

# CRITICISM AND ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK “RELIGION IN THE PROGRESS OF PERFECTION”

---

Iman Noorbakhshi

Islamic researcher

Jan 2022

*Abstract: The book “**Religion in the Progress of Perfection**” has been authored by Mr. Hossein Modarresi Tabatabai based on two aims: 1 – Introduction of the history of the Shia sect as an ideological incident in Islam to the Western and non-Muslim readers. 2 – Recognition of the gradual progress and perfection of the Shiite school in the first three Islamic centuries. The first section captioned “Rights and responsibilities” includes a brief glance at the Shiite history till the beginning of the minor occultation, in which a great portion of criticism and analysis has taken place. Traditions relied upon in the book “Religion in the Progress of Perfection” about Imamate, occultation of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.), etc. have been taken from Shiite sources like al-Mahaasin of Ahmad Ibn Muhammad Ibn Khalid al-Barqi (r.a.), al-Kafi of Shaikh al-Kulaini (r.a.), al-Ghaibah of Muhammad Ibn Ibrahim al-Nomani (r.a.), Ikhteyaar-o-Marefat al-Rejaal of Shaikh Toosi (r.a.), etc. which have been analysed in this article.*

**Keywords:**

(Book) *“Religion in the Progress of Perfection” – criticism and analysis, Shiism, Shiite history, Imamate, Caliphate, Occultation of Imam-e-Asr (a.t.f.s.)*

**Introduction**

Scientific gathering under the title “Hum-Andeeshi” (Like-minded thinking) is from the steps that took place in the presence of a group of researchers in the office of the publication “*Safeeneh*”. One of the aims of “Hum-Andeeshi” is criticism and analysis of the views of contemporary scholars. The criticism and analysis of the book “Religion in the Progress of Perfection” written by Hossein Modarresi Tabatabai was one of the topics of Hum-Andeeshi which was widely welcomed.

In this session of Hum-Andeeshi, we benefitted from Professor Afraakhtehand researcher

Hujjatul Islam wal Muslemeen Hasan Taaromi Raad, through the methodology of assessing the text, wherein the contents of the book are analysed, a general glance as well as a detailed study.

It was decided to present the report of that discussion. Naturally, expressing view vis-à-vis series of concepts is deferred to its publication in entirety.

Before entering the topic and discussions, it is necessary that we know a little about Dr. Hossein Modarresi Tabatabai. He was born in the year 1321 (of the Persian calendar). In 1355, he went to Europe for higher education and in 1361, he got his doctorate from the Oxford University, after which he is

busy teaching at Princeton University, U.S.A. He has also collaborated as a professor with other well-known universities like Columbia, Oxford, and Harvard. In the last three decades, Sayed Hossein Modarresi Tabatabai has had several publications to his name about the history of Shiism and Islamic rights in the English language. The book, "Land in Islamic Jurisprudence" can be called as his most famous work. Of course, he has had several other publications in English as well as Arabic. In the year 1974 A.D., the book "Religion in the Progress of Perfection" was published in English and had various kinds of reactions.

### **Preface:**

This book by Modarresi Tabatabai has been written with the aim of introducing the history of thought and belief of the Shiite sect as an ideological incident in Islam to the Western and non-

Muslim readers. Although this book has many positive points, but its negative effects on the society were also not less. Initially, we start it as a book and will try to understand its purpose. By religion, here we imply the religious belief and thought of Shiism. By paying attention to the preface of the author, the aim of this book is to show the progress of moulding and perfection of the Shiite thought in the first three centuries of Islam. In other words, this book indicates the history of thought and the mode of thinking of the Shiites about the concept of Imamate in the initial stages, and thereafter, its evolution in the first three centuries in the form that we know it today. For example, in the various schools of jurisprudence and theology, changes have transpired in the course of history. But the question is how do these perfections and changes take place in a divine religion? It is possible that this change takes place from two aspects:

from the side of the proponent and from the side of the receiver. The proponent can also be viewed from two facets: the facet of formation and the facet of explanation. Certainly, if someone thinks that a school/religion which regards itself as divine, progresses from the aspect of formation, then this idea is not in sync with its assumption of being divine because it has been given by God. But from the facet of the receiver of religion, two possibilities can be considered: Either the given religion was gradually received from the giver, or external factors were an impediment in its reaching to the receiver. For instance, the religion of Islam formed in the course of 23 years and its laws, were received by its recipients gradually. One factor of its gradual descent is the measured understanding of the addressees about the purposes of the bringer of the religion. Naturally, our understanding about the purposes of

the bringer, possibly can gain perfection in the course of time. Sometimes, it is possible that the bringer of a school shows some concepts but external factors are an impediment for it to reach to the recipient. Now we say: One of the fundamentally weak points of this book, is the disregard of these external factors, or at least not paying attention to them, at the level of historical analysis which the author has called as "Perfection of Religion".

From another aspect, a serious question is: The analysis of the author in this field is pertaining to the bringer or to the recipient? What were the factors that in three centuries, for the recipients of the school, perfection has taken place? Was the approach of the Imams (a.s.) as "the bringers" the cause of this gradual progress? For example, in what difficult conditions and hostile circumstances did the Imams (a.s.) live and how did they take decisions

in those hostile circumstances to relate the concepts but could not relate it? One of the fundamental criticisms of this book is the incomplete portrayal of the political situations and the historical social conditions that ruled over the relations between the Imams (a.s.) and their companions, students and those referring to them.

For instance, the external formation of Shiite jurisprudence and theology was at complete variation with that of the AhleSunnat school, implying that their (AhleSunnat) system of belief and jurisprudence was in complete sync with the government. For example, a jurist like Malik Ibn Anas while relating his laws and beliefs completely disregarded dissimulation because he was the direct appointee of the government, while Imam Sadeq (a.s.) did practise dissimulation. Our great scholars have spoken by relying on excessive testimonies and contexts, which

despite the efforts of the students and scholars, many of the concepts related by the Imams (a.s.) have not reached to us. Meanwhile, often due to these very hostile and inimical conditions, the Imams (a.s.) have not related several concepts.

In these talks, by a detailed referral of the book, we will show the extent to which the author has succeeded in his aim and to what extent the concepts of the book and its conclusions are consistent with historical documents. In the first section, he explains as to how the Shiite society was formed and how it became different. Was this distinction merely political or these differences were also found in the domains of jurisprudence and theology? He claims that these differences – in the beginning – were only political and gradually, they changed into a school of thought. With regards to the teachings of Imamate and the perfection of the concept of Imamate, he elaborates

that initially, Imamate was a political and social concept and later, it transformed into a scientific and epistemic concept. In the second section, he proceeds to analyse the various occurrences like the exaggerators (*ghulaat*), the deficient ones (*muqasserah*) and the moderate ones (*etedaali*). In the third section, he discusses about the monumental crises in the thoughts and beliefs of the Shiites after the commencement of the occultation of the twelfth Imam (may Allah hasten his reappearance) and the role of the Shiite scholars in protecting the Shiites during these times of crises. In the fourth section, he proceeds to showcase the theological views of Ibn Qubba Raazi and his efforts in replying to the objections of the Zaidiyyah about the issue of occultation.

Briefly, his claim is that the Shiite school is a collection of teachings about the beliefs, of which three copies – or in the prevalent

terminology, three readings – have emerged during history. The copy of the exaggerators, who believed in a superhuman position for the Imams (a.s.). The second were those who considered them (a.s.) merely as pious religious scholars and the third copy of the commonality (masses) who believed in the appointment of the Imams (a.s.) through divine texts (*nass*) and their infallibility (*ismat*).

As for methodology, by referring to the texts of the traditions and the exchanges of questions and answers, he has strived to derive the intellectual and cultural atmosphere of the period of Imams (a.s.) and how the Shiites thought in those times, or what political and intellectual trend did the Imams (a.s.) consider in their answers. Therefore, he does not consider the chains of narrators (*rejaali*) or understanding of the traditions (*deraayah*) while dealing with the traditions; rather, he deliberates on them by keeping the

historical conditions into) The core identity of the Shiites is the consideration. Of course, belief of scientific /intellectual occasionally, he does delve into the referral to the Ahle Bait (a.s.) and the study of the chains of narrators, the eligibility of leadership of Ameerul Momineen (a.s.) and his analysis of the manuscripts, and even descendants (a.s.). In their view, the comprehension of traditions. issue of Shiaism, is not restricted to Importantly, his work is different from other books that have been governance but includes the leadership of all facets of a religious society, and intellectual referral written about the history of the Shiites and their beliefs. In every part, we will relate the summary of discussed content in the form of a report of every section. Thereafter, analysing the sources and reference) From the Shiite viewpoint, the used by the author in every report, Imamate of the Imams (a.s.) is appointment through divine texts, we will proceed to judge the and the most important document of the Imamate of an Imam is the conclusions of the author in every instance<sup>1</sup>. availability of divine text concerning him.

### **ANALYSIS OF THE PREFACE OF THE BOOK:**

From the author's preface of this book, a few fundamental conclusions can be derived:

3) The original and reliable heritage that has reached unto us from the Imams (a.s.) of the Shiites, has been reported in the earlier books of traditions and there is nothing that has not been narrated.

- 4) It cannot be claimed that in understanding the heritage of traditions, the companions of the Imams (a.s.) were better than us.
- 5) The earlier traditionalists have mixed the real and fabricated traditions and due to their lack of cognition of the complexity and tricks of the fabricators of traditions, they have not sifted the true traditions from the fabricated ones.

These fundamentals can be derived from the preface of the book. It was better that before entering into any discussion, the respected author should have discussed the critical assessment vis-à-vis texts and sources used by him in this book. He has not stated that which traditions of the book al-Kafi he does not accept. That is, which tradition he considers as correct with regards to its emanation from the Imam (a.s.) and which one was fabricated by the

narrators. Or at least, what was his criterion in accepting the correctness of the traditions attributed to the Imams (a.s.). Or, in his view, what is the difference between the book al-Kafi and al-Mahaasin? Or what is the difference between the books of Rejaal al-Najaashi and Rejaal al-Kashi? The author has used all these sources and since he claims that the traditionalists have not sieved between the real and fabricated traditions, he should have determined that how these sources should be utilized. Unfortunately, this discussion is missing from his preface.

In the preface, he indicates towards another point that during the minor occultation and the beginning of the major occultation, there were two theological schools among the Shiites: the school of Qom and that of Baghdad. The criterion of the differences of these two schools are the books of "Eteqedaat" and "Tas'heeh al-Eteqadaat" of Shaikh



Saduq (r.a.) and Shaikh Mufeed (r.a.) respectively. In this regard, the respected author has cited as an example: Shaikh Mufeed (r.a.) does not accept the tradition “*There is none from us but that he is either poisoned or slayed*” cited by Shaikh Saduq (r.a.). Mufeed (r.a.) has also rejected the narration “*I have made their love as the wage of Quran*”. The author has cited these two instances as the disagreements between the two schools of Qom and Baghdad. But both these examples need the following explanation:

Shaikh Saduq (r.a.) takes up the issue of exaggeration and says that the one of the beliefs of the exaggerators was that the Imams (a.s.) don't die. Then, he proceeds to say that they have erred and we believe that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and the infallible Imams (a.s.) do die. This belief is supported by the narration, “*There is none from us but that he is either poisoned or slayed*”. The point emphasized by

Shaikh Saduq (r.a.) is to refute the immortality of the Imams (a.s.). Now, Shaikh Mufeed (r.a.) does not accept this tradition and does not believe it be a certainly reliable tradition. But he does accept the central discussion about the mortality of the Imams (a.s.). Hence, this concept is not the disagreement about the belief because the aim of Saduq's (r.a.) discussion is completely different and even he has not emphasized a lot on this tradition. The difference here is merely in the acceptance and non-acceptance of a tradition.

Another point is that Shaikh Saduq (r.a.) says that in the light of the Holy Quran, we consider the love of the Ahle Bait (a.s.) as the reward of the messengership of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.). Mufeed (r.a.) says that this sentence needs explanation. The reward should be from Allah and not the people. Hence, the verse should be explained thus: I will take the reward of my

Prophethood from Allah but I ask you to love my Ahle Bait (a.s.). The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) said that I don't ask you anything but the love of my Ahle Bait (a.s.) and this is of course not the reward of Prophethood.

Sometimes, it is assumed that there are differences in the beliefs of these two theological schools, while these are the maximum objections of Shaikh Mufeed (r.a.).

### **Analysis of the First Section**

The first section captioned "Rights and Responsibilities" is specific to the formation and perfection of the concept of Imamate in the political and social domain. It can be said that it is a brief glance at the history of Shiaism till the beginning of the major occultation. In the first presentation, the author claims that: "After the demise of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), three incidents

were striving for the acquisition of Caliphate viz. the Ansar, the Quraish and the partisans of the Ahle Bait (a.s.). But finally, the Quraish succeeded in seating one of their aged and old persons - through a different series called Caliphate - on the chair of power and chieftainship."

The first point: We know that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) introduced Ali (a.s.) in Ghadeer-e-Khumm. A group of persons, while returning to Madina, decided in a place called as Aqabah, to assassinate him (s.a.w.a.). This incident has been reported in the AhleSunnat sources and its details have come in Ibn Hazm's al-Mahalli, vol. 11 and its chain of narrators too is authentic as per the scales of the AhleSunnat methodology in their science of traditions. After the death of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and before his burial, a caliph was selected instantly without any gap. The reader of the book by

reading these sentences and their preceding and succeeding sentences, will imagine that a council with the presence of all companions and elders was formed. Each of the three groups supported their candidate for Caliphate. Finally, after discussions and analysis and listening to the talks of proponents and opponents and mutual consultations, ultimately through voting, they chose an elderly companion as a Caliph. While it should be said: In the incident of Saqifah, no supporter of Ahle Bait (a.s.) was present and there was absolutely none to contend that it is only the Ahle Bait (a.s.) who are worthy of Caliphate.

The second point: Using the word “aged” over here is also not correct because incidentally, even the first caliph himself did not make this claim. So much so, that some even went on to say that if age was the criterion, Abbas the uncle of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) because he was elder to him. Although the author has

not brought any reference for these sentences, but his expressions are quite similar with the concepts of one of the original sources of his book i.e., Wilfred Madelung, a German scholar on Islam and a researcher on Shiism. Wilfred has a book called *The Succession to Muhammad (s)* in which he has reported the incidents post the death of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and has analysed the various views about caliphate. In his book, Madelung has explicitly rejected the Shiite view of the necessity and presence of divine texts (*nass*) for Imam’s appointment but at the same time, he believes that in those historical conditions, Ameerul Momineen Ali (a.s.) was the most eligible of all for caliphate.

In the next presentation, the author explains that: “Till the end of the first century, the Shiite movement was recognized as merely a society opposed to the government, who were partisans of the rights of the Ahle Bait (a.s.) lawful rulers of

the Islamic society and (importantly), they had not carved a distinct and separate path for themselves from the vast majority of the Muslims vis-à-vis their beliefs and jurisprudence. In other words, Shiites differed with all other Muslims only on the issue of governance and caliphate, and in all other matters like beliefs, Islamic laws, exegesis of the Holy Quran, etc., there was no absolutely no difference whatsoever between the Shiites and all other Muslims, so much so that the Shiites were acting upon the school of jurisprudence of the Caliphate.”

This claim of the author requires details. The concept of Caliphate, especially in the beginning of Islam, either in Shiite Islam or its Sunni counterpart, was by no means used in the meaning of apparent rulership and governance. Although in the later centuries, particularly during the Abbaside reign, they believed in the separation

in the position of Caliphate and that of issuing edicts and decrees, but after the demise of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), a Caliph was the one who succeeded him (s.a.w.a.) in all his positions except receiving of revelation. Caliph means the one – in addition to rulership and governance - who should lead and guide the people in the matters of religion, relating the beliefs, exegesis of Quran, establishing the Islamic laws and punishments, etc. and the people also were obeying him. This concept became clear by paying attention to the differences of the companions during the caliphate of Abu Bakr because their disagreements were not pertaining to governance; rather, they were about the correct implementation of Islamic laws. This reality has been recorded in the annals of history in the notorious incident of Maalik Ibn Nuwairah’s apostasy and killing. If the incidents were only about governance, why did they refuse to accept the

compilation of the Holy Quran of Ameerul Momineen Ali (a.s.)? Or, in the caliphate of Usman – when the differences and disagreements were at their peak – the issues were not pertaining to governance only, but the objections of people like Abdullah Ibn Masood, Ammar Yasir and AbuzarGhaffari, apart from the compilation of the Quran, were about the implementation of Islamic laws and creed. Or, about the caliphate of Muawiyah, it has come in Tarikh-e-Tabari, that when he came to Madinah during the Hajj, he was asking that in which hand did the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) wear his ring? When he heard the answer that the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) would wear it in his right hand, he ordered that the people should wear it in their left hand. Similarly, when he heard that the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) would recite Bismillah loudly in his prayers, Muawiyah ordered that they should recite it softly. (Refer to the Tafseer of Muhammad Ibn Umar Raazi

‘MafaateehulGhaib’ regarding reciting Bismillah before the first surah in prayers). These historical testimonies – whose several examples can be cited – all indicate towards the fact especially during the first century of Islam, the position of caliphate was not merely a political one, and the differences in caliphate were not limited to acquiring power.

The author has indicated at two traditions from Imam Sadeq (a.s.) with similar content from the books of Rejaal al-Kashi and Tafseere-e-Ayyaashito prove his claim that in the beginning, the Shiism was not formed as a group with special beliefs, and in the initial stages of the second century, along with other schools of jurisprudence, gradually it evolved in a distinct school of rights:

وكانت الشيعة قبل أن يكون أبو جعفر  
وهم لا يعرفون مناسك حجهم ولا حلالهم ولا  
حرامهم حتى كان أبو جعفر ع فحج لهم وبين

مناسك حجهم وحلالهمو حرامهم، حتى استغنوا  
عن الناس، وصار الناس يتعلمون منهم بعد ما  
كانوا يتعلمون من الناس،

Prior to (Imam) Abu Ja'far (al-Baqer) (a.s.), the Shiites did not know the rituals of their Hajj and neither their permissible nor their prohibited till Abu Ja'far (a.s.) came. So, he (a.s.) performed the Hajj for them, explained the rituals of Hajj for them, their permissible and their prohibited, till they became needless of the people (i.e., the majority). In fact, the people started learning from them after they used to learn from the people.

The content of both these traditions (the tradition of Kashi has come exactly in al-Kafi vol. 2 p. 19) is that the Shiites before Imam Baqer (a.s.) did not know their laws of jurisprudence and inevitably they had to refer to the official laws (*the people*) (because acting on the Islamic laws is an obligatory duty). But after Imam Baqer (a.s.) taught

them the right rituals of Hajj and the permissible and the prohibited, they became needless of the people (i.e., the majority) and the people, who used to earlier follow the official state religious laws, now started learning the actual Islamic laws from the Shiites. Thus, the author concluded that the Shiite school became a distinct religious and juristic school from the time of Imam Baqer (a.s.).

**We say:** In the analysis of history, the conditions of those times should be taken into consideration, and only then one should present his views on the basis of complete data and strong testimonies. In this above tradition used by the author as the proof of his idea, Imam Sadeq (a.s.) emphasizes on the importance of the recognition of Imam (a.s.) for acquiring religious cognition and indicates at the historical journey of the Islamic nation after the demise of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) till the era of Imam Baqer's (a.s.)

Imamate. Tarikh-e-Tabari reports that from the reign of Muawiyah's caliphate, conditions became tougher and harsher for the Shiites of Ameerul Momineen (a.s.). The Shiites were killed on different pretexts and were taken away from the roads. This situation continued after the incident of Karbala and during the time of Imam Sajjad (a.s.). After the incident of Karbala, the Shiite society became scattered almost decimated. It was not the case that the Imams (a.s.) and their companions were free to hold classes, in all times and places to teach religious principles and Islamic laws. On the contrary, due to the stifling and hostile conditions, most of the Shiites did not even have access to their Imams (a.s.). Hence, they were compelled to learn the divine laws from others. The narration of Imam Sadeq (a.s.) conveys this very concept because it is clearly stated that the Shiites of that time did not know the laws and

were compelled to ask from the majority. Then, in the time of Imam Baqer (a.s.) and his efforts, the Shiites became needless in learning the Islamic laws from the other Muslims. It was certainly not the case that they were duty-bound to learn the Islamic laws from the likes of Abu Hanifah. Imam (a.s.) says, "*They were not knowing*", not that now we are saying that from now onwards, learn from us and act on it. Therefore, paying attention to the historical conditions, one cannot conclude from this tradition that till the end of the first century, Shiism was only a political movement and in the time of Imam Baqer (a.s.), it became an independent school.

In this regard, the author indicates towards two references: One is the letter of Hisham Ibn Abd al-Malik, the Umayyad despot, to his governor in Madinah, as reported in Tarikh-e-Tabari, and the second is the letter of Hasan Ibn Muhammad-e-Hanafiyah about the deferment

(*irjaa*). The question is that besides these two sources, did the author not have access to any other reference for introducing the Shiites in the first century of Hijri? For example, the collection of concepts reported from the earliest Shiites in debates with the opponents.

It is especially necessary that we elaborate on the second reference. Hasan Ibn Muhammad-e-Hanafiyyah was revered as an Imam by the Kaisaniyyah. Apparently, after the defeat of Mukhtar's rebellion and the renewed domination of the Umayyads, by writing this small missive, he announced his alliance with the new ruler and expressed his distance from the Shiites (in some manuscripts, it is Shabiyyah), accepted the first three Caliphs' precedence to Ali (a.s.) as a belief, and called it as Deferment (*Irjaa*). The word *Irjaa* means deferment. The Epistle of Deferment is on the subject that Allah has deferred the caliphate of

Ameerul Momineen Ali (a.s.) despite his superiority and timed his caliphate after that of Abu Bakr, Umar, and Usman. The aim of this letter is to reject the Shiite belief of Imams' appointment being based on divine text. Hence, the followers of this idea, became famous in the lexicon of the traditions of the Imams (a.s.) as the *Murjeah*. That is, those who believed in the deferment and postponement of the caliphate of Ameerul Momineen Ali (a.s.). In those times, the *Murjeah* were considered as a movement opposed to the Shiites. Therefore, this group is different from that group which later became famous as *Murjeah*. In the book "Al-Zeenah" by Abu Haatim al-Raazi, this meaning has been explained. "The *Murjeah* is the title of anyone who necessarily considers Abu Bakr, Umar and Usman prior to Ali Ibn Abi Talib (a.s.) just as Shiism is the title given to those who consider Ali (a.s.) superior to Abu Bakr and Umar." In



the book al-Kafi, there is a tradition reported on the authority of Imam Sadeq (a.s.), “*Teach your children traditions before the Murjeah overtake you in (deviating them)*”. (Al-Kafi, vol. 6, p. 47, H. 5). Here, Murjeah implies this very group. Now, one should question the author, “For introducing the Shiites in the first century, did you not have better sources than the letter of an Umayyad despot or the missive of an opponent of the Shiite beliefs viz. Hasan Ibn Muhammad-e-Hanafiyah?” The Umayyad despot in his letter to his governor in Madinah wrote, “The people of Kufa, in the name of Tabarri and distancing themselves from a political group, express their love to the Ahle Bait (a.s.) and have placed them on a high and unrealistic pedestal, thereby causing factionalism in the Muslim society.” Are all introductions of Shiites in the first century of Hijri in this manner? Are not the sayings, traditions,

sermons of the Imams (a.s.) and the debates of their Shiites, introductions of the Shiites in the first century Hijri?

From the author’s wordings, it is construed that in the eras of Imam Baqer (a.s.) and Imam Sadeq (a.s.), the Shiite school gradually became known as an independent political, juristic, belief, and theological school. He says, “Of course, most of the Shiites of that era, who were around Imam Baqer (a.s.), were not aware of the concept of Imamate in its real form, and did not consider him (a.s.) as an infallible and divinely appointed Imam. Nevertheless, they did regard caliphate as the right of the family of the Prophet’s (s.a.w.a.) family and revered Imam Baqer (a.s.) as its elder and chief. Such understanding of Shiism was quite prevalent in those times.”

In this regard, it should be explained that basically the term

Shia, according to the Shias, indicated at those people who believed in Ameerul Momineen Ali (a.s.) being a divinely appointed Imam and generally, they were the students of divine texts. Even Dr. Modarresi has about the divine texts in his book. In Tarikh-e-Tabari, in the incident of Sulaiman Ibn Surad al-Khuzaaee's uprising, Shiites are called as those who believe in the divine appointment and right to Caliphate of the Ahle Bait (a.s.). This was the reason, in the beginning of Mukhtar's rebellion, very few Shiites joined him because Mukhtar believed in the caliphate of Muhammad-e-Hanafiyah while the Shiites were with Sulaiman. But in the books of Rejaal of Ahle Sunnah, anybody who professed love of the Ahle Bait (a.s.) was called as Shia and whosoever believed that they were divinely appointed and in the infallibility of the Imams (a.s.), were labelled as exaggerators (*ghaali*) or

repudiators (*raafezi*). In the Rejaali books of Shias, the term Shias refers to those who believe in the divine appointment and infallibility of the Imams (a.s.). Of course, the Imams (a.s.) had Shias, who were merely religious scholars like Abu Haneefah, Abu al-Bakhtari Wahb Ibn Wahb. Hence, it is necessary that we distinguish the companions of the Imams (a.s.) with all other students. If we analyse the biographies of the chains of narrators (*kotob-e-rejaal*) and the beliefs of the companions of the Imams (a.s.), we will see that most of them – almost to the extent of unanimity – believed in the divine appointment, their sayings being a proof in themselves and infallibility of the Imams (a.s.).

The names of the earliest groups of Shia – who in the time of Imam Baqer (a.s.) gradually could connect to Imam – available in the books of Rejaal is the family of A'yan, the eldest of them being Zoraarah. There is an article written

about the introduction of the Zoraarahclan by one of his descendants in the third century, namely Abu Ghalib Zoraari. He was one of the teachers of Kulaini. In the beginning of the article, he writes, **“We are a family whom Allah – Majestic and Mighty be He –has obliged with His religion and honoured with the company of His chosen ones and His proofs upon His creatures.”** Thereafter, he goes on to mention each member of the family who was in service of the Imams (a.s.). We see that he does not use the word “love” over here; rather, he uses the term **“His proofs upon His creatures”** for the Imams (a.s.).

Incidentally, if the Shias gathered around the Imams (a.s.) only because they were from the family of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and had taken their knowledge from him (s.a.w.a.), why they did not go after the progeny of Imam Hasan Mujtaba (a.s.)? Anyways, they too were from

the family of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.), so much so that someone like Abdullah did not have any non-Hashemite in his family. Therefore, there should have been divine texts that the Shias must go after a special group from the progeny of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.).

In the second section of the book, the author by relying upon one tradition, reiterates the claim which we will narrate over here verbatim. In the text, he indicates that a group of companions of the Imams (a.s.), while respecting them as the rightful successors of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) and those whose obedience is obligatory, believed that they were merely **“righteous scholars”** and opposed attribution of any kind of extraordinary aspect to their lives like **“the knowledge of the unseen”**. In reply, we say: Firstly, if we analyse the books of Rejaal, we find the erroneousness of such an expression, which most of such companions thought. The Rejaal of

Kashshi has usually compiled all of what has been reported about the companions and has not judged them.

Secondly, as evidence of this claim, regards Abdullah Ibn Abi Yaafoor as the most important of this group, and indicates at the debate between him and Mualla Ibn Khunais, the student and servant of Imam Sadeq (a.s.) and says that Mualla regarded the Imams (a.s.) on par with the Prophet (s.a.w.a.). But Imam (a.s.) endorsed the view of Abdullah Ibn Abi Yaafoor. But for clarity of the concept, we reproduce the entire narration in verbatim over here:

تدارأ ابن أبي يعفور ومعلی بن خنیس،  
فقال ابن أبي يعفور الأوصیاء علماء أبرار  
أتقیاء، وقال ابن خنیس الأوصیاء أنبیاء، قال  
فدخل علی أبي عبد الله (ع) قال، فلما استقر  
مجلسهما، قال، فبدأهما أبو عبد الله (ع) فقال یا  
عبد الله ابرأ ممن قال إنا أنبیاء .

“Ibn Abi Yaafoor and Mualla Ibn Khunais once had a discussion.

Ibn Abi Yaafoor said, ‘The successors are righteous and pious scholars.’ Ibn Khunais replied, ‘The successors are Prophets’. Both went to Imam Sadeq (a.s.). When they took their seats, Imam Sadeq (a.s.) initiated talking with them and said, ‘O Abd Allah! I express my displeasure with the one who says that we are Prophets’.”

(Ikhteyaar-o-Marefat al-Rejaal, al-Shaikh al-Toosi (r.a.), p. 246, Entry 456)

According to this debate, both sides viewed Imam Sadeq (a.s.) as “successor” and the difference was about attributing Prophethood to him (a.s.), in which Imam (a.s.) has rejected the opinion of considering the successors as Prophets. The conclusion that can be derived from this report is as follows:

Firstly, the author apparently has erred in reporting the tradition because in the text of the book, instead of the word “successors”, he

has used the word “Imams” while here, “successor” is a more specific concept than Imam. A successor is he about whom divine text and divine appointment is available. He is designated through a divine text.

Secondly, the debate between Abdullah and Mualla was about the successor being on par with the Prophet, and not about possessing the knowledge of the unseen, infallibility and (appointment through) divine text. The subject of the discussion is that did the successors of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) possess the position of Prophethood like the successors of the Prophets of Bani Israel did or no? Incidentally, this tradition itself indicates that the successors of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.a.) did possess the knowledge of the unseen. For, the narrator says that these two people argued and when they sat in the presence of Imam (a.s.), he talked in a way which showed that he was aware of

their debate. So, what is the knowledge of the unseen? The question over here is that how the author concluded on the basis of this tradition that Abdullah Ibn Yafoor did not believe that the Imams (a.s.) had the knowledge of the unseen. Moreover, although Mualla Ibn Khunais was among the servants of Imam Sadeq (a.s.), but from the aspect of knowledge, he enjoyed a very high status. (Those interested can refer to his biography in the books of Rejaal).

As has been stated, the dispute between these two companions was about granting the status of Prophethood to the Imams (a.s.) and this issue was asked several times by the companions from the Imams (a.s.). In many of the compendia of Shia traditions, one can find chapters captioned “Difference between Prophet and **Mohaddas**” in which, in response to the queries concerning the difference between Prophet and Imam, the

Imams were called **Mohaddas**, i.e., those who heard the voices of the angels, but they did not receive messages in the special form as the Prophets did which was called as “Revelation”. Here too, this was the point of contention, and not their divine appointment through texts or their knowledge of the unseen. Hence, it should be said that the conclusion of the author based on this that most of the companions of Imam Baqer (a.s.) and Imam Sadeq (a.s.) did not believe that they had the knowledge of the unseen, and this belief was a prevalent one at that time, is an inaccurate and erroneous claim. Perhaps, the source of this assertion is the book of Tanqeeh al-Maqaal of Agha Maamqaani and the book Haqaaeq al-Imaan but neither of these books have brought specific chains of narrators and references for their averment. Moreover, in recent years, modern research has shown that the book Haqaaeq al-Imaan was not penned by Shaheed Saani

(Shaikh Zainuddin al-Aameli); rather, it was written by one of his contemporaries. Therefore, the claim of the author that “many Shias” think like this, is an incorrect expression and cannot be generalized for all the Shias.

The next discussion which the author has brought in his book is that the Shias of all generations hoped that the Imam of every era was the “Qaem” (the Riser) who would rebel against the tyrants and despots of his time and would lay the foundations of a government based on justice and equity. In the time of Imam Baqer (a.s.), many people expected that he would rise as the Qaem. But the Imam did not give a positive answer to the general anticipation and expectation, as a result of which, there was confusion and perplexity in some of the Shias because in their view, a true Imam from the family of the Prophet (s.a.w.a.) must rise to take his right and establish a just government. It

has also been claimed that this demand and expectation was even severer during the time of Imam Sadeq (a.s.), in a way that many regarded his silence as illegal while others expressed their despair and hopelessness. But Imam Sadeq (a.s.) prohibited his Shias from participating in any form of armed warfare and traditions indicate that he (a.s.) was not inclined on being addressed as Imam and clearly stated that he was NOT the Qaem from the progeny of Muhammad (s.a.w.a.). A similar attitude has also been reported about Imam Kazem (a.s.). Through these premises, the author's conclusion is that due to the Imams' refusal to revolt against the governments of their times, gradually, brought changes and reviews vis-à-vis the concept of Imamate. That is, slowly Imam was introduced as the explainer of beliefs, divine laws and commentator of the Holy Quran and

does not necessarily pursue the formation of a government.

One of the sources that he has relied upon is the letter of Hasan Ibn Muhammad Ibn Hanafiyyah, at which we have indicated earlier. In this letter, his aim was to guide his followers, after the defeat of Ibn Zubair, to the society of the Muslim majority and with this purpose, the concept of Deferment (*Irjaa*) came into being. The sentence of this letter on which the author has relied upon is as follows: "The Shias hope that a government would be formed before the Resurrection..." How did the author assume from this sentence that in every era, the Shias expected their Imams to revolt?

But by analysing the narrations relied upon, as opposed to the view of the author, no trace of confusion and perplexity can be seen as claimed. For clarification of the topic, we will narrate some of the traditions relied upon by the author

so that we may verify the correctness of his conclusion as claimed by him.

The traditions that he has relied upon is as follows:

عَنْ عَبْدِ الْحَمِيدِ الْوَاسِطِيِّ عَنْ أَبِي جَعْفَرٍ ع قَالَ قُلْتُ لَهُ أَصْلَحَكَ اللَّهُ لَقَدْ تَرَكْنَا أَسْوَاقَنَا انْتِظَاراً لِهَذَا الْأَمْرِ حَتَّى لِيُوشِكَ الرَّجُلُ مِنَّا أَنْ يَسْأَلَ فِي يَدِهِ فَقَالَ يَا [أَبَا] عَبْدِ الْحَمِيدِ أ تَرَى مَنْ حَبَسَ نَفْسَهُ عَلَى اللَّهِ لَا يَجْعَلُ اللَّهُ لَهُ مَخْرَجاً بَلَى وَ اللَّهُ لَيَجْعَلَنَّ اللَّهُ لَهُ مَخْرَجاً رَحِمَ اللَّهُ عَبْدًا أَحْيَا أَمْرَنَا قُلْتُ أَصْلَحَكَ اللَّهُ إِنَّ هَؤُلَاءِ الْمُرْجِنَةَ يَقُولُونَ مَا عَلَيْنَا أَنْ نَكُونَ عَلَى الَّذِي نَحْنُ عَلَيْهِ حَتَّى إِذَا جَاءَ مَا تَقُولُونَ كُنَّا نَحْنُ وَ أَنْتُمْ سَوَاءٌ فَقَالَ يَا عَبْدَ الْحَمِيدِ صَدَقُوا مَنْ تَابَ تَابَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ مَنْ أَسْرَرَ نِفَاقاً فَلَا يُرْغَمُ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِأَنفِهِ وَ مَنْ أَظْهَرَ أَمْرَنَا أَهْرَقَ اللَّهُ دَمَهُ يَذْبُحُهُمُ اللَّهُ عَلَى الْإِسْلَامِ كَمَا يَذْبُحُ الْقِصَابُ شَاتَهُ قَالَ قُلْتُ فَنَحْنُ يَوْمَئِذٍ وَ النَّاسُ فِيهِ سَوَاءٌ قَالَ لَا أَنْتُمْ يَوْمَئِذٍ سَنَامُ الْأَرْضِ وَ حُكَّامُهَا لَا يَسْعُنَا فِي دِينِنَا إِلَّا ذَلِكَ قُلْتُ فَإِنْ مِتُّ قَبْلَ أَنْ أُدْرِكَ الْقَائِمَ ع قَالَ إِنَّ الْقَائِلَ مِنْكُمْ إِذَا قَالَ إِنَّ أُدْرِكْتُ قَائِمَ آلِ مُحَمَّدٍ نَصْرَتُهُ كَالْمَقَارِعِ مَعَهُ بِسَيِّئِهِ وَ الشَّهَادَةُ مَعَهُ شَهَادَتَانِ

Abdul Hameed al-Waaseti reports that I said to Imam Baqer (a.s.), “May Allah improve your conditions! By Allah! We have left

our markets (i.e., businesses) hoping for this affair so much so that it is near that a person from us will have to beg.” Imam (a.s.) replied, “O Abd al-Hameed! Do you think that whoever dedicates himself for the sake of Allah, Allah will not provide for him an opening (i.e., a solution)? Nay, by Allah, He will provide for him an opening for sure. May Allah have mercy on the one who dedicates himself to us! May Allah have mercy on the one who enlivens our affair.” I asked, “What if I die before finding the Qaem?” He (a.s.) replied, “Whoever of you believes that ‘if I find the Qaem from the progeny of Muhammad, I will certainly help him’, is like the one who fights along with him, and martyrdom with him is equal to two martyrdoms.”

(Al-Mahaasin, p. 173, Hadis 148, Chapter 38)

In this tradition, the importance and reward for awaiting the reappearance has been indicated



at. But there is no hint of Imam Sadeq (a.s.) being the Qaem in the minds (of the Shias). How did he derive confusion and perplexity from the beginning or end of this tradition? It should be known that it was not like this the companions of the Imams (a.s.) learnt all their beliefs from one book of creed in one place or that the number and names of Imams (a.s.) was determined for them beforehand. Hence, such questions about the time of uprising and his characteristics are completely natural. The main issue for every Shia was the recognition of his Imam. It was not necessary that the Imams (a.s.) inform everyone as to what will be the number of Imams and what will be their names. Therefore, if some people did not know that Imam Baqer or Imam Sadeq (a.s.) are not the Qaem is not extraordinary. Moreover, the people became contented after listening to the explanations of the Imams (a.s.). That is, it was not the case that

they objected at the Imams (a.s.) and due to their refusal to revolt, the people joined some other sects. So, the terms “confusion” and “perplexity” are wrong.

عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَطَاءٍ عَنْ أَبِي جَعْفَرٍ ع  
 قَالَ قُلْتُ لَهُ إِنَّ شِبَعَتَكَ بِالْعِرَاقِ كَثِيرَةٌ وَاللَّهِ مَا فِي  
 أَهْلِ بَيْتِكَ مِثْلَكَ فَكَيْفَ لَا تَخْرُجُ قَالَ فَقَالَ يَا عَبْدَ  
 اللَّهِ بِنَ عَطَاءٍ قَدْ أَحَدْتُ تَفْرُشَ أُذُنَيْكَ لِلنُّوْكَىٰ إِيَّيَّ وَ  
 اللَّهُ مَا أَنَا بِصَاحِبِكُمْ قَالَ قُلْتُ لَهُ فَمَنْ صَاحِبُنَا قَالَ  
 انظُرُوا مَنْ عَمِيَ عَلَى النَّاسِ وَلَا دَنَتْهُ....

Abdullah Ibn Ataa reports from Imam Abu Ja'far (al-Baqer) (a.s.) that I asked him (a.s.), ‘Surely, your Shias in Iraq are many. By Allah! There is none in your family like you. So why don't you rise?’ He (a.s.) replied, “*O Abdallah Ibn Ataa! You have began spreading your mouth from ear to ear (an Arabic proverb to imply that you have started accepting everyone's view even if it is foolish). By Allah! I am not your Master (who will rise).*” I asked him, “So, who is our Master?” He (a.s.) responded, “*Look at the one*

*whose birth is concealed from the people...”*

(Kafi, vol. 1, p. 342, H. 26; Kamaal al-DeenwaTamaam al-Nemah, p. 325, H. 2)

In this tradition too, the narrator is inquiring from the Imam (a.s.) the reason for not rebelling against the government. He (a.s.) replies with utmost clarity that he (a.s.) is not the Qaem and the conditions for his uprising are not yet provided for. Also, the Qaem is the one whose birth is hidden from the people.

Another tradition in the book al-Kafi, vol. 8 p. 331 (on which he has relied on p. 35 of his book) is as follows: Mualla Ibn Khunais says, “They brought a few letters from the followers of Abu Muslim al-Khorasani who wore black for Imam Sadeq (a.s.) who invited him (a.s.) to lead the rebellion. He (a.s.) threw the letters on the ground and said, ‘*Oh! Oh! I am not their Imam. Don’t they*

*know that he will kill Sufyani?’” Here too, the Imam (a.s.) says that I am not the Qaem and Qaem is the one who will kill the Sufyani. Incidentally, he (a.s.) introduces himself as distant from the Bani Abbas and says that I am not their Imam in the meaning of a commander, as propagated by them to deceive the people but in reality did not believe in his Imamate. Therefore, he is not refuting his Imamate as believed by the Shias; rather, he is merely rejecting his commandership and governorship of the Bani Abbas.*

In another place, the author indicates towards a tradition that a group said to the Imam (a.s.) that not revolting against the government is prohibited for you. This tradition has come in al-Kafi vol.2, pp. 242-243, H. 4. The narrator is Sadeer al-Sairafi. He reports that I went to Imam (a.s.) and said that “By Allah! Sitting is not permissible for you.” Imam (a.s.), in response, asked,

“Why?” Sadeer reiterated, “Due to the abundance of your friends, followers and helpers” after which, Imam (a.s.) explains to him the conditions are not yet provided for and our Shias are not yet ready. Finally, he (a.s.) informed him, “O Sadeer! By Allah, if I had followers equal to the number of these sheep, I would not sit down.” Sadeer says, “When I counted the sheep, they were seventeen in number.”

So, in the above tradition, Imam (a.s.) clearly states that if I had seventeen helpers approximately, I would have revolted against the government. He (a.s.) has explained why he is not rising, and Sadeer too is satisfied with the answer.

Or in al-Kafi, vol. 1 p. 536, the narrator asked Imam Baqer (a.s.) about him being the Qaem and in response, he (a.s.) says,

كُنَّا قَائِمٌ بِأَمْرِ اللَّهِ قُلْتُ فَأَنْتَ الْمُهْدِيُّ  
قَالَ كُنَّا نَهْدِي إِلَى اللَّهِ

“All of our Qaem with the command of Allah.” The narrator inquired again, “Are you the guided one (Mahdi)?” He (a.s.) responded, “All of us guide towards Allah.”

In this tradition too, the narrator questions the possibility of Imam Baqer’s (a.s.) uprising. In reply, Imam (a.s.) says that all of us establish Allah’s command but the one who will fill the earth with justice and equity is a different person.

Anyways, in none of these traditions, there is no sign or indication that the Shias were afflicted with perplexity and confusion after Imam Sadeq’s (a.s.) refusal to revolt against the government. Naturally, the Shias of that era desired that the salvation and government of Prophet’s (s.a.w.a.) progeny should take place as soon as possible. But to have this desire in the heart and to ask about its timing and method is completely different

from skepticism and confusion about Imamate and that if despite the presence of apparent conditions, an Imam does not revolt, then one doubts about his Imamate, just as the author tries to portray for us the picture of the Shias of that time. But when we look at the traditions in their entirety, we encounter a completely different image than what is portrayed by the author.

In the book the author claims that Imam Sadeq (a.s.) was not inclined to call himself an Imam and abstained from participating in all sorts of political activities. For example, in al-Mahaasin of al-Barqi, vol. 1, pp. 288-289, the narrator presents his beliefs to the Imam (a.s.) and takes the names of each of the Imams (a.s.) till he reaches to Imam Sadeq (a.s.) and asks,

فقال له فأنت جعلت فداك قال هذا الأمر يجري لأخرنا كما يجري لأولنا و لمحمد و علي فضلهما قال فأنت جعلت فداك فقال هذا الأمر يجري كما يجري الليل و النهار قال فأنت

جعلت فداك قال هذا الأمر يجري كما يجري حد الزاني و السارق قال فأنت جعلت فداك قال القرآن نزل في أقوام و هي تجري في الناس إلى يوم القيامة قال قلت جعلت فداك أنت لتزيدني على أمر

In this narration, Imam Sadeq (a.s.) introduces each Imam (a.s.) till Imam Baqer (a.s.) and then replies about his Imamate, not directly but indirectly. As is clear from the text of the narration, apparently the conditions were not conducive for Imam (a.s.) to declare his Imamate openly on account of dissimulation. Nevertheless, Imam (a.s.) did not even deny his Imamate.

Or in Tafseer al-Ayyaashi, vol. 1, p. 327, Abdullah Ibn Abi Yaafoor presents his beliefs in front of Imam Sadeq (a.s.) and then asks him,

قال قلت تقول رحمك الله على هذا الأمر قال فقال رحمك الله على هذا الأمر

Here, Imam (a.s.) clearly gives his express and explicit

approval to Abdullah Ibn Abi Yaafoor about his Imamate.

On the same page of the book, a narration from al-Kafi, vol. 1, p.181, H. 5 has been indicated at that one of the companions of Imam Sadeq (a.s.) called Dhareeh, presents his beliefs to the Imam (a.s.) by taking the names of each of the Imams (a.s.) till he reaches to Imam Sadeq (a.s.) and says,

فَأَعَدْتُهَا عَلَيْهِ ثَلَاثَ مَرَّاتٍ فَقَالَ لِي إِنِّي  
إِنَّمَا حَدَّثْتُكَ لِتَكُونَ مِنْ شُهَدَاءِ اللَّهِ تَبَارَكَ وَتَعَالَى  
فِي أَرْضِهِ

Here too, Imam (a.s.) gives his consent to the narrator's belief and does not oppose his Imamate. The context of the narration completely indicates that Imam (a.s.) is saying that I am the Imam.

Another tradition upon which the author has relied upon (IkhteyaarMarefah al-Rejaal, al-Shaikh al-Toosi, vol. 2, pp. 565-567) is related to the time of the

martyrdom of Imam Sadeq (a.s.) as reported by Hisham Ibn Saalim that people had gathered around Abdullah Ibn Aftah. (Hisham) says that he along with Momin al-Taaqwent to Abdullah and posed him a few queries by which they understood that he is not an Imam because he was not knowing the answers to our questions. He continues,

فَحَرَجْنَا مِنْ عِنْدِهِ ضَلَالًا لَا نُنْذِرِي إِلَى  
أَيْنَ نَتَوَجَّهُ أَنَا وَأَبُو جَعْفَرِ الْأَحْوَلِ فَقَعَدْنَا فِي  
بَعْضِ أَرْقَةِ الْمَدِينَةِ بَاكِينَ حَيَارَى لَا نُنْذِرِي إِلَى  
أَيْنَ نَتَوَجَّهُ وَلَا مَنْ نَقْصِدُ وَنَقُولُ إِلَى الْمُرْجِنَةِ إِلَى  
الْقَدْرِيَّةِ إِلَى الزَّيْدِيَّةِ إِلَى الْمُعْتَزَلَةِ إِلَى الْخَوَارِجِ

Till someone guided us to the house of Imam Kazem (a.s.). He reports, "As soon as we entered, without asking us anything, Imam (a.s.) said, '...you must go neither to the Murjeah nor to the Qadariyyah nor to the Zaidiyyah nor to the Khawaarej. (You must come) to me (and he repeated it thrice).'" Thereafter, Hisham asked,

“Are you the Imam?” He (a.s.) replied,

مَا أَقُولُ ذَلِكَ قَالَ فَقُلْتُ فِي نَفْسِي لَمْ  
أَصِبْ طَرِيقَ الْمَسْأَلَةِ ثُمَّ قُلْتُ لَهُ جُعِلْتُ فِدَاكَ  
عَلَيْكَ إِمَامٌ قَالَ لَا....

Thus, it became clear to him that he (a.s.) is the Imam. Again, Hisham asked,

قُلْتُ جُعِلْتُ فِدَاكَ شَيْعَتُكَ وَشَيْعَةُ أَبِيكَ  
ضَلَالًا فَأَلْقَى إِلَيْهِمْ وَأَدْعُوهُمْ إِلَيْكَ وَقَدْ أَخَذْتُ عَلَيَّ  
الْكُتْمَانَ قَالَ مَنْ أَنْتَ مِنْهُ رُشْدًا فَأَلْقَى إِلَيْهِ وَخَذَ  
عَلَيْهِ الْكُتْمَانَ فَإِنْ أَدَاعُوا فَهُوَ الدَّبْحُ وَأَشَارَ بِيَدِهِ  
إِلَى حَلْقِهِ

In this tradition also, clearly the conditions of dissimulation (taqiyyah) after the martyrdom of Imam Sadeq (a.s.) have been hinted at, and Imam Kazem (a.s.) also in the text of the tradition, by pointing towards his neck, has shown that it was not possible for him to openly declare his Imamate. Anyways, by the questions and answers in the above narration, Imam Kazem (a.s.) has clearly introduced himself as the

Imam. Also, the narrator (Hisham) also believed that he (a.s.) is the Imam.

In another tradition, in Ikhteyaar-o-Marefah al-Rejaal of al-Shaikh al-Toosi (r.a.), vol. 2, pp. 727-728, the narrator says that two people came to Imam Sadeq (a.s.) and asked, “Is there anyone among you who considers himself as an Imam whose obedience is obligatory?” Imam (a.s.) replied, ما أمرتهم بذلك و لا قلت لهم أن يقولوه... They asked again, “Is there anybody who says such things about you?” Imam (a.s.) answered, ما

قال أ تعرفون الرجلين قلنا نعم هما  
رجلان من الزيدية، وهما يزعمان أن سيف  
رسول الله (ص) عند عبد الله بن الحسن، فقال  
كذبوا عليهم لعنة الله ثلاث مرات...

This narration is also about dissimulation in front of two men from the Zaidiyyah sect. After they have left, Imam Sadeq (a.s.) has clearly called himself as the Imam

and indicated at the signs of an Imam.

In another tradition too, in this very manner, Imam Sadeq (a.s.) has endorsed his Imamate. We refrain from mentioning it over here for the sake of brevity. Moreover, the topic of some traditions relied upon is the concealed of Imams' (a.s.) secrets and Imam (a.s.) says that don't relate our positions and secrets to everyone because everyone does not have the capacity to bear them. But the question arises is that how the author on the basis of these traditions – incidentally most of them are clearly speaking about the Imamate of Imam Sadeq's (a.s.) Imamate and one or two of them also evidently talk about the conditions of dissimulation – can conclude that he (a.s.) was not inclined on calling himself as the Imam and consequently, some Shias went after the Zaidiyyah and Hasani Sayeds. Where such concepts have been reported in history? Who were the

people that after the Imam's refusal to revolt claimed that we have joined ranks with the Zaidiyyah or the Hasanis? Such reports are there about some of the Waaqefiyyah and their names have also been recorded. But there is absolutely no mention of anyone joining the Hasani Sayeds. Likewise, fifteen days after the martyrdom of Nafs Zakiyyah, the Qaem (a.t.f.s.) will rise, has no link with Hasani Sayeds. Rather, it is a narration which talks about the signs of his reappearance. The fact is that the Hasani Sayeds by applying the concept of Nafs-e-Zakiyyah to Abdullah Ibn Hasan's son, in a way wanted to use this idea to gather some people around them. But the author does not cite any evidence to prove that the Shias were inclined towards Nafs-e-Zakiyyah.

Endnotes:

---

<sup>1</sup>Here, it is necessary that we relate an important feature of the book. That is, the respected author, while citing the references in the footnotes, has provided for the assessment of the opinions and conclusions of the texts, although it can be observed that the plethora of references may instil awe in the readers or at least, dissuade them from cross-checking them for their correctness.