

**INTRODUCTION**  
**to**  
***Kitāb al-Irshād***



**INTRODUCTION**  
**to**  
*Kitāb al-Irshād*

*by:*

ash-Shaykh Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ja‘farī

WOFIS  
World Organization for Islamic Services  
Tehran – Iran

Translated from the Arabic.  
First edition 1425/2004

© WOFIS, Tehran.  
All right reserved.

No part of this publication may be  
reproduced by any process  
without written permission  
of the copyright owner.

*E-mail:* wofis@wofis.com  
*http:* //www.wofis.com

*Annotated and Published by:*  
World Organization for Islamic Services,  
P.O.Box 11165-1545,  
Tehran – 15837,  
**ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.**

***In the Name of Allāh  
The All-Compassionate, The All-Merciful***

*Praise belongs to Allāh, the Lord of all Being;  
the All-Compassionate, the All-Merciful;  
the Master of the Day of Judgement.  
Thee only we serve; and to Thee alone we pray  
for succour.*

*Guide us in the straight path,  
the path of those whom Thou hast blessed,  
not of those against whom Thou art wrathful,  
nor of those who are astray.*

\* \* \* \* \*

*O' Allāh! Send your blessings to the head of  
your messengers and the last of  
your prophets,  
Muḥammad and his pure and cleansed progeny.  
Also send your blessings to all your  
prophets and envoys.*

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ  
أَلْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ أَلْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ  
مَلِكِ يَوْمِ الدِّينِ إِلَهِكَ عِبَادُ إِلَهِكَ دَسْتَعِينُ  
أَهْدِنَا الصِّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ صِرَاطَ الَّذِينَ  
أَنْعَمْتَ عَلَيْهِمْ غَيْرِ الْمَغْضُوبِ عَلَيْهِمْ  
وَلَا الضَّالِّينَ

اللَّهُمَّ صَلِّ عَلَى  
سَيِّدِ رُسُلِكَ وَخَاتَمِ أَنْبِيَائِكَ  
مُحَمَّدٍ وَآلِهِ الطَّيِّبِينَ الطَّاهِرِينَ  
وَصَلِّ عَلَى جَمِيعِ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ وَالرُّسُلِ

## CONTENTS

	Page
TRANSLITERATION.....	xi
FOREWORD:	
In Arabic.....	xiii
In English.....	xv
1. <i>AL-IRSHĀD</i>	
The Name of the Book.....	1
The Redership.....	2
2. IMĀMATE:	
Definition of Imāmate.....	6
Conditions for an Imām.....	6
<i>an-Naṣṣu 'l-Jaliyy</i> and <i>an-Naṣṣu 'l-Khafiyy</i> .....	9
3. SHĪ'AH SECTS:.....	
The First Category:.....	11
1. al-Ghulāt (The Extremists).....	12
2. az-Zaydiyyah.....	12
The Second Category:.....	12
a) The Ismā'īliyyah, b) The Fataḥiyyah, and	
c) The Wāqifah.....	12
A. The Ismā'īliyyah.....	13
Ismā'īlī Sources.....	14
Ismā'īl's Birth.....	16
Ismā'īl's Death.....	18
Ismā'īl's Imāmate.....	24

B. The Khaṭṭābiyyah:	
The Khaṭṭābiyyah and Ismā‘īl's Imāmate.....	25
Ismā‘īlism.....	32
<i>Aḥādīth</i> of aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) denying Ismā‘īl's Imāmate...41	
<i>Aḥādīth</i> of aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) on designation of	
al-Kāzim (‘a.s.) to Imāmate.....	42
The Concept of <i>al-Badā’</i> and Ismā‘īl.....	43
The <i>Ghaybah</i> of Ismā‘īl.....	45
C. Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl:	
Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl's Birth.....	48
Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl's Death.....	51
Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl's Imāmate.....	54
Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl and The Maymūniyyah link.....	55
Ismā‘īllīs and the Designation of al-Kāzim (‘a.s.) as	
Imām.....	60
Muḥammad and ‘Alī ibn Ismā‘īl in Shī‘ite Literature.....	62
D. ash-Shaykhu ‘I-Mufīd's Theological Arquments on:	
The Ismā‘īliyyah.....	69
The Fataḥiyyah.....	72
The Wāqifah.....	73
NOTES:.....	78
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	95
INDEX.....	105







INTRODUCTION  
to  
*Kitāb al-Irshād*

## 1. AL-IRSHĀD

§1. In his biography of ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd, Dr. Howard, the translator of *Kitāb al-Irshād* (The Book of Guidance), has reviewed the intellectual and social aspects of the author's life. On our part, we also have done so in the biographies of the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah theologians in the introduction to the English translation of "Kitābu 't-Tawhīd" of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*. Therefore, we shall neither repeat anything here nor comment on what Dr. Howard has written – in spite of some points of disagreement that we have with him – because such differences can be seen by comparing the two discussions.

Here, however, we shall only comment on some important points related to the book, *al-Irshād*, itself.

\* \* \* \* \*

**The Name of the Book:** The title of the book "*al-Irshād*" has been mentioned without any genitive construction in both *al-Fihrist* of ash-Shaykhu 'ṭ-Ṭūsī and *al-Fihrist* of an-Najāshī<sup>1</sup> as well as in most of the later sources<sup>2</sup> who apparently followed the former two bibliographical works. This is how *al-Irshād* became the famous title for the book.

However, in many ancient and later references, and also in many manuscript copies of the book, the title appears in a more

complete form as *al-Irshād fī ma'rifat ḥujajī 'llāh 'ala 'l-'ibād*. The same title also appears in the *ijāzah* (permission) for narrating the book issued by the famous Imāmī traditionalist, Rashīdu 'd-Dīn, Abū Ja'far, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Shahrāshūb as-Sarawī al-Māzandarānī (489/1096–588/1192) for as-Sayyid Muḥyi 'd-Dīn, Muḥammad ibn 'Abdillāh ibn 'Alī ibn Zuhrah al-Ḥusaynī al-Ḥalabī (566/1171–636/1239).<sup>3</sup> Similarly, the full title appears in another *ijāzah* given to al-Ḥalabī by the famous Shī'ah jurist, ash-Shaykh Abū Ja'far, Muḥammad ibn Idrīs al-Ḥillī (543/1148 – 598/1202).<sup>4</sup>

The author (r.a.)<sup>\*</sup>, himself has not described the title in the book; yet the longer title is descriptive of the purpose for which the book was written as mentioned in the author's introduction.

**§2. The Readership:** *al-Irshād* was written for the lay readership, according to their requirements, and in a form appropriate for the general level of education prevailing at al-Mufīd's time so that every reader and listener may benefit from it. Therefore, the writer (r.a.) was bound to write in brief and to the point as he himself has mentioned in the introduction, the epilogue and at various other places in the book.

The only style adopted by the author is of description and narration – just as the historical events are described in books of history and just as the *aḥādīth* are narrated in the books of *ḥadīth* – without providing, for what he has written, any proof or evidence except by quoting *ḥadīth* and history. This is the style to which every reader and every listener's mind is moulded. Indeed, the writer (r.a.), succeeded in his objective, since the book *al-Irshād* – although written a thousand years ago – has become one of the important sources for oratory in Imāmiyyah gatherings, especially in the memorial ceremonies for the Master of the Martyrs, al-Imām al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī (may the blessings

---

\* *Raḥimahu 'llāh*, i.e., May Allāh have mercy upon him.

and peace of Allāh be upon him and all those who sacrificed their lives with him). Even today, the lecturers and the orators of the *maq̣tal*<sup>5</sup> depend on it, at times even read directly from it. May Allāh reward the writer on our behalf – the community of Imāmiyyah – with the best of His rewards!

This is the reason why the writer (r.a.), did not resort to the polemical and theological style of writing which relies on rational arguments and scientific terminology – from philosophy, theology and the principles of jurisprudence – which cannot be complete without going into details, identifying the weak points, highlighting the ambiguous aspects, quoting differing views for each issue that he propounds, analyzing them and preferring one view and refuting the other as is the common practice of the theological and philosophical studies. In short, the author (r.a.), has refrained from the theological style of writing; and, therefore, it would not be correct to consider the book as anything but a reflection of ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd's perspective in history and *ḥadīth*; it cannot be considered as a sample of his theological and polemical style of writing. In the following pages, we shall mention some examples clarifying the difference between the style he has adopted in this book and the style of theologians he has adopted elsewhere when discussing the same issue.

§3. In order to combine the style of relying on the narration without analyzing them minutely or without employing profound rational thinking, on the one hand, and the exercise of convincing the reader about the validity of the narration, on the other hand, ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd has relied – in his narration of the lives of the Imāms ('a.s.)\*, and their distinctive characteristics – in most instances on what has been mentioned by the

---

\* 'Alayhi/'alayhā/'alayhima or 'alayhimu 's-salām (i.e., Peace be upon him/her or them)

neutral historians and biographers. I do not say that the attribute of neutrality can be applied to all of them and to all that they narrate, nor do I claim that the accusation of partiality and sectarian bias in presenting historical events for religious or political motivations are applicable to the sources not used by al-Mufīd. I leave aside this discussion about the affiliations of the historians, narrators and jurists to the rulers, and that they choose to ignore whatever the rulers wanted to be ignored and that they presented favourably whatever the rulers wanted to be presented favourably. At this stage, I would just like to state that the biased and official historians have ignored the lives of the later Imāms of *Ahlu 'l-bayt* ('a.s.), except where the events were connected to the rulers and the caliphs. This is the reason why ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd was compelled to rely on the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah narrators when discussing the Imāms of *Ahlu 'l-bayt* ('a.s.), who came after the first Islamic century.

§4. The style of brevity which al-Mufīd has imposed on himself in *al-Irshād* has compelled him in many instances to rely on a single historian whom he has chosen – against the others without giving reasons for his preference – as a source for that particular event. This is so even in cases where there is differences among the historians on that particular issue, for instance, when he mentions the death of al-Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim ('a.s.) in which he has relied entirely on Abu 'l-Faraj al-Iṣbahānī. This is one of the objectionable points raised by the respected translator against the writer. Moreover, Abu 'l-Faraj is considered closer than others to neutrality by the opponents of the Imāmiyyah, and he is not accused by them of sectarian bias.

If I may say so, the translator himself was also acting under the same self-imposed restriction when he mentions in his footnote (p.275) only one source for the event of Ghadīr Khumm, that is, al-Balādhurī. Any scholar slightly familiar with *ḥadīth*,

Islamic history and the discourses on imāmate knows that very few events in the history of Islam and very few *aḥādīth* among the prophetic narration on imāmate or the life of Amīru 'l-Mu'minīn 'Alī ('*a.s.*) have received that much attention at the hand of Muslim scholars and theologians (the Shī'ahs and the Sunnīs alike) as the event of Ghadīr Khumm. It would suffice to know the books written by the Muslim scholars and traditionalists – Sunnī and Shī'ah alike – on this subject; the latest and most important of all works on this issue is *al-Ghadīr fī 'l-Kitāb wa 's-Sunnah wa 'l-Adab* by one of the contemporary Shī'ah scholar ash-Shaykh 'Abdu 'l-Husayn ibn Aḥmad al-Amīnī an-Najafī (1320/1902–1390/1970) of which eleven volumes have already been published, and the work is not yet complete. ash-Shaykh al-Amīnī has dedicated the first volume to the text of *ḥadīthu 'l-Ghadīr* and its narrators from our Sunnī brethren and their scholars who number hundred and ten companions (*aṣḥāb*) of the Prophet, eighty-five disciples (*tābi'īn*) of the companions and about four hundred scholars of *ḥadīth* and history over the thirteen Islamic centuries after the first century of the companions and their disciples.

§5. The style of brevity and strict adherence to its objective also defined the contents of the book, and that is why al-Mufīd does not narrate the life of the Holy Prophet (ṣ. '*a.w.a.*')\* or the life of Fāṭimatu 'z-Zahrā' ('*a.s.*). Otherwise, the lives of these two personalities are inseparable from any discourse about the lives of the Imāms as can be observed in what has been done by al-Kulaynī in "Kitābu 'l-Ḥujjah" of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*; by aṭ-Ṭabrisī in *I'lāmu 'l-warā' bi a'lāmi 'l-hudā*; by al-Irbiliyy in *Kashfū 'l-ghummah fī ma'rīfati 'l-aimmah*; and by al-'Allāmah as-Sayyid Muḥsin al-Amīn in his *A'yānu 'sh-Shī'ah*.

---

\* *Salla 'llāhu 'alayhi wa ālih* (i.e., May the blessing of Allāh be upon him and his progeny).

## 2. IMĀMATE

**§6. Definition of Imāmate:** In the views of the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah, there are two sources to define the theological concept of imāmate and its characteristics: The first source is the Holy Qur'ān and the noble *Sunnah* narrated by reliable sources. This is the more trustworthy and reliable source; nay, it is the basis for the second source itself. The second source is whatever has come in the Shī'ah theological books concerning the definition of imāmate and its conditions.

However the *aḥādīth* about imāmate have propounded the issue in so much detail defining the meaning of imāmate and the qualities of an imām that it becomes difficult, nay impossible, to derive a brief and concise definition of imāmate encompassing all its necessary elements.<sup>6</sup> I have, therefore, preferred to quote from the specific books of theology.

The Imāmiyyah theologians have defined imāmate as "a universal and direct authority bestowed by God to a particular person in religious and worldly matters."<sup>7</sup>

**§7. Conditions for an Imām:** The foundation of imāmate depends on divine appointment found in a divine text in the Holy Qur'ān or in the confirmed prophetic traditions of the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ. 'a.w.a.). For the Imāmiyyah, imāmate is a divine position like prophethood; it cannot be vested except upon one who has been appointed by the Almighty Allāh as a prophet or an imām. *And your Lord creates and chooses whom He pleases; to choose is not theirs; (28:68). Allāh knows best where to place His message. (6:124).* The Almighty Allāh is Aware of His servants, knows what their hearts conceal and what they portray; He is the Wise who neither engages in amusement nor creates without a purpose. Allāh does not choose a messenger unless all the necessary conditions and qualities for



carrying the divine message are found in him for his entire life. So is the case of imâmate in view of the Imâmiyyah except for one difference which distinguishes the Imâm from the Messenger: The latter receives the *sharī'ah* from the Almighty Allāh directly whereas the former receives it from the latter only and not through the direct divine revelation.

The qualities of an imâm according to the Imâmiyyah are as follows:

i. Infallibility (*al-‘iṣmah*): Divine protection from sins and from failure in fulfilling the obligations, a protection which prevents the person from forgetfulness and mistakes in conveying the message, implementing the divine laws, and guiding the people.

ii. He should be the best person in his time in all virtues.

iii. He should be knowledgeable about the *sharī'ah* in all its scopes and dimensions. He should also be an expert in managing the *ummah*, with insight in regulating its affairs, and capable of leading and guiding it.

iv. He should be the most brave and courageous person of his time. The kind of courage, which is necessary to lead the *ummah* at war as well as in peace. He should also be the most wisest of all in regard to the *ummah's* interest, and the most conscious of the needs and the demands of its members in their personal and social life.

v. There should be, in the Imâm, no blemish – physical or moral, in lineage or descent – which would prevent him from commanding total control over the various elements of the *ummah* and from subjugating them completely to his divine leadership.

The imâmate – as defined above – is established through:

i) A clear text (*an-naṣṣ*), and ii) Performance of miracles (*mu‘jizah*), which clearly proves the divine link that would, in turn, prove a divine position for the performer. The numbers of

the imāms, the identifying process for each one of them, and their relationship to one another (e.g., one is the father and the other is the son; or one is the brother of the other) depends on the *naṣṣ* only.<sup>8</sup>

**§8.** The conditions for Imāmate and the Imām have not been selected arbitrarily; rather, there must be a rational proof or a clear and definite religious text which proves that this or that condition is essential for establishing the Divine Leadership (imāmate) and that without it the imāmate is not complete. The scholars in line with this basic principle outline the conditions mentioned above.

All other conditions and qualifications are either non-essential in the view of the Imāmiyyah or they are special characteristics of the Imāms, which the Almighty Allāh has bestowed upon them as a mark of honour and status for them. They do not form the general and necessary conditions for imāmate.

Examples of conditions which are not considered essential – i.e., the conditions not proven by a rational proof or a clear and definite religious text – for imāmate is that an imām must have a successor from his own children or that the imāmate cannot go except to his son or that only son of an imām can succeed an imām. These are not essential conditions for imāmate because imāmate depends on the *naṣṣ*. So, for example, if there is a *naṣṣ*, which says that, the imām after al-Ḥasan ('a.s.) is al-Ḥusayn ('a.s.), then the presence of al-Imām al-Ḥasan's sons does not prevent his brother from the position of imāmate; similarly, it would not even prevent the transferring of imāmate to al-Ḥusayn's children or descendants.

Another such example is of a supposed condition that the imām must be the eldest son of his father. This is also not an essential condition because, just as prophethood, imāmate depends on the *naṣṣ*; so if there is a *naṣṣ* for a particular person then it is

obligatory to go by the *naṣṣ* even if that person is not the eldest of his father's sons. We shall point out some real examples of this kind when we talk about the Ismā'īliyyah and the Faṭaḥiyyah.

**§9. *an-Naṣṣu 'l-Jaliyy* and *an-Naṣṣu 'l-Khafiyy*:** Certain terminologies exist in the Imāmiyyah books on imāmate, which do not have any positive meaning to the Imāmiyyah themselves. The Imāmiyyah mentions these terminologies only because they have a positive meaning in the view of the non-Imāmiyyah. This is not, however, restricted to the discussion of imāmate; rather, it is found in other theological subjects also like in *at-tawḥīd* and *an-nubuwwah*.

Examples of such terminologies are *an-naṣṣu 'l-jaliyy* (obvious *naṣṣ*) and *an-naṣṣu 'l-khafiyy* (concealed *naṣṣ*). The *naṣṣ*, according to the Imāmiyyah, as discussed in *Uṣūlu 'l-Fiqh* (the Principles of Jurisprudence) of both the Shī'ahs and the Sunnīs and used in their theological books, means "a statement which has only one meaning that cannot be interpreted otherwise and which creates certainty in the mind of the listener about the intention of the speaker in clear terms without any doubt or ambiguity in it."

So the *naṣṣ*, in this definition, can only be obvious (*jaliyy*) and clear in its meaning, which cannot accommodate any other interpretation or explanation. This is so, if *al-jaliyy* means a meaning, which is obvious and clear; and *al-khafiyy* means a meaning, which is concealed and ambiguous. If *al-jaliyy*, however, means a *naṣṣ* which is clear for all people in general in the sense that the *naṣṣ* had been heard and received by the people so that there is no room for doubt in its occurrence; and *al-khafiyy* means a *naṣṣ* which is concealed from the people in general and heard only by a few selected persons – if this is the meaning of *al-jaliyy* and *al-khafiyy* – then it has no relevance for the Imāmiyyah because they say that the *naṣṣ* for Amīru 'l-

Mu'minīn 'Alī ('a.s.) – the first Divine Imām as well as the father of the Imāms ('a.s.) and their foremost in sequence – was a clear *naṣṣ* (*al-jaliyy*) heard by the Muslims in general. Referring to the traditions narrated by the Imāmiyyah and others on the event of Ghadīr will suffice to prove this point.

Add to this the fact that if the *naṣṣ* is *khafīyy* in the sense that only a few people heard it and then these few people narrated it to others creating certainty about its authenticity, this will not harm the fact that it was stated during circumstances when only a few people were able to hear it, because fear of the hypocrites or persecution by the rulers can force the Prophet or the Imām not to reveal the *naṣṣ* except to a selected few whose narration of the *naṣṣ*, at a later stage, would create conviction in the minds of the people about its occurrence and leave no room for doubts and suspicions about its authenticity.

But the non-Imāmiyyah, including some of the Zaydiyyah sects, has divided the *naṣṣ* about the imāmate of Amīru 'l-Mu'minīn 'Alī ('a.s.) into *an-naṣṣu 'l-jaliyy* and *an-naṣṣu 'l-khafīyy*. They have taken *an-naṣṣu 'l-khafīyy* in both the above meanings: i) that it was concealed from the Muslims in general and heard only by a few persons; ii) that it is liable to interpretation and explanation, leading the person who interprets and explains it to practically violate the injunction embedded within the text (*naṣṣ*). They also adhere to the belief that the *naṣṣ* on the imāmate of 'Alī ('a.s.) was of the second type, *an-naṣṣu 'l-khafīyy*; and, therefore, they do not consider those who have opposed the *naṣṣ* as those who have betrayed and opposed Allāh and His Messenger, nor transgressed their bounds or blatantly disobeyed the Messenger of Allāh (ṣ. 'a.w.a.). In fact, the *naṣṣ* has been divided by these groups into *jaliyy* and *khafīyy* in order to defend others [who did not follow that *naṣṣ*] and not because they had doubts concerning the imāmate of Amīru 'l-Mu'minīn 'Alī ('a.s.).

When the later Imāmiyyah theologians wanted to prove the *naṣṣ* on the imāmate of Amīru 'l-Mu'minīn 'Alī ('a.s.) – a binding *naṣṣ* which would compel a Muslim to follow it and which would leave no room for the excuse of not having heard it or for interpretation in its meaning – they were faced with this dual division of *naṣṣ* and were forced to present their textual evidence as *an-nassu 'l-jaliyy* even if they did not agree with the validity of this division of *naṣṣ*. This can be seen even in the present author, ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (r.a.), who has a treatise entitled as *Mas'alah fi 'n-naṣṣi 'l-jaliyy 'alā imāmat Amīri 'l-Mu'minīn, 'alayhi 's-salām*, printed in Baghdad in 1375 AH. This is the reason why we do not see the term *an-nassu 'l-jaliyy*, based on the dual division of the *naṣṣ*, in the works of the Imāmiyyah theologians of the first three Islamic centuries; it is only found in the writings of the later Imāmiyyah theologians.<sup>9</sup>

We would most certainly like to draw the attention of our readers to the fact that many terminologies of non-Imāmiyyah sects of Islam have entered into the writings of Imāmiyyah scholars – on theology as well as other subjects – for the same reason that we have stated above. One more example of such terms is "*imāmatu 'l-afḍal* – imāmate of the most superior" and "*imāmatu 'l-mafḍūl* – imāmate of the less superior".

### 3. SHĪ'AH SECTS

§10. The sects that relate themselves to Shī'ism or the divisions, which occurred among the Shī'ahs themselves and made them into sub-sects fall into two categories: -

#### **The First Category:**

The sects that call themselves "Shī'ah" but they differ from the Imāmiyyah in the meaning of imāmate and its conditions.

The most important of these sects are:

1. **al-Ghulāt (The Extremists):** In defining the concept of imāmate, al-Ghulāt have gone to an extreme, which has placed them outside the fold of the mainstream of Islam.

2. **az-Zaydiyyah:** The concept of imāmate among the Zaydiyyah does not differ in general from the concept found among the non-Imāmiyyah Muslims. They have deleted some essential conditions of imāmate, and have added two conditions: (i) He must be a descendant of Fāṭimah (the daughter of the Holy Prophet); and (ii) He must stage an armed movement to gain political power. The only argument that can be put forth to them is, first, regarding the concept and essence of imāmate: Is imāmate a divinely invested position in which the imām and his essential conditions cannot be defined except by Allāh? Is there any religious text indicating the imāmate of any particular person? These are also other issues on which the Zaydiyyah is not in agreement with the non-Imāmiyyah Muslims. So, the dispute is not just on the imāmate of one person against the other.

We shall not discuss this category of "Shī'ah" sects because it is not our intention to discuss the history of Shī'ah sects or to evaluate their opinions or argue about the validity or otherwise of their beliefs.

### **The Second Category:**

The second category refers to the sects that are in agreement with the Imāmiyyah al-Ithnā-'ashariyyah (the Twelvers) in the general concept of imāmate (as a divine position which is not assigned to anyone except by the unequivocal *naṣṣ*), and are in agreement with them in the characteristics and attributes of an imām in an inclusive way even though they may differ in some areas. We shall confine our discussion on this second category to three sects only: -

- a) The Ismā'īliyyah; b) The Faṭahīyyah, and c) The Wāqifah.

What has prompted us, partially, to put this limitation in our discussion is that the respected translator\* has apparently faced some ambiguity or has not been able to fully comprehend all aspects of the issue wherever ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (r.a.), has talked, in his theological/polemical style, about these three sects, especially the Ismā'īliyyah. The translator, for example, makes the comment that: "al-Mufīd takes great trouble to demonstrate that Ja'far did not nominate Ismā'īl . . ." (Intro. p.xxxi, [London's edition])

We have already mentioned the justification of al-Mufīd in the method that he has adopted in writing *al-Irshād*, but here we wish to elaborate, particularly, on the issue of Ismā'īl's imāmate in order to dispel any wrong impression from the reader's mind when he reads the translator's introduction, especially the readers whose only exposure to this issue would be whatever is in this book and its introduction. Moreover, the sects that affiliate themselves to Shī'ism and those that have been mentioned in this book have almost all become extinct except the Zaydiyyah – who, as mentioned earlier, are to be discussed at a different level – and the Ismā'īliyyah, which is still alive, with its numerous sub-sects, who, willingly or unwillingly, engage in religious and theological confrontation from time to time.

### A. The Ismā'īliyyah:

§11. Although the Ismā'īliyyah has several sub-sects each calling itself a particular name or being given one, but all of them are in agreement on the issue of the imāmate of Ismā'īl ibn al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq, peace be upon him, (no matter whether the imāmate was actually bestowed upon him or that it was a nomination which necessitated the transfer of imāmate to his children) in particular, and on the issue of rejecting the imāmate of al-

---

\* [of *Kitāb al-Irshād* (The Book of Guidance) Dr. I.K.A. Howard].

Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm ('*a.s.*), as will be explained later on. It is on this point that the Ismā'īliyyah differ from the Ithnā-'ashriyyah who believe in the imāmate of Ismā'īl's brother al-Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm and his five descendants (peace be upon them all).

We do not intend to discuss here the doctrine, the jurisprudence, the literature or the various extinct and existing sub-sects of the Ismā'īliyyah. Nor are we going to discuss the differences between their sub-sects, the sons of Ismā'īl who revolted in north Africa, one of the most glorious political revolutions in the Islamic history that founded the Fāṭimid caliphate which competed and in various aspects even superseded the 'Abbāsids in Baghdad especially after setting anchor of caliphate in Egypt. Nay, it was quite often even superior to that of the 'Abbāsīd caliphate. We do not wish to discuss here about their imāms who are in hiding or living openly, or about the truth of their claim of descent from Ismā'īl, or whoever they mention in his family tree. All these are beyond the scope of our present discussion. What we intend to discuss here is only Ismā'īl himself in context of one question: Was Ismā'īl an imām designated to that position by his father, al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*)? What are the positive and negative arguments surrounding this issue? We only intend to present various views on this issue and analyze them.

**§12. Ismā'īlī Sources:** It is necessary to point out that we face great difficulty when we refer to the Ismā'īliyyah sources because the Ismā'īlīs are known to be very secretive, extremely ambiguous; and to work in secrecy of the extreme kind, they even resort to various disguises – many times contradictory ones – and they acknowledge this fact and consider it to be one of the main characteristics of their *madhhab* and their imāms. They were known for this in their political and religious activities long before the establishment of the Fāṭimid caliphate and also



in the role they played after its fall in Egypt.

This secrecy even includes their literature and intellectual legacy. Until very recently, no outsider had access to their religious literature and tradition except for small number of unreliable tracts written about them by non-Shī'ah opponents. And what we possess of their literature does not represent even minutely the literature and sources that we hear are preserved in extreme secrecy with their imāms and leaders – one cannot see them or read them even if he is very closely related to them in family ties and religious affiliation. Yet I do not know how much truth there is in this claim. We also hear that the Ismā'īlīs, or at least some of them, privately disbelieve in what they openly declare or what is publicly attributed to them or what others or themselves publish about their faith. This is also an issue, which I can neither confirm nor deny.<sup>10</sup>

The only way open to me, and probably to other research scholars also, is to refer to whatever has been collected in our Shī'ī sources from the literature and books of the Ismā'īliyyah. It is on this that I shall base my discussion comparing what we have from the Ismā'īliyyah with what exists in the non-Shī'ah sources. However, the responsibility to expose what has been kept secret, to publicly declare what has been believed privately for some many centuries, to confirm what is their true belief and what is untrue, and to explain the difference between *aẓ-ẓāhir* that they have declared and *al-bāṭin* that they have hidden (if there is any truth to such division) lies entirely upon the Ismā'īliyyah themselves.

Yet, I apologize to the Ismā'īlīs and other Muslim brethren for I do not intend – and Allāh is my witness – to insult any Muslim brother, to diminish his personality and honour, or to put down their ideas and views when I present the difference in the opinions and analyze them. I surely do not intend that specially when it comes to those brethren who are closer to us

theologically as well as historically, and who are one with us in our devotion to the *Ahlu 'l-Bayt* ('*a.s.*) even though we differ in the imāmate of the later imāms.

**§13. Ismā'īl's Birth:** Ismā'īl, with whom the Shī'ah Ismā'īliyyah is associated is the son of the al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) and was known by the agnomen al-A'raj (the lame).<sup>11</sup> His mother was Fāṭimah daughter of al-Ḥusayn al-Athram ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ('*a.s.*). This lady was also the mother of the second son of al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*), 'Abdullāh al-Afṭah, with whom the Faṭahīyyah sect was associated.

Ismā'īl was the eldest son of al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*). The Imām himself was born in 83/706; and Fāṭimah, Ismā'īl's mother, was his first wife, before whom he never married on a permanent or temporary basis, as asserted by the Ismā'īliyyah sources and we shall discuss later on. Although history has not recorded for us the time of their marriage, the most probable date – that would be in line with the personality and biography of the Imām ('*a.s.*), as well as the socio-economic conditions of the time – would be when he was eighteen years old, that is, around 100/719.

I have not found the date of Ismā'īl's birth in the biographical and genealogical works of the Imāmiyyah as well as of the non-Imāmiyyah. However, 'Ārif Tāmīr, who is an Ismā'īlī himself, has mentioned that Ismā'īl was born in 101/719–720<sup>12</sup> but he has contradicted himself in the appendix of *al-Qaṣīdatu 'sh-Shāfiyyah* (an Ismā'īlī literature that he has edited) by mentioning the birth year as 113/731-732 (on p.98). Moreover, Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib, also an Ismā'īlī, writes that Ismā'īl was born in the year 110/728-729.<sup>13</sup>

I am personally inclined to accept the first date or something closer to it, rather than the second date because of what the *shaykhs*: al-Kulaynī and aṭ-Ṭūsī have narrated (and aṣ-Ṣadūq

has also narrated something closer to it) through authentic *sanad* (chain) from Zurārah ibn A‘yan who said, "I saw a son of Abū ‘Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq, ‘a.s.], in the lifetime of Abū Ja‘far [al-Bāqir, ‘a.s.], who was known as ‘Abdullāh, who was already weaned and was walking but unsteadily.<sup>14</sup> So I said to him, 'O child! Who is this standing besides you?' – pointing to a young follower of the Imām – The child replied, 'He is my follower.' The follower – in a joking mood – responded, 'I am not your follower.' The child said, 'This is bad for you.' Then the child was stabbed and he died." The *ḥadīth* goes on to say that al-Imām al-Bāqir (‘a.s.), said the funeral prayer on that child in al-Baqī‘ graveyard and also explained the reason as to why he prayed on the child even though it was not obligatory to say the funeral prayer on a child who has not reached the age of six.<sup>15</sup>

This *ḥadīth* shows that ‘Abdullāh was a child between the age of three and four. We also know that al-Imām al-Bāqir (‘a.s.), who said this child's funeral prayer, died in the year 114/733. So this child must have been born in at least 110/728 or before it. This means that ‘Abdullāh al-Aḩḩah, Ismā‘īl's younger brother, was born after the death of the child mentioned above because al-Aḩḩah was carrying the dead child's name. Obviously, it is very unlikely that two sons of a person would have same names while both are alive. This brings us to the conclusion that Ismā‘īl, who is the eldest child of al-Imām Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.), was born years before 110/728.

Abū ḩātim ar-Rāzī and the author of *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn*, both Ismā‘īlīs, have said: "Verily aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.), remained for twenty-five years without any child except Ismā‘īl and ‘Abdullāh."<sup>16</sup> al-Imām al-Kāzīm (‘a.s.) – the eldest child after Ismā‘īl and ‘Abdullāh – was born in the year 129 AH (although some less reliable sources say 128 AH). In light of the information provided by the Ismā‘īlī sources, if we deduct 25 years from 129, we get the year 104 AH (or 103 AH if we go by the other

version of al-Imām Kāẓim's birth) as the birth year of Ismā'īl. Moreover, the *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn* says that Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl – the eldest child of Ismā'īl – was born in 13th Dhi 'l-Ḥijjah, 121/20th November, 729. The lowest possible age of Ismā'īl at the birth of his son would be seventeen. So when we take out 17 from 121, we get 104 as the birth year of Ismā'īl.

**§14. Ismā'īl's Death:** The Imāmiyyah is unanimous in saying that Ismā'īl died during the lifetime of his father. al-Mufīd has mentioned this in *al-Irshād*<sup>17</sup> as have most of the historians and the biographers of Ismā'īl.<sup>18</sup> 'Abdu 'l-Qāhir al-Baghdādī, ar-Ras'aniyy and al-Isfarāyīnī have written about the unanimity of the historians on the issue that Ismā'īl predeceased his father.<sup>19</sup>

Ismā'īl died at al-'Arīḍ, [a valley in Medina with streams and farms in it]<sup>20</sup>, and he was carried on the shoulders of men to (the cemetery) of al-Baqī' (in Medina) where he was buried. When his corpse reached Medina, al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) shrouded him with one of his outer garments and permitted the prominent Shī'ahs to see his face so that they may be assured of his death and not entertain any thoughts about him [as a future leader].<sup>21</sup> The number of such prominent Shī'ahs whom the Imām ('a.s.) used as eye-witness reached about thirty, and their names have been recorded<sup>22</sup>

Even when Ismā'īl's litter was brought to the cemetery of al-Baqī', al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) ordered that his litter to be put on the ground many times before he was buried, then he uncovered (Ismā'īl's) face and look at it, intending to establish the fact of (Ismā'īl's) death to those who had thought that he was to succeed after him, and to remove from them any mistaken belief with regard to him (still) being alive.<sup>23</sup>

As an example of what al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) did, we may quote the authentic *ḥadīth* from Sa'īd ibn 'Abdillāh al-A'raj who said, "Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq, 'a.s.], said, 'When Ismā'īl

died, I ordered that his face be uncovered, while he was on his back, then I kissed his forehead, his chin and his neck. Then I ordered that (his face) be covered. Then I said, "Uncover (his face)." Again I kissed his forehead, his chin and his neck. Then I ordered them to cover him, and ordered that he be given the ritual bath (*ghusl*). Then I went to him when he had been shrouded and said, "Uncover him [i.e., his face]." Then I kissed his forehead, his chin and his neck and prayed (for him). Then I said, "Wrap him in his shroud." al-A'raj says, "Then I asked [the Imām], 'By which did you invoke [Allāh for] his protection?' He answered, 'By the Qur'ān, so that Allāh may protect him by it from His own torment.'" <sup>24</sup>

§15. It is an unanimous view that al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) died in the year 148/765<sup>25</sup>, and that he was a contemporary of the first two 'Abbāsīd caliphs, Abu 'l-'Abbās as-Saffāḥ (b. 104/722, caliphate 132/749–136/754) and Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr (b. 95/ 714, caliphate 136/754–158/775). His son Ismā'īl died during his father's lifetime: so, when did he die?

a) ash-Sharīf al-Ḥusayn ibn Ja'far ibn al-Ḥusayn Abu 'l-Qāsim ibn Khidā' al-Ḥusaynī al-Miṣrī (b. 310/922 d. after 373/983), one of the famous genealogist with expertise in the genealogy of the Egypt's *sādāt* (descendants of the Holy Prophet of Islam) and who had lived under the Fāṭimid rule in their capital, says: "Verily Ismā'īl died in the year 133/750-751 twenty years before the death of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.)." <sup>26</sup> If this is true then Ismā'īl died at the beginning of the 'Abbāsīd rule during as-Saffāḥ's reign; but his death was not twenty years before that of his father as claimed by Ibn Khidā', rather it was five years less than that. However, Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn aṣ-Ṣūfī al-'Umarī al-'Alawī, the famous genealogist who was alive in 443/1052, quotes Ibn Khidā' as saying that Ismā'īl died in the year 138/755-756. <sup>27</sup> This coincides with the date given by

al-Maqrīzī, as will be explained later. Therefore, if al-Majdī's manuscript is correct and the quotation given in it, then it will be correct to say that Ismā'īl died ten years before the death of his father.

b) Abu 'l-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī al-Ḥusaynī al-'Ubaydī ash-Shāfi'ī (766/1365–845/1441), the famous historian whose genealogy goes back to the Fāṭimids, says: "Surely Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq died in the lifetime of his father Ja'far in the year 138/755-756 . . ." <sup>28</sup>

c) Naṣīru 'd-Dīn aṭ-Ṭūsī Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan (597/1201–672/1274), the famous scholar and philosopher, in his *Tārīkhu l-mulāḥidah*, 'Alāu 'd-Dīn al-Juwaynī (623/1226–681/1283) and Rashīdu 'd-Dīn al-Hamadānī (646/1248–718/1318) the famous Mongol minister – all had either accompanied the Mongols in their attacks upon the Ismā'īlī forts or were ministers of Mongol rulers and had direct access to the Ismā'īlī literature which the invaders had looted – said, "Ismā'īl died five years before the death of his father Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), in the year 145/762-763 . . ." <sup>29</sup>

But this date (i.e., 145 AH) precedes that of the death of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) in three years and not five. Because of this contradiction, historians have taken one or the other side of this statement. For example, Cl. Huart, while writing the entry under "Ismā'īlīsm" in the first edition of the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, says that Ismā'īl died in 143/760, that is, five years before the death of his father. az-Zirkilī has followed him in *al-A'lām*. <sup>30</sup> Whereas the Soviet orientalist, Petrochevski, editors of *al-Munjid*, and Dahkhudā have given Ismā'īl's death year as 145 AH. <sup>31</sup> This latter date is also the view of Ivanow, the famous expert on Ismā'īlīsm while writing in the *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam* (p.179), he says: "Ismā'īl died a short time before the death of Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq."

The year 145 AH has also been mentioned in the surviving

literature of the Ismā'īlīs. For example, the famous critic, Muḥammad Qazwīnī says that this date [145 AH] is also stated in *Dastūru 'l-munaḥḥimīn*.<sup>32</sup> The same view is expressed by 'Ārif Tāmir, an Ismā'īlī; even though he has contradicted himself in the appendix of *al-Qarāmiṭah* (p.44) by writing Ismā'īl's dates of birth and death as 101 and 159 AH respectively.<sup>33</sup>

Ismā'īlīs have another view also. They say that the year 145 AH was the beginning of the occultation of Ismā'īl, and that he died in the year 158/775.<sup>34</sup> Based on these two last views, Ismā'īl died during the reign of Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr.

**§16.** Besides the unanimity found in the Ismā'īlī sources, there is evidence in our *ḥadīth* and historical sources, which suggest that Ismā'īl lived till the reign of al-Manṣūr. See what Rizām ibn Muslim has narrated that Ismā'īl was with his father al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) in Ḥīrah, Iraq, during the caliphate of al-Manṣūr;<sup>35</sup> and somewhat similar narration by Abū Khadījah from a man from Kindah who was an executioner for al-Manṣūr;<sup>36</sup> and what Bakr ibn Abī Bakr al-Ḥaḍramī has narrated about the misfortune that has afflicted his father during the time of Ismā'īl's illness and eventual death.<sup>37</sup>

Based on these evidences, we cannot accept the first date of Ismā'īl's death (133 AH) as given by Ibn Khidā' even though many scholars have relied on him. We are, therefore, left with the second (138 AH) and the third (145 AH) dates which place Ismā'īl's death during al-Manṣūr's reign. Abū Ja'far aṭ-Ṭabarī has provided for us evidence, which gives credence to the third date. He narrates from 'Umar ibn Shabbah from his narrators that Muḥammad and Ibrāhīm, sons of 'Abdullāh ibn al-Ḥasan, got together with their followers in Mecca during the time of their concealment, and devised a plan to assassinate the Caliph al-Manṣūr in the *ḥajj* of the year 144/762. (Obviously, the *ḥajj* is

performed during the last month of the lunar Arabic calendar.) One of the military leaders of al-Manṣūr entered their gathering ". . . then Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad al-A'raj protested to Abū Ja'far [al-Manṣūr] who informed him of their plan. He then sent for the leader [of the conspirators] but did not succeed in arresting him; instead a group of his companions were arrested while the leader disappeared . . ." <sup>38</sup>

§17. All this ambiguity about Ismā'īl's year of death brings us to a problem for which I have yet to see a proper explanation covering all its angles. Ismā'īl did not live a short life, probably forty years or more (104/723–145/762); and a major part of his life coincided with significant events during which a revolution removed the Umayyids from power and sat the 'Abbāsids onto the seat of caliphate. The caliphate, during its early days, witnessed quite a few political movements many of which ended in bloody revolts led by sectarian groups seeking political ends or by political groups using sectarian guise. The most significant of these revolts were led by the Ḥasanids (the cousins of Ismā'īl descending from al-Imām al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī, *a.s.*) from the days of the Umayyids and reached its peak in the year 145/762 against al-Manṣūr in Medina – the city where Ismā'īl lived – and Baṣrah. Why did not Ismā'īl have any significant role in these events? This phenomenon has led Khayru'd-Dīn az-Zirkilī to make the following comment on Ismā'īl: "There is nothing in our available historical sources to suggest that he was of any significance during his lifetime." <sup>39</sup>

Could the reason for this be that Ismā'īl was associated to an extremely secret underground movement and had failed in leading it to a political success? Or was it that when his underground political movement failed (like that of Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and his companions in Kūfah, as we shall discuss below), Ismā'īl adopted an entirely negative and reclusive attitude towards political



activism, parties and events?

There is another problematic phenomenon related to the death of Ismā'īl himself: When al-Manṣūr came to power, he changed the 'Abbāsīd government's policy towards the 'Alīds from what it was during his predecessor, as-Saffāḥ. The latter was lenient and tolerant towards the 'Alīds, while the former was bent upon keeping them under surveillance, closely monitoring their activities and movements, appointing spies over them, and penetrating their ranks with informers. al-Manṣūr even ordered his governors to follow the same policy towards the 'Alīds, and if he found them to be incapable of following his policy or sensed lukewarm response towards it, he would not hesitate to replace them with others who were willing to follow his whims and desires. In the Ḥasanīd revolt, especially in the events preceding it, we see sufficient evidence to prove the change in the policy of the 'Abbāsīds towards the 'Alīds.

The stance of al-Manṣūr towards the al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq is a sufficient evidence to prove what we have said.<sup>40</sup> Soon after assuming the caliphate, al-Manṣūr targeted the Imām: "He ordered that the Imām be brought from Medina to Baṣrah, addressed him rudely, mistreated him and even accused him of organizing a revolt against the 'Abbāsīd government."<sup>41</sup>

History and its custodians, followed the official policy of al-Manṣūr in the sense that historians started to give importance to the 'Alīds by recording their activities and events related to them unlike the days of as-Saffāḥ when historians chose to ignore them. Therefore, if the death of Ismā'īl occurred during the reign of al-Manṣūr, then the historians would have recorded it, especially so when we see the extraordinary steps taken by al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq to publicize his death (by showing the face to the people and also recording it in writing with the governor of Medina). This would have been more likely also because of the year in which he died 145/762, the year of the

famous revolt of the Ḥasanids against al-Mansūr.

So, how can it be correct to accept that an event like the death of Ismā'īl – with all its extraordinary circumstances related to his death – takes place in the city of revolt (Medina) and the year of revolt (145 AH) but stays unnoticed and unreported by the officials, the spies and the informers, and consequently be overlooked by the historians also?

**§18. Ismā'īl's "Imāmate":** Ismā'īl's name is connected with a famous sect of the Shī'ahs that relates itself to him and calls itself as "Ismā'īliyyah", and claims imāmate for him.

It is obvious that the position of imāmate which they ascribe to Ismā'īl cannot be the actual imāmate as long as his father, the actual Imām, was alive because the imāmate could not be transferred from his father to himself except if the father dies or is removed from the position of imāmate. But Allāh does not bestow imāmate, being a divine position, to someone who will cease to deserve it at a later time. Neither can two persons, in view of those who see imāmate as a divine position, claim to hold actual imāmate at the same time.

In light of the above, the only plausible explanation for the Ismā'īliyyah belief *vis-à-vis* Ismā'īl and imāmate is that Ismā'īl had been appointed as the imām-designate to succeed the previous imām; however, as long as the previous imām was alive, he could be considered as an imām-designate only. Or, in terminology of *uṣūlu 'l-fiqh*, we may express their view by saying that Ismā'īl was designated (*ja'l*) as an imām but the actualization (*fi'liyyah*) of that appointment would happen only after his father's death.

So, when the Ismā'īlīs claim imāmate for Ismā'īl in the lifetime of his father, they cannot claim the actual imāmate for him unless they believe that al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) was removed from the position of imāmate since that is the only

case in which the imāmate could transfer from the father to the son while the former was still living. The Ismā'īlīs accept the imāmate of al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) for as long as he was alive; but they were compelled to believe in a form of imāmate for Ismā'īl so that they may consider him as the legitimate link through whom the imāmate transferred to his children with the exclusion of his brother al-Imām al-Kāzim and his descendants ('a.s.). This was a necessary link to authenticate the imāmate of Ismā'īlī imāms including the Fāṭimid caliphs who ruled North-West Africa and then Egypt from 297/910 to 567/1171.

### **B. The Khaṭṭābiyyah:**

**§19. The Khaṭṭābiyyah and Ismā'īl's Imāmate:** The scholars of religions say that the Khaṭṭābiyyah sect believed in Ismā'īl as an actual imām during the lifetime of his father, aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.).

The Khaṭṭābiyyah are followers of Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb ibn Abī Zaynab, Muḥammad ibn Miqlāṣ al-Ajda' al-Asadī al-Kūfī (d. 137/755). In the beginning, Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb was follower of the true *madhhab* and sound in his ideas; he associated himself with al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) and narrated *aḥādīth* from him. But then he started exaggeration and went beyond the proper limits. He started to say erroneous things about the Imāms, in particular about al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.); he even invented laws and falsely attributed them to the Imām in his narrations. A group of people started following his views. al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq, however, disassociated himself from Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb, rejected his sayings, and cursed him and his followers. Many narrations have come to us from him and the later Imāms cursing Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and condemning him and his views. The followers of Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb have been accused of exaggerating even about Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb himself to the extent of claiming prophethood, and even higher status, for him. They also believed in transmigration of souls and incarnation.

Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and his followers used to display piety, asceticism and devotional acts by staying constantly at the main mosque of Kūfah, engaged in prayers and worship. They continued their show of piety, in words of the biographers, until someone reported to 'Īsā ibn Mūsā ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn 'Abdillāh ibn al-'Abbās (102/721–167/783), the nephew of al-Mansūr, the 'Abbāsīd Caliph and his governor in Kūfah (132/75–147/764), that the Khaṭṭābiyyah are openly indulging in licentiousness and calling people to believe in the prophethood of Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb. He sent an army to arrest them, but they refused to surrender and fought the army in the mosque itself. The fighting was intense although the only weapon they possessed was sticks and canes, until all seventy of them were killed, and Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb himself was arrested and later killed in the worst manner. This happened around 137/755.<sup>42</sup>

The Khaṭṭābiyyah are considered, to some extent, a continuation of al-Mughayriyyah, the group that was associated to al-Mughīrah ibn Sa'īd al-'Ijlī al-Kūfī (d. 119/737), which was formed a few years before in Kūfah. It started as a religious group, then turned into a political revolt during the last days of the Umayyad reign, but it was crushed together with its leader. Both these groups have many similar characteristics, including the exaggeration regarding the status of the Imāms ('*a.s.*). It was this similarity (and also the fact that they were almost contemporary) that has led many to confuse one for the other.<sup>43</sup>

**§20.** The Khaṭṭābiyyah used to believe in the imāmate of Ismā'īl during his lifetime.<sup>44</sup> Probably it is somewhat exaggerated when it is said that the idea of Ismā'īl's imāmate itself originates from the Khaṭṭābiyyah and that they are the ones who invented it and adopted it.<sup>45</sup>

Abū Hātim ar-Rāzī, the Ismā'īlī missionary (*ad-dā'ī*), says: "al-Khaṭṭābiyyah: associated to Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb . . . believed in

the imāmate of Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far in the lifetime of his father Ja'far. But when Ismā'īl died, they returned to the belief in the imāmate of Ja'far."<sup>46</sup> Sa'd ibn 'Abdillāh al-Ash'arī and an-Nawbakhtī have mentioned a sect which "assumed that the Imām after Ja'far is his son Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far, and it rejected Ismā'īl's death during his father's lifetime; and said that [the death] was an attempt on the part of his father to confuse the people because he feared for his life, therefore, he concealed him from them . . . This sect is the true Ismā'īlīyyah sect."<sup>47</sup> After mentioning other sects, they say: "The true Ismā'īlīyyah is the Khaṭṭābiyyah, the followers of Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb, Muḥammad ibn Abī Zaynab al-Asadī al-Ajda' (may Allāh curse him); and a group from them have entered in the sect of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl and accepted the death of Ismā'īl during his father's lifetime."<sup>48</sup>

Probably the reason which caused Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and his followers to adopt the view of Ismā'īl's imāmate, was to call the people towards him, and to show or pretend that they were associated with him and even carried his name. Naturally, they linked all these together in order to claim that their views are actually his, and that they only execute his order – while his father, aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) was still alive and known as an Imām whose words were followed by his Shī'ahs. The Khaṭṭābiyyah did not exist but during the time and days of the imāmate of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.). They, previously, prompted the Mughayriyyahs to affiliate themselves to Muḥammad ibn 'Abdillāh al-Ḥasanī – as we shall point out later – even though this sect began in the time of al-Imām al-Bāqir ('a.s.)<sup>49</sup>; it grew during the time of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), and its revolt took place during his imāmate.

The reason, and probably the main reason, was the stand taken by the two Imāms, al-Bāqir and aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), *vis-à-vis* these two sects and their followers, which forced them to form their affiliations with others. I do not know whether their affili-

ation to Ismā'īl was with his knowledge and consent or not? Nor do we know what was his stand in the beginning when these groups started as sectarian movements, and at the end when they turned into revolutionary movements.

I do not intend to discuss here the life of Ismā'īl or to analyze him religiously and ethically, specially so after what our Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (r.a.) – the scholar of the Imāmiyyah, its teacher and one of its intellectual leaders – has said about Ismā'īl in *Kitāb al-Irshād*. (See p.431 of the Eng. transl.)

In view of the heresiographers, the Khaṭṭābiyyah considered itself as the Ismā'īliyyah. After the execution of Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb, and the deaths of Ismā'īl and then his father al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), the majority of the Khaṭṭābiyyah were either inclined to the imāmate of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl or became divided into two groups: those who remained on the imāmate of Ismā'īl, and those who joined his son Muḥammad and accepted his imāmate. This is the point of disagreement between the heresiographers.<sup>50</sup>

**§21.** It seems necessary to raise a point which would enlighten some ambiguous aspects of the Mughayriyyah's history; and that is the fact that although the Mughayriyyah existed during the time of the two Imāms, al-Bāqir and aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), it associated itself – and we do not wish to scrutinize the validity of their claim of affiliation – to Muḥammad ibn 'Abdillāh ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥasanī who led the revolt against the 'Abbāsids. The Mughayriyyah claimed that this Muḥammad was the Awaited al-Mahdī who will go into occultation and then re-appear after the occultation to lead the revolution, which has been promised to us in the religious texts. They continued in this belief even after Muḥammad rose in revolt and was killed.<sup>51</sup>

Why did the Mughayriyyah affiliate itself to the descendants of al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī, in particular, and not to any of the sons of Imāms al-Bāqir and aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.)? What caused them,

at a later stage, to associate with Ismā'īl and not with his uncles from the descendants of al-Ḥasan even though the latter continued their political revolt against the 'Abbāsids? What were the motivating factors, something contradictory, in the minds of the leaders of this sect? These questions re-enforce what I have said earlier (in §17) about the ambiguity surrounding Ismā'īl; and, perhaps, finding the right answers would lead us to understand the unknown aspects of his life and personality.

It is important to note that the famous Ismā'īlī writer, al-Qāḍī Abū Ḥanīfah an-Nu'mān ibn Muḥammad, and the Ismā'īlī missionary, Idrīs, both have reported statements of al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) against Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb himself, his views, and followers similar to what the Imāmiyyah scholars have narrated.<sup>52</sup>

This is, however, contrary to what the Ismā'īlī missionary, Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī, believes in as we have quoted in §20 above. Muḥammad Qazwīnī, quotes the famous Ismā'īlī document, *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn*, (foil 333/B), about al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq's companions as follows: "Among his famous companions, other than Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb, are al-Mufaḍḍal ibn 'Umar, Jābir ibn Ḥayyān aṣ-Ṣufī (author of many books), and 'Abdullāh ibn Maymūn from him was secured [*sic*; probably it is 'with whom'] the seventh of the children of [blank; probably it is 'Ja'far'] who was known as al-Qāim Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl."<sup>53</sup> Even more amusing is what 'Ārif Tāmir the Ismā'īlī says about the Khaṭṭābiyyah: "al-Khaṭṭābiyyah is a sect of the Ja'fariyyah which follows Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb, a student of Ja'far, who was known as Muḥammad ibn Zaynab [*sic*] al-Asadī al-Ajda'. This sect proclaims the imāmate of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad aṣ-Ṣādiq following the style of the Extremists and the Bāṭinīs. And after the death of Ja'far, they moved to the Mūsawīyyah group which proclaimed the imāmate of Mūsā al-Kāẓim ibn Ja'far (?); and finally it affiliated with the Ismā'īliyyah."<sup>54</sup>

Before concluding this section, I would like to quote what

the Ismā'īlī scholar, Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib, has said on this topic:

We ought to mention what the famous British orientalist, Bernard Lewis, has written on this subject, [giving reference to the footnote of *The Origins of Ismā'īlism*, pp.106, 104 99(?), 128]. Bernard Lewis assures that "the revolutionary movements of the second quarter of the second *hijri* century [151/768–200/815, during which period neither Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb nor aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), or Ismā'īl were alive! Perhaps, he meant the first quarter, i.e., 101/719–150/767] brought about the existence of the Ismā'īliyyah, and that the first person to organize the group was Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb in collaboration with Ismā'īl ibn al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq. When Ismā'īl and Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb died, their followers turned to Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl."

After discussing the difference over the death of Imām Ismā'īl and the division which occurred among the Shī'ahs, he says: "It is most likely that Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq had deposed his son Ismā'īl just because he was in contact with Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and had rebelled against the authority of his father al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq." Lewis concludes the discussion by saying, "The Ismā'īlī sect was founded by the children of Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb."

We are truly amazed that a famous orientalist like Bernard Lewis would state such erroneous views concerning us that betray his lack of indepth in the study of Ismā'īlism. We declare that all the manuscripts that exist in our possession reject any connection between the Ismā'īliyyah and the Khaṭṭābiyyah, and that most of the Sunnī and Shī'ah sources acknowledge that no such connection existed. Moreover, the Ismā'īlīs themselves consider the Khaṭṭābiyyah sect as one of the renegade extremist sects . . .<sup>55</sup>

We have already described (in §12) the difficulty we face on the sources of the Ismā'īliyyah and the tradition of secrecy that they have carried on till now. Therefore, until they publish their hidden literature – which contains only some, not all, of their



heritage – and until they acknowledge that it is authentic in the eyes of all their sub-sects and that it truly reflects their views and beliefs, and until they satisfy others that it is being published with integrity, in complete form without any deletion or interpolation – I stand alone, without ascribing anything to others, in doubt about the defence of this brother [Dr. M. Ghālib] of ours regarding his sect.

I say this especially after having found that our brother, Dr. Ghālib, in his *A'lāmu 'l-Ismā'īliyyah* (p.162) and *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah* (p.138) attributes a statement to al-Maqrīzī in his *Itti'āzu 'l-hunafā'* – a book published and circulated widely – which does not exist in that book at all!<sup>56</sup> Again on the same pages of his two books, Dr. Ghālib attributes to Ibn Khaldūn in his *al-Ibar*, a statement which does not exist at all.<sup>57</sup> On the same pages in both of his works, he has quoted a statement from ash-Shahristānī which is greatly different from what has been written by the latter in *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal* (vol.1, p.191) and in the notes to *al-Faṣl* (vol.2, pp.27-28), and from what has been quoted from him in *al-Wāfi bi 'l-wafayāt* (vol.9, pp.101-2). Dr. Ghālib has also attributed in his *A'lām* (p.164) a statement to Ibn 'Anabah in his *'Umdatu 't-tālib*<sup>58</sup> which does not exist in it at all!

After having found all this discrepancy in a few pages of Ghālib's two books, I have all the right to maintain the doubt and skepticism whenever he urges us to believe in the truth of his statements. The simplest of all question for which I have not yet found a convincing answer is the following: If Ismā'īl had not collaborated with Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and his followers, and did not agree with the latter's views, then why nothing has been narrated from him, or at least from his immediate followers, on this issue which would demonstrate, even remotely, Ismā'īl's rejection and displeasure? This, in spite of all that has been talked about Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb and his views! The Ismā'īliyyah themselves have

narrations from al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) on this issue, but nothing from his son Ismā'īl has been narrated even though he is an imām to them like his father!<sup>59</sup>

**§22. Ismā'īlism** – whether as a revolutionary movement founded by the Khattābiyyah (by themselves or in collaboration with another group) or as a sect – was contemporary of Ismā'īl himself. It was founded – as mentioned above – on the belief that: the imāmate was transferred from al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) to Ismā'īl, and from him to his sons. But when they were faced with the problem of Ismā'īl's death in the lifetime of his father, they tried to reconcile this accident (which almost shattered their peculiar doctrine) with theological foundations. The historians of religion state that at the death of Ismā'īl, the Ismā'īliyyah were divided into two groups:

**FIRST:** A group said that Ismā'īl had not died; instead, they believed that he had gone into hiding, that his father had hidden him, and that he deliberately confused the people, staged his death as part of dissimulation (*taqiyyah*) and even prepared a written testimony that was attested by witnesses including al-Manṣūr's governor in Medina.

Some historians of religion have stated that this group totally rejected the death of Ismā'īl, it believed that he neither died during his father's lifetime nor after his death; and that he will never die until he appears and rules the whole world. This group is known as the Pure Ismā'īliyyah (*al-Ismā'īliyyah al-Khāliṣah*).<sup>60</sup> While other historians state that this group believed in the death of Ismā'īl but only after the death of his father.<sup>61</sup> The Ismā'īliyyah sources agree with this latter view as we have already mentioned above under §15 and as we shall elaborate on it later.

**SECOND:** The second group is known as al-Mubārakiyyah, after a person known as al-Mubārak. This group believes that Ismā'īl actually died in the lifetime of his father but this hap-

pened after his father had designated him as the Imām. They also believe that such designations cannot be revoked retroactively, and that imāmate cannot be transferred to anyone but the children of the designated Imām. The benefit of such designation is that the imāmate would continue exclusively among the children of the nominated person; and Ismā'īl, at the time of his death, nominated his son Muḥammad who, thereafter, became the Imām.<sup>62</sup> The historians say that the founder of this group, al-Mubāarak, was a slave/client of Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far himself.<sup>63</sup>

**§23.** What has come to us (the non-Ismā'īlīs) from the Ismā'īliyah sources – and I would like the reader to keep in mind the difficulties we have with such sources as mentioned in §12 above – shows that all the Ismā'īlīs are unanimous on one issue: all the signs of death were apparent on Ismā'īl, and whoever saw him was convinced of his death and would testify with absolute certainty to that matter; and that all the funeral rites were performed for him including placing him in the grave and burying him.

They also agree in the extraordinary steps taken by al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq (*'a.s.*) to demonstrate the death of Ismā'īl such as assembling witnesses who wrote a testimony about Ismā'īl's death; one of those who signed was Caliph Manṣūr's governor in Medina; and that this testimony was sent to the Caliph himself. And that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq (*'a.s.*) publicly announced his death; and that when the body of al-Imām Ismā'īl – as the Ismā'īlīs like to call him – was being carried to al-Baqī' cemetery, his father ordered that it be put onto the ground and then he un-covered Ismā'īl's face so that the people could see him; and that he was asking the people, "Is this not my son Ismā'īl?" and they were saying, "Yes." This he did more than once. Then he observed the mourning ritual for several days during which people would visit him to pay their condolences

and testify to the fact that his son Ismā'īl had died.

Although the Ismā'īlī sources agree on what we have mentioned above, but they differ among themselves in reconciling the above facts with their belief: while some say that Ismā'īl had actually died, others say that he went into concealment. (We shall elaborate later on the portrayal of the last group of the event, and their concept of the occultation.)

From among the persons I have surveyed in history, the following authorities believe in the death of Ismā'īl during his father's lifetime:

- i. The famous Ismā'īlī missionary (*ad-dā'ī*), Aḥmad ibn Ḥamdān ibn Aḥmad, Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī al-Warsānī al-Laythī (d. 322/934)<sup>64</sup>.
- ii. an-Nu'mān ibn Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr, al-Qāḍī, Abū Ḥanīfah, Ibn Ḥayyūn al-Miṣrī (270/884–363/974). The most famous Ismā'īlī writer and author of the well-known work *Da'āimu 'l-Islām*<sup>65</sup>.
- iii. Ja'far ibn Manṣūr al-Yamanī, one of the distinguished Ismā'īlī missionaries at the dawn of the Fāṭimids rule in North Africa. He is mentioned in the manuscript of *Asrāru 'n-nuṭaqā'*, as quoted by Muṣṭafā Ghālib, the Ismā'īlī, in *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, p.140; and Dr. Ḥasan Ibrāhīm Ḥasan in *Tārīkhu 'd-dawlati 'l-Fāṭimiyyah*, pp. 486-7<sup>66</sup>.
- iv. Aḥmad ibn 'Abdillāh, Ḥamīdu 'd-Dīn al-Kirmānī (b. 352/963; d. after 412/1021), he is described by his companions as "Ḥujjatu 'l-'Irāqayn" and "missionary of the missionaries".<sup>67</sup>
- v. Muḥammad Qazwīnī, the author of *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn*, already mentioned in §15 above.
- vi. ad-Dā'ī Idrīs ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abdillāh, 'Imādu 'd-Dīn, al-Qurashī al-Yamānī (832/1428? –872/1467)<sup>68</sup>.
- vii. ad-Dā'ī al-Ḥasan ibn Nuḥ al-Ismā'īlī al-Bahrūchī al-Hindī (d. 939/1532-1533)<sup>69</sup>.

viii. ash-Shaykh 'Abdullāh ibn al-Murtaḍā<sup>70</sup>.

ix. Asaf A.A. Fyzee. His statement will come below.

§24. Now, as an example of this group's view, we shall quote, herebelow, two accounts of their statements; and we restrict our comments only on the necessary aspects (which cannot be left unsaid); and overlook many others which are, presently, not at our capability to cite views thereby:

**First:** The absolute *dā'ir* – as he is described by the Ismā'īlī biographers – 'Imādu 'd-Dīn, Idrīs ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abdillāh al-Qurashī al-Yamānī, in his book *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār wa funūnu 'l-āthār* (the seventh quarto)<sup>71</sup> has a section on Ismā'īl which is entitled as: "About the story of al-Imām Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, the blessing of Allāh be upon them; and his death during the lifetime of his father; and the issue of imāmate to his son Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, peace be upon them; and of the Shī'ahs who inclined towards him of the descendants of al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq, peace be upon him and his sons; and their division after the concealment of the Imām . . ."

Then he says: "Abū 'Abdillāh aṣ-Ṣādiq, Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, had five children: Ismā'īl, 'Abdillāh; their mother was Fāṭimah daughter of al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib<sup>72</sup> . . . And Ja'far ibn Muḥammad (*'a.s.*), did not marry [anyone else] nor took any slave-girl for himself until Fāṭimah bint al-Ḥasan died . . ."<sup>73</sup>

"The most exalted in position and the most beloved of all to him was his son Ismā'īl (*'a.s.*); he used to keep him closer to himself with the exclusion of others and used to show more respect compared to others just as Ya'qūb (Jacob) prefer Yusūf over his other sons.<sup>74</sup> Then al-Imām Ja'far ibn Muḥammad (*'a.s.*) designated al-Imām Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far as the Imām and introduced him to the prominent Shī'ahs as the Imām who will take his place.<sup>75</sup>

"al-Qāḍī an-Nu'mān ibn Muḥammad, may Allāh be pleased with him, [the famous Ismā'īlī scholar to whose view regarding Ismā'īl's death we had previously referred], has narrated the following from al-Imām al-Mu'izz li-Dīnillāh ('a.s.), [his full name is Ma'add ibn Ismā'īl (al-Manṣūr) ibn Muḥammad (al-Qāim) ibn 'Abdillāh (al-Mahdī – the founder of the Fāṭimid dynasty), the Fāṭimid caliph (b. 319/931), caliphate 341/953–365/975]:

The circumstances of Abū 'Abdillāh Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ('a.s.) were restricted and constrained to a great extent – these circumstances came about during his time and engulfed his era.

I [i.e., al-Qāḍī Nu'mān ibn Muḥammad] said, 'This must have put the Shī'ahs in great difficulty after his death to the extent that they differed with one another about his successor!'

He [i.e., al-Mu'izz] ('a.s.) said, 'Therein lies the good fortune of the true people and misfortune of the evil ones.' (*ibid.* p.333)

I said, 'O my master! If he [aṣ-Ṣādiq, 'a.s.] had clarified the matter of succession just as it was clarified by his father [al-Bāqir, 'a.s.] about himself, and had dispelled the doubts from his followers, appointed and clearly designated a leader to succeed him – wouldn't this have eliminated the doubts and differences?'

He said, 'Far from truth! That was not the time for such a clear designation of a successor. Of course, he had done so privately for those whom he trusted. As for declaring it openly and publicizing it, that neither was impossible at that time nor was there any opportunity for him to do so during his era because of fear of the enemies. . .'

"al-Imām Ja'far ibn Muḥammad [aṣ-Ṣādiq] ('a.s.) bought a slave-girl named Umm Farwah,<sup>76</sup> and gifted her to his son Ismā'īl ('a.s.). She bore two sons for him namely, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl and 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl. It is, however, said that the mother of 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl was a lady from Makhzūmiyyah

tribe . . .<sup>77</sup> (*ibid.* p.374)

"When Abū Ja'far [al-Manṣūr] al-'Abbāsī came to know that aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*), has appointed Ismā'īl as his successor . . . he feared that Ismā'īl will turn away the public against him. So he sent a message to aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) inquiring whether Ismā'īl was residing with him . . . but al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) did not respond to him by sending his son Ismā'īl to al-Manṣūr . . . rather he (aṣ-Ṣādiq, '*a.s.*) started treating al-Manṣūr politely out of his fear for his son's life . . . thus, he concealed his son Ismā'īl who, consequently, stayed hidden in his house for a whole year and four months<sup>78</sup> till his ('*a.s.*)'s death.

"When al-Imām Ismā'īl (may Allāh's grace, pleasure, mercy and blessing be upon him<sup>79</sup>) died during the lifetime of his father, the latter disclosed his fate and announced his death. And the body of al-Imām Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far was carried to al-Baqī' cemetery; his father, aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*), went along with it to al-Baqī' and ordered that the bier be put on the ground, then he would uncover Ismā'īl's face, look at it, and would ask those who were present: 'Is this not my son Ismā'īl?' And they would say, 'Yes.' This he did many times."<sup>80</sup>

The famous missionary, Idrīs ibn al-Ḥasan, continues his narration and repeats second and third times (on pp.349, 350) that Ismā'īl died during the lifetime of his father. He had emphasized this point even when he was writing about his father, aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*). (vol.4, p.331)

**Second:** Asaf A.A. Fyze, in his article "The Ismā'īlīs", says: ". . . Ismā'īlism takes its name from the eldest of the sons of Imam Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. It appears that Ismā'īl was appointed the heir-apparent by the sixth Imam Ja'far, but later incurred the displeasure of his father. The causes are not known; but it is suggested that he was addicted to drink<sup>81</sup> . . . As Ismā'īl died before his father, his son Muḥammad, the seventh Imam according to the Ismā'īlī computation, was given a special status."<sup>82</sup>

§25. The second group of the Ismā'īlīs, i.e., al-Mubārakiyyah, agree with the first in all that has been said above except that it claims Ismā'īl died on the command of his father – the Imām – and was raised back to life and went into occultation by a sort of miracle. The following is a list of the names of scholars of this group and their views:

1) In "ar-Risālatu 'l-Ūlā" of *Arba' Kutub Ismā'īliyyah*, it says: "Question no.12 (?), about our Master Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far (may Allāh's blessings be upon him), the display of his death, and his return back to life in Baṣrah." Then the writer answers the question by saying that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) ordered Ismā'īl to pretend death, and so he died (and for three days his father asked those who visited him to witness the death of his son, and then ordered that he be buried on the fourth day). Then he came back to life; this was kind of a miracle.<sup>83</sup>

2) Aḥmad ibn Ya'qūb, Abu 'l-Fawāris al-Ḥaqqānī aṭ-Tarābulusī al-Miṣrī (b. 360/971 d. approx. 413/1022), the Ismā'īlī missionary, discusses the imāmate of Ismā'īl and his son, Muḥammad, in his book *al-Imāmah*. He then also talks about those who reject their imāmate on account of Ismā'īl's death because "there are famous and well-known reports about Ismā'īl's death during his father's lifetime." He continues to say that this rejection is based on "clear proof that reliable people saw the face of Ismā'īl disappearing under the earth [i.e., in his grave]." Then the missionary proceeds to discredit this view by saying that "the Imām ('a.s.), has the right to conceal his proof and his ability from his enemy and from those whose might he fears because he is most knowledgeable of all about the good of the issue. And I say that the fact that aṣ-Ṣādiq, Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ('a.s.), displayed the death of his son Ismā'īl during his own lifetime in order to conceal him. If it had not been so then he would not have openly sat in mourning for his son for those



who came to pay condolences to him so that they could testify to the death of his son Ismā'īl. This is known by the correct reports narrated from his students."<sup>84</sup>

3) The 'most distinguished' missionary – as the Ismā'īlīs like to call him – Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Ḥasan aṣ-Ṣūrī (417/1026–490/1097), after refuting the Imāmiyyah's belief about the Awaited al-Mahdī, denying its authenticity, ridiculing his Occultation and questioning the advantage of concealment, says in *al-Qaṣīdatu 'ṣ-Ṣūriyah*:

*It is proven by deduction and evidence  
that in Ismā'īl's house is the guidance.  
And he, not the brothers, is the inheritor  
of the status of aṣ-Ṣādiq as his successor.  
Then ascended in his exalted position,  
Muḥammad the Seventh, holder of fortune.  
His call spread wide and opened up  
From the hidden wisdom it shone up.  
The Banū 'Abbāsīd Sultan of the age  
was a man very strong and a savage.  
The fear of 'Abbāsīd Sultan's animosity  
caused Ismā'īl to disappear prematurely.  
Just as Muḥammad after him had to hide,  
while the Sultan searched and spied.  
But Allāh took him under His protection,  
then He guarded him in His station.  
After him many Imāms went into hiding,  
for tyranny and darkness was spreading.*<sup>85</sup>

§26. As for the modern Ismā'īlī writers, we shall quote only what has been written in Arabic, for I have no access to anything in other languages except the writings of Asaf A.A. Fyzee which have already quoted earlier.

a) 'Ārif Tāmīr, while writing about Ismā'īl, says: "His father,

aş-Şādiq, claimed that he died in the year 138 AH<sup>86</sup> according to the testimony in which he asked the 'Abbāsīd Caliph al-Manşūr's governor to be a witness. This action was just a cover to conceal Ismā'īl . . . This caused him to leave [Medina] for Baṣrah so that he may live there in hiding for the rest of his life. He died in Baṣrah in 145 AH<sup>87</sup> While his brother, Mūsā ibn Ja'far al-Kāẓim worked as a cover for him . . ."

There are many statements by the historians, which confirm that he died during the lifetime of his father; and that the story of his appearance in Baṣrah is just a baseless story. Whatever may be the case, the Ismā'īlīs became known for secrecy, concealment and protection concerning their Imāms.<sup>88</sup> In the light of this, it is not implausible to think of the first narration as correct.<sup>89</sup>

b) Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib, after discussing a little about Ismā'īl and his death, says: "Yet most Ismā'īlī historians say that the story of the death of Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far during the lifetime of his father was a story by which *ibn* [sic] Ja'far aş-Şādiq intended to mislead and misinform the 'Abbāsīd Caliph Abū Ja'far al-Manşūr who pursued the Shī'ah Imāms. Ja'far aş-Şādiq feared for his son and successor, Ismā'īl, so he claimed his death, assembled the witnesses who testified to his death in writing, and then sent that testimony to the 'Abbāsīd Caliph who expressed joy and delight at the death of Ismā'īl to whom was assigned the imāmate of the Shī'ah. Then Ismā'īl has been seen at that time in Baṣrah and other cities of Iran . . ." Then Dr. Ghālib insists on this point again: "After having surveyed all that has been written about the imāmate of Ismā'īl, our view is that al-Imām Ja'far aş-Şādiq sensed the danger that threatened the life of his son . . . therefore, he ordered him to go into hiding; and this happened in the year 145 AH and he went into hiding. Then he was sighted in the year 151 AH in Baṣrah when he passed by a crippled person whom he cured by the

permission of Allāh. Ismā'īl lived for many years . . . until he died in 157 AH"<sup>90</sup>

**§27. *Aḥādīth* of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) denying Ismā'īl's Imāmate:**

Now, I would like to quote the *aḥādīth*, which clearly prove that al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) did not ever appoint Ismā'īl as an imām. I shall present these *aḥādīth* in brief without quoting their *isnād* (chain of narrators):

i) an-Nu'mānī narrates through his sources from al-Walīd ibn Ṣabīḥ who said: "There occurred between me and a person named as 'Abdu 'l-Jalīl a discussion [apparently on imāmate and imām] in which he said, 'Surely Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] ('a.s.), has appointed Ismā'īl as his successor.' I mentioned this [conversation] to Abū 'Abdillāh ('a.s.) and he said, 'O Walīd, no by Allāh! For, if I have done so, then it is for so-and-so' – referring to Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsā ('a.s.) – and then he ('a.s.) named him."<sup>91</sup>

ii) al-Kishshī narrates through his sources from Ismā'īl ibn 'Āmir who said: "I visited Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] ('a.s.), and described for him the Imāms until I reached to his name, and then I said, 'And Ismā'īl is [the Imām] after you.' He said, 'As for him, no.'" Ḥammād [ibn 'Uthmān who has narrated this *ḥadīth* from Ismā'īl] said, "I asked Ismā'īl, 'What prompted you to say that Ismā'īl after you?' He replied, 'al-Mufaḍḍal ibn 'Umar has asked me [to say that].'"<sup>92</sup>

iii) an-Nu'mānī narrates through his sources from Ishāq ibn 'Ammār aṣ-Ṣayrafī who said: "My brother, Ismā'īl ibn 'Ammār, described his faith and belief to Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] ('a.s.), and said, 'I bear witness that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allāh and that you' – and then he described them, the Imāms, one after the other until he reached Abū 'Abdillāh ('a.s.) – and then said, 'And Ismā'īl after you.' The Imām said, 'As for Ismā'īl, no.'"<sup>93</sup>

iv) There is a lengthy *ḥadīth* narrated by both an-Nu'mānī and

al-Kishshī from al-Fayḍ ibn al-Mukhtār in which al-Imām Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) has denied that imāmate was for Ismā‘īl and confirmed it for al-Kāẓim (‘a.s.), while the latter was still young and the former was present in the gathering but then left [on hearing his father's statement].<sup>94</sup>

v) aṣ-Ṣaffār and al-Mufīd have narrated with correct *isnād* from Masma‘ ibn ‘Abdi'l-Malik who [said that he] visited Abū ‘Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] (‘a.s.), while Ismā‘īl was present there. He (Masma‘) believed that Ismā‘īl would be the next imām after his father. There he [Masma‘] heard aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) clearly appointing al-Kāẓim [as the next imām]. Others, also, heard this with him; and then he (‘a.s.) denied Ismā‘īl to be an imām.<sup>95</sup>

vi) aṣ-Ṣaffār and al-Kulaynī have narrated from Abū Baṣīr who said: "I was with Abū ‘Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] (‘a.s.), while [people were] describing the successors [of the Prophet, i.e., imāms] and I mentioned Ismā‘īl. The Imām said, 'No, by Allāh, O Abū Muḥammad! This is not up to us, or anyone else except Allāh, to Whom belong Might and Majesty; He reveals one [name] after another.'"<sup>96</sup>

**§28. *Aḥādīth* of aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) on designation of al-Kāẓim (‘a.s.) to Imāmate:** There are correct *aḥādīth*, which prove that aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) has clearly appointed his son al-Kāẓim (‘a.s.) during the lifetime of Ismā‘īl. Some of such *aḥādīth* have already been mentioned in §27 (see the fourth and fifth narration), and here we add the following:

i) The *ḥadīth* by al-Fayḍ ibn al-Mukhtār as narrated by aṣ-Ṣaffār in *Baṣā’iru 'd-Darajāt*, p.336; al-Kulaynī in *al-Kāfi*, vol.1, pp.307, 798; al-Majlisī in *al-Biḥār*, vol.48, pp.14-15; and al-Mufīd in *al-Irshād* (English translation) p.437-8.

ii) The correct *ḥadīth* of Manṣūr ibn Ḥāzim which says that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.), appointed his son al-Kāẓim (‘a.s.), while the latter was around five years of age. This would mean the

year 134/751 since al-Imām al-Kāzīm was born on 7th of Safar 129/28th of October 746. See *al-Kāfi*, vol.1, p.309 and *al-Irshād* (English translation) p.438.

iii) The *ḥadīth* narrated by aṣ-Ṣadūq from Ibrāhīm al-Karkhī who said that he visited al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) and saw al-Kāzīm ('a.s.) entering the room while he was still a young boy. The Imām stood up and kissed him, and clearly declared that he is the next Imām after him. The *ḥadīth* continues until Ibrāhīm says: "Then entered a person from the sympathizers of Banū Umayyah and the speech broke off."<sup>97</sup> This shows that this event took place before 132/750 which was the beginning of the 'Abbāsīd era.

Besides these, there are other *aḥādīth* mentioned by al-Mufīd in *al-Irshād* under the chapter "The Designation (*naṣṣ*) of (al-Imām Mūsā) for the Imāmate by his Father, peace be on them" in which aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) has designated Mūsā al-Kāzīm ('a.s.) as an imām while he was still a child.

**§29. The Concept of *al-Badā'* and Ismā'īl:** As for the concept of *al-badā'* and Ismā'īl, I do not want to discuss here about *al-badā'* and its meaning or the various views on it and the correct one. Here I just intend to touch upon the issue of *al-badā'* in relation to Ismā'īl.

What is found in the Ismā'īlī literature about *al-badā'* has, to a greater extent, no significant religious value for us. Our ash-Shaykhu 'ṣ-Ṣadūq (r.a.), has pointed it out when he discusses *al-badā'* in *at-Tawhīd* (p.336) and says: "As for the saying of al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq, peace be upon him, in which he said, 'Allāh has not manifested any matter like what manifested from His [decision] concerning my son Ismā'īl.'<sup>98</sup> The Imām meant that nothing manifested itself from the will of Allāh concerning any affair, as it manifested concerning my son Ismā'īl when He took him away before me, so that it may be known that he was not

the Imām after me. However, this *ḥadīth* has been narrated to me through Abu 'l-Ḥusayn al-Asadī (may Allāh be pleased with him) and it contains a strange thing: He narrates that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) said, 'No *badā*' occurred for Allāh the way it occurred for Him in case of my [fore-]father Ismā'īl when He ordered his father Ibrāhīm to sacrifice him but then replaced it with a greater sacrifice [Qur'ān, 37:101-7].'" As for both versions of this *ḥadīth*, I have my own view, yet I have quoted them to show the meaning of *al-badā*'.

ash-Shaykhu 'ṣ-Ṣadūq says that the *ḥadīth* has come in different styles with a variety of meanings; that each word carries a different meaning from the other, and that neither versions of the *ḥadīth* is correct. This is how al-Majlisī has understood aṣ-Ṣadūq's conclusion in *al-Biḥār*, vol.4, p.109.<sup>99</sup> The opinion of aṣ-Ṣadūq (r.a.), regarding the *ḥadīth* of *al-badā*' in relation to Ismā'īl may be summarized as follows:

a) The *ḥadīth* of *al-badā*' is not authentic, therefore it would be incorrect to rely upon it as a religious proof.

b) The *ḥadīth* has been narrated in conflicting forms: One version talks about *al-badā*' in case of Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far, while the other version talks about *al-badā*' in case of the Prophet Ismā'īl ibn Ibrāhīm ('*a.s.*), the fore-father of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*).

c) The word used for Ismā'īl son of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) is not the meaning of *al-badā*' commonly used; its correct interpretation is attributable to Allāh, the Praised. The meaning of *al-badā*' in this *ḥadīth* merely means that Allāh, the Praised, manifested the error of the people (in their judgment) and their ignorance concerning destiny and death, and what Allāh, the Praised, had decreed. There were some who thought that the next imām after aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) would be his son Ismā'īl. They erroneously relied on appearance of things – not facts – like Ismā'īl being the eldest son of his father, and that he would live after his father and become the next imām, etc. as mentioned by al-Mufīd (r.a.), in

*al-Irshād*. But when Allāh caused him to die before his father, the erroneousness of their conjectures became manifest to such people, they realized that they did not have the knowledge of the future and what has been hidden from them except when Allāh Himself manifests it to them. By Ismā'īl's premature death, Allāh manifested to them that He had not chosen him as an imām; otherwise, He would not have caused him to die before his father.

d) ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (r.a.), has another interpretation concerning this *ḥadīth* in which he has relied upon another *ḥadīth* of al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.). We shall discuss it later.

**§30. The "Ghaybah" of Ismā'īl:** Even if we overlook all that has been quoted above from the Ismā'īlī sources about Ismā'īl's death and the date of his death, the usage of the term "*ghaybah*" for Ismā'īl does not convey the meaning we know for this term. *al-Ghaybah* means that a person lives the life, granted to him by Allāh, in concealment and hiding from the people, and which entails severing contact from the public – generally, if it is a minor occultation, and completely, if it is a major occultation.

We have already mentioned that the available Ismā'īlī sources are unanimous on the view that Ismā'īl definitely died like any other human beings and that complete funeral rites which are normally observed for dead persons were also observed for him. There are, however, a few among the Ismā'īlis who claim that Ismā'īl came back to life after having died, (see §25). This life after death in this world is reflected by the term *ar-raj'ah* and not by the term *al-ghaybah*. This minority group claims that:

- a) Ismā'īl did not survive his father; that he died but rose back to life. In other words, this group believes in *raj'ah* of Ismā'īl; no matter whether they like this term for their belief or not!
- b) His coming back to life was a kind of miracle of the

highest form.

- c) Ismā'īl lived for many years after coming back to life.
- d) After coming back to life, Ismā'īl lived in hiding, away from the eyes of the people.

All these four claims must be substantiated by proofs. However, the proofs offered for their claims are: -

a) They say that Ismā'īl lived, after his father's death, for five years (i.e., 148 AH + 5 yrs. = 153 AH/770 CE). So, if we add these five years to those he lived as contemporary to his father, since the death play was performed for him, he would have them lived for several years after he came back to life. They try to prove their claim by quoting the story of the crippled person who begged a man (for charity). (The man), instead of giving him money, cured him miraculously; and that man was Ismā'īl.<sup>100</sup> Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib narrates this story by saying, "And it is said that al-Imām Ismā'īl was seen in Baṣrah where he passed by a crippled person who begged for help and he cured him by the permission of Allāh."<sup>101</sup> But a few pages later, he repeats the same story as a historical fact and says that it happened in the year 151/768.<sup>102</sup> I do not know from where he got this date!

Both ash-Shahristānī and aṣ-Ṣafadī have narrated this story as the Ismā'īlīs' evidence for the raj'ah of Ismā'īl but in a slightly different form. They write that the reason, which prompted aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) to call for witnesses at the death of Ismā'īl, lies in "the report, which was forwarded to al-Manṣūr that Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far was seen in Baṣrah where he passed by a crippled person and cured him by the permission of Allāh. al-Manṣūr sent a message to aṣ-Ṣādiq saying that Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far is alive and has been seen in Baṣrah. At that time, aṣ-Ṣādiq sent the written testimony [of Ismā'īl's death] to al-Manṣūr which included the testimony of his governor in Medina."<sup>103</sup>

Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib narrates this in his *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-*



*Ismā'īliyyah* (p.139) and does not reject it. In light of this quotation, the story, even if it is true, does not prove that Ismā'īl lived after his father aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.)!

It is truly amazing to see that Muṣṭafā Ghālib quotes from *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn* – which we have already quoted under §15 in which it mentions Ismā'īl's death in the year 145/762 – as follows: "The book *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn* confirms that Ismā'īl was the first Imām to go into hiding, and the beginning of his occultation was in the year 145 AH; and that he died only seven years after that [145 AH + 7yrs. = 152 AH/769 CE]."<sup>104</sup> By keeping in mind what we have mentioned about reliability of Dr. Ghālib's quotations (in §21) and how he falsely attributes statements to published works of non-Ismā'īlī writers, we can excuse him if he interpolates while quoting from an Ismā'īlī manuscript which is inaccessible to most, thinking that it is the property of the Ismā'īliyyah who can use it any way they like without others having a right to prevent them from it!

Even more amusing is the categorical statement of Dr. Ghālib where he says that Ismā'īl died in 158/775 while he also quotes the statement from *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn* (which gives the death year as 152 AH) and proves the *ghaybah* of their imām!<sup>105</sup>

b) One more proof this group of Ismā'īlīs present for their belief (that Ismā'īl did not die, instead he just staged his death as dissimulation so that he may not be killed) is the following: Muḥammad, Ismā'īl's full brother, who was a young child at that time, went to the coffin in which Ismā'īl was placed, lifted the shroud and saw that Ismā'īl opened both his eyes. He went to his father in a startled state and said, "My brother is alive! My brother is alive!" His father said, "This is how the descendants of the Messenger (ṣ. 'a.w.a.), appear in the after-life."<sup>106</sup> Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib quoted it in *A'lāmu 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, (pp.162-3) and *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, p.139 without refuting it.

A logical explanation of this event – if it is true, although it

seems far removed from truth – is that Ismā‘īl did not die a real death; he just pretended to die so that the people may know his death; and then he disappeared after that. We may rightly question whether it is possible for a person to stage his own death to this extent – to deceive so many people in general that they became convinced of his real death, they witnessed his burial and even signed on the testimony to that effect – that he is placed in the grave and buried, and stays buried for a long time until he is dug out in the darkness of night? Is this logically possible?

Moreover, it has already been mentioned in §24 that Ismā‘īl's full brother was ‘Abdullāh al-Aḫṭāḥ, not Muḥammad son of [al-Imām] aṣ-Ṣādiq (*'a.s.*), whose mother was a slave girl. And ‘Abdullāh, the full brother, was not that much younger than Ismā‘īl to be described as a child on the day of Ismā‘īl's death – by whichever date of the latter's death you count!

### C. Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl:

**§31. Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl's Birth:** Our discussion would be incomplete if we do not discuss about Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl who was a contemporary of al-Imām al-Kāzīm (*'a.s.*) on day of aṣ-Ṣādiq's death when the imāmate was transferred to al-Kāzīm (*'a.s.*). We have already mentioned in §24 that Ismā‘īl had two sons, the eldest being Muḥammad and the youngest ‘Alī, and a daughter named Fāṭimah.

Muḥammad Qazwīnī quotes from *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn* (foil B/334) as follows: "Our Master Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl the Seventh, the Complete, the heir of aṣ-Ṣādiq (may Allāh be pleased with him) was born on 13th Dhi 'l-ḥijjah, year 121 AH [20th November 739]. On the day of his grandfather aṣ-Ṣādiq's death [25th Shawwāl 148/14th December 765], he was twenty-seven years old."<sup>107</sup> The same date has been given by ‘Ārif Tāmīr in the table appended to *al-Qaṣīdatu 'sh-Shāfiyah*, p.98.

I have not found anything in the early Ismā'īlī sources other than what has been mentioned by ad-Dā'ī Idrīs who said, "Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl and his brother 'Alī were older in age than their uncles Mūsā,<sup>108</sup> Ishāq and Muḥammad, sons of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), . . . And Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl was eight years older than his brother ['Alī]."<sup>109</sup> This is different from the date given for Muḥammad's birth in *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn*, for if we suppose that 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl was just a year older than Mūsā al-Kāzim ('a.s.), who was born in the year 129 AH (and not 128), then 'Alī's birth year would be 128 AH. And if Muḥammad was eight years older than 'Alī, then his birth year would have been 120 AH or even earlier. Idrīs further writes, "A narrator who is trusted for his truthfulness has said: 'al-Imām Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl was twenty-six years old when his father died, and his brother 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl was a man who had attained maturity and was eighteen years old.'"<sup>110</sup>

I do not know which of the three dates of Ismā'īl's death had ad-Dā'ī Idrīs taken into consideration, because he has not given his death year although he confirms that Ismā'īl died before his father aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.): from the dates given for Ismā'īl's death, the closest to his father's death is 145 AH and the remotest is 133 AH. (If we take 145 AH, then Ismā'īl's birth year would be 119 AH since he lived for 26 years. See §15 above.)

Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib quotes from the same ad-Dā'ī Idrīs and also from ad-Dā'ī Ja'far ibn Manṣūr al-Yamanī that they said, "Muḥammad was a child at the time of Ismā'īl's death."<sup>111</sup> Again Dr. Ghālib and Dr. Jamālu 'd-Dīn ash-Shayyāl quote ad-Dā'ī Idrīs that "Muḥammad was a child of three years old when his father died."<sup>112</sup>

I really do not know which of the two is truthful in narrating the views of Idrīs ibn al-Ḥasan and which of the two conflicting views of the famous missionary Idrīs (who is addressed by the Ismā'īlīs as "Sayyidunā ad-Dā'ī") is correct!

Asaf A.A. Fyzee says that Zāhid 'Alī writes in his book *Madhhab* "quoting ancient [Ismā'īlī] authorities, declares him [al-Kāzīm, 'a.s.], to a *hijāb* (protector, veil) of the infant Imam Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl"<sup>113</sup> after the death of his grandfather aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.).

ash-Shaykh 'Abdullāh ibn al-Murtaḍā says: "al-Imām Ismā'īl did not live after being designated except for a short time until he died. He left behind a wife who was pregnant with Muḥammad al-Ḥabīb, and he inspired to this imām – who was still in the womb of his mother – the secrets of imāmate. And after the death of Ismā'īl, his brother Mūsā came to his father al-Imām Ja'far saying, 'Designate the imāmate for me after my brother.' He replied, 'Be silent, O Mūsā!'"<sup>114</sup>

Muṣṭafā Ghālib says, "It is proven from the Ismā'īlī sources that the birth of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl was in the year 132 AH (749-750 CE)"<sup>115</sup> Then he says, "At the time of his father's death in 158 AH (775 CE), Ismā'īl was twenty-six years of age."<sup>116</sup> Then he further says, "Whoever says that Muḥammad was a child when his father died in the year 145 AH (762 CE) is indeed mistaken. This is the date of Ismā'īl's disappearance, not his death."<sup>117</sup> Muṣṭafā Ghālib also insists that Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl was older than his uncle al-Kāzīm ('a.s.).<sup>118</sup>

All these statements are contradictions upon contradictions! The confusion is clear even by taking one statement as true; for example: If Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl was born in 132 AH, then how can he be older than his uncle born in 129 AH? And how can he be considered a child of three years of age in the year 145 AH?

'Ārif Tāmir says, "Muḥammad was born in the year 141 AH (758-759 CE)."<sup>119</sup> Then he says, "At the time of his father's death, he was fourteen years old."<sup>120</sup> Although he dates the year of Ismā'īl's death to be 145 AH (762-3 CE)<sup>121</sup>; then he mentions that it has been listed in the index of *al-Qarāmiṭah*: "Ismā'īl ibn

Ja'far (101–159 AH)" and "Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl (141–193 AH)"<sup>122</sup>. Then he, himself, mentions in the list supplemented to *al-Qaṣīdatu 'sh-Shāfiyah*: "Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far al-Maktūm [the one kept in concealment] (113–145 AH)" and "Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Maymūn [the auspicious] (121–193)"<sup>123</sup>

Thus 'Ārif Tāmīr contradicts himself in the birth year of Ismā'īl between 101 and 113 AH, and in his death between 145 and 159 AH; then he contradicts himself in the birth year of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl between 121 and 141 AH. Thirdly, he contradicts himself by saying that Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl was fourteen years old at the death of his father: for if we take 141 AH, then Muḥammad was only four years old at the time of his father's death in the year 145 AH; or eighteen years old if his father died in 159. However, if we take 121 as Muḥammad's birth year, then he was twenty-four years old at the time of his father's death in the year 145 AH, or thirty-eight years if his father died in 159 AH!

**§32. Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl's Death:** There is disagreement among the Ismā'īlī sources that I have surveyed on the year of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl's death. Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib and 'Ārif Tāmīr have stated 193/808-809<sup>124</sup> while the Syrian *dā'ī*, Nūru 'd-Dīn Aḥmad, in his *Fuṣūl wa Akhbār*, writes 169/785-786 as the death year of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl.<sup>125</sup> The second date is definitely wrong because Muḥammad lived for many years after that as will be mentioned below.

There is, however, an even greater disagreement among the Ismā'īlīs over the occultation of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl: Where did he travel? Which cities did he visit? Where did he finally reach in his journey and where did he settle down? Where did he die and where was he buried? We are only concerned with the last question.

al-Juwaynī and al-Hamadānī have mentioned that Muḥammad

finally traveled to the Damāwand mountains in Rayy and took refuge in them, and settled down in a village which has been described by a variety of names: Samlah or Shamlah or Salambah.<sup>126</sup> Muḥammad Qazwīnī says that probably all these names are corruption of the correct name Shalambah that was at that time the capital of Damāwand district.<sup>127</sup> Yāqūt says that the village is known as Shalanbah. However, the first name is the most correct.<sup>128</sup>

ad-Dā'ī Idrīs gives a lengthy story of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl's journeys during his concealment, moving from one town to another until he settled down in Sābūr and died there, and that his grave is in Farghānah.<sup>129</sup> Muṣṭafā Ghālib relates a similar story from ad-Dā'ī Ja'far ibn Manṣūr al-Yamanī.<sup>130</sup> But Sābūr or Shāpūr was a town or a district in the province of Fārs in southern Iran<sup>131</sup> while Farghāna, if meant to be the one famous by this name, then it is a town and a precious rural district situated in Transoxania.<sup>132</sup> There are thousands of miles between the two!

Muṣṭafā Ghālib narrates a similar story from ad-Dā'ī Idrīs himself, from his book *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī* (p.54), and mentions Nayshāpūr (the famous town in Khurāsān [Iran]) instead of Sābūr.<sup>133</sup> Either Muṣṭafā Ghālib has wrongly quoted Idrīs or Idrīs has contradicted himself in his two books. However it may be, they have done nothing to resolve the issue because there are thousands of miles between Nayshāpūr, the old and modern Iranian town, and Farghāna, the town in Turkamanistan beyond the borders of Afghanistan, which is also estimated at thousands of miles. If this story of theirs is true, then there was no need to change the name from Sābūr to Nayshāpūr in order to re-write the history, because Farghānah (as mentioned by Yāqūt) or Farghān (as mentioned by as-Sam'ānī) was a village in Fārs in the same region where Sābūr is located.<sup>134</sup>

This is further verified by a statement from the Syrian *dā'ī*

Nūru 'd-Dīn Aḥmad who mentions Nahāwand instead of Damāwand and says, "Verily Muḥammad left that town [Nahāwand] under the darkness and concealment for the town of Sābūr, and from there to Farghānah, and then he went to 'Askar-Mukram and died therein."<sup>135</sup> 'Askar-Mukram is a town near Ahwāz which still exists in Khuzistān in southern Iran.<sup>136</sup>

Muṣṭafā Ghālib quotes ash-Shaykh 'Abdullāh ibn Murtaḍā, a Syrian Ismā'īlī, as follows: "Surely Muḥammad returned from his journey to Iraq which he left in the year 193 AH [809 CE, the year in which the 'Abbāsīd Caliph Hārūn ar-Rashīd died] to Tadmur."<sup>137</sup> Muṣṭafā Ghālib himself writes, "It is true that Muḥammad traveled to the countries mentioned earlier; however, the Syrian Ismā'īlī sources mention that he finally settled in the Syrian town of Tadmur in 191 AH (806 CE) where he died in the year 193 AH, and was buried in the mountain located in the north-west which is known as 'Maqām Mawlāy Muḥammad 'Alī'." This is also confirmed by 'Ārif Tāmir.<sup>138</sup>

It is really strange to read what ad-Dā'ī Idrīs writes about Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl while he was in Medina: al-Imām [Muḥammad] had built an underground cellar in his house in Medina where he used to hide from the enemy. When ar-Rashīd's men came to capture him, he entered the cellar and disappeared in it; they searched for him but could not find him."<sup>139</sup> These authorities of Ismā'īlism did not realize that underground cellars never existed in Medina, neither in past nor in present; it seems that that the myth of "disappearance in the cellar" which is wrongfully attributed to the Imāmiyyah tempted them invent a cellar for their imām in occultation in which they have concealed him!

\* \* \* \* \*

There is no clear indication in the Imāmiyyah sources about the date of birth and death of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl. However, as a circumstantial evidence we have a *ḥadīth* about his slander

against al-Imām al-Kāzīm (*a.s.*), which clearly shows that he died unexpectedly in Baghdad in 179/790. This is confirmed by one of the most prominent and famous genealogist, ash-Sharīf Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī, known as Shaykhu 'sh-Sharaf al-'Ubaydalī (338/950–437/1049). He says, "This Muḥammad is known as 'Imām of al-Maymuniyah' (whom we will discuss later) and his grave is in Baghdad."<sup>140</sup> Some scholars say that the present grave at the corner of al-Faḍl mosque, in al-Faḍl neighbourhood of Baghdad, is the grave of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl.<sup>141</sup>

**§33. Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl's Imāmate:** Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl is counted as one of the Ismā'īlī imāms. And it is generally through him – according to the most common sayings – that the Fāṭimid caliphs trace their genealogy to al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq (*a.s.*), although the various Ismā'īlī sub-sects are divided on the line which connects 'Ubaydullāh al-Mahdī (b. 259/873), the first Fāṭimid caliph (297/910–322/934), to Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl. The Musta'liyyah disagree with the Persian Nizāriyyah on the genealogical chart; and both disagree with the Indian Nizāriyyah; and all disagree with what the Druze has to say on this issue. They do not only disagree in names, but also in numbers of the ancestors.<sup>142</sup>

Asaf A.A. Fyzee writes, "After Muḥammad there followed three hidden Imams; and it is impossible to be certain whether they were historical persons or fictitious Imams created by the founders of the movement."<sup>143</sup>

It does not concern us here whether for the Ismā'īlīs Muḥammad was the seventh Imām or the eighth; whether he was a complete (*tāmm*) imām or incomplete. All the Ismā'īlīs say that Ismā'īl designated his son Muḥammad as the next imām.<sup>144</sup> And they have another argument also: Since the imāmate was designated for Ismā'īl, it was impossible to remove it from him, and



that it must continue among his descendants for ever, and that it must be transferred to the eldest son of the preceding imām. This is how Muḥammad inherited the imāmate with the exclusion of his uncles, and his children inherited it with the exclusion of their cousins.<sup>145</sup>

At times they even go beyond this and claim that aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) himself designated his grandson Muḥammad for imāmate after the death of Ismā'īl.<sup>146</sup>

We have already refuted the Ismā'īlīs' claim that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) had designated Ismā'īl (see §27-28), while the second and third claims mentioned above have been refuted by ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (see §41 below). We shall talk later on about the imāmate of al-Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm ('*a.s.*) and the stand of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl.

**§34. Muḥammad and The Maymūniyyah Link:** The statement of Shaykhu 'sh-Sharaf al-'Ubaydalī has already been mentioned in §32 where he has described Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl as the "Imām of al-Maymuniyyah". This description, going back to the fourth Islamic century, is unique in the sense that it relates Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl to the Maymuniyyah as a sect rather than a family. Although the historians of religious sects have referred to this relationship and mentioned it in different ways, but they all differ from the real meaning of this expression. On the one hand, they have used al-Maymuniyyah, in the Ismā'īlī context, only as a family affinity not as a sect. On the other hand, they have used al-Maymuniyyah as a name for a group of al-'Ajāridah, a sub-sect of the Khārijites which is affiliated to Maymūn ibn Khālid or Maymūn ibn 'Imrān (d. 100/718).<sup>147</sup>

The heresiographers, however, mentioned (a group known as) "al-Qaddāhiyyah" and said that it is one of the Bāṭinī sects, which traces its origin to 'Abdullāh ibn Maymūn al-Qaddāh. The only indication that there was a sect known as al-Maymūniyy-

yah which believed in Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl as its imām comes from Shaykhu 'sh-Sharaf, as mentioned above. 'Ārif Tāmir, the contemporary Ismā'īlī, describes al-Maymūniyyah as follows: "A Ja'fariyyah sub-sect which believed in the imāmate of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad aṣ-Ṣādiq, and which was led by Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, a Persian who was among the students of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad aṣ-Ṣādiq. This group is considered as the foundation upon which the Ismā'īliyyah was built later on."<sup>148</sup>

The two prominent persons in the Maymūniyyah family who were the most famous personalities in the Ismā'īliyyah call are Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ and his son 'Abdullāh ibn Maymūn. I do not wish to study these two persons in the light of the Imāmiyyah sources because the discussion is indeed very lengthy and comprehensive. I may summarize it by saying that Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, a client (*mawlā*) of Banū Makhzūm, was from Mecca; he narrated *aḥādīth* from Imāms aṣ-Ṣajjād (36/659–94/712), al-Bāqir (57/676–114/733), and aṣ-Ṣādiq (83/702–148/765), peace be upon them; and he was known as "al-Qaddāḥ, i.e, the arrow sharpener", because of his profession. His son, 'Abdullāh, narrated *aḥādīth* from al-Bāqir and aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.). 'Abdullāh is considered as trustworthy (*thiqah*) by the Imāmiyyah traditionalists; and although what the non-Imāmiyyah biographers have written about him concurs with the Imāmiyyah narration, but they do not considered him as trustworthy. Muḥammad Qazwīnī quotes from *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn* (foil B/333) describing "Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ among the famous companions of al-Bāqir ('a.s.)", and when he discusses aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) he says that among his famous men were Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb, al-Mufaḍḍal ibn 'Umar and Jābir ibn Ḥayyān aṣ-Ṣūfī, author of bibliography books, and 'Abdullāh ibn Maymūn . . .<sup>149</sup>

al-'Allāmah Muḥammad Qazwīnī, the famous research scholar, has studied this issue extensively in his annotations to the *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī* (vol.3, pp.313-43), and through him it reached

the Orientalist sources, and finally found its way into the contemporary Ismā'īlī literature.

Neither do I wish to comment on what the opponents of the Ismā'īliyyah have said on this issue – they have tried to trace the genealogy of the Fāṭimids and the faith of the Ismā'īliyyah to the Maymūniyyah family; and then have traced the Maymūniyyah family itself, sometimes, to the Jews, and at other times to the Magians! They have also labeled the Ismā'īliyyah with many accusations; the lightest ones are atheism, heresy, and secret adherence to Daysāniyyah [heretic] idea!

I only wish to briefly state what I have found in the Ismā'īliyyah sources. The Ismā'īlī writers disagree with non-Ismā'īlīs in computation of the era of Maymūn and his son 'Abdullāh. Non-Ismā'īlī sources are unanimous in saying that Maymūn lived only during the first half of the second Islamic century (eighth century of CE), and that his son 'Abdullāh's life did not extend beyond the early part of the second half of that century. The Ismā'īlī sources, on the other hand, state that Maymūn settled down in Salāmiyyah, in Syria, and died there towards the end of the second Islamic century<sup>150</sup> (early ninth century of CE); and that his son 'Abdullāh was born in the last year of that century (200/816), and that he died and was buried in 270/883-884 in Salāmiyyah.<sup>151</sup> Ibnu 'n-Nadīm mentions that 'Abdullāh was alive in the year 261/875;<sup>152</sup> and al-Hamadānī quotes Ismā'īlī sources saying that 'Abdullāh ibn Maymūn al-Qaddāh settled down in 'Askar-Mukram in the year 295/907-908; and that year was the beginning of his missionary activities. Then he describes a lengthy missionary career for 'Abdullāh which shows that the latter lived for many more years.<sup>153</sup>

§35. Asaf A.A. Fyzee says, "Some historians identify Imam Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl as the spiritual father of Maymūn al-Qaddāh;<sup>154</sup> while the sectarians declare him to be the seventh

Imam, the seventh *waṣī*, the seventh *nāṭiq* and the seventh *rasūl*, who completely abrogated the *sharī'a* of the Prophet Muḥammad.<sup>155</sup> These are large claims and are hardly compatible with any of the known forms of Islam.

"The career of the seventh Imam Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl raises the first of the historical puzzles. Who was this Maymūn al-Qaddāh and his son 'Abdallāh? And what was their relationship with Imam Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl? Here the historians differ vitally. That he was the younger contemporary of Imam Ja'far seems tolerably clear;<sup>156</sup> and the majority of historians identify him (or one of them) as the real founder of Ismā'īlism. Bernard Lewis, and above all Zāhid 'Alī, accept the theory; while Ivanow rejects it and says that Maymūn and 'Abdallāh are the twin myths created by unsympathetic historians. The matter cannot be said to be settled, but the weight of authority is on the side of Zāhid 'Alī, a learned Dā'ūdī Bohora<sup>157</sup> of priestly extraction, fully trained in Western methods of critical research, who produced two volumes of remarkable learning and critical acumen on the history and the tenets of the Western Ismā'īlīs."<sup>158</sup>

I do not wish to comment here on what Fyzee says about the Ismā'īlīs' belief that they regard Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl as the seventh messenger (*rasūl*); or to quote what has been mentioned in the Ismā'īlī sources – ancient or modern – that Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl has abrogated the *sharī'ah* which preceded him, lifting the apparent obligations, since through his imāmate a tumult was raised and (that is why) they call him Qāimu 'l-Qiyāmah interpreting that all the signs of the Day of Resurrection signify his appearance. Thus all obligations of the *sharī'ah* according to them became null and void. Nor do I wish to comment on how the later day Ismā'īlīs tried to explain away this phenomenon in order to safeguard themselves against the accusation of totally denying the *sharī'a*. Also, I do not wish to start this discussion, and what Fyzee has alluded to suffice us

from further elaboration on this issue.

I only wish to state here the relationship mentioned by the Ismā'īlīs between Maymūn and his son 'Abdullāh on the one hand, and Ismā'īl and his son Muḥammad on the other hand. ad-Dā'ī Idrīs and ad-Dā'ī Ja'far ibn Mansūr al-Yamanī say, "Verily al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq designated the responsibility of raising Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, until he becomes mature, to Maymūn ibn Ghaylān ibn Badr ibn Mihrān ibn Sulaymān [*sic*; it should be Salmān, the famous companion of the Prophet] al-Fārisī al-Qaddāḥ who was the most sincere of his followers. He did so because Muḥammad was a child of three years old at the death of his father Ismā'īl."<sup>159</sup>

In the 1965 edition of his *Tārīkh*, Muṣṭafā Ghālib quotes a similar statement from *'Uyūnu 'l-khbār* of ad-Dā'ī Idrīs.<sup>160</sup> Then Ghālib published the *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār* through Dāru 't-Turāthi 'l-Fāṭimī (Beirut) in 1973. Interestingly, I was unable to find such a quotation in that book! I do not know whether the trust-worthy publisher deleted it from the text or the reliable narrator wrongfully ascribed a statement to ad-Dā'ī Idrīs?

Whatever may be the case, ad-Dā'ī Idrīs has contradicted the statement ascribed to him by Ghālib. He says, "al-Imām Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far (*a.s.*), had special regard for 'Abdullāh ibn Maymūn and had appointed him as a *hujjah* for himself and his son Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl (*a.s.*), and as a guide and a proof [for people] towards them . . ."<sup>161</sup> He also said, "Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ was a *hujjah* for Ismā'īl, and his son 'Abdullāh was a *hujjah* for Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl."<sup>162</sup> If we recall what they have said concerning the date of Ismā'īl's death and concerning the date of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl's birth, and compare it with what they say about Maymūn and his son, we can see that it is contradiction upon contradiction!

It is really strange to note that when Muṣṭafā Ghālib reviews what has been mentioned in the Imāmiyyah sources concerning

Maymūn and ‘Abdullāh, he says, "The Shī‘ah Ithnā-‘ashariyyah historians say that ‘Abdullāh ibn Maymūn played an important role in the history of Ismā‘īlism since the beginning of the third Islamic century (ninth century CE) and that he was a narrator of *ḥadīth* . . . The Shī‘ī sources are unanimous that ‘Abdullāh was a contemporary of Muḥammad al-Bāqir and his son Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣādiq."<sup>163</sup> This is how he falsely attributes statements to the Imāmiyyah, which not even one of them has ever been mentioned; and he attributes to them the life-span of ‘Abdullāh, which clearly differs from what the Imāmiyyah have written about Maymūn and his son!

### §36. Ismā‘īlīs and the Designation of al-Kāzīm (‘a.s.) as

**Imām:** After the death of al-Imām Ja‘far aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.), a dispute took place (among the Shī‘ahs) as to who would succeed the Imām (‘a.s.), but the fact of the matter is what ad-Dā‘ī Idrīs, says "The majority of Shī‘ahs of aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.), had gathered around Mūsā and had believed in his imāmate. Mūsā had claimed imāmate for himself; it is, however, said about him what has been said about Zayd ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn (‘a.s.): 'It was done in *taqīyyah* in order to protect the imām; and that if he had gained the political power, he would have handed it over to its rightful owner and made him the ruler."<sup>164</sup>

It seems that the Ismā‘īlīs were finally forced to confess that aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) had designated his son Mūsā (‘a.s.) as the next Imām. Asaf A.A. Fyze says, "It appears that Ismā‘īl was appointed the heir-apparent by the sixth Imam Ja‘far, but later incurred the displeasure of his father. The causes are not known; but it is suggested that he was addicted to drink, and that Ja‘far being displeased appointed his younger son Mūsā Kāzīm to the Imāmate in his last days."<sup>165</sup>

Ivanow, the Orientalist who was sympathetic to the Ismā‘īliyyah and is fondly described by Muṣṭafā Ghālib as "the great

Orientalist professor and greatest of the historians of Ismā'īliyah movement in the twentieth century," clearly says that aṣ-Ṣādiq appointed al-Kāzim as his successor.<sup>166</sup> al-Juwaynī and al-Hamadānī also quote the Ismā'īliyah saying that "aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), had first designated Ismā'īl, but when it was found that Ismā'īl was addicted to drink, he was displeased with his behaviour and said, 'Change has occurred for Allāh in case of Ismā'īl.' Thereafter he designated his other son Mūsā. The followers of Ismā'īl say that 'Ja'far was an infallible Imām and had designated Ismā'īl; therefore, the first decision [of the Imām] is to be followed because it is inconceivable for Allāh to change His decision. And that whatever the Imām does is right [he is not to be rebuked for it]; therefore, the addiction to drinking does not harm the imāmate of Ismā'īl.'" <sup>167</sup>

It has already been mentioned that al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) had never ever designated Ismā'īl as the next imām; and that he had definitely appointed al-Kāzim ('a.s.) to that position while Ismā'īl was still living; and that the *ḥadīth* about *badā'* (change in Allāh's decision) is not valid. We may add that if we accept that aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) was an infallible Imām, then we must follow whatever he says; there can be no difference in the validity of the first or the second decision. It is not correct to say that we must abide by his first decision because he is infallible, and then say that he is mistaken in his second decision. This is true if we really believe in his imāmate with sincerity, not with hypocrisy and with ulterior motives.

§37. It appears that the justifications given above by the Ismā'īliyah for not following al-Imām Mūsā al-Kāzim ('a.s.) have created more problems for them. They say that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) designated al-Kāzim ('a.s.) as the *ḥijāb* (cover) over the actual imām. A relevant statement by ad-Dā'ī Idrīs has already been quoted above; he has also said, "Verily Mūsā al-Kāzim was not

made an imām by aṣ-Ṣādiq except as a cover for the [actual] master of affairs (Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl) so that his status may be hidden from the enemies, and so that the enemies and opponents may not overcome him. [This cover will continue] until such time when the real imām can be in position to take over the responsibility of missionary activities in secret."<sup>168</sup>

Muṣṭafā Ghālib quotes ad-Dā'ī Idrīs as follows, "When Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq appointed his son Mūsā al-Kāẓim as a protector of his grandson Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, the owner of religious right, Mūsā al-Kāẓim usurped the position excluding Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl. And this happened after the death of al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq."<sup>169</sup> This has also been mentioned by 'Ārif Tāmir.<sup>170</sup> Asaf A.A. Fyze also says, "There is, however, little doubt that Mūsā Kāẓim, did have some sort of rank in the Ismā'īlī hierarchy, for Zāhid 'Alī, quoting ancient authorities, declares him to [be] a *ḥijāb* (protector, veil) of the infant Imām Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl, who ultimately became a usurper. Such usurpations, as we shall see later, were a common feature of traditional Ismā'īlī history."<sup>171</sup>

This is how they have presented the establishment of imāmate of al-Kāẓim (*a.s.*) based on treachery. But they could not sustain the accusation of treachery; therefore they started saying that al-Imām al-Kāẓim (*a.s.*) maintained his loyalty for the hidden Imām till the last moment. Muḥammad Qazwīnī quotes from *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn* (foil # 334/a) as follows, "It has been said that he – Mūsā al-Kāẓim – sacrificed himself for the sake of his nephew, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, when the 'Abbāsids were looking for him."<sup>172</sup> al-Juwaynī and al-Hamadānī narrate from the Ismā'īlī sources as follows: "Verily Mūsā ibn Ja'far sacrificed himself for Ismā'īl, and verily 'Alī ibn Mūsā sacrificed himself for Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl."<sup>173</sup>

**§38. Muḥammad and 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl in Shī'ite Literature:**  
Nothing has come in the Imāmiyyah sources that would reveal



the personality of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl and his brother 'Alī except what al-Kishshī has narrated through his sources from al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) who said to his son 'Abdullāh al-Aftāḥ (Ismā'īl's full brother), "Now here you have the two sons of your brother [i.e., you take the custody of your nephews] for I am tired of their insolence; they both [i.e., Muḥammad and 'Alī sons of Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far] are snares of the Satan."<sup>174</sup> The Imāmiyyah sources also say that al-Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim ('a.s.) was always kind and charitable towards his two nephews, Muḥammad and 'Alī, the sons of Ismā'īl, as we will discuss later.

The *ḥadīth* about 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl's slander against his uncle, Mūsā ibn Ja'far ('a.s.), has been narrated by ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (r.a.), in *al-Irshād* (Eng. transl. pp.451-3). It has also been narrated by Abu 'l-Faraj al-Iṣbahānī in *Maqātilu 't-tālibiyyīn*, (pp.500-2); ash-Shaykhu 't-Ṭūsī in *al-Ghaybah*, (pp.21-22); Ibn Shahrāshūb in *al-Manāqib*, (vol.4, p.408). Also see al-Fattāl, *Rawḍatu 'l-wā'izīn*, (p.218); *Kashfu 'l-ghummah*, (vol.2, pp.230-1); *al-Bihār*, (vol.48, pp. 231-2); *Mu'jam rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, (vol.11, pp.291-2). In this *ḥadīth* itself, it says that "And Mūsā ('a.s.), was friendly towards 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, and used to help and be charitable to him."

Ibn Ḥazm says, "And this 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl is the one who slandered against his uncle, Mūsā ibn Ja'far, with ar-Rashīd until he was summoned to Baghdad escorted."<sup>175</sup> ash-Shaykhu 's-Ṣadūq narrates through his chain of narration from Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā aṣ-Ṣawī (d. 335/947), the famous writer and historian who had close ties with the 'Abbāsīd rulers of his time, that he has narrated through his sources the story of slandering in much more details. Among other things, he says that 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl had close ties with the Barmakids; and that whenever Yaḥyā ibn Khālid al-Barmakī [the vizier of Hārūn ar-Rashīd from 786–803 AH] went for *ḥajj*, 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl would approach him for material assistance which the former would oblige; and at times

he would even ride with vizier in the same camel litter. He also mentions that the plan of slandering al-Imām al-Kāẓim ('*a.s.*) was hatched during one of these journeys. The *ḥadīth* ends as follows: "Mūsā ibn Ja'far ('*a.s.*), would order [money be given] for 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl and would trust him to the extent that sometimes the letters sent to his Shī'ahs would go out in the handwriting of 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl. But then he felt repelled by him. When Hārūn ar-Rashīd decided to travel back to Iraq (from one of his *ḥajj* trips), Mūsā ibn Ja'far was informed that his nephew 'Alī intended to travel with the sultan to Iraq. He sent for him and asked, 'Why do you want to accompany the sultan?' 'Alī said, 'Because I am in debt.' al-Kāẓim said, 'I will pay off your debts.' 'Alī asked, 'Then what about my family's expenses?' al-Kāẓim replied, 'I will be responsible for them.' But still 'Alī insisted on accompanying the sultan. Then al-Kāẓim sent to him three hundred dīnār and four thousand dirham through his brother Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl with the message: 'Use this for your needs and do not make my children orphans.'" <sup>176</sup>

Probably, based on these contacts between the Barmakids and the children of Ismā'īl, Muṣṭafā Ghālib believes that the Barmakids had Ismā'īlī tendencies. <sup>177</sup>

**§39.** In spite of what has already been mentioned about Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl and his brother having displeased al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*), we see that the latter willed a considerable part of the one-third of his estate for the former when he made the will at the time of his death. <sup>178</sup>

As for al-Imām Mūsā ibn Ja'far ('*a.s.*), and his relationship with Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, Abū Naṣr al-Bukhārī, the famous scholar of genealogy, says, "Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far was with his uncle Mūsā al-Kāẓim ('*a.s.*), writing the secret letters for him to his Shī'ahs in distant parts of the land. But when [Hārūn] ar-Rashīd came to Ḥijāz, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl

slandered his uncle to him," – then the narrator mentions the wordings of slander, as will come later – "and disclosed his secrets. So ar-Rashīd arrested Mūsā al-Kāzīm ('a.s.), imprisoned him and caused his death. Thus Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl gained favours with ar-Rashīd, accompanied him to Iraq and died in Baghdad. Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsā [al-Kāzīm] ('a.s.) prayed against him which Allāh accepted concerning him and his children." Ibn Khidā', another famous genealogist, says, "Mūsā al-Kāzīm ('a.s.), used to fear his nephew, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, and showed kindness towards him but the latter did not cease from slandering him in presence of the 'Abbāsīd sultan."<sup>179</sup>

This story of slandering has been narrated by al-Kulaynī through his correct and reliable chain of narrators from 'Alī ibn Ja'far, the uncle of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far, that he said, "Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl determined to travel to Baghdad in Rajab [179 AH<sup>180</sup>] while the Imām ('a.s.), was in Mecca for *'umrah*." Then Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl along with his uncle 'Alī ibn Ja'far went to al-Kāzīm ('a.s.), who was in Mecca, to give him a farewell visit. ['Alī ibn Ja'far says:] "Then Muḥammad went close to him [al-Kāzīm, 'a.s.], kissed his head and said, 'May I be made your ransom! Please advise me.' So he [the Imām, 'a.s.] said, 'I advise you to fear Allāh concerning my blood!' In reply, Muḥammad said, 'Whosoever intends evil for you, may Allāh do the same to him;' and he kept praying [to Allāh] against whosoever intended evil for him [i.e., the Imām, 'a.s.]. Then he kissed his head and said, 'O uncle! Please advise me.' He ['a.s.] said, 'I advise you to fear Allāh concerning my blood!' So, he said, 'Whosoever intends evil for you, may Allāh do so and so to him who intends evil for you.' Then he [again] kissed his ('a.s.)'s head and said, 'O uncle! Please advise me.' And [again], he ['a.s.] said, 'I advise you to fear Allāh concerning my blood!' Then he prayed against one who wishes ill for him ('a.s.) . . ."

Then al-Kāzīm ('a.s.) sent through 'Alī ibn Ja'far three hun-

dred dīnār and four thousand dirham to Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl. 'Alī continues the narration: "I went to Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl and gave him the first hundred [dīnār], and so he became extremely happy and prayed for his uncle. Then I gave him the remaining two hundred [dīnār], and he became so happy that I thought he would return [to Medina] and not go out [to visit Hārūn who was also present in Mecca at that time]. Then I gave him the rest three thousand dirham. But lo! He went right away to Hārūn, greeted him by using the title of caliphate and said, 'I never thought that there are two caliphs on the earth until I saw my uncle Mūsā ibn Ja'far being greeted by the title of caliphate.' Then Hārūn sent hundred thousand dirham to him, but Allāh afflicted him with angina, and so he never was able to see or touch a dirham of it!"<sup>181</sup>

al-Kishshī has narrated the same with much more details in which he says that Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl went to see Hārūn in the same dress in which he had traveled from Medina and refused to change. He greeted Hārūn by saying, "O Leader of the Believers! There are two caliphs on the earth: Mūsā ibn Ja'far in Medina who receives revenues and you in Iraq who receives revenues!" Hārūn said, "By God?" He replied, "Yes, by God!" Hārūn ordered that he be given one-hundred thousand dirham. When Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl accepted the money and carried it to his house, an angina attack seized him during the night and he died. The money was returned back [to Hārūn] which he had brought with him.<sup>182</sup>

Probably what his brother 'Alī had done – hitting two birds with one stone, as he imagined – when he got some money from his uncle al-Kāzīm ('a.s.) through his brother Muḥammad, who carried the money to him – as stated in the previous paragraph – and some other money obtained from Hārūn – when he slandered his uncle in the latter's presence – prompted Muḥammad to visit his uncle first before going to Hārūn for slandering so that he

may gain whatever he can, first from his uncle and then from the sultan – the money he could not obtain from others! It is obvious that the best way to milk a suspecting sultan is by providing "information" which he likes to hear about his potential opponents, more so when the informers are people like Muḥammad and 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl, and the rulers are people like Hārūn! What other factor could have motivated Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl to visit his uncle when he had already intended to visit Hārūn to slander his uncle which eventually led to the latter's death?

If al-Kāẓim ('a.s.) had been in Medina, when Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl decided to travel [to Iraq], then there is ground to excuse Muḥammad that he was compelled – out of courtesy which is expected from a nephew for his uncle in spite of ill feelings – to give his uncle a farewell visit. But since his uncle was out of Medina and had left for Mecca to perform *'umrah*, then Muḥammad had a good excuse to leave Medina directly for Iraq without meeting his uncle who was out of reach. I cannot find any explanation for such odd behaviour of Muḥammad and his departure to Mecca, thus creating long distance between himself and Iraq, while he could make his trip as short as possible, not contrariwise, being in such a hurry to meet Hārūn, other than what I have mentioned above. Otherwise, what prompted him to go to Mecca first, and then travel from there to Iraq, since the distance between Mecca and Iraq is longer, if the explanation is other than what I have given?

The Ismā'īlī sources say that Zubaydah bint Ja'far, Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr (reigned 150/767–216/831), the cousin and the favourite wife of Hārūn, and the mother of his eldest son Muḥammad al-Amīn, had clandestine ties with Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl with whom she used to communicate the secret information of the caliphate. They say that she was a secret follower of the Ismā'īlī sect.<sup>183</sup> The events on which the Ismā'īlī writers base their conclusion – although I strongly believe them to be fabri-

cated because they do not reconcile with the historical realities that we know of – reveal the clandestine nature of contacts between Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl and the 'Abbāsīd establishment. The Ismā'īlī writers, naturally, present this relationship in a context of fabricated events in order to conceal its negative connotations!

**§40.** Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl devised a novel scheme in the series of actions, which led to the arrest of al-Imām al-Kāzīm (*'a.s.*), his long-term imprisonment, and then his martyrdom by poison. He wanted to conceal his intentions from his uncle 'Alī ibn Ja'far, and divert the suspicion from himself towards his other uncle, his namesake, Muḥammad son of Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq (*'a.s.*), (144/761–203/819). Muḥammad ibn Ja'far is the famous revolutionary who started the uprising in Mecca and Medina in 199/814–200/815 coinciding with the uprising in Kūfah by Abu 's-Sarāyā. He believed in the Zaydī doctrine of armed revolt against tyranny and unjust rulers and on the top of them were the 'Abbāsīd tyrants. He worked for his cause and even urged his brothers to do the same.

ash-Shaykhu 'ṣ-Ṣadūq narrates through his sources from 'Alī ibn Ja'far as follows: "Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad came to me and said, 'Muḥammad ibn Ja'far went to Hārūn ar-Rashīd, greeted him by the title of caliphate and then said, "I never thought that there were two caliphs on the earth until I saw my brother Mūsā ibn Ja'far being greeted by the title of caliphate."'"<sup>184</sup>

Probably what prompted Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl to divert the suspicion on Muḥammad ibn Ja'far was the realization that al-Imām al-Kāzīm (*'a.s.*) was aware of his intention for traveling to Iraq and that his uncle 'Alī ibn Ja'far also became aware of his plans, specially in light of what has been quoted earlier from Ibn Khidā' that "Mūsā al-Kāzīm (*'a.s.*), used to fear his

nephew, Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl, and showed kindness towards him while he never ceased plotting against him with the 'Abbāsīd sultan, (see §40)." This testimony shows that this was not the first attempt of slandering the Imām by Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl; instead it was last in the series of slanders and accusations against the Imām. This is confirmed also by the statement of Ibn 'Anabah, the famous genealogist, "And this Muḥammad slandered his uncle many times in presence of Hārūn ar-Rashīd."<sup>185</sup>

I say: What probably prompted Muḥammad [ibn Ismā'īl] to do so is that he intended to mislead his uncle 'Alī ibn Ja'far into the belief that the "Muḥammad" being mentioned in reports or rumours as the source of slandering al-Kāẓim ('a.s.) in presence of Hārūn is his own brother Muḥammad ibn Ja'far and not his nephew Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl! Allāh, the Most High, the Almighty has truly said: *Say: "Every one acts according to his manner."* (Qur'ān, 17:84)

#### **D. ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd's Theological Arguments on:**

**§41. The Ismā'īliyyah:** After all that has been discussed, it is time to quote our Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd's theological arguments in which he has countered the various claims of the Ismā'īliyyah sect and its sub-groups.

al-Mufīd first outlined the differing opinions among the Shī'ahs concerning the Imām after al-Imām Ja'far aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), and then he quotes the sayings of those who are called Ismā'īliyyah. We have already quoted him what he has mentioned above of the reports of the historians about their sub-sects. He (r.a.), while discussing their claims and arguments, comments thus:

"As to the claim of the Ismā'īliyyah that Ismā'īl, may Allāh have mercy on him, was the eldest son and that the designation must be for the eldest son, [I say that] by my life! That would be correct only if the eldest son is alive after the father; but if it is actually known<sup>186</sup> that he will die during his father's lifetime

and will not survive him, then their claim is irrelevant to that situation. In this case, there is no sense in even designating such a person because it would be incorrect – designation (*naṣṣ*) implies that the designated person will be successor of the predecessor in his official capacity [of imāmate]; now if the designated person does not survive the designator, then he cannot be a successor. So, the designation in this case would be certainly incorrect. When Allāh knew that the designated person would die before his predecessor, then His command to designate such a person would be futile and incorrect because there is neither any benefit in such an act nor any logical purpose. So, what the Ismā'īliyyah claim on basis of designation has no legs to stand on.

"As for their claim that the people had accepted the designation [by aṣ-Ṣādiq, 'a.s.], concerning Ismā'īl, I would like to state that theirs is a false claim and an erroneous conjecture. None of our companions have accepted that Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] ('a.s.) has ever designated his son Ismā'īl [as his successor] nor has any narrator narrated that in a non-canonical report or in a famous report. The fact of the matter is that during Ismā'īl's lifetime, people used to think that Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] ('a.s.) would designate him because he was the eldest of his children, specially due to the respect shown by the father towards the son. But when Ismā'īl, may Allāh have mercy be on him, died, the people's conjecture abated and they came to know that the imāmate will be for other than him. The deceptive Ismā'īlīs seized on the people's conjecture, made it into a fact, and claimed that a designation had actually taken place [concerning Ismā'īl] even though they had not a single report or *ḥadīth* which might have been known to even a single Shī'ah narrator. So, if their basis is just a mere claim devoid of any evidence, then it is quashed as we mentioned [above that the designation is false and meaningless when the designated person



died before his predecessor].

"As for the narration from Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] ('a.s.), in which he said, 'No change (*badā*) occurred for Allāh in anything as it occurred in case of Ismā'īl,' that also means other than what the Ismā'īliyyah say about the *badā*' in imāmate. The correct meaning of this statement can be found in what has been narrated from Abū 'Abdillāh ('a.s.) where he says, 'The Almighty Allāh had twice decreed death by murder for my son Ismā'īl. So I prayed to Him for him, and He prevented it from him. No change occurred for Him in anything as it occurred for Him in case of Ismā'īl.' The change mentioned here is regarding the death by murder, which was decreed for him, but was later removed by the prayer of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.). As for the imāmate, Allāh cannot be associated with change in that matter; this is the unanimous view of the Imāmiyyah jurists who even have a *ḥadīth* on this matter from the Imāms themselves. The *ḥadīth* says, 'If any change were to occur in Allāh's decision, it could not happen in dismissing a prophet from prophethood or dismissing an imām from imāmate or dismissing a believer from whom He has taken a commitment of faith from his faith.' Now that the issue on this *ḥadīth* is also clear, it is proven that their claim for Ismā'īl's designation on its basis is also groundless.

"As for those who believe in the imāmate of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl based on his father's designation for him, [I say that] this is a contradictory view and an erroneous opinion. One who accepts that Ismā'īl's imāmate has not been proven during the lifetime of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) since it is impossible to have two imāms after the Prophet (ṣ. 'a.w.a.) at one time, he cannot accept the imāmate of Muḥammad because it will be based on designation by a non-imām [since his father, Ismā'īl, whom they claim to have been nominated (as an Imām), was not Imām himself]. Therefore, such a view is null and void by logical perception."

\* \* \* \* \*

"As for those who claim that Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] (*'a.s.*), himself designated Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl after the death of the latter's father, they do not have even a single report to support their view; they just say so on basis of an invalid presumption. They believe that aṣ-Ṣādiq had designated his son Ismā'īl, and that justice demands that after the latter's death, the designation should occur for his son because he is the closest of all people to him. Since we have explained the erroneousness of their opinion about designation having occurred for Ismā'īl, the foundation of their argument becomes invalid. Even if their claim about Abū 'Abdillāh (*'a.s.*) designating his son Ismā'īl is proven, still their view on the designation of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl would not be correct. [Their view on Muḥammad's designation is based on the idea that imāmate is transferred from father to son because he inherits him, and not to his brothers.] Because imāmate and designation are not inheritable issues like inheritance of an estate; if it were so, then [all] the children of the [deceased] Imām would inherit equally. But since imāmate is not inheritable, rather it is for a person who possesses certain qualities and whose imāmate fulfills a purpose. So this view is also proven to be invalid."<sup>187</sup>

**§42. The Faṭaḥiyyah:** Our discussion on Ismā'īlism has extended to a great length; therefore, on the issue of the Faṭaḥiyyah and the Wāqifah, I will limit myself to what has been said by our Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (r.a.), on this topic. Concerning the Faṭaḥiyyah, he writes:

"As for the Faṭaḥiyyah, it is a clear issue; the erroneousness of their view is neither hidden nor concealed from one who ponders upon it. They do not claim any designation on part of Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] (*'a.s.*) for 'Abdullāh [al-Aṭṭah]; instead they have acted upon what has been narrated that the imāmate is for the eldest [surviving] son. This *ḥadīth* has always been narrated in a conditional form; for example, it is said, 'Verily

the imāmate is for the eldest provided he does not have any defect in him.' The Imāmiyyah, who believe in the imāmate of Mūsā ibn Ja'far (*'a.s.*) are unanimous in saying that 'Abdullāh [al-Afṭah] had defect in his religious views because he was inclined to the Murji'ites who have slandered 'Alī (*'a.s.*) and 'Uthmān. And that Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] (*'a.s.*), after coming out of 'Abdullāh's house, said, "Abdullāh is a big Murji'ite.' One day 'Abdullāh came to his father while the latter was talking to his companions. When the father saw him, he became silent until 'Abdullāh left. When asked about his silence, he said, 'Don't you know that he is from the Murji'ites?'

"Moreover, he did not possess any knowledge which would distinguish him from the general people; neither has any narration been quoted from him about the lawful and the unlawful [things], nor was he in a position to give (legal) judgments on religious matters. When he claimed imāmate after his father's death, he was tested [by some people] with some simple questions, which he could not answer.

"So any of the defects that we have mentioned is sufficient to prevent this person from the position of imāmate. If there had been no defect in him barring him from the imāmate, then it would not be permissible for his father to not designate him. If aṣ-Ṣādiq (*'a.s.*) had not bypassed him, then he would have manifested his designation about 'Abdullāh; and if he had done so, then it would have been quoted and would have been well known among his companions. The inability of the Faṭaḥiyyah in producing a text designating 'Abdullāh is a sufficient evidence for the erroneousness of their view."<sup>188</sup>

**§43. The Wāqifah:** Concerning this group, ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (r.a.), writes:

"After what we have described [concerning the division over Ismā'īl and 'Abdullāh al-Afṭah], the Imāmiyyah continued to

follow the system of imāmate until the death of Mūsā ibn Ja'far ('a.s.). Upon his death, they were divided into groups. The majority of them accepted the imāmate of Abu 'l-Ḥasan ar-Riḍā ('a.s.), believed in the *naṣṣ* concerning him, and followed the ideal path. A group of Shī'ahs believed in *waqf*<sup>189</sup> with Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsā [al-Kāẓim] ('a.s.), claimed that he is alive and that he is the Awaited al-Mahdī. Some from this group believed that al-Imām al-Kāẓim had died, and that he will be raised up again, and that he is the Qāim after that [i.e., after his death].

"The Wāqifah differ among themselves concerning ar-Riḍā ('a.s.), after the death of his father Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsā ('a.s.). Some of them say that they [i.e., ar-Riḍā and the latter Imāms, 'a.s.] are the successors of Abu 'l-Ḥasan [al-Kāẓim] ('a.s.), his officers and judges until the time of his appearance; and that they are neither imāms themselves nor have they ever claimed imāmate. Others say that they [i.e., ar-Riḍā and the latter Imāms, 'a.s.] are misguided, mistaken and unjust; and they say horrendous things particularly about ar-Riḍā ('a.s.), and even accuse him and his successors of *kuf*! A group, which was on the truth, isolated itself by such ridiculous beliefs! They even denied the imprisonment and death of Abu 'l-Ḥasan [al-Kāẓim], ('a.s.), and believed that it was all a fantasy of the people; they claim that he is living in occultation, and he is the Mahdī. They also believe that he appointed Muḥammad ibn Bishr,<sup>190</sup> a client of Banū Asad, as incharge of his affairs. They believed in *ghuluww* (exaggeration), in relaxation of *sharī'ah* restrictions, and in transmigration of souls.

"The Wāqifah cling, in their beliefs, to some *aḥādīth* that they have narrated from Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq] ('a.s.). For example, they say that when Mūsā ibn Ja'far ('a.s.) was born, Abū 'Abdillāh ('a.s.) went to Ḥamīdah al-Barbariyyah, the mother of Mūsā ('a.s.), and said, 'O Ḥamīdah! Congratulations! Congratulations! The kingdom has come into your house.' They

also say that when he was asked about the Qāim [i.e., the Awaited al-Mahdī], he answered, 'His name is same as that of the barber's razor.' [The razor in Arabic is known as: *mūsā*.]

"In response to this sect, we may ask: 'What is the difference between you and the Nāwūsiyyah (the group that stopped with Abū 'Abdillāh [aṣ-Ṣādiq, 'a.s.]); the Kaysāniyyah (the group that stopped with Abu 'l-Qāsim [Muḥammad] Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah [may Allāh have mercy upon him], the son of al-Imām 'Alī, ['a.s.]); the Mufawwiḍah (the group that rejects the death of al-Imām al-Ḥusayn ['a.s.], and yet believes that he was killed [in Karbalā]); the Sabāiyyah (the group that rejects the death of al-Imām 'Alī ['a.s.], and claims that he is alive); and the Muḥam-madiyyah (the group that rejects the death of the Messenger of Allāh [ṣ. 'a.w.a.], and claims that he is alive)?' Whatever they use to shatter the beliefs of the groups that we have mentioned here, that same argument will also shatter their belief and prove their own falsehood.

"As for the first *ḥadīth* that they have mentioned, we say: 'What prevents you from believing that what aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), meant by "the kingdom" could be the imāmate over mankind, the right of obedience of an imām over the people, and the authority of legislation [i.e., not the kingdom in the sense of political and governmental authority which was availed for none except al-Imām 'Alī during his caliphate and al-Imām al-Mahdī ('a.s.), when he appears]? What proof is there in his statement to Ḥamīdah that "The kingdom has entered your home" concerning the designation for his son or that he will rise [at the end of time] with the sword? Have you not heard the Almighty Allāh saying: . . . *We have, indeed, given to Ibrāhīm's children the Book and the Wisdom, and We have given them a grand Kingdom* (4:54). There, the Almighty meant the kingdom of religion and excellence over the world. [This interpretation is clearly supported by the next verse: *Some of them* (i.e., of those

who were granted a portion of the Book) *are those who believed in it and some of them are those who turned away from it, and hell is sufficient to burn.*']

"As for their narration that when aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), was asked about the name of the Qāim, he said that his name will be same as that of the barber's razor, we say: If it is a correct narration – even though it is not a well known *ḥadīth* – then we say that aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), was actually indicating the one who will rise to the position of imāmate after himself, and not the one who will rise with sword [i.e., the Awaited al-Mahdī, 'a.s.], because we know as a fact that each Imām rises to the position of leadership after his predecessor. So, the proof you cling to is nothing but blindness of heart?

"Moreover, it can be said to them: 'What is the proof for the imāmate of Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsā ('a.s.)? What is the evidence that his father designated him as a successor?' To whatever proof they cling to for this, we can show to them a similar proof on the imāmate of 'Alī ar-Riḍā ('a.s.) and the certainty of the designation made (by his father, 'a.s.), in his favour; [and it could be more correct to say that: "and the certainty of the designation by his father on him ('a.s.)"]; and this is something that they cannot find an escape from it!

"As for those who believe that ar-Riḍā ('a.s.), and his successors were the agents of Abu 'l-Ḥasan Mūsā ('a.s.), and that they have not claimed the imāmate for themselves, it should be known that this is a false statement, which does not deserve consideration to reject an obvious fact [i.e., in rejection of what has been approved of the fact that they were claiming imāmate for themselves, independently, not that they were claiming to have deputyship and representation from the Imām]; 'and not all the Shī'ahs of these people and other non-Shī'ahs are from the pure Zaydiyyah.'" [? This sentence is somewhat confusing, perhaps it means: 'And not all these people are the Shī'ahs of the

Imāms ('a.s.), but among them there are non-Shī'ahs of the pure Zaydiyyah.' Anyhow, this is the meaning ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (r.a.), wanted to clarify, and it is attested to by his own following statement.]

"And whoever study the view carefully, will certainly realize that they ascribe imāmate to themselves [without firmly believing in it wholeheartedly] and that the callers to such affair [imāmate] are of their own elite among the people [for they are the ones who embrace such sects, not the common followers among the people who simply follow them blindly and without a firm belief].

"There is no difference between these sects in their falsehood and the isolated sect of the Kaysāniyyah who claimed that al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn ('a.s.), were the agents of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah, and that the people had not paid allegiance to the two as Imāms [but just as agents of Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah]! The falsehood of this statement is obvious and does not need any elaboration.

"As for the Bishriyyah [*sic.* it should be al-Bashīriyyah, the followers of Muḥammad ibn Bashīr], the evidence of the death of Abu 'l-Ḥasan [al-Kāzīm] ('a.s.), the proof of the imāmate of ar-Riḏā ('a.s.), baselessness of the idea of incarnation, the union of the souls and the necessity of jurisdic injunctions [the necessity for people to adhere to the injunctions of the *sharī'ah* and live according to them, without being discarded as those people claim], falsehood of exaggeration and transmigration of souls collectively as well as singularly prove the futility of their ideas."<sup>191</sup>

\* \* \* \* \*

## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Fihrist*, p.187; an-Najāshī, *al-Fihrist*, p.311.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibn Shahrāshūb, *Ma'ālimu 'l-'ulamā'*, p.101; al-Quhbā'ī, *Ma'jma'u 'r-rijāl*, vol.6, pp.33-34; al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, *Wasāilu 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.20, p.43; al-Majlisī, *Biḥāru 'l-anwār*, vol.1, pp.7, 27; al-Kantūrī, *Kashfu 'l-hujub wa 'l-astār*, p.38.
- <sup>3</sup> al-Majlisī, *al-Biḥār*, vol.107, p.156.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, vol.109, p.44. The same title also appears in *adh-Dharī'ah*, vol.10, pp.509-10; the introduction by as-Sayyid Ḥasan al-Khirsān to *Tahdhību 'l-ahkām*, (an-Najaf al-Ashraf [Iraq] edition), vol.1, p.22; Brockelmann, *Tārīkhu 't-turāthi 'l-'Arabī*, (Arabic transl.), vol.12, p.278. The last two references have mentioned *numerous* manuscripts of *al-Irshād*.
- <sup>5</sup> Narration of the martyrdoms of al-Imām al-Ḥusayn's ('a.s.), and his companions.
- <sup>6</sup> See "Kitābu 'l-Ḥujjah" in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*; *Baṣā'iru 'd-darajāt* of aṣ-Ṣaffār and the numerous volumes on imāmate in *al-Biḥār*.
- <sup>7</sup> See *al-Alfayn*, p.2; *Nahju 'l-mustarshidīn*, p.62; *Qawā'idu 'l-marām*, p.174; *al-Lawāmi'u 'l-Ilāhiyyah*, p.254.
- <sup>8</sup> On this subject, refer to al-Mufīd, *al-Ifṣāḥ fī imāmat Amīri 'l-Mu'minīn 'alayhi 's-salām*, *Awāilu 'l-maqālāt*, *Taṣḥīḥu 'l-i'tiqād*; aṣ-Ṣadūq, *I'tiqādātu 'l-Imāmiyyah*; aṭ-Ṭūsī, *al-Iqtisādu 'l-hādi ila 'r-rashād*, *Talkhīṣu 'sh-Shāfi*, (especially its first volume); as-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā, *ash-Shāfi*; Naṣīru 'd-Dīn aṭ-Ṭūsī, *Tajrīdu 'l-i'tiqād*, and its commentary known as *Kashfu 'l-murād* by al-'Allāmah al-Ḥillī, and also the references mentioned under the definition of imāmate.
- <sup>9</sup> See aṭ-Ṭahrānī, *adh-Dharī'ah*, vol.20, p.397; vol.24, pp.172-4.
- <sup>10</sup> [Translator's note: On the status of development of Ismā'īlī studies during the modern times, see Farhād Daftari, *The Ismā'īlīs: Their History*



- and Doctrine, (Cambridge, UK: Camb. Univ. Press, 1990), pp.26-29.]
- <sup>11</sup> 'Umdatul-ṭ-ṭālib, p.222; at-Ṭabarī, *Dhaylu 'l-madhīl*, vol.3, p.2509; *al-Ansāb*, vol.1, fn. p.310; *Tadhkiratu 'l-khawāṣ*, p.347; *Kashfu 'l-ghummah*, vol.2, p.161.
- <sup>12</sup> Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah fi 'l-Islām*, p.180; *al-Qarāmīṭah*, p.44.
- <sup>13</sup> Ghālib, M., *A 'lāmu 'l-Isma'īliyyah*, p.161; *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Isma'īliyyah*, p.137.
- <sup>14</sup> The words in this ḥadīth say: "*qad daraja*" which means walking but unsteadily. See *al-Qāmūs*, vol.1, p.187; *Tāju 'l-'arūs*, vol.2, pp.39-40; *Lisānu 'l-'Arab*, vol.2, p.266; *al-Mu'jamu 'l-wasīṭ*, vol.1, p.277. In the narration of aṣ-Ṣadūq, 'Abdullāh is described as "a small child".
- <sup>15</sup> For the ḥadīth mentioned above, see *al-Kāfi*, vol.3, pp.206-7; *Tahdhību 'l-aḥkām*, vol.3, pp.198-9; *al-Istibṣār*, vol.1, pp.479-80; aṣ-Ṣadūq, *at-Tawhīd*, p.393; *Wasāilu 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.2, pp.790, 792; aṣ-Ṣafādī, *al-Wāfi bi 'l-wafayāt*, vol.13, pp.75-76; *al-Bihār*, vol.47, pp.264-5; *Jāmi' aḥādīthi 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.3, pp.275-6.
- For aḥādīth on the ruling that it is not obligatory to say funeral prayer on a child under six years of age, see *Wasāilu 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.2, pp.787-92; *Jāmi' aḥādīthi 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.3, pp.275-9.
- <sup>16</sup> *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, p.288; *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, p.145 quoting from *Dastūru 'l-munajjimīn*, foil B/333.
- <sup>17</sup> See Eng. transl. p.431. For details, see *al-Bihār*, vol. 47, pp. 241-2, 245-50, 253-5, 267-9.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat ansābi 'l-'Arab*, p.59; Ibn Khaldūn, vol.4, p.30; al-Khazrajī, *Khulāṣat tahdhībi 'l-kamāl*, p.33 who has added that "He died in childhood" and if this conclusion is erroneous, we shall prove it; Nashwān al-Ḥimyarī, *al-Ḥūru 'l-'īn*, p.162; and Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī, *Maqālātu 'l-Islāmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.99.
- <sup>19</sup> *al-Farq bayna 'l-fīraq*, p.63; ar-Ras'aniyy's *Mukhtaṣar* of *al-Fīraq*, p.58; *at-Tabṣīr fi 'd-dīn*, p.41.
- <sup>20</sup> *Wafāu 'l-wafā'*, vol.4, p.1265; *Mu'jamu 'l-buldān*, vol.4, p.114; *Tāju 'l-'arūs*, vol.5, p.52.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.7, p.49; *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-fīraq*, pp.78, 103; *Fīraqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, p.55.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibn Shahrāshūb, *al-Manāqib*, vol.1, pp.266-7; an-Nu'mānī, *al-Ghaybah*, pp.327-8; *al-Bihār*, vol.47, p.254; vol.48, pp.21-22.
- <sup>23</sup> *al-Irshād*, (Eng. transl.), p.431; at-Tabrisī, *I 'lāmu 'l-warā'*, p.283; *al-Bihār*, vol.47, p.242; *Takmilatu 'r-rījāl*, vol.1, p.192.
- <sup>24</sup> *Faqīh man lā yaḥḍuruhu 'l-faqīh*, vol.1, p.98; *Kamālu 'd-dīn*, vol.1, p.71; *al-*

- Bihār*, vol.48, pp.247-8; *Wasāilu 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.2, p.934; al-Fayz al-Kāshānī, *al-Wāfi*, vol.13, p.87; *Jāmi' aḥādīthi 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.3, p.6.
- <sup>25</sup> *al-Bihār*, vol.47, pp.1-8; *Tahdhību 't-tahdhīb*, vol.2, pp.103-5; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayātu 'l-a'yān*, vol.1, p.327; and most of the books of history recording the events of the year 148 AH.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibn 'Anabah, *'Umdatū 't-tālib fī ansāb Āl Abī Tālib*, vol.2, p.233; *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-fakhriyyah fī 'n-naṣab*, p.143; Abū Naṣr al-Bukhārī, *Sirru 's-silsilati 'l-'alawīyyah*, p.34; as-Sayyid Dāmin ibn Shadqam, *Tuhfatu 'l-azhār* as quoted in *Muntaha 'l-amāl*, vol.2, p.50; al-Amīn, *A'yānu 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.11, p.194.
- <sup>27</sup> al-Majdī, MS at Malak Library in Tehran, foil 31/B.
- <sup>28</sup> al-Maqrīzī, *Itti'āzu 'l-hunafā' bi akhbāri 'l-aimmati 'l-Fāṭimiyyīn al-khulafā'*, vol.1, p.15; *Siyar a'lāmi 'n-nubalā'*, vol.6, p.269.
- <sup>29</sup> Fakhru 'd-Dīn al-Banākafī (d. 730/1329-1330), *Tārīkh Banākafī*, p.108 quoting from *Tārīkhu 'l-mulāḥadah*; al-Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, p.146; al-Hamadānī, *Jāmi' u 't-tawārīkh* (section on the Ismā'īlīs and the Fāṭimids) pp.10, 16.
- <sup>30</sup> *EI<sup>I</sup>* (Arabic transl.) vol.2, pp.187-8; *al-A'lām*, vol.1 (4th ed.) pp.311-2.
- <sup>31</sup> See the Persian translation of Petrochevski's *Islām dar Irān*, pp.268, 296; *al-Munjid*, names section, p.32; Dahkhudā, *Lughat-nāmah*, ("Ismā'īliyyah") entry #19/2564.
- <sup>32</sup> *Dastūru 'l-munajjimūn*, foil #334/A; *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, p.309 fn.  
**Note:** Muḥammad Qazwīnī says that although this book is supposed to be an astronomical record but it also contains important historical informations especially in relation to Ismā'īlism. It seems that the writer of *Dastūr* was a Nizārī Ismā'īlī, and that the book was written around 500 AH/1107 CE and its original manuscript is preserved in the National Library of Paris (no. Arabe 5968), which seems to have been handwritten by the author himself. See *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, pp.356-7, 580 fn.
- <sup>33</sup> See Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah*, p.180; *al-Qarāmīṭah*, p.47; and the supplement to *al-Qaṣīdatu 'sh-Shāfiyah*, p.98.
- <sup>34</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, pp.164-5; *Tārīkh*, pp.142-3.
- <sup>35</sup> *Dalāilu 'l-imāmah*, p.119; *Mahju 'd-da'awāt*, pp.212-3; *Kashfu 'l-ghummah*, vol.2, p.191; *al-Bihār*, vol.47, p.204.
- <sup>36</sup> *al-Kharāij wa 'l-jarāih*, p.233; *al-Bihār*, vol.47, pp.102-3.
- <sup>37</sup> *Kashfu 'l-ghummah*, vol.2, p.193; *al-Bihār*, vol.47, p.145.
- <sup>38</sup> at-Ṭabarī, *at-Tārīkh*, vol.3, p.154. (Europe ed.)
- <sup>39</sup> az-Zirkilī, *al-A'lām*, vol.1, p.311.
- <sup>40</sup> See *al-Bihār*, vol.47 (section on "What happened between him and al-

- Mansūr.") pp.162-212
- <sup>41</sup> *Ihqāqu 'l-ḥaqq*, vol.12, p.254 quoting from *al-Āyātu 'l-bayyināt*, pp.159f; *'Aynu 'l-adab wa 's-siyāsah*, pp.182f.
- <sup>42</sup> *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-firaq*, pp.54-55, 63-64, 81-86; *Firaqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, pp.37-41, 58-64; ash-Shahristānī, *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1. pp.179-81; *Maqālātu 'l-Islāmiyyīn*, vol.1. pp.75-78; *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, p.289; al-Kishshī, in various places, especially pp.290-307, 324, 352-3; *Majma'u 'r-rijāl*, vol.3, p.94; vol.5, pp.106-15; *Mu'jam rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.8, pp.25-26; vol.14, pp.258-76 and many other sources.
- <sup>43</sup> See our commentary on the English translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, ("The Book of Divine Proof"), vol.1, pt.2 fasc.iv, pp.299-300.
- <sup>44</sup> al-Kishshī, pp.321, 323-4; *Majma'u 'r-rijāl*, vol.6, p.123; *Tanqīhu 'l-maqāl*, vol.1, pt.3, p.241; *Ma'jam rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.18, p.341.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibn 'n-Nadīm, p.238; Ibn 'l-Athīr, vol.8, pp.28-30; *Itti'āzu 'l-ḥunafā'*, vol.1, pp.38-39 quoting Ibn 'l-Athīr.
- <sup>46</sup> *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, p.289. On p.306, he says: "Verily one of the Extremist group is al-Khaṭṭābiyyah which believed in the imāmate of Ismā'īl and Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl."
- <sup>47</sup> *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-firaq*, p.80; *Firaqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, pp.57-58.
- <sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p.81; *ibid.*, pp.58-59.
- <sup>49</sup> Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.8, p.121; *al-'Uyūn wa 'l-ḥadāiq*, vol.3, pp.230-1.
- <sup>50</sup> *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, pp.289, 306; *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-firaq*, pp.80-81, 83; *Firaqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, pp.57-58, 60; *al-Ḥūru 'l-'īn*, p.168.
- <sup>51</sup> ash-Shahristānī, *al-Milal*, vol.1, pp.176, 177; *al-Fiṣal*, vol.4, pp.184-5; *Maqālātu 'l-Islāmiyyīn*, vol.1, pp.73, 96; *al-Wāfi bi 'l-wafayāt*, vol.3, p.299; *al-Farq bayna 'l-firaq*, pp.229, 231-3; *at-Tabṣīr fi 'd-Dīn*, p.109; Ibn Abi 'l-Ḥadīd, vol.8, p.121; *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-firaq*, pp.43, 74, 77; *Firaqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, pp. 53-55.
- <sup>52</sup> al-Qādī an-Nu'mān, *Da'āimu 'l-Islām*, vol.1, pp.49-50; Idrīs, *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, pp.287-8.
- <sup>53</sup> al-Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, p.323 (in fn. and sup.).
- <sup>54</sup> Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah*, p.86.
- <sup>55</sup> Ghālib, M., *Tārīkh*, pp.140-1. [The brackets include my own additional comments. (Author)]
- <sup>56</sup> See *Itti'āzu 'l-ḥunafā'*, vol.1, pp.5-55.
- <sup>57</sup> See *al-'Ibar*, vol.3, pp. 360ff – as quoted by Dr. Ghālib himself – and also see vol.4 pp.28ff, and *al-Muqaddimah*, vol.1, p.168 where Ibn Khaldūn has discussed the Ismā'īliyyah and the Fāṭimids.
- <sup>58</sup> See *'Umdatul-t-tālib*, pp.222-3 of the edition on Dr. Ghālib himself has

quoted; and see also p.223 of the second edition.

- <sup>59</sup> [Translator's note: After affirming the evidence that confirms the existence of close relations between Ismā'īl and the radical circles of aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.)'s followers, Dr. Farhād Daftārī writes: "In modern times, too, this identification has been maintained by certain scholars, notably Massignon and Corbin. Massignon has, in fact, suggested that Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb was the spiritual or adoptive father of Ismā'īl, whence his *kunya* of Abū Ismā'īl." See, *The Ismā'īlis*, p.99.]
- <sup>60</sup> *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-fīraq*, p.80; *Fīraqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, pp.57-58; *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtārah*, vol.2, pp.247-8; *Maqālātu 'l-Islāmiyyīn*, vol.1, p.98; *al-Hūru 'l-'īn*, p.162; *al-Farq bayna 'l-fīraq* (ed. Muḥyi 'd-Dīn) p.63; *Qawā'id 'aqā'id āl Muḥammad*, p.23.
- <sup>61</sup> ash-Shahristānī, *al-Mīlal*, vol.1, pp.167, 191-2; *al-Wāfi bi 'l-wafayāt*, vol.9, pp.101-2 (quoting ash-Shahristānī).
- <sup>62</sup> *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtārah*, vol.2, p.248; *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-fīraq*, pp.80-81; *Fīraqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, p.58; *Maqālātu 'l-Islāmiyyīn*, vol.1, pp.98-99; ash-Shahristānī, vol.1, pp.168, 191; *al-Farq bayna 'l-fīraq*, pp.63-64; *al-Hūru 'l-'īn*, pp. 162-3; *at-Tabṣīr fi 'd-dīn*, p.42; al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ*, vol.2, p.351; *Qawā'id 'aqā'id āl Muḥammad*, p.23; *al-Wāfi bi 'l-wafayāt*, vol.9, p.102.
- <sup>63</sup> Abū Ḥātim ar-Rāzī, *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, p.289; *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtārah*, vol.2, p.248; *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-fīraq*, p.81; *Fīraqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, p.58.
- <sup>64</sup> *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, pp.287-9.
- <sup>65</sup> *Sharḥu 'l-akhbār*, as quoted by ad-Dā'ī Idrīs in his '*Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, 7th quarto, p.334; al-Majdū', *al-Fihrist*, p.72, (who quoted this from vol.14 of *Sharḥu 'l-akhbār*); *Asāsu 't-ta'wīl*, p.51; see al-Majdū', *al-Fihrist*, p.241.
- <sup>66</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, pp.185-6.
- <sup>67</sup> *al-Maṣābiḥ fi ithbāti 'l-imāmah*, pp.129ff.
- <sup>68</sup> *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, MS, pp.47-49, 51; *A'lāmu*, pp.447, 559; *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, p.140; *Itti'āzu 'l-hunafā'*, vol.1, p.24, in the footnote of Ivanow; *Ḍiyāu 'l-baṣā'ir wa zubdati 's-sarā'ir*, MS, as quoted by al-Majdū' in *al-Fihrist*, p.241, and in the published edition of '*Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, which will appear later on.
- <sup>69</sup> *al-Azhār wa majma'u 'l-anwār*, as quoted in *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah* of Ghālib, M., pp.151-2.
- <sup>70</sup> *al-Falaku 'd-dawwār fi samāi 'l-aimmati 'l-aṭḥār*, as quoted in *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, pp.139-40. Muḥammad Ḥasan al-A'zamī says in *al-Ḥaqā'iqu 'l-khaṭiyyah 'ani 'sh-Shī'ati 'l-Fāṭimiyyah wa 'l-Ithnā-'ashariyyah*, chapter on "Some Fātimid Authors and Their Works" pp.189-90, that among

the works of ash-Shaykh ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Murtaḍā is *al-Falāku ‘d-dawwār fī samāi ‘l-aimmati ‘l-athār*, printed in Aleppo in 1933.

<sup>71</sup> Edited by Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib and published by Dāru ‘t-Turāthi ‘l-Fāṭimī, Beirut, 1973.

<sup>72</sup> This is how Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib has also mentioned the name of Ismā‘īl's mother in *A‘lāmu ‘l-Ismā‘īliyyah*, p.161, and in *Tārīkhu ‘d-da‘wati ‘l-Ismā‘īliyyah*, p.137.

The correct name, however, is Fāṭimah daughter of al-Ḥusayn al-Athram ibn al-Ḥasan. (See Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamharat ansābi ‘l-‘Arab*, p.59; Abū Naṣr al-Bukhārī, *Sirru ‘s-silsilati ‘l-‘Alawiyyah*, p.34; Ibn ‘Anabah, *Umdatu ‘t-tālib*, p.222; ash-Shahristānī, vol.1, p.167; *al-Maqālāt wa ‘l-fīraq*, p.80; *Firaqu ‘sh-Shī‘ah*, p.58; *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, p.287.) Besides the two brothers mentioned in the text, the following authors add that they had a half-sister from their mother named Lady Bintu ‘l-Ḥusayn whom they nicknamed Umm Farwah. (See Muṣ‘ab az-Zubayrī, *Nasab Quraysh*, p.63; aṭ-Ṭabarī, *Dhaylu ‘l-mudhayyal*, vol.3, p.2509; Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, *Tadhkirat khawāṣṣi ‘l-ummah*, p.347 quoting from Ibn Sa‘d in *aṭ-Ṭabaqāt; Khashfu ‘l-ghummah*, vol.2, p.161.)

<sup>73</sup> This is one of the arguments of the Ismā‘īliyyah that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.), did not marry anyone nor did he take any slave-girl for himself while Ismā‘īl's mother was alive just as the Holy Prophet (s. ‘a.w.a.), did out of respect for Khadījah, and just as ‘Alī (‘a.s.) did out of respect for Fāṭimah (‘a.s.). (See ash-Shahristānī, vol.1, p.191; *al-Wāfi bi ‘l-wafayāt*, vol.9, p.101; *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, p.288.)

There is, however, an authentic narration from Hishām ibn Sālim to the effect that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) had taken a slave-girl for himself while Ismā‘īl's mother was alive; and that the latter, out of jealousy, behaved in a manner not befitting her status and that she did not treat the Imām well, and that he used to fear her jealousy because of taking the slave-girl for himself. (See *Tahdhību ‘l-ahkām*, vol.1, p.134; *al-Istibṣār*, vol.1, pp.124-5; *al-Bihār*, vol.47, pp.266-7; *Wasāilu ‘sh-Shī‘ah*, vol.1, pp.507-8; *al-Wāfi*, vol.4, p.79; *Jāmi‘ ahādīthi ‘sh-Shī‘ah*, vol.2, p.403). If what they claim is true that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq did not marry anyone while Fāṭimah was alive, then it was not out of respect for her but because he feared her jealousy. Moreover, we have mentioned earlier under §13 that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq (‘a.s.) had a son, ‘Abdullāh, who died in childhood and that Ismā‘īl was not much older than him, and he was not from Ismā‘īl's mother otherwise the genealogists and historians would have mentioned it. (See §24.)

- <sup>74</sup> This is also one of the exaggerations found in the Ismā'īlī literature. What exists in the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah literature is same as what ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd (may Allāh be pleased with him) has mentioned about Ismā'īl in *al-Irshād*, (p.431 of Eng. transl.). In my opinion, this exaggeration reflects the attitude of the early Ismā'īlīs and their secretive methods; they are the ones who created this myth and spread it as far and wide as possible. I do not want to discuss this and other similar attitudes – and they are many in regard to the personality of Ismā'īl himself – and would prefer not to make any comments on which our eminent scholars have remained silent.
- <sup>75</sup> This is also one of the claims of the Ismā'īliyyah. We shall mention the proofs that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) never ever appointed Ismā'īl or gave any indication towards that possibility. ash-Shaykhu 'l-Mufīd has dealt with this issue and has also proven that the Imām gave clear indication about the imāmate of Mūsā al-Kāzīm ('a.s.) while Ismā'īl was alive.
- <sup>76</sup> al-Qāḍī an-Nu'mān does not give any reference for this claim. It seems quite implausible that the slave-girl also had the same name as that of al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.)'s own mother and his own daughter, the sister of Ismā'īl, as mentioned earlier.
- <sup>77</sup> The genealogists support the second view. For example, Muṣ'ab az-Zubayrī says in his *Nasab Quraysh* (p.63), "The following were born to Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far: Muḥammad from a slave-girl; and 'Alī and Fātimah from Umm Ibrāhīm bint Hishām ibn Ismā'īl ibn Hishām ibn al-Walīd ibn al-Mughīrah al-Makhzūmiyyah." (*Sirru 's-silsilati 'l-'Alawiyyah*, p.35; *Jamharat ansābu 'l-'Arab*, p.60; al-Majdī, foil 31/B; *Itti'āzu 'l-hunafā'*, vol.1, p.15.) The Shī'ah Imāmiyyah *aḥādīth* mention that Ismā'īl also had another woman, daughter of Zulfī, whose company he did not like that much. But the *aḥādīth* do not mention whether she was a wife or a slave-girl, although referring to her by her father's name gives credence to the view that she was a free woman and a wife of Ismā'īl. (See *al-Biḥār*, vol.47, p.268 quoting from MS *Kitābu 'l-Tamḥiṣ*.)
- <sup>78</sup> All these claims of the Ismā'īlīs are baseless. If we were to comment and review on each of these claims one by one, then the result would be completely different from what the Ismā'īlīs say.
- <sup>79</sup> Later on it will dawn upon you what the Ismā'īlīs has attributed to Ismā'īl, and then you will know the value of these salutations and praises!
- <sup>80</sup> Other Ismā'īlī authors have added that al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) assembled witnesses who wrote a testimony confirming the death of Ismā'īl; and one of the witnesses was al-Manṣūr's governor in Medina; and then this testimony was sent to the caliph himself. See Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib, *A'lāmu*

'*l-Ismā'īliyyah*, p.164. He also says: "The majority of the historians, who have documented the Ismā'īlī call, mentioned this." (*Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, pp.139, 142; 'Ārif Tāmīr, *al-Qarāmiṭah*, p.46; *al-Imāmah fī 'l-Islām*, p.180.) al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('*a.s.*) held sittings for grieving his son in which people came to him and testified to the death of his son Ismā'īl. This is known from the authentic reports of his [aṣ-Ṣādiq's] students. ad-Dā'ī Aḥmad ibn Ya'qūb, Abu 'l-Fawāris al-Ḥaqqānī (b. 360/971 d. approx. 413/1022) in *Risālatu 'l-Imāmah* as quoted by Dr. Muṣṭafā Ghālib in *al-Imāmah wa Qāimu 'l-qiyāmah*, pp.265-6. In the *Risālatu 'l-Imāmah* of Abu 'l-Fawāris al-Ḥaqqānī (pub. in *Arba' Kutub Ismā'īliyyah*, p.16), it says: "[Ismā'īl's face] remained uncovered for three days while our Master [aṣ-Ṣādiq, '*a.s.*], asked all those who visited him to witness [Ismā'īl's corpse] and then he ordered it to be buried on the fourth day. al-Qāḍī an-Nu'mān ibn Muḥammad, may Allāh be pleased with him, said in his *Sharḥu 'l-akhbār* that 'there was a reason for delaying the burial; and then al-Imām Ismā'īl was buried in al-Baqī' and his grave is well known." Historical sources that testify that Ismā'īl was buried in Medina (al-Baqī') are *Wafāu 'l-wafā' bi akhbār dāri 'l-Muṣṭafā*, vol.3, pp.920-1; *Khulāṣatu 'l-wafā'*, pp.432-3; *Tuḥfatu 'l-'ālim*, vol.2, p.14, *al-Bihār*, vol.48, pp.295-6; *Marāqīdu 'l-ma'ārif*, vol.1, pp.155-7. During the *ḥajj* season, Ismā'īlīs are seen visiting his grave in Medina.

- <sup>81</sup> This is accepted as a historical fact by the Ismā'īlīs themselves, or at least by some of their sub-sects, as can be seen by what al-Juwaynī and al-Hamadānī have narrated about their defence for Ismā'īl that after he became an Imām by the designation of his father, he was above reproach for his actions; and that drinking intoxicants does not diminish his status or disqualify him from imāmate! (See *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, pp. 145-6; *Jāmi'u 't-tawārīkh* [section on Ismā'īlī and Fātimids] pp.9; and we do not comment by edding anything more!
- <sup>82</sup> Fyzee, Asaf A. A., "The Ismā'īlīs" in *Religion in the Middle East*, by A.J. Arberry, (Cambridge University Press, 1969), vol.2, ch.17, pp.318-9.
- <sup>83</sup> *Arba' Kutub Ismā'īliyyah*, edited by Shetruman (The Scientific Academy, n.d., Guetington, Germany), pp.15-16. On page 120, the same question has been repeated and has been answered in a similar but concise form. Also see al-Majdū', *al-Fihrist*, p.225.
- <sup>84</sup> Ghālib, M., *al-Imāmah wa qāimu 'l-qiyāmah*, (Beirut: Dār Maktabatī 'l-Hilāl, 1981) pp.265-6.
- <sup>85</sup> *al-Qaṣīdatu 'ṣ-Ṣūriyah*, edited by 'Ārif Tāmīr (Damascus: The French Institute, 1955) p.67.

- <sup>86</sup> When did aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) make such a claim? Where has it been recorded? Who has narrated this claim? Yes. The year 138 is the date of Ismā'īl's death as given by al-Maqrīzī as mentioned earlier!
- <sup>87</sup> Even in 145 A.H., Ismā'īl's father, aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.), was still alive as mentioned in §15. al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq ('a.s.) died in 148/765, and this date is accepted by the Ismā'īlī writers also, including 'Ārif Tāmir. (See *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, p.331; *A'lāmu 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, p.184; *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, p.135; *al-Imāmah fi 'l-Islām*, p.118; *al-Qarāmiṭah*, p.44.) The mind of this poor writer is, indeed, confused on this issue!
- <sup>88</sup> To the extent of declaring them dead and coming up with display of funeral rituals – as the modern writers say – in the most elaborate manner, and then bringing them back to life!
- <sup>89</sup> Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah fi 'l-Islām* (Beirut: Dāru 'l-Kātibī 'l-'Arabī, n.d.) pp.180-1. Also see *al-Qarāmiṭah*: on their Origins, Development, History and Wars, (Beirut: Dār Maktabati 'l-Ḥayāt, n.d.) pp.46-47.
- <sup>90</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lāmu 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, (Beirut, Dār Yaḳzati 'l-'Arabiyyah, 1964), pp.164, 165; also see and compare pp.447-8.
- <sup>91</sup> an-Nu'mānī, *al-Ghaybah*, p.326; *al-Biḥār*, vol.48, p.22.
- <sup>92</sup> al-Kishshī, pp.325-6, 590; *Majma'u 'r-rijāl*, vol.6, p.127; *Tanqīhu 'l-maḳāl*, vol.1, pt.3, p.241; *Mu'jam rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.18, p.343.
- <sup>93</sup> *al-Ghaybah*, p.324; *al-Biḥār*, vol.47, p.261.
- <sup>94</sup> *al-Ghaybah*, pp.324-6; *al-Kishshī*, pp.354-6, 662; *al-Biḥār*, vol.47, pp.259-61.
- <sup>95</sup> *Baṣā'iru 'd-darajāt*, pp.339-40; *al-Ikhtiṣāṣ*, p.290; *al-Biḥār*, vol.48, pp.24-25.
- <sup>96</sup> *Baṣā'iru 'd-darajāt*, p.471; *al-Kāfi* (Kitābu 'l-Ḥujjah), vol.1, pp.277, 936; *al-Wāfi*, vol.2, p.60; *al-Biḥār*, vol.23, p.71.
- <sup>97</sup> *Kamālu 'd-dīn wa tamāmi 'n-ni'mah*, vol.2, pp.334-5; *al-Biḥār*, vol.48, pp.15-16.
- <sup>98</sup> "My son Ismā'īl" is the version of *ḥadīth* as quoted by Zayd an-Narsī in *al-Uṣūlu 's-sittah-'ashar*, p.49, *al-Biḥār*, vol.4, p.122; vol.47, p.269. Zayd an-Narsī is not known as a reliable narrator and there is a lot of controversy about his book. See *Mu'jam rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.7, pp.367-8, 371-2.
- <sup>99</sup> See aṣ-Ṣadūq, *I'tiqādātu 'l-Imāmiyyah*, p.73; [or Eng. transl. *A Shī'ite Creed*, trans. by Asaf A.A. Fyze, pub. by WOFIS, Tehran, p.42].
- <sup>100</sup> al-Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, p.148; al-Hamadānī, *Jāmi'u 't-tawārīkh* (section on the "Ismā'īlīs"), p.10. Both add that a blind beggar asked for him and Ismā'īl cured his blindness.
- <sup>101</sup> Ghālib, M., *Tārīkh*, p.139.
- <sup>102</sup> *Ibid*, p.143; *A'lām*, p.165.



- <sup>103</sup> ash-Shahristānī, *al-Milal wa 'n-niḥal*, vol.1, p.191; *al-Wāfi bi 'l-wafayāt*, vol.9, p.102.
- <sup>104</sup> Ghālib, M., *Tārīkh*, p.143; *A'lām*, p.164.
- <sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, p.143; *ibid.*, p.165.
- <sup>106</sup> ash-Shahristānī, *al-Milal*, vol.1, p.191; aṣ-Ṣafadī, vol.9, p.102.
- <sup>107</sup> *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, p.148, (marginal notes), p.311.
- <sup>108</sup> al-Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm ('a.s.), was born on 7th Safar 129/28th October 746 – the most correct view – or 7th Safar 128/8th November 745.
- <sup>109</sup> Idrīs ibn al-Ḥasan, *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, pp.333, 334.
- <sup>110</sup> *Ibid.* p.351.
- <sup>111</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.447 quoting from ad-Dā'ī Idrīs in *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, p.47; *Tārīkhu 'd-da'wati 'l-Ismā'īliyyah*, p.140 quoting from ad-Dā'ī Ja'far in *Asrāru 'n-nuṭaqā'*, p.15.
- <sup>112</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.559, quoting from Idrīs in *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, pp.47-49; *Itti'āzu 'l-hunafā'*, vol.1, p.24 (marginal notes), quoting from *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, pp.47, 49 (pub. by the orientalist Ivanow).
- <sup>113</sup> Fyzee, Asaf A. A., "The Ismā'īlīs", in *Religion in the Middle East*, by A.J. Arberry, vol.2, ch.17, p.319; quoting Zāhid 'Alī, *Hāmarē Ismā'īlī madhhab kā ḥaqīqat awr us kā Niẓām* (Urdu), (Hyderabad, Deccan, 1373/1954), pp.161-2. He describes Zāhid 'Alī as "a learned Dāūdī Bohora of priestly extraction . . . who produced two volumes of remarkable learning and critical acumen on the history and tenets of the Western Ismā'īlīs."
- <sup>114</sup> Ghālib, M., *Tārīkh*, pp.139-40, quoting from *al-Falaku 'd-dawwār*, p.125.
- <sup>115</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.447; *Tārīkh*, p.144.
- <sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p.448; *ibid.*, p.144.
- <sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.165, 447-8; *ibid.*, p.152.
- <sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, p.163.
- <sup>119</sup> Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah fi 'l-Islām*, p.181; *al-Qarāmiṭah*, pp.44, 47.
- <sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, p.180; *ibid.*, p.47.
- <sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, p.44.
- <sup>123</sup> *al-Qaṣīdatu 'sh-Shāfiyyah*, p.98.
- <sup>124</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.450; *Tārīkh*, p.146; Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah*, p.181; *al-Qarāmiṭah*, pp.44, 48; *al-Qaṣīdatu 'sh-Shāfiyyah*, p.98 (appendix).
- <sup>125</sup> al-A'zamī, M. Ḥ., *al-Ḥaqāiqu 'l-khaṣṣiyah 'ani 'sh-Shī'ti 'l-Fāṭimīyyah wa 'l-Ithnā-'ashariyyah*, p.56; Tāmir, 'Ā. *Jāmi'au 'l-jāmi'ah* (sec. ed.) p.15.
- <sup>126</sup> al-Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, p.148; *Jāmi'u 't-tawārīkh*, (section on "Ismā'īliyyah), p.11.
- <sup>127</sup> Qazwīnī, M., *Mu'jamu 'l-buldān*, vol.3, p.360.

- <sup>128</sup> Ibn Khurdādhbih, *Marāṣidu 'l-iṭṭilā'*, p.118; Guy Le Strange, *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, p.371.
- <sup>129</sup> Idrīs ibn al-Ḥasan, *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, pp.351-6.
- <sup>130</sup> Ghālib, M., *Tārīkh*, p.146, quoting from *Asrāru 'n-nuṭaqā'*, p.60.
- <sup>131</sup> Qazwīnī, M., *Mu'jamu 'l-buldān*, vol.3, pp.167-8; Ibn Khurdādhbih, *Marāṣidu 'l-iṭṭilā'*, vol.2, pp. 680-1; *Mu'jam mā ista'jam*, vol.3, p.711; *al-Ansāb*, vol.7, p.7; *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, pp.262-3.
- <sup>132</sup> Qazwīnī, M., *Mu'jamu 'l-buldān*, vol.4, p.253; *Marāṣidu 'l-iṭṭilā'*, vol.3, p.1029; *ar-Rawḍu 'l-mi'tār*, p.440; Ibn Ḥawqal, pp.420-2; *al-Ansāb*, foil 424/2; *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, pp.476-7.
- <sup>133</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, pp.449, 552; *Tārīkh*, p.147
- <sup>134</sup> *al-Ansāb*, foil 424/2; *al-Lubāb*, vol.2, p.423, *Mu'jamu 'l-buldān*, vol.4, p. 253; *Marāṣidu 'l-iṭṭilā'*, vol.2, p.1029; *al-Qāmūs*, vol.3, p.111; *Tāju 'l-'arūs*, vol.6, p.25, this is supported by the statement of ad-Dā'ī Nūru 'd-Dīn Aḥmad.
- <sup>135</sup> *al-Ḥaqā'iqu 'l-khaṣīyah*, p.56; *Jāmi'atu 'l-jāmi'ah*, p.15.
- <sup>136</sup> *Mu'jamu 'l-buldān*, vol.4, pp.123-4; *Marāṣidu 'l-iṭṭilā'*, vol.2, p.941; *ar-Rawḍu 'l-mi'tār*, p.420; *al-Ansāb*, vol.9, pp.297-8; *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, pp.236-7, 246-7.
- <sup>137</sup> Ghālib, M., *Tārīkh*, p.146, quoting from *al-Falaku 'd-dawwār*, p.131.
- <sup>138</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, pp.448-50; *Tārīkh*, pp.145-6; Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah*, p.181, *al-Qarāmiṭah*, p.48.
- <sup>139</sup> Ghālib, M., *ibid.*, p.451; *ibid.*, p.149, quoting from *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, pp.52-53.
- <sup>140</sup> al-Majdī, foil 31/B, *'Umdatū 't-tālib*, p.224.
- <sup>141</sup> *Marāqīdu 'l-ma'ārif*, vol.2, pp.169-71; *Tuḥfatu 'l-'ālim*, vol.1, p.14.
- <sup>142</sup> Ivanow, W., "Ismā'īliya", in *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, ed. H.A.R. Gibb and J.H. Kramers (Leiden, 1953) p.179.
- <sup>143</sup> Fyze, Asaf A. A., "The Ismā'īlīs", in *Religion in the Middle East*, by A.J. Arberry, vol.2, ch.17, pp.319-20.
- <sup>144</sup> Idrīs, ad-Dā'ī, *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, pp.334, 349, 350, 351; Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.447; *Tārīkh*, pp.143, 152.
- <sup>145</sup> ar-Rāzī, Abū Ḥātim, ad-Dā'ī, *az-Zīnah*, pt.3, p.289; al-Ḥaqqānī, Aḥmad ibn Ya'ūb, ad-Dā'ī, *al-Imāmah*, as quoted by Dr. M. Ghālib in *al-Imāmah wa qāimu 'l-qiyāmah*, p.266; Idrīs, ad-Dā'ī, *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, pp. 349-50; Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, pp.163, 447; *Tārīkh*, p.138. Also see §22 of the text.
- <sup>146</sup> The Rev. ad-Dā'ī aṣ-Ṣūrī, *al-Qaṣīdatu 'ṣ-Ṣūriyah*, p.67; al-Yamanī, Ja'far ibn Maṣṣūr, ad-Dā'ī, *Asrāru 'n-nuṭaqā'*, as quoted by Dr. Ḥasan Ibrāhīm

- Ḥasan, *Tārīkh 'd-dawlati 'l-Fāṭimīyyah*, p.487; al-Hindī, al-Ḥasan ibn Nuḥ, *al-Azhār*, as quoted by Dr. M. Ghālib in *Tārīkh*, pp.151-2. Thus do the historians of religious sub-sects quote from their own sects; see, *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtārah*, vol.2, p.248; *al-Maqālāt wa 'l-firaq*, p.81; *Firaqu 'sh-Shī'ah*, p.58.
- <sup>147</sup> *Maqālātu 'l-Islāmiyyīn*, vol.1, pp.164-5; *al-Fiṣal*, vol.4, pp.190, 191; ash-Shahristānī, *al-Mīlal*, vol.1, p.129; az-Zirkilī, *al-A'lām*, vol.7, p.341.
- <sup>148</sup> Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah*, p.88.
- <sup>149</sup> al-Juwaynī, *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī* (marginal notes and additions), vol.3, p.323.
- <sup>150</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.561; *Tārīkh*, p.161; al-Hamadānī also quotes from them in *Jāmi' u 't-tawārīkh* (the Fāṭimid section), pp.13, 22.
- <sup>151</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.347
- <sup>152</sup> Ibnu 'n-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p.238.
- <sup>153</sup> al-Hamadānī, *Jāmi' u 't-tawārīkh*, "Ismā'īlīyyān wa Fāṭimīyyān" pp.11-12; *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3 (marginal notes and annotations), p.337.
- <sup>154</sup> Fyzee's note: Bernard Lewis, *The Origins of Ismā'īlism*, (Cambridge, 1940), p.49.
- <sup>155</sup> Fyzee's note: Zāhid 'Alī, *Tārīkh* (Hyderabad, 1948), pp.538ff, on the basis of *Kanzu 'l-walad* and *Anwāru 'l-laṭīfah*, two of the most secret and authoritative of the Musta'liyan texts. This view has, however, been refuted by Ḥasan 'Alī Sarangpūrī, *Dāmighu 'l-buhtān* (a comprehensive but repetitive official refutation of Zāhid 'Alī's works in three volumes, published by the Jāmi'atu 's-Sayfiyyah, Surat, n.d.), pp.30, 115ff., 154, and other places.
- <sup>156</sup> This means that 'Abdullāh's life span was not much later than that of al-Imām aṣ-Ṣādiq (*a.s.*) as claimed by some Ismā'īlīs quoted earlier.
- <sup>157</sup> Dāūdī Bohora is the bigger of the two branches of the Musta'liyyah who are also known as Western Ismā'īlīs; the small branch of the Musta'liyyah is known as the Sulaymāniyyah. The opponent of the Western Ismā'īlīs (i.e., the Musta'liyyah) is the Eastern Ismā'īlism, which is also known as the Nizāriyyah, led at the present time by the Agha Khan.
- <sup>158</sup> Fyzee, Asaf A. A. "The Ismā'īlīs" in *Religion in the Middle East*, by A.J. Arberry, vol.2, ch.17, p.319.
- <sup>159</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, pp.447, 559 quoting from Idrīs, *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, pp.47-49; Ghālib, *Tārīkh*, p.140, quoting from Ja'far ibn Manṣūr al-Yamanī, *Asrāru 'n-nuṭaqā'*, MS, p.15; *Itti'āzu 'l-ḥunafā'*, vol.1, p.24. In the marginal notes, Ghālib also adds the following reference: *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, pp.47 & 49 in the edition published by Ivanow in his book on the

rise of the Fāṭimids in which he states that "Maymūn is from the descendants of Salmān, and Salmān is from the descendants of Ishāq ibn Ya'qūb." This would mean that the famous Salmān al-Fārisī (the Persian) was not a Persian instead he was a Jew! This would amount to a confession on part of the Ismā'īlīs that Maymūn and his son 'Abdullāh were from Jewish origins!

<sup>160</sup> Ghālib, M., *Tārīkh*, (Beirut, Dāru 'l-Andulus, 2nd ed. 1965) p.152.

<sup>161</sup> Idrīs, ad-Dā'ī, *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, p.335.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid*, vol.5, p.159.

<sup>163</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.346.

<sup>164</sup> Idrīs, ad-Dā'ī, *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, p.335.

<sup>165</sup> Fyze, Asaf A. A. "The Ismā'īlīs", in *Religion in the Middle East*, by A.J. Arberry, vol.2, ch.17, pp.318-9.

<sup>166</sup> Ivanow, W., "The Ismā'īliya", in *Shorter Encyclopaedia of Islam*, p.179.

<sup>167</sup> *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, p.145; Hamadānī, *Jāmi'u 't-tawārīkh*, ("Ismā'īliyān"), p.10.

<sup>168</sup> *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, pp.47-49 as quoted by Muṣṭafā Ghālib, *A'lām*, p.163; *Tārīkh*, pp.140, 152.

<sup>169</sup> Ghālib, M., *A'lām*, p.447, quoting from *Zahru 'l-ma'ānī*, pp.49, 51.

<sup>170</sup> Tāmir, 'Ā., *al-Imāmah*, pp.155, 180.

<sup>171</sup> Fyze, Asaf A. A., "The Ismā'īlīs", in *Religion in the Middle East*, by A.J. Arberry, vol.2, ch.17, p.319; quoting Zāhid 'Alī in *Madhhab* (Hyderabad, 1954), pp.161-2.

<sup>172</sup> *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3 (marginal notes), p.151.

<sup>173</sup> *Jahān-gushāye Juwaynī*, vol.3, pp.151-2; *Jāmi'u 't-tawārīkh*, under the "Ismā'īliyān", p.16.

<sup>174</sup> al-Kishshī, *Rijāl*, p.265; *Majma'u 'r-rijāl*, vol.5, pp.157-8; *Mu'jam rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.11, p.292; vol.15, pp.115-6.

<sup>175</sup> *Jamharat ansābi 'l-'Arab*, p.60.

<sup>176</sup> aṣ-Ṣadūq, ash-Shaykh, *'Uyūn akhbāri 'r-Riḍā ('a.s.)*, vol.1, pp.69-72; *al-Biḥār*, vol.48, pp.207-10; *Takmilatu 'r-rijāl*, vol.2, p.150.

<sup>177</sup> Ghālib, M., *Tārīkh*, (marginal note), p.145.

<sup>178</sup> *Tahdhību 'l-ahkām*, vol.9, p.194; *al-Wāfi*, vol.13, p.10; *Wasāilu 'sh-Shī'ah*, vol.13, pp.363-4.

<sup>179</sup> See *Sirru 's-silsilati 'l-'Alawiyyah*, pp.35-36; al-Majdī, *an-Nasab*, foil B/31; *Manāqib al-Abī Ṭālib*, vol.4, p.326; *'Umdat al-ṭ-ṭālib*, pp.223-4; *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-fakhriyyah fi 'n-nasab*, p.143.

<sup>180</sup> The same year in which Hārūn did 'umrah (minor pilgrimage) in Ramaḍān, and in which he had al-Imām al-Kāzīm ('a.s.) arrested.

- <sup>181</sup> *al-Kāfī*, vol.1, pp.485-6, #1295; *al-Wāfī*, vol.2, p.189; *Mir'ātu 'l-'qūl*, vol.6, pp. 68-70, where al-Majlisi comments that this *ḥadīth* is "*ṣaḥīḥ*, i.e., correct, reliable."
- <sup>182</sup> al-Kishshī, *Rijāl*, pp.263-85; *Majma'u 'r-rijāl*, vol.5, pp.155-6; *al-Biḥār*, vol.48, pp.239-40; *Mu'jam rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.15, pp.155-6.
- <sup>183</sup> Idrīs, ad-Dā'ī, *'Uyūnu 'l-akhbār*, vol.4, p.352; Ghālib M., *A'lām*, p.449; *Tārīkh*, pp.145, 147.
- <sup>184</sup> aṣ-Ṣadūq, ash-Shaykh, *'Uyūn akhbāri 'r-Riḍā*, vol.1, pp.72-73; *al-Biḥār*, vol.48, p.210; *Takmilatu 'r-rijāl*, vol.2, p.355; *Mu'jam Rijāli 'l-ḥadīth*, vol.15, pp.182-3.
- <sup>185</sup> *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-fakhriyyah*, p.143.
- <sup>186</sup> In case of designation of a person to imāmate, in the Imāmiyyah view, it is Allāh, to Whom belong Might and Majesty, Who designates and informs the Prophet (ṣ. 'a.w.a.), who had informed the Imām after him, and who, in turn, informed his successor.
- <sup>187</sup> *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtārah*, vol.2, pp.250-2.
- <sup>188</sup> *Ibid.*, p.253.
- <sup>189</sup> [**Translator's Note:** "*Waqf*" means stopping. It means that in their belief in imāmate, the Wāqifah stopped at al-Imām al-Kāzīm ('a.s.) whom they considered as their last Imām. The term: *wāqifah*, as a name for this group, is derived from *waqf*.]
- <sup>190</sup> The correct name is: Muḥammad ibn Bashīr.
- <sup>191</sup> *al-Fuṣūlu 'l-mukhtārah*, vol.2, pp.253-6.