on topics revolving around the Imamate, topics such as *īmān* and *Islam, qadā' wa qadar* and other such related subjects which had obvious political undertones. Therefore, it is also during this period that we may trace the rudiments of many of those religio-philosophical movements and religio-political sects within Islam such as the Qadariyya, the Murji'a and the Kharijīya who formed the earliest religio-political sect. The Shi'a, one of the two camps into which Islam split on the issue of the Imamate also took definite form during al-Baqir's period.

Ironically, it was also during this period that the twin cities of Mecca and Medina, especially Mecca, were transformed into centres of luxury and worldly pleasure where wealth and singing girls from the conquered lands poured in. This led many people to indulge in past-times like chess, backgammon, dice and other luxurious habits such as drinking and gambling. With such an atmosphere it was not long before poetry began to reassert itself, especially that
of the sensual type such as that of ʿUmar b. Abī Rabīʿa in Mecca and Jamīl in Medina.

Undoubtedly, the pious people were disturbed at the state of affairs in which society had sunk in. They detested especially the rulers who by leading a luxurious life themselves not only set an example to others but also gave the license which religion forbade. Another area of widespread dissatisfaction was the way in which society was roughly divided. The ruling class was formed by the caliph's family and the aristocracy of Arab conquerors. Then came the neo-muslims who were clients (mawālī) to some of the Arab tribes. This was a status which they bitterly resented and their espousal of the Shiʿite cause in Iraq and the Kharijites in Persia was one way in which they expressed their dissatisfaction. Thirdly, there were the non-Muslims i.e. Christians, Jews and others known as dhimmis for the tribute they paid in return for protection (dhimma) and then lastly, at the social ladder, stood the slaves.

Thus during the period in which al-Bāqir lived, groups of Muslims denounced the Umayyads and at the same time placed before the people some hope for liberation which they said could only be achieved through a divinely-inspired leader. Most people believed that this leader al-mahdī, the rightly guided,
could only come from the Prophet's family, the Ahl al-Bayt. This led many members of the Prophet's family to exploit the situation and a variety of competing organizations appear each claiming some connection with the Prophet's family.

Survey of Shi'ite sources:

In this study, as well as the standard Islamic sources, particular attention will be paid to Shi'ite sources which have not received as much attention from scholars. An attempt has been made to include Shi'ite sources of all persuasions, - Zaydi, Ithnawi, Ashari and Ismaili, particularly the last two. Among Zaydi sources, one particular manuscript has been extensively used in this study especially in the chapter on 'Al-Baqir's contribution to fiqh.' This is the Amali Ahmad b. Ibrahîm of Muhammad b. Mansûr al-Murâdî which contains many traditions of al-Baqir reported by Abû al-Jârûd on different juridical issues such as the adhân, prayer, gunût, divorce, zakât, the rites of pilgrimage (manâsik al-hajj) and other miscellaneous aspects of fiqh. Besides the Majmu' al-fiqh attributed to Zayd b. CAli, other Zaydi sources have been used but mainly from quotations provided in W. Madelung's Der Imam al-Qâsim ibn Ibrâhîm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen (Berlin, 1965) and C. Van Arendonk's Les Débuts de L'Imamat Zaidite au Yemen (Leyden, 1960).

1. Ambros. H. 135 Gall.
As far as Ithnā' Asharī sources are concerned the earliest extant works are collections of hadith known as usūl (sing. asl). These are supposed to consist of utterances of an Imam which are committed to writing for the first time, sometimes directly from the Imam and sometimes on the authority of a hadith scholar. The number of usūl is usually estimated at 400, of which only thirteen are known to have survived in manuscripts. Their contents include traditions of a historical, doctrinal, legal, anecdotal and polemical nature.

At a later stage, these various usūl, most of which are attributed to the disciples of Imam Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, were incorporated into larger works known as jawāmi', which in turn served as sources for subsequent Shi'Cite works. Among Shi'Cite Ithnā' Asharī

1. al-Uṣūl al-arba'Ca mi'ah (Tehran, 1371) Dānishgāh No. 962 Zayd al-Zarrād K. al-Aṣl (f.1b-9a); Ābbād al-Usfurī K. al-Aṣl (f.9b-12a); Āṣim b. Humayd al-Ḥannāt K. al-Aṣl (f.12b-25a); Zayd al-Nārsi K. al-Aṣl (f.25b-35a); Ja'far b. Muḥammad b. Shurayh al-Ḥadrāmī K. al-Aṣl (f.35b-48b); Muḥammad b. al-Muthanna al-Ḥadrāmī K. al-Aṣl (f.49a-57a); Ābd al-Malik b. Ḥākim K. al-Aṣl (f.58b-59b); Muthanna b. al-Ḥalid al-Ḥannāt K. al-Aṣl (f.59b-61b); Khallād al-Sindī K. al-Aṣl (f.61b-62a); Al-Ḥusayn b. ʿUṭmān b. Sharīk K. al-Aṣl (f.62b-65a); Ābd Allah b. Yahyā al-ʿĀṣīlī K. al-Aṣl (f.65a-66b); Salām b. Abī ʿAmra al-Ḥūfī K. al-Aṣl (f.66b-68a); Ālī b. Āshāṭ K. al-Nawādir (f.68a-74b).

compilations, a unique position is occupied by those concerned with the virtues and prerogatives of the Imam. The earliest of these to have survived is the *Basa'ir al-darajat* of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār al-Qummi (d. 290/963). It is believed that in the above work, al-Ṣaffār included many of the sayings from a document (*sahīfa*) which the Prophet had dictated to ʿAlī.

Many of the traditions found in the *Basa'ir* were incorporated by Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Kulaynī (d.329/941) in his major work *al-Kāfī fi 'ilm al-Dīn* which is divided into three parts: *al-uqūl, al-furūʿ* and *al-rawḍa*. It is the *uqūl* and *furūʿ* which are relevant to this study. *Al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī* encompasses in its two volumes the doctrine of the Imamate in the form of numerous traditions dealing with the necessity of an Imam and belief in him as prerequisite to faith, the Imam's knowledge and other theological aspects of the Imamate. It also contains sections on merits of knowledge, the concept of *tawhid*, belief and heresy, Qurʾān and prayers as well as a section on social relations. The *furūʿ* contains the basic doctrine of law where

1. Al-Ṣaffār was an important ṱāwī of al-Kulaynī. See for more details Ivanow, W. *The Alleged Founder* who has a chapter on *al-Kāfī* and its author pp.11ff including his ṱawis.
emphasis is laid on the religious aspects of law, the Cibādāt.

A work that is rarely used by scholars is the Ithbāt al-Waṣīya attributed to al-Mascudi (d.346 A.H.). He describes the transfer of the ruling authorities and the religious testament of the ancient patriarchs from generation to generation since the creation of Adam. Another work that also has traditions on the nature of the Imamate as well as on other theological issues is the Risāla al-Iṣṭiqādāt al-Imāniya of Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. ʿAlī Ibn Bābawayhī (d.381/991) which is translated by Aṣaf A.A. Fyzee under the title: A Shiʿite Creed.¹

In addition to traditions regarding the Imamate, there are numerous others dealing with the virtues of ʿAlī, the first Imam and his right to rule. These are grouped together under titles such as Khaṣṣaʾis, Manāqib or Faḍāʾil ʿAlī. Among many such works may be mentioned the Khaṣṣaʾis Amir al-Muʾminin of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sharīf al-Rāḍī (d.406/1015).² The

¹. Published for the Islamic Research Association by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press (Calcutta 1942).

². The Sunnī author al-Nasāʾī (d.303/916) also has a similar work by the same title. He was one of the many non-Shiʿite writers to collect traditions on ṣAlī's virtues.
biography of ʿAlī and other Imams has been dealt with by the renowned scholar and theologian, Muhammad b. Muhammad b. al-Nuʾmān al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413/1022) in his *K. al-Irshād*. Al-Mufīd is also the author of the *K. al-Jamāl* which contains traditions relating to the battle of Camel (36/656). Another work referred and used in this study are the sermons attributed to ʿAlī in the *Nahj al-Balāgha* as collected by al-Sharīf al-Rādi.

An invaluable source of traditions is provided by early Shiʿite Qurʾān commentaries. One such work is the *Tafsīr al-Qummi* of Abū al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummi (d.c. 307/919). This *Tafsīr* contains much historical material related to the Sīra but hardly pays any attention to linguistic problems and ignores many difficult Qurʾānic passages, perhaps due to its polemical nature. Al-Qummi's first transmitter, Abu al-Fadl al-ʿAbbas b. Muhammad b. al-Qāsim, incorporated into the work traditions from the *Tafsīr Abū al-Jārūd* otherwise referred to as the *K. al-Baqīr*

---

1. This work has been translated by I. K. A. Howard.
2. There are numerous Pakistani translations of this work. One among them is by M. A. Salmin (Lahore, n.d).
by Ibn al-Nadîm. This is the Qur'an commentary which Abū al-Jārūd Ziyād b. al-Mundhir transmitted from Imam al-Bāqir. The other later famous Qur'ān commentaries are al-Tibyān fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān of Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsî (d. 460 AH) and the Majmu‘ al-bayan fī tafsīr al-Qur'ān of al-Fadl b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabrisī (d. 548/1153). These commentaries also contain many traditions although their main concern is with legal, linguistic and doctrinal problems.

Besides the Uṣūl al-arba‘Cu - mi‘ah and the Furu‘C min al-Kāfî mentioned earlier on, Shī‘ite traditions of a legal nature are also found in the Man la yahdurūhu al-faqīh of Ibn Bābawayhi and Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsî’s Tahdhīb al-aḥkām and al-Istibqār. In fact legal traditions are also found in al-Ḥimyarī’s Qurb al-īsnād which is earlier than al-Kulaynī’s al-Kāfî. Another earlier work which has a section on jurisprudence is the K. al-Maḥāsin of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Barqī (d. 274 A.H.). Al-Barqī is also the author of the Kitāb al-Rijāl in which he has listed the followers of the various Imams. Later writers have commented upon these traditions, of which one of the most popular is the Waqā‘il al-Shī‘a ilā aḥādith al-Sharī‘a by Muḥammad by al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr al-Cāmīlī

1. Fihrist, trans. by Dodge, I, p.75.
The other sources for Shi'ite traditions are works known as the Amali. These are dictations taken down by the pupils from their shaykhs. As these Amali were usually dictated at a number of successive sessions (majalis, sing. majlis) these works sometimes may be referred to as majalis as well. Several such works have come down from prominent scholars like Ibn Babawayhi, al-Mufid, al-Sharif al-Murtada and Abü Ja'far al-Tusī. The traditions in these works are not grouped according to any specific themes; rather they relate to different issues such as historical, doctrinal and legal.

Another useful work is the Cumdat al-Talib, a Shi'ite genealogical work by Aḥmad b. Ṭalib, known as Ibn Ṭinab (d.825/1422). He is quite well informed regarding the early Shi'ite movements.

Another important source material for the early period is preserved by later Shi'ite writers in their voluminous works. Among them may be mentioned the Manaqib Al-Abi Ṭalib of Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ṭalib Ibn Shahrashūb (d.588/1192). Another prolific writer is Ḥasan b. Yūsuf Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (d.726/1325) who has written extensively on Ḥadīth, theology and history. But perhaps the most famous and the
most useful is the encyclopaedic work *Bihār al-anwār* by Muḥammad Baqir b. Muḥammad Taqī al-Majlisi (d.1110/1700). Using a vast variety of Shiʿite sources and scrupulously mentioning them, al-Majlisi's work provides valuable information on early Shiʿite history, doctrine and tradition.

The fundamental work for Ismāʿīlī source material is Ismāʿīl b. ʿAbd al-Rasūl al-Majdū's *Fihrist* compiled during the second half of the 12th/18th century in India. Al-Majdū describes the contents of about 250 works, classifying them into various branches and arranging them in progressive order according to the study of daʿwa literature. W. Ivanow published a more comprehensive work, entitled, *A Guide to Ismaʿīlī Literature* based mainly on al-Majdū's *Fihrist* as well as on oral information derived from members of the Ismāʿīlī community. A revision of this work was undertaken and published with some additions and omissions in 1963 under the title, *Ismāʿīlī Literature: A Bibliographical Survey*.

However, the more recent work of Poonawala,

---


Biobibliography of Ismāʿīlī Literature is undoubtedly an invaluable compendium and a major contribution to Ismāʿīlī Studies. This work lists and locates all the Ismāʿīlī works, printed as well as in manuscripts that are known to exist. Like Carl Brockelmann in his Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur, Poonawala also describes each author and his works, giving dates of the authors where known with some biographical details as well. In addition he also provides a list of sources for the author's life and works.

One of the earliest Ismāʿīlī works that has been particularly useful in this study is the K. al-Zīna of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d.c. 322/934-5), one of the earliest Ismāʿīlī dāʿīs. The work itself is in a manuscript form and is divided into nine sections. The section that is of interest here is the seventh section dealing with muslim schools and sects and has been edited by an Iraqi scholar, al-Sāmarrāʾī in the appendix of his work al-Ghulūww.

1. (California, 1977).
2. See for more details, Poonawala's Biobibliography, pp.36ff as well as A. H. Hamdani paper in "Acte Du XXI Congres International de Orientalistes" (Paris 1948), pp.291-94 who gives some details about the author and the work. Al-Rāzī is also the author of other works such as K. al-Iṣlah, and Ḥāl al-Nubūwa both of which fall outside the scope of this study.
3. (Baghdad, 1972).
Another early Ismāʿīlī writer whose various works have been extensively used in this study is the famous al-Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān (d.363/974), a brilliant and versatile writer who appears equally at ease writing history, theology or law. Among his various works is the *Sharḥ al-Akhbār* which is a manuscript in 16 parts. The first eleven parts deal with ʿAlī, his delegation from the Prophet, his role in the battles, his struggle against the various rebels, his qualities and other aspects of his life. Part 12 deals with Hasan and Husayn, and part 13 which is more essential to this study mentions the battle of Karbala' and those who died there moving on to the delegation of authority to Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn. He then gives some details of the Imam's life and circumstances before moving on to al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq. In each case he gives some details about the happenings that occurred during these Imams' times.\(^1\) Parts 14, 15 and 16 give some reports on Imams, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, Imam Ismāʿīl, Imam Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl and *al-Aʾīma al-Masturīn* until the time of al-Mahdī but provides more details on the Alids who preceded al-Mahdī in his claims to the Caliphate.\(^2\)

---

1. See A. S. Tritton (and P. Kraus), "Notes on some Ismāʿīlī Manuscripts" *BSOS*, 7 (1933).

2. For more details on the contents of each of the sixteen parts in four volumes, see Majdū ʿFihrist 69-72. Part I has been printed by al-Jamīʿa al-Sayfiya. (Surat, India).
Another work of al-Qādī al-Nuṣrān which is also in a manuscript and which proved useful is the Manāqib li Ahl al-Bayt wa al-Mathālib Banī Umayya. According to Ivanow¹ this work was compiled earlier than the Sharh in which he used extracts from the Manāqib. A comparison of the section dealing with al-Baqir proves this to be true. However, in the Manāqib some additional and useful information is given about the history of the Umayyad period since in the above work he compares the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt with the faults of the Banū Umayya.

Yet another work of al-Qādī al-Nuṣrān used here is the K. al-Iqāh. It is or was one of the earliest and most comprehensive works on fiqh. However only a portion of it on salāt has survived.² It begins with traditions of al-Baqir and al-Ṣādiq on the merits of the prescribed prayer and the approach towards it. Then follows a detailed discussion on how to determine the exact time for each prayer. After that there are traditions on various aspects of the prayer such as the inclusion of the formula Hayy ḡala khayr al-camal in the adhān, the adhān itself and Iqāma, the

¹ Ivanow, "Early Shiʿite Movements" JBBRAS 17 (1941) p.4.
² See for more details Poonawala's Biobibliography pp.51-52. I have used the microfilm of the Tubingen manuscript given to me by Prof. Madelung.
mosque and its rules of conduct. Then, there are traditions about one who leads the prayer, about the merits of reciting the *ṣishā* and the *fajr* prayers in congregation as well as about what *suras* (actually *suwar*) may be said or recited in the prescribed prayers.

Among the various printed works of al-ʿQādī al-Nuṣairī that have been extensively used in this study is the *Daqīq al-Islam* in two volumes. It is worth mentioning that there is a fundamental distinction in Ismāʿīlī literature between *zāhirī* knowledge and *bāṭinī* knowledge. The former comprises of *fiqh*, history, admonition, *manāqib*, *fada'il* and other related areas while the *bāṭinī* knowledge consists of *ta'wīl* and *hagāʾiq*.

As for the *Daqīq* itself, it follows the usual pattern of other works on Islamic *fiqh* with the exception of the theory of *walāya*, (allegiance and devotion to the Imams) and the subject of *tahāra* or religious purity. The latter is of course a speciality of all Shiʿite *fiqh* but for the Ismāʿīlis in particular *tahāra* has an esoteric meaning signifying love and

---

1. See for more details regarding the manuscripts, editions and translation, Poonawala, *Biobibliography* pp. 56-7.
devotion to the Imams. The corresponding esoteric works for the Da'īm are al-Qādī al-Nuṣṣār’s Ta’wil al-Da’īm and the Asās al-Ta’wil, both of which have been edited.

Still another work of al-Qādī al-Nuṣṣār is the kitāb al-himma fi atbāʾ al-a’immah which deals primarily with the subject of the Imamate. It also gives an ethic or code of conduct for the believers as well as refutes ghulāt ideas and argues that ghanīma is "everything acquired by man", a fifth of which belongs to the Imams. Yet a work of al-Qādī al-Nuṣṣār is al-Urjūza al-Mukhtāra where he explains the idea of the Imamate and other related aspects in a poem. It is basically a work of polemics and refutation. There are quite a number of other works of al-Qādī on other subjects especially fiqh, such as al-Urjūza al-Muntakhaba, Mukhtaṣar al-Īdāh, K. al-Iqtisār, k. al-Yanbū’, Mukhtaṣar al-Āthār and

---

1. Da’īm al-Islam I, pp.121-158; al-Majālis al Mustansirīya, pp.40-43 and Tāj al-‘Aqā’id, p.51
2. See for more details the Biobibliography of Poonawala pp.63-64.
3. The work was first edited by M. Kāmil Husayn but I have used the one edited by Mustafa Ghālib (Beirut, 1979).
4. Edited by Ismā’īl K. Poonawala.
The earliest esoteric work which contains some useful information is the *Asrar al-Nutaqa* of Sayyid-na Ja'far b. Mansūr al-Yaman, a contemporary of al-Qāqī al-Nūmān. The *Asrar al-Nutaqa* is closely connected with his other work the *Sarā'ir al-Nutaqa* and appears to be a revised and amplified version of the latter. The *Sarā'ir* deals with the esoteric interpretations of the stories of the great prophets and ends with the *ta'wil* of *Sūra al-Masad*. The *Asrar* appears to be a verbatim copy of the *Sarā'ir* with some additions and omissions. One of the additions is a section on "Shi'ite sects after the death of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq." In this work the author also mentions that 120 years have elapsed since the "disappearance" of al-Ḥasan al-Askarī which was in 260 A.H. Therefore, it is possible that either the second work compiled around 380 A.H. was later ascribed to Ja'far b. Mansūr al-Yaman or that the author was not the son but the grandson of Ibn Hawshab, *ibn* signifying a descendant rather than a son.

---

1. For details about the manuscripts and editions of these works, ref. Poonawala's *Biobibliography* pp.52-54.

2. Poonawala, *Bibliography*, p.72

3. Ivanow, *Rise of the Fatimids*, p.18
Ja'far b. Manṣūr al-Yaman has written a number of other works and is considered one of the leading exponents of ta'wīl. Many of his works such as the kitāb al-farā'īd wa ḥudūd al-dīn containing esoteric interpretations of sura Yusuf, Kahf and Nūr are still in manuscript form. Others such as the K. al-Kashf are edited. An interesting work that is ascribed to him is the kitāb al-fatarāt wa al-girānāt. This work which deals with the prophecies and occult sciences believed to have been revealed by ʿAlī is also known as K. al-Jaf in Mowlana ʿAlī b. Abī ʿAlī. Still another interesting work of his is the Shawāhid wa al-Bayān also in a manuscript which contains ayats referring to ʿAlī and his successors.

Two other brilliant writers of the period were Abū Yaḥyā b. Sijistānī (d. 386-393 A.H.) and Ḥamīd al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAbdAllah al-Kirmānī, both of whom have written numerous works. Among Sijistānī’s many works may be mentioned the Ithbāṭ al-Nabūwwa, the Kitāb al-maqlālid, the Kitāb al-Yanābī and many others.2

1. See Poonawala’s Biobibliography pp. 70-75 for more details regarding this as well as other works of the author.

2. See for more details about al-Sijistānī and his other works Poonawala, Biobibliography, pp. 82ff. For the contents of these works, see al-Majdū, Fihrist and Ivanow Guide to Iṣmāʿīlī literature and his Iṣmāʿīlī Literature: A Bibliographical Survey.
Al-Kirmānī (d.c. 412 A.H.) too, wrote a number of works among which are the Rāhat al-Cāql, the Kitāb al-Riyāḍ, al-Aqwāl al-Dakahīya the Maṣāḥīm al-Ḥuda and al-Maṣābiḥ fī Ithbāt al-Imama.

Another work that has been used in this study is the Risāla fī al-Imama by Abū al-Fawāris Ahmād b. Yaqūb (d.413 A.H.).² This consists of answers given by him to various questions put to him concerning the Imamate.

Al-Mu'ayyad fī al-Dīn al-Shirāzī (d.470 A.H.) was yet another learned scholar of the Ismā'īlis whose many works are mostly in manuscripts except the Sīra al-Mu'ayyad and the Diwān al-Mu'ayyad, both of which have been edited by M. Kāmil Ḥusayn. Some excerpts of his great work, al-Majālīs al-Mu'ayyadīya,³ consisting of eight hundred majālīs in eight volumes are found in M. Ḥārithī, Majmū' al-tarbīya while some of his majālīs are summarised by Muscati and Moulvi in their Life and Lectures of al-Mu'ayyad.

---

1. This work which is in a manuscript and only the second half of which is extant is a refutation of al-Jāḥiẓ’s K. al- Cūthmāniya. See Poonawala Biobibliography p.98 and al-Majdū' Fihrist pp.95-96. For other works of Kirmānī, see Poonawala op. cit. and al-Majdū' op.cit.

2. This work has been edited and translated with notes by S. Makarem under the title The Political Doctrine of the Ismā'īlis.

3. The Majālīs have been edited by Hamid ud-Din.
Another work of a slightly later scholar that has been used in this study is the *Cuyūn al-Akhbar* of Idrīs, ʿImād al-Dīn (d. 872 A.H.) which is in seven volumes. The volume most relevant to this work is the fourth one and has been edited by Mustafa Ghālib. It consists of biographies of the Imams after ʿAlī until the last Imam of the *Dawr al-Satr*. Idrīs has written many other works besides the *Cuyūn*, famous among which is his work on ḥaqāʾiq Ṣahr al-Maḡānī. Some excerpts of this work are edited and translated by Ivanow in his *Rise of the Fatimids*. 
a) Early disputes about the leadership of the Community.

Historical sources indicate that from the earliest times there was dispute about the succession to the Prophet. Several sources suggest that at least some people felt that Calī had a valid claim to succession. As early as the saqīfa, some people objected to offer allegiance to Abu Bakr saying that they would not give bayṣa to anyone but Calī. Why it was Calī, the sources do not mention and they also fail to explain why the Anṣār were willing to give up their own candidate, Sa'd b. Ubāda for a compromise in favour of Calī who was obviously a Muhājir from the Quraysh. What is important from the historian's point of view is that historical reports which put forward such sentiments about Calī and his family are contained

in the earliest surviving historical material.¹

There are reports which maintain that the voices raised in support for ⁴AlI’s right did not subside after the decision taken in favour of Abu Bakr at saqīfa.² For, when the group came back to the mosque, there arose an unusual tumult in the gathering. In fact ⁴AlI, until then was not even aware of the decision. It is believed that at this point, ⁴AlI, with some of his supporters, both, from the Ansār and the Muhājirūn, gathered at Fāṭima’s house to ponder over the matter.³ But, before any decision could be reached, ⁴AlI and his supporters were summoned to the mosque to pay homage.⁴ It must be pointed out however that collection of traditions in the sources render it difficult to determine when exactly this demand for homage was made; whether it was immediately after they came to the mosque from the saqīfa, or whether it was after the burial ceremony of

---

1. It is claimed that even during the Prophet’s lifetime, there was a group deeply attached to ⁴AlI, who on that account came to be referred to as the Shī’ a of ⁴AlI. See al-Rāzī, K. al-Zīna, p. 259 in al-Samarrā’ī’s edition. Also see al Nawbakhtī al-Firaq p. 15.


3. Ya’qūbī II p. 126

4. Balādhrī I p. 582
the Prophet the next day when Abu Bakr was offered allegiance from the general public.

According to some reports\(^1\) \(\text{CAlI}^\) and his supporters refused to go to the mosque at which point \(\text{CUm}\)ar is believed to have advised Abu Bakr to do the needful and that was to go in person and see what it was all about. Sources\(^2\) suggest that the two men\(^3\) marched to \(\text{CAlI}^\) 's house with an armed party, surrounded the house and threatened to set it on fire if \(\text{CAlI}^\) and his supporters would not come to offer allegiance. \(\text{CAlI}^\), it is believed, came out protesting about his own rights and refused to give in to their demands. The scene soon became violent\(^4\) and \(\text{CUm}\)ar tried to push through the gate. However, at that moment, \(\text{FAtima}^\) is believed to have appeared suddenly,

---

1. Baladhor\(\text{I}^\) I, pp.585 ff; Ya\(\text{qUbI}^\) II, p.126; al-Tabar\(\text{I}^\) I, p.1818.

2. ibid. All the above sources as well as al-Im\(\text{ma wa al Siyasa}^\) incorrectly attributed to Ibn Qutayba although quite an early work all give a detailed account of \(\text{CUm}\)ar and Ab\(\text{U}^\) Bakr's attack on \(\text{FAtima}^\) 's house as well as the force they exercised to secure \(\text{CAlI}^\) 's homage. See also EI\(^2\) art. "\(\text{FAtima}^\)" where L. V. Vaglieri, comments regarding these events that "even if they have been expanded by invented details, they are based on facts."

3. al-Ya\(\text{qUbI}^\) Ta\(\text{'Rikh}^\) II p.126. A report in al Baladhor\(\text{I}^\) Ansab I p. 585 Ab\(\text{U}^\) Bakr sent \(\text{CUm}\)ar and Zayd b. Thabit to \(\text{CAlI}^\) 's house.

4. al-Ya\(\text{qUbI}^\) op.cit.
"Before God, I say, either you get out of here at once, or with my hair dishevelled I will make my appeal to God."

With this then, Abū Bakr's group left the place apparently without securing Ālī's allegiance.¹

There were a number of people who delayed offering allegiance to Abū Bakr but gradually, one after the other, became reconciled to the circumstances and offered him allegiance.² As for Ālī himself, the traditions from the early times present a version of events that suggest that Ālī opposed the pledge of allegiance to Abū Bakr and felt that it should have gone to him. There is even a degree of unanimity although not total, that Ālī delayed the pledge of allegiance until after Fāṭima's death though some late Shī'ite scholars deny that he ever made the pledge.³ Thus the evidence for his pledge in the preserved traditions is for delay rather than immediately.⁴ Even the ones

1. al-Balādhurī I, pp.585 ff; al-Yaqūbī II, p.126
   al-Tabarī p.1818.

2. For details of names see Yaqūbī II p.126 ff
   al-Balādhurī I, p.588.


4. al-Balādhurī Ansāb I pp.585-6 strongly suggests
   that Ālī delayed the pledge until after Fāṭima's
dehth which was after six months. One of the
   reports is on the authority of Ā'ishā.
which say immediately agree that he had to be sent for.

When ʿAlī went with Fāṭima to ask ʿAbdul-Bakr for her inheritance he said that the Prophet had said, "I am of the company of the Prophets, we will not have people inherit from us what we have left of money dedicated to pious purposes." ʿĀlī replied, "Is it then that you will be heir to your father and that I will not be heir to my father, for surely the Messenger of Allah said, 'A man will protect his child'?". The dispute over this problem of inheritance reflects the dispute over succession. If the Prophet could leave property to heirs then there might be an argument for hereditary succession.

ʿAlī, as is known, played a passive role in political affairs during the reign of the first two caliphs. This is quite revealing in comparison to his extremely active participation during the

---

1. Fāṭima claimed the estate of Fadak which her father had given to her unconditionally as his share of the spoils of Khaybar. See EI² art "Fadak." Also see Ibn Saʿd II pp.314 f; Ibn Hishām III pp.352, 368; Yaʿqūbī II p.127.

2. al-Yaʿqūbī Taʾrīkh II p.127. Kumayt (d. 126 A H) in his Hashimiyat does not fail to mention this incident as to how Fāṭima was illegally deprived of her paternal inheritance especially Fadak and ʿAlī's supreme authority.
Prophet’s time. It is difficult to determine whether he abstained himself or whether he was actually excluded. The former would tend to suggest he was not happy with the way things were running while the latter would mean or imply he was a possible threat. In this connection there is a report that Ali declined Abū Sufyān’s offer to fight for his rights, for in his view that would have meant destroying Islam. 1

On his deathbed, Abū Bakr, having consulted 1Abd al-Raḥmān b. Āwfl and Īuthmān, nominated 1Umar as the Caliph 2, completely ignoring 1Ali, both in consultation as well as in nomination. This nomination was extremely disturbing and upsetting to some prominent companions of the Prophet and according to a report in al-Ṭabarî 3 1Talḥa complained about it to Abū Bakr. However,

1. al-Ṭabarî I p.1827; al-Balādhurī I, p.583.
2. YaSQūbI II pp.136 f; al-Ṭabarî I p.2135. The choice of these two men is quite revealing in that first of all, none of them belonged to the Banū Ḥāshim and secondly, the branches of both these men, Banū Zuhra and Banū Umayya respectively had been great rivals of Banū Ḥāshim before Islam. Furthermore, both of them belonged to the wealthy circles of the Muslim Umma.
3. al-Ṭabarî I pp.2143-4; Ibn SaCd Tabaqāt III p.196 records a tradition saying that 1Ali and 1Talḥa approached Abū Bakr asking him how he would answer God on the day of resurrection? Abū Bakr is said to have replied that he had appointed the best one among them.
Abū Bakr was adamant in his choice and made sure that this was there in writing.

As far as ĈUmar's Caliphate is concerned, sources suggest that ĈAlī had some major disagreements with him. Of special significance is the question of diwān which involved many administrative and financial matters. ĈAlī is said to have recommended the distribution of the entire revenue, without holding anything in reserve, a policy which ĈUmar did not accept.¹

Al-Ẓabarī² records an interesting dialogue between ĈUmar and Ibn ĈAbbās which suggests ĈUmar's attitude towards the Banū Hāshim and especially ĈAlī. According to this ĈUmar is believed to have asked Ibn ĈAbbās as to why ĈAlī did not co-operate with them and that why did the Quraysh not support their family? When Ibn ĈAbbās said he did not know the reason, ĈUmar retorted, "it was because the Quraysh did not want both the Prophethood and the Caliphate to be combined in your house for that would make you rejoice

². Ta'rikh I, p.2796.
and feel arrogant.\footnote{1}

In nominating his successor, \textsuperscript{c}Umar restricted the choice to six people: \textsuperscript{c}Uthmān, \textsuperscript{c}Abd al-Rahmān b. \textsuperscript{c}Awf, Sa\textsuperscript{d} b. Abi Waqqās, \textsuperscript{c}Alī, Taḥfa and Zubayr with his own son \textsuperscript{c}AbdAllah in the capacity of an advisor.\footnote{2} As is known, according to the reports, the six candidates were not given a choice but rather were forced and pressurized in partaking in the decision making body.\footnote{3} According to the \textit{Nahj al-\textsuperscript{c}Balāgha}, \textsuperscript{c}Alī said that the very selection of Abd al-Rahmān b. \textsuperscript{c}Awf as the deciding chairman ensured that the succession would not go to him.\footnote{4} \textsuperscript{c}Alī further suggested that this choice of \textsuperscript{c}Abd al-Rahmān was a virtual guarantee for the nomination of \textsuperscript{c}Uthmān who was his old friend and brother-in-law, whereas Sa\textsuperscript{d} b.

\begin{enumerate}
\item Another version of the tradition has \textsuperscript{c}Umar telling Ibn Abbās that he was not aware of any other clan among the Quraysh to whom the verses of Zuhayr b. Abī Salma would be applied except the Banu Hāshim. This, he said, was due to their relationship and superior claims to the Prophet but the people did not want both the Prophethood and the Caliphate in their family for that would have made them rejoice and be proud. See \textit{Al-Ṭabari\textsuperscript{I}}, p.2770 ff.
\item Ibn Sa\textsuperscript{d} \textit{Tabaqāt III} p.246 ff. See also \textit{al-Ṭabari\textsuperscript{I}} p2778; \textit{al-Balādhuri\textsuperscript{V}} p.16,18; \textit{al-Ya\textsuperscript{c}qūbī\textsuperscript{II}} p.160.
\item See Ibn Sa\textsuperscript{d} \textit{Tabaqāt III} ii p.41-42.
\item See \textit{al-Shiqshiqīya : Nahj al-\textsuperscript{c}Balāgha I} no.3 48-50. See also Howard's translation of \textit{Irshād} pp.212-213
\end{enumerate}
Abī Waqqās being Ābd al-Raḥmān's cousin was bound to support him.\(^1\) Traditions in al-Balādhirī\(^2\) and al-Ṭabari\(^3\) maintain that Ālī protested about it but to no avail.

An interesting report which is recorded by al-Ṭabari is that Ālī was asked if he would rule according to the Sīra of the first two caliphs as well as the Sunna of the Prophet and Kitāb Allāh. Ālī's refusal to do this indicates that he regarded the Caliphate in a somewhat different light than others.\(^4\) Ĉūthmān accepted the conditions and was declared caliph by Ābd al-Raḥmān.\(^5\) Sources\(^6\) suggest that Ĉūthmān's selection did not pass by without serious protest from Ālī's ardent supporters. Ĉammār b. Yāsir said:

"O people, God has made us most honourable through this Prophet and distinguished us through his religion, but you are turning

---

1. al-Mufīd Irshād (trans. Howard) pp.210-211.
4. One report in al-Ṭabari I p.2778 goes so far as to mention that Ālī refused to follow all three and said he would judge according to his own better judgment.
away from the people of the house (Ahl al-Bayt) of your Prophet.\(^1\)

Miqdād's protest in favour of ČAlī was even stronger than that of ČAmmār. He said:

"It is very hard to see how the people are paying their respect to the members of the family (Ahl al-Bayt) of their Prophet after him. It is indeed shocking to see that the Quraysh have forsaken and by-passed the man who is the best among them."

Then someone asked Miqdād who were these Ahl al-Bayt and who was that man among them. Miqdād replied that "the Ahl al-Bayt were the Banū ČAbd al-Muţţalib and the man was ČAlī b. Abī Ṭālib.\(^2\)"

These statements demonstrate that support for ČAlī's claim had not died down, although it may have subsided for a while. With the coming of ČUthmān, as his kinsmen who occupied the governorships and leading posts, kept on behaving disgracefully and accumulating wealth, discontent soared high and many people looked towards ČAlī, besides those who had already initially supported him. According to al-Yaצqūbī, one of ČAlī's ardent supporters, Abū Dharr al-Ghafārī used to protest violently against ČUthmān's regime. He delivered speeches in the mosque of Medina in ČAlī's favour referring to him the waṣī of the Prophet and the wārith of his knowledge. He

1. Al-Ťabarī I pp. 2785.

also invited the people whom he called the confused community (al-umma al-mutahayyira) to give preference to whom God had given preference and to set aside those whom God had set aside.  

There are clear indications that ĈUthmān's attitude towards Abū Dharr was hostile. If such speeches were made it is hardly surprising. All sources agree that ĈUthmān sent him away to Syria where he continued his campaign until Muḥāwiya complained about his dangerous activities. ĈUthmān then ordered him to be bound to a wooden camel saddle and sent to Medina under escort. Eventually, he was exiled to al-Rāḍībha, his birthplace, where he died.  

The seething dissatisfaction in the empire eventually exploded into a revolt that ended in ĈUthmān's assassination. Amidst all the chaos and

1. al-Yaṣāqūbī II p.171.

2. al-Baladhrī V pp.52ff; al-Tabarī I pp.285 ff. al-Masʿūdī Murūj II pp.339 ff; al-Yaṣāqūbī II p.171ff. All these sources, except al-Tabarī also mention how ĈAlī together with Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and ĈAmmār b. Yāsir accompanied Abū Dharr to see him off and even talked to him, despite orders from ĈUthmān to the contrary.

confusion,  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\text{A}\text{I}\text{I}\] became the Caliph, inheriting all its problems compounded by the murder of  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\text{U}\text{t}\text{h}\text{m}\text{a}\text{n}.\] He was acclaimed and hailed by many of his supporters and from what one gathers from  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{a}l-Ya}\text{q}\text{\textsuperscript{u}b\text{i}},^1\] the sentiments expressed by them on the occasion, show that a number of people conceded to  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\text{A}\text{I}\] to have outstanding merits and superior claims to the Caliphate. Thus, according to  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{a}l-Ya}\text{q}\text{\textsuperscript{u}b\text{i}},\] the spokesman of the An\textsuperscript{s}\text{\textacute{a}}\text{r}, Th\text{\textae}\text{b}\text{i}t b. Qays b. Sham\text{\textae}s al-An\text{\textsuperscript{s}\text{\textacute{a}}}r\text{\textae}r paid him a glowing tribute saying:

"Even though they preceded you in being leader yet they could not overtake you in religion;

and even though they were ahead of you of you yesterday, today you have caught up with them.

Neither you, nor they could conceal your position and nor were they ignorant of your status.

They used to need you in what they did not know, while you, with your knowledge, do not need anyone."

\[\text{\textsuperscript{a}l-Ya}\text{q}\text{\textsuperscript{u}b\text{i}}\] goes on to mention that another An\text{\textsuperscript{s}\text{\textacute{a}}}r\text{\textae}r, Khuzayma b. Th\text{\textae}b\text{i}t, whose testimony was as well substantiated as that of two men (dh\text{\textae} al-shah\textadatayn) also stood up and after extolling  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{c}}\text{A}\text{I}\text{I}'s\] faith and knowledge said:

"You have what they have but they don't have what you have."

---

1. Ta'\text{\textr\textae}kh II p.179.
Yet another report in al-Yaḍqūbī says that ﾞ atṣ'aṭ'a ْb. Sawḥān stood up to say:

"Oh Commander of the Faithful, you have indeed adorned the Caliphate and not it you;  
You have raised its status and not it yours;  
The Caliphate needed you more than you wanted it." 1

The pledge of Mālik b. al-Hārith al-Ashtar in al-Yaḍqūbī appears unique in that he declared ْCAlI as the waṣf al-awṣiyā' and wārith ْCilm al-anbiyā' 2 This shows that there was a group whose attitude towards him was different from the rest of the community.

The events that followed ْCAlI's acclamation such as the rebellions of Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and ْCĀ'isha as well as that of Muṣawiya and the secession of the Khārijites are too well known to need any elaboration. However, it is significant to note that in the battles that were fought, especially al-jamal and ْṣaffīn, expressions such as waṣf were used as referring to ْCAlI. 3 The poet,

1. Ta'rīkh II, p.179  
2. al-Yaḍqūbī Ta'rīkh II p.179.  
Abū al-Aswad al-Du'allī who fought by the side of CAlī at Ŧifīn accorded ascertainable religious honours to him when he said:

"When I looked into the face of Abu al Husayn, I saw the full moon, which filled the spectators with reverent wonder.

The Quraysh now know, wherever they may be, that thou art their noblest in merit and religion."1

If these reports are genuine statements of words spoken about CAlī by these men then it would indicate that as early as CAlī, these ideas were already part of what might be termed as the Shiite tradition. Similar statements were attributed to the controversial figure of AbdAllah b. Saba2 who is said to have declared, during CUthman's reign that every


2. See EI2 art. "CAbdAllah b. Sabā." Also see the muslim scholar CAlī al-Wardī who suggests quite strongly that the activities attributed to CAbdAllah b. Saba were actually carried out by CAmmār b. Yāsir whose nickname was also al-Sawdā'. See his WuCāz al-Salāṭīn (Baghdad, 1954), pp. 148 ff. apud. Jafri, Origins, p.86.
prophet had a wasī and that ۚAlī was the wasī of Muḥammad, and had been designated as such by him. He is also believed to have taught that the divine spirit which dwells in every prophet passing successively from one to another was transferred from Muḥammad to ۚAlī who bequeathed it to his descendants who succeeded him in the Imamate.¹ According to Nawbakhtī,² Ibn Sabā also preached that the first three caliphs and their followers should be cursed. He was also the first to preach the doctrine of waqf for he refused to recognize the death of ۚAlī.

Such ideas suggest that there was a group which viewed ۚAlī's succession as a matter of divine right rather than as merely political. This group was perhaps not necessarily known by any particular name at the time, although those who supported ۚAlī in the battle of the Camel and at Siffin, whether religiously or politically were all referred to as shīCat ۚAlī³ or al-ۚAlawiyya as opposed to shīCat ۚUthmān or more popularly al-ۚUthmāniyya.

3. It should be noted however that the name ShiCa was used for some people who were close to ۚAlī in the time of the Prophet. But it obviously did not imply a sect or a group. See al-Nawbakhtī Fīraq p.15 and al-Razi, K. al-Zīna, p.259 in al-Sāmarrāʾī's edition.
When Alī was assassinated by a Khārijite, his son Hasan was acclaimed as the Caliph by the Kūfans. Muḥāwiya, not only denounced the appointment both in speeches and letters, but also sent agents and spies to arouse people against Hasan. Sources maintain that Muḥāwiya was able to bribe Hasan's commanders which eventually led to his abdication. Hasan then left Kufa and settled in Medina where he is believed to have been poisoned by one of his wives, Jūda bint al-Ashcath who the sources suggest was bribed to do so by Muḥāwiya. Apparently this was necessary for Yazīd's succession which could not have materialised on account of the treaty that existed between Muḥāwiya and Hasan.

Meanwhile a few Kufans gathered in the house of Sulaymān b. Ṣurad and wrote to Ḥusayn to rise against

---

1. Wellhausen Arab Kingdom pp. 104-7 gives only a sketchy account of Hasan's abdiction using only al-Tabarī, al-Dinawarī and al-Yaqūbī but al-Isfahānī in his Maqātil al-Tālibīyīn pp.46-77 and Shaʿbān using Ibn Aṯam al-Kūfī's K. al-Futūḥ gives details of how Muḥāwiya worked for Hasan's abdication. See EI2 art "Ibn Aṯam" as well as Jafri's Origin from whom I have obtained the above information.

2. Isfahānī Maqātil p.73; Masūdī Murūj II p.426.

3. al-Yaqūbī II p.228.
Mu\textsuperscript{C}awiya but he refused to respond, honouring his brother's treaty. Quite a few people were perturbed at Ḫasan's abdication. One such person was Ḫujr b. Ǧadī al-Kindī who was untiring in his protest against Mu\textsuperscript{C}awiya and the official cursing of \textsuperscript{C}Ali\textsuperscript{2} from the pulpits that he had prescribed. Ḫujr and some of his associates revolted against Mu\textsuperscript{C}awiya and his governor Ziyād b. Abihi.\textsuperscript{1} Ziyād tried to persuade Ḫujr by every means including political concessions and material rewards but when he declined, he and his thirteen associates were rounded up. Seven of them were freed through the influence of their relatives while Ḫujr and six others were given the option of either being beheaded or saving their lives by publicly cursing and denouncing \textsuperscript{C}Ali\textsuperscript{2} and giving good witness of \textsuperscript{C}Uthmān.\textsuperscript{2} When they refused to do that, they were executed. It is quite significant that Ḫujr and his associates paid for their lives because of their sentiments for \textsuperscript{C}Ali\textsuperscript{2}.

---

1. Ziyād was initially on the side of \textsuperscript{C}Ali\textsuperscript{2}'s supporters but was won over by Mu\textsuperscript{C}awiya who accepted him as his half-brother. He then appointed him governor of Kūfa and Baṣra after the death of Kūfa's governor al-Mughira b. Shu\textsuperscript{C}ba in 51-671.

2. al-Ṭabarī II pp.111-55; al-Balāḍūrī IV A pp.21 1-36. Aghānī XVII pp. 78-96. Already here the opinions about \textsuperscript{C}Ali\textsuperscript{2} and \textsuperscript{C}Uthmān are used to determine the tendency to which they belong. Later on judgments made on them and on the person of the first two caliphs served as a criteria for determining a person's tendency.
When Muawiya died and his son Yazid came to power in 60/680, Husayn and two other people refused to pledge allegiance. The numerous messages and letters from the people of Kufa and Basra mentioning that they had no Imam other than him led Husayn to attempt to gain power. He therefore sent his cousin Muslim b. Aqil to find out the true situation in Kufa and report to him.

In answer to the above letters and messages what Husayn wrote to the people of Kufa and Basra is quite revealing for it defines how an Imam should conduct his office as an Imam and also helps us to understand the concept of the Imamate as early as that.

1. The two others were ĀbdAllah b. Āmar, and ĀbdAllah b. al-Zubayr.
The following is the letter which Imam Husayn wrote to people of Basra:

أما بعد نان الله أمامي محمدًا صلى الله عليه وسلم فأكرمه بنبراءه وابتذائه لرسالته ثم تفض الله الله نان نك أصبه وربتاه وأثبته رحبته واحق الناس بحمايته في الناصر، فأثبت معه مليتنا ورثينا بذلك في عيننا كرمنا الفرحة وأحبناها العاتية، ونحن نعلم أننا حق بذلك النفح المستحق ليتنا ومن تولاه ونناحنا وصلناها وحراها الحق في جميع الله وفرزا لنا ونقد بهمنا رسلنا المحكم بين هذا الكتاب وننا أدمركم إلى كتاب الله ونستئبه صلى الله نان السنة نان المأتمة نان أحبيته ونن تسمعوا تلوي وطمعنا أما اهديكم سهيل الرضوان، السلام ملهمكم ورحمة الله
In the above letters the first revealing aspect is that Ḫusayn does not use the word Shi'a for them; instead he refers to them as muṣminīn and muslimīn. This in turn is quite significant for he appears to be making a distinction between 'those who have faith' (muṣminīn) and 'those who have only submitted' ( muslimīn). He was probably referring to his committed followers when he wrote muṣminīn and it is also worth noting that he addressed first the muṣminīn and then the muslimīn. The other thing to observe is the fact that the Kufans invited him to go to them as they had no Imam to guide them. Furthermore, in the last two lines he describes how an Imam conducts himself i.e. "The Imam is none but one who follows the Book, is fair and just in his dealings, judges by truth and devotes himself to the service of God."1

In the letter to the Bagrants, he appears more specific regarding his family's right to succession. He is also quite open about telling them that people preferred themselves over his family and himself,

1. al-Tabari II p.235.
adding that even though they were more entitled to the leadership being the Prophet's ahl and awliyā' his awsyā' and wārith, they remained silent in order to avoid dissension.\(^1\)

Thus Ḫusayn is already defining the concept of the Imamate although only in an embryonic form to the people who have called him to them. However, before he reached Iraq, the enthusiasm to take up arms for him in Kūfa had already begun cooling on account of the severe measures taken by the governor. Ḫusayn met his death together with his small group at Karbalā' without the Kūfans doing anything to help him.\(^2\)

c) The aftermath of Karbalā'

Ḫusayn's death aroused new movements in Kūfa. Many people expressed remorse for their apathy. They wanted to expiate themselves for it by throwing themselves into the struggle for seeking vengeance for Ḫusayn's blood. They chose Sulaymān b. Ṣurad al-Khuzā‘ī as their head and calling themselves the

---

1. al-Ṭabarī II, p.240.
tawwābūn (penitents) they began working secretly and accruing support.¹

Meanwhile the traumatic experience of Karbala' led ʿUsayn's son, ʿAlī, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn to avoid political involvement as far as possible. When the Medinese rebelled against Yazīd in the year 63/681, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn left the city to go and stay on his estate in the outskirts of the city.² Later, when Yazīd's army led by Muslim b. ʿUqba defeated the Medinese in the battle of Harra and sacked and looted the city, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn and his family were left unmolested. Moreover, there is evidence that he was exempted from giving allegiance to Yazid while all other Medinese were obliged to do so.³

By this time, the tawwābūn who had begun their activities secretly in Kufa had gathered enough support and were looking for a favourable occasion to do more work. Yazīd's death provided this opportunity. At this stage, al-Mukhtar b. Abī ʿUbayd al-Thaqafī, who

---

2. al-Ṭabarī II p. 220.
had been in exile for his participation in the revolt in Kūfa under Muslim b. ʿAqīl appeared in Kūfa and tried to persuade the tawwābūn to join him for a better chance of success. But they refused and went ahead with their plans to meet at Nukhayla, a suburb of Kūfa in 65/684. However, only a quarter of those expected turned up. Full of guilt feelings, they prayed for the first three days and then proceeded to Karbalā making vows at the tomb of Ḥusayn. The tawwābūn finally reached Ayn al-Warda and fought the Syrians zealously who far outnumbered them. Most of them were killed. Yet the movement itself was significant in that it was not only a purely religious movement but also a purely Arab movement i.e. the mawāli had not yet entered the scene.

Meanwhile, in the Hijaz and Syria there was utter chaos and confusion. Muḥawiya II, who had succeeded his father Yazīd had died after only six months and Marwān b. al-Ḥakam had managed to become the new caliph. In the Hijaz, ʿAbdAllāh b. al-Zubayr had already put forward his claims for the caliphate. In this struggle for the caliphate, Zayn al-ʿAbidīn

1. Wellhausen op. cit.
2. Van Ardendonk Le Debuts, p.10
maintained his non-involvement attitude.

As far as Kufa was concerned, although the tawwābūn had failed, there were still many Shī'a there who wanted to do something. They found a willing leader in Mukhtār. According to the letter he wrote to the remnants of the tawwābūn he said he would base his policy on "the Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet, vengeance for "the family", defence of the weak and jiḥād against the evil doers."

Sources suggest that Mukhtār may well have offered to be an emissary of Zayn-al-ʿAbidīn. When he refused, Mukhtar began exciting Shī'ite feelings in the name of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafīya, claiming that he had been entrusted with avenging the shedded blood and ending injustice. This last aspect of injustice was taken up quite resolutely by him and in fact this brought him the sympathy of the mawālī who considered themselves

1. al-Tabarī II, pp.569 ff; Also see Watt, Formative Period, pp.44 ff.
2. al-Baladhurī V p.272; Masʿūdī Murūj III p.74.
deprived of the rights that they could claim as Muslims. On the other hand, the support of the mawālī alienated him from those who proclaimed the supremacy of the Arabs.¹

In the meantime, Marwān had died and 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān who succeeded his father began strengthening his position. By this time Mukhtār had mobilized his forces as well and seized possession of Kūfa in 66/686-7. He even captured Mesopotamia as well as parts of the eastern provinces of the Umayyads.² When Mukhtār's army hunted down the murderers of Ḫusayn, although he was not propagating in Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn's name, he still sent Ubaydullah's head to him. After some time though Mukhtār's army became divided and one by one they were subdued by Musāb, the brother of AdbAllāh b. al-Zubayr. Mukhtār himself struggled for a while but later, he lost control and was eventually killed in 67-8/687-8.³

For his part, Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya is believed to have adopted an equivocal attitude towards Mukhtār's

¹ Van Arendonk Le Debuts, p.10.
² Ibn Saʿd V p.105
³ ibid.
represented at the pilgrimage of 71/638 by a personal flag. When he was addressed by the term Mahdi, he turned it into an innocuous meaning and told the people to address him as Muḥammad and Abū al-Ḡāsim.¹ The fact that he was imprisoned by Ibn al-Zubayr shows that he was a possible threat and therefore a potential candidate. When in prison, Ibn al-Ḥanafiya however had turned to Mukhtar for help and this shows that his attitude towards Mukhtar was not as passive and non-committal as some sources would have us believe.²

It is suggested that Ibn al-Ḥanafiya did have secret designs for the Caliphate because he had in fact provisionally abstained from pledging allegiance to either Ibn al-Zubayr or ʿAbd al-Malik in the hope that perhaps their rivalry might take a favourable turn towards him.³ However, such a hope was rendered futile after the submission of Iraq and the fall of Ibn al-Zubayr in 73/692. He was then

1. Ibn Saḥd Tabaqāt V, p.94.
3. Ibn Saḥd op. cit. See also F. Buhl op. cit and Van Arkel, op. cit.
allegiance to either Ibn al-Zubayr or 'Abd al-Malik in the hope that perhaps their rivalry might take a favourable turn towards him. However, such a hope was rendered futile after the submission of Iraq and the fall of Ibn al-Zubayr in 73/692. He was then obliged to give allegiance to 'Abd al-Malik and in 78 A.H. even went to Damascus and gave some service to the caliph. In return the caliph rewarded him and his family with substantial subventions and also paid off his debts.

The Kaysānīya

Out of the movement directed by al-Mukhtār there appeared a Shi'ite tendency which is given the name Kaysānīya. This is a collective name used by heresio-graphers for all the sects which evolved out of the movement of al-Mukhtār and traced the Imamate through Muhammad b. al-Ḥarāfīya. Various explanations are given for this name, but it appears most probably to have derived from Kaysān Abū Ṭālib, chief of the guard and leader of the mawāli under al-Mukhtār.

1. Ibn Sa'ūd op. cit. See also F. Buhl op. cit and Van Arendonk op. cit.
2. Ibn Sa'ūd op. cit.
Kaysān is reported to have been more extreme than al-Mukhtar, charging the caliphs preceding ʿAlī with infidelity, while al-Mukhtar condemned only ʿAlī's opponents in the battles of the Camel and at ʿiffin. He is also alleged to have asserted that the angel Jibrāʾil transmitted divine revelations to al-Mukhtar, who could hear, but not see him. Further, he is reported to have claimed that Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya was appointed by ʿAlī as his executor (waṣī) thus excluding his brothers, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, from the imamate. In Madelung's view, however, this doctrine was probably formulated later in opposition to Imāmī and Zaydī denials of the rights of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya. Moreover, this was also contrary to the common view of the Kaysāniyya who upheld the consecutive imamate of the three sons of ʿAlī.

The choice of the name 'Kaysāniyya' was probably a pejorative nickname first applied by the opponents in order to discredit the movement, but it also appears

1. Van Arendonk op. cit
to reflect the significance they attached to the mawla\textsuperscript{1} element in it. The role of Kaysān seems to have been soon forgotten for the name was also explained as having been derived from the surname Kaysān which al-Mukhtar allegedly was given by ʻAlī, or from the name of mawla of ʻAlī killed at ṣifīn from whom, it was claimed, al-Mukhtar got his ideas.\textsuperscript{2}

It was presumably after the death of Ibn al-Ḥanafiya in 81/700 that messianic ideas about him began to spread. Some of his supporters called the Karibīya or Kuraybīya after their leader Abū Karib [Kurayb] al-Darīr believed that Ibn al-Ḥanafiya had not died but was in concealment at Mount Rawda, west of Medina, nourished by springs of water and honey and protected by a lion and a leopard; that he would reappear as the mahdī at the appropriate time and fill the earth with justice as it was now filled with wickedness.\textsuperscript{3} Among the people who were involved in this messianism, the

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] For more details on the mawla element see Wellhausen, Opposition..., pp. 87-95. Watt W.M. Formative period, pp.44-7; also JRAS 1960, Shi'ism under Umayyads."
\item[2.] Nawbakhtī, op.cit, pp.20-1: Also Madelung's art. "Kaysāniyya," EI\textsuperscript{2}. p.836.
\item[3.] See Madelung's arts. "Kuraybiyya" and "Mahdī" in EI\textsuperscript{2}
\end{itemize}
name of the poet, Kuthayyir (d. 723)\(^1\) is prominent. Similar to his views were those of another later poet, al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī (723-789).\(^2\)

The Shi'ite sources,\(^3\) on the other hand maintain that Abū Karib and his followers were a distinct group from those who believed that he was hiding in the mountains of Raḍwā. According to them the whereabouts of Ibn al-Ḥanāfiyya could not be known and in their view Āllī had named him the mahdī. Abū Ḫātim al-Rāżī maintains that for Abū Karib, Ibn al-Ḥanāfiyya was the immediate successor of Āllī in the Imamate and opposed those who upheld the Imamate of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn before him.\(^4\) This however was contrary to views expressed by the majority of the Kaysānīya who upheld

---


the consecutive Imamate of the three sons of Cali. 1

This appears to be the first occurrence among Muslims of this kind, though later they came to be held by Shi'iite groups in many forms. The similarity of these ideas to Judaeo-Christian messianic ideas is too obvious 2 to need further elaboration. The similarity is also with the ancient pre-Islamic Arabian tradition where it was believed that the hero would return. 3 Perhaps later this came to be believed that the hero would either return in the same body (raj'â) or in a different body (tanâsukh) having the same spirit.

Another group mentioned by Abû al-Qâsim al-Balkhi is the one which followed Hayyân al-Sarrāj 4 maintaining that Ibn al- Ḥanâfîya had died in the Radwa mountains

2. For more details see Friedlaender, JAOS, 29, pp.36ff. Also see Watt, Formative Period, passim; Ardendonk, op.cit. 10-15. Seale, M.S. Muslim Theology, a study of Origins with reference to the Church Fathers, (London 1964). For more details on the word Mahdî see the chapter on "The Expected Deliverer" in Themes of Islamic Civilization, ed. by John Alder Williams (Univ. of California Press, 1971), pp.189ff.
Imamate to his son, Abu Hashim, who he knew would die childless. Still another group believed that Muhammad b. al-Qanafiya had died and that the Imam after him was his son Abu Hashim whom he had appointed as his successor.1

All these different groups of the Kaysaniya are characterized by their love for Ali and his family and hatred towards the reigning dynasty. They were distinguished by the fact that they considered that their Imam who carried the name and kunya of the Prophet as the depository of a special knowledge and they venerated him to that effect.2

According to the Mu'tazilite, Qadi Abd al-Jabbar,3 some of the Kaysaniya after Ibn al-Qanafiya's death went over to Zayn al-Abidin. This would tend to suggest that among many of the Shi'a, Ali's family did not yet signify a single individual or for that matter Husayn's descendants. It could well be that it was in

1. Ivanov, 'Early Shi'i Movements', JBBRAS (1941) 17. Madelung 'Kaysaniyya', EI2; Nawbakhti, op.cit. p.27.
2. Van Arendonk, p.12-3 quoting Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi as citing a hadith from the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal which had authorized Ali to give these names to a son. According to al-Zuhri's explanation however this was only permission.
In these circumstances, the doctrine of nass (designation) became a significant determinant of who the Imam was. This doctrine involved the idea of a pre-ordained ordinance which was given public reality by the formal act of the Imam designating his successor. The doctrine can be seen to be compatible with hereditary succession but it does not preclude the possibility of the nass moving outside the hereditary chain, until specified.

The doctrine of the nass of al-Husayn on his son 'Ali, Zayn al-Abidin helps to confirm his Imamate to the exclusion of the sons of al-Hasan or any other descendants of 'Ali. However, at the time, since the concept of Imamate had not been laid out clearly, the doctrine of nass could also work in favour of others who claimed it. It seems that such a claim of nass may have been put forward on behalf of Ibn al-Hanafiya by the various groups mentioned.

Another doctrine that helped partisans to explain the rather ambivalent attitude in public of the various claimants for the Imamate was
the doctrine of *taqIya* (precautionary dissimulation). Thus Imams could pledge allegiance to despotic caliphs under this doctrine without affecting their own claims to the Imamate.
CHAPTER THREE

ASPECTS OF AL-BĀQIR’S LIFE AND CAREER

Al-Bāqir’s full name was Muḥammad b. Ẓāli b. al-Ḥusayn b. Ẓāli b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Ẓāli. While his nickname was Abū Ja’far. His mother was Umm Aḥmad, the daughter of al-Ḥasan b. Ẓāli. Thus al-Bāqir was the first one in the family to have descent from both the Prophet’s grandsons. He was born about 57 A.H. in Medina, roughly around the time when Muḥiyya was exacting the oath of allegiance from the people for his son, Yazīd.

When a mere child, his family was afflicted by the tragedy of Karbalā’. There is a report in al-Yaqūbī which says that al-Bāqir was actually present at Karbalā’. This must have left a profound impression on him. His early childhood

1. Qāḍī al-Nuṣayrī Sharḥ f.63; Manāqib f.299a.

2. Most authorities are unanimous about this date. See al-Kulaynī al-Kafī I p.469; al-Amīlī Āyān al Shi‘a IV p.3. Although some authorities like to maintain it was the year 56 AH.


4. al-Yaqūbī II, p.320 says that al-Bāqir was not only present there but that he even remembers his grandfather being killed.
and teens witnessed the struggle for powers involving the Umayyads, Ibn al-Zubayr and groups of Shi'ites while at the same time he saw his father remaining aloof and avoiding getting entangled in the politics of the day.

1) The Name al-Baqir:

It is difficult to determine when al-Baqir acquired this epithet which is a shortened form of Baqir al-ilm "One who splits open knowledge." It is also equally difficult to say whether he was known as such in his very lifetime or whether he later came to be known as such. The earliest evidence we have of a writer calling him as such is a third century writer, Zubayr b. Bakkār (d.c. 256 A.H./870 A.D.). Both al-Qāḍī al-Numān and Ibn Ḥajar mention Zubayr b. Bakkār as saying that Muhammad b. ṢAlī was called Baqir al-ilm.

According to Ibn Ḥallikān, Muhammad b. ṢAlī

1. Sharḥ al-Akhbār f. 68. In his other manuscript al-Manaqīb f. 299a, al-Qāḍī al-Numān does mention that he was called Baqir al-ilm but without mentioning the source of Zubayr b. Bakkār.

2. Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqallānī Tahdhib al-Tahdhib says that according to Zubayr b. Bakkār, Muhammad b. ṢAlī was called Baqir al-ilm. See his vol.9-10 pp. 350 ff.

received the epithet **al-Bāqir** because he collected an ample fund of knowledge but he does not specify when he received this appellation and from whom. Ya'qūbī says that he used to be called **Bāqir al-ʿIlm** because he split open knowledge. The *Lisān al-ʿArab* says that Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-Bāqir was called thus because he split open knowledge, knew its principles (or roots), discovered its branches and had vast knowledge.

For the Shi'a in general, the title **Bāqir al-ʿIlm** was no ordinary title for it was in their view, given to him by the Prophet. According to the account given in *al-Kulayn*, Jābir b. ʿAbdAllāh the oldest surviving companion of the Prophet, used to sit in the mosque of the Prophet wearing a black turban and call out: "**Ya Bāqir al-ʿIlm**, **Ya Bāqir al-ʿIlm**" i.e. "Oh, One who splits open knowledge." People in Medina used to say Jābir was talking nonsense but he told them that the reason why he was talking

1. Ya'qūbī *Ta'rikh II*, p.320.
2. Ibn Manẓūr, p.140
like that was because he had actually heard the Prophet say:

"O Jābir, You will meet a man from my family who will have the same name and the same characteristics as mine, and who will split open knowledge extensively."

As regards how Jābir met al-Baqir, the report in al-Kulaynī2 recounts that once it so happened that Jābir was going to and fro in some of the streets of Medina when he passed by a street that had a Qur'ān school (kuttāb) which al-Baqir used to attend. When Jābir saw him, he asked him to go near him to which al-Baqir responded. When Jābir asked him to return al-Baqir did that as well. Thereupon Jābir explained:

"Characteristics of the Messenger of Allah; by Him in whose Hands is my soul, O boy, what is your name?"

When al-Baqir told him that he was Muhammad b. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, Jābir went up to him and kissed his head and swore by his father and mother that the Messenger of Allah had recited his greetings upon him.

Another account of this episode is given

1. al-Kulaynī 1-Kāfī, p.469.
2. al-Kāfī I, pp.460-470.
by al-Qādi' al-Nu‘man, according to whom Jabir b. ČAbdAllāh used to inquire about al-Ḥusayn's grandson as to whether there was anyone among them by the name of Muḥammad. One day, he happened to pass by the house of ČAlī b. al-Ḥusayn and heard the maid-servant calling someone, 'Muḥammad'. This was when he had already lost his sight. So he asked his guide whether that was the house of ČAlī b. al-Ḥusayn and when he was told that it was, he asked the maid-servant who this Muḥammad was whom she was calling. She said it was Muḥammad b. ČAlī b. al-Ḥusayn whereupon Jabir asked her to bring the child near him. When she did so Jabir kept on rubbing his face over him, kissing his hands and feet and said: "O! Son of the Messenger of Allāh, your grandfather has recited his greetings to you."

---

1. Manāqib, f. 299b - 300a. The account given by al-Qādi' al-Nu‘man in his Sharh is different. Here it is al-Bāqir who happens to go and visit Jabir who had already lost his sight by then. When asked who he was, al-Bāqir said that he was Muḥammad b. ČAlī b. al-Ḥusayn whereupon Jabir asked him to go near him. He then began kissing his hand and when he bent to kiss his feet, al-Bāqir moved away. It was then that Jabir told him that the Messenger of Allāh had recited his greetings upon him. So al-Bāqir asked Jabir as to how that had happened and Jabir related that once it so happened that the Prophet told him that he would meet Muḥammad b. ČAlī b. al-Ḥusayn from amongst his sons whom God will grant light and wisdom. The Prophet then asked him to recite his greetings to this son.
When Jābir was asked regarding this matter he said that once al-Ḥusayn happened to be playing before the Messenger of Allāh when he said:

"O! Jābir. You will live until you meet the son of this boy who will be called Muhammad al-Bāqir, whom God will give 'The Light' and 'The Wisdom'. So recite upon him my greetings."¹

The incident given in al-Ṭabarī² produces still another angle to the meeting whereby Jābir went up to al-Bāqir when he was in the Qur'ān school, (kuttāb). Jābir asked him to uncover his belly and when al-Bāqir did that, Jābir kissed it and said that the Messenger of Allāh had asked him to recite his greetings upon him.

There are many difficulties regarding this episode, not least the existence of variants. The material so far examined shows a divergence of views not only about the title itself but also regarding how and when Jābir met al-Bāqir. For, according to al-Kulaynī³ the Prophet is supposed to have said to Jābir that he would meet a man from his family who would have the same name and

---

1. Manāqib op.cit.
2. al-Tārikh III p.2496
and same characteristics as he and who would split open knowledge extensively. Whereas al-Qādi al-Nu'mān maintains, Jābir was told about meeting a son of ʿUsayn who apparently had been playing before the Messenger of Allah, who would be called Muḥammad al-Bāqir whom God would grant 'light' and 'wisdom'. Al-Ṭabarī's account does not say anything of the title but that Jābir asked al-Bāqir to uncover his belly and when he did so, he kissed it saying that the Messenger had recited his greetings to him.

This last aspect of reciting greetings is maintained by all the three versions. There seems to be a general agreement among the early sources that the two had certainly met. There also seems to be strong indication from widely differing sources (al-Ṭabarī, al-Kulaynī and al-Qādi al-Nu'mān) that Jābir had regarded this great, great-grandson of the Prophet as someone special in religious terms.

With regard to the question of whether al-Bāqir was called as such during his very lifetime, there is an interesting report preserved by Ibn Ḥanba in his Umdat

---

1. Ṣanāqib f. 299b-300a.

2. Tarikh p. 2496. This report is apparently from al-Bāqir himself which certainly looks abbreviated if not subdual.
When Zayd b. ʿAlī called on to see Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik, he asked Zayd how was his brother, the cow, (al-Baqara) implying al-ʿBaqir. So Zayd told him that he had vehemently opposed the Messenger of Allah who had named him al-Baqir while he was calling him al-Bagara. Zayd then went on to tell Hisham that the Messenger would surely oppose him on the day of resurrection when the former would enter Heaven while he (Hisham) would go to hell.

The above report, if authentic, is quite significant for, it not only means that al-Baqir was called as such during his life-time but it also suggests that the Prophet had already been associated with giving him that name. The fact that Caliph Hisham

distorted the title of al-Bāqir to al-Baqara suggests that al-Bāqir was indeed known as such during his lifetime. Moreover, the fact that Zayd, who was otherwise in opposition to his brother, defended his title as having been given to him by the Prophet, also makes it conceivable that as early as the beginning of the second century al-Bāqir was known as such which means in his life-time.

However, whether the traditions about the title are true or not, the concept appears certainly true in the light of the traditions that have come down from al-Bāqir in the various Shī'ite works of all persuasions, Zaydi, Ithnā Ashari and Isma'ili.¹ Moreover, sporadic traditions from him are also found in major Sunnite works such as Mālik's Muwattā', Ibn Hanbal's Musnad and al-'Shafī‘i’s Risāla.² Al-Tabarī not only uses him as an authority in his famous Ta'rikh but in his voluminous Taafsīr, al-Bāqir's traditions have been included.

Thus, from the various works, both, Shī'ite and non-Shī'ite al-Bāqir emerges as a versatile scholar.

¹. See chapter on Al-Bāqir's contribution to Figh.
². For details see the chapter on 'al-Bāqir in traditionist circles'.
conversant not only in matters of rites and rituals but also on the exegesis of the Qur'an, questions pertaining to law as such as well as theological topics of both mundane mundane and spiritual nature. It is also significant to note that before al-Bāqir's time, Shī'ite learning was limited. Then suddenly in his time there was a sudden profusion of knowledge on various aspects. He thus happened to be the first Imam of the Shī'ite from whom such a vast corpus of ḥadīth literature has come down. 1

Thus whether the tradition is true or not and whether the title is subject to prophecy or not, the title itself has meaning, the significance of which is much more a matter for scholarship. It emphasizes the role al-Bāqir played in disseminating knowledge to the general public as well as his place in Shī'ite literature.

2. Wasīya:

According to both Ithnā'īAshari and Ismā'īli

1. What has been preserved from his son and successor is even more.
sources\(^1\) after Zayn al-\(^\text{C}\)Abid\(^\text{In}\)'s death in c.94 A.H. his son, al-Bāqir succeeded to the Imāmāte as a spiritual function. The traditions in al-Kulayn\(^I\) would tend to suggest that al-Bāqir actually received a chest full of weapons and books of the Messenger of Allah from his father in the presence of his brothers.\(^2\)

It is believed that the weapons which symbolize authority consisted of the sword, the armour, the helmet as well as the short spear (\(^\text{C}\)anazah) of the Prophet. Besides these weapons, traditions in al-Kulayn\(^I\) maintain that the Imams also inherited certain documents that contained important information. In fact the \(_{\text{jami}^\text{Ca}}\) is supposed to contain everything that a man may need; every case of law was covered by it, even blood-wit for a scratch. Other documents that the Imams are supposed to have possessed are the \(_{\text{jafr}}\) a leather bag containing knowledge and the \(_{\text{mashaf}}\) of Fāṭima. This mashaf, it is believed, contained messages that Fāṭima

---

\(^1\) al-Kulayn\(^I\), al-Kāfī I, 305-6; al-Qādi al-Nuṣrān, Sharḥ al-Akhbār p.62 ff and Manāqib p.299 ff does not specifically say in these two works that the Imam after Zayn al-\(^\text{C}\)Abid\(^\text{In}\) was al-Bāqir, nor does he give the various traditions given in al-Kulayn\(^I\). However, the way he has dealt with the Imams one after the other, it is obvious that he means al-Bāqir succeeded his father, Zayn al-\(^\text{C}\)Abid\(^\text{In}\). Cf. his Daʿīs\(^\text{im}^I\), p.43 where he mentions the Imams one after the other by their names.

\(^2\) al-Kāfī I, pp.305-6; See also Majlisī Bihār VI, pp.100ff and Mufīd Irshād (trans. Howard), p.393.
received from an angel after the Prophet's death.¹

It appears that the jāmi'a did certainly exist. However, it is an open question whether or not this document as well as the sword of the Prophet² were in possession of al-Ḥusayn's descendants.

3. **Rivals of al-Bāqir**

When al-Bāqir took over from his father, the Kaysānīya in its various branches was a prominent group. Of all the branches, the Ḥāshimiya, a group that had pronounced itself in favour of Abū Ḥāshim, the son of Ibn al-Ḥanafiya appeared more active. Sources³ suggest that their leader Abū Ḥāshim certainly vied for the Imamate according to a record of a meeting between him and al-Bāqir. It so happened that once al-Bāqir was

---


2. According to some sources, the sword appears to have belonged to the Ḥasīnad branch of the Prophet's family. See al-Isfahānī Maqātil (Najaf 1303 A.H.) p. 188.

3. al-Qādī al-Nū'mān Manāqib f.302. Also see his Sharh, f.70. Idrīs Īmād al-Dīn who wrote his Uyun al-Akhbār much later also mentions this meeting.
sitting in the mosque talking to people around him, when suddenly Abū Hāshim came up to him, abusing him:

"You (plural) claim the wasīya of the Messenger of Allāh by deception and lies."

Al-Bāqir replied:

"Say what you like. I am the son of Fāṭima, while you are from a Ḥanafite woman."

When the people in the audience heard this, they pounced upon Abū Hāshim and began pelting him with stones and sandals until he was driven out of the mosque. There may or may not be some exaggeration in the details of the above incident but there seems to be hardly any doubt that he did aspire for the leadership. This is also evident from the fact that he was not only living in exile,¹ but also because he was poisoned by Caliph Sulaymān before whom he had made his claims public. Abu Hāshim's death in c. 98./817-8 led to new splits. Sources² indicate no less than four to five groups claiming succession from him although he himself had died childless.

---

1. Ei² art. "Abū Hāshim".

2. Nawbakhtī Firāq p. 28 says that the Hāshimīya split into four groups but ʿAbd al-Jabbār (d.415) in his al-Mughnī Vol. 20 part II (Dār al-Misrīya n.d.) pp.177ff quoting Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkhī (d.270) says there were five.
One group asserted that Abū Hāšim was the mahdī and he was alive hiding in the mountains of Raḍwā. Another group claimed that he had appointed his brother ʿAlī and that the Imamate was then continued through ʿAlī's son al-Ḥasan and so on, maintaining that it belonged exclusively to the descendents of Muḥammad al-Ḥanafiya. They also believed that the Imamate could not be transferred to others, and that the mahdī will come from their house.¹

Others believed that Abū Hāšim died and appointed ʿAbdAllāh b. Muḥāwiya b. ʿAbdAllah b. Jaʿfar b. Abī ʿTālib² then a child after him, in charge of a certain Ṣāliḥ b. Mudrik (acting as a temporary Imam): the latter then handed over the authority to his charge when the child became of age. He became the ruler of Isfāhān but was later imprisoned by Abū Muslim and eventually executed.³

1. Ivanow, "Early Shiʿite Movements", JBBRAS (1941) 17, p.6.

2. He rose in Kūfa in Muharram of 127/744 and was defeated. However, he was able to withdraw to Persia. See art. on him EI, vol. I, pp.26-27; Ṭabari, Vol.II, pp.1879-87, 1947-8, 1976-80. Cf. Also Ibn ḲInaba's (d.825/1422) ʿUmdat al-Ṭālib, pp.21-22. He was ultimately overpowered by Abu Muslim, imprisoned in Herat in 129-746-7 and was either executed or, as the author of ʿUmdat al-Ṭālib says, was kept in prison till 183/799 when he died. Nawbakhti, op.cit. pp.29ff. says his followers split into several groups after his death.

Yet another group maintained that he died without having appointed anyone to succeed him; they believed in their headmen being their Imams.\(^1\) Many however believed that Abū Hashīm had appointed Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbdAllāh b. ʿAbbās as the Imam after Abū Ḥāshim, asserting that before his death Abū Ḥāshim had handed the appointment to his father ʿAlī b. ʿAbdAllāh in trust for him since Muḥammad was still a minor.\(^2\) It is reported that this group who believed in Muḥammad b. ʿAlī and the group which followed ʿAbdAllāh b. Muḥāwiya disputed and then agreed to have an arbitration by one of their chiefs, Abū Rīyāh. He decided the case in favour of Muḥammad b. ʿAlī whereupon ʿAbdAllāh b. Muḥāwiya's party is believed to have joined Muḥammad b. ʿAlī's group and together they were known as the Ṣāḥībiyya.\(^3\)

Those who trace the Imāmate through the ʿAbbāsid Muḥammad b. ʿAlī and his son Ibrāhīm to the ʿAbbāsid

---

1. Ivanow, "Early Shiʿite Movements", p.6 wonders if this has anything to do with the Qarmatians of Bahrayn.

2. Nawbakhtiʾ, op.cit. p.29; Ivanhow, op.cit. p.6; Madelung's art. in EI\(^2\), p.837. See also art. "Alī b. ʿAbdAllāh b. ʿAbbās" EI\(^2\).

3. Madelung, op.cit. Nawbakhtī mentions the merger of the two groups but does not say that they were known as Ṣāḥībiyya; It is interesting to note that Abu al-ʿAbbās al-Ṣaffāh and Abū Jaʿfar al-Manṣūr were present in ʿAbdAllāh's army.
caliphs commonly came to be known as Rawāndīya although some heresiographers restrict the name to those who claimed that the first Imam after the death of the Prophet was his uncle, al-ʿAbbās and that the Imamate continued among his descendants. Al-Nāshī also mentions sects of Bukayrīya and Khidāšīya within the early ʿAbbāsid movement. The former were the followers of Bukayr b. Mahān (d. 127/744-5), the Kūfān dāʿī mainly responsible for the organization of the ʿAbbāsid movement in Khurāsān. The Khidāšīya were called after ʿAmmār b. Yazīd, nicknamed Khidāsh, a dāʿī active in the area of Nisapur and Merv. When Muḥammad b. ʿAlī disowned him on account of doctrinal deviation, his supporters held that Muḥammad b. ʿAlī had forfeited the Imamate and that it had passed to Khidāsh. Khidāsh was executed in 118/736 but his supporters maintained that he was alive and had been raised to heaven by God.


4. Baghdādī, op.cit., p.28; Nawbakhtī, op.cit. p.30f; Madelung, op.cit.; also art. 'Bayān b. Samīʿān' in EI2 by M.G.S. Hodgson; see also Watt, Formative Period, pp.50-51.

5. Al-Nāshī', op.cit.
The fact that there were so many splinter groups within the Shi'a movement obviously meant that for most of the early Shi'a sympathizers it did not matter who was the leader, provided he was an 'Ash'imi. As pointed out earlier, the doctrine of *nass* was being used to work in favour of anyone who claimed it. Until now, the various claimants were restricted to the 'Alids only, but the claim that Abū Ḥasim passed his heritage to the Abbāsids as well as the assertions of Bayān and Abū Mansūr claiming *nass* shows that the doctrine of *nass* was being used and could be used to extend the hereditary field of the Imamate. This is where al-Bāqir must have perhaps felt the need to lay out the theory of the Imamate with its various requirements.¹

Al-Bāqir did have a special advantage however, in that he was no ordinary 'Alid for, as pointed out, both his paternal and maternal grandfathers were the Prophet's grandsons who were therefore, in some sense, sacred.² This descent from Fātima that eventually came to be a major force of appeal among both, the Ismā'īlīs

---

1. This is discussed in the following chapter "Al-Bāqir's views on the Imamate."

2. In Abū Mikhnaf's narratives on Karbalā' there is already the sense that al-Husayn being the grandson of the Prophet was in some sense sacred. Al-Ṭabarī *Tārīkh*. 
and the Ithnāʿī ʿAsharīs, gave al-Bāqir a unique lineage and secured him a sound position among some circles at least.

Al-Bāqir did manage to rally around himself a number of followers⁴ in spite of the various claimants that existed and in addition to the followers acquired during his father's time, especially during the latter years of his life. According to al-Balkhī⁵ even ʿAlī b. al-Husayn did have a following of his own, let alone al-Bāqir, whose times were more conducive for public teaching than his father's. Thus, there is little doubt that al-Bāqir was recognised as an Imam during his lifetime and views expressed by some scholars⁶ are no longer acceptable. The stories in NawbakhtI⁷ of al-Bāqir's difficulties with some of his followers are too life-like to be easily dismissed. The anecdote about a group that followed ʿUmar b. Riyāḥ in abandoning al-Bāqir⁸, although being rather damaging

---

1. See the section on Shiʿite associates of al-Bāqir included in the chapter, "Al-Bāqir in traditionist circles."
2. ʿAbd al-Jabbār, al-Mughnī p. 177.
4. Firaq, pp. 52-3; 54-5.
5. After he gave two different answers to the same question. See Nawbakhtī, pp. 52-55.
in itself has a positive side in that it proves that al-Bāqir did indeed have a following of his own and that some among them were given to repudiate him as well.¹

Moreover the fact that Bayān and Abū Manṣūr both claimed at some point to be al-Bāqir's wasī shows that al-Bāqir must have been of sufficient importance as an Imam for these men to claim the wasīya from him. Some followers of al-Bāqir's like al-Mughīra b. Sa'id al-Ijlī, went as far as claiming that al-Bāqir was Divine; and although al-Mughīra was repudiated by him, this, together with other instances mentioned above are strong evidences to prove that al-Bāqir was indeed recognized as an Imam if only within his own circle.

Furthermore, even though the ideas of the Kaysānīya found poetic expression in poets like Kuthayyir and Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī, al-Bāqir too, did not lack poets who carried his family's name far and wide. During his father's time, the poet Farazdaq used to compose many verses. Once during a pilgrimage when Hishām b. ʿAbd al-Malik (who was then a prince) was unable to touch

¹ Another follower of al-Bāqir, Muḥammad b. Qays also left him after what he heard from Ibn Riyāḥ's views.

² To be discussed in the section below on Ghulāt.
the blackstone because of the crowd, and saw people giving way to Zayn al-Abidīn, he asked angrily who that person was. In reply, Farazdaq recited an ode\(^1\) in Zayn al-Abidīn's favour.

Even more popular than Farazdaq were the verses of Kumayt (d. 126A.H.) who was a contemporary of al-Bāqir\(^2\). His verses, the Ḥashimīyāt were such that they could be appreciated by a larger public unlike those of Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī who offended people by vilifying the first two caliphs.\(^3\) Kumayt did not go beyond the limit of 'tashayyūs hasan' and although at times he expressed some fear of the Umayyads,\(^4\) in his heart their power was an illegitimate one.\(^5\)

Kumayt publicly declared that the claims of the Banu Hashim were based on the fact that they were the inheritors\(^6\) and that these claims found their support in the Qur'an.\(^7\) It must be mentioned however that the

---

1. See Farazdaq, Diwān I, pp.847 ff; Aghānī XX I, pp.400 ff. J. Hell however denies the attribution of these verses to Farazdaq \textit{apud} Arendonk p.15.

2. See pp.23 and 139 of Kumayt's Ḥashimīyāt in the Horovitz edition.


5. \textit{ibid} 2 vv. 28, 31, 37 ff.


7. \textit{ibid} 2 vv 29 ff.
verses which Kumayt cited such as "I do not ask you for retribution, only love for my next of kin," were being equally used by the Abbāsids and later by the Zaydīya as well. This is due to the "difference in interpretation of the words "next of kin," which were being used to include the whole family of the Prophet.

Al-Bāqir and the Ghulāt

Al-Bāqir also faced problems from some individuals who became classed among the ghulāt (exaggerators). One such person was the already mentioned Bayān b. Simcān. At first he believed that Abū Ḥāshim would return as the mahdī. He and his followers, the Bayānīya adopted extremist views about Abū Ḥāshim and claimed that he had conferred prophethood on Bayān on behalf of God. According to another report, Bayān later wrote to

---

1. Qur'ān 22:42.
4. Nawbakhtī Firaq 30,25; cf. Baghdādī pp.227ff; Shahrastānī Millāl pp. 113ff. See also Hodgson, art "Bayān b. Samcān" EI². Watt, Formative Period p.51, thinks this might be a later invention to support the Shī'ite claims that al-Bāqir was recognized as Imam during his lifetime. Refer also al-Rāzi k. al-Zīna p.297 in al-Sāmarrahī's edition.
Muḥammad b. ʿAlī (al-Baqir) perhaps after Abū Ḥāshim's death and called on him to accept himself (i.e. Bayān) as a prophet. Probably after al-Baqir's death he is believed to have claimed that al-Baqir had appointed him as his emissary. However, there are also reports to say that he was hostile to al-Baqir. Other reports maintain that he was planning a revolt¹ either in the name of al-Baqir's son, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq or of al-Nafs al-Zakīya, a Ḥasanid who actually revolted in 762 A.D. Bayān himself together with al-Mughīra was executed in Kūfa by the order of the governor Khālid al-Qasrī.²

Among other ghulāt, there was a group called Harbīya or Ḥārithīya, after their leader ʿAbdAllāh b. al-Ḥarb.³ Sources ascribe to them a prominent role in the introduction of the theory of metempsychosis (mask) and other extremist ideas. After the death of Abū Ḥāshim, Ibn Ḥarb taught that the Divine Spirit (rūḥ Allāh) had been present in Prophet Muḥammad and had

1. In conjunction it is believed with his associate al-Mughīra b. Saʿīd al-Ijli.

2. al-Ṭabarī II 1619 ff.

3. His name is variously given as ʿAbdAllah (b. ʿAmr) b. (al-) Ḥārith al-Kindī al-Kufī or al-Madaʿīnī or al-Shamlī. See Madelung's art. in EI² where he says this may indicate a fusion of more than one person into a single identity. See also Ashʿarī 1, 6,22; Baghdādi 233f; 235f; Shahristānī 1 244f. Ibn Ḥazm iv 187f has ʿAbdAllah b. al Ḥārith who may be the same, Cf JAOS XXIX 124 ff. See also Halm in Der Islam 58 (1981)
successively been transferred to ālī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya, Abū Ḥāshim and finally to Ibn Ḥarb who thus had become the imām until the reappearance of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya. However, when his claim of omniscience was found to be spurious by his followers, many of them renounced him in favour of Ābdullāh b. Muḥāwiya. It is suggested that Ibn Ḥarb was converted to Sufī Khārijism and died as a Sufrite.

Another individual regularly classed among the ghulāt who caused problems for al-Bāqir was al-Mughīra b. Saṭīd al-Ijīlī who was mentioned earlier on. He was a client of the governor, Khālid b. Ābdullāh al-Qasrī and used to claim that al-Bāqir had appointed him as the wasṭ. Later perhaps after al-Bāqir's death he claimed that he was an agent of Muḥammad b. Ābdullāh

1. It is doubtful whether he himself approved of the claims made for him; some were not made until after his death in c.747 A.D. when he was assassinated by Abū Muslin. See Watt, "Shī ḥīsm under the Umayyads" JRAS 1920.

2. For details on this type of Khārijism, see Watt, Formative period pp.26f.

3. Madelung's art. in EI2.

b. al-Ḥasan (al-Nafs al-Zākiya). He claimed the prophethood and Imamate for himself and said that the angel Jibrāʾīl brought him revelations and that he could raise the dead. Khālid b. ʿAbd Allāh had him arrested, killed and crucified.

Yet another person who professed himself as a Ṽasi of al-Bāqīr was Abū Manṣūr. He either belonged to the tribe of Ijli or ʿAbd al-Qays and lived in Kūfa. Abū Manṣūr further claimed that he had experienced an ascension to heaven, in the course of which he had been appointed by God as a prophet and messenger. He too, like his tribesman, al-Mughīra was executed by the governor of Iraq in 742 A.D.

Still another individual, classed among the ghulāt, adopting extremist views about al-Bāqīr was Muʿammar. He claimed that al-Bāqīr and Abū al-Khattāb were both gods. They, he maintained, were gods in the heaven while he, Muʿammar was god on earth and that he knew the merit of the heavenly god. He also, used to claim the

1. Of whom more will be said in the following pages.

2. AshCari, pp.9ff; Nawbakhtī, p.34 and Baghdādī, pp. 234 ff. See also Tucker's article on "Abū Manṣūr al-Ijli and the Manṣūrīya, a study in medieval terrorism," Der Islam, 54/1 (1977) pp.66-76.

3. See al-Rāzī K. al-Zīna p.306. According to al-Ashʿarī Maqalāt p. 11 he belonged into later times i.e. during Imam al-Ṣādiq's period.
divinity of Abū Ṭālib, Ĕabd al-Muṭṭalib, Muḥammad and ĔAli.

Al-Bāqir and al-Ḥasan al-Muthanna

As is known, the Alids among themselves were far from united and between the Hasanids and the Ḥusaynids there was downright rivalry. This manifested itself at times in family disputes and at other times in the struggle for leadership. During Zayn al-ĊAbidīn's time al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan known as al-Muthanna - the redoubled happened to be in charge of the ṣadāqāt from estates left by the Prophet. It is believed that Zayn al-ĈAbidīn contested this office from him which provoked the latter's fury and resulted in him being rude to Zayn al-ĈAbidīn. There is no apparent evidence that al-Ḥasan al-Muthanna had any designs on the Imamate, although he might have considered his elder lineage to be more entitled to ĔAli's spiritual heritage.

After Zayn al-ĈAbidīn's death, al-Bāqir resumed the quarrel over the ṣadāqāt with al-Ḥasan al-Muthanna and after the latter's death with his son, Zayd b. al-

1. al-Mufīd op.cit. p.
2. Yet the fact that his son ĔabdAllāh b. al-Ḥasan al Mahdī was spreading propaganda in favour of his youthful son, Nafs al-Zakiya, raises some doubt as to whether al-Ḥasan's rivalry with Zayn al-ĈAbidīn only sprang from his fury over the ṣadāqāt.
Hasan into whose hands the administration had passed. Yet another son of al-Hasan al-Muthanna, CAbdAllah b. al-Hasan al-Mahd found himself in opposition to al-Baqir for different reasons. Although the actual revolt of his son, al-Nafs al-Zakīya took place long after al-Baqir's death, yet the propaganda for him had started much earlier; in fact, as early as his birth in 100/718 he was proclaimed by his father to be the expected mahdī on account of the prophecy that the mahdī had to be called by the same name as the Prophet i.e. Muḥammad b. CAbdAllāh.3

CAbdAllāh al-Mahd's effort to spread the propaganda in favour of his youthful son had already met with certain success during the latter years of al-Baqir's life. The extremist, al-Mughīra b. SaCīd, the former supporter of al-Baqir, changed his allegiance and with a whole circle of his disciples joined CAbdAllah al-Mahd and his son4. In Madelung's5 view, this meant

2. The revolt took place in 145/762 during the time of JaCfar al-Ṣādiq when the second CAbbāsid caliph Abū JaCfar al-Manṣūr was reigning (136-158/754-755). See EI art. by F. Buhl vol III pp. 665-6. Also see al-Tabari III pp. 209ff; Ibn Tiqtaqa al-Fakhrī pp. 225 ff.
4. Nawbakhtī p. 54; Madelung Der Qāsim p. 46. It is also possible that al-Mughīra probably changed his allegiance after al-Baqir's death.
5. Ibid.
that the father to son Imāmate was not widely accepted
since al-Mughīra could leave al-Bāqir for Nafs al-
Zakīya. Even without Mughīra's defection there is
little doubt that the principle of hereditary Imāmate
was not yet established. It was precisely for that
reason that al-Bāqir felt it necessary to put forward
the views that he did so that some sort of order was
brought into the chaos that had resulted from the
variant Shi‘īte ideas rampant in the Islamic empire.¹

Al-Bāqir and Zayd

By the turn of the first century Hijra, al-Bāqir
was involved in even more serious problems; for
according to many Shi‘īte sources² he had to deal with
his own half-brother Zayd b. ʿAlī who propagated a more
aggressive and revolutionary policy.

It is conceived that the struggle for leadership
between al-Bāqir and Zayd began immediately after the
death of Zayn al-ʿAbidīn³ while some believe that Zayd
had not intended the Imamate for himself and actually

¹. See below the chapter on 'His views on the
Imamate.'

². See below pp. 87 ff.

³. Jafri, Origins pp. 249, 265; Rajkowski W.W.,
Early Shi‘īsm in Iraq (unpublished Ph.D thesis,
favoured his brother's leadership. As far as the first view is concerned, Zayd at the time of his father's death in 94 A.H. was only fourteen years old so it is highly improbable that at that age he would have been able to attract any following. However, in the course of time, Zayd is alleged to have become strongly impressed with the Mu'tazilite ideas of Wāsil b. Ata. He began laying emphasis on the principles of 'ordering good and prohibiting evil' by force, if necessary and accordingly believed that if an Imam wanted to be recognised, he had to claim his right, sword in hand. Sources suggest that al-Bāqir and Zayd quarrelled over this, for, when the latter asserted that an Imam must rise against the oppressors, al-Bāqir remarked: "So you deny your own father was Imam, for he never fought the issue." If this were true, then considering Zayd's age, this could not have happened earlier than the beginning of second century Hijra.


Zayd is believed to have rejected the Mu'tazilite doctrine of "the intermediate state" Manzila bayna al-
manzilatayn), although he did not object to the opinion that in the quarrels that raged between CAli and his
opponents, one party was certainly wrong.1 The
Mu'tazilites were not sure which but, for Zayd, the
virtues of CAli were of such superior quality that the
idea of him being in the wrong was incomprehensible.2
However, he agreed with the Mu'taziliteS3 that although
CAli was the best (al-af'dal) and therefore the
preferable candidate, yet, AbU Bakr and CUmarr had been
legally elected leaders. This attitude of his greatly
impressed the circle of traditionists and was a major
factor in securing him their sympathy and support.4

As far as Mufid's5 views about Zayd's revolt are

3. At this stage, however, it is difficult to identify
the actual doctrines of the early Mu'tazila and
many of their doctrines about CAli may well belong
to a later stage in the development.
4. Some however, also took him up on his views, as for
instance the two Kūfan Shī'ite brothers, AbU Bakr
b. Muḥammad al-Maqrāmī and CAqama who asked him
whether CAli was an Imam before he resorted to the
sword. Zayd is believed to have refused to answer
see KashshI Ikhtiyār MaCrifat al-Rijāl p. 416.
Also see Ibn Nashwān al Ḥimyarī Hurr al C'ayn (Cairo
1943) p. 185
5. K. al-Irshād op.cit.
concerned, i.e. that his main reason was seeking vengeance for Ḥusayn's blood and that he really did not intend the leadership for himself, these are no longer tenable in view of the facts revealed in other sources much earlier than his.¹

All the early writers such as al-Ṭabarī, Ibn Sa'ād, al-Isfahānī and also Ismā'īlī authors like Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and al-Qāḍī al-Nuṣayrī give the reason for Zayd's revolt to be the order for his arrest by Caliph Hishām. This arrest was on account of some money being lent to Zayd by the deposed governor Khālid b. ʿAbdAllah al-Qasrī. It is clear that this was undoubtedly the apparent and the immediate cause of his revolt. But one does not have to look very far to realise that this could hardly have been the main reason for his rebellion.

¹ Qāḍī al-Nuṣayrī Manāqib f. 303 ff; Sharḥ f. 69 ff. Also see K. al-Zīna of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī who is even earlier than the Qāḍī and who is a source for the Qāḍī in his words. The text of K. al-Zīna is published in al-Sāmarrā'ī's work al-Ghulāt (Iraq, 1972) in the appendix.
According to al-Yaqubi, Hisham told Zayd that he had heard that he considered himself worthy of the Caliphate.\(^1\) When taunted as to how the black-skinned son of a slave-woman could be a caliph, his ready reply was that the Prophet himself had descended from Ishmael who was also the son of a slave.\(^2\) It is quite likely that Hisham having been informed about Zayd's motives and plans may have made the money business a pretext to find out more about them and later not having substantial evidence against him had to release him when he and Dawud b. Cali (b. AbdAllah b. Abbás) swore that they did not have the money.

1. Yaqubi Ta'rikh II, p. 325.

2. al-Tabari, Annales ed. M.J. de Geoje Secunda Series II (Netherlands, 1964) p. 1676. See also Yaqubi op. cit. Al-Mufid op. cit. pp.403-5 also gives this episode but with a slight variation. In his version Zayd visited Hisham when the latter said to him: "So it is you who considers yourself entitled to the Caliphate." Then Hisham taunted Zayd about him having no mother for his mother was only a servant-girl.
Those who supported Zayd b. ČAli's rebellion against the Umayyad caliph Hishân b. ČAbd al-Malik were later all known as the Zaydîya. Among the groups who supported Zayd in his rebellion were some Baṭrîya (Buṭrîya) and Jârûdiya.

Baṭrîya:

At the time, one of the differences among the various groups was the legitimacy of Abû Bakr and ČUmar's leadership. Depending on this view was the belief whether the early community had erred or not in

---

1. MasČūdî Murūj al-Dahab Vol. 3-4 (Beirut new edition) pp. 208 ff. classifies the Zaydiya into eight groups while Baghdâdî Fargq speaks of only three - the Jârûdiya, the Baṭrîya and the Sulaymânîya. Ibn Hazm, Kitâb al-Milâl wa al-Nihal, part of which Friedlaender has translated in his article in the JAOS vol. 28, 29 considers the Zaydiya within the Shiâ and only talks of the Jârûdiya. See also Nawbakhti who divides the Zaydiya initially into 'weak' and 'strong' and then goes on to subdivide them pp. 50 ff. al-Râzî, K. al-Zîna classifies them into Jârûdiya (or Surhubiyya), Ẓîlîya and Baṭrîya. See pp. 300-302.
having chosen them. This obviously was based on the idea whether or not the Prophet had nominated his successor. Following the traditions of the moderate wing of the Kūfan Shi'a, the Baṭrīya upheld the leadership of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and of ʿUthmān during the first six years of his rule. Their basis for this belief was that ʿAlī had pledged allegiance to them. They repudiated ʿUthmān during the last six years of his rule, just as they repudiated all later opponents of ʿAlī.²

Considering ʿAlī the most excellent (afḍal) of men,

---

1. Shahrastānī speaks of Sāliḥiya, the followers of al-Ḥasan b. Sāliḥ and Baṭrīya as the followers of Kathir al-Abtār, while Baghdādī mentions them jointly as Baṭrīya and distinguishes the Sulaymāniya or the Jarlīya as those who only differed from the Baṭrīya with regard to ʿUthmān's position whom they considered unorthodox.

2. Madelung's art. on "Imama" in EI², p. 1166; cf. Nawbakti, pp. 12, 50 who just says that they repudiate ʿUthmān, ʿAlī, and Zubayr without specifying the last six years. Baghdādī says that the Baṭrīya did not commit themselves regarding ʿUthmān, neither attacking his faults nor praising his virtues. See n.3 before.
the Batriya allowed the imamate of the less excellent (mafaqul). They regarded the rebellion (khuruj) of anyone among the children of Ali as though it were 'ordering the good and forbidding the evil' (al-amr bi-al-macruf wa al-nahin al-Munkar). They did not observe al-masl cal'a al-khuffayn, i.e. the wiping of shoes in ritual ablution but drinking nabidh (intoxicating date-wine) and eating of eels (jirri) were permissible. They also maintained that 'knowledge' was not only confined to the Prophet's family but was also scattered among the ordinary people and thus the seeker of knowledge was entitled to receive it from either of them. Again if the seeker was unable to find it in either of them, then Nawbakhti3 says, it was permissible for them to practice ijtihad and ikhtiyar (choice) as well as advocate individual opinions (ara').

1. Nawbakhti, p.51. He classifies the Ijliya, followers of Harun b. Sa'id al-Ijli with the Batriya as the 'weak' Zaydiya.

2. Nawbakhti, p.12; Madelung, Der Qasim, p.49.

The Batriya thus allowed the whole tradition of the community to be valid as a proper source for law. In event of any gaps in the said tradition they were to exercise *ijtihād*.\(^1\) This (positive) attitude of the Batriya towards the tradition of the entire community was based on their thesis that the early community of the Prophet's followers had not fallen into error when they had chosen Abū Bakr and Cūmar in place of CAlī as Imam. Thus says Nawbakhti\(\text{ī}\)\(^2\) in their view the Muslims were right in paying homage to them since CAlī himself had paid them homage. They advocated the view that the Imam should be determined by a *shūrā* of the best of the community who would choose the most excellent (al-afqāl). However they maintained that the choice of the less excellent (al-mafqūl) was permissible when it could prevent discord and chaos. It must be remembered that although they made these assertions for the *shūrā*,

---

1. Those who believed in the hereditary Imamate maintained that the Imams were the only authority who were able to guarantee the true tradition of the law. They were thus able to seek the judgement of the Imam for each new question that arose.

2. Nawbakhti\(\text{ī}\), *op. cit.* p. 18; *Magālat* of al-Ash\(\text{ā}\)r\(\text{i}\), p. 68. Also see Madelung, *Der Qāsim*, p. 50.
yet this did not undermine their unqualified preference for Calī.¹

This strong emphasis on Calī's priority was especially prevalent in Iraq, particularly in Kufa, although it did not constitute a united faction. In Nawbakhti's² view they were the original Batriya. It was from them that a group arose with views expressed earlier as well as with the standpoint that the Imamate belonged of right to any descendant of Calī when he took the field.³ This group of Batriya supported the cause of Zayd b. Calī when he rose in rebellion against the Umayyad Caliph Hisham b. Abd al-Malik in the year 122 A.H.

---

1. Madelung, op. cit. maintains this is where the Batriya differ from the Sunnis.
Another group that also supported Zayd's cause but had different views were the Jārūdīya, the followers of Abū al-Jārūd, Ziyād b. Mundhir al-ʿAbdī.\(^1\) The Jārūdīya were originally supporters of al-Bāqir, Abū al-Jārūd being a prominent transmitter of his.\(^2\) In Nawbakhtī’s opinion even Abū Khālid al-Wāsitī and Fuḍayl b. al-Zubayr al-Rassān’s followers were among the Jārūdīya. He calls them Surhūbīya as in his view, Abū al-Jārūd’s title “Surhūb” had been given to him by al-Bāqir which is said to designate “a blind devil dwelling in the sea.”\(^3\) Abū Khālid and Fuḍayl too were among the transmitters of al-Bāqir.\(^4\)

The Jārūdīya did not recognise Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān in the capacity of Imāms. They declared that

---


2. This can be ascertained from al-Murādī’s Amāli Ahmad b. ʿĪsā, where Abū al-Jārūd narrates numerous traditions from al-Bāqir. Here I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to Prof. Madelung of Oxford University, who kindly lent me his microfilm of this manuscript. Also refer Madelung, Der Qāsim, p. 44.

3. Nawbakhtī, op.cit. pp.45-9. See also al-Rāzī’s K. al-Zīna pp. 300-302. For more details on this name see Kashshī, Rījāl, p.150; Shahrastānī Milal, p.119 especially see Strothmann Straatsrecht der Zaiditen (Strasbourg, 1912).

4. Madelung, Der Qāsim, p.44
the Prophet had appointed al-\textit{I} as his \textit{wasi} and therewith as the legitimate Imam in his place. According to Madelung\textsuperscript{1} in ZaydI sources there is in general an ascertainable hesitation from characterizing the first three caliphs as heretics and from cursing them. From Ab\textsuperscript{u} Mikhna\textsuperscript{f's}\textsuperscript{2} account it was Zayd's outright refusal to curse Ab\textsuperscript{u} Bakr and C\textsuperscript{Umar} which gave the Kūfans the reason or the pretext for deserting him.

Adopting more radical views of al-Bāqīr's school, the JārūdIya rejected the Imamate of the first three caliphs. Writers such as al-Ash\textsuperscript{b} and Sa\textsuperscript{d} b. AbdAllāh\textsuperscript{4} maintain that they put forward the nomination of al-I from the Prophet although NawbakhtI does not explicitly say that. According to ShahrastānI\textsuperscript{4}, they held that the Prophet nominated

1. Madelung, \textit{Der Qāsim}, p.45; Arendonk, p.254 says that al-HādI considers both patriarchs as apostates who deserved death. According to al-NajrI (d.877/1472) cited by Madelung, the early authorities held it unlawful to use the formal blessings for the first three caliphs while others had opposite views. However subsequent authorities, including al-NajrI maintained firmly that the formal blessing could be used for them.


4. Sa\textsuperscript{d} b. AbdAllāh, p:19.

5. \textit{Milal}, p.118.
cAli "by a description (of his qualities) without the
mention of his name."¹ [bi al-waṣf dūna tasmīya] — In
Zaydī literature,² his nomination resulted in a manner
that the believers could understand not directly and of
necessity but merely by inference.³ Later this thesis
of 'obscure nomination' nasṣ khāfī, gayr jallī was
universally advocated by the Zaydīya.⁴

Holding that the great majority of the Companions
of the Prophet had gone astray by following Abū Bakr
and ʿUmar, the Jārūdīya, unlike the Bāṭrīya, rejected
the tradition of the law handed down by them.⁵ This
critical attitude of theirs, which undoubtedly they had
adopted from al-Bāqir's school and the attitude of al-
Bāqir's school towards the great majority of the early

¹ Al-ʿAshcārī, Maqālāt, p.67; also refer to Abū al-
Qāsim al-Balkhi's views in al-Hajjūrī, Raudāh, fol.
139a, cited by Madelung, Der Qāsim, p.45. See also
Baghdādi, Farg, pp.22 for the same views; Ibn Ḥazm
omits the question of Imamate altogether which
Friedlaender, JAOS, vol. 29 p.22 regards it strange
that he should omit the mention of this typical
heterodoxy of the Jārūdīya: the "Tafkīr al-Ṣaḥāba."

² Abū al-Ḥasan Siyān Sarijān's work Kitāb al-muhīt
min usul al-Imāma ʿalā madhhab al-Zaydiya, cited
by Madelung in Der Qāsim, p.45.

³ Al-Bāqir's school on the other hand taught that
cAli's nomination had been clear and directly
intelligible. See the chapter,
"Al-Bāqir's views on the Imamate".

⁴ Straatsrecht, p.39, cited by Madelung, op.cit,p.45.

⁵ Madelung's art on "Imāma", section on Zaydīya,
EI².
community of the Prophet's Companions, had a significant effect on the legal pattern. They declared that only the traditions from the Prophet's family were valid. But because of their belief that after al-Ḥusayn the Imamate belongs to any qualified descendant of al-Ḥasan or al-Ḥusayn who calls to his allegiance and rises against the illegitimate rulers, the Jārūdiya relied for religious knowledge also on the descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn as a whole, not merely those recognized as Imams. Based on the belief that the Imamate becomes only valid through the formal "call" to allegiance (daʿwa) and "rising" (khurūj), the Jārūdiya also maintained that those who did not "rise" could not on that account be considered as Imams.

As regards the restriction of the Imamate to the successors of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, this may well have first become the dogma of the majority of Zaydiya at the Abbāsid conquest. For, towards the end of the Umayyad era, they were still able to support the revolt of ʿAbdAllāh b. Muʿāwiya, the great grandson of

1. Madelung, Der Qāsim, pp. 45ff. More will be said about this in an exclusive chapter on fiqh.

2. Madelung's art. on Imama in EI² and also his Der Qāsim, pp. 47ff. For al-Dāqir's school true knowledge could be found only in the recognised Imams.

CAI's brother Ja'far. It is difficult to determine whether the authoritative leaders of the schools were prepared to participate or not. However, it must be said that at least until the 4th/10th century this idea of not limiting the Prophet's family to the descendants of al-Hasan and al-Husayn, maintained itself still as a Zaydi tendency. Then it had called itself apparently the Tālibiya and venerated ʿAbdAllah b. Muʿawiya in the same manner as Zayd b. CAI. Nabil Abbot maintains that a leader of this group, Ibn ʿUqda lived as far as the first half of the 3rd/9th century and there seems little doubt that he condemned the Imamates of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar, since he has been labelled as a Jārūdiya.

Nawbakhti appears quite polemical about their theory maintaining that they had transmitted only a little from Zayd and ʿAbdAllāh b. ʿHasan while most of their knowledge was from al-Baqir and al-Ṣādiq. This statement of his follows certain peculiar dogmas that

1. Madelung, Der Qāsim, footnote on p.47. Also see Arendonk, op.cit. p.38, ʿAbdAllāh b. Muʿawiya's revolt in 127 A.H.
4. Tūsī, p.42
5. Firaq, pp.49-50
he attributes to them such as "knowledge grows in their hearts just as rain makes the cultivated land grow."\(^1\) Earlier he maintains that they believed that every descendant of the Prophet, young or old, are all equal in their knowledge, even if they were still in their cradle and that all of them are equally entitled to the Imamate. This is where Nawbakht\(^2\) adds that inspite of that, they do not transmit any useful knowledge from anyone of them except from al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq and only a few traditions here and there are from Zayd b. CAll and even fewer from AbdAllāh b. al-Ḥasan al-Mahd.

These beliefs about their knowledge clearly underlie the theory of Inspiration (Ilhām) which al-Jāḥiz\(^3\) charged against the Jārūdīya. Madelung\(^4\) maintains that the attribution of this theory to the Jārūdīya probably developed out of a discussion with the followers of al-Bāqir's school, who considered knowledge as an inheritance of their series of Imams and were inclined to charge the Zaydīya that many of their Ālid authorities have not related exclusively from their

---

1. Nawbakht\(^1\) Firaq pp. 49-50.
2. ibid.
3. Kitāb faḍīlāt al-Muṭtazila. See also RI\(^2\) art. Ilhām.
fathers. The Zaydiya on the other hand, in opposition to the Imami Shi'ites in general allowed their Alid authorities to relate from non-Alid transmitters. Thus, their theory of inspiration is slightly modified in that they ascribe to the Alids, a guaranteed capacity especially from God for the acquisition of knowledge. However in Madelung's opinion there is no apparent trace of such a discussion in the later Zaydi literature.


The question that arises in this connection is whether Zayd claimed the leadership and stood in rivalry to al-Baqir in his lifetime or not. This is directly related to the various controversies that have arisen regarding al-Baqir's conflicting dates of death. The problem becomes even more complex in view of the fact that the historical sources do not delve into doctrinal issues while the heresiographical writers restrict themselves to the latter. Nevertheless, if we are to maintain that Zayd revolted

1. Der Qāsim, p.48
2. Qādi al-Nu'mān and al-Kulaynī give it as 114 A.H. while Masūdī puts it as late as 126 A.H. Nāwbakhtī mentions 114 A.H. adding that others say it is 119 A.H. Ibn Sa'd and Yāqūtī place it in 117 A.H.
in 122 A.H. while the problem between him and Hishām arose in 120 A.H. when he deposed Khālid al-Qasrī and replaced him with Yusūf b. ʻUmar then taking into account what some of Zayd's supporters said when they cross-examined him and abandoned him; it appears to me at least that al-ʻĀqir although not alive at the time

1. al-Tabari II, 1700

Van Arendonk in his Les Debuts p.31 thinks it to be strange that the Kūfan Shiʿites ignored their feelings towards Abū Bakr and ʻUmar until the last moment when, as Abū Mikhnaf relates, they cross-examined Zayd and abandoned him. However, if one were to look at the history of Kūfans in the past this is not a novel thing and there is nothing strange about them supporting someone until the last moment and then backing out. The same happened at Ṣifīn, in Ḥasan's struggle against Muʿawiyah and at Karbalā'. In fact even after Karbalā' when Sulayman b. Surad and his group formed the tawwābūn wanting to avenge ʻUbayy's blood, there too, as is known, only one-fourth of those who had initially agreed turned up. Thus there is nothing novel about this attitude of the Kufans, so it is quite likely that they did examine Zayd at the last moment. Moreover, this report in al-Tabari's Taʾrīkh is being reported by Abū Mikhnaf who was a -contemporary of Zayd b. ʻAlī so it is quite likely that there is very little distortion of facts.
could not have been dead for a very long time.\(^1\) Qādī al-Nuṣrān\(^2\) gives an interesting account as to why this group suddenly decided to cross-examine Zayd. It runs as follows:

When Zayd was released after his arrest by Yusūf b. Ĕmar, his followers encouraged him to rise in rebellion. He confused people with the idea of Khurūj saying that there can be no Imam except he who unsheaths his sword and rises in accordance with the command of Allah, not one who sits at home and lets down the curtains (upon himself). Here the author adds that he meant Abū Ja'far al-Bāqir. The narrative continues saying that when Zayd's affair gained too much popularity, al-Bāqir feared there would be fitna.

1. See Hodgson's "How did the Early Shi‘a become Sectarian\(^3\) JAOS 75 (1955) p. 10. f.n. 60 who uses this line of argument against Strothmann, Staatsrecht, p. 28. Also see his note 61 on the same page where he says "Soon after his (i.e. al-Bāqir's death when Zayd's followers abandoned Zayd, they are said to have gone to Ja'far as representing Bāqir's claim.

So he chose a trusted follower of his and prepared him with asking certain questions to Zayd. Accordingly this man approached Zayd one day while he was with his group and asked him whether he was claiming what he was in accordance with his father's wishes. Zayd denied this but continued to relate the idea of *khurūj*, mentioned above, to the man. So the man asked him:

"If no-one amongst you were to rise in rebellion, does it mean then, that there would be no Imam and if a group of people, all were to arise, then would all of them be Imams?"

Zayd, according to the author, is said to have remained silent and those who were present realised the weakness that was there in his claims.

Thereafter the same person who had asked him these questions told Zayd that his brother Abū Ja'far had informed him that their father, ʿAlī, Zayn al-ʿAbidin had made the *wasiya* to him, whereupon Zayd retorted:

1. The author did not give any names.
"If he had done that he would have surely told me for my father's love for me was such that whenever he shook off the bone-marrow from the bone and found it hot, he would first blow over it before giving it to me, therefore is it possible that he would guard me against the heat of his bone-marrow and not from the heat of hell? He surely would have told me if he had really made the covenant to my brother."

So the man replied:

"Then why is that Prophet Yaʿqūb warned Yusuf not to relate his dream to his brothers for fear they might conspire against him while he was not asked to conceal the matter from the people."

Thereafter, the author mentions one report saying that Zayd became quiet after this, not being able to reply while the other report maintains that Zayd told them that he was doing what he was doing according to his father's orders.

It was after this incident, continues al-Qādi al-Nuṣayrī that some of his followers cross-examined him about Abū Bakr and Ṭāhir's position and then abandoned him. From the Qādi's above account of Zayd's revolt it seems that al-Bāqir was still alive at the time when Hishām confronted Zayd with certain allegations and had him arrested and then released.
Nevertheless, before the sequence of these events, he mentions that al-Baqir passed away in 114 A.H. and later places Zayd's death in 122 A.H. In any case, if we are to maintain that Zayd's actual problem with Hisham arose in 120 A.H. and the revolt took place in 122 A.H., then al-Baqir's death seems quite possible to have occurred after the conflict in 120 A.H. yet before Zayd's actual revolt in 122 A.H.

Yet another incident given in al-Tabari\(^1\) would place al-Baqir's death to be even later than that - as far as 125 A.H. or even further than that. Someone by the name of Amr b. Ali approached al-Baqir and said to him:

Hisham has been reigning for a long time and his period of rule has lasted nearly twenty years whereas people claim that Prophet Sulayman had asked his Lord not to let anyone rule more than him, which the people claim to be twenty years.

---

1. al-Tabari Ta'rikh II 1739-40.
According to al-Ṭabari, al-Bāqir replied:

I have no idea of what people talk but I have heard my father, who heard it from his father, from ʿAlī who heard the Prophet say: God will never let a king in a community of a prophet live as long as that prophet.

If this took place in the year 125 A.H. as mentioned by al-Ṭabari, this implies that al-Bāqir was still alive at the time, whereas in the same work earlier on, when narrating Zayd's revolt in 122 A.H., he includes Abū Mikhnaf's report about a group abandoning Zayd and approaching Jaʿfar al-Sadiq as representing al-Bāqir's claims.

However, since the above accounts from Qādī al-Nuṣairī and al-Ṭabari depict a total disregard for chronology and historical circumstances, these cannot be taken as evidence for history and therefore the date of al-Bāqir's death still remains an open question. However one thing appears certain and that is placing al-Bāqir's death in 114 A.H. seems too early while putting it as late as 126 A.H. appears too late.

1. ibid.
Unlike Zayd, al-Baqir never thought of resorting to the sword. Instead, people were attracted to him on account of his extensive knowledge that had earned him the title of al-Baqir al-Ilm. His noble birth, primogeniture and his personality played no smaller role in establishing his position and gaining him followers. More than this, his views on the Imamate had a significant impact upon some of the people who became permanently attached to him and his family. In contrast to Zayd and his supporters, al-Baqir's school maintained that the institution of the Imamate was hereditary in nature and did not depend on the khuruj of the Imam as held by them. Thus al-Baqir was introducing the idea of a non-rebelling Imamate. This was significant and timely as many had come to believe by then that the point of claiming Imamate was to bid for power, that is, political powers.

A stronger argument in favour of al-Baqir's school was their conviction that the Prophet had expressly designated and appointed Ali as his successor before his death by nass, i.e. by means of explicit
This meant that as the Prophet had sanctioned 'Ali's appointment, the succession of Abū Bakr and ĈUmar was an invalid usurpation. It must be pointed out, however, that al-Bāqir was never known to have reviled the two caliphs, at least not in public. The tradition in Ibn Sa'd says that when asked if any one from among the Prophet's family spoke ill of the two caliphs, al-Bāqir replied that one the contrary they had always loved them, followed them in succession and 'prayed for them' or 'asked for forgiveness for them' istaqlfara lahuma.

1. See section on theology of the Imamate in Chapter Four 'Al-Bāqir's views on the Imamate.'

2. Dhahabi Tārikh IV p. 300; Abū Nu'aym Ḥilyat III 185. Some Kufans maintained that al-Bāqir only concealed his real opinion by using the principle of precautionary dissimulation (tagiyā). Traditions referring to the poet Kumayt quote al-Bāqir as very violently disavowing Abū Bakr and ĈUmar see Kashshī Rījāl, pp. 205 ff. whereas Kumayt himself never vilified the first two caliphs openly. See Hāshimiyyāt, p. 155.

Dā'C Idrīs in his Cuyūn al-Akhbār pp. 239 ff has an interesting account of al-Bāqir's debates with the Ḥarūriya on the question of ĈAli's rights and denial of Abū Bakr's. Dā'C Idrīs does not mention his source but it has got to be other than his usual one i.e. Qādī al-Nu'aymān for the latter does not mention this at least in his Sharh or his Manāqib.

Al-Bāqir, by insisting on the nāṣṣ of the Imam, meant that the Imam had the authority from above and not from any human electors or from the bayṣa (pledge of allegiance) of the ordinary people. Furthermore, since the Imam's authority was from above, 'true knowledge was confined only to the Imam in the Prophet's family; not to every member of the Prophet's family and certainly not to the whole Community. It was thus, he held, that the whole tradition of the Community was not valid as a proper source for law. This also meant that he did not allow the practice of ijtiḥād and ikhtiyār nor did he advocate individual opinions (arā`) which the Baṭrīya did. For, the Imam's followers would be able to seek the judgement of the Imam on each new question that arose being the only authority able to guarantee the true tradition of law. This was possible because the inspired Imam was the recipient of that special sum of knowledge (Cilm) handed down to him.
which was hereditary and which was the exclusive right of each succeeding Imam.
CHAPTER FOUR

AL-BAQIR’S VIEWS ON THE IMamate

(i) Qur’anic basis of the Imamate

In the discussion of the nature and basis of the Imamate, Shi‘ite sources\(^1\) suggest that al-Baqir laid great emphasis on the Qur’anic verse 5:55:—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{اَنَّا وَلَيْكَمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُ الَّذِينَ اعْتَمَرُوا الْدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةَ وَمِنْ اَلْعَلَامَاتِ}
\end{align*}
\]

This verse can either be translated as:—

"Indeed your [real] Protector or Guardian is only God, His Messenger and those believers who perform prayer and give the zakat while prostrating."

---

1. al-\(\text{Qādī}\) al-Nu\(\text{mān}\), \(\text{Da’ā’im}\) al-\(\text{Islām}\) I pp. 17ff. al-Kulaynī, \(\text{al-\(Uṣūl\) min al-\(Kāfī\)}\) I p. 289; al-\(\text{Ṭabarsī}\) al-Shaykh Abī \(\text{‘Alī}\) al-\(\text{Faḍl}\) b. al-\(\text{Ḥasan}\), \(\text{Majmu‘}\) al-Bayān \(\text{fī Tafsīr al-Qur‘ān}\), Vol. 3 (Teheran, 1395 A.H) pp. 209 ff. Ismā‘īlī sources such as Al-\(\text{Risāla fī al-Imāma}\) of Abū al-Fawāris \(\text{‘Alī}\) al-Dīn b. Ya‘qūb (dā‘i during al-\(\text{Ḥakim’s}\) reign who became the Imam in 386/996) p. 13 in the edition of S.N. Makarem (Beirut, 1977) and \(\text{al-Maṣābīḥ fī Ithbāt al-Imāma}\) of another dā‘i of al-\(\text{Ḥakim}\), \(\text{‘Alī}\) b. \(\text{Ḥamīd}\) al-Dīn al-\(\text{Kirmānī}\) (d.c.411/1021) edited by Mustafa Ghālib (Beirut, 1969) p. 111 both mention this Qur’ānic verse (although not mentioning al-Baqir’s name) as being one of the proofs for the validity of \(\text{‘Alī’s}\) divine appointment. This verse is also given in Tafsīr al-\(\text{Qummī}\) I p. 170 and Tafsīr al-\(\text{Tibyān}\) of \(\text{Tūsī}\) III, pp. 549ff. where al-Baqir has commented upon it.
or as:

"Indeed your [real] Protector of Guardian is only god, His Messenger and those believers who perform prayer and give the zakāt, and they are the ones who prostrate."¹

These two alternate translations depend on one single letter i.e. the wāw which besides being a conjunction [wāw al-catf] can also be grammatically used in this position to introduce the state a person was in when performing the action in the previous clause [wāw al-hāl]. The first translation of the verse takes the hāl into account while the second one ignores it. Both these translations involve significant implications. If the hāl is rejected, that would mean all the believers are fit enough to be the walāya whereas if the hāl is accepted then, besides God and His Messenger, the walāya is restricted to only those believers who give zakāt while still prostrating in prayer.

Muslim exegetes² over the years have had contradictory views regarding this verse. Some³

---

1. יעדAllah Yusuf יעד in his translation of the Holy Qur'an has adopted this alternative. See Chapter 5, verse 58 on page 261.


3. יעדutba b. יעד Hakam and Mujāhid, see Ṭabarī, op.cit.
believe it is in reference to Ali who, while kneeling down in prayer, once threw his ring to a beggar who stood asking for alms. Whereas others maintain that the verse really refers merely to believers. They maintain that the verse was revealed when Ubadah b. al-Qaysit freed himself from the patronage and alliance of the Banu Qaynuqa and went over to the Messenger and believers. Still others, like Ibn al-Kalbi think it was revealed concerning Abdullah b. Salam and his companions when they became Muslims and the Jews broke off their contract of clientage (muwalat). 3

Commenting on the above verse, al-Baqir4,

1. al-Kulayni Kafi I p.289 says that Ali threw a garment (hulla ) rather than a ring to the beggar. This garment had been given to him by the Prophet who had received it as a gift from the King of Abyssinia. The value of this garment, says al-Kulayni, was one thousand dinars. Al-Kulayni appears to be an exception in holding this view for all other scholars, including twelvers like al-Tabarsi, Vol.3 pp.209ff say it was a ring. See also al-Tabari, Tafsir, Vol.5-6 pp.285 ff. AL-Baydawi, Anwar al-Tanzil wa Asrar al-Tawil I, p.263.


3. al-Tusi, Tafsir al-Tibyan p.549. Note that the word muwalat can have different meanings in different contexts.

categorically maintains that it was revealed at the time when the Messenger was with a group of Jews, amongst whom ĀbdAllāh b. al-Salām was present. As soon as the verse was revealed the Messenger got up and walked towards the mosque where he met a beggar. Inquiring if anyone had given him anything, the beggar pointed at a man who was still praying. That man turned out to be Ālī.

However, what we read of al-Bāqir's viewpoint according to two of his traditions mentioned by al-Ṭabarī is quite different from the accounts in al-Qummī, al-Ṭūsī and al-Ṭabarī. In al-Ṭabarī's account when al-Bāqir is asked: "Who are those who believe" in the above mentioned verse, his reply is al-ladhīna āmanū i.e. those who believe. When the group cornered him by saying that they had heard it was revealed in reference to Ālī, al-Bāqir gave an equivocal reply: "Ālī is among those who believe."

Al-Ṭabarī's selection of reports on this verse is very fascinating and revealing. He puts forward the varying reports alongside each other without weighing them up, sometimes using the same authority to narrate

1. al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, Vol.5-6, p.286.
contrary views. It is interesting to find al-Ṭabarī using al-باءقير's traditions twice to deny the Shi‘ite position and the fact that he does that would suggest that there had been some early arguments about al-باءقير's position. Moreover, the two traditions used by al-Ṭabarī have a common person in the isnād which is regarded as being a problematic isnād by some critics.

There seems to be therefore a strong evidence that the verse was regarded by some as referring to ʿAlī; for even al-Ṭabarī, despite his use of traditions ascribed to Abū Ja‘far (i.e. al-ificance) to the contrary, has to include a number of traditions indicating that the verse does refer to ʿAlī.

But the question arises how can it mean a single person when the form used in the verse is in the plural: -اللذين يقيمون السبعة. Al-Ṭusī's arguments for this problem are taken directly from the Qur'an

1. For instance he reports from ʿHanīd b. al-Sarī, the traditions of both, ʿUbāda and Abū Ja‘far, i.e. al-ificance. See al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, Vol.5-6 p.286.

2. Which is ʿAbd al-Malik. Among al-ificance's companions in Rijāl al-ificance there are two persons mentioned under this name: (i) ʿAbd al-Malik b. ʿAṭā’ and (ii) ʿAbd al Malik b. ʿAyan, mawla of Banū Shaybān.

3. For more details on this, see Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, p. 163 ff.
where not only God refers to Himself in the plural\textsuperscript{1} but also there are a number of other verses where the plural is used when actually only a single person is meant. For instance verse 173 of \textit{sūra Al-Imrān} says:

\textit{الذين نفحل لهم الناس أن الناس قد جمعوا لكم...}

"Those to whom the people said: Indeed the people have gathered for you ..."

There is no dispute among the exegetes that the plural form in the above verse actually refers to one man and that is Nu\textsuperscript{c}aym b. Ma\textsuperscript{s}ud al-Ashjā\textsuperscript{c}I. Among other such verses\textsuperscript{2} is verse 168 of the same \textit{sūra Al-Imrān}:

\textit{الذين فحلوا لأخوانهم...}

"Those who say about their brethren [who were slain] while they themselves sat [at ease]: If only they had obeyed us they would not have been killed."

\begin{enumerate}
\item We have indeed sent down the Message and We shall certainly be its Guardian [\textit{sūra 15 : 9}]. If We had
\textit{وَلَوْ نَزَّنَا الْذِّكْرِ وَانَّهُ لَحَقَّ رَبِّنَا لَحَقًا}

If We had willed, We could certainly have brought every soul its true guidance [\textit{sūra 12 : 172}]
\item Another example is \textit{II : 199}.
\end{enumerate}

Then move on quickly from where people move on .... Again here the person meant was the Messenger. Cf. Tūsī, p.552
In the above verse too, although the plural is used, the exegetes opine that it was revealed about ĀbdAllāh b. Ubayy b. Salūl. Thus there is no reason why the plural form in verse 5:55 could not have been meant for a single person and that is Ālī b. Abī Ṭalib. Moreover, since God used the word wālī and not awlīyā in the first place, it suggests that only a single person was actually meant.

However, what emerges from the Shi'ite sources is the fact that in al-Bāqir's view, the Messenger had been reluctant to explain this wālāya of Ālī to the believers. It is reported that a man approached al-Bāqir saying to him that al-Ḥasan al-Basrī (d.c. 110 A.H.) had told him that the Messenger had received a certain message and when he hesitated to deliver it to the people God threatened him with punishment if he did not do so. Then al-Bāqir asked the questioner whether al-Ḥasan had told him what the message was. He said: No, whereupon al-Bāqir told him: "By God, he certainly knows what the message was, but has deliberately concealed it." The questioner then asked al-Baqir to clarify the message.

2. He was a contemporary of al-Bāqir.
3. Qāḍī al-Nuʾmān Daʾāʾīʾim I, p.17
Explaining this message, al-Bāqir said that just as the Messenger had elucidated the details regarding the verses on prayer, alms giving, fasting and pilgrimage, so too, he was expected to expound on the *walāya* that was revealed in the aforementioned verse. But when asked to do that, the Messengers felt extremely uneasy fearing that people would apostatize. As his reluctance continued, God repeated the command in verse 5:67.

"O Messenger, deliver (to the people) what has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you did not do so then, you have not delivered His message, and Allah will protect you from the people."

---

1. Details such as how and when to pray, how much zakāt was to be given, when to fast and how long for as well as how and when to do the pilgrimage.
Al-Baqir continued relating to the questioner that
the Messenger, upon receiving this verse then carried
out God's command and endorsed the walāya¹ or Imamate
of ʿAlī b. Abī ʿṬālib at Ghadīr Khumm². The Sunni
commentators obviously do not interpret the verse so as
to mean that God's Message is only truly conveyed by
the appointment of an Imam. By "that which has been
revealed" they understand the whole Book, i.e. that the
Prophet should not omit any verse out of fear or
cautión.³

Al-Ṭabarī starts off by giving his interpretation
that the revelation was regarding those stories which
God had enumerated about the Jews and the Christians.
Since these passages involved their shortcomings and
their faults as well as their tampering with the
scripture, the Messenger in al-Ṭabarī's view was
apprehensive about revealing the message in full. That

---

1. Other Shi'ite sources on the exegesis of this verse
tally with views expressed by al-Baqir in Qādī al-
Nuʿmān's K. al Walāya. See Tafsīr al-Qummī p.171 and
al-Ṭūsī's Tafsīr al Tībyān pp. 574 ff. Ṭūsī begins
by giving different versions and then in the end,
reports on the authority of al-Baqir and al-Ṣādiq
that this verse was revealed to the Messenger as an
encouragement to deliver what had already been
revealed to him before.

2. See for more details L. Veccia Vaglieri art. "Ghadīr
Khumm" in EI². For more references see the section
on 'Traditional basis of the Imamate' where the
event is dealt with in detail.

3. See al-Baydāwī, Anwār 1:367
is the reason for the revelation of this verse he believes. Nevertheless, he goes on to give varying reports that the Prophet had concealed something while also quoting traditions from Ḥā'isha to say that whoever says that the Prophet had concealed something of the revelation is a liar. Al-Ṭabarī then adds that the commentators are divided regarding the cause for this revelation. Some say that it was because a bedouin wanted to kill the Messenger and therefore God said He would protect him while others say he used to be afraid of the Quraysh.

However, according to al-Bāqir it was only after the endorsement of walāya that God revealed the following verse, 5:3:-

اللهم اكمل للكم دينكم
واستؤتكم بكم تعصي
وقد اللهكم الإسلام لينا

"This day I have perfected your faith for you and completed my favours upon you and have chosen for you Islam as a faith/religion."

Al-Baqir's position reported from various Shi'ite sources\(^1\) regarding the above verse "Al-yawm akmałtu lakum..." is very clear and that is, it was revealed on the occasion of Ali's appointment as an Imam at Ghadir Khumm.\(^2\) Al-Tabari not only excludes reports in favour of the Shi'ite position but goes on to include certain traditions to deny their position. It is also noteworthy that all

---


2. Sunni commentators like al-Bayḍawî do not believe this verse was issued then nor do they explain "the perfection of religion" and completion of God's favour or blessings" as referring to the appointment of an Imam after the Prophet. Al-Bayḍawî commenting on this verse says: "Today I have perfected your religion for you" means either that God has perfected your religion with victory and distinction over all other religions, or with defining the foundations of the doctrine and acquainting the believers with the principles of the laws and the rules of legal judgment. "I have completed my blessings upon you" means that God has completed His blessings upon you with guidance and success or with the perfection of religion or with the conquest of Mecca and the destruction of the pale of Jâhilîya. See Bayḍawî Anwâr I, p. 247.
these traditions are on the authority of Ibn ĔAbbās. Commenting on the varying reports al-Ṭabarī maintains that the correct reports are those that say that God informed His Prophet and thereby the faithful that He had perfected their faith on the day this verse was revealed by making the sacred country exclusive for them and excluding the idolators so that the believers may make the pilgrimage without having to mix with them.


   (a) حدثني الشنقيط قال ، حدثنا ميد الله قال حدثني معاوية من علي بن أبي سفيان قال ، "الله اكملكم وحصتم وصواه السلام" قال أخبر الله نبى صلى الله عليه وسلم بالخبر إنك قد أكلتم الله البقرة وكانوا من أنفسهم إلى زيدة أبدا ، وقد آيتهم الله مزدكر فلا ينتميه إبدا ، وقد رضى الله فلا يخطه إبدا.

   (b) حدثني الشنقيط قال ، حدثنا ميد الله قال ، حدثنا معاوية من علي ، من أبي سفيان قال الشروان والمسلم يحرون جميعا ، فلما تزلت براءة تثنى المشركين على البيت وحج المسلمين لاشاركم في البيت الحرام احد من المشركين ، فكان ذلك من نظم النعمة ، رأست طليمك نعمتي.
Another Qur'ānic verse used by al-Baqir\textsuperscript{1} to emphasise the \textit{walāya} of the Imams is 4:59:-

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{بابمَلا للهَ وَاطِبَمَوا الرُّسُلَ}

واللَّهُ الْامِنِرُ شَكُمَ
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{quote}

translated as:- 

\begin{quote}
O Ye who believe! Obey God and obey the Messenger and those who hold authority [from] amongst you........
\end{quote}

This verse is even more controversial than the ones already mentioned; the obvious problem being the identity of the \textit{ulī al-amr}. Numerous reports\textsuperscript{2} have come down to us giving varied suggestions, some maintaining that they are 'the rulers' while others believing them to be the scholars. Al-Baqir's\textsuperscript{3} commentary on this verse is that the \textit{ulī al-amr} are the Imams from the family of Muḥammad, although a tradition

\begin{enumerate}
\item Qāḍī Nuṣrān Daǧā'im I, p.31.
\item See al-Ṭabarī \textit{Tafsīr} Vol. 5 pp. 146 ff. and al-Ṭūsī; \textit{Tafsīr al-Tibyān}, Vol. 3, pp. 235 ff. According to Ibn Ya'qūb, the author of \textit{al-Risāla fi al Imama} p. this phrase \textit{Ulī al-Amr} (those in authority) refers only to Cālī b. Ṭālib because the Prophet appointed him to be in authority even during his lifetime when the latter left for his Tabuk expedition. He says that obedience to Cālī is a requirement because in the Arabic language the letter \textit{alif} and \textit{lām} (al) are used for specification
\item al-Ṭūsī \textit{op.cit.}; al-Ṭabarī, \textit{Majma} C Vol. 2-3 p. 64. In \textit{Tafsīr al-Qummi} Vol. I the tradition is from al-Baqir's son, al-Ṣādiq.
\end{enumerate}
from his son, al-Ṣādiq found in al-Ṭabarī says that
they are the scholars. Al-Ṭabarī in his commentary
also includes reports which maintain the ʿulī al-amr
were Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. At the same time he excludes
traditions in favour of ʿAlī and his family.

However, the matter does not end there, for, the
line following the ʿulī al-amr entails serious problems
for the Shiʿite position. It runs as follows:-

فَانْتَقِئُواَ مِنْ شَيْءٍ نَصْرُوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ إِن
كَتَمْتُمْ أَنَّ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ إِلَى الْآخِرَةِ الْمُلْكَ
وَأَحْسَنَ تَأْيِمًا

This is translated as:-

"If you differ about anything, then refer
it to God and His Messenger if you are
[truly] believers in God and the Hereafter.
That is better and more seemly in the end."

In answer to this, al-Bāqir uses another Qur'ānic
verse 4:83:-

وَلَوَرَدْوَهُ إِلَى الرَّسُولِ وَإِلَى ابْنِ الْآمَرِ وَلَعَلَّهُ
الذِّيْنَ يَتَبَطَّرُهُنِّ شَهْدَتُهُنَّ

1. See al-Ṭabarī Vol 5 pp. 146 ff. where the following
are found:-

تَلَآخِرِينَ: حَمَّةَ أَبِي بَكْرِ وَمُرْؤِي اللَّهُ مَنْ هُمْ:- هَدْنَا أَحْدَمْ بِنْ عَبْرِ الْبَعْرِ
تَلَآخِرِينَ: هَمْ أَبِي بَكْرِ وَمُرْؤِي اللَّهُ مَنْ هُمْ:- هَدْنَا أَحْدَمْ بِنْ عَبْرِ الْبَعْرِ
تَلَآخِرِينَ: هَمْ أَبِي بَكْرِ وَمُرْؤِي اللَّهُ مَنْ هُمْ:- هَدْنَا أَحْدَمْ بِنْ عَبْرِ الْبَعْرِ
تَلَآخِرِينَ: هَمْ أَبِي بَكْرِ وَمُرْؤِي اللَّهُ مَنْ هُمْ:- هَدْنَا أَحْدَمْ بِنْ عَبْرِ الْبَعْرِ
which means:-

"If they had only referred it to the Messenger and those who had authority among them, then those among them who derive [or extract knowledge] would have perceived it."

Using the above verse to reassert the position of the Imams, al-Bāqir maintains that obedience to the Imams is incumbent as God made them 'the people of knowledge' and enabled them to extract that knowledge.¹

It is interesting to note that even al-Ṭabarī has a tradition from one of the earliest exegetes, Mujāhid (d.c. 100 A.H.)² to strengthen the position of ʿullāl amr:—

2. al-Ṭabarī  Tafsīr Vol. 8 pp. 504-5
According to Shi'ite sources\(^1\) when al-Baqir was asked about the verse: Obey God, obey the Messenger and those who hold authority amongst you (\(\mathcal{U}l\mathcal{I} \ amr\)), he responded by giving a long survey of Qur'anic allusions to the Imams. He said:

"Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the Book believing in sorcery and evil [saying] to the unbelievers that they are better guided than those who believe"\(^2\)

Explaining this verse, he says that such people claim that the leaders of error and those who urge people to hell-fire are better guided than the family of Muhammad. He adds another verse, "they are those whom God has cursed and those whom God will curse and you will find (that they) have no helper",\(^3\) "or have they a share in the Kingdom (\(m\mathcal{U}l\mathcal{k}\)) (which according to according to al-Baqir means the Imamate and the Caliphate)\(^4\) Behold! they give not even a speck on the date-stone to the people".\(^5\) Al-Baqir,\(^6\) then commented that they were 'the people'

---


\(^2\) Qur'ān 4: 51

\(^3\) Ibid 4: 52

\(^4\) "We have already given the family of Abraham the Book and Wisdom and conferred upon them a great kingdom" i.e. We made from them Messengers, Prophets and Imams.

\(^5\) 4:53

\(^6\) See Qaḍī al-Nuṣṭāmī Daqā'im I pp. 17 ff; al-Kulaynī \(\mathcal{K}\mathcal{F}\) I p. 205
whom God meant in the above verse. He went on to give another Qur'ānic verse, 4:54:

"Or do they envy the people for what God has bestowed upon them of His bounty?"

and said that they were the ones envied by the people because of the favour of the Imamate which God bestowed upon them apart from all other creatures.

Referring to another verse 4.58

"Lo, Allāh has commanded you that you restore deposits to their owners ...."

al-Baqir said, it is the Imams who were meant there and that they are the ones who have to give to their successors the special books, the special knowledge (Cilm) and the weapons of the Prophet. They are the truthful ones referred to in the Qur'ān1 as well as "the believers"2. God has made the Imams, according to al-Baqir's interpretation of verse 2:143 an umma wasat so that they can be God's witnesses to his creatures. His definition of "a great kingdom conferred upon the family of Abrahām"3 is that God made from among them leaders whose obedience was equal to God being obeyed

1. 9:119
2. 9:105
3. 4:54
and whose disobedience was equal to the disobedience of God. Then argues al-Bāqir, how could people accept that in the family of Ābrahām and deny it in the family of Muḥammad?

The Imams he adds, are the chosen ones and are named as 'those who submitted' not only in the Qur'an but also in the earlier scriptures. Since they have been endowed with knowledge from God, the Imams, says al-Bāqir have the clear signs of God in their hearts and since they are the ahl al-dhikr, i.e. the people of the Message they are ones who should be questioned about its interpretation.

The Prophet, continues al-Bāqir, was a warner to his people and in every age there is an Imam to guide

---

1. Al-Bāqir referring to verses 22:77-78 in Qāḍī al-Nuʾmān op. cit.; See also al-Kulaynī Kāfī I 205-6

2. Quoting verse 29:49 'Nay, here are Signs self-evident in the hearts of those endowed with knowledge.'

3. Referring to verse 43:44 in Qāḍī al-Nuʾmān op. cit. al-Kulaynī Kāfī I 210-211.

4. According to his interpretation of verse 13:7

"You are (only) a Warmer and for every people there is a guide"

See Qāḍī al-Nuʾmān Daʾāʾīm I p. 28; al-Kulaynī Kāfī I 191-2
his people to what the Prophet brought. The first of these guides after the Prophet was ʿAlī and then his awṣiyāʿ, inheritors, after him. AlʿBāqir, then, went on to add yet another Qurʾānic verse 3:5:-

"And No-one knows its interpretation except God and those firmly rooted in ʿilm (knowledge)"

Commenting on the above verse¹, al-Bāqir said that the Messenger was the best of those firmly rooted in knowledge. God taught him regarding all that was revealed to him and how to interpret it. Thereafter, it is the Imams who know all the interpretation of the Qurʾān. The Imams are, according to his interpretation of verse 35:32,² the chosen servants of God who have been given the Qurʾān as an inheritance. The foremost of the people in performing good deeds are the Imams, those who follow the middle course are the people who acknowledge the right of the Imam, and those who wrong themselves are the ones who do not accept the Imams.

1. Qāḍī al-Nuʾmān Daḍāʾim I p.28
2. "Then we gave the scripture as inheritance to those whom we chose among our worshippers. But among them are some who wrong themselves and some who follow the mid-road while some outstrip (others) through good deeds by Allah's leave. That is the great favour"

See Qāḍī al-Nuʾmān Daḍāʾim I p.29
Concluding his long survey of Qur'anic allusions to the Imams, al-Baqir pointed out to the questioner that the non-Shi'i claim the above verse to have been revealed for them. He then argues that if it were revealed concerning all of them, then all of them would be the chosen ones and in fact all would go to paradise (which is hardly the case). Likewise, he went on, they claimed regarding the ta'wil of the earlier verse (of ...... ʿUṯl al-amr) with which we began.

**Love for the Imams**

Al Baqir maintained that not only obedience to the Imams was incumbent upon the believers but that love for them was a duty enjoined upon the worshippers according to verse 42:22:

"...Say, I do not ask for any reward except love for my kith and kin ..."²

However, he adds, that the community differs with regard to the interpretation of this verse. There are

---

1. Qādī al-Nūmān Dā'ī'm I pp. 29ff.

2. Qādī al-Nūmān, Dā'ī'm pp. 84 ff. See also his *Kitāb al-Himma fi Adab Atibācí al-A'imma* ed. by Mustafa Ghalib (Beirut 1979) p.25 where al-Baqir adds: "He who loves us, Allah will raise him with us on the Day of Resurrection." Then he went on to say: "Is religion anything but love." Also see al-Tabarsī, *Majma'C al-Bayān* Vol. 9-10 pp. 27-28. Al-Baydawī *Anwār al-Tanzīl* II p. 230 says that this was revealed regarding ʿAlī, Fāṭima and their two sons. However, he ends by saying that this verse is also said to have been revealed in reference to Abū Bakr.
four different groups upholding different views. One group believes what we believe i.e. this verse was in fact revealed for the Ahl al-Bayt of the Messenger of Allah. The second group insists that this verse was abrogated by another one saying:

"Say, whatever I ask you with regard to my reward, it is (actually) for you. I rely for my reward on no-one except God and He is witness to everything."

Refuting their position, al-Bāqir argues that the above verse could only have been revealed either before the first one or after it. If it was revealed before, then, obviously it cannot cancel or abrogate the verse that has been revealed after it. On the other hand if it was revealed after the verse of "love for relations," then this later verse makes the first verse all the more emphatic since the love for the relations which the Prophet has asked from the believers does him really no good but the believers. Hence the verse reads:

"Say whatever I ask you in way of return, is meant for you ..."

1. See DaCa'īm pp. 84 ff. Sura 34:49
2. ibid. See also for the same point of view, Muscati and Moulvi, Life and Lectures of al-Mu'ayyad (Karachi 1950), pp.135-136 where some of al-Majālis al-Mu'ayyadīya which consists of eight hundred majalis in eight volumes, are summarised.
Al-Bāqir continues that the third group holds that this verse was meant for all the Arabs as the Prophet had a relation in every Arab house. They said that the Prophet had asked them to love him that is to love him through them. Al-Bāqir argues that if those whom he asked were believers then they would love him for their faith in him and their belief in him, so why would God be gracious upon them regarding that. On the contrary if those whom He is addressing are unbelievers, then how can he ask them for reward in a thing which they do not believe in. Moreover al-Bāqir says that restricting "the believers" only to the Arabs is ignorance on their part as well as being clearly presumptious. Not only that, al-Bāqir adds, it is misconstruing the Book of God and distorting His words, for the verse is addressed to all the believers, Arabs as well as non-Arabs, and all those who believe in God and Prophet; all of them have been enjoined to love the relations of His Prophet.

The fourth group, says al-Bāqir, holds that this verse meant gaining God's proximity through His obedience. This, al-Bāqir says, is the farthest in meaning as well as the most remote of the interpretations which has been reported from al-Ḥasan al-Basrī. Arguing his point of view al-Bāqir then says that if the verse meant what this misconstruer of God's words (al-muharrif li kalām Allāh) says then, there was
no point in mentioning words such as 'love' and 'reward'. Despite what the misconstruer of God's words says here, he goes on to report a tradition from Ibn cAbass was asked when the Prophet was asked who were relations he replied: cAlī, Fāṭima and their two sons.

Imams are the Light of God (Nūr Allāh)

Al-Bāqir said that the Imams are the Light of God mentioned in various verses of the Qur'ān such as:

"And believe in Allah and His Messenger and the Light that We have brought down."

Another such verse is 28:28:

"O! Ye who believe, Fear God and believe in His Apostle and He will bestow upon you a double portion of His mercy; He will provide for you a light by which ye shall walk ..."

The Imams, al-Bāqir said, are the light which guides men along the path of righteousness. They illuminate the hearts of the believers in whom the Imam's light is brighter than the bright sunlight during day time. Interpreting another verse of the Qur'ān 6:122:

1. Dağā'im, pp.84 ff.
"Is he who was dead and We raised him unto life and set for him a light that would walk in the midst of men, similar to him who is in utter darkness from which there is no way out ..."

Al-Bāqir said that 'the dead' meant those who did not know anything while 'the light that walks amidst people' meant the Imam who guides and 'those in darkness from which there is no way out' meant those who do not know the Imam.

According to Al-Ṭabarī this verse was revealed in connection with two men, one, a believer and another, a non-believer. Then he goes on to say that the exegetes differ with regard to the believer who some say it was Cūmar b. al-Khattāb while others believe him to be ‘Ammār b. Yāsir. The non-believer is said to have been Abū Jahl b. Hishām.

Continuing his commentary al-Ṭabarī gives other traditions to say that some believe 'the dead' meant those who had gone astray and 'we raised them to life'

2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī Vol.I p.185
3. al-Ṭabarī Tafsīr, Vol.12 p.90. He supports this with one tradition.
4. ibid. He includes two traditions for this view.
meant we guided them and 'the light' was the right guidance. He then gives variant reports that the light in the midst of men was the Qur'ān or the right guidance or Islam. He does not however report any tradition in favour of the Imam's position given in Shiʿite sources.1

The Hereditary character of the Imamate

Al-Bāqir emphasized that the Imamate remained in the progeny of the Imams. This was according to his interpretation of Sūra 33:6 ... "Those related by blood are nearer to one another in the book of God."2 He further explained that this verse was revealed especially with regard to the children of Ḫusayn. Another such verse describing Imamic succession is 43:28:- "And He made it a word to continue in his posterity that they may return."3

---

1. See Daʿāʾim. I p.214 and al-Kulaynī Kāfī I, p.185. It is interesting to note that al-Ṭabarsī Majmuʿ al-Bayān, vol. 3-4 pp.358-360 does not say that the light were the Imams but gives different traditions to say it was either knowledge and wisdom or the Qur'ān or Faith. Another common Qur'ānic verse interpreted for the Imams being the light of God is verse 35 of Sūra al-Nūr namely, "God is the Light of the heavens and the earth..." See Kitāb al-Kašf, pp.16-17 of Jaʿfar b. Manṣūr al-Yaman. Also see Tafsīr al Qummī II, pp.102 ff.

2. See al-Kāfī I, p.288 for the details of the tradition reported in al-Bāqir's authority.

3. See Tafsīr al-Qummī II, p.274 where the tradition is narrated on the authority of al-Bāqir's son, al-Ṣādiq who interpreting this verse says that it meant the Imamate.
Another aspect of the Imamate which al-Baqir put forward was the **Cisma** (infallibility) of the Imam i.e. he was divinely protected from sin and error (**macgum**). This too, is based on his interpretation of Qur'anic verse 33:33.

> "And God only wishes to remove uncleanness far from you 0, People of the House (Ahl al-Bayt) and cleanse you with a thorough cleansing or to purify you thoroughly."

This verse is accepted by some Sunni scholars as well to have been revealed for Hazrat **AlI**, Fatiha, al-Hasan and al-Husayn.

**Shafa**

Closely related to the concept of **Cisma** is the notion of **shafa** i.e. intercession which is inherent in the theory of Imamate propounded by al-Baqir. There

---

1. Literally the word **Cisma** and **macgum** are derived from the verb **Casama** which, according to Lane, means prevented, hindered, protected, defended, preserved, withheld etc. So **Cisma** is prevention, hindrance, defence, protection; the Shi'a explain it as protection from sin and is a specific quality of the Imams. See **Majma al-Babrayn**, an Arabic (Shi'ite) lexicon, by Fakhr al-Din b. Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Najafi (Tehran, 1321 A.H.) under **Casama**. Also see EI² art. "**Cisma**". Donaldson in his Shi'ite Religion, gives a detailed account of **Cisma**, see pp. 320-338.

2. **Tafsir al-Qummi** II, p. 193. The report includes other details such as whether the **Ahl al-Bayt** included the Prophet's wives or not.

3. Ibn Kathir, **Tafsir al-Qur'an al-Cazim** (Cairo, 1971). There are, of course, others who hold that it refers to the wives of the Prophet.
are many Qur'ānic verses mentioned above which al-Bāqir has interpreted, some of which imply the intercessional powers of the Imam. One of them is "on the day when we shall call all men with their Imam..."¹

Commenting on this verse, al-Bāqir said that when this verse was revealed, the Muslims asked the Messenger whether he was not the Imam for all the people. The Messenger said that he was the Messenger of Allah for all the people but after him there would be the Imams from his family who would stay with the people but who would not be accepted but instead would be oppressed. However, those who would love them, follow them and believe in them were indeed from him and would meet him while those who oppressed them and called them liars were not from him and he would in fact disown them.²

---

In the foregoing pages, al-Baqir has put forward his views on the Imamate from the Qur'an and *walāya* or Imamate undoubtedly emerges as one of the duties imposed by God upon the believer; in fact according to al-Baqir it is the most important duty. He considers it to be the major pillar of Islam and the pivot around which all other pillars revolve.

The Imams are in al-Baqir's view, the Protectors or Guardians of the believers and obedience to them is an obligatory duty. They are the people of the Message, to whom the Book, i.e. the Qur'an is given as an inheritance. Thus they are the interpreters of that Message and since they are the ones firmly rooted in knowledge it is they who should be asked about its interpretation. People envy the Imams because of God's favour upon them and because of the light and wisdom that has been bestowed upon them. Thus they are the ones who guide others and they are God's witnesses over His creatures. The Imams are pure and protected from sin and error and they are the light of God that walks amidst men so love for them was made incumbent upon the believers. On the day of Resurrection, all men will be called by their Imams. Thus, it is evident that al-Baqir in propounding his theory of Imamate was not only maintaining its hereditary and divine character but also its necessity in this world (for the sake of true knowledge etc.)
(ii) Traditional basis of the Imamate

After demonstrating his view that the Imamate was a divine ordination on the basis of the Qur'ān, al-Baqr also laid stress on the traditions of the Prophet which, according to him were a further proof of the Imamate. The number of traditions quoted by al-Baqir are many but here an attempt will be made to lay stress on mainly those traditions accepted by all Muslims, Shī'a as well as non-Shī'a. This however should not lead us to believe that the non-Shī'ite scholars necessarily agree with the interpretations of these traditions. For them, as is known, the question of the Imamate, is not a principle issue as it is for the Shī'a: "it is neither a part of rational sciences nor of fiqh", says al-Ghazālī.¹

a) The ḥadīth or the tradition which the Prophet said at Ghadir Khumm appears in al-Bāqir's view² to be one of the most important traditions in proving the Prophet's appointment of Ālī to the Imamate. It has been related with slightly different versions by the various Shī'ite scholars.³ The gist of the hadith is

that on his return from the Farewell Pilgrimage, the Prophet stopped at Ghadîr Khumm\textsuperscript{1} to make an announcement to the pilgrims who were then to disperse on their ways from this junction. He called for a congregational prayer and had a special pulpit erected.

After the prayer, the Prophet asked the people: \textit{Man awlā bikum} i.e. who has the first claim over you? The people replied that God and His Messenger knew better. The Prophet then said: "Do I not have a prior claim upon you than you have upon yourselves according to what God, the Exalted has said, 'The Prophet has a prior claim upon the believers than theirselves'?\textsuperscript{2}" They replied, "Yes O Messenger of God". After repeating this three times and making God a witness to their agreement, the Prophet took the hand of cAli, of cAli, lifted it with his own hand and said, "\textit{man kuntu mawlāhu fa cAlī-un mawlāhu}" (He whose mawlā I am, cAli is his mawlā). He then declared, "O God, help whomever helps him, oppose whomever opposes him, support whomever supports him, forsake whomever forsakes him and turn the light to whatever direction he turns." Hearing this, cUmar ibn al-Khattāb said, "Congratulations to you, O cAlī! You have become the

\begin{enumerate}
\item For details and sources see Veccia Vaglieri's art. on Ghadîr Khumm El\textsuperscript{2}.
\item Qur'ān 33:6
\end{enumerate}
mawlā of every believer, man and woman."¹

The Sunnis² also confirm the above tradition and it has been mentioned by a great number of Sunni traditionists.³ However, this does not mean that the Sunni scholars admit that the Prophet invoked God to install ⁵Aλî as Imam by pronouncing the invocation of Imamate upon him. Al-Baqillani,⁴ for instance, argues that the phrase awlā bi al-mu'minin min anfusihim which he interprets as "in charge of the believers more than their own selves" does not necessarily imply that ⁵Aλî is also in charge of them too even though he said right after, "he whose mawlā I am, ⁵Aλî is his mawlā". In his view the two words awlā and mawlā are by no means synonymous.

Another argument is that the word mawlā does not necessarily mean master and therefore it does not necessarily signify Imam whose obedience is incumbent


2. Al-Khatib al-Tabrizī Mishkāt 3:342; Al-Dhahabī in fact says that the first part of the hadith i.e. Man kuntu is of the Mutawātir type (that which has been reported by numerous authorities) while the second part has a strong chain of transmitters. See Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya wa al-Nihaya 5:24 (Cairo 1348-7 A.H.)


The word *mawla* is derived from the verb *wala* (to be near...). Grammatically, it belongs to a class of nouns called Noun of Place and thus signifies either the place where the action of the verb is committed or the subject in which the state of being expressed by that verb has its existence. The word *mawla* therefore signifies the place in which or the person in whom proximity exists. It can therefore mean master, patron, beloved, supporter, freed slave, companion, client, neighbour, confederate or relation. It is easy to see that the idea of proximity or nearness pervades these various meanings either in a physical or a moral sense. When a word can denote so many meanings, the context in which this word was used would perhaps help to clear its ambiguity. As the word *mawla* was used by the Prophet soon after the phrase in which he used *awlā* (*man awlā bikum*) it is quite likely that he must have meant them to be synonymous.

Some² try and explain the circumstances which led

---

1. Ibid.

the Prophet to say that what he did. In their view the problem was that some people were grumbling against cAli on account of the way in which he dealt with the distribution of the spoils in the expedition of al-Yaman, that had just taken place under cAli's leadership and from where he and others who had taken part in the expedition, came directly to Mecca to join the Prophet in the pilgrimage. So, they said, the Prophet was only trying to dispel these ill-feelings against cAli.

The normal ways in which the word mawlā and its plural mawālī appear in the Qur'an are as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mawālī</th>
<th>4:33</th>
<th>heirs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19:5</td>
<td>kinsfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mawālikum</td>
<td>33:5</td>
<td>clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-mawlā</td>
<td>22:13</td>
<td>Patron (Allah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44:41</td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mawlākum</td>
<td>3:150</td>
<td>Your Protector (Allah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>Your Befriender – a Transendent Patron (Allah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22:78</td>
<td>Your Protecting Friend (Allah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57:15</td>
<td>Your Patron (Fire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66:2</td>
<td>Your Protector (Allah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mawlāna</td>
<td>2:286</td>
<td>Our Protector (Allah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:51</td>
<td>Our Protecting Friend (Allah)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mawlāhu 16:76  His owner
66:4   His Protecting Friend
(Allah)

mawlāhum 10:30  their Lord (Allah)

It is quite obvious that the word was used in pre-Islamic and early Islamic practice. It was used for both mawlā as a master, patron, friend as well as for the relationship between the mawlā and the mawāllī (clients) - wāllī'. It is also used in the Constitution of Medina as the next of kin having the power of succession. In Islamic fiqh the wālī is the person who gives away the girl in marriage as well as the person who demands blood wit.

Besides all the above ways in which the word mawlā was used before and after the coming of Islam what is more important is actually the context in which the word was used by the prophet in his sermon. As mentioned earlier on he had used the word mawlā soon after using the word awlā bi al-mu'mīnīn min anfusīhim (in charge of the believers more than their own selves). Therefore it seems more likely that the word was used in the same context despite al-Bāqillānī's contrary observation.
To the Shi'a, according to al-Bāqir,¹ this pronouncement was not only indicative of the Prophets inclination towards Āli but was a clear and specific appointment which the people deliberately misconstrued.

b) Another tradition which is taken by al-Bāqir as evidence for the Imamate is the Prophet's saying to Āli:

"You are to me what Aaron was to Moses except that there is no Prophet after me."²

This hadith is recognised by the Sunnis³ as one of the

---

1. Da'ā'im I, pp.17ff al-Bāqir does not give the details of the event but only says that the Prophet endorsed the walāya at Ghādir Khumm. This implies that the event was quite well known by then. The Qādī relates the details of the event without mentioning the name of the authority saying it is well-known and well attested by authorities. The oldest evidence for this event is the poetry of Hassan b. Thabit who composed and recited the verses spontaneously when people began congratulating Āli. (See Amini, al-Ghadir Vol. 2 p. 32) However, Horowitz and Goldziher (see art. "Kumayt" in EI') think that those verses are spurious so in their view the earliest evidence of this tradition are Kumayt's verse (d. 126 A.H.)

2. Da'ā'im I:21,25 Qādī al-Nu'mān does not say from whom this tradition is related but only says that it is well-known and well attested (on page 25 he says it has been related from the Prophet but does not again say from whom). It is interesting to note that in his version the Prophet said this at Ghadir Khumm. See also al-Kirmānī Maṣābih pp. 115-16.

3. al-Bukhārī Sahih 5:24; 6:3; Muslim Sahih 7:20. Also see Ibn Sa'd Tabaqāt 3:1,14,15; Ibn Ḥanbal Musnad 1:182; Ibn Maja Sunan 1:43; al-Tirmidhī Sahih 5:638-41; al-Nasa'i Khaṣṣā'is, p. 4. Also see Ibn Hishām IV p. 163 and Ibn c'Abd Rabīh Ḥgd al-Farīd IV p. 311.
a sound (sahih) tradition. Although admitting the authenticity of this tradition, the Sunnis however do not consider it to be an indication of 'Ali's appointment to the Imamate. They maintain that the Prophet only said this hadith at one special occasion and that was when he set forth on his expedition to Tabuk (9 A.H.) and left 'Ali in Medina. Some people insinuated that the Prophet had left behind 'Ali because he disapproved of him and when 'Ali objected about it, the Prophet replied, "Are you not satisfied that you are to me what Aaron was to Moses except that there is no Prophet after me."

In view of the Sunnī scholars1 this meant that the Prophet made 'Ali his deputy over Medina as Moses had made Aaron his deputy over the Israelites when Moses went to Mount Sinai. Aaron had three positions in relationship to Moses say the Sunnis.2 In the first place he was his brother; secondly he was a prophet like Moses and finally he was his deputy when Moses left the Israelites to go to Mount Sinai. They say that since Aaron died before Moses, he could not be his

---


2. al-Bāqillānī Tamhīd pp.174-175
successor. As ʾAlī was neither the Prophet's brother nor was he a prophet like Muḥammad, he could therefore, they argue, only be like Aaron by being Muḥammad's deputy when he left for the military expedition to Tabuk as was Aaron when Moses left for Mount Sinai.

The Ismaʿili author, Ibn Yaṣṣūn is al-Riṣāla fi al-ʾImāma, chapter four and his translation, pp. 28-33.

1. In this case Ibn Yaṣṣūn appears to be ignoring the Ukhūwwa between Muḥammad and ʾAlī.

3. Ibid.
more than mere deputyship on a special occasion.

c) One of the basic traditions used by al-Baqir in proving the necessity of a testament is "It is incumbent on every Muslim not to spend one night without having a written testament by his head."¹ This is further strengthened by the Qur'anic verse 2:130-32:

"Prescribed to you, when any of you is visited by death, and he leaves behind some goods, is to make testament in favour of his parents and kinsmen honourably - an obligation on the god-fearing. Then if any man changes it after hearing it, the sin shall rest upon those who change it; surely God is All-hearing, All-knowing."²

1. Daqī'īm 2:343 where a version of it is mentioned by the Qadi. Another tradition says: "He who does not write his testament has a defect in his religion and in his reason." See Daqī'īm 2:344. Also see Ibn Yaṣṣūb's al-Risāla in S.N. Makarem's edition, pp. 32-33.

2. According to some Sunnī commentators these verse are totally abrogated by the so called "Verses of Inheritance" (Sūra 4:10-14). See Mustafa Zayd Al Naskh fi al-Qur'ān al-Karīm 2:385-93, apud S.N. Makarem while others believe they are not abrogated. Still others believe that the verses are abrogated only in relation to "the parents and kinsmen" who are supposed to inherit the property of the deceased. See al-Ṭabarī Tafsīr Vol. 3, pp. 384ff (Cairo edition) for details. There are still others and among them al-Hasan al-Basri who believe that these verses are not abrogated but they are rather elaborated specifically by the Verses of Inheritance. Since kinsmen are too remotely connected to be treated as natural inheritors, a testament is therefore necessary to allocate each one's share. Each of the natural inheritors' share is then specified in the "Verse of Inheritance." See Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Bulugh al-Marām min Adillāt al-Ahkām p. 273, apud S.N. Makarem op. cit.
This tradition is also mentioned and accepted by the Sunnis though with slight variations and is considered to be sound having been related by both al-Bukhārī and Muslim as well as other traditionists.¹

d) Al-Bāqir stressed the necessity of the Imamate by another tradition "He who dies without an Imam shall die a death of ignorance."² This tradition is recognized and considered extremely reliable, with different versions, by both Sunnis and Shi'as. Ibn Hanbal³ relates as follows, "He who dies without an Imam shall die in ignorance." Muslim b. al-Hajjaj relates it as "He who forsakes obedience (to the Imam) shall meet God on the Day of Resurrection without any allegations, and he who dies without having had


2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I, p.397

3. Musnad 4:96
allegiance (to an Imam) shall die in ignorance."¹

It is interesting to note the Isma’ilî version of this tradition mentioned by Qâdî al-Nu’mân² and Ibn Ya’qub³ where the term "the Imam of the time" (Imam al-dahr, Imam al-Qasr or Imam al-zaman) is present. This implies that either the Isma’ilî authors introduced this term in the hadith on account of their belief in the "ever living guide" or else the term was omitted or suppressed by others.

Emphasizing the necessity of the presence of an Imam, al-Baqir added that no efforts would avail anyone without guidance from the Imam of the time. In his view, such a person was similar to a strayed sheep who searches in vain for its shepherd and flock until eventually it is devoured by the wolf who takes advantage of this confusion.⁴

1. See al-Khatib al-Tabrîzî Mîskhât 2:319

2. Da’îr, I, 31 cf. ibid 34, "He who dies without having known the Imam of his time (dahr) while alive (bayyan) dies in ignorance.

3. al-Risâla fi al-Imâma in S.N. Makarem’s edition p.3 (Arabic text) and p.22 for translation. Also see note 18 for details.

Al-Bāqir is reported to have told one of his followers that even when any of them travelled only a few miles out to a strange place they needed a guide, then what about the path to the heaven of which they were far more ignorant than those of the earth.¹

The fact that the Sunni traditionists relate some of these traditions and consider them to be genuine does not mean that they agree with the Shiʿa concept of the Imamate, be it Ithna ʿAsharī or Ismāʿīlī. In the Sunni view, the Imam's function is pre-eminently political although he may perform religious functions but these do not tend to lend him any sanctity.² In their view, as the Imam is only a protector and an executor of the Sharīʿa, he does not need to be divinely appointed; but is installed by Ijmāʿ (consensus).³

However, according to the Shiʿa the choice of an Imam does not fall within the community's sphere and

---

¹. al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī pp.183-4.
². See for details, Sir Thomas Arnold The Caliphate p.17.
³. See al-Baqillānī Tamhīd pp.185-86; al-Ghazālī Fadāih, pp.143-144.
the therefore it is not their concern to decide who the Imam should be. This is seen by them to follow from al-Bāqir's view\(^1\) that the *walāya* or the Imamate is one of the pillars of Islam rather the most important one. In his view "Islam is built on seven pillars: *walāya* (Love and Allegiance to Imam), *tahāra* (Purification), *ṣalāt* (Prayer), *zakāt* (Almsgiving), *ṣawm* (Fasting), *ḥajj* (Pilgrimage) and *jihād* (Strife in God's Way). *Walāya* is the best among them, because through it and through the one to whom allegiance should be paid, the knowledge of the other pillars is reached."\(^2\) Being thus a matter of fundamental belief, the Consensus (*ijmāʿ*) cannot be applied just as it cannot be applied in matters concerning monothesim and in the prophethood of Muhammad and in his being God's Messenger.\(^3\)

---

1. DaCāʾīm I, p.2

2. QāḍI al-NuCmān DaCāʾīm I, p.2; al-Kulaynī al-Kāffī I, p.290 has a tradition from al-Bāqir which says God made five things incumbent upon his worshippers: they adopted four and left aside one and that is the *walāya*; the other four being *ṣalāt*, *zakāt*, *ḥajj* and *ṣawm*.

3. See Ibn YaCqūb's *Risāla*, p.27 where he refutes the notion that the Imam should be chosen and installed by the Consensus of the Community.
The choice of an Imam according to al-Bāqirī was long decided when God granted Ibrāhīm this favour and conferred the Imamate to him and his progeny (who did not go astray). In fact this favour was given to Ibrahim after God had initially accepted him first as a worshipper, second as a Prophet, third as a Messenger, fourth as a friend and finally as an Imam over the people. When this distinction was given to Ibrāhīm he could not help asking God whether this favour would remain in his progeny whereupon God answered that those who go astray shall not receive it. Thus the choice of an Imam is not a matter to be decided by the people but comes from above. It is in fact a favour that God grants, it cannot be acquired.

iii) Theology of the Imamate

In enunciating the theory or the doctrine of the Imamate, al-Bāqirī postulated certain principles prerequisite to it.

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfi I p. 175
a) **Nass**

Al-Baqir categorically maintained that the Imam had to be divinely appointed\(^1\) and that, that appointment had to necessarily be clear and precise, i.e. by **nass** (explicit designation) instead of what some groups believed. He had to be quite specific about his theory lest there were loopholes in it for those who were already claiming the Imamate during his time\(^2\) as well as for those who intended to claim it in future.

In order that his theory had sufficient credence, al-Baqir had to begin with the appointment of **AlI** who had to be designated expressly by Prophet Muhammad. This in his view was done at several occasions culminating in the event of Ghadir Khumm.\(^3\)

---

1. See his views in "the Qur'anic basis of the Imamate," and the "Traditional basis of the Imamate.

2. The claims of the Kaysanlya and its various branches; the claims of Zayd and his followers as well as the claims of other Alids and also those of the extremists. See Chapter Three for more details.

Al-Bāqir is reported to have said to Abū Hamza al-Thumālī that:

أرحى الله تعالى اليه أن بحمد قد تثبت نبرتكم
واستكملت ابامكم، فاجعل العلم الذي منلك والأمان
والاسم الاكبر ويرات العلم وآثار العلم البنوة في
أهل بيتك منذد ملقي بابي طالب فنانى لنقطع
العلم والأمان والاسم الاكبر ويرات العلم وآثار علم
البنوة من العقاب من ذريتك كلام أقطعهما من
ذرى البيت الأنبياء: 1

In brief the above passage relates that the Prophet, before his death was commanded by God to bequeath to ʿAlī his knowledge, his faith and the Great Name (Ism al-āʿzam) that he had as well as the legacy of knowledge and prophethood, so that the transmission of the divine heritage would be followed through the prophet's progeny. This implies that this nass which constituted of special knowledge was meant exclusively for the offspring of the Prophet and thus was

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I, p. 293
hereditary. The hereditary character of the *nāqq* was the crucial point in the doctrine of the Imamate that al-Bāqir was putting forward. He was therefore trying to bring some order into the muddled, confused and chaotic ideas of the Imamate rampant at the time.¹ For until then anyone and everyone was claiming *nāqq* from someone or the other.² So the idea of hereditary *nāqq* was a kind of restriction for all those who thought could claim the *nāqq* and have the licence for leadership.³

It was in this manner then i.e. by *al-nāqq* that al-Bāqir appointed his son, Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. On a number of occasions, al-Bāqir let his followers know that Ja'far was the best of the mankind and that he was the *Qā'īm al-Muḥammad* (one in charge of the Prophet's family).⁴ When his days were drawing near he asked for

---

1. See chapter three - section on rivals of al-Bāqir.
2. ibid.
3. Although it must be added that this did not deter some who were bent on claiming this leadership e.g. some of the ghulāt like Bayan claimed *nāqq* from al-Bāqir himself. See section on Al-Bāqir and the Ghulāt in Ch.3.
witnesses to be brought to him. So four people from the Quraysh came, among whom was Nafic the freedman of ĀbdAllāh b. Umar (d. c. 117 A.H.)\(^1\) Al-Bāqir is then reported to have asked them to write down what Prophet Yaqūb had entrusted to his son, and thus made a nagg- on his son Jačfar al-Ṣādiq.\(^2\)

If the above report is authentic then this aspect of calling witnesses from outside was something quite different, for, al-Bāqir’s own appointment, according to traditions in al-Kulaynī\(^3\) was done in the presence of his brothers when he was entrusted with a casket containing secret religious scrolls and the weapons of the Prophet. Apparently both al-Baqir and

1. This gives us another insight to al-Bāqir’s death-date. According to Mufid’s Irshād Nāfīc died in 119 A.H.

2. Ṣādiq b. ʿAbd Allāh b. Qaynārī,安静本名他只被你给他的一个秘密继承人，他拒绝说这是给他的专有继承人。

3. al-Kāfī I:305 ff. It is believed that when Zayn al-ʿAbidīn died, al-Bāqir’s brothers demanded their share of the contents of the casket but he refused, saying that it was given to him as his exclusive inheritance.
later his son al-Ṣādiq insisted upon the importance of these weapons which were the same to the Muslims, they said, as the Tabūt (Ark of Covenant) had been to the Israelites.\(^1\)

Again, according to traditions found in al-Kulaynī, al-Bāqir maintained that his father Zayn al-ʿAbidīn was designated by Ḫusayn\(^2\) who in turn was appointed by Ḥasan\(^3\) whom ʿAlī had designated.\(^4\)

1. *al-Kāfī* I:238 ff. The Ḥasanids who claimed to have them but Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq emphatically denied that ʿAbdAllah al-Mahd and his son Nafs al-Zakīya had, as they asserted the famous sword of the Prophet, Dhū al-Fiqār. See Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī *Maqātil* 188; al-Ṭabarī *Annales* ... III 247. Other versions in al-Ṭabarī state that they came into the possession of the ʿAbbasids as well.

2. There are conflicting reports from al-Bāqir as to when the naqq was made on Imam Zayn al-ʿAbidīn - whether the battlefield or before setting forth for Karbalāʾ. See *al-Kāfī*, I pp.303


4. See al-Kulaynī *al-Kāfī* I pp. 298-9. However, later Ismāʿīlī sources suggest that after ʿAlī, the Imam was Ḫusayn not Ḥasan as the Twelvers and other Shiʿite sects believe. To the Nizārī Ismāʿīlīs al-Ḥasan was no more than a Trustee (Mustawdaʿ) Imam. See Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Fīrās, *Ash-Shāfiʿya* (The Healer) ed. and transl. by S.N. Makarem (Beirut, 1966) pp. 146-7. Also see

   (i) ʿAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Walīd *Risālat al-Idāh* p. 139.
   (ii) Ibn Zahra, *al-Cuṣūl wal aḥkām* p. 120
   (iii) al-Khattāb ibn Ḥasan, *Ghayāt al-Mawālid* p. 35
   apud S.N. Makarem's transl. of *ash-Shāfiʿya*. 
b) **C\(\text{Ilm}^\text{\textperiodcentered}\)**

Besides the hereditary character of the *nass* what was out of the ordinary about al-Baqir's theory was that this *nass* embodied in itself exclusively authoritative knowledge (**C\(\text{Ilm}^\text{\textperiodcentered}\)**) for the recipient of that *nass*. This **C\(\text{Ilm}^\text{\textperiodcentered}\)** too had to be traced back to C\(\text{Ali}^\text{\textperiodcentered}\) of whom the Prophet had said "I am the city of knowledge and C\(\text{Ali}^\text{\textperiodcentered}\) its gate". This tradition has been acknowledged by the Sunnis\(^2\) as well although they do not necessarily agree with the Shi'ite interpretation. According to al-Baqir's traditions in al-Kulayni\(^3\), God

---

1. See Qādī al-Nūmān, *Ta'wil al-Da\(\text{C\(\text{Ilm}\)}^\text{\textperiodcentered}\)im* ed. by Muḥammad Ḥasan al-\(\text{C\(\text{A\(\text{Zāmī}\)}\)}\) (Cairo n.d.) p.86. Also see *Kitāb al-Kashf* attributed to Ja\(\text{fār b. Mansur}\) al-Yaman ed. by Mustafa Ghālib (Beirut, 1984) p.118

2. al-Tirmidhī *Sahīh* 5:301; al-Khaṭīb al-Tabrīzī *Mishkāt* 3:244; al-Khwārizmī *Ma'nāqīb C\(\text{Ali}^\text{\textperiodcentered}\) p.40 al-Tirmidhī considers this tradition as being gharīb munkar i.e resting on only one authority who is unreliable while al-Bukhārī rejects its authenticity completely. However, Ibn Hajar al-\(\text{Aṣqālānī}\) considers it authentic (see al-Khāṭīb al-mahābbī *Mishkāt* 3:315) *apud* S.N Makarem's translation of Ibn Ya\(\text{qūb's al-Riṣāla fi al-Imama* p. 76 note 62.*

3. al-Kāfī I p. 437

ان إلها مز حل نمسه مهما لمن خلقه فسره كان مز وما من

ان كر كان كنافا إلها مز حل نمسه مهما لمن خلقه فسره كان مز وما من

ان ملها باب نصح الله من دخله كان مز وما لمن خلقه فسره كان كنافا ...
has appointed Ālī as a flag or signpost between Himself and His creation and thus whoever acknowledges Ālī is a believer and he who rejects him is an unbeliever. Again he adds that "Ālī is a door that God has opened; he who enters it is a believer and he who leaves it is an unbeliever."

Al-Bāqir maintained that knowledge which descended upon Adam is never taken away but is to be inherited. Ālī was the learned one of this community and a learned one from among us never perishes before leaving behind him someone from his family who inherits this knowledge from him or what God wills. The Imams, according to al-Bāqir, are the guards of Allah (khuzzān Allāh) on the heavens and the earth, not over gold and silver but over his knowledge.

Ālī had inherited the knowledge of all the awṣṭā' of the Prophets that had gone before him as the

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I 222
2. Ibid p. 192-3
3. Ibid p. 224
Prophet who had been endowed with the sum of knowledge available to all the preceding prophets had imparted it to \(\text{CAli}\) who in turn bequeathed it to his descendants. Every Imam, before death passes it on to his successor.\(^2\) This includes both the \(\text{gahir}\) (exoteric) and the \(\text{batin}\) (esoteric) sides of the Qur'an and in fact, in al-Baqir's view no one except the \(\text{awsiya}\) can claim to possess the whole Qur'an.\(^3\) Describing some aspects of the knowledge that is given to them and that is unfolded to them, al-Bāqir said that it included the interpretation of the Qur'an and its legal judgments as well as the knowledge of the changing times and its misfortunes.\(^4\)

The Imams, too, al-Bāqir said, know the Greatest Name of God (\(\text{Ism Allāh} \text{ al-} \text{ Agam}\)) which is in seventy-three versions (\(\text{harfan}\)-literally letters). Al-Bāqir added that Aşif (Aşaph) who had known only one version of it could reach the throne of Bilqis by pronouncing

1. \(\text{al-KāfI}\) I p. 263
2. \(\text{al-KāfI}\) I p. 222
3. \(\text{Ibid}\) p. 228
4. \(\text{Ibid}\) p. 229
that version\textsuperscript{1} while the Imams knew seventy two versions of that and the remaining one is with Allah himself. This refers exclusively to hidden knowledge.

Thus this doctrine of Imamate put forward by al-Bāqir was based primarily on knowledge, not on political rule although they were entitled to the latter as well. If the Imams wished to know anything they would know it he said.\textsuperscript{2}

However in order to avoid confusion, al-Bāqir did make a distinction between the offices of a \textit{rasūl} (Messenger), a \textit{nabī} (Prophet) and a \textit{muhaddath} (One who is spoken to i.e. the Imam) and the way they came to have their knowledge. Thus according to al-Bāqir, a messenger (\textit{rasūl}) is one who is inspired externally by the mediation of the archangel Jibrāil. He may see the archangel and hear his words either in a dream or when awake. A prophet (\textit{nabī}) either sees visions without

\textsuperscript{1} al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p. 230. Aṣīf (Aṣaph) said that the earth between him and the throne of Bilqis sank, so that he could reach it with his hand, then the earth returned to its previous state, quicker than an eye could blink.

\textsuperscript{2} al-Kāfī I p. 257
hearing them speak or hears voices without seeing anyone. A *mubaddath* does not see any supernatural being either in dreams or in a wakeful state but hears voices.\(^1\) The Imams, al-Bāqir said, were the *mubaddathun* mentioned in the Qur'ān.\(^2\)

c) **Nūr**

Besides the *Cilm*, the clear or manifest delegation of authority also appears to involve the transmission of *Nūr* for as we have seen earlier,\(^3\) the Imams are, according to al-Bāqir, the light of God (*Nūr Allah*). When asked to comment on the following Qur'ānic verse 44:8

> "And believe in Allah and His Messenger and the *Nūr* (Light) that We have brought down"

Al-Baqir said that the *Nūr* (light) was indeed the *Nūr*

---

1. al-Kulaynī al-FTER I p. 176
2. Ibid p. 270-1
3. See section on 'Qur'ānic basis of the Imamate'
of the Imams from the Prophet's family; they i.e. the Imams were the light that God had brought down and they (in fact) were the light of God (Nūr Allāh) in the heavens and on earth.¹ This spiritual light which transmigrates from generation to generation is actually the symbol of that eternal knowledge (ilm)² which forms part of the Prophet Muhammad's testament (wasiyya) to Ālī and thereafter to the following Imams. According to this doctrine, the Light became incarnate in Ālī only at the last moment of the Prophet's life.³

However, another tradition of al-Bāqir⁴ tends to reveal the concept of Nūr Muhammad whereby he is reported to have said to Jābir al-Ju'fi:

---

1. See al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p.194
2. See Uri Rubin's article "Prophets and Progenitors in Early Shi'a Tradition" JSAI I (1979) p. 44
3. See al-Kāfī I: 274 where traditions from al-Bāqir's son, Ja'far al-Sādiq reveal that the following Imam became aware of all the knowledge that the previous Imam had only at the last moment of the latter's life. See also p.239 where a tradition relates that before his death, the Prophet called for Ālī and communicated to him a thousand chapters of knowledge, each one opening into a thousand more.
4. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p.442
"O Jābir, the first beings that God created were Muḥammad and his family, the rightly guided ones and the guides; they were the phantoms of light before God." Jabir asked, 'And what were the phantoms?' Al-Bāqir said, "Shadows of light, luminous bodies without spirits; they were strengthened by the Holy Spirit (Rūḥ al-Quds), through which Muḥammad and his family worshipped God. For that reason he created them forebearing, learned, endowed with filial piety, and pure; they worship God through prayer, fasting, prostrating themselves, enumerating His names, and pronouncing: God is Great."

According to the above concept, Ālī's share of light was transferred on his birth.1 Traditions maintain that Muḥammad and Ālī were created from the same (prophetic) light which wandered through the loins of their common ancestors, till it was split in the loins of Ābūṣ al-Muṭṭalib, the common grandfather of both Muḥammad and Ālī. After that it was divided into two parts, Muḥammād's light being placed in the loins of his father Ābūṣ Allāh and Ālī's in those of Abū Ṭālib².

2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī p. 442
From ʿAlī this light was transmitted to the following Imams, thus serving as the basis of their divine nature.¹ This hereditary doctrine of Nūr Muḥammad which, as part of the ancestral sperm had come to him not from Muhammad but from his father, Abū Ṭālib appears to be different from Nūr Allāh (Divine Light) which is regarded as a part of the divine spirit which transmigrated from Muḥammad to ʿAlī at the former's death. This light, too is regarded as having been transmitted through a universal line of carriers and is said to have reached Muḥammad from Adam through the Judaeo-Christian prophets who apparently had no relation to Muḥammad.²


2. See for details U. Rubin's art. "Prophets and Progenitors in the Early Shīʿa Tradition" JSAI I (1979) pp.41-65. The light is said to have reached Muḥammad from Ismāʿīl (Ishmael) not through his Arab progenitors - the posterity of Ishmael - but through the Judaeo-Christian prophets of Banū Israel to whom the light was transferred from Ishmael via his brother, Issac. Rubin however does not seem to verify his statement. He only adds in the footnote that this view is parallel to the Ismāʿīlī doctrine about the cyclical manifestation of the Fāql through the nātīgs but the examination of the exact relationship between the two views remains beyond the scope of his paper.
In Rajkowski's view the above tradition on Light and other such similar ones tend to indicate that Manichean ideas were being introduced in the Shi'ite doctrine by extremists and semi-extremists; he, in fact places Jābir al-Ju'fī among them. There may perhaps be some truth in the views that he has expressed but one must not forget that the doctrine of light in its embryonic form is embodied in the Qur'ān itself. Muhammad himself is described in the Qur'ān as Sirāj Munīr.

It thus appears that the doctrine of Nūr Allāh according to which the Prophet and the Imams possess a divine heritage and a sanctified light which they have inherited from the preceding prophets is different from the doctrine of Nūr Muḥammad which regards the prophetic light of the Prophet and the Imams as coming from Prophet Muḥammad's Arab ancestors.

1. See his unpub. thesis Early Shi'ism in Iraq (Univ. of London, 1955)
It is possible that the Imam is receipient of not only Nūr Allāh which as an independent spiritual entity is entrusted to the next Imam by nagg only at the last moment of the previous Imam's death but also of Nūr Muḥammad, which as part of the ancestral sperm is confined to the genealogical line of the Imam's progenitors. The latter i.e. Nūr Muḥammad makes the Imam who is sāmit (silent) until such time as when he receives the former i.e. (Nūr Allāh) and he becomes Nāṭiq (speaking). In other words Nūr Muḥammad gives the receipient potentiality of the Imamate but the actuality appears only when he receives Nūr Allāh by means of nagg from the previous Imam.

What we have here are two symbols: one is the symbol of prophecy (Nūr Allāh) which is shared by both Prophets and Imams. On the other hand, there is the symbol of succession (Nūr Muḥammad) which is also related to the divine and which is there as part and parcel of the line from Adam to Muḥammad and through to the Imams. This of course is a light that may be latent, i.e. did not shine in the person of Ābd al-Muṭṭalib and Ḥāshim but yet it distinguished them from the others around them. Whether they were aware of it or not, they were from a special family.
The fact that the two images of light are used here does not mean that they are conflicting. In other words, *Nūr Allāh* embraces all men chosen by God but *Nūr Muhammad* is limited to the direct line of Adam through Muḥammad down to the line of the *Ahl al-Bayt*.

d) *'Iṣma*

The *Nūr* and the *Cilm* which the Imam came to have possession of by the *nā'iss*, rendered the Imam *maṣṣum* i.e. protected from error and sim. As mentioned earlier on, al-Bāqir based this concept on his interpretation of the Qur'anic verse, 33:33.

The question to be asked is whether the concept of infallibility or impeccability (*'Iṣma*) applies only to the religious matters or does it cover the actions accruing from human nature? Qāḍī al-Nuṣrānī² does not appear to specify and nor does al-Kirmānī.³ He adds

---

1. See section on "Qur'ānic basis of the Imamate".
2. K. al-Walāya in *Da'Cā'im* and K. al-himma.
3. *Rahat al-Ṣaghl*, p.217, although he discusses the *'Iṣma* of the Imam in his analyses of *al-arkān al-arba'ā* (the four elements) where the soul is the "learner" and the bāb, ḥujja and dāqī are "teachers". The Imam is above all these, see *ibid* pp. 201-218, 250 *apud*, P.J. Vatikiotis who has described this in his book *The Fāṭimid Theory of State* (Lahore, 1957) pp. 43 ff.
that "the souls of Prophets and legatees and the Imams are not similar to the souls of these lesser ḫudūd (grades) inferior to them, are not impeccable and are amenable (tastaḥūl) to good and evil."¹ However the author of al-majālis al-mustansīriyya claims that the Imam is magṣūm but that the Ǧisma applies only to divine and religious matters, not to those of the human realm.²

The legal and political implications of this above doctrine are clear, i.e. that the Imam has the absolute

1. ibid, p.45.

2. p. 110 using Sura II: 33, 35-38. Until recently there was a controversy regarding the author of this collection of thirty-five discourses in al-Mustansirīyya, for the book states it is written by al-dāʿī Thiqāt al-Imam ǦAlam al-Islam. This situation appears to have arisen as a result of a continuous change of dāʿīs between the years 451 A.H. and 454 A.H. Moreover, the position of Imam al-Mustansirballah was getting precarious as the minister was fast gaining strength. When (in his despair) he assigned the offices of wazir, qāṭi al-quḍāt and dāʿī al-duʿāt to one person, the titles of thiqāt al-Imam and Ǧalam al-Islam became common addresses of these officials. Hence the difficulty of knowing which thiqāt al-Imam or Ǧalam al-Islam is which. Ivanow thinks the work belongs to al-Muʿayyad fi al-din but Vatikiotis is not sure of that. See for more details, pp. 201ff. in his Fatimid Theory of State. S.M. Stern however has proved that the author is Abū ʿl-ʿAlāʾīm ǦAbd al-Hakīm b. Wahb b. ǦAbd al-Rahmān al-Malījī, chief qāṭi from 7 Dhu ʿl-Qaʿda 450-11 Rajab 452; Studies in Early Ismaʿilism pp.239-40.
power over the community and since he is appointed by God and is infallible, the community who are not infallible can neither appoint him nor elect him. Thus there is no room for the principle of *ijmāc* (consensus).

e) **Hujja**

Another aspect of the Imamate which has come down to us from al-Bāqir's traditions is the concept of hujja (guarantor). In his view, ever since the time of Adam's death there has always been an Imam to guide (mankind) towards Allah who is His guarantor (hujja) over His worshippers. The world, al-Bāqir maintains, cannot exist (even) for a moment without the Imam who is the hujja of God. If the Imam were to be taken

---


2. **Hujja** in my view is best translated as guarantor. See Madelung's *art.* on *Imāma* in EI2 who has translated it as both, proof or guarantor and from whom I have adopted the word. The word 'proof' has been in use for a long time and still can be used but to me it does not appear to reveal the task which the hujja has to undertake. On the other hand the word 'guarantor' gives the meaning that he is someone who has undertaken some kind of responsibility from someone for somebody else.

3. al-Kāfī I, p. 179. See also Qādi al-Nu'mān Dā'Cā'im I p. 20-21.
away from the earth (even) for an hour, the earth would heave with all its inhabitants just as the sea heaves with its people.¹

"We (The Imams) are", al-Bāqir said, "the hujja (guarantor) of God and His Gate. We are the tongue as well as the face of God; we are eyes of God (guarding) His creation and we are the responsible guardians (wulāt al-amr) of God on earth."² Al-Bāqir further added that God is worshipped through the Imams and it is through them that God is known and declared as One.³

The above mentioned qualities which the Imam possesses makes him al-afdal al-Nās i.e. the best among mankind. It was in this manner thus that al-Bāqir tried to establish his position as the Imam declaring himself to be the representative of God upon earth and the divinely-inspired interpreter of His words. His success in this aspect can be gauged

1. ibid
2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī, I. p.145
3. ibid.
from two angles - firstly from the number of followers he had been able to gather and attract\(^1\) and secondly from the success and immense popularity of his son, al-Šādiq who followed and elaborated his views.

---

1. See chapter six - section on Shi'ite associates.
CHAPTER FIVE

SOME THEOLOGICAL VIEWS OF AL-BĀQIR

The theological discussions which were aggravated by the fitna\(^1\) had grown even more serious at the time when al-Bāqir lived. People began to question the validity of the Imamate\(^2\) and the "status of the believer" which the Imam must possess. This led to questions about \textit{Imān} and \textit{islām} and whether \textit{aqrābāl} (actions/deeds) were a necessary part of \textit{Imān} as well as whether they were a requirement for a person to be called a \textit{muslim}. These questions gave rise to the problem of man's responsibility or lack of responsibility and then, as parallel considerations arose questions about the nature of the Qur'an (created or uncreated) and the emphasis laid upon the divine attribute of the Word.

\begin{enumerate}
\item The \textit{fitna} resulting from Čūthmān's murder.
\item \textit{Imamate} in the general sense of the word; not in the \textit{Shī'\(\text{a}\)} sense.
\end{enumerate}
The above issues brought into its wake the more general problem of the divine attributes, their existence and their connection with the divine essence, and its unity. In the course of time many more issues were raised and added; however at this early period, the essential themes which were later to constitute the religious science of kalām had already arisen. In the following pages, an attempt will be made to present al-Baqir's views on some of the issues that were being seriously debated and broadly discussed during his time.

1) Ḥīmān:
One of the essential questions that was being discussed at this early period and upon which the various schools were divided was Ḥīmān. A number of many related questions were raised such as the distinction or non-distinction between Ḥīmān and islām, and of their connection. Another issue connected with this was whether there were degrees of faith.

1. See L. Gardet's art. on "Cilm al-Kalām" in EI²
2. A more detailed discussion about this will be found in EI² art. "Ḥīmān" where the views of the various schools of thought are mentioned.
Al-Baqir basing his views on the Qur'ānic verse 49:14:

"The Bedouins say: 'we believe'. Say: you do not believe; rather say, 'we have accepted Islam (aslamna). Faith has not yet entered your heart."

made a clear distinction between ḫmān and islām. He said that ḫmān included islām but islām did not encompass ḫmān.\(^1\) Similar views of al-Baqir are to be found in the Daḵā'im al-Islām,\(^2\) where he symbolizes islām and ḫmān by drawing two circles on his palm and describing the outer one as islām and the inner one as ḫmān because that he said, was the realization of the heart. Therefore in his view a muʿmin is automatically a muslim but a muslim is not necessarily a muʿmin.\(^3\)

Al-Baqir elaborated the above aspect when asked by someone whether he who had entered islām had entered

---

2. al-Qāḍī al-Nuṣrān Daḵā'im I, p.16.
3. Daḵā'im I, pp.16-17.
Imān? He replied: "No" but added that the person had come out of kufr (unbelief) and was being associated with Imān (gad udīfū ila al-Imān). Taking the example of the Ka'ba and the Masjid al-Ḥarām, al-Baqir then asked the questioner that if he had seen a person in the mosque, would he testify that he had seen him in the Ka'ba? The questioner replied: "He could not say that." Al-Baqir then asked that if he had seen a person in the Ka'ba would he be able to ascertain that he had been in the mosque? The questioner said: "Yes." So al-Baqir said that the same was the case with Imān and islām.¹

Further details about the differences between Imān and islām can be seen from yet another question put to al-Baqir. Asked if he who witnessed that there is no divinity but God, and Muhammad is the Messenger of God was a believer? Al-Baqir replied: "then what about the duties imposed by God?"² As far as the duties were concerned, there were seven of them according to al-Baqir as mentioned earlier.³ In his view, walāya

---

2. al-Kaff II, p.26
3. See the previous chapter on Imamate.
was the foremost of the duties imposed upon the believers around which all other duties revolved.¹

Thus for al-Baqir, true īmān is directly related to the walāya of the Imams; rather īmān emerges from believing in Imam. Thus his formula of īmān as distinct from islām was formed by belief in the Prophets, Messengers and Imams of God with complete obedience to the commands of the Imam of the time.²

The above views of al-Baqir tend to show that īmān is both words (qawl) and deeds/actions (aḍmal).³ According to the definition given by al-Baqir's son īmān is qawl bi al-lisan (words with the tongue),

1. al-Dā'īm I, p.17.
2. Dā'īm I, pp.15-17 where some of the traditions are from ʿAlī. One tradition says islām is iqrār (confession) and īmān is iqrār and maʿarifa (knowledge consisting of acknowledgement of God, Prophet and Imams).
3. See al-Kulaynī al-Kūfī II, p.26 where the word fiqī is used instead of aḍmal.
inner conviction (tagdiq bi al-janān) and works/actions in accordance with the pillars imposed by God (wa camal bi al-arkān). On the other hand, Abū Ḥanīfa, a younger contemporary of al-Bāqir held different views. According to article 1 of the Waṣīya ascribed to Abī Ḥanīfa:

"Faith is confession (iqrār) by the tongue, internal conviction (tagdiq bi al-janān) and knowledge of the heart (wa ma’rifah bi al-qalb)".

It is clear that there is no mention of actions in the above definition. But according to the Khārijites, the Qadarites and the Mu'tazilites, "works or actions" are an integral part of faith, even as faith itself. The Murji'a, on the other hand regard "works" as irrelevant to faith (īmān) which implied that faith had

1. Da'Ca'im I, p.1. His tradition in al-Kāfī I, p.70 says that Hazrat ʿAlī reported from the Prophet that there can be no 'words' except by 'works' and no 'words or works' except by 'intention' and no 'intention' (niyyah) except by adhering to the sunna correctly (iṣaba al-sunna).

2. ʿīr art. "Imān". Here it is not meant to go into the details of what status the Khārijites and Mu'tazilites accord to the 'grave sinner'.


a degree of stability and was not impaired by sin. ¹

Al-Baqir vehemently opposed these Murji'ite views, for according to Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī he is reported to have said that "the Murji'a had changed the Sunna of Allāh, both externally and internally" and that "they were the Jews of this community whose enmity towards us is more severe than that of the Christians and the Jews." ² In the political field such an attitude meant that the Murji'a were ready to accept the temporal rulers even when their behaviour was sinful in some respects and therefore they were not to be opposed by other Muslims. Since they believed in the 'postponement' of the decision about the grave sinner, they had to face the problem of defining ʿImān so that it corresponded to that which made a man a member of the community as a whole. This is what made them exclude 'works' (aṣmāl) from faith (ʿImān). Abū Ḥanīfa and his followers appear to be taking the same line of thought; in fact al-Ashʿarī in his Maqalāt al-Islamiyyān ³ considers the Ḥanāfīya as a sect of the Murji'a.

¹ Wensink Muslim Creed 38, 45. Cf. also his article on "Murji'a in EI1. See also al-Ṣādiq's views on Murji'a in the DaCā'im, p.1
² K. al-Zīna in al-Sāmīnarrā'i's edition p. 262
According to al-Bāqir there are different grades among the Mu'min\(^1\). Explaining this further, al-Baqir's son, al-Sadiq says that some believers are better than others, some pray more than others some are more clear-sighted or discerning than others.\(^2\)

Among the qualities which a mu'min ought to have according to al-Bāqir are:

"Reliance (tawakhul) on God, Leaving the decision of affairs (tafwîd) to God, Contentment (rida) with the decree (qaḍā) of God, and Submission (taslîm) to the Command or Will of God."\(^3\)

Whilst on a journey, the Prophet once came across a group of people who told him that they were believers whereupon the Prophet asked them what was the proof of their Iman and they gave the last three of the four qualities mentioned above, said al-Bāqir.\(^4\)

---

1. al-Kâfi II, p.45
2. ibid.
3. al-Kâfi II, p.47
In al-Bāqir's view Iman was built on four pillars:

(i) Patience (sabr)
(ii) Certainty (yaqīn)
(iii) Justice (qadl) and
(iv) Struggle or War (jihād)

It is clear that in al-Bāqir's views a person's virtues were directly linked to his Iman. In one of his traditions al-Bāqir maintains that

"The believer who is most perfect in Iman is the one who has the best character."^1

Talking of more specific virtues, he talks of one especially that is sabr (patience or patient endurance) which he says is like the head to the body.\(^2\) He who has no sabr has no Iman and describing the perfect sabr he said it was that in which there is no

---

1. al-Kāfī II, p.99
2. ibid, p.87
complaint to the people. ¹

An aspect that arises from the question of degrees of faith is regarding ʾIḥān Can Ilm i.e. faith based on knowledge (religious knowledge). Al-Bāqir places immense emphasis on acquiring ʾUlīm for there are numerous traditions reported from him exhorting his followers to do so. ²

However, in al-Bāqir's view acquiring knowledge is not an end in itself but a means to an end. He says it is not enough to acquire knowledge but it is important to act according to the knowledge acquired³ and even to teach others what one has learnt. ⁴ This leads us to the question of ʾUlīm and ʾAṣmāl i.e. by means of ʾUlīm, ʾAṣmāl can be improved and if ʾAṣmāl are improved, then ʾIḥān can increase and become stronger. Thus, according to al-Bāqir, ʾUlīm, ʾAṣmāl and ʾIḥān are all inter related.

¹ ibid, p.93
² See al-Kulaynī's al-Kāfī I, especially the Kitab faḍl al-ʾUlīm pp. 30 ff.
³ al-Kāfī I, p.45
⁴ ibid, p.35, 41.
ii) Taqīya (precautionary dissimulation)

In al-Bāqir's view, the question of taqīya\(^1\) appears directly related to that of Cilm and Imān mentioned above. A man visiting him from Basra told him that al-Hasan al-Basri claimed that those who concealed knowledge would offend people in Hell with their wind. Al-Bāqir told him that if that were the case then the believer from the Pharoah's family would have been destroyed. He then went on to add that:

"Knowledge has remained hidden ever since God sent Noah, so let al-Hasan wander everywhere (lit. right and left) for by God, no knowledge will be found except in here\(^2\)

The above incident suggest that the question whether knowledge could be concealed or not, i.e. whether it was permissible to operate taqīya or not was
being discussed during the time of al-Bāqir. The views expressed by al-Bāqir indicate the emphasis he laid on concealing knowledge i.e. operating taqiya with regard to knowledge. He once asked someone what would he say if he (i.e. al-Bāqir) told a person who loved them to use some precautionary disguise or dissimulation (taqiya). The man replied: 'You know best', then al-Bāqir said: 'If he would adopt it (i.e. taqiya) it would be better for him and he would be greatly rewarded.' According to a variant version he said: 'If he adopted it, he would be rewarded and if he neglected it, he had sinned, by God.'

The first version of the tradition suggests that it was preferable for someone to employ taqiya but the second version implies that it is a duty which if not obeyed was a sin. According to his son al-Ṣādiq, al-Bāqir also said that "concealment is my religious practice as well as that of my ancestors. Whosoever does not practice taqiya has no real faith. He who divulges our secret (amr) is like the one who rejects it." Thus, here al-Bāqir is already putting forward

1. al-Kāfī I, p.65.
2. al-Dāca'im I, p.75. See also Ja'far b. Mansur al-Yaman's Asrār al-Nuṭaqā' in Ivanow's Rise of the Fatimids (excerpts) p. 92.
the doctrine of *tagīya* as a principle or as a necessary part of *Imān*.

Once Zurāra b. Acyan came with a problem to al-Bāqir to which he replied. Then came another person who inquired about the same problem Zurāra had asked. Al-Bāqir gave him a different answer. After that a third person came along to ask the same question. He too was given a different answer to the ones given before. When the two questioners had left Zurāra asked al-Bāqir as to why he had given different answers to the two Shī'īs of Iraq? Al-Bāqir replied:

"That is better for us and that will remain with us and with you, for if you all were to agree upon one thing then people would turn against us which would mean (the chances of) your survival and our survival would decrease"

The use of taqīya appears extremely essential to al-Bāqir's teaching for he insisted on ʿilm being divided into zāhir (exoteric) and bātin (esoteric). In this connection al-Bāqir's reply to Jābir b. Yazīd al-Juʿfī is significant when the latter inquired why he gave different answers to the same Qur'ānic problem at different times:¹

In the above answer, al-Bāqir tells Jābir that the Qur'ān has an inner meaning (baṭn) and the inner meaning has still another inner meaning and that the Qur'ān has an outer meaning (zāhr) which also has

---

¹ al-Barqī K. al-Mahāsin II p. 300
another outer meaning. Then, al-Bāqir adds that there was nothing further from men's intellect than the tafsīr of Qur'an for the beginning of an āyat can be about something while the end of it may be about something else; they are words which are connected (muttaṣil) in meaning yet changing (munṣarif) in various aspects.

The question of taqīya in political terms was closely linked with the discussion on amr bi al-maṣruḍ wa l-nahy can al-munkar i.e. 'enjoining good and prohibiting evil'. The question raised in this connection was how far it is a duty to see that other people do what is right and refrain from wrong. Some muslims believed that this operation of 'enjoining good and prohibiting evil' should be done by force if necessary. The Muṣtaṣila adopted this view believing that if there was a reasonable chance of opposing then the opponent must be opposed even if that meant someone had to be killed in the process.

Al-Baqī'ī's views did not tally with the views of those who were using this doctrine at this particular time to advocate revolution, at least for the time being, for as is known, he did not approve of armed revolt and infact had dissuaded his half-brother, Zayd
b. ١١٩١ from adopting that course. This must be under taqīya for according to his tradition١ he did believe in undertaking the sword but that at the time when he lived the time was not yet ripe enough.

Another area where al-Baqir appears to have used taqīya was on the question of the two shaykhs i.e. Abū Bakr and ١١٩مار. According to Ibn SaCd٢, he is reported to have called them leaders of right guidance and said that ١١٩١ did not want to contravene their practice.٣ Yet his conviction that the Prophet had expressly designated ١١٩١ as his successor must have meant to him that their succession was an invalid usurpation. Some Kufans believed that al-Baqir only concealed his real opinion

---

1. al-Qādī al-Nuṣārī Shakhī f.71 ff; Manāqib f.303 ff

"Anyone from among the Prophet's family who undertakes the sword before our mahdi's time is like the young bird who tries to fly before its wings are strong enough; as a result it would only jump once or twice before being caught by the children who would then toy with it."

2. Ibn SaCd Tabaqät V p. 231

3. This is of course contrary to reports in al-Tabarī I p.2778 where ١١٩١ refuses to follow the sira i.e. the practice of the two Caliphs.
by using the principle of *taqiya*.¹ So concerned was al-Bāqir about the situation, that the doctrine which was for the protection of the Shi'a was made a principle in order to ensure their safety.

However *taqiya* was never unfamiliar to Islam, even its early phases. The following Qur'ānic verse excuses *taqiya* under conditions of severe constraint:

"Whoever disbelieves in God, after he has believed - excepting him who has been compelled, and his heart is still at rest in his belief - but whosoever's breast is expanded in unbelief, upon them shall rest anger from God, and there awaits them a mighty chastisement."²

This verse is unanimously believed to refer to Ammār b. Yāsar, the famous companion of the Prophet, who was compelled under heavy torture by the unbelievers from Quraysh to renounce Islam. When he was accused by some

---

1. See Kashshī *Rijāl* pp. 205ff where traditions referring to the poet Kumayt quote al-Bāqir as violently disavowing Abū Bakr and Umar. But Kumayt himself never vilified the first two caliphs openly according to his Ḥāshimiyāt (p. 155) at least. Perhaps Kumayt was using *taqiya* as Ḥāshimiyāt was a poem for the public.

2. Qur'an 16:106. Another such verse is 3:28.
Muslims of disbelief, the Prophet said, "Cāmmār is full of faith from head to foot. Faith has been mixed with his flesh and blood." When Cāmmār in fact came to the Prophet crying because of his forced renunciation, he was told, "Why should you (cry)? If they repeat (their torture), repeat what you have told them."\(^1\)

iii) Qāda' wa Qadar

During the Umayyad period there was much discussion on this question of qāda' wa qadar which was related to the previously discussed topic of Iman. Some people argued that, since God determined everything they could not help committing sins\(^2\) This in a way was a justification of moral complacency and was not purely academic, but was linked with political concerns. For such an altitude could mean that the Umayyad regime was ordained by God and was therefore not to be opposed. In fact there is adequate evidence to suggest that the Umayyads defended and justified

1. Al-Baydāwī, Anwār 1:528; Ibn Kathir, Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-Čāṣīm 2:586. Although the Sunnis allowed such taqiya, they preferred that the believer abide by the declaration of his faith.

their rule on the basis of such predestinarian ideas.  

These theological arguments provoked a reaction from those who were accustomed to think of man as a responsible agent. Those who held this doctrine of freewill came to be known somewhat illogically as Qadarīya. One group believed that ḥasanāt (noble actions) and khayr (goodness) are from God while wickedness and base actions are from men.

According to traditions in al-Kulaynī, al-Bāqir quoted a revelation of God who said "I have created both, good and evil; thus blessed were those from whose hands I perform good and woe upon those through whose

1. 'The earth is God's; He has entrusted it to his Khalīfa; He who is head in it will not be overcome.' Al-Farazdaq Diwan ed. (Beirut, 1960) I, p. 24.

'God has garlanded you with the Khilāfa and guidance, for what God decrees (qadā') there is no change'. Jarīr, Diwan (Beirut, 1960) p. 380.

2. The name would have been more appropriate for those who maintained God's omnipotence and His qadar but it came to be applied to those who believed in human responsibility and freewill. See EI arts "Qadariya" and "al-Qaḍā wa al-Qadar". Also see W.M. Watt, Freewill and Predestination .... (London, 1948) pp. 48ff. It is to be noted however, that at the time, men who agreed on certain doctrines did not necessarily associate it with certain principles. This varied from time to time as well as from person to person.

3. al-Kāfī I p. 154
hands I performed evil, and woe also to those who said: how is this and how is that?" According to tradition, al-Bāqir said:

"Allah the Almighty and Exalted was there (when) nothing was there except Him. He always knew what will be, and His knowledge of a thing before it comes into existence is like His knowledge of it after it comes into being."

However, elsewhere al-Bāqir maintains that:

"God is more merciful than forcing His creatures to sin and then punishing them and God is more powerful than desiring a matter/thing that cannot be done."

When asked whether there was a third position in between jabr and qadr, al-Bāqir replied that there was and that it was wider than the distance between the sky and the earth. When his son was asked about jabr and qadr, he replied:

"There is no jabr and no qadr but there is a position in between the two."

1. al-Kāfī I p. 107
2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p. 159
3. al-Kāfī I p. 159
He then added that its truth is not known by anyone except the *Callīm* or by him whom the *Callīm* has taught.\(^1\) Al-Bāqir's views here depict an intermediate position supporting neither determination nor freewill. However, the first tradition of al-Baqir is unambiguously deterministic.

iv) The Unity of God

There were three main areas of dispute which came under the topic of 'unity of God': a) the nature of the Qur'ān, (b) the problem of God's attributes and (c) the denial of any resemblance between God and his creation.

(a) As far as the first problem is concerned, the point at issue was whether the Qur'ān, which all agreed to be the speech of God (*Kalām Allāh*) was created speech or uncreated speech. The view that it was uncreated perhaps originated as a result of many scholars claiming that events occurred by the *qadar* or

---

1. See for details regarding al-Ṣādiq's views Madelung, *Der Imam al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm* (Berlin, 1965) p. 58 n. 94. Also see Kulaynī *Kāfi* pp. 159-160.
determination of God. The argument from some Muslims was partly that since certain historical events are mentioned in the Qur'ān, these must have been known eternally by God and therefore pre-determined. The reaction to this doctrine of uncreatedness i.e. that the Qur'ān had appeared in time was evaded by taking the Qur'ān as an expression of God's knowledge. Thus some defenders of human freedom insisted that the Qur'ān was created, supporting their views by quoting such Qur'ānic verses as:

"We have made it an Arabic Qur'ān;"

1. For details see Watt, Formative Period p. 179 and for an even fuller discussion see his 'Early discussions about the Qur'ān' Muslim World xl (1950), 27-40, 96-105.

Perhaps there was also a connection between this problem of uncreated Qur'ān with that of the 2nd person of the trinity in Christian theology.

2. It must be pointed out however that those who believed in human freewill generally did not deny the eternal fore knowledge of God.

3. Watt op. cit.

4. It must be remembered that there were many predestinarians also who held that Qur'ān was created.

5. Qur'ān 43:2
They asserted that the word 'made' (ja'alinā) meant the same as 'created'.

As far as al-Bāqir's views on the question are concerned they are not clearly discernible from his traditions in the Da'ā'im or al-Kāfī except for one tradition which implies that the Qur'an was created. ¹ The tradition runs as follows:

انالله خلومن خلته رخلته خلوته
وكل مارقع عليه اسم شمسى معاشلا
الله تعالى نعمن مخللق
والله خالق كنالى مانى

"God is separate from His creation and His creation is separate from Him; everything which is given a name is a thing which is created except God and He is the Creator of everything."

Since the Qur'ān is the name of the Book it would imply that it is created. However, according to al-Kashshī,² al-Bāqir is reported to have said that the Qur'an is neither created nor uncreated; it is the Word of the Creator. This is supported by views attributed

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 82.
2. Rijāl p. 305
to al-Baqir's father as well as his son. Thus al-Baqir seems to be proposing here a midway position between the two opposing arguments.

(b) The question of God's attributes is directly related to the doctrine of the createdness or uncreatedness of the Qur'ān, for the speech of God is an attribute of God. Therefore the dispute was also carried out about the nature of the divine attributes.

The Qur'ān describes God as Willing, Knowing, Decreeing etc. According to al-Ashārī, most of the Khārijites as well as many Murji'ites and the Mu'tazila held that 'God is knowing, powerful and living through Himself (bi-nafsi-hi) not by knowledge, power and life,' and when they permit the phrase 'God has knowledge to be used, it is only in the sense that He is knowing.

1. Abū Nu'aym Hilyāt al Awliyā' III p. 188
3. Maqālat 164.
When al-Baqir was asked about the relationship of divine attributes to God, he is said to have replied: "there is nothing like God and nothing resembles Him. He has forever been the Knowing, the Hearing and the Seeing." It is also reported that when al-Baqir was asked if it was proper to worship the Compassionate, the Merciful One, the Unique, the Absolute, he said: "Anyone who worships 'the names' without the One named is committing shirk (polytheism), is an infidel and a denier and in fact does not worship anything. "Rather" al-Baqir added, "worship God, the One, the Unique, the Absolute who is called by these names without the names (themselves) for the names are only attributes by which He characterizes Himself." 

For al-Baqir, the attributes appear to be eternal but only as adjectives. They help believers to understand something about God but they are not to be confused with God.

(c) When al-Baqir was asked about the Unity of God by

1. al-Kāfī I p. 86.
2. Ibid p. 87.
Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Najrān whether it was proper for him to imagine (God as) something, al-Bāqir replied: Yes, but not as something reasonable or limited. He added: “God is completely different to whatever you imagine; he neither resembles anything nor can imagination (ever) attain Him, for how could imagination even attain him while He is totally different to what is reasonable and (also) different from what can be pictured in imagination. He can be imagined only as a thing beyond reasoning and beyond (any) limitation.”

A Khārijīte went up to al-Bāqir and asked him “what thing do you worship?”, he replied: “Allāh, the High”. So he was asked whether he had seen Allāh and al-Bāqir gave a long reply that “Although eyes do not see Him yet the heart can see Him with the reality of faith.” He is not known by analogy nor is He felt by the senses nor can He be likened human beings. He is described by signs or the verses (of the Qur'ān) and

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 82.

2. This answer in response to a theological question seems to have mystical connotations and is used by later Sufis.
known by symbols; He is not unjust in His judgements, that (verily) is Allah, there is no God but He."

When al-Bāqir was asked by the transmitter of the tradition, Abū Ḥāshim al-Ja'farī to comment on the Qur'ānic verse "Although vision or eyesight could not see God yet God could see (or discern the power of) vision", al-Bāqir said:

"the imagination of the heart is more accurate than the vision of the eyes; you may imagine Sind, Hind and other countries that you have never visited and seen with your eyes; yet the imagination of the heart does not attain Him, then how could the vision of eyes?"

Al-Bāqir is also reported to have said "talk about the creation of Allah but do not discuss about Allah Himself as the conversation will only create confusion for the speaker." When thinking of God, al-Bāqir is reported to have warned people to be careful.

1. al-Kāfī I p. 97. The Khārijite went away saying: "God knows where to place His message"
2. al-Kāfī I p. 99.
3. al-Kāfī I p. 92
Thus God, in al-Baqir's view does not resemble anything and is beyond imagination and beyond any limitation. He cannot be seen with the naked eye but can be felt by the inner reality of faith; and can be described by signs and symbols.

The primitive nature of the theological ideas discussed above would indicate the early stage of the discussion in which al-Baqir was taking part and the probable authenticity of his views which are at a very simple level compared with the theological discussions that were to come later. The sources for these views are mainly traditions attributed to al-Baqir in al-Kaff and al-Dacg'im. While both these collections of traditions are much later than al-Baqir, it is interesting to note that al-Baqir is never attributed with theological language which is identifiably later than his own, nor with theological views that are clearly different from those of his time. Thus it would seem fair to assume that these traditions represent views held by al-Baqir.
CHAPTER SIX

AL-BĀQIR IN TRADITIONIST CIRCLES

(i) Non-Shī‘ite circle:

This section intends to look at al-Bāqir's picture outside his immediate Shī‘a. Scholars suggest that his reputation as a traditionist was wider than his Shī‘a. He is unanimously esteemed in non-Shī‘ite circles as one of the most trustworthy authorities on the traditions of the Prophet bearing the quality of thiqā. This was the highest degree of trust bestowed by Muslim scholars only to those people who were reliable, trustworthy and accurate in transmitting traditions. Al-Bāqir and his son, al-Ṣādiq are included in Sunnī isnāds in works such as Mālik's Muwattā', Ṭabarī's Ta'rīkh and Tafsīr


Ibn Hanbal's Musnad\(^1\), Shafi'i's Risala\(^2\) and many such other works.

Al-Baqir's position among his contemporaries appears to be such that many other scholars felt inferior to him and even the most eminent ones regarded him with awe and reverence on account of his outstanding knowledge. \(^3\)AbdAllah b.\(^4\)Ata' al-Makki is reported to have said that he had never seen the scholars feel so small in the presence of anyone as he had seen them feel besides Abu Ja'far Muhamnad b. \(^5\)Ali b. al-Hasayn (al-Baqir). He added, even al-Hakam b. Utayba (d. 113/731), a famous traditionist, despite his age and eminence, behaved before Abu Ja'far as though he were a pupil in front of a teacher. \(^6\)

Another famous non-Shiite scholar, Muhammad b. al-Munkadir is reported to have said\(^5\) that he had not

---


3. It must be admitted however, that such praise is not rare in the biographies of traditionists.


seen anyone surpassing CAli b. al-Husayn until he encountered his son Muḥammad b. CAli, i.e. al-Bāqir. The encounter itself is not given in Ibn Hajar's Tahdhib. But according to the Shiʿite sources, once it so happened that he had been out to one of the suburbs in Medina on an extremely hot day, where he came across al-Bāqir, a well built man, leaning on two of his servant boys. Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir thought to himself: "Here is a venerable leader of the Quraysh out at this time, seeking worldly advantage in these circumstances. Let me warn him." So he approached al-Bāqir and greeted him. Al-Bāqir returned his greetings with anger, sweat pouring down him. Muḥammad al-Munkadir said:

May God reform you, O! venerable leader of the Quraysh, out at this time seeking worldly advantage in these circumstances. (What would you do) if death were to come upon you while you were in this condition?"

Al-Bāqir made the two servant boys let go of his hands and held himself up. Then he said:

"By God, if death came upon me while I was in this condition, it would come upon me while I am (fulfilling) an act of obedience to God, by which I make myself withdraw from you and from the (rest of the) people. I would only fear death if it came upon me while I was performing an act of disobedience against God."

Then Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir replied: "May God have mercy on you, I had intended to warn you but you have in fact warned me."

Despite all the credit given to al-Bāqir in non-Shī'ite literature, traditions reported by al-Bāqir do not feature very prominently in the surviving traditional literature. There are however reports on his authority, though few in most of the major works. But, the few traditions in the extant Sunnī literature do not tend to support his authority as an eminent traditionist as described by the biographical dictionaries. It must be admitted however that not all the traditionists described as prominent have numerous traditions reported in their names. Yet one cannot but help analysing the situation in al-Bāqir's case as he is generally acclaimed as Bāqir al-ʿIlm "One who splits open knowledge."

It is interesting to note that al-Zuhrī (d.124), who narrated traditions from al-Bāqir and studied under

1. i.e. the six canonical works of Bukhārī, Muslim and others.

2. See Ibn Hajar Tahdhib, Vol 9-10 pp. 350 ff. which gives a list of those people who said that he was called al-Bāqir al-ʿIlm. This includes the name of Zubayr b. Bakkār (d. 256 A.H.), a scholar of historical traditions at Medina who later became a Qaḍī at Mecca.
al-Bāqir's father, Zayn al-CʻAbidIn features extremely well in the surviving Sunnī literatures, while al-Bāqir at whose feet even Mālik (97-179) and Abū Ḥanifa (80-150 A. H.) sat, has been set aside with only a few traditions to his credit. Obviously, one has to take into account the fact that the surviving literature is not in anyway comprehensive. Further, the text (matn) of the traditions may have been available to the reporters through many asānid (plural of isnād - chain of transmission). Therefore it is quite probable that one isnād may have been inserted to the exclusion of others. Yet the possibility always remains whether this was purely coincidence or a deliberate matter of preference; a process of conscious "picking and choosing." The latter possibility cannot be totally ignored for even the most objective writer or reported would have his own attitudes and tendencies. A brief look at the background of the period will elucidate this point clearly.

Hadith literature led a troubled existence during its formative period. One of the things that had significant effects on its development was the political changes in the early history of Islam. Therefore those who occupied themselves in collecting and narrating traditions soon found out that they had to reckon with severe state censorship. Al-Tabari\(^1\), for example states that Mu\(\ddot{a}\)wiya I had ordered public condemnation of \(\ddot{A}\)l\(\ddot{I}\) and his parties, and the glories of the family of \(\ddot{U}\)thm\(\ddot{a}\)n be extolled. In such circumstances then, except during \(\ddot{U}\)mar II's period, and later when the Umayyad power was sapped, it was hardly possible for anyone to sympathize publicly with the house of \(\ddot{A}\)l\(\ddot{I}\).

However, it must be mentioned that the extant traditional literature does not date as far back as the Umayyad Caliphate although some of the traditions have been handed down since then. One of the earliest extant works is the Muwatta whose writer M\(\ddot{a}\)lik b.

---

1. Al-Tabari\(^1\) II, p.112; al-Zuhr\(\ddot{I}\) has definitely stated that these princes have made us write \(\ddot{h}\)ad\(\ddot{i}\)th.
Anas, although born during that period, lived the last forty-five years of his life, the years of his literary activity, under the aegis of the Abbasids. An exception to this is the Musnad of Ahmad b. Hanbal (d. 241 A.H.) which has not been expurgated so as to entirely please the Abbasids. It includes traditions of obviously Syrian origin that are favourable to the Umayyads as well as a great many exceedingly detailed records that support the claim of the Shiites.

It is then safe to assume that such political upheaval may have been an influential factor in determining what traditions were to be circulated and in whose names they were to be reported.

Despite the fact that not many traditions in al-Baqir's name are reported in the extant Sunni literature yet Ibn Hajar (d. 852 A.H.) gives a long list of names from whom al-Baqir has reported traditions and to whom he has in turn transmitted them. According to him the following names are of those from whom al-Baqir

---

1. Malik b. Anas had given his oath of allegiance with others to the Abbasid al-Manṣūr under compulsion. He was publicly flogged for venturing to make the decision that an oath given under compulsion was not binding. His interest in collecting traditions was for the sake of their bearing on jurisprudence and his Muwatta' is not one of the six canonical collections.
has reported traditions:—

1. His father ۷۷۰۷۰, Zayn al-۷۰۰۰۰ (d. c. 94 A.H.)
2. His two grandfathers, ۷۰۰۰۰ (d. 49 A.H.) and ۷۰۰۰۰ (d. 61 A.H.)
3. His father's grandfather, ۷۰۰۰۰ b. Abi ۷۰۰۰۰ (d. 41 A.H.) — mursal.
4. His father's uncle, Muḥammad b. al-۷۰۰۰۰۰ (d. 81 A.H.)
5. His grandfather's cousin, ۷۰۰۰۰ b. Ja۷۰۰۰۰ (d. 80 A.H.)
7. ۷۰۰۰۰ b. ۷۰۰۰۰ (d. c. 68 A.H.)
8. ۷۰۰۰۰ b. ۷۰۰۰۰ (d. c. 73-4 A.H.)
9. Abū Hurayra (d. 57-8 A.H.)
10. ۷۰۰۰۰ bint. AbI Bakr (d. c. 58 A.H.)
11. Umm Salama.
12. Abū Sa۷۰۰۰۰۰ al-KhudrI.
13. Jābir b. ۷۰۰۰۰ al-Anṣārī (d. c. 78 A.H.)
14. Anas b. Mālik (d. 91-3 A.H.)
15. Ibrāhīm b. Sa۷۰۰۰۰ b. AbI Wāqqās.
16. Sa۷۰۰۰ b. al-Musayyib (d. 94 A.H.)
17. UbaydAllāh b. AbI RāfiC.
18. Ḥarmala, mawla of Usāma.
19. ۷۰۰۰۰ b. Yasār, mawla of Maymuna (d. 103 of 94 A.H.)

1. See Ibn Sa۷۰۰۰ V, p.129.
20. Yazīd b. Hurmuz.¹

21. Abū Murra mawla of Āqil b. Abī Ṭālib (no date of death is given in Ibn Sa'd, vol. 5, p. 131 but he goes on to say he was an old man narrating traditions from people like Abū Hurayra and Īthmān).

These above names include the Sahābis or the Aṣḥāb who were contemporary with Muḥammad as for instance, Samura b. Jundub, Jābir b. ĀbādAllah, Abū Hurayra, Ā'īsha and others. However, if one were to look at their dates of death and compare them with al-Bāqir's birthdate one soon realizes that Abū Hurayra and Ā'īsha had died before al-Bāqir was born. In the case of Samura, and his paternal grandfather, al-Ḥusayn, he was a mere toddler at the time of their death while his maternal grandfather, al-Ḥasan died long before he was born. It is thus that Ibn Hajar² mentions a report saying that only the traditions of al-Bāqir from Ibn Ābābās,³ Jābir b. ĀbādAllah and AbdAllah b. Ja'far b. Abī Ṭālib are marfuq, i.e. traceable directly to the Prophet while what he has narrated from other

---

1. Ibid
2. See Tahdhib, vol. 11-12, p. 369 where it is believed he died during Īmar II's reign.
Companions (although the list includes some tābīcūn i.e. the first generation after the Prophet as well as tābīcū al-tābīcūn i.e. the second generation after the Prophet) are all mursal i.e. traditions that are handed down by a tābīcī about the Prophet when an intermediary link is missing.

The few traditions of al-Bāqir found in some of the Sunni sources reveal that besides narrating traditions from his own immediate family, the only outsider on whose authority al-Bāqir reports the traditions is Jābir b. ʿAbdAllāh al-Ansārī. He is the only one among the companions who lived until al-Bāqir was almost twenty-one. The other aspect that comes forth in these few traditions is al-Bāqir's own standing as a traditionist for all the three sources include isnāds that stop at al-Bāqir.

In the Muwattā' out of eight traditions the first two traditions stop at al-Bāqir as follows: Malik...... Jaʿfar...... his father (al-Bāqir), while the other four add that al-Bāqir heard it from Jābir b.


2. Muwattā' I traditions nos. 40 and 44.

3. Muwattā' I traditions nos. 107, 126, 127 and 131.
CAbdAllāh and the last two maintain that he heard it from CAI b. Abī Tālib. This clearly indicates the authority of al-Bāqir as a traditionist; in fact it gives us an idea about the families' standing as sources of authority. It must be mentioned, however, that Mālik was not a traditionist and his interest in collecting traditions lay mainly for their impact upon jurisprudence.

The two traditions found in al-Shāfi‘ī’s Risāla also show that one stops at al-Bāqir while the other, is reported from Jābir. In the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal too, there are some isnāds stopping at al-Bāqir while in some traditions he is reporting from his father CAI Zayn al-CAbidIn.  

The fact that the Sunni sources include in their works traditions having isnāds that stop at al-Bāqir suggests that al-Bāqir is quoted as a direct authority. This means that either his traditions are regarded as

1. Muwattā’ I tradition No. 158 and Muwattā’ II tradition No. 17.
2. Tradition no. 1245 and 1182.
3. Musnad III tradition no. 2081; Musnad I tradition no. 576.
4. Tradition nos. 601 and 688 in Musnad II.
marfu\(^c\) i.e. traceable to the Prophet\(^1\) or that al-Bāqir was speaking on his own authority as an Imam. The latter aspect is not altogether impossible keeping in mind his own views on the Imamate but whether the Sunnī traditionists mentioned him in their works in his capacity as an Imam is debatable. For, as is known\(^2\) when the Medinans began accusing al-Bāqir of transmitting hadiths on the authority of the Prophet, whom he had never seen, the name of Jābir b. ̲̲ʿAbdAllāh was inserted between him and that of the Prophet to make the traditions more acceptable.\(^3\) This does not of course mean that al-Bāqir did not report any traditions from Jābir but what it does suggest is that although al-Bāqir may have been saying things in his capacity as

\[1. \text{لَوْ اِمْتَاَنُناَ هُدِيَّنا بِرَأِيَانَا مَثَلًا كَمَا نُهْنَا بِرَأِيَة لِسِئِلَةٍ فِي ثُيُبَتِّنا لَنَا.} \]

"If we said anything according to our own individual opinion, we would go astray just as those before us have done. But we give evidence from our Lord who explained it to his Prophet who in turn explained us". See al-Saffār, Bāṣaʿīr al-Dar-ajāt II p.299. \(\text{apud.}\) Al-Sayyid Murtuqa al-Askārī, Mughaddimat Mirāt al-Ṣugūl II (Tehran, 1398 A.H.) pp.55. See also other traditions of al-Bāqir on pp. 54-57 in the same work.


an Imam from the Shi'ite point of view, the non-Shi'ite transmitters could not accept his authority as an Imam and therefore the formal act of inserting Jābīr's name had to be employed in some traditions.

**Transmitters of al-Bāqīr:**

Ibn Ḥajar¹ gives a long list of those people who narrated traditions from al-Bāqīr. Many of them attained great fame and formed their own study circles in turn. In this way al-Bāqīr's traditions reached posterity not only through his own progeny but also through these various scholars. They are as follows:-

1. His son, Ja'far al-Ṣādiq (d. 148 A.H.)
2. Abū Ishāq al-Sabī, Ṭām b. ʿAbdAllāh (d.128 A.H.)
3. Al-ʿArāj, (d. after 140 A.H.)
4. Al-Zuhri, Muḥammad b. ʿAbdAllāh Ibn Shihāb (d.124 A.H)
5. Ṭām b. Dīnār (d.c. 126 A.H.)
6. Abū Jahdām, Musa b. ʿAlīm.
7. Al-Qāsim (Qasm according to Dhahabī) b. al-Faḍl.
10. Al-Acīmash, Sulaymān b. Māhrūn (d. 148 A.H.)
12. Ṭām b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad b. Ṭām b. ʿAbdAllāh b. ʿAbdAllāh b. al-ʿAshʿarī

---

13. 'AbdAllah b. 'Atā'.
15. Ḥarb b. Surayj
16. Ḥajjāj b. Artāt.
18. Makḥūl b. Rāshid (d. 115).

Ibn Hajar's list does not appear to be complete for al-Dhahabī' (d. 748 A.H.)¹, includes some more names not given in the Ibn Hajar's Tahdhīb like:-

1. Rabīʿa al-Rā'y (d. 136 A.H.) and

Abū Nuṣaym al-Isfahānī (d. 136 A.H.)² has even more names not mentioned by Ibn Hajar. They are:

1. 'Atā' b. Abī Rabāḥ (d. 114 A.H.)
2. Jābir al-Juʿfī (d. 128 A.H.)
3. Abān b. Taghlib (d. 141 A.H.)
4. Layth b. Abī Salim/Sulaym

In fact Ibn Hajar, himself when ending the list of

---

¹ Taʿrīkh al-Islam, vol. 4, p. 299.
² Hilyat al-Awliyā', vol. 3, p. 188.
names mentions 'and others', obviously implying he has not been able to include all of them. Moreover, when he has dealt with individual scholars he mentions some more people like Ziyād b. al-Mundhir, Abū al-Jārūd and Ābād Allāh b. Abū Bakr b. Āmīr b. Hazm as having reported traditions from al-Bāqir.

The names given in all the three works will reveal some outstanding scholars who had formed their own study circles, such as al-Zuhrī, al-Awzāʾī, Ibn Jurayj, al-Āmash, Makhūl and others. Some like al-Zuhrī attained great fame not only for his share in collecting the traditions but also for being the author of many other works, famous among which are the Tanzīl al Qurʾān and the Mansūkh al-Qurʾān. These two works have come down to us in a single manuscript dated 653 A.H. Makhūl, the Syrian jurist who narrated traditions from al-Bāqir collected some of the Prophetic traditions and some juristic decisions based on the rulings of the Companions in a book called Kitāb al-Sunan. The traditions narrated by Ābād al-Raḥmān b. Hurmuz al-Āraj who reported from al-Bāqir as well,


2. For more details see Hāfiz's Ph.D thesis on Zuhrī pp.162ff.

3. Fihrist 227; Al-Zirkīlī Ālam VIII 212.
were also collected by Abū al-Zinād (d. 131 A.H.) in a
worked called Kitāb ma ṭawāhu al Akrāj.1 CAbd al-Malik
b. CAbd al-CAzīz b. Jurayj (d. 150 A.H.) who compiled
the Kitāb al-Sunan and who is considered to be one of
the compiler of ḥadīth and sunna in Islam2 was also a
transmitter of al-Bāqir's. Another transmitter of al-
Bāqir who was highly esteemed was CAbd al-Raḥman b.
CAmr al-Awzā'ī.3 He was a Syrian and he too wrote a
book called Kitāb al-Sunan fi al-Fiqh4 and was in fact
the founder of a legal school.

Al-Bāqir's reports in al-Ṭabarī's (d. 310 A.H.)
Tarīkh reveal few narrators of his, such as:

1. Ishāq b. CAbdAllāh b. Abū Farwa.5
2. Muḥammad b. Ishaq.6
3. CAmr al-Duḥnī.7

1. Tahdhīb VI, p. 172; Sam Cānī Ansāb p. 173.
2. Dhahabī Ta'rikh VI, p. 559; Tahdhīb VI, 403-4.
3. Ibn Sa'd VII, ii 185; Tahdhīb VI, pp. 238-42
Hiliyāt al-Awliyā' VI, 135-49.
5. Al-Ṭabarī Ta'rikh, vol. 2 pp. 410, 485; Vol. 5,
pp. 153 ff.
6. Al-Ṭabarī Ta'rikh, vol. 2 pp. 446; Vol. 3 pp. 73.
7. Ibid, vol. 5 pp. 347ff and 389 reporting the murder of
Ḥusayn at Karbala'.
4. Ibn Quba b. Bashîr al-Asadî.¹

However, it must be borne in mind that some among the whole list of reporters were actually al-Bâqîr's associates more so than his narrators, even though they may have reported traditions from him at times. For instance scholars like Zuhrî and Ata' b. Abî Rabîh despite having been included in his list of transmitter by non-Shîite writers were in fact his contemporaries. They, in fact could be regarded as transmitters of al-Bâqîr's father, Alî, Zayn al-Çâbidîn. Zuhrî, as pointed out earlier was definitely a student of Zayn al-Çâbidîn, while Ata' is believed to have been a disciple of Zayn al-Çâbidîn.² However, this might be a later Shîite interpretation in view of the fact that the two men were very close. Ata' himself was quite a prestigious scholar and his knowledge about the rites of the pilgrimage, of which al-Bâqîr himself was an expert, was such that al-Bâqîr said thus about him:—

"No one remains today who is more learned than Ata' b. Abî Rabîh in respect of the manasik (laws) of haji"³

¹. Ibid, vol.5 pp.448
². Ibn Dâwûd Kitâb al-Riţâl (Teheran 1342 A.H.) 79.
### Older and Younger Scholars During Al-Baqir's Time (b. 57 – d.c. 120 A.H.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MECCA</strong></th>
<th><strong>MEDINA</strong></th>
<th><strong>KUFA</strong></th>
<th><strong>BASRA</strong></th>
<th><strong>SYRIA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. ʻAtâ' b. Abi Rabâl</td>
<td>Sa'id al-Mussayyib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ʻIkrima, mawla Ibn ʻAbbâs</td>
<td>Ibn Usba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sulaymân b. Yaṣâr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nâfi' b. Jarrah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ʻAbdallah b. ʻAtâ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ʻAbd al-ʻUtayba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ibn Shihâb al-Zahrâ'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rabi' b. ʻAbd al-Rahmân</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sâlih b. Kaysân</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ʻAbd al-Rahmân b. ʻAbd al-ʻUtayba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Muhammad b. al-Munkadîq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Qaysîm b. Muhammad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Yahya b. Sa'id</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Malik b. Anas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The list (above) drawn up to show some of the older and younger scholars during al-Baqir's life-time reveals that his period of time coincided with some of the most outstanding and distinguished scholars in the Islamic empire. Although there were giant figures existing in each centre such as al-Zuhri in Medina, Atâ'ib, Abî Rabân in Mecca, Ibn ʿAmmād and Sha'ibī in Kūfa, Ibn Sirīn and Qatādā in Baṣra and Makḥūl in Syria, yet it can be seen that the number of scholars in Medina far exceeded those in other cities. This does not necessarily mean that the Medinese were better than their counterparts but it at least shows the degree of intellectual activity going on in the city. This, in turn, brings out the background in which al-Baqir grew up and the circle in which he mixed. His contact with scholars was by no means limited to those of Medina for as mentioned earlier on, he had acquaintances as well as associates, transmitters and disciples in Mecca, Kūfa, Baṣra as well as in Syria and Yemen.

The list also illustrates that al-Baqir was a younger contemporary of some of the "seven lawyers of Medina": Saʿīd Ibn al-Musayyib, ʿUrwa b. al-Zubayr, Abû Bakr Ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān, ʿUbaydAllāh Ibn ʿAbdAllāh b. ʿUtba, Khārija b. Zayd b. Thābit, Sulaymān b. Yasaʿr and Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abû Bakr who in fact happened to be the father-in-law of al-Baqir. He was
also an older contemporary of scholars such as Mālik b. Anas, Ibn ʿUyayna, Ibn Abī Laylā, Abū Ḥanīfa, Sufyān al-Thawrī and al-Awzāʿī. Amidst such eminent scholars, al-Bāqir stood as their equal if not better. In fact according to some scholars, he was not only viewed as one of the many distinguished scholars but that he stood head and shoulders above all of them.

(ii) Shīʿite circle:

From the Shīʿa point of view, al-Bāqir's image is totally different for two reasons - firstly because he was one of the Imams and secondly because of the structural difference between Shīʿite and Sunnite ḥadīth. The Shīʿite ḥadīth differs mainly with regard to the source of authority in Islam after the death of the Prophet. The Sunnīs assign the primary role of transmitting traditions to the Companions of the Prophet and so a Sunnite isnād will as a rule go back to a Companion who transmits from the Prophet. But Shīʿite traditions are mainly a recording of statements made by the Prophet or by an Imam and transmitted to

later generation by the disciples of each Imam.\(^1\) This, in the ShīCite view, was because the Companions are fallible mortals and therefore cannot claim any authority to true knowledge and correct judgment while the Imams, in whom ultimate religious authority is vested, are by their very nature divinely protected from sin and error (ma'sūm). Moreover, the ShīCites argue\(^2\) that the Companions could not serve as trustworthy transmitters because most, if not all, had acquiesced in, or even actively supported the rule of the first three caliphs.

This brief outline of the structural difference between ShīCite and Sunnite hadith will help us determine and appreciate al-Bāqir's image from a ShīCite point much better. Since ShīCite traditions are mainly the sayings of the Prophet or the Imams and since the Prophet and the Imams are considered infallible in ShīCite view, it is clear that their authority is final and unquestionable. As pointed out in the previous paragraph, al-Bāqir was one of the ShīCite Imams, therefore from the ShīCite point of view

---

1. There are some instances were the Companions do appear as transmitters from the Prophet but E. Kohlberg *op. cit.* maintains that the reason lay in *taqiya* (precautionary dissimulation) as well as sometimes providing a convincing argument in polemical works.

2. E. Kohlberg, *op. cit.* p. 300
his authority is absolute and indisputable. Yet one has to take into account the different attitudes and tendencies of the various disciples who transmitted from him. When one looks at the large number of ShIclude hadiths, some of these traditions tend to reflect these different attitudes and tendencies.

It is worth noting that here, although the term ShIclude is used, it must be taken to mean in this section in the IthnãAsharî and the IsmãIlî sense for the Zaydi approach appears more akin to the Sunnite view. Nevertheless, it is revealing that when al-Baqir is quoted in some of their traditions, he is referred to as direct authority and his traditions are regarded as marfu’ i.e. traceable to the Prophet. Jürüdiya3 branch of the Zaydiya go as far as believing that every descendant of the Prophet, young or old, are all equal in their knowledge, even if they were still in their cradle and that "knowledge grew in their hearts just as rain makes the cultivated land (just as

1. See Amãlî Ahmad b. ʾIsã passim.
2. See Al-Saffâr, Baṣāʾir al-Dar ḥaj̲āt II p. 299 IV and VI p. 300. apud. Al-Sayyid Murtaḍa al-Askari Muqaddimat Mirat al-CUqul Vol. II (Tehran, 1398 A.H.) pp. 54-57. However, it is quite likely that most often al-Baqir spoke on his own authority as an Imam and it was only assumed that what he said was traceable to the Prophet.
truffles and grass) grow."¹ It is, of course, a case of hostile reporting as it is not very likely that the Jarudiya themselves made the comparison of the knowledge of the Prophet's descendants with truffles and grass. It is interesting to note that some of al-Baqir and al-Sadiq's traditions found in the Sunni sources also have family isnāds as mentioned earlier on.

Shi'ite sources² suggest that al-Baqir was the most learned man during his time as well as the greatest jurist of the period.³ Other jurists from the khawāss (Shī'ī) and the ṭawāmm (non-Shī'ī) reported from him the zahīr (external knowledge) concerning halāl (what is permissible) and haram (what is forbidden).⁴ He was called Bāqir- al-ʿilm (One who splits open knowledge), says Qaḍī al-Nuṣrān, because he happened to be the first one among the Imams of the Prophet's family to split it open and disclose it. This became possible for him because he found his times more congenial; the ruling dynasty i.e. the Umayyads had taken a more softer approach now that their end was drawing near.

¹ al-O Ḥ o i al-Nuṣ r a n, Kitāb al-Manāqib lil-Ah l- al-Bay t f. 299b.
² al-Qaḍī al-Nuṣ rān, Sharh al-ʿAkbār f. 64
³ al-Qaḍī al-Nuṣ rān, Sharh al-ʿAkbār f. 64
⁴ al-Qaḍī al-Nuṣ rān, Sharh al-ʿAkbār f. 64

وأخذ عنده ظاهران الحلال والحرام اهل الفئة من الخوارج والموارم.
while others among them were busy leading a lavish and carefree life, full of sins.¹

In another work of his, which is also still in a manuscript form he says:²

```
ورغم الباقر العلم لاتنأ كأنه أول من بقر منه وكتاب نيبه وقبرته وثوان منه أكابر رواة
السنه وفقهها في الشاطر والсим الكامن إلى العلم الحديث من العامة مغ
من أدرك مدر، وحق يجمعه من أكابر التوقيعهم أمرا منه
وهموا منه ركأن مدهم ويد من تحقيقهم من بعدهم
زمان يائ. أهيل العلم تدوى نبه، قائمة في النبوقة لم ينحد
من يبرى الله حتى أن المقطوع من الحديث مدر منه
بحد موصولا. وذكر مندا لمدته منه وثاثته ولا ينحد.
كالرسول الله ‚الامير منه انت تلته. ولم يذكر انداده. وسم
منب منه. ذلك حجة رسول الله، م حجة الوداع لم بروها الناس أطى
نظام باجاههم فيه من الناس والإخبار الذي من جابر بن عبد الله. رضي الله عنه
من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم. بسط بعض الشافعيين منهم ما نذكر من الفراشات
والسن ونحو ذلك وبينه نكمل منه كتاب كبير.
```

¹ ibid.
² Kitāb al-Manāqib li Ahl al-Bayt ....... f. 299b.
"He was called Bāqir al-ʿIlm i.e. One who splits open knowledge because he was the first one to split it open and talk about it as well as the first one to classify it. (That knowledge) was borrowed from him and he was known for it. The learned reporters of the Shiʿa, those well-known with regard to the precedence in Islam (al-sībaq), and those affiliated with ʿIlm and hadith from among the non-Shiʿa who lived until his period of time heard that from him and transmitted that (knowledge) on his authority. They and those who came after them and the rest of the people of knowledge had in him an example to follow. He was considered among them to hold the utmost degree of reliability for those who received (traditions) from him. (This strength was also for) what had been ascribed to him as its first authority so much so that when a tradition that was technically maqtū (i.e. a tradition that goes back no further than the first generation after Prophet Muhammad) was reported by al-Baqir, it was regarded as mawsūl i.e. linked and was mentioned as marfuʿ i.e. that which is traceable to the Prophet. This was because of their trust and reliance on him as well as because he never said that 'the Prophet had said' except when it was firmly established that he had indeed said that even if he neither mentioned his isnād nor named the person from whom he narrated it. The pilgrimage of the Messenger of Allah i.e. the farewell pilgrimage has not been reported fully by the people,
according to what has come down to us from the practices and from the reports except from him (i.e. al-Baqir) on the authority of Jabir b. AbdAllah, may God be pleased with, from the Messenger of Allâh, peace be upon him, such that one of the later (scholars) has expounded the religious duties and practices mentioned by him, has commented on that and explained it, and a large book has been completed on his authority."¹

The above passage of Qâdi al-Nu'man clearly depicts to us al-Baqir's image in the Shî'ite world and the rank that he had attained outside his own group. The significant aspect that comes out in the above passage is al-Baqir's reputation as a traditionist. Undoubtedly, he was a prominent traditionist but the fact that the 'interrupted' or 'broken' traditions were regarded as 'linked' and traceable to the Prophet when they came from al-Baqir speaks for itself regarding his esteem and his image in the Shî'ite circle.² It is

¹ al-Qâdi, al-Nu'mân K. al Manâqib.........f. 299b.
² It is to be noted however that the Sunnite hadith authorities do not say this although a few traditions are found in their works where the isnâds stop at al-Baqir which does in a way imply what Qâdi al-Nu'mân says about al-Baqir. On the other hand the fact that al-Baqir is so rarely quoted in Sunnite hadith collections may well be because in the Sunnite view his isnâds were formally defective although that is not contradicted by his being considered thîqa as a transmitter.
also worth noting that in the author's view, the farewell pilgrimage has been reported fully only by al-Bāqir who had asked Jābir b. ʿAbdAllāh about it. The latter, who is believed to have accompanied the Prophet, informed al-Bāqir about things that the Prophet did since the time he left Medina until the completion of the pilgrimage.¹

Al-Bāqir is believed to have recounted reports about the beginnings of history (mubtada')² and stories of the Prophet. The account of the campaigns of the Prophet (maghāzī) were written on his authority.³

"People followed the practices of the Prophet (sunan) on his authority and relied on him with regard to the rites of the pilgrimage which he reported on the authority of the Messenger of God, may God bless him and his family."⁴

Many Muslim scholars and jurists transmitted the principle features of religious (maṣālim) on his authority. He, in fact became a signpost of knowledge even in his own family for he surpassed them all by his

---

1. See Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān's *Sharḥ al-Akhbār* f.64-65.

2. Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān in his *Sharḥ* f. 64-66 has an interesting account of what al-Bāqir said regarding the beginnings of the House of Ka'ba and the creation of mankind as well as the covenant between man and God.

3. See Howard's transl. of Mufīd's *Kitāb al-Irshād* p. 397.

4. *ibid*. This view of Mufīd's tallies with that of Qāḍī al Nuʿmān.
outstanding merit (*faḍl*) in traditional knowledge (*ʿIlm*), ascetism and leadership. His fame travelled wide and far so much so that proverbs were coined about him and verses were written to describe him. The poet al-Qurāzī had said the following lines in praise of al-Bāqir:

"O, (You) who split open knowledge (making it available to the people of piety
And the best of those who seek to answer the call of the Exalted."

Malik b. ʿAYān al-Juhnī is even more generous in his praise for al-Bāqir and has said the following regarding him.

1. Howard *op cit.* p.393. Also see Ibn Shahrashūb, *Manāqib* *apud* ʿAMīlī ʿAYān al-Shīʿa IV, pp. 3 ff mentions "No one from among the sons of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn will be as learned as al-Bāqir in the sciences such as *tafsīr*, *kālām*, *futya*, *aḥkām*, *ḥalāl* and *ḥaram*.

When people seek knowledge of the Qur'an, the Quraysh rely upon him.

If someone asked who is the son of the daughter of the Prophet, I realised that for that there are wide branches i.e. many descendants.

(They are like) stars that provide light for the night travellers, (They are like) mountains that bequeaths vast knowledge.

The traditions that have come down to us from al-Bāqir in Shi‘ite sources of all three persuasions, Zaydī, Ithnā‘Asharī and Ismā‘īlī cover a vast spectrum, ranging from problems of the material world to questions concerning the spiritual life. Due to the nature of their contents these sayings have influenced nearly every branch of Shi‘ite learning. Besides the Qur‘ān, these traditions of al-Bāqir as well as those of his son, al-Ṣādiq form the backbone of Shi‘ite jurisprudence (fīqh) and Shi‘ite theology (kalām) too, would be inexplicable and incomprehensible without them. Thus, his importance from the Shi‘ite point of view is not difficult to gauge. It comes as no surprise then, when he is regarded by the Shi‘a as the most versatile and erudite man of the epoch. As pointed out earlier on he cannot be held responsible

1. al-Murādī, Amālī Ahmad b. Ǧisā passim (Zaydī)
al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī, vol. I and II passim
(Ithnā‘Asharī). al-Qādī al-Nu‘mān, Da‘ūd b. Ǧasir al-Islam and Ma wujida min Kitāb al-‘Iqāb passim
(Ismā‘īlī).
for some of the forged traditions that go under his name. His traditions were handed down to posterity by his son and successor, al-Ṣādiq by his other sons and relations as well as by his associates and disciples who were innumerable from what one gathers in the extant Shiʿite sources.¹

(iii) Shiʿite Associates of al-Bāqir

In this section an attempt will be made to look at certain individuals who appear to have been involved with al-Bāqir. All the stories in the extant sources cannot always be taken at their face value. However, it is worth looking at some of the other anecdotes which may help us to paint a picture of individuals who may have been involved intimately with al-Bāqir. The task is rendered difficult not only because Shiʿite organization was largely underground but also because there were several competing Shiʿite organizations. The other difficulty arises from the fact that as an eminent traditionist, there were numerous people narrating traditions from al-Bāqir who were not necessarily his followers but who nevertheless have been mentioned among his associates by some sources. Thus the task of determining who were merely his

¹ al-Barqî Kitāb al-Rijab, pp. 9-16; Ibn Dāwūd Rijab passim; al-Kashshî, Maʿrifat al-Rijab passim; al-Tusi K. al-Rijab passim.
transmitters and who were his real followers is not an easy job. Moreover, there were some who were sympathetic with the Alid cause but were not necessarily Shī'ite.

Al-Bāqir himself resided in Medina and although he did have a few followers there as well as in Mecca, Basra and Syria, yet sources suggest that the bulk of his followers were mainly Kūfans. For the sake of brevity, not all his followers will be mentioned but only those who attained fame and were in some ways connected with enhancing al-Bāqir's position.

a) KŪFA

The chief representative of the Imam in Kūfa was Abū ĀbdAllāh Jābir b. Yazīd b. al-Ḥārith al-Juʿfī (d. 128/745-6). Views regarding his merit as a traditionist are greatly divergent. Some authorities maintain, among them Sufyān al-Thawrī, he was truthful (saduq) and trustworthy (thīqa) as a traditionist and

1. al-Samcanī, Ābd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad, Kitāb al-Ansāb (Leiden, 1912) p. 113; Kashshī, Rijāl, pp. 191 ff; Najāshī, Rijāl, pp. 93-94.

2. Kashshī op.cit p. 129; Dhahabī Mizān al-ʿIṣṭidāl. Samcanī calls him a liar while Najāshī thinks he was weak.
that only his transmitters Amr b. Shamir al-Jufi', Mufaddal b. Sahih al-Ashadi and Munakhkhal b. Jamil al-Ashadi Bayya al Jawari (a seller of slave girls) were liars who introduced many spurious traditions. Whatever may have been his status as a traditionist outside the Shi'ite circle, there is little doubt that among Shi'ite traditionists he was a striking personality and was considered to be an enthusiastic follower of al-Baqir.

Jabir extolled the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt and his devotion to al-Baqir can be ascertained from the way in which he addressed him - "The trustee of the trustees and inheritor of the knowledge of the Prophets" (wasi al-awshiya' wa warith Ilm al-anbiya'). He claimed to have witnessed miracles of the Imam and is believed to have been recognised as the bab (Gate)

1. Al-Ha'irî, Muhammed b. Isma'il Muntaha al-Maqâl (Teheran 1302) p.230: al-Tafrihî, Nagd al-Rijal fol. 147 b. These references have been taken from Rajkowski's thesis. For more details see Madelung's art. Djabir al-Djuçi'î in the Suppl. of the E.I. See also Halm in Der Islam LVIII (1981) pp. 29ff.

2. al-Ha'irî op.cit. 307-8.

3. He was accused of extremism and regarded as a 'weak' traditionist, see al-Ha'irî op.cit p.311 Najashi Rijal p.298.


of al-Bāqir\(^1\) who, it is reported, related to him seventy secret traditions\(^2\). It is also believed that Jābir confessed before al-Bāqir that the secrets which the Imam had imparted to him at times stirred him so much that something like madness overtook him. Al-Bāqir is reported to have said to him, "when you feel like that, go into the desert (lit. the mountain), dig a hole and put your head into it."\(^3\)

Some people were either impatient regarding traditions related by Jābir or considered him to be a madman.\(^4\) However, this reputation for madness was to one day save him from serious trouble when Caliph Hishām ordered him to be sent to Damascus for an enquiry into his activities and people testified before the Amir that he was insane.\(^5\) Despite all his assertions, the Shī'a do not reject him as a ghāli\(^6\)

---

2. Majlisī Bīḥār al-Anwār Vol. XI p.98. Another tradition maintains that he claimed to have known 50,000 or even 70,000 traditions which he would not relate to anyone. See Kashshī ṫīṣāl p. 128. Ibn Hajar Tahdīhī II p.49; Dhahabī Mizān I p.155
3. Kashshī ṫīṣāl p.128
4. ibid.
5. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p.251; Kashshī, ṫīṣāl p.128
6. Ibn Qutayba Mağārif p.267 calls him a ghāli and Ibn Hajar calls him a Sabā'ite. See Tahdīhī II p.50
(one who exaggerates) perhaps because he remained faithful to the Imam in the conflict with al-Mughira b. Sa'd al-Ijlī whom he reviled and cursed.¹

Jābir is quoted as the transmitter of some traditions in the Umm al-Kitāb which is supposed to contain answers of al-Bāqir to the different questions asked by the followers.² Jābir is also the main narrator of al-Bāqir in Risālat al-Ju'fī which is believed to contain Ismā'īlī doctrines.³ It is difficult to determine whether Jabir did really narrate all those traditions attributed to him and that too from al-Bāqir or whether some or many were later fathered upon him.⁴ Whatever may be the case, there is little doubt that he was an ardent follower of al-Bāqir.

1. Kashshi Rijāl p.126-7; Hā'irī, Muntaha p.73 See Madelung's art. Djabir al-Ju'fī in the Suppl. of the EI who says that there may have been some relationship between him and al-Mughira since according to the Sunni heresiographers Jābir became the leader of Mughira's extremist Shī'ī followers after the latter was killed in 119/737 by Khālid al-Qasrī, governor of Kūfā.

2. W.Ivanow, "Notes sur l' Ummu'l kitāb de Ismaéli del' Asie Centrale" REI (1932) pp.419-482. Also see Der Islam XXIII (1936) where Ivanow has edited the Ummu'l kitāb.


Abān b. Taghlib (d. 141 A.H.) was another associate of al-Bāqir. He was an important and outstanding jurist-traditionist of his time. Formerly an associate of Zayn al-Abidīn, he lived long enough to narrate traditions even from al-Bāqir's son, al-Ṣādiq. Al-Bāqir is reported to have said to Abān:

"Sit in the mosque of Kūfa and give legal judgments to the people. Indeed, I would like to see among my Shi′a, people like you."2

Aban's reputation for learning was quite high and by the time he reached al-Ṣādiq's Imamate, it was such that whenever he visited Medina, people would give way to him and allowed him to use the column where the Prophet used to lean against in the mosque.3

In due course al-Bāqir was able to attract three of the previous pupils of al-Ḥākam b. Cūtayba. One of the most eminent among them was Abū al-Ḥasan b. Cīyan b. Sunsan, popularly known as al-Zurāra. He and his two brothers Ḥumrān and Ḥamza b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbdAllāh al-Ṭayyār later changed their allegiance and joined

2. Ibn Dāwūd op cit. p.10. Quoting Kashshī, Jafri says that it was al-Ṣādiq who said that to Abān. See p.310 of his Origins.
al-Bāqir's group. It is believed Humran was the first to take the step.\textsuperscript{1} He in fact was formerly a close associate of Zayn al-Ābidīn and later came to be an extremely committed follower of al-Bāqir.\textsuperscript{2} Ḥamza is believed to have hesitated between the various claimants and finally chose to follow al-Bāqir.\textsuperscript{3}

The acquisition of Zurāra appears to have been quite significant for he not only was regarded as an eminent traditionist but also a famous theologian of his time who had a wide circle of disciples in Kūfa.\textsuperscript{4}

Shīcīte sources suggest that Zurāra played a significant role in the development of Shīcīte thought. He is one of the the most oft-quoted authorities in all the major books of the Shīʿa, be it IthnāʿAsharī or Ismāʿīlī.\textsuperscript{5} Zurāra survived al-Bāqir and became one of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Hā'irī \textit{Muntaha} p.120;
  \item Kashshī, pp.161, 167 ff.
  \item \textit{ibid.} pp.276, 347ff. See Ibn Dāwūd \textit{Rijāl} p.135 who says that Shaykh Ṭūsī in his \textit{K. al-Rijāl} has mistaken Ḥamza's title \textit{al-Tayyār} to be his father's for he writes Ḥamza b. al-Tayyār. This must be because in the \textit{K. al-Rijāl} his name is given as Ḥamza b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbdAllah al-Tayyār.
  \item Kashshī \textit{Rijāl} pp.133-61 gives a detailed account of Zurāra and his circle.
  \item See al-Kulaynī \textit{al-Kāfī} I and II passim as well as other books of tradition.
\end{itemize}
the closest adherents of al-Ṣādiq. However, later, al-Ṣādiq apparently disavowed him but Kashshi1 tells us that in order to save Zurāra, al-Ṣādiq had acted in the same way as the Prophet Khidr, when he sank a ship to save it from being taken from its owners by a tyrannous king.

Apart from Zurāra, another striking figure in Kūfa was Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Riyāḥ al-Ṭā'īfī.2 A mawlä of Thaqīf, he was a miller by trade and popularly known as al-Acwar 'the one-eyed'. He was regarded with great esteem in the jurist circles of Kūfa and happened to be the contemporary of famous jurists like Ibn Abī Layla, Abū Ḥanifa and Sharik al-Cādī. While Zurāra was a traditionist and a speculative theologian, Muḥammad b. Muslim not only had a sound knowledge of traditions but was also a practical lawyer, renowned for his quick decisions. He appears to have been a famous zāhid (ascetic)3 as well, who died in the year 150/267-8.

2. Kashshi ṭijāl, pp.169, 238.
Abū al-Qāsim Burayd b. Muḥāwiya al-ʿIjlī, an Arab by origin was yet another adherent of al-Ḥāʾirī as well as of al-Ṣādiq for he died in the year 150/267-8, the same year in which Muḥammad b. Muslim died. Burayd was a notable jurist and had a special place with both Imams, al-Ḥāʾirī and al-Ṣādiq. Al-Ḥāʾirī is believed to have promised him Paradise (as he did to Layth al-Bakhtārī al-Murādī, Muḥammad b. Muslim and Zurārā). Burayd later became one of the main authorities on Shiʿī Fiqh.

Abū Baṣīr Layth al-Bakhtārī al-Murādī was yet another follower of al-Ḥāʾirī and later of al-Ṣādiq who attained great fame as Shiʿī Faqīh (jurist) and traditionist. He was a mawla of Banū Asad. Al-Ṣādiq is believed to have said about him, Burayd, Zurārā and Muḥammad b. Muslim that they were the "tent pegs of the world" and that without them the Prophetic traditions would have been lost. They were he added, "the fastest runners and the closest associates" of the Imam.

1. Ibn Dāwūd Riḍāl p.65; Kaḥshī Riḍāl, p. 155.
2. See the paragraph below.
Abū Khālid al-Kābulī Kankar\(^1\) and Abū Ḥamza al-Thumalī\(^2\) formerly disciples of Zayn al-ʿAbidīn were also among al-Bāqir's followers. Abū Ḥamza, according to Ibn Dāwūd was a trustworthy transmitter and is believed to have written a book.\(^3\) Many traditions, especially those relating to miracles may be traced to him.\(^4\)

Abū al-Qāsim al-Fudayl b. Yasār al-Nahdī\(^5\) was another favourite of al-Bāqir and later of al-ʿAshādiq who is believed to have said of him what the Prophet had said of Salmān al-Fārisī: "Al-Fuqayl is from us, the People of the House."\(^6\)

Al-Kumayt b. Zayd\(^7\) occupied a unique place in al-Bāqir's following. He was a renowned poet of his

---

1. al-Barqi Riḍāl p.9 (he later joined the Zaydiya).
2. Ibid, also so Ibn Dāwūd Riḍāl p.77 and Kashshi’s Riḍāl pp.201ff. al-Thumalī’s actual name was Thābit b. Dinar.
5. Kashshi op. cit. pp.213f. He was an Arab from Basra. al-Barqi Riḍāl p.11.
6. Ibid. See also Rajkowski quoting Hā'irī. Muntaha p.243; Najāshī Riḍāl p.219 calls him al-Faḍl.
period and although he was a devout Shi'ite he was still friendly with al-Ṭirrimah, a Sufrite-Khārijite and a poet of the Tayyi' tribe.¹

Kumayt had a significant role to play, for his verses, devoted to the praises of the Ahl al-Bayt, the Ḥāshimiyyat were such that they could be appreciated by the public at large.² The fact that on occasion he celebrates the glory of Umayyads ought not to prejudice his sincerity to Banū Ḥāshim. This was done in order to placate the Caliph Hishām b. Abd al-Malik to whose attention his work was brought by the Viceroy of Iraq, Yusuf b. cUmar.³ At heart, Kumayt was with the Banū Hāshim. In his view the power of the Umayyads was an illegitimate one⁴ and the claims of the Banū

---

2. Kumayt does not go beyond the limits of 'tashhayu hasan' unlike al-Sayyid al-Himyarī who offended many people by vilifying the person of the first two caliphs. See Aghānī vo.7, p.41, lines 15-17, (reference quoted from Arendonk's Le Débuts p.15, n.2).
Hāshim were based on their being inheritors\(^1\) and even found support in the Qur'ān.\(^2\)

Kumayt's work has come down to us and serves as one of the most ancient evidence regarding the doctrine of Imamate.

Another striking personality in Kūfa was Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Nuḥmān al-Aḥwal.\(^3\) He was one of the most devoted adherents of al-Bāqir whose claims he defended against Zayd. He later became an equally committed followers of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and distinguished himself in theology. He was known for his sharp and stimulating answers in debates and disputes with his adversaries. He is reported to have held heated discussions with the famous scholar, Abū Ḥanifa.\(^4\) He defended the rights of the Imam and believed in complete obedience to the Imam who possesses the supreme knowledge to guide

---

1. Kumayt Hāshimīyāt verses 38 ff.

2. *ibid* verse 29 quoting Qur'ānic verses 40–46 of Sūra Ha Mim. He also quotes verse 22:42; 33:33; 17:28 and 8:42.


mankind. Sources suggest he wrote a number of works including *Kitāb al-Imama* and *K. al-radd al-Muṣṭazila fi Imamat al-Mafḍūl*.

**BAṢRA:**

The city of Baṣra was supposed to be generally anti-Shīcīte but al-Bāqir is believed to have had a few followers there as well. Muḥammad b. Marwān al-Baṣrī was one such person. He was a Kūfan by birth but living in Baṣra. In al-Kashshī's view he was a descendant of Abū al-Aswad al-Du'ālī.

Another eminent follower of al-Bāqir was Ismāʿīl b. al-Faḍl al-Hāshimi, a descendant of ʿAbd al-Muṭṭalib. He was a trustworthy transmitter, living in Baṣra. Still another adherent of al-Baqir in Basra was Mālik b. Aṣyān al-Juhání who should not be confused with his namesake, Mālik b. Aṣyān, Zurārā's brother. Al-Juhání survived his Imam, al-Bāqir and died during the lifetime of al-Ṣādiq.

1. Ibn Nadim *Fihrīst* p.176; Najāshī *op.cit.*
Burd al-Iskāf and Bassām al-Šayraft were two other narrators of both al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq but it is not known whether they were Başrans or whether they were his followers as well.

Two other associates of al-Bāqir whose residence is not known were Bashīr al-Nabbāl and Bukayr b. Aقyan b. Sunsun. They lived until al-Ṣādiq's time. Still other associates of al-Bāqir whose residential area is unknown were al-Ḥārith b. al-Mughīra al-Nasrī, Ḥabāba al-Wālibīya and Ḥabīb al-Sijistānī. Al-Ḥārith was a follower of al-Ṣādiq as well and is believed to have been extremely reliable as a narrator. Ḥabāba had been an adherent of the Imams even before the time of al-Ḥusayn, whereas Ḥabīb al-Sijistānī who was an associate of three successive Imams, Zayn al-ĊAbidīn, al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq, belonged to the Khārijites
initially, according to Ibn Dāwūd and later returned to them. Still other associates of al-Bāqir were Ḥasan b. Jabir al-Juфи, Ḥasan b. Ṣād al-Raḥmān al-Juфи, Ḥasan al-Azraq and many others.

MECCA

Al-Bāqir's group in Mecca consisted of very few notables. One of the most important fúqahá' there was Macrūf b. Kharrabudh, a mawlá of the Quraysh. His reputation as a traditionist could not be compared to that of Zurara and was sometimes regarded as weak. According to Kashshi he seems to have been of moderate Shiite attitude.

Apart from Macruf, another main figure in Mecca was Maymun b. al-Aswad al-Qaddāḥ, al-Makkī, a mawlá of the Banū Makhzūm. All sorts of legends and myths have been invented by later non-Shíite sources against this Maymun and his son Ṣād b. Ṣād b. Qaddāḥ. This has been cleared by Ivanow's painstaking research which demonstrates that the story of Ibn al-Qaddāḥ, the supposed founder of

1. Rijal pp.211,238; Ha'iri Muntaha al-Magal (Tehran, 1302) pp.304-5.
2. al-Barqi, Rijal p.15.
3. Ivanow W. The Alleged Founder of Ismailism (Bombay, 1946). See also his Rise of the Fatimids (Bombay 1942), pp.127-156.
Ismāʿīlism "is nothing but an aetiological myth" which was invented incidentally and later gradually embellished and developed during the course of transmission, both oral and written.  

According to Ivanow then, Maymūn al-Qadāh was an influential resident of Mecca, who was a devout servant of Imam Muḥammad al-Ṭāqīr and his son Jaʿfar. In his view, it is quite possible that Maymūn was a merchant of some sort and he also appears to have been in charge of the Imam's property in Mecca. Maymūn does not seem to have been educated but had an impressive personality. He had several sons, of whom ĠAbdAllāḥ appears to have gained fame as the alleged progenitor of the Ismāʿīlīs. Being in the service of the Imams, he had the chance of hearing from them and it is quite possible that he committed to writing what he heard although he seems to have had little time for the proper study of traditions. Moreover he

---

1. Ivanow, The Alleged Founder, p.2
2. ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. ĠAbdAllāḥ seems to have been at least a young man before the death of al-Ṭāqīr (see Ivanow Op. cit p.69).
restricted himself to traditions only from al-Ṣādiq. He does not seem to have been in contact with Musa al-
Kāẓim and there are no traditions reported by him from Musa al-Kāẓim. On the other hand it is possible that he may have recorded some but these were probably lost.¹

Other eminent followers of al-Bāqir were Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl b. Bazī including other members of the Bazī family,² Abū Hārūn and his namesake Abū Hārūn al-Makfuf,³ Cūqba b. Bashīr al-Asadī,⁴ Aslam al-Makki, formerly a mawlā of Ibn al-Ḥanafiya⁵ and Nājiya b. Abū Muʿadh b. Muslim al-Nahwī.⁶ It must be pointed out however, that it is difficult to determine where these above named persons lived.

Some of the other followers of al-Bāqir such as Abū al-Jārūd Ziyad b. Mundhir, Fuḍayl b. Rassān and Abū Khālid al-Wāsitī left al-Bāqir's group to join

1. ibid.
the Zaydiya movement. Still other followers of his such as Qays b. Rabia and his companion abandoned al-Baqir on account of the two different answers he gave them on two different occasions. Other followers of his such as Mughira b. Sa'id al-IjlI, Bayan b. Sim'an and Abu Mansur al-IjlI were repudiated by al-Baqir on account of their extremist views. 

There are many associates of al-Baqir listed in the Shi'a sources but it is not always easy to determine where these people lived and also whether they were intimately involved with al-Baqir. In some cases sources mention that the person mentioned belonged to such and such a school. For instance Ibn Dawud mentions Salim b. Abi Hafsa as being Zaydiya (BatrIya) and that he invented lies against the Imam.

This section cannot be comprehensive but it gives a picture of a wide and knowledgeable circle of

1. Madelung, Der Qasim pp. 44ff.
2. Nawbakhti, Firag, p. 52-55
3. See Al-Baqir and the Ghulat in Chapter three of the thesis.
4. Rijal, p.455.
adherents. The sources do not give us a clear idea of the organization of al-Baqir's Shī'a at that time yet it is nonetheless clear that there was some rudimentary organization system existing so that al-Baqir could communicate with his Shī'a and they with him.
Al-Baqir's juridical views appear to spring directly from his epistemology or theory of knowledge. Since he believed that the Imam was endowed with the hereditary *ilm which made him an exclusive source of knowledge, he and his followers maintained that 'true knowledge' was restricted only to the Imam from among the Prophet's family. Thus the whole tradition of the community was not valid as a proper source for law; only the traditions from the Imam or the traditions from the Prophet as attested by the Imams were allowed. It was this attitude of al-Baqir's school towards the majority of the early community of the Prophet's Companions that changed the legal pattern of the Shi'a in the years to come. The basis of Shi'a law and theology was to emerge from this attitude and was left to develop itself within the circle of al-Baqir's
adherents.¹

Shī'ite sources record an appropriate statement according to which Ja'far al-Ṣādiq said:—

"...Before Abū Ja'far, i.e. al-Bāqir, the Shī'ites did not know the rites of the pilgrimage and what was permitted (ḥalāl) to them and what was forbidden (ḥarām) to them. But Abū Ja'far opened these up to them and explained the rites of the pilgrimage and what was permitted and what was forbidden. Thus the people came to have need of them i.e. Shī'ites, whereas before they had had need of the people."²

This statement indicates that until the time of al-Bāqir, the Shī'ites followed the same principles as everyone else in Mecca, Medina, Kūfa and other places. It must be added however, that at the time, the division of the community was not yet deep enough and many Aghāb al-Hadīth were sympathisers and supporters of the Shī'ite cause although they never regarded

1. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen. (Berlin, 1965) p. 44. I would like to gratefully acknowledge Howard's help in translating the relevant portions of Madelung's work.

themselves as specifically Shī'a. During that period one of the determining factors was the positive-negative attitude towards the first two caliphs and the harsh-lenient attitude towards ʿUthmān. However, the reason for the establishment of the Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt does not appear to be so much in the above attitude as in the sphere of religious practice.

This was the time when the traditionists were attempting to construct total systems of the pious life. Consequently, there were conflicting opinions and discussions over points of law within the early schools of law. It is worth noting that law in Islam does not only consist of a proper legal system but also of ordinances regarding cult and ritual; it thus is an all-embracing body of religious duties. Amidst the polemical discussions of so many legal scholars, it became paramount for the followers of the Imam to have the right guidance.

The situation in which ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-ʿAbidīn found himself in after Karbalā' led him to

---

1. We know from early well-known writers that Imam Zayn-al-ʿAbidīn was one of the most outstanding and distinguished scholars of his period. See al-Tabarī, Taʾrīkh, vol. 7, p. 496; Ibn Saʿd, vol. 5 (Leiden 1905), pp. 156-164; Muslim b. al Hajjāj in his Riḍāl Urwa b. al Zubayr mentions ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn's name as being one of those who taught privately at home. Among scholars who attended his classes were Zuhrī, see f. 3-5a in the above work apud Hafiz op. cit. p.26. This manuscript is in the Zahirīya Library, Damascus, collection No. 55, (139-146).
avoid active political life and lead a dedicated religious life. Sources mention that he was one of the most prominent jurists of the time, held in respect and visited by the famous lawyers (fugahāʾ) and scholars (ulamāʾ) of Medina and elsewhere. On the other hand, al-Bāqir's epoch proved to be far more congenial as well as conducive for undertaking the systematic teaching of law to his followers. The ruling authorities appeared less hostile to the religious activities as long as they did not impinge upon political authorities.

In contrast to the ancient schools of law who accepted the common doctrine of the community, the

1. al-Tabarī Taʾrikh Vol. 7, p. 496. See also Ibn Saʿd V, p. 164, who says:-

مات علي بن حسين بالمدينة ودفن بالبقيع سنة أربع وسربع وكان يقال لهذه السنة سنة الفقيه لكثرة من مات منهم فيها.

كان علي بن حسين ثقة مأمونا كثير الحديث عاليا رفيعا ورعيًا.
Traditionists maintained that the authority of traditions (ḥadīth) from the Prophet superseded that of the community. Al-Bāqir and his followers went even further and rejected the whole tradition of the community completely; they only allowed the traditions from the Imam and from the Prophet's family as attested by the Imam as a proper source of law. Consequently, al-Bāqir's legal theory became utterly different from that of the traditionists. He thus laid the foundation of a separate school - the Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt.

Another significant contribution of al-Bāqir's school to general Islamic law was that, like the Traditionists, al-Bāqir and his followers disliked all 'human reasoning' and 'personal opinion' which had become an integral part of the living tradition of the ancient schools.²


2. Schacht, Intro. p.34
In the light of the above discussion then, Schacht's outline of the development of ShIca law seems scarcely defensible for he would have us believe that the origins of ShIca law are late and that their early works are apocryphal. Undoubtedly it is difficult to prove all that has come to us from al-Bāqir as authentic. Even if certain traditions from him are spurious, it should not lead us to assume that his entire tradition is fictitious. Living at the time when the legal theory was dominated by the struggle between two concepts: that of the common doctrine of the community and that of the authority of the traditions from the Prophet, it seems impossible that a personality as popular as al-Bāqir's (at least in the field of knowledge) would not have somehow been involved in these discussions. The vast corpus of traditions which al-Bāqir's (and his son's) followers pass on are a clear testimony to that; these traditions must, as are those of the Sunnīs, be parallel to the broad development of the school for, in essence they all go back to the period. The schools of law, thus,

2. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qāsim p.46
have clearly developed alongside each other.¹

On the one hand Schacht maintains that the division of the community was not yet deep enough to exclude the mutual influence of schools of law while, on the other hand he goes on to conclude that legal maxims that were not exclusively ShiCite could not generally be valid as firm ShiCite law. Rather, this explains itself says Madelung², the difference in the law, at all events from the SunnI side, had not yet been exaggerated into a question of belief. This happened during the third century under the growing influence of the Ahl al-Sunna wa al JamāC, representing on the one hand a strictly anti-Shicite tendency and on the other a hostility to disagreement (Ikhtilāf) in questions of law which the older law schools had largely accepted.³ Therefore, in Madelung's view, it was then possible for a question like mašh Calā al-khuffayn, rubbing the shoe or sock in ritual ablution, to be considered as a question of

---

1. Madelung, op.cit. p. 46.
2. Der Imam al-Qāsim p.47.
3. Schacht quoting ShafIC origins, p.95
belief, not because the Shī'ā had belatedly made it their own. Consequently, it is hardly fair for Schacht to state that the Zaydiya were the first Shi'ite sect to secede from the Sunnī community.¹

The Zaydiya, as mentioned previously were doctrinally divided into two main groups: the Bātīya and the Jārūdiya. As far as evidences show, the Jārūdiya were originally supporters of al-Baqir² and their beliefs which are fundamentally different from those of the Bātīya clearly depict traces of al-Baqir's school. The Jārūdiya took parts of the legal theory of al-Baqir's school and then added their own requirements to it. For instance, like al-Baqir's school they maintained that 'true knowledge' was confined to the Prophet's family but then according to the Zaydi belief that anyone from among the sons of Hasan and Ḥusayn could 'rise in rebellion' they believed that true knowledge could also be obtained from anyone of the descendants of Hasan and

2. See Chapter three.
Husayn.1

The Majmūṣ al-Fiqh2 has been regarded by many scholars as the oldest attempt at a codification of Islamic Law and Goldziher3 says that if it were a direct product of Zayd b. Ṭalib's circle then the priority of the Shī'ite branch of Islam in fiqh literature that has survived would have to be recognized. Sources4 indicate that, although the Batriya tendency was clearly dominant in the beginning yet it was the doctrine of the 'stronger' Jārūdiyya that had won eventually under the Zaydis. Their doctrine, as mentioned earlier on had been taken over from al-Bāqir's school. The writings on the

1. See the tradition of Ibn DaCi that the Fuṣayl b. Rassān and Abū Khālid al-Wāsitī claimed that every descendant of al-Hasan and Husayn resembled the Prophet in their knowledge, before they learnt anything and while they were still in their napkins. (Tabsirt al-CĀwām, p. 186). Apud, Madelung op. cit. p.48.

2. E. Griffini has published from the South Arabian treasures of the Ambrosian Library in Milan, a compendium of fiqh attributed to the founder of the Shī'ite sect of Zaydiyya entitled Majmūṣ al-fiqh of Zayd. b. Ṭalib (d. 122/740) under the title Corpus Juris di Zayd ibn Ṭalib, Milan 1919.

3. Article on 'fiqh' in SEI p. 104.

Imamate in Zaydî literature too are clearly ḽārūdîte.¹ They tend to regard the Imamate of Abû Bakr and Ĉûmar as illegitimate. The Risāla Can Zayd fī Ithbāt waṣīyat Amir al-Mu'īmīnîn² also seeks to demonstrate the illegitimacy of the first caliphs. Another work, the Kitāb al-Safwa³ attributed to Zayd is also ḽārūdîte in its view where the author laments the dissension in Muḥammad's community and wants to demonstrate that in order to be saved everyone ought to obey the relatives of the Prophet's family for they are the ones who have preserved the Qur'ān, know its proper reading and interpretation and it is they who can give orders and prohibitions according to the Prophet.

As regards the contents of Majmu' al-fiqh, it is essentially to be considered as the work of Abû Khālid

---

3. M.S. British Museum, Or. 3877 f. 72a cited by Madelung p.54. In his view inclusion of the tradition attributed to Zayd implying that God's commands were just as valid for the Prophet's family is clearly directed against the Imamites who raise the Imam above the law.
al-Wāsitī, the Jārūdīte.¹ Strothmann and Bergstrasser have already proved that the Corpus Juris owes to Zayd not much more than his name. A large portion of this corpus is included in the Amālī of Aḥmad b. Qīsa² which contains numerous traditions of al-Ṭāqir reported from Abū al-Jārūd. These include traditions on a wide range of subjects both ṭabādāt and Muḥamalāt such as divorce, drinking of nabīdah, saying "the Bismillah" loudly, inclusion of ḥayyaḥalā ḥayr al-ʾCamal, in the call to prayer, the pilgrimage rites, the maṣūḥ ṭalā al-khuffayn and other individual cases. This shows the dependence of Zayḍī law on al-Ṭāqir. Thus Shiʿa law has in al-Ṭāqir an earlier root than that of the Zayḍīya in as much as it does not derive itself from him.³ Therefore it was al-Ṭāqir who established the Madḥhab (or the legal school) of the Ahl al-Bayt.

Moreover if, as Goldziher puts it, the priority

---


2. Griffini Corpus introduction CLXXIII cited by Madelung see the details of the discussion about the corpus in Madelung op. cit. p.54.

3. Madelung, p.47
of *fiqh* literature of the Zaydis has to be recognized then in the light of the above discussion the priority of al-Bāqir's contribution to *fiqh* has to be recognised even more although there is no specific book on *fiqh* by al-Baqir.

Al-Baqir's role in *fiqh* does not seem an over exaggeration for not only does Zaydi law appear to have derived from him but Ismā'īlī law¹ and Ithnā ʿAsharī law² both record numerous traditions on *fiqh* from him and regard him as the father of *fiqh*. It is

1. *Dağım al-Islam* of Qādī al-Nūmān and especially his *K. al Igāh* contain numerous traditions of al-Baqir. This manuscript was kindly lent to me by Prof. Madelung to whom I am indebted.

2. The bulk of traditions in Kulaynī's *al-Kāfī* are from al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq.
interesting to note that Zaydī law that was finally compiled in Yemen, Ismā'īlī law in Egypt and Ithnā ʿAsharī law in Baghdad and Qumm all stem from this one personality and as such there seems little room for doubting his said role.

(b) Some legal problems common to the three Shiʿite groups — the Zaydīya, the Ithnā ʿAsharīya and the Ismā'īlīya.

The traditions that have come down to us from al-Bāqir suggest that he was more concerned with furūʿ al-fiqh rather than usūl al-fiqh. Al-Bāqir's school was not in favour of other methods used by some of the scholars during his time — principles such as raʿy (individual opinion) and qiyyās (analogy). Later this breach of legal learning i.e. usūl al-fiqh was developed even further and general Islamic law came to be based on four principles or "roots" (usūl pl. of
asl): the Qur'ān, the Sunna of the Prophet from recognised traditions, the consensus (Ijmā') of the scholars of the community and the method of reasoning by analogy (qiyaṣ). The last two have little relevance in al-Bāqir's school for it is the Imam who is looked to in case of any gaps in the tradition or in case of any problem that arises in the community. Indirectly this also indicates the necessity of the Imam of the time not only at one given time but in all times to come in all changing circumstances thus showing that the Qur'ān and Sunna on its own were not enough as sources of law but needed a "true interpreter" which could only be found in the Imam of the time.

For the sake of brevity, not all that has been related from al-Bāqir can or will be dealt with but certain selections will be made in order to demonstrate his concern with furuṣ al-fiqh. An attempt will be made in the following

1. This has not been possible for the Zaydis and Ithnā Asharīs. The latter, after their twelfth Imam's occultation, have had to develop their own roots/principles of law. So in reality it is only the Ismā'īlīs who enjoy this privilege of looking to the Imam. (See Coulson, History of Islamic law). Qāḍī al-Nu'mān in his Ikhtilāf usūl al-madhāhib ed. by M. Ghālib (Beirut, 1973) p.51 gives madhāhib al-a'imma as a third source besides Qur'ān and Sunna of the Prophet.
pages to deal with the main features of the legal problem that are mostly common to all the three Shi'ite groups with a brief discussion to show that these legal points belong to the early period contrary to the statements of some scholars and that these were being taught and expounded by al-Bāqir at the time when other jurists in the early schools of law were discussing and arguing over them.

(i) **Mash' ala al-Khuffayn**

A tradition from Abū Ishāq al-Sablūlī (d.128/9) in Shi'ite works suggests that until al-Bāqir forbade them people used to wipe/moisten their socks/sandals in ritual ablution (**mash' ala al-Khuffayn**) under certain circumstances instead of washing their feet. As pointed out earlier Schacht suggested that this only later became a distinctive point of difference between the Shi'ites who rejected it and the Sunnis who in opposition to them considered it as valid. However,

---


2. **Origins**, p.263
there is enough evidence to suggest that the masb was a controversial issue among the scholars and jurists long before the sectarian barriers became firmly established. The dispute revolves around the interpretation of the last line of the Qur'ānic ayat on wudu':

"O Ye who believe, when you arise to pray, wash your faces and your arms to the elbows and wipe your heads and your feet to the ankles"

\[(\text{wa-}'\text{msabū bi-ru'ūsikum wa arjulikum, arjulikum})\]

according to the Shī'īs and therefore dependent on the preposition bi while the Sunnis read arjulakum which then becomes the object of the verb aghsilū "wash").

Al-Ṭabarī in his Tafsīr\textsuperscript{2} has preserved traditions

1. Qur'ān V:6 There are many points (e.g. elbows-to or from, extent of the face, wetting the beard etc.) in this āya that became a subject of disputes but we shall be dealing with the masb as it happened to be the area where the greatest dispute occurred.

on both these readings from early scholars which points to the fact that the issue was indeed argued over early in Islam. This also shows that the Shiite view was held by some scholars at the very beginning of the development of Islamic jurisprudence.

Schacht¹ maintains that the prohibition of the practice of the masb by the Shīa is late, for no mention of it is made in the Sunni creed of the second century² but then says that the Sunnis themselves were not too sure of the masb thus defeating his own argument. Basing his claim on al-Shāfī's discussion of masb³, Schacht then goes on to assert that the discussion about the masb started between the Traditionists and the ancient schools in Medina, not between the Shiites and the Sunnis. Yet what has come down to us of al-Bāqir's traditions from all three Shiite sources Zaydi⁴, Ismai⁵ and

1. Origins p. 263
2. Abū Ḥanīfa does not mention it in his Fiqh Akbar while mentioning other points of difference from the Shiites.
3. Origins p. 263-4
4. al-Murādī, Amālī Ahmad b. Cīsā f.234
5. al-Qādī al-Nuwmān, Sharḥ al-Akhlāq f.68; Daqa'im II p.133.
Ithnāʾī Ashārī, seems to maintain that the Shiʿite prohibition of mash goes back to the time of al-Baqir.

(ii) Nabīdh

This was another area where al-Baqir's school differed from the Kufan jurists. Nabīdh is a comprehensive designation used for all intoxicating drinks, several varieties of which were known and produced in early Arabia, such as mizr from barley, ḏīḥ from honey and faḍīkh from different kinds of dates. It is believed that as grapes were scarce in Arabia, 'wine' was usually prepared from varieties of dates and only exceptionally from grapes. The question was whether the prohibition of wine included that of intoxicating drinks. The difficulty in this matter arose because people were accustomed to preparations of all kinds

1. al-Kulayni al-Kāfī III, p.32
2. See art on "nabīdh" in SEI by A.J. Wensinck, p.428 where references are given for these different varieties.
3. Ibid.
of dates, from raisins and other fruits, drinks which only became inebriating if they were preserved a long time and probably also if they were prepared by special methods. Therefore it was difficult to determine the line of demarcation between the allowed and the prohibited kind.

Al-Bāqir was known to have prohibited all intoxicating drinks (muskir) including nabīdhn. He did allow fresh fruit juices that had been kept for a day and a night on condition that it had not become intoxicating for then, even a little of it was forbidden. All three schools of the Shi'a as well as the three of the four Sunni ones prohibit the use of nabīdh. The Ḥanafis, on the other hand, allow it with some moderation.

1. For more details see arts on "Khamr" in EI² and also in SEI by A.J. Wensinck.
2. Qādī al-Nuṣrān Da'ī'īm al Islam II p. 130.
3. al-Murādī Amālī f. 224b; al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī III p.32. The tradition in the Amālī is from al-Bāqir's son al-Ṣādiq.
4. al-Qādī Da'ī'īm II p. 126
Although the tradition prohibiting nabīdh is to be found in Zaydī sources, yet Zayd himself has been accused of drinking nabīdh by IthnāṢašāri writers.\(^1\) It is believed that a man once approached al-Bāqir asking him what was his opinion regarding nabīdh for he had seen Zayd drinking it. To this al-Bāqir is said to have replied that he was not ready to believe that Zayd would drink it but then even if he did, he was neither a Prophet nor a trustee of the Prophet and therefore he may sometimes be right and sometimes wrong. It is quite likely that this tradition may have no basis, considering the enmity between Zayd and al-Bāqir.

(iii)Al-Jahr bi-bismillāh

Shīṣite sources of all three origins normally tend to mention the mash and the nabīdh together in a tradition of al-Bāqir along with one other aspect (that does not seem to be common among them.) But the

---

1. Al-Kashshīṣī Ṣīrāj p. 232. This, however seems to be the usual smear between religious rivals. IsmāṢīlī is also accused of drinking wine by IthnāṢašāri sources.
Zaydi and the Isma'ili sources mention the third point as being al-Jahr bi-bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim, i.e., saying the Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim loudly as opposed to others who only whisper it, while the Ithnai Ashari record the third point as being mutcat al-bajj. However, the Ithnai Asharis, although not mentioning the Bismillah al-Rahman al-Rahim with the nabidh and mash, yet are not opposed to it. They too believe that the Bismillah al-Rahim should be recited loudly but to them it does not appear to be as important as to the Zaydis and to the Isma'ili who consider it to be among the three things in which Taqiya cannot be observed as can be seen from the following tradition of al-Baqir's

1. al-Muradi, op. cit. f. 224b.
2. al-Qadi K. al-Idah f. 117 a b., 118 b. See also Da'aim p. 193 where the tradition is from al-Sadiq.
3. Malik, Muwatta I p. 81 says not to say it loudly.
4. al-Kulayni, al-Kafi III p. 32
5. al-Kulayni, al-Kafi III p. 313.
son, al-ṣādiq

On the other side, the Zaydīs and the Ismāʿīlīs not only do not mention the mutʿat al-hajj as one of the three things not bound by Taqīya but they oppose it completely although the Zaydī sect of the Jārūdīya are said to have permitted it. 2

1. al-Qāḍī, Daʿā'im i p. 133, 193. al-Qāḍī p. 193 mentions a tradition which has been reported on the authority of the Messenger, ʿAlī, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, ʿAlī Zayn al-ʿAbidīn, Muḥammad al-Bāqir and ʿAṭfar al-ṣādiq saying that all of them used to say the Bismillāh loudly in Sūra al-Fatīha and at the beginning of the Sūra in each rukuʿ. ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn said that all the children of Fāṭima are agreed in that.

2. See art. on Mutʿa by W. Heffening p. 418-420 in SEI where further references are given to this. Also see Howard I.K.A. "Mutʿa marriage reconsidered in the context of the formal procedures for Islamic marriage", Journal of Semitic Studies, vol. 20 (Spring, 1975) pp. 82-92 who feels that because the Jārūdīya were formerly supporters of al-Bāqir, this could mean that he did actually hold the doctrine.
(iv) MutCat al-Hajj

Another name for this is tamattu<sup>c</sup> which is one of the three types of pilgrimages, the other two being girān which involves combining the umra and hajj and the ifrād that prescribes the full rites of the hajj to be performed quite separate from the Cumra<sup>1</sup>. The tamattu<sup>c</sup> form of the pilgrimage emphasizes a separation between the Cumra and the hajj but within the same visit. In this type the pilgrim, after having performed the opening rites, makes a minor sacrifice of hair (taqṭir - trimming of hair) and leaves the state of consecration (iḥrām)<sup>2</sup> until the time he resumes the rites of the hajj. During this period he is not bound by any of the restrictions of iḥrām and he enjoys normal life which includes sexual relations as well.


2. Ibid. pp. 30 ff.
The problem in this context arose because the tamattu\textsuperscript{C} form of pilgrimage could involve the other mut\textsuperscript{C}a, mut\textsuperscript{C}at al-nis\textsuperscript{A} for the pilgrim who performed the cumra as early as the month of Shawwal or Dhu-al Qa\textsuperscript{C}da would resume normal life until the time of hajj. During this time, if he happened to be away from his family, he would perhaps contract a temporary marriage which is concluded for a fixed term, at the end of which it is dissolved automatically.

This kind of marriage is of special interest as it happens to be one of the main areas of controversy not only between the Sunn\textsuperscript{I}s and Ithn\textsuperscript{A} Ashari Sh\textsuperscript{I}a but also between the latter and the Zaydi and Isma\textsuperscript{I} Il Sh\textsuperscript{I}i. The Quranic verse\textsuperscript{1} that is generally supposed to embody the sanction of the mut\textsuperscript{C}a marriage in the standard version is:

1. Qur'an IV : 24
"and all (women) besides these are made lawful for you, provided that you seek (them) with your property marrying (them) without committing fornication, then as to those by (marrying) whom you seek content (famā istamta'ūm bihi minhunna), pay them their rewards as a duty, and there is no blame on you about what you mutually agree after that which is stipulated."

In this version, the above verse does not seem to sanction mutca in any way unless one is to understand "mutca" by the word "istimtāa". However, Ibn Ābbās, Ibn Mas'ūd and Ubayy read the phrase "ila ajalin musamā (up to a fixed period) after the words "famā istamta'ūm bihi minhunna", a reading which supports the view that mutca was sanctioned in the Qur'ān. On the other hand, it is quite possible that this type of marriage was not sanctioned, but was conceded by the Prophet as a matter of expediency. For, it is significant to note that the bulk of his traditions referring to mutca are about the pilgrimage or campaigns. According to various traditions, the Prophet subsequently prohibited


2. V.M. Daudpota and A.A.A. Fyzee, "Notes on Mutca or temporary marriage in Islam" JBFRAS (Bombay, 1932) 8 p. 83.

3. See art on "Mutca" in EI1 by Heffening.
it\textsuperscript{1}, thus supporting the belief that like wine, this practice was gradually abolished.

However, the Ithnā\textsuperscript{2} Shī\textsuperscript{3} regard mut\textsuperscript{ca} marriage as valid up to the present day. They maintain that a divinely revealed institution could not be abrogated except by a divine revelation or by the Commandment of an Infallible (\textit{ma\textsuperscript{c}gūm}) Imam. They further assert that the sanction of mut\textsuperscript{ca} has also been given by their Imams.\textsuperscript{2}

What is significant here is that the traditions found in the three Shī\textsuperscript{c}ite sources of Zayd\textsuperscript{1}, Ismā\textsuperscript{III} and Ithnā\textsuperscript{2} Shī\textsuperscript{3} origin appear to be contradictory in this particular case. The traditions are handed down by the same Imams, al-Bāqir and his son al-Ṣādiq

---

1. Muslim \textit{Sahīh} Vol. 9 p. 184-185; Zayd, \textit{Majmū\textsuperscript{C}} pp. 328-9; al-Qāḍī Mukhtāṣar \textit{al-Athār} vol II p. 248 - for details see Daudpota and Fyzee "Notes on Mut\textsuperscript{ca} ...." \textit{op. cit.} pp. 87 ff. Also ref. al-Qāḍī's \textit{Da\textsuperscript{c}ā\textsuperscript{im}} vol II pp. 216, 226.

2. al-Kulayn\textsuperscript{1} al-Kāf\textsuperscript{ii} III p. 32 where mut\textsuperscript{cat} al-hajj is mentioned along with māṣḥ and nābīḍh. Also see his \textit{vol} IV p. 291 and al-Ṭūsī's \textit{Nīhāya} p. 206. The bulk of their traditions go back in fact only to two Imams, al-Bāqir and his son al-Ṣādiq.
in all three sources. Ithnā CAsharī writers like to believe that the traditions in Zaydī and Ismaīlī sources are a later fabrication but this can be considered a mere assumption on their part as the core of the traditions in all three sources go back to the same period.

(v) The Adhān or Call to the ritual prayer

This is another matter of dispute between the Shiʿīs and the Sunnis. But unlike the mutca, the Shiʿīs of all three origins are agreed on the view that ʿUmar had tampered with the formula of the adhān and caused one of the formulas to be dropped. This

1. It is interesting to note that in this respect Qādī al-Nuʿmān relied on Zaydī tradition and disregarded the Imami sources on which he generally relied. See Madelung's art. "The Sources of Ismaīlī Law" JNES 35 (1976) pp. 32-3.


3. al-Qādī K. al-Īdāh f. 41 b; Also see his Daʿīs'īm p. 182, al-Murādī Amālī f. 24 b; al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, al-Īdāh pp. 201-202.
formula, the Shi'ia assert was ḥayya ʿala Khayr al-
camal{1} but Umar, fearing that people would give
preference to prayers than jihād gave such orders
as to have that formula removed.

As this is a serious allegation, it calls for a
brief discussion as to whether this formula did belong
to the adhān at an early period or whether the Shi'ia
had conjectured the whole thing and made it belatedly
their own. The early jurists and the traditionists
have passed over in silence on this issue and therefore
it would seem as though the Shi'ia have imagined the
whole thing up. However, some evidence regarding
it has been preserved in Shaybānī's recension of
Mālik's Muwatta{2} giving us an indication that the
formula did belong to the adhān at a much earlier

1. al-Qāḍī k. al ʿIdāh f. 44 b; Da ḡa'im I p. 172
   al-Murādī op. cit. al-Faḍl b. Shāhān op. cit.
   The full formula for the Shi'ia adhān would thus
   run as follows: (i) Allahu Akbar (ii) Ashhadu an
   la ilāh illa Allah (iii) Ashhadu anna Muḥammadan
   Rasūl Allāh (iv) Hayya ʿala al-ṣalat (v) Hayya
   ʿala' al-falaḥ (vi) Hayya ʿala Khayr al-camal
   (vii) Allahu akbar (viii) La ilāh illā'Allāh.
   The Sunni adhān does not have number (vi) See
   Th. W. Juynboll art. adhān EI{2}

2. al-Muwatta'- recension of al-Shaybānī (Cairo,
   1976) p. 55
period. The tradition recorded by Shaybānī which has a standard Medinan īsnād (Mālik - Nāfi - Ibn ʿUmar) says that Ibn ʿUmar sometimes used to recite bayyā ṣaḥīḥ khayr al-camal after bayyā ṣaḥīḥ al-falāḥ. One may perhaps doubt the authenticity of such a tradition; but in this case there is hardly any room for doubt as it is used for a practice that was no longer in use. It must be noted however that Shaybānī rejects this practice saying that nothing that did not belong to the adhān should be added to it. Yet, it is significant that this tradition is not to be found in Yahyā b. Yahyā al-Laythī's recension of the Muwatta and in fact seems to have been submerged by all Sunni sources until it reappears in Ibn Hazm who also rejects it as a fabrication.

Shīʿite sources of all three origins record traditions from al-Bāqir saying that the formula was

4. al-Qāḍī - K. al ʿIdāh f. 41b, 44b; Daʿā'im p. 182 al-Murādī - Amālī f 24-25; al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, al-ʿIdāh p. 201-202;
originally there but was later removed by cUmar. Since all the three sources independently support the fact that al-Baqir did make this statement and since the tradition regarding it has been mentioned in Shaybānī's recension of Mālik's Muwattā', it seems quite likely that the formula did in fact belong to the early period and it is also possible that it may have been removed during cUmar's caliphate. However, if we are to accept the suggestion that as the form of the adhān had not been fixed, the formula of ḥayya Cala khayr al ġamal may have been added to by the Ahl al Bayt after the martyrdom of _VCusayn_ to emphasize the quiescent policy of the Imams, then we shall have to retract the former conclusion about the possibility of the formula being removed during cUmar's time. For, the martyrdom of _VCusayn_ comes much later after cUmar's time so how could the formula be removed during his time when it was introduced afterwards? In that case either one has to forget that cUmar ever tampered with the

adhan or have to maintain that the Imams reintroduced (instead of introduced) this barred formula after Husayn's martyrdom.

(vi) Qunūt

The term qunūt which came to mean imprecation against political enemies during ritual prayer, may originally not have meant that. For the Qur'ānic phrase wa qunūt li'llāhī gānitin which follows the words "Keep the salawāt and the salāt al wusta" does not seem to indicate that meaning literally and commentators have suggested its meaning to be either a state of submission or supplication. Al-Ṭabarī also gives no suggestion that qunūt means "cursing enemies" and neither does the Lisān al Ārab. Most commentators of the

1. II: 238
2. Supplication may include cursing although not necessarily see SEI p. 271 art. Kunūt by A.J. Wensinck saying there is no unanimity among lexicographers about its meaning.
3. Ṭabarī Tafsīr V 228-237 (new edition)
4. Ibn Manzūr Lisān al- Ārab section on
hadiṯūn seem to maintain that ġunūt is a standing recitation usually connected in meaning with ḏuqā'ī. The traditions that have come down to us about ġunūt are very conflicting, some favouring it, others either rejecting it altogether, or restricting it to certain prayers. Yet others state that the prophet had said it only during a certain period and then abandoned it. Except Abu Hanifa who excluded ġunūt from all prescribed prayer, others mainly seem to dispute whether the ġunūt is allowed in all prayers or restricted to a certain prayer i.e. the ǧalāt al-wusta.

1. Muslim, K. al-Imān trad 100; Nawawī, Tirmidhī Ǧalāt bab 168. See for more details the art. on ġunūt in SEI by A.J. Wensinck.

2. Shāfiʿī, K. al-Umm VII 285-7

3. See Schacht Origins pp. 267-8 for more references

4. Abū Yusūf K. al-Athār 69 dislikes ġunūt in general but allows it in ṭifr. He includes a tradition from Ǧalī saying "Praise Allah, bless the Messenger and ask (help) for yourself." This does not specifically imply cursing.

5. Schacht Origins pp. 267-8

6. This tallies with the views of the Murji'ites who endeavoured not to get involved with disputes, about the merits of the Companions. See art. EI. "Murji'ā" by A.J. Wensinck.
This dispute stems from the interpretation of the above mentioned Qur'ānic verse namely whether gānitīn refers to all the prayers or only to salāt al-wusta. Malik\(^1\) thinks it is salāt al-wusta which for him is the fajr prayer. Strothmann\(^2\) and Goldziher\(^3\) believe that the Zaydis also followed the Malikis although the traditions in the Amāli Ahmad b. Cisa\(^4\) from al-Bāqir reported by Abū al-Jārūd does not specify the times of qunūt. Traditions in Iṣmaʿīlī sources\(^5\) maintain that the qunūt prayer has many aspects to it showing that there is nothing fixed for qunūt. Thus it can be said at any time in all prayers if one so wishes and it does not necessarily involve cursing. Ithnā ʿAsḥarī sources\(^6\) refer gānitīn to all prayers and so does Shāfī\(^7\).

1. Malik Muwattā' I 159, 139
2. See Howard, Imami Shi'ī Ritual p. 284 note 205
3. Ibid.
4. The traditions only say that he heard Abū Ja'far (al-Bāqir) saying that the Prophet and ʿAlī used to curse men in qunūt, naming them specifically. See f. 37b.
5. DaCā'im I p. 246
6. al-Kāfī III 339-40 and al-Barqī op. cit II p. 324
7. K. al-Umm VII pp. 285-7 has traditions from al-Bāqir and al-Sadiq supporting qunūt in all prayers
(vii) Salat al Janaza

The funeral prayer is yet another subject of dispute between the Sunnis and the Shafs. The Sunnis maintain it should consist of four takbir while the Shafs of all origin say it is five. Both groups claim their final authority to be the Prophet whose practice according to the traditions that have come down to us seems to have varied from time to time as well as from person to person. There are reports maintaining that the Prophet used to either say four or five or six takbir. This practice was carried on by the first caliph but was standardized to four takbir by the second caliph, Umar on the basis of the last funeral service performed by the Prophet.


2. Abu Yusuf in his K. al-Athar p. 79 reports a tradition from Ibrahim al-Nakha'i. Also see Howard, Imam Shi' Ritual p. 172 for more details.

3. Ibid. The Zaydhs preserve a similar account without Umar's search for the last funeral service performed by the Prophet or his conclusion from it.
was reported to have said up to seven takbîrs.¹

Mālik² and al-Shāfî³ both follow the practice of four takbîrs, although elsewhere Shāfî does record traditions that ĀlĪ had said five or six takbîrs at one funeral⁴. As late as the fifth century, Ibn Hazm⁵ records the names of some Companions⁶ saying five takbîrs. This shows that the matter was disputed early in Islam and that the Shi’a have not made this doctrine belatedly their own.

These are but few of the legal problems that were being discussed and argued over during the late first and early second centuries of Islam. In his

1. Zaydī tradition from Zayd b. ĀlĪ who reports that ĀlĪ used to say four, five, six or seven takbîrs but he himself states that there are five takbîrs. Ibid.
3. K. al-Umm I 239.
4. Ibid I, 251; VII 156
5. Ibn Hazm K. al-Muballa V 124
6. Among them were Zayd b. al-Arqam, Ibn Mas‘ūd and ĀlĪ.
own group and to others who came to ask his views, al-Bāqir was also giving his own specific views of these and other legal matters as can be seen from the above discussion. Besides the points already discussed, other problems that were being expounded at the time by al-Bāqir and others were the ḳhiyār al-Majlis (the right of option given to a party in a sale as long as they had not separated), the rites of pilgrimage, the right to sell the umm al-walad and many other points. This makes him the first Imam to systematically undertake the teaching of law to his followers in particular and others in general.
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, although al-Bāqir eschewed active political action, he had a significant role to play in history, both from the intellectual point of view as well as from the religious angle. He emerges as a versatile scholar conversant not only in matters of rites and rituals but also on the exegesis of Qur'ān, the traditions of the Prophet, questions pertaining to law as such, as well as theological topics of both mundane and spiritual nature. It is also significant to note that before al-Bāqir's time Shi'ite learning appeared limited. Then, suddenly in his time, there is a sudden profusion of knowledge on various aspects as seen by the vast number of traditions that have come down from him. This makes him the first Imam of the Shi'ite from whom such knowledge has been preserved and in fact because of his times he was also the first Imam to engage in systematic teaching.

At the time when al-Bāqir lived, there were many groups who, being dissatisfied with the reigning rulers began denouncing them in different ways - some resorting to political action, some acquiesing and some diverting their energies to religious learning. Among
the dissatisfied were groups of Shiites; many among them publicly denounced the Umayyads and wanted to take immediate political action against them. They placed before the people a hope of a deliverer which they said could only come from the Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet. This last aspect was exploited by many. Thus the various groups such as Mukhtar and the Kaysanlya in its various branches, the Zaydiya and its sister branches as well as other Alids like al-Hasan al-Muthanna propagating for his son, al-Nafs al-Zakiya all had a different concept about the Imam and the Imamate.

In order to bring some sort of order in the chaos that had thus occurred as well as the resulting confused concept of Imamate, al-Baqir put forward his own theory of Imamate which had Qur'ân and Hadîth as its bases. He also explained the necessary qualities that an Imam must possess such as nagg, IIm, Nûr, Isma and others that distinguished the Imam from others and made him al-afdal al-Nâs, the best of mankind. In this manner, he declared himself as the representative of God on earth and the divine interpreter of His words. By demonstrating his role in providing true knowledge in this world and in providing intercession in the hereafter, al-Baqir also proposed a theory of Imamate that was not necessarily rebellious and which therefore did not
depend on political power. This was quite timely as many had come to believe by then that the Imam is not an Imam unless he bids for political power. This theory of al-Ḍāqir's suited the reigning Umayyads very well who thus left him in peace to pursue the intellectual and religious activities.

This was also the time when the pious were beginning to construct total systems of their life and providing an ethical code for the followers of its precepts. This resulted in varying interpretations given by the various scholars on a variety of questions. Amidst this, evidence shows that al-Ḍāqir, being an eminent and distinguished scholar of ḥadīth, numerous people came to him for advice regarding many problems as well as about the traditions of the Prophet on which he was considered a reliable authority.

Another area where al-Ḍāqir played a significant role was in the enhancement of the Prophetic traditions. Just before his time, Sunna used to be considered as the 'custom' of the particular place and many scholars used to give judgements according to the 'custom' of their own particular area rather than according to the traditions of the Prophet. Along
with the 'pious movement', al-Bāqir emphasized the importance of the traditions of the Prophet but whereas the former included the traditions of the whole community, al-Bāqir only accepted traditions of the Prophet as attested by the Imams from the Prophet's family.

The above attitude of al-Bāqir distinguished them from the rest of the community and formed the bases from which Shī'ā law and theology emerged. He thus became instrumental in founding a separate school, the Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt having different views on many aspects of fiqh such as mash' al-Kalā al-khuffayn, nabi' dh, adhān, jarh bībismillah and such other legal problems. Moreover like the Ashbāb al-Hadīth, al-Bāqir and his school also rejected the use of ra'ī (opinion) and qiyaṣ (analogy) when giving judgements on juridical questions. Thus, amidst the varying interpretations given by the different scholars, al-Bāqir's followers were able to seek advice and guidance from him on these various legal matters and this also distinguished them from others.

Al-Baqir also contributed to the theological doctrines concerning Ḥīmān, taqiyya, qāda' wa al-qadar, the unity of God as well as a host of other related topics
that were being discussed and hotly debated in his time.

Thus, al-Bāqir emerges not only as a head of a particular group, having founded a separate school and providing a basis for them but he also comes forth as one of the most distinguished scholars of the period disseminating knowledge on all aspects to the general public.
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