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Abstract

The scholarly consensus regarding Ibn Bābawayh is that he was a traditionalist, a follower of the text ḥašavi who did not go beyond the Šī’ah traditions. However, this thesis will explore the original hypothesis that his work has been characterised by Muslim Aristotelian and Platonic thought. This would have come about through his reading of Muslim thinkers such as al-Nubakṭī, al-Rāzī, and al-Fārābī. No researcher to date has sought to thoroughly research possible links between Ibn Bābawayh and Greek philosophy. In pursuit of the exploratory aim of this hypothesis, I will provide relevant information about the thought of abū Bakr al-Rāzī, as far as is currently available. I will also show why Ibn Bābawayh’s doctrine cannot be fully explained by the Imāmī tradition, but instead indicates that we should understand that he drew upon external sources, in particular, the logician and metaphysic Muslim schools. I will pursue twelve key arguments for the link between Ibn Bābawayh, and al-Rāzī.
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Introduction to the Thesis

This thesis focuses on Ibn Bābawayh, a Muslim theologian from the tenth century. The scholarly consensus regarding him is that he was a ḥašawī, i.e., not going beyond the text, following the text to the letter, and avoiding rational thinking. It is often thought that he was isolated and provincial, his thinking localised to the city of Qom. He was regarded as having nothing to do with philosophy. He certainly had nothing to do with Greek philosophy and he was by no means an independent thinker. However, this thesis will explore the original hypothesis that his work is closer to Aristotelian and Platonic thought than is often appreciated. This would be the case due to Muslim thinkers such as al-Nubākṭī, al-Rāzī, and al-Fārābī. No researcher to date has sought to thoroughly research possible links between Ibn Bābawayh and Greek philosophy. No researcher to date has raised the possibility that Ibn Bābawayh was an independent thinker. That is the scholarly gap which this thesis will fill.

In pursuit of the exploratory aim of this hypothesis, I will provide a full account of the thought of abū Bakr al-Rāzī, so far as is currently available. I note that he was a Persian physician, who lived and worked as director of the hospitals, one of which was in Bağdād. He was dedicated to writing and study until his later years before he lost his sight. Plato’s Timaeus was one of the most influential works for al-Rāzī. The second is Socrates, who put morals and ethics above all. Though al-Rāzī had students who discussed medicine and philosophy, he was not a narrator of ḥadīṯ and did not have a theological school. Ibn Bābawayh, on the other hand, though he had no school, was nevertheless a narrator of ḥadīṯ (muḥaddith). According to al-Najāšī, he was one of the chief Šīʿah traditionalists of the

---

إبى ما ذكره الشيخ أبو جعفر ورواه أن الأرواح مخلوقة قبل الأجساد بألف ي عام؟ فما تعارف منها ائتلف، وما تناكر منها اختلف، فهو حديث من أحاديث الآحاد وخبر من طرقات الأفراد ..... ودخلت الشبهة فيه على حشوية الشيعة

فأما ما ذكره الشيخ أبو جعفر ورواه أن الأرواح مخلوقة قبل الأجساد بألف ي عام؟ فما تعارف منها ائتلف، وما تناكر منها اختلف، فهو حديث من أحاديث الآحاد وخبر من طرقات الأفراد ..... ودخلت الشبهة فيه على حشوية الشيعة
inosaur region (Shaik al-Ta’ifa), and was a noted figure in the court of the Sultan of Rayy. Ibn Bābawayh was like al-Rāzī; he too valued morals and ethics above all. However, ethics without the support of traditions could not stand a chance in the atmosphere that followed the traditions and deeds of Imams and the Prophet of Islam. I will also show why his doctrine cannot be fully explained by the Imāmī tradition but instead indicates that we should understand that he drew upon external sources, in particular the logician school, dualist thought, Manichaeism, and Bardaisanism.

In the thesis, I will pursue the following twelve key arguments for the link between Ibn Bābawayh and al-Rāzī:

1. Ibn Bābawayh wrote a book on law and ethics and explicitly stated in his introduction that he was following the example of al-Rāzī’s work on medicine. Thus, we cannot deny Ibn Bābawayh’s awareness of al-Rāzī’s work, and methodology, and his favourable disposition towards al-Rāzī. See Chapter 2 section: 2.12.

2. Ibn Bābawayh’s teaching of the faculties such as intellect, which are inherent in spirit (rūḥ), is very similar to al-Rāzī’s teaching on the soul (nafs), thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh may have drawn upon al-Rāzī. See Chapter 2 sections: 2.12 and 2.12.2, and Chapter 5 sections: 5.3.19.1.

3. Ibn Bābawayh’s teachings on the eternity of the soul are very similar to al-Rāzī’s understanding of the eternity of the soul, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh may have drawn upon al-Rāzī. See Chapter 5 sections: 5.1.3.

4. Ibn Bābawayh rejected human infallibility, as did al-Rāzī, and for the same reason: that matter cannot be infallible, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh may have drawn upon al-Rāzī. See Chapter 4 Section: 4.8 and Chapter 3 section: 3.4.4.

---

5. Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of the constitution of humans out of ‘form’ and ‘substance’ is identical with al-Rāzī’s understanding, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh drew upon al-Rāzī. See Chapter 4 section: 4.8.

6. Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of evil as a metaphor for arrogance, envy, and maliciousness is identical with al-Rāzī’s concept, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh drew upon al-Rāzī. See Chapter 5 sections: 5.5.

7. Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of the necessity of transmigration linked with progression is similar to al-Rāzī, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh may draw upon al-Rāzī. See Chapter 2 section: 2.8, Chapter 4 sections 4.8.1 and 4.8.2.

8. Ibn Bābawayh discusses intellect vs ignorance, while al-Rāzī discusses soul (nafs) vs ignorance produced by the material world. Both use the term, ‘infatuation/passion’ (ʿišq) as related to ignorance and lust. Furthermore, both teach that all are born with inner energy. For al-Rāzī, the soul (nafs) has an instinct to desire matter and this desire must be trained to learn wisdom and science. Similarly, for Ibn Bābawayh, longing is a part of human nature, and we have the choice of which direction one should take, longing for ethics or the ignorance of the material world. See Chapter 5 sections: 5.3.4 and 5.3.19.7.

9. Ibn Bābawayh and al-Rāzī are both very strong on free will. Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of free will is similar to al-Rāzī’s and not like the rest of the Šī‘ah, who were predominantly Qadarīyah. See Chapter 5 sections: 5.8.2.4.

10. Ibn Bābawayh spoke similarly to al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī, namely, the five prime principles (God, intellect/light/good/souls, celestial pen, ignorance/matter/darkness/evil, air) all existed before the creation of the world. There is no mention of Satan or angels among the five prime principles. See Chapter 5 sections: 5.3.2, and 5.3.10.
11. Ibn Bābawayh, like other philosophers, understood religion within the context of the ethical norms of his time. Revelation is ethics that are recognised by all religions and is not restricted to Islam. The centre of his argument is ethics. See Chapter 5 sections: 5.3.15 and 5.3.19.4.

12. A later Šīʿah philosopher wrote a commentary on Ibn Bābawayh’s Tawḥīd because he saw Ibn Bābawayh’s work as useful for his philosophy. This is an example of someone else besides myself who has recognised philosophical content in Ibn Bābawayh’s work and that he was an independent Šīʿah thinker.

Furthermore, my discussion will utilise the methodology followed by French Islamic scholar and anthropologist, Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi. Amir-Moezzi goes back to the early sources and examines them using a comparative approach. In addition, he emphasizes critical issues of theological significance. This method, in his own words, is as follows: My conclusions are based on the analysis of the great number of ancient and recent sources (such as the one I just quoted\(^3\)), all examined according to the historico-critical methodology. One just has to carefully examine the sources, go beyond the filter of late orthodox “doxa” and attempt to understand the most intimate beliefs of the Shi’is by frequenting them for a long time in order to know that the “theology of Imam” as the locus of manifestation of the divine attributes does not spring out of my “fecund imagination”.\(^4\)

Amir-Moezzi’s approach is a Western, academic one, using anthropological methods and historical criticism. An advantage of the comparative approach is that it is intended to

---


be objective and bases itself on religious presupposition. If I were to employ Islamic traditional thinking alone, I would limit myself to accepted interpretations of Ibn Bābawayh. I want to step back and see him from the point of view of a critical academic researcher, not of a dāʿīyah or hawzah, whose sole purpose is to preach and perpetuate his religious creed, be that based on either 'irfān, taqlīd, Ḥadīṯ, or Usūl.

To agree with Amir-Moezzi: historically, it is almost impossible to be certain about the exact wording of the Imams’ sayings. However, it is legitimate to observe and examine the texts compiled and attributed to the Imams with the intention to find out the chief thought streams of the period during the compilations that have crossed the Šī’a mind in that particular period. Amir-Moezzi’s study focused on compilations from the pre-Buwayhid era sources (up to al-Kulaynī) as he states that the Buwayhid was a turning point. Whereas in this thesis I have gone further than Amir-Moezzi’s and chosen the text that was compiled by Ibn Bābawayh at the time in which he lived.

Here, his method is useful because he emphasizes the fact that the individual authors each seek to resolve a pressing issue of their own time, rather than following the process of the dogmatic approach where they randomly select traditions, without taking into consideration the context in which the traditions were originally written.

Amir-Moezzi again:

One can thus recognize that the properly Shi’i doctrines (all tendencies included), as they are reported in the most ancient sources, that is the pre-Buwayhid sources (I have indicated at length as to why the Buwayhids era represents a turning point) dating from the first three centuries of Islam, are

---

strongly characterised by teachings of an esoteric, initiatic, mystical even magical type and intense messianic coloration.\textsuperscript{6}

In his \textit{What is Shi‘i Islam? An Introduction} he shows how the Šī‘ah were divided into two: those who follow the mystical esoteric and gnostic persuasion argument of the occultation such as Ḫallāj and al-Šalmağānī, their interpretation often being associated with Qarmatian,\textsuperscript{7} versus those who follow rationalistic interpretation that came through the translation of Aristotelian work logical reasoning of `aql which was led by abū Sahl al-Nubakšī.\textsuperscript{8} Back to the ‘A Reply to Prof. Karim Douglas Crow’. Here I agree with Amir-Moezzi, in that Christianity, Persian dualism, Ismaili thought, Nuṣayrī, and messianic interpretations affected the Šī‘ah community. He discusses philosophical influences on Šī‘ah, but he mainly finds that Neoplatonism had influenced al-Kulaynī, without going into detail. He does not talk about potential philosophical influences upon Ibn Bābawayh. This thesis will. But there is more to it than that. People from an even wider variety of mystical groups, Manichaeans, Bardaisanites, Eastern Christians, Zaydī, Mu‘tazilite, and Sunnī, who converted to Šī‘ah Islam, brought with them their old ways of thinking. These ways of thinking were tolerated and even protected. To convert, on the surface they had to accept the Prophet of Islam and the continuation of the Imamah. But beneath the surface, the new converts kept many of their old ways of thinking. Some of the new converts were figures known in their time as learned men. They had to find a spiritual justification in Islam to maintain their own personal theological/ideological integrity. They needed a cosmological link between God and Man. They all provided their interpretation of cosmological connection.

\textsuperscript{6} ibid., p. 111.
\textsuperscript{8} ibid., p. 108.
Thus, for example, for some, such as the Bardaisanites and Manichaeans, the Holy Spirit was the explanation, the means of continuity, because they said that God would not leave earth without his essence to guide people against evil, so the Holy Spirit ‘indwells’ the imams and, in Manichaeism, the followers of the imams as well. This is not traditional Islam, this is esotericism. My thesis addresses this process by engaging with two key Muslim philosophers, al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī. Why these two? They were the predominant scholars of the tenth century whose historical context, together with Ibn Bābawayh, will be discussed fully in Chapter 5.

Amir-Moezzi’s work briefly mentions the influence of the philosophy taught by al-Fārābī and abū Bakr al-Rāzī on Šīʿah of the tenth century. He briefly mentioned it as being related to Rayy’s political climate.

"The great philosopher and propagandist abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 322/934) was al-Kulaynī’s contemporary and lived right in Rayy. He stood at the very origin of the famous controversies with other thinkers on the subjects of prophecy and the law. His debates with the great scholar and philosopher Muḥammad b. Zakariyya al-Rāzī (d. 313/925), another of al-Kulaynī’s contemporaries—debates that probably took place in the presence of Mardawīj, the governor of the city—are still celebrated...”

Chapter 1 Literature Review contemporary discussions

This literature review will discuss critical scholarship on Ibn Bābawayh relative to the question of whether he was an independent thinker or a traditionalist. I will not discuss non-critical scholarship. A number of contemporary scholars have discussed Ibn Bābawayh’s works such as Hossein Modarressi Tabataba’i, Etan Kohlberg, Wilferd Madelung, Martin J. McDermott, Andrew Newman, Christopher Melchert, Colin Turner, Amir-Moezzi, The Silent Qur’an, p. 139.
They focused on three issues: a) Ibn Bābawayh’s reliability in transmitting ḥadīth, b) interpretations of the relationship between God and Man, and c) whether or not his work has survived. Contemporary scholars discussed two issues regarding Ibn Bābawayh:

i. Whether he was a muhaddīṣ (expert transmitter) and whether he was truthful or a propagandist.

ii. Whether his interpretation of theoretical ideas was based on traditions (ḥadīth) or borrowed from others.

iii. The sudden interest in his work from year 1501 and onwards in whether truly his work or attributed to him.

Those who are sceptical about Ibn Bābawayh’s expertise in hadīth are McDermott, Kohlberg, Thomas and Modarressi, and George Warner. The non-sceptics are fairly few, namely Newman, Amir-Moezzi, Melchert, and Gleave. Those who were sceptical whether Ibn Bābawayh borrowed interpretations from others are Kohlberg, McDermott, and Abdulsater. The non-sceptical include Andrew Newman, Amir-Moezzi, and Robert Gleave. A further two, Madelung and Modarressi, talked about Qom as being traditionalists and having had their own established way. Those who were sceptical about whether his work had survived and not fabricated include Kohlberg and Turner, whereas those are not sceptical include McDermott, Madelung, Newman, Amir-Moezzi and Gleave.

1.1 Manuscripts

Contemporary academics raised a number of doubts about Šī‘ah sources altogether and works dated post the Safavid era. Colin Turner “… The fact that when Isma’il entered Tabriz he was unable to find anything that had been written on the principal tenets of Twelver Shi’ism save for a single manuscript on Twelver jurisprudence in an obscure
private library, supports the theory that pre-Safavid Iran was, from the point of view of madhhāb at least, predominantly Sunnī. Not even in Kashan, known on account of its staunch Shi’ism as dār al-mu’minīn (‘the abode of the believers’), could a competent Twelver faqīh be found for more than a decade.”

Similarly, Etan Kohlberg shared similar doubts about all the works included in Bihār al-Anwār as being unreliable due to political influences by the Safavid. He gave a list of names such as the works of Ibn Bābawayh, al-Mufīd, Šarīf Murtada, and Šaiḵ al-Ţūsī. Then there were the works of the later ’Abbasid period by Ibn Šahrāšūb and Ibn Ṭawūṣūs, ‘Allāma Ḥiṭṭī and al-Ŝahīd al-Awal. Finally, those of the Safavid period al-Ŝahīd al-Ţānī and Šaiḵ Bahā’-al-Dīn Ŭāmīlī.”

Kohlberg has argued from a historical point of view that Ţiʿah society gradually lost interest in the work of Ibn Bābawayh from around the time of the end of the Buwayhids era until Majlisī (d. 1699/1070). This raises suspicion about the sudden renewal of intensive interest in his work in the Safavid time. Kohlberg describes it as ‘rediscovered’ which makes their appearance to be ambiguous and raise the doubts over their authenticity. Whereas Newman describes it as ‘produced,’ which suggests that they were transmitted from generation to generation, remaining within the people of the same faith through the process of orally transmitted traditions, and when the Safavid came to power they started reproducing the old works and made them accessible to the public. George Warner argues that Ibn Bābawayh’s most famous work is Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh.

However, I argue that Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh was not famous enough to be in Ibn al-Nadīm’s Fihrist let alone Ţiʿah. It was not recognised by al-Najāšī, but it was

---

12 In this thesis my focus on Ibn Bābawayh works and for further study about the rest of the works see article ‘The Recovery of the Past: Ibn Bābawayh, Bāqir al-Majlisī and Safavid Medical Discourse’.
mentioned by al-Ṭūsī in his *Fihris*.\(^{14}\) I will demonstrate this shortly. I agree with Newman that the work did not get much attention or commentary until al-Šahīd al-Ṭānī (d. 1558/965 A.H), in his debate with his student and founder of Bahā’ī, Ḥasan ʿAbdul Ṣamad. Moreover, the number of commentaries began to increase during the Bahā’ī debate. This is valid point, I agree with it, and it will be investigated further. Whereas, the work *al-ʿillal* was not mentioned between 1055/447 and 1501/907 and then all of a sudden the work was back again in Šīʿah work.\(^{15}\) Newman, in his article ‘The Recovery of the Past: Ibn Bābawayh, Bāqir al-Majlīsī and Safavid Medical Discourse’, states that at the end of the Buwayhids period, access to the work of Ibn Bābawayh, particularly his contribution to Imāmī thought started to regress and continued to decline until the Safavid era when Sufi messianic interest had increased.\(^{16}\) More precisely Newman argues that *Medinat al-ʿīlm* disappeared in the second century after the Safavid came to power and not before.\(^{17}\) Furthermore, not everything was unavailable. Newman argues that, between 1055/447 and 1501/907, scholars of the faith had their own personal copies.\(^{18}\) The surviving copies were not only from al-Majlīsī but there were other copyists too, including a number of unknown copyists.\(^{19}\)

Similarly, Robert Gleave argues that in fact the reproducing and compilation of old traditions was not welcomed by the Uṣūlī current. After 1501 a group of scholars of Aḵbārī appeared to transmit the narrations of Imams. They consider the Imams to be the only source of legal rulings.\(^{20}\) The works that were produced and collected was through the *ijāza* system. For example, a) the *ijāza* system: Al-Bahrānī gives Baḥr al-ʿUlūm the *ijāza* to

---


\(^{16}\) Ibid., p. 115.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., p. 112.

\(^{18}\) Ibid., p. 113.

\(^{19}\) Ibid., p. 125.

transmit everything that he has written including treatises, commentaries, and paths (ṭuruq), to books.\textsuperscript{21} Al-Baḥrānī presented several chains of ijāza reaching 35 isnāds. the idea of the multiplicity to prove that the stories or the sayings are reliable. The isnād goes back to the source 900 years before al-Baḥrānī. For example a network of narrators 160 individuals between al-Baḥrānī and the main two compilers such as Ibn Bābawayh and al-Kulaynī.\textsuperscript{22} Likewise, the Safavid scholar Muḥammed Taqī al-Majlisī (d. 1659/1070 A.H) took \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh} as his base for his doctrine.\textsuperscript{23} And when he wrote his commentary of \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh} he used Ḥadīṯ and part of a Ḥadīṯ that he found in the original sources.\textsuperscript{24} Finally, all isnāds from al-Majlisī ended up with one single point al-Mufīd.\textsuperscript{25} c) the context of \textit{Tahḏīb al-Aḥkām} was compiled by al-Ṭūsī as a way to resolve the conflicting akhbār, following his teacher’s work \textit{al-Muqni‘}.\textsuperscript{26} Then he added that Ibn Bābawayh did not have access to \textit{al-Kāfī} while al-Ṭūsī had access to both authors’ works.\textsuperscript{27} However, I will discuss this further whether Ibn Bābawayh had access al-Kāfī or not in due course. Gleave argued that the legal ruling according to Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq was that it is not permitted to join two women from a descendant of Fāṭimah in polygamous marriage to one man.\textsuperscript{28} This tradition in \textit{ʾillāl al-Šarāye‘}, was not used as reference to support their argument from \textit{ʾillāl al-Šarāye‘} they mainly refer to wok of al-Ṭūsī \textit{Tahḏīb al-Aḥkām} who narrated same text with a different chain of isnād. This continued until 700 years later when the tradition appeared in the work of al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī’s (d. 1693/1104 A.H) \textit{Wasāʾil al-Šīʿah}.\textsuperscript{29} Yusuf al-Baḥrānī (d. 1772/1186 A.H) accepted the Ḥadīṯ whereas the Uṣūlī Muḥammed Bāqir al-Bībahānī (d. 1790/1205 A.H), considered the Ḥadīṯ.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., vol 32, p. 117.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., p. 24.
\textsuperscript{25} Gleave, ‘The Ijāza from Yūsuf Al-Bahrānī’, vol 32, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., vol 8, p. 381.
\textsuperscript{29} Gleave, ‘Marrying Fatimid Women, vol 6, p. 39.
d) the terms used by Uṣūl al-Fiqh existed before the occultation, such as ṣām, kāṣ, mutašābah, muḥkam, nāṣīk and mansūk in the book of Salīm b. Qays al-Hilālī (d. 695/76 A.H) who narrated about Imam ʿAlī. The term created nature of Allah’s words maʿna. al-Hilālī narrates that God has taught Adam all the names of things and the Prophet said to Imam ʿAlī that Allah has taught ʿAlī all the names too.

Devin Stewart in his review argued that Gleave said that Aḵbārī adopted some of Ibn Bābawayh’s traditionalist elements. Gleave argued two more points that Ibn Bābawayh did not have access to al-Kulaynī’s al-Kāfī.  1.2 Early traditions/400 uṣūl

Gleave and Kohlberg are sceptic about the claim that early Šīʿah had 400 uṣūl (a notebook or a book). Gleave argued that only a few of the uṣūl have survived, and that to prove their authenticity is challenging. Kohlberg went further, saying that no reliable ṣasl was ever available, for the following reasons: a) heresies and fabricated traditions were widespread, b) The earlier sources had disappeared, c) the editing and sifting were left for the compiler to decide, and d) the writers relied on oral transmission. These were for the following reasons: First, the spread of heresies, unreliable uṣūl, and liars during the occultation and after: as a result these false traditions were compounded and the extant uṣūl were incorporated into the four books of al-Kāfī, Man lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-faqīh, Tahḏib al-Tahḏīb, and al-Istibšār. Second, some of the reliable uṣūl indarasat (disappeared) because people, fearing the Sunni rulers, refrained from izhār (exhibiting) or copying them.

30 Ibid., vol 6, p. 40.
32 Ibid., p. 234.
33 Ibid., p. 238.
At the same time, unreliable *uṣūl* began circulating; the alarming result is that many of the falsified *uṣūl* were attributed to the Imams and propagated before, during, and after the occultation and it became difficult to distinguish them from the reliable ones. Third, it is very difficult (if not impossible) to find any reliable sources that were not altered or orally transmitted in the time after the occultation. The problems accompanying oral transmission, the scrutinising, and editing of the traditional accounts, were left to the discretion of the compiler and were open to alteration. Fourth, using *ḵabar al-wāḥid* relying on oral transmission means that anyone could come to al-Ṭūsī claiming that an author from the pre-occultation time had been recorded as justifying a text; this is because al-Ṭūsī completely abandoned the earlier method of separating narrators from the existing *uṣūl* literature to the extent that al-Ṭūsī addressed as high colleagues those who did so.

The problem with *ḵabar al-wāḥid* is that it permits to accept one person’s *uṣūl* and make it part of Šīʿī law. But there was no evidence at this time that for every narrator there was an *ašl*; this was only customary at a later time. Consequently, this would have helped to falsify *uṣūls* and claim that they belonged to someone from the pre-occultation era. The use of oral transmission, in particular a *ḵabar al-wāḥid* (a singular narrator), with the power to provide *Isnād*, allowed many false traditions to be incorporated into the four Šīʿī books (*al-Kāfī, Man lā Yahduruhu al-Faqīh, Tahḏīb al-Tahḏīb, and al-Istibṣār*). However, in the meantime, Kohlberg stated that Ibn Bābawayh identifies two falsified *uṣūl* attributed to Zayd al-Zarrād and Zayd al-Narsī, which clearly shows that Ibn Bābawayh did not agree with all *uṣūl*. It does not seem that Kohlberg could find an answer to this.
the opposite side, Gleave argues about kbdar al-wāḥid: for example, al-Bahrānī was careful with accepting the uptools only if they were transmitted from multiple chain of narrators isnāds. Then added that al-Bahrānī avoided narrating from single chain of narrators to avoid falling into (kbdar al-wāḥid); and sometimes he included the biography of a narrator to assure the reader.47 Sometimes he treats a narrator to be weak, such as if one uses his own opinion (raʾī), which could have a negative impact on the reliability of the text.48 I agree with Kohlberg about Ibn Bābawayh rejecting ṭūqūl as being fabricated.

1.3 Ibn Bābawayh contradictory traditions

Contemporary academics noticed that Ibn Bābawayh had a different interpretation from other Shiʿah. There are two contemporary arguments: those who would argue that Ibn Bābawayh borrowed interpretations from outside the community, and those who would argue that there was a shift within the Shiʿī community.

The first group consists of McDermott, Modarressi and Kohlberg. McDermott observes that Ibn Bābawayh seems to have accepted a tradition based on beliefs foreign to Islam. He did not hold the same views as the theologians, and when a tradition he was reporting seemed to contradict one of his theological views, on God’s unity or Justice, for example, Ibn Bābawayh would speak his interpretation of the tradition. 49 This was apparent in his thesis that the joys of the highest of the blessed in the Garden will not be sensual.50 When Ibn Bābawayh set out to explain a difficulty or answer a question, he preferred to quote a tradition rather than reason out an answer of his own. Similarly, Modarressi goes further about the contradictions of Shiʿī ḥadīṯ by suggesting it was due to traditionalist error and their lack of understanding of history. He argued that during the

47 Robert Gleave, “The Ijāza from Yūsuf Al-Bahrānī (D. 1186/1772) to Sayyid Muhammad Mahdi Bahr al-
d’Ulūm (D. 1212/1797-8).” Iran, (British Institute of Persian Studies, 1994), vol. 32, p. 121.
49 Martin J. McDermott, The Theology of al-Shaikh al-Mufid (d. 413/1022), (Imprint Beyrouth: Dār el-
50 Ibid., p. 369.
post occultation in 874/260, the Šīʿī traditionalists were in control of the whole Šīʿī intellectual community.\textsuperscript{51} Ibn Bābawayh was their last leader. Qom was not only a leading city of religious traditionalists but also a location of experts in tradition.\textsuperscript{52} The traditionalists’ position was weakened; they argued among themselves over contradictory traditions.\textsuperscript{53} For example, they did not find a definitive answer about how many days Ramadan should last. They remained in doubt as to whether they would follow the predictions of astronomers or remain within the transmitted tradition. Ibn Bābawayh was among those who believed that the month of Ramadan was limited to thirty days.\textsuperscript{54} Modarressi views Ibn Bābawayh as an \textit{Aḵbārī}. He states that in the works of Šīʿī theologians of the 4\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th}/10\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} centuries, terms such as Ḥašawīyah and a follower (\textit{muqallid}) together with the terms \textit{aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth} and \textit{aḵbārīyah} were applied to all the followers of the traditional current, even the former group.\textsuperscript{55}

The second group includes Madelung and Amir-Moezzi. Madelung describes Qom as kept to the original way and by the ninth/third century, Qom became the centre for Imāmī Twelver. The ḥadīth was first transmitted in Kūfa and was sifted elsewhere,\textsuperscript{56} such as Qom. Likewise, more than 80 percent of ḥadīth in \textit{al-Kāfī} related to Qom. Similarly, Madelung argue that Ibn Bābawayh compiled his work \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh} exclusively from his home city Qom.\textsuperscript{57} He argues that the cutting out of Qom means cutting out orthodoxy from Šīʿah and al-Mufīd succeeded in that. He openly turned against his teacher Ibn Bābawayh, wrote a correction (\textit{taṣḥīḥ}) to his creed and described the scholars of Qom as Ḥašawīyah of the Šīʿah.\textsuperscript{58} In dealing with Sunnī ḥadīth. He came up with that an ijmā`

\textsuperscript{51} Traditionalist, one who reads literally and does not use reason to identify the difference between traditions.
\textsuperscript{52} Modarressi, \textit{An Introduction to Shi'i Law}, (London: Ithaca Press, 1984), p. 34.
\textsuperscript{53} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 39 and 40.
\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 39.
\textsuperscript{55} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 33-4.
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 82.
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Ibid.}
without the inclusion of an Imam has no value.\textsuperscript{59} He then added that the Imams had granted Šī‘ah ‘Ulamā’ the authority to carry out legal punishments.\textsuperscript{60} Then al-Mufīd accepted ḥadīṯ aḥād as the basis for law, only with the condition that it agreed with reason, Qur’ān or an authentic tradition.\textsuperscript{61} He then added that al-Mufīd introduced a new approach, replacing traditionalist Šī‘ah, by introducing the Mu’tazilite method that reason and revelation must co-operate to lay the foundation for theology.\textsuperscript{62} However, I infer the exact opposite, that al-Mufīd (abū ʿabdullah Muḥammed b. Muḥammed b. al-Nu’mān) (d. 1022/413) can not only be classed as the defender of maḏhab, but that he also preached superiority of Šī‘ah. Whereas in later Šī‘ah such as al-Bahā’ī (d. 1621/1031 A.H), he was thankful to God for Ibn Bābawayh to die before completing his work questioning infallibility.\textsuperscript{63}

Then there was Amir-Moezzi, who would argue that pre-al-Mufīd there was no clear picture of which direction the Šī‘ah community should take. Amir-Moezzi emphasizes that Ibn Bābawayh wrote 13 chapters dedicated to the prediction of the occultation in comparison to another Šī‘ah author, Muḥammed b. Ya’qūb al-Kulaynī (d. 941/329), who wrote only one chapter. The Šī‘ah moved from historical Imamah to the esoteric bāṭin aspect of the occultation.\textsuperscript{64} The Imamah, in both the cosmic and historic sense, was understood as a divine guide.\textsuperscript{65} Whereas Newman observes that philosophy of Galen is present in Ibn Bābawayh’s al-Ḵiṣāl, in a section entitled, ‘the building of the body on four things (bunīya al-Jasad ʿala arba’at ašīyā’).\textsuperscript{66} The description of rūḥ is identical to that of

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., X, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., X, p. 168.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid., X, p. 166.
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., p. 125.
the Greek physician, Galen, who used the term *pneuma*.\(^{67}\) Another important element highlighted that Ibn Bābawayh’s use of the term ‘faculties’. He argued that Ibn Bābawayh speaks about the spirit (*rūḥ*) as animal *pneuma* (*rūḥ al-ḥaywānīyah*), and about (*rūḥ*) as humans’ speaking faculty (*al-nafs al-nāṭiqā*).\(^{68}\) The important aspect of Newman’s argument is that although Ibn Bābawayh was a follower of Ḥadīṯ, which can only lead to the conclusion that Ibn Bābawayh’s work has been composed in an environment where there was familiarity with the philosophy of Galen.\(^{69}\) This argument will be discussed further throughout the thesis.

1.3.1 The Question of Oneness of God *Tawḥīd*

It is apparent that the academic could not find a proper place for Ibn Bābawayh to fit with other Šīʿah authors. Christopher Melchert could not comfortably place Ibn Bābawayh in either school *Qadarīyah* or *Ašʿarīyah*. On the topic of human free will, Melchert views Ibn Bābawayh as a mixture of both.\(^{70}\) McDermott’s analysis is similar: for Ibn Bābawayh, God’s attributes are not connected to His actions; they are metaphorical. By contrast, to al-Mufīd, God’s attributes are connected to His actions.\(^{71}\) For example, they both interpret the story of Lucifer with God. In the Qur’an, it reads: “(Allah) said: "O Iblis! What prevents thee from prostrating thyself to one whom I have created with my hands?".\(^{72}\) Al-Mufīd interprets the hands of God as his favour ‘*luṭf*’, while he rejects Ibn Bābawayh’s interpretation of the hand as meaning the power of God.\(^{73}\) McDermott argues that the purpose of *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* was to defend the Imamis from the accusations of


\(^{68}\) Newman, *The Recovery of the Past: Ibn Babawayh, Baqir al-Majlisi and Safavid Medical Discourse*, (Iran: Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies, 2012), p. 120.


\(^{72}\) Abdullah Yusufali, *the Meanings Of The Holy Qur’an*, 38:75.

anthropomorphism. While 'Uyūn akbār al-Ridā was presented as a gift to the wazīr Şāhib b. ‘Abbād as a reward for the wazīr making two poems to praise the Imams.74 McDermott pointed out that there were two different phases of the relationship between Ibn Bābawayh and b. ‘Abbād. For example, after the book al-Tawḥīd the relationship was changed and Şāhib b. ‘Abbād prevented him from teaching, then Ibn Bābawayh wrote 'Uyūn Akbār al-Ridā as a gift to Ibn 'Abbād.75 Similarly, in Newman’s early work The Development and Political Significance of the Rationalist (Usuli) and Traditionalist (Akhbari) Schools in Imami Shi‘I History from the Third/Ninth to the Tenth/Sixteenth Century A.D. he stated that Ibn Bābawayh, in al-Tawḥīd, changed his first view and adopted the Mu‘tazilite interpretation, now saying that no vision can lead to perfection and that a believer could only attain perfect knowledge after being resurrected.76 This is because in the debates with the Mu‘tazilites he sometimes had to rationalise traditions to be useful in his colleagues’ debates.77 Newman points out that Ibn Bābawayh, in The Imāmī Creed al-I‘tiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah, does not question the authority of the Qur’an but accepts it as a single book revealed to the Prophet,78 while in the ‘Meanings of Traditions’ Ma‘ānī al-Akbār, he contradicts this view by saying that the Qur’an needs a muḥbir informant and does not restrict this role to the Imam.79 The Qur’an, in the common view of the Imamis, such as the student of al-Kulaynī, al-Nu‘mānī, was tampered with or even falsified by the Sunnīs.80

Therefore, the only authority that can speak on its behalf is the Imam.

75 Ibid.
77 Ibid., pp. 138-9.
78 Ibid., pp. 187-8.
79 Ibid., p. 188.
80 Ibid., p. 187.
1.3.2 Dualism and Philosophy

McDermott describes Ibn Bābawayh’s lack of a system in his thought when refuting dualism Mānī and Ibn Dayṣān. He did not refute the idea of the eternity of bodies. He described Ibn Bābawayh’s lack of a system in his thought when refuting dualism Mānī and Ibn Dayṣān. He did not refute the idea of the eternity of bodies.81 God is the initiator of the process for existence. Ibn Bābawayh says that it is not possible to have two Gods ruling our world, one that is responsible for the world of matter, and one that is responsible for the celestial world.82 Amir-Moezzi argues that the Šī’ah became more accepting towards traditions of dualism Bardaisanism and Manichaeism as they did not pose a threat to their ideology and added that the Šī’ah removed themselves from association with the Sunnī.83 For example, the intelligence here are treated as angels, they are above the celestial sphere and our lower world.84 Hence for Amir-Moezzi, Ibn Bābawayh falls into this category of the early Šī’ah of adopted gnostic dualist groups. He then added that the message of Ibn Bābawayh is that the world is dominated by darkness and cannot be saved without Imamah. Since Imamah is the cosmic universal key, it is also, by necessity, the sacred key of our world. Imamah is world salvation and without Imamah the universe will tremble.85

1.3.3 Ḥudūṯ al-ʿālam

There is another point where McDermott finds that Ibn Bābawayh was different. He argues that to Ibn Bābawayh, the world must have come through a sequential process (hudūṯ), and that this way of thinking is not Islamic in origin. An accident here is not called (ʿard) but is described as (maʿna).86 The same thing with the next argument about the temporality of bodies (ajsām) are attached to adjunct (kawn) that is limited by its shape, and the meaning (maʿna) for its existence; both are inseparable from making the body

82 ibid.
84 ibid., p. 190.
86 McDermott, Theology, pp. 325-6.
(jism) and God is free from both.⁸⁷ An example of this is that he tackles the topic of the eternity of the void.⁸⁸ Martin J. McDermott wrote about al-Mufīd, but within his work, he made valuable comments about the difference between Ibn Bābawayh and al-Mufīd. However, he did not follow it through, and after his chapter on Ibn Bābawayh, he followed al-Mufīd’s interpretation of Ibn Bābawayh, which this thesis will show to be a misinterpretation. He then added that Ibn Bābawayh’s argument about God is not like any of His creation: on the discussion about the eternal and non-eternal, for example, everything that has been said about creatures there must reflect their temporal existence. It was a clumsy argument.⁸⁹ This is a significant point and the difference between the two interpretations in that they belong to two different philosophies will be discussed further.

1.3.4 Eternity of the soul

Further difference was observed by academics on the topic of the state of the soul. McDermott states that ‘Ibn Bābawayh’s doctrine that ‘souls were created before bodies’ depends upon an interpretation of the Qur’an and upon traditions which al-Mufīd rejected. But al-Mufīd’s principal reason for rejecting the doctrine is that it opens the door to metempsychosis’.⁹⁰ Then McDermott adds that al-Mufīd criticises Ibn Bābawayh that one ‘(this quotation should end at some point) could argue if we follow Ibn Bābawayh’s thinking then will lead to the theory that the soul journey goes through several transmigrations and each time in different body. But Ibn Bābawayh states the opposite: he maintains that there is only one journey for each soul and he rejected transmigration tanāsuk, because it involves the denial of the reward of heaven and punishment of Fire.’⁹¹ While David Thomas argues that Ibn Bābawayh made grievous errors in interpreting the
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⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 368.
⁹¹ Ibid., p. 363.
simplest philosophical terms. Ibn Bābawayh’s contemporaries, for instance al-Bāqillānī (d. 1012/403) and ʿAbdul Jabbār al-Muʿtazī (d. 1024/415), were well aware of simple details that Ibn Bābawayh missed. For example, the Christian dogma surrounding the word spirit (rūḥ). I disagree with that. The tradition states that a Christian would use rūḥ to answer a philosophical question instead of using uqnūm. Thomas examines three reports by Ibn Bābawayh of debates between learned Christian persons and the Imams, all of which end with the Christian patriarch, Barīḥah, praising the Imams for their knowledge and embracing Islam. Hussein Ali Abdulsater argued that Ibn Bābawayh believed in the return of the soul to its original body. He then stated that al-Mufīd abstains from following Ibn Bābawayh’s criticism of extremist groups such as the ḥallājīyah because their ideology was widespread in Bağdād. He added that al-Mufīd did not tell us why Ibn Bābawayh held the belief of eternity of the soul except that it could be out of fear of threats or even attacks from extremists. He then suggested that Ibn Bābawayh’s belief in transmigration of the soul leads us to believe that Ibn Bābawayh was ḥulūlī. This point is important and will be elaborated on throughout the thesis.

1.3.5 Infallibility

Another point noted by academics is the difference about infallibility. Both McDermott and Newman observe there are several traditions of Ibn Bābawayh which differed from traditional Šīʿī practices. For example, Ibn Bābawayh differed from the common Imāmī creed concerning infallibility (ʿisma) of the Prophet and the Imams.

---
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Newman notes that Ibn Bābawayh, in *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīḥ* and al-ʿIʿtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah, argues that the Prophet and the Imams were not infallible.98

McDermott talks about Ibn Bābawayh’s relationship with the political establishment, stating that Ibn Bābawayh travelled in Persia, Iraq, arriving in Rayy, a city that was dominated by the Muʿtazilite wazīr Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād who leaned towards offspring of Imam ʿAlī, where he composed his *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*, the purpose of which was to bring closer and show compatibility between the doctrine of the Imamite and the Muʿtazilite such as in the themes of God’s unity and justice. Then the wazīr forced both Sunni and Šīʿa, including Ibn Bābawayh to stop teaching. This was witnessed and recounted by Tawḥīdī.99 He then added that although Ibn Bābawayh is a traditionalist, he holds views that are akin to the Muʿtazilite teachings. Warner takes a similar view.

On the contrary, I argue that Ibn Bābawayh moved to Rayy much earlier than al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād became the wazīr. Ibn Bābawayh had closer relationship with previous Sultan Rukn al-Dawlah and his wazīr Ibn al-ʿAmīd but not with al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād. In his book he made it clear that he had a closer relationship with the Sultan Rukn al-Dawlah. Reminding him that in 963/352 Sultan Rukn al-Dawlah had asked him to make prayer for him while he visited the al-Riḍā shrine in Mašhad. According to al-Ḵurasānī, Sultan Rukn al-Dawlah invited Ibn Bābawayh to live in Rayy. In 958/347 A.H narrated Ḫadīt from figures of Rayy from Ibn Jarāda al-Bardaʿī and abī ʿAlī b. ʿAbd Rubbah al-Rāżī.100 The political affiliation will be discussed further in this thesis.

---

1.3.6 Tašbīḥ wa l-Jabr

There is a lack of awareness about the philosophical impact on Ibn Bābawayh of thinkers that surrounded him such as al-Fārābī, al-Rāzī and the Ismaili abū Ḥātim. For example, Warner distinguishes between tašbīḥ wa l-Jabr, whereas Ibn Bābawayh speaks about them as one. Instead he links Jabr with badā’a. Warner then goes further and gives two points that they seem to him go against each other: “… the imām’s supremacy as the perfect narrator, the infallible conduit of the Prophet’s knowledge.”

1.3.7 Two Contradictory Traditions?

George Warner wrote his PhD title: Imagining Ḥujja: Proof and Representation in the works of al-Shaykh al-Ṣadūq. The work is dedicated to Ibn Bābawayh’s works. Here are some of the arguments:

i. About Sulaym b. Qays tradition in al-Iʿtiqādāt, he argues that al-Kulaynī after the tradition Sulaym b. Qays offered a chapter and narrated examples of how to deal with contradictory traditions whereas Ibn Bābawayh did not.

“… our having already noted that al-Ṣadūq is not so restricted (as illustrated by passages elsewhere in al-Iʿtiqādāt), it is also the case that we see in other authors aḥādīth in which problems of conflicting aḥādīth are discussed more thoroughly. Al-Kulaynī includes a chapter on precisely this issue in al-Kāfī, which includes this same ḥadīth of ʿAlī and Sulaym but also a number of others.”
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He then adds a response justifying al-Mufīd’s criticism of Ibn Bābawayh. On the contrary, Ibn Bābawayh narrated the same examples in his Mar Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh and has a section in al-I’tiqādāt talking about the same thing. In the case of two different verdicts made by two Imams, he would take traditions narrated by a god-fearing person, someone who does not lie, and who is an expert in law and the sayings of the Imams. He added that one must be aware of contradictions within the rulings of the Imams since these could relate to the differences between cases or situations presented to the Imams when the verdict was passed. Ibn Bābawayh had a set of criteria as a way to filter traditions, based on his approach to the statement of Imam ʿAlī, who stated in his work, al-I’tiqādāt, under the title باب الاعتقاد في الحديثين المختلفين, that in case of contradictory ḥadīths, one should follow the ḥadīth of Imam ʿAlī to avoid four problems: fabrication, abrogation, ambiguity, and specificity or generality. Ibn Bābawayh wrote a section of al-I’tiqādāt under the heading ‘Reasons or Causes’ ‘illal, in which he states that rules can be abrogated, and only an expert could find out the differences between two narrators such as Salmān and abū Đar. Each was well respected by the Prophet and Imams, but, both narrated conflicting traditions. Only ʿAlī could distinguish between the two because he knew the background of their arguments. In essence, Ibn Bābawayh was defending himself against not only Muʿtazila but his Šīʿah opponents. Ibn Bābawayh was saying that the criterion of ḥadīth was not new. The foundations to sift ḥadīth were already in place by the time of Imām ʿAlī. I infer that Ibn Bābawayh was careful, and he would always look for traditions that had the support of multiple Imams with multiple reliable isnād (Šīʿī or Sunni) – except traditions by Imām al-Riḍa had more respect and he accepted them on the condition that they provide reliable isnād. In his books, he has

---

107 Ibid., vol 1, p. 133.
chapter titles, then subheadings. He never has a single Imam’s traditions supporting or dealing with that subheading. He always has multiple Imams.

ii. On the next question, he argued that: “al-Ṣadūq is suppressing questions of authenticity in favour of compelling reverence to the corpus as a whole.”

In answer to this question, the tradition was aimed to focus on Imam ʿAlī alone and not all the Imams. This was to demonstrate to the reader that Imam ʿAlī was the Prophet’s loyal student and successor in knowledge. This is because traditions from the companions were disputed topic as being ḥašū worthless and outdated news. Ibn Bābawayh in the book and al-Mufīd responded to it. Ibn Bābawayh spoke about 12 Imams being assassinated whereas al-Mufīd objected to it. This is because there is a bigger subject about it. This is only the tip of the iceberg.

iii. Then he argues that, Ibn Bābawayh in his Kamāl al-Dīn, was vague about tawātur. He was not concerned about the technicalities of tawātur. It is not about the report’s quality but about their number.

“The tawātur that al-Ṣadūq presents is a concern of volume, an assertion not primarily of reports’ quality but of their number. Even here he prefers to be vague, only once entering discussion of how sources are needed to constitute tawātur. What al-Ṣadūq instead focusses on is the existential need for textual proofs that is imbedded within the very fabric of religion itself.”

On the contrary, mutawātir, it was explained briefly in his book and said that tawātur requires three reliable chains of narrators. We must remined ourselves here the term mutawātir was common used term. Ibn Bābawayh was talking in terms understood by
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his readers. For explanation about the term see *al-Muğnî* vol 16, by Qādī 'Abdul Jabbār(1024/415 A.H).

iv. Warner added that the wazīr Ibn 'Abbād was hostile towards traditions:

“While we do know from a remark by al-Tawḥīdī that al-Ṣadūq was at one point banished by ibn 'Abbād in a fit of hostility towards traditionists.”

However, this is an overgeneralised statement, and not all traditions were rejected by Ibn 'Abbād. Otherwise, there would be no religion left to practice. See the work by the Judge of Rayy which was employed by wazīr Ibn 'Abbād, Qādī 'Abdul Jabbār b. Ahmad al-Asadābādī, *al-Muğnî*, in which he wrote the whole sixteenth volume about traditions.

This seems to be a reoccurring pattern within Warner’s study. One thing for sure he did not study authors from the time of Ibn Bābawayh. It is important to find out about what the Sunnī said about him, the student who narrated from him, what they narrated from him and who Ibn Bābawayh interacted with. All these questions needed to be addressed. I shall cover these throughout the thesis.

1.5 Conclusion

As we have seen, there is a possible lacuna in the study of Ibn Bābawayh. There is limited appreciation of Ibn Bābawayh’s work and the use of philosophical terms or interpretations. There has been little comparison between Ibn Bābawayh and philosophies that were current in his time. Regardless of whether his teachers were traditionalists or not, we need to consider Ibn Bābawayh’s understanding of the cosmology that was accepted in his time. The scholars reviewed here focus upon the transmission of traditions rather than the purpose of the traditions. When they do discuss the purpose, it is seen as strictly political.

Chapter 2 Methodology

2.1 Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi useful methodology

Amir-Moezzi an academic provided us with his methodology of Šī‘ah study. The centre point of Amir-Moezzi’s discussion is the ‘aql and Imamah. Amir-Moezzi in his work the Divine Guide in Early Shi‘ism looks at the dimensions of how early Šī‘ah understood ‘aql. He interprets the “hiero-intelligence” a reasoning and not the accustomed theological texts. To him it is the cosmic entity “imam” the force of good versus forces of evil.\(^{112}\) However, his methodology did not go uncontested. He argues that ‘aql according to early Šī‘ah: (a) cosmogenic dimension: focuses on the morality represented by the Imam and his faithful ones versus their enemies the ignorance. (b) the ethical-epistemological: this is about good education (adab), and that to be good is to recognise knowledge that is taught by the imams as the true knowledge.\(^{113}\) (c) the spiritual: following a tradition narrated by Hišām b. al-Ḥakam that the interior proof versus the exterior proof. The ‘aql is the interior (ḥujja bātina), and without the ‘aql, that is without the religion, they are cut off from the divine plan.\(^{114}\) (d) the soteriological: those who are obsessed with prayers and ablution have the appearance of piety but inside them is hypocrisy. The ‘aql is about submission and desire for closeness to God.\(^{115}\) In this methodology, I discuss Amir-Moezzi’s methods in dealing with the topic of relation between God and man; three issues which I chose for my research spotted from Ibn Bābawayh’s work, Amir-Moezzi an academic specialising in Šī‘ah study provides us with the methodology. However, his work is not focussed on Ibn Bābawayh but is about Šī‘ah in general. There are contemporary authors who made criticisms of Amir-Moezzi such as Karim Douglas Crow about not paying attention to kalām and ḥadīṯ. Moojan Momen criticised him for ignoring pre-

\(^{113}\) Ibid., p. 8.
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Buwayhids speculative reasoning, and William F. Tucker for ‘hiero-intelligence’ and translating it as ‘intellect’ (ʿaql).

Amir-Moezzi speaks from the point of view that the expansion of Zaydism and the rise of philosophy contributed to the development of the doctrine of tanzīh among the Imāmī of Rayy. However, he did not address the philosophical impact on Ibn Bābawayh doctrine. Whereas McDermott rightly argued that al-Mufīd wrote in reaction to the widespread of al-Rāzī’s teachings which were accepted by the mutakalimūn the doctrine of the void.116 He made valuable comments about the difference between Ibn Bābawayh and al-Mufīd. However, he did not follow it through, and at the conclusion of his chapter on Ibn Bābawayh, he followed al-Mufīd’s interpretation of Ibn Bābawayh, which this thesis will show to be a misinterpretation.117 Neither of the two academics provided indepth study about the philosophy impact on Ibn Bābawayh. In this thesis I will argue this topic more in depth that abū Bakr al-Rāzī philosophy was widespread in Rayy whereas Zaydism had no serious impact on the doctrine until much later.

Amir-Moezzi added that during the Buwayhid when al-Mufīd wrote a refutation of his teacher Ibn Bābawayh it was about the inner proof of God as the Imam versus the “outer proof.” Moezzi argues that mystical traditions were ignored in Šīʿah text, and their dialogue mainly focussed on Imamah. In later times these traditions were deemed to be heresy ḣulū.118 Whereas the Ismaili abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī who corresponded with Carmatian (Qarmatian) abū Ṭāhir al-Janābī their common ground was philosophy and what they understood as their authoritative dialogue.119 He suggests that al-Kulaynī was more likely to lean towards a Šīʿah person, such as the Ismaili, abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, rather than the physician/philosopher, abū
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Bakr al-Rāzī. In his reply that the doctrinal authenticity it is not based on historical authenticity but on what in the believers’ eyes. Moezzi argues that we should not reject the doctrines from early Šīʿah extremists, because they did not go outside the Šīʿah mainstream and their use of mythical language was merely a conflict of interpretation when they addressed the Imams a manifestation of God on earth. He quotes 'Abdallāh al-Māmqānī Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl who stated that whatever was considered extremist ǧulāt is not even worth taken into consideration.

On the contrary, I differ from Moezzi on the following points, (i) the term ǧulāt, used by the early Šīʿah biographers describing extremist movements based on their military action against the state and for their challenging later Imams and their agents. The biographer Saʿad b. ʿAbdullah al-Ašʿarī al-Qommī (d. 913/301), Kitāb al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq stated that the majority of these groups believed in anyone opposed to the Imām and that they were therefore considered sinners and their punishment would be hell fire. Not only Saʿad b. ʿAbdullah al-Qommī spoke about ǧulāt, biographers such as al-Nāṣīʿ al-Akbar (d. 905/293 A.H) Masāʾil al-Imāmah wa Muqtaṭaṭūt min al-Kitāb al-Awsat fī al-Maqālāt, al-Nubakṭī Ḥasan b. Musa (d. between 912/300 and 942/330) Firaq al-Šīʿah, and Ibn Bābawayh. (ii) the term darūrīyat al-maḏhab found in ‘Abdallāh al-Māmaqānī, work, defending of Ibn Bābawayh and dismissing al-Mufīd’s criticism then he posed the question: how can we accuse them (Qom) of being ǧulāt when their leader raʾīs al-Qomīyīn Ibn Bābawayh saw anyone who believe in the infallibility of the Prophet to be ǧulāt?
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Furthermore, the statement *min ḍarūrīyāt al-maqāb*; this was from al-Ḥā’irī, *Muntaha al-Maqāl fī Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* and not in al-Māmaqānī’s work, it is again he was defending Ibn Bābawayh against those doubted his reliability ‘adālah, then added that it is indispensable to our belief (*min ḍarūrīyāt al-maqāb*) that to accept Ibn Bābawayh reliable.\(^{125}\)

Furthermore, (iii) I infer this gap between Ibn Bābawayh and al-Kulaynī remain unchallenged, and it is absent in Moezzi’s work. For example, the academic has highlighted several differences such as the relationship with the political establishment: A) in *al-Kāfī*, there is a whole chapter (chapter eighteen) on *Jihād or al-Amr Wa l-Nahī*. By contrast, Ibn Bābawayh has no chapter or section devoted to these topics.\(^{126}\) B) Ibn Bābawayh’s work’s main purpose was as a refutation of false claimants and pretenders to the Imamate. By contrast, al-Kulaynī’s work speaks of injustice (jawr) and criticises rulers. C) Newman notes that Ibn Bābawayh did not speak of the agent of the Imams receiving the fifth, but, in contrast, al-Kulaynī does speak about Imams entrusting subordinates (walī) with authority to collect the fifth on their behalf.\(^{127}\) Likewise funding the movement using the fifth (ḵums) in *al-Kāfī* mentions that a fifth of each person’s income is to be paid directly to the Imam. By contrast, Ibn Bābawayh adds more details to instruct the Šīʿī community to pay intermediaries on the Imam’s behalf.\(^{128}\) Newman’s observation of Ibn Bābawayh’s work: In *al-Faqīh*, the Imams … took a more lenient attitude towards associating with the secular political establishment – Sulṭān than had been in the case in al-Kāfī.\(^{129}\) As we have seen Amir-Moezzi speak of one side of early Šīʿah. He is more focussed about finding answers to the contradiction of traditions within Šīʿah works. His argument that the old


Šīʿah treated the world of intelligence not as an abstract of ideas but as emanations of God and that the mythical traditions should not therefore be treated as real history.\(^\text{130}\)

My work will develop this point during the time frame between abū Bakr al-Rāzī until the wazīr Ibn ʿAbbād. Moreover, in this study, I will use three themes from Amir-Moezzi’s structure that are relevant to my study of Ibn Bābawayh’s thoughts: the problem of evil, Imamah, and return after death. Amir-Moezzi finds that the doctrine of Imamah was influenced by Christian Neoplatonic gnostic traditions of late Antiquity. It has a concept that is parallel to Neoplatonism, namely, that the struggle between two forces, good and evil, existed in the cosmos before the creation of the world. The human divided these according to their instincts into three: pneumatics (Greek word for “spirit”), psychics (psyche “soul”) and Hylics (hyle “the matter”) and ordinary people only follow the latter through their basic instincts.\(^\text{131}\) In this thesis, I will examine Amir-Moezzi more closely and consider the criticisms of his work and methodology. As alternative to Amir-Moezzi. Then I move onto McDermott, who discusses the relation of God and Man in Islam but based on al-Mufīd’s work. Which makes Amir-Moezzi’s methodology a candidate for this research but with modifications and a change of direction. Next, I talk about Amir-Moezzi’s answer to the three issues: ‘Historical imām’ – ‘Cosmic Imām’, The Problem of Evil the two opposites concept and the Soul. Then I move onto the method of this thesis.

2.1.1 The relevance of Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi

Amir-Moezzi is a leading academic figure in the study of the Šīʿah Imāmī known as Twelver Šīʿah Islam. Professor M. A. Amir-Moezzi is a specialist in Šīʿī Imāmī theology, Islamic mysticism, and classical Persian poetry. He is the chair of ‘Exegesis and Theology’ at Sorbonne University, and Paris Professor of Islamic Studies. In 1992, he has joined the


\(^{131}\) Amir-Moezzi, The Silent Qur’an, p. 170.

His work received a number of criticisms, and I will share some of them here. Michael Ebstein argues on whether Amir-Moezzi was a continuation of his teacher, Henry Corbin (1903-1978), who looked at the historical development of Shi‘īsm. By contrast, Amir-Moezzi avoids the historical development aspect and is more interested in introducing the mystical-esoteric dimension of Shi‘ism to western academics. Likewise, William F.

---


Tucker states that Amir-Moezzi’s methodology is weak, unlike his teacher Henry Corbin, who combined western educational methodology and Islamic learning. He sees Amir-Moezzi as closer to Hossein Modarressi and Sachedina, who are not western, secular, and open-minded, but fall into the trap of being in favour of a particular religious point of view.\textsuperscript{135} Amir-Moezzi contends that it is almost impossible to determine historical authenticity. He says if we were to follow ḥadīṯ criticism from the post-Buwayhids era, it would not be possible to write any history, not even the Prophet’s biography.\textsuperscript{136} Moreover, he argues that in the same way as the Sunnī criticise the Šī‘ah, so academics tend to be biased against the Šī‘ah.\textsuperscript{137}

2.1.2 Cosmic Imam and Historical imam

Amir-Moezzi argues that there are two versions of Imamah and not one. The cosmic and historical. When he writes Imāmah (with an upper case “I”) he is referring to the cosmic Imām, who is God in his goodness who caused the earthly Imām to be born into our world in order to become God’s instrument manifested into the Imām. When Amir-Moezzi writes imām (with a lower case “i”), he is referring to a historical, earthly person, a human.\textsuperscript{138} While on earth they are always faced with moral opposites, by a battle between armies of good and evil.\textsuperscript{139} However, there is no ḥadīṯ describing Imam as cosmic (kawnī); this is from Amir-Moezzi addition.

If we go back to Ibn Bābawayh ḥadīṯ, makes a clear distinction, between before the birth of Imam and after his death. Before they were born and after their death they were the light. The eleven Imams’ martyrdoms necessarily paved the way for the twelfth to be the force to defeat evil. Ibn Bābawayh narrates that Imam al-Riḍā knew his assassination

\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., Volume 108. Issue 1., p. 114.
\textsuperscript{138} Amir-Moezzi, What is Shi‘i Islam?: An Introduction, p. 14.
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was inevitable, for death was the fate of the Prophet and his succeeding Imams. He also narrates that because Muslims sacrificed Ḥusayn instead of an animal, those who took part in his killing would not have their fasting accepted. Not only was Ḥusayn sacrificed, but a further ten Imams were as well, all as ‘lambs of God’. The task for people is not redemption, as in Christianity, but a call to support the Imams, who were victims. Only by supporting and identifying with the Imams would people be saved. On the contrary, al-Mufīd rejected Ibn Bābawayh’s statement. He rejected the idea that the death of the eleven Imams was a guarantee of humanity’s awakening. He argued that God’s vengeance through the Mahdī would restore justice on earth. As part of the theodicy, God’s justice must be victorious. For him, the figure of al-Mahdī only appears when acceptance of the Šī'ah message becomes widespread and there will be enough followers for him to return and take revenge.

i. walāya and gnosis (‘ilm)

Amir-Moezzi argued that old Šī'ah had their own philosophical explanation and saw there is a link between God and Imāmah. However, Amir-Moezzi did not provide an historical (or philosophical) source to prove such link between Šī'ah and early philosophy. It is apparent, there is a gap in Amir-Moezzi’s argument. He did not support the Imāmī ĥadīth.

ii. Three philosophers

Amir-Moezzi’s study introduces another element that is Šī'ism, that is to say that they had always been influenced by philosophy and their ideal state similar to what al-Fārābī’s
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describe his version of the divine politics *siyāsa ilaḥīyah*.\(^{146}\) However, Amir-Moezzi did not demonstrate the similarities and differences between al-Fārābī and al-Kulaynī.

In this thesis I will advance further on the fact that al-Fārābī studied the work of Aristotle and not the Imami Ḥadīṣ... As stated earlier there were debates between al-Rāzī and Ismaili abū Ḥātim on the topics of prophecy and law.

Amir-Moezzi explores the fact that there are three major philosophers during the tenth century 10\(^{\text{th}}/4\(^{\text{th}}\). Al-Fārābī was involved in philosophy with the assistance of Aristotle’s ethics. To al-Fārābī, man is a political animal, and the government backs and respects the law and the rule of law.\(^{147}\) He takes human attributes as a starting point to demonstrate that man cannot do without a unique, righteous guide inspired by divine wisdom. This is different from classical norms of the time, which started with God and ended up with the need for authority which was the proof of God.\(^{148}\) Amir-Moezzi continues his discussion of al-Fārābī by saying that, while al-Fārābī looks at the evil which emanates from our mind, fantasies, when a person allows himself to make judgments this is an illusion and leads to disorder and wars.\(^{149}\) The difference between people and government is measured by the aim they set for themselves, such as pleasure or honour. The government has to prevent society from becoming unjust and taking the property of others.\(^{150}\) The order of the universe must be reflected in the political order. Therefore, the metaphysical world plays an important part in formulating political structure. He calls it ‘the divine political system’ (*siyāsah ilaḥīyah*).\(^{151}\) This approach was adopted by the Šī‘ah of the tenth century.

\(^{146}\) Amir-Moezzi, *What is Shi'i Islam?: An Introduction*, p. 152.
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2.1.3 Rival to the state

Extremism and rejecting established authorities. Amir-Moezzi maintains that there is a difference between an extremist who wants to destroy society and an extremist who provides social critique:

“The Shi‘i rejection of a “common consensus “(ijmā’) independent of the imam’s directives – something that results from the deliberations of men, … it is a matter of mistrust of personal impulse, which is often ruled by emotion and hankering after false (power, wealth and honours). But it is also a matter of rejecting authorities – caliphs without legitimacy or misguided princes. It is a matter of asking oneself: Who is worthy of supreme authority? Who has a lawful right to take firm decisions? Who should legislate? The answer can only come from a contemplation of the essence of Good.”152

Amir-Moezzi adds that when we speak of ‘freedom’ in the contemporary world, it would be categorised in a religious context as heresy.153 For the early Shi‘ah freedom meant following the Imām, not the state; freedom represented the ability to obey God and not man-made law.154 He asserts that in the religious traditional Muslim world, you cannot be a free thinker and challenge the text unless you interpret the text metaphorically.

However, I argue, Amir-Moezzi has overgeneralised early Shi‘ah by describing their criticism of the state as “the epitome of social criticism”? Today we see that Iran and Iraq are strongholds of the theocratic establishment. In fact, there is no freedom or room to criticise and go against the two Ayatollah Sistani and Khamenei.
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During Ibn Bābawayh’s time a number of Šī’ah rivals went against the state. In choosing ‘Alī al-Riḍā’s traditions as a safe way from being associated with Šī’ah rivals and their ideologies. Infallibility and succession were topics of dispute among the early Šī’a. Ibn Bābawayh is the only Šī’a author to discuss the problem of Zayd al-Nār. Neither al-Kulaynī, nor al-Mufīd, nor al-Ţūsī spoke of Zayd al-Nār. For example, the brother of the Eighth Imam, al-Riḍā, named Zayd al-Nār, claimed the authority of Imamah, thinking that all the lineage of the Prophet were infallible. He attacked and burnt alive the supporters of the Abbasids in Basra. However, his attack failed, and he was captured and brought to Imam al-Riḍā, who rebuked him and rejected his interpretation of Imamah.

Likewise, al-Ḥallājīyah challengers, al-Mufīd and Ibn Bābawayh, each had their own version of Imamah. Al-Mufīd in his criticism of Ibn Bābawayh, defended al-Ḥallājīyah. He stated that al-taṣawwuf such al-Ḥallājīyah they rejected that their Imam’s soul was created before the creation, unlike Ibn Bābawayh, and they are closer in the interpretation to magus majūsīyah who saw Zoroaster performed miracles and he was a prophet. They are mulḥid because they claimed that their Imam is in charge (delegates) of all creation and acts to come. Whereas Ibn Bābawayh, picked on a specific point that he disagrees with mufawiḍa, mainly religious practice-related, he argues that mufawiḍa minimise God’s role so they escape their religious practices, they believe in the resurrection of their Imams similar to Jesus, but we (Ibn Bābawayh) believe that our Imams deceased, martyred and not resurrected. Then added, hence they are muṣriks. Both al-Mufīd and Ibn Bābawayh had their difference in describing tafwīḍ and Ḥallājīyah. It reflects their doctrine
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about transmigration and incarnation, al-Mufid focussing on the eternity of the soul while Ibn Bābawayh on the belief in the journey of the soul after death.

We also need to consider Ibn Bābawayh’s modes of expression, in particular, the metaphorical language which reveals an underlying ethical position. Take, for example, the mystical journey of the Prophet’s ascension through the seven heavens. Such narrative expressions were used in describing the importance of laws and emphasising the Prophet’s meeting with other prophets – for example, with Moses rather than Jesus. For example, Ibn Bābawayh and al-Mufid uses the term ‘alité’ but in opposite ways. Someone who Ibn Bābawayh says is ělī, al-Mufid would, on the contrary, say is a believer and reliable.

When al-Mufid calls the people of the city of Qom ělī, Ibn Bābawayh sees them as representing the uncorrupted essence of Šīʿīsm. Ibn Bābawayh uses the term ělī for those who claim that the prophets and Imams were infallible. He uses the term ‘extremist’ (alité) for those who believe in infallible Imams and claim the right to leadership because they claim a relationship with the infallible Imam. This is because, to him, Imams are ordinary beings and God does not intervene in human life.

Conversely, al-Mufid divides ěḷī into two: a) those who believe in the eternity of the soul of the Imāms, and b) those who deny infallibility, who are called minimisers taqṣīr. Al-Mufid talked about say that Ibn Bābawayh fits both labels. He then added that Ibn Bābawayh’s teacher from Qom b. al-Walīd said that the first sign of ěḷī is to deny that Imāms’ did not make errors. He criticises his position about infallibility, he claims that Ibn Bābawayh adopted a philosophical interpretation by interpreting the soul as
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eternal, similar to exaggerators (ḡulāt) who interpret the Imam’s souls as eternal. For al-Mufid, the eternity of the soul can only lead to the analogy that the soul of the Imams is eternal and has no beginning and is not created corporeal (ḥudūṯ). Thus, al-Mufid argues that eternity of the soul makes the cosmological Imam in charge of and delegated responsibility (tafwīḍ) for both what exists and what happens on the earth. Here al-Mufid is criticizing Ibn Bābawayh, claiming that he thinks the twelve were present with God in the beginning. Ibn Bābawayh, however, states that the soul of believers and Imams were created with the soul of the Prophet, explaining Imamah as the good aspect of human nature that all humans shares. It originated from the first intellect. He did not believe what al-Mufid accused him of believing. He did not believe in twelve literal Imams circling God. Al-Mufid did not recognise that Ibn Bābawayh distinguished between soul and spirit. Spirit can only be inherited from the prophet through lineage, by contrast, everyone has a soul, the will to do good. There is a second way al-Mufid misunderstood Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Mufid did not recognise that he distinguished between soul and personality. For Ibn Bābawayh, the soul/energy of all humanity, including the twelve Imams and all the prophets of history, emanated from God at the beginning of creation. This is parallel to al-Rāzī, but al-Rāzī called the soul (nafs). For Ibn Bābawayh the soul or energy combines with faculties such as intelligence to create a unique personality with a name and an identity. Al-Mufid, however, did not make this fine distinction between soul and faculty and spirit. Al-Mufid thought that Ibn Bābawayh argued that the literal ‘Alī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn were all together with God at the beginning. If Ibn Bābawayh had believed that, he would have been extremist. But he did not. The term nafs was not unknown, al-Masʿūdī stated it was Plato who separated between the two nafs from ruḥ. If nafs is inside the body it is called ruḥ. Outside the body it is called ruḥ. The difference between the two is their
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role. If the body in which it is dwelling has bodily attachments, when it leaves the body, it becomes free nafs again. Other philosophers then divided souls into two groups: sinful and righteous. Then the Muslim disputed to what extent the soul has awareness dārik al-umūr. While the Ṣufī divided the souls into three groups: the righteous soul nafs al-muṭmaʿinna, the doubtful soul nafs al-lawāma, and the sinful soul nafs ammāra bil-sūt.  

In my thesis is a third approach that Amir-Moezzi does not take into consideration, which interprets the text, neither in terms of ḥadīṯ, nor in terms of metaphor, but philosophically. As will be demonstrated, this was the approach of Ibn Bābawayh. He tried to find a middle path between text and philosophy, between al-Mufīd’s rationalistic, legalistic approach (uṣūl al-fiqh), and the allegorical/metaphorical (baṭīnyah) approach of the followers of Ibn Ḥallāj.

2.1.4 The Gradual Shift Towards Sectarianism

There is no mentioning of 400 uṣūl in the work of Ibn Bābawayh, he only mentioned 11 uṣūl that were circulated in his time. This suggests that Ibn Bābawayh was discriminating in his selection of ḥadīṯ. Ibn Bābawayh only chose 11 notebooks as his sources for his compilation on law Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh.

Amir-Moezzi argues that there was a gradual development of several esoteric traditions which were ignored in the compilation of al-Mufīd’s student, al-Ṭūsī, and that expert in rational speculation such as Šarīf al-Murtaḍa (1044/436). Al-Mufīd to include new sources into Šīʿah thought, namely, the so-called four hundred notes or books 400 uṣūl. The aim was to cut-out Šīʿah writers by accusing them of being extremist. It was a turning point in moving away from mystical, esoteric thinking towards using rationalistic thinking as the way to justify Imāmah. It was an attempt at rationalisation that took place
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during the Buwayhids’ rule. It resulted in closer ties to the religious Muslim Sunnī establishment. Amir-Moezzi traces down the changes on the Šī‘ī and how during the Buwayhids dynasty, for example, in Bağdād, the Šī‘ah shifted from esoteric thinking to a rational/speculative approach. Hence, this is why most traditions from the pre-Buwayhid era speak about Imāms in an esoteric, mystical way, in other words, in a ‘mythical’ fashion. By contrast, post-Buwayhid scholars tend to be more focused on law and rationality.

Then Amir-Moezzi added that due to the major event of the occultation of the twelfth Imām in the Tenth/Fourth century, the community had no alternative but to follow a rational approach, because they felt vulnerable to the Muʿtazilites and Sunnīs. Indeed, the rational approach in the work of al-Muḥīd and his two students al-Ṭūsī and al-Murtaḍa was an example of that. They silenced all traditions that viewed Imāms as mystical/esoteric figures. Since the twelfth Imām went on occultation, the Šī‘ah community has been left in a difficult position theologically. Since there was no charismatic leader to replace the Imām, several tensions arose. The traditionalists of Qom and Rayy were opposed by the speculative Sunnī theology (kalām) of Bağdād, and by the new Šī‘ah trend led by al-Muḥīd in Bağdād. On the contrary, Amir-Moezzi does not seem to accept that there was a positive relation between the Sunnī and Šī‘ah. Amir-Moezzi seems to stick on one side of the coin. I will show later on how Ibn Bābawayh worked side by side with the Sunnī Muʿtazilites and philosophers and responded to Šī‘ah extremists.

2.2 Criticism of Amir-Moezzi

This methodology has not gone uncontested. There are two basic critiques that I am interested in which have been levelled against Amir-Moezzi. The first is the criticism that relying on historical information can give only a partial representation or a hypothetical
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picture. The second is that the view of the Qur’an as a human creation leads to agnosticism, which downplays the central role of the transcendent.

2.2.1 Karim Douglas Crow

Following the first type of critique, Karim Douglas Crow criticises Amir-Moezzi, in that he pays attention to all Imāms’ esoteric (bāṭīn) themes without looking into the context of the debates surrounding the exoteric currents, such as speculative theology (kalām) and legal traditions (ḥadīth).178 In response to Karim Douglas Crow, Amir-Moezzi acknowledges the fact that the authenticity of traditions have been exposed to alteration and misinterpretation for example adding the names of the Twelvers’ Imams to the tradition.179 He further argues that simply by examining several sources from the same era180 we find two points:

1) The early Šī‘ah understood the topic of Imamah from the mystical wisdom ‘īrfaṇī and not from a rationalistic or ‘speculative’ theology.181 Mystical language should not be treated as literal.

2) The discussion and responses between Imams and their disciples were not directed at Šī‘ah per se, but were mostly polemical discussions and responses to disputes with other religious movements.182 Amir-Moezzi continues that, first, in early Šī‘ī history, the followers’ dialogue with their Imāms was called ‘wisdom’. It is best described as (‘īrfaṇ), whose main role draws out the mystical dimension of Imamology.183 Secondly, because of political transition during the 10th century, this mystical approach was neglected, and people began to treat the tradition literally – there was a switch to
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rationality and the use of speculative theology. For example, early Šī‘ah theology addressed the concept of intellect (‘āql) in terms of the Neoplatonic ‘world above’; that is, the ‘ideal type’ Imām was located in heaven above, in the metaphysical world, while the earthly instantiation existed in the physical Imām who taught students in the community.\footnote{Ibid., p. 110.}

2.2.3 Sajjad Rizvi

In the second class of critiques against Amir-Moezzi, Sajjad Rizvi objects that Amir-Moezzi is not following the proper Šī‘ah way, is not faithful to the religious tradition. Early Šī‘ah sources were thrown out by Šī‘ah figures, such as al-Ṭūsī and al-Najāšī, for a reason. They do not merely contain esoterism, but, they contain the views of extremists, who claim that the present version of the Qur’an is full of errors and alterations, and who suggest that there was only one authentic version which remained with ‘Alī and his household.\footnote{Sajjad Rizvi, Review: Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi. The Silent Qur’an and the Speaking Qur’an: Scriptural Sources of Islam between History and Fervor. Translated by Eric Ormsby. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017), volume 51, Issue 2., p. 264.}

However, Amir-Moezzi’s did not relate to one argument. For example, in his \textit{The Divine Guide in Early Shi’ism},\footnote{Amir-Moezzi, \textit{The Divine Guide in Early Shi’ism}, \textit{The Sources of Esotericism in Islam}, (N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1994), p. 83., and \textit{The Silent Qur’an and the Speaking Qur’an}, (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 2016), p. 64.} he argued the authenticity of the Qur’an that why had more verses and in his \textit{The Silent Qur’an and the Speaking Qur’an} he spoke about hermeneutics and not about how many verses.\footnote{Amir-Moezzi, \textit{The Silent Qur’an and the Speaking Qur’an}, (N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 2016), pp. 75, 77, 88, 95 and 177.}

2.2.4 George Warner

closer to the Ismaili than the wukālā’. This is an interesting point, however it is more of a suggestion rather than proven findings. Then moves on and argued that Amir-Moezzi’s saw al-Ḥallāj and al-Šalmağānī as being extremists. On the contrary, Amir-Moezzi’s does not see al-Ḥallāj and al-Šalmağānī as extremist nor did he question their doctrine, but he saw them as using the same esoteric and gnostic language which is used by followers of the Ismaili and Qarmatian.

2.2.5 Moojan Momen

According to Moojan Momen, Amir-Moezzi’s interpretation of terms such as assimilation (tašbīh) and agnosticism (taʿīl). To Momen, the early Šīʿah, pre-Buwayhids, were more influenced by speculative or logical reasoning and had no link to Gnosticism. I agree with Momen that it is correct. Gnosticism was part of the extremist Šīʿah milieu.

2.2.5 William F. Tucker

Tucker, a critic of Amir-Moezzi, focussed on his translating ‘intellect’ (ʿaqīl), as ‘hiero-intelligence’, a gnostic term for divine guide, when in fact the pre-Buwayhids period, ‘Hiero-intelligence’ was not used. This is a fundamental point. I agree with Tucker, it is unclear why Amir-Moezzi made an error. The difference is that to accept ‘hiero-intelligence’ this interpretation must have justified to him wīlāyat al-Faqīh, when it was not the case. Also, Amir-Moezzi’s shares similar thought with Hossein Modarressi and
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cannot be seen as secular academics. They fall under the category of being apologetic and perhaps the defenders of the faith as this shown in their works dealing with traditions, ġulāt and Ibn Bābawayh.

2.2.6 My Response to Amir-Moezzi’s Critics

Some of the Šī‘ah figures behind the execution of Ḥallāj were the agents wukalā’ of the twelfth Imam and not just random Šī‘ah. They were originally Persian and considered the defenders of the faith such as abū Sahl al-Nubaḵtī. It is unclear why Amir-Moezzi pointed out that Ḥallāj was executed under the influence of Šī‘ah of Bağdād and not saying who were these figures were and why specifically he pointed out the Šī‘ah of city of Bağdād? I will now summarise my response to Amir-Moezzi’s critics. Contra Ebstein, Amir-Moezzi does not link mystical themes of Šī‘ah compilers (muḥadditūn) with mystical Sufi. Rather, he reminds us that the early traditions were treated by the pre-Buwayhids Šī‘ah differently than in the Post-Buwayhids Šī‘ah. Pre-Buwayhids, historical Imāms, such as Imām Ḥusayn, were treated similarly to how Christians viewed the historical Jesus. The Imāms are the manifestation of the light of God and that light is the heavenly intellect (ʿaql). Every believer has within him some of that light, and consequently, every believer can visualise the manifestation of God’s aspects but not his essence, and likewise can recognise the manifestation of Imāms but not their essence and example of this the Saba’īyah. I argue this approach is closer to Šī‘ah Ismaili abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī rather than Sufis.

Amir-Moezzi argues that al-Kulaynī was contemporary to the two intellectuals and philosophers, abū Bakr al-Rāzī and abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī. Therefore, al-Kulaynī’s work may have traces of the Neoplatonic philosophy that is similar to abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī which was
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widespread in Qom and Rayy.  

Amir-Moezzi suggest that there are similarities between al-Kulaynī and the Ismaili abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī, but, he also tells us that there was a conflict between the two philosophies of abū Bakr al-Rāzī and abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī. He argued that al-Kulaynī’s had a diverse education and well known. At the same time Amir-Moezzi, argue, that al-Kulaynī’s name was not mentioned by biographers of Bağdād such as Ibn al-Nadīm and al-Bağdādī, then state because al-Kulaynī’s stayed briefly in Bağdād. However, according to al-Ḍahabī in Siyar a’lām al-Nubalā’ al-Kulaynī lived in Bağdād and was buried there. In the biography there is no mention of his books, nor that his name was mentioned by Sunni who were contemporary to him, nor that Ibn Bābawayh listed him as one of the 11 sources.

Ibn Bābawayh’s views were not discussed in terms of which philosophy he belongs to. I argue that is the conflict between the side Ibn Bābawayh and the side of al-Kulaynī. Furthermore, the topic worthy of investigation is whether Ibn Bābawayh adopted the philosophy of abū Ḥātim, al-Fārābī or the physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī. This is important and it is not discussed before. This thesis will demonstrate as to why Ibn Bābawayh was different from al-Kulaynī and later on, by al-Mufīd.

In conclusion, Ibn Bābawayh was a faqīh and followed the text whereas Amir-Moezzi’s Šī’ism, far from being ‘religion of the Book’, is a religion of a person God is not made manifest through the silent test but through an individual. For this reason alone suggest that he would go against Ibn Bābawayh compiling his work Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh.
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2.3 Alternatives to Amir-Moezzi

McDermott made some valuable findings but did not follow it through and his work was focussed on al-Mufīd and not Ibn Bābawayh. While Amir-Moezzi and Modarressi are more apologetic defenders of the faith than a secular academics. Karim Douglas Crow suggests that, there is slight difference between Amir-Moezzi and Modarressi. The latter preferable methodology by remaining within religious Ṣīʿah Tradition. As mentioned earlier that Modarressi who argues that even ḥadīṯ experts could not explain the contradictions between the traditions. Again in his defence of traditions that were considered unreliable that this problem of contradiction he goes back to the disagreements among the Imāms’ companions. Therefore individually transmitted traditions could be authentic but could still contradict each other. Both Amir-Moezzi and Modarressi defended traditions that were considered unreliable by the standard of Ibn Bābawayh.

From observing Modarressi, he seeks to defend al-Mufīd and discredit Ibn Bābawayh’s work for his differences from the majority of Ṣīʿah scholars. Modarressi recognises Ibn Bābawayh’s skill as a narrator but argues that narrative ability does not equate to scholarship. Modarressi praises al-Mufīd for defending authors (for example 400 usūl) who were excluded from the tradition by Ibn Bābawayh. For Modarressi, Ibn Bābawayh is simply too narrow. As a solution to avoid contradictions among the traditions, Modarressi argues that Ṣīʿah scholars should accept the consensus of a greatly increased number of sources (usūl), as with al-Mufīd’s approach, rather than Ibn Bābawayh’s approach of employing strict criteria to exclude narrators (ruwāt). However, I believe it is worth saying that Ibn Bābawayh did not avoid consecutive traditions (mutawātir), but he
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established criteria that, to be accepted as material for consensus, the tradition needed to have a chain of at least three reliable narrators (isnāds).

Amir-Moezzi suggests that the Šī‘a ignored the Sunnī traditions altogether, and paid special attention to old beliefs such as Manichaeism, which were anti-state. Amir-Moezzi suggests that the Šī‘a ignored the Sunnī traditions altogether, and paid special attention to old beliefs such as Manichaeism, which were anti-state.209 Hence, the Šī‘a Imāmī doctrine emerged from a dualist vision of Imāmah as the forces of good combating the forces of evil.210 Thus, gnostic thought was undoubtedly present in Manichaeism and Bardaisanism.211

2.4 Conceptual Framework

In addition to strength, their understanding of ethics and morality is also an integral part of our interpretation of Ibn Bābawayh. The depiction of the mystical journey ascension and the selection of the characters involved in the journey were relevant to their contemporary philosophical, social and political currents, revealing the author's inclination, as well as his ethics and cultural values. Just as Ibn Bābawayh collected earlier teachings, he too became a recognised lawyer faqīh as such in his time and in subsequent centuries. His works themselves have acquired an authoritative character over time. Therefore, the researcher must determine what is meant by his books. Quentin Skinner's approach discussed by James Tully is useful in this regard.212 In a similar vein, this thesis analyses and comments on Ibn Bābawayh’s background to find the factors that contributed to his ideology, and to try to read the text with an eye to understanding what he intended.

First, like Skinner, who begins his study from the background of Hobbes,213 this study will examine Ibn Bābawayh’s background to ascertain how it affected his outlook. For
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example, his father’s involvement in debating with the great Sufi figure, Ibn al-Ḥallāj, could well have contributed to Ibn Bābawayh’s becoming anti-Ṣūfī. Second, we seek to examine what led Ibn Bābawayh to write The Creed of the Twelve Imams, and ask whether he accepted the available Šī‘ah doctrine before writing his text. And if he did, to what extent was the text changed during the process of interpretation? In effect, we are looking into what Tully, elaborating Skinner’s approach, called ‘ideology’, or an inherent set of ideas and an outlook that formed the background to the text.

Why Ibn Bābawayh? Why study him? Western scholarship does not recognise him as an independent thinker, though it does so recognise Kulaynī and al-Mufīd. However, Ibn Bābawayh was not just a follower of Islam, he was one of several architects of the Šī‘ah creed. We need to study an individual who constructed a whole philosophy of religion. If he had only been a religious leader, a person who in charge of a religious community, we would not have such a pressing need to learn about him. But he was more. This thesis will demonstrate that. Ibn Bābawayh’s works were not written in a vacuum, and the implicit ideology that guided these texts could not have been absorbed without a process of circulation and adaptation of thought that was accepted as local practice. In other words, I am interested in what shapes the believer’s mind, as it relates to what he or she believes, i.e., the religious texts. First, Ibn Bābawayh does not always explicitly or overtly say what he thinks, because he would be accused of being an innovator and an enemy of the state. So, for example, he does not say the literal words, analogy against the word of God ‘qīyās is evil’. Instead, he will say, ‘Imam Ja’far said that those who use qīyās are following Lucifer’ and he will have a chapter entitled, ‘Qīyās is Accursed’ with a series of traditions of the Imams supporting this title. The thesis discusses the three themes, which were pressing issues in the time of Ibn Bābawayh, of the eternity of the soul, Imamah, and the problem of evil.
2.4.1 Textual Authority – Three Observations

First, we must look at the chapter content, the ḥadīth that Ibn Bābawayh selected. Like all textual interpretation, it can be questioned and is subjective but, like all interpretation, it is plausible if based on the overall logic of the author’s contributions. This thesis will follow three methods, the latter two explicitly suggested by Tully. Also, as has been noted above, it will assess Ibn Bābawayh’s individual ideas in the context of his entire corpus of work. This comprehensive view allows us to see the overall trends of his thought and to assess how ‘strong’ or ‘weak’ an affirmation of his is – that is, how consistently he used it over time and what priority was given to it. Second, I observe that Ibn Bābawayh’s utilisation of ḥadīt and their themes vs al-Mufīd’s refutations of him, inform us about his agenda, and what he saw as fitting for his society at the time. We will also compare Ibn Bābawayh’s works with those of his contemporaries, such as Taṣḥīḥ ʿIʿtiqādāt al-Imāmīyah, by al-Mufīd. We will analyse the two sets of thoughts, using earlier sources such as the traditions transmitted by the Šīʿah followers of Manichaeism and Bardaisanism, to investigate what had been accepted and rejected. This will allow us to gauge how far Ibn Bābawayh was reacting to formulate his work the Creed. One of the charges against him is the controversy of his statement, against those who believe in the infallibility of the Prophets and Imams and whether the Šīʿī Imams were liable to error (ṣahū). By comparing Ibn Bābawayh’s writings with those of his contemporaries, we will be able to discern how far he regarded the doctrine of infallibility as extreme. In the emergence of the compilation of ḥadīts in Šīʿah, there was no consensus on a single author, but there were others as well who compiled their ḥadīts with different doctrines from his doctrine. They did not like his doctrine, and they accepted his ḥadīt, but not his teaching. Third, and finally, the thesis will investigate the use of ḥadīt. Some of the words of ḥadīt that are employed, such as light
(nūr), 214 soul (rūḥ), spirit (nafs) 215 or evil (šar), are terms common between the three figures of al-Fārābī, al-Rāzī, and Ibn Bābawayh, and therefore reveal Ibn Bābawayh’s philosophical position in comparison to these other two. The very phrasing of the texts may reveal the author’s tools in justifying his philosophy and what he regarded as important elements of the debate.

2.4.2 Ibn Bābawayh on the Authority of the Text

Here I will explain why I did not choose Amir-Moezzi for my methodology. First, Amir-Moezzi is dismissive of literary traditions, and this does not enable him to challenge the current state of research in the field by investigating the corpus of traditions. In contrast, Ibn Bābawayh challenged Islamic doctrine through examination of the traditions. They are not united in their scrutiny of the Ḥadīṯ. Hence, I infer that Ibn Bābawayh work is revolutionary at least in later centuries when it became accessible to both Sunni and Šīʿah.

There are different approaches to studying Ibn Bābawayh’s work, such as those taken by Etan Kohlberg, Andrew Newman, Van Ess, and Hossein Modarressi. I intend to interpret Ibn Bābawayh from the point of view of the collective traditions, and to narrow them down, as we have seen, to the three issues mentioned above: 1) the problem of evil,
2), the significance of the soul and 3) the ‘return after death’. I am, however, constrained in my research, by the fact that Ibn Bābawayh does not explicitly state that his work concerns the relationship between God and man, nor does he give us a clue as to what he thought about this relationship. Yet the silence of a text does not negate a reasoned inference based on an appreciation for the overall corpus and how particular issues within it are discussed, the priority they are given, and the words used to describe them. All these reveal the inner logic of the corpus. In addition, a consideration of the context in which the works were written is instructive. An informed understanding of the time, place, and the underlying intellectual and political impulses which inspired the works, sheds valuable light on the meaning of the core texts.

The Mu’tazila figure Ibn abī al-Ḥadīd (1258/656 A.H),\textsuperscript{216} raised a criticism that Ibn Bābawayh’s verdict in law *fiqh* issue often rely on traditions that did not reach *mutawātir* they are usually from singular source narrated by singular chain *akbār aḥād*.\textsuperscript{217} Ibn abī al-Ḥadīd here by referring to *mutawātir* it should include Sunnī sources too.

Instead, the Ḥanbalī figure Ibn Taymīyah (abī al-ʿAbbās Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmed b. Taymīyah) (d. 1327/728 A.H) states that Šī‘ah such as Mufīd and his followers abū al-Qāsim al-Mūsawī Šarīf Murtaḍa (d. 1044/436), al-Ţūsī (d. 460/1067) and al-Karākajī (d. 1057/449) do not care about isnād they base their argument on unconnected traditions that has no historical reliability.\textsuperscript{218} Both they say the Šī‘ah only focus on isnād when it supports their belief in Imāmah. Šī‘ah scholars themselves, both ancient and modern, acknowledge that they focus on isnād only when it comes from the Imām himself. Similarly, Kohlberg argues that a large percentage of this isnād were fabricated by Šī‘ah and Sunnī authors for


\textsuperscript{218} Ibn Taymīyah, *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘ilmīyah, 1999), vol 1, p. 19,
political reasons. But, in this thesis I argue that Ibn Bābawayh did not fabricate ḥadīṯ; however, he creatively arranged ḥadīṯ according to his ideology. He was an independent thinker. He had his ideological framework into which he inserted ḥadīṯ to substantiate his views. He travelled to different cities to source ḥadīṯ which he could then use, like jigsaw-puzzle pieces, putting them together to form his picture. For example, a student of al-Muḥīḍ named al-Najāšī stated in his list of narrators that Ibn Bābawayh narrated ḥadīṯ attributed to a person called Ibn Ṭ˚Uqdah, traditions that no one in the city of Kūfa had heard about. Al-Najāšī stated that:

Aḥmed b. al-Ḥusayn said to me that he saw Ibn Bābawayh who presented to him a notebook he had copied that had Ibn Ṭ˚Uqdah’s traditions, that he heard Muḥammed b. Ibrahim b. Ishāq al-Ṭalqānī who said that he heard from Aḥmed b. Muḥammed b. Sa˚d (b. Ṭ˚Uqdah) who said that he heard ‘Al˚ī b. Faḍ˚āl from his father from Im˚ām al-Ri˚d˚ā.

Then al-Najāšī commented that none of the people of Kūfa whom he knows, had heard about this notebook and that this story was not narrated in this fashion anywhere else.

Thus, there is scholarly confusion about Ibn Bābawayh’s thinking. Scholars argue that he does not have his own opinion, he is just a narrator, all he has is ḥadīṯ with isn˚ād. I argue that he does have his own opinion and that he strongly supports his own opinion through isn˚ād, and he often expresses his opinion through having multiple traditions on one subject, or he might have a subtitle in his book. For example, he might have a heading entitled ‘the eternity of the soul’. He would then list under the heading a series of ḥadīṯ that support his philosophical view on the eternity of the soul. As we know al-R˚āz˚ī and al-F˚ār˚āb˚ī were not focussed on ḥadīṯ, they simply utilised rational discussion. Ibn Bābawayh

---


220 Al-Naj˚ā˚sh˚ī, _Rij˚āl Al-Naj˚ā˚sh˚ī_, p. 258.
on the other hand tended to select ḥadīṯ that matched al-Rāzī’s philosophy.\textsuperscript{221} I substantiate my argument by engaging with the method behind his narrative theology. Thus, to understand Ibn Bābawayh’s conception of the world, to grasp his independent thinking, we need to consider three methodological factors.

2.5 Themes of the Thesis concerning Amir-Moezzi

These themes were mentioned by Amir-Moezzi. He failed to respond to them accordingly, creating gaps in the field of Šī‘ah study. I will explore them further, as they are essential in the study of Ibn Bābawayh.

2.5.1 ‘Historical imām’ – ‘Cosmic Imām’

Amir-Moezzi suggesting that there were similarities between Ibn Bābawayh and the students of al-Kulaynī in how they view the five themes. The twelfth Imām, for example, was viewed by the students of al-Kulaynī, such as abū Zaynab al-Nu‘mānī (d. 956/345) as giving different version of the role of the Mahdi when he returns before the end of days, from what Ibn Bābawayh taught listed five differences:

1) \textit{Imām Mahdī} has supernatural abilities and a miraculous conception and birth,

2) At his arrival he will replace the teaching of the Prophet and his companions, the \textit{sunnah},

3) He will have a long rule before the arrival of the final resurrection,

4) His followers are non-Arabs (Persians) who fight the Arabs as punishment for their treachery,

5) All his followers will enjoy supernatural powers,

6) They will commit themselves to the esoteric teachings of the Imāms.

\textsuperscript{221} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Ḵisāl}, vol 1, p. 266.
By contrast, Ibn Bābawayh has much less detail than al-Nuʿmānī and does not talk about the Mahdi’s followers as having superhuman powers, nor that they must be Persian. He deals with 1, 3, 5, and 6, but leaves out 2 and 4. This comparison does not prove that there was political influence, but rather the opposite. It was a philosophical difference. Amir-Moezzi did not seem to consider this. Amir-Moezzi focusses on mythical Imāmah the cosmic Imām, but from the perspective of al-Kulaynī and his students. He did not address Ibn Bābawayh and his contribution. Amir-Moezzi made another error arguing that, in the pre-Buwayhids era, al-Kulaynī, Ibn abī Zaynab al-Nu’mānī, and Ibn Bābawayh, their writings shared similar themes. He included Ibn Bābawayh when in fact he was talking about al-Kulaynī and his student but not Ibn Bābawayh.

2.5.2 Rationalist interpretations of the three issues:

We have seen that although Amir-Moezzi speaks mainly of the gnostic Šī‘ah in the pre-Buwayhids era, his work is relevant to this thesis because he emphasises an approach; namely, the importance of the authority of the religious text, such as the Philosophy and Ḥadīṯ. He is also relevant because he focuses on issues of parallel importance to Ibn Bābawayh. I turn now to three issues that Amir-Moezzi flagged up as important:

i. Historical criticism

ii. The assistance of philosophy which has contributed to the development of Šī‘ah thought,

iii. The very concept of Imām, i.e., Imāmah vs evil.

2.5.3 The Problem of Evil

Amir-Moezzi argues that the old Šī‘ah had followed a dualist concept of two opposites (did and plural addād) that the universe was made as a battlefield between forces of good

---

and evil. The good sides were the prophets, saints, imāms, and their disciples. They saw
the repeated pattern of good vs evil, the victim vs the victimisers, as a sign of dualism.
Other examples are Adam and Satan, Abraham and Nimrud, Moses and Pharaoh, Jesus and
Pontius Pilate, Muḥammed, 'Alī, and abū Bakr, 'Umar. The evil keeps winning because
the prophets and Imāms are constantly being betrayed by their followers. Moses was
betrayed by the Israelites and the prophet Muḥammed and Imām 'Alī were betrayed by
their companions. It is a continuous battle, instantiated in different times and histories.

However, Amir-Moezzi did not provide his evidence. According to al-Asʿarī, Maqālāt
al-Islāmiyīn in his description of ǧulāt sects, that al-Šarīʿ (abī Muḥammed al-Ḥasan) and
his followers they believed in transmigration and the 5 aẓdād. It is worth mentioning
that Ibn Bābawayh version of aẓdād is fundamentally different. He referred to a tradition
narrated by Sunnī that the Prophet said this matter will not be finalised until succeeded by
twelve rulers (ḵulafāʾ) and all of them has to be from the tribe of Qurayš. Then the
prophet said that there are twelve hypocrites among his companions and that therefore they
will not enter heaven. Similar tradition narrated that there are twelve evil men six from
pre-Islam and six in Islam, that each one represents one character of evil. He narrates
that the Prophet was succeeded by twelve righteous Imams and they are all his offspring.
In another, traditions he referred to their opposites as evils. It is an ongoing battle between
truth and falsehood. Likewise, al-Fārābī states the ideal Imām of the virtuous states who

---

There is no evidence provided in this article.
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226 Al-Asʿarī, Maqālāt al-Islāmiyīn, p. 84.
228 Al-Nawawī, Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi Ṣarḥ al-Nawawī, vol 9, p. 107.
has twelve attributes\textsuperscript{230} versus the ignorance state, that has opposite attributes.\textsuperscript{231} Ibn Bābawayh describes the companions (Ṣaḥaba) in a place called ḡadīr ḫum and how they were commanded by the Prophet, after his death, to keep their oath to ʿAlī as their Imām.\textsuperscript{232} But ʿUmar misled the Ṣaḥaba, gathering in Saqīfa ṣāḥīb al-ʿīdah\textsuperscript{233} to conspire to deprive ʿAlī of the caliphate and replace him with ʿUmar’s friend, abū Bakr.\textsuperscript{234} Ibn Bābawayh argues that, since then, the Sunnī school has been corrupted and divided, Muslims have become weakened. By contrast, ʿAlī is similar to Adam, with the gathering of Companions receiving the Prophet’s mandate that ʿAlī was to be his successor, akin to God instructing the angels to bow to Adam kind and wise’. By contrast, those who broke the consensus and disregarded the succession of ʿAlī, represent friends of Satan.\textsuperscript{235} What Ibn Bābawayh was emphasising in the plan for succession from Prophet to Imām ʿAlī was that it was for the benefit of all of humanity, not just the Muslims. But, like the Adam and Eve story, lust and worldly temptation diverted the companions from ʿAlī. Having learned from the example of the Prophet and his companions, we now continue with the concept of free will (\textit{wa hadaynāhu al-najdayn}).\textsuperscript{236} I observe that Ibn Bābawayh speaks of angels possessing God-given authority to pass revelations/visions to prophets and Imāms as an attempt to save humanity and the world from disorder.\textsuperscript{237} However, Ibn Bābawayh otherwise gives a very minimal role to the angels in our world. It is important to analyse how similar or how different Ibn Bābawayh was from al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī, in how they envisaged the place of angels in the world, and how different categories of duty are given to the angels.

\textsuperscript{231} Al-Fārābī, al-Madīna al-Fāḍīlah, p. 131., and Al-Fārābī in Ed._ Walzer, Al-Farabi on The Perfect State, p. 252.
\textsuperscript{232} Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī a l-Ḵābār, p. 70 and al-Ḵīṣāl, vol 2, p. 550.
\textsuperscript{233} Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ḵīṣāl, vol 1, p. 171.
\textsuperscript{234} Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-Aḥbār, p. 70 and al-Ḵīṣāl, vol 2, p. 550.
\textsuperscript{236} Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 411.
\textsuperscript{237} Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Amālī, p. 235.
2.5.4 The Soul

The notion of the pre-existence of the Imāms in form of luminous lights which emanated from God represented as phantoms (ašbāḥ) and shadows (aẓllah). It means that they existed before the creation of the world as well as afterward when the world came to be. However, I argue that Amir-Moezzi has overgeneralised this. There is a decisive difference between the two versions of the luminous by al-Kulaynī’s and Ibn Bābawayh’s. Ibn Bābawayh version about the Imams’ souls have existed before the body of Adam (kuna nūr nas ‘a bayna yaday Allah ... qabla in yakulqa Allahu Adam). In al-Kulaynī’s version, the Imams’ souls are green shadows alone with God.

As an alternative, I begin now to address the issue of the soul through utilising three key thinkers, al-Fārābī, al-Rāzī, and Ibn Bābawayh. The first two have always been considered philosophers, while the last has, since his own time, been reckoned as a traditionalist/theologian. Naturally, Islamic philosophers were concerned with the soul and utilised concepts such as psyche, nafs, and rūḥ. But Islamic theologians were also involved in explaining matters of the soul. The three main topics of discussion common to both groups were: 1) the problem of evil, 2) the significance of the soul, and 3) the ‘return after death’. In the philosophical and theological discussion of the soul, a critical question arose: how does one discern those who are gifted with the ability of prophecies and knowledge? Muslim philosophers and theologians always had in mind the need to find a place for prophets, to justify the existence of prophets both to themselves as Muslim scholars, and to the Šī‘ah public. Greek philosophy speaks of the love of wisdom as the great solution for the salvation of humankind, while religion, on the other hand, speaks of chosen men as

---

241 Al-Kulaynī, al-Ḳāfi, vol 1, p. 441.
guides for humanity. I contend that al-Fārābī, al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh sought to find where they fit in this dialectic between philosophy and religion. They needed to keep the structure of philosophy, while at the same time recognising the Prophet Muḥammed and his prophecies as having their proper place within that structure. All three thinkers agreed that the human body is like a vessel that carries something precious – the soul. It was considered to be that requirement that makes humans' characters different from each other.

Yet, after death, where does the soul go? All three scholars agreed that souls go to two separate places, one for the good, and one for the evil. A second related question is where do souls go when sleeping people dream? Ibn Bābawayh discusses this at length because, for him, this concept of dream travel of the soul contributes to the justification of his concept of occultation. He states that, while he slept, in a dream he saw the Imām Mahdi telling him to write a book to convince those who were affected with confusion from the logicians. On the other hand, al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī speak of the faculty of representation in the human mind. Al-Fārābī explicitly states that most visions happen while asleep.²⁴²

Next, we have a series of questions: How can an uncompleted soul reach its full light? What kind of relationship exists between us and God? In what realm does God exist? To what extent does God intervene and interact with humans? What do our three thinkers teach people regarding the above? These issues certainly held importance during the tenth century in the Muslim world and will be discussed in depth below.

2.5.5 Imāmah / The divine beings

Amir-Moezzi says that the pre-Buwayhids Šī‘ah traditions speak of the Imāms as mystical divine beings with their roots in the origins of the cosmos. These Imāms are capable of ascending above, of making journeys to the heavenly world and returning. Their

role is to save humans by introducing the Divine mystical world to humanity. However, I argue that Amir-Moezzi has oversimplified the pre-Buwayhid interpretation of mystical ascension. For example, we have al-Kulaynī and Ibn Bābawayh, who differ from one another in their interpretations of the Prophet’s ascension. Ibn Bābawayh states that, according to Jesus, ‘there is nothing that ascends to heaven unless it originally descended from heaven’. He further states that the Prophet Muḥammad ascended 120 times, and each time God revealed to him that the political succession wilāyah should go to ‘Alī. By contrast, with al-Kulaynī, the ascension only happens twice. The difference between the two commentators becomes even more stark in their individual interpretations of the very concept of ‘ascension’. Al-Kulaynī treated the Prophet and Imam ‘Alī as beings pure in body and soul, existed before everything exist, who, because of their purity, can literally, physically ascend and travel to a point where angels cannot go to, nearest from God. By contrast, Ibn Bābawayh understood the Prophet’s ascension to be in heavens scattered places biqā’, where pure soul of sleeping person and prophets ascend.

In light of this evidence, I wonder how Amir-Moezzi could have missed that there was a fundamental difference between Ibn Bābawayh and al-Kulaynī? Then he addresses al-Kulaynī and his work al-Kāfī being influential social among the Imāmī in Rayy. However, there is no evidence to prove his status. For example, Ibn Bābawayh did not include al-Kāfī as one of

---

The same tradition was narrated in earlier work by Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan al-Saffār, Basāʿir al-Darajāt, (Maktabat ayātu llah al-Mar’ašī, 1404 A.H), p. 79.
246 Al-Kulaynī, Al-Kāfī, (Tehran: Dār Al-Kutub Al-Islāmīyah, 1375 A.H), vol 1, p. 442.
247 Ibid., vol 1, p. 442. See Ḥadīṣ 9, 10, 11 and 12.
important circulated 11 sources in his introduction of *Man Lā Yahḍuruhu al-Faqīh* nor Ibn al-Nadīm and al-Tawḥīdī included al-Kulaynī in their work.

2.5.6 Three Methodological Factors in Ibn Bābawayh’s Approach to Ḥadīth

From reading and analysing Ibn Bābawayh’s work, I have picked three methodological factors in his approach to Ḥadīth. No one heretofore has discussed this methodological dimension of his work. He was Šīʿah in doctrine, Muʿtazilite standard and from aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth comply with isnād parallel if not competing with the condition of Sunnī. He was a *muḥaddīṭ* (expert in transmitted Ḥadīth), the leader of the traditionalists and the defender of Imāmī Šīʿī. Al-Bağdādī described al-Mufīd as a leading figure of misguidance and following his death God brought peace back on the Muslim communities. Ibn Bābawayh was able to withstand the challenge of Sunnī traditionalists and the Muʿtazilite in the court of the caliph because he had developed a newer system or a methodology which would secure the reliability of the transmitted texts before it reached the caliph’s court. Amir-Moezzi did not address neither of the two points in his works. Both points of difference will be addressed in this thesis.

I infer that he followed a criteria which made him welcome in the wazīr court. Also in sifting traditions, made him stand out from al-Mufīd on two topics, Ḥadīth and infallibility, as al-Mufīd’s pointed out. One of his criteria a tradition supported by 2 isnāds. That was similar to the criteria of Muʿtazilites such as: abī ʿAlī al-Jubāʾī al-Muʿtazī (d. 303/916), Abul-Husayn al-Baṣrī (d. 1044/436) a leading Muʿtazilite school of Basra wrote in his *al-Muʿtamid fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* about the condition of reliable Ḥadīth it has to be narrated by two narrators or more from the start to end. Likewise, a similar criterion was adopted by Šāfiʿī figure abū ʿAbdullāh Muḥammed al-Ḥākim al-Naysāpūrī al-Šāfiʿī (d. 1014/405).
2.5.7 The Isnād Factor and Its Three Dimensions

The first methodological factor in Ibn Bābawayh’s approach to ḥadīṯ is isnād, which I categorise into three dimensions. First, there is the simple fact that there exists a chain of narrators. For example, Abū Ja‘far received from ‘Alī, who received from another ‘Alī, who received from Ḥusayn, who received from Ismā‘īl, who received from Ṣādiq. But who are these names, who are these narrators? We need to understand the full identity of the individual names to gauge their reliability and to evaluate them in terms of the transmission of the ḥadīṯ. That brings us to the second dimension of isnād, which is the concept of ‘connectivity (mutaṣil), that is, the ‘quality’ of the connection, i.e., the kind of link that exists between narrators when the tradition is passed on. It ranges from simple hearsay, to face to face communication. Abū Ja‘far received it face to face from his father ‘Alī, who received from another ‘Alī, who was a Qur’an interpreter living in the same city as the first ‘Alī, who received from Ḥusayn, who was a Šī‘ah who worked in a government office, who received it from Ismā‘īl, who was a follower of Imām Ja‘far Ṣādiq. The third dimension of isnād is the intention of the narrator. Some narrators have ideological intentions to promote their school or try to prevent sectarian conflict, especially those who are only interested in rituals and ethics, they are not worried about the details of the conflicts between followers of Imāms and followers of The Prophet. Some narrators drop out large portions of the tradition, just to get to the important part for them.

2.5.8 The Social Context of Ibn Bābawayh and his Contemporaries

Ibn Bābawayh, al-Mufīd, and al-Nu‘mānī (Kulaynī’s student) presented different images of the character of the Imams depending upon the political agendas of their time. Although the Imams were all deceased, what is important is that what was told about them had to influence in shaping Šī‘ī society at large. Ibn Bābawayh had his version of the Imams

253 I here draw upon Abu‘l-Ḥusayn al-.Busri and Al-Ḥākim, who each discuss aspects of the tripartite concept which I outline here.
and his own opinion regarding who were reliable transmitters of their teachings, that is, who were reliable narrators (ruwāt). But this could not be understood without explaining how he assessed the reliability of the chains of narrators (ruwāt) which led to the material complied in his self-attested thirteen books (aṣl) which he used as sources for his book on law. This has been discussed above. Ibn Bābawayh’s writings reveal implicit ideas of political authority. As Brinkley Messick says of other kinds of text, ‘the chain of witnesses constitutes the legitimizing support for the writer’s document’. My task therefore will be to uncover not only the chain of witnesses on which he relied but his methods of assessing them and of circulating his analysis. This brings part of my research into the field of ḥadīṯ interpretation. It is not our task to judge whether Ibn Bābawayh was correct or incorrect, but to discern the internal logic of his writings within the classical Islamic framework of inquiry. The thesis will do so by comparing what he presented in the light of the traditional approach to scholarship, (‘ilm al-hadīṯ), as understood among the Šī‘ah, thereby emphasizing how he differed from others and what unique contributions he made.

2.5.9 The Contextual Matn Factor: Metaphorical and Historical

The third methodological factor in Ibn Bābawayh’s approach is the context of the ḥadīṯ, the (matn). Context is then divided into two categories: metaphorical and historical. For an example of the metaphorical context, if a tradition came to him with the number twelve, he would assume that it had a metaphorical meaning of the Twelve Imāms. If a tradition came about the throne ‘arṣ of God, he would treat it as metaphorically representing the limit, or border between the heavenly, celestial world and the terrestrial, earthly sphere. As an example of historical context, Ibn Bābawayh cared about whether the ḥadīṯ came from the Prophet or not. No one in his time would claim that the Prophet

255 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ḵiṣāl, vol 2, pp. 478, 81, 89 and 91.
directly criticised Šī‘ah because Šī‘ah did not exist in the Prophet’s time. But, if a ḥadīṯ came which purported to be from the Prophet, and it had criticism of some element that later became a part of Šī‘ah belief, Ibn Bābawayh would blame the narrator for adding that criticism. He would not believe that the Prophet himself had made that criticism. Sometimes Ibn Bābawayh mentions part of the traditions that relate to a topic about which he expresses his opinion; that is, he cites other sources as references for his opinions and ḥadīths. For instance, in al-Tawḥīd, in a section about visions and dreams, he comments that this is only part of a ḥadīṯ which is mentioned in the book al-Nubuwāt. Another example is that he sometimes directs his reader to well-known Sunnī narrators and compilers to obtain the full ḥadīṯ. This can be useful when the modern published copy of ḥadīṯ does not contain the same ḥadīḥ which he claims is there. For example, Ibn Bābawayh, along with other two Sunnī figures, al-Ḥākim, and abū Na`īm al-Aşıkānī, has narrated the same ḥadīṯ from Aḥmed Ibn Ḥanbal. Al-Ḥākim’s manuscript Tarīḵ Naysāpūr is not present in current time but is mentioned by al-Subkī, in Ṭabaqāt al-Šāfiʿī ַiyah.

2.6 Metaphorical Expressions

In addition to power, ethics is also integral to our interpretation of Ibn Bābawayh. The very portrayal of the journey to God and the choice of characters involved in the metaphorical story were relevant to contemporary society and political powers, revealing the author’s political situation, as well as his moral and cultural values. Just as Ibn Bābawayh invoked prior authentic voices, he too became an authority recognised as such in his own time and later centuries. His works themselves have acquired an authoritative quality over time. It is therefore incumbent upon the researcher to determine what was
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intended by his books. The approach of Quentin Skinner discussed by James Tully is helpful in this regard.\textsuperscript{262} In a similar vein, this thesis analyses and comments on Ibn Bābawayh’s background to find the factors that contributed to his ideology, and to try to read the text with an eye to understanding what he intended.

First, like Skinner, who begins his study from the background of Hobbes,\textsuperscript{263} this study will examine Ibn Bābawayh’s background to ascertain how it affected his outlook. For example, his father’s involvement in debating with the great Sufī figure, Ibn al-Ḥallāj, could well have contributed to Ibn Bābawayh’s becoming anti-Ṣūfī. Second, we seek to examine what led Ibn Bābawayh to write The Creed of the Twelve Imams, (\textit{al-Iʿtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah}) and ask whether he accepted the available Šīʿah doctrine before writing his text. And if he did, to what extent was the text changed during the process of interpretation? In effect, we are looking into what Tully, elaborating Skinner’s approach, called ‘ideology’, or an inherent set of ideas and an outlook that formed the background to the text.

Why Ibn Bābawayh? Why study him? Western scholarship does not recognise him as an architect of Šīʿah Islam, though it does so recognise Kulaynī and al-Mufīd. However, Ibn Bābawayh was not just a follower of Islam, he was one of several architects of the Šīʿah creed. We need to study an individual who constructed a whole philosophy of religion. If he had only been a religious leader, a person who was in charge of a religious community, we would not have such a pressing need to learn about him. But he was more. This thesis will demonstrate that. Ibn Bābawayh’s works were not written in a vacuum, and the implicit ideology that guided these texts could not have been absorbed without a process of circulation and adaptation of thought that was accepted as local practice. In other


words, I am interested in what shapes the believer’s mind, as it relates to what he or she believes, i.e., the religious texts. First, Ibn Bābawayh does not always explicitly or overtly say what he thinks, because he would be accused of being an innovator and an enemy of the state. So, for example, he does not say the literal words, ‘speculative theology is evil’. Instead, he will say, ‘Imam Ja’far said that those who use speculative theology are following Lucifer’ and he will have a chapter entitled, ‘Speculative Theology is Accursed’ with a series of traditions of the Imams supporting this title. Thus – and this has not been noted by scholarship before – we need to look at the titles of his chapters to determine what he is trying to say. Working similarly to a lawyer in the Sulṭān’s court, he would make sure that each statement which he makes is backed by the Imam’s teachings. Therefore, the chapter titles are extremely important. No one else has studied Ibn Bābawayh’s chapter titles. This thesis covers this fresh ground thematically. Not every chapter title is discussed. The thesis discusses the chapter titles related to the three themes, which were pressing issues in the time of Ibn Bābawayh, of the eternity of the soul, Imamah, and the problem of evil.

2.7 Textual Authority – Three Observations

First, I observe that, in addition to studying chapter titles, we must look at the chapter content, the ḥadīth that Ibn Bābawayh selected. Like all textual interpretation, it can be questioned and is subjective but, like all interpretation, it is plausible if based on the overall logic of the author’s contributions. This thesis will follow three methods, the latter two explicitly suggested by Tully. Also, as has been noted above, it will assess Ibn Bābawayh’s individual ideas in the context of his entire corpus of work. This comprehensive view allows us to see the overall trends of his thought and to assess how ‘strong’ or ‘weak’ an affirmation of his is – that is, how consistently he used it over time and what priority was given to it. Second, I observe that Ibn Bābawayh’s utilisation of ḥadīth and their themes vs al-Mufid’s refutations of him, inform us about his agenda, and what he saw as fitting for
his society at the time. We will also compare Ibn Bābawayh’s works with those of his contemporaries, such as Taṣḥīḥ Iʿtiqādāt al-Imāmiyah, by al-Mufīd. We will analyse the two sets of thoughts, using earlier sources such as the traditions transmitted by the Šīʿah followers of Manichaeism and Bardaisanism, to investigate what had been accepted and rejected. This will allow us to gauge how far Ibn Bābawayh was reacting to and reformulating the great debates of his time. One great controversy, as we saw above, was over the infallibility of the Prophets and whether the Šīʿī Imams were liable to error (sahū).

By comparing Ibn Bābawayh’s writings with those of his contemporaries, we will be able to discern how far he regarded the doctrine of infallibility as extreme. In the emergence of the compilation of ḥadīths in Šīʿah, there was no consensus on a single author, but there were others as well who compiled their ḥadīth with different doctrines from his doctrine. They did not like his doctrine, and they accepted his ḥadīth, but not his teaching. Third, and finally, the thesis will investigate the use of language in the corpus of the texts. Some of the words that are employed, such as light (nūr), soul (rūḥ), spirit (nafs) or evil (shar), are terms common between the three figures of al-Fārābī, al-Rāzī, and Ibn Bābawayh, and therefore reveal Ibn Bābawayh’s philosophical position in comparison to these other two. The very phrasing of the texts may reveal the author’s tools in justifying his philosophy and what he regarded as important elements of the debate.

---

264 Ibn Bābawayh's version of rūḥ identical to spirit nafs used by Al-Rāzī.
Ibn Bābawayh, Al-kisāl, vol 1, p. 226. "الجسد بين على أربعة أشياء: الروح، العقل، الدم والنفاس.. فإذا خرج الروح تبعه العقل وإذا رأى الروح شيئا حفظه عليه العقل وغي الدم والنفاس."
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Maʿānī al-Ḵāl, p. 160.
"الجهاد الأكبر قال جهاد النفس.\\nIʿtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah, p. 50.
2.8 Limitations

The limitations of this study include the fact that Ibn Bābawayh did not illustrate how the world is connected with the Imam Mahdi. Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh used biblical stories to emphasise the possibility of the occultation of the Mahdi. Furthermore, there are two major issues with his manuscripts. Not only is there a long time-gap between the extant copies and his time, but some of his works were not mentioned in early biographies.

Further away from Moezzi’s argument about Kulaynī and Ibn Bābawayh, I argue that the fundamental difference between al-Kulaynī and Ibn Bābawayh was also political and ideological. This can be illustrated by the fact that al-Nubakṭī was contemporary with al-Kulaynī and worked for the caliph’s office; he supported the state and was opposed to gnostic Šī’ah extremist movements. Al-Kulaynī on the other hand, did not work for the state, and he ignored al-Nubakṭī’s work, even using used some extremist narrators. For example, he compiled traditions of unreliable narration that came through several ṭida people that he trusted.265 For example, Muḥammad b. ṭisa b. ῥbayd who was ġulāt.266 Ibn Bābawayh, would only narrate his tradition if he had approval of his teacher Ibn al-Walīd.267 By contrast, Ibn Bābawayh, like al-Nubakṭī, worked for the state, and mentions al-Nubakṭī as one of his main sources in defending occultation, for example. Another point of differentiation is that, in al-Kulaynī’s time, before the Šī’ah became politically involved, when the Šī’ah were still finding a common unity during the minor occultation, they were trying to avoid division. Ibn Bābawayh, on the other hand, lived in a time when the Šī’ah were involved in the Caliphate, in the Sulṭān’s court, and he could travel freely to promote Šī’ah ḥadīṯ and Šī’ah ideology.

Where does Ibn Bābawayh fit in the kalām school? Contemporary academic David Thomas cites a ḥadīṯ about a Christian who debated with the seventh Imam and converted

265 Al-Najāšī, Rijāl al-Najāšī, p. 377.
267 Al-Ṭūsī, al-Fihrist, p. 140.
to Islam. Thomas says that what Ibn Bābawayh recorded in the ḥadīṯ about the debate indicates that Ibn Bābawayh did not know Christian theology because he did not use Christian concepts or terms but used Muslim concepts and terms. The ḥadīṯ sounds like two unlearned Muslims debating, not at all like a learned Christian and a learned Muslim debating. Specifically, Thomas asserts that Ibn Bābawayh, in this ḥadīṯ, does not adopt the language of the learned Ašʿarī and Muʿtazilites who followed speculative theology (kalam), and who used both the term jawhar and the term rūḥ, interchangeably for ‘substance’. Neither does Ibn Bābawayh use the Christian Arabic term, uqnūm.268 Likewise, Christopher Melchert says that he was not fully traditionalist, he denied seeing God and saw men’s actions as being created by pre-estimation (taqdīr) and not production (takwīn). Al-Mufīd argued this does not coincide with what the Imams taught: men’s action are not created and then added that it could be the isnād that was the problem.269 Therefore is no clear answer about where Ibn Bābawayh got his interpretations from, whether from the Ašʿarī or the Muʿtazilites.270 However, I argue that, following Thomas and Melchert, we cannot place Ibn Bābawayh in any of the three streams, Christian, Ašʿarī, or Muʿtazilite. Moreover, I observe that we cannot place him with the later term aḵbārī either. Therefore, I argue that we must go back to al-Mufīd’s argument that Ibn Bābawayh treats the human soul and spiritual faculty as a single entity instead of two different things. Al-Mufīd described it as identical with pagan philosophers (al-falāsifā al-mulḥidīn).271 Al-Mufīd, moreover, said that Greek philosophers believed in transmigration (tanāṣuḵ), and hinted that Ibn Bābawayh followed them.272 Al-Mufīd describes the root of some of Ibn Bābawayh’s Ḥadīṯ associated with philosophers and mulḥidīn. They saw nafs as eternal, not affected by birth and death, but transmigrating from one structure (body) to the next.

---
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Al-Mufīd added that, for example, in Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of death, only the articulated components shape the body into a human (ajsād al-murakkaba). Therefore, the human body does not die fully in Ibn Bābawayh’s thought; the soul will remain alive for eternity. It goes to a separate metaphysical realm for some time until it finds another suitable body to come back to earth again.273 Al-Mufīd argues that Ibn Bābawayh says that the souls meet regularly in a separate realm and can recognise each other. Whenever there is a human body, there will be a soul. This leads to the belief that the soul was not created for a single human body; but for a continuing journey of transmigration, of transfer from one body to another, and from form (ṣuwar) to form (ṣuwar), each time taking a different form. In Taṣḥīḥ I’tiqādāt al-Imāmīyah, al-Mufīd cites Ibn Bābawayh from the Imāmī Creed, criticising him for being identical with Greek thought, where Ibn Bābawayh talks about the concept of return of qualities from the deceased soul. Islam does not promote such interpretations.274 He then added that extremist Ġulāt compiled a book and called it al-Âshbāḥ wa l-Adillah and attributed to Muḥammed b. Sinān, the book focussing on the same Ḥadīṯ to prove the transmigration.275 Al-Nuบาktī in his Firaq al-Šīʿah stated that zanīḍiq of Median believes in transmigration tanāsūḵ and their evidence a Ḥadīṯ was narrated by Jābir b. yazīd al-Juʿfī.276 However, Ibn al-Nadīm did not mention the book in his Fihrist, he relied on b. Sinan opinion’s of abū al-Jārūḏ saying that he said that abū al-Jārūḏ joined the kufār’s camp and died after he started drinking alcohol.277 Which implies that he died a sinner.

I argue that this is not new, for example, the Šīʿah group such as the followers of al-Šarīʿī, and later on al-Numayrī believed in transmigration and the idea of two opposites addād.278 Al-Šarīʿī was the companion of Imām abī al-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Muḥammed (al-Hādī)
and then later on al-Numayrī (Muḥammed b. Naṣīr) who claimed to be bāb was in competition with second agent (wakīl) abī Jaʿfar b. Muḥammed b. ʿUṭmān. Al-Numayrī was at the same time of al-Šalmaḡānī. Again this demonstrates that ideologies and philosophies were spread among the companions of Imams.

Al-Isfarāyīnī (d. 1078/471) states that those who believes in transmigrations tanāsuḵ are the Muslim philosophers, the Qadařīyah and a group from Šīʿah. The Qadařīyah such as Aḥmed b. Ḵābiṭ (d. 943/332 A.H), a student of Muʿtazila figure Ibn al-Nāẓẓām, claim that the soul of good people will go to the world of light whereas a sinner (fāsiq) is destined to be in the body of an animal and keep transmigrating from body to body until it cleanses and get released. According to Ibn Ḥazm included abū Bakr al-Rāżī too with the same category for sharing the same ideology about transmigration. Al-Mufīd added: Ibn Ḵābiṭ and his teacher al-Nazẓām saw the jawhar has a shape, therefore, they have body ajsām that can take the shape to fit in with the new body, whereas al-Nubaḵtī family Banī Nubaḵt saw the jawhar stays the same for eternity and does not change or expire. The second group, dahrīya rejects any kind of transmigration of the soul to a different kind of body. The difference between the two transmigrations is that some thought that a brave soul would go to a brave body, hile others think that transmigration is random and a brave soul might end up in a cowardly body depending on their sins.

In summary, al-Mufīd has emphasized that the interpretations of Ibn Bābawayh come from outside the traditional Šīʿah community. My claim is that this material containing Greek philosophy was present among the community in Rayy and it is his actual choice to
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include them in as part of his thought. I argue that we need to consider the following: 1) that Ibn Bābawayh included interpretations and texts which are identical with Greek thought and al-Mufid, who is contemporary with Ibn Bābawayh, criticised him for following Greek thought, 2) early pre-Buwayhids Šī’ah, such as abū Sahl al-Nubaḵtī and his nephew, abū Muḥammed al-Nubaḵtī, used Aristotelian logic, which was the predominant philosophy of their time, and Ibn Bābawayh mentions al-Nubaḵtī in agreement with, 3) the rival gnostic movements and Persian dualists posed a threat to the leadership of the community and the Islamic Caliphate, therefore it is reasonable to suppose that Islamic thinkers would rely upon Greek philosophy as a response and counter to these extremist movements, 4) after the death of al-Nubaḵtī, who was responsible for defending occultation, historically we know from credible Šī’ah sources, Najāšī and Ṭūsī, that Ibn Bābawayh dedicated an entire book to defending occultation. As this is one of God’s attributes ‘justice’ that no one will be questioned in his grave unless they have reached (Maḥḍ al-Kufr) or (Maḥḍ al-Imān) and if the soul did not reach this point, they will be ignored until the final day.\(^{286}\) That is, the soul has to go through the hardship of life to reach its ultimate journey whether pure good disbelief or pure faith. To defend occultation, Ibn Bābawayh needed the soul to be eternal; in process of transmigration to reach its ultimate good or evil, therefore, it would be reasonable for him to have turned to Platonism and ethics to establish the true state (dawlatu l-ḥaq\(^{287}\)) at the end of time. Since Platonism was circulating in Ibn Bābawayh’s home city of Rayy through the efforts of the physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī, it is not unreasonable to think that Ibn Bābawayh was aware of Platonism. Moreover, he was part of the Sultan’s court attended by scholars from throughout the region. Aside from the Šī’ī Creed, there are hardly any explicit statements of Ibn Bābawayh’s opinion that have survived. Ibn Bābawayh produced the large number of
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collections of Ḥadīth dedicated to Imams, numbering more than 300 compilation muṣanaf.288 By contrast, al-Mufīd focussed on naqḍ and radd, responding to the earlier attacks by the mutakalimūn against the Šī‘ah over the issue of the succession of Imāmah.289 Ibn Bābawayh started the foundation of a school of thought through his works which was dedicated to the twelve Imams. It is he who linked occultation and the problem of evil with the ‘biography of the prophets. i.e., he mentions all the prophets, including Moses and Jesus, showing how the prophets progressively increased in knowledge and wisdom. Ibn Bābawayh tells us that now we are left with the problem of evil, but there are two factors in our favour, first our freedom of choice, and second, the completed religion – humanity, in the twelve Imams, who gave their lives for the greater good, has the fullest example of virtue and the fullness of the message of God. These two, free choice and the example of The Twelve, help us to overcome evil. Then Ibn Bābawayh begins to talk about evil. He cites the stories of the deaths of each Imam emphasising their status as victims of evil reasoning going back to the source of all evil – Adam and Lucifer iblīs. Ibn Bābawayh finds a pattern of evil reasoning generated by envy, jealousy, and arrogance. This is precisely parallel to al-Rāzī’s description of evil, which will be discussed later on. It is he who came with Qommi traditions and promoted them as the missing piece in the large jigsaw puzzle within Islamic thought. His articulation of Imamah and discussion of cosmology was structured so that he clothed philosophical concepts with traditional Ḥadīth. He tailored his ideological work to the religious Islamic mind. Muhammed al-Ḵurāsānī stated that Ibn Bābawayh had fatwa that is unique to him. This is evidence that Ibn Bābawayh was an independent thinker. The fatwas are: 1) Prophets and Imams can fall into errors, 2) it is permitted to pray with different languages and not only in Arabic.290 3) One may use rosewater during ablutions,291 4) touching private parts will invalidate the
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ablutions, 5) spotting blood on the body or garment requires the specific spot to be cleaned rather than the whole garment, 6) sunset prayers begin when the sun completely disappears, 7) if a woman starts her monthly period during the middle of her prayers she can stop and postpone them until the end of her period.292

Observing Ibn Bābawayh’s thoughts, the eternity of the soul and return is also a controversial issue. The ultimate goal of the return is that the good side must have a second chance to defeat evil – the second chance to finish the battle between Adam and Evil must come to an end where good wins and the bad side loses. His major concern had to do with the time in between the two battles. He found the answer for the time between Adam and his own time (the occultation of the Twelfth Imam), claiming that these are examples of sacrifice for the greater good and he called it ‘the process of completion of religion’. These lessons are for a greater purpose, for ordinary people to learn from these lessons and develop their awareness and the world they live in, namely, the dual forces in an ongoing battle. His major concern was with the question about the status of the good soul who did not get justice and could not win over evil in this world. How can he benefit from al-Rāzī’s philosophy on the eternity of the soul? However, Ibn Bābawayh did not want to divert attention from occultation and his predecessors’ (the logicians’) interpretations of cosmology. There is not much which has survived about Ibn Bābawayh’s philosophical links, except that which was identified by al-Mufīd in his criticism of him. On the other hand, chapter titles can lead us to understand Ibn Bābawayh’s overall thought. Nevertheless, his Greek philosophy could not be completely excised, because it was intertwined into the ḥadīṯ of the imams. According to Šahīd al-Ṭānī, that his link with all sources Šī‘ah Uṣūl that were listed in al-Mufīd’s student al-Ṭūsī’s list and have reached him, because the majority of Uṣūl al-Maṣḥab goes back him and they came through al-

292 Al-Ḵurāsānī, Ḥayāt Ra’īs Al-Muhaddītūn, p. Āiā.
It is worth mentioning that the Shi’ah Usul means including the works of Ibn Bābawayh. It must be noted that al-Ṭūsī was opposed to Ibn Bābawayh’s thought, yet he transmitted works because they contained hadīths of the Imams. As the famous tradition narrated by al-Ṭūsī says, ‘it is permitted to the Shi’ah community to narrate from heretics as long they avoid their beliefs and take only the Imams’ hadīth, ‘kuḍū bi mā rawwū wa ǧarū ma ra’ī’.

Abū ‘alī al-Ḥā’irī Al-Māzandarānī argues that ‘It is the ma’dhab necessity to accept Ibn Bābawayh as reliable source’.  

2.8.1 The Historical Issue – Number of Ibn Bābawayh’s work 300 or 6?  

According to philologist al-Ḥasan b. Saʿīd al-ʿAskarī the term book kitāb is not always a multi pages book; it starts from one page to multiple pages. Ibn Bābawayh in his work Ṯawāb al-A’māl has a chapter called book on punishment kitāb iqāb al-Aʿmāl. Back to al-Ṭūsī’s statement, he stated that Ibn Bābawayh authored 300 kitāb. Then he added that he was listing only the works he remembers, and that he currently could not remember them all. Then he listed 40 works and said we were informed about all of his works and narrations by a group of our companions aṣḥābanā and among them was the teacher Šaiḵ al-Mufīd…

له نحو من ثلاثمائة مصنف، وفهرست كتبه معروف، وانا أذكر منها ما يحضرني في الوقت من أسماء كتبه.... أخبرنا جميع كتبه ورواياته جمعة من أصحابنا، منهم الشيخ المفيد والحسين بن عبيد الله وأبو الحسين جعفر بن الحسن بن حسكة القمي وأبو زكريا محمد بن سليمان الحمراوي، كلهم، عليه.
There are conflicting statements about whether the majority of Ibn Bābawayh’s works had survived or been lost due to negligence or lack of interest. 'Alī Akbar al-Ǧifārī states that of the 300 works, the majority were lost and forgotten, hidden neglected somewhere in the corner of a library and were left covered with spiderwebs and dust and most of the texts had faded away. Then he added that some simple people with no expertise came from outside and bought the manuscripts for very little of what they were worth. There was little available of Ibn Bābawayh; the majority of his work was lost, what survived numbered no more than 20 manuscripts and out of the 20 not all were easy to read, these manuscripts were not copied by experts, they were filled with errors and missing letters and were published in such a poor state.298 Again the Sunnī biographer al-Ḍahabī describes Ibn Bābawayh’s work as 300 muṣanaf and only listed 6 works.299 Al-Ḍahabī’s list contains a slightly different title from what we have today, for example: A) Ġarīb Ḥadīṯ al-Aʿīmah while al-Ṭūsī’s list Ġarīb Ḥadīṯ al-Nabī. B) Kitāb al-Malāḥī, Kitāb al-Ḵawātīm and Kitāb Daʿāʾī al-Islām the same titles as al-Ṭūsī’s.300 These books that were not listed in al-Ḍahabī’s such as: ‘Uyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā, al-Amālī, Faḍāʾil Šahr Ramadān, Ṭawāb al-A’māl, Muṣādaqat al-Iḵwān, Kamāl al-Dīn, ‘illal al-Šarāye’ and al-Hidāyah. He describes Ibn Bābawayh’s work as widely circulated compilations (al-taṣānīf) among rejecters (ṣāḥib al-taṣānīf al-sāʾira bayna al-rāfiḍah).301 C) Al-Ǧifārī states in his preface the work Maʿānī al-ʾAḵbār and Muṣkilāt Aḵbār ʿan lisān Aʿīmah ahlu al-Bayt.302 This would suggest that the copy he received similar to the title al-Ḍahabī had and was one compilation with ‘illal al-Šarāye’ and called Ġarīb Ḥadīṯ al-Aʿīmah. This answers the question raised by Kohlberg whether these copies were rediscovered or not. He addresses Ibn Bābawayh’s works as compilations muṣanafāt and listed 6. Whereas in later time, Taqī

al-Majlisī (d. 1659/1070 A.H) describes them as ‘books’ (kutub) and not compilations muṣanafāt. He listed 12: Ḳūmāl al-Dīn, ‘Uyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā, ‘illal al-Ṣarāye’, Ṭawāb al-‘A’māl, ‘iqāb al-‘A’māl, Ma’ānī al-Aḵbār, al-Ḵisāl, al-Nuṣūṣ ‘Ala al-‘a’immah, al-Tawḥīd, al-Muqni’, al-Hidāyah, al-I’tiqādāt and Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faṣīḥ.\(^{303}\) I infer that the compilations were originally 6 then separated into 12 books. For example, in the year 1872/1289 A.H ‘illal al-Ṣarāye’, Ma’ānī al-Aḵbār and book al-Faṣīḥ’īl from unknown author,\(^{304}\) three of them were printed as one book and rearranged alphabetically al-Ṣaḥīḥ Dāwūūd b. al-Ḥasan b. Yūsuf al-Awālī al-Baḥrānī and were called the book Ṭartīb Ma’ānī al-Aḵbār.\(^{305}\) In the year 1881/1299 A.H a copy of Ma’ānī al-Aḵbār was part of ‘illal al-Ṣarāye’.\(^{306}\) the book ‘illal al-Ṣarāye’ and Ma’ānī al-Aḵbār were one book.\(^{307}\) Likewise, Ṭawāb al-‘A’māl and ‘Iqāb al-‘A’māl combined as one book.\(^{308}\) The same term muṣanaf Ibn Bābawayh used it in his introduction of Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faṣīḥ he described them 11 muṣanaf. He states works such as kitāb al-Mahāsin, letter risālah from my father and other muṣanafāt, passed on to me from my teachers in an oral form (rawaytuha) in a form of kutub.\(^{309}\) We find that in his book Ṭawāb al-‘A’māl the chapter heading names the book kitāb ‘iqāb al-‘A’māl,\(^{310}\) again in his ‘illal al-Ṣarāye’, he mentions that the tradition was also narrated in the book kitāb al-Manāḥī from book kitāb ‘iqāb al-‘a’māl.\(^{311}\)

However, it remains unclear how many pages these books were, whether 300 volumes, or 300 books with multiple volumes? And whether al-Ṭūsī’s had the 300 works in his collection or he just telling us about their titles? This was at an early stage and majority of


\(^{308}\) Ibid., p. 36.


\(^{310}\) Ibn Bābawayh, Ṭawāb al-‘A’māl, p. 203,

his works (except *al-Hidāyah* was listed by Ibn al-Nadīm) were not accessible to outside Twelvers and when it reached al-Dahabī there were 6 compilations and not 300. Al-Ṭūsī’s list could be a mixture between books and few pages and not always 300 books with volumes of hundreds of pages. That is to say that kitāb can mean both one page, chapter or multiple pages.

2.8.2 The available work during the Safavid

During Shah Isma’il ruler of the Safavid state. Fazlallah b. Rozbahan Ḵunjī Isfāḥānī (d. 1521/927 A.H) who was Sunnī Persian and fled from Isfahan when Shah Isma’il started hostility against the native Sunnīs. He wrote Refutation of Falsehood (*Iḥtīl al-Bāṭīl wa ihmāl Kašf al-ʿĀṭīl*) refuting *Nahj al-Ḥaq wa Kašf al-Ṣidq* by b. Muṭṭahar al-Ḥillī. He completed his book in the year 1503/909, in the city of Kašān.  

I have selected from those who lived between the time of Ṭāleb al-Ḥillī and the Safavid era, and those who stated in their work they have listed the names of Ibn Bābawayh’s works.

13. Al-Arbalī (d. 1293/692 A.H), in his *kašf al-Ǧumma fī Maʿrifat al-Aʿimah* mentions 2 books *Kamāl al-Dīn,* and *ʿUyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā.* Al-Arbalī in his work mentions part of the ḥadīṯ and tells us that the full text can be found in book *Kamāl al-

---

In another he stated that he copied the ḥadīṯ from ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā’. He referred to the reader to return to a book that was already available and accessible. Suggesting that the two books were circulated.

14. al-Ḍahabī (d. 1348/748 A.H), in his Sīyar aʿlām al-Nubalā’, listed 6 compilations. Daʾāʾim al-Īṣām (the list above called Daʾāʾim al-Iʿtiqād), Dīn al-Imāmīyah, al-Tawḥīd, al-Kawātīm, Ḥarīb Ḥadīṯ al-Aʾimmah, and al-Malāḥī and lā ... 319

15. al-Hasan al-Daylamī (d. 1437/841 A.H), in his Aʿlām al-Dīn mainly focused on quoting from 1 book al-Ḥisāl. 320


20. Šaraf al-Dīn Yahya al-Baḥrānī (d. ~1562/970 A.H), Šaraf al-Dīn Yahya al-Baḥrānī (d. was alive ~ 1562/970 A.H) after his summary of ‘illal al-Šarāye’ he listed 5 books: al-Iʿtiqād, Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīḥ, ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā, al-Ǧaybah and al-Muqni’ fi al-Fiqh. He wrote his Risāla focusing on listing Šīʿah compilers of the Imāmī ḥadīṯ and listed 110 names in chronological order, starting with ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qommī and finishing with Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿĀmilī. He placed Ibn Bābawayh as the ninth

317 Ibid., vol 2, p. 511.
318 Ibid., vol 2, p. 284.
in his list. He then stated that there are more books written by Ibn Bābawayh.321 In the introduction of the published *al-Amālī* he states that (without giving the name who said this) “… in year 113/507 A.H, I heard abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Muḥammed b. al-Ḥusayn al-Qomī who narrated from al-Ṣaiğ al-Faqīh abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ‘abdul Ṣamad b. Muḥammed al-Timīmī in the year 1081/474 A.H…”322 and in the last page of the book states that the editing of this book was completed in the year 1954/1374 by Faḍlulah al-Yazdī.323

21. Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī (d. 1772/1186 A.H) stated that the circulated books in his time are ‘Uyūn akbār al-Riḍā, al-Ḵiṣāl, al-Hidāyah and al-Amālī (known as al-Majālis) and that he had transmitted to him through a chain of narrators all goes back to al-Ṭūsī.324 *Dīn al-Imāmīyah* (ʿiṭādāt al-Imāmīyah) wrote it in Naysāpūr 978/368.325 Yusuf al-Baḥrānī added that Kamāl al-Dīn is same book al-Ḡaybah.326

22. Al-Majlisī’s *Bihār al-Anwār*: There is distinction between al-Majlisī’s *Bihār al-Anwār* edition of Ibn Bābawayh work and the published version. For example, the names of Ibn Bābawayh’s teachers:

23. Ibrahīm b. Ḥārūn was written in 6 different spellings and names.327 In *Maʿānī al-Ḵbār* written as Ibrahīm b. Ḥārūn al-Hīṣī,328 and al-ʿAbsī,329 in *al-Tawḥīd al-Hīṭī,330 ʿillal al-Šarāyeʿ* al-Hāṣimī.331

---


26. Whereas in Biḥār al-Anwār narrated from ‘illal al-Šarāye’ and gave the name Aḥmed b. al-Ḥusayn al-Naysāpūrī.339 This indicates that there is more than copy of one book and that al-Majlisī his own different copies from another source. Bahr al-ʿUlūm stated that he received three copies ‘illal al-Šarāye’ from Iran and that they all contained errors.340


332 Al-Majlisī, Biḥār al-Anwār, vol 4, p. 15.
342 Ibid., p. 255.
343 Ibid., p. 170.

The work was translated in 1227 A.H. by Ġūlām Mohammad b. Muḥī al-Dīn al-Aslamī. The work originally written in Persian language by
described him as a follower of b. Saba’s. He sometimes disagrees with Ibn Bābawayh and stated that he contradicted himself in al-Amālī narrated that the prophets are greater than Imams, whereas in al-Iʿtiqādāt states the opposite that God did not create is greater than the Imams. He then added that in Ibn Bābawayh’s book the ascension (al-miʿrāj) that Imam ʿAlī had never ascended to seven heavens nor he was infallible. Whereas al-Kulaynī narrated in rawda the Prophet said the Imam was ascended to heavens. It is worth noting that according to Sayyid Miḥsin al-Amīn (d. 1952/1371 A.H) quoted from Tatimat Amal al-Āmil that the book of Ibn Bābawayh ascension, al-Miʿrāj had been left out by al-Majlisī out of his compilation al-Bihār, while Hāšim al-Bahrānī (d. 1695/1107 A.H) narrated from it.

2.8.3 Ijāза

While it may be challenging to evaluate the reliability of the narrators between Ibn Bābawayh in the 10th century and the 17th-century compilations of al-Majlisī. I agree that these books had survived in both forms: copied and through Ijāза. However, some versions they differ from other.

28. According to al-Majlisī stated that, al-Šahīd al-Ṭānī (d. 1558/965), in his ijāза to ʿabdul Šamad (the father of Šaiķ al-Bahāʾī) that all his sources of that from an earlier generation than al-Ṭūsī’s, (including Ibn Bābawayh’s works), it came through al-Ṭūsī. This also means, that Majlisī giving assurance that the Šīʿah books were transmitted through Šīʿah chain of isnād. As discussed earlier that the earlier works has

---
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Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Iʿtiqādāt, p. 93.
351 Al-Majlisī, Bihār Al-Anwār, (Beirut: Mūsasat al-Wafāʾ, 1404 A.H), vol 105, p. 162. (C.D Noor)
survived through ijāza and in fact scholar would not accept random books other than in form of Ijāza that is passed on from teacher to student.352

29. There was an effort to make Ibn Bābawayh more accepted. For example, by making him no difference from Kulaynī. Taqī al-Majlisī stated that Ibn Bābawayh was no different from al-Kulaynī both transmitted their traditions from 400 Usūl.353 Whereas al-Šāhīd al-Ṭānī stated that the best sources containing 400 usūl al-Kāfī by al-Kulaynī and Tahdīb by al-Ṭūsī. In contrast, Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīḥ had fewer sources and does not go beyond the boundaries of these two sources.354 Taqī al-Majlisī commented that al-Ṭūsī had rejected the idea that the Prophet made an error and provided an alternative answer that according to Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, in conversation with Zurāra, the Prophet never made an error.355 Al-Majlisī commented that although the tradition was narrated by both al-kāssa and ‘āmma (Ṣī’ah and Sunnī), then added this tradition should not be taken literarily for two reasons: a) the Ḥadīth was narrated under fear taqīyah, and b) Ibn Bābawayh had his own criterion, anything that contradicts his belief; he would reject it even if it was an authentic Ḥadīth.356

30. During al-Majlisī’s time, there were multiple isnād for Ibn Bābawayh’s works. Newman acknowledges multiple isnād and Gleave more than one ijaza. Further to their point, from the manuscript evidence. For example, for Ibn Bābawayh’s work Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīḥ, there are a few manuscripts which are identical to each other: 1) by Fathullah Ibn Ṣan’ullah b. al-Bayabankī dated (1667/1077),357 2) by Šaīk

356 ibid.
358 Copied by: Sayyid Barakat, (the first page was missing), (Saudi Arabia: King Saud University).
359 Copied by: Ibn Muhibb All Muhammad Husayn al-Isfahani (The Institute of Ismaili Studies).
https://iis.ac.uk/node/224176 (Accessed 13.10.2021)
360 Al-Kurāsānī, Wasā'il al-Šī'ah, (Qom: Mu'asasat Āl Bayt, 1409 A.H)
https://iis.ac.uk/node/224176 (Accessed 13.10.2021)

Barakāt date copied (1639/1049),358 3 by al-Majlīṣī al-Awal dated (1660/1070),359 and al-Ḥur al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1692/1104) included al-faqīh as part of Wasā'il al-Šī'ah dated 1661/1072.360 When Ibn Bābawayh visited cities, he met with various narrators. Ḥasan al-Mūsawī al-Kurasānī listed two hundred and eleven narrators that Ibn Bābawayh met with.361

31. From Gleave argument. The akbārī movement wanted to be recognised by the state to be legitimate. One of the movement’s figures al-Astrabādī (d. 1707/1119 A.H), to defend his claim, argued that akbārī is not an invention but much earlier started, then claimed that Ibn Bābawayh was an akbārī. He based his argument on Ibn Bābawayh’s introduction of Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh, that he believes whatever in his book to be reliable and it is a witness between him and God (Allah), this to al-Astrabādī was evidence that he was an akbārī.362 However, no one addressed him as akbārī until al-Astrabādī time. While those who opposed al-Astrabādī, such as Šaiḵ al-Bahā’ī, who was a leading figure in Uṣūl, argued that it is a bad choice for the akbārī to use Ibn Bābawayh because he questioned the infallibility of the Imāms.363 Al-Kurāsānī then added that al-Bahā’ī harshly criticised Ibn Bābawayh and said that he was thankful to Allah for the death of Ibn Bābawayh, before finishing his work doubting
infallibility.\textsuperscript{364} Šī‘ī thought, by then, had become hostile against those who do not believe in the infallibility of the Imams.\textsuperscript{365}

32. Abū ‘Alī Muhammad al-Ḥā’irī al-Māzandarānī (1801/1216 A.H) in \textit{Muntaha al-Maqāl} stated that it is a necessity in our faith (\textit{min ẓarūriyyāt al-madhab}) to accept Ibn Bābawāyhi as a trustworthy character, however, his judgment of ḥadīṯ authenticity is questionable.\textsuperscript{366} For example, it is a necessity in our faith that the Imams were infallible from making an error (\textit{sahū}), whereas Ibn Bābawāyhi considers those who do not accept the fallibility of the Prophet and Imams, to be extremists and unreliable transmitters.\textsuperscript{367}

33. Similarly, on the topic of infallibility according to al-ʿAllāma ʿAbdullah al-Māmqānī (d. 1932/1351 A.H), stated that al-Iḥṣāʿī on the topic of infallibility called Ibn Bābawāyhi a liar. Then al-Māmqānī commented we should not take what was said to be accusing people of Qom of being extremist.\textsuperscript{368} Moezzi seems to interpret this as in favour of the ǧulāt and not to take it seriously their accusation of each other.\textsuperscript{369} Which completely gives the opposite meaning to what al-Māmqānī said. Here al-Māmqānī is responding to al-Mufīd’s accusation against Ibn Bābawāyhi being unjustified.

34. Al-Mīrza ʿabdullah Al-ʾAbshāhānī stated that Šaraf al-Dīn al-Bāḥrānī also wrote a refutation of Ibn Bābawāyhi’s \textit{Tawāb al-Aʾmāl} and ʿiqāb al-Aʾmāl.\textsuperscript{370} Šaraf al-Dīn al-Bāḥrānī did not write another refutation except on Ibn Bābawāyhi.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Al-Kūrāsānī, Ḥayāt Raʾis al-Muḥaddithūn, p. Alf Yaʾ aif.
\item \textit{Ibid}.
\item Al-Ḥāʾirī, M., \textit{Muntaha al-Maqāl fī Ahwāl al-Riżāl}, (Qom: Muʿasat āl-Bayt Li-Iḥiyāʾ al-Turāṭ, 1416), vol 6, p. 373.
\item Al-Māmqānī, Taḥāṣib al-Maqāl, (Qom: Muʿasat āl-Bayt Li-Iḥiyāʾ al-Turāṭ, 1424 A.H), vol 5, p. 187.
\item Al-ʾAbshāhānī, A., \textit{Riyāḍ al-Ummāṭ wa Ḥiyāḍ al-Fudūlāʾ}, (Qom: Matbāʿah al-Ḵīyām, 1401 A.H), vol 5, p. 344.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
35. Similar criticism was posed by al-Muḥaddīṯ al-Nūrī (d. 1902/1320) who said that Ibn Bābawayh narrated a tradition similar to what al-Kulaynī narrated but with an alteration to the content to please the Muʿtazilite (the followers of creed God is just ahl al-ʿadl) who were in power.\(^{371}\)

I do not believe this accusation is true, however. Why? I have looked at the ḥadīṯ in al-Kulaynī and Ibn Bābawayh, and the ḥadīṯ is the same insofar as the two ḥadīṯ overlap, but Ibn Bābawayh’s version of the ḥadīṯ is shorter. In al-Kāfī by al-Kulaynī stated that God’s book granted the sinners the power to do sin and “did prevent them”.\(^{372}\) Ibn Bābawayh narrated from al-Daqqāq from al-Kulaynī that in God’s book He granted the sinners the power to do sin but “did not prevent them” from making the sin: “\(wahab li-ahl al-maʿṣīyah al-qūwah ʿala maʿṣīyatuhum li-sabqi ʿilmihī fī hum, wa lam yamnaʿuhum iṭāqah al-qubūl minhu\)”.\(^{373}\) In al-Kāfī, before the end of time, “God will put his hand on the heads” of God’s servants.\(^{374}\) Whereas Ibn Bābawayh’s version is not from al-Kulaynī, but Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Masrūr narrated that when al-Qāʾim appears before the end of time “will put his hand on the heads” of God’s servants.\(^{375}\) Al-Kulaynī narrated that “God created someone happy that means never was angry with him”.\(^{376}\) Ibn Bābawayh’s version was narrated by his teacher b. al-Walīḍ who heard from al-Ṣaffār that “God knowledge if someone is happy that means God never was angry with him”.\(^{377}\) Ibn Bābawayh’s version similar to al-Maḥāsin by al-Barqī.\(^{378}\)

---


\(^{373}\) Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 354.

\(^{374}\) Al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī, vol 1, p. 25.

\(^{375}\) Al-Kulaynī, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 2, p. 675.

\(^{376}\) Al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī, vol 1, p. 152.

\(^{377}\) Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 357.

\(^{378}\) Al-Barqī, al-Maḥāsin, vol 2, p. 279.
It can be easy to think that Ibn Bābawayh did not have a copy of al-Kāfī, for various reasons. This is following contemporary academics Gleave who pointed out that Ibn Bābawayh did not have access to al-Kāfī. Ibn Bābawayh did not narrate much from al-Kulaynī, in his Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh, he only narrated nine traditions. This is not surprising, with the biography of narrators by al-Najāšī and al-Ṭūsī, a late Šīʿah such as Aǧā Buzrug al-Ṭahrānī (d. 1965/1385 A.H) stating that 9,485 out of sixteen thousand traditions are not reliable. It is worth mentioning that Ibn al-Nadīm did not include al-Kulaynī (or his work) in his Fihrist, nor did Ibn Bābawayh include him in his introduction. Ibn Bābawayh stated in his Mašyekha that he had both, orally transmitted from those who narrated from al-Kulaynī and he had al-Kāfī and was narrated from them too. They are three narrators: Muḥammed b. Muḥammed b. ʿiṣām al-Kulaynī, ʿAlī b. Aḥmed b. Mūsa and Muḥammed b. Aḥmed al-Sinānī. Beside the three narrators, he narrated from different narrators from al-Kulaynī such as al-Daqāq (ʿAlī b. Aḥmed b. Muḥammed b. ʿimrān), Muḥammed b. Majīlwayh, Muḥammed b. Mūsa al-Mutawakil, ʿAlī b. ʿabdullah al-Warrāq and al-Ḥusayn b. Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmed b. Hišām al-Muʿadib. Ibn Bābawayh mentioned not only narrating traditions from the book of al-Kulaynī but from people who heard of al-Kulaynī. The current version of al-Kāfī has the name of Ibn

380 Such as Ahmed ibn ႀlī ibn Ibrahim Al-Qommi and Ahmed ibn Muhammad ibn Yahiyā Al-Atār. Also narrated from Hamza ibn Muhammad ibn Ahmad ibn Jaʿfar ibn Muhammad ibn Zayd and Sāliḥ ibn ႀuʿayb Al-Tālqānī.
381 Al-Tahrānī, al-Ḍarʿa fi Taṣānīf al-Ṣīa, (Qom: Ismāʿilyān, 1408 A.H), vol 17, p. 245.
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Bābawayh,\textsuperscript{388} which suggests that \textit{al-Kāfī} was made a combination of versions in much later time. Al-Majlīsī added that we find names in \textit{al-Kāfī} names (i.e. from later generation) such as al-Nu’mānī and al-Ṣafwānī, which is because it is a compilation of \textit{al-Kāfī} included their versions.\textsuperscript{389} There are other names besides al-Ṣafwānī,\textsuperscript{390} such as al-Tal’akbarī Hārūn b. Mūṣa (d. 995/385 A.H).\textsuperscript{391} Then we have Ibn Qawlawayh Ja’far b. Muḥammad (d. 979/368 A.H) was the narrator of al-Kulaynī’s work. Al-Najāšī stated that his copy from a group of šuyūḵ: Muḥammad b. Muḥammad (al-Mufīd), al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ubaydullah (al-Ṣaḑīrī) and Aḥmed b. ‘Alī b. Nūḥ and that they all narrated the work from Ja’far b. Qawlawayh. Al-Najāšī then added that in the mosque of Naṭawayh al-Naḥawī the work \textit{al-Kāfī} taught by abī al-Ḥusayn Aḥmed b. Aḥmed b. al-Kūfī al-Kātib and from him was narrated \textit{al-Kāfī} to those such as abū al-Ḥasan (or al-Ḥusayn) al-‘Aqrānī.\textsuperscript{392}

2.9.2 The Question of the Sources

The second issue is a question concerning Ibn Bābawayh’s sources and his narrators. Not all of Ibn Bābawayh’s traditions came from sources indexed the work of in al-Najāšī’s and al-Ṭūsī’s. Both al-Najāšī and al-Ṭūsī had in their lists’ names used by Ibn Bābawayh. However, Ibn Bābawayh narrated from three narrators that were not included in their lists such as Ibrāhīm b. Sufyān, Ismāʿīl ibn ʿīsa, Anas b. Muḥammad, Ja’far b. al-Qāsim, al-Ḥasan b. Qāren. Other names were not mentioned by biographers. He narrated from Aḥmed b. Ṭābit al-Dawālīnī (sometimes call him al-Dawālībī), who met in 352 A.H during his visit

\textsuperscript{388} Al-Kulaynī, \textit{al-Kāfī}, vol 1, p. 468.
\textsuperscript{389} Al-Majlīsī, \textit{Bihār al-Anwār}, vol 53, p. 270.
\textsuperscript{390} Al-Kulaynī, \textit{al-Kāfī}, vol 1, pp. 283, 286, 298, 304, 311 and 325.
\textsuperscript{391} Ibid., vol 6, p. 202.
\textsuperscript{392} Al-Najāšī, \textit{Rijāl Al-Najāšī}, p. 377.

Secondly, there was a notebook attributed to Imam al-Riḍā. Al-Naqāš, al-Qaṭān, and al-Ṭalqānī all claim to have seen the notebook when they met with Ibn ʿUqdah (d. 943/332) in the city of Kūfa. The three claim that the notebook came to Ibn ʿUqdah from Ibn Faḍāl, who was the son of the companion of Imam al-Riḍā.396 Against their claim stands the statement by ‘the people of Kūfa’ who said that they had never heard about Ibn ʿUqdah having a special notebook attributed to the companion of Imam al-Riḍā Ibn Faḍāl. Moreover, there is no text from Ibn ʿUqdah stating that he ever had such a notebook in his possession, or that such a notebook ever existed. This creates doubt over Ibn Bābawayh reliability. However, it is unclear who was his source from Kūfa. Moreover, Ibn Bābawayh did not claim that al-Naqāš, al-Qaṭān, and al-Ṭalqānī quoted to him from the notebook and did not say that they showed him the physical notebook. If they had shown it to him, I infer that he would have said so. Thus, he treated them as reliable sources. This treatment of al-Naqāš, al-Qaṭān, and al-Ṭalqānī as reliable was objected to by the Šīʿah community, specifically by al-Mufīd’s students al-Najāšī and al-Ṭūsī. Al-Najāšī, who said that Ibn Bābawayh narrated several traditions passed on by the son of Ibn Faḍāl from his father, who claimed that they were narrated by Imam al-Riḍā. But, there was an objection from al-Najāšī that Ibn Faḍāl never talked to his father about tradition because his father died earlier. Moreover, al-Najāšī also stated that the famous Šīʿah figures of Kūfa said they had never heard that Ibn ʿUqdah had narrated such traditions,397 thereby again undermining Ibn Bābawayh’s credibility. While taking seriously the concerns raised by Kohlberg with regards to the authenticity of Ibn Bābawayh’s traditions, we must also consider what his

396 Al-Najāšī, Rījāl al-Najāšī, p. 258.
397 Al-Najāšī, Rījāl Al-Najāšī, p. 257.
contemporaries said about him. I will discuss several points emphasized by al-Mufid against Ibn Bābawayh, particularly against his books, *Imāmī Creed* and *The Rectification of the Imāmī Creed Taṣḥīḥ Itiqādāt al-Imāmīyah*. I have picked five points from al-Mufid’s criticism of Ibn Bābawayh to discuss in the coming two thesis chapters: the eternity of the soul, the non-infallible Imam, the non-eternal Qur’an, the freedom of the human will, the return of the ‘soul’ (*nafs*) after death, and the occultation.

This issue of Ibn Bābawayh being linked to Greek philosophy has never been discussed in this way and takes the matter a step further from the work conducted by Amir-Moezzi, who acknowledges that philosophy influenced the early pre-Buwayhids Šīʿah, in his *The Silent Qur’an and Speaking Qur’an-Scriptural Sources of Islam Between History and Fervor*. Newman, in *The Recovery of the Past: Ibn Babawayh, Baqir al-Majlisi and Safavid Medical Discourse*, quotes from al-Majlisī identifying Galenic terminology in the material of Ibn Bābawayh. As we saw from our Amir-Moezzi study, when it comes to the study of the formation of Šīʿah doctrine, he narrows it to the transitional changes from pre-Buwayhids to Buwayhids, from Ḥadīṯ to *kalām*. However, in saying that, the issues are much larger. I will elaborate below.

1. We cannot ignore the wide circulation of Aristotelian and Platonic philosophy and the conflicts that preceded the arrival of the Buwayhids between the two cities of Rayy and Samanid. We cannot separate al-Fārābī’s Aristotelian structural interpretation of the Universe and the ethics of al-Rāzī’s Platonic scheme from the contemporary political climate.

2. Al-Mufīd raised several objections to Ibn Bābawayh’s teachings and one of them was that he was borrowing from Greek philosophy on the eternity of the soul.
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Likewise, the conflict between Ibn Bābawayh and the logicians from Buḵāra motivated him to move to another philosophy.

3. An unknown logician from Buḵāra clashed with occultation during Ibn Bābawayh’s time. Previously the logicians had clashed with the physician Abū Bakr al-Rāzī, who wrote a book refuting the logicians. The book used Platonism, especially Galen. Both al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh were in Rayy, both worked with the same Sultān of Rayy, but at about 30 or 40 years apart. It is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that Ibn Bābawayh had access to abū Bakr al-Rāzī’s book. In fact, in one of the major books of Ibn Bābawayh, it is stated that a noble person al-Šarīf Ni’mah Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Iṣḥāq told him to follow al-Rāzī.

4. Similarly, in an earlier debate between abū Bakr al-Rāzī and the school of logicians based in Buḵāra, most of its elements are present in the teachings attributed to Ibn Bābawayh. Both the tenth-century al-Mufīd and the contemporary academic, Newman, recognise that in the Ibn Bābawayh attributed material, specifically the material dealing with the soul, there is significant evidence of the presence of Greek philosophy, especially Galen.

5. Ibn Bābawayh narrated from Aḥmed b. al-Ḥasan al-Qaṭṭān al-Rāzī who narrated from abū Bakr Muhammad b. Qārin al-Rāzī. The student of abū Bakr al-Rāzī with the same name abū Bakr Muhammad b. Qārin al-Rāzī was a physician. Both lived at the same time. Aḥmed b. al-Ḥasan al-Qaṭṭān who narrated from b. Qārin narrated a tradition about the Throne of God like a bowl that contains
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everything that exists. I infer this is similar to the philosophical discussion about space (makān), in the tradition uses the Throne of God instead of space.

2.9 Commentaries and summaries

The interest in Ibn Bābawayh’s works varied and no particular preference.

a) Summary, ‘illal al-Šarāye’ by Šaraf al-Dīn Yaḥya b. ‘izz al-Dīn Ḥusayn b. ‘Aṣīra
b. Nāṣir al-Bahrānī (d. was alive ~ 1562/970 A.H) he was the student of al-Karkī (d. 1533/940 A.H), had.

b) Commentary, al-Qāḍī Sa’īd Muḥammad Mufīd al-Qommī (d. 1695/1107 A.H), wrote his Šarḥ Tawḥīd al-Ṣadūq.

c) Combined as one book, according to al-Ǧifarī he received two copies that comprises Maʾānī al-Ḵbār and ‘illal al-Šarāye’ were one book two copies dated 1299 and 1311 A.H. Bahr al-’ulūm states similarly that ‘illal al-Šarāye’ was printed in years 1289 and 1311 A.H was part of 3 books with Maʾānī al-Ḵbār and al-Rawḍa ʿī al-Faḍāʿīl. Bahr al-’ulūm added that this book ‘illal al-Šarāye’ it is unclear when did Ibn Bābawayh start or finish writing it (wa lam na’lamu sabab ta’līfahu lil-kitāb wa lā ta’rīḵ ta’līfahu).

In the year 1870/1287 Maʾānī al-Ḵbār was with al-Amālī as one book in the library of al-Marʿašī.

2.10 Copyist comments

Perhaps Ibn Bābawayh’s works contain ‘the author of this book’ (muʿallif hāda al-kitāb) - referring to Ibn Bābawayh as the original author of this book. The most cited sentence out of four Uṣūl. For example, his books mentioned 382 times ‘the author of this book’ and the ‘compiler of this book’ (muṣanaf hāda al-kitāb) 28 times. In Man Lā
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Yahḍuruhu al-Faqīḥ 127 times, Kamāl al-Dīn 31 times, Maʾānī al-ʿAkbār 38 times, 'Uyūn ʿakbār al-Riḍā 43 times, al-Ḵiṣāl 64 times, 'illal al-Šarāyeʿ 30 times, al-Tawḥīd 44 times. Other ʿIthāʿah authors works by al-Mufīd, al-Murtaḍa, and al-Ṣaffār had none of the copyists’ statement. While the work of al-Kulaynī the copyist mentioned 2 times, al-Ṭūsī 7 times in his al-Tahḏīb al-ʿĀkhām.

2.1 Sources

It is necessary to conduct a further search of this area and to review the original texts of Ibn Bābawayh using a comparative study to clarify how his interpretations differ from other thinkers contemporary with him, and if possible, to remove confusion. In this research, Ibn Bābawayh’s primary sources will be analysed, such as Man Lā Yahḍuruhu al-Faqīḥ, Maʾānī al-ʿAkbār, 'illal al-Šarāyeʿ, 'Uyūn ʿakbār al-Riḍā, al-Tawḥīd, al-Hidāyah, Kamāl al-Dīn, al-Iʿtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmiyah and al-Muqniʿ. All these sources will be used alongside works by Ibn Bābawayh’s contemporaries to help to contextualise his work. These include Ibn al-Nadīm al-Fihrīst, abū Ḥāyyān al-Tawḥīdī’s al-Imtāʿ wal Muʿānasah, al-Muqābasāt, ʿaklāq al-Wazīrayn: Maṭālib al-Wazīrayn al-Sāḥib ibn ʿAbbād and Ibn al-'Amīd and the work of al-Mufīd’s Taṣḥīh Iʿtiqādāt al-Imāmiyah, al-Masāʾil al-Jārūdiah and al-Irašād.

It is important to use these books to investigate the views which present themselves as an alternative to Ibn Bābawayh’s. This could therefore be used as a basis for raising relevant issues. I want to add al-Kāfī by al-Kulaynī, to investigate ideas already in existence but rejected by Ibn Bābawayh, and some of the ideas developed from al-Kulaynī’s work. There is very little mentioned about Ibn Bābawayh, mainly al-Mufīd, Abū Ḥāyyān al-Tawḥīdī, and Ibn al-Nadīm. Al-Mufīd is generally negative towards Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīdī is generally positive and Ibn al-Nadīm put Ibn Bābawayh with his father under
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the title Zaydīa.\textsuperscript{408} McDermott observes that al-Mufid work \textit{Awāʾl al-Maqālāt} focusses on points that the Imamate are indifferent with other groups mainly the Muʿtazilite school of Baḵdād lead by ʿabdul Jabbār. McDermott notes that al-Mufid’s work was not arranged or organised, it merely focussed on answering questions legal, historical, and theological promoting the infallibility of Imams.\textsuperscript{409} For example, in his book, \textit{Awāʾl al-Maqālāt}, his major focus is on the belief that the world must have 12 infallible Imams starting with Imam ʿAlī. The Imams are immune to sinning.\textsuperscript{410} The twelve Imams were created in succession and one after another were subjected to danger and physical illness like any other men and after death, they can hear who visits them.\textsuperscript{411} He then added that, whereas ǧulāt believe that prophets and Imams do not stay buried under the soil for long. Their soul returning back to their body to be lifted to live in heaven.\textsuperscript{412} God command creature to do good and obey his commands. Thus, Imamah is God’s favour ’lutf’ to mankind.\textsuperscript{413}

2.12 Ibn Bābawayh / Philosophical Influence

Ibn Bābawayh had been faced with challenges to prove the occultation and return of the Mahdi. Ibn Bābawayh could not claim this without borrowing from the philosophy of the physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī, in particular, al-Rāzī’s argument on the eternity of the soul, which was adopted from the work of the Greek physician, Galen. I hypothesise that Ibn Bābawayh, in his search for a rational explanation of the occultation and return of the Imām, may have been greatly influenced by a mutakalim such as al-Nubakhtī. However, fundamentally, the credit for Ibn Bābawayh’s argument goes to abū Bakr al-Rāzī. This I will argue below. The focal point in Ibn Bābawayh’s version of occultation is the return of the ‘spirit’ (rūḥ)\textsuperscript{414} to earth after the death of a human. That is, the soul continues in its

\textsuperscript{408} Ibn Al-Nadīm, \textit{al-Fihrist}, p. 240.
\textsuperscript{409} McDermott, \textit{Theology}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{410} Al-Mufid, \textit{Awāʾl al-Maqālāt}, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{411} Al-Mufid, \textit{Awāʾl al-Maqālāt}, p. 72., and McDermott, \textit{Theology}, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{412} Al-Mufid, \textit{Awāʾl al-Maqālāt}, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{413} Al-Mufid, \textit{Awāʾl al-Maqālāt}, p. 134., and McDermott, \textit{Theology}, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{414} Ibn Bābawayh’s version of rūḥ identical with Al-Rāzī’s version of spirit (nafs).
journey until it reaches its final stage, evil or good.\textsuperscript{415} The conflict regarding the Mahdi’s return started during the last years of Ibn Bābawayh’s father and was focused upon intensely in Ibn Bābawayh’s work. One of his major themes was the eternity of the soul and the soul’s return from the metaphysical world to the terrestrial world. The second major theme was that of ethics and the ideal world. These first two themes lead to his final major theme, namely the non-infallibility of the Imam. Ibn Bābawayh must have decided to develop his notion of occultation by switching from Aristotelian logic to Platonist idealism. That is, al-Rāzī went from studying only his physical surroundings to striving for knowledge that included a transcendent dimension. This point is remarkably absent from both the Western and Eastern scholarship, i.e., the philosophical link to al-Rāzī. From these two themes, the eternity of the soul and ethics and the ideal world, I infer that it is worth drawing out the difference between al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī. Both thinkers represent the conflict between the ethics of Plato, which became popular in the city of Rayy and lead by al-Rāzī, versus the logicians’ school of Aristotle adopted by al-Fārābī that was predominant in Syria, Iraq, Buğâra, and Egypt.

From the 963/352 battle with logicians in Buğâra, discussed at book-length in his work \textit{Kamāl al-Dīn}, Ibn Bābawayh faced continuous conflict with logicians until the year 978/368, when Ibn Bābawayh was asked by the noble al-Šarīf Ni’ mah Muḥammed Ibn al-Ḥasan Ibn Ishāq to compile a work on law based on and following in the steps of the philosopher and physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī’s work on medicine.\textsuperscript{416} Ibn Bābawayh tells us that his work, \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh}, followed the famous physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī’s work \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Ṭabbīb}. Ibn Bābawayh did not hesitate to fulfil the request of the noble and wrote something akin to abū Bakr al-Rāzī’s work.\textsuperscript{417} Ibn


\textsuperscript{416} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faṣ̱iḥ}, vol 1, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{417} \textit{Ibid}. This will be discussed further in 2.11.2 The Philosophy link.
Bābawayh’s use of al-Rāzī’s work on medicine indicates that Ibn Bābawayh followed al-Rāzī’s philosophical interpretation of the soul, which, in my opinion, made Ibn Bābawayh stand out as being identical with Galen’s philosophy. The fact that al-Rāzī was seen as a philosopher makes it even more significant that Ibn Bābawayh openly declared, in one of his books, that he was following the physician’s work al-Rāzī. The doctrine of Ibn Bābawayh the theologian emerged in an environment that was multi-cultural both religiously, philosophically, as well as politically. People spoke many languages: Syriac, Aramaic, Greek, Coptic, Persian, and Arabic. The Caliphate court was full of multi-cultural thinkers who spoke a diversity of languages. The Muslims interacted with the Eastern Church, including the Malachites, Jacobites, and Nestorians. Thus, Islam provided the umbrella of a political structure and beneath it existed a milieu of philosophical and theological currents. This multi-culturalism surrounding Ibn Bābawayh makes it not unreasonable that Ibn Bābawayh would be influenced by Greek philosophy. He openly criticised Persian philosophy, Manichaeism, and Bardaisanism. He never criticised Greek philosophy.

To establish the nature of Ibn Bābawayh’s doctrine, we need to consider the context and currents of the time. In this thesis, I infer that Ibn Bābawayh, in his search for a rational explanation of occultation, could not achieve his aims without the assistance of Greek philosophy; this was apparent in his work and has not been sufficiently noted by modern academics. I will explore the details of a link between Ibn Bābawayh and Greek philosophy below. I argue that, first, some fundamental principles, which were discussed by abū Bakr al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī, such as ethics, the eternity of the soul, the nature of prophecy, the problem of evil, Imamah, and cosmology, contributed directly and indirectly towards establishing Ibn Bābawayh’s doctrinal work ‘aqā’id al-Imāmīyah. Second, I argue, the responses of al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī represent the nature of the currents of the time. It becomes difficult to deny that these thoughts and interpretations have been echoed in Ibn
Bābawayh’s writings. They had an impact on the court itself. Why should we deny an impact on Ibn Bābawayh? Although al-Nubakṭī’s work *kitāb al-Tanbīḥ* was included in *Kamāl al-Dīn*, it mainly focused on Imāmah and *naṣ*, and not philosophy, like the work of the mutakalim Ibn Qibba al-Rāzī both had a direct influence on Ibn Bābawayh’s thought. In similar fashion al-Mufīd had influence on al-Ṭūsī. His arguments were kalām based had no support from Ḥadīṯ. It was his student al-Ṭūsī who compiled Ḥadīṯ and references to back up his teacher’s arguments in *al-Muqniīa* and wrote *Tahḏīb al-Aḥkām*. Hence we find beside the topic of occultation, the work *Kamāl al-Dīn* focussed on providing references and Ḥadīṯ to support and advancing al-Nubakṭī’s original argument on Imāmah and *naṣ*. Likewise, the influence came from his father who had a close relationship with al-Nubakṭī’s family. For instance, Ibn Bābawayh’s response to gnostic political rival movements shares similar features to the three key figures, abū Bakr al-Rāzī, al-Fārābī, and al-Nubakṭī’s, refutations of Gnosticism.

2.12.1 Al-Nubakṭī

Abū Sahl al-Nubakṭī (924/311) and his nephew were known for their interest in Greek philosophy. The nephew, abū Muḥammed Ḥasan ibn Musa (d. between 912/300 and 942/330), was influenced by Aristotelian work. The same was true for Ibn Bābawayh’s father, who worked with them and wrote about *manṭiq*. They defended the idea of the virtuous Imām in a non-virtuous world and the importance of occultation. I infer that soon after the challenge of al-Ḥallāj and al-Salmaḡānī, they declared major occultation. During the time of abū Sahl al-Nubaḵṭī, the focus was mainly to support the agents (*bābīyah*) of the Imams, and to refute gnostic competing political movements. However, with the Imāmī’s moving from an apparent Imām to intermediary agents, this added
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This Will be discussed further in 4.7.1
complications for the community since they were without an Imam. These complications continued until the decision was made in 941/329 that the agents bābīyah would cease. The last agent, ʿAlī ibn Muḥammed al-Sāmerī, is the one who announced the major occultation of the twelfth Imam. The community became weaker without strong leadership. The idea of occultation became harder to accept. There were major divisions among the community regarding occultation. The Šīʿah could not defend occultation against a certain unnamed logician figure from the city of Buḵāra. We do not know who this person was. It could have been any one of several well-known logicians who were contemporary with Ibn Bābawayh. The Muslim philosophers of Buḵāra who taught Aristotelian logic were: abū al-Ḥasan Ṭāhir b. Musa al-Nubaḵtī and his nephew abū Ḥādī b. Musa al-Nubaḵtī. However, in finding the link between the world of the cosmos and the return of the ‘soul’ after death, I argue that their interpretation of the occultation was suitable for only a short period, a so-called minor occultation, but when the major occultation was announced, the two leaders, abū Sahil al-Nubaḵtī and abū Muḥammed Ḥasan b. Musa al-Nubaḵtī, by then were both deceased, and no one else had the philosophical skills to find logical support for the major occultation. The responsibility for this fell to Ibn Bābawayh.

423 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 3.
424 Abu Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Imtāʿ wal Mūʿānasah, (Cairo: Maṭbaʿah Lujnat Al-Taḥqīq, 1939), vol 1, p. 36.
425 Ibid., vol 1, p. 222.
It is evidently in a later time of Ibn Bābawayh’s life that he speaks negatively of logicians. In his book, *Kamāl al-Dīn*, he states that, after his visit to Naysāpūr in 963/352, he saw the Šī‘ah community was in grievous doubt and confusion about the occultation of the Imam and the return (*rajʿah*). This was caused by the logicians from Buḵāra.427

2.12.2 The Philosophy link

I infer that there were two camps. In one camp were the Ismaili and al-Mufīd and in the other camp Ibn Bābawayh and al-Rāzī. There was a friendly relationship between al-Mufīd and the Ismaili dāʿī al-Kirmānī. For example, al-Mufīd wrote to al-Kirmānī answering some of his questions about what made the Prophet Muḥammad above all prophets.428 The Ismaili abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 934/322 A.H), in his refutation of abū Bakr al-Rāzī describes him *mulḥid*,429 for believing in the five eternal elements: God, *nafs*, material, time, and space.430 Ibn Bābawayh also was accused by al-Mufīd of narrating philosophy malāḥidah in his book, *Imāmī Creed*.431

Importantly, Ibn Bābawayh was not afraid to cite al-Rāzī as his example to follow in the writing of his book *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīḥ* as stated above.432 This is not surprising because, in the city of Rayy, al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh were not considered *mulḥids*. Sulṭān Rukn al-Dawlah was a friend of al-Rāzī, who was his physician. Al-Rāzī’s ideas were never considered *ilḥād* during the Sulṭān’s reign. After the death of al-Rāzī, Ibn Bābawayh became part of the Sultan’s circle. There is therefore the possibility that Ibn Bābawayh not only imbibed the intellectual milieu of the city of Rayy but also drank
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directly from the fount of al-Rāzī’s thoughts. For example, Ibn Bābawayh among Islamic theologians adopts the al-Rāzī pattern of the five eternal principles. When talking about creation he states that in the beginning, God created the First Intellect (‘aql) which was a soul,⁴³³ responsible for souls and intelligence and all that metaphysical world, then Second Intellect which is called ‘ignorance’ his description match (hyle) the prime matter. Thus, everything began with these two points.⁴³⁴ He talks about Time (al-Dahr); saying that sometimes people focus on Time and ignore God the creator.⁴³⁵ Then the void where the twelve layers of veils of light exist.⁴³⁶ Likewise, he saw God as the originator of the cosmos. He believed in the return after death.⁴³⁷ Ibn Bābawayh also believed in the return of the Twelfth Imam. There was a division of opinion. Some accepted the idea of occultation, and some opposed it. This became the focal point of contention within the community. Al-Nubaḵtī’s doctrine of occultation was neither clear nor philosophical. It was not discussed by al-Nubaḵtī or by Ibn Bābawayh’s father. Ibn Bābawayh provided an interpretation of the faculties of the soul, similar to al-Ṣaffār the terms used were similar to the philosophy of Plato and the physician al-Rāzī in describing the faculties of a Man (Insān).⁴³⁸ Al-Rāzī states that according to Plato human-made by three faculties the ḥaywānīyah/ğaḍabīyah responsible for generating body movement, nabātīyah appetite (šahwa) and called nāmīyah and the rational soul (nafs l-nāṭiqa). These faculties for the purpose to serve the rational soul.⁴³⁹ The three faculties have no sense of direction; their job is to fulfil basic needs. What we have beyond three faculties is the instinct of
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⁴³⁵ Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-Ḵiṣār, p. 135.
⁴³⁶ “أن يعتقدوا الدهر وجحدوا الباريء”
⁴⁴⁰ Abū Bakr al-Rāzī, cited in Kraus, Ed. Opera Philosophica (Rasāʾīl Falsafīyah), (Egypt: Publications of Fouad I University, 1939), p. 27.
determination Malaka l-Irāda. The drive of the three faculties can lead to seeking knowledge and becoming a philosopher or to chasing basic human needs, driven by lusts to the level of an animal.\textsuperscript{440} Al-Fārābī similarly explains al-Irāda and he does not call it the instinct of determination but the appetitive faculty (al-qūwa al-Nuzūʿīah) that makes the will to arise towards or turn away from.\textsuperscript{441} Ibn Bābawayh went further and stated the three basic faculties are of the none believer: strength (qūwa), appetite (šahwa), and motion (mudraj- sometimes called rūḥ l-badan\textsuperscript{442}), whereas the believer has fourth faculty faith faculty rūḥ al-Imān, whereas the prophets and Imams inherited the fifth faculty that is the faculty of rūḥ l-qudus.\textsuperscript{443} This will be discussed further in “The Soul and the Holy Spirit”.

2.13 Differentiating Ibn Bābawayh from His Contemporary, Al-Mufid

Ibn Bābawayh, like al-Rāzī, argued that everyone, even unbelievers, recognise the existence of a single creator whom they identified with Tawḥīd.\textsuperscript{444} Everyone created instinctively recognises that there is a creator. That is to say, instinct is part of human creation regardless of learning. Ibn Bābawayh writes that the evidence of God’s existence is within us. Humans instinctively, naturally, recognise that there is a God. This instinct must be there for a reason. He argued that even a person living in the middle of nowhere in an uninhabited land will if he reflects on his surroundings, come to the conclusion that there is one God or maker.\textsuperscript{445} Our intellect leads us to know that there is one God.\textsuperscript{446} God must have planted this sense within us such that the mental discovery of him is an integral

\textsuperscript{441} Al-Fārābī, Mabādi’ Ārā’ Ahl al-Madīna al-Fāḍilah, p. 170.
\textsuperscript{442} Al-Saffār, Rasā’il al-Darajāt, p. 447.
\textsuperscript{443} Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 330 and Al-Mufid, Taṣḥīḥ l-Tiqādāt, p. 61.
\textsuperscript{444} Ibn Bābawayh stated in his work al-Tawḥīd is to see the full traditions in ‘Uyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā, he indicates that al-Tawḥīd was written in later time. Al-Tawḥīd, p. 122.
\textsuperscript{445} Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 290.
\textsuperscript{446} Ibid., p. 290.
part of our thinking. On the contrary, al-Mufīd believed the opposite, not everyone recognises that there is a creator and therefore everyone needs to make an effort to gain *iktisāb*, awareness. Al-Mufīd states that to recognise God is to recognise the Imamah.

The way Ibn Bābawayh describes the term *Tafwīḍ* (Mufawīḍah) is that God has no control over man’s freedom of choice to sin, in the meantime it does not mean God has permitted the act of sinning, since God is not responsible for human acts. Whereas al-Mufīd states that delegation *tafwīḍ* does not mean being free unethical to act, human are created with an instinct to like pleasant acts and dislike repulsive deed, then God sent his commands to keep man’s out of the disliked acts. 

Al-Mufīd: “those who reject Imāmah are outside the fold of Islam but so are those who do not know or are ignorant who the Imams were.”

Al-Šahrastānī argues, that although the Šīʿah took a similar approach interpreting the Qur’an to the Muʿtazilites, they differed on the subject of Imamah. For example, ʿabdul Jabbār al-Muʿtazilī stated that some of the Šīʿah saw that the Qur’an was not immune to change *tahrīf* similar to Torah, and only the Prophet or an Imām can interpret the Qur’an. Al-Mufīd argues; to the Muʿtazilites, it is not necessary to have an Imam in every century and it is sufficient to rely on reasoning instead of searching for the Imām. By contrast, to the Šīʿī, God would not leave humanity without an Imam as guidance and salvation from confusion. 

Al-Mufīd here is talking about Muʿtazilite’s of Baġdād.
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449 Mufawīḍah: full authority and obligation the term mufawīḍah is often used by Ibn Bābawayh to invalidate an author as a heretic. Mufawīḍah is a term used to describe the Qadarīyah call that God has no power over man’s free-will. With Ibn Bābawayh mufawīḍah meant those who claim that the Prophet was infallible. See for example, Ibn Bābawayh, *Man Lā Yaduruhu al-Faqīḥ*, vol 1, p. 359.
455 Ibid., vol 16, p. 369.
457 Ibid.
As doctrine there is not much different between Imāmīyah and Muʿtazilite in fact al-Mufīd in his introduction stated that there were claims that Šīʿah adopted their doctrine from Qadarīyah before they branched out as Muʿtazilite ḥāb manzila bayna al-manzilatayn.\(^{458}\) Al-Mufīd begins with Imāmīyah they believe Gid’s divine will it is necessary that in every generation there will be an Imām who is infallible, perfect in religious knowledge to guide people. Whereas to Muʿtazilite, Zaydī and Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ it is not necessary to have Imām, infallible or religious scholar.\(^{459}\) To the Imāmīyah the Imām must be from the offspring of the Prophet, perform a miracle supported with written evidence naṣ from the prophet or from his predecessor Imam. To Muʿtazilite this is not necessary, and leadership can go to someone between himself and God. He can be a sinner and does not have to be pious or have naṣ.\(^{460}\) To the Imāmīyah and Zaydī both saw that whoever took leadership to replace the Prophet before Imām Ṭālī is a sinner and misguided. Whereas to Muʿtazilite and ḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ this is not necessary.\(^{461}\)

2.13.1 Al-Rāzī
Abū Bakr al-Rāzī and, later on, Ibn Bābawayh, both lived and were buried in Rayy and worked for Ṣultān Rukn al-Dawlah. The city of Rayy was the centre for Platonic Greek thinking and for followers of al-Rāzī, who was the Sulṭān’s physician and enjoyed a close relationship with the Sulṭān. On the other hand, the city of Buḵāra focused on Aristotelian logic. Similarly, the conflict was apparent between Buḵāra and Rayy. Abū Bakr al-Rāzī had a student Muḥammed b. Yūnus, who was a logician from the city of Buḵāra. Al-Rāzī wrote a book entitled Sir al-Asrār at the request of his student.\(^{462}\) We thus can compare two Muslim philosophers: Aristotelian logic represented by abū Naṣr Muḥammed b.

\(^{458}\) Al-Mufīd, Awa’il Al-Maqālāt, pp. 33 and 4., and Al-Mas’ūdī, Murūj Al-Ḍahab, vol 3, p. 269.
\(^{459}\) Al-Mufīd, Awa’il Al-Maqālāt, p. 39.
\(^{460}\) Ibid.
\(^{461}\) Ibid., p. 41.
\(^{462}\) Abū Bakr al-Rāzī, al-Asrār, p. 1.


Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Imtāʿ wa l-Muʿānasah, (Cairo: Maṭbaʿah Lujnāt al-Tāʾlīf wa l-Tarjama, 1942), vol 1, p. 35.
Pioneers of ḥadīth used to gather in the court of the wazīr Ibn al-ʿAmīd among them wazīr al-Jaʿābī and al-Ṭabarānī.⁴⁷⁰

2.13.3 Is the World Eternal or Created?

There are close links between the interpretations of Ibn Bābawayh and abū Bakr al-Rāzī, though not as close between Ibn Bābawayh and al-Fārābī. Al-Fārābī followed Aristotle that the movement of the planets are eternal and has a soul,⁴⁷¹ by contrast, al-Rāzī rejected the eternity of planets and that they have a soul.⁴⁷² Like abū Bakr al-Rāzī after him, Ibn Bābawayh used the term muḥdaṭah, i.e., something new that has occurred in a point of time. We understand simply through our common sense that a well-built ship must have a maker, and that the sky, planets, sun, and moon, and their movements, setting and rising, cannot exist without a creator.⁴⁷³ Ibn Bābawayh respected the universal faculty of human reason. Ibn Bābawayh particularly argued that, according to Imam al-Riḍā, God is known to our conscious mind in general and cannot be perceived through the senses of an individual.⁴⁷⁴ Ibn Bābawayh explains that no one can deny the existence of God and the world. In the same way that any building will reveal the architect and his skills, so also the universe exists which proves that God exists.⁴⁷⁵ On the contrary, Al-Mufīd like al-Fārābī argues, that because the idea of the world is in God’s mind (badāʾah),⁴⁷⁶ the idea is therefore eternal. He states that a building cannot exist without a builder and the builder cannot build without an ‘idea’ of what to build. In a religious context, this idea is badāʾah.

---

⁴⁷³Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 299.
⁴⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 47.
⁴⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 194 and 8.
preceding the making of something. In the process of making, thoughts can change. The debate is, therefore, about how God can be responsible for everything and yet not directly involved. This is to say, that God is all-powerful and self-sufficient.

2.13.4 Jawhar-’ard and Two Worlds Images (ṣuwar)

Ibn Bābawayh in agreement with al-Kulaynī that jawāhir (plural for jawhar) means soul rūḥ and identity a’yān means bodies abdān. When talking about the making of a baby inside the mother’s womb the next question about whether male or female, healthy happy child or unhappy. The next question on whether the character of that child already existed set before pregnancy or during? To al-Kulaynī after 4 months of pregnancy two angels comes and blow the soul inside the body, decide whether male or female, happy or wretched. Likewise from Sunnī al-Buḵārī narrates with slight difference that after 120 days (4 months) God send an angel to deliver the fate whether male or female, happy or wretched and then the angel blow the soul into the body. To al-Mufīd, the soul enters the body after 6 months of pregnancy. Whereas Ibn Bābawayh refrain from narrating in similar fashion, he narrated that after 40 days the child receives his fate male or female, happy or unhappy there is no mentioning of blowing of the soul by an angel. Al-Rāzī explains the process of making the child inside the womb, the womb does not shape the child nor has a specific order of facial part to place the eyes, nose and mouth, while the sperm (manī) is a jawhar has certain attributes like the gold, silver and copper, with the difference that we have nerve system, blood and bones. When the sperm placed inside the womb, it will then grow within that mold. Therefore, parents have no effect on how the

481 Al-Mufīd, al-Muqniʿa, p. 538.
child born whether the parent blind and has no hand, it does not make the child blind or born with no hand.\textsuperscript{483}

Al-Fārābī – discusses that the first thing the body has inside the womb is the sense of feeling that enables him to feel hot and cold.\textsuperscript{484} Whereas al-Rāzī, the first sense is pleasure/taste (\textit{leḏah}). The body is not a jawhar but merely a machine (Åla) that survives on food and therefore it needs sense of taste.\textsuperscript{485} He argued that better being not to judged by \textit{leḏah}, in this case animal are naturally driven by \textit{leḏah}.\textsuperscript{486} Ibn Bābawayh uses \textit{leḏah} too. He describes it as form of urge that when it is satisfied reaches pleasure, he narrates that: quenching your thirst to the point of satisfaction this is \textit{leḏah}.\textsuperscript{487}

Al-Rāzī continues, the body used by nafs al-Nāṭīqa for a period of time and after death it disintegrates and decomposes.\textsuperscript{488} Whereas nafs a jawhar eternal (\textit{qadīmah}) and it is the reason for the body to become alive, however, the nafs an ignorant of their capability until it experiences a new skill, for example, the human does not know how to use a bow and arrow until he mastered the skill of archery.\textsuperscript{489}

2.13.5 Ibn Bābawayh on the Soul: Suffering, Sacrifice, and Imamah

We will now discuss how Ibn Bābawayh’s understanding of the soul, which was considered controversial among the Šīʿah of his time, differs from the understanding of al-Mufīd. Ibn Bābawayh treats Imams as ‘cosmic Imams’ (my term) who are trapped inside a physical, material body and are exposed to the dangers of ignorance (which, for Ibn Bābawayh is what produces evil) in this world. Ibn Bābawayh gives the example of the

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{484} Al-Fārābī, \textit{Kitāb Ārā’ ahl al-Madīna al-Fāḍilah}, p. 87., and Al-Fārābī in Ed._ Walzer, \textit{Al-Farabi on The Perfect State}, p. 164.
\textsuperscript{487} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Ma‘āni al-Aḵbār}, p. 149.
\end{flushright}
prevention of Abraham from sacrificing his son, Ishmael, as an illustration of the dangerous
destiny of prophets and Imams. Moreover, when Abraham sacrificed a ram instead of his
son, God told him that he needed to leave Ishmael to wait for the eventual birth of Ḥusayn
(the grandson of the Prophet) who would be the sacrificed one.490 Ibn Bābawayh here
mentions the sacrifice as an honour that was not meant for Ishmael but Ḥusayn. From Ḥusayn’s offspring come, nine successors, who, in turn, were all assassinated, except for
the Twelfth, who, as Mahdi, had a much greater role to play. Ibn Bābawayh states in al-
Iʾtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah that the Prophet and twelve Imams were martyred.491 In other
words, it took eleven Imams to be sacrificed for the Mahdi to be born.492 In such trials only
Imams succeeded in passing. Ibn Bābawayh states that the Imams would all suffer from
injustice; it is almost a condition for the Imamah. He says that Imam ʿAlī asked the Prophet
why the Imams succeeding him would experience injustice and hardship. The Prophet
replied it was a test for people and they would be judged according to which side they
took.493

For al-Mufid, on the other hand, Ibn Bābawayh’s statement that the eleven Imams
were all poisoned or assassinated for the sake of human redemption was not accurate. Al-
Mufid contested the historical accuracy of Ibn Bābawayh’s claim that all were assassinated.
Al-Mufid argued that Ibn Bābawayh twisted history to make it fit his theology.494 This is
evidence that Ibn Bābawayh was regarded as an independent thinker. According to Ibn
Bābawayh, the soul of the Prophet and Imams existed as one entity 4000 years before
reaching the body of Adam.495 He states that souls with complete full intelligence have
existed before Adam.496 In another tradition, He writes that God placed intellectual light

490 Ibn Bābawayh, ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā, vol 1, p. 212.
493 Ibid.
494 Al-Mufid, Taṣḥīḥ lʾtiqādāt, p. 131.
(nūr) in the clay of the Prophet which existed two thousand years before Adam, and the journey of the knowledge of pure full light (nūr) passed on through the prophetic lineage shares the same essence that Adam’s soul received from God then passed on to Noah to Abraham, before finally reaching ’Abdul al-Muṭṭalib (the grandfather of the Prophet Muḥammed). The soul was divided into two: one half went to the father of the Prophet to produce the Prophet Muḥammed with the ability to prophesy, and the second went to abū Ṭālib (the uncle of the Prophet) to produce ‘Alī, who was endowed with the skill of fighting and with bravery.\footnote{497} He narrated that what makes the prophets’ and Imam ‘Alī’s souls unique is that their soul originated from nūr (in another tradition nūr is the intellect which is responsible for all souls to exist).\footnote{498}

On the question of souls before the creation of Adam and the human race, Ibn Bābawayh and al-Mufīd differ in their opinions. Ibn Bābawayh believes that before Adam, all souls were in the realm of azīlah, pure and innocent without any experience of the world.\footnote{499} They are not personalities. They are non-personal energy ḥaywānīyah, and are still in a transparent raw form. On the other hand, al-Mufīd critiques the idea that souls existed before Adam as non-intelligent spiritual forms, ašbāḥ.\footnote{500} Al-Mufīd labelled Ibn Bābawayh’s thought with the term ašbāh. To be clear, al-Mufīd used the term ašbāh, Ibn Bābawayh did not. Al-Mufīd argues that if we were to believe that souls existed before the creation of the world, then we would have to treat those souls as being associated with God and as being partners with God in the creation of the world. This would mean the abandonment of monotheism. Al-Mufīd, like Ibn Bābawayh, believes in the return of the soul after death, but with a difference. For al-Mufīd, those who will return to life again in person will do so with the Mahdi. These are those who have reached their ultimate level of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{497} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Maʿānī al-Aḥbār}, p. 56.
\footnote{498} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Ḵisāl}, vol 2, p. 640.
\footnote{499} \textit{Ibid.}, vol 1, p. 169., and \textit{ʿillal al-Šarāyeʿ}, vol 1, p. 84.
\footnote{500} Al-Mufīd, \textit{Al-Masāʿil Al-Sarawīyah}, p. 39.
\end{footnotes}
good or evil. For example, the martyr Ḥusayn and his murderer have both reach the pinnacle of morality, good and evil respectively. Those who have not yet reached the pinnacle of morality will remain in their place, either a good realm or a bad realm, until the Day of Judgement.\textsuperscript{501} For al-Mufīd, the soul returns to its original form, like the form it was born with and will receive its rewards or punishment from its lord.\textsuperscript{502} However, al-Mufīd argues against Ibn Bābawayh’s three claims of 1) the eternity of the soul, that is, for all eternity past, all souls have always existed, and 2) that ‘the souls meet with each other regardless of whether or not their body exists’,\textsuperscript{503} that is when people die their souls go to a metaphysical realm, and, when people sleep, their souls can also go, for a short time, to this metaphysical realm and exchange information with other souls, and 3) the belief that the soul cycles through different bodies – after one body dies, the soul goes to a metaphysical realm for an indeterminate period and then returns to earth in a new body that suits it appropriately. The conscious personality ceases to exist at death, only the soul/energy continuing in the cycle of return.\textsuperscript{504} These three claims, argues al-Mufīd, go against the Muslim doctrine on heaven and hell, and are identical with the language of philosophers who believe in transmigration, thus avoiding the reward and punishment system of heaven and hell.\textsuperscript{505} In other words, it is antithetical to the consciousness of the three major religions that sin would not be punished, which is the case in Ibn Bābawayh’s system where the individual conscious person ceases to exist at death. Al-Mufīd argues that souls do not meet each other and there is no continuous return to this life. There is no cycle of return. Souls cannot meet with the souls of the deceased nor have a life experience in different bodies. If that were true, they would naturally carry the memory and experience

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{502} Ibid., p. 92.
\textsuperscript{503} Ibid., p. 80.
\textsuperscript{504} I will elaborate upon this topic in chapter 5.
\textsuperscript{505} Al-Mufīd, \textit{Taṣḥīh ʿIʿtiqādāt}, p. 88.
\end{flushright}
from a previous body 506 or the world of atoms (ʿālam al-джار). 507 Al-Mufid believed that Adam, as a prophet, saw the future, he saw the phantoms (اشباھ) of the Imams, not their souls. 508 These phantoms did not exist around Adam, he only saw them as representations of the souls that would exist in the future. Al-Mufid explains why Ibn Bābawayh’s idea of the soul’s cycle of return cannot possibly be correct. If someone experienced the rebirth of his soul, for example, and it had previously been in a different body, he would have the memories of the previous body. Thus, if someone was born and lived his whole life in Bağdād and died there but was reborn in Egypt with a new body, he would carry some of his memories of Bağdād with him. 509 Al-Mufid argues that because this has never occurred, the idea of the eternity of the soul cannot be credible. 510 Ibn Bābawayh's concept of the soul is different from al-Mufid's. Ibn Bābawayh saw the soul has a full functioning mind, hearing, feeling, and speaking. 511 Whereas human bodies are imprisonment where the soul is kept captive for a short period. The physical world is merely a temporary world filled with images, deceptions, and doubts. 512 The physical world is described as an ocean, the human is imprisoned and has to sail through it, and only if they take piety as their sustenance and faith as their sail ship can they reach their destination safely. 513 It is a natural phenomenon that every human before death will see their place in paradise or hell. 514 Al-Mufid in his refutation of Ibn Bābawayh has argued that the Šī‘ah ḥaṣawīyah they see that human spirits were created in the world of phantom (ʿālam al-джار) has the full intelligence to think and to speak then God clothed with the human body (จำกما ڪلاڪا لاها ڏيڪاڏن

506 Ibid., p. 86.
507 Ibid., p. 80.
508 Al-Mufid, Al-Masā’il Al-Sarawīyah, p. 39.
509 Ibid., p. 86.
510 Ibid., p. 56.
512 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Iʿtiqādāt, p. 47.
513 Ibid., p. 49.
514 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, , pp. 176 and 120.

واعتقادنا أنه لا يخرج أحد من الدنيا حب يرى مكانه من الجنة أو من النار. واعتقادنا أنه لا يخرج أحد من الدنيا حب يرى مكانه من الجنة أو من
Ibn Bābawayh describes after death the soul will see with the heart true clarity, true knowledge, and far greater than that seen with the naked eye (ru’yah bil-galb wa laysat ru’ya bil ’ayn). Again Ibn Bābawayh like al-Rāżī focuses on ethics, he narrates that the greatest jihād is jihād al-nafs. He states that experiencing death when the souls washed out of their latched stains of sins wizr, the dying believer who humbled before God their sins will be removed, and none believer their good deeds will be removed from them. Hence death is a painful experience.

2.14 Al-Mufīd’s criticisms

Al-Mufīd Muḥammed Ibn al-Nu’mān al-Mufīd (d. 1022/413) stressed in his Tashīḥ I’tiqādāt that Ibn Bābawayh’s traditions were of Greek philosophical origin. Al-Mufīd emphasized two major points in his response. He argued that Ibn Bābawayh’s interpretation of the creation of the soul preceding the creation of the body coincides with Greek philosophy and not the creed of the Šīʿah.

Al-Mufīd criticised Ibn Bābawayh for being from maḏhab of Aṣḥāb Ḥadīṯ who rely on transmitted Ḥadīṯ and treat it as fact. Al-Mufīd, who studied under Ibn Bābawayh and wrote a refutation against Ibn Bābawayh, listed thirty-seven topics that were he disagrees with Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Mufīd raised doubts against Ibn Bābawayh that he was not immune to zanādiqa interpretations. Al-Mufīd describes Ibn Bābawayh and other Ḥadīṯ collectors as collecting randomly without filtration, leaving the doors open for heretical philosophies mixing with the Imams’ teachings. He made a strong point that Ibn Bābawayh’s non-standard interpretations allow the anti-Šīʿah (nāṣibah) to say that the Šīʿah are zanādiqa.

---

515 Al-Mufīd, Tashīḥ al-I’tiqādāt, p. 80 and Al-Masā’il Al’Akbarīyah, p. 27.
516 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawhīd, p. 120.
517 Ibn Bābawayh, Ma ‘ānī al-Aḵbār, p. 160.
518 Ibn Bābawayh, al-I’tiqādāt, p. 54.
520 ibid., p. 137 and Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Ḵiṣal, (Qom: Mū’asasat al-Naṣr al-Islāmī, 1403 A.H), vol 1, p. 255.
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Chapter 3 Ibn Bābawayh: His Life and Times

Sabine Schmidtke states that religious authorities are those who organize the scriptures into a formal canon and establish a legitimate method of interpretation. The term authority is a description for a person who is responsible for producing or interpreting a written text, but also refers to the text itself. More importantly, one needs to consider a whole set of critical suppositions behind the formulation of the text. These, in turn, are defined by the political and social discourses of the time.

3.1 Ibn Bābawayh

We now turn to a discussion of the life and times of Ibn Bābawayh. Šīʿah theologian Ibn Bābawayh’s works were not written in a vacuum, and the implicit ideology that guided these texts could not have been absorbed without a process of circulation and adaptation of thought that was accepted as a local practice in the city of Rayy. I argue that tenth century Šīʿah ideology developed as the Šīʿah Muslim community evolved over time and gradually formed its own unique identity.

Ibn Bābawayh, was a man distinguished by birth and by his ability to memorise large amounts of ḥadīth and their narrators, became a leading figure of ḥadīth in the region of Ḵūrasān in the tenth century. At the time of his death, he had separated himself from the school of Qom, his native place, and had moved on to the city of Rayy, where he worked with Sulṭān Rukn al-Dawlah and took part in the debates at the Sulṭān’s court. Today, Ibn Bābawayh is considered as one of three major sources forming part of the modern Šīʿah Imāmī school of thought. Ibn Bābawayh is described by renowned Šīʿī figures of 10th/11th century, such as al-Najāšī and al-Ṭūsī. The Šīʿah figures were divided on Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Najāšī, in his catalogue, describes him as the prominent Imāmī scholar of ḥadīth in the region (which included Qom and several cities in Persia) wajh al-ṭāʿifah.

---

523 Al-Najāšī, Rijāl al-Najāšī, p. 389.
524 Al-Najāšī, Rijāl al-Najāšī, p. 389.
Ḏahābī Šams al-Dīn (1374/748 A.H) describes him as the head (ra’s) Imāmīyah and the son of learned Šī`ah figure.⁵²⁵ Al-Ţūsī, in his catalogue, describes Ibn Bābawayh as an expert in ḥadīṯ in the city of Qom.⁵²⁶ I infer that during the changing of wazīr in Rayy, Ibn Bābawayh fell out of favour. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī lived in the time of the new wazīr b. ’Abbād. He added that one of the major issues he had witnessed was that the wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. ’Abbād, when he first came to power, had thrown out of his court all the famous leading thinkers, and some were even exiled. Among those who were thrown out were, Ibn Bābawayh, al-Balkī, al-Ruyānī, and Abū Fāris. Ibn ’Abbād replaced them with Zaydī preachers such as al-Najjār.⁵²⁷ Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī was critical of al-Ṣāḥib Ibn ’Abbād for this act. Ibn Bābawayh wrote many books. Ibn Bābawayh was buried in Rayy in a mausoleum nearby ‘abdul ‘aẓīm al-Ḥasanī.⁵²⁸ Ibn Bābawayh wrote in his work Ṭawāb al-A’māl a section under the title the deeds in visiting the grave of ’abdul ‘aẓīm al-Ḥasanī.⁵²⁹

The teachings of the twelve Imams and traditions were carefully selected and grouped into topics related to the nature of the debates, and to topics of time and place. Ibn Bābawayh, born in C.E 918/ Hijri 306 in the city of Qom, (today, a city in Iran), the year after Ibn Rawḥul-Illeh became the agent (bāb) of the twelfth Imam.⁵³⁰ Al-Ḥusayn Ibn Rawḥul-Illeh, from Nubaḵt in Baḡdād, played an important role in making Qom into the role model that led the Šī`ah traditionalists. In particular, Rawḥul-Illeh influenced Ibn Bābawayh’s father to raise his son to memorise teachings of the twelve Imams ḥadīṯ. He was credited from the day he was born with being the answer to the prayer of the last Imam and blessed with a unique memory that helped him to continue the teachings and thought

---

⁵²⁶ Al-Ţūsī, Al-Fihrist, p. 157.
of the twelve Imams.\textsuperscript{531} Very little is known about Ibn Bābawayh’s teacher, Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Walīd (d. 954/343), except that in his early life, Ibn Bābawayh studied under him and that he was a commentator on the Qur’an. Al-Ṭūsī describes Ibn al-Walīd as an expert in the science of narrators (rijāl), but not to the same extent as he described Ibn Bābawayh as being an expert in ḥadīth and rijāl.\textsuperscript{532} Although Ibn Bābawayh focused on traditions, his work remains strictly related to particular themes and issues of his time. Therefore, in this section, I will offer my interpretation of the historical context Ibn Bābawayh lived within. In relating the biography of Ibn Bābawayh, we will see that a great deal of his authority derived from his father, who in turn gained from his relationship with the principal deputy (wakīl) of the twelfth Imam. It must be admitted that the information on the biography of Ibn Bābawayh is very limited and tends to be repetitive as is the case for many of the leading thinkers of this period. ‘Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn - Ibn Bābawayh’s father is considered a Qommī figure. It was recorded that he visited Bağdād in 939/328 and gave permission (ijāzah) to narrate his works.\textsuperscript{533} Ibn Bābawayh’s father is not mentioned directly as having met with the Imams, but it is mentioned indirectly in a letter that was addressed to him from the eleventh Imam al-Ḥasan al-‘Askarī. In this letter, the Imam called him Šaiḵ, a title given to a respected man.\textsuperscript{534} It is worth mentioning that ‘Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn wrote to Ibn Rawḥullāh asking whether it was safe to make the pilgrimage to Mecca.\textsuperscript{535} The response was ‘If you must, then be in the last caravan.’ In the year 923/311, the Qarmatians attacked pilgrims’ caravans, but, made an exception of the last caravan where Ibn Bābawayh’s father was.\textsuperscript{536} This raised suspicions

\textsuperscript{532} Al-Ṭūsī, Ṣirāj al-Ṭūsī, p. 439., al-Ğaybah, p. 320.
\textsuperscript{533} Ibid., vol 12, p. 399.
\textsuperscript{534} Al-Māzindārānī, Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib, (Qom: Mū’asasat Al-Allamah Lil-Nāšr, 1379 A.H), vol 4, p. 425.
\textsuperscript{535} Al-Ḏahabī, Dūwal Al-Islām, (Beirut: Mū’asast al-ʿAḥlam, 1985), p. 172.
\textsuperscript{536} Al-Ṭūsī, Al-Ğaybah, p. 320.
in the mind of the Caliph as to the question of whether Ibn Rawḥul-Illaḥ did write to the Qarmatians urging them to make an exception for Ibn Bābawayh’s father.

In 917/309 two religious radicals, Ibn al-Ḥallāj and al-Ṣalmağānī, both claimed religious leadership and the fifth (ḵums), taking the place of Ibn Rawḥul-Illaḥ. The second time ‘Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn is mentioned is when he visited the agent (wakīl) of the Imam namely Ibn Rawḥul-Illaḥ. The third mention of ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn is in a letter from the fourth agent abū Ḥusayn ‘Alī b. Muḥammed al-Sāmmarī (d. 941/329), wishing him mercy on the day he died. There is no mention of him meeting with the first or second wakīl. Neither did Ibn Bābawayh’s grandfather have any relationship with the Imams or their wukalā’. Abū Ja’far Muḥammed Ibn ‘Alī al-Aswad (one of those who collected tax for the wukalā’) requested that the Imam pray for him to have a son. The response came as a letter from al-Mahdi, which read that ‘Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn would have a boy. ‘Alī named his son Muḥammed, who turned out to be gifted in memorising traditions. Al-Ṭūsī gives a detailed account whereby ‘Alī remarried a young woman from Daylem. Soon she bore him three boys: the eldest was Muḥammed, known for his expertise and memory of traditions, the second was al-Ḥusayn, who became faqīh, but the third was al-Ḥasan, a pious person who was not as well-known as his two brothers. However, it seems no Sunnī quoted from him and Ibn Bābawayh’s father except in al-Ḥākim’s History of Naysāpūr Tārīḵ Naysāpūr. ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn wrote on different subjects, though not many of his works have survived. Al-Najāšī compiled a list of various Šīʿah authors and their works, one of whom is al-Ḥusayn. From this list, we learn that al-Ḥusayn wrote several books. Imamah

538 Al-Ṭūsī, Al-Ghaybah, p. 320.
540 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 2, p. 502. (C.D Noor)
541 Al-Najāšī, Riǧīl Al-Najāšī, p. 261 and Al-Ṭūsī, Al-Ghaybah, p. 308. Al-Ṭūsī gave the detailed account in which he ‘remarried a young woman from Daylem’ and ‘she bore him three boys’.
wal Tabsirah is attributed to him, and it talks about Imamah and attributes of the Imams. He also wrote on Al-Manṭiq (the word can also be interpreted as philosophical logic or rhetoric), medicine Ṭebb, Monotheism al-Tawhīd, religious etiquette and rituals fiqh, such as Five Daily Prayers Kitāb al-Ṣalāt, on the etiquette at funerals al-Janā’z, marriage al-Nikāh, the pilgrimage al-Ḥajj, inheritance mawārī, and brotherhood al-Iḵwān.

Other works which influenced his father and which were passed on to his son Ibn Bābawayh included books on Imamah such as Reason for Rulings al-Šarāyeʿ and The Importance of Imamah Guidance from Confusion Al-Imamah wa l-Tabṣirah mina Al-Ḥīrah, and The Ascension Al-Miʿrāj, as well as books on traditions which were close in time to the sources (Qurb al-Isnād), and, finally, A Record of Uncommon Traditions (Imlāʿ al-Nawādir).543 He was an important figure within the Šīʿah community. There is a dispute over the year that ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn died. It was either 939/328 or 940/329. The Šīʿah scholars accept that al-Kulaynī died in the same year of wakīl ʿAlī al-Sāmerī, 939/328. He lived independently and had a shop in Qom, which was mentioned during his debate with Ibn al-Ḥallāj.544 One of Ibn Bābawayh sources al-Barqī’s al-Mahāsīn. Ibn Hajar al-Aʿsqalānī states that al-Barqī’s grandfather was alive during the rule of the Abbasid caliph al-Mu’taṣim (d. 841/227).545 Abū ʿAbdullah aḥmed b. Muḥammed b. Kālid al-Barqī (d. 893/280), whose his great-grandfather, Muḥammed b. ʿAlī was captured and imprisoned and then was killed, his son ʿAbdul-Raḥmān al-Barqī, fled Kūfa and took refuge in Qom during the capture of Zayd b. ʿAlī in 739/122.546 There are mixed views about how reliable he was. Ibn Bābawayh took a special interest in al-Barqī’s work of rijāl and wrote a commentary.547 Al-Kiššī describes al-Barqī’s ḥadīth near sound hasan qarīb al-Isnād and

---

543 Al-Najāṣī, Rijāl Al-Najāṣī, p. 261.  
544 Al-Ṭūsī, Al-Ḡaybah, p. 400.  
547 Al-Najāṣī, Rijāl Al-Najāṣī, p. 391.
classed him as commoner ʿāmi,\(^{548}\) whereas al-Najāšī categorised him as weak and unreliable in his Ḥadīṯ.\(^{549}\)

3.1.1 Choosing traditions of ʿAlī al-Riḍā

Ibn Bābawayh did not seem to clash with either the Muʿtazilite or any of the major Sunnī schools of thought. According to abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī (d. 1023/414), that during his time, the quarrel was between followers of Zaydī and Imāmī, and between followers of Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal (d. 855/241) and Muḥammed b. Jaʿrīr al-Ṭabarānī (d. 923/310).\(^{550}\) This indicates that there were no clashes between Sunnī asḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ and Shi‘a. Ibn Bābawayh would respond to Zaydī and not to Muʿtazilite nor followers of Ḥanbal and al-Ṭabarānī. For example, he narrated a tradition in al-Ḵiṣāl, the isnād from al-ʿAyyāsī who narrated similarly to al-Ṭabarānī who narrated from al-Layṯ b. Saʿad.\(^{551}\) The same tradition narrated by al-ʿUqaylī who was from asḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ they both link with same narrator ʿAlwān b. Dāwūd.\(^{552}\) He often relied on the responses of the eighth Imām ʿAlī al-Riḍā. More importantly, the two asḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ figures such as Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal (d. 855/241 A.H) or ʾĪsāq b. Rāḥawayh (d. 853/238 A.H), that they were impressed by the isnād of Imām al-Riḍā’s isnād.\(^{553}\) The two figures were known Ḥadīṯ compilers. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḥārī and Muslim

---

\(^{548}\) Al-Kīšī, Rijāl al-Kīšī, p. 129.  
\(^{549}\) Al-Najāšī, Rijāl al-Najāšī, p. 335.  
\(^{550}\) Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Imtāʿ wal Mūʿānasah, (Cairo: Matba‘ah Lujnāt al-Ta‘īf wa l-Tarjama, 1942), vol 2, p. 188.  
\(^{551}\) Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ḵiṣāl, vol 1, p. 171.  
\(^{552}\) An example of rāfīda traditions means, narrating that: Abū Bakr on his death bed regretted three things: sending group of fighters against the house of Faṭimah, accepted being the caliph and hid away in thī qiṣa when Kālid b. al-Walī attacked people of riddah.  
\(^{553}\) The isnād: Ḥadīth the sunnī asḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ from al-ʿUqaylī who narrated similarly to al-Ṭabarānī who narrated from al-Layṯ b. Saʿad. They both link with same narrator ʿAlwān b. Dāwūd. The same tradition narrated by al-ʿUqaylī who was from asḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ they both link with same narrator ʿAlwān b. Dāwūd. Al-ʿUqaylī who often relied on the responses of the eighth Imām ʿAlī al-Riḍā. More importantly, the two asḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ figures such as Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal (d. 855/241 A.H) or ʾĪsāq b. Rāḥawayh (d. 853/238 A.H), that they were impressed by the isnād of Imām al-Riḍā’s isnād. The two figures were known Ḥadīṯ compilers. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Buḥārī and Muslim.
both narrated from Ahmed b. Ḥanbal and Ishāq b. Rāhawayh.\textsuperscript{554} I infer that Ibn Bābawayh did not pay attention to al-Bukkārī nor Muslim, he is an Imāmī and his focus was on compiling the Ḥadīṯ of Imāms. Ṣuyūṭī Aḵbār al-Riḍā the work compiled more like a misnad but divided to topics.

3.1.2 Ṭabaqāt al-‘Ulamā’

What I mean by that is to what group of scholars of the faith does Ibn Bābawayh belongs to? More important was the relationship between Ibn Bābawayh and scholars of Ḥadīṯ from Sunni school of thought. This is a new field and has not been discussed before. For instance, when Ibn Bābawayh narrated from well-known Sunnī figures such as al-Daynūrī and al-‘Askarī, however, when he visited Bağdād he specifically narrated traditions with chain of isnād from the city of Qom that were unfamiliar to the Sunnīs.\textsuperscript{555} During Ibn Bābawayh’s visit to Naysāpūr narrated from abū Naṣr Ahmed al-Mawānī al-Naysāpurī al-Ḍibbī (d. 990/380 A.H) and described him as anti-Imams nāṣibī.\textsuperscript{556} Ibn Bābawayh was not included in Naysāpur authors such as al-Ṭa‘ālibī’s list, but was included by others. We know from his introduction after his visit to Naysāpur Ibn Bābawayh was not happy about how doubtful the Šīʿah in Naysāpur, when he returned then wrote his Kamāl al-Dīn.\textsuperscript{556} Ibn Bābawayh did not seem to narrate from known authors from Naysāpur. To find out more about Ibn Bābawayh and to clear the ambiguity. I have selected 5 figures and one of them from Naysāpur known al-Ḍibbī that he interacted with in his traditions. The five figures were respected and prominent figures within the Muslim community, such as: al-Ja‘ābī, abū Bakr al-Sunnī al-Daynūrī, abī Hilāl al-‘Askarī, al-Ḍibbī and al-Ḵalīl b. Ahmed al-Sajzī.

\textsuperscript{554} Al-Ḍahabi, Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’, vol 9, pp. 436 and 548.
\textsuperscript{555} Al-Ḳatib Al-Bağdādī, Tārīḵ Bağdād, vol 3, p. 303.
\textsuperscript{556} Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ma‘ānī, p. 56., and ‘Ilal al-Šarāye, vol 1, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{557} Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 3.
a) Abū Bakr Muḥammed b. 'Umar al-Jaʿābī al-Baḡdādī (d. 965/355), al-Ḥākim too narrated from al-Jaʿābī. 558 Al-Jaʿābī had a debate with abū al-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī in the court of wazīr Ibn al-ʿAmīd. 559 Abū Bakr al-Jaʿābī one of the teachers of ḥadīṣ, both Ibn Bābawayh and al-Ḥākim al-Naysāpūrī who met, sat and narrated ḥadīṣ from him. 560 Al-Ḵāṭīb al-Baḡdādī states that al-Jaʿābī was well known for his sharp and quick response while al-Ṭabarānī known for his memorisation of ḥadīṣ. 561 Al-Jaʿābī was considered reliable trustworthy in al-Ṭūṣī Fihrist. 562 Ibn Bābawayh narrates from abū Bakr al-Jaʿābī directly. 563 However, there is no record that Ibn Bābawayh narrated from al-Ṭabarānī. I counted the number of times Ibn Bābawayh narrated from al-Jaʿābī in 6 of his works al-Ḵiṣāl, ʿUyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā, Al-Tawḥīd, Kamāl al-Dīn, Maʿānī al-Aḵbār and al-Amālī: 132 times. 564

b) Abū Bakr al-Sunnī al-Daynūrī (d. 974/364 A.H), 565 a well-known muḥaddīṣ, narrated from him directly traditions mainly about Imām ʿAḥmad b. Ḥanāfī. 566 He must have known him when Ibn al-ʿAmīd was wazīr. Al-Daynūrī was the judge of Rayy (before al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād became wazīr) who summarised Sunan of al-Nasāʿī. 567 When Ibn Bābawayh speaks about Prophetic sayings he says I heard from al-Daynūrī who was from Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ. 568 Ibn Bābawayh wrote on the same topic with al-Daynūrī, 569

---

560 Al-Ḥākim, Maʿīfah ʿUlām al-Hadīth, p. 188.
562 Al-Ṭūṣī, Al-Fihrist, p. 114.
568 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 28.
for example, *masḵ*, and he supported his response with Imam al-Riḍā reply to one of his students, *masḵ*, will be discussed further in 4.7.

c) The philologist al-Ḥasan b. Saʿīd al-ʿAskarī (d. 992/382 A.H), Ibn Bābawayh often consults al-ʿAskarī and sometimes narrates Ḥadīth from him. He asked him about the interpretation of the verse (39:67): “On the Day of Resurrection the whole of the earth will be grasped by His Hand and the heavens will be rolled up in His Right Hand”. He asked him about what Imam Ṭalib meant by saying “*taqamašaḥa*”, he replied meaning wore it like a clock, in different Ḥadīth he asked him about what Fāṭimah meant in saying “*lafadat-hum*”. Al-ʿAskarī was a leading figure in his expertise *riʿāsat al-taḥadduṭ*. Al-Samʿānī described him as a well-known figure not only in collecting traditions and in collecting odd *aḵbār* (*ahad aʿimah al-adab wa ẓāḥib al-aḵbār wa l-nawādir*). Some of the al-ʿAskarī work available today talks about errors made by narrators (*aḵțāʾ al-Muḥaddīṭūn*). He was respected by al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād, who wrote a poem mourning his death.

d) Abū Naṣr Aḥmed al-Marwānī al-Naysāpūrī al-Ḍibbī (d. 990/380 A.H), he states that “… although al-Marwānī was *nāsibī* but narrated that the souls of the Prophet and Ṭalib were together as one entity existed before the creation, and they were on the

---

570 He asked him about the interpretation of the verse (39:67): “On the Day of Resurrection the whole of the earth will be grasped by His Hand and the heavens will be rolled up in His Right Hand”. Ibn Bābawayh, *al-Tawḥīd*, p. 160.


572 He also asked him about what Fāṭimah meant in saying “*lafadathum*”, Ibn Bābawayh, *Maʿānī al-ʿAḵbār*, p. 356.


right side of God’s throne.  

In Naysāpūr, narrated from al-Ḍībī.  

Ibn Bābawayh stated that he met al-Ḍībī and narrated from him several Ḥadīṯ in: al-Tawḥīd, ‘Uyūn Ākbār al-Riḍā, Maʿānī al-Ākbār and illal al-Šarāye’.  

Likewise abū Naʿīm al-Aṣbahānī narrated from al-Ḍībī that ‘Āʾiša had said: ‘gazing on the face of ‘Alī is an act of worship’. Al-Ḍāḥabī stated that al-Ḍībī died in 990/380 A.H. However, it was not recognised by biographers that Ibn Bābawayh was one of al-Ḍībī’s narrators.

e) Al-Ḵalīl b. Aḥmed al-Sajzī (d. 988/378), according to the biographer al-Ṭaʾālibī that al-Sajzī was a well-known ḥanafī judge of Naysāpūr. Al-Ḥākim narrated from al-Sajzī.  

It is worth mentioning that Ibn Bābawayh narrated from al-Ḵalīl b. Aḥmed al-Sajzī, while other Ṣī’ah did not narrate from him.

f) It is worth mentioning there is a common source between Ibn Bābawayh and the figure al-Ḵaṭṭābī abī Sulaimān aḥmed b. Muḥammed (d. 998/388 A.H) both followed the interpretation of philologist Muḥammed b. Bahār al-Šaybānī (d. before 941/330 A.H). Ibn Bābawayh openly stated in his illal al-Šarāye’ on the topic of ‘the superiority of prophets and Imams over angels’ (min qawl muḍaḍilū al-Anbīyā’ wa l-Rusul ‘ala al-Malāʾ ikah).

---

582 Al-Ṭaʾālibī, Yatīmat al-Dahar, (Egypt: Matba’ah al-Husaynīyah, 1934), vol 4, p. 313.  
584 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ḵiṣāl, vol 1, pp. 32, 73, 74, 75, 84, 121, 144, 163, 198, 266 and vol 2 p. 340.  
From the above examples, I infer that not to underestimate Ibn Bābawayh’s social status that which enabled him to have direct access to aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth, jurists and judges. The only work that he wrote and was recognised by his contemporary al-Hidāyah and al-I’tiqādāt and both works were about presenting Imāmī doctrine and topics of fiqh. Then after his death, several books became accessible to the followers of the faith. I infer that these books were no more than references to what he said in his two books.

The time and context in which Ibn Bābawayh lived were clearly challenging, and it reflected on his works. His contemporaries were some thinkers, jurists and biographers (also, aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth I will discuss in next section) such as: al-Tawḥīdī al-Imtā’ wa al-Mu’ānasa, Qāḍī ’abdul Jabbār al-Mu’tazilī al-Mugnī fī Abwāb al-Tawḥīd wa l-’adl, Ibn al-Nadīm al-Fihrist and al-Ṣāḥib b. ’Abbād al-Zaydiyah, I found they are the closest to what was going on in Ibn Bābawayh’s time.

3.1.3 Where do Ibn Bābawayh fits in with his contemporaries?

It is worth looking at the Sunnī narrators who took Ḥadīth from Ibn Bābawayh as narrator. Several famous Sunnī figures met and described Ibn Bābawayh. This has not been discussed in any other modern research that I am aware of. First, al-Ḥākim, who was a judge of Naysāpūr, narrated in his History of Naysāpūr, narrated from his teacher, ‘Alī Ibn Muḥammed al-Muḍakir, and his teacher narrated from Ibn Bābawayh. His teacher narrated the same ḥadīth as Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Ḥākim gave the full name of Ibn Bābawayh – Muḥammed Ibn ‘Alī Ibn Ḥusayn al-Rāzī and called him ‘the lawyer’ (faqīh). Second, al-Ḵaṭīb al-Baḍā’ī mentions Ibn Bābawayh as one of the famous Șī’ah figures who came to Baḍā’ī and narrated traditions about Imam Ja’far al-Ṣādiq and

---

586 There was a one figure in neighbouring city, Ašbāhān, who, though he did not meet or directly describe Ibn Bābawayh, is still of interest. Abū Na’īm al-Ašbāhānī (d. 1038/430) narrated the same ḥadīth as Ibn Bābawayh, but Al-Ašbāhānī did not narrate the full ḥadīth, the names were missing. However, Ibn Bābawayh gave the full details of the names of the Sunnī figures Ahmed Ibn Hanbal and Ishāq Ibn Rāhawayh who met with Imam ‘Alī Al-Riḍā. Abū Na’īm al-Ašbāhānī, Ḥulayṭ Al-Awliyā’, (Beirut: Dār Al-Fikr, n.d), vol 3, p. 192.

addressed Ibn Bābawayh as faqīh from Rayy (al-faqīh al-Rāzī),\footnote{Al-Ḵaṭīb Al-Bağdādī, Tārīḵ Bağdād, vol 3, p. 37.} faqīh which is different from muḥaddīt and then described him as one of rejecters scholars Šaika min šuyūḵ al-Rāfīdah.\footnote{Ibid.} Al-Bağdādī states that the narrators of isnād of these traditions told by Ibn Bābawayh were not recognised (majhūlūn) by the Sunnī biographers.\footnote{Al-Najāšī, Rijāl Al-Najāšī, p. 389.} Al-Bağdādī stated that his teacher, named al-Naʿālī, who met Ibn Bābawayh (possibly during Ibn Bābawayh’s visit to Bağdād in 965/355),\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh, vol 1, p. 139.} asked if he could narrate a ḥadīṯ from the Prophet. Ibn Bābawayh replied: “I heard my father who heard from Ḥaḍīṯ Al-Qommī, who heard his father, from Ḥusayn b. Aḥmed b. Muḥammed b. Ṭaḥlī al-Naʿālī, who met Ibn Bābawayh (possibly during Ibn Bābawayh’s visit to Bağdād in 965/355),\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh, vol 1, p. 139.} Ḥusayn b. Aḥmed b. Muḥammed b. Ṭaḥlī al-Naʿālī, who met Ibn Bābawayh (possibly during Ibn Bābawayh’s visit to Bağdād in 965/355), and then described him as one of rejecters scholars Šaiḵ min šuyūḵ al-Rāfīdah.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh, vol 1, p. 139.} Al-Bağdādī then commented that none of the names in the isnād were familiar to us except Jaʿfar b. Muḥammed. The chain of transmitters isnād, between Ibn Bābawayh and the sixth Imam Jaʿfar b. Muḥammed were unknown majjhūl to Sunnī narrators.\footnote{Al-Ḵaṭīb Al-Bağdādī, Tārīḵ Bağdād, vol 3, p. 303.} Third, abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī describes Ibn Bābawayh, ‘I have never met anyone from the older generation Shayḵan greater and more expert in knowledge than Ibn Bābawayh’.\footnote{Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Ṣadāqa wa l-Ṣadīq, (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Muʿāṣir, 1998), p. 169.} Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, in his work, states that he heard Ibn Bābawayh the scholar who narrated ḥadīṯ from Imam Jaʿfar.\footnote{Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Ṣadāqa wa l-Ṣadīq, (Beirut: Dār al-Fikr al-Muʿāṣir, 1998), p. 169.}

3.1.4 Number of students

There are not many Sunnī narrators who took ḥadīṯ from Ibn Bābawayh nor they have engaged in writing refutations against Ibn Bābawayh. Among those who narrated from Ibn Bābawayh such as al-ハウスayn b. Aḥmed b. Muḥammed b. Ṭalḥa al-Naʿālī and Ḥaḍīṯ Al-Qommī.
Muḥammed al-Muḍakir.\textsuperscript{596} He did not seem to have a large following. However, he was recognised by his large collection of ḥadīth,\textsuperscript{597} and was a known figure in the Buwayhī court who received hostility from Zaydī.\textsuperscript{598} According to Al-Ḍahabī and al-Ṭūsī, there are 5 main narrators from Ibn Bābawayh and only one student. Al-Ḍahabī listed 3: Ibn al-Nuʿmān al-Mufīd, al-Ḥusayn b. ʿabdullah b. al-Faḥām (al-Ḡaḍāʾīrī) and Jaʿfar b. al-Ḥasan b. Ḥasaka al-Qommī. Al-Ṭūsī added ʿAlī b. Aḥmed b. al-ʿAbbās al-Najašī (father of al-Najašī) and abū Zakariya Muḥammed b. Sulaymān al-Ḥimrānī.\textsuperscript{599} Al-Ṭubkī in his ʿTabaqāt al-Ṣāfi ʿiyah al-Kubra and Al-Bağdādī in his Tarīkh Bağdād they narrates that ʿAlī b. Muhammad al-Muḍakir narrated from Ibn Bābawayh faqih al-Rāzī.\textsuperscript{600} Al-Bağdādī narrated from Muḥammed b. Ṭalḥa al-Naʿālī (d. 413 A.H) who narrated from Ibn Bābawayh, this time called Ibn Bābawayh al-ʿammī (العمي) instead of al-Qommī (القمي).\textsuperscript{601} Al-Mufīd narrated ḥadīth from Ibn Bābawayh but was against his creed. Whereas al-Ḡaḍāʾīrī and father of al-Najašī their main work based on a biography of books such as the permission to narrate his ḥadīth (ijaza), they relied on Ibn Bābawayh as one of their sources.\textsuperscript{602}

In summary, Ibn Bābawayh was recognised as an important figure to be part of the Rukn al-Dawlāh court and was pushed aside when wazir b. ʿAbbād came in charge of Rayy. Ibn Bābawayh had students from both Sunnī and Šīʿah. Ibn Bābawayh wrote books and these books survived till al-Ḍahabī time. Ibn Bābawayh was specifically challenged by al-Mufīd a well-known figure. Interest in Ibn Bābawayh was lessened until the Safawī era. He is back as a topic of refutation and dispute. Ibn Bābawayh ḥadīth were identical to his contemporaries Sunnī figures. Ibn Bābawayh narrates the same ḥadīth by abī Naʿīm al-

\textsuperscript{596} Al-Ḵāṭīb al-Bağdādī, Tāriḵ Bağdād, vol 3, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{597} Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 242.
\textsuperscript{598} Al-Tawḥīdī, Aḥqāq al-Wazīrayn, p. 89.
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Aṣbahānī and al-Ṭabarānī,603 who were contemporary to Ibn Bābawayh.604 Likewise, Sunni figures such as al-Ḥākim al-Naysāpurī have narrated from Ibn Bābawayh through ‘Alī b. Muhammad al-Muṭakir.605 In both examples, the ḥadīths exist in Ibn Bābawayh work.606 Al-Mufīd does not hold Ibn Bābawayh responsible for narrating ḥadīths that did not coincide with Imāmī creed, simply he treats him as a non-thinking compiler of ḥadīths (aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth). He excused him from going through every single ḥadīth content and deciding whether they reflect Imāmī creed or not. His main job was to make sure they were transmitted with a sound chain of isnād.607 The majority of his work was transmitted by his student al-Mufīd to al-Ṭūsī to al-ʿimād abī al-Ṣimsām to Faḍlū-llah b. ‘Alī al-Rāwūndī to al-Burhān Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī to Ahmed b. Yusuf al-ʿArīḍ al-ʿAlawī to the father of ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī to ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī.608 ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī describes Ibn Bābawayh as a chief author and trustworthy. Al-Ḏahabī here mentioned the names of those who narrated from Ibn Bābawayh. All were Șīʿah, showing that Ibn Bābawayh was not recognised by Sunni traditionalists. Al-Najaṣī and al-Ǧaḍāʾīrī’s work did not survive except for one. While in the case of Jaʿfar al-Qommī and Muḥammed al-Ḥimrānī, none of their works survive. Out of the five students, only al-Mufīd’s work survived. Indeed, it is hard to gauge what Ibn Bābawayh had said without going back to al-Mufīd.

3.1.5 Ibn Bābawayh Faqīḥ/Buwayhid/Rāfiḍī

Biographers including Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Sāmʿānī, and al-Ḏahabī: 1) Ibn al-Nadīm (d. ~990/380 A.H) completed his Fihrist in 377 A.H.609 He lists Șīʿah as the fifth maḥṣub between Dāwūūd (al-Ẓāhirī) and al-muḥaddīṭūn (Ahmed b. Ḥanbal and al-Buḵārī). Ibn Bābawayh was alive when Ibn al-Nadīm completed his index Fihrist. He mentioned him
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605 Al-Subkī, T., Ṭabqaqt Al-Sāfiʿa Al-Kubra, (Jeeza: Hajar Lil-Tibaʾa wa l-Naṣr, 1992), vol 1, p. 119.
twice. He describes him as the author of *al-Hidāyah*, as something was known, and the second time as the narrator of his father’s books. He describes the father ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn as *faqīh*.\(^{610}\) He stated that he read from the handwriting of abī Ja’far Muḥammed b. ‘Alī (Ibn Bābawayh) giving a permission ijāza to someone to narrate the 18 kitāb by Ibn Bābawayh and to narrate his father’s 200 kitāb.\(^{611}\) Ibn al-Nadīm under the title: “Zaydīyah” include Ibn Bābawayh, Ibn Bābawayh’s father, wazīr ibn al-Ja’ābī, al-‘Ayāšī, Ibn al-Junyad, and al-Mufīd.\(^{612}\) However, he did not mention al-Kulaynī at all. It is most likely adding them under the Zaydī section, he saw them working with the Buwayhids, whose ideology was considered Zaydī’s. He listed Šīʿah theologians, traditionalists and scholars (fuqahā’ al-Šīʿah, muḥaddīṭūn wa ulamā’uhm), such as al-Barqī, Yunus b. ‘abdul-Raḥmān, and the teacher of Ibn Bābawayh Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Walīd (d. 954/343).\(^{613}\)

2) Al-Sāmʿānī (d. 1166/562 A.H) in his al-Ansāb stated that Ibn Bābawayh visited Bağdad and narrated his father traditions who was one of the elites Šuyūk al-Šīʿah and famous rejector rāfiḍī, narrated from Ibn Bābawayh the figure Muḥammed b. Ṭalḥa al-Naʿālī”.\(^{614}\) Again similar to *Fihrist* there is no mentioning of Ibn Bābawayh’s books other than his father’s.

### 3.2 Modes of Expression

Al-Mufīd describes Ibn Bābawayh as people (or follower) of ḥadīth (*Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth*).\(^{615}\) Whereas Ibn al-Nadīm (Muḥammed b. Ishāq) (d. 995/385) addresses him as narrators of *fiqh* but not ḥadīth.\(^{616}\) He describes ‘Alī b. al-Hussein (Ibn Bābawayh’s father) as *faqīh*.\(^{617}\) and in different topic included Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan b. al-Walīd (the teacher of Ibn

---
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Bābawayh) under the title ‘Ṣīʿah lawyers fuqahā’, narrators and scholars’ (Fuqahāʾ al-Ṣīʿa wa muḥaddithūhum wa ‘Ulamāʾihim ... wa yaḥtawī ‘ala Aḵbār fuqahāʾ al-Ṣīʿa wa Asmāʾ mā ṣanāfūhū min al-Kutub). He included Ibn Bābawayh and al-Muḵfīd under the title: ‘about scholars and their books (fī Aḵbār al-ʿUlamāʾ wa Asmāʾ mā ṣanāfūhū min al-Kutub).

Whereas Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ he listed names from earlier generations such as Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal (d. 855/241 A.H) the author of kitāb al-Musnad and Muḥammed b. Ismāʿīl al-Buḵārī (d. 870/256 A.H), the author of kitāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ, and Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Naysāpūrī (d. 875/261 A.H), the author of kitāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ.

Those who were classed as Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ and contemporary to Ibn Bābawayh they travelled to compile Ḥadīṯ however science of Ḥadīṯ was developed yet, it was left to the compiler discretion. Al-Muḵfīd then added that Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ their sole purpose to gather as much as possible Ḥadīṯ without sifting and filtering the Ḥadīṯ. A century later al-Ḵaṭīb al-Bağdādī (d. 1071/463 A.H) talks about compilers of Ḥadīṯ in the same way, stating that a group of dedicated people have dedicated their time traveling crossing deserts and cities to collect Prophetic Ḥadīṯ that has a closer chain of isnād from the Prophet (ʿalā min al-Isnād), for the purpose making juristic decisions. Then added, however, they did not know whether the person they travelled to was worth it, has sounding memory and knew well who the previous person was before collecting his Ḥadīṯ from, likewise whether he in his life kept to high morals and did not indulge in sinning. These who are recognised as scholars of Ḥadīṯ such as al-Ḥākim (abī ʿAbdullah Muḥammed b. ʿabdullah al-Ḥākim al-Naysāpūrī (d. 1014/405) had his own criterion. For example, in his book ‘knowing science of Ḥadīṯ’ (maʿrifat ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīṯ) stated that after seeing an increase compiling of Ḥadīṯ and parallel to it there was an increase of corrupted ideologies, he noticed there was a decrease

---
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of knowledge in the basics of practice (*Uṣūl al-Sunan*) he decided to compile a book that can explains in a simplified way to the science of Ḥadīth (ʿilm al-Ḥadīth). Then added that *aṣḥāb al-ḥadīth* have a specific order of topics, the opening of their Ḥadīṯ should start with ‘action by intention’ (*al-Aʿmāl bil Nīyāt*), then ‘God bless the one who listens to my words and understand them’, (*naẓar Allahu amran samiʿa maqāliṭī fa-Waʿāhā*), then ‘God descend to lower heaven to hear those who call on him’ (*yanzilu Allah kul layla ila al-Samāʾ al-Dunyā*), and ….. ‘souls are together and when they are on earth they recognise each other...’ (*al-Arwāḥ junūd mujannadah*).

3.2.1 Aḵbārī

None of the 10th century figures such as Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Mufīd, al-Tawḥīdī described Ibn Bābawayh as aḵbārī. The term aḵbārī described as an informants or narrator of an events. Ibn al-Nadīm, the term aḵbārī more precisely a narrator of events, whereas muḥaddīt narrator of Prophet’s Ḥadīṯ/traditions for a juristic reason. Ibn al-Nadīm gives the distinctions between aḵbārī and muḥaddīt, and between lawyer muḥaddīt and lawyer Šīʿah muḥaddīt. He gave 3 different titles. Under a section called ‘Informants, lineage and events narrators’ (*fī aḵbār al-aḵbāriyyīn wa l-nassābin wa aṣḥāb al-ḥadāṯ wa l-āyāt*). He stated that although Mujālid b. Saʿīd b. ʿUmayr a narrator of aḵbār and heard Ḥadīṯ, but he was considered as unreliable by the muḥaddīṭīn. Ibn al-Nadīm then gives the list of aḵbārī, such as abū al-Faraj al-Asfahānī (d. 967/356 A.H) the author of *kitāb al-Aḡānī*, Muḥammed b. ʿUmar al-Wāqidī (d. 823/207 A.H) the author of *kitāb al-Tārīḵ wal Maḡāzī*, he was a Šīʿah but pretend not to be, abū Muḥṣaf b. Lūṭ (d. 774/157 A.H) the author of *kitāb al-Ridda* he was again Šīʿah and his grandfather was one of the companions of Imam

ʿAlī b. abī Ṭālib.629 The term ḵabar mentioned on title of Ibn Bābawayh’s work such as: ‘the meaning of what the Imāms said’ (Maʾānī al-ʾAḵbār),630 and ‘the precise news’ about Imām al-Riḍā’ (ʿUyūn aḵbār Al-ʾRiḍā). A century and a half later al-Šahrastānī (d. 1153/548 A.H) stated that the Imāmīyah were divided into two groups: Muʿtazila and aḵbāriyah. Then added that the aḵbāriyah are divided into two mušabbiha and salafīyah.631 There was no mentioning of who were the aḵbāriyah.

3.2.2 Ḥašawī

Al-Mufīd objected to Ibn Bābawayh and described him to be ḥašawī based on his own doctrine. He argued that Ibn Bābawayh fell in trap of odd interpretations that were falsely attributed to Imams.632 Then discredit the reliability of his compiled Ḥadīṯ and describe him as compiler of Imams’ Ḥadīṯ, when the majority of their saying was not true to what they believe in it was sayings when they lived in state of fear.633 The term ḥašawī was not new. The historian and traveller al-Masʿūdī (d. 957/346 A.H) describes both the followers of Ḥadīṯ as ḥašawīyah,634 in same way he describes followers of philosophy in Ḥarrān as ḥašawīyah al-Falasifa.635 Al-Faḍl b. Šāḏān (d. 873/260) in his al-ʾĪḍāb quote from al-Jāḥiẓ describing followers of the texts aṣḥāb al-ḥadīṯ as ḥašawīyah. He argued that they would attack those who do not follow the text by describing them qadarī, Muʿtazila and sometimes calling them mulḥid for contradicting the Qur’anic text based on following prophets' stories who have committed major sins in the past.636 Again the term ḥašawī used by Ibn al-Nadīm to describe the aṣḥāb al-ḥadīṯ such as ʿabdu-ʾllah b. Muḥammed b. Kulāb al-Qaṭṭān was ḥašawī.637
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3.2.3 Ġulāt

Ibn Bābawayh and al-Mufīd uses the term ‘ġulāt’ but in opposite ways. Who Ibn Bābawayh says is ġulāt, al-Mufīd would, on the contrary, say is a believer and reliable narrator of Ḥadīṯ. Ibn Bābawayh when narrating a Ḥadīṯ in front of a Sunni narrator would narrate using isnād from Qom, as a way to say that they are reliable narrators, whereas al-Mufīd calls the people of the city of Qom ġulāt. Ibn Bābawayh uses the term ġulāt for those who claim that the prophets and Imams were infallible.638 He uses the term ‘extremist’ (ġulāt) for those who believe in infallible Imams and claim the right to leadership because they claim a relationship with the infallible Imam.639 This is because, to him, Imams are ordinary beings and God does not intervene in human’s life. He criticises his position about infallibility, he claims that Ibn Bābawayh adopted a philosophical interpretation by interpreting the soul as eternal, similar to exaggerators (ġulāt) who interpret the Imam’s souls as eternal.640 For al-Mufīd, eternity of the soul can only lead to the analogy that the soul of the Imams is eternal and has no beginning and is not created corporeal (ḥudūṯ). Thus, al-Mufīd argues that eternity of the soul makes the cosmological Imam in charge of and delegated responsibility (tafwīḍ) for both what exists and what happens on the earth.641 That is, Imams become partners with God because they are part of the first emanation and therefore are responsible for everything to come. Here al-Mufīd is criticizing Ibn Bābawayh claiming that he thinks the twelve were literally present with God in the beginning. Ibn Bābawayh, however, explains Imamah as the good aspect of human nature that all humans shares. It originated from the first intellect. He did not believe what al-Mufīd accused him of believing. He did not believe in twelve literal Imams circling around God. Al-Mufīd did not recognise that Ibn Bābawayh distinguished between soul

639 Ibid., vol 1, p. 359.
and spirit. Spirit can only be inherited from the prophet through lineage; by contrast, everyone has a soul, the will to do good. There is a second way al-Mufīd misunderstood Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Mufīd did not recognise that he distinguished between soul and personality. For Ibn Bābawayh, the soul/energy all humanity, including the twelve Imams and all the prophets of history, emanated from God in the beginning of creation. This is parallel to al-Rāzī, but al-Rāzī called the soul *nafs*. For Ibn Bābawayh the soul or energy combines with faculties such as intelligence to create a unique personality with a name and an identity. Al-Mufīd, however, did not make this fine distinction between soul and faculty and spirit. Al-Mufīd thought that Ibn Bābawayh argued that the literal ‘Alī, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn were all together with God at the beginning. If Ibn Bābawayh had believed that he would have been extremist. But he did not.

3.3 Ibn Bābawayh and His Times

The last visit of Ibn Bābawayh to Bağdād was recorded in 966/355. The Sunnī Ḥanbalī, al-Ḵaṭīb al-Bağdādī (d. 1071/463 A.H), narrated a particular ḥadīṯ from his teacher who had received it from Ibn Bābawayh in Bağdād, then commented at the end of the ḥadīṯ that all the members of the chain of narrators between Ibn Bābawayh and the sixth Imam Ja’far al-Ṣādiq were unknown including Ibn Bābawayh’s father. Imam Ja’far al-Ṣādiq narrated from his forefathers from the Prophet that those who take extra precautions for tomorrow make bad companions for death [i.e. prepare well so you will not die before your time].

أخبرنا محمد بن طلحة بن محمد، حدثنا أبو جعفر محمد بن علي بن الحسين بن بابويه العمي إملاه،
حدثني أبي، حدثنا علي بن إبراهيم، عن أبيه عن الحسين بن يزيد التوفلي، عن إسماعيل بن مسلم،
عن جعفر بن محمد، عن أبيه. قال: قال رسول الله (صلى الله عليه وسلم): من عديجا من أجله فقد
أسماء صحبة الموت. من دون جعفر بن محمد كلهم مجهولون.⁶⁴³
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The Ḥadīth it is in *Man Lā Yahdurutu Al-Faqīh* tradition. Ibn Bābawayh must have wanted to impress narrators in Bağdād by reciting traditions that were not from mainstream Ṣī`ah. Ḥasan al-Musawī al-Ḵūrasānī states that throughout past 9 centuries the four Uṣūl (al-Uṣūl al-Arba`a: al-Kāfī, *Man Lā Yahdurutu Al-Faqīh*, Tahdīh al-Tahdīh, and *Istibsār*) they received respect and admiration from within the community as a source for religious rulings (*akhām*) and hence these books have survived. He states that according to al-Ṣāīk Sulaymān al-Māḥūzī al-Bahrānī (d. 1709/1121 A.H) accepted ḥaddīṣ narrated by Ibn Bābawayh that had no chain of isnād *marāṣīl ḥaddīṣ* as authentic ḥaddīṣ. Scholars such as al-ʿAllama al-Ḥillī, al-Ṣāḥīd al-Ṭānī and al-Muḥaqiq Mir-Dāmād. Mir-Dāmād (d. 1631/1041 A.H), states that in his book *al-Rawāsīḥ al-Samāwīyah*, his sources about Rijāl he relied on the work al-Kīssī, Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ṭūsī, al-Najāshī and Ibn Ţāwūs al-Ḥillī. When Mir-Dāmād discussing the tradition of ḍū al-Yadayn that Ibn Bābawayh narrated in his defence of rejecting of infallibility. He describes Ibn Bābawayh as the pillar of Islam.

3.3.1 The Caliphate Attitude Towards the Ṣī`ah

The close relationship between the caliphate and the Ṣī`ah community continued successfully. Ibn Bābawayh visited Bağdād twice in 963/352. There, Ibn Bābawayh gave his verdict that the day of ḡādir *kum* has no foundation in religious value, therefore, there is no compulsory prayer day of ḡādir *kum*. During Buwayhid rule, they sympathised with the Ṣī`ah when the ‘eid al-ḡādir occurred in the year 963/352 when Mu`z al-Dawlah in Bağdād promulged a law to celebrate ‘eid al-ḡādir. Mu'awiyah, the enemy of the first Imam 'Alī, could be cursed openly and the mourning of the death of Imam al-Ḥusayn was
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Soon Ibn Bābawayh had to deal with issues such as clashes between Sunnī and Šīʿah. The mourning of Šīʿah over Ḥusayn took place in the same year 964/353. The Šīʿah of Bağdād called for a major mourning day and cursing of Sunnī figures for siding with the killers of Ḥusayn. Consequently, this started a major clash between the two communities. In the same year, Muḥammed b. Ḥusayn claimed to be the Mahdi and had a large crowd following him. Ibn Bābawayh in 966/355 visited Bağdād again. At this time, he began to compile two of his books, ‘The Traits of Character’ (al-Ḵiṣāl), and Monotheism (al-Tawḥīd). In the year 963/352, he started al-Ḵiṣāl, and in 965/354 started al-Tawḥīd. Ibn Bābawayh’s second journey to Bağdād was more important. During the reign of Muʿz al-Dawlah, Ibn Bābawayh made it his mission to meet with a group of Šīʿah figures, including al-Mufīd and Najāšī’s father.

It is important to understand that each of the different ruling dynasties had its philosophical schools and/or ideologies. To win the backing of the crowds, they had had to have convincing, solid ideologies that could stand up to neighbouring rival philosophical and political movements. Thus, to begin with, there was a 10th-century transition of the attitude of the Caliphate from favouring traditionalist Ḥanbalīs towards favouring the Šīʿah. Al-Qāhir (brother of al-Muqtadir) (932/320-934/322), al-Qāhir was different from his brother Al-Muqtadir, close to the Šīʿah and distant from the Sunnīs. He also allowed the cursing of Muʿāwīyah, then gave the order that any gathering between two Sunnī Ḥanbalī followers of al-Barbahārī (d. 940/329) was captured and imprisoned. Iʿtizāl (Muʿtazila) and the rejection of the companions associated with the Buwayhid.
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transition sent a message that the Caliph had left the Ḥanbalīs and instead would allow the Muʿtazilites to participate in official life and become Muftīs and Judges. We will find that the cursing of abū Bakr and ʿUmar was also a sign to allow the inclusion of the Imāmī Shīʿah taking part in political roles. For example, abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aḥmed (d. 1009/400) the father of Šarīf al-Raḍī and Murtuḍa became the ambassador ‘saḥīf’ of al-Ṭālibīyīn responsible for pilgrimage to and from Mecca during Muʿz al-Dawlah and Bahāʾ al-Dawlah called him al-Ṭāhir al-Ahwād. He was made an ambassador between the caliph and Buwayhid’s rulers. In year 956/345 a fight took place between the two cities Qom and Aṣbahān. In Qom cursing the Prophet’s companion was normal practice, whereas in the city of Aṣbahān predominantly Sunnī they saw them as rightly guided companions. The Sultan Rukn al-Dawlah got involved and sent an army to stop the bloodshed, but the Sultan sided with Qom. The Caliphate’s new title was given by Muʿz al-Dawlah to al-Faḍil b. al-Muqtadir and the Abbasid Caliphate now became merely nominally engaged with the state. Muʿz al-Dawlah chose to keep the Caliphate under the family of the Abbasid instead of the house of ʿAlī since, according to Ibn Kaṭīr, they thought that having a weak Caliph with the popular appeal was better than a powerful Caliph who could have had Muʿz al-Dawlah at his mercy. The Abbasid Caliphate politically struggled to maintain power, in part because the Ḥanbalīs, as an ideology, were literalists and did not have any convincing philosophical or scientific arguments to back up the caliphate. Examples of struggling Caliphs include the Caliph al-Muqtadir (who ruled between 908/295-932/320), there was coup and the brother al-Qāhir (933/321-934/322), al-Raḍī (son of al-Muqtadir) (934/322-940/328), al-Mutaqī (son of al-Muqtadir) (940/328-945/333), and al-
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Mustakfī (945/333-946/334). However, during the era of the Buwayhid dynasty, the Abbasid Caliphs became more stable, with the assistance of the Shī‘ah and the Mu‘tazilites, in the Caliphate. Examples include the al-Muṭī’ son of al-Muqtadir (946/334-973/362) and al-Ṭā‘i (973/362-991/381). For example, in 360 ǧāḥḍ (Šī‘ah anti-Sunnī) became in control of east and west Syria and Egypt and the Sunna disappeared for a while. Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī argued that during 980/370 A.H maḏhab al-Taʿṣayyū (Šī‘ah) was widespread to the point the famous ‘Alī b. ʿīsa al-Rumānī (d. 994/384 A.H) who had to hide his identity Sunnī maḏhab and practice taqīyah and write books in favour of Šī‘ah maḏhab.

3.3.2 The Buwayhids

The father of the Buwayhids was Abū Šujā’ Buwayh, a fisherman who lived humbly. Abū Šujā’ was from Fars (Persia), where the Zaydī al-ʿAṭrūsh ruled successfully until his death. Abū Šujā’’s lineage goes back to the Persian Malik (King) Yazdajard, son of Hirmiz. Abū Šujā’ and his sons were part of the army that gradually gained position and finally rebelled against the commander Mardād-beḵ (Mardawīj king of Daylem). The Buwayhid family were Šī‘ah Zaydīs by doctrine, that is, they believed that because Imam ʿAlī had accepted the rule of abū Bakr, a person inferior to himself, they too can do the same. Thus, they ruled from behind the throne. They did not claim either the Caliphate, or to have come from ‘Alī’s lineage, neither did they remove the Abbasid Caliph completely from the throne but made the Caliph merely a figurehead. Al-ʿAṭrūsh had a great influence on the Buwayhids. The first successful Šī‘ah movement to make it to the status of the Caliphate office in Iraq were the Šī‘ah Zaydīs led by the Buwayhids, who supported the Šī‘ah Imamis a great deal. In 933/322, the general, al-Ḥasan Ibn Buwayh, who worked

663 Ḣabī, p. 187.
664 Ẓaqqaqī, Al-Fakhrī fī Al-Adāb Al-Sultaniyah, (Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, n.d), vol 1, p. 102.
under the king of the Samanid, managed to overthrow Mardād al-Daylemī, who had been a supporter of the physician al-Rāzī and took over the cities, declaring himself the king of Daylem.\textsuperscript{668} Twelve years later, al-Ḥasan Ibn Buwayh and his two brothers took over the capital Bağdād and gained control of the Caliphate. In Rayy, unlike in Bağdād, the Sultān of Rayy, Rukn al-Dawlah, called for regular open debates and discussions between different beliefs and religious groups.\textsuperscript{669} and for once the Šīʿah were no longer in the shadows or treated as adherents of a heretical dogma.\textsuperscript{670} He also included the Imamis as part of his circle in debates and discussions. For example, the wazīr al-Muḥalabī selected debaters who were capable to restore people’s confidence and secure the dynasty under their ruling. The name he suggested: Ibn al-Baqqāl, Ibn Saʿīd al-Sīrafa, abī Muḥammed al-Fārisī, Ibn Darstwayh, abī Ḥamīd al-Marūwaṭī, abī Abdullah al-Baṣrī, abī Bakr al-Zuhrī, abū Ishāq al-Ṣābi’ (313-384), abū ‘Alā’ al-Ṣaʿīd, abū al-Ḵaṭṭāb al-Ṣābi’, abū Aḥmed b. al-Hayṭam, abū Tamām al-Zaynabī, Ibn Maʿrūf al-Qāḍī, abū al-Faḍl b. al-Hussayn, Aḥmed al-Ṭawīl, Ibn Ḥafṣ who was in charge of the court (ṣāhib al-Dīwān) and Sirrī.\textsuperscript{671} (for more see below 4.9).

The rulers of the region, including Persia and Iraq, competed among themselves. They believed that the more scholarly knowledge they possessed the more legitimacy they would have to rule. Each ruler of the region gathered prominent thinkers to their court. The physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī was invited as well and welcomed in the circle of Sultān Rukn al-Dawlah. Al-Rāzī explained his transition from the recently defeated Mardād to Sultān Rukn al-Dawlah: ‘I accompanied the Sultān, not to be his soldier carrying his sword nor as a worker, but I was there to heal him when he is ill and when he is well, I offer him my consultation when he needs it, all my intention was about helping him and helping his

\textsuperscript{668} Al-Dahabī, Dūwal Al-Islām, p. 176 and Siyar aʿlām al-Nubalā’, vol 11, p. 550. 
Note: this source uses the word Malik of Daylem i.e. King of Daylem region.

\textsuperscript{669} Muqadamat lujnat al-Taḥqīq cited, in the introduction of Ibn Bābawayh, Hidāyah, p. 132.

\textsuperscript{670} Al-Dahabī, Siyar aʿlām al-Nubalā’, vol 12, p. 527.

\textsuperscript{671} Abu Ḥayyān Al-Taḥwīlī, Al-Imtā’ wal Muʿānasah, (Cairo: Maṭbaʿah Lujn al-Taʿlīf wal Tarjama, 1944) vol 3, pp. 211 and 3.
people raʾīyah. The conflict between philosophy and Ṣī′ah Īmāmiyah seems to have settled down by the peace between Rukn al-Dawlah and the king Mašūr b. Nūḥ al-Sāmānī. In the year 361, Mašūr ibn Nūḥ married the daughter of Rukn al-Dawlah. The two dynasties, Samanid and Buwayhīd, then had peace. Because there was such peace, Ibn Bābawayh was able to travel. Ibn Bābawayh acted as Muftī for the Ṣī′ah community in the whole region, working for Sulṭān Rukn al-Dawlah and responding to letters from Ṣī′ah in Iraq, cities such as Kūfā, Basra, Wāsiṭ and Madāʾin, or Persian cities, such as Qazwīn and Naysāpūr, and Egypt the Faṭimid. For Ibn Bābawayh, it was not satisfactory to follow the information available in Qom. He found more questions that needed answering. Ibn Bābawayh remained in Qom until 950/339 and after a long journey in 960/349, he went to Rayy as his second home, where he worked under the Sulṭān Rukn al-Dawlah. He mentioned in 963/352 that he took permission from Rukn al-Dawlah to travel outside Rayy to Mašhad Ḵūrāsān province.

3.3.3 Ibn Bābawayh: What did the Sunnīs Say about Him?

Although Ibn Bābawayh wrote a book and gave it as a gift to al-Ṣāḥib b. Ṣabbād, that was the only time he mentioned his name. He did not narrate a tradition from Ibn Ṣabbād. Ibn Ṣabbād had a negative opinion about Īmāmiyah describing them to be far much worse to deal with than haustawīyah and ʿawāsiḥ. Within the state, they should be categorised

674 Ibid., p. 356.
677 In 979/365 Rukn al-Dawlah divided Daylem between his three sons: ʿAḍūd al-Dawlah had Persia and Karmān, Ṣafār al-Dawlah had Hamdan and Daynūr; and Muʾayyed al-Dawlah had Rayy and Ṣabḥān. Al-Ṭahābī, Duvāl Al-Islām, p. 201.
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as equal to the rebel Zanj, the Abyssinians ḥabaš (group rebelled against the Abbasids state, started in 869 in the south of Iraq Basra). Also, same time as b. 'Abbād there was a fight against Zanj.\textsuperscript{681} Al-Ṣāhib b. 'Abbād was here talking as an official. He could not place Imamīyah within those officially recognised by the state, since he saw them being unpredictable and rebellious. He then argued that the Imamīyah went wrong when focussed on lineage as a condition for a succession of Imāmah. They always struggled to find the next Imam, for example after the death of Imam Ja'far there were disputes and conflicts among themselves about who should succeed Ja'far. These disputes not only once happened but multiple times, after Ja'far, Mūsa, 'Alī and after the eleventh Imam al-Hasan al-'Askari.\textsuperscript{682} Since then they have not settled with one single person as their Imām. Then part of them went with the idea of occultation.\textsuperscript{683} Since then they have had no Imam.

The two terms ḥašawīyah and nawāsib. Ibn Bābawayh described who narrates traditions in favour of Imam 'Alī as Šī'ah and describe those who follow traditions in favour other than Imam 'Alī as ḥašawīyah.\textsuperscript{684} When he talked about one sunnī figure of Ḥadīṯ and described him nāsibī such as abū Naṣr Ḍakhīm al-Marwānī al-Naysāpūrī (d. 990/380 A.H).\textsuperscript{685} Another figure he narrated from the grandson of Ibn Ḵuzayma (d. 923/311 A.H) his name Muḥammed b. al-Faḍl b. Muḥammed b. Ḥishāq al-Muḍakir Ibn Bābawayh calls him abū Sa'id al-Mu'ālim al-Naysāpūrī who he met in 352 A.H.\textsuperscript{686} the significance of mentioning the date when they met because some of the narrators lose their memory and start mixing and making errors in Ḥadīṯ and the isnād, the narrator started

\textsuperscript{683} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 233.
\textsuperscript{685} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Maʿānī}, p. 56., and \textit{'ilal al-Šarāye'}, vol 1, p. 134.
\textsuperscript{686} Al-Đahabi stated that al-Marwānī narrated from Ibn Ḥuzayma and al-Hākim narrated from him. Al-Đahabi, \textit{Siyar Aḥām al-Nubalā'}, vol 12, p. 448.
losing his memory by year 994/384 until the year when he died in 997/387 A.H.687 The majority of Ḥadīṯ he narrated from Sunnī figures was mainly in favour of the Imams.

3.3 Ibn Bābawayh, Impacting the Šīʿah Community, Not Paying the Fifth

It is argued that Imams kept receiving taxation, fifth (ḵums), during the time the twelve Imams were alive, to keep the Imāmī an independent institutionalized religious body separate from the state. At that time, paying fifth (ḵums) was considered an act of faith and of giving/renewing allegiance to the Imams.688 In some traditions, the Imams would intercede for them before God, in return for their fifth. A facet of this, which is a lively issue even today, is what financial obligation the individual has to the Imam. Ibn Bābawayh believed that the Imams had neither infallibility nor the right to continue receiving the fifth (ḵums) of people’s wealth after the occultation of the twelfth Imam. He argued that for the Imam take money from individuals is no different than asking for charity and this does not suit the respectable lineage of ‘Ālī.689 The lineage of the Prophet should take their income from the state treasury from zakat.690 In a fatwa, Ibn Bābawayh put the taxation and income under the control of the state. He offered an affirmative answer to whether the household of the Prophet, (‘Alawī), should get their money from the treasury (Bayt al-māl). On the contrary, Newman rightly states that al-Mufīd made it ‘obligatory duty’ (farḍ) for the Šīʿah community to pay their fifth to fuqahā’, and treated them as the successors of the deputies sufarā’ of the Imam.691 Al-Mufīd’s student al-Murtada, a leading figure in Iraq, asserts that it is binding for the Šīʿah to continue to pay their fifth to the descendant of a daughter of the Prophet Faṭimah and Imam ‘Alī (‘Alawī) to allow the Imams independence from the state, to pay for the release of prisoners, and to meet their

---

687 Al-Dahābī, Mīzān al-Iʿtīdāl, vol 6, p. 300.
688 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 112.
689 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Iʿtīqādāt, p. 111.
debts. Giving a fifth of one’s wealth helps Shi'ah brothers. Another student of al-Mufid, al-Ṭūsī, narrated that Imam Ja’far al-Ṣādiq stated: “take the wealth of nāšibī (anti-Imams) and send us the fifth”. On the contrary, Ibn Bābawayh saw that the kums (taxation equal to the fifth) were cancelled on the day of occultation 329/940. Thus, there was a clear difference of opinion between the positions of al-Mufid’s students in Bağdād, and Ibn Bābawayh in Rayy.

3.4 Ibn Bābawayh, What Made Him Unique?

3.4.1 Al-Kulaynī vs Ibn Bābawayh

The division between Muḥammed b. Ya’qūb al-Kulaynī (d. 941/329) and Ibn Bābawayh on the choice of Imams is generally overlooked in modern scholarship. Al-Kulaynī dedicated his life to compiling traditions and teachings of Imam Ja’far which reflect a time of hostility between the Shi’ah and the state. By contrast, Ibn Bābawayh was interested in Imam al-Riḍā. Al-Riḍā traditions were a reflection of a good relationship between the Shi’ah and the state. Imam al-Riḍā and caliph Mā’mūn both condemned gnostic extremist movements which claimed Imamah and infallibility. Next, we will discuss Ibn Bābawayh’s open rejection of gnostic movements affiliated with Manichaeism and Bardaisanism. Newman has observed that there was a discussion about Jihād in a book by al-Kulaynī but there is no similar discussion of the topic of Jihād present in Ibn Bābawayh’s work. According to al-Kulaynī, humans must engage in jihād but only in support of the Imam, because to do so is to fight evil, and not to fight evil is to be evil oneself. I agree with Newman. I have found no such reasoning in Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Kulaynī allowed ġulāt as his narrators and as result extremism moved into his work more profoundly. Al-Kulaynī would accept a ḥadīth that was attributed to the Imam, even if it was

---

narrated by what some called a liar and fabricator, such as ‘Sahl b. Ziyād’,\(^{696}\) so long as it had been passed to al-Kulaynī by three trustworthy teachers.\(^{697}\) Many of these narrators were labelled ǧulāt (extremists and exaggerators). In his work al-Kāfī, there are 5,072 classed as reliable by later scholars out of a total of 15,181 ḥadīṭs.\(^{698}\) Furthermore, Ibn Bābawayh’s version of Jihād first and the second type of Jihād are compulsory that includes self-discipline to do good and abstain from evil.\(^{699}\)

3.4.2 400 Uṣūl

To discuss 400 four hundred Uṣūl. Is to find out why they were not accepted by Ibn Bābawayh and why they were championed by al-Mufīd and those to come after. This is a fundamental difference between both and its worthy of analytical discussion. According to Muḥammed b. Šahrāsūb al-Māzandarānī (d. 1192/588) stated that Ibn ‘Uqda’s (d. 944/333) had compiled a book listing all those narrated from Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and they were about four thousand narrators.\(^{700}\) Then added, that al-Mufīd to have said that Imam Jaʿfar teachings were compiled into 400 four hundred books kitāb.\(^{701}\) Not only al-Māzandarānī referred to the same statement, al-Ṭabarašī (d. 1153/548), stated 400 books but did not refer it to Ibn ‘Uqda nor al-Mufīd. Then after al-Māzandarānī, al-ʿAllāmah al-Ḥillī (d. 1277/676), then al-Arbalī (d. 1293/693) and al-Šahīd al-Ṭānī (d. 1558/965) claiming that Imam Jaʿfar ḥadīţ was compiled into 400 four hundred compilations arbaʿmā’at Muṣanaf.\(^{702}\) Al-Ṭabarašī, al-Māzandarānī and al-Arbalī narrated that they were 400 books.\(^{703}\) Al-Ḵaṭīb al-Bağdādī narrated that he heard his teachers that Ibn ‘Uqda felt sorry for people in Kufa (Șīʿah) he used to compile notebooks and take it to them and tell them

\(^{696}\) Al-ʿAllamah al-Ḥillī, Rījāl Al-ʿAllamāh, p. 271.

\(^{697}\) Ibid., p. 272.


\(^{699}\) Ibn Bābawayh, al-Hidāyah, p. 58.

\(^{700}\) Al-Māzandarānī, Al-Manāqub, vol 4, p 247.


to claim that these notebooks were theirs. In this way will bring ḥadīṯ collectors to their doorstep. It was a way to bring attention and a way to make a living.

It is not clear who was earlier than al-Ṭabrāsī and said that there was 400 uṣūl? Moreover, linguistically there is a slight difference between al-Ṭabrāsī’s statement and al-Māzandarānī. Al-Ṭabrāsī states that: ‘Ja’far answers known as uṣūl were compiled into notebooks that this uṣūl -Ja’far answers- were transmitted by his companions and the companions of his father’ (wa ṣunnīfa Jawābātih fī al-Masā’il arba’mā’at kitāb wa hīya ma’rūfa bi kutub al-Uṣūl rawāha aṣḥābih wa aṣḥāb abīh). Al-Māzandarānī wrote: ‘from his answers were compiled into 400 book’ (wa ṣunnīfa min Jawābātih fī al-Masā’il arba’mā’at kitāb).

They were four hundred questions that Ja’far al-Ṣādiq had answered scattered in various books. Then, later on, they were compiled with other Imam’s teachings in four Uṣūl by Kulaynī, Ibn Bābawayh, and al-Ṭūsī. Al-Ṭūsī included Sunnī figure Mālik b. Anas as one of the authors of these books. However, I argue that, for example, book of Mālik b. Anas al-Muwatta’ was not dedicated to Ja’far al-Ṣādiq but a collection of Ḥadīṯ among those who he met with was Ja’far al-Ṣādiq a section discussing the etiquette and rituals of Ḥajj. It is argued that there is no evidence that al-Mufid said this himself.

The 400 uṣūl was not recognised or mentioned by Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Tawḥīdī nor al-Nubaḵtī. Ibn al-Nadīm wrote in his work under a section titled ‘Ṣī’ah lawyers and narrators of Ḥadīṯ and their dialectic theologians’ (fuqahā’ al-Ṣī’ah wa muḥaddaṭūhum wa ‘ulamā’ uhum). He did not include the 400 books. He included 6 names similar to the list of Ibn Bābawayh’s introduction Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh, such as Muḥammed b.

---

704 Al-Baḡdādī, Tārīḵ Baḡdād, vol 5, p. 224.
705 Al-Ṭabrāsī, A’lām al-Wara, p. 409.
712 Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīḥ, vol 1, p. 3.
kālid al-Barqī the author of *al-Maḥāsin*.

Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan al-Walīd the author *tafsīr al-Qur‘an*.

Muḥammed b. Aḥmad al-Āṣ’arī the author of *kitāb al-Nawādir*.

Ḥarīz b. ʿAbdullah al-Sajistānī the author of *Kitāb al-Zakāt, al-Ṣalāt, al-Ṣiyām* and *kitāb al-Nawādir*,

al-Ḥasan and his brother al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd al-Ḥasan al-Walīd the author *tafsīr al-Qur‘an*,

Muḥammed b. Aḥmad al-Āṣ’arī the author of *kitāb al-Nawādir*.

Ḥarīz b. ʿAbdullah al-Sajistānī the author of *Kitāb al-Zakāt, al-Ṣalāt, al-Ṣiyām* and *kitāb al-Nawādir*,

al-Ḥasan and his brother al-Ḥusayn b. Saʿīd al-Ḥasan al-Walīd the author *tafsīr al-Qur‘an*,

Muḥammed b. Aḥmad al-Āṣ’arī the author of *kitāb al-Nawādir*.


Ibn Bābawayh included 5 more names that were not listed in Ibn al-Nadīm’s *al-Fihrist* for example Saʿad b. ʿAbdullah al-Ašʿarī al-Qommī (d. ~911 or 913/299 or 301 A.H.

Moreover, the number of those who met Jaʿfar does not match the claim of Ibn ʿUqda and al-Mufīd, for example, al-Ṭūsī only managed to list 3,086 names and not 4000. Al-Ṭūsī added that the works by Saʿad b. ʿAbdullah al-Āṣ’arī al-Qommī (d. ~911 or 913/299 or 301 A.H.) were transmitted to him going back to Ibn Bābawayh. This explains Ibn Bābawayh’s being discriminate in his choices of ḥadīṯ.

3.4.3 Ibn Bābawayh and the Sunnī Sources

Whereas Ibn Bābawayh from the technical side of transmitting ḥadīṯ; he did not completely isolate Sunnī transmitters from his work. He narrates traditions in *ʿUyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā* and al-Ḵiṣāl tradition that was narrated by Sunnī figures. In his narration focussing on two things: a) the relationship between Sunnī figures and Imām ʿAlī al-Riḍā, b)
choosing isnād. He particularly mentions the meeting that took place between Ahmed b. Ḥanbal and Ishāq b. Rahawayh (the teacher of al-Buḫārī) and Imam ‘Alī al-Riḍā, emphasising that both figures praised the isnād of Imam ‘Alī al-Riḍā (d. 818/203), describing it to be exceptional. To Ibn Bābawayh they confirmed that al-Riḍā’s isnād was far more superior to theirs, isnād was so pure, it was like a ‘shock that can cure a mad man’.723 It is a meeting noted not only by Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Bağdādī’s, in his Tārīḵ Baḡdād, narrated same text identical and similarly, al-Subkī in his Ṭabaqāt al-Šāfi’īa narrated it from al-Ḥākim’s Tārīḵ Naysāpūr.724 Except for abū Naʿīm al-ʿAṣbahānī (d. 1038/430), who narrated the same ḥadīṯ, but without mentioning the names of Ahmed b. Ḥanbal and Ishāq b. Rāhawayh. He instead nicknamed them as people from the past (salaf).725 The topic about what most accurate chain of isnād, was mentioned by al-Ḥākim’s Maʿrifat ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīṯ the most accurate isnād narrated by ahlu al-Bayt is Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad from his father Muḥammad who narrated from his father who narrated from his grandfather ‘Alī. Then added on the condition if the narrator from Jaʿfar was trustworthy.726

I note that the aim of Ibn Bābawayh in describing the meeting of two Ḥadīṯ experts with ‘Alī al-Riḍā was to demonstrate the superiority and accuracy of Šī’ah Imāmī isnād to the Sunnī isnād. During the debate between abū al-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī and al-Jaʿābī on the court of b. al-ʿAmīd, it was stated that Aṣbahān were known to be anti-Imams nāṣibah.727 There was a separation between the two streams, Sunnī from Aṣbahān and Šī’ah. Ibn Bābawayh did not narrow himself to Ḥadīṯ from the Prophet but instead included the fatāwa

726 Al-Ḥākim, Maʿrifat Ulūm al-Hadīṯ, p. 55.
of the Imams. By contrast, the Sunnī claimed thousands of ḥadīṯ by the Prophet. That was one of the differences.

3.4.4 Conflicted traditions/ Infallibility ‘īṣma

Ibn Bābawayh has been criticised for treating the Imams as fallible beings. The idea of infallibility in particular, is found within the pioneers of Šī‘ah creed such as al-Kulaynī, al-Mufīd, and al-Ṭūsī, but not in the work of Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Mufīd criticises Ibn Bābawayh for stripping away all the responsibilities and duties of the individual Muslim towards religion and providing an interpretation similar to that of the zanādiqa (plural of zindīq, the followers of Mānī and b. Dayṣān). 728 Al-Mufīd in his response to Ibn Bābawayh said that the work of al-Kulaynī was the most honourable Šī‘ah source. However, this was al-Mufīd’s way of discrediting Ibn Bābawayh’s argument and dismissing his narration that the Imams forbade their followers getting involved in argumentative jadal trying to defend their faith. Before this point no one said that al-Kāfī was the most honourable Šī‘ah book. I argue, none of these authors and biographers has listed al-Kāfī as being important Šī‘ah book. Neither Ibn al-Nadīm, nor Ḵaṭīb al-Baġdādī and all the way to al-Ḍahabī. This will be discussed shortly.

Al-Mufīd was not very different from al-Kulaynī in his views of the reliability of ḥadīṯ. Through debates and political changes, al-Mufīd took the clear stance that the reliability of Ḥadīṯs depends on the multiplicity of contemporary narrators as consensus (ijmā‘). Al-Mufīd has rejected the ḥadīṯ about ‘the man with the two hands’ which questioned the Prophet’s or the Imam’s infallibility. He reasons that God in Islam deals with the problem of evil and would not leave humanity without someone perfect enough to fight evil and able to lead people to perfection. Imāms are not to be judged by their biography because

730 Al-Mufīd, Taṣḥīḥ l’tiqādāt, p. 46.
731 Ibid., p. 68.
they are part of God’s plan. That was his response to the school of ḥadīṯ led by Ibn Bābawayh who questioned the Prophet’s infallibility. For al-Mufīd, common sense meant that Imams are above any errors, infallible beings, and agents of God on earth. On the contrary, Ibn Bābawayh, unlike al-Kulaynī and al-Mufīd, highlighted as problematic the incorrect predictions of the Imams, such as the incorrect predictions of the sixth Imam about the supposed success of Imams by prodigal sons. For example, Imam Ja’far thought his son Ismāʿīl would be his successor and not die before him. He said, ‘At first, it has appeared to me badā’ that my son Ismāʿīl was going to be my successor’. Contradictory statements will directly bring into question the Imams’ infallibility (ʿiṣma). Infallibility is the major element of Ibn Bābawayh’s teaching that makes him, as Šīʿah, unique. The Sunnī do not believe in infallibility, but the Šīʿah do. However, both narrate the Ḥadīṯ of the Cloak (kisā‘), also known as the Ḥadīṯ of Cleanliness (taṯīr). The Šīʿah tell the story to support their doctrine of infallibility, while Ibn Bābawayh, as we shall see, tells the story for a different purpose. The tradition is as follows. Out of his large household, the Prophet called his two grandsons, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, and their Mother Fāṭimah, and their father ‘Alī. He wrapped them all under his camel-wool cloak. Then he received a revelation to recite: ‘O people of the household, God desires to take away uncleanness and purify you’.
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732 Ibid., p. 137.
735 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 336.
The Sunnī understand this Ḥadīṯ to mean that they were included as part of his household (ḥāʾūlāʾ ahlu baytī). However, the Šīʿah understand this Ḥadīṯ to mean they, Ibn Bābawayh were purified from doubts to become the successors of the Prophet, whereas to al-Mufīd not purification from doubt – because the family of ʿAlī never had any doubts – but that everyone inside the cloak became both sinless and infallible. By this, the Prophet prepared them for the divine purpose of Imamah. However, Ibn Bābawayh, though a Šīʿah, cites the story of the cloak in conjunction with the story about the šūrā, and in this way brings into question the doctrine of infallibility. After the death of the second caliph, ʿUmar, the companions were trying to decide who would succeed him, ʿAlī or ʿUṭmān. In support of his case, ʿAlī argued from kisāʾ that he alone had been covered by the cloak and therefore he had the right to succeed the Prophet. Ibn Bābawayh uniquely narrates that while the Prophet was leading the prayer, he forgot how many rakʿah he had performed. He had to ask his companion, the one known as ‘the man with two hands’ (ḏū al-Yadayn), to tell him how many rakʿah he had missed. Ibn Bābawayh then comments that this incident, in itself, is proof against those exaggerators (ǧulāt), that there is no one immune from errors, not even the Prophet. This response makes Ibn Bābawayh stand out from al-Mufīd who affirm the infallibility from error of the Prophet, Imams, and Fāṭimah. The four members of the Prophet’s household infallible who were covered with the cloak.
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3.4.5 The Ascension to biqāʿ

As mentioned earlier Ibn Bābawayh narrated that the Prophet was ascended 120 times.747 Whereas al-Kulaynī ascended only twice.748 The difference between the two becomes even starker in their interpretations of the very concept of ‘ascension’. Ibn Bābawayh was aware of ḥlūlīyah interpretation and more careful than al-Kulaynī, he talks about places scattered in heavens (Lil-lahī taʿāla biqāʿ an fī samāwātiḥ) and whoever see themselves ascended to these places, then they have indeed gone there.749 For example, the Prophet’s ascension journey to Lote Tree of the Utmost Boundary (Sidrat al-Muntaha), so he can tell people about what he saw,750 another traditions heavens meant realm, he visited places in heavens where Moses and Jesus dwells.751 Then quoted Qur’anic verse about Jesus not being killed but instead being lifted to a place in the heavens “Nay, Allah raised him unto Himself; and Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise.” Then added that there are some places scattered in the heavens where human souls ascend while their body asleep.752

This is similar to what abū Sahl al-Nubaḵtī said that the substance of angels is different from a human’s spirit. For example, on the death bed, a human can see the deceased Prophet and Imam ʿAlī, but they cannot see angels.753 Ibn Bābawayh states that there are souls that were twins two thousand years before the creation of Adam and when the Imam al-qāʾim appear, the laws of inheritance will change, the souls that were twins before being born in the human world, will inherit each other.754

---


748 Al-Kulaynī, Al-Kāfī, (Tehran: Dār Al-Kutub Al-Islāmīyah, 1375 A.H), vol 1, p. 442.


750 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Amālī, p. 639.


752 Ibid., vol 1, p. 198.


754 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Hidāyah, p. 343.
In contrast, al-Kulaynî talks about (biqā’ an) places in the earth called the avengers al-Muntaqimāt against unlawful wealth. Al-Mufid al-Qommî in his commentary of Tawḥīd did not discuss this further. He states buq’a is similar to say a place or a room. When the tradition says God ascends someone to a buq’a an ambiguous majhūl.

This is another difference between Ibn Bābawayh and al-Kulaynî. Ibn Bābawayh rejected the interpretations of the ascension to God traditions. He argues that the Prophet met other prophets in heavens but never went back and forth between God and Moses. God does not dwell in one place and is neither near nor far. The Prophet saw the hellfire during the ascension, and entered the paradise; ate from it a fruit, and returned to earth, on the same night he cohabited with his wife Қadījah and became pregnant with Fāṭimah. Ibn Bābawayh does not accept the traditions that God descends to the human world to answer those who call on him. He narrated that Imam al-Riḍā rejected the Sunnī interpretations and said it was the angel who descends from the celestial world (malakūt).

It is important to see how Ibn Bābawayh envisages the world. For him, the ascension, where the Prophet Muhammed travelled to levels or realms of skies and heavens, was a real experience. The significant number is seven, concerning the seven astronomical and spiritual realms, the opposite being the seven levels of hell. The journey moved on to tell us about earth, planets, time, heavens, the way things existed before creation in the physical world on earth and were known as prophecies. Nevertheless, Ibn Bābawayh confirms
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that heaven and hell do exist. According to Ibn Bābawayh, longing to be near God, longing for heaven, longing for the spiritual world, will remain within us in the afterlife. For those who reach heaven, their spirit tastes ultimate le dah will be satisfied, depending on how much meditation they did in their life on earth. On the contrary, al-Mufīd argued that heavenly rewards, without actually tasting and enjoying what you have desired, cannot be other than that. That is, heavenly rewards will be physical, tangible. Then added, that only Christianity believes the soul will become like angels and only pleasure will have that is the praising of God. Different Ibn Bābawayh traditions give allegorical interpretations about treasures in heaven doing good deeds believing they will be stored in heaven. He stated, for example, that there are no treasures in Heaven. If we follow our intellect, normally individuals start treasuring possessions out of fear of poverty, which is in contrast to what heaven decrees about there is no poverty, therefore there are no treasures as such. I infer this is different from other Šīʿah and not mentioned by al-Mufīd, and his student, such as Ṭūsī in his Tahdīb al-Aḥkām. For Ibn Bābawayh the ascension traveling through the metaphysical world freely, but not to God, conflicts with the idea of God being beyond physicality or place, indeed beyond human
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comprehension. Ibn Bābawayh talks about the chair of God and the throne as two separate topics in his *Iʿtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah*. Ibn Bābawayh stated that the first interpretation both can be interpreted metaphorically as knowledge, the chair representing knowledge that is not shared with prophets, Imams, and proofs (*ʿilm al-laḍī lam yataʿlaʾu ʿalayhī aḥad*), whereas the throne is the knowledge that is shared with prophets, Imams, and proofs. The second interpretation is the chair of God, like a bowl (*wiʿāʾ*) that holds, the throne, heavens, earth, and everything that exists. Al-Mufīd, however, talks about only the Throne and not the chair.

3.4.6 Qur’an muḥḍat but not muḵbir

Ibn Bābawayh gave his description, starting with the problem of using the human interpretation of the Qur’an led to sectarianism. The Qur’an literal meaning alone is not the answer, being open to interpretation, causing the early community to be divided into multiple sects, likewise, the teaching of the Prophet the Sunna faced the same. An informant (muḵbir) is someone who can clear the confusion and who understands the Qur’an and Sunna well, who does not lie on God and the Prophet, nor err about God’s intention. Someone with such ability has existed in every century. Since the Imams they have deceased, this leads to the next question about muḵbir.

This brings us back to Newman’s observation “…to have a muḵbir present at all times to give the correct interpretation of the Qu’ran to the community.” However, muḵbir here about the twelve Imams who existed and were present among the community, their role was to clear the confusion about the Qur’an and the Sunna. In his book, *al-Iʿtiqādāt*, he
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“وجب أن يكون مع القرآن والسنة في كل عصر من بيين عن المعاني التي عناها الله عز وجل في القرآن بكلامه”
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does not question the authority of the Qur’an but accepts it as a single book revealed to the Prophet. But he questioned the infallibility of the Imams. Ibn Bābawayh authenticates the Qur’an, although what has been said about Ibn Bābawayh’s explaining the relationship between Qur’an and muḥbir. In Maʿānī al-ʿAkbār Ibn Bābawayh discussing the two topics together ʿisma and muḥbir. Why muḥbir is an Imam. He started with the problem of sin, according to Hišām b. al-Ḥakam who narrated from Ja’far al-Ṣādiq the Sin has four sides: enviousness, anger, lie, and lust. Only those (not Imams) who feel inferior to others will feel one of these conditions, whereas someone who feels content for example, who has more wealth and power than others, it is natural that he does not feel inferior to others.

His argument about muḥbir is about who is not lesser than others.

Al-Mufid argues that the Qur’an was received by the Prophet and that was a miracle. Al-Mufid also said that all the prophets were immune from error and infallible. Those errors arose only in the transmission of their works. Then he adds that the majority of Šī‘ah saw the Qur’an as a revealed book, but we cannot get its full benefits without an infallible Imam. Therefore, the only authority who can speak on its behalf is the Imam. Al-Mufid states that the consensus of major Muslim sects such as Imamis, Zaydis and the followers of traditions (aṣḥāb Al-ḥadīṯ), and the Muʿtazilite, is that the Qur’an is corporeal (muḥdāṭ), and not eternal. Al-Mufid claimed that the main purpose of the Qur’an is the necessity of the succession of the Prophet Muḥammad by Imam ʿAlī. He further claimed that Imams are gifted with the ability to predict knowledge muḥaddat because God spoke to Imam ʿAlī in the city of ṭāʿif of things to come. On the other hand, I infer that Ibn Bābawayh is saying that God’s light is continual and cannot be narrowed into a single book. He added that the Qur’an is a book that is open to many interpretations, causing multiple sects, each
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group believing in their interpretation is the correct one. It does not mean that God could change his mind (badā) and intervene, any interpretations departing away from the Prophet and Imams lead to error. Ibn Bābawayh did not talk very much about miracles, miracles being perceived as a sign of God’s intervention and perhaps of anthropomorphism. He saw that sometimes performing miracles could have negative consequences. The only miracle he discussed extensively is ġaybah, for example, his response to the Mu’tazilite. Ibn Bābawayh did not assert that the Prophet performed miracles, such as the delaying of the sun. Rather, he treated them with ambiguity and did not bother to provide isnād for them, but merely said, ‘it was told’ rūwīyah.

3.4.7 Infallibility

Ibn Bābawayh stated that it is God’s responsibility to appoint an infallible Imam, through the mouth of the Prophet. Furthermore, McDermott raises the topic about Ibn Bābawayh talking about falling short of (taqṣīr) it focussed on “…in the view of Ibn Bābūya and the school of Qom to which he belonged, that if the Prophet could be distracted in prayer, the Imams could be distracted also. For their Šīite opponents laid against them the charge of “falling short (taqṣīr)”...” However, what is important here and was not explored by McDermott is that Ibn Bābawayh gave his interpretation of (taqṣīr), beyond the topic about the Prophet being distracted sahū in his ṣaḥāṭ. There are two types of ġulāt discussed in al-I’tiqādāt those who abandon the Prophet and Imams such as Ibn al-Ḥallāj who claim to be a successor to the Imams and yet he does the opposite. The second are
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those who claim prophets and Imams are infallible from error *sahū*. Ibn Bābawayh defended the belief of the people of Qom, that they have not departed from the way of the Prophet and Imams.\(^790\) He stated that those who believe in interpreting religion, are guilty of falling short of (*taqṣīr*) the abandonment of the way of Prophet and Imams and replacing it with their own. They are then the delegators (*mufawīda*) who claim can move away from common religion values and claim their own the right path and fight others, they are the extremists (*ḡulāt*), then Ibn Bābawayh gave the example, the followers of b. Ḥallāj (*al-hallājiyah*), describing them as extremist in their belief in Ibn al-Ḥallāj taking him as their Imam, while they promote abandoning religious practices. Then added this is what *taqṣīr* means, a term used by *mašāyeḵ* al-Qom describing delegators *mufawīda* and extremist *ḡulāt*.\(^791\) While in his *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh* he talked about another type of *ḡulāt*, those who say that the Prophet and Imams are beyond making any errors.\(^792\) This suggests that Ibn Bābawayh, from the historical point of view, accepted that the Qur’an belonged to the Prophet and was unaltered. However, there is no evidence that he considered the Qur’an miraculous or eternal. Ibn Bābawayh believed that the Qur’an was not the word of God, but a collection of interpreted visions seen by the Prophet Muḥammed related to the time and circumstances under which the Prophet lived.

Indeed, I observe that Ibn Bābawayh’s teaching that the Qur’an was created will give the ruler more authority over the text, and thus power to rule. Ibn Bābawayh saw the Qur’an as neither eternal nor miraculous in its content. To say that the Qur’an was not created (*ḡayr maklūq*) would give the wrong impression that the Qur’an is eternal.\(^793\) This does not mean that if the Qur’an was created to think it was faked. Neither to say not created it

meant not corporeal, nor revealed and not recorded, \(^{794}\) and not eternal (\(\text{ǧayr} \text{ azalī} \)). \(^{795}\) When you first read you think he is different from Sunnī interpretation and closer to the muʿtazila.

This is identical with Sunnī traditions of abī Bakr al-Ājirī (d. 970/360) Kitāb al-Šarīʿa instead of eternal the term creator was used; according to Jaʿfar b. Muhammad the Qur’an, not the creator and nor created but the words of God. \(^{796}\) Not being eternal, it is unlikely that the Qur’an eternal contains the whole light of God stored in a book. \(^{797}\) Ibn Bābawayh similarly interprets the continuation of revelation to the philosophy of emanation, and not as an attribute of speaking. \(^{798}\) Regarding revelation, whether it is eternal or not, there are two different interpretations. First, al-Kulaynī and his student al-Nuʿmānī, argued that the Qur’an was tampered with or even falsified by the Sunnīs. \(^{799}\) Al-Kulaynī refers to the history of the Qur’an to prove it was altered after the death of the Prophet by his companions for political gain. Imam ʿAlī compiled the true Qur’an, and it remained with his offspring, the Imams until it finally reached the twelfth Imam al-Mahdi who took it and went into hiding as punishment for people for their negligence. According to al-Kulaynī, the number of revealed verses is 17,000, \(^{800}\) far more than what is in the Qur’an today (6,236 verses). By contrast, for Ibn Bābawayh, the Qur’an has not been altered. The 17,000 verses were not all in the Qur’an but included revelations that the Prophet experienced during his prophethood. \(^{801}\) The Prophet had said ‘we the prophets communicate with people according to their understanding’; the number of instances of this kind of teaching is 17,000. \(^{802}\) However, Šīʿah narrators such as al-Kulaynī consider the 17,000 as the original
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In some of Ibn Bābawayh’s thoughts, the Qur’an is not the eternal word of God, and therefore is not eternal guidance, nor is it the ultimate and only necessary tool to combat evil, but a book that is created (muḥdāf). That is to say, God’s words cannot be limited to a humanly created text. He then lists the reasons why the Qur’an cannot be eternal and why it cannot apply to all times. He argued that the text of the Qur’an contains laws that were new at the time nāsīḵ, and also rules that had expired (mansūḵ), as well as general rules (ʿām) and specific rules for specific situations (kāṣ), fixed rules (muḥkam) and hypothetical interpretation (mutašābah). This topic goes beyond whether the Qur’an is God’s speech, but it is about whether God intervenes in humans’ lives. Ibn Bābawayh saw the Qur’an as a created text (muḥdāf) and not eternal. Moreover, he stated that between man and God there are veils. Veils are often related to man’s inability to see. God can see through everything because there is no veil of ignorance that can restrict Him, for He is so pure. Humans, on the other hand, are surrounded by veils of ignorance and ego, which prevent them from seeing. According to Ibn Bābawayh, the souls of the prophets and Imams were first created before everything else existed and their light passed through twelve pure veils before finally entering the material inside the bodies of Adam and Eve. The first Intellectual light was responsible for all existence, even before the celestial pen (qalam) that wrote about the start of everything to come, and the celestial board (laūḥ) on which everything is written. Both are angels made out of intellectual light responsible for the creation of the heavens, God’s throne, and the skies.
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Here, Ibn Bābawayh separates himself from those who claim God has spoken to them and can receive wisdom and revelations. By way of contrast, he stated that after the death of the Prophet there is no revelation other than the Prophet. The revelation starts from God and is passed to one angel, then passed on to another, closer to man’s world. The first angel who receives the revelations from God is known as the pen and the next angel is known as the celestial tablet (*al-laūḥ l-mahfūz*). The revelation then goes to the angel Isrāfīl, then to Michael, and then finally to Gabriel.\(^{810}\) For example, Imam ‘Alī narrates from the Prophet who narrates from Gabriel.\(^{811}\) On the contrary, al-Mufīd rejected what Ibn Bābawayh said about revelations coming in stages through angels and heavens. Al-Mufīd saw that God can reveal His Word directly to the prophets, without intermediaries.\(^{812}\) God can send revelations with various angels in various ways depending on His reasons.\(^{813}\) Ibn Bābawayh was not the only one who shared this view; al-Rāzī too argued if we agree that God eternal does not need to act therefore we agree He will never need to act in the future no matter what the circumstances are. This statement leading to making God insignificant in our life like an idle, this argument was challenged by the Mu’tazila figure abū ’Abdullah al-Ḥusayn b. al-Ja’al *Kitāb Naqd Kitāb al-Rāzī fī anahu Lā Yajūz an Yaf’al Allah taʾāla ba’d a an Kāna Ġayr Fāʾil*.\(^{814}\) Al-Mufīd, notwithstanding, makes his claim clear that the Qur’an came directly from God and not from *baytul al-ma’mūr*.\(^{815}\) Al-Mufīd argues that Ibn Bābawayh’s interpretations of the celestial house of worship are metaphorical\(^{816}\) and that the house of worship was not part of God, but an external creation of God.\(^{817}\) In resolving issues, God contacted the Prophet directly. Al-Mufīd argues that this verse was certainly an immediate response by God to the woman’s case as evidence that God

\(^{812}\) Al-Mufīd, *Taṣḥīḥ lʾiṭiqādāt*, p. 120.  
intervenes if necessary, and an actual response was not revealed any earlier not in Mecca but Medina.\textsuperscript{818} What al-Mufid is highlighting here is that God’s angels are his messengers and servants, like the angel Gabriel. For al-Mufid, this statement contradicts the apparent meaning of the Qur’an that the revelation and God’s communication come either directly from Allah or through the medium of angels. He disagrees with Ibn Bābawayh’s statement that all scriptures of theistic religions have nothing to do with being eternal text, but all scriptures equally came from something separate: the celestial Tablet (sometimes called \textit{al-laūḥ l-mahfūẓ}).\textsuperscript{819} Al-Mufid argued that Angels are servants of God, external beings sent by God depending on occurrences requiring their intervention.\textsuperscript{820} In making these accusations against Ibn Bābawayh, especially those accusations concerning the Qur’an and concerning the attributes of God, al-Mufid is pushing Ibn Bābawayh out of the Islamic community. He is saying that Ibn Bābawayh has nothing at all to do with Islam since Ibn Bābawayh’s teaching makes both God and the Qur’an redundant. Where then, does this leave Ibn Bābawayh? What is he then? In the following, I will examine al-Mufid’s arguments, specifically the themes in Ibn Bābawayh which al-Mufid found problematic.

3.4.8 Al-Mufid’s Criticism of Ibn Bābawayh: The Problematic Themes

For al-Mufid, the Qur’an is a prophecy and the miracle of the Prophet.\textsuperscript{821} The performance of miracles by each Imām signalled his Imamah. Likewise, to al-Mufid, each Imam has shown evidence they can perform miracles.\textsuperscript{822} The prophets and Imams demonstrate larger miracles that involve alteration of nature, such as delaying the sun and splitting the moon. Al-Mufid addressed the problem of contradiction between Imams by saying that there was no problem and that Imams never contradicted each other because
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they are infallible. He accuses Ibn Bābawayh of being an unthinking *hašawī*, who brought in *ḥadīt* from outside the Šī‘ah community that the Imams never actually said. So, Ibn Bābawayh, through his carelessness, his lack of discrimination, and his lack of reasoning, created the so-called ‘problem’ of contradiction among Imams. Thus, al-Mufid instructed his student al-Tusī to respond to the matter of ‘contradiction’ and provide new, fresh *ḥadīt* to support al-Mufid’s stance.

Ibn Bābawayh was not the only one who questioned the miracles of the Prophet and defended the Qur’an, he described the verse about splitting of the moon when the time draws near for the day of judgment.823 For example, abī Ishāq al-Nāḍām rejected the miracle of the splitting of the moon.824 ‘Abdul Jabbār had a similar approach, that any event that was out of the norm should be supported by being widespread and passed on from generation to generation. Then he questioned the tradition of splitting the moon. Unlike the Qur’an he considered it as an existing miracle.825 In the same way, al-Rāzī questioned miracles, those who claimed that the Prophet performed miracles, no more than 3 Muslims, such a small number that can easily fabricate a lie.826 Ibn Bābawayh states with similar argument, Ḥadīth from the Prophet was hardly reliable, he argued that 3 narrators are the minimum number to be classed as consecutive *mutawātir*. He then added that the core condition of *mutawātir* is that they cannot get together and fabricate a lie.827 The number of narrators is not the only thing that can guarantee the authenticity of a tradition because multiple narrators can be problematic and produce different versions of the same thing but contradict one another, he added that authenticity of the Ḥadīth came from the Imams. When Ibn Bābawayh discussed the challenge from *jadalī* the Ḥadīth of splitting the moon.828

827 Ibn Bābawayh, *Kamāl al-Ḍīn*, vol 1, p. 84.
828 Ibid.
Let us go back to the birthplace of Ibn Bābawayh, the city of Qom. In the year 702/83, a group of seventeen Šī‘ah came from Kūfa (city of Najaf south of Iraq known for its Šī‘ah heritage) as part of the army of 'Abdul Raḥmān b. al-Aš‘āt (d. 702/83) which fought against the Umayyad ruler 'Abdul Mālik b. Marwān and his commander al-Hajjāj b. Yūsuf (d. 713/95). After 'Abdul Raḥmān b. al-Aš‘āt lost the battle, a large part of the army took refuge in Qom, among them the sons of Sa‘ad b. Mālik b. Šāfī‘ āmīr al-Asfarī: 'Abdullah al-Ḥūaṣ, 'Abdul Raḥmān, Isḥāq and Naʿīm. They also brought with them the teachings of Imam ʿAlī b. abū Ṭālib. This is considered Qom’s first experience of the Šī‘ah Imāmī version of Islam. The traveller and historian Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī (d. 1228/626) adds that there has never been a typical Sunnī name such as abū Bakr or ʿUmar found in Qom. The people of Qom have always been known to be followers of Imams known as (Šī‘ah Imāmī). Similarly, abū al-Ḥasan al-Aš‘ārī (d. 935/324) states that the majority of people from Qom are Šī‘ah. The poet Du’bul b. ‘Alī al-Kuẓā‘ī (d. 835/220) said to Imām al-Riḍā that he wanted something from him that he could take with him to his grave, Imām al-Riḍā had a garment on and handed it over to him, when the people of Qom heard about it, they offered him 30 thousand dirham and that, when he sold it, it was cut into small pieces and shared among them to be blessed. According to al-Najāšī, the student of Yūnus b. ‘Abdul Raḥmān such as Ibhrāhīm b. Hāšim al-Qommī (originally from Kufa) was the first to spread Ḥadīth from Kūfa in Qom. The city of Qom is Ibn Bābawayh’s birthplace, a Persian city originally named Kamandān. It was conquered by the Prophet’s companion abū Mūsa al-Aš‘ārī (d. 662/42) in the year 643/23, in which the second caliph ʿUmar b. al-Ḵaṭṭāb was
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assassinated and succeeded by 'Uṭmān b. 'Affān. The city of Qom has a history of Šīʿah heritage, since the time of (tabīʿīn) when 17 learned students of companions (tabīʿīn) who flee from Iraq/Kūfa during the Umayyad governor al-Ḥajjāj b. Yusuf al-Ṭaqafī (d. 714/95 A.H) who was against the companions of Imām ʿAlī. They fled from Kūfa and took refuge in Qom. Among them were the brothers from the house of banī al-ʿAṣʿar.

3.6 Ibn Bābawayh and his Travels: The Source of his Collection of Traditions?

Ibn Bābawayh beside being faqīh he was dedicated to collecting the Imams’ sayings to canonise the works of the traditions. During his work with Buwayhids Rukn al-Dawlah, Ibn Bābawayh travelled to Persia and visited various cities. During his traveling, he touched on questions and disputes which were raised during his visits. It is worth noting that all of his books were, in f
tact, responses to the questions raised in his visits.


836 Al-Samʿānī, al-Ansāb, vol 4, p. 522.

iii. Ḥasan al-Ḵurāsānī and al-Ǧifārī added that in the year 963/352, Ibn Bābawayh visited Ḫurāsān and started 'Uyun it-kibr al-Ridā,841 in 977/367 he visited Ḫurāsān again and wrote some of his majālis in his al-Amālī.842

iv. Muḥammad al-Ḵurāsānī and Bahr al-ʾUlūm stated that there is no exact date when he compiled illal al-Šarāye',843 al-Ḵurāsānī then added that it was after 978/368, he narrated from various places for example in Fargānah he narrated from abī Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Ṭayfūr al-Dāmḡānī and in Balk he narrated from abī al-Ḥasan Ṭāhir.844

v. In the year 352, he travelled from Bağdād to Naysāpūr where he was asked questions about occultation, and after his visit, he started his work Kamāl al-Dīn.845 He narrated from abī Saʿīd Muḥammad b. al-ʾAṭṭār b. abī al-Ṭayīb al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmed al-Rāzī.846

vi. In the year 963/352, he went to Marū where he narrated from abū al-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Šāh al-Faqīḥ al-Marwāzī,847 and Ṣāfī b. ʿAbdullah b. ʿabdul Malik.848

vii. In the year 963/352, he visited Bağdād, he narrated from Muḥammad b. ʿUmar al-Ḥāfiẓ (al-Jaʿābī849), abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Yahyā al-ʿAlawī known Ibn abī Ṭāhir, and

---

845 Ibid., p. 27.
848 Ibid., vol 1, p. ʿFāʾ.
849 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Amālī, p. 64.


ix. In the year 965/354, he went on pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina,855 he journeyed to Kūfa,856 he stayed at Fayd, in the year 966/355, he went back to Baḥdād. By then he had hundred and three books. al-Najāšī’s father met with him and heard his books.857 In the year 986/367, he went to Rayy and started work on *al-Amālī*.858 In the year 978/368, he visited Ilāq and narrated from abā Naṣr Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan b. Ibrāhīm al-Karḵī, abā Muḥammed Bakr b. 'Alī b. Muḥammed b. al-Faḍl al-Ḥanafi al-Ṣāṣī al-Ḥākim and abū al-Hasan Muḥammed b. 'Amrū b. 'Alī b. 'Abdullah al-BAṣrī.859 He narrated from al-

---

857 Al-Najāšī, Ṭijāl Al-Najāšī, p. 389.
858 He went to Baḥdād in 352 and 355.

x. He went to Samarqand and Balk and met with al-Ṣārif Ni’mah Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAbd al-Ṭālib, al-Ṣārif Ni’mah then heard of Ibn Bābawayh’s two hundred and forty-five books and requested from Ibn Bābawayh that he compile a book for those who have no lawyer (Man Lā Yaḥḍūruhu al-Faqīḥ). Books that he wrote earlier such as Faḍā’il Šahr Ramaḍān, Faḍā’il Šahr ‘Iṣra‘, and Faḍā’il Šahr Rajab were mentioned in Man Lā Yaḥḍūruhu al-Faqīḥ. It should be noted that al-Ṣārif Ni’mah is the one who advised Ibn Bābawayh to follow al-Rāzī.

xi. In the year 978/368, he then went to Farḡānah, Ustrabād, and Jarjān. These were his last cities. In Man Lā Yaḥḍūruhu Al-Faqīḥ he stated he will compile a book called Ibṭāl al-Ḡulū, however, in ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā he stated that he narrated a tradition with the similar meaning in Ibṭāl al-Ḡulū. That means Man Lā Yaḥḍūruhu Al-Faqīḥ compiled before ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā.

---

864 Hasan al-Ḵurasānī and Bahr al-ʿUlūm both said that the physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī died in year 974/364 A.H. However, al-Rāzī died in 923/311 and not 974/364.
867 Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yaḥḍūruhu Al-Faqīḥ, vol 1, p. 252.
3.7 Chronological order

The chronological order of his books did not seem to have one book earlier than the other.\(^{868}\) This observation comes from observing the biographers’ lists. The only work that was mentioned while he was alive was *al-Hidāyah* by Ibn al-Nadīm in his *al-Fihrīst*.\(^{869}\) Al-Ṭūsī followed Ibn al-Nadīm’s example, and wrote his *al-Fihrīst* dedicated to Šī’aah authors,\(^{870}\) but included more books that were transmitted to him by his four teachers who met with Ibn Bābawayh when he visited Bağdād such as al-Mufīd, al-Ḥusayn b. Ubaydullāh (al-Gaḍā’irī\(^{871}\)), Ja’far b. al-Ḥasan b. Ḥasaka and Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Ḥimrānī.\(^{872}\) Then al-Najāšī followed his example and compiled *al-Rijāl*,\(^{873}\) and gave a similar list of books that he heard from his father who heard from Ibn Bābawayh during the visit.\(^{874}\) However, neither of them mentioned Sunnī names who narrated from Ibn Bābawayh, which means that his books were made available only to the followers of faith and not to the public. This is an example of his work crossed reference each other and there is no a specific order. In (1) *al-I’tiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmiyyah*, he states that the tradition was narrated in the book of *al-Tawḥīd*,\(^{875}\) and then said that there is a full chapter in the book of *al-Hidāyah*.\(^{876}\) In *al-I’tiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmiyyah* the emphasise mainly on the contested topics against Šī’aah such as the soul, ascension, life after death, and Imamah. He started with the subject of oneness of God (*Tawḥīd*) and finished with the importance of sifting and analysing ḥadīṯ.\(^{877}\) (2) *Al-Tawḥīd*, he stated that the tradition was narrated with full isnād in *Ma ‘ānī al-Akbār*.\(^{878}\) This is a long ḥadīṯ and it is available in full in book *al-Kiṣāl*.

---

871 In number of occasions, he quote from Ibn al-Nadīm’s *Fihrīst*. For example: pp. 41, 42 and 136.
875 Ibid., p. 392.
877 Ibid., p. 95.
Again, this is a long ḥadīth and it is available in full in ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā.

Thus books that are before al-Tawḥīd: Al-Ḵiṣāl, ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā and Maʿānī al-Aḵbār. (3) Al-Ḵiṣāl, he states that he narrated traditions with the same meaning in other books such as Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, Kitāb Šīfāt al-Ṣīʿah, Kamāl al-Dīn, al-Tawḥīd. In ‘illal al-Šarāyē’ he mentioned that he narrated of a similar meaning in Kamāl al-Dīn, with full isnād in ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā, and narrated with a similar meaning in ‘iqāb al-Aʾmāl.

(4) Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, stated he narrated with the same meaning in al-Tawḥīd, composed the same traditions but in more organised by chapter topic in ‘illal al-Šarāyē’. (5) ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā he mentioned that he narrated with various isnād in ‘illal al-Šarāyē’ then added that in this book ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā only focussed on traditions related to Imām al-Riḍā, then stated in ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā there are various isnād mentioned in al-Ḵiṣāl and an interpretation is available in Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, then added that the tradition was narrated with similar meaning in Kamāl al-Dīn, and for further explanation see the work Iʿtiqād al-Šīʿah. He added that the same Ḥadīth (statement from the Prophet) with a different chain of narrators in our work Medinat al-ʿilm. Thus books that are before ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā such as al-Ḵiṣāl, Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, ‘illal al-Šarāyē’, Kamāl al-Dīn and Medinat al-ʿilm are before ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā. Thus, ‘illal al-Šarāyē’, ‘Uyūn

---

879 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 407.
880 Ibid., pp. 75 and 122.
881 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Ḵiṣāl, vol 1, p. 332.
882 Ibid., vol 1, p. 296.
883 Ibid., vol 2, p. 480.
884 Ibid., vol 2, p. 594.
885 Ibid., vol 1, p. 246.
886 Ibn Bābawayh, ‘illal al-Šarāyē’, vol 1, p. 27.
887 Ibid., vol 2, p. 533.
888 Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, pp. 8 and 371.
889 Ibid., pp. 48 and 64.
891 Ibid., vol 1, p. 51.
892 Ibid., vol 1, p. 319.
893 Ibid., vol 1, p. 69.
894 Ibid., vol 1, p. 249.
895 Ibid., vol 1, p. 225.

Medinat al-ʿilm is typically refers to Imām ʿAlī as being the gate to the knowledge of the Prophet. The Prophet stating that I am the city of knowledge and ʿAlī its gate, so for those who seeks knowledge let come through the gate. ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā, vol 1, p. 231 and vol 2, p. 66. Al-Ḵiṣāl, vol 2, p. 574. Al-Tawḥīd p. 307. Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, p. 58. Al-Amālī, p. 343 and 561.
aḵbār al-Riḍā, al-Ḵiṣāl, Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, Kamāl al-Dīn, Ḥiǧāzāt al-Imāmīyah and Medinat al-ʿilm. (6) Kamāl al-Dīn, narrated the tradition with isnād in 'illac al-Šarāye.896 (7) Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīḥ will compile a book called ibṭāl al-ḡulū.897 however, in 'Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā, he narrated with the similar meaning in ibṭāl al-ḡulū,898 the same topic with number of traditions available in Kamāl al-Dīn.899 the same tradition with isnād in al-Ḵiṣāl,900 the tradition was narrated with similar meaning in Faḍāʾil Šahr Ramaḍān,901 the causes and reason (ʿillal) are fully narrated in 'illac al-Šarāye,902 he narrated several aḵbār with a similar meaning from several reliable isnād in Kamāl al-Dīn.903 Thus books were before Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīḥ, such as: Kamāl al-Dīn, al-Ḵiṣāl, Faḍāʾil Šahr Ramaḍān and 'illac al-Šarāye are before Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīḥ. (8) Kamāl al-Dīn, he stated that he narrated the same ḵabar with its full isnād in 'illac al-Šarāye.904 (9) 'illac al-Šarāye he mentioned that similar meaning in Kamāl al-Dīn,905 with isnād in 'Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā,906 narrated with similar meaning in 'iqāb al-Aʿmāl.907 Thus the books that are before 'illac al-Šarāye such as Kamāl al-Dīn, 'Uyūn aḵbār al-Riḍā and 'iqāb al-Aʿmāl.

I am not going to talk about those who gave him the permission ʿIJāza to narrate their books. This research focussing on a certain tradition from certain books are relevant to my thesis. I have demonstrated there was no particular chronological order of his books. But one thing was clear that after 11 years later from Ibn ʿAbbād the only book was accessible to public was al-Hidāyah have made it to Ibn al-Nadīm’s al-Fihrist,908 whereas the work of al-Kulaynī and al-Mufīd did not make it to al-Fihrist.

897 Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīḥ, vol 1, p. 252.
900 ibid., vol 3, p. 347.
901 ibid., vol 2, p. 100.
902 ibid., vol 1, p. 215.
905 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Ḵiṣāl, vol 1, p. 246.
906 Ibn Bābawayh, 'illac al-Šarāye', vol 1, p. 27.
907 ibid., vol 2, p. 533.
3.8 Ibn Bābawayh and his Works

He exclusively collected the traditions from his home city to create Man Lā Yahḍuruhu Al-Faqīh,\textsuperscript{909} which reflected traditions that were from the minor occultation and often traditions that were approved by the agents. Whereas ʿUyūn aḵbār Al-Riḍā focused on transmitted news about Imam al-Riḍā as a gift for the wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād for writing a poem praising the Imams.\textsuperscript{910} However, it is unclear whether the book ʿUyūn aḵbār al-Riḍāʾs aim was to show gratitude to the wazīr, to help the wazīr access a survey of all debate between Imam al-Riḍā and rivals, or to convert him. In his work he mentioned that in year 963/352 he asked the Sulṭān Rukn al-Dawlah the permission to go to Mašhad, the shrine of al-Riḍā.\textsuperscript{911} This visit was much earlier than al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād became the wazīr, why would he say this to him? This work reflects the relationship of a Šīʿah living under the Caliph, who was Muʿtazilite and a projection of the relationship between two important figures religious Imam ʿAlī Riḍā and state ruler and Muʿtazila al-Māʾmūn.

The next work was al-Tawḥīd. Even though the working title related to the study of monotheism, the objective of this work according to Thomas it was not about interpreting God’s relation to Man, but instead about presenting the Imams as revealers of truth.\textsuperscript{912} Those who know with full knowledge that there is one God are known as ʿārifīn.\textsuperscript{913} They can easily comprehend why Imam Mahdi exists, the sense of knowing of the Mahdi’s existence is sufficient, without requiring proof by meeting with the Imam.\textsuperscript{914} In another tradition, it is stated that knowing Imam ʿAlī is sufficient to be an ʿārif. Through human common sense, one will lean towards Imam ʿAlī for his heroic role and you do not need to be a Muslim to recognise his qualities.\textsuperscript{915} Ibn Bābawayh, in al-Tawḥīd, begins with God,

\textsuperscript{909} Ibid., p. 83.
\textsuperscript{910} Ibn Bābawayh, ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā, vol 1, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{911} Ibid., vol 2, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{912} Thomas, ‘Two Muslim-Christian Debates’, p. 53.
\textsuperscript{913} Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 81.
\textsuperscript{914} Ibid., vol 1, p. 85.
\textsuperscript{915} Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Amālī, p. 563.
who had been recognised by world religions. A pearl of true wisdom, awareness, and knowledge (singular ʿārif and plural ʿārifīn) belongs to those who recognise God and do not narrow Him down to a particular religion or sect or a human figure. In this work, he speaks of the difference between his interpretations of God and the interpretations of others who narrowed God to one belief, such as Bardaisan (in Arabic known as al-Daysānī), Mānī, and the Persian Magian. In al-Tawḥīd, Ibn Bābawayh does not use a kalām approach like the Muʿtazilite, but he uses the traditions and sayings of the Imams. Similarly, in his work Kamāl al-Dīn, he classifies as mufawīdah those who exaggerate and attribute supernatural power to the Imams, to the point where the Shi‘ah who add to the adān (call for prayer) ʿAlī walīyul-llah (ʿAlī the deputy of God), are also classified as mufawīdah.

It did not seem his visit to Naysāpūr has been successful. He states that during his visit to Mašhad on his return to Naysāpūr, he discovered there that the majority of Shi‘ah doubted the existence of al-qā‘im (Imam al-Mahdi). He keeps reminding us that when Imām al-Riḍa had visited Naysāpūr, the people of Ḥadīth had gathered to stop him from leaving and narrate Ḥadīth from his forefather from the Prophet. He listed their names such as Muḥammed b. Rāfī’, Ahmed b. Ḥarb, Yahya b. Yahya and Ishāq b. Rāhawayh they heard the al-Riḍa narrated that the Prophet said: “anyone of you who sincerely bear a witness to one God, has saved himself, entered my fort and protected himself from hellfire.” The community was struggling with the absence of the Imam. During Ibn Bābawayh visit to Naysāpūr, he met with Shi‘ah leader Najm al-Dīn abū Saʿīd al-Ṣult al-Qommī Najm al-Dīn abū Saʿīd b. al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammed b. Aḥmed b. ʿAlī b. al-Ṣult. This man’s grandfather

916 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 82.
917 Ibid., p. 290.
918 Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yaḥḍūruhu Al-Faqīh, vol 1, p. 291.
919 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 2.
was known as a reliable narrator and even as a close companion of the Imams. Moreover, Ibn Bābawayh’s father knew Ibn al-Ṣūl’s grandfather. Najm al-Dīn b. al-Ṣūl met with Ibn Bābawayh’s during his visit to Naysāpūr coming from Buḵāra. He said to Ibn Bābawayh that due to a discussion with a logician had met in Buḵāra, Al-Ṣūl had lost his faith, along with several other Šīʿah, regarding the occultation of the Twelfth Imam. Ibn Bābawayh promised himself that once he returned to his home city of Rayy, he would compile traditions to refute the logicians’ accusations.\(^{921}\) There is not much interaction was between Ibn Bābawayh and Naysāpūr in fact when the biographer abī Manṣūr ‘Abul Malik al-Ṭaʿālabī (d. 1037/429 A.H) when he wrote his list 5 volumes long Yatīmat al-Dahr, he did not include Ibn Bābawayh in his list but included al-Ṣāḥib b. ‘Abbād.

On his return he compiled Kamāl al-Dīn, containing stories to prove the possibility of occultation. In Kamāl al-Dīn, Ibn Bābawayh introduces his version of the character of Imam and what occultation is about. If we put the Imamah simply, the minor occultation started when the community was led by bāb. By contrast, the major occultation occurred when the community was led by the text of the Imams.\(^{922}\) His responses highlight not only the occultation of the Imām but that the Imamah should remain with the hidden Imam. Ibn Bābawayh credits his work, Kamāl al-Dīn, as starting with a ruʿya in which the Mahdi told him to compile a work supporting the occultation based on the traditions of the previous prophets.\(^{923}\) Ibn Bābawayh stated that the Mūʿmin (those who are righteous and believe in the unseen) can experience visions while asleep, and receive answers to questions.\(^{924}\) Ibn Bābawayh himself states this in the introduction of Kamāl al-Dīn, a compilation inspired by Imam Mahdi.\(^{925}\) It certainly delivers a message to his readers, but he does not say where

\(^{921}\) Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 3.

\(^{922}\) Ibid., vol 1, p. 2.

\(^{923}\) Ibid., vol 1, p. 3.

\(^{924}\) Ibn Hazm has highlighted in his work when you asked the Šīʿa what’s your evidence about the existence of Mahdī? they claim they receive ilḥām. Ibn Hazm, al-Faṣr fī al-Milal wa l-Nihāl, vol 3, p. 114.

it was compiled from. At all events, he was bidden to collect as many past statements and pieces of evidence for occultation as possible. Ibn Bābawayh must have thought his book was based on a vision and therefore must be true. The inspiration itself is not enough until it is channelled and gathered into a book as an open challenge. To prove that, Ibn Bābawayh gathered traditions related to each Imam showing that each one of the Imams was a scholar in all the fields of his time, thereby justifying his Šī‘ah position and his knowledge.

3.8.1 Al-Hidāyah

This is different book from and set out to be read by authority, biographers Sunnī and Šī‘ah. When we look at al-Hidāyah we need look into what been said in previous generations. Šī‘ah figures such as al-Nubaḵtī, Qommī and al-Nāšī’. They all wrote about Šī‘ah that were not acceptable. But this time Ibn Bābawayh needed to demonstrate his ideal doctrine an answer that separate him from the cast out Šī‘ah movements.

One of the contested issues between communities is over who should be the reference to lawyers and jurist before issuing a new law Sunnī or Šī‘ah Twelvers. A tradition that is original and untampered with is received pure through a succession of knowledgeable scholars. Ibn Bābawayh would narrate what was already narrated by Sunnī and the second chain of narration linked with one of the twelve Imāms, he argues that Imāms inherited their knowledge from the Prophet from father to son, therefore it is sufficient as a statement of truth, and then he quoted ʿAlī al-Riḍā’s isnād as the highest level of authenticity was described by that to Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal and Ishāq b. Rahawayh would cure mad man. For example, within the Šī‘ah context, the succession of knowledge is not new. Similarly, Jābir al-Juʿfī (d. 784/167 A.H) said that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq had inherited his knowledge from his father Muhammad al-Bāqir who inherited his knowledge from his father ʿAlī Ibn Zayn al-ʿAbidīn who inherited his knowledge from his father Hussein who inherited knowledge.

926 Ibid., vol 1, p. 3.
from his father ‘Alî who inherited his knowledge from the Prophet Muhammad who received his knowledge from God.\textsuperscript{928} This was recorded by Ibn ‘Uday (d. 975/365 A.H) \emph{al-Kāmil fī al-Ḍu‘afā’} who was contemporary to Ibn Bābawayh and expert on science of rījāl.\textsuperscript{929}

3.8.2 Tawātur

Ibn Bābawayh supports what he said in his two books \emph{Hidāyah} and \emph{Iʿtiqādāt}. We find some of the topics have ḥadīths narrated by both Sunnīs and Šīʿah, to show that the number twelve for Imams was not invented by the Šīʿah. The companion of the Prophet, Jābir b. Sumra, who was from the tribe of Qurayš and worked with the Umayyads, states that he heard the Prophet in a sermon saying that ‘this nation (\emph{umma}) will remain held high on the condition that it is led by twelve caliphs, then the Prophet paused and said silently ‘they are from the tribe of Qurayš’.\textsuperscript{930} Ibn Bābawayh’s two versions stated caliphs\textsuperscript{931} and amīr.\textsuperscript{932} Ibn Bābawayh would argue that being in the company of the Prophet and from tribe of Qurayš, does not hold any credit because the term ‘righteous’ in this tradition can only apply to the twelve Imams. This meant twelve successors from his offspring, who were not only knowledgeable, but were from the purest of lineage of the Qurayš. Ibn Bābawayh gave a reference of Imām ‘Alī teaching to a Šīʿah book by Sulaym b. Qays al-Hilalī that was narrated from the lineage of ‘Alī will succeed by twelve Imams.\textsuperscript{933}

Even though in his compilation \emph{ʿUyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍa} listed 7 Šīʿī isnāds. In his \emph{Hidāyah he} did not call it mutawātīr. Under a section on identifying the Imams ‘Bāb

\textsuperscript{929} Ibn ‘Uday, \textit{Ibid.}, and al-Ḍahabi, \textit{Ibid.}.
\textsuperscript{933} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-ʿIṭīqādāt}, pp. 122.
Ma‘rifat al–A‘imah, he used the term Ma‘rifat instead of we believe. In his I‘tiqādāt again he referred to Sulaym b. Qays and nothing else.

The wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. ‘Abbād was aware of the twelve Imams traditions. He raised scepticisms about two Ḥadīths (al-ḵiḍr) and (al-laūḥ) both include the names of 12 Imams. Al-Ṣāḥib b. ‘Abbād describe the two Ḥadīth of how sectarian Ḥadīth look like. They could appear to be consecutive when in reality they are not. He states there are two traditions Šī‘ah narrates: about the tablet (al-laūḥ) and (al-ḵiḍr). That these two traditions supposed the Prophet prophesy claiming that he will be succeeded by 12 Imams and he supposedly gave their names, the names of the twelve Imāms. Then he goes further stating that Šī‘ah narrators tend to exaggerate and sometimes take a false story and attach it to an isnād of narrators to give it some value and often the names of the isnād are not heard before, then added, for example, the tradition about (al-ḵiḍr) and the other tradition about the tablet (al-laūḥ). However, Ibn Bābawayh in his support for the Imāmī traditions argued that mutawātir was a tradition supported by al-‘itrāh (the household of the Prophet). Al-Mufīd defended Ḥadīth tablet (al-laūḥ), however, did not provide isnād to the Ḥadīth in a number of his work (al-Masā‘i’il al-Jārūdīyah, al-Irṣād, al-Fuṣūl al-Muḵṭārah, and al-Iḥtiṣāṣ).

However, the tradition about (al-ḵiḍr) narrated in earlier work in al-Maḥāsin by al-Barqī only mentioned ‘... your successors from Hussein ... until he reached the last successor’, he mentioned only Imām ‘Alī and Hussein. There are two versions of al-

---

934 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Hidāyah, 30.
935 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-I‘tiqādāt, p. 122.
937 Ibid., p. 237.
938 Ibid., p. 232.
939 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 124.
941 Al-Barqī, al-Maḥāsin, p. 332.
942 Ibid., p. 332.
Barqī’s book, one that is circulated did not have the full list of names and one that was narrated had the full list of names. Al-Ṭūsī stated that the work of al-Maḥāsin sometimes had extra text added to it and sometimes texts were taken out. The two works that were recognised during the lifetime of Ibn Bābawayh al-Hidāyah and al-I tiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah. Neither of them contains the two traditions (al-ḵiḍr) and (al-laūḥ). Ibn Bābawayh narrated the tradition tablet (al-laūḥ) with 7 isnāds in ‘Uyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā. He narrated the same tradition in Kamāl Al-Dīn. While the tradition about (al-ḵiḍr) it is narrated in 3 books: Kamāl Al-Dīn, ‘illal al-Šarāye’, and ‘Uyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā. The isnād of the tradition came from his father and his teacher Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan al-Walīd, who narrated from Sa’ad b. ’abdullah and al-Ḥumairī similar content to al-Kulaynī’s. both isnāds narrated from al-Barqī, giving the 12 names of successors.

On the other hand, Ibn Bābawayh in his introduction of Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh stated that the books of al-Maḥāsin by al-Barqī is one of his main sources. Ibn Bābawayh sometimes narrates from his father and teacher Ibn al-Walīd and not from al-Maḥāsin. In either version of the tradition, b. ’Abbād was aware of the context and rejected it as fabrication.

I infer that we can deduce that it is likely that Ibn Bābawayh believed in the names of the twelve Imams for the following: 1) al-Barqī was a Twelver, 2) Ibn Bābawayh argued defending his creed in his Hidāyah and 3) he gave his interpretation of the number twelve.
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944 Al-Ṭūsī, al-Fihrist, p. 20.
946 Ibid., vol 1, p. 3.
949 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 313.
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951 Al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī, vol 1, p. 525.
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one thing they had in common the general agreement their martyrdom and gifted with
knowledge. He included ḥadīṯ is that the religion of Islam was not completed until the
passing of the twelve Imams.\textsuperscript{954}

We need to reminded ourselves that Ibn Bābawayh was not mere narrator of ḥadīṯ nor
was local faqīh. He was among the selected ones to attend wazīr court. In his introduction
of Kamāl al-Dīn we do not see the same with al-Kulaynī nor al-Ṭūsī. He is showing us who
he used to dealing with such as the Ismail, Zaydī and Ḥallājīyah. He was able to face the
challenge, was more careful within his community, especially because of rival movements
within Šīʿah, such as ḡulāt and ḥulūliyah.

Al-Mufīd defended ḥadīṯ tablet (al-laūḥ), however, did not provide isnād to the ḥadīṯ
in a number of his works (al-Masāʾīl al-Jārūdīyah, al-Iršād, al-Fuṣūl al-Muḵtārah, and al-
Iḥtiṣās).\textsuperscript{955} For al-Mufīd, does not talk about his version of tawātur. He argues that if the
Muslim nation transmitted a tradition that reached tawātur but it lacked the support from
one of the infallible Imams; this tradition was merely a falsehood (bāṭil).\textsuperscript{956} Ibn Bābawayh
argued that mutawātir as a tradition is supported by al-ʾitrāh (the household of the
Prophet).\textsuperscript{957}

On the other hand, the community was full of heretical influences (heretical, at least,
in the eyes of Ibn Bābawayh) such as Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Bardaisanism, Persian
Dualism, and so forth. For example, al-Ṭūsī stated that many compilers of uṣūl adopted
corrupted ideologies.\textsuperscript{958} By contrast, Ibn Bābawayh only selected 11 notebooks for his

\textsuperscript{954} Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, pp. 67, 276, 281, 300.
\textsuperscript{956} Al-Mufīd, al-Taḏkīrah, p. 45, and Awāʾil al-Maqālāt, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{957} Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 124.
\textsuperscript{958} Al-Ṭūsī, al-Fihrist, p. 3.
book *Man Lā Yahḍūruhu al-Faqīḥ*, that were commonly known and most of these books are listed in Ibn al-Nadīm’s *al-Fihrist*. Ibn Bābawayh narrates that the last message of the twelfth Imam: a) the Šī‘ah community should not expect for the Mahdī to return in a specific time, b) the community should not think that Imām Ḣusayn did not die and was still alive, and c) and any other unexpected occurrence that needs clarification the community should return to our Ḥadīṭ narrators. Here he is referring to two ideologies: those who claim leadership by claiming reincarnation of Imām Ḣusayn and those who claim they are the agent of Imam Mahdi and have the power to receive taxes and pass verdict. The aim of this is to return to Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṭ. In same vein but from Sunnī point of view al-Ḥākim narrated that Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal said that the Prophet saying that there will be a the victorious group, Ibn Ḥanbal said that the Prophet meant Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṭ for battling evil and following the high standard and virtues of the companions of the Prophet.

While al-Mufīd criticised Ibn Bābawayh for carelessness and lack of discrimination among Ḥadīṭ, we find that Ibn Bābawayh was quite careful and employed the science of Ḥadīṭ, using several criteria. Ibn Bābawayh’s first criterion for multiplicity is narrated from three chains of isnād. He was aware that isnād from the Imāms received through Šī‘ah isnād classed as a singular Ḥadīṭ. This is evident in his work and gave an example in his *al-Iʿtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah* from Sulaym b. Qays al-Hilalī. To dismiss Ibn Bābawayh argument, again al-Mufīd criticise Ibn Bābawayh in using the circulated copy version narrated by Abān b. ‘Ayyāš who narrated from Sulaym b. Qays. Al-Mufīd argued that although the text of this book is sound the isnād are unreliable and Ibn Bābawayh unthinkingly adopted it. Then he added that multiplicity is not an indication of
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962 Ibn Bābawayh, *Kamāl al-Dīn*, vol 1, p. 84.
authenticity, the Imāms were living in fear. To base an argument on multiplicity of isnād is not going to prove false traditions to be their true teachings and the only way to find reliable teachings is to follow the practices of scholars that continued for generations. Al-Mufīd, questioning the reliability of the book, has dismissed the Ḥadīṯ criterion mentioned in this book. However, al-Mufīd contradicted himself in his work al-Muqni‘ah used the tradition narrated by Abān b. ‘Ayyāš when spoke about paying the fifth. Also, al-Mufīd classified the reliability of early narrators depending upon whether they confirmed that each Imam had a will of succession from their fathers and forefathers. In other words, I observe that al-Mufīd judged narrators based upon their ideology and not based upon their skill and reliability as a source. His only criterion that was mentioned was a plurality of Šī‘ah narrators. Similarly, to al-Kulaynī whenever there is an unreliable narrator (such as Sahl b. Zīyād) in his al-Kāfī he uses the term ‘Several of our friends’ (ʿida min aṣḥābinā) narrated it too. If, for example, there were several narrators in his community who all narrated from a single isnād, then he would consider it as a ‘consensus’ (ijmāʿ). He makes much of this term. But in reality, no matter how many contemporary narrators he adduces, the only thing that matters are the number of isnāds. Moreover, on one hand, al-Mufīd was focused on defending and championing Šī‘ah belief, refuting those questioned Imāmah such as wazīr b. ‘Abbād (kitāb al-Naqd ‘ala b. ‘Abbād fi al-Imāmah), al-Rumānī and described Ibn Bābawayh describing him Ḥašawī. While on the

966 Ibid., pp. 147 and 8.
969 Al-Najašī, Rijāl Al-Najašī, p. 185.
other, shedding the light on Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq as superior to the Sunnī in his knowledge; stating that al-Ṣādiq had four thousand students from both Sunnī and Shi‘ah.973

3.8.3 ‘ibādāt

With the exception of traditions about worship/rituals (taʿabud), Qāḍī Abdul Jabbār, the judge of Rayy (1024/415 A.H), said he would allow two chains of narrators and connected with the Prophet, specifically to support the rule about the etiquettes of worship (taʿabud).974 Hence it is important for Ibn Bābawayh to comply with what was permitted. Also, this explains why Ibn Bābawayh was careful and did not share all of his works until after his death. About responding to questions involving ritual ‘ibādāt, as we see in his condition of Man Lā Yahḍuruhu al-Faqīh. Ibn Bābawayh preferred narrators, free from association with Manichaeism, Bardaisanism, or hallājīyah. He did not mind Sunnī so much for questions involving history or politics. However, it was the ġulāt (his umbrella term for all non-Sunnī sectarians) that he did not accept as authoritative narrators. At the Caliph’s court, all Ibn Bābawayh cared about was proving his case. Though he would never use a Bardaisan narrator, or Manichaean narrator (these were all considered extremist by the Caliph from the time of the Abbasid Mā’mūn) he might use Sunnī narrators, or Muʿtazilite narrators, or notes (uṣūl).975 But at home, among his community in Rayy, he required three reliable narrators.976

I infer that he did not include Ḥadīṯ for example in his al-Hidāyah unless they were supported with at least three reliable chains of narrators, at least three separate, non-

974 Those who shared similar conditions of reliability, such as muʿtazila figure and judge Qāḍī abdul Jabbār and Sunnī figure and judge al-Ḥākim. Qāḍī abdul Jabbār, al-Muḡnī, (Cairo: wizārat al-ṯaqāfa wa l-Irṣād al-qawmī, n.d.), vol 17, p. 380. 
975 Notes are a record of a tradition written by students and hadīṯ collectors. These notes were written on various forms leather, wood, bones, and paper.
976 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 84.
intersecting isnād that all traced back to the same Imām, at this early stage, there was no preference whether to choose a Sunnī chain of isnād or Šīʿah. For Ibn Bābawayh, the source did not need to be the Prophet. As soon as he could trace a chain of narrators back to an Imām, he was satisfied that it was inherited from the Prophet, regardless of the process of transmission from The Prophet to the Imām. It could even be an intuition that the Imām had. For Ibn Bābawayh’s contemporaries, al-Mufīd and al-Kulaynī, sufficient consensus consisted of three respected teachers drawing upon a single chain of narrators. He was stricter than his contemporaries. That is why al-Mufīd called him an ḥašawī since he cut out large swaths of tradition because he was so strict on isnād. Ibn Bābawayh called those who see the Prophet and the Imams to be infallible from making errors exaggerators/extremists (ḡulāt), saying they are unreliable narrators; for example, he stated that if it was permitted to reject all traditions aḵbār (news of the past) there will be no ūsārī to practice.977

One of the characters in Ibn Bābawayh’s work. He often refers to Imāms statements more than the Prophet. Similarly, we see his contemporary the judge of Rayy, Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār al-Muʿtazilī.978 Who stated it is not permissible to say what the Prophet said, or the Prophet commanded particularly when it comes to religious rulings. Simply, because the traditions did not come from the Prophet directly but transmitted from a single chain of narration.979 However, with certain exceptions, if something was considered to be historically accepted then it is permitted. For example, early companions such as abū Bakr in his succession of the Prophet continued some of the rulings such as the rights of inheritance grandparents to inherit their grandchildren, he trusted ʿUmar narrating from the Prophet.980 Furthermore, Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār explains further the ḥadīṯ system in Faḍl al-

To see more about the biography of Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār see al-Ḍahabi, Siyar aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ, (Beirut: Dār Al-Fikr, 1997), vol 13, p. 151.
980 Ibid., p. 380.
Iʿtizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-Muʿtazila.\textsuperscript{981} Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār worked as the judge of the city of Rayy. Both Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār and Ibn Bābawayh wrote works for wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. 'Abbād. There is no mentioning of Ibn Bābawayh from wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. 'Abbād, whereas Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār’s work Al-Muğnī fi Abwāb al-Tawḥīd wa l-ʿadl stated that it was a gift to the wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. 'Abbād.\textsuperscript{982} Then the wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. 'Abbād praised Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār for his knowledge and described him as the most knowledgeable person that walked on the face of the earth.\textsuperscript{983} We don’t see the same response with Ibn Bābawayh. Ibn Bābawayh mentions that wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. 'Abbād wrote a poem praising ʿAlī al-Riḍā and in response to that Ibn Bābawayh, gave him his book.\textsuperscript{984} Al-Ṣāḥib b. 'Abbād was not Muʿtazila but strictly Ḥanafī exercise raʿī and in favour of the Zaydī claim.\textsuperscript{985}

Again Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and ʿAlī al-Riḍā appeared in Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār’s work giving similar response to the creed of Muʿtazila.\textsuperscript{986} The question that ʿAlī al-Riḍā answered whether mankind has the freedom of will or God has full charge over their decision.\textsuperscript{987} He gave a list of names from the first and second generation from the offspring of the Prophet who followed Muʿtazila thinking.\textsuperscript{988} The significance of the response of ʿAlī al-Riḍā to al-Faḍl b. Sahl in the court of the Caliph al-Māʾmūn.\textsuperscript{989} Ibn Bābawayh similarly narrated 18 traditions in ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā about ʿAlī al-Riḍā responding to al-Faḍl b. Sahl and one of the traditions similar to that of Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār, but with an extended discussion


\textsuperscript{983} Ibid., p. 121.


\textsuperscript{985} Ibn Hajar al-ʿAṣqalānī, Lisān al-Mīzān, vol 1, pp. 531-2.

\textsuperscript{986} Abī al-Qāsim al-Balḵī, Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār al-Muʿtazili and al-Hākim al-Jashmī, Fāl al-ʿtizāl wa Ṭabaqāt al-Muʿtazila, p. 337.

\textsuperscript{987} Ibid., p. 337.

\textsuperscript{988} Ibid., pp. 75 and 214.

\textsuperscript{989} Ibid., p. 337.
between al-Māʾmūn and al-Riḍā. Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār added abū Sahl al-Nubaḵtī and his nephew, abū Muḥammed Ḥasan b. Musa as members of Muʿtazila thinking.

Ibn Bābawayh’s methodology did not differ from the Sunnī leading figure and judge abū ʿAbdullah Muḥammed al-Ḥākim al-Naysāpūrī al-Shafiʿī (d. 1014/405), Abū l-Husayn al-Baṣrī (d. 1044/436) was a leading figure of the Muʿtazila school. Singular transmitted traditions cannot be used as the uṣūl al-dīn unless was supported by a second witness. al-Baṣrī gave a further explanation that a singular isnād could mean narrator’s opinion, interpretation and sometimes fabrication and cannot be used in uṣūl of religion. Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh shared a similar approach to decide which ḥadīṯ used in uṣūl al-dīn. An example of that, the topic of infallibility, Ibn Bābawayh referred to an incident took during the Prophet’s time. A companion of the Prophet known as ǧū al-yadayn reminded the Prophet that he had missed a rakʿa while performing prayer. The Prophet turned back and asked two of his companions abū Bakr, and ʿUmar, whether ǧū al-yadayn was correct or not. Both Ibn Bābawayh and abū l-Husayn al-Baṣrī concluded that the reliability of a single isnād ḥadīṯ singularly transmitted cannot be considered as the truth unless it has a second witness testimony to testify it was true.

Ibn Bābawayh on this ḥadīṯ went further to prove his argument that neither the Prophet nor Imāms were infallible beings, stating that he followed his teacher Ibn al-Walīd. On the contrary, al-Mufīd dismissed the tradition altogether and said that there is no such companion called ǧū al-yadayn. Al-Kulaynī narrated a different version that the companions behind the Prophet questioned whether the prayer was shortened, then Prophet

asked ŏū al-yadayn whether he confirm the companions’ statement. Here al-Kulaynî version. 994

Let us not assume all Ibn Bābawayh’s ḥadīth to be supported by two isnād. Ibn Bābawayh with this restriction took a similar approach to his contemporaries. These traditions are ultimately to serve as a witness to his creed, the closest to his creed we have today his work al-Hidāyah and al-I’tiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah (which will be discussed shortly). There is another version of the latter work that has survived through the refutations by his student al-Mufid.

3.8.4 Kabar al-Wāḥid(597,469),(933,472),(930,526),(594,523)

Al-Mufid criticises Ibn Bābawayh for using kabar al-wāḥid.(609,523),(914,526),(911,579),(606,577) 995 Whereas al-Qāḍī ʿabdul Jabbār gives more explanation that kabar al-wāḥid(659,579),(860,580),(857,634),(656,633) that could easily starts as a lie, a fabrication made up by a sect, that over the time can become widespread and seen to be authentic by that particular sect (madhab). 996 He argues that some of the traditions start as propaganda then in later generations’ thinking mutawātir. 997 ʿAbdul Jabbār argued that for a tradition to be taken seriously and reliable it has to be transmitted by the multitude (several communities) not related or associated to each other i.e. there is no evidence that they gathered together and fabricated false news. 998 He added that the second current that of the lawyers (fuqahā’) who accepted kabar al-wāḥid(517,634),(938,636),(935,690),(514,688) as authentic with the condition of being supported by the practice from generation to generation. 999 Then added that this

994 Al-Kulaynī, Al-Kāfī, vol 3, p. 357.
998 Ibid., vol 16, p. 10.
999 Those who shared similar conditions of reliability, such as muʿtazila figure and judge Qāḍī abdul Jabbār and Sunnī figure and judge al-Hākim. Qāḍī abdul Jabbār, al-Muğnī, (Cairo: wizārat al-ṭaqāfa wa l-īrāsād al-qawmī, n.d.), vol 17, p. 380.
approach back to al-Jāḥiẓ.\textsuperscript{1000} Hence Ḥadīṯ narrated by one sect is classed as a single narration.

3.8.5 Appreciating his Ḥadīṯ

We cannot understand Iʿtiqādāt al-Imāmīyah and Taṣḥīḥ al-Iʿtiqādāt without going back to al-Hidāyah and we cannot fully grasp Iʿtiqādāt al-Imāmīyah without going back to his Ḥadīṯ and we cannot appreciate his Ḥadīṯ without going back to the isnād. The wazīr Ibn ʿAbbād was known to have rejected singular (aḥād) Ḥadīṯ.\textsuperscript{1001} Not all traditions. In an environment that was competitive. There was no room for singular narration or for a random unexperienced compiler to attend his court. Ibn Bābawayh was known to the Sunnī as faqīh from Rayy,\textsuperscript{1002} and the Muʿtazilite biographer Ibn al-Nadīm addressed him as faqīh his book al-Hidāyah.\textsuperscript{1003} Ibn Bābawayh attended the wazīr’s court and his work such as al-Hidāyah demonstrate that he followed Muʿtazilite conditions. The difference is al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād describes what was classed as tawātur that has been recognised by multitude for centuries such as the battle of Badr and Uḥud.\textsuperscript{1004} This will be discussed further shortly.

Ibn Bābawayh to support what he said in books Hīyah and Iʿtiqādāt. He narrates a Ḥadīṯ, common among both Sunnīs and Šīʿah, to show that the number twelve for Imams was not invented by the Šīʿah. The companion of the Prophet, Jābir Ibn Sumra, who was from the tribe of Qurayš and worked with the Umayyad’s, states that he heard the Prophet in a sermon saying that ‘this nation (umma) will remain held high on the condition that it is led by twelve caliphs, then the Prophet paused and said silently ‘they are from the tribe

\textsuperscript{1000} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1001} Al-Tawḥīdī, Aḵlāq al-Wazīrayn, p. 89.

of Qurayš
does not hold any credit because the term ‘righteous’ in this tradition can only apply to
the twelve Imams. This meant twelve successors from his offspring, who were not only
knowledgeable, but were from the purest of lineage of the Qurayš. Ibn Bābawayh in his
narration of Sulaym b. Qays was not saying that Imām ʿAlī was a ‘conduit’ (Warner’s
term), I infer he was trying to convince others to make an exception of him and take his
teachings in replacing the all of the Ṣaḥāba.

The wazīr al-Ṣāhib b. ʿAbbād raised scepticisms about two Ḥadīṭs (al-ḵidr) and (al-
laiḥ) both include the names of 12 Imams. Al-Ṣāhib b. ʿAbbād describe the two Ḥadīṭ of
how sectarian Ḥadīṭ look like. They could appear to be consecutive when in reality they
are not. He states there are two traditions Šīʿah narrates: about the tablet (al-laiḥ) and (al-
ḵidr). That these two traditions supposed the Prophet prophesy claiming that he will be
succeeded by 12 Imams and he supposedly gave their names, the names of the twelve
Imāms. Then he goes further stating that Šīʿah narrators tend to exaggerate and
sometimes take a false story and attach it to an isnād of narrators to give it some value and
often the names of the isnād are not heard before, then added, for example, the tradition
about (al-kidr) and the other tradition about the tablet (al-laiḥ). Ibn Bābawayh
sometimes narrates from his father and teacher Ibn al-walīd and not from al-Mahāsin. In
either version of the tradition, b. ʿAbbād was aware of the context and rejected it as
fabrication.

1005 Ṭhāmed b. Hanbal, Misnad, (Beirut: Dār Iḥyāʾ al-Turāṭ al-ʿArabī, 1994), vol 6, p. 94., and Muslim al-
and al-ʿAmāṣī, p. 310.
1009 Ibid.
1010 Ibid., p. 237.
1011 Ibid., p. 232.
The contemporaries such as Kohlberg have discussed al-Barqī’s tradition and the names of the 12 Imams. Kohlberg greatly doubts Ibn Bābawayh’s ability as a muḥaddīṭ and an interpreter of philosophical traditions. In Kohlberg’s work *From Imāmiyya to Ithnā Ashariyya*, he states that many fabrications are to be found in Ibn Bābawayh’s works in comparison to one of the major sources, such as *al-Maḥāsin* by al-Barqī (d. 893/280). He argues that Ibn Bābawayh repeatedly gives different versions from those in *Kamāl al-Dīn* and *Kitāb al-Ḵiṣāl* and his work shows alterations and much manipulation, possibly fabricated to suit the new situation of the Imāmī now living without an Imam. For example, *al-Maḥāsin* mentions nothing about the names of the Imams; by contrast, Ibn Bābawayh’s work gives a full list of the names of the twelve Imams to claim that it had elements of prophecy in containing certain names.\(^{1012}\) For Kohlberg Ibn Bābawayh is a traditionalist and a believer. He changed the tradition to suit his beliefs. This is why he fabricated the names of the Imams when there was no such list of Imams in the original ḥadīth. The tradition about (al-ḵiḍr) narrated in earlier work in *al-Maḥāsin* by al-Barqī only mentioned ‘… your successors from Hussein … until he reached the last successor’,\(^{1013}\) He mentioned only Imām ‘Alī and Hussein.\(^{1014}\) Ibn Bābawayh in his introduction of *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh* stated that the books of *al-Maḥāsin* by al-Barqī is one of his main sources.\(^{1015}\) But Ibn Bābawayh narrated the tradition tablet (al-laūḥ) with 7 isnāds in *ʿUyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā*, and all of them list the names of the 12 Imams.\(^{1016}\) His work was given as a gift to the wazīr b. ’Abbād.\(^{1017}\) Again he narrated the same tradition in *Kamāl Al-Dīn*.\(^{1018}\) While the tradition about (al-ḵiḍr) is narrated in 3 books: *Kamāl Al-Dīn*, ‘illal al-Šarāye’, and *ʿUyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā*.\(^{1019}\) The isnād of the tradition came from his father and his teacher

---


\(^{1014}\) Ibid.


\(^{1016}\) Ibn Bābawayh, *ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā*, vol 1, pp. 308-47.

\(^{1017}\) Ibid., vol 1, p. 3.


Muḥammed b. al-Ḥasan al-Walīd, who narrated from Saʿad b. ʿabdullah and al-Ḥumairī similar content to al-Kulaynī’s. both isnāds narrated from al-Barqī, giving the 12 names of the successors.

There are two versions of his work; one that is published did not have the full list of names and one that is orally transmitted in Ibn Bābawayh work and al-Kulaynī had the full list of names. Al-Ṭūsī stated that the work of al-Maḥāsin, sometimes had extra text added to it and sometimes texts were taken out. The two works that were recognised during the lifetime of Ibn Bābawayh al-Hidāyah and al-ʿIʿtiqādāt fī Dīn al-Imāmīyah. Neither of them contains the two traditions (al-kiḍr) and (al-laūḥ).

However, I infer that it is likely that Ibn Bābawayh believed that he knew the names of the twelve Imams for the following: 1) al-Barqī was a Twelver, 2) Ibn Bābawayh argued defending his creed in his Hidāyah and 3) he gave his interpretation of the number twelve one thing they had in common the general agreement their martyrdom and gifted with knowledge. He included ḥadīṯ is that the religion of Islam was not completed until passing of twelve Imams.

We need to go back to the restrictions surrounded Ibn Bābawayh’s time. Al-Tawḥīdī stated that the wazīr Ibn ʿAbbād saw prophetic ḥadīṯ, tafsīr and following Ṣaḥābah rulings of halal and haram as outdated useless material used by compilers to fill their books (ḥašū). Ibn ʿAbbād was strict on not allowing prophetic ḥadīṯ. He even described the famous al-Buḵārī as a hašawī stating that his work was not

---

1020 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 313.
1021 Ibid., vol 1 p. 308 and ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Ridā, vol 1, p. 41.
1022 Al-Kulaynī, al-Kafī, vol 1, p. 525.
1023 Ibid.
1024 Al-Ṭūsī, al-Fihrist, p. 20.
1025 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, pp. 67, 276, 281, 300.
1026 In vol 1, p. 67. Ibn Bābawayh respond to Zaydī challenge about the hadith. The Zaydī argue that the hadith is deliberately falsified by the Šīʿah Imamī narrators to support their doctrine and was not prophecy from the Prophet. Ibn Bābawayh respond to the contrary, that the hadith has been overwhelmingly narrated by the Sunnī narrators and not just the Šīʿah Imamī.
worthy (la yu’awal ‘alaihy).\textsuperscript{1026} And yet he did not describe Ibn Bābawayh as ḥašawi.\textsuperscript{1027} Ibn Bābawayh was aware of the strictness and careful about what he could narrate. His work dedicated mainly to Imams as the narrators and interpreters of prophetic teachings and not about the Šaḥābah. This is what makes him different from al-Buḵārī. Except al-Mufīd who uses the term ḥašawi and aşhāb al-ḥadīṯ in his refutation of Ibn Bābawayh.\textsuperscript{1028} His objection based on Ibn Bābawayh questioning the infallibility of the Imāms by the Ḥadīṯ. He stated that they (ḥašawi) base their judgment on the apparent meaning of the text, has led them to believe that prophets were fallible can commit major sins like us and they accuse those who believes in the prophets’ infallibility to be extremist and exaggerators.\textsuperscript{1029}

Ibn Bābawayh was not alone in narrating the same ḥadīṯ: it was narrated by al-Tawḥīdī who narrated it from Ibn Rabāṭ al-Kufī, the head of the Šīʿ ah of Bağdād, but without the reference of Sulaym b. Qays.\textsuperscript{1030} Ibn al-Nadīm describes the book as one of the earliest Šīʿ ah works available.\textsuperscript{1031} I agree with Gleave that the tradition presents that the Imams were well aware about the literal meaning and categorisation of the text much before the emergence of Uṣūl al-Fiqh.\textsuperscript{1032}

To go further about al-Mufīd argument. He saw ḥašawi as the opposites from qīyās. Al-Mufīd admittedly stated that his two teachers, Ibn Bābawayh and Ibn al-Junayd Iskāfī, both gave opposite verdicts on fiqh and both claimed their knowledge from the Imams.\textsuperscript{1033} However, Ibn Bābawayh supported his verdicts with ḥadīṯ, by contrast, Ibn al-Junayd did

---

\textsuperscript{1026} Al-Ḍahābī, Siyār aʿlām al-Nubalā’, (Beirut: Dār Al-Fikr, 1997), vol 12, p. 527.
\textsuperscript{1028} Al-Mufīd, Taṣḥīḥ al-ʿtiqādāt, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{1030} Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Imtāʿ wal Mūʾānasah, (Cairo: Luqnit al-Taʿlīf wa l-Tarjamah wa l-Naṣr, 1944) vol 3, p. 197.
\textsuperscript{1031} Ibn al-Nadīm, Al-Fihrist, p. 271.
not rely on ḥadīṯ. Then al-Mufīd commented that Ibn Bābawayh was a follower of ḥadīṯ and did not use reason and, therefore, that made him contradict those who know best.\footnote{Ibid.} The difference between Ibn al-Junayd and Ibn Bābawayh is that Al-Mufīd used neither deductive nor inductive reasoning. His thinking was very much political, he was concerned only with common knowledge ‘ām, that is the consensus of the Šī‘ah community.\footnote{Al-Mufīd, al-Taḍkirah, p. 36.} He states that everything is disputable except if for a specific situation that had a consecutive ḥadīṯ from the Imams otherwise everything is disputable including singular ḥadīṯ.\footnote{Al-Mufīd, Awā’il al-Maqaṣāt, p. 139.} He argues that the difference between Ibn al-Junayd (Muḥammed b. Ahmed al-Iskafi) and Ibn Bābawayh is that Ibn al-Junayd uses qīyās in a deductive (istidlālī) manner without the support of Imams’ ḥadīṯ. Ibn Bābawayh, on the other hand, does the opposite. He uses qīyās inductively (istiqrā’ī) with the support of ḥadīṯ, that is transmitted from a singular chain of isnād and often singular narrator open to making errors.\footnote{Al-Mufīd, al-Masā’il al-Sarawīyah, (Qom: Al-Mu’tamar Al-ʿālamī Lil-Šaiḵ Al-Mufīd, 1413 A.H), p. 71.} I infer that al-Mufīd is referring to a singular chain which it could be an interpretation of a Sunni narrator and never was the true meaning of the Imams. For the traditionalists, qīyās was the logic that Lucifer used against God’s command.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, ‘I’llal al-Šarāyi’e’, vol 1, pp. 88 and 91.} Qīyās was always bad because it replaces God’s revelation with manmade thinking. The traditionalists did, however, use a form of logic, namely, they used the linguistic and historical context to interpret the text. They did not call this qīyās, they simply spoke of ‘collecting ḥadīṯ jāmiʿ al-ḥadīṯ. I infer that Ibn Bābawayh was in this category, collecting a large number of ḥadīṯ so that he would have a better historical/textual understanding of the ḥadīṯ context. This is reflected on his work al-Hidāyah who was made accessible to mainstream, and it was recognised by Ibn al-Nadīm.\footnote{Ibn Al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 243.} al-Mufīd, like Ibn al-Junayd, had limited ḥadīṯs, and therefore his historical/linguistic context was also limited. Al-Mufīd states that Ibn Bābawayh is
influenced by Greek philosophy because his narrators were all influenced by philosophy, and he indiscriminately collected them. This is similar to what Newman states. He argues that much of the work by Ibn Bābawayh has a philosophical flavour. Thus, the accusation that he was not rational thinking but that he was a follower of the text ḥašawī goes back to al-Mufīd. Al-Mufīd disliked Ibn Bābawayh for two reasons, first, Ibn Bābawayh excluded Šīʿah narrators who believed in infallibility, and second, al-Mufīd opposed Greek philosophy itself, and he believed that Ibn Bābawayh used interpretations from Greek Philosophy in his works, though in an unthinking way, for al-Mufīd did not credit Ibn Bābawayh with being a philosopher, but only with ignorantly repeating philosophy.1040

I infer that al-Mufīd had his own motive that was not related or concerned with teachings of the Imams. It was political motive. He wanted the Prophet and Imams to be seen as infallible and as superior to the state law. He argued that ḥašawīyah those who see God redundant in creating the world and believing in traditions states that the souls of Imams eternal and not created making their soul like gods partners to God and this belief parallel with philosophy malāḥidah.1041 In al-Masāʾ il ʿAkbarīyah he describes ḥašawī those who take the literal meaning of ḥadīṯ that souls were created before creation and have the ability to thinking, understanding and speaking.1042 Then al-Mufīd called Ibn Bābawayh a ḥašawī and aṣḥāb al-ḥadīṯ.1043 While Mufīd’s student, such as al-Šarīf al-Murtaḍa describes ḥašawīyah and aṣḥāb al-ḥadīṯ, they believe that prophets are allowed to commit major sins.1044 For example, Ibn Bābawayh in believing what he narrates about the souls

---
1042 Al-Mufid, Al-Masāʾ il AlʿAkbarīyah, p. 27.
The brother of Šarīf Al-Raḍī (d. 1015/406) he was best known for his book Nahj al-Balāğah (Peak of Eloquence) a collection of ‘Ali ibn Abī Ĺālib speeches.
Al-Husayn b. Mūsa al-Musawi (their father of Šarīf Al-Raḍī and al-Murtaḍa) became the ambassador ‘ṣafīr’ of al-Tālibiin responsible for pilgrimage to and from Mecca.

---
exiting before the body with fully functioning consciousness in the world of al-ğar.\textsuperscript{1045} Furthermore, the fact that al-Mufīd was opposed to Greek Philosophy and describes it ilḥād,\textsuperscript{1046} yet that he used Ibn Bābawayh’s material in his arguments in his books indicates that he must have considered Ibn Bābawayh’s ḥadīths to be reliable.\textsuperscript{1047} Al-Mufīd narrated directly from Ibn Bābawayh.\textsuperscript{1048}

Al-Mufīd accusation was not whether the isnād connected or weak. He argued that Ibn Bābawayh was not careful with what he compiled.\textsuperscript{1049} How to reconcile with the fact that Ibn Bābawayh was accepted as one of those attended the court. He was known by biographers to be Imāmī faqīh.\textsuperscript{1050}

He believed the Prophet’s ḥadīt are not to be taken literally, they have to be explained and verified by the Imams. For example, in his Iʿtiqādāt al-Imāmīyah he supported his argument by two chains of narrators, and they did not always have to be narrated by a Šīʿah.

Some of the disputed points raised against Ibn Bābawayh. Here the link of each point supported by Ibn Bābawayh has a parallel ḥadīt in Sunnī canon. (a) the soul. The ḥadīt states that within the human instinct, people like each other or not, it depends on our souls’ relationships with each other before our birth in the human world. The souls meet with each other before their birth and by that, it defines their feelings towards one and another human world.\textsuperscript{1051} The same ḥadīt mentioned with a different chain of narrators by his

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1046} Al-Mufīd, Taṣḥīḥ al-ʾtiqādāt, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{1050} Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 243.
\textsuperscript{1051} Ibn Bābawayh, Al-ʾtiqādāt, p. 48.
\end{flushright}
contemporaries Sunnī such as abū al-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī (d. 970/360) in his *Mu’jam al-Wasīṭ* and abū Na‘īm al- nóngānī (1038/430 A.H) in his *Ḥulliyat al-Awilīyā’* and al-Mas‘ūdī in his *Murūj al-Ḍahab*.\(^{1052}\) Whereas al-Mufid classed this tradition as singular *ahād*.\(^{1053}\) (b) the ḥadīṭ about the intellect, Ibn Bābawayh narrated that God’s first creation from light was the intellect. He narrated the tradition with two different chains from Sunnī,\(^{1054}\) and Shī ‘ah.\(^{1055}\) The same tradition was narrated by abū al-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī but with a different chain of narrators.\(^{1056}\) (c) *al-la‘īl m-mahfūz* placed on the forehead between the eyes of angel Isrāfīl.\(^{1057}\) He narrated it from the Sunnī chain of narrators.\(^{1058}\) The ḥadīṭ narrated in Tafsīr al-Qommī with different isnād.\(^{1059}\) Al-Ṭabarāṇī narrated same ḥadīṯ with a different chain of isnād.\(^{1060}\) Ibn Bābawayh added that *al-la‘īl* and *al-Qalam*.\(^{1061}\) (d) ḥadīṯ about kindness. The second importance after belief is kindness (tawādud).\(^{1062}\) Abū al-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī narrated the same tradition.\(^{1063}\) (e) *la‘īl* and *kursī* are two angels,\(^{1064}\) Al-Ṭabarī. Also narrated tradition about abū Bakr on his death bed he regretted doing three things and one of them attacking the house of Fāṭimah.\(^{1065}\) The same tradition was narrated by al-Ṭabarī and al-Uqaylī.\(^{1066}\)
Whereas al-Mufid did not follow the same way, instead followed an approach that was more sectarian by narrowing the condition for authenticity. Al-Mufid in his *al-Iršād* states that all those who narrated that Imam al-Riḍā was his father’s successor, he argued, therefore, they are reliable, trustworthy, knowledgeable, and pious.\(^{1067}\) In his work *Awā’il al-Maqālāt*, al-Mufid was critical of the Muʿtazilite and other groups treating consensus as having the upper hand in interpreting the text, and he argued in favour of the Imāmī community and the Imāms’ interpretations above the consensus. He also listed several views in agreement with Muʿtazilite of Bağdād over the Muʿtazilite of Basra who he was critical of the latter.\(^{1068}\) From both demonstrated examples from Ibn Bābawayh and al-Mufid. I infer, al-Mufid criticism of Ibn Bābawayh is based on being exclusivist, dismissing all Šī‘ah traditions that their content similar to what with Sunnī narrated.

### 3.9 Summary of Chapter Three

The Šī‘ah ḥadīths were of two currents. First, there was al-Kulaynī and al-Mufid, who largely focussed on the teachings of Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. Second, there was Ibn Bābawayh, who referred to Imam ʿAlī al-Riḍā. Those who based themselves on Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq formed into unified extremist ideologies. Al-Kulaynī and al-Mufid’s separate compilations became the foundation for this extremist current. Their collection came from various interpretations of followers of Imam Jaʿfar. These followers came from Manichaeism and Bardaisanism. Al-Kulaynī and al-Mufid were concerned to bring as many as possible under the umbrella of Imam Jaʿfar. Their school was originally attributed to Imam Jaʿfar. They were interested in the number of adherents, not in the quality of adherents. By contrast, Ibn Bābawayh, on the other hand, was interested, not in the number of adherents he compiled, but in the purity, the quality, of his compilations. Ibn Bābawayh’s major focus shifted from simply passing on the traditions, to finding a place


for, and justifying through philosophy, the occultation of the Twelfth Imam. His major concern became resolving, through philosophy, several basic questions: the eternity and nature of the soul, the concept of infallibility as applied to the Qur’an and to Imams and to The Prophet, and the problem of evil as it relates to the ‘return’ of the ‘soul’ after death.
Chapter 4 Historical Background

4.1 Conflicts in Early Islam – the Birth of Three Ideologies

The key point in the theological debate is the extent of God’s involvement keeping our world safe from evil that accompanied human beings since Adam creation. For example, the story of Adam, Angels and Lucifer easily found in Qur’an (2:34-8) and Ḥadīṯ. There are commonalities among Muslim groups that God did not leave earth without a guide. It could mean the Qur’an while to some an agent to give them a clear direction for eternal life. However, there are differences regarding the identity of this divine agent. In the history of Islam, after the death of the Prophet, there was no consensus on the condition of the legitimacy of the role of the ideal leader/caliph to succeed the Prophet. The Muslim community continued to be unified and did not require leadership until the Prophet’s death. They did not have a clear guideline on who should lead and succeed the prophet. There were few debates caused by differences of views among the companions and nothing was serious enough to cause a war. The role of the Prophet Muḥammad as the Ideal virtuous leader Imam and political leader was ended by his death, leading to the separation of the idea of spiritual leader [Imām] and political leader caliph. The caliph had limited authority and certainly not the same power as the Prophet. By contrast, the Šīʿah saw Imamah as necessary for God’s justice. The Šīʿah emphasised the bloodline that continued through twelve generations after the Prophet through his lineage.

There was no clarity on who should lead. For example, there is the tradition of ḡadīr ḵum the pond of Kum (in present-day in Saudi Arabia close to the city of al-Juḥfah),to which in 632/10 the Prophet gave a sermon. This sermon has two versions transmitted

---

by Shī‘ah and by Sunnī but with two different interpretations of the same event. The Sunnīs hold that the Prophet said that ‘Alī is the loyal friend of the Prophet and others should not be back-biting him, while the Shī‘ah version states that the Prophet said ‘God has instructed me’ to tell you ‘Alī is your chosen friend and ally. The Shī‘ah Twelvers al-Kulaynī and al-Mufīd believe in following Imam ‘Alī, the Prophet’s cousin and son-in-law, to be his successor and the Imam. This was not due to his kinship but because ‘God has revealed to the Prophet that ‘Alī should be his successor.’ Some Ḥadīth include details that the Prophet had placed a turban on ‘Alī’s head as a sign of succession. A year after this, the Prophet was poisoned and died. While Ibn Bābawayh Ḥadīth did not say that he was appointed as a political leader but as Imām of piety (Imām al-Mutaqīn). The Shī‘ah traditions by al-Kulaynī, al-Mufīd and Ibn Bābawayh claims that it was intentionally done by companions who wanted the power for themselves and hence were trying to keep ‘Alī out. The subject of succession and leadership has remained controversial ever since. The Sunnīs such as al-Isfrāyenī accepted that the Prophet’s early companions were the best examples to follow and had the right to choose their leader and therefore who should succeed the Prophet. However, the Sunnī view did not entirely prevail, the Prophet’s companions fought each other, and four caliphs were assassinated one after another. After the death of the Prophet, there was nothing which established whether his cousin

1076 Al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī, vol 1, p. 289 and vol 8, p. 27.
Ibn Bābawayh narrated two different versions of the Ḥadīth:
Similar to al-Kulaynī God instructed the Prophet to call announce ‘Alī as his successor. (al-Amālī, vol 2, p. 125). In the second version in al-Amālī, (vol 2, p. 354) at the end of the Ḥadīth a verse was revealed: “This day have I perfected your religion for you and completed My favour unto you, and have chosen for you as religion al-Islam.” (Translation: Pickthall, M. The Holy Qur’an, 5:3).
1081 Al-Sayūfī, Tārīḵ al-Ṣulafā’, pp. 85, 147, 180 and 196.
Imam ʿAlī or his oldest companion and father-in-law abū Bakr should succeed the Prophet. The community continued as unified; they did not question each other about from where they narrated their isnād until the assassination of the third caliph ʿUṭmān Ibn ʿAffān, who was succeeded by Imam ʿAlī. This was followed by three major wars: the Camel Jamal between ʿAlī and ʿĀʾīšah the wife of the Prophet and daughter of abū Bakr. Şiffīn between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiyah the cousin of ʿUṭmān, and Nahrawayn, and ʿAlī and a group of his soldiers known as ‘The Leavers’ Kawārijīj. The war between companions made the community question the religious text, the revealed word of God, the Qur’an, for describing the companions to be pious and just (ʿadalaṭ al-Ṣaḥābah). The latter was not satisfied with what the religious texts provided. The Šīʿah who rejected both the text and Prophet’s companions treated the companions and those who believed in them as sinners for favouring others over Imam ʿAlī. During the conflict among the companions of the prophet, a new movement appeared which started with the theological claim that humans possess free will and are responsible for their action, and the movement, known as Qadarīyah and later on known as Muʿtazilia. They questioned the doctrine that all those who met with the prophet and died as Muslims were ‘just companions’ (ʿadalaṭ al-Ṣaḥābah). A group

1083 Al-Nawawī, Sahih Muslim bi-Šarh al-Nawawī, vol 1, p. 80.
1085 Ibid., vol 3, pp 70-1.
1086 Al-Ṣahrastānī, al-Mīlāl wa l-Nīhāl, vol 1, p. 132.
1089 Al-Ṣahrastānī, al-Mīlāl wa l-Nīhāl, vol 1, pp 40 and 56.
of fighters belonging to Imam ʿAlī turned against him: ‘if you see your enemies were believers that means, according to the prophetic text, you have become a sinner, it would not have been lawful to fight them’. This group was named ‘The Leavers’ ʿKawārijj, not only for turning against ʿAlī but also for questioning the text.¹⁰⁹¹ The first theological doubts and questions arose immediately after the death of the Prophet, and then in an ongoing fashion in the next generations after the death of the Companions. Their questions were basic: who is worthy to be the Just Guide? What is the origin of violence: divine will or human action? Who is a believer and an unbeliever?¹⁰⁹²

Tenth century Šīʿah writers such as Saʿad b. ʿAbdullah al-Ašʿarī al-Qommī (d. 913/301), Kitāb al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq argue that after the death of Imām ʿAlī both divisions ‘Āʾišah and Muʿāwīyah gathered together under one leadership of Muʿāwīyah a new doctrine appeared Murjiʿah that they saw those who opposed Imām ʿAlī were not sinners but Muslims and ‘left to’ (irjāʿ) God to decide. Then added and from Murjiʿah came Jahmīyah and most of Ḥašawīyah are followers of irjāʿ.¹⁰⁹³ Abī Muḥammed al-Nubaktī (d. 922/310) Firaq al-Šīʿah, abū al-Ḥasan al-Ašʿarī, (d. 936/324 A.H) Maqālāt al-Islāmiyīn, abī al-Ḥasan al-Masʿūdī (d. 957/346 A.H) Murūj al-Ḍahāb. ḍabdul Qāhir al-Baḡdādī (d. 1037/429 A.H) Uṣūlal-Dīn and al-Farqu bayna al-Firaq, Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalūsī (d. 1063/456 A.H) al-Faṣl fi al-Milal wal Niḥal, abī al-Muẓaffar al-Isfarāyīnī (d. 1078/471) al-Ṭabṣīr fi al-Dīn wa tamyīz al-Firaq al-Nājīyah ‘an al-Firaq al-Hālikīn, abī al-Faṭḥ al-Šahrastānī (d. 1153/548) al-Milal wal Niḥal. From their list I have chosen four sects for study: Šīʿah, Qadarīyah, Muʿtazilite, and Jabrīyah. Al-Nubaktī stated that all Muslims groups spurred out of 4 divisions: Šīʿah, Muʿtazilite, Murjiʿah, and

Kawārijj.\textsuperscript{1094} Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ašʿarī stated that started with first five groups: Šīʿah, Kawārijj, Murjiʿah, Muʿtazilite, and Jahmīyah.\textsuperscript{1095} Abū Bakr al-Jawzī started with Kawārijj, Qadarīyah by Maʿbad al-Juhanī and al-Jaʿad b. Dirham, then branched into Muʿtazilite by Wāṣil b. ʿAṭṭā’ and ʿUmrū b. Ubayd during the caliph abū Jaʿfar al-Manṣūr.\textsuperscript{1096} The four major sects were divided ideologically.

4.2 Four Ideologies for Interpretations

The problem of evil has always been a topic of debate. From early generation the question persists that if God is the creator of the good and evil, then who is responsible for evil doing? For example, the burning of Kaʿba during the Ṣaḥābah generation, Maʿbad al-Juhanī questioned God’s will Qadar.\textsuperscript{1097} His question became fundamental to start the doctrine of free-will that humans possess free will and God does not control them Qadarīyah.\textsuperscript{1098} In the early Abbassid period philosophy became integrated in the discussion and debates were held at the court of the caliph included different sects and religions. Some of the questions Muslim and non-Muslim philosophers and theologians have tried to make sense of the corporeality of the world (ḥudūq al-ʿālam), evil šar, and revelations wahī. In early Islam, Muslims were divided ideologically into sects regarding how they envisaged the universe and their role in this world and how to deal with the problem of evil. Furthermore, these ideologies and sects became political movements, and some were involved in coups.

a) The Šīʿah, such as al-Mufīd, who held that God had chosen ʿAlī as the successor of the Prophet, but the Companion ʿUmar intervened preventing the Prophet from writing his

\textsuperscript{1094} Al-Nubaḵtī, Fīraq al-Šīʿa, p. 51.
\textsuperscript{1095} Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ašʿarī, Maqālāt al-ʾIslāmīīn wa Ḥikmat Al-Muṣafīn, (Beirut: al-Maktabah al-ʿaṣrīyah, 1990), vol 1, p. 65.
\textsuperscript{1096} Abū Bakr al-Jawzī, Talbīs Iblīs, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{1097} Al-Faryābī, Kitāb al-Qadar, p. 207.
\textsuperscript{1098} Al-Šahrastānī, Al-Milāl wa-Nīḥal, vol 1, p. 57.
will,\textsuperscript{1099} then they grouped against him in \textit{Saqīfa banī Sā‘īda} and pushed him aside \textit{jahādīh},\textsuperscript{1100} which makes the companions responsible for the evils that came afterward.\textsuperscript{1101}

b) The \textit{Murji‘ah}, who believed that non-practice of religious obligations is not a sin, and only God has the authority to judge others.\textsuperscript{1102} al-\textit{Isfrāyenī} added they are similar to \textit{Qadarīyah} on God’s will that in their doctrine you can be religiously faithful and a sinner at the same time.\textsuperscript{1103} Some of the figures are abū Ḥanīfā al-Nu‘mān, Mālik b. Anas and majority of the Ḥašawīyah.\textsuperscript{1104}

c) The \textit{Qadarīyah}, they argued that if God wanted to stop or prevent any kind of disobedience he would have stopped Lucifer from questioning him and exiled him from heaven, but instead he granted him to misguide human beings until the end of time.\textsuperscript{1105} Sinning is not God’s responsibility but man’s.\textsuperscript{1106} The caliph abū Bakr shared similar doctrine with \textit{Qadarīyah} whereas to the caliph ‘Umar doctrine everything was predestined by God similar to Jabrīyah.\textsuperscript{1107} (for further explanation see section 4.4.3)

d) The Mu‘tazilites, known as \textit{ašhāb manzila bayna al-manzilatayn}.\textsuperscript{1108} a branch of \textit{Qadarīyah} who claim that we are responsible for our evil doings and not God.\textsuperscript{1109} There are no eternal attributes and God has no power over human, fish and ant.\textsuperscript{1110} They were
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\textsuperscript{1099} Al-Mufid, \textit{al-Iršād}, vol 1, p. 184., and \textit{al-Amālī}, p. 36.


\textsuperscript{1101} Al-Mufid, al-Iršād, vol 1, p. 184., and al-Amālī, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{1102} Al-Šahrastānī, \textit{Al-Milal wa I-Nihal}, vol 1, p. 162.


\textsuperscript{1108} For further about Jabrīyah see al-\textit{Šahrastaṇī}, \textit{Al-Milal wa I-Nihal}, vol 1, p. 97.

\textsuperscript{1109} Al-Mufid, \textit{Awā’il al-Maqālāt}, pp. 33 and 4.

\textsuperscript{1110} Al-\textit{Šahrastaṇī}, \textit{Al-Milal wa I-Nihal}, vol 1, p. 57.
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divided about merits of Imamah. That is leadership whether a virtuous (fāḍil) person able to be role model or based on expertise skilful in what he can do for example the Prophet appointed someone skilled but not religious such as ’Amrū b. al-‘Āṣ to lead an army had virtuous men.\textsuperscript{1111}

The debate was regarding the Imamah, namely, questions about whether God’s plan is for leadership to reside in the family of the Prophet. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī argued that this is contradictory to what he witnessed at the time, that Muslims are divided over the leadership and none have agreed on the criterion to be the true Imamah. Imamah meant ‘clarity’, not confusion; the sign for clarity is that everyone is convinced who should be the Imam and not what groups are claiming.\textsuperscript{1112} Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh gives tradition according to al-Riḍā that gives a similar description of the Imamah and clarity,\textsuperscript{1113} an Imām who has the gift of knowledge that is doubt free, continuously grow, namī al-‘ilm, full maturity, kāmil al-ḥilm, the instinct to leadership, muḍṭali’ bil Imāmah, skilled in the management of the state affairs, ‘ālim bil Siyāsah, by instinct he is recognised by the laymen as Godly commander, mafrūḍ al-Ṭā’ah, and qā’im bi amr Allah. The same Ḥadīṭ was present in 4 of his books.\textsuperscript{1114} Back to al-Tawḥīdī, it states we have several claimers and none of them succeeded in convincing one another: Qaṭī (Twelver), Jubā’ī (Mu’tazilite), Jārūdī (Zaydī), Ašʿarī, Qarmatian, Nuṣayrī, and Kārijī. By contrast, if God had appointed someone as Imam, then his leadership would not be in dispute, all would naturally agree and accept him.\textsuperscript{1115}

\textsuperscript{1112} Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, \textit{Al-Imtāʿ wal Mūʿānasah}, vol 2, pp. 76-7.
\textsuperscript{1115} Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, \textit{Al-Imtāʿ wal Mūʿānasah}, vol 2, pp. 76-7.
4.3 The Seventh Century Origins of the debate regarding fate qadar and ‘free will’

From 632 to the death of ‘Uṭmān, to the Battle of the Camel, to the Battle of Šīfṭīn, to the problem of Kawārijj, the death of ‘Alī, up until the Burning of the Ka’ba,1116 there was continual conflict and unrest, both intellectual and political. The Prophet was gone, there were questions about whether the Qur’ān was eternal or created,1117 and the Companions of the Prophet were morally debatable. All this provoked people to think. It stirred up kalām – speculative theology became inescapable.1118

4.3.1 Earliest Šī‘ah’s Interpretations of the Death of ‘Alī, of Judaism, and Occultation

The assassination of ‘Alī brought a new issue. His death lead to theological clashes regarding God being just for letting the Imam be killed by evildoers without recompense. The Šī‘ah interpretation of the conflict between God’s justice and the killing of the Imams and living without an Imam led them to the belief in three things: a) return (rajʿah) to life after death to restore justice, b) Occultation of the Imam as a mechanism of concealment for a greater purpose and c) the eternity of Imām ‘Alī soul and that he is not dead.1119 In the first encounter, Gnosticism was introduced to the Šī‘ah during the ‘Uṭmān reign. There was a religious Jew in Yemen named ‘Abdullah ibn Saba’ son of Sabaean or son of the land of Sheba, who believed in Joshua Yuṣa’ ibn Nūn, as the successor of Moses, in the sense that Moses’ soul transmigrated within Joshua. After the death of the Prophet Muḥammed, Ibn Saba’ embraced Islam.1120 He decided to join ‘Alī. He introduced gnostic

1117 Ibn Ḥażm al-Andalūsī, al-Fasā’il fī al-Mīlāl wa l-Nihal, vol 2, p. 36.
thought according to which it is part of God’s plan for ‘Alī not to die until God fulfils his promise for ‘Alī to inherit the earth and bring justice. His belief became widespread among the people of Kūfah and Babylon.1121 The term saba‘iyah does not always mean the followers of ‘Abdullah b. Saba’. It refers to Shi‘ah followers who believe in the transmigration of the soul.1122 Specifically, Sunnis will apply the term to Shi‘ah in a derogatory way, even though the Shi‘ah does not follow the actual man ‘Abdullah b. Saba’. I observe that the belief of ‘Abdullah b. Saba’ was unique to Shi‘ah because he spoke about Imamah and return (raj’ah).1123 The Imamah to continue until the end of time through the offspring of Imam ‘Alī.1124 Some of the controversial teachings of ‘Abdullah b. Saba’ were:

a) ‘Alī was the successor of the Prophet Muḥammed in the same way as Joshua was the successor to Moses; b) It is compulsory to believe that ‘Alī is the Imam after the Prophet; and c) It is compulsory to reject the three caliphs such as abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uṯmān, treating them as symbols of falsehood.1125 Ibn Saba’ treated the Imams like God. After the death of Imam ‘Alī, he stated that ‘Alī only died for a short period and would not be dead forever and was destined to return to life again and his return was needed to establish God’s justice on earth which was filled with evil, namely greed and immoral values.1126 Ibn Saba’ argued that if God is all good and just, He will not allow evil to be left unpunished. The death of an Imam is unethical and immoral. If God is all good, He will not allow evil to claim victory over righteous people and leave criminals unpunished. This question goes


right to the heart of Šīʿah theodicy and the problem of evil. Then when Imam ‘Alī heard what Ibn Saba’ has said about him, he exiled Ibn Saba’ to the land of Babylon.\footnote{1127}{Ibid.} Similarly, the Šīʿah authors agreed with al-Šahrastānī, and al-Nubaḵtī added, ‘hence this is why others see that the Šīʿah doctrine has roots traced back to Judaism’.\footnote{1128}{Ibid.} Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh narrated a similar story indicating that Ibn Saba’ met with Imam ‘Alī and asked him, ‘If God is everywhere then why do we raise our hand in prayer?’ Imam ‘Alī responded that our sustenance (rain) comes from above, so we raise our hand to the source of sustenance.\footnote{1129}{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh}, vol 1, p. 325.} The authors such as al-Nubaḵtī, abū al-Ḥasan al-Ašʿarī and al-Nāšī’ al-Akbar they said that Ibn Saba’ doctrine was the return (rajʿah) of Imām ‘Alī only,\footnote{1130}{Al-Nubaḵtī, \textit{Firaq al-Šīʿah}, (Istanbul: Maṭb’a al-Dawlah, 1931), p. 20.} whereas Sa’ad b. ‘Abdullah al-Ašʿarī al-Qommī attached transmigration (tanāsuḵ) with Saba’īyah.\footnote{1131}{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh}, vol 1, p. 325.} However, I infer that transmigration came much later that Saba’īyah, when Muslims adapted philosophy.

**4.3.2 Christianity and Occultation**

Ibn Bābawayh, in his works, does not discuss Christianity or the Arab Christians, or Gnosticism, in detail. However, he does mention them, and also mentions the themes that derive from them. This section will therefore address the Christian background which influenced Ibn Bābawayh’s discussion of the problem of evil and return after death. The occultation was present in the belief of gnostic Arab Christians. The Christian mainstream was led by two Churches: eastern and western. There was a third group, however, in the Arabian Peninsula. There were those Christians who had been rejected by the two mainstream churches. They settled in the Arabian Peninsula. They followed a gnostic

---

version of Christianity, which taught that Jesus went into occultation. They argued that, when Jesus returned after his death and resurrection, he looked different from the Jesus they formerly knew. They claimed that Jesus had appeared again to them and had chosen Simon as his successor (in Arabic called Šamʿūn who was the first person to believe in Jesus and is often linked with the gnostic version of Jesus). Similarly, Ibn Bābawayh saw occultation as his main point for why the Šī’ah community could believe in Imamah even when no apparent Imam is living among them and gave the example of Šamʿūn going into hiding.1132 According to al-Šahrastānī, the mainstream Muslims did not agree with Jewish or Christian interpretations of God’s transcendence. The Jews treated God like a human, while the Christians preferred the idea of a human-like God. These two interpretations became absorbed and adopted by Muslim groups. The Šī’ah treated their Imams ‘like God’ while traditional Sunnī treated God ‘like a human’.1133

After the Sunnī and Šī’ah views of God’s transcendence, there comes a third interpretation by the followers of the Mu’tazilites who saw transcendence as the great solution in the interpretation of God. For instance, the term ġulū from a Sunnī point of view is given to those who believe in the incarnation of ġulūl from the world above onto the created human being.1134

During al-Ma’mūn he sent for Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ to question him about whether the Qur’an was created or not and tašbīḥ. Among them was Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal he was prevented from continuing his fatwa and narrating Ḥadīṯ, known as the inquisition about the corporality of the Qur’an.1135 On the other hand, some of the Šī’ah went to the extreme and believed incarnation ġulūl of God’s essence in their Imāms.1136 I observe that this question

1132 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 158.
1134 Ibid., p. 204.
1135 Al-Ṭabarī, Tārīḵ al-Umam wa l-Mulūk, vol 5, pp. 189 and 91.
1136 Al-ʿAṣrī, Maqālāt al-İslāmiyyīn, vol 1, p. 82., and al-Šahrastānī, Al-Milal wa l-Nihal, vol 1, p. 27.
of God’s transcendence and immanence, namely his intervention in the world, is fundamental to Šī‘ah theology. God intervenes through manifestation into the body of the Imam who is like a vessel for God’s knowledge and guidance. As Amir-Moezzi noted, the Šī‘ah doctrine of the imam is similar to the figure of Christ within Christianity.\textsuperscript{1137} This is due to the influence of Christian Neoplatonism that brought with it a gnostic version of interpretation.\textsuperscript{1138} Those who followed traditions describing God above the heavens could not escape from falling into making God similar (\textit{tašbīh}) to humans and thus were contradicted by the question of transcendence.

The Šī‘ah of Qom and Rayy found their way forward amid various other minorities who did not want to clash with the Buwayhid's rulers. McDermott observes from the al-Tawḥīdī account that due to the pressure posed by Ibn ʿAbbād against followers of traditions for believing in anthropomorphism, Ibn Bābawayh wrote his book, \textit{al-Tawḥīd}, as a defence against the accusations that the Šī‘ah believed in anthropomorphism and the assimilation \textit{tašbīh} of God’s attributes to created beings such as humans. Ibn Bābawayh’s defence of the Šī‘ah was based on claiming that the Šī‘ah belief was compatible with transcendence \textit{tanzīh} and divine justice, which are the two main principles of the Mu’tazilite doctrine.\textsuperscript{1139}

Ibn Bābawayh was faced with the question of how to justify gaps that occurred between prophets and Imams. He argues that there may be a gap between revelations, but never in Imamah. He asserts that the non-apparent Imamah does not contradict the continuity of \textit{nūr}, that is, God’s light, essence. The succession of God’s light has continued since Adam. For example, there is a gap between the \textit{Injīl} and the Qur’an called \textit{fatrah}, and between Jesus and Muḥammed. There was a succession of successors (\textit{wasīt}) who kept

\textsuperscript{1137} Amir-Moezzi, \textit{The Silent Qur’an}, p. 172.
\textsuperscript{1138} Ibid., p. 170.
themselves hidden and anonymous out of fear of their enemies. One such was Ḵālid b. Sinān al-ʿAbsī who was the last wasḥ before the Prophet Muḥammed.\textsuperscript{1140} The time gap between Jesus and Muḥammed is fatrah. The occultation of a prophet is ġaybah.\textsuperscript{1141} It does not matter if there is fatrah or if the Imam should be apparent or in hiding, like Ḵālid b. Sinān al-ʿAbsī, for fear of enemies, as long the prophets’ teaching continues.\textsuperscript{1142} The same story narrated by al-Masʿūdī, however, he mentioned that Ḵālid b. Sinān had died and was buried. Then he added that b. Sinān had asked his children when they see a camel coming from a neighbouring village and start to tap on the grave, he asked them to dig him out of his grave. It is a sign of his resurrection from death. After a while, the camel did come and did exactly what their father had told them. However, his sons did not dig him out for the fear of being ashamed by the people.\textsuperscript{1143}

Ibn Bābawayh commented that the first occultation in history occurred in history was the Prophet Enoch (Idrīs). After his disappearance, his followers suffered injustice from rulers until it was revealed to them that their saviour is coming and that he is one of Idrīs’s offspring. The moral of the story that the right of the land belongs to a Šīʿah rāfiḍī and it was unlawfully taken from them.\textsuperscript{1144} Again the same with term Rāfiḍa, he narrated that Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq said 70 men of Pharaoh joined the camp of Moses and because of this they were called by Pharaoh side as the rejecters Rāfiḍa for rejecting the rule of Pharaoh.\textsuperscript{1145} Al-Nubakṭī refers to the term rejecters with Ibn Saba’ who claim that the belief in ’Alī as the Imam to be made compulsory and to reject his enemies.\textsuperscript{1146} Likewise, the term rāfiḍa is associated with political movement anti-state. Abī Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (d.
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1004/395 A.H) stated that usually when you ask a rejecter (rāfīdah) about their doctrine they associate themselves with Šī’ah, and similarly when you ask the jabriyyah they associate themselves with the Sunnī, except Mu’tazila they did not mind to be called Mu’tazila.\footnote{Abī Hilāl al-ʿAskārī, al-Awā’il, (Beruit: Dār al-Kutub al-ʿilmīyah, 1992), p. 265.} Then added the belief in rejection (rāfīd) of salaf it was Ibn Saba’ invention.\footnote{Ibid., p. 270.} It is worth mentioning that Ibn Bābawayh uses terms such as azāriqa and rāfiḍa before they existed. For example, he narrated according to al-Bāqir that one day a dictator saw green land that he liked and wanted to have it for himself. He was informed the land belong to a rejecter rāfīdī, so he asked the owner and made him an offer, but the rāfīdī rejected his offers. The king was married to a woman from azāriqa (ḵawārij), she said to him to use false witness against rāfīdī and take ownership of the land. The king brought azāriqa as his witnesses and forcefully took ownership.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 127.}

The gap that exists between revelations or between philosophers has always been a matter of disputation. Muḥammed b. Aḥmed al-Bayrūnī (d. 1050/442) states that during his time the concept of knowledge was split into two: corporeal muḥdāt and eternal qadīm.\footnote{Al-Bayrūnī, Risālah lil-Bayrūnī, (Paris: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1936), pp. 21-2.}

The first argument is that knowledge is corporeal (muḥdāt). This signifies that the essence of knowledge is revealed, namely, God’s intervention with revelations that later on created religions and was ultimately passed on to later generations. Often this applies to the Abrahamic beliefs. The second argument is that knowledge is eternal (qadīm). Those who argue that knowledge is eternal say that to access it we need to learn theories to uncover the knowledge.\footnote{Ibid.} On the other hand, Ibn Bābawayh does not agree with the teachings that God intervenes in human affairs. If knowledge is eternal, there is no need to connect one generation with the rest, since knowledge is part of the universe and has always

1148 Ibid., p. 270.
1149 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 127.
1151 Ibid.
Here Ibn Bābawayh agrees with the belief that knowledge is eternal. He described God as the eternal light (*al-Nūr al-Qadīm*). However, proving the continuity of scriptures became problematic because it raised the issue of gaps between prophets and the discontinuity of scriptures. Ibn Bābawayh affirmed that there were several gaps (*fatrah*) of discontinued prophetic laws (*Šarāye*), such as laws of Nūḥ and Abraham, Abraham and Moses, Moses and Jesus, and Jesus and Mohammad. He argued that discontinuity of scriptures should not question the continuity of succession (*waṣī*) who did not have the apparent role as Imam among the people. And sometimes waṣī’s role is to interpret the scripture. Ibn Bābawayh, explains this in his *Kamāl Al-Dīn* and did not explain anywhere else. In his defence of the occultation of the twelfth Imam, argues that occultation was common knowledge at the time of the companions (*Ṣaḥābah*). For example, when the Prophet passed away, the companion ’Umar said that the Prophet was not dead but in ḡaybah. He said this because they were familiar with the ḡaybah of Moses who went away for forty days from the children of Israel. If the Imam was in Mecca but not in Medina, one could not conclude that there was no Imam at all; he did not need to be physically visible to exist. He states in response to his opponents that ḡaybah was not invented by the Imamis. ’Abdul Qāhir al-Bağdādī (d. 1037/429 A.H) stated that one of the earliest disputes among the companions was that the Prophet did not die but that he lifted above for a short while like Jesus.

---

1154 Ibn Bābawayh, *al-Ḵiṣāl*, vol 1, p. 283. The term *fatrah* (period of time) is often confused with the time of resurrection. However, *fatrah* is when people can gain good or bad deeds.
1156 Ibid., vol 2, p. 662.
1157 Ibid., vol 1, p. 85.
1158 Ibid., p. 110.
4.3.3 The Eastern Church among the Muslims

The Muslims did not talk in detail about Christianity. Their main focus of discussion and refutations were the views of three eastern Christian groups: Malachite, Jacobite, and Nestorians. This is discussed in the works of abū ʿIsā al-Warrāq Al-Radd ʿala al-tathlīth, and Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī (d. 1064/456) al-faṣl fī al-Milal wa al-ahwāʾ wa al-niḥal and al-Šarastānī (d. 1153/584) al-Milal wa al-Niḥal. The focus of these authors was mainly the trinity as it clashes with their doctrine about God. On the other hand, this indicates it may not necessarily be that Islam was opposed to every aspect of Christianity, but only to a few particular aspects such as the trinity and the incarnation of Christ.

4.4 Free-Will

Now we will discuss the origins of the debate regarding fate qadar and ‘free will’, two related topics which the Sunnī group is known as Qadarīyah actively brought to the attention of the Islamic leadership in Mecca and Medina. Three major moral issues provoked theological debate and hence, raised the prominence of speculative theology which was used in the debates. First was the problem that not all the Companions of the Prophet were righteous and thus their ethics were not valid for all time, second, whether the Qur’an was an eternal book and word of God, and third, the general problem of evil and free-will regarding the justice of God.

4.4.1 First Moral Issue Provoking Theological Debate: The (Un)Righteousness of The Companions

The first major moral issue stirring up the Qadarīyah was the problem of the Companions, a theological debate concerning an apparent moral conflict: certain verses of Qur’an describe the Prophet’s companions as being righteous and just, but, those very companions slaughtered thirty thousand of each other for political gain during the Battle of the Camel, ʿAbdul Qāhir al-Bağdādī added that if we follow the interpretation of ʿAmrū
b. 'Ubayd then all those who joined the Camel battle are destined for hell fire (sāʾir aṣḥāb al-Jamal fī al-Nār). Those of the Qadarīyah faction asked how does one resolve this tension between the text and actual historical events? The Qadarīyah observed that the Battle of the Camel presents only three moral possibilities. First, because all the combatants ('Alī, 'Āʾishah, and the Prophet’s companions) shed the blood of fellow Muslim believers, therefore, they all committed a major sin according to the Qur’an and the Sunnah, which explicitly forbids the killing of fellow Muslims. Thus, they were all evil. This was the view of the group called ‘The Leavers’ (Kawārijj) who were fighters in 'Alī’s army who left 'Alī when he did not punish 'Āʾishah and The Companions of the Prophet as sinners. They left the community and started their fighting group. The fact that there was no punishment of the opponents as ‘sinners’, prompted the Leavers to conclude that 'Alī had fought his opponents for personal gain, not for moral reasons. Ultimately, the Leavers assassinated 'Alī, because they felt he had tricked them, manipulating religion for his gain.

The second moral possibility raised by the Qadarīyah was that 'Alī was good, and the others were neither good nor evil, neither sinful nor pious, but ‘in-between (manzila bayna al-manzilatayn). There was, in fact, a whole group of Sunnī who believed this. They were the Mu‘tazilites, the followers of Wāsil b. 'Aṭṭa known as the mutakalimūn. They taught that some of the Companions, of their own free will, fought 'Alī, knowing that he was more righteous than they. But the Companions who took part in the fighting against 'Alī were morally ‘in-between’ (manzila bayna al-manzilatayn). The Mu‘tazilites claimed this was an alternative answer to resolve the apparent contradiction between the Qur’an describing the companions as pious and the historical reality of the Companions fighting each other over the political position. The third moral possibility was that the

---
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1164 Al-Šahrastānī, Al-Milal wa l-Nihal, vol 1, p. 63.
Opponents of ʿAlī were all good but simply exercised poor judgment. The majority of Sunnī Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ took this option. In this case, ʿĀʾīšah and all the Companions had high morals. They are to be treated as one treats one’s parents, who may individually make different decisions. In this way, the Sunnī managed to explain how ʿĀʾīšah could remain a highly moral person, and keep her position of being Mother of the Believers, even though she fought ʿAlī. ʿĀʾīšah simply made a bad decision, she was not intrinsically evil or a sinner. Now the Sunnī said that, since the Companions fought each other, we will not join in their criticism of each other, because it is distracting from the practice of religion and undermining Islam itself. Therefore, they said they would only take religious traditions, ḥadīṯ, from the Companions, but they would not accept The Companion’s personal political opinions regarding each other. But there is one exception, any narration that has a narrator that focuses on criticism of the Companions should be excluded as unreliable and heretical, against the ‘right path. Thus, they excluded a large number of Šī’ah and Qadaṣūyah narrators. The Qadaṣūyah differentiated themselves from the Šī’ah, who had their version of the Battle of the Camel. The Šī’ah said that anyone who challenged Imam ʿAlī regarding leadership was evil, including ʿĀʾīšah and all the companions of the Prophet who sided with abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUṯmān. A similar moral conflict ensued two years after the Battle of the Camel at the battle of Ṣifīn. The Qadaṣūyah argued that historically, the Companions again fought each other in the battle of Ṣifīn between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiya and Companions were killed. The Muʿtazilite fassagu al-Ṣaḥāba the Companions committed a major sin for transgressing towards the other. This is the same moral dilemma as with the Battle of the Camel.


\[1166\] Ibid.


\[1168\] Al-Nubaṭṭī, Firaq al-Šī’ah, p. 44.
4.4.2 The Second Moral Issue Provoking Theological Debate: The Eternity of The Qur’an

This second major moral issue is about the nature of revelation, whether the actual word of God came to the Prophet, or whether the Prophet received a revelation that needed interpretation. Everything depends on whether the revelation came directly from God word for word, in concrete fashion, needing no interpretation, or whether it was revealed as intuition abstractly, needing interpretation by the Prophet who would then apply it to his circumstances. The Mu’tazilites took the second option and therefore claimed that there was no eternal book and no word-for-word revelation. For them, the Qur’an is created (maklūq), only applicable to the Prophet’s circumstances. Therefore, for the Mu’tazilites, Qur’an is not above the state. The authority of the learned caliph supersedes that of the Qur’an. The Qur’an is outdated by its limitation to the era of the Prophet. The Prophet is dead and therefore his teaching is no longer authoritative. The Mu’tazilites praise the Prophet but not his book. For them, the Qur’an is unique only in that its poetic standard is perfect, and in this miracle of perfection, it shows that the Prophet was unique. This issue is illustrated in the early debate between the Abbasid’s caliph and the Mu’tazilite al-Mā’mūn, and the traditionalist, Ahmed b. Ḥanbal.1169 This debate continued, and the caliph al-Mu’tashm has punished Aḥmed b. Ḥanbal on the topic of the Qur’an created.1170 For the Mu’tazilite God is eternal and nothing else.1171 It was a turning point in Islamic thinking regarding the Qur’an because it helped to resolve the question of the locus of political authority. After the death of the Prophet, it was not clear where political authority resided. The traditionalist Sunnīs claimed absolute authority, both political and religious, resided in the Prophet’s book. The debate was won by al-Mā’mūn, who rejected the absolute authority

1170 Al-Masʿūdī, Murūj al-Ḏahab, vol 4, p. 60.
of the Qur’ān, and thus the Sunnī appeal to the Qur’ān and Ḥadīth were side-lined. The remaining contenders for power were the caliphate and the Šī’ah leadership. Both the state and the Šī’ah leadership claimed that because the Prophet was dead, neither he nor his book had authority over them. He had no authority because he was dead. His book had no authority because, in Mu’tazilite thinking, its authority was tied to the living Prophet. Both the caliphate and the Šī’ah leadership accepted this Mu’tazilite premise limiting the authority of the Qur’ān. The prophet during his lifetime combined military and religious leadership. The caliphate inherited the military power, the Šī’ah leadership inherited the religious power (at least this was so at the time of the debate during the early ninth century). Thus, there was a conflict. The caliph claimed absolute political power and so did the Šī’ah leadership. This ongoing debate was reflected in Ibn Bābawayh’s writings.

4.4.3 The Third Moral Issue Provoking Theological Debate: The Problem of God’s relationship with Good and Evil

The third major moral issue that stimulated the ‘free will movement’ Qadarīyah controversy was the fact that during the time of the Companions of the Prophet,1172 Al-Aṣ’arī commented that the earliest two ideologies that challenged the Muslim community. The question about God’s qadar came from Christian theologian convert and Imāmah came from Jewish theologian convert.1173 The Qadarīyah movement was influenced by a question posed by Ma’bad al-Juhanī, who argued that if God was more involved in human affairs, he would have protected the Ka’ba from being attacked by Ḥajjāj’s catapult, or at least, would have punished Ḥajjāj.1174 Why did not the good God deal with the problem of evil? He just let it happen. Ma’bad al-Juhanī discussed God’s involvement in human destiny, or ‘fate’ qadar because of Sawsan (or Sansawayh), an Iraqi Christian convert to

1172 Al-Aṣ’arī, Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn, p. 10.
1173 Ibid., pp. 10-1.
Islam, who introduced this question of the extent to which God is involved in our destiny and our free will. The Qadarīyah ideology rejected the eternity of all God’s attributes and God’s intervention in human affairs, leaving it to human free will. The Qadarīyah talks about two Eternals (abadīyah), evil and good. For the Qadarīyah, reason told them that people will always face evil and have to fight it. Therefore, the military state should have the upper hand over religion, since, as Hajjāj’s catapult proved, religion by itself was unable to defeat evil. The Qadarīyah began to say that God did not involve himself in human affairs, after all, they saw the Ka’ba burn, and God was absent. Thus, they became known as negators of God’s attributes mu’ātilah. They argued everything is in our hands, we have to use our reasoning, our own free will, and our military power to protect our religion. The Qadarīyah’s conclusion is identical with that of the dualist Persian Magians, for whom the king was a defender of the religion. This is important for the traditionalists who wanted to criticise the Qadarīyah and the Mu’tazilite for granting the state power over religion. By saying that the Qadarīyah got their ideas from a non-Islamic source, whether Persian or Christian, they could delegitimize it. The earliest Muslim groups Šīʿah Sabaʾiyah found by Jewish convert Ibn Saba’, Qadarīyah found by Maʿbad al-Juhanī (d. 699/80 A.H) influenced by Christian converts, Murji’ites by al-Jaʿad b. Dirham (d. 724/105) followed by al-Jahm b. Ṣafwān (d. 746/128 A.H), and Mu’tazilite found by wāṣil b. ‘Aṭā and ‘Umrū b. ‘Ubayd. They questioned God and his control of fate (qadar), and because they asserted that humans have free will. Thirdly, abū al-Ḥasan al-Aṣ’arī states that the three groups because they based their assumptions on non-reliable

1176 Al-Šahrastānī, Al-Mīlāl wa l-Nīḥal, vol 1, p. 60.
1177 Ibid., p. 240.
1178 Ibn Bābawayh stated that the Qadarīyah in their attempt to defend God; they ended up deny God’s sovereignty Sultān, which makes them the Magians of this Umma. See Ibn Bābawayh, al-Hidāyah, (Qom: Muʿasast al-Imām al-Hādī, 1418 A.H), p. 20.
1180 Ibid.
1181 Al-Nubakṭī, Firaq al-Šīʿah, p. 44.
narrators, who were Persian converts, Christians, and Jews, who brought their old beliefs with them into Islam, thereby creating more ideological and doctrinal divisions, and that they added their sectarian interpretation onto the pure prophetic traditions.\textsuperscript{1182} Having outlined this accusatory background context, we will now focus on the second group of accusations surrounding fate and free will, as this is fundamental to my thesis, since by the tenth century, the Šī‘ah, and the Qadarīyah especially, were virtually in charge of the state and so their theological concerns were widely accepted, were normalised, and the other Sunnī accusations were irrelevant.

The pivotal difference between Ibn Bābawayh and Qadarīyah is mainly about leaving free will without an Imām. For example, Ibn Bābawayh in his \textit{al-Hidāyah} was aware that Qadarīyah doctrine has some similarities with Imamīyah. In section 1 of this book, he talks about \textit{tawḥīd} and then addressed Qadarīyah as the Magian of this \textit{Umma}. Then stated they are Magian (relating them to dualism) for stripping God out of his sovereignty \textit{Sulṭān}, in section 2 about Prophecy \textit{Nubūwah} and then talked about the household of the Prophet that they are the cause for everything to exist including heaven and earth.\textsuperscript{1183} In section 3 about Imamah stated that denying Imamah is denying the Prophet and denying the Prophet is denying God.\textsuperscript{1184} He then describes Imams as God’s key to knowledge and salvation.\textsuperscript{1185} Ibn Bābawayh unlike the Qadarīyah, God did not leave earth without a guide. This guide can be apparent to the public or in hiding.\textsuperscript{1186}

4.5 Historical background of the Transitional time/ Sunnī to Šī‘ah

By the end of the ninth and tenth centuries, the Šī‘ah community did not worry about challenges from the Sunnī and did not even see the Sunnī as competitors, and there is hardly any refutation written against the Sunnī. For example, Caliph al-Muqtadīr, who was Sunnī,
in 902/290 A.H sent al-Ṭabarī to Ṭabaristān in Persia to promote ābū Bakr and ʿUmar and persuade the Šī‘ah people of Ṭabaristān,1187 in hopes that they would come back under his control, but with no success.1188 Al-Ṭabarī saw that the Šī‘ah belief was widely accepted and cursing of ābū Bakr and ʿUmar had become the normal practice.1189 Al-Ṭabarī died during the reign of al-Muqtadir.1190 Thirty years later in 336 Rukn al-Dawlah campaigned against the Samanids and took cities such as Ṭabaristān and Jirjān from Šamakīr the brother of the Samanid king Mardād.1191

4.5.1 The Ascendency of Šī‘ah Ḥadīṯ and the Inception of the Šī‘ah School

The ascendency of Šī‘ah Ḥadīṯ began in Bağdād during the reign of Caliph al-Muqtadir when a debate took place between the Šī‘ah author and narrator, Ibn ʿUqdah, and the Muftī of the state, Yaḥīya Ibn Muḥammed Ibn Saʿīd (d. 930/318 A.H.). Ibn ʿUqdah challenged Muftī Ibn Saʿīd and won the debate. It was a debate over a minor technical issue regarding the narration of ḥadīṯ. But it was ground-breaking for a Šī‘ah scholar to challenge a Sunnī expert who was a Muftī, and receive support from another Sunnī scholar in Rayy, namely, from ʿAbdul Raḥmān b. Muḥammed b. Idris al-Rāzī (d. 938/327 A.H.).1192 This debate was the foundation for Ibn Bābawayh to later justify the narration of ḥadīṯ whose source was the Imams. I infer that this debate provided encouragement that the Šī‘ah could now be considered by the Sunnī as scholars of ḥadīṯ in their own right. This debate meant that the Šī‘ah have their ḥadīṯ which are worthy to be considered by the Sunnī scholarly community. Moreover, now the Šī‘ah can stand before the State, the Caliph’s court, based on their ḥadīṯ, and not have to appeal to Sunnī ḥadīṯ. The establishment of independent Šī‘ah ḥadīṯ meant that, Šī‘ah school of law parallel to four established Sunnī schools.

1187 Al-Ḥamawī, Muʿjam Al-Udabā‘, vol 17, p. 57.
1188 Ibid., vol 17, p. 58.
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1190 Ibid., p. 58.
1191 Ibn Ḵaṭīr, Al-Bidāyah wa l-Nihāyah, vol 11, p. 300.
4.5.2 The Debate Between Ibn ʿUqdah and Muftī Ibn Saʿīd

This debate took place during the reign of the Caliph al-Muqtadir either between 913/301 and 917/305 or between 927/315 and 929/317. Ibn ʿUqdah had travelled and studied under both Sunnī and Šīʿah theologians of his time. The argument that the person with the most ḥadīṯ knowledge should lead the Muslim communities was central to the debate. Šīʿah focussing on Imāmah in predominant Sunnī would lose on this point because they had rejected the companions of the Prophet and so they had fewer ḥadīṯ, and the few ḥadīṯ they did have were all considered tainted with political emphasis on ʿAlī. The Sunnī never respected such politically coloured traditions. But this time, someone from the Sunnī themselves who had converted to a Šīʿah sect was defending Šīʿah ḥadīṯ. Without him, the Šīʿah would never have been recognised. Ibn ʿUqdah made possible the later birth of the Imāmī school of Twelvers. Ibn ʿUqdah emphasised two major points that the debate signified. First, he pointed out that the debate showed that there was a defect within the Sunnī school of thought. Second, through the debate, he brought back the Šīʿah heritage of ḥadīṯ. Regarding the first point of there being a defect in Sunnī thought, Ibn ʿUqdah was the first to introduce the claim that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq had inherited the prophet’s knowledge and that he had four thousand students, as a way of suggesting that Šīʿah can have their school of thought equal to the Sunnī, if not greater than the Sunnī. Immediately after the debate, Ibn ʿUqdah was imprisoned by the wazīr ʿAlī Ibn ʿIsa Ibn Dawūūd (d. 946/334). This was because it seemed that he had challenged the State. He was released after the ḥadīṯ was checked by the Sunnī leader of Rayy, ʿAbdul Raḥmān b. Muḥammed b. Idrīs al-Rāzī. Rayy was seen by the Caliphate as being authoritative because it had

1193 The wazīr ʿAlī Ibn ʿIsa Ibn Dawūūd worked as wazīr between 913/301 and 917/305 and then was brought back to work between 927/315 and 929/317. Ibn Dawūūd is the wazīr who imprisoned Ibn ʿUqdah after the debate, but we do not know whether it was in his first term or second.
1194 Al-Ḍahabī, ʿIṣyār aʿlām al-Nubalāʿ, vol 11, p. 446.
1195 Al-Mufīd, al-Iṣbahāʾ, vol 2, p. 179.
already fought various Šī‘ah sectarian heresies, Zaydisn, Ismailism, and gnostic movements in general. Thus, when a leading Rayy scholar approved of Ibn ʿUqdah’s ḥadīth, it was accepted by the Caliphate as being safe. Thus, the Šī‘ah themselves were now viewed by the Caliphate as being safe, and not a threat to the Caliph. Because of this turn of events, Ibn Bābawayh was later free to collect ḥadīth from Šī‘ah sources who were no longer afraid to speak about what they knew; he was also now free to use Šī‘ah ḥadīth, and compile book helps to answer individual issues such as marriage, death, inheritance, divorce, etc. Around the time of the debate, the Šī‘ah commander ʿAlī Ibn Buwayh Rukn al-Dawlah rebelled against the caliphate and took control of the region Iqlīm of the Mountains of Daylem,1198 and replaced Mardād as Sulṭān of Rayy. This administrative change did nothing to alter the theological field. Al-Rāzī continued in his position until his death and al-Rāzī’s theology continued to dominate in Rayy. Ibn Bābawayh himself would later work with Sulṭān Rukn al-Dawlah. Ibn Bābawayh was, in a real sense, the inheritor of the work of Ibn ʿUqdah and al-Rāzī.

4.6 Šī‘ah Moving into Greek philosophy

4.6.1 The Ismailis challenge

Now we will encounter, for the first time, philosophy debating a Šī‘ah scholar of ḥadīth. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (Aḥmed Ibn Ḥamdān Ibn Aḥmed al-Warsāmī), who was known for his knowledge of ḥadīth and his skill with language, converted to Ismailism and Ḥādīd.1199 Ibn al-Nadīm describes him as a dualist and who became zindīq.1200 He had a large following in Rayy. He was in charge of Daylem province, and led an esoteric bāṭinī dualist movement started by Maymūn al-Qadāḥ reaching abū Ḥātim.1201 Al-Isfarāyīnī added, describing their

---

success in art of persuasion deceivingly cleaver far more dangerous than the Dajjāl,\textsuperscript{1202} that Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī had his extreme views against abū Bakr al-Rāzī, calling him mulḥid and someone who rejected God’s involvement agnosticism taʿīl.\textsuperscript{1203}

I infer that abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī must have felt threatened by spreading of the philosophy of abū Bakr al-Rāzī in Rayy for him to pointedly say that he was mulḥid and to write a refutation against him.

4.6.2 Abū Bakr al-Rāzī vs Ismaili abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī

Up to this point, there was no true success in refuting extremist ideologies such as Ḥallāj, Šalmāḡānī, Ismaili, and Qarmatians. The physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī changed things. There was a great debate between abū Bakr al-Rāzī and the Ismaili abū Ḥātim in the city of Rayy about God’s relation to humanity the topic of revelation and prophecy,\textsuperscript{1204} abū Ḥātim was the missionary dāʿī of Rayy in the debate attended by the ruler Mardawīj.\textsuperscript{1205} I infer that abū Bakr al-Rāzī provided the ideological influence among the believing masses that would counter the anti-state ideology of Ismailism. Abū Bakr al-Rāzī died in 925/313 and in 929/317 Mardād took over the lands of Daylem. The Ismaili sect of the Qarmatians seized the black stone of Kaʿba.\textsuperscript{1206} In the meantime, the Romans took some lands and enforced taxes, while the Caliphate was losing its power. It also started losing taxes and struggled to maintain the army.\textsuperscript{1207}

4.6.3 Ideology of abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī

Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī argues, it is natural that all people are divided into two groups: teachers or learners (followers), and there is no third option. Naturally, the student will


\textsuperscript{1207} Al-Dāḥablī, \textit{Sīyar a lām al-Nubalā‘}, vol 11, p. 520.
develop intuition based on what he has learned from his teacher.\textsuperscript{1208} The teacher, too, when he was a student, learned from his teacher. Ultimately knowledge is inherited from somewhere else or someone who has received a revelation. This ultimate source of knowledge he called the ‘first knowledge’ which was the Imamah.\textsuperscript{1209} Therefore, every instance of knowledge that comes after this is merely a ripple of the original and called \textit{ilhām}, such as human tongues (languages), originated from \textit{ilhām}.\textsuperscript{1210} As for religious laws, the Imam is to decide what laws to keep or not. This is the responsibility of the Imams as teachers and providers of guidance from confusion.\textsuperscript{1211} God could only choose the best of people as an agent, as an Imam, so humans would not be left unguided. Based on this, abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī suggests it is in the best interests for humans to follow God’s agent and Imam.\textsuperscript{1212} Politically, the implication of abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī’s teaching was massive – the Caliph must obey the Imam. After challenging the state in this manner, abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī also challenged the philosophers and scientists. He said that knowledge and sciences are rooted in revelations belonging to prophets and can only be transmitted through learning passed on from one generation to another: for example, Plato was the teacher of Aristotle and so on. Knowledge could only be rooted back to a prophet and not invented by a philosopher.\textsuperscript{1213} What abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī was referring to is that the science of Astrology originated from the prophet Idrīs Enoch and also called Hermes, who was not a philosopher, but a prophet who received revelation from God.\textsuperscript{1214} Al-Bayrūnī added that
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there are two currents: those who see knowledge belongs to the prophets only and those who see that humans are born with the instinct to learn and use their analogy (qīyās) to seek, learn and analyse knowledge. The conclusion at the end of the process will naturally develop into inspiration (ilḥām). Thus, knowledge and science come from human observation, and not from prophets. For example, it could be a small action, such as observing a bird (ṭair) drinking water and carrying it in his beak, and then the observation grows into scientific knowledge. Knowledge was always present to all in ilḥām form, ‘alhama al-Jamī‘ wa ja‘al haḍîhi al-Hiiba ‘Āmma’, it only awaited humans to gain it through learning and practice and by seeking knowledge their spirit able to gain peace and clear sight. One does not necessarily need to be taught to understand how things work, one can be self-taught through trial and error. For example, the level of the cleanness (ṭahārah) of water is decided by our senses and not assumptions. To illustrate this idea, to some people (the followers of the religious school of thought maḍḥab) the water remains pure if a drop of blood falls in a lake, while for others the water has become impure. This divergence is because people use their faculty of senses to judge and not analogy from prophetic teaching. If they were thinkers using an analogy, they would immediately realize that the water is impure simply because it is exposed to natural situations and could be infested with dead animals.

This had tremendous political implications in favour of one philosophical position over the other. For abū Bakr anyone, through philosophy, can be an independent thinker. There is no need for prophecy. Abū Ḥātim, on the other hand, argued that prophecy is the key to

---
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salvation for the whole of society. Society needs an Imam to be treated as superior to a ruler that is not an Imam. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī issued a *fatwa* that abū Bakr al-Rāzī is *mulḥid*, a term used to denigrate philosophers for denying God’s involvement (*taʿṣīl*), or intervention in human life through an Imam. However, the state, which found abū Bakr’s teaching very useful, protected him. Abū Bakr al-Rāzī’s work successfully continued a century later to be a challenge to the Ismaili’s doctrine of Imamah. It was considered a threat to the Ismailis rulers and Imams in Egypt. The Ismailis considered that their Imam had inherited revelations from the Prophet on which the legitimacy of the Fatimid leaders was based. Imam al-Ḥākim of Egypt, whose legitimacy had started to decline, was greatly concerned that the work of abū Bakr al-Rāzī would become a political threat to his position as the current Imam. At this point, Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī (d. 1020/411), the Ismaili *dāʾī* of Iraq and student of Ibn Sīnā, planned to discredit and challenge the philosophy of abū Bakr al-Rāzī and focused his work *Raha al-ʿaql* on emanation. He saw it as the continuation of revelation through the offspring of the Prophet and made some corrections to abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī’s responses to abū Bakr al-Rāzī. He also wrote *al-Aqwāl al-Ḏahabiyya* responding to al-Rāzī on the points that were not answered accurately by abū Ḥātim. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī was killed and succeeded by Muḥammad b. Aḥmed al-Nasafī (d. 942/331 A.H), who his missionary work persuaded to convert Naṣr b. Aḥmed, for little while the leader of Samanid region, and made him pay for the death of al-Marwazī who was killed as a rebel, Naṣr b. Aḥmed regretted his following the advice of al-Nasafī and soon died then his son Nūḥ gathered

---
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lawyers and dialectic theologians (*mutakalimūn*) to debate al-Nasafī exposing him and his belief, he was sentenced and killed and then captured the rest of missionaries.\(^{1226}\)

4.7 Conflicts from within the 10th century – Three Versions of Muslim Dualism

The conflict moved on into the next century. Al-Masʿūdī stated that some of Muslims believed in delegates *aṣḥāb al-tafwīd* such as al-Muḡīrīyah and Qadarīyah and more recent al-Ḥallāj and al-Ṣalmaḡānī; they believed in incarnation *ḥulūl*, God’s embodiment in the body of Imām.\(^{1227}\) Al-Masʿūdī added that the followers of philosophy claim that the soul transmigrates but not incarnation *ḥulūl*. The soul journey from generation to generation and from garment to garment and they say that the Prophet believed in *tanāṣuḵ* when he praised a poet for saying he came from generation to generation, ‘ship to ship and from fathers to mothers until he was born as a prophet and saviour’.\(^{1228}\) Within the Šīʿah return and transmigration were not completely rejected. For example, on transmigration, Ibn Bābawayh narrated that the Prophet’s soul survived the flood when was in Noah ark,\(^{1229}\) and transmigrated from noble forefathers to the next *al-mutanāsak min krayr al-aṣlāb* until reached to be born a Prophet.\(^{1230}\)

Transmigrations and incarnations are the focal point of delegation *Tafwīd*. 'Abdul Qāhir al-Baḡdādī stated that the *Mufawīda* believe God has delegated the responsibility of the world to the Prophet Muhammed and then was succeeded by Imam ‘Alī.\(^{1231}\) Similarly al-Isfrāyīnī stated that Šīʿah were two divisions: those who believe the Imāms are gods such as Ḥallājīyah, Muḡayrīa and Ḷaṭṭābīyah and those who do not believe they gods such as the Imāmīyah and Ismailia.\(^{1232}\) Al-Nubaḵtī added that the doctrine of the Ismaili are

---


\(^{1228}\) Al-Hallaj and al-Salmaqānī believed in *hulūl*.


actually of the Kaṭṭābīyah. A group of followers from abī al-Kaṭṭāb joined Muḥammed b. Ismāʿīl and created the Ismaili al-Ḵāliṣa who believes that Imams do not die.\textsuperscript{1233}

Al-İsfrāyenī added that tanāsuḵ doctrine was widespread among Qadařīyah and rejectors (Ṣīʿah), that the souls are eternal and continue transmigrating from body to body.\textsuperscript{1234} On the contrary, al-Ḥallāj claimed that God incarnated within him and al-Šalmaḡānī claimed the holy spirit had incarnated within himself ḥulūl then added both were considered heretics and were sentenced to death.\textsuperscript{1235} al-Kiššī and al-Ṭūsī state that Šīʿah figures and companions of the Imams believed in transmigration (tanāsuḵ) such as Muḥammed b. Mūsa al-Šarīʿī (al-Šarīqī) and ʿAlī b. Ḥasaka al-Qommī.\textsuperscript{1236} Al-Ṭūsī added that al-Šarīʿī was the companion of Imam ʿAlī al-Hādī after the death of the Imam he claimed he was the gate bābīyah of the Imam using the example of transmigration.\textsuperscript{1237} Another part of tanāsuḵ is the journey of the soul, going downwards and being reincarnated into the darkness of a body of an animal. This journey is called maskḵ. Next, Ibn Bābawayh talks about maskḵ, the punished souls, going downward and being born into an animal. He narrated that there were 700 nations punished by God for being disobedient of their waṣī. 400 have ended up land animals and 300 ended up animals living in the sea.\textsuperscript{1238} In different Ḥadīṯ it is narrated that God forbade us to eat the flesh of swine and monkeys. Both two animals were originally humans greedy debtors, but they took usuary forcing poor people to pay interest on the debts rather than help them; the evil debtors ended up swine and monkeys, depending on how severe they were with their greed.\textsuperscript{1239} Ibn Bābawayh added that the term maskḵ, does not mean souls keep being reborn multiple times, it is a borrowed term in Islam to describe the rebirth of the soul that went downward from noble to
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In both examples we are led to think that no one is born nobler than the Prophet. Ibn Bābawayh stated that there are two streams. 1) Human has responsibility and power to act, they are known, the delegators mufawida, 2) human dependant on God jabr. Ibn Bābawayh was critical of jabr he wrote in the introduction of his book al-Tawḥīd that others wrongly attribute to us jabr. Then stated in his ‘illal al-Šarāye’ that there are two currents: those who see mankind as superior to angels versus those who see angels are superior to mankind. Those who in favour of the angels they argue that angels are pure creatures and nearer to God whereas human is not pure and weak with temptations. Those who are in favour of mankind have more power, their argument, that angels are not special, he adds, they argue that even Lucifer reached the level of angels prayed with them when God created Adam, both Lucifer and angels disobeyed God, they argued why God would create Adam when we worship him and praise whereas Adam’s offspring will shed blood on earth, likewise, Lucifer disobeyed God when said I am better than Adam why God would favour him over us. Then God revealed to Adam to demonstrate his knowledge to the angels, they were astonished how much he knew the names of things. Ibn Bābawayh argues that hence Adam has all the capability to sciences and only prophets and scientists can get access to such knowledge.

People are predestined to be good or to be evil, all for a divine purpose. The interpretation of this same verse, according to Imam Mūsa al-Kāẓim, is that the salty and sweet waters are divided by a thin line barzaḵ, as described in the Qur’an:

"He let loose the two salty and sweet seas meeting together. Between them is a barrier so that none of them can transgress."

---

1240 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Kisāl, vol 2, p. 494. The sub-title masūq ṭalātaʾ ‘asār ṣinfa. Then listed 13 different evil acts, that were born into 13 different animals.
1242 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 17.
However, we must not forget that Ibn Bābawayh specifically criticised two gnostic and dualist movements, Manichaeism and Bardaisanism. Furthermore, Ibn Bābawayh comments on some ḥadīth in his marginal notes in ‘illal al-Šarāye’. He says that in order to check the full isnād of a tradition in ‘illal al-Šarāye’ that he supports (as noted in the margin of ‘illal al-Šarāye’), one needs to go back to his work ‘Uyūn aḵbār al-Ridā, where he himself lists the full isnād of that particular ḥadīth. The fact that Ibn Bābawayh specifically identifies some ḥadīth within ‘illal al-Šarāye’ as being worthy of having their isnād recorded elsewhere in his works, indicates that he differentiated between traditions in ‘illal al-Šarāye’ which he considered reliable and those he did not.

In his books, he often states the question which he seeks to answer as the title of the chapter in which that question will be discussed, and he seeks to prove that his thoughts are not invented or borrowed from somewhere else, but are original statements of the Imams. The difference, however, is that sometimes he interprets religious texts metaphorically. Ibn Bābawayh states that only the prayers of the Imams can change or alter the time of things. He cites al-Bāqir who states that God is responsible for the rain, but the Imam could cause the rain to fall before its time. However, Ibn Bābawayh never discusses the idea that Imams could stop or start the rain. The way he understands it is that the people’s sin or good deeds is what affects how nature behaves. The responsibility is upon the people, not the Imam. He states that at the end of time each soul unites with its likeness apart from any free choice of the soul. The soul is predestined to go in one direction or the other. Every soul is naturally inclined either to do good or to do evil and in life cannot to do otherwise than the natural inclination. Ibn Bābawayh, in his broader corpus, argues for free will and against predestination. He states that if the soul longed for something else, other than God, then it would get what it longed for. That if you see evil exceeding good,

---

Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, pp. 75 and 122 and ‘illal al-Sharāye’, vol 1, p. 86.
it will naturally mean that the evil hates the family of the Prophet because souls of that evil disposition were naturally ‘vile’, (ḵubatā’). 1247 Those who hate the Prophet are naturally born vile. It is not their ‘free choice,’ but their destiny.

Ibn Bābawayh, in al-Amālī, says that only those with a heart clear from confusion are able to receive the prophets and Imam ʿAlī. Confusion is a matter of free will. People who chose to follow their lusts and desires are distracted from clarity. Those who love the family of the Prophet will not be fooled by deception and lies by the dajjāl. 1248 Ibn Bābawayh always emphasizes love, choice, and free will. Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh, in his al-Khiṣāl, gives a metaphoric interpretation of a verse in the Qurʾan about the two waters. He says the waters represent the purity of imam ʿAlī and his wife Faṭīmah. The pearls and precious coral represent their two sons Ḥasan and Ḥusayn. 1249 In ʿillal al-Šarāyeʾ he narrated that, according to Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the two waters explain the verse about people on the left side and right side at the time of creation. 1250 This would suggest that people’s morality is predestined. Qurʾan ‘Indeed, the record of the wicked is in sijjīn’. (كلآن كتاب الفجار لفي سجين.) 1251

4.7.1 Ḫallājjite hulūliyah

Ibn Bābawayh describes Ḫallājiyyah as claiming that after a certain level of devotion and worship you can reach a level where you become at the station beyond praying to God and then added they even claim that the jinn will start them, for such station become greater than prophets. 1252 Here speaking about Imamah cannot be reached by excessive worship simply worship does not elevate you to Imamah. This is similar to al-Rāzī approach to religious practises he describes a Ṣaiḥ who took ʾišq and mastering eloquence thinking that

1247 Ibid., pp. 140-1.
1248 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Amālī, p. 585.
1249 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Khiṣāl, vol 1, p. 65.
1250 Ibid., vol 2, p. 425.
1251 Qurʾan translation, surah 83, verse 7.
would elevate them above prophets and trying to compare himself to Philosophers. He then added there are people who follow inferior religious practices and rituals like the followers of Dayṣānīya and Mānīyah, trying to spoil sīyāsah and promoting dubious acts that were prohibited by law for a reason. In al-Sīrah al-Falsafiyah he openly says those who wear rough garments, eat little they spend majority their time in mosques and temples. During Ibn Bābawayh’s father’s time, some gnostic movements were not only a challenge to the state but also a challenge to the Šīʿah community. Ibn Bābawayh’s father was from the city of Qom and wrote on logic mantiq, but he was not known as a follower of the school of philosophy. Al-Ḥallāj claimed that the spirit from the Prophet will continue to incarnate, not only in through the lineage of Imam ‘Alī but also in the bodies of scholars, including those scholars with no specific lineage. Al-Ḥallāj was a Sunnī but had more interest in the Imāmī community for they had a similar doctrine on return of the soul. He wrote to abū Sahl al-Nubaḵtī suggesting that because he had a large following from the Imāmī community, could al-Nubaḵtī announce him as the head of the Imāmī madhab? Consequently, the Caliph captured al-Ḥallāj and killed him and ordered the body to be mutilated and separated, the head was in Bağdād for two days but the body was burnt to ashes. This was done to prove to his followers that he was dead and would not be able to resurrect after death. After al-Ḥallāj was sentenced to death, his followers were expecting his return from death after 40 days. Al-Ṭabarī added that al-Ḥallāj was

1254 Ibid., p. 92.
Al-Ḥallāj and al-Salmaḡānī believed in ḥulūl.
1259 Ibid.
1260 Ibid.
imprisoned and got released but then went back again and gained more followers, he heard from people that al-Ḥallāj claimed to be God.\textsuperscript{1261} They believed that the pre-existing spirit of the Prophet had incarnated in al-Ḥallāj.\textsuperscript{1262} Ibn Bābawayh uses the term ḥulūliyah (which was a derogatory term for followers of al-Ḥallāj) to refer to those who believe that God incarnates into the chosen ones. For example, to Šī‘ah who believe in ḥulūl God was incarnated in ‘Alī’s body, then passed on to his succeeding lineage.\textsuperscript{1263} Also, ḥulūliyah refers to those who claim that the Imams were not truly killed and that their souls continue within the succeeding student embodied from one person to another, and that the soul of Imam ‘Alī, in particular, was born again within their teacher al-Ḥallāj.\textsuperscript{1264} For those who believed in ḥulūliyah, the acquisition of knowledge through the philosophical or scientific study was unimportant. This was because they believed that knowledge was passed on automatically through the transmigration of the soul. In Ibn Bābawayh’s time, those who believed in the possibility of perfect knowledge through meditation alone were the Ḥallājjites. They believed that one received knowledge through the transmigration of the soul, but one must use meditation to access that internal knowledge. They took the manifestation of God to person literally, meaning that anyone could claim to have perfect, God-like knowledge if they had visionary power. Visionary power came through practicing meditation. Soon this was rejected and classed by Šī‘ah as ḡulāt. During the minor occultation, there was nothing fixed about what length of time the Twelfth Imam would be in occultation. In the period of minor occultation 260-329, there were heated disputes over who should be the successor of the Twelfth Imam. There were also disputes about his agent wakīl. The esoteric movements were very interested in the issue of succession.\textsuperscript{1265} The

\textsuperscript{1261} Al-Ṭabarî, Tārîḵ al-Umam waṭ Mulûk, vol 5, p. 677.
\textsuperscript{1262} Al-Ḏahabī, Siyar aʿlām al-Nubalā’, (Beirut: Dār Al-Fikr, 1997), vol 11, pp. 332-5.
\textsuperscript{1263} Ibn Abī Al-Ḥadīd, Šarḥ Nahj Al-Balāghah, vol 3, p. 236.
\textsuperscript{1264} Ibn Bābawayh, ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riddā, vol 1, p. 215.
\textsuperscript{1265} Al-Ṭūsī, al-Ḡaybah, p. 371. Ibn Rawh was chosen by five figures – Abū ʿAlī Muhammad ibn Humām, Abū Sahl Ismaʿīl b. ʿAlī Al-Nubaṭkī, Abū ʿAbdulah Al-Baqṭānī, Abū ʿAbdullah b. Muḥammad Al-Kātbī, and Abū ʿAbdullāh ibn Al-Wajnāʾi – the first two of whom were recognised scholars. They chose Al-Ḥusayn ibn Rawḥul-llah al-Nubaṭkī (d. 937/326) as the wakīl of the Imam.
occultation ğaybah of the Imam created rivalry and competitors all claiming they were the Imam’s gateway (bāb). In 911/299, Ibn al-Ḥallāj became a well-known esoteric bāṭinī preacher.1266 Al-Ḥallāj was considered as an opportunist, seeking the leadership of the Šīʾah community.1267 Abīʿ Alī al-Miḥsin b.ʿAlī al-Tanūḵī (d. 994/384 A.H) stated that al-Ḥallāj interested to gather followers from particularly Šīʾah rejecters, he wrote to abū Sahl al-Nubakṭī inviting him to join him, al-Nubakṭī responded by saying “I am a bold man and have no hair on my forehead, can you bring my hair back? If you do I will follow you” as a way to push al-Ḥallāj away.1268 Ibn al-Ḥallāj was both political, competing with Šīʾah agents and preaching heresy; he was sentenced of seeking to overthrow the Caliphate.1269 The way al-Ḥallāj persuaded the people to follow him was that he attended gatherings at mosques pretending to be a poor person. He targeted the poor and needy. He would offer them food and money, and when they asked him where he got all the money from, he claimed it was a miracle because it was gifted from God.1270 Abū Sahl al-Nubakṭī had to deal with al-Ḥallāj who became popular for his charity and converting poor people to be his followers.1271 Abū Sahl al-Nubakṭī had the support of a judge dāhīrī from the Sunnī school of thought named abū Umar Muḥḥammad b. Yūsuf.1272 The Sunnī Ḥanbalī scholar abū Bakr b. Dawūūd issued a fatwa identifying him as a heretic, saying that he believed that he was a god. Then Caliph al-Muqtadir implemented the fatwa and executed him publicly, and to show his followers that he is dead and unable to return from the dead.1273

The challenges facing the Imāmī community did not stop with the death of al-Ḥallāj. In 873, something happened to the Twelfth Imam, a boy of four years, Muḥammad Ibn

---

1267 Al-Ṭūsī, al-Ḡaybah, p. 400.
1271 Al-Ḏahabī, Siyar aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ, vol 11, p. 325.
1273 Ibn Al-Nadīm, Al-Fihrist, p. 238.
Hasan al-`Askari. The Shi`ah leadership could not declare that the Twelfth Imam was dead without naming the next successor. They solved the problem by declaring, instead, that the Twelfth Imam was the last and there would be no more. Al-Mas`uddi describes them Qat`iya bil-Imamah al-Itna `Asar`iyah, cut through to twelve Imams. The title Qat`iya describing Shi`ah did not stop at Musa al-Kazim as their last Imam they continued up to twelve Imams and to support their claim they referred to a Hadith from the book by Salim ib. Qays that the Prophet succeeded by twelve Imams.\(^{1274}\) The `agents` would now succeed each other. Ibn al-Nadim stated that believe in Imam that absent (gā`ib), abū Sahl al-Nubaqtî faced challenges from al-Salma`ānī,\(^{1275}\) and al-Ḥallaj preaching and gathering followers.\(^{1276}\) Abū Sahl al-Nubaqtî declared that Muḥammed, the son of al-Ḥasan al-`Askari, had died and succeeded by his son and that the succession shall continue until God decided to appear. This way made it difficult for pretenders to claim succession through transmigration, whether to the Imam or his agent (wakil).\(^{1277}\) Succession became a fundamental argument in Ibn Bābawayh`s work Kamāl al-Dīn in refuting the Ismaili and Zaydi. At this point, Ibn Bābawayh becomes important. He had followed his father and Ibn Rawḥul-l-lah in their stance against al-Ḥallaj and his followers. Ibn Bābawayh taught that the Twelfth Imam was alive and could be communicated with. Ibn Bābawayh claimed to have seen the Twelfth Imam, the Mahdi, in a dream, where the Mahdi commanded him to compile Ḥadīth emphasising occultation.

4.7.2 Al-Muĝira Groups and their Influence upon the Qarmatians

During the time of Ibn Bābawayh`s father, `Alī Ibn al-Ḥusayn, a group arose which was later spoken about by Ibn Bābawayh – the Qarmatians. The Qarmatian movement was started in the time of the Caliph al-Mu`taḍid in the city of Basra (a city in the south of Iraq)

\(^{1274}\) Al-Mas`ūdī, al-Tanbih wa l-Iṣrāf, p. 199
\(^{1275}\) Ibn Al-Nadīm, Al-Fihrist, p. 219.
\(^{1276}\) Ibid., p. 236.
\(^{1277}\) Ibid., p. 219.
by Abū Saʿīd al-Janābī in the year 899/286.\(^\text{1278}\) Al-Janābī was succeeded by Abū ʿAlī Aḥmed Ibn Abū Saʿīd (891/278 - 976/366), born in al-Iḥsāʿ.\(^\text{1279}\) In the year 928/316, the Qarmatians openly claimed their own Mahdi as the rightful leader instead of the Caliph. Many ordinary Šīʿah in Baṣrah followed this claim.\(^\text{1280}\) The followers of Abū Saʿīd al-Ḥasan Ibn Bahram al-Janābī adopted the Qarmatian claim that his descendants had the power of God, while others saw their leader, Muḥammed Ibn Ismaʿīl Ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, as having an earthly position that mirrored God in the heavens.\(^\text{1281}\) In 927/315 the Caliph al-Muqtadir was defeated in battle in the city of Anbār (in the west of Iraq) by the Qarmatians (qarāmiṭa).\(^\text{1282}\)

Where did the Qarmatian theology come from? Ibn al-Nadīm, a historian from the tenth century, gives an example of how the teachings of the Manichaean figure, al-Muḡīra, influenced the Ismaili movement and, after his death, developed into the Qarmatian sect. Abū al-Ḵaṭṭāb al-Muḡīra b. Saʿīd claimed that ʿAlī was God incarnate on earth. Ibn al-Nadīm stated that ʿAbdullah b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ was the founder of the Maimonides who followed the teachings of al-Muḡīra abū al-Ḵaṭṭāb that were widespread in al-Aḥuāz.\(^\text{1283}\) But, ʿAbdullah b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ and his son stopped following the Manichaean teachings and started following the teachings of Bardaisan. From a Sunnī point of view, it was the teachings of Manichaeism and of Bardaisanism that led ʿAbdullah b. Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ to believe that he was the grandson of Ismāʿīl the eldest son of the Sixth Imam, Jaʿfar; therefore, that he was a prophet of God.\(^\text{1284}\) From a Šīʿah point of view, he was the physical grandson of Ismāʿīl. He became the head of Ismailism and he sent preachers out to all cities and regions teaching and spreading the Ismaili movement. His
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\(^{1279}\) Al-Dahabī, Siyār aʿlām al-Nubalāʿ, (Beirut: Dār Al-Ālām, 1985), p. 171 and abū Al-Ḥasan al-Aṣʿārī, Maqālayt Al-Islāmīn wa Iḵtīlāf Al-Musālin, vol 1, p. 98.


\(^{1281}\) Ibn Hazīm, Al-Faṣr fi Al-Milaw l-Nihal, vol 3, p. 121.


\(^{1283}\) Ibn Al-Nadīm, Al-Fihrist, p. 232.

\(^{1284}\) Ibid.
The sect was known as the Qarmatians. The Qarmatians were mixed among the Šīʿah communities in Kūfa, Rayy, Kūrasān, Yemen, and Basra in 948/337. However, in Kūrasān, one of his preachers, al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-Marūwazī was imprisoned by the Samanid king Naṣr b. ʿAhmed. After the death of ʿAbbūdullah Ibn Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ, the leadership of the Qarmatian missionary work was taken up by al-Nasaṭī. The Qarmatians were an Ismaili movement that did not wish to follow the rules of the state. They claimed that since the martyrdom of Imam Ḥusayn there are no laws worthy to be obeyed. Ibn Bābawayh speaks critically about the Qarmatians, saying that they rejected all laws and replaced them with their own. He insists that the teachings of the Imams did not come to change Šarīʿah or cancel previous prophetic laws.

4.7.3 Dealing with the Problem of Gnosticism: Al-Rāzī, Al-Fārābī, al-Nubakṭī, and Ibn Bābawayh

The Šīʿah community became less eager to welcome ideologies that brought danger to them. These groups not only posed a threat to the state, but they also posed a threat to the agents of the twelfth Imam. For example, al-Isfrāyenī (d. 1079/471), describes the followers of al-Šalmaḡānī and Ibn al-Ḥallāj as heretics in claiming incarnation (ḥulūliyah) and did not include them with Šīʿah. In a later generation, the conflict with the followers of al-Šalmaḡānī, al-Ḥallāj, and Ismaili Qarmatians continued. Ibn Bābawayh was critical of the gnostic groups. In his work, he responded to the followers of dualism and dealt with them under one ambarella. He emphasises he was against incarnation by saying that all prophets, Imams, and righteous men were created from a single light or intellect, and their souls have been created thousands of years before their body and through twelve

1285 Ibid., p. 234.
1286 Ibid., Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 60.
1288 Ibid., vol 2, p. 657.
layers of emanations until it was made ready for the human body of Adam. In the celestial tablet before Adam four thousand years and went down to the bottom of God’s throne, i.e. the heavens, and then reached the body of Adam who became the father of humanity. Then it went through the material body of Adam, his lineage, reaching the prophet Muḥammed and then the Imams. The souls do not come directly from God into the body of the Prophet or any other human being. Ibn Bābawayh singularly passes on a tradition from ʿAlī b. abī Ṭālib, whereby God has twelve layers of light, the first one being the brightest. This brightness weakens layer by layer until the twelfth layer, where the physical world begins and Adam is created, and the soul of the Prophet Muḥammed emanates from God as part of a line of descent reaching back to Adam. The first layer of light near God continued to travel from one layer to another, from brightness to dark, until it reached the bottom of the process, marking the end of God’s throne. Adam, as a physical, non-infallible being, was created there. Thus, the body of Adam becomes the connecting point between the earthly, physical world, and the metaphysical world of heaven.

4.8 The Rise of the Nubaḵt family/ Ibn Rawḥul-llah

The city of Rayy began to calm down after abū Bakr al-Rāzī’s debate with abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī resulted in the defeat of Ismailis ideology. However, in Bağdād, the Šīʿah community was continuously exposed to extremist gnostic movements. Ibn Rawḥul-llah, a respected figure among the ministers from the previous government, held a study circle attended by other important figures and officials. It is he who said that the Twelfth Imam prayed for Ibn Bābawayh’s birth. There is no exact date of Ibn Bābawayh’s birth. However, after the death of the second agent Muḥammed b. ʿUṭmān al-ʿUmarī (d. 917/305) his father went to Baghdad and during his visit asked abū Jaʿfar Muḥammed b. ʿAlī al-
Aswad to ask the Imam to pray for him because his wife could not have children, and 3 days later his wife was pregnant with Ibn Bābawayh.  

Ibn Rawḥul-Ilah was accused of exchanging letters with the enemy Qarmatians and was sentenced to five years in prison. For him, not paying the tax to the caliph was equivalent to funding the Qarmatians. While he was in prison, the government in Bağdād was overthrown and a new Caliph was put in place called al-Qāhir, but after a short while, the Caliph al-Muqtadir came back into power. Upon Ibn Rawḥul-Ilah’s release in 924/312 after five years’ imprisonment, Al-Ḍahabī added that people from the circle of the Caliph reminded him that the release of Ibn Rawḥul-Ilah could bring trouble. Al-Muqtadir seems, however, to have changed his mind: [the imprisonment of] ‘Al-Ḥusayn Ibn Rawḥul-Ilah brought us bad luck, let him free’. The trouble was not from Ibn Rawḥul-Ilah, but from the Caliph’s head of servants, Mū’nis. Newman relates the story of how the relationship between the caliph and al-Ḥusayn Ibn Rawḥul-Ilah was broken temporarily after the attack on pilgrims to Mecca in 923/311 by the Ismaili Qarmatians. In this attack, some of the caliph’s relatives were killed. At this point, the wazīr from the tribe of Banī Furāt, ‘Alī Ibn Muḥamme Ibn Furāt, and his son, were accused of association with the attackers. In the meantime, al-Ḥusayn Ibn Rawḥul-Ilah was sent to prison, for not paying the collected tax revenue, the fifth, to the caliph’s office, but for sending it to the Qarmatians. He was imprisoned for five years until 929/317 and then was released by the caliph al-Muqtadir. 

4.8.1 Abū Sahl Al-Nubaṣṭī and Philosophy

Interpreting how God created the universe has always been a topic of discussion. Muslim thinkers join philosophy to interpret how God created the world, but within the
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1295 Al-Ṭūsī, al-Ṣayba, p. 308.
religious context. Šīʿah intellectuals of Bağdād such as abū Sahl Ismāʿīl b. Ṭālī al-Nubaḵtī (born 851/237 – died 924/311), and his nephew abū Muḥammed (al-Ḥasan b. Musa) al-Nubaḵtī (d. between 913/300 and 923/310) both reached different philosophies.

Abū Sahl al-Nubaḵtī, was friend with Ṭābit b. Qurra Aristotelian and Sabian from Ḥarrān and the Muʿtazilite abū ʿAlī al-Jubāʿī (d. 915/303 A.H); he recorded his majālis with them.1298 He wrote a book on World Corporeality (Kitāb Ḥadaṯ al-ʿĀlam),1299 refutation against abū ʿīsa al-Warrāq (d. 861/247 A.H) on the claim eternity of bodies,1300 and wrote a book on al-Insān (human).1301

His nephew abū Muḥammed al-Nubaḵtī was more of Aristotelian in his work. He wrote a refutation against Ṭābit b. Qurra al-Ḥarrānī and abū ʿAlī al-Jubāʿī.1302 He mentioned that when he was in his youth asked Isḥāq b. Ṭābit a question in front of others, he did not get his response, but when he saw him outside he answered him.1303 He befriended with the Muʿtazilite abū al-Qāsim al-Kaʿbī/Balkī (d. 931/319 A.H) and wrote the majālis between them.1304 He sent answers to the mutakalim Ibn Qibba al-Rāzī.1305 He followed a certain theme of Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam, on human ability (Istiṭāʿa).1306 He wrote the refutation Firaq al-Ṣiʿah against competing Šīʿah groups, and addressed them as zandīqīyah, dahrīyah, and mazdakīyah as ġulāt. He stated that all these groups shared a similar doctrine, that they denied God’s Lordship but they believed that His spirit incarnated within their leaders, then
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1298 Al-Najāšī, Rijāl al-Najāšī, p. 32., and Ibn Al-Nadīm, Al-Fihrist, p. 220.
1299 Al-Najāšī, Rijāl al-Najāšī, p. 32., and Ibn Al-Nadīm, Al-Fihrist, p. 220.
1300 Al-Najāšī, Rijāl, and Ibn Al-Nadīm, Al-Fihrist, p. 220.
1302 Al-Najāšī, Ṭābit b. Qurra Aristotelian and Sabian from Ḥarrān and the Muʿtazilite abū ʿAlī al-Jubāʿī, d. 915/303 A.H; he recorded his majālis with them.
1303 He befriended with the Muʿtazilite abū al-Qāsim al-Kaʿbī/Balkī (d. 931/319 A.H) and wrote the majālis between them.
1304 He sent answers to the mutakalim Ibn Qibba al-Rāzī.
1305 He followed a certain theme of Ḥišām b. al-Ḥakam, on human ability (Istiṭāʿa).
1306 He wrote the refutation Firaq al-Ṣiʿah against competing Šīʿah groups, and addressed them as zandīqīyah, dahrīyah, and mazdakīyah as ġulāt. He stated that all these groups shared a similar doctrine, that they denied God’s Lordship but they believed that His spirit incarnated within their leaders, then
added there is no difference between their doctrine the only difference is their figureheads.\textsuperscript{1307} He wrote defending Aristotle, arguing that Aristotle did not support the eternity of the universe against those who claim that the celestial planets have an intellectual soul (ḥay nāṭiq).\textsuperscript{1308} A refutation against logicians. He wrote a summary of Aristotle’s \textit{On Generation and Corruption}.\textsuperscript{1309} He meets with the transmitters of Greek philosophy such as abī Uṯmān al-Dīmašqī (Ṣā’īd b. Ya’qūb), Ishāq and Ṭābit.\textsuperscript{1310} Al-Nubaṭṭī was Aristotelian, rejected all that related to old philosophy school (pre-Aristotle) and the transmigration of the soul. He wrote refutations against the transmigration \textit{tanāsuk} of the soul.\textsuperscript{1311}

Ibn Bābawayh’s \textit{Kamāl al-Dīn} defended abū Sahl al-Nubaṭṭī and not the latter his nephew abū Muḥammed. Ibn Bābawayh lists several objections against abū Sahl al-Nubaṭṭī’s doctrine. The first objection was that of the Muʿtazilite figure, abū al-Qāsim al-Kaʾbī, who asked why God did not choose a well-trained adult able to fight and defend his community instead of a child who was unable to protect himself. Ibn Bābawayh responded that, in the concept of Imamah, it is the same as Jesus when he was a child, the focus was on his gift of knowledge and not how skilful he was in fighting. Ibn Bābawayh continued that, like Jesus who demonstrated superior knowledge to his Jewish opponents, one of the conditions for the Imamah is the miraculous sign of knowledge that marks him as a unique human being, superior to all other scholars.\textsuperscript{1312}

\textsuperscript{1307} Al-Nubaṭṭī, \textit{Fīrāq al-Šīʿa}, p. 88.
\textsuperscript{1308} Ibn al-Nadīm, \textit{al-Fīhrīst}, p. 411.
\textsuperscript{1311} Ibn Al-Nadīm, \textit{Al-Fīhrīst}, p. 220.
\textsuperscript{1312} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Kamāl Al-Dīn}, vol 1, p. 78.
Al-Nubaḵṭī saw that with the help of theology he could link the Twelfth Imam with the idea of occultation. This meant that the Imamate would continue without needing a man to physically sit in the chair of the Imam. The theological ground was not developed with ḥadīṯ to back up such an idea until thirty years later through Ibn Qibba al-Rāzī, who was originally a Muʿtazilite and converted to Šīʿah. He arrived at the idea that occultation is a logical explanation for the Imāmī doctrines. He asserts that the twelve Imams are God’s continuation as proof of God’s existence hujja. This idea fits well with the idea of success through being appointed by the statement naṣṣ of the previous Imam. He rejected the Qarmatian version of succession, and he rejected the Qadarīyah version that there is no need at all for succession.

4.8.2 Al-Nubaḵṭī vs Gnostic Movements

There were two individuals highly influential upon Ibn Bābawayh: abū Sahl al-Nubaḵṭī and his nephew abū Muḥammed al-Nubaḵṭī. By understanding these two, it becomes easy to figure out Ibn Bābawayh’s attitude towards other groups. Ibn Bābawayh is constantly commenting on the work of these two men and responding to people who objected to them. Abū Sahl al-Nubaḵṭī and abū Muḥammed al-Nubaḵṭī were both not only involved in the formation and conceptualisation of Imāmī doctrine but they were also involved with the philosophy of Aristotle. Abū Sahl Iṣmāʿīl b. Ṭalḥa b. ʿAlī b. Ishaq b. abī Sahl al-Nubaḵṭī was a famous theologian from Baḡdād, an expert in dialectic (Kalām) and the author of The Nullifying of Analogy (Iḥṭāl al-Qīyās), Monotheism (al-Tawḥīd), The Human (Al-Insān), how the world came to being (Ḥudūṯ al-ʿĀlam). He saw the corporeal (muhdaṭ) world as coming into existence in stages, and a record of his meetings with Ṭābit b. Qurrah (majālis). He was one of most influential Šīʿah figures
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1313 Al-Ṭūsī, Al-Fihrist, p. 12.
1315 Al-Ṭūsī, Al-Fihrist, p. 12.
in the state, as influential as the wazīr.\textsuperscript{1316} While his nephew Ḥasan b. Musa al-Nubaḵṭī his writing focused on refuting logicians, Sīʿa groups who were not twelve Imāmī, such as the Ismaili, Zaydī and Sabaʾīa and Muʿtazilite. He refuted the astrologers, the logicians, and the Sabian from Ḥarrān, Ṭābit b. Qurrah, all of whom claimed that Aristotle believed the celestial planets have intellectual souls (ḥay nāṭiq).\textsuperscript{1317} Ṭābit b. Qurrah (d. 901/288 A.H) was originally from Ḥarrān and worked in the caliph’s court al-Muʿtaḍid and became a well-known major figure in transmitting Aristotle, Socrates, and the work on Medicine by Galen into Arabic.\textsuperscript{1318}

I observe that at that time, among the many Šīʿah groups, there were Ismailis and Zaydī but not Sabaʾīa. The Sabaʾīa existed as a group in the second generation after the Prophet. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the term sabaʾ ĭyah does not always mean the followers of ‘Abdullah Ibn Saba’, but refers to those who believe in the rajʾah of Imam ʿAlī.\textsuperscript{1319} He refuted the Šīʿah groups who believed in the incarnation of their Imams. In his work, Firaq al-Šīʾah, the groups he refuted was the Sabaʾīa,\textsuperscript{1320} al-Zandīqīa,\textsuperscript{1321} al-Ḵaṭṭābīyīa,\textsuperscript{1322} and Muḡairīa,\textsuperscript{1323} who were all Manichaeans and were rebels competing with the deputy of the Imam and calling for the Šīʾah to follow them and wage war against the state. The third group he refuted was the Muʿtazilite. He objected to their views on what it means to be a sinner fāsiq. This is the Muʿtazilite position about the companions who fought Imām ʿAlī. He said that Muʿtazilite believe that a sinner is neither a believer mūʾmin nor a disbeliever kāfir, the intermediate position (al-manzila bayna al-manzilatayn) and wrote a refutation

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotenumber{1316} Al-ʿAllamah al-Hillī, Rijāl Al-ʿAllāmah, (Qom: Dār Al-Daḵaʾr, 1411 A.H), p. 9.
\footnotenumber{1317} Al-Najāṣī, Rijāl al-Najāṣī, p. 63.
\footnotenumber{1319} Al-Šahrastānī, Al-Milal wa l-Nībāl, vol 1, p. 205.
\footnotenumber{1320} Al-Nubaḵṭī, Firaq al-Šīʾa, pp. 57-8.
\footnotenumber{1321} Ibid., p. 88.
\footnotenumber{1322} Ibid., p. 82.
\footnotenumber{1323} Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
to abī 'Alī al-Jubā′ī.\textsuperscript{1324} On the other hand, his friend, the Muʿtazilite abū al-Qāsim al-Balkī, saw the Earth as like a dot inside a circle that is surrounded by the Sun, Moon, and stars. Likewise, al-Muṣīd sided with al-Balkī, while Ibn Bābawayh sided with al-Nubaḵtī.\textsuperscript{1325}

There was an exchange of responses and refutations between abū Bakr al-Rāzī and al-Balkī. Al-Rāzī wrote Kitāb al-Radʿala al-Balkī refutations against abī al-Qāsim al-Balkī (al-Ka‘bī) and Kitāb naqḍ naqḍ al-Balkī lil-ʿilm al-Ilāhī.\textsuperscript{1326} Al-Balkī wrote Kitāb fī al-Naqḍʿala al-Rāzī fī al-Falsafah ʿilm al-Ilāhīyah.\textsuperscript{1327}

On the other hand, al-Muṣīd states that al-Nubaḵtī’s family had their criterion for Imamah which was different from the mainstream Šīʿah.\textsuperscript{1328} Al-Muṣīd was critical but treated al-Nubaḵtī’s family as if they had their maqīḥab and were different from the rest of the Šīʿah. He similarly treated Ibn Bābawayh. He stated that they saw the Imams should be unique in their intelligence and different from the laymen and must demonstrate the ability to communicate with all nations in different languages and know all sciences.\textsuperscript{1329} The Imam must have evidence that supports his claim, such as receiving prophecies from God and performing miracles.\textsuperscript{1330} They put up these impossible criteria to stop pretenders. He also said that the Imam can only come through succession appointed by the previous Imam.\textsuperscript{1331}

4.9 Debates During the Time of abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī and Ibn Bābawayh

Moving on from al-Rāzī’s time, we come into the mid-tenth century, the time of Ibn Bābawayh. The decline of interest in the philosophy of abū Bakr al-Rāzī in the city of Rayy

\textsuperscript{1324} Al-Najāšī, Rījāl al-Najāšī, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{1327} Al-Daḥabī, Siyār aṯām al-Nubalā’, vol 11, p. 322.
\textsuperscript{1329} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1330} Ibid., pp. 68-9.
\textsuperscript{1331} Ibid., p. 65.
started much later in Ibn Bābawayh’s lifetime. When the Mu’tazilite thinker, al-Šāhib b. ‘Abbād, arrived in Rayy to become the new wazīr, he brought Mu’tazilite ideology with him, reinvigorated interest in it, and rejected philosophy. After the death of Rukn al-Dawlah in 366, he was succeeded by his son ‘Aḍud al-Dawlah. Things turned against Ibn al-’Amīd, who had been the wazīr of Rukn al-Dawlah, and who had been fond of al-Rāzī, and he was put in prison.\footnote{Ibn Kaṭīr, Al-Bidāyah wa l-Nihāyah, vol 11, p. 372.} He was replaced by al-Šāhib b. ‘Abbād. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī states that when Mū’ayid al-Dawlah was the governor of Aṣbahān, the younger son of Rukn al-Dawlah arrived at Rayy. He saw the state was well managed under Ibn al-’Amīd, so he had to find an excuse to criticise him. He wanted to cut the budget. He found fault with the surplus of soldiers who he claimed were expensive. Ibn al-’Amīd responded that these soldiers had managed to keep the state running and the Sulṭān’s family safe and protected. Al-Šāhib b. ‘Abbād took advantage of their disagreement and his close relation with Mū’ayid al-Dawlah and incited hatred against Ibn al-’Amīd. Ibn al-’Amīd wrote to the son of Rukn al-Dawlah, ‘Aḍud al-Dawlah explaining what happened, but things just got worse with the governor.\footnote{Ibid, p. 545.} ‘Aḍud al-Dawlah was worried about how Ibn al-’Amīd was in such tight control of the state, so he sent him to prison.\footnote{Al-Tawḥīdī, Aḵṭaq al-Wazīrayn, p. 167.} It is believed that Ibn al-’Amīd died in the following year 978/367. The wazīr al-Šāhib b. ‘Abbād, unlike Ibn al-’Amīd, abandoned talking about philosophy.\footnote{Ibn Hajar al-’Asqalānī, Lisān Al-Mīzān, vol 1, p. 531.} Also, he abandoned narrators of ḥadīṭ, commentators of Qur’an, and old religious laws halal and ḥarām.\footnote{Al-Tawḥīdī, Aḵṭaq al-Wazīrayn, p. 167.} Ibn Bābawayh seems to have been involved very little with him. During the time of al-Šāhib b. ‘Abbād, he encouraged regular debates. Al-Tawḥīdī described these debates were merely a contest to quarrel (jidālāt).\footnote{Ibn Hajar al-’Asqalānī, Lisān Al-Mīzān, vol 5, p. 365.} And he favoured Ibn Najjār who promoted Zaydism.\footnote{Al-Tawḥīdī, Aḵṭaq al-Wazīrayn, p. 167.} Ibn
Bābawayh was against Zaydism. The main ḥadīṯ experts, such as Ibn Bābawayh, Ibn al-ʿAṭṭār, Ibn Ṣāḏān (abū al-Ḥasan Bakr b. Ṣāḏān al-Muqrī’ d. 1014/405), al-Rūyānī, al-Balkī, and Ibn Fāris, were all reduced to nothing. Under Ibn ʿAbbād, both philosophy and ḥadīṯ suffered. According to al-Tawḥīdī, some experts were expelled from his court and some were forbidden from narrating ḥadīṯs.1339 Most of all, Ibn ʿAbbād was critical of the work of Sunnī figure al-Buḵārī.1340 Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī states that al-Ṣāḥib Ibn ʿAbbād, aside from being anti-tradition, kept anti-Qur’anic books in his collection, such as those by Ibn al-Rāwūndī (Aḥmed Ibn Yeḥya Ibn Ishāq d. 910/298), Ibn al-ʿAujā’ (ʿAbdul Karim Ibn Abī al-ʿAujā’ died after year 160), Ṣāliḥ Ibn ʿAbdul Qudūs, Abī Saʿīd al-Ḥuṣayrī, and the work on the philosophy of Aristotle.1341

4.10 Summary

In this chapter, I have discussed aspects of the political and religious influences of Persian and Greek philosophies on early Islam. I have also discussed the relationship between monotheistic religions and neighbouring philosophies. In the early Šīʿah movement, there was not only a borrowing of interpretations from neighbouring philosophies but there was also a process of transition among Šīʿah thinkers from Manichaeism to Bardaisanism and finally to Greek philosophy. But, most importantly, for the leadership after the death of the Prophet Muḥammed, the discussion continued with the political changes from the Abbasid to the Buwayhids. Indeed, the three interpretations of Manichaeism, Bardaisanism, and the use of Greek philosophy became the predominant structure later on. Likewise, the Šīʿah scholars, in their studies of philosophy, inherited the ancient conflict between the Greeks and Persians. The three names, al-Šalmaḡānī, the

1339 Ibid.
1340 Ibid., p. 268.
Al-Ḥakīmī, Tārīḵ Al-ʿUlamā’, p. 74 referred it to the work of Al-Māzandrānī, Al-Manāqib, vol 1, p. 325.
Qarmatians, and Ibn al-Ḥallāj, were all strongly Manichaean mixed with Aristotelian philosophy, all were connected in shaping and directly influencing Šī‘ah theology. On the contrary, Ibn Bābawayh was in support of, and continued, al-Nubaḵtī’s philosophy, which was opposed to the three Manichaean movements. Al-Nubaḵtī, however, did not provide a philosophical solution to the continuation of the occultation. Ibn Bābawayh, though, was operating in opposition to Manichaeism and Bardaisanism, while al-Kulaynī did not criticise it in his book, nor did he write to separate himself from these movements. Thus, we see again, Ibn Bābawayh showing his independent thinking and making an original contribution to Šī‘ah theology. Al-Nubaḵtī shared a similar interest in philosophy, translating it into Arabic as did his peers, al-Rāzī in Rayy and al-Fārābī in Damascus. This was all during the time of Caliph Muqtadir in Bağdād, who was facing gnostic movements challenging his rule. In the process of translating philosophical texts, the outcome was shaped, not just to fit the mainstream, but also to stand the challenges against local ideologies such as Manichaeism and Bardaisanism. Al-Nubaḵtī, al-Rāzī, and al-Fārābī all worked within a common cosmological framework which was fundamentally based on the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. Each of the three, then, discussed different elements within the framework: Imamah, revelation, life after death, the eternity of the soul, the problem of evil.

In this chapter, I have illustrated historical and cultural patterns of ideologies regarding the problem of evil. Then moving on, I have discussed the formation of thoughts about life after death (rajʿah). Also, I have investigated the original debate dealing with the problem of evil. By the tenth century, the idea of the Imamah itself became fundamentally important in the early Šī‘ah, anyone who claimed to have Imamah outside the twelve Imams was classed as a heretic. This is evident in al-Nubaḵtī’s work, in which he lists all the Šī‘ah sects that were heretical. As we have seen, the predominant argument in the tenth century was no longer about Imam ʿAlī or abū Bakr and ʿUmar, that is, who is the rightful leader.
and who is Caliph, it was about who is ethically more advanced and worthy to lead the communities alongside the state. The search for succession for the Imamah led them to the disputes about the continuation of Imamah which were often linked with either with the incarnation (ḥulūl) or union (itiḥād). The occultation was aimed to counter both. It was still unclear which way to go with the succession of Imamah. There were two challenging figures, al-Ḥallāj, who believed in union (itiḥād), and al-Ṣalmağānī, who used (ḥulūl), that is, incarnation outside the lineage of ʿAlī, that is, God appointed as his agents, men, plural, not just a man, singular. Al-Ḥallāj, the Ismaili Qarmatians, and al-Ṣalmağānī all settled with the Persian gnostic version of Imamah, namely, God appointed men, plural. Except for the Ismaili Qarmatians, they cemented their thought in Persian dualist belief and combined it with Neoplatonism emanation. As an alternative to the above, the ideology of Imamah came back to the Muslim community not from Persian dualism, but Greek philosophy tanāsuḵ. Abū Sahl al-Nubakṭī and abū Muḥammad al-Nubakṭī shared similar ideas with their contemporary al-Fārābī on logic and rejected the Prophet’s infallibility and employed philosophy as a way to counter gnostic Šīʿah movements such as groups lead by Ibn al-Ḥallāj, Ismaili Qarmatians and al-Ṣalmağānī. Al-Nubakṭīs sided with the state, as did al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī. When they talked about the ‘virtuous state’ they made it difficult for pretenders and gnostic movements to compete for support among the common people. Aside from ethics and virtues, they emphasised that the Imamah must have the ability to exhibit unique levels of knowledge and excellence of communication. By contrast, abū Sahl al-Nubakṭī added the condition that the Imamah must come through the lineage of the Prophet. As we have seen, during the tenth century the lawyer faqīḥ became equally important as the physician ṭabībb. In the religious sense, the treatment of evil thoughts became equally as important as the treatment of sickness. Ibn Bābawayh’s work reflected the importance of virtues and ethics. The Caliph has to safeguard citizens not only from sickness but also from evil thinking, that is, heretical movements. Theologians and
philosophers were both involved in the Caliph’s court. We find ethics as a common factor for physicians and theologians/lawyers as the mean for happiness. It is no surprise that the work of the physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī was mentioned in the introductions of Ibn Bābawayh’s work on law *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh*. Ibn Bābawayh saw his work as a continuation of al-Rāzī but from an ethical, rather than a medical, viewpoint. In summary, by the tenth century, the Šīʿah were split into two movements, a current that demanded from its followers’ service to a ‘higher ideology’, and a current that called for hatred of the Sunnī state. It was based widely on teachings attributed to Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. The character of these teachings was extremist, gnostic, anti-state, and strong on the institutionalised establishment of the Imamah. We also have a second current, one that was not as militant and not at all political. It sought to find a middle ground for Imamah within cosmology. Imamah became an abstract concept.
Chapter 5: The Three Thinkers: Al-Rāzī, Al-Fārābī, and Ibn Bābawayh

5.1 The significance of al-Rāzī and Al-Fārābī for Ibn Bābawayh’s intellectual development

By the end of the tenth century, the Muslims were divided between those anti-state groups who believed they can have their own leader and do not have to abide by the state, also believing in the incarnation ḥulūliyah, and those who are the friends of the state and accepted the state as part of their life, following Greek philosophy. This chapter focuses on the ‘friends of the state’: al-Rāzī, al-Fārābī, and Ibn Bābawayh. They have one thing in common. They all spoke about virtue as a political concept. Al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī spoke about the ‘virtuous state’ (al-Madīna al-Fāḍilah), and Ibn Bābawayh spoke about the ‘ideal state’ (Ḵilāfah) of the Mahdi. In fact, what they were offering was a reconstruction of the religious vision of God and humanity, leading to the ideal leader, the Imam, and the virtuous state, to al-Madīna al-Fāḍilah.

5.1.1 Where Does Ibn Bābawayh Fit In?

As discussed in chapter one, modern scholars exhibit minor variations in their views of Ibn Bābawayh. Melchert cannot seem to locate him within either the Muʿtazilites or the Ašʿarītes. Thomas cannot place him with either the Muʿtazilites or Ašʿarītes or Christians. Amir-Moezzi says al-Fārābī, who was contemporary to al-Kulaynī, is a well-known example of integrating an interest in philosophy with Šīʿah theology. But he is uncertain where to place Ibn Bābawayh. For McDermott, on other hand, Ibn Bābawayh experienced isolation from the Sultan’s court during the period of the Muʿtazilite wazīr Ibn ʿAbbād. I suggest that there is a better way to understand Ibn Bābawayh. He uses religious terminology, but in doing so, we must recognise that he employs philosophical concepts at the same time. To demonstrate this, I will now compare him with two prominent
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1342 Amir-Moezzi, The Silent Qur’an, p. 139.
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philosophers, al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī. Amir-Moezzi noted that al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī had a great impact on the Šī`ah of the tenth century, particularly on the topics of divine wisdom and ethics.\textsuperscript{1343} The aims of this chapter are first to demonstrate the similarities and differences between the two philosophers, al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī, and second, to see similarities and differences between them and Ibn Bābawayh. At this point, I am not making a claim of direct or indirect influence on Ibn Bābawayh, I am only looking at similarities. Here I first begin with the two examples of philosophy, al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī that occurred before Ibn Bābawayh (c. 924-991). Ibn Bābawayh’s work was not written in a vacuum, and the implicit ideology that guided these texts could not have been absorbed without the process of circulation and adaptation of thought that was common in the city of Rayy. I argue that the Šī`ah initially were confronted with a variety of ideologies which they absorbed over a period of time and as a result the Šī`ah Muslim community evolved and gradually established a distinct group identity.

5.1.2 Pragmatists vs Idealists – The Pragmatic Aristotelians: Al-Fārābī and al-Nubakhtī vs The Idealist Platonist: Abū Bakr al-Rāzī

In the tenth century, the two main streams of thought were the logicians and the idealists. In the Sulṭān’s court, there were a number of philosophers and thinkers taking part in regular meetings, including, Jews, Christians, and Muslims. The debates were not about converting each other, but about rational philosophical discussion. It was an intellectual discussion most of the time.\textsuperscript{1344} For example, al-Fārābī divided all knowledge into the practical and the theoretical: the religious schools of jurisprudence fiqh and reason/theology kalām respectively. On the contrary, for al-Rāzī, religion and reason are incompatible. He argues that philosophy promotes searching and learning for the soul to reach peace and tranquillity whereas religious texts are simply an institution based on old

\textsuperscript{1343} Amir-Moezzi, The Silent Qur’an, p. 139 and Amir-Moezzi, What is Shi’i Islam?: An Introduction, p. 151.

\textsuperscript{1344} Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhidi, Al-imtā’ wal Mū’ānasah, p. 50.
wives’ tales and inherited falsehoods. Al-Fārābī, on the other hand, respected religion and viewed it as a constructive force within society. He describes the city of ignorance because they follow old, outdated opinions, reject changes, and go against anything that is different from their own. Al-Fārābī in his Kitāb Ārāʾ ahl al-Madīna al-Fāḍilah offered a structured system of philosophy. For example, the concept of demonstration of unique knowledge, such as prophecy, as the condition of Imamah in the virtuous state, is part of al-Fārābī’s whole system. In everyone there is a desire and thirst to perfection; we all need one another in creating a village or a town or a city. He started his work with the title ‘the starter of existence’ (al-Mūjid al-Awāl), which is different from al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh uses the Evolver (al-bārī), he begins his work with the one and only. The idea of the One Supreme Being, the Prime Mover, fits in with Islam. Thus, al-Fārābī was able to blend religion with Aristotelian philosophy. On the other hand, abū Bakr al-Rāzī was in favour of Platonic thought over the philosophy of the logician Aristotle. He argued in favour of five Eternals: The Evolver (al-bārī), Soul (nafs kulīyah), Matter (hyle), Void (makān), and Time (zamān). The philosophy of al-Rāzī was favoured by Manṣūr b. Nūḥ b. Sāmān. His philosophical thought continued in Rayy under the Buwayhids Rukn al-Dawlah, the same Sulṭān with whom Ibn Bābawayh worked. While al-Fārābī was favoured by the prince Sayf al-Dawla al-Ḥamdānī (d. 967/356) court (majlis) in Syria.
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5.1.3 Islamic Philosophy: Seeking a Solution for Transcendence

Islamic philosophy tried to find a ‘solution’ to the problem of evil and to the transcendence of God. On one hand, there were those Šī‘ah who studied logic and understood human reasoning in terms of intellect ʿaql. The fact that there was ʿaql told the logician Šī‘ah, like al-Fārābī, that God did not leave the world without guides, that is, the Imams, to bring order, i.e., the ‘virtuous state’. On the other hand, idealists, specifically al-Rāzī, argued from an ethical point of view that God made the human soul (nafs) eternal. Both al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī agree that the soul is the driving energy that animates the human person. But we must be careful here to clarify that, for both of them, the soul itself is not a person, it is only the driving energy behind the human personality. At death, the body returns to minerals, and the human personality disappears forever, since the soul/driving energy does not have consciousness of its own. This energy that what had once melded together with a body to form a human goes to a metaphysical-astral realm (barzakh), where it remains for an indeterminate period of time until it returns to join with a physical body which creates a new human personality. This new personality has inherited both the advantages and disadvantages, that is, both the positive and negative energy, from the life of the previous personality, that is, from the last ‘cycle’.

5.1.4 Al-Rāzī, Imamah, and the Necessity of Studying Philosophy

Abū Bakr al-Rāzī has a different opinion of the term ‘Imam’; it is more than just an Imam of a mosque. Prophets are not Imams. For example, he described Plato as ‘The Imam’. One of Plato’s works is a dialogue with his teacher Socrates. In al-Rāzī’s philosophic life (kitāb Sīrah al-Falsafīyah) he mentions Socrates as ‘our Imam’ in ethics. One can reach the level of a philosopher only if your knowledge has reached the

---

maximum level when not equal to you, Ibn al-Nadīm stated: al-Rāzī added the condition the mastery of chemistry to be considered a philosopher.\textsuperscript{1359} This is the level of philosophers, such as Pythagoras, Democritus, Plato, Aristotle, and Galen.\textsuperscript{1360} Al-Rāzī warns others from trying to reach the level of early philosophers in one year such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Eudemus, Chrysippus, Themistius, or Alexander of Aphrodisiacs.\textsuperscript{1361} Similarly, Ibn Bābawayh talked about the condition of chemistry, saying that the followers of the Ḫallāj claim that he mastered chemistry when he did not; it was mere deception and false trickery.\textsuperscript{1362}

5.1.5 The Links to Ibn Bābawayh: Greek Philosophy /Muslim Relations, Translated Books from Greek to Arabic

When Byzantium became Christian, philosophy faded away. Philosophy was considered heresy.\textsuperscript{1363} However, it paved the way for it to be transmitted to the neighbouring Muslim caliphate. According to al-Ḵaṭīb al-Bağdādī, the theAbbasids caliph who paid the most special interest to Ḫadīṯ was al-Maʿmūn.\textsuperscript{1364} Until one-day al-Maʿmūn saw a vision in his sleep and saw a wise man sitting on his chair,. He had no hair on top, had a broad forehead, and looked wise. Hhe asked him three questions: who do I need to pay respect first? The man replied: “thinkers” then he asked and next? the man replied “Šarīʿah”, then next, the man replied: “the general public” (\textit{al-Jamhūr}), then he asked again who is next? The man replied there is nothing else. Upon answering his questions, he asked him, who he was, the man said, “I am Aristotle”. Al-Maʿmūn was happy and since then paid special interest to encourage the public to study Aristotle’s works.\textsuperscript{1365} Also, it was said

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1359} Ibn al-Nadīm, \textit{al-Fihrist}, p. 431.
\textsuperscript{1360} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{1363} Ibn al-Nadīm, \textit{al-Fihrist}, p. 300.
\textsuperscript{1365} Ibn al-Nadīm, \textit{al-Fihrist}, p. 301., and Ibn Abī Usaybiʿah, ‘Uyūn al-anbāʾ fi ṭabaqāt al-atibbāʾ’, vol 1, p. 468,
\end{flushright}
that he paid five hundred dinars a month for each translator.\footnote{Ibn Abī Usaybi'ah, 'Uyūn al-anbā' fi ṭabaqāt al-ḍībbā', vol 1, p. 469.} The works were brought to the central library of the caliphate Bağdād, known as House of Wisdom (Dār al-Ḥikmah).\footnote{Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 301.} Thus his works were translated and made accessible to the public, ultimately impacting on the Mu’tazila, abū Bakr al-Jawzī (d. 1201/597 A.H) named 4 Mu’tazila figures such as abī Ḥuḍayl al-‘Allāf (d. 849/235 A.H), abū Isḥāq al-Naḍḍām (d. 836/221 A.H), Mu’ammad (d. 830/215 A.H), abū ‘Uṯmān al-Jāḥiḍ (d. 869/255 A.H).\footnote{Abū Bakr al-Jawzī, Taḥlīs Ibilis, p. 108.} Šahrastānī added that, for example, Zayd b. ‘Alī studied under Wāṣil b. ‘Aṭṭā’, during al-Ma’mūn philosophy became integrated with Qadarīya, for example, in philosophy describe rational discussion as logic (manṭiq) whereas Mu’tazila call it kalām.\footnote{Al-Šahrastānī, al-Milal wal Niḥal, vol 1, p. 41.}

I infer that the integration of both had influenced Ibn Bābawayh.\footnote{For example, Ibn Bābawayh was familiar with al-Naḍḍām position on the Imamah and referred to him in his defence of Imāmī doctrine. See Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 122.} Philosophy became widely popular under the Abbasid ruler al-Ma’mūn (reign 813-833/198-218), who took the initiative and wrote several times to Theophilos the Emperor of neighbouring Byzantium to give him the old works of philosophy. When the Emperor agreed, he sent experts such as Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq al-Ḥarrānī (d. 877/264 A.H) and Yūḥanna b. Māsawayh (d. 857/243 A.H) to their library and collected philosophy works.\footnote{Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 301.} Ḥunayn b. Isḥāq translated Plato’s work kitāb al-Sīyāsah.\footnote{Ibid., p. 305.} The latter (Ibn Māsawayh) was a Christian Assyrian who worked for the caliph Hārūn al-Rašīd translated mainly works science of physician and treatments,\footnote{Ibn Abī Usaybi'ah, 'Uyūn al-anbā' fi ṭabaqāt al-ḍībbā', vol 1, p. 459.} and was his personal physician who translated works that came from the two cities Ankara and Amorium, during when the calipha took control parts of Byzantine.\footnote{Ibid., p. 446.} b. Isḥāq al-Ḥarrānī was specialised in the translation of Aristotle

\footnote{Ibid., p. 301.}
and the works of Galen. The work of philosophy interpreted and encouraged the wider public to study, which became widespread. The library was open to the public.

Al-Māʾmūn the Abbassid caliph, to secure a stable caliphate and to stand against the Shīʿah movements picked Imam ʿAlī al-Riḍā as an ally and successor who was respectful by the offspring of Imam ʿAlī b. abī Ṭālib, and was able to rely on him to debate competing ideologies and challenges against the state from rivals of the offspring of Imam ʿAlī. In a different version, Ibn Bābawayh commented describing these debates were exaggerated by al-Māʾmūn trying to degrade al-Riḍā through showing how little he knew.

Al-Masʿūdī states that during the visit of ʿAlī al-Riḍā to Marū, al-Māʾmūn gathered his elites and loyalists and gave a speech saying, “I have looked from all over the offspring of Abbas and ʿAlī b. abī Ṭālib, I could not find anyone more worthy for this position, to be the second person in the state, other than ʿAlī al-Riḍā”. Ibn Bābawayh narrates, when al-Riḍā accepted this position, some of Shīʿah came to him and said to him: you already renounced any involvement with the state, what made you accept it now when you already declared to the public the opposite? He replied, I had to choose between being not involved or involved in stopping the bloodshed, my situation is similar to that of prophet Josef, when he saw the drought was coming on Egypt, he saw himself was able to carry out the task, so he came forward with a solution. By the ninth century, Manichaeism’s extremist views became more apparent within the Zaydī Shīʿa. Among the children of the Imams, there were various claims to be the rightful successor to the deceased Imam. According to Ibn Bābawayh, Imam al-Riḍā condemned Zayd al-Nār for claiming that all the offspring of Faṭimah are blessed and not going to the hellfire. Ibn Bābawayh then narrated the second part of the conversation: al-Riḍā said, ‘it is not just for God to treat someone like you the

1375 Ibid., pp. 472 and 7.
1378 Al-Masʿūdī, Mūrūj al-Ḍahab, vol 4, p. 33.
1379 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Amālī, p. 72.
1380 Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿāni al-Akbār, p. 105.
same as Imam Mūsa al-Kāẓim [the Seventh Imam, their father], when Mūsa was righteous and you are not, and it is wrong to assume that all the offspring of Faṭīmah are destined to enter heaven’.\textsuperscript{1381} This tradition was not narrated by other Šī’a. It indicates that it is not enough to be from the lineage of the Prophet, blessed, or in receipt of revelation and true knowledge. To identify someone as an Imām just by his knowledge alone is insufficient to succeed to the Imamah, in the opinion of Ibn Bābawayh. For Ibn Bābawayh, there must be a written prophecy in the hadīth describing the successor.\textsuperscript{1382} Ibn Bābawayh narrated when al-Riḍā was on his death bed, the caliph came running barefoot, shocked at what had happened to him, and said: “The people will not forgive me and will think that I was the one behind your death”. Ibn Bābawayh commented that the narrator ‘Alī b. Ibrahīm said that he was told more details by Yāsir that I wish not to discuss them in this book.\textsuperscript{1383} The second challenge which impacted Sunnī and Šī`ah each had their own way. After the death of Imam al-Riḍā, there was a significant dispute among his followers, the Imam’s son Muḥammad al-Jawād was a child of seven years old.\textsuperscript{1384} This not only had divided the companions of Imam al-Riḍā, but it also changes their perception of their criterion of Imamah. After the death of al-Riḍā, the companions were in confusion not knowing what to do and what will become of them, the companions such as al-Rayān b. al-Ṣult, Ṣafwān b. Yaḥiyya, ‘abdul Raḥmān b. al-Ḥajjāj and Muḥammad b. Ḥakīm they were in confusion, not knowing the next step. It was Yunus b. ’Abdul Raḥmān who said to them we have to choose someone until the child matures and ready for the role Imamah when he is old enough to respond to disputed law issues, the companion rejected his proposal and decided it make ‘al-Jawād’ as their Imām even though he was a child.\textsuperscript{1385} The dispute took place in Baghdad

\textsuperscript{1381} Ibid., p. 106.
\textsuperscript{1382} Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Khīṣāl, vol 1, p. 310.
\textsuperscript{1383} Ibn Bābawayh, ‘Uyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā, vol 1, p. 242.
\textsuperscript{1384} Al-Mašūfūdī, Murūj al-Ḍahāb, vol 4, p. 61.
and wide spread across the cities. The difference here is between al-Riḍā and his son al-Jawād. Al-Riḍā was in an active role. The caliph al-Ma’mūn chose him to deal with and respond to various mutakalimūn from various rival movements, as Ibn Bābawayh would describe. al-Jawād was appointed out of a desperate situation when he was just a child, in fact, the Ḥadīṯ states they only wanted him to have knowledge in law fiqh. Nothing was mentioned about ideologies or philosophy.

Al-Ma’mūn took the challenge of responding to scholars of Ḥadīṯ such as debating Ahmed b. Ḥanbal, about whether the Qur’an was created word of God or not created. Al-Mas’ūdī added this continued after the death of al-Ma’mūn and during the reign of the succeeding caliph al-Mu’tasim, Ibn Ḥanbal had received 80 lashes on the same topic. This explains why there was no recorded dispute between Imam al-Riḍā and Ibn Ḥanbal or Isḥāq b. Rāhawayh. In fact, when they met with ’Alī al-Riḍā and heard his isnād they were impressed and replied: ‘shock that can cure a mad man’. Isḥāq b. Rāhawayh, later on, had asked his student al-Bukārī Muḥammed b. Ismā’īl (d. 868/254 A.H) to compile a summarised version of all the Prophet’s sunna. al-Bukārī and then Muslim (d. 874/261 A.H) the first compilers who collected and compiled Ḥadīṯ on the condition they are authentic. Both compilers had three things in common: the traditions were divided by topic subject, each individual Ḥadīṯ was supported by well-known narrators (a criterion for authentication) and the number was reduced. They are not only talked about the reliability of their Ḥadīṯ but about whether the Ḥadīṯ said what the prophet meant by relying on the interpretation of the companions. Whereas Ibn Ḥanbal misnad merely a list of companions
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of the Prophet and by each companion a list of their sayings and narrations from the Prophet. In his *misnad*, he compiled 27,100 Ḥadīṯ and by later generation such as al-Buḫārī (Muḥammed b. Ismāʿīl) the number of Ḥadīṯ reduced to 7,563 Ḥadīṯ, without repetition the number reduced to 4000 approximate, the Ḥadīṯ divided by topic sections.

The authenticity became the goal of followers of Ḥadīṯ, even by adding stricter conditions before accepting Ḥadīṯ as from the Prophet or not. Šīʿah recognised the position of Imām as a political leader, an Imām of the two worlds: the political/exoteric (*ẓāḥīr*) and the inner world of faith, the esoteric (*bāṭīn*). Moreover, the ‘Imāmah’ came with a hierarchical structure of society which became the focal point of debate between the Šīʿah and the Muʿtazilite regarding the political idea of justice, of determining the position of people in society.

Philosophy continued throughout the Abbasids caliphate, through well-known figures such as Ishāq b. Ḥunayn (d. 902/290 A.H) who was like his father expert in languages and translated works of commentary on Aristotle, he died during the reign of al-Muqtadir. The next figure was Ṭābit b. Qurrah (d. 900/288 A.H) was Sabian from Ḥarrān and was challenged with questions from abī Muḥammed al-Nubaḵṭī. Al-Masʿūdī met with al-Rāzī and they exchanged discussion about the corporeality of the world Ḥudūṯ al-ʿĀlam. He described al-Rāzī elite figure to explain to us the works came from Ḥarrān. When it comes to explaining the belief of Ḥarrān and Plato, al-Masʿūdī would refer to the texts by Ishāq b. Ḥunayn and abū Bakr al-Rāzī. Al-Masʿūdī added, that the school of Philosophy moved from Athens to Egypt Alexandria then moved to Antioch during the reign of ʿUmar b. ʿabdul Azīz, then to Ḥarrān during caliph al-Mutawakil and finally during reign al-
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Muʿtaḍīd the learning of philosophy was led by Quwayrī, Ibrāhīm al-Marūwazī, and Yuḥanna b. Ḥaylān who died in Bağdād during the reign of al-Muqtadīr. Then succeeded Muḥammed b. Kārnbīb and abī Baṣar Mattī b. Yūnūs both were students of Ibrāhīm al-Marūwazī. He then added that most people rely on the translation by Mattī b. Yūnūs of Aristotle’s work and finally the school succeeded by al-Fārābī, who studied under Yuḥanna b. Ḥaylān. Al-Masʿūdī added that al-Fārābī at the beginning shared a similar opinion to abū Bakr al-Rāzī, both following the old school of philosophy Pythagoras, but that he then shifted to Aristotle’s. Philosophy continued and integrated with kalām during the Abbasid Caliphate: Māʿmūn (d. 833), al-Mutawakil (d. 861), al-Muʿtaḍīd (d. 902) and al-Muqtadīr (d. 932). Among those from Ḥarrān, the head of the Mandaean faith (Sabian followers of the teachings of John the Baptist) Ṭābit b. Qurrah (d. 835/221- 842/228), was a well-known figure in the court of Caliph al-Muʿtaḍīd. He was originally from Ḥarrān and became well known for transmitting works by Aristotle, Socrates, and on medicine by Galen, into Arabic. Nonetheless, in the ninth century, the issue of Christian and Sabian converts to become a part of Muslim thought about God’s role in human affairs, and the problem of evil. Converts to Islam who were ex-Christian and Sabian theologians brought with them their own interpretations of the world and God, passing them on to Muslims. For example, the physicians Ishāq b. Ḥunayn and abī Uṯmān al-Dimašqī were Christian converts to Islam and close companions of al-Nubakṭī, and of his nephew, abū Muḥammed Ḥasan b. Musa al-Nubakṭī. The father of Ishāq b. Ḥunayn attended majlis the caliph al-Wāṣiq and discussed philosophy and Medicine. His father’s name was Ḥunayn.
b. Ishāq.\(^{1406}\) Since he was a child chosen by al-Maʿmūn to translate philosophy works from Greek to Arabic he mainly focussed on Aristotle’s and Galen’s.\(^{1407}\)

It is also said that philosophy came during the time of the Umayyad ruler, Yazīd b. Muʿawīyah, he was nicknamed as the wise man of the al-Marwān family. He brought Greek philosophers who came to visit Egypt and he asked them to translate the works of philosophy from the Greek and Coptic languages into Arabic.\(^{1408}\)

As discussed in the previous chapter, the friend of al-Nubaḵtī and Christian convert to Islam, Ishāq b. Ḥunayn, translated the works of Plato, Aristotle, Hippocrates, and Galen among other translations to Arabic.\(^{1409}\) A second friend of al-Nubaḵtī, the Syrian physician who worked in Bağdād, abī Saʿīd ʿUṭmān al-Dimašqī, translated the work of Galen into Arabic.\(^{1410}\) As a friend of these translators, and in a role similar to a wazīr, he was responsible for arranging meetings, it is not unreasonable to think that al-Nubaḵtī had been influenced by interaction with them and that this influence impacted his own work on philosophy, a summary of Aristotle’s *On Generation and Corruption* entitled, (*Iḥtisār Iḥtisār al-Kawn wa l-Fasād*).\(^{1411}\) As a government official in the administration of the Caliph, he needed information on how to govern the various religious groups, including non-Muslim groups like Christians and Jews.

Moving on from al-Nubaḵtī the Aristotelian thinker, we come to al-Rāzī the Platonic thinker. While the Christian, abī Uṭmān al-Dimašqī, translated Galen’s work, the famous Muslim physician of the city of Rayy, al-Rāzī, also wrote a commentary on Galen’s work. Al-Masʿūdī states that abū Bakr al-Rāzī was the most prominent expert who studied the beliefs of people from Ḥarrān.\(^{1412}\) Their work was mostly written in the Syriac language.\(^{1413}\)
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\(^{1408}\) Ibn Al-Nadīm, *al-Fīhrīst*, p. 300.


\(^{1411}\) Ibn Al-Nadīm, *al-Fīhrīst*, p. 220.


Ḥarrān main beliefs based on the old school of philosophy are pre-Aristotelian and followed Plato’s interpretation, the belief in transmigration of the soul. They also believe in eternal deities, each deity had its own house of worship such as First Intellect, Active Intellect, Image, Soul, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the Moon. This was not favoured by the mainstream, whether Muslim or Christian sometimes described as heresy (zanādiqa) and sometimes described as Sabian (Ṣābi’ah). By contrast, in Bağdād, with al-Nubaḵtī and his Christian associates, in Syria with al-Fārābī, in Buḵāra with abī Zayd al-Balḵī, and in Qom with Ibn Bābawayh’s father, they had similarity in their interpretation was based on Aristotelian logic. For instance, in Aristotelian philosophy, there is no emphasis upon the return or transmigration of the soul. On the contrary, in Ḥarrān’s translated works, it was a frequent theme.

The interpretation of Philosophy started during the Abbāsid caliph abū Jaʿfar al-Manṣūr (d. 775/158 A.H) philosophical books were translated and made accessible to the public such as the work of Aristotle and Ptolemy including the story of Kalīla wa Dimna. Some of those who attended his court such as the translators al-Nubaḵt al-magusī (the grandfather of al-Nubaḵtī, later on, embraced Islam on the hand of the caliph), worked in his office as astrologers, translating books from Persian to Arabic. The head of Muʿtazila ’Amrū b. ‘Ubayd who was his friend became a caliph. New movements started to rise. In 762/145 A.H Muḥammed b. ’Abdullah al-Nafs al-Zakīyah (d. 762/145 A.H) offspring of Imam al-Ḥasan, raised an army in Medina, and there was an exchange of letters between al-Nafs al-Zakīyah and the caliph. Al-Nafs al-Zakīyah wrote to the caliph that he was nobler than the offsprings of Imam Hasan and the caliph was not. Al-Manṣūr
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1421 Abū Al-Ḥasan al-Ašʿarī, Maqālāt Al-Islāmīn wa Iḵṭilāf Al-Muṣalān, p. 19.
wrote back saying that Ja’far b. Muḥammad is more knowledgeable and nobler than him and that he is on his side.\textsuperscript{1422} Al-Nafs al-Zakīyah was killed in Medina. Ja’far became popular and there were a number of traditions where he became the frontier to combat new rivals intellectually. The caliph gave Ja’far b. Muḥammad the title ‘the truthful one’ \textit{al-Ṣādiq}.\textsuperscript{1423} Things did not last very long. Al-Manṣūr had called abū Ḥanīfa and told him that ‘...the people of Kufa are infatuated with Ja’far al-Ṣādiq and disobedient to me, can you prepare 40 questions, that are complicated, to embarrass Ja’far in the next meeting?’\textsuperscript{1424} After the debate abī Ḥanīfa praised Ja’far al-Ṣādiq and said that he had never seen someone expert in fiqh as much as Ja’far al-Ṣādiq.\textsuperscript{1425} However, abī Ḥanīfa did not say that Ja’far al-Ṣādiq was knowledgeable in other fields, he only mentioned \textit{fiqh} that is something that was outdated and not unusual to the caliph. Another challenge, the caliph had a man from India who is knowledgeable in physician’s books, he invited Ja’far al-Ṣādiq and made him listen to the physician after he finished, the physician asked Ja’far al-Ṣādiq if he would like to learn from him. Ja’far al-Ṣādiq replied, “No, I have inherited knowledge better than yours, I know how to treat cold with heat, and with heat I use coolness, likewise dry sickness treated with moist and moist with dry, and so on this is how the body works”.\textsuperscript{1426} Ibn Bābawayh lists other traditions by Ja’far al-Ṣādiq under sub-title ‘why inside ear wax bitter tasting, the saliva sweet-tasting, eye salt tasting, and nose cold feeling’.\textsuperscript{1427} Al-Mas’ūdī stated that it was the caliph al-Manṣūr who broke the relationship between the Abbasids and banī ‘abdul Muṭalib.\textsuperscript{1428} The second challenge was dualist based, a student of Ja’far al-Ṣādiq such as Manṣūr b. Ḥāzim had said to him that he debated people, but they all provided evidence from the Qur’an, Ja’far al-Ṣādiq, responded sarcastically, “how can
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be Qur’an your evidence when al-murji’, hurūrī and zindiq use it to support their heretical arguments? 1429 Some of the topic debates were about: 1) how the world came to be Ḥudūṯ al-Ālim, 2) how many supreme beings were controlling the universe, 3) life after death, 4) rewards after death and 5) whether there are living forms in heavens or merely empty space. The debate was between Ja’far al-Ṣadiq and Ibn abī al-‘awjā’, and ‘abdullah al-Muqaffa’ came with Ibn abī al-‘awjā’. 1430 Similarly, abū Muḥammed al-Nubakṭī stated that the roots usūl of all groups firāq are four: Šī’ah, Mu’tazila, Murji’a and Kawārij (ḥurūrī). 1431 Ibn al-Nadīm stated that Persian in the past had translated some books on logic and physician, they were translated to Arabic, by ‘abdullah b. al-Muqaffa’ (d. 759/142 A.H). 1432 Al-Qādī Muḥīd al-Qommī in his commentary of book al-Tawḥīd relates to Plato then when spoke about al-Muqaffa’ he stated it was him who interpreted Aristotle’s logic to the caliph abū Ja’far al-Dawānīqī (a derogatory name for abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr). 1433 The challenge of dualism to the point that the companions and students of Ja’far al-Ṣadiq before they speak had to recite their doctrine to him. For example, Ḥimrān b. A’ūn began by saying “I bare witness that there is only one God and has no partner, has no son, He is not redundant Taʾṭīl of his creation nor anything similar to Him tašbīh, He does not control human acts jabr nor delegate human’s to do what they want, Muḥammed is his messenger and humble servant of God, heavenly rewards and hell punishments are facts, the resurrection after death is the fact, bear witness ‘Alī is His proof that no one can deny his unique, then he was succeeded by his son Ḥasan, then his brother Ḥusayn, then his son ‘Alī, then his son Muḥammed, then you (Ja’far al-Ṣadiq)” Then Ja’far al-Ṣadiq responded this the correct doctrine that anyone who disagrees with it he is a zindiq. Ḥimrān responded even if he was ‘Alawī and Fāṭimī

1430 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, pp. 125
1431 Al-Nubakṭī, Firaq al-Šī’a, p. 51.
1432 Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 300.
Similarly, abū Hātim al-Rāzī stated that al-Muqaffa’ although was a Muslim but his doctrine dualist zindiq. abū Hātim al-Rāzī, A lām al-Nubūwa, p. 50.
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(from the lineage of 'Alī and Fatimah)? Ja’far al-Ṣādiq responded: “even if he was Muḥammedī, ‘Alawī, and Fāṭimī”. Further debates were between Ja’far al-Ṣādiq and dualists such as abū Šākir al-Daysănī,1435 and zindīq from Egypt.1436 Al-Mas’ūdī stated that followers of the teachings of Mānī, Daysănīyah, and Marqūnīyah were widespread. Interpreters were categorised as Muslim but zanādiqa such as Ibn abī al-ʿawjā’, Ḥamād ‘ajrad, Yahya b. Ziyād and Muṭī’ b. Āyās. Until caliph al-Mahdi (d. 785/169 A.H) came to power and decided to combat zanādiqa by supporting mutakilmūn and jadalīn to defend religion and write books refuting zanādiqa.1437 Ibn al-Nadīm added, names who were Muslims classed as zanādiqa such as abī al-Ḵaṭṭāb, Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ,1438 abū Ḥātim al-Warsnānī (abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī),1439 abū al-‘abbās al-Nāšī (d. 906/293 A.H) and abū ʿīsa al-Warrāq (d. 994/383 A.H).1440 There are two al-Nāšī’ with the same nickname al-Nāšī. Al-Nāšī’ al-Aṣgar abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Waṣīf al-Nāšī’ al-Aṣgar (d. 975/365 A.H), he was a poet and his fiqh followed the school of al-Zāhīr (he is listed as one of Šī’ah authors who wrote a book on Imamah1441), he states that he studied under abū Sahl al-Nubaḵtī.1442 Whereas al-Nāšī’ al-Akbar abū al-ʿAbbās ʿabdullah b. Muḥammed was not listed as Šī’ah. He is the author of Masā’il al-Imāmah wa muqṭatafīt min Kitāb al-Awsaf fi al-Maqaīlāt and wrote a refutation against al-Rāzī about the medical study and the latter responded back defending the study.1443

The integration of dualism within early Šī’ah. When Hišām b. al-Ḥakam was faced with the question about Šī’ah traditions, his response was that the companions of Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq used to take their notebooks and go to abī al-Ḵaṭṭāb who was a dualist and

1434 Ibn Bābawayh, Ma‘ānī al-Ḵbār, p. 212.
1436 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 293.
1437 Al-Mas’ūdī, Murūj al-Ḏahab, vol 4, p. 355.
1439 Ibid., p. 234.
1440 Ibid., p. 411.
1443 Ibid., p. 361.
he then adds his own interpretations and changes the isnād to Muḥammed al-Bāqir (the father of Ja’far al-Ṣādiq). Al-Mufīd added that al-Mānīyah and Dayṣānīyah doctrine is closer to Persian dualism magus than of Ṣābi’a, whereas Ṣābi’a, closer to mušriks for their association of gods to God and claiming that the celestial sphere is responsible for our worldly existence. Ibn Bābawayh was dismissive of Mānī and Bardaisan and describes their argument as ‘merely dualist old myth, similar to Persian magus, who made evil Ahriman be eternal like God, and include bodies ajsām to be eternal too’, he listed several Ḥadīṯ under the sub title: ‘refutations against dualists and zanādiqa’. He argued that the universe is of three types: inanimate, vegetative animal, and moving celestials. God imprinted on the celestials to keep constantly orbiting by nature.

5.1.6 Transmigration and Return – The Old Philosophers and the Šī‘ah Version of the Šābi’a

As a soul journeys through life, it accumulates good or bad qualities, energy, depending on what the human, through his free will, prioritises. There are two views at the time about Plato’s thinking on the topic. One view was that the soul of the wicked people would turn into demons, the evil soul would not be able to leave earth because it needs the instrument of a body to become pure. The reward is becoming substance like the intellect and returning to the divine world. The other view is that Plato believed that souls existed in both worlds. An evil soul on earth would end up in the metaphysical world as an animal form whether donkey or cow, depending upon its acts in the physical world.

---

1444 Al-Kiššī, Rijāl al-Kiššī, p. 225.  
1445 Al-Mufīd, al-Muqni’a, pp. 271 and 2.  
1446 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 269.  
1448 Al-Sijistānī, Kitāb Muntaḵab Šiwān al-Hikmah, p. 114.  
5.1.7 The Return as an Animal

It is worth talking about the return as discussed by three key figures: Al-Fārābī, al-Rāzī, and Ibn Bābawayh. Al-Fārābī argues that the souls of people of the City of Ignorance (al-Mudin al-Jāhiliyyah) are destined either to become like the souls of animals or to die and vanish completely like an animal’s soul,\(^\text{1450}\) while Abū Bakr al-Rāzī thought that the soul of a deceased evil human will transmigrate into a newly born animal, the slaughter of animals would not be a crime but liberation of the soul.\(^\text{1451}\) Abū Bakr al-Rāzī takes it that the soul is eternal, and transmigration will continue. The rebirth in a different body depends on the moral character of the previous life.\(^\text{1452}\) Al-Rāzī is moral towards the animals. He states that although animals are less intelligent than a human, this should not be taken for granted, as what Kings do in their sports hunting animals and hurting them or those use their animal excessively and causing to suffer severely, everything should be in moderation. For example, you demand your horse to speed only when there is a danger behind you. He then added that harm is only inflicted on an animal when they become a threat to your existence. Killing harmful animals could be freeing their souls, to move to a more effective body (\textit{taqa' u nufūsuha fi juṭat aṣlāhu}).\(^\text{1453}\) Our body is an instrument of the soul, and if we take pleasure in hurting animals we will end up in a painful afterlife.\(^\text{1454}\) Ibn Bābawayh, like abū Bakr al-Rāzī, differed from al-Fārābī on the question of returning as an animal. Ibn Bābawayh states that some Persian Magians believe that to purify oneself one needs to go through extreme practices, such as not eating slaughtered animals unless they died naturally.\(^\text{1455}\) Perhaps this is because they believe the human soul can be incarnated into the body of an animal for a period of time. Until the soul departed from the


\(^{1452}\) Ibid., p. 109.


animal, the animal would not be appropriate to eat. Ibn Bābawayh narrated that, although the Qur’an says certain people went against a prophet and were cursed and turned into pigs and monkeys, Ibn Bābawayh said that they only survived for three days and then they died and this never happened again.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, ʿUyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā, vol 2, p. 202} He then talked about the story of Harūt and Marūt after they taught people black magic; they were cursed and turned into stars, and he added that according to al-Riḍā, who said the following sarcastically if God punishes people He would turn them into animals and not shining stars in heavens.\footnote{Ibid., vol 1, p. 271.}

The doctrine of believing eternity of the soul received criticism by logicians and Ismaili against al-Rāzī and al-Mufīd against Ibn Bābawayh, for believing of the ‘eternity of the soul’ making man hold full responsibility of his choice and God has no effect in man’s life. The criticism is because it minimises the role of scripture and role of God. Man has the full control of his will and responsibility in dealing with the problem of evil. The eternity of the soul is that the soul existed a long time before the creation of human beings and has jawhar of its own that can feel pain, joy and death (taliḏ wa taʿlam wa tamūt).\footnote{Al-Masʿūdī, Murūj al-Ḍahab, vol 2, pp. 264., and al-Mufīd, Tashīḥ iʿtiqādāt, p. 83.} They were close to the thinking of the Šābiʿa of Ḥarrān. According to the biographer, Ṣaʿīd b. aḥmed b. Ṣaʿīd al-Andalusī (d. 1070/462 A.H), in his Ṭabaqāt al-Umām, the physician abū Bakr al-Rāzī was parallel with the Hindu Brahmins and dualists; they both rejected the religious interpretation of prophecies and adopted a version of incarnation from Šābiʿa of Ḥarrān.\footnote{Ibn Sāʿīd al-Andalusī, Ṭabaqāt al-Umām, p. 33.} The only difference here was that Ibn Bābawayh mentions the Brahmins in a negative way, but not for their denial of prophecy but for denying the existence of Imamah in every generation.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl Al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 4.} Al-Masʿūdī stated that the return of the soul after death was
accepted by both Plato and Hindu, then added that Şābi’a of Ḥarrān followed that thought and abū Bakr al-Rāzī who explains their belief in details.¹⁴⁶¹

5.1.8 Ibn Bābawayh’s Understanding of Imamah and Transmigration

The importance of Imāmah. Ibn Bābawayh narrated that the continued passing of the soul does not stop with one Imam but proceeds from one Imam to another, and this is how good will prevail.¹⁴⁶² If one wants to interpret Ibn Bābawayh’s interpretation of the Imamah, one must do so from the principle of Imamah as the knowledge that made him unique and the qualities of such an Imam we keep receiving same description from scriptures based on revelations. He would argue that ‘Alī’s attributes were mentioned in pre-Islamic religious texts of the ancient nations.¹⁴⁶³ For example, the description of a person with the ability to distinguish right from wrong (fārūq) and truthful (siddīq) is the Imam ‘Alī b. abī Ṭālib.¹⁴⁶⁴ The universal idea of Imam ‘Alī (not the person of ‘Alī himself) was in the New Testament as Elias or Elijah. In the religions before Islam, the idea of ‘Alī was present. In the Torah, ‘Alī appears as Barī’, in Hinduism, ‘Alī is the Kabkar, for the Armenians ‘Alī is the Farīq, for the Turks ‘Alī is the Baṭīr, for the Persians ‘Alī is the Jabtar and for finally the Arabs we have the actual person, Imam ‘Alī.¹⁴⁶⁵ He wrote a book in support of this ‘Revocation of Choice and Proof of Text’ (Ibtāl al-Iktīyār wa Iṭbāt al-Naṣ). Again, this is one of the differences with the Mu’tazila and Zaydī. Therefore, to Ibn Bābawayh it is only natural Imamah is thus something familiar to all religions and should not be left to layman’s choice, but we should look for matching descriptions of that Imam. Ibn Bābawayh gave an example about revelation being superior to human choice, when King David chose Solomon as his successor ignoring the disagreement of the vast majority

¹⁴⁶¹ Al-Maš‘ūdī, Murāj al-Ḍahab, vol 2, pp. 264-5.
¹⁴⁶³ Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, p. 58.
¹⁴⁶⁵ Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, p. 59.
of the Jews. The Imamah here is a common dialogue between major religions of the time, they have agreed that Imamah is part of God’s divine plan, but they debated the identity of Imamah, and what the ideal character of Imamah is.

5.1.9 The exclusivity of the Imamah

There is no servant of God when they are sleeping and their souls do not ascend to the heavens and sometimes, they can remember things that they saw from their journey of ascension. On the other hand, Ibn Bābawayh disagrees with using ascension as evidence for Imamah. He narrated for example that Lucifer was able to ascend and be purified and directly communicate with angels. But that does not apply to human beings because of the great difference in lifespan between Lucifer and a human. Ibn Bābawayh narrated according to the Persian Salmān al-Fārisī, a companion to the Prophet, that because Lucifer worshipped God for 12,000 years, he was raised to the first heaven. Lucifer then worshipped for another 12,000 years and was raised to the second heaven, and so on until he reached the seventh heaven and mixed with the angels. There he saw how the clay bore the name of Imam 'Alī. Satan, even though he came from the realm of smokeless fire, the world of the Jinn, he rose to be next to the angels after gaining piety. In another version, Lucifer comes from the world of the Jinn, he decided to worship God and elevate himself. In this process, the Jinn were destroyed, leaving Lucifer as the only one of his kind. Lucifer worshipped God for 12,000 years. In order to be elevated out of the world of the Jinn, he then worshipped God for 12,000 years more, in order to be elevated to the world of the sky, where the angels dwell. He worshipped God with the angels for 12,000

---


1467 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Amālī, pp. 146 and 626. He gave two different versions of ascension one to God and one to heavens.

1468 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Amālī, p. 347.

1469 Ibn Bābawayh, 'illal al-Šarāye’, vol 1, p. 27.

1470 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Amālī, p. 347.
more years and experienced the sight of the blessed clay that made ʿAlī b. abī Ṭālib, which he saw like shining light.\textsuperscript{1471}

In \textit{al-Ķišāl} Lucifer saw the names of Muḥammed, ʿAlī, Faṭimah, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn imprinted on the throne of God (i.e., knowledge\textsuperscript{1472}), their names existed seven thousand years before the creation of Adam and are greater than Lucifer. Lucifer asked to be granted mercy in their name.\textsuperscript{1473} Ibn Bābawayh, in his refutation of the rival gnostic movements, argued that there is no direct communication between God and man. He was against Ṣūfī \textit{hulūlīyah}, those who claim God or the Imams are manifested in them, describing them as exaggerators, and extremist (ḡulāt) and sometimes as \textit{mufawiḍah}.\textsuperscript{1474} For the same reason, he rejects the claim made by Ṣūfīs that through purifying yourself from sins you can ascend \textit{al-Isrā’} and purify your \textit{nafs} and then God can speak directly (\textit{yatajala}) to you. This is what happens with the Ṣūfīs’ \textit{walī} (saint). This gives their Imam the possibility of direct access to a knowledge of what is inside God that may create more divine commandments.\textsuperscript{1475} Al-Mufīd, however, named it \textit{tafwīḍ}, the concept of free will being opposite to someone practicing religious obligations and hence treated as heresy. It is necessary for salvation for one to follow religious practices. Otherwise, if left to our own choice \textit{tafwīḍ}, we would not be prepared for the afterlife. However, as discussed earlier, abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī stated that Ibn Bābawayh was isolated by wazīr al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād and there is no possible way that he would follow the doctrine of a Muʿtazilite.\textsuperscript{1476}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1471} Ibid., p. 348. \\
\textsuperscript{1473} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Ķišāl}, vol 2, p. 639. \\
\textsuperscript{1474} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā}, vol 2, p. 204., and Al-Mufīd, \textit{Taṣḥīḥ lʾtiqādāt}, p. 131. \\
\textsuperscript{1475} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Alʾlʾtiqādāt}, p. 101. \\
\textsuperscript{1476} Al-Tawḥīdī, \textit{Aḵlāq al-Wazīrayn}, p. 89.
\end{flushright}
5.1.10 Reincarnation and Ibn Bābawayh: Journeying Towards the Ultimate Perfection of Good and Evil

The focus of Ibn Bābawayh’s refutations differs from his contemporaries. His work mainly focuses on three things: life after death, i.e., the ‘return’, that Jesus as a human was not infallible, and the fallibility of historical prophets. The return is closely related to the Christian teaching that the body of Jesus was resurrected from the dead after being crucified and tortured. Ibn Bābawayh argued that, if Jesus suffered and ‘returned’, then we have a precedent for the Imams to return. This is what makes him different from mainstream Muslims. He believed in return for both good and evil ‘souls’ (nafs) before the day of judgment. Ibn Bābawayh further argues that Jesus was resurrected and was succeeded by other prophets successively until the Prophet Muḥammed and then on to the Imams through ‘Alī. Ibn Bābawayh talks about six wicked characters from early times who appeared again but each time much more advanced in evil. This was a continual process of increasing intensity. They will appear again and again, each time being greater in their evil, before the end of time and the final judgment. Likewise, he stated that creation preceded humanity. Before Adam, there were seven worlds and some of these worlds already received their judgment whether heaven or hell. The process of re-creation continues until reaching perfection, a generation neither male nor female. Ibn Bābawayh was clearly looking for a justification for the twelve Imams, which would avoid what he deems to be the heresy of incarnation. For example, he attempted to present the number 12 as a natural phenomenon, not an innovation, by referring to the Old and New Testaments. The hardships of the prophets are transformed into twelve spiritual states to become a unique human being who will be the inheritor (Ḵilāfah) of earth.

---

1478 Ibid., vol 2, p. 359.
5.3 Ibn Bābawayh

5.3.1 Ibn Bābawayh and the Creation of Human Souls

When it comes to Imamah and prophethood, Ibn Bābawayh has many similarities with al-Fārābī. He agreed with al-Fārābī on transcendence and rejected the idea that God speaks directly with humans, apart from intermediaries such as angels or emanations that came from the intellects in the process translated an angel. As with al-Fārābī, he understood souls to be created by ‘intellects’ but not by angels. Ibn Bābawayh’s cosmos is formed from two ‘intellects’, The First Intellect and the Second Intellect. In the beginning, God created the First Intellect (ʿaql), but in the place where (ʿaql) was absent, God created the Second Intellect which is called ‘ignorance’ (jahl). Similarly, Ibn al-Nadīm states that Mānī’s saw the world as coming into existence from light and darkness, the attribute of the intellectual light nūr, meek hilm, knowledge ʿilm, rational ʿaql, metaphysic ġayb, and acumen al-fīṭna, and has spiritual attributes such as love ḥub, faith Imān, sincerity wafā’, courage murūʿa, and wisdom hikmah versus darkness attribute smoke duḵān, fire harīq, darkness ẓalma, heat samūm and fogginess ḍabāb from the two mixture the twelve attributes creating a human being. Thus, everything began with these two points, the world came into being from these two starting points, namely, intellect and ignorance. He talks about how each has 75 qualities or attributes in opposition to the other. For example, the intellect has a light, but ignorance has darkness; intellect has truth, but ignorance has falsehood, and so on. Intellect (ʿaql) is responsible for the existence of the metaphysical world and souls, while ignorance (jahl) is responsible for the non-intelligent world, the physical world, including the human body. Thus, God emanates (yaṭīḍ) in a similar way to the language of early philosophy, but Ibn Bābawayh uses yaṭīḍ as a

---

1481 Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 400.
description of God’s generosity in heaven and not his direct involvement in creating the world, which is interpreted as an overflow of his kindness or as emanating from his light.\textsuperscript{1483} The two terms, \textit{yafīd} and intellect (\textit{aql}), are similar to the language of abū Bakr al-Rāzī. The term ‘gushing out’ (\textit{fayḍ}) was, for instance, in Ibn Bābawayh’s work stating that God overflows with kindness (\textit{yafīd Allahu ‘alyah min faḍli ṣatā’ih}). Here the word ‘overflow’ (\textit{yafīḍ}) is used to describe God’s kindness gushing out.\textsuperscript{1484} Then created from the light of God’s throne the highest heaven.\textsuperscript{1485} This is a typical theme employed by al-Fārābī God is the first and from his emanation came the first intellect (in Ibn Bābawayh would be His throne) and from his throne created first heaven.\textsuperscript{1486} It should be noted that Ibn Bābawayh only used, to my knowledge, the term \textit{fayḍ} once, and in that case, it was in reference to fasting and reward. Heavens creating four elements and veils creating souls Ibn Bābawayh stated that there are layers and skies between humans and God and there are twelve heavens. These twelve layers cannot be reversed. Like the sun has layers of light, the emanations of the intellectual lights start from God, creating layers of heavens and skies descending down to the physical world. In the beginning, there was only one intellect, the first intellect, and all that follows are twelve layers of veils of light or heavens. Ibn Bābawayh divided cosmology into two parts, metaphysical heaven, and the physical skies with planets. He called the seventh sky, which is the highest level of the sky and nearest to heaven, ‘white shining like a pearl’ (‘\textit{ajmā}') , the sixth ‘shining like a green pearl’ (‘\textit{arūs}’), the fifth, ‘shining like gold’ (\textit{hayfūn}), the fourth ‘shining like silver’ (\textit{arqalūn}), the third ‘lower than the above’ (\textit{marūm}), the second ‘shining like copper’ (\textit{qaydūm}), and the first sky that is near the earth he called the noble (\textit{rafī’}), a mix between smoke and water. 

\textsuperscript{1483} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Ma‘ānī al-Âkbār}, p. 409.  
\textsuperscript{1484} \textit{Ibid.}  
\textsuperscript{1485} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Ṣūbūl}, vol 1, p. 187.  
earth was then created from the foam of the water while the mountains were created from

He narrates that, according to Imam ʿAlī, the Prophet’s spirit from light (nūr) existed
before the existence. God created his spirit before the pen, tablet, heaven and hell, beside
the four has created 12 layers of veils (ḥijāb): al-qudra, al-ʿażama, al-mina, al-rahma, al-
saʿāda, al-karāmah, al-manzila, al-hidāyah, al-nubūwa, al-rifʿah, al-haybah and al-
šafaʿah. The spirit went through the layers starting with first one and stationed for 12
thousand years and then gradually less and less time by last veil stayed 1 thousand years.
Then the name of the Prophet appeared on the pillar of the throne like a shining light, and
finally into the body of Adam. He then added that afterwards Adam the Prophet’s spirit
kept passing from generation to generation, until it reached the father of the Prophet, then
he was born into the world.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā, vol 1, p. 240, al-ḵiṣāl, vol 2, p. 345, and ʾilāl al-Šarāye, vol 2, p. 593.} In another Ḥadīṯ he narrates that when the body of Adam
was made ready her spirit was offered to entered Adam’s body.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, p. 306.}

With al-Fārābī, God is the first and from Him came 11 intellects and beside the
intellects 11 spheres (aflāk).\footnote{Ibid., p. 396.} And from the sphere of the moon (falak al-Qamar) and
intellect (aql) came the four elements and living beings.\footnote{Al-Fārābī, Kitāb Ārāʾ ahl al-Madīna al-Fāḍilah, (Beirut: Dār al-Mašriq, 1968), pp. 61-2.}

Again, when Ibn Bābawayh stated that the light (nūr) that created the Prophet is also
responsible for everything existing. With al-Fārābī, the first intellect through a process
of involuntary emanations started from the first emanation to become responsible for the
rest to exist.\footnote{Ibid., p. 63.}

He uses ‘emanation’ instead of ‘creation’ that the focal point that separate between
those who believe in free-will and those who believe in creationism. In this example, God
is not responsible over Man’s choice.
5.3.2 Ibn Bābawayh five Eternals and the Cosmological Hierarchy

Ibn Bābawayh was aware of the accusation of anthropomorphism tašbīh and the denial of freedom of will jabr against ašḥāb al-Aḵbār and thought that the latter took the Ḥadīṯ about God’s attributes to be literal.\(^{1493}\) He combined a number of traditions under one subheading: the refutation of God in space, time, reside, movement, descent, ascend, and transition.\(^{1494}\) Then added, to reside in a space that means God needs the space. To have needs makes God was created and not the creator.\(^{1495}\) When he spoke about space he narrates that space within God’s knowledge before it came to existence.\(^{1496}\) I infer that, by making the space as part of God’s knowledge, it also means that the knowledge before space came to existence is also eternal. Ibn Bābawayh’s cosmology is like al-Rāzī’s: God first created the light then he created the heavens.\(^{1497}\) Ibn Bābawayh narrates that God created three essentials: intellect/light, the celestial pen (qalam), and air (hawā’); these three elements existed before God’s throne.\(^{1498}\) In other traditions, he stated that when God created intellect, it was on the right-hand side of God, and was responsible for the heavens, and from the heavens comes ‘the divine faculty’. This is different from al-Fārābī’s scheme.\(^{1499}\)

Returning to Ibn Bābawayh’s understanding, after the intellect was created, God created ignorance/darkness/matter, the opposite from the intellect. “… When God commanded ignorance to respond, it did not, so God gave it 75 characteristics which are opposite the 75 characteristics of the intellect. The Ḥadīṯ was narrated by Sunnī too, such as abū Jaʿfar Muḥammed al-ʿUqaylī (d. 934/322 A.H) in his Kitāb al-Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Kabīr, 

\(^{1493}\) Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawhīd, p. 18.
\(^{1494}\) Ibid., p. 183., and al-Amālī, p. 279.
\(^{1495}\) Subheading: bāb nafī al-makān wal zaman wal sukūn wal haraka wal nuzūl walṣuʿūd wal intiqāl ‘an Allah.
\(^{1496}\) Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawhīd, p. 178.
\(^{1497}\) Ibid., p. 137.
\(^{1498}\) Ibn Bābawayh, ‘Uyūn Aḵbār Al-ṣaḥāb, vol 1, p. 240.
\(^{1499}\) Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawhīd, p. 324.
\(^{1499}\) Al-Fārābī, Kitāb Ārā’ ahl al-Madīna al-Fāḍilah, pp. 61, 108 and 113., and al-Fārābī in Ed._ Walzer, Al-Farabi on The Perfect State, pp. 100, 210 and 20.
however, the text in a shorter version was attributed to the Prophet, the author classing the content of the text as ‘disclaimed report’ (*munkar*). The Ḥadīṯ mentioned in al-Maḥāsin with an extended version, this time was not attributed to the Prophet, but as being the teaching of Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. Ibn Bābawayh narrated in two of his books *ʿillal al-Šarāyeʿ* and *al-Ḳiṣāl*. Ibn Bābawayh narrates this tradition from al-Barqī’s book *al-Maḥāsin*, which defines the character of good from evil. He begins by saying the intellect was made from realm of spirits *rūḥānīyīn*, positioned on the right side of God’s throne, and on the left side God made the ignorance from realm of celestial ocean of darkness, the ignorance complained to God about why the intellect was made superior with 75 attributes, he asked God to be granted for each characteristic with the opposites quality, God gave the intellect good as their wazīr, then gave evilness as the wazīr of ignorance, the intellect was given faith whereas ignorance was given *kufr*. He continued and listed then disbelief as contrast to belief, ungratefulness versus grateful, injustice versus justice, resentment versus contentment, *kufr* (ungratefulness) versus thankfulness, misery versus hope, insecurity versus security, pride versus compassion, anger versus empathy, ignorance versus science, foolishness versus understanding, indiscipline versus self-restraint, meanness versus kindness, audacity versus politeness, arrogance versus humility, haste versus restraint, brutality versus gentleness, babbling versus silence, arrogance versus modesty, coercion versus submissiveness, hatred versus forgiveness, hard-heartedness versus soft heartedness, doubt versus certainty, patience versus impatience, revenge versus forgiveness, poverty versus wealth, neglect versus mindfulness, forgetfulness versus attentiveness, incomprehension versus sympathy…” The significance of this Ḥadīṯ leads to humans being responsible for their actions without knowing the difference between

---


The actual tradition available in al-Barqī, al-Maḥāsin, vol 2, p. 196.
which example to follow, intellect or ignorance, being no better than an animal.\textsuperscript{1503} Similarly, al-Tawḥīdī lists 38 characters of good and evil,\textsuperscript{1504} as a step to move away from the level of animals.\textsuperscript{1505} Similar to al-Fārābī’s framework, Ibn Bābawayh states that the existence of the intellect ‘\textit{\textacute{a}ql}’ means that the light (\textit{nūr}) of God has shone on the heavens and the earth.\textsuperscript{1506} The light (\textit{nūr}) is not like ordinary light but is the light of guidance.\textsuperscript{1507} The actual list of virtuous characters and the identifying virtuous characters versus their opposite, it was already mentioned in al-Maḥāsin,\textsuperscript{1508} much earlier than al-Fārābī’s virtuous states. Ibn Bābawayh describes God in terms of a lamp with a shining intellectual light; the light, in this case, is created by its source, which, being superior, does not itself need to be created.\textsuperscript{1509} This is an intellectual light, not like sunlight but beyond human comprehension.\textsuperscript{1510} The light shines in layers according to its brightness. For example, the brightest light is the closest to God, which is the intellect. The intellect (‘\textit{\textacute{a}ql}’) was created out of the (\textit{nūr}) light which came directly from God.\textsuperscript{1511} Ibn Bābawayh takes from Imam al-Bāqir the notion that the first creation is the intellect, created out of the power (\textit{qudrah}) of God.\textsuperscript{1512} Power (\textit{qudrah}) is, for Ibn Bābawayh, basically the same idea as emanation. Al-Qāḍī Muḥīd al-Qomī states that the term \textit{qudrah} here is not related to action but an emanation an example of that for example, in the Qur’an it is stated that God created Jesus out of his will from the world of souls \textit{‘ālam al-Arwāh}.\textsuperscript{1513} The Ḥadīṯ say that God made the intellect first, intellect here has all the good traits and is also responsible for souls to exist whereas the body came from ignorance. In another
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tradition, the struggle between soul and bodily lusts jihād al-Nafs is far greater than facing your enemy. Ibn Bābawayh then added that since man departed from good acts he becomes exposed to the wrath of God and consequences. Avoiding knowledge and following the masses is not always the right thing; he narrates, for example, masses gathering together to choose something that serves their worldly gain. He narrates that God commanded the Angels and Lucifer to bow down before Adam to expose their hatred and enviousness. Ibn Bābawayh then continues by saying that when the emanating light reached the ends of the heavens, distant from the light of the throne, there was another light, which is responsible for creating a ‘divine faculty’ in human bodies. The light of the throne creating the celestial bodies of the Prophet, Ṭāli and Fāṭimah. One-third of the light went to the Prophet, the second third to Fāṭimah, and the third to Ṭāli. If anyone is touched by some of the original light, that person will naturally recognise Fāṭimah and Ṭāli. This is what he states in al-Iʿtiqādāt, his doctrine that the interpretation of the verse “and follow the light which is sent down with him, it is they who will prosper.” (7:157), is that the light is the prophets and then he added to follow the twelve Imams as part of the successful path.

As mentioned earlier, transmigration was not alien to Šīʿah so long there is no claim of the succession of the Imams. Ibn Bābawayh puts forward the philosophical interpretation that intellect (ʿaql) shone from God, that was planted within Adam. A sequence was established for transmitting revelation or knowledge from God to humans. The first intellectual thing created is the Celestial Intellect, which guides people or rewards them. Ibn Bābawayh mentions that the throne (metaphorically, God’s knowledge) was there before intellect was created. He then returns to the traditions from Imam Ṭāli b. abī
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1514 Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿāni al-Akbār, p. 160.
1516 Ibn Bābawayh, Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 5.
1517 Ibid., vol 1, p. 187.
1518 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Iʿtiqādāt, p. 93.
Ṭālib that the intellect was created from light.\textsuperscript{1520} We see here Ibn Bābawayh using the very same terms as al-Fārābī. Ibn Bābawayh recounts that the soul is created from the Intellect which came down through twelve veils (hijāb), going out towards the physical world to be ready for the body of Adam.\textsuperscript{1521} Similar expressions are mentioned in the ascension of the Prophet Muḥammed, who went through the veils of reality to be near God. To Ibn Bābawayh, Adam was the first body, while his soul, which was created earlier, came from the first Intellectual light rippling through twelve layers of veils, reaching the last layer where the light became the soul placed inside Adam.\textsuperscript{1522} The soul inserted in Adam continued to be passed on to prophets and was the reason for the prophet Jacob to regain his eyesight and for Jonah to survive the great fish until it reached the grandfather of the Prophet ʿAbdul al-Muṭṭalib when it passed into ʿAbdullah and then the Prophet Muḥammed was born.\textsuperscript{1523} The soul of Muḥammed originated from a tree in heaven from which prophetic souls descend. Through the process of transmigration (tanāsaka), it was passed on through his forefathers (aṣlāb wa arḥām), granting him the gift of trustworthy intellect (rūḥ al-amīn), rendering insights and revelations as natural to him with shining light (nūr al-mubīn), and blessing him with the book of guidance (Kitāb mustabīn).\textsuperscript{1524}

Ibn Bābawayh narrates that out of the light God created seven things in a specific order: The intellects (nufūs) are naturally (arwāḥ) souls and the first to be created.\textsuperscript{1525} The throne of God, the heavens, planets, angels, the boundary of the heavens, (Sidrat al-Muntahā) the Lote tree\textsuperscript{1526}, and, finally, Adam. God’s throne is the last of the metaphysical world and the place where the soul and body of Adam were made.\textsuperscript{1527} Thus, the

\textsuperscript{1520} Ibid., vol 2, p. 427.
\textsuperscript{1521} Ibn Bābawayh, Mā ṣānī al-Aḵbār, pp. 307-8.
\textsuperscript{1522} Ibid., p. 308.
\textsuperscript{1523} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1524} Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawhīd, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{1525} Ibn Bābawayh, al-ʿiṭiqādāt, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{1526} Sidrat Al-Muntahā: The mark where no creation could pass placed at the end of seven heavens and it is the mark signifying the closest point from God that only the Prophet has reached.
\textsuperscript{1527} Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ḡisrīl, vol 2, p. 481.
cosmological order of hierarchy, according to Ibn Bābawayh, starts with the first layer near God, which has the air (sphere), the pen, and the light. The second has the throne, water, and angels. The third is heaven and earth. This cosmological hierarchy is a clear indication that philosophy had an influence on Ibn Bābawayh. He wrote that God does not involve himself in the creation of humans. Everything is involuntary. But he qualified this involuntariness by saying that the emanation of everything is due to God’s generosity. God is naturally generous, that is one of his attributes, and therefore, for this reason, the emanations gushed out of Him. It must be emphasised that Ibn Bābawayh separated himself from dualist philosophies and did not talk about good and evil but used knowledge and ignorance as to the starting points of all that exists. He argues that the two opposite worlds cannot be mixed together to create a human being; thus his view is different from Manichaeism and Bardaisanism.

5.3.3 Realm of darkness

To each thinker, al-Rāzī, al-Fārābī and Ibn Bābawayh, they gave their own version of how the world came to be. Ibn Bābawayh is a follower of Ḥadīṯ, unlike al-Rāzī, al-Fārābī he does not use Aristotle and Plato, I infer that he seeks sayings of the Imams that present his version of the world. For example, the world of darkness was very much presented as the ‘realm of smokeless fire’ the world responsible for creating demons. The world of darkness was not attached to evil yet. It is more about being corrupted and chaotic in its nature, and that it lacks awareness of God. From the world of darkness, created by ignorance, comes smokeless fire, a temporary substance; it has existed, has a beginning, and also has an ending. It is closely tied in with human behaviour and moral action. Satan originated from the last of the metaphysical world (the world of darkness) the realm of smokeless fire (nār al-samūm). At first he was Lucifer, known in Arabic as (iblīs), and was

1528 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, pp. 321 and 325.
from the nation called demons (*Jinn*) who were created from dark smokeless fire and when *iblīs* acted evil he turned into Satan (*Šayṭān*), meaning the source of all evil.\(^{1530}\) As explained earlier Ibn Bābawayh saw God as being responsible for both the intellect and ignorance they have equal 75 characteristics that contrast each other and by that man is tested.\(^{1531}\)

For example, for al-Muḡīra b. Saʿīd, from the beginning of creation there was a separation between believers and non-believers, the believers being created from an ocean of light, and disbelievers from an ocean of darkness.\(^{1532}\) On the other hand, Ibn Bābawayh, in his works, states that the Imams’ bodies were created more from sweet water than salty water, the mix of good and evil, indicating that Imams cannot be infallible. He is in line with the idea that there is nothing equal to the specific single lineage of the Imams. The Quraysh, the Prophet’s tribe, is the purest of the tribes that were linked with the prophet Abraham, and among his offspring there were many prophets who knew the future and could act with diplomacy and trustworthiness.\(^{1533}\) Perhaps Ibn Bābawayh saw human bodies, including those of the Imams, as not free from pollution. For example, from the time of Adam, we cannot assume that the clay which passed from generation to generation remained pure. This is one reason why Ibn Bābawayh suggests that Imams are not infallible. This is an unusual view among the early Šī‘ah.

The second point Ibn Bābawayh narrates is that humans are all naturally a complete mixture, and whenever there is someone with a character of ignorance or evil it is by nature rooted in the salty water that is mixed with the clay from which Adam was made.\(^{1534}\) Ibn Bābawayh writes that if someone did what Islam forbids, such as fornication or drinking

\(^{1531}\) Ibn Bābawayh, *al-Ḵīṣāl*, vol 1, p. 588., and *ʿillal al-Šarāyeʿ*, vol 1, p. 113.
alcohol, they should not be treated as anti-Imam ʿAlī (nāṣbī), because their essence (jawhar) is Šīʿah. It was pure and made with sweet water and then became stained with the attributes of salty water. But if Adam had been created from the clay mixed with the sweet water only, those who hate Imam ʿAlī without any reason nāṣbīs and sinners could never have existed. Furthermore, Ibn Bābawayh made a statement wishing someone who hates the Imams to be granted mercy, which caused an argument. His teacher, abū Naṣr al-Ḍibbī, called him the nāṣbī (one who hates the Imams) but Ibn Bābawayh replied, ‘may God have mercy on him’.1535 Whereas al-Mufīd thought it is unusual to grant someone who hates the Imams or even question their infallibility enough reliability to take their religious teachings seriously.1536 Ibn Bābawayh, in the same spirit, observes that not everyone is nāṣbī, but only those who are filled with enmity and take pride in killing or hurting Muslims.1537 For Ibn Bābawayh, the responsibility for human actions comes from evil thoughts, yet also from freedom of choice. The emphasis would be on human responsibility. He narrates that, according to Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, every human being is accompanied by two presences: an angel and Satan. This tradition was followed by explaining the origin of the whisper. It was said by Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq that human beings originated from Adam who was made out of two types of clay, the blessed and unblessed. Here, Ibn Bābawayh is telling us through traditions that what was responsible for the whisper was the way in which Adam was made, namely, having a mixture of salty and sweet water. The fact that he was from a watery mixture is what gave Adam free choice. Ibn Bābawayh does not attribute Adam’s fall to Satan’s having power over Adam. The mixture of two clays sometimes produced blessed people capable of sin, and sometimes evil people who on occasion could act righteously. Ibn Bābawayh promotes extreme practices that will purify the soul. The weakening of the body helps in cleansing the dirt of sin; for example, poverty is the punishment that purifies the

1535 Ibn Bābawayh, ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā, vol 2, p. 279.
1536 Al-Mufīd, ʿAdam Sahū al-Nabī, p. 15.
human soul, sickness will weaken physical strength, and this will purify the body from desiring pleasure.\textsuperscript{1538} Here, the emphasis is not about Satan as an external power, but about reminding us that the clay from which Adam was formed contains susceptibility to temptation and greed. Then he adds to the story of Adam and evil leading us to see that Satan was reasonable, using the analogy that fire should be superior to the clay that made Adam.\textsuperscript{1539} This is where Ibn Bābawayh separates the divine light \textit{nūr} that came through twelve veils and the analogy of Lucifer comparing himself with Adam.\textsuperscript{1540} It was made clear that Adam, after he lost his ability to prophecy one day, ran out of food, so it was revealed to him to return to what he had learned when he was a Prophet to survive.\textsuperscript{1541} He narrated that what prevents human beings from seeing God is our sins, while God is pure from sins therefore he can seethrough us all.\textsuperscript{1542} He then narrated that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq said that, ‘On the Day of Judgement, each soul goes back to the world it originated from, all the good souls will get together with us by the blessings of God for our place with him \textit{šafā ʾah}'.\textsuperscript{1543}

And what can make you know what is sijjeen? It is [their destination recorded in] a register inscribed. Woe, that Day, to the deniers, Who deny the Day of Recompense.\textsuperscript{1544}

And what can make you know what is 'illiyyun? It is [their destination recorded in] a register inscribed. Which is witnessed by those brought near [to Allah]. Indeed, the righteous will be in pleasure.\textsuperscript{1545}

\textsuperscript{1538} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{ʻillal al-Šarāye}, vol 1, p. 108.
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\textsuperscript{1542} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{1543} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 93.
\textsuperscript{1544} Qur’an, Surah 83: Verse 8-11.
\textsuperscript{1545} \textit{Ibid.}, Surah 83: Verse 19-24.
Prophets and Imams are created from the highest clay (ʿišṭiyn), the kāfirūn are created from the clay of lowest of low worlds (sijjīn). Those who are created from ʿišṭiyn are not immune to error and evil, likewise for those created from sijjīn it does not mean they cannot reach perfection. Ibn Bābawayh, in his corpus, openly said he was against Manichaeism. Therefore, I do not believe he would have articulated the concept of two clays ʿišṭiyn and sijjīn. Manichaeism emphasises hardship in life and its function to purify individuals from evil. He narrates that Lucifer from the world of Jinn ascended and went through twelve layers of skies, twelve levels of hardships, before being purified for the company of angels. For instance, this is not to say that ʿAlī comes before Adam, but the good elements that compose ʿAlī as an Imam were created in the world of cosmos from the highest of the high, the nearest to God, the clay of the noblest that made the rest of the Šīʿah. However, it is worth noting that Ibn Bābawayh did not mention this ḥadīth anywhere else in his corpus. It is only found in ʿillal al-Šarāyeʿ. Ibn Bābawayh did not go into much detail about the process of the mixing of two clays to make humans, except what is in ʿillal al-Šarāyeʿ. The creation of human beings from two waters mixed with clay (hyle), sweet and salty, the salty with a foul smell for the purpose of fermentation which made the clay malleable. Ibn Hazm states that the concept of the fermentation of the clay (ḵamīrah) as part of the process of creating a human body, is originally from the Magian of Persia. The sweet water that was part of the mix in creating human beings is responsible for good character, while salt water is responsible for evil doing. ʿillal al-Šarāyeʿ narrates that according to al-Bāqir the salty water was left for seven days until it turned into sticky black mud from which Adam was created. Adam’s body was made
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out of physical entities such as salt and water.\textsuperscript{1553} 'illal al-Šarāye’ narrates that, according to the Prophet, even if someone committed major sins such as theft, drinking alcohol, and zina, but believed in God without association, he shall enter heaven. The term zina usually means ‘illicit sexual intercourse’, opposite to ‘legal marriage’. It is not about intercourse but about evil being able to mix with good in the production of human beings, poisoning their instinct and making it corrupted. The poisoning process here is termed, according to Ibn Bābawayh, zina. For example, those who hate Imam ʿAlī are a result of zina.\textsuperscript{1554} However, Ibn Bābawayh added to this ḥadīth that it means the one who sins will be elevated to repentance (ywafaq lil-tawba).\textsuperscript{1555} However, it is unclear what exactly zina means within the context of Ibn Bābawayh. He gives two interpretations: either the soul of the child was from the world of darkness, or the child was damaged by menstrual blood. In either case, zina is not clearly discussed. For Ibn Bābawayh, the inner longing reveals the nature of the soul, whether good or evil. Zina here is metaphorical when we think of the insertion of an evil soul into a person’s body brought about by Satan. The performance of pilgrimage to the shrine of Imam Ḥusayn is evidence of pure lineage. By contrast, those who go to Mecca for ‘Umra have both illegitimate and legitimate lineage.\textsuperscript{1556}

5.3.4 The Experience of the Soul Through Life

This section will discuss the soul as a separate being, the highest version of the soul being the Imamah. It will address how people are gifted with unique qualities of the divine faculty and will distinguish good souls from evil souls according to their attraction to evil or good.

\textsuperscript{1553} Ibid., vol 1, p. 83 and vol 2, p. 593.
\textsuperscript{1554} Ibn Bābawayh, 'illal al-Šarāye’, vol 1, p. 142.
\textsuperscript{1556} Al-Kulaynī similarly narrated according to Abū Ja’far (Muhammad al-Bāqir) that the enemies of the Imams were created from sijjīn. Al-Kulaynī, Al-Kāfī, vol 1, p. 390.
\textsuperscript{1556} Ibn Bābawayh, Thawāb Al-ʿAmil, p. 90.
5.3.4.1 The Soul is Trapped in the World of Matter

Al-Mufid argues that Ibn Bābawayh's argument that all the Imams were killed and not died a natural death. He supports the eternity of the Imams’ soul.\textsuperscript{1557} The example of continuous cycle every generation there is a battle between good and evil, he narrates that there are 12 evil examples six from pre-Islam and six in Islam, and each one of them has killed or fought a prophet or an Imam.\textsuperscript{1558} Ibn Bābawayh repeated this tradition twice in his book \textit{al-Ḵiṣāl} and in the Imāmī’s Creed \textit{al-Iʿtiqādāt}.\textsuperscript{1559} The idea of the opposites not new, a generation earlier abū al-Ḥasan al-Ašʿārī (d. 935/324 A.H) in his \textit{Maqālāt al-Islāmīyīn} states that the followers of al-Šarīʿī a leading figure of a Šīʿah sect who believed in good versus evil, the 5 members of the Prophet house hold represent good on earth and their 5 opposites (\textit{aḍdād}) abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUṯmān, Muʿāwīyah, and ʿAmrū b. al-ʿĀṣ.\textsuperscript{1560} Imamah is the highest of all human intellectual beings and ethical life. Also, Imamah is connected with ethics and suffering. For the purification of their soul, each one had to go through hardship and even death. He narrates that death to a righteous person is like being released from chains, taking dirty clothes off, and exchanging them for beautiful garments.\textsuperscript{1561} Ibn Bābawayh narrates this under the title ‘\textit{what was the reason behind putting souls inside bodies?’} Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq stated that hardship purifies the soul and teaches it the humility to recognise its lord. By contrast, souls that did not experience hardship are destined for arrogance.\textsuperscript{1562} True freedom is when one is freed from the body that longed for worldly, temporary pleasures. \textit{Sickness is the cleanliness of the soul from all sins.} \textsuperscript{1563} This task helps in wiping out sins, as Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq asserts: ‘human souls are naive it is necessary for humans to go through sickness and trials in order to humble
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themselves before God and to prevent themselves from being corrupted by arrogance and the desire to become like God. Ibn Bābawayh finds limitation in the assumption that there are three possible interpretations about God. First, he is actively involved in fighting evil. Second, he let evil control the world. Third, God himself is inactive, but through his light (nūr) guides people. Ibn Bābawayh, under the title ‘Refutation against Dualists and Zanādiqa’, is in favour of the third position. Like al-Fārābī, he rejected that God has an equal opposite (ḍid). Both al-Fārābī and Ibn Bābawayh spoke about why you do not need two opposites for to creation to exit.

Both spoke about Imamah. Ibn Bābawayh saw Imamah and revelation as being both from the same source, the First Intellect. He asserts that according to Ja’far al-Ṣadiq God is involved through the Imamah. Imams are the interpreters of revelation and carry God’s knowledge, and the revelation is knowledge like the light that guides. This is because the Imams are real and alive. On the other hand, those who lose their kindness and moral sense are eventually led to become a friend of the devil and have an evil character. Another kind of disease is the trust and dependence upon power and wealth; if someone is entrusted with a treasure, it makes him struggle with the temptation to keep hold of it. This is like being tempted by a hundred devils sent by Satan himself.

Mufīd al-Qommī in his commentary Šarḥ Tawḥīd al-Ṣadūq added that Ibn Bābawayh made a clear statement to Hišām b. al-Ḥakam and responded that bodies (ajsām) are corporeal and not eternal. Jism is a compound of hyle and image, and behind these two elements, there must be a force to combine them together. The force itself requires a mover.
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or an instigator and that mover is God. He then added that it is nonsense to say that everything came out of nothing.\textsuperscript{1572}

Ibn Bābawayh lists four evil acts, which all related to irresponsibility: to betray the family and destroy it; to commit theft; to drink alcohol, and to engage in illicit sex.\textsuperscript{1573} These sins must have made sense to him as they related to the context of his time, as well as the time of previous generations living under a religious dictatorship. For example, betrayal of the family meant being ungrateful and selfish, which to him were cardinal sins. For example, he narrated that those who will not smell the fragrance of heaven are those who treat their parents with disgrace (ʿāq), cut ties with their family and relatives (qāṭīʿu l-raḥm), an old man who is addicted to adultery (šaıkun zān), a neighbour who enjoys showing off his wealth (jār izāru al-kailāʾ), someone who finds pleasure in causing friction among people (fāṭān), or someone who treats others with disrespect sees them in debated to him and the greedy for worldly material (jaʿzarī lā yašbaʿu min al-dunya).\textsuperscript{1574} Committing theft, particularly against the poor was also especially bad because it was contrary to the ideal of a virtuous society. Drinking alcohol negates human intellect and leads to societal destruction, again a transgression of the virtuous society. Illicit sex, including the taboos on premarital sex and adultery, because it was primarily concerned with inter-tribal relations which could cause greater harm. By protecting the virtue of the women, one protected the honour of the tribe and thus maintained the virtue of society. In one way, Ibn Bābawayh was strict about avoiding these four sins. In another way, he was universal in that he believed that the basic ethical values. There are thus two parts to his thought, one that is ethics in its emphasis on the virtuous citizen who follows the 100 ethical traits of sane person māʿatu ḵuṣlah min aḵlāq al-ʿāqil\textsuperscript{1575} adding that those who do not

\textsuperscript{1573} Ibid., p. 398.
\textsuperscript{1574} Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-Ḵbār, p. 330.
\textsuperscript{1575} Ibn Bābawayh, ʿillal al-Ṣarāyeistung
know the difference between good from the evil they are merely animals, and a second, more relaxed approach, focusing on the ethical knowledge common to all about abstaining from evil acts.

5.3.4.2 The Soul and the divine faculty

In another tradition, Ibn Bābawayh writes that God created the intellect first, and that by the intellect humanity will be rewarded or punished. The earth was created for the Imams. He states that the Prophet said to Imam ʿAlī that their souls first existed before the angels and before earth, heaven, or hell. By contrast, in the religious texts, the evil character, Lucifer, is recognised by his enviousness, which appeared at the time when Adam was created out of clay, signifying how unintelligent, in comparison to the world of God and angels, Adam was. Then Adam was granted to carry divine faculty, which is not an incarnation, a soul which later transmigrates from generation to generation transformed into prophets and Imams. This is what made Satan jealous of Adam – the divine faculty. These Imams are proofs of God on earth (ḥujjaj). God commanded Lucifer to obey Adam but he chose not to; his hypocritical pride prevented him from remaining among the angels.  Rūḥ l-qudus is mentioned in the Qur’an as the spirit that spoke to Mary. The term is disputed among Muslims. For the Sunnī, rūḥ l-qudus meant angel Gabriel, further meaning that after the Prophet’s death there is no further connection between rūḥ l-qudus and human beings, therefore, the Qur’an is a source of all knowledge. In the Šīʿī interpretation, Ibn Bābawayh writes that rūḥ l-qudus was not an angel but a faculty that

---
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was never separated from prophets and Imams.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, ʿillal al-Šarāye, vol 1, p. 124.} He writes that Imam al-Riḍā gave detailed knowledge of science which proves he had special help from ṭūḥ l-qudus to respond to challengers from outside the Muslim community.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā, vol 2, p. 239.}

5.3.4.3 Good Souls vs Bad Souls

The only way to differentiate a good from an evil soul is by whether a soul loves the Imams or hates them. More precisely, Ibn Bābawayh speaks of loving the Imams for their attributes, not as individual persons. After all, the Imams, to Ibn Bābawayh, are not infallible. They all came from Adam. They did not come directly from the Intellect. Some people obtain a pure heart, even among those we categorise as ‘anti-imams’, and some, who we consider Imāmī, have the faces of humans but the heart of Satan.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ḵiṣṭāl, vol 1, p. 154.} Thus, free will is essential. It is about what it is to love and what to hate, not about loving or hating individual persons. We are all born with fairness. It is a part of human nature. We naturally sympathise with victims and hate the unjust. Love is the key to eternal happiness. For Ibn Bābawayh, the eleven Imams were all victims of injustice. We do not need religion to sympathise with them. Ibn Bābawayh claims that, according to the Prophet, it was written that the Imams must suffer hardship and torture.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, al-Amālī, p. 134.} The suffering of ʿAlī and the Imams is to test people to see which side they will take, those who take Imam ʿAlī’s side go to heaven.\footnote{Ibid.} Here ‘longing’ does not mean longing for the fallible, historical personage of Imam ʿAlī as such, but longing for his attributes of kindness and knowledge – the attraction towards being ethical. In the natural inclination toward siding with evil or good, a good person is naturally attracted to good actions which lead him to be a good person. For Ibn Bābawayh, evil thus has a necessary existence in a moral system. The theodicy of redemption expressed, for example, in illness, is a necessary part of purification from sin,
as is the arduous effort involved in journeying to religious shrines across different lands, exposing the traveller to rain, illness, and other dangers. The narrative that we deduce from the texts is that he suggests that Adam was not the reason for sin but, rather, that he serves as an example of human beings; they are capable of sinning but their struggle in life towards righteousness is an act of redemption from their veil of ego.

5.3.5 Ibn Bābawayh’s Cosmology: The Prophet’s Ascension, Heaven, and Hell

Ibn Bābawayh explained his cosmology with the analogy of the Prophet’s ascension. Ibn Bābawayh states that the Prophet saw hell as being closest to the physical world while the furthest point is the heavens. Ibn Bābawayh argues that the meaning of ‘bodily ascension’ in the traditions is not that the Prophet ascended to be near God because he lacked nobility, he was elevated as an honour (tašrīfān). He possessed nobility because he was derived from the first intellectual light. For Ibn Bābawayh, the soul is the energy that animates the human. The spirit is that aspect of the human which is released while you sleep and when you die. For Ibn Bābawayh, God continually sends visions carrying good and bad news of the future into believers’ hearts. People are told by God through visions and dreams about things to come so that they can prepare and make good moral choices.

Even though Ibn Bābawayh confirms that heaven and hell do exist, he states that there are no treasures in Heaven. If we follow our intellect, normally individuals start treasuring possessions out of fear of poverty, which is in contrast to what heaven decrees about there being no poverty, therefore there are no treasures as such. As discussed
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earlier in ‘The Ascension’ this is different from Al-Mufid\textsuperscript{1598} and his student, al-Ṭūsī in his \textit{Tahṣīl al-Aḥkām} and \textit{al-Istibšār}.\textsuperscript{1599} Ibn Bābawayh’s interpretation of paradise and rewards are merely metaphorical, simply because dreams of heaven and hell must be a fact.\textsuperscript{1600} Ibn Bābawayh interprets metaphorically, for example, the expression used in the Qur’an whereby hasten (\textit{firrū}) does not mean to run away but to ‘go back to God’.\textsuperscript{1601} The ascension of the Prophet is similar to the verse in the Qur’an: ‘Hasten ye then (at once) to Allah…’\textsuperscript{1602} This should not lead us to assume that God is in a place, for there are no directions or places where God is. What is meant, rather, is that one should find salvation in humbleness by performing pilgrimage and visiting the house of God in Mecca.\textsuperscript{1603} The purpose of the ascension is that no one with sin can ascend to God, not even the Prophet. This is to say that, after the Prophet had gone through hardship and was made free from all sin, then he was ready for the mystical journey. Ibn Bābawayh narrated that al-Riḍā stated that the Prophet in his ascension entered heaven and saw hell from above\textsuperscript{1604} and, according to Imam ‘Alī Ibn abī Ṭālib, hell was created on a Wednesday.\textsuperscript{1605} Ibn Bābawayh mentions the punishments in hell for specific acts.\textsuperscript{1606} He went on to say that, on the night of ascension, according to the version of abūl-Raḥmān b. Ǧānām,\textsuperscript{1607} the angel Gabriel took the Prophet to \textit{Bayt al-maqdis} Jerusalem where the Prophet felt a hot wind coming towards him from the heat of hellfire.\textsuperscript{1608} The valley of Barhūt in Yemen where the sinners’ souls were kept is a valley of hellfire\textsuperscript{1609} and, before the end of time, a fire will come out from
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beneath the land of Yemen to surround people, forcing them to gather in a place for the Judgement Day.\textsuperscript{1610} This tells us that the journey of the Prophet was not so that he could receive prophecy, a journey to discover that there are three realms where the souls are kept. Thus, we come to Ibn Bābawayh’s description of heaven and hell. The ascension was considered as not only a prophecy, but a journey through the skies and heavens, where the reward or punishment in the afterlife was witnessed. The world of darkness here is represented by Hell, which was created after heaven, and then the Jinn were created from smokeless fire, and from the Jinn came Satan.\textsuperscript{1611} Ibn Bābawayh narrated from al-Riḍā that Wednesday is the day when Abraham was thrown into the fire, Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed and turned upside down, the temple of Solomon was burnt, John the Baptist was killed, Job was afflicted with an illness that destroyed his health, family and wealth, the Prophet was injured in the war, and the Ka’ba was attacked and burnt by the Catapult.\textsuperscript{1612} The paradise of heaven was created on a Thursday.\textsuperscript{1613}

5.3.6 Ibn Bābawayh and the Journey of the Soul

For Ibn Bābawayh, when the human body is asleep there is a great chance for the soul to be freed from the material world into the metaphysical world of souls where knowledge has no boundaries. For example, ʿabdul al-Muṭṭalib saw the birth of his grandson the Prophet Muḥammed in a vision and was told by a soothsayer that there would be a Prophet from his offspring.\textsuperscript{1614} Ibn Bābawayh narrates that, in addition to al-Muṭṭalib, ʿAlī b. abī Tālib had a dream in which he met with al-ṣārīr, who told him a prayer to recite before the battle of Badr, which he went on to win.\textsuperscript{1615}

\textsuperscript{1610} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-ḳiṣāl}, vol 2, p. 449.
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5.3.7 Ibn Bābawayh and Space

Al-Rāżī speaks of space as eternal. How did Ibn Bābawayh speak of space? He describes the seven heavens when compared with God’s chair as no bigger than a small ring dropped in the middle of a desert, while the size of the chair in comparison to the throne itself is no bigger than the ring in relation to the desert.\textsuperscript{1616} Ibn Bābawayh saw our world as an echo of the world above, that the earth was inside a celestial whale and a smaller whale went inside the whale’s nostrils, and so the smaller whale was responsible for earthquakes.\textsuperscript{1617} In other traditions, it was stated that every country is on top of one shell of the little whale and when it moves it causes earthquakes.\textsuperscript{1618} For Ibn Bābawayh, the sun and the moon orbit around the earth. The seven heavens compared to the size of God’s chair are like the size of a hand ring in a flat desert.\textsuperscript{1619} He narrates on the one hand that the sun and the moon are destined to be destroyed before the Day of Judgement and, on the other, that the sun and the moon are not eternal, which separates it from doctrines that claim the eternity of the sun and the moon. Ibn Bābawayh comments that it is part of God’s justice that the movement of the moon and the sun is responsible for the day and night.\textsuperscript{1620} As for the size of the sun and the moon, they are equal, according to Imam Ṭalḥah\textsuperscript{b} who said that the sun and the moon are each nine hundred \textit{farsaḵ} (2700 miles) and the planets are each twelve \textit{farsaḵ} (36 miles).\textsuperscript{1621} The sun was also said to move between the devil’s horns,\textsuperscript{1622} rising from one side and passing to the other. The horn here is used in describing how the sun moves from one side to another during the day. He adds that there is a celestial sea, and from it, God created the sun and the moon.

\textsuperscript{1616} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Maʿānī al-Ḵār}, p. 333.
\textsuperscript{1617} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Man Lā Yahduruhu Al-Faqīh}, vol 1, p. 542.
\textsuperscript{1618} Ibid., p. 543.
\textsuperscript{1619} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Ḵiṣāl}, vol 2, p. 523 and \textit{Maʿānī al-Ḵār}, p. 332.
\textsuperscript{1622} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Man Lā Yahduruhu Al-Faqīh}, vol 1, p. 211.
from the light of the fire and the purity of water. God covered them with seven layers and the last layer of the sun was made with the heat of the fire and the moon from the chill of the water. Ibn Bābawayh envisages several ‘parallel worlds’ (ʿawālim), one after another, each of which has its own Judgement Day. Some souls enter heaven, and some enter hell, and there will be more worlds to come and this world is not the last. God created thousands and thousands of worlds before us with different versions of Adam and different Judgement Days, sending some to heaven and others to hell. God willed that the earth would be inherited by sexless beings. Ibn Bābawayh mentions traditions from al-Bāqir that there were seven worlds of creation preceding Adam. From these worlds, people have already been judged and sent to heaven or hell. The process of re-creation will continue until a generation that is neither male nor female will be living on the earth.

5.3.8 Ibn Bābawayh and the Lower World

The physical world must have been the last of the worlds to be created. Not one world alone but many worlds were created, and each has its own suns and moons. The multi-dimensional universe that gushed out of God’s light signifies that God is the source and cause of everything that exists within the universe. Ibn Bābawayh says that, according to the fifth Imam al-Bāqir, God created many worlds, each world having its own kind of Adam, and Adam’s world on earth is the last of all worlds. Ibn Bābawayh’s description of the celestial world is similar to his Sunnī contemporaries such as al-Ṭabarī and al-Ḥākim. The skies are on the back of a cockerel bigger than the seven heavens similar in comparison to a ring in a desert. The cockerel is standing on a giant rock like the ring is smaller than the desert. The rock rests on the back of a whale and is smaller than the whale-like the ring is smaller than a desert. He also narrates from his father, according to Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq,
that this earth is *falāt* in comparison to the first heaven, while the first heaven is small in comparison to the second heaven. Then the same comparison of each heaven continues until the seventh heaven, which is the largest of all heavens.\textsuperscript{1628} The seven heavens and the rock, whale, and ocean are like a ring of seventy thousand layers of the shining light of God, which is small in comparison to the throne of God.\textsuperscript{1629} The whale is swimming in the lower and darkest part of the celestial sea and the darkest part is on the bottom of the end of the celestial sea ('*aqīīm*). Beyond the '*aqīīm* is moist dirt ('*turā*), and only God knows what is beyond the dust.\textsuperscript{1630} This can show how majestic the void (makān) is, the celestial universe existing in a massive void. He describes the Throne of God contain everything that exists including the heavens and earth like a bowl (**wiʿā**).\textsuperscript{1631}

The hierarchical order in which Ibn Bābawayh placed the skies in this journey contained prophets from the Old Testament in each heaven. The first Prophet that the Prophet Muḥammed met was in the lowest of the heavens and in the heaven next to the highest was Moses.\textsuperscript{1632} In the process, there were several returns back and forth between God and Moses, and the traditions state that the Prophet went to the highest heaven above Moses and received the commands that granted the Prophet the right to be a lawgiver.\textsuperscript{1633} Whereas aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīṯ from Sunnī continued with their belief, Ibn Mandah al-Aṣfahānī (d. 1004/395 A.H) narrates that God literally feels,\textsuperscript{1634} talks, and laughs,\textsuperscript{1635} and even comes down to the sky and stays until the dawn to hear those who call on him.\textsuperscript{1636}
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5.3.9 Ibn Bābawayh and Echoes of the Kaʿba

Al-Mufid criticises Ibn Bābawayh by saying he does not take the Qur’anic prophecies seriously enough but interprets the Qur’anic verses metaphorically. Al-Mufid gives the following examples. Ibn Bābawayh saw the throne of God as simply intellectual knowledge/light and not as a literal throne.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1637} Al-Mufid, \textit{Taṣḥīḥ ʾl-iṭiqādāt}, p. 78.} Ibn Bābawayh also highlighted that those who carry the throne of God are the scholars and not the angels.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1638} Ibid., p. 75.} He explains the verse in an allegorical way that the throne in this context rose above the waters before the angels carried the heavens and earth. This does not mean that anything was literally above the waters or was carried by the angels, but that among human beings there are some bearers of knowledge.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1639} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawhīd}, p. 263.} In other words, among men, there are Imams and prophets who are reliable and loyal enough to carry knowledge. Again, al-Mufid further criticises Ibn Bābawayh for saying that the Qur’an was not revealed by God in an instant, but it was revealed from the world of forms, the fourth heaven, not the ultimate heaven near God. The interpretation of \textit{baytul al-maʾmūr} is that it is a place somewhere in the celestial universe where knowledge from God resides before it is revealed to individual prophets.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1640} Al-Mufid, \textit{Taṣḥīḥ ʾl-iṭiqādāt}, p. 125.} Ibn Bābawayh stated that the Kaʿba being built was based on the interpretation of earthly things mirroring heavenly things: a version of the Kaʿba exists in heaven, the \textit{baytul maʾmūr}. It has four pillars which are prayers glorifying God’s majestic creation: ‘praise to God (\textit{subḥān Allah}), thanks to God (\textit{al-ḥamdulilah}), no God but one God (\textit{Lā Ilāha Ila Allah}), and God is great (\textit{Allahu akbar})’.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1641} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{ʿillal al-Šarāyē}, vol 2, p. 398 and \textit{Man Lā Yaḥḍūruhu Al-Faqīh}, vol 2, p. 190.} The Kaʿba exists in three parallel realms: (\textit{baytul dirāh}), (\textit{baytul Maʾmūr}) and Kaʿba. I infer that these are also three symbols of the parallel realms next to each other: heavens, astral plain, and worldly life. For Ibn Bābawayh, the Sphere of Lote tree this is where the soul of Adam came from before it went
into orbit around its point of origin. This is why the children of Adam are inclined to go on pilgrimages to the Kaʿba.\(^{1642}\) I infer that what Ibn Bābawayh is saying that if Kaʿba at the bottom of baytul maʿmūr it is equally vertically baytul maʿmūr, and the order of the skies is vertical too. The traditions about baytul al-maʿmūr have two interpretations. One is about a place that was visited by angels and the Prophet Muḥammed. Second, the Qur’an came down from God into the baytul al-maʿmūr as a single revelation but then took twenty years to be revealed to the Prophet.\(^{1643}\) Al-Mufīd has argued against the fact Qur’an stayed in baytul al-maʿmūr for 20 years.\(^{1644}\) Ibn Bābawayh mentions that baytul al-maʿmūr is a place in the worldly sky placed on the edge of the bottom of God’s throne.\(^{1645}\) Since the angel questioned God about Adam. The angels descend to the fourth heaven, baytul maʿmūr where it is located, and do not return until the end of time.\(^{1646}\) My observation here is that each house represents a realm, the number of realms according to Ibn Bābawayh being three. In the fourth sky, there is a place called dirāh at the base of God’s throne and placed at the bottom of dirāh is a place called baytul maʿmūr, and at the bottom of all is the Kaʿba.\(^{1647}\) The next part, the way the revelations are described by al-Fārābī is echoed in Ibn Bābawayh’s framework on emanation. Emanation is based on Neo-Platonism which is not what you would expect from a religious view which is that everything comes directly from God. Ibn Bābawayh treated revelations as emanations and stated that the Qur’an was not delivered by one single angel between God and the human world, but Gabriel, the closest angel to the world of humankind, received it after it had passed from angel to angel, heaven to heaven, having ultimately originated with God.\(^{1648}\) Ibn Bābawayh states the
revelation was delivered angel to angel until it reached a place in the fourth heaven baytul al-ma’mūr as a single entity and was revealed to the Prophet in verses at a time by the assistance of Gabriel.1649 The emphasis on the receiver of the revelation is mainly on the psyche which has to be pure and clear, indicating the reason for Qur’anic verses being delivered in parts. The Qur’an was then written according to the context of the time; that is, over 20 years.1650

5.3.10 from Ma’na to the World of Forms Amtāl

Ibn Bābawayh narrates that according to al-Riḍā if God (Allah) has 99 names and attributes, they would be 99 gods (ilāh). Allah is the ma’na for everything that has a name that exists.1651 Then he narrated that, when we say God is the Hearer, the Seer and Knower, they are all share one ma’na everything spurred from one single irāda.1652 Simialrly, al-Rāzī nothing came directly from God.

The world came to existence Ḥudūṭ al-‘Ālam from what known as the ‘five eternals’, al-qudamā’ al-kamsah. God and 4 the principles ma’na for everything that exist. This is what people of Ḥarrān and al-Rāzī adopted from old philosophy pre-Aristotelian. Two that are active and live such as the Evolver and Nafs. Two of them that neither live nor active Time and Void. The one that active but not alive is Hyle. The Evolver is the starting point of everything that to exist. Al-Bārī’ the knower and nothing like on to him, he is all aware. He emanates intellectual light, like the sun shines its light. This emanation universal soul al-nafs al-Kulīyah emanates souls and spirits and becomes the source for life and every that has soul and living form. On the other hand, the universal soul has no knowledge of things without trying them. But nafs, the wants, the pleasure leḍa are with the prime matter hyle. God out of his kindness let the mix occur to spark the living being creating elements, plantations and animals. From its experience with hyle he will start to feel peaceful and
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enjoy bodily pleasure. From that experience he will encounter experiencing sorrow, and by then nafs will understand something different and start gaining knowledge. Then He emanates images from its own world, reminding her about her origin where no pain exists. The soul starts developing feelings to longing to its origin that being with hyle is a journey mixed with hardship and pain. A person with no knowledge like an animal stuck in its own world of hyle.¹⁶⁵³

Ibn Bābawayh describes humans being transformed from the metaphysical world and injected into our world. He narrates that the prophet had said that we were light by the throne of God praising him, the companion asked the Prophet in what form mittāl? He replied, in the form of a phantom of light, then when God gave us images, we were placed in a long pillar of light then were shot/injected in Adam then from Adam passed on from generation to generation until we were born. He then added that our lineage remained pure from the start free from association with God Širk and free from fornication, by our birth you will find people will get divided some people see us as good news while others see us the bringers of wretched and misery.¹⁶⁵⁴ Al-Mufīd commented that Šī’a Ḥašawīyah ignorantly believe in this tradition and see the forms as having a full functioning intelligence.¹⁶⁵⁵ This topic is not discussed before and it is relevant to identify the philosophy they adopted.

Mufīd al-Qommī added that the interpretation of Ibn Bābawayh at the start al-mabādi’ al-Aula our souls were phantoms and then images before entering the first human (Adam).¹⁶⁵⁶ Ibn Bābawayh narrates that Ja’far al-Ṣādiq states that to God belong all the names and forms above.¹⁶⁵⁷ There is no possibility we can compare God with anything

¹⁶⁵⁵ Al-Mufīd, al-Masā’il il-‘Akbariyah, p. 27.
else, the world came to be through a long process of mixing and making. He profoundly created the world and from mixing elements created multiplicity.

The interpretation is a follow on from Plato philosophy about the forms that everything that exists originally came from the metaphysical world of forms ‘ālam al-Amāl and through mixing imtizāj (al-mumāzaja) with other elements creating a version of these forms but impure and imperfect. Mufīd al-Qomī added new sub-heading tafsīr sura al-Iklās he referred back to the philosophy of al-Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā to explain Ibn Bābawayh’s Ḥadīth for example tafsīr sura al-Iklās verse one. He then added that for example the Ibn Bābawayh’s tradition talks about ascension to the heavens and the Prophet went to the Lote Tree, the original form of all trees on earth. Like with burāq represented as the animal is the original form of all animals on earth, when revealed itself to the Prophet to ride it is the al-qūwa al-mutafakira came to al-qūwa al-nāṭiqa and to carry to its final destination Lote-Tree Sidrat al-Mutaha that the original form of all humans being the perfect Man form Insān al-Kāmil. While angle Gabriel is al-Nafs al-Nāṭiqa that transmit from the world above. The mystical mule burāq is the original form of al-qūwa al-Šawqīya the force of attraction to perfection that pulled the human psyche to the world above Sidrat al-Mutaha. In his introduction to the topic about negation limiting God to place, time, movement and stillness ‘bāb nafī al-makān, wal zamān wal ḥaraka wal sukūn wal šuʿīd wal nuzūl ‘an Allah’. The commentary under the title ‘An epistemological court between the sages Plato and Aristotle on the subject of place’ Muhākamah ‘irfānīyah fī al-Jam’ bayna raʾī al-Ḥakīmayn Iflāṭon and Aristū fī al-Makān.
Allah the initiator \( (al-mubdi') \). He always existed before the existence by himself without partner and alone; no one knows Him and not anonymous.\(^{1666}\) Ibn Bābawayh then narrated that He created creation with His divine will \( (kalaqa al-kalq bi-qudratihi) \),\(^{1667}\) simply that God was the evolver \( al-bārī' \) who initiated \( al-mubdi' \), who began, all of existence, but does not clearly say how He caused all things to happen.\(^{1668}\) He argues that because the causality of creation is based on God’s intellectual light \( (nūr) \), no one can guess what God will create. It remains hidden with God alone and cannot be arrived at through the use of analogy.\(^{1669}\) The human instinct is to dislike things, such as the forbidding of a brother marrying his own sister.\(^{1670}\)

Moving on to \textit{taqdīr} the term used in the same way as al-Fārābī’s emanations and intellects, will be discussed below. \textit{Taqdīr} begins with God. The revelation from God goes to the tablet (the celestial tablet \( al-laūḥ l-mahfūẓ \)), which inspires the angel Isrāfīl, then the inspiration is passed to the angel Michael, then to angel Gabriel, and then to Muḥammed.\(^{1671}\) Ibn Bābawayh understood that God had created a ‘faculty’ through which the prophets received the revelation transmitted from angels. Before existence, God willed and created the sacred spirit \( (rūḥ al-muqadas) \) to inspire, guide, and guard the prophets and Imams against falling into errors or Satan’s traps.\(^{1672}\) Then God created the ‘trustworthy spirit’ \( (rūḥ al-amīn) \) from which the prophets receive their revelations.\(^{1673}\) In this, we see that Ibn Bābawayh is very similar to al-Fārābī, and the Ismaili al-Kirmānī, in saying that


\(^{1667}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawḥīd}, p. 137.

\(^{1668}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawḥīd}, p. 435., and ‘\textit{Uyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā}, vol 1, p. 171.

\(^{1669}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawḥīd}, p. 265.


\(^{1671}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-ʾiʿtiqādāt}, p. 81, and Al-Majīsī, \textit{Bihār Al-Anwār}, vol 18, p. 248.

\(^{1672}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawḥīd}, p. 129.

\(^{1673}\) \textit{Ibid.}
prophecy only comes to the Prophet and his lineage because they are uniquely gifted with the special ‘faculty’ to receive revelation. Al-Fārābī called this the gift of imagination and poetic expression, which was the normal view among the maššāʾi thinkers.

Ibn Bābawayh emphasises human free will. God estimate human’s acts did not create them afʿāl al-ʿibād kalq taqdir lā kalq takwīn.1674 Human action is caused by the desire šahwa to act and then the ability irāda to act.1675 He moves on to talk about revelation, similarly to al-Fārābī, in that revelation does not bypass the chain of angels, revelation come through levels God project onto the heart of malāʾika ruūḥānīn then passed on to angel Isrāfīl then Mīkāʾīl then Jibāʾīl and the Prophet.1676 The first intellect was created from ruūḥānīn too.1677

Ibn Bābawayh’s understanding of prayer demonstrates his view of free will and (taqdir). For example, sincere prayers can divert the course of the effects of divine taqdir. He said that to fast for four days during the month of Rajab will prevent future calamities such as madness, leprosy, albinism, and the triumph of the dajjāl.1678 Morals can benefit the afterlife, and there are six actions that will continue to benefit the dead person’s soul after death. These include prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, charity, kindness, and petitioning God, not people.1679 Ibn Bābawayh recounts specific times that prayer in particular is more effective: the times when hell is brought near to earth, the time between night and the darkest part of the night near dawn. Also, the afternoon prayer time (ṣalāt ḏasr) is the time when Adam ate from the forbidden tree and so this prayer reconciles his sin. Finally, prayers at sunset recall when Adam made his repentance.1680 For him, the Prophet and his lineage have the power to understand how taqdir works and how it can be changed. Ibn

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1674} Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawhid, pp. 216, 406 and 16., Al-Kīsāl, vol 2, p. 608., 'Uyūn Aḵbār al-Riḍā, vol 2, p. 120., Šifāt al-Šīaḥ, p. 50.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1675} Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawhid, p. 226.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1676} Ibid., p. 263.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1677} Ibn Bābawayh, 'illal al-Šarāye', vol 1, p. 113., al-Kīsāl, vol 2, p. 588.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1678} Ibn Bābawayh, Faḍāʾil Šahr Ramadan, (Qom: Maktabat Al-Dawrī, n.d), p. 22.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1679} Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh, vol 1, p. 185.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{1680} Ibid., vol 1, p. 211.}\]
Bābawayh narrates a tradition that fits in with abū Bakr al-Rāzī’s hierarchical order, but with Qur’anic expressions. On the authority of Ahmed b. al-Hasan al-Qaṭān al-Rāzī, Ibn Bābawayh narrated traditions that spoke of the celestial world, the tablet and the pen as two angels, the throne of God as the hidden knowledge of God, and the chair as knowledge itself, carried by the prophets and proofs (hujjaj) Imams.

5.3.12 Ibn Bābawayh and Emanation: Levels of Revelation and Qur’an

For Ibn Bābawayh, citing Imam ’Alī, (kalām) (the speech of God) is far greater than the written text; they are two separate things and God’s word should not be confused with the written text of the Qur’an. He considered the revelations of the Qur’an as a single entity, but one that was read in various versions depending on the dialect. Ibn Bābawayh explains his differences from others on four points. Firstly, God does not talk to prophets directly; secondly, the prophet or the Imam was chosen through inheritance of a gift divine faculty rūḥ l-qudus; third, and very different from traditional Muslims, the angel Gabriel does not travel between God and prophets, but revelation traverses from angel to angel, from the sky to sky, into the heart of the Prophet; and fourth, light (nūr) is the same as knowledge and revelation. Ibn Bābawayh gave another reason why God historically did not talk directly to prophets and why he still does not talk directly to prophets. He narrated according to al-Riḍā that the prophet Moses did not hear God directly, but heard God’s speech coming out of the burning bush. That is, the bush made the sound, not God. Likewise, manifestation (tajala) does not literally mean Moses seeing God, but metaphorically meant that Moses had seen signs of God. On the contrary, al-Mufid
argues that, if one of God’s attributes is speaking, then God’s speech is direct (i.e. God could contact the prophet at any time), and al-Mufid argues this is not what Ibn Bābawayh refers to as revelations, or inner thoughts or inspiration. He argued that righteous people too could have the same experience while in their sleep.\textsuperscript{1687} Al-Mufid argues that the Prophet must have heard the Qur’an revealed by the angel Gabriel verse by verse,\textsuperscript{1688} but the compilation of the Qur’an is different depending on the skills of the scribes and compilers in the case of Qur’an some verses were missing. For al-Mufīd, what Ibn Bābawayh calls ‘revelation’ is actually merely ‘inspiration’. The Šī‘ah and Mu’tazilite held a similar approach to the Qur’an as a created book, but they differed on the wording because God, in both Šī‘ah and Mu’tazilite, no longer had the attribute of ‘speaking’ and therefore the Qur’an is no longer the eternal word of God.\textsuperscript{1689} For example, Ibn Bābawayh separates God’s speech (\textit{kalām Allah}) from the Qur’an the written book, and describes it as a corporeal text. Ibn Bābawayh saw that the Qur’an is not the eternal word of God \textit{Allah} but is corporeal (\textit{muḥdaq}).\textsuperscript{1690} That is to say, God’s words cannot be limited to a humanly created text.

Ibn Bābawayh then lists the reasons why the Qur’an cannot be applicable to all times. For example, it contains ‘laws which abrogate or supersede’ (\textit{nāsīḵ}) and expired laws (\textit{mansūḵ}), general rules (‘\textit{ām}), and specific rules for specific situations (\textit{kāṣ}), fixed rules (\textit{muḥkam}), and hypothetical interpretations of law (\textit{mutašābah}).\textsuperscript{1691} These are all contingent, not eternal.

\textsuperscript{1687} Al-Mufid, \textit{Tashīḥ i tiqādāt}, pp. 120-1.
\textsuperscript{1688} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 125-6.
\textsuperscript{1690} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawḥīd}, (Qom: Mū‘asat al-Naṣr al-Islami, 1398 A.H), p. 223.
\textsuperscript{1691} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-ḵiṣāl}, vol 1, p. 255.
5.3.13 Ibn Bābawayh and Imamah

Ibn Bābawayh states that the gift of the Imams is that they have the skill of communication and always have explanations and answers ready to various debates and he gave the example of when al-Ma’mūn invited the scholars from each community has challenged Imam al-Riḍa. Ibn Bābawayh finds a historical context for each Imam. Imāmah proven by mastery of knowledge makes him standout from the crowd, as someone who can supersede scholars. This is an evidence of being appointed by God. Then he started with ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn: he was able to pray a thousand rak’a a day, then his son Muḥammed was known al-Bāqir for his break through knowledge during his time, then his son Ja’far known as al-Ṣādiq in a time were from same lineage claimed Imamah, then his son Mūsa known al-Kādīm for holding his patience with those he knew they will betray him and turn him in, then his son ‘Alī known as al-Riḍa for being accepted and respected by all including his enemies, then his son Muḥammed known as al-Taqī because God saved him last minute from the sword of al-Ma’mūn, then his son ‘Alī and the son of his son Ḥasan both known as al-‘Askarī because of the area they settled in *sir min ra’a* (city of Samarra north of Baghdad). As we explained earlier, for al-Rāzī, to be an Imam one must be at the head of one’s field like no other, like Socrates was the leader in the field of ethics and there is no point in competing with them. He wrote about each Imam and what he was famous with.

Whereas Ibn 'Abbād description of an Imam is different from Ibn Bābawayh's. There are Imams like the wazīr and muftī in each field there is an Imam and their Imam is the state leader. Each position reached through gradual knowledge. Whereas leadership is political. He then added that the political role of the state Imam to make sure the wazīr

---

and muftī implement Šarʿīyāt. The state leader does not need to be an expert in every field.

1697 Al-Ṣāhib b. ’Abbād quoted that Jaʿfar stated that his uncle Zayd b. ’Alī had said that those who want to change of leadership let him carry the sword and follow me and those want to seek knowledge go to my nephew Jaʿfar.1698

Ibn Bābawayh does not refer literally to God’s promise (and this makes him different from the religious traditionalist) but is metaphorically saying that it is only natural that an Imam should have all the answers. The Imams were appointed based on demonstrations of ability in law. Ibn Bābawayh narrated that, according to Imam al-Riḍā, the Imam is naturally gifted from birth; he has the ability since the day he was born to speak and bear witness to the monotheistic belief that there is only one God and that Muḥammad was his messenger. Not only that, but he is a unique being; he can be recognised by others as the wisest, kindest, bravest, and most generous, and can give evidence of his lineage. He has the ability to prophesy in the names of the loyal Šīʿah listed in the book of hidden knowledge (al-Jafr).1699

Ibn Bābawayh saw revealed knowledge as something abstract that is suitable for interpretations in various tongues (languages) revealed to various nations.1700 God’s words are not restricted to one language or one religion as there is an unlimited number of angels who praise God in various languages. The miracle of the Imams is their expertise in running the state (ṣīyāsah), where people could benefit from their advice, to prevent them from falling into error; this is Ibn Bābawayh’s response to those who doubted the Imamah of the Mahdi and asked for evidence of performing miracles.1701 In another tradition he narrated that the Prophet came to the Arabs, ordered their lives, and stopped the bloodshed: this was

---

1698 Ibid., p. 236.
1699 Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-ʾAḵbār, p. 102.
1700 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 326.
1701 Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-ʾAḵbār, p. 100.
Like al-Fārābī, Ibn Bābawayh categorises knowledge according to its source. Knowledge reflects the uniqueness of the Imams’ gifts in decoding abstract visions into clear prophecies, and also divides people intellectually. For Ibn Bābawayh, any knowledge humanly expressed, including the Qur’an, is created (muhdat). Inner intuition which is developed by scholars after a long process of learning and analysing is not revelation. When it comes to miracles, similarly, Ibn Bābawayh argues that miracles are the opposite of natural disasters. Normally miracles are considered positive, by contrast, disasters are more about the climate, lead to death and misfortune, and are sometimes seen as punishment in sinning. There are two main interpretations of miracles. First, God intervenes directly at any time by creating a miracle and, second, God only initiates the flow, but when the sin of man interferes causes it to deviate from its course. The Imams are there with divine knowledge to bring it back.

Those who see the world as being created by emanation would focus on how to correct the course of emanations. For example, the Imam abū Ja’far gave this answer to resolve the problem of earthquakes in the city of Ahwaz. He advised the inhabitants to remain in the city, and that they should fast every Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, and on Friday conduct group prayer. I infer that this is to do with the concept that prayers can have an effect on the directions of the flow of the emanations before they reach our physical world and are transformed into physical creations. Although Ibn Bābawayh was not a philosopher, one can infer that this was his perception of how things work. For example, he believes his birth was a miracle because Imam Mahdi prayed for his barren mother to be pregnant; his prayer changed what was already fixated. Again he narrates that five evil acts could bring disasters: obscene acts will bring the plague, cheating in scale will bring poverty and being led by a dictator, not paying zakat will cause the rain to stop but

---

because people looked after their animal the rain did not stop, and if they do not take seriously what God revealed they will turn against each other. Ibn Bābawayh narrates another tradition of the same kind, that in the celestial world, the earth is placed on top of a whale. Whenever a multitude is committing acts considered sinful, the whale will shake the sins off his body, causing earthquakes and storms, and the only way to calm him down is by offering prayers and repentance from sin. Tidal movements in the sea occur because the angel in charge puts his foot in the water and it creates a tidal movement.

It was understood that the way to avoid natural disasters such as earthquakes and storms is for the Imams to teach people prayers to prevent disasters. By contrast, incantation (ruqī) in English translation is often used negatively to mean magic and spells, but in Arabic there are positive and negative incantations, and in this context it is positive. This is a part of positive qadar that will contrast with negative qadar. Ibn Bābawayh too narrates that, according to Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, if you make an error, then follow it by asking God’s forgiveness as a way to counter it. Al-Mufid interprets Ibn Bābawayh’s term ‘divine ability’ (qudrah) as the same as power (qūah), so for example, saying that God created Adam out of his power is the same as saying God predestined Adam to exist. This is because al-Mufid argued that God can intervene in human affairs through causality, unlike Ibn Bābawayh, who believes that God is the evolver of things and God uses qudrah to bring about his will.

5.3.14 Ibn Bābawayh: Ethics and Rituals

Ethics and rituals play a big part in Ibn Bābawayh’s thought. For him, even if someone is following religious instructions, if he cuts the ties of duty he will cut his own life, and

1706 Ibn Bābawayh, Ṭawāb al-Aʿmāl, p. 252.
1707 Ibid.
1708 Ibid., p. 554.
1710 Ibid., p. 360.
1711 Al-Mufid, Taṣḥīḥ ʾiṭiqādāt, p. 34.
if illicit sex becomes widespread it will bring earthquakes. Cheating customers by giving short weight brings poverty and tyranny; not paying zakat causes drought; disobeying the Prophet brings enemies, and disobeying the commandments of God creates enmity and quarrelsomeness. Ibn Bābawayh believes that regarding things and their consequences if narrowed down at all, the outcomes are of our own making. Al-Badā’ah is to confirm that God has started everything, if occurrences change the circumstance will change and the role will be different, for example, keeping close ties with the family has an effect on increasing life span and cutting it will reduce the life span. Likewise, at one point Muslims prayed towards Jerusalem and the next was changed towards the Ka’ba. Ibn Bābawayh’s much earlier response was that God continues to be in charge of giving life and taking life and God brings out a new thing every day. On the contrary, al-Mufīd, because of his argument in support of Imamah, believed that everything proves that God has, in eternity past, thought and planned the existence of everything on earth. He argues that a building cannot exist without a builder, and the builder cannot build without an idea of what to build. In the religious context, this idea is (badā’ah), preceding the making of something. In the process of making, thoughts and plans can change. On the other hand, for Ibn Bābawayh the laws will always change. In his thinking, this change is because creation, in general, is based on God’s emanation, therefore no one can guess what God will create; the emanation itself could change its course or be altered. It remains hidden with God alone and cannot be understood through the use of analogy. Ibn Bābawayh states that because human bodies (ajsām) are created (muḥḍaṭ), this is evidence of God’s

1713 Ibn Bābawayh, Man Lā Yahḍuruhu al-Faqīh, vol 1, p. 524.
1714 Ibn Bābawayh, Tawāb Aḥlāl, p. 252.
1715 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Tawḥīd, p. 335.
1716 Ibid., p. 158 and Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 335.
1718 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 265.
involvement in the continuous making of human bodies.\textsuperscript{1719} He ends the paragraph by stating that this argument coincides with two others: the arguments of the rationalist Muʿtazilites and the teachings of the Imams.\textsuperscript{1720} For Ibn Bābawayh, revelation is a process that can occur while we are asleep. This is because access to our psyche is made easier in our sleep. Ibn Bābawayh treats revelation as a continuation of light. It always exists but needs to find a body purified from all sin to receive it, cleared from veils of ignorance. The body is the vehicle that carries the soul and must be released from sin and powered by knowledge. There is a second hierarchy – the lineage and successions, from the Prophet to the Imams – where no angels are mentioned but the divine faculty (\textit{rūḥ l-qudus}). In another tradition, Ibn Bābawayh narrates that Imam ʿAlī b. abī Ṭālib receives knowledge from the Prophet, who in turn receives it from Gabriel, who himself receives it from Michael, who is the recipient of what Isrāʾīl receives from the celestial tablet, from the pen, and finally from the ultimate source, God.\textsuperscript{1721} This is to say that, the first source of knowledge is God like the sun and the last is the angel Gabriel. Ibn Bābawayh focuses on succession to esoteric knowledge rather than externalised institutions such as the Șarīʿah. For example, he states that there were 124,000 prophets and the same number of \textit{waṣī} (legatees or successors; for each prophet, there was a \textit{waṣī}).\textsuperscript{1722}

5.3.15 Ibn Bābawayh’s Version of Universalism

Based on the argument that ethics are universal, namely, that all nations have common morals and ethics, do not lie, do not kill, etc., Ibn Bābawayh did not limit God to Islam. God is known in all languages and his existence is common knowledge among all mankind.\textsuperscript{1723} God is known from birth by every person born with a soul. Each person is born with the knowledge that God exists, regardless of the name by which their religion

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{1719} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-ʾiṭiqādāt}, p. 41.
\textsuperscript{1720} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawhīd}, p. 300.
\textsuperscript{1721} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Ḵiṣāl}, vol 2, p. 481 and \textit{Maʿānī al-ʾAkābār}, p. 235.
\textsuperscript{1723} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawhīd}, (Najaf: Maṭbaʿa al-Haydarīyah, 1966), p. 44.
\end{footnotesize}
calls him, and therefore, the soul must have a connection with God. This knowledge is interpreted as light (*nūr*).\(^{1724}\) So every person has some amount of light in them, some amount of ethics in them, some appreciation for knowledge. All of this is part of human nature according to Ibn Bābawayh. Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh states that there is a tradition dating back to the uncle of the Prophet, where the Prophet was told by a Christian monk that the commonality between the revelations of the Torah, the Gospel, and the Qur’an came to you from the same great law (*nāmūs al-akbar*).\(^{1725}\) That knowledge has existed through all time but is interpreted by various tongues, creating various religions.\(^{1726}\) As mentioned before (section 5.4.11), Ibn Bābawayh taught that there were 124,000 prophets before Muḥammed.\(^{1727}\) He made a link between traditions and stated that these 124,000 prophets existed,\(^{1728}\) but indicated that not all of the prophets spoke the same language. In other words, they were from different nations. He decreed a *fatwa* that reflects his view of the universality of religion. He declared that in religious practices the wording of canonised prayers (*qunūt* normally prayed in Arabic) can be performed in other languages, for example in Farsī (Persian).\(^{1729}\)

Similarly, Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī describe the common ethics *nāmūs* speaks on behalf the common best interest (*istiṣlāḥ ʿām*).\(^{1730}\) Knowledge assists one to differentiate truth from falsehood.\(^{1731}\) Ruling itself a form of system where certain people able to rule people and whenever Šarī‘a became detached itself from the system it will become incomplete, for kings and rulers are God sent too with a mission like religious scholar.\(^{1732}\) They saw philosophy as helping to put things in perspective in a way complementary to


\(^{1725}\) Ibn Bābawayh, *Kamāl al-Dīn*, vol 1, p. 186.


\(^{1728}\) Ibn Bābawayh, *Al-ʾtiqādat*, p. 89.


\(^{1730}\) Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, *Al-ʾintā wa al-Mūʾasah*, vol 1, p. 224.

\(^{1731}\) *Ibid*.

\(^{1732}\) *Ibid*, vol 2, p. 33.
the religions. For all of them, religion provides direction and purpose. As the soul is to the body, so are philosophy and religion. This is a combination that leads to salvation and enlightenment. Ibn al-Nadīm states that Mānī’s saw that humans are made out of twelve attributes. Al-Tawḥīdī stated that abī al-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmirī (Aristotelian Muslim philosopher) combines religion with philosophy. Similarly al-Tawḥīdī share his teacher response al-Sajistānī (Aristotelian Muslim philosopher) that philosophy does not clash with religion. Then added how the art of kalām is based on dialect the winning of an argument whereas philosophy is based on 6 fundamental observations made by: 1. the naked eye. 2. the brain understanding. 3. The combination of both. 4. Siding with one of them. 5. Not siding with either. 6. The evidence that we have from the knowledge and perception.

What, then, is the story of the Iḵwān al-Ṣafā? The tenth-century Muslim thinker, abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, stated that the Iḵwān al-Ṣafā was co-authored by a group of ten men in Basra from various professions. They saw the Šarīʿa had become ‘filled with dirt’ and they decided to clean it up with the assistance of philosophy. They compiled 50 treatises. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī listed only four co-authors of Iḵwān al-Ṣafā, namely, Muḥammed Ibn Maʿšar al-Bistī (or Abū Sulaymān al-Maqdisi), Ṭālī Ibn Hārūn (Abū al-Ḥasan al-Zanjānī), abū Aḥmed al-Mahrajānī, al-ʿAwfī. Iḵwān al-Ṣafā makes religion superior to philosophy. Philosophy is merely a tool, a complementary device, to religion. The only opposition Iḵwān al-Ṣafā faced was whether philosophy came to confirm revelations, this was noted by abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī.

1734 Ibn al-Nadīm, al-Fihrist, p. 400.
1736 Ibid., p. 199.
1737 Ibid., p. 223.
1739 Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Imtāʿ wa l-Mūʿānasah, (Cairo: Maṭbaʿa al-Taʾlīf wa l-Tarjama, 1942) vol 2, p. 5.
1740 Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Muqābasāt, p. 49.
5.3.16 The Hierarchal order of the world of the living

Furthermore, as we have seen Ibn Bābawayh spoke in his *al-Ḵiṣāl* about the making of human being which is similar to Galen’s. In his ‘*illal al-Šarāye’* he speaks about the categorisation of the living ḥaywān according to their intelligence.\(^{1741}\) He begins from the ground *al-ard*, then moves up the vegetative nāmī, animal ḥaywān, non-rational speaking animal ḥaywān a’jam, rational speaking animal ḥaywān nāṭiq, rational speaking animal ignorant ḥaywān al-jāhil al-nāṭiq, the rational speaking animal that has knowledge ḥaywān al-ʿālam al-nāṭiq, rational speaking animal knowledge seeker al-ḥaywān al-ʿālam al-nāṭiq al-mahjūj, rational speaking animal a scholar al-ḥaywān al-ʿālam al-nāṭiq al-ḥujja which divided into two: a scholar that can demonstrate knowledge with refining Arabic language al-mu’arrab al-mubayen and a scholar that can demonstrate knowledge with unrefined Arabic language al-a’jam al-ḡayr faṣīḥ.\(^{1742}\) Ethics and values are the keys that keeps everything in balance, Ibn Bābawayh narrated that the world stands on three a scholar/scientist that uses his science, wealthy man that generous not stingy, and poor who is patient when the scientist choose not to share his science, the wealthy choose stinginess and the poor cannot hold his patience by then, bringing the world back to the starting point which is *kufr*.\(^{1743}\) Ibn Bābawayh here did not target a specific religion or faith; the aim is fairness in society.

One of the major arguments in Rayy during this time was about the precise nature of the human soul. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī attended the debates in Rayy and tells us that there is consensus that the soul is eternal and does not die. Thus, everyone in Rayy followed identically with al-Rāzī. One of the typical debate is about the nature of the soul, whether


\(^{1742}\) *Ibid.*


Same Ḥadīṯ narrated in *al-Ḵiṣāl*, the world stands on four and the forth is an ignorant who not afraid to seek knowledge. *Al-Ḵiṣāl*, vol 1, p. 197.
it is jawhar or 'ard.\textsuperscript{1744} He listed nine interpretations: 1) Whether the soul moves independently- (al-Nafs 'ard muḥarrik bi ḍātih), 2) the soul as a substance combined essences of temptations of the universe – (Nafs mazāj al-Arkān), 3) the soul combined essence of the substances - (Nafs taʾāluf al-Astaqsāt) 4) The soul is the accident that moves by itself – (Nafs 'ard muḥarrik bi-ḍatiḥ), 5) soul like air - (Nafs Hawāʾīa), 6) the soul a hot spirit – (Nafs rūḥ Ḥārra), 7) the soul a natural force that constantly moves – (Nafs Ṭabīʾīa ḍāimat al-Ḥarakah), 8) the soul a complementary to a body that can move – (al-Nafs tamāmun li-Jism Ṭabīʾī ḍī Ḥayāt) and 9) the soul as essence that can move the body but which has no body of its own – (Nafs jawhar laysa bi-jism, muḥarrik lil-badan).\textsuperscript{1745} In locating philosophical terms in Muslim texts, abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī holds that al-Nafs is more likely to be accident 'ard because both do not have shape.\textsuperscript{1746}

5.3.17 Virtuous state, The State of Truth (dawlatu l-haq)

After the 11 Imams have passed and the 12\textsuperscript{th} ready for the final appearance. Ibn Bābawayh describes the guided Kīlāfah, the ideal state. The only difference from al-Fārābī’s “virtuous state”, that will happen at the very end of time. Dawlatu l-haq shares similar elements with the virtuous state, the city of scholars. The State of Truth (dawlatu l-haq) versus the state falsehood (dawlatu l-bāṭil). Ibn Bābawayh,\textsuperscript{1747} use similar language to that of al-Fārābī.\textsuperscript{1748} Al-Rāzī spoke about the way of the philosophers in his, al-Sīrah al-Falsafīyah,\textsuperscript{1749} versus the unjust way al-Sīrah Jāʾirah.\textsuperscript{1750}

\textsuperscript{1744} Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, Al-Imtāwal Mūʾānasah, (Cairo: Lujnit al-Taʿlīf wa l-Tarjamah wa l-Naṣr, 1944), vol 1, pp. 199-200.
\textsuperscript{1745} Ibid., vol 3, p. 108.
\textsuperscript{1746} Ibid., p. 113.
\textsuperscript{1748} Al-Fārābī, Kitāb Ārāʾ ahl al-Madīna al-Fādīlah, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{1749} Abū Bakr al-Rāzī, al-Sīrah al-Falsafīyah, cited in Kraus, Ed._ Opera Philosophica (Rasāʾīl Falsafīyah), p. 97.
\textsuperscript{1750} Ibid. p. 91.
Once you have loyalty wilāyah to Imām 'Alī, you have entered God’s fort, and being Šī‘ah and living in dawlatu l-bāṭil you will live in fear and you will have to practice taqīyah. In his al-I‘tiqādāt narrates according to al-Bāqir to be granted our wilāyah only when you have achieved a certain level in ethics and morals. This is when your instinct (light) will naturally recognise 'Alī, Fāṭimah, Hasan and Husayn. A virtuous nation (al-Umma al-Fāḍilah) who choose to rule by the religion of God and not the multitude’s opinion and qīyās (analogy based on their corrupted desire). Its new era is the end of dawlatu l-bāṭil and start of dawlatu l-haq. Al-Qā‘im has the sign aya lil-mutawasmīn to expose evil from good. Knowledge will become the predominant and only true friends of God will appear and lead. Al-Qā‘im will uphold morality at the highest level where you do not see sheikh chasing after his lust and fornicating and you do not see those who do not pay their Zakat to help the needy. In this state al-Qā‘im new law to be implemented brothers in souls will inherit each other. This is a stage where people finally have advanced the 75 characters of the intellect, as mentioned earlier. Ethics and morals become the only things that exist. Ibn Bābawayh, narrates that the state will be ruled following the rule of king David. As what al-Sajistānī described that the rule of king David is the common link between philosophy and religion. Ibn Bābawayh does not completely abolish the religious practices while waiting for the appearance of al-Qā‘im, he narrates that the hardship received during falsehood state Dawlutul Bāṭil is far more rewarding than living under al-Qā‘im where everything become clear.

1753 Ibid., Al-I‘tiqādāt, p. 113.
1754 Ibid., Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 1, p. 187.
1755 Ibid., al-Ḵiṣāl, vol 1, p. 305.
1757 Ibid., Kamāl al-Dīn, vol 2, p. 671.
1759 Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ḵiṣāl, vol 1, p. 169.
1761 Al-Sijistānī, Kitāb Muntaḵab Šiwn al-Hikmah, p. 5.
Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī concluded that kingship does not have to be like prophecy. For example, a king can be sent from God, such as King Saul (Ṭālūt), who was the first king of the kingdom of Israel. The fourth debate is about sīyāsah. In modern times, this term refers merely to politics. However, in Ibn Bābawayh’s time, it referred to the whole matter of how the state cared for its people, including the idea of the state’s responsibility and proper leadership. It was about a hierarchical system mirroring the pure heavenly realm on earth. This is sīyāsah. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī student of the Fārābīan School, was asked the question ‘how did sīyāsah Ilāhiya become like sīyāsah bašarīyah?’ That is, how did the heavenly hierarchy emanate to become the earthly hierarchy? To which he replied, ‘humankind did not find sīyāsah by themselves, but emanated images like a reflection of heavenly abstract images in a mirror received by the human psyche from God and led them to sīyāsah.’

5.3.18 Nāmūs or philosophy?

Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī describes Šarīʿah covers general topics; by contrast, philosophy is more about specific details – for instance, the upright members (qiwām) of society (ʾāmma) rely on experts of a specific field (kāṣṣa); and experts also have the best interest of the general public in mind. The consensus of communities that become the common virtue amongst religions and traditions is known as the mujma’ ‘alaihī bayna al-milal wa l-akbār. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī said that virtues and ethics that are common amongst all religions represent the revealed law nāmūs. An example of how they justify using philosophy is from the teacher of abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, the logician (al-Manṭiqī) abū Sulayman al-Sajistānī, who argued that ethics are the common virtues between all
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1763 Ibid., vol 2, p. 33. Old Testament Book of Judges (7:5-7) and Qur’an (2:247).
1764 Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawḥīdī, Al-İmtāʿ wal Mūʿānasah, (Cairo: Lujnit al-Taʿlīf wa l-Tarjamah wa l-Naṣr, 1944), vol 3, p. 115.
1765 Ibid., vol 2, p. 12.
1766 Ibid., p. 7.
1768 Ibid., vol 1, p. 29.
Philosophy talks about the specific details while Šarīʿah discusses the common issues; therefore, virtues only apply if they are common between religions. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī refers to the virtuous laws (nāmūs) which are the revealed common virtue that is shared by religions as a sign from God. On the other hand, nāmūs speaks of the common ethics that lead to inner peace al-nāmūs hūwa istiślāḥun ʿām li yakūn al-naf ʾ bihi šāʾiʾan fī sukūn al-nafs wa tīb al-qalb wa rūḥ al-ṣadr. That is, those who supported maslaha used the idea of nāmūs to seek to persuade the religious crowd of their position. It is worth revisiting the statements of those who lived and met with Ibn Bābawayh, such as abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, who says that Aristotle’s thought is one of the major influences of the time, and his philosophy teaches that there are two worlds which cannot be mixed: the celestial and physical. This cut out Manichaeism and Bardaisanism, who both believed in a mixture of the two worlds. During Ibn Bābawayh’s time, the idea of no mixture became accepted, as evidenced above. Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī continues in stating that the two worlds are the lower world, the world of senses; and the higher world, the celestial world. The material world hyle is no longer associated with the celestial world after human intellect/senses descend from the celestial world to the lower world and become ‘trapped’ in the human body. This is not a mixture, as the dualists would say. The original form of matter (hyle) has power over the soul and not vice versa. Therefore, saving the soul occurs only by following ethics through God’s mediators. God is merciful, giving us Šarīʿah for salvation and sending us messengers as our mediators with him, who are recognized by Islam. He has not left us to our human efforts of analogy. This is the
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evidence from God that if one is chosen as a mediator, one has to be supported with revelations and miracles to convince humanity.\textsuperscript{1774}

The debate evolved was whether philosophy is superior and should lead Šarīʿah, or whether Šarīʿah is superior and should lead philosophy.\textsuperscript{1775} Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī witnessed that there was a difference between the logician, abū Sulaymān al-Manṭiqī, and al-Rāzī’s student, abū Ğānim (the physician) about whether philosophy is superior to Šarīʿah.\textsuperscript{1776} That Šarīʿah leads philosophy is the line of abū Sulaymān al-Manṭiqī. By contrast, for abū Zayd al-Balkī (d. 934/322 A.H), philosophy should lead Šarīʿah.\textsuperscript{1777} Abū Zayd al-Balkī in his early life was Šīʿah Imāmī, studied under al-Kindī and wrote about philosophy from old and new (pre and post-Aristotle).\textsuperscript{1778} Ibn al-Nadīm added that the accusation of ilḥād came from two people, a dualist and a Qarmatian, indicating that it held no credit or it was a common practice between the rivals doctrines of Greek philosophy versus Persian dualism. For example, the wazīr of Ḵūrāsān ʿahmed b. Muhammad b. Naṣr al-Jihānī was a dualist and al-Ḥusayn b. Ālī al-Marūwāḏī was Qarmatian. Both accused abū Zayd al-Balkī of ilḥād. Ibn al-Nadīm narrated that the accusation had no value because al-Balkī studied logic \textit{mantiq}.\textsuperscript{1779} Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkī questioned the claim of Imamah made by the Šīʿah. On the contrary, Ibn Qibba al-Rāzī refuted abū al-Qāsim al-Balkī’s work \textit{al-Mustaršid} and wrote \textit{Kitāb al-Mustaḥbit}.\textsuperscript{1780} Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkī had a better relationship with abū Zayd al-Balkī than al-Rāzī, he wrote to abū Zayd and received answers to his questions.\textsuperscript{1781} Their influence continued through the Buwayhid Sulṭān, Rukan al-Dawlah, and through his wazīr, Ibn al-ʿAmīd. Abū Sulaymān al-Manṭiqī criticized science, contending: ‘Can human intellect, with its limited capacity – the most one can do

\textsuperscript{1774} Ibid., p. 47.
\textsuperscript{1775} Abū Ḥayyān Al-Tawhīdī, \textit{Al-Imtāʿ wal mūʿānasah}, vol 2, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{1776} Ibid., p. 23.
\textsuperscript{1777} Ibid., p. 15.
\textsuperscript{1778} Ibn ʿHajar al-ʿAsqalānī, \textit{Lisān al-Mīzān}, vol 1, p. 289.
\textsuperscript{1779} Ibn al-Nadīm, \textit{Al-Fihrist}, p. 170.
\textsuperscript{1780} Al-Najāšī, \textit{Rijāl Al-Najāšī}, p. 375., and Modarressi, Crisis and consolidation, p. 119.
\textsuperscript{1781} Ibn Al-Nadīm, \textit{Al-Fihrist}, p. 171.
is experiment with chemicals and enchantment of magic spells – be treated as guidance on its own without the revelations and prophecies?1782

5.3.19 Ibn Bābawayh: The Distinction between a Normal Human Being and an Imam

5.3.19.1 ṫūḥ l-Qudus: The Holy Spirit

Ibn Bābawayh categorised many things. For him, all things are naturally the way they are, and he relates them to how they started. He points out that God Allah does not communicate directly, nor does He speak to prophets, but prophets and Imams are naturally born gifted with ‘divine faculty’ (rūḥ l-qudus). I note that this is to be distinguished from the Christian ‘Holy Spirit’. For example, Ibn Bābawayh cites the story of a poet named Du’bul l-Ḵuzāʾī who was not an Imam nor a practicing Muslim, but he had rūḥ l-qudus. The Imam al-Riḍā commented that rūḥ l-qudus showed in al-Ḵuzāʾī’s words, in that al-Ḵuzāʾī was telling the truth in this profound and brave way regardless of any adverse consequences that might occur. This is despite the fact that al-Ḵuzāʾī was a known non-practicing Muslim and had a habit of drinking alcohol, but he gave up his drinking toward the end of his life.1783 Nonetheless, Imam al-Riḍā described al-Ḵuzāʾī as someone who spoke in the spirit of divine faculty rūḥ l-qudus when he recited two lines of his poem opposite the caliph, praising the Imams.1784 A faculty that is sharper than others, regardless of whether one practices religion or not, is called the blessed or divine faculty (rūḥ l-qudus). It is different in character than the Holy Spirit in Christianity. Ibn Bābawayh narrated that rūḥ l-qudus is never separated from the Imams.1785 However, poetic skills are not a sign for Imamah, he states that someone who commits sins major or minor is not suitable for Imamah, and we will never be able to identify an Imam without a prophecy from the Prophet.1786 The soul of the prophets and Imams was created from the purest of all souls
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1782 Abū Hayyān Al-Tawhīdī, Al-Muqābasāt, p. 49.
1786 Ibn Bābawayh, al-ḵīsāl, vol 1, p. 310.
and part of its quality is \textit{rūḥ l-qudus}. He narrates according to al-Riḍā, that knowledge is transferred in connection with the \textit{rūḥ l-qudus}.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Kamāl al-Dīn}, vol 2, p. 428.} The Prophet and Imams naturally have access to insight and complete knowledge.\footnote{Ibid.} \textit{Rūḥ l-qudus} was planted into Adam and passed on through a single line of his offspring. An example of this, according to Imam al-Riḍā, is that \textit{rūḥ l-qudus} went into the Virgin Mary.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Tawḥīd}, p. 425.} Thus divine faculty \textit{rūḥ l-qudus} is an inherited gift, not shared by all the offspring of the Prophet. The challenge for Ibn Bābawayh was to prove why people should follow the guidance of Imams and, more specifically, that the twelve Imams’ lineage is naturally gifted and receives knowledge not only because they are gifted, but because of the way there were made. He described them as vessels (\textit{zujājah}).\footnote{Al-Mufīd, \textit{al-Iḵtīṣās}, (Qom: Al-Mūtamar Al-ʿālamī Lil-Šaḵ Al-Mufīd, 1413 A.H), p. 278.} This type of guidance is like injecting lights into the inner psyche of the Imams, which makes them special. For Ibn Bābawayh, what makes the Imams unique and special is that they share the Prophet’s divine faculty (\textit{rūḥ l-qudus}). Like al-Rāżī, Ibn Bābawayh does not use the term `išq in the sense of ‘longing’ but as a spiritual disease, he interprets as ‘lust’, which can lead to losing one’s inner goodness and then to becoming subservient to falsehood, (\textit{bāṭil}), because lust replaces ethics with falsehood.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Amālī}, p. 668.} He gives an example of a person gifted with ‘divine faculty’ that can receive revelation versus learned knowledge. For example, the prophet Abraham was not a philosopher but was born with the gift of Imamah, the insight that enabled him to be more advanced than the thinkers and philosophers of his time. When he was young, he was able to debate with the wise men among his people (in Babylon) who worshipped the planets and stars.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Tawḥīd}, p. 291.} Each nation had its own version of revelation and prophets.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Kamāl al-Dīn}, vol 2, p. 662.} Ibn Bābawayh argues that an Imam is a human gifted from birth with ‘divine faculty’ through inheritance. He has the
psyche with a fully independent ability to receive knowledge. This psyche was not gained by being taught by others but was naturally gifted by birth.\textsuperscript{1794}

I argue that Ibn Bābawayh took the philosophical concepts that were widespread in his time and rephrased them in religious terminology to make the concepts acceptable to the religious community. Thus, for example, he speaks of ‘angels’ rather than ‘emanations’. He asserts that the revelation comes from God through a hierarchal chain of angels, first from Isrāfīl, the highest of all angels, then passed on to the lower angels, until it reaches the angel Gabriel who reveals it to the prophets. He states that Baytul ma’mūr is a place where revelations of the Qur’an were received.\textsuperscript{1795} By contrast, in Sunnī traditions, al-Buḵārī narrates the angel Gabriel was the mediator between God and the Prophet,\textsuperscript{1796} and recited the Qur’an every year on month of Ramadan.\textsuperscript{1797}

Ibn Bābawayh’s work indicates that the connection between God and humanity could only occur through a separate realm: the metaphysical world. The revelation does not come directly to the Prophet Muḥammed, but travels via a specific order of angels from top to bottom, i.e. from the world of heavens to earth. On the authority of Aḥmad Ibn al-Ḥasan, al-Qaṭṭān stated that the Imamah of the prophets is naturally connected through revelations received from the angel Gabriel, who was a messenger between God and our world and who received a revelation in wordless form from the archangel of the trumpet, Isrāfīl. Isrāfīl received the revelation from the celestial angels, \textit{(malā’kah al-ruḥānyīn)}, and together they retold the revelation and placed it in the Prophet’s heart.\textsuperscript{1798} In another work, Ibn Bābawayh writes that, according to al-Riḍā, revelation is intellectual knowledge transmitted from God downwards through revelations to the angel Isrāfīl, to the angel Michael, to the angel Gabriel, to the Prophet Muḥammed and to ‘Alī. It

\textsuperscript{1794} Ibid., vol 2, p. 678.
\textsuperscript{1795} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Amālī}, p. 62.
\textsuperscript{1796} Muslim al-Naysāpūrī in Ed._ al-Nawawī, \textit{Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim bi Şarah al-Nawawī}, vol 8, p. 354.
\textsuperscript{1798} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawḥīd}, p. 264.
continued to be transmitted to his successors the Imams, until it reached Imam al-Riḍā himself.\(^{1799}\) No one can bypass the chain of revelation from God through the angels and claim reincarnation Ḥulūl.\(^{1800}\) The Imams do not have access to direct revelations from God. In the eyes of Ibn Bābawayh this sort of access is impossible; even angels cannot have such free access to God.\(^{1801}\) In this Ibn Bābawayh contradicts the Sunnīs, who say that the angel Gabriel has direct access to God’s first stage of revelation. This again shows Ibn Bābawayh to be an independent thinker.

5.3.19.2 Analogy \(\text{Ṣiyās}\)

Analogy is often described by Ibn Bābawayh as a symptom of arrogance, referring to Satan’s response to God. The interpretation of \(\text{ṣiyās}\) differs from one school to another depending on context. The only one who is capable of using analogy (\(\text{ṣiyās}\)) is the Imam.\(^{1802}\) This is because he has a divine faculty from birth, so it is safe to trust him with analogy. For Ibn Bābawayh, the analogy practiced by Muslims goes back to ‘Umar. It is similar to the analogy of Satan mentioned in the Qur’an. In Ibn Bābawayh’s work, Reward of Actions, (\(\text{Tawāb A’māl}\)) he uses the section title: The Punishment of the Son of Adam who Murdered his Brother and Nimrud who Quarrelled with Abraham (‘\(\text{iqāb Ibn Adam wa al-lathī qatal akāhu wa namrūd al-lathī ḥājaja Ibrahīm}\)).\(^{1803}\) In this section, he describes analogy as misconception. For example, Cain and Abel both used analogies. Nimrud also used analogy in his quarrel with Abraham. Categorizing knowledge, as well as defining, means clarifying misconceptions of meaning. Categorizing is based on one’s own judgement. The first type is prophecy, which was strongly stated in his work, while \(\text{ṣiyās}\) is the worst and is often described as arrogance and is not based on knowledge that has

\(^{1799}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \(\text{al-Amālī}\), p. 222.


\(^{1801}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \(\text{Al-Tawḥīd}\), p. 264.

\(^{1802}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \(\text{Kamāl al-Dīn}\), vol 1, p. 120.

\(^{1803}\) Ibn Bābawayh, \(\text{Tawāb A’māl}\), p. 215.
been taught. Knowledge from learning is lower than prophecy. It is for those who have
developed scholarly awareness. Scholar here means someone who has knowledge in all
fields, as they are all part of studying God, nature, and creation. Ibn Bābawayh did not
hesitate to put himself among those know the truth, (ʿārifīn), who know the Imams and use
evidence in their debates with the opposition.1804

Ibn Bābawayh narrates that the companion of the prophet, ʿUmar Ibn al-Ḵaṭṭāb, used
analogy (qīyās) against the succession of ʿAlī. For Ibn Bābawayh, this was pure arrogance
against the teachings of the Prophet. Ibn Bābawayh saw a repetition of a pattern, the battle
between good and evil.1805 Abū Bakr and ʿUmar are responsible for distorting knowledge
and either disobeying or ignorantly misinterpreting the teaching of the Prophet’s
knowledge, just like Satan disobeying God. That is why the Sunnīs never saw the
importance of the number twelve, as it relates to Imamah. Ibn Bābawayh made a point by
saying that on the Day of Judgement the first two people to enter the hellfire with Lucifer
will be abū Bakr and ʿUmar, one on Lucifer’s right side and the other on his left.1806 Ibn
Bābawayh excused the Sunnīs for not following Imam ʿAlī, emphasising that abū Bakr and
ʿUmar had confused them with their use of analogy (qīyās) against Imam ʿAlī and the will
of the Prophet to win the caliphate. He states that there is a similarity between Imam ʿAlī’s
wisdom and that of Moses as well as ʿUmar’s arrogance and the Sumerian, when Moses
was away he (the Sumerian) took advantage and created for them a calf to replace the
worship of God.1807 This marks a return to Adam and Lucifer, with one difference. Adam
was granted leadership while ʿAlī was not. Similarly, Lucifer lost his high position to Adam
while ʿUmar won the caliphate from ʿAlī.1808 Al-Muḥīḍ thinks that those who reject
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1804 Ibn Bābawayh, ʿUyūn Aḵbār Al-Řiḍā, vol 1, p. 191.
1805 For example, the belief of two opposites sides was present in earlier Šīʿa sects. See al-Ašʿārī, Maqālāt
al-Islāmiyīn, p. 84.
1807 Ibid., and Al-Tawḥīd, p. 60.
   According to the Bible, when Moses went up to Mount Sinai, the Israelites asked Aaron to make an idol, the
golden calf, to be worshipped. This incident is found in Exodus 32:1-10. While in the Qurʾān (20:85) it is the
Sumerian and not Aron who made the idol.
1808 Ibid.
Imamah are outside the fold of Islam, as well as those who do not know or are who are ignorant of who the Imams were. This is similar to what Kulaynī narrated, that all humankind is illegitimate, from illicit sexual intercourse, except the followers of the Šīʿah Imams. Al-Mufīd’s student, al-Ţūsī, narrated according to Imam Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq: ‘take the wealth of nāšbī and send us the fifth’. However, it is not clear why al-Ţūsī included anti nāšbī traditions in his work. As discussed above, for al-Mufīd the nāšbī begins from the stage before Adam. Thus, I observe that for Ibn Bābawayh, analogy is related to human lust and desire for the world, for political gain; all of which lead to destruction. By contrast, prophecy leads to ultimate clarity and truth.

5.3.19.3 The Taught

The term ‘ārif means when you have learnt enough to reach the level of scholar but still realise that analogy cannot replace the ability of prediction and seeing futuristic visions and revelation. Ibn Bābawayh starts al-Tawḥīd with a tradition stating there is no greater knowledge than the knowledge that there is ‘no God but one God’. In the first chapter, Ibn Bābawayh begins with the rewards of the Unitarians (muwahidīn), and the attainment of knowledge through learning ‘ārifīn. He refers to ‘ārifīn (plural for ‘ārif), meaning those who attain scholarly knowledge. Maʿrifah is the noun of ‘ārif, referring to how much is learnt from what has been written. The key for spiritual experience is to be ‘ārif, and maʿrifah is greater than praying. He categorises the relationship with God in four ways, all of which are related to being a good citizen: 1) the lowest of all are those who fear God too much, they are the extremists, the Kawārijj, they are dangerous to the state, 2) then the sinners, who bring shame to the community, 3) then the scholars are those who have
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1809 Al-Mufid, Al-Ifsāh, p. 28.
1810 Al-Kulaynī, Al-Rowda, vol 8, p. 135.
1812 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 3.
1813 Ibid., p. 416.
learned to avoid falling into error, they know their proper place in the community, and finally, 4) the highest of all are the devotees to God, those who have developed a sense of humility before God (wajal) and those who are the ‘knowers’ (ʿārifīn), who can give wise advice to the state.\textsuperscript{1816} The term ʿārifīn means those who do not claim to receive knowledge or revelations which create heresies, and they are different from those who believe in attaining unity with God (ḥulūlīyah). He then adds the Imams, those who are naturally gifted with the ability to receive divine knowledge which can be used as the source of all science.\textsuperscript{1817} They are all either deceased or in occultation and thus, outside of the categorisation.

5.3.19.4 Visions, Dreams, and Soul Journeys

Ibn Bābawayh maintains the possibility of physical existence in one place although the soul can exist in more than one place. The soul is not restricted to a single place. This thought can be embodied on the social level; someone may meet someone else for the first time and yet act as if they had always known each other. This is because their souls recognise each other from a previous meeting in the metaphysical world.\textsuperscript{1818} If their souls previously rejected one another, they will reject each other in this world too.\textsuperscript{1819} Ibn Bābawayh supports his claim and refers to Qur’an as the common ground between himself and other Muslims on the topic of souls, and states that verse (3:169) says that the souls of the martyred are alive with their Lord. Then added:

“…And concerning the souls, we believe that they were created for eternal existence (baqā’), and not for extinction (fanā’). For the Prophet has said: You were not created for extinction, but for eternal existence and you will only be transferred from one abode to another…” , “…Imām Jaʿfar has

\textsuperscript{1816} Ibn Bābawayh, al-Ḵisāl, vol 1, p. 282.
\textsuperscript{1817} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1818} Ibn Bābawayh, ʿillal al-Šarāye’, vol 1, pp. 84-5.
\textsuperscript{1819} Ibn Bābawayh, Amālī, p. 145.
said: Verily, Allah has inculcated fraternity between souls in the World of Shadows two thousand years prior to the creation of bodies.\ref{1820}

By ‘lord’ Ibn Bābawayh understands the metaphysical world; not God per se, but the emanation of God. Ibn Ḥazm (d. 1063) follows similar traditions and adds that the soul of the dead person is alive until the end of time and can experience happiness or pain; then on Day of Judgement each soul will return to its own original body for the final judgement.\ref{1821} Ibn Bābawayh, however, does not mention about returning to the original body. For Ibn Ḥazm, the souls existed before the body of Adam was made and for each body, each individual semen carries a soul before entering into the womb. After death, all souls go to the astral plane (barzak) to be kept until no more souls are born, and then brought back for resurrection.\ref{1822} This understanding was not invented by Ibn Bābawayh. Ibn Bābawayh spoke about the world of barzak where the souls of living humans and the dead meet each other. By contrast, al-Mufīd argues against Ibn Bābawayh, saying that Ibn Bābawayh’s āḥādīs go against what Imams taught, namely that the souls of the dead people are of two groups: 1) the pious mahd Imān will have a body exact like the one they had and go to a place like a waiting area for final rewards on the day of resurrection, and 2) those who reached ultimate disbelief mahd kufr come back with a body similar to, or appropriate to, their own deeds – these are destined for hell.\ref{1823} He argues that there are two views of life after death: either the soul passes to another body, like its former one but not the same, to receive its reward or punishment; or the soul receives its reward or punishment directly without a body. He added that only prophets and Imams receive their soul back with their body.\ref{1824} They keep their bodies intact. I observe that al-Mufīd gives the impression that
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  \item Ibn Ḥazm, Al-Faṣḥ fi Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal, vol 1, p. 110.
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they will return bodily as if from a long sleep, and that, therefore, Muslims have a duty to protect shrines. Ibn Bābawayh narrates that the souls of the dead and living meet together when a person is asleep.\textsuperscript{1825} He relates the possibility of meeting outside our world. Relating to first impressions, for example, if your instinct is a negative feeling towards someone you have never met before, this must be a warning.\textsuperscript{1826} More simply, to Ibn Bābawayh, everything is made as one of a pair to begin with. For example, every human being has another existence in time, a mirror in a different time and space. His future image does not exist yet and is immeasurable in quantity yet equal in likeness to what exists today. An illustration of this would be someone who twenty years ago was an ignorant person but now has become a scholar. It is the same person but at different stages.\textsuperscript{1827} This does not, of course, apply to God; He exists and there is no equal to Him in any time or space.\textsuperscript{1828} For Ibn Bābawayh, to deny prophecies would mean denying Imamah and \textit{vice versa}.\textsuperscript{1829} According to Ibn Bābawayh, when people sleep, their intellectual souls are free to wander the heavenly world, so that whatever they see is fact and whatever they see from the reflections of the day is merely a dream.\textsuperscript{1830} The soul of every sleeper ascends to God.\textsuperscript{1831} To experience this is to have a vision, and its content can be considered factual. Likewise, when a sleeper’s soul travels, it also meets other souls and exchanges information.\textsuperscript{1832} It meets both living souls and the souls of the dead.\textsuperscript{1833} The same tradition appears again under the subtitle, ‘Why we need to be cleansed before bedtime’, i.e. the more a believer is cleansed, the greater the chance of going further towards God.\textsuperscript{1834} As mentioned earlier, Ibn Bābawayh states that the Persian emperor, Kosrau, saw a vision that his throne and the
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largest archway in the world *ewān* trembled on the day the Prophet was born.\textsuperscript{1835} The story states that Morbīḍān, a friend and advisor of the king, saw in a dream a Bedouin born carrying the *ewān* of Persia in his hand.\textsuperscript{1836} What Ibn Bābawayh was trying to show is that visions are not restricted to religious people or bound by time. Also, Ibn Bābawayh addresses the possibility of human access to the Mahdi through a separate realm of the world of dreams. This is to show that life of different kinds exist. Moreover, receiving visions helps people to find things long lost or hidden. For instance, Ibn Bābawayh narrates an incident from his teacher abū Naṣr Aḥmed b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ḍībbī, in which a friend of his, abū Bakr al-Ḥamāmī, was given wealth to keep for people while they were travelling. Al-Ḥamāmī buried the money but forgot where. The people returned and asked al-Ḥamāmī to return their money. He became worried, having forgotten where the money was buried. He went to the shrine of Imam al-Riḍā, praying for help. On that night, in his sleep, he heard someone telling him where the money was buried, and when he woke up, he found the money and returned it to the owners. After that, al-Ḥamāmī encouraged people to visit the shrine.\textsuperscript{1837}

5.3.19.5 Ilhām and Mahdi

Ibn Bābawayh narrates that God gave the Prophet revelations while he gave `Alī divine inspiration (*ilhām*).\textsuperscript{1838} (*Ilhām*), as mentioned in the Qur’an, He came to Mary, the mother of Jesus,\textsuperscript{1839} who received *ilhām* even though she was not a prophet. The Imams have the same degree of divine inspiration, however not everyone from the lineage of the Prophet will have the gift of sending *ilhām*. Ibn Bābawayh emphasises that, since the beginning of the occultation of the twelfth Imam, God has not left earth without an agent. He is there to

\textsuperscript{1835} Ibn Bābawayh, *Kamāl Al-Dīn*, vol 1, p. 191.
\textsuperscript{1836} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1837} Ibn Bābawayh, *ʻUyūn Aḵbār Al-Riḍā*, vol 2, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{1838} Ibn Bābawayh, *Al-Ḵiṣāl*, vol 1, p. 293.
\textsuperscript{1839} “O Jesus the son of Mary! recount my favour to thee and to thy mother. Behold! I strengthened thee with the holy spirit so that thou didst speak to the people in childhood and in maturity.” Yusuf Ali Translation, *The Meaning of the Holy Qur’an*, Sura 5: verse 110.
save mankind from darkness as the source of knowledge and light.\textsuperscript{1840} Hence when the Imāms receive a question, their instinct is naturally inspired to respond accurately.\textsuperscript{1841} Then narrated according to Imam al-Riḍā, this is the attribute of a true servant of God when his heart becomes source for wisdoms, he speaks with clarity \textit{bi jawāb lā yahīr fihī `an al-şawāb} from pure \textit{ilhām} that we all inherited instinct. Imams, however, are gifted and their answers have clarity secure from distortion and confusion \textit{al-zalal wa l-ṭa‘a}.\textsuperscript{1842} Ibn Bābawayh then narrated that the religious texts say that earth will always have an Imam to top up when people miss knowledge. He explains if everyone on earth benefits from continual Imamah it must be \textit{ilhām} inspiration they have driving them towards Imamah.\textsuperscript{1843} Imamah is a natural phenomenon like the day and night.\textsuperscript{1844} Ibn Bābawayh specifically mentions that the Mahdi appeared to him in his sleep and commanded him to write \textit{Kamāl al-Dīn}.\textsuperscript{1845} On the contrary, al-Mufīd argues that divine inspiration (\textit{ilhām}) is not revelation as they are two different channels. For example, the Qur’an says that God sent divine inspiration (\textit{ilhām}) to the bees, therefore the Imams are the same as God intervening with the bees.\textsuperscript{1846} However, \textit{ilhām} has a wider meaning. Imam Mahdi might be physically in occultation (\textit{ğaybah}), but will continue as a source of inspiration from a hidden place.\textsuperscript{1847} Likewise, the interpretation of his teacher al-Ḥasan b. Saʿīd al-ʿAskarī, who divides knowing of two parts: involuntary knowing an instinct inside your heart tells if it is right or wrong called \textit{ilhām} and knowing by necessity \textit{ma rifaḥ darūriyah} that is based on four elements: observation, experience, hearing from multi sources and its rational.\textsuperscript{1848} This

\textsuperscript{1842} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Ḵiṣāl}, vol 1, p. 311.
\textsuperscript{1843} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Kamāl al-Dīn}, vol 2, p. 655.
\textsuperscript{1844} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Kamāl al-Dīn}, vol 2, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{1845} Al-Mufīd, \textit{Taṣḥīḥ i tiqādāt}, p. 120.
\textsuperscript{1846} Al-Mufīd, \textit{Kamāl al-Dīn}, vol 1, p. 87.
topic was not new, al-Tawḥīdī discussed ilḥām but without the support of tradition. In his interpretation he followed his teacher the logician abū Sulaymān al-Sajistānī. He stated that every creature born with inspiration/instinct ilḥām. The animals are born with (ilḥām) in a form of instinct, but without the freedom of choice. Man are born with ilḥām and has the freedom of choice, hence Man are superior to animals.\(^{1849}\) Al-Bayrūnī writes that some claim ilḥām inherited from their forefather which is a version of tanāsuk. It is like copying old books into a new one, then the information gets developed into another version until the person die and the ilḥām get passed on while others claim that we do not need ilḥām, we need analogy (qīyās). He then added, however, that ilḥām wins over analogy; for example, when Cain killed his brother Abel and did not know how to bury his brother dead body until he saw two crows fighting each other and buried the dead one, Cain then followed the crows’ example, this experience became a practice for mankind.\(^{1850}\) Similarly, al-Tawḥīdī states that Man is divided into three groups according to their instincts: inspirational mulham for others to follow, a student of knowledge but not mulham, and lastly neither mulham nor a student who has the ability to learn but more suitable for physical work.\(^{1851}\) Ibn Bābawayh was contemporary to al-Ḥasan b. Saʿīd al-ʿAskarī, abū Sulaymān al-Sajistānī and his student al-Tawḥīdī. Ibn Bābawayh goes further and presents a similar argument supported by Imām’s Ḫadīl. For example, he used the story of Adam (referring to Man), the same knowledge instinct passed on from generation to generation, hence there will always be a person who inherited knowledge so called an Imam. He narrates that after when Adam cast out from heaven, he felt hungry, Adam had an instinct to rely on his knowledge and wisdom to feed himself.\(^{1852}\) He then gave different example of inspirations. Mother of Moses had an instinct to leave her child inside a basket on the

\(^{1849}\) Al-Tawḥīdī, al-Imtōʾ wa l-Mūʾānasa, (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Lujnat al-Taʿlīf, 1939), vol 1, p. 145.


\(^{1851}\) Al-Tawḥīdī, al-Imtōʾ wa l-Mūʾānasa, (Cairo: Maṭbaʿat Lujnat al-Taʿlīf, 1939), vol 1, p. 145.

\(^{1852}\) Ibn Bābawayh, ʿillal al-Šarāyeʿ, vol 1, p. 195.
river, an inspiration was so divine that changed the future for Moses and Pharoah.  

Similarly the bees had instinct that by it changed the future when Jesus companions were in hiding in island in the sea, the bees had an instinct to migrate to that island, their honey becoming the companion sustenance for them to survive for a bigger role.  

5.3.19.6 Prophecies Are Like a Flash of Light

Similar to al-Fārābī’s idea of the Prophet being born with the faculty of representation (al-qūwa al-mutaḵayila), Ibn Bābawayh understood this as the ‘divine faculty’. For al-Fārābī, prophets see abstract concepts and decode them with their intellectual faculty:

“When this occurs in both parts of his rational faculty, namely the theoretical and the practical rational faculties, and also in his representative faculty, then it is this man who receives Divine Revelation, and God Almighty grant him Revelation through the mediation of the Active Intellect…”

For Ibn Bābawayh, prophecy is instant knowledge like a flash of light; the prophet interprets the flash with the assistance of his own divine faculty. Ibn Bābawayh gives the example from the life of the Prophet where he saw a flash of light showing him the defeat of the Persian Empire, which only happened after his death. So, for Ibn Bābawayh, these flashes of light reveal specific events but are not eternal law, they are not eternal revelation. They are limited by historical context. This makes the Qur’an also limited to its historical context. By that, I mean that the book was created specifically with relevance to the Prophet. His imaginative faculty interpreted the revelations in relation to his own situation. In fact, for Ibn Bābawayh, any knowledge expressed by humans, whether from
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the Prophet, Qur’an, or Imams’ sayings, is created and not eternal. Ibn Bābawayh does not see the Imam’s knowledge on medicine to be miraculous or eternal. Ibn Bābawayh does not see the Imam’s knowledge on medicine to be miraculous or eternal. Actually, he lists their teachings of medicines under odd, seldom used medical prescriptions Nawādir al-Ṭibb, which is equivalent of their being suspect, unreliable traditions. In this way he is unlike his contemporary, ‘Abdullah Ibn Buṣṭām, who was associated with al-Šalmaḡānī, and who took the Imams’ sayings to be miracles and wrote Medical Advice of the Imams Ṭibb al-‘īmah. The Šī’ah were divided, with some seeing the Imams’ teachings as miraculous, and some not. Those who have written about the groups are Šī’ah authors such as: al-⁎Nāšī’ al-⁎Akbar (d. 905/293 A.H) Masā’il al-Imāmah wa Muqtaṭafāt min al-Kitāb al-Awsatfī al-Maqālāt, Sa‘ad b. ʿAbdullah al-⁎Aš‘arī al-Qommī (d. 913/301) Kitāb al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq, abī Muḥammad al-Nubaḵtī (d. 922/310) Firaq l-Šī’ah. Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh’s father ʿAlī b. al-⁎Ḥusayn b. Bābawayh (d. 940/329) wrote al-Imāmah wa l-Tabṣirah min al-Ḥīrah. The division among Šī’ah continued, according to al-Kulaynī’s student, Muḥammad b. İbrāhīm al-Nu’mānī (d. 970/360) stating that during his time only few remained on their belief and the majority have left the faith.

5.3.19.7 Why the Imam Cannot be Infallible

Ibn Bābawayh avoids interpretations associated with infallibility and treating it as divine faculty, he saw that to believe in full infallibility meant their soul is the divine faculty transmigrate from the Imams to their students a succession of tafwīḍ from one person to another. He referred to those who believed they had received revelations from God as exaggerators and extremists (ḡulāt). Ibn Bābawayh made it clear that abī al-Ḵaṭṭāb was cast out of the Šī’ah Imāmī by Imam Jaʿfar al-Šādiq. To al-Rāzī, it is impossible for
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the human body to be infallible when it is created from the world of matter and always exposed to lust, errors and forgetfulness.1862 Ibn Bābawayh rejected the ġulāt claim that the Prophet is incapable of forgetfulness because if we accept he was forgetful then we have to question his reliability of deliverance God’s message.1863 To Ibn Bābawayh this is impossible because infallibility meant immunity from pain, sadness, anger, pride, and sickness which is impossible for any human body to claim. He narrated traditions which make clear the statement that Prophets cannot be infallible; Imam ʿAlī himself could not make infallible decisions when he ruled, but rather relied on lots to make these decisions.1864 The question of the infallibility of the Imams looms large as a central point of contention. Different traditions explain that Imamah and Imam are two different interpretations.

There is no work written by Ibn Bābawayh refuting Christianity, except in al-Tawḥīd. Ibn Bābawayh narrated a tradition that Hišām b. al-Ḥakam had a debate with Barīha, the Christian patriarch, on ‘refutation to those who claim God is one of three, and that there is no God but one’. He asked if the Son was in heaven with God causing everything to exist.1865 Then he asked if in heavens the holy spirit was the Son and incarnated into the body of Jesus.1866 How can we reconcile that he was later trapped inside the body of Jesus and tortured by evil men?1867

This dialogue with patriarch provides some of Ibn Bābawayh’s thinking about the distinction between eternity of the soul, incarnation (ḥulūl) and Imamah. He accepted the soul eternal and Imamah but rejected incarnation ḥulūl. As discussed earlier about al-Ḥallāj and al-Šalmaḡānī. Ibn Bābawayh continued that Hišām b. al-Ḥakam responded to the
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patriarch are you claiming that the Son now is the father of his Father?\footnote{Ibid., p. 273.} Hišām b. al-Ḥakam here arguing that God and holy spirit are two separate entities and not one. Ibn Bābawayh agreed with Hišām b. al-Ḥakam’s view that God cannot be incarnated into one person. This an overview on where to place incarnation in Ibn Bābawayh’s thinking. This then led to another question, namely who should then be worthy to be an Imam and can carry the light of God. Ibn Bābawayh makes a clear distinction between the version of infallibility introduced by Hišām b. al-Ḥakam. He narrates according to Imām Jaʿfar that if someone naturally can abstain from what is forbidden, then this is akin to infallibility.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Maʿānī al-Ḵbār}, p. 132.}

For Ibn al-Ḥakam, the Imam is free from stinginess, enviousness, temper, and lusts.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Tawhīd}, p. 133.}

The conditions about Imāmah were not clear. A debate took place between Hišām b. al-Ḥakam and ʿAmrū b. ʿUbayd head of Muʿtazilte and Hišām b. al-Ḥakam, Hišām he describes Imāmah of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, like the heart of the body, and without Imāmah the people cannot survive.\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Ḵiṣāl}, vol 1, p. 215 and \textit{Amālī}, vol 1, p. 204.} There are two versions of the same story. The first version by Ibn Bābawayh narrated that Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq then asked Hišām b. al-Ḥakam from where did you learn this? He replied, “it came to my mouth.”\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Ḵiṣāl}, vol 1, p. 207., \textit{illal al-Ṣarāye}, vol 1, p. 193., and \textit{Amālī}, p. 589.} Whereas in al-Kulaynī’s version b. al-Ḥakam said, it was based on your teachings (Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq).\footnote{Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Ḵiṣāl}, vol 1, p. 169.}

There are two different views about Hišām b. al-Ḥakam. Ibn Bābawayh narrates that according to Hišām b. al-Ḥakam passed a message from abī Šākir al-Daysānī (al-Ḥakam’s previous teacher\footnote{Al-Kišī, \textit{Rijāl Al-Kišī}, p. 278.}) to Imām Jaʿfar, saying that there is a verse in the Qur’an supports what we believe \{\textit{هو الذي في السماء إله وفي الأرض إله} (Qur’an Surah 43: Verse 84)} Imām Jaʿfar replied this is a statement of a zindīq.\footnote{Al-Kišī, \textit{Rijāl Al-Kišī}, p. 278.} Hišām b. al-Ḥakam’s teaching continued with his follower Yūnis b. ʿabdul Raḥmān. During al-Maʿmūn, philosophy became accessible.
Yūnis b. ʿabdul Raḥmān wrote to Imam al-Riḍā, asking him whether Adam carried a substance (jawhar) from God or not? Al-Riḍā replied, this is the question of a zindīq. On another tradition, al-Riḍā replied he has nothing to do with the confusion of Ibn al-Ḥakam in describing God has a body. As shown although al-Ḥakam was companion of the Imams, his interpretation was of abī Šākir al-Daysānī with slight variation replacing ilāh on earth with Imam on earth.

Going back to Ibn Bābawayh’s interpretation, all prophets and Imams are human and can fall into error. For him, the Prophet unintentionally fell into error but did not sin. Then added only ġulāt and mufawiḍa do not accept that. Ibn Bābawayh dedicates a work, Kitāb Ibṭāl al-Ğulū wa l-Tafwīḍ, to prove that the Imams fall in error and to refute those who denied it.

Moreover, on the companions of the Imāms. Hišām b. al-Ḥakam al-Kišíšī added that he was a follower (ġulām) of abī Šākir al-Daysānī. Likewise, ʿAlī b. Ḥadīd gave a fatwa not to pray behind al-Ḥakam’s student Yūnus b. ʿAbdul Raḥmān, he treated the followers of Hišām b. al-Ḥakam of being heretics. Ibn al-Nadīm states that Hišām b. al-Ḥakam at first was a follower of Jahm b. Ṣafwān (d. 746/128 A.H). Ibn Bābawayh narrated that when Imam Musa al-Kāẓim, heard about what Hišām b. al-Ḥakam claim that ‘God has a body jism but nothing like on to us’, al-Kāẓim replied; may God punish him we do not teach this, because jism is a mass which is surrounded by space, and God is beyond our comprehension, God does not need to speak to create his creation, everything that was created came by God’s divine will. There are a number of companions of Ja’far al-Ṣādiq
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were described to be zindīq such as: Muḥammed b. abī Zaynab (known as Miqlāṣ).\textsuperscript{1886} Bayān, al-Sirrī and Bazī.\textsuperscript{1887}

5.3.19.8 The Virtuous State, Imamah, and the Contentious Number ‘Twelve’

Three concepts are intertwined in the thinking of tenth century Islamic scholars: the virtuous state, the Imamah, and the number twelve. Al-Fārābī speaks of the twelve virtuous character traits of the Imam (1) fit for action, (2) good understanding and speaking ability, (3) retaining what he comes to know and see forget almost nothing, (4) ready intelligence and bright, (5) fine diction from his tongue, enabling him to explain to perfection, (6) fond of learning and acquiring knowledge can grasp things easily, (7) fond of truth, (8) by nature not craving for food, drink, sexual intercourse and gambling, (9) being fond of honour and having a proud of spirit, (10) Dirham and Dinar should be little amount in his view, (11) not stubborn fond of justice and just people, (12) strongly setting his mind firmly on things ought to be done and bravely carry it out without fear or weak-mindedness).\textsuperscript{1888} Similarly, al-Mufid states that there are twelve men appointed by God to fight the twelve men appointed by darkness. Where does Ibn Bābawayh fit in? Ibn Bābawayh in the same tone speaks about twelve virtuous Imams who have historically existed and were victimised by evil and were assassinated.\textsuperscript{1889} The number twelve was present in the teachings of Mānī, referring to the number of attributes of the intellect. The first Human was created out of twelve attributes. The five attributes are: mercy, knowledge, intellect, the unseen, and awareness. His soul was made of five attributes: love, faith, loyalty, braveness and wisdom. Finally, his body was made from two eternals: earth and air. These twelve components aimed to fight the darkness.\textsuperscript{1890} Mānī interprets this as fighting the forces of evil. Mānī said human beings came into being through combining both the world of good and evil. This
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\textsuperscript{1889} Ibn Bābawayh, al-l’tiqādāt, p. 99.
\textsuperscript{1890} Ibn Al-Nadīm, Al-Fihrist, p. 400.
ultimately led to the belief in ḥulūl, that through meditation one can reach a place where there is no barrier between the creator and the created; rather, they mix and unite as one entity. This in turn leads to the belief, erroneous in Ibn Bābawayh’s view, that God and evil are equally eternal.1891

When Ibn Bābawayh speaks about a just ruler he speaks about a ruler who rule multi factions’ society, wWho has the knowledge of religions and sects. When Mūsa met with Barīha he was able to respond to questions from his own books.1892 Knowledge is another common theme between him and al-Fārābī. When he was challenged by questioners in the court of Sultan, the question was, ‘why does the offspring of Imam Ḥusayn have the upper hand over the offspring of Imam Ḥasan?’ He responded that the son of al-Ḥasan, Ibn al-Ḥasan, was an ordinary person not known for his knowledge of what is lawful and unlawful (ḥalāl) and (ḥarām). By contrast, Ḥusayn’s son, ZaynulʿAbidīn, was uniquely expert in ethics, singling him out from the crowd for his intelligence over his cousin Ḥasan Ibn al-Ḥasan.1893 I infer that the criteria of Imamah was more about to be a leader in one’s field, is closer to the example of al-Rāzī than al-Fārābī. Whether in philosophy, wisdom or ethics. Moreover, Ibn Bābawayh’s second point was that even though one may be of the lineage of the Prophet, one is not necessarily fit to be an Imam. He has to be gifted with knowledge. The only legitimate way to choose an Imam is not by the ordinary people but by appointed by the Prophet (al-naṣṣ) or appointed by the previous Imam.1894 Similarly to al-Rāzī list the philosophers in successive way Socrates, Plato and Aristotle.1895 Likewise al-Rāzī describe obsession with religious practices their force of desire stronger than their rational thinking, cleanness should be judged by our senses and not by (qīyās) for example, religious practices praying with same garment while this garment has flies landed on it and

1891 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 269.
1892 Ibid., p. 275.
some of these flies carry dirt and blood stain of dead pig, how then take religious practices and consider it clean?\textsuperscript{1896} Philosophers are experts in dealing with people they speak for the good for all, whereas those who have rigidity in their practices spoil harmonious society (\textit{ifsād al-Sīyāsa}) and they permit themselves cheating others.\textsuperscript{1897} Ibn Bābawayh narrates from Imams from the Prophet who said do not judge people by their religious practices praying and recitation but judge them by telling the truth and trustworthiness.\textsuperscript{1898} He gives a similar example about being gifted with knowledge; he refers to the case of Jesus as an ‘Imam’ based on the ability of knowing – he, as a gifted child, superseded the rabbis at the synagogue.\textsuperscript{1899} That is what makes him an Imam. Al-Mufid, on the other hand, considers John the Baptist an example of being born infallible and immune from falling into error.\textsuperscript{1900} Here we have two versions of Imamah, demonstrating knowledge and lineage. Aside from lineage, the death of John the Baptist signifies his Imamah. It focuses on suffering, which is prominent in al-Mufid’s theme of his work. It has more political connotations linked with the death of Imam Ḩusayn. al-Mufid also uses the number twelve, describing the twelve Imams as representing the ‘force of good’ against evil.

5.4 Linking Al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh: The Problem of Evil and Free Will

Within a religious context, Satan represents the force opposite to what is good. The two created beings that precede Adam are the two forces, angels, who represent good and Satan who represents evil.\textsuperscript{1901} Based on the story of Adam, Satan is by nature in rebellion against what God favours.\textsuperscript{1902} In other traditions, Lucifer envied Adam and saw himself as superior so that he could not bow to Adam and was willing to disobey God’s commands.\textsuperscript{1903}
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\textsuperscript{1901} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawḥīd}, p. 193.
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The commands are usually related to morals and the relation between humanity. The argument is about to what extent Satan had a part in Adam’s creation, or whether he was even involved in it at all. Amir Moezzi insists that dualism is inseparably grounded in Šī‘ah thought, as is shown in the concept of ‘love and hate’. Ibn Bābawayh, however, rejects dualism on the basis that evil in the Cosmos cannot be eternal. Like al-Rāzī, Ibn Bābawayh departs from the widespread interpretations that were integrated with the Šī‘ah community such as those of Bardaisan, Mānī, and the Magian on evil. Ibn Bābawayh takes a similar stance to al-Rāzī in that the soul is understood as having existed before Satan. Ibn Bābawayh makes the point that the soul preceded Satan and therefore Adam was the carrier and ancestor of the Imamah. The Imams are gifted and therefore they are the proofs of God (ḥujjaj), that God, the evolver, emanated light. The offspring of Adam carries the light that came with their soul, that is the counterforce to evil. He argued from his religious view that we cannot accept two equals – the duality of good and evil. He added if there were two Gods, one of them would be Lucifer (Iblīs), which he thought was absurd. Dualism is based on two equal forces, good versus evil, and was utterly contradictory, because the universe proves that it is impossible to have more than one God. If there were two Gods, one God would lead one way while the other would lead in the opposite or another direction. For Ibn Bābawayh, evil has no eternal existence, therefore evil has a temporary life. The true battle is between us and our ignorance. This brings us back to al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī, who argue nafs get corrupted if the body get corrupted attached to lusts, when human start using their sense of pleasure leḏah instead of using it to seek

1908 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 245.
knowledge, they become subservient, serving their lusts to the point cannot use their rational they are engaged it to serve habits, at this point they are no longer can think they at the level of an animal, one of the evils they gain enviousness find pleasure in seeing others do not get what he cannot have, that knowledge prevents negative consequences, namely, evil deeds. Al-Fārābī describes bad people as producing badness to their souls, like the mentally sick enjoy the opposite habits, choosing unpleasant food when they can enjoy sweet food. Their soul is diseased, and their faculty of representation is controlled by their will chasing habit. They are unable to learn or listen because they are unable to feel that they are badly sick. However, Ibn Bābawayh talks about how the battle before the end of time led by al-Mahdi against the forces of evil will not exterminate Satan – there is no mention of Satan’s death.

To him, knowledge is the key, but knowledge alone is insufficient. It must come through Imamah. Ibn Bābawayh supports the belief of ‘Ali b. Mūsa al-Riḍā, the Eighth Imam, who differentiates himself from dualism, by arguing that he would not assume dualism simply because the events of the physical world are inversely coordinated with each other: day and night, knowledge and ignorance, health and sickness, and life and death. The colours black and white are complemented by red, which is the opposite of both, and everything is in harmony with all the rest. For Ibn Bābawayh, ethics are the centre of religious discussion. For example, he cites the verse in the Qur’an: ‘It was We Who created man, and We know what dark suggestions his soul makes to him: for We are nearer to him than (his) jugular vein.’ On the other hand, al-Mufīd provides a different
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interpretation – God is near in the sense that he can hear what we think or say. However, for Ibn Bābawayh, God is near metaphorically, He is near to those who stand upright and do good.

This leads to the next question: From where does evil come? Are there people born naturally evil, or it is matter of choice, of the freedom of the will? As we have seen, God is described by al-Fārābī, as the First Cause and Prime Mover of the world. This is unlike traditionalists, who would describe God with attributes such as the creator, hearer, listener, and punisher. For al-Rāzī, human *leđah* is the evidence of the combination of matter and the soul, which creates the human being (Adam being the first such combination). This soul (*nafs*) goes through the material world and is exposed to all sorts of hardship, and this was not nature, but they were fashioned this way for a purpose. This *leđah* to improve is the instinct of *Irāda*. It gains wisdom though hardship. This journey improves the soul’s status in the life after death. Ibn Bābawayh stated that within human beings, knowledge preceded desire (*šahwa*). God planted in Adam knowledge (*ma'rifah*) before desire (*šahwa*). For Ibn Bābawayh, like al-Rāzī, *šahwa* in the physical world is attached to matter. Illicit sexual intercourse, excessive amounts of food and pleasure all lead to destruction. He narrated that there are four acts that are opposite to perfection: eagerness to enjoy this world, enviousness, anger, and infatuation (*šahwa*). In *Kamāl al-Dīn* he stressed that these acts are easily recognised by a sane *ʿāql* person, regardless of whether the person is Muslim or not, who abstains from falling into them, for he recognises that they are unethical and whatever is unethical is disliked by God. The will to do good
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precedes evil deeds. For example, idol worship is due to the different versions of God in the different interpretations and cultures. He argues that idol worship is man-made religion that originated with God but was mixed with later analogy (qīyās), causing the faith to divert from its original path into creating new religions. Ibn Bābawayh did not treat this as evil but excused it as a misjudgement — narrated under a title ‘The Cause Behind Worshipping Idols’. Ibn Bābawayh here focuses on how this started as a good intention but then was diverted, creating multiple beliefs. Ibn Bābawayh considers that every child is born with innate knowledge of the existence of a creator.1925 We are all born with freedom to make choices – free will. It is also in our nature to recognise that there is a God.1926 For Ibn Bābawayh, the important thing for existence after death is holding humans accountable to their choice of either loving good or loving evil. What is important here is Ibn Bābawayh did not judge others’ beliefs by Šīʿah consensus, as did al-Mufīd. For Ibn Bābawayh, one should not judge another religion unless we know whether it started based on the belief of God or on something other than God. The start of heretical religions such as idol worshipping and other controversial teachings was not based on the instructions of the Imams or the prophets of the past, but on false desire which he calls analogy.

5.5 The Progression of All living – From ‘aql and Jahl to Maḥḍ al-Ḵayr and Maḥḍ Šar

To abū Bakr al-Rāzī that God emanates intellect onto ‘nafs’, causing it to have an instinct of realisation ‘ta’rrafat’ that after passing through experience of pain and pleasure by the end of the experience, good ‘nafs’ will be drawn towards its original pure world and that should causing it to ascend for eternal world, while the evil ‘nafs’ after passing the experience become entwined with the world and drawn to it and furthest from pure world.1927 Al-Fārābī the evil soul become so entangled with the world become inseparable
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to the point become animals and they are the deceased one. Ibn Katîr added that al-Fârâbî saw the reward after life spiritual not physical; and only when soul has reached its final destination of realisation while the ignorant soul has no place in life after. According to abû Bakr al-Râzî, the soul \textit{nafs} is only energy, it is neither good nor evil, it is innocent. When it turns towards its Evolver (\textit{al-bârî}), it shines with good and when it turns towards prime matter (\textit{hyle}), that is, when it becomes weak by temptation in material world, it leads the soul to pure ignorance \textit{jahl Maḥḍ} and it becomes forgetful. \textit{Hyle} is categorised as pure ignorance.

This leads to the next point, the question about God and man relation the question of theodicy. Did the world come to be naturally or by an involuntary emanation? Al-Fârâbî the soul depends on a prior intellect, by contrast, for al-Râzî the soul is made absolute, an unconditional existence, self-existing and eternal. The term \textit{maḥḍ} was used by Ibn Bâbawayh too. Ibn Bâbawayh states that once both worlds have separated into ultimate good (\textit{maḥḍ al-ḵâyrr}) and ultimate darkness (\textit{maḥḍ Šar}), the point of their separation becomes clear. He continues that there will be no Day of Judgement until justice on earth is first established; this is when good combats evil and ends with the victory of good. As this is one of God’s attributes, ‘justice,’ to bring the dead Imams and their enemies from the dead back to life, and place them in two groups, evil and good in a final battle for clarity and justice. Return is only for those who reached ‘ultimate faith’ (\textit{maḥḍ al-Imān}) or ‘ultimate disbelief’ (\textit{maḥḍ kufr}). As for those neither completely evil nor completely good, they are left for the day of judgement. In the same way, the term \textit{jahl maḥḍ} was used in Ibn Bâbawayh to speak metaphorically of the judgement day when the soul has
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reached its ultimate/pure disbelief or ultimate/pure faith – *(Maḥḍ al-Kufr)* or *(Maḥḍ al-Imān)*. Ibn Bābawayh mentions that a return to life could only happen at the point of reaching *maḥḍ al-kufr* or *maḥḍ al-imān*. The soul after death is like a thin breeze, released to return to its essence (*jawhar*). The eternity of the soul meant the possibility of the past soul’s character being passed on into the future, but not the soul itself. Ibn Bābawayh stated that the return after death is a crucial part of the Imāmī belief. It has to end with two sides: good and evil. This is because for Ibn Bābawayh the soul is eternal, after the death of the body it returns to its world (realm). Al-Mufīd says there is a consensus among the Imamis that people who have died will return to life before the resurrection day. Al-Mufid indicated that Ibn Bābawayh deviated from the consensus and adopted the philosophers’ idea that the soul, which is eternal, passes from one body to another, while the body cannot not be resurrected, since it is made of earthly components and is affected by death.

5.6 Passion as the Energy for Transmigration/Return

One of the discussions among the three thinkers, al-Rāzī, al-Fārābī, and Ibn Bābawayh, related closely to the problem of evil, being about the deceased nations, whether their acts are transferred to the living generation or whether everything simply gets erased. This question is related to God’s justice and how he ultimately will deal with evil. Al-Fārābī asserts that after the death of each generation, it is necessary that their acts are transferred into the next generation due to a process of continuity. As long as the next generation more steadily applies itself to the acts of the preceding generation, their soul becomes stronger and better, ‘clearer’. For example, with the act of writing, the more practice one does, the
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والذي ضح به أبو جعفر رحمه الله في معي الروح النفس هو قول التناسخية بعينه.....والذي حكاه وتوهمه هو مذهب كثير من الفلسفاء التلخدين.  
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more excellence in the art one attains. Due to constant repetition of actions, a soul gains an instinct of wanting more of those actions.\textsuperscript{1940} These acts became more and more a way for feeding into its own pleasure (\textit{iltidād}) (plural for \textit{legah}). Then it reaches the ultimate point of growing to a total independence from the body and losing all the interest in the body reaching completion, or ‘independence’ (\textit{kamāl}).\textsuperscript{1941} When the soul is separated from the body the accidents (\textit{a ṭād}) will vanish, leaving it free. The soul is affected by individuals’ temperament of the bodies, some more and some less, depending on the conditioning of the temperament of the body.\textsuperscript{1942} Hence, we see one generation perish and succeeded by a better one, an improved version of it, even though they have different bodies. However, the accidents are a continuous improvement of the previous one. When their souls meet their own kind among the departed souls, they recognise each other by their good qualities. The newer developed souls, who for example has developed the art of writing, are more advanced in comparison with the souls of the previous generation.\textsuperscript{1943} The soul feels the pleasure of its own achievement whenever it meets with the previous souls and becomes more and more attached to stay with them. This process continues from one generation to another, increasing the strength of the soul and their desire to learn in a continual process until the last human generation.\textsuperscript{1944}

Unlike al-Fārābī, al-Rāzī had his own interpretation of return after death. It depended on the pleasure (\textit{legah}) force, on the principle that everything that diverges from its nature will cause pain and when it returns to its original nature it goes back to peace. Similarly, when a person goes out into the desert and after some distance feels the heat he returns,
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and when he arrives home, he enjoys the coolness which brings peace and happiness.\textsuperscript{1945} To al-Rāzī we are born with an instinct the inner ‘will’ or ‘wanting to do’, (\textit{malakat al-irādah}) and describes it as the key difference between human and animals, the choice of desire to do something, (\textit{leḏah}) an instinct that means when a child has conjunctivitis, he instantly rubs it. He then continued that if this inner desire trained well with knowledge and self-disciplining, it will eventually reach a state in which it is ready to become a philosopher, but he then added but this is rare, whereas when the desire was left loose, it will decline to the level of an animal.\textsuperscript{1946} While al-Fārābī calls this \textit{tašawuq},\textsuperscript{1947} which also means ‘desire’ or ‘wanting’ and he interpret \textit{leḏah} as to have lust to do better, combined with joy (\textit{surūr}).\textsuperscript{1948} On the other hand, al-Mufīd interpreted \textit{leḏah} similar to that of al-Fārābī, meaning the desire for lust and the description he chose is the natural feeling of being drawn to something better.\textsuperscript{1949} Like abū Bakr al-Rāzī, Ibn Bābawayh holds that the soul is eternal and souls are created to live for eternity (\textit{ḵuliqat lil-baqāʾ}), and they become imprisoned when born into a body.\textsuperscript{1950} Ibn Bābawayh says that the personality of a righteous person can return in the afterlife, and an evil character could also return. The personalities good and evil are stored in the metaphysical world until they are brought back into the physical world, after they have found their match perhaps centuries after they have been introduced into the metaphysical world. He writes in \textit{The Creed ‘Al-I tiqādāt’}, that there are several returns which have occurred before and during Islam. He writes that Šī‘ah and non-Šī‘ah individuals will/have return(ed), and Jesus is not the only one to whom this happened.\textsuperscript{1951}
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Ibn Bābawayh addresses the return from the biographies of the prophets, and not from philosophy. For example, Ibn Bābawayh narrated according to Imam al-Riḍā that whatever has happened in pre-Islam with biblical prophets will repeat in Islam too. For example, Jesus returned after death.1952 This is what makes him different from other Muslim philosophers such as al-Rāzī. This can also cause him to be confused with traditionalist thought. Ibn Bābawayh brought philosophy into Islam, but he did so in traditional Muslim garb. He narrated that six evil characters from early times were repeated again in Islamic history. These people were: 'Uṯmān b. 'Affān, Mu‘āwiya, Zīyād b. abī Waqāṣ, abū Mūsa al-Aš’ārī and 'Amrū b. al-‘Āṣ.1953 The return is not limited to righteous people, and even the anti-Christ/deceiver dajjāl lives until the end of time. He then added that if dajjāl can live so long, so should the twelfth Imam.1954 Then he also added, the golden calf which was an idol that was not human and was worshipped by the Israelites during the absence of Moses, returned as 'Uṯmān b. 'Affān. Hāmān the Pharaoh’s wazīr, leading the army against the Israelites and building a tall tower for the Pharaoh so he could climb and see the God of Moses, returned as Zīyād b. Abīh. The pharaoh who fought Moses returned as Mu‘āwiyyah. Korah Qārūn who was known for his rebellious action against Moses, returned as Sa‘īd b. abī Waqāṣ, al-Sāmerī, for his hypocrisy, then was cursed with a skin disease and returned as abī Mūsa al-Aš’ārī. The one who was cursed by the prophet so that he cannot have any descendant (al-Abtar) returned as ‘Amrū b. al-‘Āṣ.1955 Ibn Bābawayh relates that the return is a final sign of the clarity of the Mahdi’s appearance. This is the time when fairness and justice will be evident.1956

5.8 The City of Ignorance: Al-Fārābī, Al-Rāzī, and Ibn Bābawayh
Building on the idea of progression, Ibn Bābawayh narrates that there will be a long period of disappearance of knowledge ґaybah, and ignorance will be the great challenge of society. Ibn Bābawayh here chose ignorance instead of ‘evil doings’ as al-Mufīd also chose. Ignorance is curable with knowledge and strong determination to learn. However, the consequence of ignorance is evil deeds which lead to punishment. He then narrates that there are certain signs that will herald the return of the Mahdi, such as lying becoming the norm, human life having no value, no longer having faith in the Evolver or faith in prayer that can change fate, greed, bribery, princes becoming immoral, people believing liars over the trusted, false witnesses as the norm, kindness considered weakness, and dictatorship being honoured. This view perhaps reflected the political situation of the Šī‘ah at the time. Al-Fārābī described this negative loss of knowledge as ‘the city of ignorance’. It is the opposite of the virtuous city filled with scholars. He considered as a matter of choice whether one follows the revealed knowledge of perfection from the active intellect or ignores it and follows bodily desires and urges that are a product of the lower world. This is what constitutes good and evil, moral good versus immoral evil. Thus, I observe that Ibn Bābawayh and al-Fārābī share a common understanding of the ‘city of ignorance’. Al-Fārābī, in describing the evil city, often refers to it as a city that is attached to matter. He understands matter (hyle) as darkness. The opposite to the excellent city is the city of ignorance, an unethical, wicked place, the city that has deliberately changed its character, possessing faulty judgement that intentionally elevates common, base people over those who are worthy of responsibility. This results in a misguided city (al-Madīna al- نقط). Al-Fārābī posits various levels of depravity for a city. First, there is the city of ignorance which is attached to desire and does not know, appreciate or have the will to grasp true happiness.

They seek pleasure in the material, and their worst enemy is the fear of poverty and sickness. The rulers of these cities are alike in that those in them all depend on their own desires. Second, there is the unethical, wicked city which knows of God’s existence, and the existence of the Active Intellect, but its behaviour is the behaviour of the ignorant cities (al-Mudin al-Jāhiliyyah). Third, there is the city corrupted by ideas which affected their thinking and changed their behaviour to that which is different from their views and behaviour of an excellent city. Fourth, there is the misguided or erroneous city which aims at happiness in life after death, but holds wrong and useless beliefs, and is led by someone who pretends to create an impression of being in receipt of ‘revelation’ when he is merely either a pretender or a fraud. Next, al-Rāzī highlights the good example that we inherited from philosophers to treat people with fairness and be kind to them, with the exception of followers of Mānī and Daysân who believe it is permissible for them to cheat and harm others for their belief differences, in this case you are bound to expose their belief through the use of kalām. Al-Rāzī explains that the existence of ignorance is not left out, and it has accompanied humans as part of human nature, along with curiosity. Abū Bakr al-Rāzī stated that the world of hyle is where evil has more power than good and not the other way around.

Moving on to Ibn Bābawayh, there is no doubt that Ibn Bābawayh dealt with Satan as a metaphorical figure who represents immoral human acts, but not as you would normally expect from monotheistic religious teaching, which understands Satan as a real being, a person. He emphasizes that the central character of Satan is his envy of Adam as the verse stated ‘I am better than Adam’ and not what he looks like. He emphasises this envy in
another verse where Satan is described as (zanīm) evil and arrogant. Ibn Bābawayh narrates that Adam and Eve envied what they saw about their offspring such as the Prophet, 'Alī, and Faṭimah. They thought that by eating from the forbidden tree they would attain knowledge. On their repentance, God inspired them with prayers to seek forgiveness.

The general approach is to seek answers about knowledge and its source, and to find a logical answer to understand God in connection with man and his involvement in creating the physical body and metaphysical soul of mankind. This is where Ibn Bābawayh separates the divine light (nūr) that came through twelve veils, from the analogy of Lucifer who was confused for basing his judgement on comparison with Adam and not following God’s revelation.

5.7 Purification and Ascension

According to Ibn Bābawayh, the soul that originated from God still has the spark of God, and when the body is asleep the soul is practically free and can travel near the divine realm. The human soul is trapped inside a physical body; its freedom depending on purity of the lineage and clarity of the mind through regular meditation. Ibn Bābawayh explains regarding the soul of sleepers that the soul departs. The reason for its departure from the body is that sleep means it is attracted to its source, in the same way that light is connected to its source, the sun. In the opposite direction is the ascension from the physical world to the metaphysical. The Prophet journeying to God during his famous Night Journey is going back to the source, a journey crossing veils which is sometimes described as heavens between the Prophet and God. This all depends on how the human being is entangled with the material world. The freer one is, the more likely his soul has a chance of a blessed journey. The journey is not physical, but it is a journey of clarity and often the objects seen
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1965 Ibn Bābawayh, Maʿānī al-Aḵbār, p. 149.
1966 Ibid., p. 125.
1968 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Amālī, p. 145.
in the journey are metaphorical. This could lead to the thought that the visions of the Prophet Muḥammed about angels were shaped how they imagined what the angels look like, by their access to the traditions or the historical and mythological themes. For example, for Ibn Bābawayh, removing sins makes the soul lighter in weight and closer to God. He narrates that, according to Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, the soul of the righteous who live their life by virtue and ethics is connected with the ṛūḥ of God.\textsuperscript{1970} The human body and soul has each individually six states: health, sickness, death, life, being awake, and sleep. As for the soul, the life of the soul is knowledge and ignorance is its death, sickness is its doubt, and health is its awareness, sleep is its lack of awareness, and wakefulness is its memory.\textsuperscript{1971}

5.8 Conclusion

5.8.1 Rationalist Interpretation of The Three Issues

The three figures al-Fārābī, al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh, besides being mutakalimūn and philosophers, all had major impacts upon the interpretation of the soul, cosmology, and the vision of the ideal state. Ibn Bābawayh, of course, was Šīʿah. Al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī, who were Sunnī, nevertheless worked closely with Šīʿah in a Šīʿah influenced environment. Al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī speak mainly of philosophy, while Ibn Bābawayh is a theologian. Their work collectively is relevant to this thesis because they emphasise approach – the importance of the authority created by the religious text, such as the Qur’an and Ḥadīṣ. They are relevant because they focus on issues of parallel importance to a multicultural society. Before establishing the Imamah they have to be careful that they do not contradict the philosophical arguments of the time. The five points that were discussed that are relevant to Ibn Bābawayh are: no eternal Qur’an, free will, eternity of the soul, no infallibility, and the return. These five points had a definite philosophical backing that was

\textsuperscript{1971} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{Al-Tawhīd}, p. 300.
focused by al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī into four important issues: God’s transcendence, the existence of evil, Imamah, and return to life after death. Ibn Bābawayh was indebted to his predecessors Abū Sahl al-Nubaḵtī, al-Fārābī, and al-Rāzī, in framing the discussed issues in a particular way. We have seen that Muslims of the ninth and tenth century accepted philosophy as a normal practice. Philosophers such as al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī were predominantly accepted and both worked closely with the Sultāns, likewise al-Nubaḵtī. Al-Nubaḵtī, in particular, worked closely with Ibn Bābawayh’s father. Al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī highlighted critical philosophical issues of theological significance to Ibn Bābawayh. In this study, I have come to a summary that uses four themes from al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī’s structures which are relevant to my study of Ibn Bābawayh’s scheme: God’s intervention, the existence of evil, Imamah, and return. It is important to note, that al-Nubaḵtī’s ideas were very possibly influenced by his close associates, and he worked within an intellectual environment which was shared with Christian thinkers.

Amir-Moezzi has also observed the influence of Christianity on Šīʿism, as was discussed in section 2.3. The Greek, Aristotelian thinking was the new trend, replacing Manichaeism and Bardaisanism. This is where Ibn Bābawayh separates from the rest of the Šīʿah. The three thinkers all spoke in nearly identical terms. For example, all used ‘intellect’ and ‘light’ and all meant basically the same thing by these terms. However, sometimes they would use the same term with different meanings. For example, all spoke of ‘angels’, but al-Fārābī understood this as the Prophet’s faculty of imagination at work on the emanations he was receiving. There were no actual ‘angels’ with wings. Al-Rāzī was no different, and in this sense, neither was Ibn Bābawayh. But Ibn Bābawayh does not frame his conception of ‘angels’ quite the way that al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī do. For Ibn Bābawayh, ‘angels’ are a metaphor. The version of transmigration which was rejected by al-Nubaḵtī was identical to the school of Greek philosophy which was adopted by Ibn
Bābawayh and al-Rāzī. Al-Nubakṭī was Aristotelian and rejected all the old Greek philosophers. Ibn Bābawayh and al-Rāzī, on the other hand, were both more Platonic.

5.8.2 God’s Transcendence

5.8.2.1 Ethics / Nāmūs

There is no distinction from one religion to another; the argument was never about Islam being lesser than, or superior to, another belief. In fact, al-Rāzī, al-Fārābī, and Ibn Bābawayh spoke of nāmūs as the revealed virtues present in all religions. They understood that, for other religions, the Qur’an was not considered the ultimate truth. It has verses that are irrelevant and are not related to other communities, it is related to a specific time and is consequently limited in scope. The religion is based on abstract ethical concepts open to interpretation. Different God-like figures have been described from one religion to another. The difference between belief systems or doctrines is found in the descriptions of manifestations of the Evolver; each individual community has elaborated its own set of manifestations, leading to conflicts between cultural interpretations, which consequently have developed into new religions or movements. The differences in the descriptions of the divine reality have therefore created different traditions.

5.8.2.2 The World as a Training Camp for the Soul

For our three thinkers, al-Rāzī, al-Fārābī, and Ibn Bābawayh, there was a great emphasis upon free will. They would argue that it is fruitless to say that human senses and faculties have no purpose. In every moment of our lives, we rely on these senses and faculties. God, in creating the world, did not create them in vain. He is like an architect who plans a house to be equipped suitable for humans and equipped with senses: smell, sight, hearing, and touching. Thus, we should not blame the architect if problems occur.

Abū Bakr al-Rāzī agrees with the physician Galen. He stated that the body is shaped according to the character of the soul (nafs) and not vis-à-vis; with its own essence
(jawhar), and each jawhar having its own independent self (ḏāt). When creation begins, the tools shape and select the body according to the character of the jawhar. If the jawhar illustrates bravery and strength, the body will be that of a lion, but if the jawhar is that of a ḏāt coward the body will be that of a rabbit with the ability to run fast away from danger. Ibn Bābawayh goes further and narrates that the body is a vehicle, and each soul is fitted for its own kind. For example, he writes that some people may be born poor because it might be better for their faith to begin poor rather than rich, while others who were created in rich conditions might benefit, since being born poor could have a negative effect on their faith.

5.8.2.3 Sin

We have shown that to al-Rāzī there is no such thing called ‘Evil’. Evil is a phenomenon describing lust and love to the world of the material. An evil person is someone who is envious and takes pleasure in hurting people, and is displeased when positive things happen to people. Al-Rāzī argues that God in relation to us is like a father who watches his child from a distance but does not interfere. His child, which is the nafs, needs to experience the material (hyle) until he learns about pain and through experiencing the struggle and sorrow will gain the realisation of the importance of analogy. It also leads him to humble himself and gain knowledge. Thus, evil is curable and temporary, not eternal. Ibn Bābawayh speaks of evil in a way similar to al-Rāzī. He relates evil to character traits such as arrogance, envy, lying, deception, lust for political power, which, for Ibn Bābawayh, all have their root in ignorance. He narrates that God
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1973 Ibn Bābawayh, Al-Tawḥīd, p. 400.
knew the souls are noble soul but naive, if they were left alone they will start thinking they are associated with God and out of mercy God let them mix with the bodies to experience life starting within seeking sustenance they will experience the challenge of evil and start develop awareness and from that they will start to learn the value of reward and punishment with this journey. God did not leave human alone He sends messengers and prophets to prepare for life after and teach them ‘religion’ to humble themselves before God. The evolver al-Bārī’ has assembled souls inside bodies. There is a wisdom behind putting them together. The purpose of the body to feed the soul with senses, through experiencing life learning its limitations and with religious practices teaching the souls humbleness. souls without body is senseless and body without soul lifeless, again he shares with qadarīyah doctrine that destiny and actions are important to each other like soul and body. For Ibn Bābawayh, theodicy means that God’s inability to eliminate evil has left humans to do this job.

5.8.2.4 God’s Responsibilities

Al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī illustrated God’s responsibilities in creating the world and free will. For al-Fārābī, the appetite (al-qūwa al-nuzūʿ iah) and the faculty of ‘like or dislike’ (tašawuq) are the forces that drive human beings. By contrast, for al-Rāzī, human free will originates in ‘sensation’ (leḏah), which God put in the nafs. Without the instinct of (leḏah) the human will be like a rock that has no freedom to make choices.

Al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī also differed on what initiates the human choice, is it tašawuq or is it leḏah? For al-Fārābī, infatuation (ʿišq) is the appetitive faculty which is ‘like or dislike’ (tašawuq), which is responsible for the body’s performance of acts such as
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reaching out a limb, hand, or foot. By contrast, al-Rāzī rejects using the term ‘išq. God had already implanted in the human beings the desire of pleasure (leḍah). Through it, human freedom of will can be elevated through seeking knowledge and rejecting bodily pleasures. Ibn Bābawayh, like al-Rāzī, rejects the term ‘išq and links it with falsehood (bāṭil). Both avoid using the term ‘išq because it can be interpreted as lust/infatuation and not passion. The key to success is longing for knowledge. Those whose psyche naturally longs for knowledge are those who reach salvation. Ibn Bābawayh does not speak about leḍah because he is not a physician, as al-Rāzī was, but he says we all have a natural instinct to be attracted to good moral character in another person. Therefore, he concludes that only good people can appreciate and recognise a scholar or an Imam.

5.8.3 Abstracts of Knowledge

In relation to knowledge, Ibn Bābawayh is similar to al-Fārābī. Knowledge is continuously emanated as abstract concepts. It simply needs someone with the gifting of divine faculty to decode it. For al-Fārābī, one can acquire this talent of decoding through poetic and linguistic training. But, for Ibn Bābawayh, this one occurs in the Prophet’s lineage. One must be born with divine faculty and then, in addition, demonstrate the faculties of imagination and of knowledge. Similar to al-Rāzī, who says revelation is just old wives’ tales, Ibn Bābawayh, from a religious point of view, see emanations as real, but the revelation, that is, the actualisation of the emanation, is created in the mind of the prophet within the context of the prophet’s time. Therefore, for Ibn Bābawayh, there will never be an eternal revelation, because the interpretation of abstract concepts can vary from one prophet to another or from one philosopher to another. The interpretation of abstract concepts emanated from above occurs in the context of the time in which it is received, namely the political, economic, sociological, and geographical context. The revelation is
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the response to human actions or events. It is seen as a dialogue between the Evolver and his people. Al-Mufid and Ibn Bābawayh differ on whether God intervenes in human life or not. Ibn Bābawayh does not address the issue of whether God can know about individual events. Al-Mufīd, on the other hand, does address this issue (see section 3.4.5). The concept of a non-intervening, anthropomorphic God, who does not intervene in human life or cause things to happen or prevent humans from falling into foolish acts, is religiously unsatisfying. Ibn Bābawayh speaks of angels metaphorically; they are simply emanations, lights. They do not possess authority and power to keep the world in order. They do not intervene on God’s behalf.

5.8.4 The Problem of Evil

For al-Rāzī, God’s intervention would mean that the world would be made like a training camp, ready for humans to live gaining knowledge and awareness to enable humans to be prepared for life after Utopia. To go through the journey, the soul needs to reach full awareness of a philosopher and Imam equipped with virtues and devotion. To Ibn Bābawayh, there are negative energies of evil in every individual human mind, logically co-ordinating with human wickedness. This kind of evil is discussed in works of Kamāl al-Dīn. He claims the Imams’ death in martyrdom is necessary as the sign for human liberation of ignorance and whether the Imams poisoned or killed in the war does not matter; it is the fact that they were killed by those who knew their role that matters. The aim of their story is first to inspire love for one’s own Maker; humanity was at first spiritually and morally good, but temptation hindered us and we chose to be miserable and evil. According to Al-Rāzī, God does not intervene in the world he created. There is no point in God having created an imperfect world and then creating an infallible being as a counter to evil. Al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh reject dualism, the idea that evil is equal to God. If this were true, it would create an autonomous universe, in which God could not intervene. What difference does belief in God make in our expectations? The purpose of
this world is not paradise. It is rather that this world is a place for the human soul (nafs) to grow into adulthood. For al-Rāzī, this world is a place not for immediate pleasure but a place for the realisation of human potential.

In this discussion, I argue that in al-Rāzī’s mind God is no longer to be held responsible for the acts of humanity. If God were represented by a man on earth and if this man turned out to be corrupted – that is, corrupted by human standards and laws – he would be held accountable for his acts and punished. By contrast, God’s will in traditional Islam is unquestionable and the person who represents God such as prophet, Imam, or caliph enjoys worldly authority. In the logic of al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh, no human is perfect. Ibn Bābawayh maintains that nothing exists without its opposite. Evil thus has a necessary existence in a moral system. The theology of redemption expressed, for example, in illness, is a necessary part of purification from sin, as is the arduous effort involved in journeying to religious shrines across different lands, exposing the traveller to illness, robbery and other dangers.1984 The narrative that we deduce from the texts that Ibn Bābawayh approves, suggests that Adam was not the reason for sin. He did not create sin for us to inherit, But Adam rather serves as an example of human beings. The death of the eleven Imams has two purposes: it serves as a wakeup call for the human instinct of what is right and wrong, and the experience of being martyred helps the Imams to elevate into mahd ḫayr. By contrast, their enemies will decline to mahd Šar.

5.8.4.1 Physical Evil

In the literature of theodicy, evil is of two kinds: moral evil is the evil done by humans, such as cruel, unjust, vicious, and perverse thoughts; natural evil is independent of human actions, such as earthquakes, storms, droughts, tornadoes, disease, etc. To Ibn Bābawayh, humankind through its life and struggles develops responsibility in its creaturely world and
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becomes accountable for its actions, while God is responsible for the existence of the creaturely world within which we should live responsibly.

5.8.4.2 The Problem of Evil and an All Powerful and All Good God

Ibn Bābawayh argues that God is perfectly good. He must want to abolish all evil. If He is unlimitedly powerful, then He must abolish all evil, but nevertheless evil exists; therefore, either God is not unlimitedly powerful, or He is not perfectly good. In al-Mufīd’s interpretation, evil is the creation of God, separate from good as a test for mankind. Ibn Bābawayh argues that whatever occurred before this nation and will repeat in this nation, for example, multiple nations experienced life and death, the companions of Moses who doubted his message returned after death, believed in him, lived their life, had children, grew old and died, likewise with the Qur’anic example group of people returned to life after three hundred years being dead who. After providing a number of verses proving that the return (rajʿah) is inevitable trial; Ibn Bābawayh concluded that rajʿah unlike tanāsuḵ, it has heaven and hell. By way of contrast, in a dualist approach, evil is parallel in power with God and both oppose each other for eternity, Ibn Bābawayh argue that Šīʿah groups such as Sabʾīa, Ismaili and Qarāmiṭa they claim it is necessary to have an Imam continually, therefore his return after death, is certain, they are no different from dualist followers of Mānī, claim, that he performed miracles. Hence, humans, when first born, begin their life as morally immature, but through struggle begin to develop moral sense, leading towards ultimate perfection and maturity. Ibn Bābawayh narrated that if a person is ignorant of the difference between good and evil, that means that his level of intelligence
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Qur’an 2:56: [Then We revived you after your death that perhaps you would be grateful].
Qur’an 18:25: […they stayed in their Cave three hundred years, and (some) add nine (more)].
is like an animal.\textsuperscript{1989} Then quoted a verse from Qur’an 21:35 ‘and We test you with good and evil as a trial’ (\textit{wa nablūakum bil-Šar wa al-ḵayr fitnah}), he, commented that evil meant inflicted with sickness.\textsuperscript{1990} In this reasoning, it is necessary for physical evil to exist in our world; without it, there could be no training for the soul to progress.\textsuperscript{1991} Ibn Bābawayh calls this process ‘return’ (\textit{raj’ah}), whereby the natural process of the evolution of human thoughts gives humans the freedom with which they are created, but within this process is the struggle to survive in harsh conditions and surroundings The natural human instinct is to survive and flourish. For God, moral and natural evils are necessary to struggle against. They are parts of the process towards perfection. To al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh, this is a process best described as the human transformation from immaturity. Ultimately, humans will be divided according to their own choice, their own free will, into two groups: those with \textit{maḥḍ al-ḵayr} versus those with \textit{maḥḍ al-šar}.

The problem of evil seems to be resolved by the return. Al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh share a similar argument that justice will only be established when humankind reaches scholarly maturity. Then goodness will prevail. Humans will continue in the cycle of return until they have reached ultimate good (\textit{maḥḍ al-ḵayr}) or ultimate evil (\textit{maḥḍ al-šar}). The ultimate good, which is the virtuous state, will win.

5.8.5 Imamah

5.8.5.1 Prophets, the Virtuous State, and the Virtuous Leader

The ideal ruler who has moral and intellectual virtues combines prophecy and philosophy, all in harmony. He must have clarity in his speech and expression (\textit{ḥusn al-ta’būr}) to communicate with the public.\textsuperscript{1992} Reason does not make one a heretic. Reason should not stop one from believing in Islam, or in the prophet of Islam receiving prophecy.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1990} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{al-Tawḥīd}, p. 359.
\item \textsuperscript{1991} Ibn Bābawayh, \textit{īllal al-Šarāyeʿ}, vol 1, p. 15., and \textit{al-Tawḥīd}, p. 402.
\end{itemize}
In the case of the visionary experience of the prophet Muḥammed in hearing the voice of the angel Gabriel reciting the Qur’an, al-Fārābī argues that there is a difference between human beings in their faculty of perception (muḵayīlah) and in their imagination (taḵayyul).¹⁹⁹³ Some people naturally attain the gift of imagination, which in Ibn Bābawayh’s understanding is ‘divine faculty’, which allows them to receive and decode abstract concepts from the emanations. Then, if they can demonstrate intellectual skills, they are a prophet.¹⁹⁹⁴ The demonstrative skills linked with communication are the art of eloquence.¹⁹⁹⁵ Those who have such faculties are described as prophets or Imams, and are capable of receiving the emanations of abstract concepts and explaining them and refuting illogic.¹⁹⁹⁶ The ideal leader has a way of achieving ‘moral maturity’ madīnah fāḍilah. Thus, when the people reach maturity, then they will realise their need to be led in their lives by morality and virtue, and that would lead them to the seek the ideal virtuous ruler. Al-Rāzī, on the other hand, rejected poetry as having anything to do with being gifted as prophet. In fact, he saw human intellects as having advantages over prophecy. For Ibn Bābawayh, because God is fair and just, He did not leave earth without Imamah. However, the historical reality is that Imams were executed by the greedy caliphs because they feared them being hailed as the expected successors to the Prophet. It can be argued that Ibn Bābawayh’s understanding of the soul nafs was similar to al-Rāzī’s. For both of them, nafs originated from the intellect as one kind, the soul is capable of developing knowledge independently without the need for revelation. By contrast, for al-Mufīd, knowledge can only be developed with the assistance of prophets and Imams.¹⁹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁹³ Al-Fārābī, Kitāb Ārā’ ahl al-Madinah al-Fāḍilah, pp. 89 and 114., and al-Fārābī in Ed._ Walzer, Al-Farabi on The Perfect State, pp. 172 and 222.
¹⁹⁹⁴ Al-Fārābī, Kitāb Ārā’ ahl al-Madinah al-Fāḍilah, p. 125., and Al-Fārābī in Ed._ Walzer, Al-Farabi on The Perfect State, p. 244.
5.8.5.2 No Infallibility

Al-Rāzī wrote about the prophets’ mistakes and faults. Ibn Bābawayh wrote similarly, arguing that prophets and imams are fallible beings. For Ibn Bābawayh, it is ġulāt999 (‘exaggeration and a lie’) to claim that the prophets and Imams were infallible.2000 This is because for Ibn Bābawayh God does not intervene in mortal life. By contrast, the idea of a divine human being or Imam within Šīʿī Imāmī did not have theological merit until Hišām b. al-Ḥakam, who introduced an argument that made break through the speculative theology fataqa al-Kalām fī al-Imāmah and introduced the principle of Imamah as part of God’s merciful nature, He would not leave earth without an infallible Imam to lead people to piety.2001 However, al-Fārābī did not see prophecy on its own as a complete system. He speaks of how an ideal ruler is to achieve intellectual and moral virtues. He is to be someone who has the ability to combine prophecy and philosophy, what he calls an ideal religious and political leadership.2002

5.8.5.3 14 Heavens / 14 Key Šīʿah Figures

A common term employed is that God is known as the ‘Prime Mover’. For al-Fārābī, the creation of the world came to be through a single act of God’s emanation, which was also responsible for creating the celestial world, heavens, and planets, resulting in creation beneath the moon. But for al-Rāzī the world was made out of five elements, and God is one of them. The idea of a series of intellectual emanations was adopted not just by al-Fārābī, but by the al-Kirmānī Šīʿah Islmailis too. Ibn Bābawayh did not seem to agree with everything that logicians had to say, but certainly showed a keen interest in connecting
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998 Ibn Al-Nadim, al-Fihrist, p. 363.
999 There are two interpretations of ġulāt, which is what Šīʿah scholars call exaggerators and extremists and what Sunnī scholars call the Šīʿah who rejected Abū Bakr and ʿUmar. Both Šīʿah and Sunnīs use this term to describe narrators whom they see as unreliable.
the two worlds, the metaphysical world with our world. He saw that in the ascension traditions, the number of heavens between humans and God is seven heavens and seven skies, which adds up to the number the fourteen, which is also the number of the Imams including the Prophet and Fāṭimah. By contrast, from the underworld, there are seven levels more, and it took Lucifer Iblīs 12,000 years of devotion to be raised one level.2004

5.8.5.4 Return

Al-Fārābī understood regarding the souls of the people of the Cities of Ignorance (al-Mudīn al-Jāhilīyah), that, due to their focus on the lower world they consequently lose their chance to remain as human. Their souls are destined to vanish completely or to be born into an animal such as cattle or a predatory animal and then die.2005 On the contrary, Ibn Ḥazīm, narrates from al-Rāzī’s work al-‘ilm al-Ilāhī, that, an example of transmigration of the soul, you see a human acts different from his surrounding, this is because he came from different place and brought with it character of previous person.2006 Ibn Taymiyyah describes the belief of Harnānīn, being that the world was created to detach the human soul (nafs) from the world and to recall its true happiness with God. This can only be attained through the growth of the soul in the cycle of return, until one day, it stays forever with its lord.2007 I argue that these traditions were compiled for a reason. Namely, to communicate philosophical truth to the common, traditionalist, religious mind. Ibn Bābawayh used the Imams as examples, not because he personally believed they were infallible, because he did not believe that, but, rather because the common people venerated them. Thus, in this sense, he is Imāmī. But, from a philosophical point of view, he belongs to the Platonic school as interpreted by al-Rāzī. Ibn Bābawayh was trying to find the balance between God’s transcendence and his being ‘the Just’. That is, he wanted to

address the problem of evil. For example, take the issue of occultation and the return before the end of time. Ibn Bābawayh considers the return of the Imams (rājʿah) as inevitable. Then the world will become a struggle of good versus evil, from which justice will prevail to establish a world made into a utopia. He argues that people will be brought from the dead into life again, both the Imams and their enemies. Ultimately, the return can only be for those who have strong energy in their soul, which is required for them to reach either ultimate good (mahḍ al-Imān) or ultimate unbelief (mahḍ kufr). For Ibn Bābawayh, the soul survives eternally, but by contrast for al-Mufīd it does not. For instance, al-Mufīd believes that eternal punishment is conducted by the angels. This leads to the next question: is God responsible for the existence of evil? In Ibn Bābawayh’s interpretation of God’s transcendence, he asks whether God is actively involved with humans, or descends into the human world. Ibn Bābawayh was clearly different from al-Kulaynī and al-Mufīd. But he is similar to al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī’s interpretations, more precisely about cosmology, and the soul living in the world as a training camp. I have demonstrated that Ibn Bābawayh’s thoughts did not exist in a vacuum. Philosophical, political, and religious contexts all contributed to shaping his answers to such questions.

Conclusion to the Thesis

The title of this thesis has asked the question as to whether Ibn Bābawayh is a follower of Ḥadīṭ or a follower of philosophy. I have sought to explore the possibilities of Ibn Bābawayh as being much more than a Ḥašawī and I have shown that he goes beyond being just a follower of Ḥadīṭ. I have cautiously argued that, from Ibn Bābawayh’s interpretation of a variety of themes, we can best situate him among the 10th century Muslim philosophical thinkers, but a thinker cleverly veiled with traditionalist imagery. I have further argued that we should consider Ibn Bābawayh as an independent thinker, not to be classed with al-Kulaynī or Ḥašawī. My work highlights how subtle Ibn Bābawayh is, and how he is often incorrectly grouped together with mainstream Šī‘ah. Furthermore, I have explored the hypothesis that his work may have been shaped, both directly and indirectly, by Aristotelian and Platonic thought. This I have shown likely occurred through Muslim thinkers such as al-Nubakṭī, al-Rāzī, and al-Fārābī. Why then, might we think of Ibn Bābawayh as an independent thinker? First, we cannot group Ibn Bābawayh’s ḥadīṭ out of the context of his entire work in order to find superficial links with other traditionalist Šī‘ah narrators. He lived in a time and place, in the Sultan’s court, where philosophy was always present. Equally, we cannot take terms from al-Fārābī and apply them to all Muslim philosophy, assuming all are the same because all believe in Greek philosophy. Also, we cannot ignore those who believed (ḥulūliyyah). ḥulūliyyah ideas which were already circulating in Ibn Bābawayh’s time. There were powerful political issues at stake. When the caliphate was weak there were many contenders for the rulership, all searching for followers as believers to take over the state. Ibn Bābawayh was different from other Šī‘ah compilers: his aim went beyond compiling the teachings of Imams saving it from being lost. He had to face this tense political climate, building his arguments by using ḥadīṭ against ḥadīṭ. Because Šī‘ah were dominant, he focused upon Šī‘ah ḥadīṭ. In regard to Imamah and martyrdom, Ibn Bābawayh chose Jesus.
as an example in defence of Imamah, while al-Mufīd uses John the Baptist’s martyrdom as his evidence of Imamah. Ibn Bābawayh used Jesus as a model of suffering, the pattern which played out in the sufferings and martyrdoms of the eleven Imams. Al-Mufīd, however, did not do this. Unlike Ibn Bābawayh, he did not see that standing for truth necessarily entails suffering and death. He put the responsibility for the deaths of the Imams on the people who were not strong enough in their faith, who did not gather sufficiently to the Imams. Even in the ḥadīth, Ibn Bābawayh looked for a good, reliable chain of narrators, while al-Mufīd did not. Al-Mufīd was only concerned with what his peers in the Šīʿah community agreed upon. It was sect-based belief. Hence, we see al-Mufīd denigrated the importance of Ibn Bābawayh’s ḥadīth skills and replaced it with the idea that there were four hundred books of ḥadīth which Ibn Bābawayh did not use; and Ibn Bābawayh only used eleven. In actuality, Ibn Bābawayh was significantly stricter in his ḥadīth criteria than anyone else. He excluded a number of groups and narrators. By contrast, others were more inclusive. He had the skills to represent Šīʿah as an independent school of thought in the Sultān’s court. For example, he was so skilful that his Sunnī peers narrated ḥadīth which came through him, for example, al-Ḥākim and Aṣbahānī. Also, thinkers such as Tawḥīdī, who met with Ibn Bābawayh and asked him about his views on the authenticity of the Qur’an. Tawḥīdī did not follow Ibn Bābawayh, but he wanted to know Ibn Bābawayh’s views. Furthermore, in his visit to Bağdād, he narrated traditions that experts in ḥadīth had never heard before. He knew that his city of Qom had kept its old traditions from the companions of ʿAlī. This Bağdād did not have. The Sultān of Rayy, Rukn al-Dawlah, was known for his interest in philosophy, and both al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh, years later after al-Rāzī had died, worked for al-Dawlah. Ibn Bābawayh challenges the idea of infallibility when virtually no one else of his time does. Al-Kulaynī and al-Mufīd did not deny infallibility. This means that Ibn Bābawayh is a unique and independent thinker. The difference between Ibn Bābawayh and al-Mufīd is clear. Ibn Bābawayh discusses
infallibility from a philosophical point of view, that humans are made of two components, body and soul. He was stuck to this interpretation and did not deviate from it. He makes the soul superior to the body and argues that any soul inside a body is exposed to the corruptibility, limitations, and desires of the body. Thus, it is impossible, even for a perfect soul, to be infallible when combined with a fallible body.

Al-Mufīd, on the other hand, focused more on sectarian, traditionalist ideology, that Imams are infallible because they represent the force of good which fights evil (this is identical to the Manichaeism of the time). Also, al-Mufīd’s ideology includes thought from Bardaisanism, in particular the idea that God does not leave earth without an Imam who mirrors God on earth. Thus, al-Mufīd is highly influenced by dualism; by contrast, Ibn Bābawayh openly opposed dualism. Yes, al-Mufīd might on occasion declare himself opposed to Persian religion, but in actuality he was infested with it and did not realise it, because it was so engrained in the Šī‘ah of his time. Ibn Bābawayh had the philosophical training to know the difference, al-Mufīd did not. Furthermore, Ibn Bābawayh requires philosophical justification for all religious teaching including the teaching of the Imam. For example, Ibn Bābawayh focuses upon Imam Riḍā, and this is not without reason. Imam Riḍā worked with the Caliph, al-Mā‘mūn, against rival Šī‘ah movements. At the same time, al-Mā‘mūn is the one who brought Greek philosophy to the court. Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh saw himself in a similar situation. Greek philosophy was not his enemy. Neither were the Sunnīs. Rather, his enemies were Šī‘ah dualists, and other extremists who were anti-state and were taking advantage of the Šī‘ah followers. Hence, this is why we find that he is the only one among his peers, who spoke openly about the brother of Imam Riḍā, Zayd al-Nār, as being an extremist for following the traditions of the Šī‘ah of Kūfā. Moreover, Ibn Bābawayh was highly creative in his theological thinking. To begin with, he had a unique teaching on occultation which no other Sunnī nor Šī‘ah had. It is true that other religions of the time held beliefs about a Messiah figure whose coming was delayed, namely the Jews.
and Christians, and in this distant eschatological hope he was not unique and he did not clash with them. Yet, his main enemies were the political Šī‘ah sects, the Ismaili and the Zaydī, as well as the hulūliyah, who looked for the Mahdi immediately, to come and overthrow the Caliph. For these rival sects, there is no point in Mahdi going on occultation. Al-Mufīd, on the other hand, held a third view, namely that by promoting Šī‘aism and gathering followers, the coming of Mahdi would be hastened. Thus, all Ibn Bābawayh’s contemporaries believed in some way in the speedy coming of the Mahdi, by contrast, Ibn Bābawayh emphatically did not. He made the clear point that with the occultation, religion is complete. Moreover, his teaching on occultation was unique in the following ways. First, his concept of ‘the history of the prophets’ and how God reveals his plan to get to Mahdi was unique. As we saw in al-Fārābī and al-Rāzī, progression in intellect was essential. Ibn Bābawayh too, had to find theological ground for the idea of progression in the history of the prophets. He compares early prophets with later prophets, for example, Adam is a simple model. Adam was simple and uneducated. Later prophets had better intellectual skills. For example, Jesus was more advanced than Moses, and Muhammed was more advanced than Jesus. The one caveat to this progression is that Ibn Bābawayh would not see the twelve Imams as progressing among themselves. Thus, Mahdi is not greater than ʿAlī. Al-Kulaynī, on the other hand, does view Mahdi as greater than ʿAlī. For Ibn Bābawayh, the importance of progression in the ‘history of the prophets’ came to him directly from the Mahdi, who spoke to him in a dream. For Ibn Bābawayh, progression ties in with the return of the soul. The way Ibn Bābawayh speaks of the soul is identical with al-Rāzī, and distinct from al-Fārābī and other Muslim thinkers. For Ibn Bābawayh, the soul is eternal, it has intellectual curiosity, and when it comes into a physical body, it has a free will. Al-Fārābī, however, referred to the term ‘infatuation’ ‘išq, as the essence of the soul, while Ibn Bābawayh is opposed to the idea of ‘infatuation’, seeing it as a sin. Ibn Bābawayh was also similar to al-Rāzī in using terms like ‘ultimate good’ and ‘ultimate evil’. Ibn
Bābawayh speaks of multiple cycles of the soul, which do not necessarily occur in immediate succession; the cycle could occur over centuries. Progression continues, even over great spans of time. Al-Mufīd openly criticised Ibn Bābawayh for following Greek understandings of the eternality of the soul. For, Ibn Bābawayh, the final destiny of the human race is the establishment of the ‘virtuous state’ he call it the true state (dawlatu l-ḥaq), where everyone has ultimate knowledge. A Greek version of this would be utopia, with everyone being a philosopher. Next comes the matter of the separation of religion from the state because of occultation. I acknowledge Ibn Bābawayh’s ‘political’ involvement. He debated in the court of the Sulṭān. He was one of the most influential figures in Šī‘ah Kurāsān. However, for Ibn Bābawayh, the religion is complete and therefore there was occultation. He even wrote a manual for those who have no Imam. People can follow his manual if they want to live a religious life, and they do not need to follow the dualist movements. Only in the case of a dispute can one go to an expert in hadīṯ. Al-Mufīd, by contrast, said that occultation occurred because God was angry with the human race and therefore removed the blessing of the Imamah. Ibn Bābawayh taught that all political power belonged to the Sulṭān and not to the community of the offspring of the Prophet, because of the occultation of the Mahdi. Therefore, he denied the continued legality of the Fifth (ḵums). Therefore, he allowed prayer in different languages besides Arabic.

Next, Ibn Bābawayh, in contrast to his peers, was a universalist in his doctrine of the ‘cycle of progression of the soul’. By universalist, we mean that he spoke not only of Islam, but understood religion as ethics, not the reverse, not the ‘ethics of religion’. In understanding religion as ethics, he was able to include all the religious minorities in the Sulṭānate of Rayy. His ethics were based upon the consensus of cultures, not just upon Islam. Furthermore, for Ibn Bābawayh, there is no continuation of the conscious person, therefore no material rewards in Heaven or punishments in Hell. This is very much like al-
Rāzī, but very different from traditional Muslim (ḥašawī). Finally, in this thesis I have shown that the following twelve key arguments link Ibn Bābawayh and al-Rāzī: First, Ibn Bābawayh wrote a book on law Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh. He explicitly stated in his introduction that he was following the example of al-Rāzī’s work on medicine. Thus, we cannot deny Ibn Bābawayh’s awareness of al-Rāzī’s work and methodology, and his favourable disposition towards al-Rāzī. Moreover, Rayy was a city heavily influenced by al-Rāzī’s philosophy and it was a common practice to use his interpretation of the soul. After the conflict with the logician of Buḵāra, Ibn Bābawayh, in 963/352, started his two books Kamāl al-Dīn and al-Ḵiṣāl. In Kamāl al-Dīn, he mentioned the conflict with the logician and that it was damaging to the community. In al-Ḵiṣāl, he began to promote the idea about the soul. It was very much like Galen’s. Kamāl al-Dīn was a typical work designed for believers based on prophetic stories that were available at the time. In al-Ḵiṣāl on the other hand, he spoke more directly about soul and human intellect, and even about cosmological hierarchy, directed at those who were familiar with stoic/natural philosophy. It was only later, in 978/368, that Ibn Bābawayh openly states in his Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu Al-Faqīh that he is doing what had been suggested to him, namely, to follow the work of al-Rāzī.

Second, Ibn Bābawayh’s teaching of the faculties of rūḥ is very similar to al-Rāzī’s nafs, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh drew upon al-Rāzī. The Aristotelian logical approach was not alien to the Imāmī community. Al-Nubaḵtī, with his high social position in the community and his influence as a political figure, shared with his peers’ principles of logical thinking. The problem was, however, that the Aristotelian approach did not help him to justify occultation. The occultation by then had become part of community doctrine but it lacked philosophical backing. The first person to successfully justify the occultation with philosophy was Ibn Bābawayh. He combined al-Rāzī’s philosophy with the biographies of the prophets. This success could not have been achieved without al-
Nubakṭī’s Aristotelian approach. Al-Nubakṭī gave a logical framework which allowed Ibn Bābawayh to develop his idea about occultation. With one exception, Ibn Bābawayh uses Qur’anic terms instead of philosophical terms. Where al-Rāzī uses spirit, Ibn Bābawayh uses soul, and vice versa.

Third, Ibn Bābawayh equally draws attention to ideal perfect state without referring to al-Rāzī’s and al-Fārābī’s ‘virtuous state’. He combined the return of the Imam with the idea that a natural process of maturing growth was necessary for mankind to be made ready for the utopian/virtuous state.

Fourth, Ibn Bābawayh rejected human infallibility, as did al-Rāzī, and for the same reason, namely that matter cannot be infallible. This suggests that Ibn Bābawayh may have drawn upon al-Rāzī. However, I recognise that these ideas were part of the culture of the time and Ibn Bābawayh may well have simply imbibed them without a direct link to al-Rāzī.

Fifth, Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of the constitution of humans out of form (jism) and substance (hyle) is identical with al-Rāzī’s understanding, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh drew upon al-Rāzī. Ibn Bābawayh’s description of the soul is identical with al-Rāzī’s description of the spirit, both treated this nonphysical reality as a separate entity and world. It already existed and will exit after death. The spirit/soul held importance as the component that brings everything to life. Both thinkers similarly emphasise the importance of the world of matter as the way for spirit/soul to grow. It is necessary for those who attain knowledge to go through the experience of facing the challenged of the force of evil. This experience brings clarity.

Sixth, Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of evil as a metaphor for arrogance, envy, and maliciousness, is identical with al-Rāzī’s concept, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh drew upon al-Rāzī. Ibn Bābawayh saw the link between ignorance, material and evil. Both al-
Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh equally saw evil as temporary and not eternal. Evil is only active during the time period that spirit/soul is embodied. While it is true Satan is evil and Satan non-material, Satan only become evil when Adam was created. Thus, evil remains connected with matter. Evil acts are not from God but are a human invention because of human weakness in resistance to the material world.

Seventh, Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of the necessity of transmigration linked with progression is similar to al-Rāzī, thus suggesting that Ibn Bābawayh drew upon al-Rāzī. Ibn Bābawayh saw the survival of the soul as depending on its journey through life. In order to be made strong enough to return to a new body after it dies, the soul has to go through the difficulties of human life. This is a normal process which has occurred in the past in the lives of the prophets, and which shall continue in the future. Ibn Bābawayh specifically applies the return to souls that have reached the stage of maḥḍ, ultimate good or ultimate evil. Moreover, the term was used by Bardaisanism and Manichaeism. Al-Rāzī’s thought was based on pre-Aristotelian philosophy that transmigration is a natural process.

Eighth, Ibn Bābawayh discusses intellect vs ignorance, while al-Rāzī discusses soul nafs vs ignorance produced by the material world. Both use the term, ‘infatuation’ ʿišq as related to ignorance and to lust. Furthermore, both teach that all are born with inner energy. For al-Rāzī, the soul nafs has a natural instinct to desire matter and this desire must be trained to learn wisdom and science. Similarly, for Ibn Bābawayh, longing is a part of human nature, and we have the choice of which direction we should take, longing for ethics or longing for the ignorance of the material world.

Ninth, Ibn Bābawayh and al-Rāzī are both very interested in free will. Ibn Bābawayh’s concept of free will is similar to al-Rāzī. Ibn Bābawayh talks about ‘free-will’ as being totally left to human intention, initiating evil or good. Ibn Bābawayh treats prayers as part
of good-will to combat evil-will. Al-Rāzī talks about free-will as the key leading to either happiness or destruction.

Tenth, Ibn Bābawayh spoke similarly to al-Rāzī and al-Fārābī, namely on the five prime principles (God, intellect/light/good/souls, celestial pen, ignorance/matter/darkness/evil, air) which all existed before the creation of the world. There is no mention of Satan or of angels among the five prime principles. Ibn Bābawayh, however, does not clearly state his belief in the five eternals. Ibn Bābawayh did not treat the four principles as eternals simply because they were the product of God. He covers the four as existing before the start of the world namely as soul (instead of spirit), space (instead of void), time (time of the celestial world) and prime matter (hyle). The only different between al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh is Ibn Bābawayh emphasise that the four principles are not God.

Eleventh, Ibn Bābawayh, like other philosophers, was a universalist regarding revelation. Revelation is ethics, which is recognised by all religions, and is not restricted to Islam. The centre of Ibn Bābawayh’s argument is ethics. Both al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh criticised the practices followers of Bardaisan and the followers of Mānī for their extreme practices. Al-Rāzī and Ibn Bābawayh were against suffering and discomforting of the soul. They spoke of the common ethics which humankind shares, the revealed law (nāmūs), the term originally in Greek nomos. These common terms were not introduced by Islam, but they reflect the time and knowledge of the tenth century.

Twelfth, A later Šī‘ah philosopher wrote a commentary on Ibn Bābawayh’s Tawḥīd, because he saw Ibn Bābawayh’s work as useful for his philosophy. This is an example of someone else besides myself who has recognised philosophical content in Ibn Bābawayh’s thinking.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Alone</th>
<th>Romanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ (Ā)</td>
<td>١ (ā)</td>
<td>١ (ā)</td>
<td>أ</td>
<td>(omit see Note 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بـ (B)</td>
<td>بـ ـبـ</td>
<td>بـ ـبـ</td>
<td>بـ ـبـ</td>
<td>بـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تـ (T)</td>
<td>تـ ـتـ</td>
<td>تـ ـتـ</td>
<td>تـ ـتـ</td>
<td>تـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جـ (J)</td>
<td>جـ ـجـ</td>
<td>جـ ـجـ</td>
<td>جـ ـجـ</td>
<td>جـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حـ (H)</td>
<td>حـ ـحـ</td>
<td>حـ ـحـ</td>
<td>حـ ـحـ</td>
<td>حـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خـ (K)</td>
<td>خـ ـخـ</td>
<td>خـ ـخـ</td>
<td>خـ ـخـ</td>
<td>خـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>دـ (D)</td>
<td>دـ ـدـ</td>
<td>دـ ـدـ</td>
<td>دـ ـدـ</td>
<td>دـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذـ (D)</td>
<td>ذـ ـذـ</td>
<td>ذـ ـذـ</td>
<td>ذـ ـذـ</td>
<td>ذـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>رـ (R)</td>
<td>رـ ـرـ</td>
<td>رـ ـرـ</td>
<td>رـ ـرـ</td>
<td>رـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>زـ (Z)</td>
<td>زـ ـزـ</td>
<td>زـ ـزـ</td>
<td>زـ ـزـ</td>
<td>زـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سـ (S)</td>
<td>سـ ـسـ</td>
<td>سـ ـسـ</td>
<td>سـ ـسـ</td>
<td>سـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>شـ Š (S)</td>
<td>شـ ـشـ</td>
<td>شـ ـشـ</td>
<td>شـ ـشـ</td>
<td>شـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صـ صـ (S)</td>
<td>صـ ـصـ</td>
<td>صـ ـصـ</td>
<td>صـ ـصـ</td>
<td>صـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ضـ ضـ (D)</td>
<td>ضـ ـضـ</td>
<td>ضـ ـضـ</td>
<td>ضـ ـضـ</td>
<td>ضـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طـ طـ (T)</td>
<td>طـ ـطـ</td>
<td>طـ ـطـ</td>
<td>طـ ـطـ</td>
<td>طـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ظـ ظـ (Z)</td>
<td>ظـ ـظـ</td>
<td>ظـ ـظـ</td>
<td>ظـ ـظـ</td>
<td>ظـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عـ عـ (')</td>
<td>عـ ـعـ</td>
<td>عـ ـعـ</td>
<td>عـ ـعـ</td>
<td>عـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>غـ غـ (Ḡ)</td>
<td>غـ ـغـ</td>
<td>غـ ـغـ</td>
<td>غـ ـغـ</td>
<td>غـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>فـ فـ (F)</td>
<td>فـ ـفـ</td>
<td>فـ ـفـ</td>
<td>فـ ـفـ</td>
<td>فـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>قـ قـ (Q)</td>
<td>قـ ـقـ</td>
<td>قـ ـقـ</td>
<td>قـ ـقـ</td>
<td>قـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>كـ كـ (K)</td>
<td>كـ ـكـ</td>
<td>كـ ـكـ</td>
<td>كـ ـكـ</td>
<td>كـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>لـ لـ (L)</td>
<td>لـ ـلـ</td>
<td>لـ ـلـ</td>
<td>لـ ـلـ</td>
<td>لـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مـ مـ (M)</td>
<td>مـ ـمـ</td>
<td>مـ ـمـ</td>
<td>مـ ـمـ</td>
<td>مـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نـ نـ (N)</td>
<td>نـ ـنـ</td>
<td>نـ ـنـ</td>
<td>نـ ـنـ</td>
<td>نـ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>هـ هـ (H)</td>
<td>هـ ـهـ</td>
<td>هـ ـهـ</td>
<td>هـ ـهـ</td>
<td>هـ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>ɛ</th>
<th>en</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ː</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>ː</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1 alphabet alone:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>alif</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>bā'</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>tā'</th>
<th>ː</th>
<th>ː</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>ħim</td>
<td>ħ</td>
<td>ḥā'</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kā'</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>ːn</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>sād</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dād</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>ː</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ː</td>
<td>zā'</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>'ayn</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>ġayn</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>fā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>qāf</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>kāf'</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>lām</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>mīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>āl</td>
<td>dāl</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>wāw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>nūn</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>yā'</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>ː</td>
<td>hamza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A table of Arabic words transliterated using English alphabets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>بغداد:</td>
<td>إسلام:</td>
<td>دينور:</td>
<td>محدثين</td>
<td>رئيس:</td>
<td>عباس:</td>
<td>حياة:</td>
<td>دولة:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-ṣarābārah:</td>
<td>ملائحة</td>
<td>المقالات</td>
<td>الأنظمة</td>
<td>عائشة:</td>
<td>معشر:</td>
<td>مرجة:</td>
<td>إسلاميين:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-ḥadīth:</td>
<td>الحديث</td>
<td>Aḥbāb al-</td>
<td>Fihrist:</td>
<td>İḥāṣ:</td>
<td>اين:</td>
<td>محلة:</td>
<td>مسلميين:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūsī:</td>
<td>طوسي</td>
<td>Taṣawwūq:</td>
<td>Fihrist:</td>
<td>چ:</td>
<td>توش:</td>
<td>چ:</td>
<td>مسلمين:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>al-nuzūrah:</td>
<td>القوة</td>
<td>qadarīyāh:</td>
<td>قدرية</td>
<td>qadarīyāh:</td>
<td>قدرية</td>
<td>Mahād:</td>
<td>Mahād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nabilākum:</td>
<td>نبلوككم بالشر</td>
<td>nabilākum:</td>
<td>نبلوككم بالشر</td>
<td>nabilākum:</td>
<td>نبلوككم بالشر</td>
<td>Mahād:</td>
<td>Mahād</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

389